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Abstract
The Tea Party Movement as a Modern Incarnation of Nativism in the United States and Its Role in American Electoral Politics, 2009-2014
by
Albert Choi

Advisor: Professor Frances Piven

The Tea Party movement has been a keyword in American politics since its inception in 2009. Widely regarded as having helped the Republican Party to engineer a comeback during the elections of 2010, the Tea Party movement offered the American public a Republican agenda that was distinguishable from the Bush era by limiting its talking points to issues such as fiscal discipline and budget deficit. However, fact that the image of Republicans changed because of the Tea Party presence and the Republican focus on fiscal issues leaves whether the Republican agenda as influenced by Tea Partiers changed much in substance from the Bush era a very open question. In this regard, I argue in this paper that the Tea Party movement should be seen as a modern incarnation of the recurrent streak of nativism in the United States, whose early forms included the Anti-Masonic movement, the "Know-Nothing" ("American") Party of 1856, and was succeeded by modern political movements such as the second Ku Klux Klan, the John Birch Society, "the religious right" of the late 20th Century and the Tea Party movement.

The Tea Party movement's nature as a modern incarnation of nativism would be made clear in a number of traits shown by the movement and its supporters, including their tendency to view themselves as the true "Americans" while viewing the opposition as those conspiring against the United States. This trait, as will be observed, will result in the Tea Party movement possessing a rigid, dogmatic nature that made it incapable of making a compromise. The Tea Party movement would have develop an embittered
relationship with the Republican leadership largely due to its unwillingness to compromise even with its own camp. This tension would heighten during the Republican primaries in 2010 and 2012, when Tea Party favorites such as Mike Lee, Joe Miller and Christine O'Donnell defeating the more established Republican figures, and culminate during the primaries of 2013 when business interests funded establishment figure Bradley Byrne over Tea Party favorite Dean Young, and Tea Party-backed Ken Cuccinelli lost the Virginia gubernatorial election to Democrat Terry McAuliffe after having been badly outfunded by McAuliffe throughout the campaign. Conservative business organizations such as the United States Chamber of Commerce heavily contributed to Byrne's campaign, reflecting the business interests' souring relationship with the Tea Party movement.

The setbacks in 2013 notwithstanding, Tea Party favorite Dave Brat's upset victory over House Majority leader Eric Cantor led to speculation that the Tea Party movement was, after all, on a comeback trail. In this paper, I specifically argue against such a position given the facts that 1) Brat's victory will likely do little to alter the American public's perception of the Tea Party movement, which has been consistently highly unfavorable, 2) Nor is Brat's victory, which took place in a Republican primary in a solidly conservative district, likely to change the big picture in national or even statewide context, and 3) it is doubtful if Cantor's defeat does much to change the business interests' contribution to the Republican candidates running against a Tea Party candidate in primaries (in any event, Cantor's defeat would make businesses more vigilant in countering Tea Party insurgencies), and 4) the changing demographics in the United States indicates that nativist politics as practiced by the Tea Party movement will have less appeal in the United States as a whole as time progresses. In conclusion, I will argue that the Tea Party movement's nature as a modern incarnation of nativism, while having made it a powerful movement within a short period of time, has made it largely incapable reaching a compromise with not just the opposition but also the Republicans, thereby convincing established figures within the Republican Party that it was more of a liability than an asset for the Republicans as a whole.
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I. Introduction

The Tea Party movement has been the keyword in discussing conservative politics in the United States since the early days of the presidency of Barack Obama. Having formed shortly after Obama’s inauguration, the Tea Party movement began as something of a grassroots organization with loose platforms whose focus was on fiscal conservatism and budget balance. The movement’s supporters came from largely the same demographics that twice supported George W. Bush as the president of the United States – white, native, economically comfortable, and often more religiously observant than Americans at large. Yet, the Tea Party agenda somewhat differed from the conservative agenda of the Bush era. Whereas the Bush era conservatives pushed on their agenda in issues ranging from social issues such as ban on partial-birth abortion and on “War on Terrorism,” the Tea Partiers, at least when acting as a coherent force, limited their agenda to fiscal issues and loosely defined “American values.”

The Tea Party movement began to receive extensive media coverage from the conservative press almost immediately after its existence became noticed. Industrialists and interest organizations such as the Koch Brothers and FreedomWorks soon followed the suit, as both avidly promoted their version of the Tea Party agenda and the latter helped founding the Tea Party Patriots, a nationwide organization that promotes the Tea Party agenda, especially its fiscal conservatism.

The emergence of the Tea Party Movement was followed by a major Republican comeback in the 2010 midterm elections. The Republican resurgence in the 2010 elections was unique in that a large portion of the Republican voters that year were members or sympathizers of something of a grassroots civic movement in Tea Party. Traditionally, an electoral comeback by the minority party in American politics had been engineered by the party leadership in what one would describe as a “top-down” approach, with Newt Gingrich’s “Contract with America” of 1994 serving as a vivid recent example. In a “top-down”
approach, prominent figures in the minority party formulate the agenda for the upcoming election to turn out votes from the party’s electorate and persuade swing voters to vote for them. In the 2010 elections, the Republican agenda was formed largely by the discourse promoted by a ragtag coalition of Tea Party groups and media pundits who claimed to speak on their behalf, rather than established party leaders. Thus, the 2010 election arguably marked the first time in the history of American conservative politics where an electoral comeback was engineered not by party leaders but by a movement created by rank-and-file members within the party.

From a historical perspective, the Tea Party movement has a number of similarities with the recurrent streak of nativism in the United States. Nativism in the United States often came out in a form where one group (usually white, Protestant, non-immigrants) considered itself and its value system “American” while accusing other groups – often immigrants, the colored, or non-Protestants – of being un-American or running afoul of “American” values. Examples from United States history include radical Puritanism in early colonial years (as seen in the Salem Witch Trials), the anti-Masonic movement in early 19th century, the anti-Catholic “Know-Nothing” Party in 1856, and, most recently, the emergence of evangelical Christian fundamentalism and the discourse of “culture war.”

Many have observed that Tea Partiers played the central role in reinvigorating the Republican Party after a humiliating defeat suffered at the 2008 general elections, thus creating the right atmosphere for the Republican resurgence in the midterm elections of 2010. Notwithstanding the validity of this claim (which we will observe more closely in Chapter IV of this essay), it seems clear that a large portion of those who voted Republican in 2010 sympathized with the Tea Party agenda. Indeed, while campaigning for the 2010 elections, the Republicans focused on the issues largely raised by Tea Party groups such as

---

a Assuming that the contemporary conservative politics in the United States began with the nomination of Barry Goldwater as the presidential candidate in 1964, as is widely agreed.
budget balance, opposition to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (“Obamacare”), and, if in a somewhat more tacit manner, the “birther” debate surrounding Obama’s U.S. citizenship.

The Tea Party movement has been characterized as both a spontaneous grassroots movement by its supporters and a faux-grassroots movement that is funded by outside interests by its critics. While it is true that outside interests such as FreedomWorks have injected considerable resources to Tea Party groups and advocated for Tea Party agenda at Washington, it seems fair to suggest that the Tea Party movement does have some grassroots characteristics in that 1) it does not have a central governing body that coordinates the nationwide Tea Party agenda, and 2) it does not seem to comply with the wishes of the established figures in the Republican Party or even the organizations that initially supported the Tea Party movement. The “bottom-up” nature of the Tea Party movement, as shown in the above characteristics, led the movement to start an insurgency en masse within the Republican Party, which resulted in the ascent of candidates who strictly followed the Tea Party agenda on various issues running under the Republican ticket – often at the expense of the more moderate, electable candidates.

The Tea Party insurgency against the Republican establishment began as early as the 2010 elections. At the time, the Tea Party movement was seen by conservatives in the United States (by and large) as a vehicle through which the conservative America could fight back against the Obama Administration’s liberal agenda. Empowered with what they likely saw as a mandate from conservative voters across the country, the Tea Party activists began to challenge established Republican candidates that they deemed not sufficiently conservative in state and local primaries, and got their way in numerous instances. Indeed, about one-third of the Republican elects for the House of Representatives from the 2010 election were freshman, many of whom were elected with hefty Tea Party support. Republican leaders such as House Minority Leader John Boehner refrained from speaking unfavorably about the Tea Partiers, as doing so would have alienated a very large and vocal group of Republican voters that year.
Up until that point, it seemed that the Tea Party movement was to become a long-term political force to be reckoned with, shifting the Republican Party (and possibly the United States as a whole) to a further rightward direction.

However, the honeymoon between the Republican Party at large and Tea Party activists did not last very long. This was largely due to the fact that the Tea Partiers were unwilling to make a compromise with the opposition or even non-Tea Party Republicans when their agenda was bound to be perceived as too conservative by the general public. The Republican comeback at the 2010 elections was made possible largely because of the fact that 1) the newly elected president’s party generally tends to poorly in midterm elections, and 2) the passage of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act made it easy for Republicans to generate votes from its conservative base through the sense of fear and uncertainty the legislation created for many conservative voters. As such, the electoral performance of the Tea Party-influenced Republican Party began to struggle after the 2010 elections, as will be discussed in detail in Chapter IV of this essay.

The Tea Party candidates’ lack of appeal among moderate, nonideological voters began to show in the 2012 elections, as Tea Party candidates often alienated the general electorate with their agenda and found themselves in losing end as a result. Also, the “bottom-up” nature of the Tea Party movement meant that it pushed its conservative agenda even when it went against business interests, with the most vivid example being the Tea Party stance on immigration issues. This, of course, came to the dismay of the Republican establishment and business interests, which increasingly viewed the Tea Party movement as more of a liability than an asset in advancing their agenda. By 2014, indeed, business interests such as the Chamber of Commerce have made clear that they parted ways with the Tea Party movement.
The purpose of this essay is as follows. First, I would like to revisit the argument that the Tea Party movement can be seen as a reincarnation of the recurrent nativist streak in American politics. I intend to do so by 1) assessing the history of nativism in the United States prior to the emergence of the modern incarnations of nativism in the “religious right,” of the late 20th Century, and by 2) observing how the “religious right” and the Tea Party movement reflected the recurrent streak of nativism in the United States. Then, I will investigate how the Tea Party Movement became one of the driving forces for the Republican resurgence in the 2010 elections by offering the Republican Party a talking point that seemed to be different from the Republican agenda from the Bush era. Afterwards, I intend to assess how the “bottom-up” origin of the Tea Party movement resulted in the movement challenging the established figures within the Republican Party. This, as we will observe, would convince the Republican establishment to distance itself from the movement under the belief that the Tea Partiers are bad for national support and threatening for its own job security. The tension between the hard-line Tea Partiers and the Republican establishment would continue to escalate well into 2013 to 2014, when major corporate donors to the Republican Party ceased their support of the Tea Party movement and the Tea Partiers continued their insurgencies within the Republican ranks, resulting in events such as the government shutdown of 2013 and the defeat of House Majority Leader Eric Cantor in the Republican primary in his district. This tension, as I will demonstrate, would confirm the observation that the Tea Party movement should be viewed in the context of the recurrent streak of nativism in the United States rather than either a continuum of mere conservatism (i.e. from the days of Robert Taft and William Buckley) or a bona fide movement for a smaller government and fiscal responsibility. In concluding this essay, I will observe how the Tea Party movement, despite having been central in re-energizing the Republican Party during the Obama years, has also proven to be a substantial liability to the Republican Party on a national scale, and will offer an observation that the Tea Party movement, despite its limited resurgence in recent months (as of July 2014, as shown in the Tea Party insurgents’
ouster of Cantor), will likely have a waning hold on the national politics as well as within the Republican ranks, and that the current form of American nativism, which heavily depends on white, native, older Americans for support, is unsustainable as a political force in a long run given the changing demographic structure of the United States.
II. Nativist Politics in the United States from the Salem Witch Trials to the Presidential Election of 1968.

The Tea Party movement could be seen as a descendant of the recurrent streak of nativism in the United States politics. For the purpose of this essay, nativism in the United States is defined as a political movement inspired by 1) the sense of self-righteousness held by the groups that believe themselves as those who extol the “American” values, and 2) the resentment these groups feel against anyone they perceive as a threat in maintaining these “American” values in society.\(^b\) The term “American” values, of course, have been highly amorphous over the years, as what qualifies as “American” has changed drastically over the years. Nativist movements, however, constructed “American” largely based on their own image of what “America” was, allowing them to frame those who do not fit in their standard on being “American” as a threat to “America” (e.g. “un-American”). The groups that were accused of failing to adhere to “American” values encompassed a wide array of groups other than immigrants, although immigrants groups have almost always been a target. The question of how the Tea Party movement reflects such belief will be discussed in detail in the third and fourth chapters of this paper.

Nativism in the United States formed under the belief that the United States was exceptional among countries because of the divine providence it received, and that influences from outside constitute a threat to the United States’ exceptionality in the world. In his book *The Party of Fear*, historian David Bennett argues that the nativist sentiment, which was based on the belief that the United States was a country that received a divine guidance to lead the world to enlightenment, led to the fear that influence from overseas may endanger the ideals upon which the country was founded upon.\(^1\) The nativists’ fear on foreign influences in the United States, according to Bennett, naturally led to a strict dichotomy between the “true” Americans and those conspiring to undermine it.\(^2\) The nativist school of

\(^b\) The definition above is in accordance with history of nativism in the United States, as I will show in this chapter.
thought, as will be observed in this chapter, has had a long history in the United States and continues to wield a considerable degree of influence, with its modern incarnations being evangelical Christian fundamentalism of the late 20th Century and the Tea Party movement beginning in 2009.

The Tea Party movement could be seen as a direct descendant of nativist movements in the United States in the following respects. First, supporters of the Tea Party movement have shown tendencies to identify themselves as those who embrace the “American” values while accusing those with different views as un-“American.” This allowed Tea Party supporters to frame their movement as an endeavor to restore “America” from those who seek to undermine it. In addition, the Tea Party movement comes from largely the same demographics the historical nativist movements originated. Historically, nativist movements in the United States have been led by demographics characterized as white, Protestant, and socially conservative. While modern incarnations of nativist movements have incorporated some members who do not fit into this description (e.g. Catholics, African-Americans, among others), they still were mostly led by largely similar demographics that led nativist movements of the past. Indeed, surveys show that the Tea Party movement garnered most of its support from conservative white Protestants who often lived in rural areas – the same demographics that had been the support base for nativism for many years.

Nativism in the United States has lived on through various forms of incarnations including the harsh, dogmatic Puritanism of early colonies, movements against Catholicism, immigrants and even the Masonic order during the 19th Century, the emergence of the second Ku Klux Klan in the 1920s. Also, the “red scare” of the early 20th Century and the emergence of the John Birch Society marked the politics of anti-Communism in the United States, the negative aspects of which culminated during the McCarthyism era in the early 1950s. Another incarnation of nativist movement in the 20th Century was the rise of evangelical Christian fundamentalism, which has been a potent political force since the late 1970s and was one of the prominent factors of American conservative politics until the 2008 elections.
The earliest incidence of what could be described as a “nativist” political phenomenon (as defined earlier) took place during the colonial years in New England in what became known as the Salem witch trials. The Salem witch trials began when a group of young women, which included a beggar, an alleged adultress, and a female slave from the West Indies, were accused of practicing witchcraft and sent to trial for that accusation. At the time, New England was governed under strict Puritan standards. Deviating from this rule often meant not only deprivation of liberty or property, but death - indeed, the accused were eventually convicted to death and were executed. The rigid, intolerant nature of Puritans fit squarely into the definition of “nativism” for the purpose of this essay in that the Puritans felt a sense of self-righteousness as a group who extolled the virtue of their society, and cast those who deviated from their value system as an inherent threat. Constructing outsiders as an inherent threat to the established order justified the use of violence as means to keep such threat at bay – at the Salem witch trials, such violence was deemed to justify the accused for having violated the “laws of God” for failing to live according to the Puritan lifestyle.

Nativism in the United States during the 19th Century often took the forms of what one would describe as a movement of a “bottom-up” origin. The nature of nativist movements during this era as a “bottom-up” rather than “top-down” movements was perhaps caused by the fact that unlike the Puritan rulers of New England in the 17th Century, the founding figures of the United States showed little sign of religious fanaticism. Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, was quoted as saying that “the legitimate powers of government extend to such acts only as are injurious to others, and (specifically) that “it does me no injury for my neighbour to say there are twenty gods, or no god. It neither picks my pocket nor breaks my leg.” Benjamin Franklin, another crucial figure during the American struggle for independence, stated that “as for Jesus of Nazareth ... I think the system of Morals and Religion as he left them to us, the best the World ever saw ... but I have ... some Doubts to his Divinity; though' it is a Question I do not dogmatism upon, having never studied it, and think it is
needless to busy myself with it now — reflecting a view that hardly resembled the rigid Puritanism of the early colonies or early religious leaders such as Jonathan Edwards.

The views of the American political elite as shown in the words of Jefferson and Franklin indicate that the notion that 1) the United States was founded on a divine providence of God (i.e. that is governed by religious rather than secular principles), and 2) foreign influences, including immigrants and Catholicism, necessarily constituted a threat to the United States was something that was not embraced by the founding figures of the United States. Indeed, nativist movements during the 19th Century were organized as a movement against the establishment rather than as a movement using government institutions as a vehicle (as in the Salem witch trials), as the political establishment during this era did not subscribe to the nativist account of “America.” Like their successors in the modern era, nativists of the 19th Century perceived their movements as part of a struggle against the just, virtuous “us” (i.e. real “Americans”) against the corrupt, unjust “them” (political establishment, immigrants, etc.), in what would later become a recurring theme in nativist movements in the United States. The prominent nativist movements in the 19th Century were the Anti-Masonic movement of the early 19th Century and the “Know-Nothing” Party that garnered a considerable support during the 1856 Presidential election.

The Anti-Masonic movement began as a movement against the Freemasons; with the Freemasonry being a secret fraternal organization that did have a considerable degree of influence at the time. Supporters of the Anti-Masonic movement alleged that the secret nature of the Masonic order made the members of these groups unaccountable to the public, making their occupation of public position detrimental to the republican principles the United States had been founded upon. The Anti-Masons’ suspicion against the Freemasons extended to Catholics as well — the idea here was that Catholics, like the Freemasons, were a threat to the American republic because of their allegiance to the papal authority (for the masons, the brotherhood). The Anti-Masons’ tirade against outside influences such as the Masonic order and the Catholic Church, as seen here, reflected the nativist fear against
these groups forming a conspiracy against the United States and the republican mode of governance therein. Thus, the Anti-Masonic movement began what would become a staple of nativist movements in the United States – the politics of conspiracy, where nativists would allege groups other than themselves as plotting against America and the values it stands for.

The “Know-Nothing” Party, whose official name was the American Party, marked the first instance where the nativists voiced their disapproval of both newcomers they perceived as threatening to existing American order (in their case, Catholics), and established politicians they considered as corrupt and incapable. The “Know-Nothing” opposition to Catholicism was largely based on the nativist belief that Papal leaders, who ostensibly controlled Catholic immigrants and citizens in the United States, were forming a conspiracy to destroy the republican form of government in America. Aside from their embrace of the politics of conspiracy in a similar manner with the Anti-Masonic movement, the “Know-Nothing” movement was unique in starting a trend where a nativist movement would include not only the groups generally perceived as being relative newcomers or outsiders in American society (e.g. immigrants, “liberals,” etc.) but established politicians who were viewed as incapable and corrupt. The rhetoric where the nativists saw themselves as those who embraced genuine American values and would denounce established politicians as failing to adhere to such values would later become a recurring theme in nativist movements in the United States.

Nativism in the United States lived on well into the 20th Century. During the early part of that century, various nativist movements, including the second Ku Klux Klan, were instrumental in advancing a nativist agenda that was in large part based on the belief that groups such as immigrants, Catholics and Communists were conspiring to destroy the United States. Like their predecessors in the 19th Century, the nativists of this era including the Klansmen saw themselves as protectors of the “American” values.

Indeed, the Presidential Election of 1856 featured former president Millard Fillmore, now backed by the nativist-leaning Know-Nothing Party, receiving more than 20% of the popular vote against Democrat James Buchanan and anti-slavery Republican John C. Fremont.
while viewing the opposition as a threat to preserving such values. The nativist agenda advanced between World War I and the Great Depression (1918-1929) included 1) the passage of the 18th Amendment, which prohibited the “manufacture, sale, or transportation” of alcoholic beverage in the United States, 2) the reconstruction of “American” identity under the nativist viewpoint that the United States was founded as a bastion for strict Protestantism, the idea that was heavily influenced by the nativists’ profound distrust of immigrants, newcomers and other social minorities.

[Figure i] KKK poster portraying the Klan as the “defender of the 18th Amendment” shows the nativist belief where the virtuous support the amendment and the corrupt, debouched (with a connotation that many of them are elites) are seen as consumers of alcoholic beverages.

[Figure courtesy of Wikimedia]

One of the political events where nativists played a defining role was the passage of the 18th Amendment. Restrictions on sale and consumption of alcohol was generally supported by rural
Protestant population and opposed by urban immigrant communities. While supporters of greater regulation of alcohol and/or prohibition included many of those who did so in good faith (i.e. based on actual concerns about alcohol abuse at the time rather than on hatred of certain ethnic groups), these groups did not have enough strength to push for legislation that regulates alcohol use or consumption, let alone a Constitutional Amendment. This required the good-faith prohibitionists, such as the Anti-Saloon League and Women’s Christian Temperance Union, to seek an ally in advancing their cause.

The good-faith supporters of prohibition found a powerful ally for that purpose in Americans with nativist impulses. This was because many nativists associated consumption of alcohol with those who they perceived as threatening America: immigrants such as Catholics and Jews, corrupt businessmen and politicians, urban dwellers at large, and, last but not least, the Communists. The outbreak of nativist (mostly anti-German) tendencies after the beginning of American involvement in World War I gave nativists and their good-faith prohibitionist allies enough momentum to obtain approval from 36 out of 48 states as required for a Constitutional Amendment. During its years of existence (1919-1933), prohibition resulted in a dramatic rise in organized crime – many of whose prominent figures came from the immigrant groups whose influence the nativist wanted to curb. Prohibition also created a significant health hazard for those who consumed alcoholic beverages produced by illicit distilleries, while doing very little to reduce the consumption of alcohol: while consumption of alcohol initially decreased during the years prohibition was enforced, the degree of decrease was rather insignificant and was followed by a rebound. Therefore, it was probably the general change of diet rather than prohibition that reduced the American public’s alcohol consumption that was deemed as excessive. Thus, the passage and enforcement of the 18th Amendment, which was believed to reduce the immigrant influence by nativists and promote the general public’s health by good-faith prohibitionists, managed to achieve neither goal in the end.
The nativist support for the 18th Amendment, which was largely based on the nativists’ sentiment against immigrant communities, reflected the nativists’ fear that ethnic minorities and newcomers such as Jews, Catholics and African-Americans constituted a threat to the United States. One of the prominent groups that openly embraced the nativist agenda during this era was the second Ku Klux Klan, which began to form around 1915. The original Ku Klux Klan had formed during the “reconstruction” era after the Civil War and disappeared a few years afterwards as “reconstruction” itself faded away after the Presidential election of 1876, where southern states were guaranteed an autonomy equivalent to the pre-war years (thus eliminating the need for violent resistance). The second Klan, in this respect, had a somewhat wider agenda than its predecessor. Whereas the original Klan was a nearly single-issue organization that condemned the federal authorities trying to reshape the racially segregated institution of the South, the second Klan condemned a very wide variety of ethnic, social and ideological groups, including Jews, Catholics, and Communists, which it perceived as a threat to the existing order. In this regard, the second Klan probably had more resemblance with the Know-Nothings of the 1850s than the original Klan in that it 1) was formed by rural Protestant groups across the nation rather than in the South, 2) reflected the rural Protestant America’s fear and uncertainty with newcomers to the country (e.g. Catholics, Jews, Communists, etc.), and 3) positioned itself as the movement based on “American” (i.e. nativist) values while treating the opposition as those running afoul of those values.

The second Klan’s plea against Catholic, Jews, and other immigrants as well as other groups such as African-Americans and Communists made it a powerful grassroots organization with a national appeal. The second Klan’s nationwide appeal attested to the continuing presence of the same demographics that took part in earlier nativist movements such as the Anti-Masonic movement and the Know-Nothing Party. Indeed, the main demographics of both nativism of the 19th Century and the second Klan was the native Protestants generally disfavoring societal changes in both their communities and America as a whole, the group that neither declined in their numerical strength nor changed much in character. The
success of D.W. Griffith’s film *The Birth of a Nation*, based on a novel titled *The Klansman* written by Baptist minister Thomas Dixon, demonstrated how the national rather than Southern audience was willing to embrace the romanticized account about a group that was the sign of horror for many African-Americans in the reconstruction era. Klan members controlled important elected in the union states of Indiana and California, demonstrating how the second Klan was a nationwide movement based on nativist sentiments rather than a parochial movement merely nostalgic of the antebellum South. About 30% of native white men in the Union State of Indiana were members of the Klan during the 1920s,19 with its governor, Edward L. Jackson, being a known Klan member.20 The Klan had a presence in city governments in California such as Anaheim21 and San Diego, where Klan activity was focused on actions against Mexican immigrants as well as Jews and African-Americans.22 The Klan’s stance against the immigrants and those who did not share their values at large would be reprised by its nativist successors, as shown in the evangelical Christian fundamentalists’ belief in a “war” between the virtuous (i.e. themselves) and immoral, and later the Tea Party movement’s tirade against both those they perceived as running afoul of the values the United States was founded upon, and the immigrants, undocumented or not, who they perceived as inherently a threat to the character that has defined the United States.

The nativist influence in American politics during early 20th Century began to wane shortly before and during the presidency of Franklin D. Roosevelt. The second Klan, after reaching its pinnacle in around 1924, went out of vogue by the end of the decade. Also, the reversal of the 18th Amendment in 1933, along with Roosevelt’s election the same year, marked the end of an era where the nativist America was a dominant force in politics of the United States. This, however, did not mark the death or even decline of nativism itself. The demographics that comprised nativist groups such as the second Klan neither declined in numbers nor curbed their nativist belief. The continuation of segregation in the South and the popularity of nativist discourses in traditional nativist strongholds such as the South and Midwest attest to this fact. Also, the Democrats’ status as the predominant party during the New Deal era was
made possible only with the inclusion of Southern Democrats – which necessarily implied condoning the South’s post-“reconstruction” institutions such as segregation. In practice, therefore, the New Deal coalition, ostensibly the symbol of liberal consensus of the era, was a rather precarious alliance with a heavy presence of members with nativist impulse.

Nativism as a political discourse was alive and well even during the heyday of FDR’s New Deal Agenda, although it never enjoyed enough support to comprise majority of the general public. Popular discourses among the demographics traditionally susceptible to nativism often portrayed Roosevelt as part of a communist conspiracy against the United States. Nativist radio pundits such as Father Charles E. Coughlin, who was one of the most popular political commentators of the era, often echoed such claims with little substantiation.23 The nativist opposition to Roosevelt based on these conspiracy theories highly resembled the allegations advanced by supporters of the Anti-Masonic movement and the “Know-Nothing”s in that it reflected 1) the conspiracy theorists’ belief that they were those who protected “American” values, and 2) their tendency to suspect anyone who did not follow what they believed and/or constructed as “American” values of taking part in a worldwide conspiracy against the United States (let it be Freemasons, Catholics, or communists). The politics of conspiracy as displayed here would play an important role in nativist politics well after the New Deal era, as will be observed in this chapter.

Another reason why the rather strong nativist presence during the New Deal era tends to be overlooked was the inclusion of Southern Democrats in the New Deal coalition. This was because the South’s incorporation into Roosevelt’s coalition, while having created an impression that it was now part of the liberal coalition in favor of the New Deal, did very little to change the South’s political landscape. Indeed, Southern United States during the New Deal era was characterized by 1) the support for Roosevelt’s economic policies, 2) under the same institutions that disenfranchised African-Americans and even some poor whites from the region’s political system, 3) which was largely condoned by the Democratic
leadership at the time, which found it necessary to retain the South as a solid Democratic hold. The precarious nature of the South and the Democratic Party’s marriage of convenience meant that the South was ready to resort to the nativist impulse of old if the Southern institutions of racial segregation were to be challenged by the Democratic leadership.

Southern United States had been a Democratic stronghold ever since the South regained its status as full-fledged states (i.e. that can vote in national elections) in the 1876 elections, earning it the nickname “Solid South.” The moniker “Solid South” attached for a good reason: Democrats carried nearly every Southern state in presidential elections from 1876 to 1944, even when the Democrats gained less than 30% of the overall national vote, as in 1924. The only exception to this rule came when the Democrats nominated New York Governor Alfred Smith, who represented the interests of urban dwellers and Catholic and Jewish immigrants, as the presidential candidate in 1928. 24 The South’s allegiance to the Democratic Party stemmed from 1) the fact that the Republican Party at the time represented the interests of business elites and middle-class of the Northeast, which invited ample resentment from white Southerners, and 2) the Democratic Party’s willingness to condone the segregation policies of the South that resurged after the end of the “reconstruction” years.

Nativist beliefs, such as the sense of resentment against non-Protestant immigrants, remained intact in Southern United States during the New Deal era. Nativist allegations about Roosevelt’s presidency being involved in a communist conspiracy against the United States found little support in Southern states, as Southerners themselves benefited from federal programs that provided relief for those who became economically displaced because of the Great Depression, and because the Democratic leadership at the time, including Roosevelt himself, never seriously challenged the discriminatory institutions of the South. Nativist tendencies against groups such as immigrants and African-Americans, however, went virtually unchecked. The good indicator of the persistence of nativism in the South during this era is the Klan membership of important government figures. Hugo Black, a Democratic Senator from Alabama who
later became an associate justice for the United States Supreme Court, was an active member of the second Klan during the early years of his political career. Future president pro tempore Robert C. Byrd (born 1911) was the leading figure in a local Klan chapter as late as the 1940s. Conditions for African-Americans, not surprisingly, did not improve much. The ghastly practice of lynching remained a commonplace threat to African-Americans in the region. Interracial marriage was banned by criminal law, something that was repealed as late as 1967 by the Supreme Court’s ruling in *Loving v. Virginia*.

As seen in the foregoing evidences, the South’s nativist tendencies remained intact during the New Deal years, although somewhat masked by the fact that it was part of the coalition that supported New Deal policies. The South’s incorporation into the nativist politics of conspiracy, however, would not take place until the 1960s, when the Democratic Party, led by Texas native Lyndon B. Johnson, began to tackle race issues in the South in an aggressive manner.

Nativism as a political discourse began to slowly re-emerge as a dominant discourse in American politics after the end of World War II. The two driving forces of nativist resurgence during this era were Roosevelt’s death, which marked the departure of the leader of the New Deal coalition, and the rise of communism as a potent threat to the United States as the war’s aftermath. After the conclusion of World War II, the Soviet Union had aggressively expanded its sphere of influence to encompass virtually all parts of Eastern Europe and eastern parts of Germany it occupied during the war, making the need to contain the Soviet threat on Europe, Asia, and other regions a legitimate concern. Indeed, U.S. Presidents, such as Harry Truman and former Allied Forces commander-in-chief Dwight D. Eisenhower adopted measures reacting to the Soviet threat based on the idea of “containment,” which aimed to limit the scope of Soviet expansion to the areas already taken over by the Soviets. For the emerging school of hard-line anti-communists, however, “containment” was not good enough, even when it worked. For them, the Soviet Union and communism were the enemies that had to be defeated at all costs. In so arguing, the hard-line anti-communists alleged those who disagreed with them—many of
them anti-communists who favored a more cautious strategy in dealing with Soviet threat— as a part of a conspiracy to bring down America.

The hard-liners’ rhetoric of conspiracy against America was something that could be traced to the rhetoric employed by past nativist movements in the United States. Supporters of the Anti-Masonic movement accused members of the Freemasonry of forming a conspiracy against the American republic. For Know-Nothings of the 1850s, Catholics, taking orders from the papal leader in Italy, were conspiring to destroy the democratic rule in the United States. Nativist groups of the early 20th Century such as the second Ku Klux Klan found newcomers and minorities such as Jews, Catholics and African-Americans as threatening to the existing social order. For the hard-line anti-communists, the communist threat did not end at the border along the “Iron Curtain.” Rather, the real threat existed within the border, by those who were conspiring to be “soft” to communism and hinder America from achieving a complete victory over the Soviet threat. Here, the hard-liners framed themselves as a common man who remained loyal to the United States, while framing the opposition as the corrupt, unreliable elites who were not accountable to the people and were disloyal and self-serving.

The notion of elites in Washington being part of a communist-led conspiracy against America found an ample, ready pool of subscribers in the general public, especially among the demographics that have been susceptible to nativist movements of the past – white, native, and Protestant. These allegations of conspiracy soon had an effect in government, too. The House Un-American Committee, initially viewed as a wartime measure, became a standing (i.e. permanent) committee by 1945 and began to investigate multiple individuals including government figures based on the allegation that they were spies for the Soviet Union. One of the most well-known incidents involving HUAC was the investigation of Alger Hiss, who was alleged of being a Soviet spy from 1938 to 1945 – Hiss would be convicted of perjury in a case where many believed the prosecution failed to find Hiss’s guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.28 29 The American public’s embrace of the theory of communist conspiracy to bring down America reinvigorated
the once dormant nativist movements to a large degree. The noteworthy nativist phenomena during this era included the emergence of hard-line anti-communist groups with strong nativist tendencies such as the John Birch Society, and the rise of the politics of communist conspiracy in McCarthyism.

The John Birch Society was founded in 1958 by a businessman named Robert W. Welch and named after John Birch, an American intelligence officer who saw action and was killed in China during World War II. Industrialist Fred C. Koch, the father of the Koch Brothers, was one of the founding members of the society. The main agenda of the John Birch Society included the following issues: First, the society strongly believed in a notion that there were agents within the U.S. government who were conspiring with foreign entities (here, the Soviet Union) to destroy and/or undermine the United States. For the “Birchers,” as the society’s members were often called, the communist-inspired conspiracy against the United States came from not only the Soviet Union but other international institutions such as the United Nations. The Birchers’ unwillingness to work with foreign entities even when they did not have direct ties with the actual enemy reflected their profound distrust of foreigners at large and their firm belief in foreign agents, along with their American collaborators, forming a conspiracy against the United States.

Another and perhaps more historically important aspect of the agenda promoted by the John Birch Society was its stern opposition to what it perceived as government intrusion on either individual liberty or states’ rights. The Birchers’ allegation of tyranny by federal government was often closely intertwined with their unshakeable knowledge about the vast communist conspiracy against the United States as well as the endeavor to end racial segregation the South. One of the most bizarre incidents in this regard took place during the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s, where the Birches, in expressing their opposition to the Civil Rights protests, who were protesting unequal treatment of African-Americans in Southern United States, asserted that the Civil Rights movement was “deliberately and wholly created” by communist influence. The Birches were not alone in their belief in the dubious link between the
Civil Rights movement and communist conspiracy; a *TIME* article in 1962 reports an incident where a Southern white protestors against the Civil Rights movement chanting "Kennedy is out to destroy America [i.e. by endeavoring to repeal segregation in the South] because he is a sick, sick Communist."\(^{36}\)

McCarthyism was a political phenomenon based on the allegation that members of the United States government were taking part in a Soviet/communist-led conspiracy to destroy the United States. The leading figure of the phenomenon was Joseph McCarthy, a Republican senator from Wisconsin who defeated longtime Wisconsin incumbent Robert La Follette with the slogan “tailgunner Joe,” a reference to his service as an aircraft gunner at the Pacific theater of World War II.\(^{37}\) Once elected as a senator, McCarthy continuously advanced the notion that there were those within the United States who are collaborating with the Soviet Union in a communist plot to destroy the United States. To this end, McCarthy made numerous allegations against both government figures and private individuals while managing to substantiate very little—if any—portion of his allegations, as McCarthy, a longtime alcoholic, struggled to merely keep sober most of the time. McCarthy’s tirades were put to an end after the Senate censured him by an overwhelming (67 to 22) margin\(^{38}\) after a botched attempt to accuse officers of the Armed Forces in an alleged communist conspiracy.\(^{39}\) \(^{40}\)

What was remarkable about McCarthy’s crusade was its resonance and longevity despite 1) McCarthy’s failure to substantiate much of his allegations, and 2) his lack of popularity with the general American public. Although popular among hard-line anti-communists and nativist groups such as the Birchers, McCarthy never enjoyed a widespread popularity among the general public – Gallup polls at the time show that McCarthy largely fell out of the public’s favor as early as April 1954, some eight months before the Senate passed the censure against him.\(^{41}\) This brings us to an interesting aspect of McCarthyism – the fact that McCarthy and his supporters viewed whoever disagreed with McCarthy’s allegations, even when they comprised a good majority of the public and had substantive evidence to support their concern, as accomplices to the conspiracy McCarthy said was building against America.
McCarthy’s usage of politics of conspiracy to portray the opposition as disloyal Americans would become a recurring theme in modern incarnations of nativism, as we will observe throughout this paper.

Nativist influence in conservative politics during the mid-20th Century culminated with the nomination of Barry Goldwater, whose famous quote read “extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice.”42 Up until that point, hard-liners such as Joseph McCarthy never managed to become a leading figure within the Republican Party – indeed, Republican leaders until Goldwater such as former New York Governor Thomas Dewey and President Dwight D. Eisenhower were known for their practical, moderate brand of conservatism rather than the doctrinaire, hard-line conservatism the Republican Party later became known for. Therefore, the Republican nomination of Barry Goldwater, who very much embraced beliefs similar to nativists such as the presence of a communist conspiracy against the United States, and the federal government’s “tyranny” in advancing the New Deal policies and attempting to ensure a greater integration for African-Americans in the South, indicated that nativist politics was to once again play a prominent role in American politics.

Goldwater’s nomination by the Republican Party was remarkable in that it marked the first instance where nativist groups managed to nominate the candidate for a major party rather than remaining as something of a fringe movement against established politicians. The Anti-Masonic Party, which had considerable following among rural Protestants, were hopelessly disorganized and did poorly in national elections. The “Know-Nothings,” despite having recruited a relative heavyweight in former president Millard Fillmore, barely put a dent on the ever strengthening bipartisan system. Therefore, the nomination of Goldwater, who had more in common with nativist leaders of the past4 than partisan\textsuperscript{\textdegree}.

\textsuperscript{\textdegree} Although, to Goldwater’s credit, he was not a bigot and did not take part in openly discriminatory groups such as the second Ku Klux Klan.

\textsuperscript{\textdegree} I use the term “partisan” than “Republican” here because the Republican Party featured the “liberal” wing within the party ranks as late as the late 1970s, blurring the clear line between Republicans and Democrats in terms of their ideological affiliation. (New York governor Nelson Rockefeller was the leading figure of the liberal wing of the Republican Party) The era where being a Republican became
leaders of his time, marked the beginning of an era where it was possible for a grassroots figure to obtain a major party ticket for presidency with support of a ready audience in nativists. Indeed, Robert Horwitz observes in his book *Anti-establishment Conservatism from Goldwater to the Tea Party*, that the hard-liners’ rhetoric of corrupt politicians in Washington being part of communist conspiracy to bring down (or undermine) America led to Goldwater’s nomination for the Republican ticket for the election of 1964, marking the birth of what he describes as “anti-establishment” conservatism, whose target was the “establishment” politicians they deemed as corrupt and incapable. The presidential election of 1964 ended as a sound defeat for both Barry Goldwater and the “anti-establishment” conservatism as a whole, as Goldwater carried less than 40% of the popular vote in an electoral landslide. This, however, did not mark the decline of nativist influence within the Republican Party for the following reasons. First, the passage of the Civil Rights Act (and Democratic support thereof) ended the Southern voters’ allegiance to the Democratic Party, resulting in the influx of Southern voters with nativist tendencies to the Republican ranks. Also, a series of societal upheavals in the 1960s, both real and perceived, became a mobilizing factor for white, rural, Protestant voters that traditionally had been the demographic bedrock for nativism. The resulting nativist group, generally described as “fundamentalist” or “evangelical” Christians, would grow to become a political juggernaut that had a tremendous degree of influence within the Republican ranks by the end of the century.

---

equivalent of being “conservative” and being a Democrat being “liberal” began around the late 1980s, when conservative Democrats in the South began to defect to the Republican Party during the presidency of Ronald Reagan.
Figures ii, iii] The above maps show that the Democratic hold in Southern United States, while having remained intact during the FDR years, began to look wobbly as Democratic Presidents Harry Truman and Lyndon Johnson began to show willingness to confront the racially discriminatory institutions in the South. Here, it is shown that four Southern states voted for Strom Thurmond—who ran as a write-in candidate—in what could have cost Truman a re-election bid, and five Southern states voted for Barry Goldwater in 1964 amid the controversies surrounding the Civil Rights laws. [Figures courtesy of Wikimedia]

The passage of the Civil Rights Act marked an end to institutionalized racial discrimination in the United States, something that been a *modus operandi* in the South for many years. The Act’s triumph and the Democratic support there resulted in a large portion of Southern white voters becoming wary of the Democratic Party and defecting to the Republican Party, a situation the Republicans began to take advantage of. Indeed, the 1964 election saw the first time in American history after Civil War when the Republicans carried a substantial number of Southern states—Goldwater carried Alabama, Georgia,

---

1 For the purpose here, I define “institutionalized” as established by law and endorsed by the government. While de facto racial discrimination did occur in the United States after the passage of the 1964 act, the 1964 act marked the end of the practice where a state government established and endorsed a law that discriminated people solely on race.
Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina; the only other state that went Republican that year was Goldwater’s home state of Arizona.

The 1964 elections was not the first time when Southern white voters defected from the Democratic Party on a presidential election based on racial issues. In 1948, voters in a number of Southern states, wary of President Harry Truman’s willingness to tackle segregation in the South, nominated Strom Thurmond, a segregationist Democrat from South Carolina, in what would later became known as the “Dixiecrat” movement. Thurmond would move on to carry four states in the South despite having run as a write-in candidate. The Democrats did well in South in presidential elections subsequent to 1948 as long as the party remained silent on racial issues – the elections of 1952 and 1956 saw Adlai Stevenson, that liberal “egghead,” carrying the majority of Southern states despite losing both elections by landside.

The Southern white voters’ resentment over the Civil Rights laws was quickly taken advantage of by the Republicans beginning in Richard Nixon’s campaign for presidency in 1968. The rise in the number of Southern Republican voters as seen in the 1964 election convinced the party leadership to employ the so-called “Southern Strategy” in the 1968 elections. In employing the “Southern Strategy,” the Nixon campaign did not expressly mention the racially discriminatory institutions that had existed in the South – instead, he focused on the crimes, the moral decay, and other turmoil he claimed was created by the disorder of the 1960s. Nixon’s “Southern Strategy” worked in that it convinced many Southern voters who felt resentful amid the passage of the Civil Rights laws to switch their ballot to Republicans. Nixon carried a majority of Southern states in 1968, with George C. Wallace, former Alabama governor whose quote read “In the name of the greatest people that have ever trod this earth, I draw the line in the dust and toss the gauntlet before the feet of tyranny, and I say segregation now, segregation tomorrow, segregation forever,” carrying most of the deep South. The only Southern state carried by Hubert H. Humphrey, the Democratic candidate, was Johnson’s home state of Texas.
This electoral map of the 1968 Presidential Election shows that the Nixon campaign’s “Southern Strategy,” which took advantage of discontents among Southern white voters after the passage of the Civil Rights legislations, resulted in Nixon carrying the majority of Southern states. At the meantime, five states in the “deep South” (Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, and Mississippi) were carried by George C. Wallace, a former Alabama governor who was known for his advocacy of racial segregation during his gubernatorial terms. [Figure courtesy of Wikimedia]

The efficiency of the “Southern Strategy” as shown in the 1968 elections heralded a practical end of the New Deal Coalition in the context of presidential elections. This, again, was largely because of the Democratic leadership’s willingness to tackle institutionalized segregation in the South that allowed the Republicans to court disaffected Southern white voters in that region. The efficacy of the “Southern Strategy” as shown in the 1968 presidential election, however, should not be overstated because the Southern component of the New Deal Coalition remained largely intact in terms of Congressional politics. The Democrats retained a commanding lead in the Senate that was often filibuster-proof throughout the 1960s and 1970s. The Democratic control of the House of Representatives, which would continue throughout the 1970s and 1980s, ended as late as 1994, when Newt Gingrich’s “Contract with America”
resulted in sizable Republican gains in both House and the Senate. Both were made possible only with the continuing presence of Southern Democrats, who were reluctant to switch party ranks despite their objection to the Civil Rights laws at the time of their passage. The South’s defection to the Republican Party, therefore, cannot be explained with the Southern voter’s discontent with the passage of Civil Rights laws. Indeed, there was another and perhaps more important factor in the South’s departure from the New Deal coalition – the rise of evangelical Christian fundamentalism as a modern incarnation of nativism in the United States. The evangelical fundamentalist influences that would form the “religious right” as the modern incarnation of nativism and the Tea Party movement as its successor will be discussed in the next chapter of this essay.
III. The emergence of the “religious right” and the Tea Party movement as the modern incarnations of nativism in the United States

Nativist politics in the United States during the late 20th Century and the early 21st Century was first led by the evangelical Christian fundamentalists who formed the “religious right,” and was succeeded by the Tea Party movement shortly after Barack Obama’s election to the presidency in 2008. In hindsight, the “religious right,” whose main agenda was regarding “social” issues such as abortion and homosexual marriage, and the Tea Party movement, which focused on the issues of fiscal responsibility and adherence to the Constitution, seems problematic. This is so especially because the “religious right” proved to be an invaluable support base for the Bush Administration, whose years saw the surplus created during the Clinton years turning into the largest budget deficit in the history of the United States up until that point, and the Tea Party movement did not employ the “social” issues as its talking points during its rise to prominence in the 2010 Midterm election. However, the “religious right” and the Tea Party movement could be seen as having stemmed from the same lineage of nativist politics in the United States in that both movements 1) received support from the same demographics in white, native, Protestants who were resentful of the societal changes in the 1960s, 2) framed themselves as the defenders of what they perceived was the “American” way of life while accusing others of being a threat to that way of life, and 3) subscribed to the notion of conspiracy against the United States allegedly plotted by whoever they perceived as a threat to the existing order in the United States. In addition, the “religious right” and the Tea Party movement often shared the same political ideologies in substance regardless of the difference in their rhetoric, as will be explained in greater detail later in this chapter.

Nativism in the United States never quite managed to play a defining role in American politics up until the rise of the “religious right” in the late 20th Century. Neither the Anti-Masonic movement nor the Know-Nothing Party managed to promote their rigidly anti-immigrant, “American” agenda to the general public. While the Barry Goldwater’s presidential campaign in 1964 was successful in nominating
Goldwater as the presidential candidate, the Republicans lost a landslide defeat in the Presidential Election that year. In 1968, while the Republicans employed “Southern Strategy” to court Southern voters disaffected with the Democrats’ support of desegregation, they nominated Richard Nixon, a moderate Republican whose agenda was hardly comparable to that of Goldwater or a member of the John Birch Society. By the late 20th Century, however, nativism would finally become a mainstream political force to be reckoned with, when the evangelical Christian fundamentalists, under the banner of “religious right,” became a highly influential force within the Republican Party while helping it to gain the upper hand in national elections in 1990s and beyond. Once the influence of the “religious right” waned, nativism in the United States would stage yet another comeback as the Tea Party movement.

While the Tea Party movement differed with the “religious right” in terms of the issues it politicized (with the “religious right” emphasizing “social” issues such as abortion while the Tea Party movement focusing on issues such as fiscal discipline and a strict adherence to (the Tea Partiers’ perception of) the Constitution of the United States, it would represent the same nativist streak shown by the “religious right” in that it reflected the same demographics, issue preferences, and anti-immigrant sentiment shown by past nativist movements in the United States.

Evangelical Christian fundamentalism as a political force began to form in the 1970s, amid the widely shared perception that the United States was on an intolerable moral decay. The 1960s saw a number of important societal upheavals in the United States. Institutionalized segregation in the South ended with the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Progress was also made on women’s rights, as the fifties ideal of women staying at home was replaced with women playing a more active role in society. Also, the Supreme Court’s decision in *Griswold v. Connecticut*, which held that the right to privacy although not explicitly stated in the Bill of Rights, was a protected right under the Constitution through a “penumbra” formed by explicit Constitutional guarantees such as the right to associate, freedom from unwarranted search, and the reservation of unenumerated rights to the people, marked the beginning of an era
where an individual’s personal lives were no longer subject to government regulation.\textsuperscript{46} In addition, the Supreme Court’s decision in \textit{Roe v. Wade}, which ruled that abortion was a woman’s right under the Due Process clause of the 14\textsuperscript{th} Amendment, marked the beginning of an era where state governments were no longer allowed to adopt laws that regulated abortion.\textsuperscript{47} The upheavals as stated above created a sense of urgency among those who perceived these changes as detrimental to the United States to devise the means through which they could react to these changes. To that end, a coalition of conservative religious organizations, which would become known colloquially as the “religious right,” offered a viable solution. The perceived moral decline of the 1960s, however, was not the only reason behind the rise of evangelical fundamentalism as a potent political force – instead, the “religious right” was in many respects a modern incarnation of nativist politics in that it reflected the sense of racial resentment created by federally mandated racial de-segregation and the perennial fear within rural America that those outside the rural, Protestant sphere are part of a conspiracy against the United States.

The groups belonging to the “religious right” movement had similarities with nativist groups of the past in the following respects. First, the “religious right” movement, at least during its initial stage, was led by Southern Baptist groups that had supported institutionalized racial segregation in the South, and embraced the kind of hard-line anti-communism exemplified by Goldwater and the John Birch Society. The linkage between the “religious right” and support for segregation in Southern United States would often result in leaders of these movements injecting negative connotations to racial, ethnic or social minorities in order to rally support for their groups. In addition, the evangelical fundamentalist belief that comprised the “religious right” appealed to mostly white, rural, and Protestant voters, the same demographics that were the traditional support base for nativist politics, as shown in the fact that the groups identified as part of the “religious right” often showed tendencies to portray themselves as embracing “American” values while accusing the opposition of running afoul of it, as shown in James
Dobson’s notion of a “war” between the Christian traditionalists and the godless secularists. The evangelical fundamentalists’ strict dichotomy between the evangelicals themselves (i.e. the virtuous) and the opposition (i.e. the godless, those constituting a threat to America) would also lead to their subscription to the nativist politics of conspiracy, where those who disagreed with the notion that the United States was founded as a “Christian” nation with evangelical fundamentalist doctrines were often deemed to be a part of a communist conspiracy against the United States.

The evangelical fundamentalist sect of Protestantism that moved on to form the “religious right” had a close linkage with nativist political thoughts in Southern United States from the very beginning. Jerry Falwell’s Moral Majority, which played an important role in mobilizing evangelical fundamentalist voters during the Presidential Election of 1980, primarily constituted of Southern Baptist ministries that also supported past nativist movements such as the John Birch Society while remaining a staunch proponent of institutionalized racial segregation during the Civil Rights era. The Christian Coalition, an organization that was deemed by many as the successor organization to Moral Majority after the latter’s dissolution in 1989, was also in many ways an organization primarily based in the South – Pat Robertson and Ralph Reed, the founders of the Coalition, were both Southern Baptist ministers. The overlap between Southern nativism, which incorporated the white Southerners’ resentment of the end of institutionalized racial segregation in the region and the evangelical fundamentalists who formed the “religious right” were also shown in the rhetoric employed by the leading figures of the movement.

Falwell, in a 1958 interview, asserted that segregation was “a line of distinction” created by God, and that "If Chief Justice Warren and his associates had known God's word and had desired to do the Lord's will, I am quite confident that the 1954 decision [Brown v. Board of Education] would never had been made," going as far as asserting that “the true Negro does not want integration.... He realizes his potential is far better among his own race.” Robertson took a step even further when he stated that non-Baptists such as “Episcopalian, Presbyterians, and Methodists” (i.e. non-Baptists) represented the
“spirit of the Antichrist,” thus making it clear that the demographics he seeks support from was conservative Baptists who are predominantly white and Southern.

The link between nativism and evangelical Christian fundamentalism as expressed by the “religious right” was not solely because of the group’s large presence in the South, either. The demise of Christian Coalition in 1997 marked James Dobson, then the president of the Colorado-based organization Focus on the Family, emerging as the *de facto* leader of the “religious right” movement. Dobson’s movement featured the white, native conservative Protestants forming a strict dichotomy between the virtuous common man (i.e. themselves) and the corrupt and immoral conspiring to undermine the values the United States was founded upon in a manner not unlike the supporters of the Anti-Masonic Movement, the Know-Nothing Party, and later modern nativist movements such as the John Birch Society. Dobson’s belief in the struggle between the virtuous and the unholy became clear when he declared that a “Second Great Civil War” was waging between “two sides with vastly differing and incompatible world views.” The “two sides” Dobson mentioned, of course, meant the decent, righteous Christian America pitted against the godless secular left that was a threat to Christian America by its very existence.

Dobson’s notion of “Second Great Civil War” paralleled with nativist slogans of the past in that it fit squarely into the recurrent pattern in American history where a group that saw itself as representing “American” values saw itself in conflict with groups with differing views or background that it perceived as a threat to the existing order.

Dobson and his organization Focus on the Family have stated that 1) there was a clear division between the virtuous and the corrupt in the United States [i.e. in terms of whether one is observant of the principles based on the literal interpretation of the Bible], and 2) those who fail to live up to biblical standards constitute a threat to the United States by their very existence, confirming his belief in the “second civil war” raging in the United States. Dobson, in responding to a question that read “Has God withdrawn His protective hand from the US?” regarding the terrorist incident in September 11th, 2001,
responded that while it would be misleading “to forge a direct cause-and-effect relationship between the terrorist attacks and America's abandonment of biblical principles,”\textsuperscript{53} he believed that America’s sins such as “its pride and arrogance, for killing 40 million unborn babies, for the universality of profanity and for other forms of immorality” led to “the truth that this nation will suffer in many ways for departing from the principles of righteousness.”\textsuperscript{54} Dobson’s remarks here reflected his view that people who fail to live up to the biblical moral principles endanger the United States by their very existence. For “the wages of sin is death,”\textsuperscript{55} it was the virtuous (i.e. the religious) who were to stand up to the immoral acts in America even when such acts inflict no harm to anyone else or violate any laws of the land. One of the well-known end products of this discourse was Dobson’s (and the religious right’s) crusade against homosexual marriage in states and homosexuality at large. Dobson stated on record that “the agenda” (i.e. the homosexual agenda), which promoted homosexuality by allowing “any circle of people who love each other” of rights such as adoption or marriage, “must be opposed.”\textsuperscript{56} Dobson’s agenda against homosexuals would receive nationwide attention after he voiced his objection against a music video featuring popular cartoon character Spongebob Squarepants based on the belief that it was a homosexual propaganda.\textsuperscript{57}

![Spongebob Squarepants](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Spongebob_Squarepants.png)

[Figure v] Spongebob Squarepants: a homosexual propaganda.

[Figure courtesy of Wikimedia]
The parallel between the recurrent streak of nativism in American politics and the “religious right” under the de facto leadership of Dobson and Focus was also shown in its confrontational attitude against the Republican Party based on the perception that it was not executing the mandate from the “religious right” in a faithful manner. On February 7, 1998, Dobson was quoted as saying that “does the Republican Party want our [i.e. evangelical fundamentalist] votes, no strings attached—to court us every two years, and then to say, 'Don’t call me; I'll call you’—and to not care about the moral law of the universe?...Is that what they want? Is that the way the system works? Is this the way it's going to be? If it is, I'm gone, and if I go, I will do everything I can to take as many people with me as possible.”

Here, we can observe that Dobson’s view is that the “moral law of the universe” (i.e. the moral principle based on the literal interpretation of the Bible) should be implemented at all costs, regardless of whether doing so would prove to be an electoral liability to Republicans or would unduly restrict the personal liberties of individuals as entitled under the Constitution and laws of the United States. The pattern where a group, possessing an unshakeable knowledge about their belief, insists that its views should be implemented on the society as a whole and view the political establishment that fails (or chooses not to) do so as corrupt, as observed in this chapter so far, has been a staple of modern nativist movements in the United States. The Birchers believed that Eisenhower was a Communist hack because he refused to take a hard-line stance on the reviled Soviets. The supporters of McCarthyism regarded whoever disagreed with their extremism or the tactics employed in their cause as collaborators with Communists abroad. In evangelical fundamentalism associated with the “religious right,” this trait as shown during the era of JBS and McCarthyism was fused with the religious belief based on the literal interpretation of the Bible, leading to the view that whoever fails to live up to the “moral law of the universe” should be confronted and toppled from the political establishment if possible. This pattern, as will be observed

---

6 Actual quote.
later in this essay, would later be reprised in the Tea Party movement, which also had many traits inherited from nativism in the United States.

Dobson’s rhetoric of “war’ between the virtuous and the unholy was employed by virtually all evangelical fundamentalist leaders associated with the “religious right,” often leading to the politics of conspiracy, a staple of nativist politics since the Anti-Masonic movement of the 1820s. Central to the politics of conspiracy as advanced by the “religious right” was the notion that there was a struggle between those who embraced the American values and those who did not, which included not only the Communists affiliated with the Soviet Union but also those who disagreed with the evangelical fundamentalists’ rigid, often factually unsubstantiated beliefs at large, such as the liberals, secularists, and even mainline Protestants. North Carolina Senator Jesse Helms, a known segregationist who was closely affiliated with Falwell’s Moral Majority, stated that “atheism and socialism -- or liberalism, which tends in the same direction -- are inseparable entities” in that once a person does not believe that “God is in charge of human affairs,” “you have men attempting to take the place of God by means of superstate,” in what he describes as “the modern-day version of Baal.” Right-wing evangelist Billy James Hargis, who had a sizable following throughout the 1960s among the rural white evangelical crowd, used his influence to campaign against not only communism but organized labor, sex education at schools, and even racial integration in the South.

The evangelical fundamentalists’ politics of conspiracy spanned over popular culture of the era as well — the new popular cultures that the evangelical fundamentalists deemed as immoral were often linked with a Communist conspiracy against the United States, usually with little –if any– substantiation based on facts. A rather bizarre example of this line of reasoning was shown in a booklet titled *Communism, Hypnotism, and the Beatles*, written by David A. Noebel, then a subordinate of Billy James Hargis. Here, Noebel asserted that the rock music as played by the Beatles was part of a Communist plan to render “a generation of American youth useless through nerve-jamming, mental deterioration and retardation.”
Noebel proceeds to argue that the United States needs to protect its identity as a “Christian nation” by making sure that “four mop-headed anti-Christ beatniks [presumably referring to the Beatles] don’t destroy our children’s emotional and mental stability and ultimately destroy nation as Plato warned in his Republic.” Noebel’s assertions, of course, would be shown unfounded, as the teenagers of the Sixties moved on to form the backbone of the United States that prevailed over the Soviet Union (many of the rock music Noebel denounced, at the meantime, often found its way to Republican political events), while the surviving members of the Beatles have since become wealthy capitalists thanks to the fortune they garnered during their musical career. Noebel would later take over Hargis’ operation in Christian Crusade after the latter was forced to resign from his posts amid the allegations of sexual abuse.

The politics of conspiracy as practiced by the “religious right” was often closely intertwined with the politics of racial resentment. Falwell, for instance, made a series of allegations that the activists for racial de-segregation in the United States (during the Civil Rights era) and South Africa (which, at the time, was under the Apartheid regime) were in fact controlled by the Soviet Union. In regard to the Civil Rights movements in the United States during the early 1960s, Falwell was quoted as saying that “the Communists, as they do in all parts of the world, are taking advantage of a tense situation in our land,” eager to “bring about violence and bloodshed.” Falwell also charged Dr. Martin Luther King, one of the leaders of the movement, as a “Communist subversive.” Likewise, Falwell dismissed Archbishop Desmond Tutu, one of the prominent leaders of the anti-Apartheid struggle in South Africa, as a “phony” while alleging that Nelson Mandela, who would later become the president of South Africa, as a “communist.” On a similar note, Billy James Hargis denounced the NAACP, the organization that was

---

h Ronald Reagan used Bruce Springsteen’s Born in the U.S.A. during his 1984 re-election campaign despite the song’s lyrics that is critical of the American foreign policy during the Vietnam War. Tea Party Caucus chair Michelle Bachmann used Tom Petty and the Heartbreakers’ American Girl during her short-lived presidential campaign. Gingrich Republican Joe Scarborough also has used many classic rock analogies in his radio program and publications (e.g. “meet the new boss, same as the old boss”).
crucial in the Supreme Court’s decision in Brown v. Board of Education and later the Civil Rights of 1964, as a “pro-Communist movement to destroy the unity of a nation.” The evangelical fundamentalists’ use of 1) politics of conspiracy as an important part of their political discourse, and 2) racial resentments in the alleged conspiracy against the United States, demonstrated how their political movement was more a continuum of nativist politics rather than a movement stemming from mere Christianity.

![Figure vi] The above figure shows the cover of a book titled Communism, Hypnotism, and the Beatles, authored by David A. Noebel, then a subordinate of Billy James Hargis, the leader of the Christian Crusade. In this book, Noebel asserts that rock music is a part of a communist conspiracy against the United States in an assertion that seems quite bizarre in retrospect. The above copy of Noebel’s book was acquired by the FBI during the FBI investigation of the Christian Crusade [Figure courtesy of Wikimedia].

The demographics associated with nativism and the “religious right” elected a considerable number of figures closely associated with (i.e. in words and deeds) the evangelical, fundamentalist brand of Christianity that constituted the “religious right” since the 1970s, a pattern that continues to this day.
The election of Jesse Helms to Senate in North Carolina in 1972 arguably marked the first instance where a person closely affiliated with the nativist school of evangelical fundamentalism, was elected to the United States Senate under a major party ticket. While individuals with nativist political beliefs such as Barry Goldwater had been elected to the Senate and even received presidential nomination in 1964, Helms’s election brought yet another dimension to the rise of nativist influence within the Republican ranks. This was because whereas Goldwater, while a hard-line conservative, did not believe in injecting the literal interpretation of Bible in making of public policy, Helms and associates, many of whom were elected through the “religious right,” did.

The fact that the newly elected Republican lawmakers and their supporters believed that the United States needs to be run under strictly biblical principles, notwithstanding the Constitutional principle of separation of church and state and the fact that many of the founding fathers were inspired by secular enlightenment ideals and virtually none were “evangelicals” (defined as non-mainline Christians with literal reading of the Bible, of whom many are Baptists from the South). Some even stated that failure to do so would result in divine punishment against America per the biblical account of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. Tom DeLay, a Texas congressman who was the House Majority Whip for the Republicans from 1995 to 2003 and later Majority Leader from 2003 to 2005, was quoted as saying that Bill Clinton was unfit to be president of the United States because he had a “wrong worldview,” asserting that the president of the United States should possess what he describes as a “Biblical worldview.” Pat Robertson took a step farther when he (in)famously asserted that Hurricane Katrina, 

---

1 Many of the prominent founding figures such as Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin were deists with dubious records of religiosity. Even those who were religious, such as self-described Puritan in John Adams, believed in a republic governed by the rule of law rather than a society governed by a “Biblical worldview” as suggested by the likes of DeLay and Robertson. Evangelical Christianity in the United States, from which the core beliefs of the “religious right” came about, would start to have a large following only after the so-called second “Great Awakening” in the early 19th Century.
which cost thousands of lives and billions of property damage in New Orleans area and beyond, was a divine punishment against America for legalized abortion.\textsuperscript{73}

The evangelical fundamentalist discourse of a war between the virtuous and the godless was quick to be adopted by the conservative politicians at large. In 1978, a young academic from Georgia named Newt Gingrich ran on the slogan “America needs a return to moral values.”\textsuperscript{74} To that end, argued Gingrich, those who embrace “moral values” were to be prepared to fight a “nasty” war against those who were threatening the traditional “moral values” in the United States. Indeed, during the campaign for the 1978 election (which he won), Gingrich said that “the great strength of the Democratic Party in my lifetime has been that it has always produced young, nasty people who had no respect for their elders,” which required the Republicans to stop being so “neat, obedient, and loyal and faithful” as they usually were and elect the leaders who are “tough, hard-working, energetic” to match the immoral opposition “in a slug fest” to save the country.\textsuperscript{75} Although it is hard to say Gingrich himself exemplified the pious, morally steadfast American he claimed to speak for,\textsuperscript{1} Gingrich’s call to arms to those who perceived a moral decline during and after the 1960s began to pay off in terms of Republican performance in congressional elections, especially in Southern\textsuperscript{k} states during the 1990s and beyond. After the 1980 elections, the Republicans controlled 41 out of 104 seats in Southern states, when compared to 192 out of 435 seats in the United States as a whole,\textsuperscript{76} making the percentage of Republicans in Southern states 6.2\% lower when compared to non-Southern states. In the 1994 elections, Republicans, empowered with the “Contract with America” platform devised by Gingrich and his associates, took a majority of the house for the first time since 1952.\textsuperscript{77} Here, the Republicans took a larger lead in Southern states than all

\textsuperscript{1} While I will not go into further details about Gingrich’s personal life here since this is a paper on the Tea Party movement, Gingrich had divorced twice in his three marriages so far – both divorces were related with extramarital affairs Gingrich had.

\textsuperscript{k} For the purpose of this paper, the “Southern” states are defined as eleven former Confederate states that were not subdued to the Union immediately after the war’s outbreak. Those states are: 1) Alabama, 2) Arkansas, 3) Florida, 4) Georgia, 5) Louisiana, 6) Mississippi, 7) North Carolina, 8) South Carolina, 9) Tennessee, 10) Texas, and 11) Virginia.
the other regions combined, in a pattern that completed the “Southern Strategy” of 1968 in the Congressional context.

[Chart i]: The above chart shows that the Republicans, despite being a minority party in Southern United States as late as 1980, increasingly became a Republican stronghold as the nativist base in the South became mobilized for the Republicans after the advent of the “religious right” [Chart ©Albert Choi, data extracted from sources indicated in endnotes 76, 77, 88, 89].

The perceived “war” between the holy and the godless was also quickly adopted by the conservative media such as the Fox News Channel. Conservative news anchor Bill O’Reilly, in his book Culture Warrior, stated that the United States is being threatened by “secular-progressives” whose goal is to
“dramatically change America, molding it in the image of Western Europe.” On a similar note, conservative columnist Ann Coulter was quoted as saying that “whenever the nation is under attack, from within or without, liberal side with the enemy. This is their essence,” while hailing Joseph McCarthy as an “American hero.” Conservative radio host Rush Limbaugh took a step further when he was quoted as saying that the Americans reject “abnormal or perverted” things such as “commie libs” (presumably referring to liberals at large), “feminazis,” and “environmental wackos.” Michael Savage, known for his book Liberalism is a Mental Disorder, stated that America was “being overrun by psycho-lib Commu-Nazi organizations like ACLU who defend child molesters and terrorists,” showing an interesting amalgamation of unrelated ideologies such as liberalism, Communism and National Socialism. Joseph Farah, a conservative blogger who would later author The Tea Party Manifesto, claimed that the Democrats are “pure and simple” evil because they have “no redeeming social value” and are “outright traitors themselves or apologists for treasonous behavior,” and are “enemies of the American people and the American way of life.” The conservative media pundits’ embrace of the notion of “war” between the virtuous and the corrupt would play an important role in the promotion of such notions during the Bush era and later prove to be an indispensable in its promotion of the Tea Party movement after the movement’s inception in 2009.

The influence of the “religious right” and the nativist agenda therein reached its pinnacle during the presidency of George W. Bush. Bush, since his years as the governor of Texas, had openly expressed his evangelical Christian faith, and owed much of his support from the “religious right” both as the governor and later as a candidate in Presidential primaries and elections. As such, many in the “religious right” viewed Bush as the president through whom they could implement many of their nativist vis a vis religious agenda in the public sphere in a manner they had (unsuccessfully) attempted during the presidency of Southern Baptist Jimmy Carter. The Bush years, indeed, would prove to be the years where the degree of influence wielded by the “religious right” in the public sphere reached its
zenith, especially after the incident in September 11th, 2011, which gave birth to the agenda of the “War on Terrorism.”

The close linkage between the Bush Administration and the “religious right” was shown in the growing Republican lead in the Southern states. The election of 2000 saw 71 out of 124 of those elected to House seats in Southern states being Republicans, making the percentage of Republicans 57.3% in the South compared to 50.8% in the nation as a whole.\(^\text{88}\) The gap between the Republican presence in the South and the nation as a whole further widened after the 2004 elections – by then, some 62.3% (81 out of 130) of the legislators from Southern states were Republicans, making it 16.8% more likely that a Republican elected to a House seat in the South than in the United States as a whole\(^\text{89}\) (the figure for the 2000 elections was 12.7%).\(^\text{90}\) In fact, Republicans would have been unable to take majority in the House of Representatives in neither 2000 nor 2004 had it not been for the commanding lead it took in the Southern states.\(^\text{i}\) The Republican Party’s strong performance in Southern state would continue after the Bush presidency into the Tea Party years in a manner that indicates that the Republican surge in the South reflected the party’s usage of nativist agenda to garner support (or, rather, the pattern where the party was taken over by those Horwitz described as “anti-establishment” conservatives).

The presidential campaign of George W. Bush in 2000 presented Bush as a moderate conservative well capable of compromising with the opposition under the catchphrases such as “compassionate conservatism”\(^\text{91}\) and Bush being a “uniter, not a divider.”\(^\text{92}\) Indeed, Bush’s campaign during the 2000 election season created a mixed impression on whether the Bush campaign itself espoused the political positions of the “religious right.” On one hand, the Bush campaign was closely aligned with the “religious right,” and Bush himself had long professed his “born again” Christian faith since his days as the governor of Texas. In addition, the Bush campaign eliminated the most threatening rival in John McCain in the Republican primaries through creating a rumor that McCain had fathered an illegitimate

\(^\text{i}\) See Chart 1.
black child (in fact, McCain and his wife, Cindy, had adopted a baby from overseas) during the primary that took place in South Carolina, thus leaving an impression that the Bush campaign looked to appeal to the racist impulse of Southern conservative voters, many of whom have remained prone of nativist and implicitly racist political appeals. On the other hand, Bush supported a “humble” foreign policy that refrains from nation-building in a policy preference that hardly resembled many evangelical fundamentalists’ belief in (literal) Armageddon in Israel between the Israelites and the Palestinians, and pushed for federal assistance to the country’s education woes through what eventually became the No Child Left Behind Act. Indeed, the early Bush years saw limited linkage put between the presidency and the agenda pushed by the religious right — this was so up until the terrorist incident in September 11th, 2001, which cost about 3,000 American lives, would transform the Bush presidency in an irrevocable fashion.

The neoconservative foreign policy agenda as embraced by the Bush Administration was in many respects heavily influenced by nativist political thoughts in the United States. The neoconservatives of the Bush era such as Richard Perle and Paul Wolfowitz believed that the United States should seek to realize “the possibility of a unipolar peace, a Pax Americana” by actively intervening to topple or mend the regimes hostile to the “universal liberal values,” which they believed were inherently tied to the interests of the United States. Underlying such belief was the notion that the United States was a nation that received a divine providence to act as a beacon of reason in this world, the belief that was also embraced by nativist movements of the past. For the early nativist such as Anti-Masons and Know-Nothings who subscribed to this line of reasoning, the threat to the American duty to act as the bastion for enlightenment came from those who were alleged as being controlled by outside influences such as Catholics and members of the Masonic order. For the neoconservatives, the threat to the providence given to America came from the regimes that were hostile to the American values rather than interest – this, according to neoconservatives, made it necessary for the United States to topple all tyrannical
regimes that threatened democracy and freedom in this world. Only then will the United States be safe from a terrorist attack such as the one from September 11th. The fact that neoconservatism became the premier foreign policy doctrine in the Bush Administration was shown in the statements made by the key figures of the administration as well as President Bush himself. Dick Cheney, who had made an incorrect assertion that Saddam Hussein’s Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction prior to the U.S. invasion of Iraq, was quoted as saying that “we don’t negotiate with the evil – we defeat it,” in a statement that seemingly defined “evil” as a monolithic entity that was to be defeated at all costs, even when it did not sponsor terrorist activities against the United States or otherwise threatens the security or well-being of American citizens or material interests. Bush himself stated in his 2005 inaugural address that “the survival of liberty in our land increasingly depends on the success of liberty in other lands,” opining that “the best hope for peace in our world is the expansion of freedom in all the world.” It was under this line of reasoning that the Bush Administration’s “War on Terrorism” came to define “terrorism” as terrorism against humanity (e.g. dictactor brutally treating his own people) rather than a more narrow definition of terrorist activities against the United States – indeed, Bush’s 2002 State of the Union speech saw Bush mentioning Iran, Iraq, and North Korea as forming an “axis of evil” when none of these three countries had a direct link with the terrorist attack of September 11th.

Neoconservative foreign policy as shown in the Bush Administration’s “War on Terrorism” received ample support from the contemporary nativists in the predominantly white evangelical fundamentalists who comprised the “religious right.” The evangelical fundamentalists’ support for neoconservatism largely stemmed from their literal reading of the bible, especially regarding the “Revelation” part of the New Testament, which states that the end of the world will be characterized by a final battle (the “Armageddon”) between the good and the evil. Horwitz observes that this line of belief led evangelical fundamentalist leaders to view Saddam Hussein as “a forerunner of the ‘evil one,'” leading them to
believe that Saddam Hussein had to be removed because of his alleged role in the biblical Armageddon rather than because of him aiding or abetting terrorist activities against the United States. For evangelicals and neoconservatives alike, therefore, the question of whether Saddam Hussein was involved in the terrorist incident in September 11th or any other plots against the United States was of secondary relevance, if relevant at all, as Hussein and his regime were perceived as a threat by their very existence.

The religious right’s support of the Bush Administration was also strengthened by Bush’s willingness to subscribe to the notion that the United States had suffered an intolerable moral decay since the 1960s. Neoconservatives and the evangelical fundamentalists who subscribed to the neoconservative foreign policy agenda believed that the traditional notion of “national interest” was of little relevance in determining the right policy for the United States, as oppressive dictators such as those mentioned in Bush’s “Axis of Evil” speech posed a threat to the United States by their mere presence. For many evangelicals, at the meantime, the questions on foreign policy, Iraq, or economy were only of secondary relevance, as they believed that the nation’s foremost concern was regarding the “moral” issues such as abortion and the question of whether homosexuals should be allowed to marry. Indeed, the exit polls from the Presidential Election of 2004 showed that some 22 percent of voters nationwide stated that they found “moral values” to be the most important issue for the 2004 election. In the electorally significant state of Ohio, 25% of all voters were white evangelical or “born-again” Christians and some three-fourths of them supported Bush, leading to observations that Bush carried his closely contested re-election bid largely because of the evangelical support he obtained.

The ascendancy of the Bush Administration and its evangelical fundamentalist allies did not last very long. In 2006, the Republicans lost 6 seats in the Senate and 31 seats in the House of Representatives.

---

*m* Bush carried 286 in the Electoral College compared to Kerry’s 252. This means that Kerry could have won the election had Bush not managed to carry Ohio (which had 20 Electoral College votes as of 2004), which he won largely because of the evangelical fundamentalist votes.
Representatives, losing controls for both houses of Congress. Many of the Republican lawmakers defeated in this election were associated with the “religious right,” most notably Senator Rick Santorum, who compared homosexuality to zoophilia (i.e. having a sexual desire to animals) and expressed doubts on the constitutional right to privacy as held in Griswold. The Republican defeats, which were largely viewed as a referendum against the Bush Administration’s handling of foreign policy such as the war in Iraq, marked the end of an era where the Republicans could carry a national election based on the platform surrounded by “moral” issues as it did in 2004. Indeed, Christianity Today, a nonpartisan evangelical Christian press, noted that the 2006 elections saw “Evangelicals working to bolster the Democratic Party exulted in the resounding victory,” leading Jim Wallis, an evangelical Christian affiliated with the Democrats, to note that “The Religious Right’s dominance over politics and evangelicals has come to an end.”

The American public’s disapproval of the “religious right” agenda became clearer with the elections of 2008, when the Republicans lost 21 more seats in the House of Representatives and surrendered a filibuster-proof majority in the Senate. The correlation between the Republican Party and the “religious right” became clear with the Republicans’ ability to do well in South despite the defeats it suffered in all other regions of the country – the Republicans managed to retain some 72 out of 131 seats (55.0%) in the Southern states despite obtaining only 106 out of 304 seats (34.9%) in non-Southern states and 178 out of 435 (40.9%) seats in the nation as a whole. Based on these facts, a New York Times article in November 10, 2008 observed that the South’s influence in national politics may be waning in a manner that could spell an end to the “Southern Strategy” that was the key for success for Republicans for many years. James Dobson, the de facto leader of the “religious right” movement after the Christian Coalition’s dissolution in 1997, also conceded a “defeat” for his cause of social conservatism in his farewell address as the president of his organization Focus on the Family, stating that he and his organization “tried to defend the unborn child, the dignity of the family, but it was a holding action,” but
were “now in the most discouraging period of that long conflict,” and that “we [i.e. Dobson and his compatriots] can say we have lost all those battles.”¹¹³ In sum, the influence of the “religious right” and the nativist tendencies there in seemed to no longer control either the platform of the Republican Party or American electoral politics as a whole after the 2008 elections that resulted in the election of Barack Obama. This, at least, seemed to be indeed the case up until the emergence of the Tea Party movement in early 2009.

[Chart ii]: The above chart shows that the Republicans maintained a comfortable majority in Southern states after the 2008 election despite having claimed only 178 seats (40.9%) of seats in what was viewed as a crushing defeat for the Republican Party. This pattern, as is shown in Chart 3, would result in the Republican Party increasingly relying on Southern states for support, resulting in the influence of nativist
idea popular in Southern states becoming incorporated into the Republican agenda as shown during the Tea Party era. [Chart © Albert Choi, data extracted from sources indicated in endnotes 76, 77, 88, 89, 111]

[Chart iii]: The above chart shows the percentage of Republican House members in Southern states indexed to the national figure and the figure for non-Southern states. Here, it is shown that the

---

n The index figures were calculating by dividing the percentage of Republican House members in Southern states in a given year to that percentage in non-Southern states or the nation as a whole. For example, the percentage of Republican House members in Southern states indexed to the national
Republican defeat during the 2008 elections resulted in a sharp increase in the index figure, as the Republicans managed to hold the majority of seats in the Southern states despite obtaining only 34.9% of seats in the non-Southern states. [Chart © Albert Choi, data extracted from sources indicated in endnotes 76, 77, 88, 89, 111]

The Republican losses in the 2008 elections seemed to mark the end of an era where the Republicans could expect to win a national election largely based on the support from the voters susceptible to nativist impulses in Southern states and elsewhere. This observation, however, was only partially correct. To be sure, the nativist agenda as implemented during the Bush era, which focused on 1) the “War on Terrorism” against the enemies beyond those who actively conspired a terrorist attack against the United States, and 2) the “social” issues such as the legal status of abortion in the United States and on the question of whether homosexuals should be allowed to marry. However, the election of Barack Hussein Obama, which marked the election of the first president of an African descent in the United States, proved to be a highly efficient recruiting tool for the nativist cause. The nativist agenda, indeed, would return under yet another incarnation during the Obama years, this time under the banner of the Tea Party movement.

The Tea Party movement, underwritten by well-funded corporate interests such as the organization led by the Koch Brothers, focused on issues such as budget discipline (and the allegation that it was the Obama Administration that lost that discipline), and a strict adherence to the Constitution rather than the “social” issues and the “War on Terrorism” as by the “religious right.” However, fact that the image of Republicans changed because of the Tea Party presence and the Republican focus on fiscal issues left whether the Republican agenda as influenced by Tea Partiers during the 2010 election changed much in substance from the Bush era a very open question. In this regard, there have been schools that argued

---

figure as of 2000 can be calculated by dividing the percentage in the Southern states (57.3%) to the national figure (50.8%), resulting in the index figure of 1.127, or 112.7%.
that the Tea Party movement indeed marked a substantial departure from the conservative agenda during the Bush years, whereas the opposing school pointed out that the Tea Party movement (and the 2010 Republican agenda it influenced) had its agenda stemmed largely from nativist politics (e.g. the sense of fear against the Obama Administration and the values it allegedly stands for) rather than a genuine concern for fiscal issues. While it would be incorrect to assume that the Tea Party movement was an entirely astroturfed group, the Tea Party agenda bore a number of similarity and continua with its predecessors, thus disqualifying it as a purely independent political movement as some of its supporters claim.

There are some although not overwhelming evidences that the Tea Party movement did somewhat depart from the conservative agenda of the 2000s by toning down (although not completely abandoning) the neoconservative foreign policy and the social policy as promoted by the “religious right.” Senator Rand Paul, son of libertarian icon Ron Paul who won his Senate seat under a Tea Party platform, expresses this point of view in his book *The Tea Party Goes to Washington*. Here, Paul offers a Tea Party agenda that is based on 1) limited role of government in economy, and 2) what believes constitutes a strict adherence to the Constitution of the United States. Paul, in so arguing, admits that the Republican Party during the Bush years created big government (and that he was willing to criticize the Bush Administration for such inconsistencies). Paul also argues that the Tea Party movement “stands for limited government” based on the principles outlined in the Constitution of the United States. According to Paul, “the extent to which Washington, DC, has ventured outside its constitutional box” resulted in an undue expansion of federal power that the Tea Party movement is now looking to roll back.
Paul’s self-assessment of the Tea Party movement, while presumably a genuine argument from a fundamentally honest person,\(^\circ\) is problematic for the following reasons. First, evidences point to the fact that the supporters of Tea Party movement, grassroots supporters and leading figures alike, have used issues such as budget deficit and government spending in a partisan manner, meaning that the Tea Party criticism of “big government” is almost exclusively directed at the Democrats. Furthermore, the Tea Party movement has shown similar traits with nativist groups of the past, leading to the impression that it should be understood more as a modern incarnation of nativism rather than a group stemming from a principled opposition to big government and violation of Constitutional principles. In addition, the publications by other figures influential to the Tea Party movement, such as WorldNetDaily’s Joseph Farah contradict Paul’s more principled constitutional libertarianism in many respects, as will be discussed. Finally, studies on who constitutes the Tea Party movement shows that it encompasses much of the same electorate that voted for President George W. Bush for reasons other than fiscal or Constitutional issues, which further discredits the notion that the Tea Party movement arose spontaneously amid the growing concerns among the public for the lack of fiscal discipline and the politicians’ willingness to use unconstitutional measures.

The Tea Party talking point of fiscal irresponsibility has been used in a highly partisan manner. True, Paul, one of those who rose to prominence during the 2010 Tea Party insurgency, did admit (and indeed opposed) the Bush Administration’s spending spree that turned a sizable surplus from the Clinton years into the largest deficit up until that point. Others in the Tea Party leadership, however, remained rather silent about this inconvenient truth. Michelle Bachmann, who would later found and chair the Tea Party Caucus in the House of Representatives, received support from then White House insiders such as Cheney and Rove as a freshman lawmaker, making it doubtful if she was a vocal opponent of the Bush Administration’s spending.

\(^\circ\) To his credit, Rand Paul, like his father, embraced his brand of constitutional conservatism (a la Justice Antonin Scalia) and called for the restoration of fiscal discipline when virtually no one in the Republican Party was willing to speak up about the issue.
Administration’s fiscal or foreign policy at the time. Jim DeMint, the self-professed “Tea Party” Senator, had voted for Iraq War and has embraced hard-line (and potentially costly) policy preferences such as allowing Georgia and Ukraine into NATO and “spend to establish freedom abroad.”\textsuperscript{117} The Obama Administration’s bailout program, a program that was initiated during President Bush’s tenure\textsuperscript{p} and largely benefited Corporate America, by contrast, were denounced as “socialism” almost immediately after they were introduced.

The Republican Party (and its nativist supporters) during the Bush years were hardly known for either fiscal responsibility or adherence to the Constitution. Dick Cheney was quoted as saying that “Reagan proved that deficits don’t matter”\textsuperscript{118} in a media interview, Republican Senator Connie Mack, when asked where we would get the money to “run this country,” responded that “we’ll borrow it.”\textsuperscript{119} When asked about whether the administration borrows money “from the Saudis” (i.e. from foreign lenders) whenever money was needed, Mack responded: “In a sense, we do. Maybe [we will borrow from] the Chinese.”\textsuperscript{120} Rarely – if ever – were the administration, Cheney, or mainstream Republicans such as Mack subject to criticism for engaging in “socialist” policy goals, leading to the impression that a large portion of the supporters of the Tea Party movement has used fiscal discipline and constitution as more of a partisan tool (i.e. against Democrats) rather than as a \textit{bona fide} platform.\textsuperscript{q}

The fact that the Tea Party movement is not a group solely focused on fiscal and constitutional issues is also clearly shown in the demographics that constitute the movement. More specifically, the Tea Party movement comprises much of the same demographics that voted for President George W. Bush for the

\textsuperscript{p} Both the bailout of AIG and the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 were implemented during the late Bush years.

\textsuperscript{q} Another fact worth mentioning is that the PATRIOT Act, passed by the Bush Administration after the terrorist incident in September 11\textsuperscript{th}, 2001, was challenged for its constitutionality from its early stage. Only small pockets of Republicans at the time (with Ron Paul being one of them) protested the constitutionality of the act at the time. Senator Russ Feingold, one of the few lawmakers who opposed the act at the time because of its constitutionality, would later be ousted from office by a Tea Party challenger.
reasons other than fiscal or constitutional issues. Ronald P. Formisano, in his book *The Tea Party: A Brief History*, argues that there is a parallel between the biblical fundamentalism possessed by the religious right and the “constitutional originalism” held by Tea Partiers.\(^{121}\) Indeed, there is a correlation between the evangelical fundamentalists of the Bush era and the modern Tea Partiers – Tea Party supporters opposed same-sex marriage “by two to one compared to a 42 percent to 49 percent split among all voters,” while “six in ten Tea Party supporters” believed abortions “should be illegal in all or most cases.”\(^{122}\) The demographic overlap between the Tea Party movement and Bush supporters were shown in general polls as well – a 2010 CBS poll showed that 57% of Tea Party supporters had a favorable impression to President George W. Bush, while only 27% said they had an unfavorable impression.\(^{123}\) By contrast, Ron Paul garnered only 28% in favorable impression, while some 56% of the respondents said they were “unsure” about their opinion on him.\(^{124}\)

Paul’s belief that the Tea Party movement represents a principled opposition to big government and what he believes are unconstitutional practices is contradicted by the prominent figures within the movement themselves. Farah’s book *The Tea Party Manifesto*, for instance, seems to exemplify neither principled libertarianism nor constitutionalism and reads more like a right-wing populist tract written by a former associate of the John Birch Society. Farah states that the Tea Party movement is not “a movement concerned only with materialistic economy issues”\(^{125}\) in that it is (or, rather, should be)\(^{126}\) a movement whose purpose is “to revive liberty, restore social justice, and jump-start a moral renewal.”\(^{127}\) This, Farah argues, is so because the “American Dream is under spiritual attack” where a battle against the attackers “will not be successful” unless accompanied “with prayer and obedience to God,”\(^{128}\) in a statement that resembles evangelical fundamentalists of the late 20th Century more than

\(^{\dagger}\) The position that abortion should be illegal in all of the United States is, contrary to popular belief, something that transcends the scope of the Supreme Court’s decision in *Roe v. Wade*. In *Roe*, the Supreme Court outlawed a Texas statute criminalizing abortions, thus outlawing states from criminalizing abortions. Overturning *Roe v. Wade* would merely allow states to criminalize abortions rather than resulting in a nationwide ban on abortions.
the principled libertarianism of Rand Paul. Indeed, Farah embraces rather than shows caution to the protest remarks with religious overtone – such as “Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God,” “One Nation Under God,” “Wake up America! Study the Constitution.” It’s the only thing between you and the tyranny of politicians,” and “Wake up America – II Chronicles 7:14.” Farah further states that “if we are not accountable to God, we are incapable of self-government,” asserting that the founders embraced this vision and that “99.9 percent” of Tea Partiers agree with it.

Farah’s “manifesto” for the Tea Party movement holds beliefs that seem to have been inherited from nativist movements of the past in a variety of respects. Farah asserts that certain groups such as “smokers” and “Bible-believing [i.e. evangelical fundamentalist] Christians” are demonized, while groups such as “Native Americans and homosexuals” are treated as “chosen people.” Here, people such as “smokers” and “Bible-believing” Christians are constructed as “us,” whereas the “Native Americans and homosexuals” are treated as “them” whose alleged special status in the society Farah seems to be protesting. In addition, Farah seems to define the struggle between the Tea Partiers and the opposition as a struggle between the virtuous and the unholy in a manner not unlike the evangelical fundamentalists of the late 20th Century. Farah states that the “heart and soul” of the Tea Party movement constitutes of “prayerful people, people who love God, people who go to church and synagogue.” According to Farah, therefore, the Tea Party movement’s purpose is not promoting a limited set of issue such as restoring fiscal discipline in Washington (i.e. as stated by Ron and Rand Paul), but to restore the religious, “spiritual” values upon which the United States was allegedly founded upon.

In this regard, Farah’s version of the Tea Party movement seems to squarely fit into the pattern shown

---

5 Curiously, those of us who do study the Constitution in a professional setting (i.e. lawyers, law students, and legal scholars) tend to have highly diverse political views. Only a small fraction of them are avid conservatives (e.g. members to the Federalist Society), and even fewer embrace the Tea Party agenda.  

† Farah seems to have a generally limited understanding of modern history of the United States and elsewhere, as he states that the next steps from “socialism” are fascism and communism (pg. 36-37), and that Mussolini was beloved by the left (pg. 39), a dubious statement given Il Duce’s role in the Spanish Civil War.
by the nativist movements of the past, where the struggle was defined as those who embrace the “American” values (often with a religious overtone) against those who allegedly ran afoul of it.

The “manifesto” of the Tea Party movement as presented by Farah makes clear that Paul’s focus on fiscal discipline and (his reading of) Constitution is not a vision shared unanimously among the supporters of the Tea Party movement. Indeed, the Tea Party movement has shown similar traits with nativist groups of the past in terms of their belief system. Early nativists such as the supporters of the Anti-Masonic movement and the Know-Nothing Party subscribed to the belief that outside influences such as the Masonic order or the Catholic Church were conspiring to undermine the republican character of the United States. The Tea Party movement was similar to these nativist movements in that it treated “socialism” (or, more precisely, what it constructed as “socialism” after Obama’s inauguration to the White House) was to undermine what America great, namely free enterprise and capitalist work ethic."

The Tea Party movement resembled nativist movements of the past also in terms of the sense of racial resentment the movement’s supporters possessed. A study conducted by the University of Washington Institute for the Study of Ethnicity, Race, and Sexuality showed that some 73% of those who strongly approve the Tea Party movement responded positively to the survey question “blacks would be as well off as whites if they just tried harder,” compared to 33% among those who strongly disapproved of the movement. Also, 56% of strong Tea Party supporters responded positively to the question “immigrants take jobs from Americans” compared to 31% of those disapproving of Tea Party.

Formisano, in his book, also recounts the instance where Tea Party protestors “called black

---

"The sentiment that the Obama Administration’s policy is “socialism” is, notwithstanding the wisdom of the belief in work ethic and free enterprise, factually inaccurate. The tax rates during the Obama years (including for the rich) have been lower than during the Reagan years. Under the logic that Obama is a “socialist,” it probably follows that Republican president Richard Nixon, who was quoted as saying that “we are all Keynesians now,” should be dubbed a “communist.” Of course, rarely if ever does one see a Tea Party supporter employing such a rhetoric, although it would be factually and historically accurate.
congressman ‘nigger’ and spat at him.”¹³⁵ A November 2011 poll showed that supporters of the Tea Party movement “said that discrimination against whites was a major problem.”¹³⁶

The Tea Party supporters’ susceptibility to racially resentful impulses was once again clearly shown during the “Birther” debate, which also demonstrated that the Tea Partiers readily subscribed to the nativist politics of conspiracy (i.e. led by the President of the United States and the majority of Americans who voted for him) with the slightest opportunity at their hand. The “Birther” debate started when supporters of the Tea Party movement began to claim that the President was in fact born outside the United States,¹³⁷ despite the fact that Obama’s birth was recorded in a local newspaper (The Honolulu Advertiser) on August 13, 1961.¹³⁸ Real estate magnate Donald Trump took charge of the promotion of this dubious conspiracy theory when he claimed that there was a “real question” regarding whether Obama was born in the United States,¹³⁹ and that those who believe that Obama was born an American citizen were “co-opted” by “Obama and his minions.”¹⁴⁰ The fact that the “birther” debate garnered a considerable following despite the lack of factual basis for these attacks indicated that it was likely created largely because of the sense of resentment Tea Party supporters possessed against the first president of African descent in the history of the United States. Indeed, the Tea Party supporters’ subscription to the “birther” conspiracy theory would continue even after Obama disclosed his birth certificate – Joseph Farah’s WorldNetDaily alleged that Obama’s birth certificate and social security number were fraudulent.¹⁴¹ Trump, as always an avid seeker of public attention, also made a similar claim.¹⁴² The conspiracy theory surrounding Obama’s birth certificate eventually got to a point where it began to frustrate conservative politicians – Senator Lindsey Graham, a very conservative Republican from South Carolina, put it well when he said that those who subscribed to the “birther” conspiracy theory were “crazy” and their views did not reflect the views of the Republican Party as a whole.¹⁴³ The rift between established conservative politicians such as Graham and the more aggressive
conservative grassroots activists such as the Tea Partiers and the “birthers” would become a theme that defined the American conservative politics during the Tea Party years.

[Figures vii, viii] The above figures show a billboard posted by WorldNetDaily, a conservative news site operated by Joseph Farah, who also wrote *The Tea Party Manifesto*. Despite the limited factual bases, the “birther” conspiracy theory garnered a considerable following among Tea Party supporters shortly after its creation, The “birther” debate would persist even after Obama’s disclosure of his birth certificate, this time under the rhetoric that the birth certificate was fraudulent. [Figures courtesy of Wikimedia]

One of the explanatory factors on the sense of racial resentment often demonstrated by the supporters of the Tea Party movement was the movement’s commanding presence in the Southern United States. When Michelle Bachmann formed the Tea Party Caucus in 2010, she stated that the caucus was to serve the Americans who embrace the “timeless principles” of “fiscal responsibility, adherence to the Constitution, and limited government.”\(^{144}\) This, in hindsight, created an impression that the Tea Party movement was a nationwide calling for the adherence to the principles of fiscal responsibility and
limited Constitutional government. In practice, however, the Tea Party Caucus (alongside the Tea Party movement in general, as we have already observed) was to a large extent a regional movement. Of the 50 House members who were part of the Tea Party Caucus at the time it went practically defunct\textsuperscript{145} in 2012, 30 (i.e. 60\%) hailed from the Southern states\textsuperscript{146} - Bachmann was the only member representing her home state of Minnesota. The Southerners’ disproportionate presence within the Tea Party movement dwarfed the already heavy Southern presence within the Republican Party at large – which was 38.8\% in 2010 and peaked at 41.9\% in 2012.\textsuperscript{147} Aside from its presence in the South, the Tea Party movement also shared a number of key demographic traits with nativist groups of the past. A 2010 poll jointly conducted by the \textit{New York Times} and CBS News showed that Tea Party supporters tended to be older, white, and politically conservative. According to this poll, some 59\% of Tea Party supporters were male, compared to 49\% for the nation as a whole.\textsuperscript{148} 89\% were white, compared to the national figure of 77\%.\textsuperscript{149} Those who were 45 or older comprised 75\% of the movement (the percentage of 45 or older in the United States at the time of the survey was 50\%).\textsuperscript{150} 73\% of the Tea Party supporters identified themselves as politically “conservative” (the national figure was 34\%), while only 4\% described themselves as “somewhat liberal.”\textsuperscript{151} Some 38\% responded they attend religious services on a weekly basis compared to 27\% for Americans at large,\textsuperscript{152} showing the probable correlation between the Tea Party movement and the “religious right.” Indeed, the same poll showed that Tea Party supporters tended to oppose gay marriage on a double-digit (23\%) margin and did the same regarding abortion (16\% gap on the response on whether abortion should be “generally available”).\textsuperscript{153}
The above chart shows that some 60% of the members of the House Tea Party Caucus were Southerners at the time of the Caucus’s practical dissolution in 2012. The commanding Southern presence in the House Tea Party caucus shows that the Tea Party movement should be understood in a regional (i.e. Southern) context rather than as a *bona fide* movement for “fiscal responsibility, adherence to the Constitution, and limited government” as claimed by Michelle Bachmann, who founded the Tea Party Caucus. Chart © Albert Choi, list of Tea Party caucus members retrieved from: ¹⁵⁴

The nature of the Tea Party movement as a modern incarnation of nativism in the United States rather than a group solely concerned with fiscal responsibility and limited government is also shown in the fact that the Tea Partiers do not oppose all government programs. Indeed, a Wall Street Journal/NBC poll conducted in early 2011 showed that Tea Party supporters were opposed to significant cuts to Social
Security “by a nearly 2-to-1 margin,” and a nonpartisan poll conducted later that year found that 34% of Tea Party supporters were opposed to cuts in Social Security and Medicare “no matter what,” while an additional 30% believed cuts in these programs should be met with an alternative program to help people prepare for retirement.\footnote{156}

In hindsight, the Tea Party supporters’ embrace of federal programs such as Social Security and Medicare seems ironic in that these programs are a 1) federally funded program, 2) passed by the Democrats as a part of the New Deal and Great Society, which were 3) opposed by conservatives at the time of their passage and have been reviled by conservatives ever since. Indeed, there have been views that slogans such as “hands off my Medicare” reflect the complex nature of ordinary Tea Party supporters’ attitude towards government programs. For instance, Skocpol and Williamson observe that these statements indicate that Tea Party supporters believe in government benefit for those who deserve it (e.g. Medicare for people like themselves) rather than opposing government programs altogether (e.g. food-stamp program for low-income families).\footnote{157} Under this theory, government programs should exist for those who earned such entitlements (i.e. themselves), whereas those who did not earn it (e.g. food stamp recipients) should not be entitled to such programs. The Tea Partiers’ construct on who are entitled to government benefits and who aren’t, as will be observed, were based on the nativist political thoughts the Tea Partiers inherited from earlier nativist movement, and the Tea Partiers’ practical concern on their own economic well-being after retirement, while deriving little from an ideologically coherent fiscal conservatism.

Programs such as the Social Security Act of 1935 and the Social Security Amendments of 1965 (which enacted Medicare) were met with opposition from conservatives at the time of their passage, with Barry Goldwater and Ronald Reagan, both conservative icons of the era, leading the opposition. The
conservatives\(^v\) managed to garner 33 votes in opposition to the Social Security Act of 1935 in the House of Representatives\(^{158}\) despite having public opinion overwhelmingly in favor of the Act’s passage because of the dire economic circumstances created by the Great Depression. The conservative opposition to Medicare proved somewhat sturdier, as only 70 out of 140 Republicans voted for the amendments in the House (13 out of 32 in the Senate).\(^{159}\) Goldwater, who Horwitz argues was the founding figure of the nativist-inspired “anti-establishment” conservatism, was quoted as saying that “if Medicare is added to Social Security, it means that an individual could take the money that he and his employer spend on Social Security and buy twice as good a policy to cover everything that Social Security proposes to cover.”\(^{160}\) Future president and leading conservative Ronald Reagan, on his LP titled *Ronald Reagan Speaks Out Against Socialized Medicine*, stated that most Americans “would unhesitatingly vote against” Medicare if given a choice, and that Medicare was “a short step to all the rest of socialism,” eventually leading to the government determining an individual’s work, education, and career.\(^{161}\) Reagan’s outcry of socialism would be largely reprised by Tea Party supporters during their opposition to the Obama Administration’s battle for (and the eventual passage of) the Affordable Care Act of 2010, during which Obama’s plan to overhaul health care in the United States was portrayed as a precursor to socialism.

\(^v\) Here, I chose the term “conservative” instead of making a party-specific argument (e.g. the “Republicans opposed ---”) because records show that opposition to Social Security was made based on ideological rather than partisan lines. 81 out of 103 House Republicans supported the 1935 Social Security Act.
Medicare, a federally funded program that provides health care benefits for Americans 65 or older and for Americans with ALS (also known as Lou Gehrig’s disease), was vigorously opposed by right-wing conservatives of the era. Barry Goldwater, the Republican presidential candidate for the 1964 Presidential election, led the opposition to Medicare in Senate. Future U.S. President Ronald Reagan, who had cultivated a career as a spokesman for the conservative cause during the 1950s, also took part in the opposition to the passage of the 1965 Amendments that enacted Medicare. Here, Reagan is shown in a cover for LP titled *Ronald Reagan Speaks Out Against Socialized Medicine*, where he described Medicare as “a short step to all the rest of socialism.” Oddly enough, the program that Reagan described as “socialism” in this LP would become something that supporters of the Tea Party movement, ostensibly the advocates for “small government” and limited role of federal government, came to vigorously support [Figure courtesy of Wikimedia].
The above chart shows the decrease in the percentage of Republicans that voted for the Social Security Amendments of 1965 (which enacted Medicare) compared to the percentage that voted for the Social Security Act of 1935. Here, it is shown that there was a 28.6% decrease in the percentage of House Republicans who voted “Aye” in 1965 (compared to 1935), with a decrease of 23.4% shown in Senate. While the still substantial Republican votes in 1965 may serve as a counterexample to former DNC Chair Howard Dean’s rhetoric on how Republicans opposed Medicare, it seems fair to suggest that the American conservative movement opposed Medicare from its very beginning, as majority of the Republicans who voted “Aye” in 1965 were likely the members of the liberal or moderate wing of the Republican Party, which continued to have a substantial presence up until the late 1970s. The decline and eventual downfall of the liberal and moderate factions within the Republican is discussed in detail on Geoffrey Kabaservice’s book Rule and Ruin: The Downfall of Moderation and the Destruction of the Republican Party. Chart © Albert Choi, sources for the chart derived from: 162 163.
The Tea Party supporters’ 1) embrace of certain federal programs that were once denounced as “socialism” by conservatives (e.g. Medicare) and 2) denunciation of the Obama Administration’s health care agenda as “socialist” provides another display on how the Tea Party movement’s agenda is based on nativist political thoughts rather than an ideologically coherent fiscal conservatism. The American conservative movement as led by Goldwater and Reagan was seldom—if ever— in favor of expanding federal role to government, having vehemently opposed Medicare at the time of its passage. Yet, under the Tea Party agenda, benefits from the federal government are not deemed to be “socialism” threatening to the “American” way of life so long as they are distributed to those who have earned it (as observed by Skocpol and Williamson). Even Paul Ryan, who became a darling of the conservative movement by calling for sweeping cuts in federal entitlement programs such as Social Security and Medicare, frequently referred to the cuts that would be made to Medicare under the Affordable Care Act during his Vice Presidential campaign in 2012, although he neglected to mention that the plan endorsed by Ryan himself would have made even similar cuts to the Medicare programs. According to Tea Party supporters, therefore, the federal social welfare programs that is inherently “socialist” that is threatening to the “American” way of life were the programs aimed at helping those who don’t deserve it; the programs that are in nature virtually identical were not to be treated as a threat as long as they were aimed at helping those who did deserve the government assistance.

There are multiple evidences as to how the Tea Party supporters’ preference for a federal entitlement program that serves a selected clientele (i.e. people who the Tea Partiers perceive as deserving government help, with that group often overlapping with people like themselves) has been shaped largely by nativist political thoughts that heavily influenced the Tea Party movement from the very beginning. The fact that conservatives from the Goldwater-Reagan era were adamant at their opposition to the passage of Medicare, along with the fact that most Tea Partiers want these programs untouched, indicate that it is hard to say that the Tea Party supporters’ opposition to “socialist” government policies
is based on an ideologically coherent fiscal conservatism that opposes *all* “big government” policies based on legal or economic principles, a la Justice Antonin Scalia (legal) or Milton Friedman (economic).

A more plausible explanation to the Tea Partiers’ ambivalent attitude on social welfare policies would be the politics of racial resentment that has been employed by nativist groups in the United States. As observed earlier, the Tea Party movement has been linked with nativist groups of the past in that it inherited much of the same demographics from past nativist movements in white, native, religious voters and racially and/or socioculturally resentful white voters in Southern United States. This, as having been discussed, resulted in supporters of the Tea Party movement often showing traits indicative of a deep racial resentment, as shown during the “birther” debate and explicit and implicit racial remarks employed by Tea Party supporters. In addition, the Tea Party supporters’ allegations of “socialism” are concentrated on the programs that benefit socioeconomically disadvantaged groups, which, by definition, happen to encompass a large portion of racial and ethnic minorities. Results from the 2010 *New York Times/CBS* poll also tend to support this hypothesis: According to this poll, more than half (52%) of Tea Party supporters agreed with the statement that “too much been made of the problems facing black people” compared to 28% of Americans at large who made the same response. In addition, Tea Party supporters were 14% more likely (25% compared to 11% of Americans at large) to believe that the Obama Administration favored blacks over whites. While the evidences presented here do not necessarily prove that the politics of racial resentment has been a definitive factor in the Tea Party agenda on federal entitlement programs, it seems safe to suggest that 1) the Tea Party supporters’ opposition to a selected group of entitlement programs (e.g. “Obamacare”) is hardly based on an ideologically coherent fiscal conservatism, and 2) the sense of racial resentment possessed by the Tea Party supporters offers a plausible alternative explanation to the Tea Partiers’ ambivalent attitude on federal entitlement programs, given the amount of evidences that can be presented to support it and the absence of other plausible alternative explanations.
The Tea Party movement’s appeal to the general American public was largely due to the fact that it seemed to offer a fresh face of the Republican Party and conservative politics at large by portraying itself as an independent political movement with a genuine concern on the scope of federal government and the alleged fiscal irresponsibility in Washington. However, the Tea Party movement was closer to the modern incarnation of nativist politics in the United States rather than a bona fide independent political movement in that it 1) represented the interests of the Americans on the far right of the political spectrum rather than appealing to a wider audience, 2) inherited the demographics traditionally susceptible to nativist impulses from the “religious right” movement and the racially resentful white voters in the Southern United States, 3) did not differ in its substantive policy preferences with the supporters of the “religious right,” as shown in the both the literatures published and/or circulated by Tea Partiers themselves and the poll results on Tea Party supporters, 4) subscribed to the notion that the supporters of the Tea Party movement extol the “American” values that are threatened by the opposition, and 5) demonstrated the belief in the nativist politics of conspiracy, where those who have allegedly run afoul of the “American” values were actively forming a conspiracy against the United States. The nativist aspects of the Tea Party movement as described above would alert the established figures within the Republican Party as well as the Democratic opposition, as the establishment Republicans increasingly viewed the Tea Partiers as 1) a liability in national elections, as the Tea Party movement’s far-right views often alienated the more moderate Americans (i.e. majority of the electorate), and 2) a threat in their hold to power within the Republican ranks, as the candidates backed by the Tea Party movement increasingly challenged and often defeated the more established and better funded incumbents in the Republican primary in the state or district level. The Tea Party movement’s role in the Republican comeback during the 2010 midterm elections, the 2012 elections, and the deepening rift between the Tea Party movement and the Republican establishment after the 2010 elections is the subject matter of the next chapter.
IV. The Tea Party movement’s role during the elections of 2010 and 2012 and how the Tea Party insurgencies within the Republican Party created a rift between the Tea Party movement and the Republican establishment.

The Tea Party movement was one of the driving forces behind the Republican Party’s strong performance in the 2010 midterm elections by reinvigorating the conservative support base after the crushing defeats of the 2008 election and by offering a Republican agenda that was seemingly different from that from the Bush years. Despite beginning as little more than a loose group of small-scale protests, the Tea Party movement quickly grew to possess a nationwide reach with the help of 1) the spotlight given from the conservative media, 2) “astroturfing” by outside interest groups such as FreedomWorks and the Chamber of Commerce, which in turn helped in 3) mobilizing the demographics traditionally susceptible to nativist discourses, where the Tea Party agenda appealed the most. The conservative media, including the enterprises owned by News Corp (which encompasses major news outlets such as the Fox News Channel, the New York Post, and the Wall Street Journal) and interest organizations such as FreedomWorks viewed the Tea Party movement as a vehicle through which they could commandeer a viable opposition against the Democratic ascendancy in the government. The Tea Party movement, indeed, successfully played this role during the 2010 election scale by offering an image of the Republican Party that seemed quite different from the now unpopular image from the Bush era. The agenda advanced by the Tea Party movement, however, was to a large extent a continuum of conservative populism that was heavily influenced by nativist politics, which resulted in the Tea Party agenda often differing from the one desired by their corporate and media sponsors (most frequently, by insisting on a strict adherence on a rigid set of right-wing agenda even when doing so costs dearly in elections). Hence, the strong presence of the Tea Party movement during the 2010 election could be viewed as a marriage of convenience between conservative populists who looked to advance their nativist agenda through the Tea Party movement, and the conservative media and
interest groups who saw the movement as a tool through which the Republicans could regain some hold in Washington in 2010. This marriage of convenience, as we will observe in Chapter V of this essay, would come to dissolve as the differences between the Tea Party agenda and that of the movement’s sponsors became increasingly irreconcilable.

The Tea Party movement focused on a narrow set of issues (fiscal conservatism and “constitutionalism”) rather than promoting a right-wing agenda on a wide variety of issues (e.g. social issues), while creating an impression that Obama’s “socialist” agenda was changing America for the worse in an irrevocable fashion. Indeed, the Tea Party movement was successful in creating a Republican agenda that seemed to be distinct from the Bush era by focusing on a narrow set of issues such as fiscal conservatism (i.e. budget balance) and a strict adherence to the Constitution of the United States. The Tea Party agenda on fiscal issues (in surface, at least) could be characterized as restoring fiscal discipline (i.e. eliminating deficit) through a strict adherence to what the Tea Partiers view as the Constitutional principles. Rick Santelli, a CNBC commentator who supported the Tea Party movement from its early stage, exclaimed such sentiment when he said on his broadcast that it is unfair for a working American to pay for one’s “neighbor’s mortgage that has an extra bathroom” when those neighbors “can’t pay their bills.” Belief in (what Tea Partiers believe/construct as) a strict adherence to the Constitution was yet another central theme of the early Tea Party movement – Skocpol notes that “pocket-sized versions of the Constitutions,” including those signed by Tea Party leaders such as Michelle Bachmann, was widely available in Tea Party gatherings. It is questionable whether the Republicans, including the politicians who benefited from or actively led the Tea Party movement, were seriously concerned about either budget balance or adherence to Constitutional principles prior to the emergence of the Tea Party movement. Still, the Tea Party movement’s focus on fiscal and Constitutional issues allowed the Republicans to frame their opposition to the Obama Administration based on such issues rather than

\[\text{\textsuperscript{\textit{w}} Indeed, there are many evidences to the contrary, as will be discussed later.} \]
the issues such as foreign policy (e.g. Iraq) and social issues, thereby allowing them to present themselves as a viable opposition to the Democratic ascendancy rather than the remnants from the widely unpopular Bush Administration.

The Tea Party movement received extensive media coverage from the conservative media almost immediately after its inception. The media outlet that probably played the greatest role in this regard was Fox News Channel, a News Corp subsidiary that traditionally had been the premier conservative television news provider in the United States. The Tea Party movement received extensive media coverage from the conservative media almost immediately after its inception. The media outlet that probably played the greatest role in this regard was Fox News Channel, a News Corp subsidiary that traditionally had been the premier conservative television news provider in the United States. The FNC support for the Tea Party movement began early as April 15, 2009 (i.e. almost immediately after the movement was on the radar), when anchors from the channel encouraged those who have discontents with Obama’s presidency to have their voices heard in Fox News-sponsored Tea Party rallies. Fox News, which was openly partisan in that it did not always conform to the journalistic norm of presenting “both sides of the issue,” appealed to the white, native, older Americans who identify themselves as conservatives – the same demographics that would comprise the Tea Party movement. The cheerleading conducted by the conservative media and outside interest groups quickly energized the Tea Party support base that had remained dormant after the Republican defeat in 2008 by shifting the agenda from a hard-line foreign policy and social conservatism (both of which became increasingly unpopular among the general public, as shown in the elections of 2006 and 2008) to demand the restoration of fiscal discipline in Washington. Now, the focus was paid not on the “war on terrorism” whose appeal had faded, but on the alleged “socialism” of the Obama Administration and how it constituted a threat to the values the Tea Party supporters asserted that made America great. By doing
so, the Republicans were able to present a fresh face on which the general public could be more inclined to vote for despite their disapproval of the agenda of the Bush Administration.

The Fox News coverage of the Tea Party movement began to catch steam with the company’s hiring of two outsiders – Glenn Beck, a self-styled populist who often subscribed to the politics of conspiracy often found in nativist movements, and former Republican VP candidate Sarah Palin, whose “hockey mom” image somewhat energized the conservative voting base during the 2008 presidential elections while alienating many others. Beck, who was hired by Fox News in 2009, was quick at accusing the new presidency of being part of a conspiracy against the United States, alleging that the Obama Administration was leading the country to the path of totalitarianism in a path that was started by Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson. Palin, continuing from her rhetoric during the 2008 campaign, accused the presidency of resorting to “socialism” in order to address the country’s woes. Traditional Fox staples such as Bill O’Reilly and Sean Hannity soon followed the suit in alleging the presidency of running afoul of American values by its economic policies, with Hannity playing an important role in organizing early Tea Party rallies and becoming one of the premier supporters of the movement among the pundits in the mass media for years to come.
The Tea Party protests, which began as a group of small-scale protests, caught nationwide attention after receiving an extensive coverage from the conservative media. [Figure courtesy of Wikimedia]

The conservative media coverage of the Tea Party movement caught further steam with the sense of urgency felt by the Tea Party supporters based on the belief that Obama’s presidency was to transform America into a “socialist” state. Sarah Palin during the 2008 presidential election season had denounced Obama’s economic platform as “socialism” when she was quoted as saying that "But Joe the Plumber and Ed the Dairy Man, I believe that they [i.e. the plumber and the dairy man] think that it sounds more like socialism," adding that “now is no time to experiment with socialism.”174 Palin’s mentioning of “Joe the Plumber”175 marked the Republican vis a vis Tea Party tactic of framing fiscal conservatism (i.e. avoiding “socialism”) as a common citizen’s concern rather than something pushed by wealthier Americans who would immediately benefit from a smaller government. Indeed, the conservative media such as Fox News Channel was quick to portray the Obama Administration’s economic policy as that based on “socialism,” although the definition of “socialism” often remained unclear and somewhat inaccurate. Glenn Beck, for instance, “warned viewers about the socialist takeover of the federal government” under a plot that was initiated by the early 20th Century “Progressives” such as Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson.176 Palin, as a Tea Party speaker, continued to use the ill-defined “socialism” in criticizing the Obama Administration.177 Ordinary Tea Party supporters often echoed these remarks, denouncing the presidency as leading the country into a “socialist” future.178 While the factual accuracy of linking Obama’s presidency with “socialism” remained largely debatable, such allegations

---

x Oddly enough, the real Woodrow Wilson was known for a series of crackdowns on suspected Communists in the United States; the “Palmer raids,” which was aimed at arresting and departing dangerous left-wing radicals in the United States, was named after A. Mitchell Palmer, who was the Attorney General under Wilson’s presidency.

y Despite all the hype about the supposed rise in the role of government during the Obama years, the tax rates during the Obama years has been substantially lower than during the Reagan years, which saw
provided a convenient tool through which the Republicans could oppose the presidency that rose amid the plummeting popularity of its predecessor.

The conservative media’s call to arms towards Tea Party activists through portraying the Obama Administration as “socialist” further accelerated with the debate on and the eventual passage of the Affordable Care of 2010 (“Obamacare”). Palin introduced the apocryphal notion of “death panels” that would determine whether a person under a serious medical condition would receive a treatment or not (i.e. live or die). The crucial talking point here was the cuts that would be made to Medicare with the passage of a nationwide health care reform, thus the famous Tea Party slogan “keep your government hands off my Medicare.” While the question of whether statements like this reflects the ideological inconsistency of an average Tea Party supporters has been a matter of dispute (as will be discussed later in this chapter), statements as above did reflect the fear among many Tea Partiers that “Obamacare” would affect their interests in an adverse manner while steering the country into a wrong (e.g. “socialist”) direction. Indeed, the conservative media used “Obamacare” as a convenient tool through which they labeled the Obama Administration as “socialist” on multiple instances, which in turn helped energizing the Tea Party movement by bringing a sense of brinkmanship (i.e. against the upcoming “socialism”) among the movement’s white, older, native support base.

The Tea Party movement was also greatly assisted by “astroturfing” from outside interest groups that saw the movement as a vehicle through which they could advance their fiscally conservative agenda. The term “astroturfing” was originated from “astroturf,” an artificial grass used for the Astrodome, the home field for the Houston Astros, since it was hard to maintain natural grass in a closed-door setting. Therefore, whereas a “grassroots” movement referred to a political movement that stemmed purely substantial cuts in tax levels for individuals and business, particularly wealthier Americans. As such, if one is to assume that the Obama Administration is “socialist,” a natural conclusion is that majority of American presidents after FDR, including Eisenhower, Nixon, and Ford, were “socialists” if not worse. Who, as observed earlier, tend to be older, white Americans who are, while economically comfortable, likely to be receiving federally entitled benefits such as Medicare and Social Security.
from the people’s concern, an “astroturfed” movement referred to a movement that was at least partially assisted by funding and rhetoric from outside influences. The outside groups that wielded a considerable influence in the Tea Party movement through “astroturfing” included Dick Armey’s FreedomWorks, wealthy individual donors such as the Koch Brothers, and other interest group funded by Koch Brothers such as Americans for Prosperity.

Dick Armey’s FreedomWorks was one of the premier outside interest groups that promoted the Tea Party movement from its beginning stage. FreedomWorks started as “Citizens for a Sound Economy,” founded by Dick Armey, a North Dakota native and a Republican Congressman from Texas, and funded by the Koch Brothers. Armey and FreedomWorks president Matt Kibbe had planned a citizen movement by “an irate, tireless minority” forming “a cadre of vocal citizens” protesting the amount of money they were taxed modeled on John Adams’ strategy during the Revolutionary War (i.e. to displace Tories/loyalists in town hall meetings) as early as 2007, well before the emergence of the Tea Party movement. Indeed, Armey would promote his fiscal conservative agenda and receive the chants “Freedom works!” years before the Tea Party movement’s birth. FreedomWorks began to sponsor various Tea Party events opposing the Obama Administration almost immediately after the movement’s inception. At the meantime, Americans for Prosperity, another organization underwritten by the Koch Brothers that promoted largely the same agenda with FreedomWorks, rallied conservative activist across the country in an endeavor that helped the conservative initiatives in many states including Wisconsin governor Scott Walker’s attempt (and eventual success) in greatly reducing the bargaining capacities of labor unions for the state government of his state. FreedomWorks would later contribute in Tea Party insurgency within the Republican Party when it helped displacing the “establishment” Republicans who were not deemed sufficiently conservative by it vis a vis supporters of the Tea Party movement.
Interest groups promoting fiscal conservatism such as FreedomWorks were funded largely by wealthy Americans with a history of supporting groups that promoted the fiscal conservative agenda that looked to eliminate the legacies of the New Deal/Great Society era such as Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. Perhaps the most noteworthy of these wealthy Americans were the Koch Brothers, who came to the national spotlight during the emergence of the Tea Party movement for their close association with and financial support of the movement. The Koch Brothers, who father was John Birch Society supporter Fred C. Koch, had been highly influential contributors to the causes of reducing the role of government in economy and promote skepticism for climate change for many years at the time the Tea Party movement came to emerge. Once the Tea Party movement came into existence, the Koch Brothers helped the movement grow by sponsoring a series of events that promoted the Tea Party cause of denouncing the “socialist” agenda of the Obama Administration, as shown in a July 4th meeting dubbed “Texas Defending the American Dream.” The Kochs’ influence were not limited to merely underwriting spontaneous Tea Party insurgencies, either – groups funded by the Kochs such as Americans for Prosperity played a role in shaping the Tea Party agenda by providing those sympathetic to the movement guidelines such as “Tea Party Talking Points.” The Koch Brothers also hosted meetings to “develop strategies to counter the most severe threats facing our free society” including “climate change alarmism and the move to socialized health care,” adding to the observation that they looked to actively promote their fiscal conservative agenda by shaping the Tea Party talking points rather than merely underwriting a movement that already existed in the grassroots.

The success of the Tea Party movement in spreading their agenda among the conservative support base was followed by the politicians already elected in a Congress seat claiming leadership of the movement. Michelle Bachmann’s “Tea Party caucus” featured Bachmann, who was first elected to the House of Representatives in 2006 as a generic conservative of the Bush era, formed the Tea Party Caucus in the House of Representatives and became its chairperson, in an endeavor that would bring her to a
national spotlight for years to come. Other figures such as South Carolina Senator Jim DeMint also associated themselves with the Tea Party movement, with DeMint fashioning himself as the “Senator Tea Party.” The Republican leadership, at the meantime, largely embraced the Tea Party agenda during the 2010 election season and offered it as an alternative to what they alleged was a “socialist” agenda of the Obama Administration.

The rise in Tea Party influence within the Republican ranks through 1) elected politicians joining the ranks, and 2) grassroots activists starting an insurgency within the party ranks aided by the conservative media and outside interest groups, coincided with the solid Republican performance in the 2010 elections, where the Republicans were able to regain the majority in the House of Representatives only two years after the sound Republican defeat in 2008. While the exact role of the Tea Party movement in the Republican comeback in the 2010 elections seems to remain an open debate, it seems safe to suggest that the Tea Party movement did play a substantial role in offering a fresh face (notwithstanding the substance) of the Republican Party for the 2010 elections, replacing the highly unpopular agenda from the Bush/McCain era to a more presentable form of fiscal responsibility and budget balance. Indeed, issues such as strict adherence to the Constitution and the necessity to restore fiscal discipline were the issues hardly discussed during the Bush years, if at all. The Tea Party movement, by contrast, offered a seemingly principled opposition to all big government actions in what one could believe was a truly independent, non-partisan movement.

During and shortly after the 2010 elections, the Tea Party movement was seldom treated as a threat to the Republican leadership. After all, the Tea Party movement was the vehicle through which the Republicans were able to draw attention to the conservative opposition to the Obama Administration rather than the substantive policy promoted by Obama’s presidency. For the established Republican figures such as the House Minority Leader (later to be House Speaker) John Boehner, the Tea Party movement was probably thought of as a boon as long as it 1) helped winning nationwide elections by
energizing the conservative support base (under the assumption that the benefit of doing so outweighed the loss from alienating the more moderate voters), and 2) refrained from seriously challenging the Republican leadership in its substantive policy preferences and its incumbency. Naturally, the rift between the Republican establishment and the Tea Party movement continued to widen as it became increasingly clear that the Tea Party movement was interested in doing neither. The beginning of this rift took place during the 2010 elections in the Republican primary seasons, showing that the marriage between the Tea Party movement and the Republican establishment was a precarious one to begin with, as the nativist tendencies of the Tea Party movement made it difficult for the Republican Party to work with it while not alienating the general public with the Tea Partiers’ radical right-wing agenda.

The embrace of the Tea Party agenda by a large number of Republican elected officials (i.e. from “above”) was met by insurgencies within the Republican ranks to oust “establishment” Republican candidates that the Tea Partiers thought were not unfit to carry out their (i.e. their, not Republican) agenda. These insurgencies, as we will observe, would often prove to be a liability for the Republican Party in the long run. In Utah, Senator Bob Bennett, a reliable conservative who received good ranks from conservative think tanks such as the American Conservative Union, was defeated in the Republican primary by Tea Party favorite Mike Lee. In a special election held in the 23rd Congressional district of New York in 2009, Tea Party activists and national politicians associated with the movement supported Doug Hoffman, the candidate for the Conservative Party of New York, rather than the Republican candidate Dede Scozzafava. The election was won by Democrat Bill Owens after Scozzafava, having been displaced by the Tea Party-backed Hoffman, endorsed Owens after suspending her campaign.

---

aa The Conservative Party of New York was founded during the governorship of Nelson Rockefeller, a moderate Republican who was widely seen as the leader of the liberal wing of the Republican Party. Right-wing conservatives in New York State distrusted Rockefeller precisely for this reason and founded the Conservative Party as a bulwark against the Republican Party they saw as too liberal to represent their interests.
Perhaps the most well-known instance of Tea Party insurgency against the Republican establishment was shown during the nomination of Christine O’Donnell, a Tea Party favorite, over establishment Republican Mike Castle in the Delaware Senate race in 2010. Here, Mike Castle, a moderate Republican who had a realistic chance of winning a statewide election, lost the Republican primary to Tea Party favorite Christine O’Donnell. O’Donnell, a graduate of Farleigh Dickinson University with little professional or educational achievements who received grassroots support from rural conservatives as well as support from nationwide right-wing groups for her strict adherence to the right-wing agenda as espoused by the Tea Party movement. O’Donnell would lose the Senate election amid controversies about the statements she made regarding how she “dabbled into witchcraft” in a contest many believed was not winnable with a Tea Party favorite (i.e. instead of a well-liked moderate Republican). In Alaska, the home state of Tea Party icon Sarah Palin, moderate Republican incumbent Lisa Murkowski lost the Republican primary for senate to Tea Party favorite Joe Miller, who was endorsed by Palin and ran on the agenda that “the only way out” for the United States to overcome the economic crisis was “to get out of the age of the entitlement state,” and that Obama was responsible for “moving this country towards socialism.” Miller would be defeated by Murkowski, who ran as a write-in candidate after losing the Republican nomination in the general election.

The Tea Party movement’s role in making winnable competitions out of reach for Republicans (notwithstanding the movement’s contribution in the 2010 election) began to cause concern even among the business interests that were initially supportive of the movement. Even prior to the 2010 elections, a BusinessWeek article titled “Why Business Doesn’t Trust the Tea Party” noted that the Tea Party activists’ rigid, dogmatic ways found little affections from the more practical minded business leaders, pointing out that the Tea Party movement could be a “dream come true” for the business community “as long as the corporation in question doesn't have international operations, rely on immigrant labor, see the value of national monetary policy, or find itself in need of a subsidy to boost...
exports or an emergency loan from the Fed to survive the worst recession in seven decades.\textsuperscript{210}

Naturally, businesses that could benefit from a moderately conservative agenda promoted by the pragmatically minded Republicans but could incur some damage from the Tea Party agenda began to distance themselves from the movement once the right opportunities came.

A clear display of such turn in the business perception of the Tea Party agenda was shown when popular Fox News anchor Glenn Beck, whose nativist-inspired conspiracy theories fueled much of the early Tea Party protests in 2009, was let go by Fox News Channel, which continued to sponsor and support key Tea Party agenda and events. Beck was never a stranger to making controversial remarks, having called Obama a “racist” possessing “deep-seat hatred for the white people or the white culture,”\textsuperscript{211} declaring that a group called “Crime Inc.” constituting of Obama, former Presidential hopeful Al Gore, Goldman Sachs, and Fannie Mae.\textsuperscript{212} Beck also accused hedge fund icon George Soros of profiteering from the BP oil spill at the Gulf of Mexico, citing Soros’s investment in a Brazilian oil firm named Petrobras,\textsuperscript{213} an allegation that likely pleased few (if any) business leaders otherwise supportive of the conservative cause.\textsuperscript{bb} A series of controversial remarks made corporations, including the ones that are otherwise staunch allies to the conservative cause, including Arkansas-based Walmart and agribusiness ConAgra, to boycott advertisements for Beck’s programming.\textsuperscript{214} Beck would be let go by Fox News in 2011 when it became clear that Beck’s presence, notwithstanding the high ratings his show carried, increasingly became a liability for even a conservative media outlet like Fox.\textsuperscript{215} Beck’s removal from the Fox News Channel illuminated the theme that would characterized the conflict between the Tea Party supporters and the Republican leadership – much like Beck, who promoted his own agenda even when doing so was so polarizing that it dispelled even business interests otherwise friendly to the conservative cause,

\textsuperscript{bb} While Soros himself is a Democrat, it seems doubtful if business leaders would be approving of a political pundit who, in a manner not dissimilar to Father Charles Coughlin, actively promotes the theory that some of the business leaders in the United States are forming a conspiracy against the United States.
the Tea Partiers were poised to advance their agenda even when doing so hampered the Republican Party from obtaining an upper hand in national elections by making otherwise winnable contests unwinnable with their radical right-wing agenda. What is more, the Tea Party supporters, not unlike Beck whose belief in “Crime Inc.” earned little affection from the business community, subscribed to the nativist politics of conspiracy against the United States by those who ran afoul of the “American” values. The Tea Partiers’ belief in the politics of conspiracy (as shown in the “birther” debate) as well as their unwillingness to compromise their views would convince the business interests behind the Republican Party to treat the Tea Party movement as more of a liability than an asset for the Republicans at large.

[Figure xi] The above figure shows Gleen Beck’s (in)famous portrayal of “tree of revolution,” where a group of seemingly unrelated people are said to have formed a “progressive” conspiracy against the United States. The controversial, often unsubstantiated statements made by Beck eventually alienated Fox News’s corporate sponsors as well as the general audience, forcing Fox News Channel to part ways with Beck by 2011. [Figure courtesy of Wikimedia]

The increasing rift between the Tea Party movement and the Republican Party at large was once again clearly shown during the Republican primaries for the 2012 elections. In Texas, a state that held 11
members of the House Tea Party Caucus when the caucus went practically defunct in 2012, Ted Cruz, a Tea Party favorite, won the Republican nomination for Senate over a more established Republican in David Dewhurst, who had served as the lieutenant governor under Governor Rick Perry, a very conservative Republican who openly objected to the idea of federal income tax. Cruz would win the general election in a breeze in the solidly Republican state of Texas. Tea Party candidates also managed to displace more established Republican candidates and carry the general election in a number of solidly Republican districts. In the solidly Republican Illinois 16th district, longtime incumbent Don Manzullo was defeated in the Republican primary by Tea Party favorite Adam Kinzinger by a double-digit margin. Kinzinger would carry the general election maintaining a comfortable lead over Wanda Rohl, the Democratic candidate. In Ohio’s second district, which had not produced a Democratic representative since 1983, Representative Jean Schmidt, a very conservative Republican who told a Tea Party protestor that she agreed with the protestor’s contention that Obama was not born in the United States and thus was not constitutionally qualified to become president, was defeated by Tea Party-backed Brad Wenstrup. Wenstrup handily won the general election, where he received 59% of the votes.

The Tea Party candidates’ success in states and districts that were solidly Republican were not reprised in the parts of the country that had a more even political distribution. Perhaps the most vivid example in this regard during the 2012 primary took place in Indiana, where Senator Richard Lugar, a highly popular Republican incumbent who had never faced a serious challenge in general elections since 1982, lost the Republican primary to Tea Party favorite and self-described evangelical Christian Richard Mourdock. Lugar’s ouster, which marked Tea Party insurgency ousting a fairly conservative senator who never faced a serious challenge in elections as an incumbent, raised concerns for some Republicans who were concerned about their party’s well-being. That was because it meant that Tea Party rebels

___

*cc Manzullo had carried every general election since 2000 at the time of the 2012 Republican primary.*
would promote the candidates that fit their agenda the most even when doing so would be at the expense of the party’s viability on a national level. Indeed, Mourdock, defeated Lugar by a double-digit margin in the Republican primary lost the Senatorial election to Democrat Joe Donnelly in what otherwise would have been an easy hold for Republicans. Indiana was not the only swing state where the Tea Party insurgents mobilized to nominate a Republican candidate that they deemed conservative enough rather than a candidate who had a realistic chance of winning the general election. In Missouri, a swing state that produced far-right conservatives such as radio mogul Rush Limbaugh, the Tea Party supporters were essential in nominating Todd Akin, who got a start in politics as an anti-abortion activist, over more established politicians. Akin would lose the general election to incumbent Claire McCaskill on a double-digit margin after having hurt his own campaign with a controversial statement on “legitimate rape.”

The real, potent threat posed by the Tea Party activists crowding out the more moderate Republican-leaning voters in primaries resulted in the Republican Party (at large) shifting further rightward in order to avoid losing the state or district primaries, leading to the virtual extinction of moderate Republicans in the federal government. Former “maverick” Republicans such as 2008 presidential hopeful John McCain were forced to rescind their moderate views in order to accommodate the increasingly assertive Tea Party insurgents. As late as 2005, McCain had demonstrated traits of a true “maverick” – indeed, McCain had opposed the “abusive interrogation tactics” employed during the Bush Administration and called a proposed constitutional amendment to ban same-sax marriage “un-Republican.” By 2010, amid mounting challenges from a local Tea Party favorite in the Republican primary, McCain was forced to rescind most of his stances that had characterized him as a moderate Republican, going as far as claiming that he “never” considered himself a “maverick” during a Newsweek interview conducted April 2010. McCain also rescinded a number of political positions that may have made him unpopular among Tea Party activists to court Tea Party voters – he now opposed the closure of the controversial
detention center at Guantanamo Bay and the presence of gays in the military.\textsuperscript{231} McCain’s abandonment of his old “maverick” ways reflected how the Tea Party movement pushed the Republican Party farther to the right to meet its agenda, even when doing so came at the expense of the Republican Party’s viability in national politics. Indeed, Skocpol and Williamson observe that established Republican politicians became increasingly unwilling to compromise with the Democrats fearing challenge from the right-wingers in Republican primaries.\textsuperscript{232} The continuing Tea Party influence within the Republican ranks, therefore, meant the emergence of a Republican Party that is increasingly unwilling to compromise, making it somewhat free of internal strife from Tea Party insurgencies but vulnerable to poor performance in national elections due to its alienation of much of the Americans at large.

The pattern where major political figures within the Republican Party shift their political position rightward despite the fact that doing so would likely hurt the Republicans’ prospect in national politics reflected the degree of influence wielded by the Tea Party movement within the Republican ranks. Moderate Republicans, such as Richard Lugar and Charlie Crist, could (and indeed did) carry the general elections in a comfortable margin by forming a broad coalition within their states, but their willingness to compromise left them vulnerable to challenges from within. The fact that a candidate who has less viability on a state/district-wide scale could gain an upper hand in the partisan primaries, therefore, made the Republican primaries in the Tea Party era something of a contest on who embraces what the Tea Party supporters perceived was a more orthodox form of conservatism. While this may have helped the Tea Partiers and their sympathizers within the Republican Party to oust those they perceived as Republicans in Name Only, it helped little to help the Republicans winning elections, as shown in the cases of Mourdock and Akin, where Tea Party candidates who ousted established Republicans in primaries were trounced in general elections in the fairly conservative states of Indiana and Missouri.

The Tea Party supporters’ 1) tendency to subscribe to a rigid, dogmatic brand of conservatism, and 2) their unwillingness to reach a compromise with any group they even slightly disagreed with, became
reflected in the general public’s perception of the Tea Party movement. As early as March 2011, a Gallup poll indicated that some 47% of Americans at large had an unfavorable view of the Tea Party movement, compared to 33% that had a favorable view.\textsuperscript{233} This gap further widened according to a Gallup poll conducted at December 2013, where it was shown that 51% of Americans viewed the Tea Party movement negatively compared to 30% that held the opposite view.\textsuperscript{234} In a May 2014 poll, it was revealed that less than half (41%) of Republicans viewed the Tea Party movement in a favorable manner, compared to 61% of Republicans who so answered in a 2010 poll.\textsuperscript{235} The fact that the Tea Party movement fell out of favor not only among the American public but even among the Republicans meant the Tea Party presence (and its nomination of Tea Party candidates in elections) increasingly became a liability for Republicans, something the Republican establishment would begin to react upon, as will be observed.

The Tea Party movement has been an important factor in the Republican comeback in the 2010 elections and American conservative politics at large in recent years. Despite the Tea Party movement’s role in reinvigorating the conservative voting base for the 2010 midterm elections, the Republican establishment grew increasingly wary of the Tea Party movement as the movement’s supporters demanded the established Republicans to follow their demands or face consequences in the form of Tea Party insurgencies that displaced a number of key Republican politicians (and, as in Lugar’s case, their seats) during the elections of 2010 and 2012. The Tea Party movement’s rigid, dogmatic ideology and their unwillingness to compromise with the opposition or even moderate Republicans resulted in the American public developing an increasingly negative attitude on the Tea Party movement. The American public’s unfavorable view of the Tea Party movement meant that the greater the influence the Tea Party movement wielded within the Republican ranks, it would likely hamper rather than help the Republican Party’s prospect in national elections. This, among others, was an important factor behind why the
Republican establishment as well as the business interests began to treat the Tea Party movement as a liability in recent years, as will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.
V. The establishment strikes back: the Republican establishment moves to end the party for the Tea Party movement, and Tea Party supporters react.

The subject matter of the previous chapter was regarding how the Tea Party movement, despite its alleged and real contributions to the Republican comeback in the 2010 midterm elections, began to have a fallout with the Republican establishment and their business allies that started seeing the Tea Party movement as, to a large degree, a liability. Having discussed how and why the rift between the Republican leadership and the Tea Party movement began, this chapter discusses how 1) the rift between the two camps culminated during the government shutdown of 2013, resulting in 2) the Republican establishment actively seeking to decrease the influence wielded by the Tea Party movement during the Republican primaries in 2013, with a number of prominent Tea Party candidates defeated in the Republican primaries as a result. While the defeat of House Majority leader Eric Cantor, a very conservative lawmaker from a heavily Republican district in Virginia, may seem to indicate that the Tea Party movement is on a comeback trail to prominence within the Republican ranks, I maintain that the Tea Party success will likely remain limited on a long run. This, as I will argue in this chapter, is because 1) business interests that support (and, to a large degree, fund) the Republican Party and 2) the Republican strategists, who are somewhat more practical-minded than the Tea Party activists, rightly continue to believe that the Tea Party movement is more a liability than an asset in the context of national politics, resulting in them putting mounting pressure through monetary and other means against the Tea Party movement in a manner that will be irreversible with the input of a handful of right-wing ideologues such as the Koch Brothers and FreedomWorks.

The Tea Party movement was known for its unwillingness to compromise with the opposition under virtually any circumstances. This, as observed in the third chapter of this essay, was largely due to the fact that the Tea Party movement inherited many of its traits from nativist movements of the past. The nativist traits within the Tea Party movement led the movement’s supporters to believe that reaching a
compromise with the opposition was not unlike compromising with those who were actively plotting to undermine the “American” way of life – the conspirators, such as President Obama with his “socialist” agenda and those Glenn Beck described as “Crime Inc.”, were to be repelled at all costs with whom the Tea Partiers simply could not reach a compromise. The Tea Party supporters’ unwillingness to compromise remained unflinched even when doing so was at the peril of the economic prospects of the United States, the business confidence in the Republican Party (as already observed), and the stability of the United States government. This was because, for many Tea Partiers, their cause was beyond what was good (i.e. materially) for the United States. Instead, for them the Tea Party’s struggle was a fight between right and wrong, a trait that reflected a belief system that is not unlike that of a John Birch Society supporter demanding Communism to be rolled back at all costs (even in instances where doing so could have meant a nuclear war), and an evangelical fundamentalist who demanded the United States be governed by the “moral law of the universe.” It was precisely under this kind of mindset that the Tea Party supporters and their elected agents, much to the dismay of the Republican leadership, refused to compromise even when refusing to do so would result in shutting down the federal government of the United States.

The crisis surrounding the government shutdown of 2013 began when the Tea Party-backed members of the Republican Party signed an agreement that they would refuse to sign any legislations that provided funding for the Affordable Care and Patient Protection Act (“Obamacare”).236 Utah’s Mike Lee, who ran as a Tea Party favorite in 2010 and defeated longtime incumbent Mike Bennett in the Republican primary, stated that “if Republicans in both houses simply refuse to vote for any continuing resolution that contains further funding for further enforcement of ObamaCare, we can stop it.”237 North Carolina’s Mark Meadows said “We have 64 of my colleagues on this letter and we’re asking the leadership not to bring anything to the floor that has funding for ObamaCare in it.”238 Florida’s Tea Party-backed freshman Marco Rubio also stated that he would not vote for a continuing resolution (i.e. a resolution that would
let the federal budget continue) if it provided funding for the Affordable Care Act. FreedomWorks also weighed in, issuing a statement that “Congress must honor sequester savings and defund ObamaCare before it is too late.”

The Tea Party proposal, which essentially called for de-funding a legislation that was neither repealed by Congress nor struck down as unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, caused much reservation even within the Republican Party. Mitt Romney, the 2012 presidential candidate for Republicans, specifically warned against the Tea Party adventurism in this regard, citing concerns on what would happen if the federal government shut down. 2008 presidential hopeful John McCain expressed a similar concern, stating that although he would “love to repeal ObamaCare,” citing the American public’s weariness with the Tea Party threats to “these shutdown-the-government threats.” Neither House Speaker John Boehner nor Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell supported the plan. Senator Richard Burr of North Carolina called that the Tea Party strategy (i.e. based on a government shutdown) “the dumbest idea I’ve ever heard of.” Conservatives such as Senator Lindsey Graham, a very conservative Senator from South Carolina, also objected to the Tea Party tactics. The more established Republicans’ vocal or tacit opposition to the Tea Party strategy would prove futile, as the federal government indeed shut down on October 1, 2013, leading Harry Reid, the Senate majority leader, to declare that “it is embarrassing that these people [the Tea Party-backed Republican lawmakers] are elected to represent the country are representing the tea party,” while Boehner “privately warned House Republicans that they could lose their majority in 2014 as a result of shutting down the government.”

The commencement of the government shutdown of 2013 and the Republican leadership’s inability to stop it led prominent figures within the Tea Party movement to declare it as a victory for themselves and the Tea Party supporters. Tea Party Caucus chair Michelle Bachmann declared that “this is about the happiest I’ve seen members in a long time because we’ve seen we’re starting to win this dialogue on a national level.” Tennessee’s Marsha Blackburn was quoted as saying that “there is some good news
out of the shutdown, the EPA can't issue new regulations."\(^{249}\) Jeff Duncan of South Carolina went as far as stating that “I believe Obamacare has *shut down America, so I’d rather shut down the government* than continue doing what we’re doing, which is penalizing businesses and families in this country.”\(^{250}\) Tom Massie of Kentucky went as far as asserting that the shutdown, which resulted in an interruption in the function of the federal government and even prevented veterans from visiting national cemeteries, was “not *that big of a deal.*”\(^{251}\) Also, shortly after the end of the shutdown, Senator Ted Cruz, who was closely associated with the Tea Party movement from his election in 2012, stated that the government shutdown was “a *remarkable victory* to see the House engage in a profile of courage.”\(^{252}\)

![Protest against government shutdown](figure xii) The above figure shows federal employees protesting the government shutdown caused by the Tea Party Republicans’ refusal to sign a budget containing funds for the Affordable Care Act, which put thousands of federal employees temporarily out of work. The Tea Party Republicans’ role in the government shutdown and their unapologetic attitude about the shutdown would play a negative role in the public perception of the Tea Party movement and the Republican Party as a whole. [Figure courtesy of Wikimedia]

Among those who disagreed with the Tea Party lawmakers’ assessment of the government shutdown (i.e. either that it was a “victory” or “not that big of a deal”) were the more established Republicans, many of whom had spoken up against a potential shutdown before it took place, and the business
interests that were otherwise friendly to the Republican Party. Governor John Sununu opined that “it’s time for someone to act like a grown-up in this process,” implying that the Tea Party insurgents’ behavior leading to and during the shutdown was far from commendable.\textsuperscript{253} Former Mississippi governor Harry Barbour pointed out that the Tea Party plan to defund the Affordable Care Act by refusing to sign any law funding it was a reckless tactic that “never had a chance.”\textsuperscript{254} Financial institutions at Wall Street and lobbying groups such as the Chamber of Commerce also expressed a concern, as a continued government shutdown (i.e. the federal government potentially going on a default) was clearly not in the interests of the business community.\textsuperscript{255}

The Republican establishment and Wall Street were not alone in their negative assessment of Tea Party actions during the shutdown; a Pew Research poll conducted on October 2013 showed that the percentage of Americans who had an unfavorable perception of the Tea Party movement increased to 49\% on October 2013 from 45\% on June 2013 and 43\% on August 2011.\textsuperscript{256} By contrast, the percentage of Americans who viewed the movement favorably decreased from 37\% on June 2013 to 30\% on October 2013.\textsuperscript{257} A CBS poll conducted the same month presented an even grimmer picture for the Tea Party supporters, as it reported that only 14\% of Americans had a favorable view of the Tea Party movement.\textsuperscript{258} The increasingly negative public perception of the Tea Party movement as well as the Republican leadership’s inability to exert any control over the Tea Party lawmakers would exacerbate the rift between the Tea Party supporters and the Republican establishment to a point where the Republican establishment (and its allies in the business community) began to extensively lobby against the Tea Party candidates and incumbents within the Republican Party.

The Tea Party activists’ role in the government shutdown of 2013 and the resulting decline in the Republican Party’s popularity persuaded the established figures within the Republican Party to distance themselves from the Tea Party.

\textsuperscript{dd} Since the article states that “half of Americans still hold no view of the tea party or aren’t familiar with it,” it follows that about 36\% of Americans have an unfavorable opinion about the Tea Party movement according to this poll, compared to the 14\% that have a favorable opinion.
themselves from the Tea Party movement. House Speaker John Boehner, a reliable conservative categorized as a “hard-core conservative” by political aggregate website OnThe Issues based on his voting records, was one of the first to express such a concern. Boehner had dealt with freshman lawmakers elected as Tea Party favorites demanding that the Republican Party never reaches a compromise with the Obama Administration as early as 2011, even if the refusal to compromise would result in a shutdown of the federal government (as did indeed happen). This, as observed by Skocpol and Williamson, resulted in business interests such as the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers to prioritize on avoiding a government shutdown over giving in to the Tea Party demands. The rift between the dogmatic, self-righteous Tea Party supporters and the more practical minded Boehner culminated after the government shutdown of 2013, after which Boehner stated that the Tea Party activists “lost all credibility,” having pushed the Congressional Republicans “into this fight to defund Obamacare and to shut down the government.” Boehner also stated that the Tea Party movement was “misleading” its followers.

Republican strategist Karl Rove, who was widely credited with engineering victories for President George W. Bush in the elections of 2000 and 2004 by mobilizing votes from the voters affiliated with the “religious right,” also followed the suit. Previously, Rove caused some ire among Tea Party supporters by expressing concern over the candidacy of Christine O’Donnell for Senate in Delaware, citing the things she said on record in the past and her “checkered background.” The Tea Party activists’ anger over Rove’s statement ended only when Rove agreed to campaign for O’Donnell, in a chain of events that featured a rare instance Rove, a hard-headed strategist, making conciliatory gestures to appease a group of adamant, self-righteous individuals within the party ranks. The rift between Rove (and the more established conservatives who shared his concern over the Tea Party movement) and the Tea Party activists became apparent with the formation of the Conservative Victory Project, whose stated purpose was to “recruit seasoned candidates and protect Senate incumbents from challenges by far-
right conservatives and Tea Party enthusiasts who Republican leaders worry could complicate the party’s efforts to win control of the Senate, leading Breitbart, a conservative website generally supportive of the Tea Party movement, to state that Rove “declares[d] war” on Tea Party. The conflict between Rove, who remained a strategist (i.e. for the Republican Party) and the Tea Party activists eventually reached a point where an e-mail circulated by the Tea Party Patriots contained a picture that portrayed Rove in a Nazi uniform, although the group claimed the inclusion of the picture was an accident.

The business interests’ and the Republican establishment’s concern over the damage inflicted to the conservative cause by the reckless extremism of the Tea Party movement was reflected in these groups’ reluctance to support Tea Party candidates and willingness to support establishment candidates challenged by a Tea Party candidates in Republican primaries whenever possible. A 2013 study from the Brennan Center for Justice at the New York University School of Law showed that “all but two” of the “high-dollar primaries” that featured a Tea Party candidate saw a Tea Party candidate being vastly outmatched by a more established figure. Some 52% of the contribution to the “high-dollar primaries” came from large donors, meaning that the Tea Party candidates’ difficulty in financing their campaign was due to the business interests growing increasingly disapproving of the Tea Party movement.

The business interests’ newfound unwillingness to support Tea Party candidates were shown in the key Tea Party defeats in the special elections of 2013. In Alabama, establishment Republican Bradley Byrne defeated Tea Party favorite Dean Young in the Republican primary for Alabama’s 1st Congressional district. Young’s campaign was badly outfunded by Byrne’s campaign as Byrne’s campaign received funds from business organizations such as the United States Chamber of Commerce, AT&T and Home Depot. Young, whose support base were the remnants of the “religious right” and the Tea Party supporters, found difficulties in attracting large contributors, as he financed his campaign largely out of his own wallet and from small-scale donors from the local community. Byrne defeated Young in a
close contest despite Young’s strong performance in rural counties within the district, in a result that was described as “a hard-fought victory for the business wing of the GOP” by the Washington Post, and “the first of what is likely to be many battles to come over the direction of the party” that is “to the relief of many in the Republican leadership” by the New York Times.

Young was not the only Tea Party Republican who faced down a defeat in 2013. In Virginia, Tea Party favorite Ken Cuccinelli was defeated by Democrat Terry McAuliffe in the gubernatorial election. Cuccinelli’s campaign was riddled with controversy from the very beginning, as Cuccinelli received the Republican nomination for the gubernatorial election in an uncontested “convention” rather than a primary. Further controversy arose when hard-line Republicans, empowered with Cuccinelli’s nomination, “picked a nominee for lieutenant governor who is nothing short of outrageous” in E.W. Jackson, an African-American minister who caused controversy by calling homosexuals “very sick people psychologically, mentally and emotionally” and comparing Egypt’s Muslim Brotherhood to the Ku Klux Klan. Cuccinelli himself, while not endorsing the extreme statements made by Jackson, made statements that reflected the nativist vis a vis evangelical fundamentalist wing of the Republican Party, such as the statement that “government legislation shouldn’t address contraception,” and that homosexual acts are “intrinsically wrong” because “they don’t comport with natural law.” Cuccinelli also voted for bills such as a legislation that urged the United States Congress to “amend the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution to clarify specifically that a person born to a parent who is a U.S. Citizen is also a citizen of the United States (i.e. that a child of an undocumented alien cannot be a U.S. citizen even if born in the United States),” and stop providing unemployment compensation benefits for immigrant workers who do not speak English. Cuccinelli’s polarizing political posture as well as his association with the Tea Party movement did not pay out in general elections, as he was defeated by McAuliffe by the margin of about 55,000 votes, having been out raised by McAuliffe by the margin of about 15 million dollars.
The defeats the Tea Party movement suffered in the Republican primaries as well as the party apparatus in 2013, as well as the deteriorating perception of the movement after the government shutdown the same year made it reasonable to forecast that the movement was to fade into obscurity in a manner not dissimilar to the nativist groups of the past. Indeed, the Tea Party defeats in 2013 made it reasonable to foresee that the Republican establishment, invigorated by Byrne’s victory in Alabama and cautioned by Byrne’s defeat in Virginia, would further accelerate its endeavor to drive out the Tea Party influence within the Republican Party. The experiences from the Alabama primary showed that a Tea Party favorite with a considerable grassroots following could be outmatched by a well-funded orthodox Republican. Also, Virginia’s gubernatorial election was probably winnable with a candidate who represented a wider array of interest than a Tea Party/nativist favorite in Cuccinelli – Virginia elected Bob McDonnell, a more established Republican by a double-digit margin in 2009, and the early difficulties in the implementation of the Affordable Care Act had provided a highly viable talking point for the Republicans. Bloomberg made a similar assessment when it published an article titled “Virginia, Alabama Voter Choices Show Tea Party Declining,” where it observed that the extreme, uncompromising nature of the Tea Party movement (and the candidates supported by it) convinced many voters who otherwise vote Republicans to vote against Tea Party candidates, resulting in the decline in the Tea Party movement’s electoral fortune.

The forecast that the Tea Party movement lost steam as discussed above was proven to be somewhat misleading amid the defeat of House Majority Leader Eric Cantor, who was deemed to have been responsible for prolonging the government shutdown of 2013, by Dave Brat, a hitherto little-known challenger endorsed by the Tea Party activists. One of the talking points employed by Brat was that Cantor (eventually) voted to end the government shutdown of 2013, showing Brat’s position that the shutdown should not have ended by a compromise, even if the shutdown was to end much later because of the refusal to compromise (if it was to end at all). Another talking point employed by Brat
was the allegation that Cantor supported undocumented immigrants staying in the United States, displaying the link between the Tea Party movement and the anti-immigrant politics demonstrated by earlier nativist movements in the United States. Brat’s usage of immigration as a talking point, aside from showing the Tea Party movement’s linkage with nativism, demonstrated the fundamental differences between the business interests and the Tea Party movement – businesses supported the proposed immigration reform, as many businesses in the United States, big or small, depend on immigrant labor to stay competitive. For the Tea Party activists, however, whose ideology stemmed from neither what is good for businesses nor an ideologically consistent fiscal conservatism, what mattered the most was what they perceived was (or ought to be) the “American” values and the “American” way of life, not what was the best way to facilitate business (and/or economy at large) in the United States. It was for precisely this reason that the business interests attempted to (and was largely successful in) downplaying the influence of the Tea Party movement during the 2013 season – what was different this time around, though, was the fact that the Tea Party supporters were –and successfully did– fight back. Indeed, Cantor’s defeat marked an instance where the nativist wing of the Republican Party could fight back against the establishment and win, however occasional that win may be.

Cantor’s defeat in the Republican primary sent shockwaves for the reasons other than the fact that a very conservative Republican who was often deemed as an extremist was defeated by a Tea Party challenger whose ideology was even more extreme. The more fundamental problem for many established Republican lawmakers was the fact that Cantor’s defeat eliminated a major financial contributor within the party ranks. Indeed, Cantor’s Every Republican is Crucial PAC contributed “at least $8.3 million to 500 candidates” over the years. Cantor’s defeat to a hitherto little known Tea Party activist sent a profound message to established Republicans, as it resulted in the Republicans “losing a formidable fundraising apparatus for the establishment GOP as well as for promising young candidates.” The Tea Party victory in the primary that unseated Cantor, therefore, probably was not
viewed as welcome news by either the business interests supporting the Republican Party or the Republican strategists whose goal was to help the Republicans, rather than the far-right elements therein, to win (i.e. on general rather than primary elections).

The Tea Party victory in Cantor’s defeat will likely have the following implications for the Republican Party up leading to the 2014 general elections: elected Republican leaders will generally have to refrain from making statements that would offend the Tea Party activists and Republicans with nativist tendencies alike; this is because doing so may cost them in this or next Republican primary – remember that it doesn’t matter how popular one is in state or district at large at party primaries (where, as a general rule, only party members get to vote). Also, the general American public will tend link the Republican Party and the Tea Party movement much closer than it otherwise would have, having observed a very conservative Republican leader being displaced by a small-town Tea Party favorite.

While it is hard to say either of these implications will help the Republican prospects for the upcoming influence, for reasons that should be rather obvious to a reader who paid attention up until this point, the appeasement of Tea Party interests and/or demands, which the Republican leaders will likely be obliged to conduct, will prevent the Republican Party from splitting from within, allowing it to mobilize its support base for the upcoming elections.

The long-term effect of Cantor’s defeat, however, must not be overstated. It may be vogue at the time I write this essay (July 2014) to foresee something of a butterfly effect that this particular incident may produce. The circumstances surrounding American politics at large, however, seem to practically foreclose such a prediction. To begin with, Cantor’s defeat took place in the 7th electoral district of Virginia, a very conservative suburban-rural district\textsuperscript{297} that did not produce a Democratic House member since 1971.\textsuperscript{298} As such, the fact that a Tea Party activist carried the Republican primary in what is already a very conservative district should be met with little surprise notwithstanding the fact that the defeated establishment candidate happened to be the House Majority Leader. In addition, the Tea Party victory in
1) a Republican primary, 2) in what is already a very conservative district, 3) located in the Southern state of Virginia does little to alter an inconvenient truth for the Tea Party supporters: America’s perception of the Tea Party movement has been unfavorable since at least 2011, and that perception further deteriorated amid the turmoil created by the Tea Partiers’ recklessness during the government shutdown of 2013.

There is also doubt about whether Cantor’s defeat would have an impact in a nationwide or statewide context rather than primary contests in already conservative districts. Virginia, the very state where the upset took place, voted against the Tea Party favorite Ken Cuccinelli in the 2013 elections despite the opposing candidate’s lack of appeal among the electorate. Cuccinelli’s running mate E.W. Jackson, a former associate of Pat Robertson’s Christian Coalition who declared that “The Tea Party is a move of God to stir this nation’s back to its conscience and back to its senses,” lost to Democrat Ralph Northam on a double-digit margin. It seems doubtful if someone like Brat, who ran on a platform that Eric Cantor was not conservative enough, would be able to somehow obtain different results from Cuccinelli and Jackson should be make a bid for a statewide office. Brat’s upset victory over Cantor probably should not be seen as a precursor for a full-scale comeback of the Tea Party movement for this reason alone.

Nor does Cantor’s defeat do much to alter the business interests’ attitude about the Tea Party movement that it became more of a nuisance rather than an asset in creating a conservative coalition that has a nationwide appeal that could lead to a conservative majority in the federal government. The businesses’ support of an establishment Republican Bradley Byrne over Tea Party favorite Dean Young and the establishment in the “high-dollar” primaries as observed by the Brennan Center for Justice all attest to this fact. It is highly doubtful if Brat’s victory in a district that is already solidly Republican would alter the business interests’ attitude on the Tea Party movement in the context of nationwide or even statewide politics. Recent Tea Party assailment over business interests, such as Sarah Palin’s tirade
against Obama on “cuddlin’ and purrin’ and tummy ticklin’” with the “fat cats,” and Rush Limbaugh’s comment that the Republican Party “betrayed” Ken Cuccinelli in his gubernatorial bid, cast serious doubts on the prospect where the Tea Party activists will mend their position to make it more appealing to the business interests in any foreseeable future.

The Tea Party movement made headlines for promoting its own candidates and often prevailing over a more established Republican candidate shortly after its inception. While the Republican Party was initially reluctant to strike back against the Tea Party movement’s growing influence within the party ranks due to the movement’s (real and perceived) role in the Republican comeback during the election of 2010, it became increasingly wary of the Tea Party influences within the party as Tea Party insurgencies eventually came to threaten 1) the job security for many establishment figures, and (perhaps more importantly) 2) the national appeal of the Republican Party as a whole. In recent years, indeed, moderate Republicans, supporters of established Republican leaders and the business interests began to actively try to roll back the Tea Party influence within the party in an increasingly active manner, with Karl Rove’s tacit opposition to the Tea Party agenda in 2010 growing replaced by the United States Chamber of Commerce contributing to the candidates running against a Tea Party favorite in Republican primaries. While Dave Brat’s victory over Eric Cantor may provide for a good headline and a sense of empowerment for a Tea Party supporter, it seems unlikely that it will do much to alter the “big picture,” where the Tea Party movement continues to face the American public’s increasingly unfavorable impression over the Tea Party movement, the fact that the Tea Party victory at the district primary likely has limited implications in national and even statewide politics, and the business interests’ wariness on the Tea Party movement, which will make it difficult for Tea Party candidates to run against the well-funded candidates from the Republican establishment.

---

ee For a record, Breitbart is a conservative news outlet that is sympathetic to the Tea Party movement.
VI. Conclusions and Limitations

The Tea Party movement perhaps has been the most talked about political entity in the United States in recent years. Yet, the observation on Tea Party has been often limited to either an unwarranted praise as a group that seeks to restore the “American” way of life, or simply dismissed as a group of “angry white folks” unworthy of a serious scholarly attention. While there have been some excellent scholarly works about the Tea Party movement, virtually none seemed to discuss the Tea Party movement’s nature as a modern successor to nativism in the United States that began from the days of the Anti-Masonic movement and the Know-Nothing (“American”) Party of 1856. In this essay, therefore, I have made an assessment on how the Tea Party movement could be seen as a modern incarnation of a recurrent streak of nativism in the United States, and how the nativist wing of the Republican Party, feeling empowered by the emergence of the Tea Party movement, came to actively confront not only the Democratic opposition but the Republican establishment as well. While the Republican establishment and its allies in the business community initially welcomed the Tea Party presence, which it viewed as a powerful tool in opposing the Obama Administration’s agenda, they became increasingly wary of the Tea Party influence within the Republican Party as it proved to be a liability in both the Republicans’ appeal on a national stage and the appeal the Republican Party had to the business interests.

The story of the Tea Party movement reflects the history of nativist politics in the United States. A group that regard themselves as true “Americans” while assailing the opposition for allegedly running afoul of what they regard as the “American” values, with these values often having a religious overtone in that it propagated the notion that the United States was founded as a nation for pious Protestants, despite the fact that 1) many of the prominent founding figures such as Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin showed little sign of religiosity, and 2) the founding fathers who were religious, such as President John Adams, envisioned a country governed by a rule of law rather than on strict Puritan principles as shown
during the Salem Witch Trials. It was under this mindset where the supporters of the Anti-Masonic movement believed that members of the Masonic order were unfit to occupy elected offices because of their allegiance to a secret order, and the Know-Nothing supporters believed that Catholics were threatening America (i.e. by their mere presence) because of their allegiance to the papal authority rather than the United States. The emergence of the second Ku Klux Klan saw the nativist politics of conspiracy expanding into the struggle against the alleged Communists and seditioners, while also helping to incorporate the racially resentful white Southerners into the historic strand of nativism. The emergence of the “religious right” in the late 20th Century saw the nativist belief in a vast conspiracy against the “American” way of life taking the form of the Godly, virtuous “us” (i.e. evangelical fundamentalists) against the godless, disloyal “them” (in Jesse Helms’ words, “atheism and socialism—or liberalism”). The strict dichotomy between the virtuous “us” and the disloyal “them” would be inherited into the Tea Party movement in that the Tea Party supporters saw themselves as the true “Americans” while viewed the opposition as forming a conspiracy against the “American” way of life through the allegedly “socialist” agenda of the Obama Administration.

The observation that the Tea Party movement should be viewed in the context of nativism in the United States rather than an ideologically coherent fiscal conservatism is strengthened by the facts that the Tea Party supporters come from largely the same demographics that formed the “religious right,” are generally favorable to the Republican figures who brought about the government deficit faced by the Obama Administration, and embody the nativist politics of racial resentment as shown by the past nativist groups such as the “Know-Nothing” Party, the second Klan, and the “religious right.” Indeed, we have observed in this paper that the Tea Party movement catered primarily to the white, native, rural, Protestant demographics that constituted the nativist movements of the past, and that the rhetoric and the substantive policy preferences of the Tea Party movement reflected the politics of racial resentment
that became an important theme of nativism in the United States since the end of institutionalized racial discrimination in Southern United States after the passage of the Civil Rights legislations in the 1960s.

The Tea Party movement’s close linkage to nativism in the United States was also shown in the Tea Party supporters’ unwillingness to reach a compromise with whoever they perceived as having run afoul of what they believed were the “American” values. Like the McCarthyites and the John Birch Society supporters from the Cold War era who viewed whatever they perceived as Communism as an absolute evil that was to be defeated at all costs (leading the Birchers to believe that many of the government officials, including President Eisenhower, were Communist hacks), the Tea Party supporters believed that the Obama Administration’s “socialist” agenda needs to be actively confronted and rolled back. It was under this mentality that the Tea Party Republicans, despite all the discouragements from the Republican leadership, refused reach any compromise with the Democrats on the budget in a crisis that eventually culminated in the government shutdown of 2013. The shutdown, a result that was not approved of by the Republican leadership, convinced the Republican establishment and its allies in the business community that the Tea Party movement became more of a liability than an asset for the Republican Party as a whole. The rift between the Tea Party supporters and the Republican establishment vis à vis the business interests was shown during the elections of 2012 and 2013, which saw Tea Party candidates causing Republican defeats in the contests that otherwise could have been winnable or would have been a sure win without a Tea Party candidate. In particular, the Tea Party defeat in Virginia in 2013 saw a Tea Party candidate being rejected by the same electorate that had voted for a Republican governor on a double-digit margin in 2009, indicating how the Tea Party movement came to have become a liability for Republicans even in a fairly conservative state.

The Tea Party agenda’s lack of appeal in not only national but statewide context as shown in the case of the swing state of Virginia in 2013 caused a divide within even a group of commentators who were considered to be supportive of the Tea Party movement. In February 2014 conservative media pundit
Ann Coulter appeared on an episode of *Hannity* (hosted by Fox News anchor Sean Hannity) and debated Hannity, who described as a “Tea Party conservative,” on the role of the Tea Party movement within the Republican Party in the future. Coulter opened the debate when she stated that the Tea Party movement was infiltrated by “con-men and scamsters.” Hannity countered that people he knew were “there in the trenches” fighting for everyday Americans. The “con-men and scamsters” Coulter referred to were “anyone who claims to be going after establishment Republican,” pointing out that the Republicans would not be able to “repeal Obamacare” unless more Republicans (i.e. in general) were elected to Congress. Hannity made it clear that he disagreed with Coulter’s assessment, stating that the Republicans “need a vision that will unite us [i.e. conservatives],” citing popular film *Braveheart*. The debate ended after a series of interrupted sentences by both participants. Hannity had made donation requests for the Tea Party Patriots the very same day.

The above vignette, which features the conservative pundits in Sean Hannity and Ann Coulter debating one another about the future place of the Tea Party movement, reflects the widespread skepticism about Tea Party even among conservatives. This, along with the fact that the American public’s perception of the Tea Party movement has been generally unfavorable since at least 2011 and has deteriorated since, makes it doubtful if the Tea Party movement will once again become a driving factor in energizing the Republican Party in a foreseeable future. As to the future prospects of the Tea Party movement, I believe that the following scenarios are possible. The most likely scenario is that the Tea Party movement, facing a highly unfavorable polls from the general public, its lack of appeal in national or even statewide contexts (as shown in the Virginia gubernatorial election in 2013), and lack of resources to match the well-funded Republican political machine, will gradually fade into obscurity in favor of a return to a more orthodox, top-down conservatism. An alternative scenario, which probably will be a grimmer picture for those who wish conservatism well, is that the Tea Party supporters, empowered by their commanding presence in Republican strongholds in the South, Midwest and some
Southwestern states, will prevail over the Republican establishment and take control of the party apparatus. A Republican Party controlled by the Tea Party conservatives will likely be a weaker foe for the Democrats, as this version of Republican Party will be unable to 1) garner support among moderate or center-right voters who otherwise would have voted Republican, and 2) hold an upper hand in its relationship with the business community in a manner an “establishment”-led Republican Party did. Hence, it seems fair to suggest that the Tea Party takeover of the Republican Party could make the latter a “permanent minority” in American politics for quite some time, as it will force the Republican Party to mandate its decision-making to the demographics that is already and increasingly marginalized. The marginalization of the Tea Party demographics, of course, would deepen over the years as the United States becomes increasingly less rural and more diverse in race, ethnicity, and culture.

The purpose of this paper has been to assess the nature of the Tea Party movement as a modern successor to nativism in the United States and how the Tea Party movement’s nativist lineage made it a driving force for the Republicans in 2010 but made it a liability after the elections of 2012 and 2013. In this regard, I provided the historical account of nativism in the United States to explain the Tea Party movement under this context, and the movement’s short-lived marriage of convenience with the Republicans that eventually resulted in the Tea Partiers and the establishment fighting for the control of the party. As to the limitations of this essay, I need to acknowledge that the future of the Tea Party movements, notwithstanding the assessments made in this paper, remains unclear as I write this essay. Many (including myself) saw the Tea Party movement as a largely spent force at the time when House Majority Leader Eric Cantor was defeated by the hitherto little-known Dave Brat in the Republican primary. Brat’s upset victory caused some commentators to alter their views and predict Tea Party resurgence in the upcoming elections and beyond. While I do not share this line of assessment for the reasons stated earlier in this essay, I would agree with the point that Brat’s victory makes it uncertain whether the Tea Party supporters will play a role in Republican politics in a short run (e.g. during the
2014 elections). I also have failed to predict a nativist successor to the Tea Party movement that could arise in American politics in a foreseeable future. While I possess neither sufficient imagination nor resources to undertake such an enterprise for the time being, inquiring for possible future nativist movements rather than nativist movements of the past seems to be a fascinating research topic for future.
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