

Racial and Political Violence in the United States: A Brief Historical Analysis

Earnest N. Bracey, Ph.D., DPA, Army LTC (Ret.)

Professor of Political Science

College of Southern Nevada

Social Science Department

6375 West Charleston Boulevard W2C

Las Vegas, Nevada 89146-1164

United States of America

Abstract

This paper exposes the truth about the racial and political violence in the United States. Sadly, our nation has a legacy of violence and abuse wrought by hateful people. Unfortunately, some Americans are less informed about the racial and political violence occurring in the United States, rather than being shrouded in cultural ignorance, while pretending that these horrible incidents haven't happened in our past — and even today. Moreover, we need to have a further understanding of why dangerous individuals over the years have committed any number of racial and political crimes and assassinations.

Hence, this brief, historical examination of violence draws back the curtain about various ideological beliefs in their rawest and ugliest forms. Indeed, shedding light on these important matters are significant because of the increasing wave of violence across the nation. Hopefully, all things considering, we also can gain new insights into the racial and political violence in this polarized country, as these things have far reaching implications. And we can learn about the past and future of our democracy. In the final analysis, racial and political violence will always be with our nation.

Keywords: *racism, inequality, empathy, violence, war, nationalism, peace, democracy*

Introduction: A Political and Racial Reflection

It is unfortunate, but some Americans believe that our country only today isn't marked by racial and political violence; but nothing can be further from the truth. Indeed, related threats of mass violence are almost routine in the United States today, which is as it was in the inception of our nation. It is also fair to say that in America, there has been a steady stream of violence, which is not a mere coincidence in forming this country. Violence, of course, is the "unjust or unwarranted use of force, usually accompanied by fury, vehemence, or outrage." Additionally, we can explain violence as "physical force unlawfully exercised with the intent to harm" ("Violence," 1999, p. 1564). And for whatever reason, some Americans have an insatiable appetite for racial and political violence. Hence, we should have some kind of equanimity with which we can look back on our disgusting, violent past. No doubt, *violence* — in all its evil forms — is a sad commentary about our polarized, multiracial democracy. Which is to say that racial and political violence are contentious and divisive issues that our society should confront and not ignore. Indeed, violence is like the Great American past time — or like baseball, because it has expanded over the years, despite the fact that we might know the horrible consequences, cultural reflexes, and adverse connections.

Regardless, we are *defined* by our violence as a nation. H. Rap Brown (AKA Jamil Al-Amin), “who was one of the most vocal leaders of the Black Power movement” during “the racial upheaval of the late 1960s and early 1970s” stated that violence was “as American as cherry pie,” mainly because it “is a part of America’s culture...” (“Former Black,” 2025, p. 4B). So, was he right? Perhaps. To be sure, racial and political violence have become more common and entrenched in our society, with no end in sight.

In other words, *violence* has always been acute in the United States and is widespread today. Unfortunately, racial violence is foundationally woven into the fabric of our country, too. So, are we at a *crossroads* or negative “turning point” because of political and racial divisions? Or will it be a “breaking point?” Violence is not inherently political, but it is often through (violently) charged rhetoric and (dirty) lenses that political violence takes hold, which is akin to political warfare. This type of violence is sometimes tinged with issues of race and/or racism. For example, American conservatives tell us that the so-called left or people of color are solely responsible for all of the political violence occurring in the United States today. What rubbish. Indeed, we must take such (false) accusations with a *grain of salt* — and rightly so, because this disinformation, quite frankly, is a lie or falsehood. Accordingly, it is important to note that the current American “DOJ took down a previously posted study that had rightly concluded” that white, “right-wing extremists have [violently] killed far more Americans in recent years than any other form of domestic terrorism” (“Editorial from,” 2025, p. 2). We must ask why? Is it because this hard truth doesn’t fit their misleading, conservative narrative? Probably. Reality: Political violence is not primarily caused by leftist, minority groups, who consider themselves progressive or liberal. Therefore, we should have no illusion about who commits the most (political and racial) violence in this country. In a nutshell, it should be understood that white, *extremist groups* are the *real* problem for our fragile democracy and nation.

Moreover, according to the Anti-Defamation League, “multiple data sources show that neither [the right or left] side has a monopoly on political violence, but it is more likely to come from the [conservative] right.” For example, “Between 2015 and 2024, 54% of ideologically connected killings were committed by people on the far right.... By comparison, [only] 8% came from the political left” (“Editorial Roundup: The New,” 2025, p. 6). On the wings of this report, so to speak, even the FBI, under Republican Director Kash Patel, has gotten in on the misinformation *bandwagon*, by “cutting ties with two organizations that for decades have tracked domestic extremism and racial and religious bias, [which was a bone-headed] move that [followed after] complaints about the groups from conservatives, and prominent allies” of the current White House.

It should also be noted that *violence*, in general, doesn’t suggest a principal discussion about politics and positive/cooperative *race-relations*. Indeed, some Americans are, unfortunately, motivated by their violent, ideological beliefs. In this regard, as professor of media and communications at the University of Florida, Andrew Selepak accurately states: “political divisions” among American citizens “have resulted in the casting of large segments of society as *sub-human*, leading to the suggestion that they deserve violence...” (Svab, 2025, p. A4) and death. In this respect, we must also consider the founding of our nation, because it was established on principles of political and racial violence. Indeed, the American Revolutionary War “was not the jolly enterprise of *fifes* and *drums* and men in powdered wigs but savage, sweaty butchery, often among [and against] neighbors” (Poniewozik, 2025, p. 10) (Note 1); and the unanticipated violence wrought by run-away, Black slaves and different Native American tribes, like the *Mohegans* and *Mohawks*. It should also be noted that the first person to die for the American Revolutionary cause was a Black man named Crispus Attucks “during the *Boston Massacre* on March 5, 1770.” In essence, “Attucks was one of those at the front [lines] of the fight amid dozens of people, and when the British opened fire he was the first of five men killed.” In so many words, Attucks was murdered by political violence, perpetrated by the *guilty* British, making “him the first casualty of the American Revolution” (“Biography-Crispus,” 2014) (Note 2).

There was political violence perpetrated from even some of our American founders. For example, Aaron Burr, who was one of our important founders, was resentful of Alexander Hamilton’s political maneuvering, “to block his [Burr’s] nomination for governor of New York in 1804.” Hence, “he challenged Hamilton,” who was another founder, “to a duel following some [of his] remarks about Burr’s character.” Through political or gun violence, Burr “mortally wounded Hamilton, causing his death.” Later, Aaron Burr “fled to Philadelphia” (“Burr, Aaron,” 2000, p. 255) (Note 3), out of harm’s way. What happened was especially tragic, but violent *duels* among so-called sophisticated white statesmen were never really prosecuted in courts of law at that time; but this incident eventually destroyed his (Burr’s) promising political career.

In this regard, we must also understand that violent, impulsive behavior/actions are especially *egregious* and dangerous, as previously discussed about Aaron Burr — and later described in this work. Additionally, we should consider the life of George Washington, a founder, slave owner, and the first president of the United States, who was a violent white man. According to Issac J. Bailey (2025), a professor at Davidson College:

Our first president, George Washington, sometimes used to whip the Black men and women he enslaved. Other times, he'd assign a white overseer to whip them on his behalf. [Furthermore,] Washington forced enslaved Black men and women to work from sunup to sundown — and considered them lazy and ungrateful for trying to find ways to not work themselves literally to death (p. 3) (Note 4).

Some might argue that Washington was *wrong* for mistreating his slaves in a hurtful, “premediated” way, because there is no acceptable excuse for his (Washington’s) heartless, violent, and contemptible behavior. Where was his *empathy*? Was George Washington trying to compartmentalize his *evil* actions and cruelty? Probably not. Or maybe Washington thought that brutally striking his slaves was an *expedient* way to frighten and control them on his Mt. Vernon plantation in the state of Virginia? In either case, Washington should have known that there are “degrees of violence.” But as Simon Baron-Cohen (2011), a professor of Developmental Psychopathology at the University of Cambridge, writes: “Lacking any guilt means one could hurt a person knowing they would indeed hurt, but lacking any insight into the impact of one’s behavior means that one also might hurt someone without realizing it” (p. 73). However, we might find this hard to believe in the case with George Washington. So, was he aware of his racial violence? Or did he even feel *any* guilt? We may never know.

In the final analysis, the United States was founded on *progressivism*, falsehoods, racism, slavery, political violence, and a break from the *status quo*, while declaring our independence from the aggressive British Empire. Unfortunately, according to Bailey (2025), “We’ve never fully grappled with this country’s origins. We’ve spent much of the past 250 years denying ugly truths [violence] and spreading pretty lies that make us feel better or don’t discomfort us” (p. 3).

Another incident/example of political violence in American history was the *Civil War* in the United States, which was the violent “conflict between the U.S. federal government and 11 southern states that fought to secede from the [American] Union.” To be abundantly clear, the *Civil War* “arose out of disputes over [racial] issues of slavery, trade and tariffs, and the doctrine of states’ rights” (“American Civil War,” 2000, p. 49). Moreover, *violence* against the so-called “others” was the vehicle in which white supremacists and *traitors* wanted to accomplish their racist and supremacist goals of government control and having American Slavery in perpetuity. As distinguished research Professor of Sociology *emeritus* at the University of California, Los Angeles, Michael Mann (2023) writes:

It is sometimes argued that human groups distinguish between killing within their own community and killing [so-called] outsiders. Aware that the former raises moral dilemmas, they apply an “internal ethic” to make fine distinctions between murder [or violence], manslaughter, self-defense, and legitimate retribution. Such distinctions are not applied to foreign enemies, to whom a weaker “external” ethical ideology is applied. Yet this argument is undermined by the frequency [and start of] civil wars in which worse atrocities occur, and wars [which] have often ensued in which combatants [like the Union Army and confederates] saw each other as [not] sharing the same culture (p. 49) (Note 5).

Racial Violence and Cultural Warfare

Although white, southern confederates wanted to win by *any* means necessary — *violence* or otherwise — Mann was right when he implied that *wars* among different groups are, unfortunately, an American tradition, as with the United States Civil War. The white men who spat on the U.S. Constitution and started the *war* saw it, perhaps, as a looming, violent, “intraparty, states rights’ battle,” based on their irrational bigotry. After the American Civil War, incidents of racial violence continued against former Black slaves, unabated, especially after *Reconstruction*, which was “the period of southern race relations following the Civil War.” Although the era of *Reconstruction* “lasted from 1865 until the 1880s and witnessed many racial reforms,” these *progressive moves*, particularly for former Black slaves, “were reversed during *de jure* segregation, or the Jim Crow era” (Healey, 2003, p. 611). Therefore, *American Reconstruction* was *sadly* an abject failure in the long run, because it didn’t stop the tremendous *violence* against former Black slaves and/or indigenous people. Essentially:

[Slavery] left a strong tradition of racism in the white community. Antiblack prejudice and racism originated as rationalizations for slavery but had taken on lives of their own over the generations. After two centuries of slavery, the heritage of prejudice and racism was thoroughly ingrained in southern [white] culture. White southerners were predisposed by this culture legacy to see racial inequality and exploitation of [Black] Americans as normal and desirable, and after Reconstruction ended and [when] the federal government withdrew [from the treasonous Southern States], they were able to act on [their racist impulses and] assumptions (Healey, 2003, p. 213).

Meanwhile, former Black slaves suffered in silence from violent white supremacists, which reached negative consequences and unmitigated harshness for all affected or involved. Unfortunately, some white American proponents of slavery firmly believed and advocated for eventual *violence* against Black people, which they felt was necessary — and *inevitable*. These white supremacists also argued about it (their actions) being for so-called self-defense and “the cause.” In this respect, some white extremists even today are more *ruthless* than ever. It is as if they are living in the past. Take for example, what took place during the *race riots* of 1919, which came to be known as “the Red Summer,” where white *mobs* or crowds of white men in Washington, D.C. attacked Black communities in 20 other cities, like Chicago, Omaha, Knoxville, Tennessee, Charleston, and South Carolina, based mostly on some perceived insults or *transgression* from Black men. However, “unlike virtually all the disturbances that preceded it” — that is, “in which white-on-black violence dominated — the Washington riot of 1919 [which] was distinguished by strong, organized, and armed black resistance, foreshadowing the civil rights struggles later in the [20th] century” (Pearl, 1999, p. A1). During these violent times, “In Mississippi, three thousand whites, with the [ignoble] blessing of a Baptist minister, roasted [or burned to death] John Hartfield,” a Black man, “who they accused of assaulting a white woman.” In regard to this racist incident — and in the fall of that same year of 1919, “one English visitor to the United States [sadly] remarked that he could not forget the feverish condition of the public [or white racist] mind.” Award winning author, Donald Yacovone (2022), a white man, described the 1919s as “an unrelenting orgy of violence” (p. 219) (Note 6). Yacovone (2022) goes on to write:

While nothing could match the astounding level of white violence in 1919, nothing else could equal the insidious and horrific murder of Mary Turner [a Black woman] the year before near Valdosta, Georgia. Turner had made the mistake of protesting the lynching of her husband and six other African American sharecroppers. To repay her audacity, whites hung her upside down, soaked her in gasoline, and then incinerated her. As she burned, one of the [white] rioters sliced open her womb with a butcher knife, ripped out her unborn infant, and threw it to the ground. Another eager white man then crushed its [little black] skull under his heels (p. 219).

Incredulously, white supremacists and others of their hateful *ilk* sat on their horrible, guilty hands, without a care in the world, perhaps never feeling *any* shame or regret — that is, for what they had done, which was disdainful. Even more troubling, despicable, white supremacists have assaulted and murdered Black Americans and other people of color without giving it a second thought. Or so it seemed. In other words, there seemed to have been a persistent effort by some extremist white Americans to literally assassinate/murder Black people for no good reason, other than they could sometimes get away with their unlawful, bloody crimes? Was this because angry, white *mobs* lost their ability to think critically or empathize? Or was it because of their racial hatred, *political socialization*, indoctrination, or willful ignorance? One thing is certain, white supremacists don’t want people to question their established white *orthodoxy*. More importantly, what we should understand is that “The signature of sociopathic ignorance is a lack of remorse for the grief [some] cause” (Graef, 2017, p. 75) (Note 7), particularly with what happened during the *Tulsa Race Massacre*. Journalists Dale Denwalt and Minnah Arshad (2024) explained it this way:

In the early 1900s, the 40 blocks to the north of downtown *Tulsa* boasted 10,000 residents, hundreds of businesses, medical facilities, an airport, and more. Then on May 31, 1921, a white mob descended on Greenwood — the black section of *Tulsa* — burning, looting, and destroying more than 1,000 homes.

The massacre is reported to have started with an accusation that Dick Rowland, a 19-year-old [black] shoe-shiner, assaulted a white female teenager on an elevator. Decades later, the 2001 Tulsa Race Riot Commission concluded, Sarah Page, 17, was interviewed by police but made no allegations of [such an] assault.

[Nevertheless,] A [white] mob then invaded Greenwood, [plundering] and destroying businesses and homes. Most historians who have studied the [tragic] event estimated the death toll to be between 75 and 300 people (p. 6A) (Note 8).

Unfortunately, the white descendants of the white, Tulsa *mobs* have never wanted to take responsibility for their deceitful, violent, racial attacks and the *bloodshed* they wrought against the city of Greenwood, where *Black Wall Street* once existed. However, this *loathsome* incident will always serve as the “bellwether” of civil rights in the United States. For white supremacists, it was/is *all or nothing at all* when directing their violence toward blacks and other minority groups. Indeed, white extremists have come out of the *woodwork*, so to speak — and they are not sympathetic with the ideals of human life or decency — that is, if it doesn’t involve their so-called tribe, or their white community. Recently, “The Georgia chapter of a Confederacy group filed a lawsuit... against a state park with the largest Confederate monument in the country, arguing [that] officials broke state law by planning an exhibit on ties to [Black] slavery, segregation and [sic] white supremacy” (Kramon, 2025, p. 2A). What? This outrageous lawsuit proves that some white Americans still want to hide their *evil* actions — today and in the past — or deny the horrible system of Black American slavery and *Jim Crow Racism*. Some white supremacists even have a warped fascination with *violence* and the *death*, or eradication of blacks and other brown-skin people. Equally important, journalists Cassie Miller and Jeff Tischauser (2025) tell us that, “A group of white nationalists in Arkansas operating under the name Return to the Land (RTTL) is building a “whites only” compound in the latest attempt by organized racists to build exclusive spaces to protect their perceived racial and cultural superiority” (p. 5) (Note 9). What nonsense. We must also bear in mind that the divisive, poisonous beliefs of white supremacists in the United States are beyond the pale. Indeed, their twisted, perverse instincts and violence, while preaching their racial and cultural superiority is *insane*. To be sure, their *right-wing* ideology is not only unhealthy, but it is dangerous (or deadly) to mostly minority communities. In other words, white supremacists don’t give a fig about black and brown people, when they should give a *damn* about humanity at large. More importantly, white supremacists often focus on looking *backward* instead of *forward*. And the sheer impunity of their threats of violence is beyond compare. White supremacists also depend on gaslighting, conspiracy theories, falsehood, and historical *revisionism*, to make themselves seem like great American heroes, when they are nothing of the sort.

Likewise, openly white supremacist groups, like the Patriot Front, Neo-Nazis, Aryan Nations, Skinheads, WAR, the Oath Keepers, and other white, militia groups are becoming even more hateful, spiteful, and dangerous. This is to say that these aforementioned, white extremist groups are committing vicious attacks on minority groups with hate crimes and horrifying “assaults and murders, vandalism of Jewish synagogues, mosques, cross burnings, [destruction of Black churches,] and other [inhumane] acts of intimidation and harassment...” (Healey, 2003, p. 145). Perhaps with sinister purposes, according to Joseph F. Healey (2003), Professor of Sociology at Christopher Newport University in Virginia, “Both [black and white] groups have committed violence and hate crimes on the other, but the power differentials and the patterns of inequality that are the legacy of our racist past guarantee that [Black] Americans will more often be seen as “invaders” pushing into areas where they [supposedly] do not belong and are not wanted,” like with redlining (pp. 267-268) (Note 10). About racial segregation and inequality, Professor of Social Sciences at Brown University, Glenn C. Loury (2002) writes:

Discrimination is about how people are treated; stigma is about who, at the deepest cognitive level, they are understood to be. As such, these distinct ways of framing the problem of racial inequality [and segregation] lead to radically distinct intellectual and political programs. A diagnosis of discrimination yields a search for harmful or malicious actions [like racial violence] as the treatment, using the law and moral suasion to curtail or modify those actions. But seeing stigma [or violence] as the disease inclines one to look for insidious habits of thought, selective patterns of social intercourse, biased processes of social cognition, and defective public deliberations when seeking a cure (pp. 167-168).

Furthermore, “the reactions to... perceived intrusions are immediate and bloody, but other, subtler attempts to maintain the exclusion of [Black] Americans continue to be part of everyday life, even at the highest levels of society” (Healey, 2003, pp. 267-268) (Note 11), particularly when it comes to the racist machinations of white supremacists, who widely loath those who are different. And although they “are culturally constructed abstractions, race and ethnicity are given substance in the institutions and cultures of America’s peoples, providing justifications and means for [racial] division... inequality...” (Okiihiro, 2001, p. 644), and racial violence.

So, will we fully understand the horrifying racial violence? If anything, the problem of racial violence is not or should not be understated, because violent assaults against blacks and other minority groups have grown exponentially, because of lies and the dehumanizing rhetoric from conservatives and white supremacists. Indeed, these culturally ignorant individuals will continue to live in a sort of *cul-de-sac* of ignorance, hatred, racial violence and political violence. Furthermore, “Our ahistorical orientation and subsequent problem — solving mode” has brought us “full circle to individualism and our concern for equality and individual rights” (Livermore, 2009, p. 73), which is based on race or a person’s ethnic groups. Nevertheless, indigenous people, former Black slaves, and their descendants, as well as other people of color, have had to endure racial violence and *conquest* that have ravaged different American populations, because of white nationalism and other assorted *evils*. This is to say that the racialized world of white supremacists — and their tribal hatreds have made our nation worse and less safe. Meaning, the white, *right-wing* attacks against Black Americans, brown-skinned immigrants and other people of color have gone national, even after the historic deaths and racial violence mentioned in this work. Equally, Black men and women and other marginalized groups are still being brutalized, and shot by guns or choked to death, in “half-nelson,” deadly grips, by inscrutably violent, white Americans and law enforcement officials, because of who they (blacks) are, or because of their *poverty* and different political, ideological beliefs. That said, “The fairy tale of white supremacy — that poisoned *mindset* from our nation’s founding — does real harm [to the U.S.] to this day” (Granderson, 2025, p. 3). The *underlying* problem of racial violence is actually the issue, because it touches upon gun violence, slavery, racism, inequality, white supremacy, and our ugly American history. Therefore, we must learn “to reach across the chasm of [our] cultural difference with love and respect,” and *empathy*, which should become “an essential *competency*” (Livermore, 2009, p. 11) for *all* American citizens. In the final analysis, there probably won’t be a *oneness*, or *unity* among racial/ethnic groups or some kind of consensus for related, democratic goals in this country. So, will we ever be able to get along with each other; or can we have some kind of *inclusivity* without violence? Probably not. When it is all said and done, racial violence will be an endless story about *good* and *evil*, not compassion and togetherness, because of white supremacy and ethnic hatred.

Political Violence and the Art of Death

First and foremost, political violence will *never* be a thing of our past. Indeed, “the same kind of political violence” in our immediate past, is “at work in American society” today (Bates, 2025, p. 5A). Take for example, the parallels of political violence now and in the 1940s, and what happened to Black soldiers during World War II. Journalist Gary Younge (2025) wrote:

Parallels between the evils that African [or Black] American soldiers fought overseas and the evils they faced at home were at times laid bare. The comparisons became particularly acute during the summer of 1943, when race riots [again] spread through the [United States]. Thurgood Marshall, head lawyer for the NAACP and later the first black Supreme Court justice, wrote a report on the disturbances in Detroit, which left thirty-four people dead and more than six hundred wounded — most of them black. He [Marshall] called it [the] “*Gestapo* in Detroit” (p. 8).

Younge is absolutely right for pointing this out, because *political violence* is the greatest threat to safety, and human life in the United States, particularly black life. Thus, would some people be “tarred and feathered” or *lynched* for no other reason than being the wrong skin-color, or having different political beliefs and/or ideologies? To wit, *political violence* is entrenched in our society, and probably always will be. Of course, political violence is like *war*, because it is more than a political act. *War*, of course, “is characterized by [the] intentional violence on... large bodies of individuals organized and [often] trained for that purpose” (“War,” 2000, p. 1773) (Note 12). Unfortunately, the United States is in the grips of political violence. However, political differences do not give someone the right to shoot or murder *anyone*, because all life is sacred. Consequently, as a political matter, we must be able to *agree* to *disagree*, rather than always having white, dominant groups rule and control others by *fiat* or decree. As Stokely Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton (1967) explain, “the white groups tend to view their interests in a particularly united, solidified way when confronted with [Black Americans and other marginalized groups] making demands which are seen as threatening to [their] vested interests.” More importantly, some white Americans “react [violently] in a united group to protect interests they perceive to be theirs — interests possessed to the exclusion of those who, for varying reasons, are outside [their] group” (p. 7) (Note 13), which is the definition of raw *tribalism*. In this regard, white supremacists, perhaps, celebrate political violence, as it is conducive or favorable to their interests and political beliefs. After all, many of “the white group,” or tribe don’t often suffer *any* discernible, political consequences for their wicked deeds.

Or so it seems. Furthermore, the *quicksand* of political violence is also *tied up* with their white supremacy *hierarchy*, or established, superiority doctrine. Political journalist Stephen Marche (2022) also tells us that, “The threat multipliers from economic and environmental sources are [sadly] driving an underlying *tribalism* that is shredding the ability of the [white] political order to respond to threats against [their] own stability. [And] The [U.S.] Constitution is becoming incoherent.” Marche goes on to write that, “One possible conclusion is violence. The other is civilized separation,” which we have already tried with the infamous *Plessy vs. Ferguson* decision of 1896, where the U.S. Supreme Court condoned the legal segregation of ethnic groups in America and ushered in the failed “separate-but-equal” doctrine. Finally, Marche prescribed “disunion,” which he believed “is among the best-case [scenario] for the United States” (p. 177) (Note 14), which is also so much foolishness, because our nation tried this violent solution, too, with the American Civil War or the War between the states from 1861-65. It was also a “lost cause” and failure. Therefore, such *asinine* solutions remain to be seen.

Moving on with our discussion of political violence, we must not forget the murder of Medgar Evers, a Black man, who was the field secretary for National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Evers was assassinated by a white supremacist in Jackson, Mississippi in 1963. Later, “President John F. Kennedy was gunned down.” And “The deaths of civil rights leaders Martin Luther King Jr. and Malcolm X, and U.S. Senator Robert F. Kennedy followed later that decade” (Bates, 2025, p. 5A) (Note 15) from (cursed) gun or political violence. It should be pointed out that racism, white supremacy, political violence, and “discriminatory government policies are still harming communities of color decades later...” (Riquier, 2025, p. 5B) (Note 16). There is also the fact that in the past few decades, violent attacks throughout the United States have become almost a normal occurrence, especially when it comes to extreme, political violence and unnecessary deaths. According to political reporter David French (2025), “Every threat, every shooting, every murder — and certainly every political assassination — builds the momentum of [hatred and] fear” (p. 5). But political violence and assassinations go nowhere in terms of American justice. Take for example, what happened to native Mexicans and *Tejanos* — Texans of Mexican descent, who were American citizens. In 1918, during the *Porvenir Massacre*, these Hispanic farmers were brutally killed by white, Texas Rangers in cold blood. This was the *epitome* of political and racial violence. According to journalist Ron Soodalter (2023), “Many of the victims were guilty of one thing: being of Mexican descent.” Therefore, “it serves no one to deny or ignore an event — indeed, a period — in which the [Texas] Rangers behaved criminally.” In the final analysis, “not a single Ranger was charged with a crime” (pp. 27-29) (Note 17). Unfortunately, this horrible incident (of history) shows how white perpetrators of political violence are not away held to account in the United States throughout the centuries for their misdeeds and *inhumanity* toward other people. A more recent example of political violence is/was when a 21-year-old white supremacist named Patrick Crusius in 2019 “slaughtered 23 people and injured 22 others.” Sadly, “Most of the victims were Mexican or Mexican American.” Crusius’ goal was to “singlehandedly fend off a [so-called] ‘Hispanic invasion’” in order to “make America white again.” It was reported that “He grabbed a high powered rifle and drove about eight hours from his home in north Texas to a Walmart in El Paso.” Crusius wanted to “kill as many Mexicans as possible” (Navarrette, 2025, p. 8A) (Note 18). Sadly, what Crusius did was beyond reason or logic, but because of his racial hatred, he did it (committed murder) anyway, as his harmful worldview *underpinned* his white supremacy beliefs and limited (racial/political) understanding. Of course, vicious hate crimes by white Americans make blacks and other people of color feel absolutely unwelcomed, almost *any time* and place in the nation, like what has happened to Asian Americans. Indeed, during the COVID-19 pandemic, in the United States, anti-Asian violence was racially and politically tainted, which had a profound, negative “effects on their [home and] work lives from racist incidents and microaggression to safety fears” (Guynn, 2025, p. 6B) (Note 19), because of white supremacists and other hate groups.

As demonstrated already, political violence is hardly a new *phenomenon* in “a country that has seen a civil war, four presidential assassinations and lynchings” mostly of Black Americans, as well as the murder and *genocide* of numerous Native American tribes. To be certain, this political violence “is rising again,” because of hateful, racist rhetoric and unconscionable violence. This is to say that “Ordinary Americans are being (unnecessarily) radicalized,” to commit political crimes of violence. Furthermore, “In such an environment, one thing unites the [different] political poles; any prominent figure is vulnerable, though women and people of color are particularly targeted” (“Editorial Roundup: The Guardian,” 2025, p. 6) (Note 20). Moreover, the *uptick* in political violence has also made many Americans *weary* and afraid. Such *toxic* behavior is something that we should be ashamed and embarrassed about — that is, the dangerous, morally bad, misjudgments and uncouth actions of some hateful, disagreeable/deplorable people. These white supremacists are hurtful, angry, and dissatisfied about the multi-racial direction of the United States.

Hence, they are essentially anti-American, not patriots, with their violent and cruel actions, causing suffering to others, who are not like them. To be clear, their political beliefs outweigh *everything* else. However, “Political violence is always wrong. It undermines the very foundation of democracy, which relies on peaceful discourse, compromise, free elections and the rule of law to resolve disagreements,” particularly about political matters (“Political violence serves,” 2024, p. 2). So, can we learn *anything* from political violence? Probably not. Nevertheless, white supremacists and hate groups pursue the so-called “righteousness” of their violence, directed primarily at those who don’t agree with them.

Unfortunately, radicalized, young, conservatives “show a similar sort of [hateful] thinking,” which is “percolating among some” of these so-called right-wing revolutionaries (Goldberg, 2023, p. 3). And they make it abundantly clear about their conservative, political views and harsh notions — and their white, *fascist*, puritanical pursuits. But to what end? Most importantly, are they willing to die for their ideological beliefs? Probably not. To the contrary, right-wing revolutionaries are supreme cowards and bad actors when it comes to their political violence, who often work outside the bounds of reason and American justice. In fact, these ignorant, hard core, *right-wing* individuals could care less about those who think differently from them. They also have a disdain for the truth, and are repulsed by things we know to be true. Not surprisingly, they are unencumbered by the reality of things, too. Moreover, white supremacists want their (political) violence to be overlooked, as they perhaps think of themselves as *untouchable*. And many admit that the death of *non-whites* is fated. But we must reject what they advise, because what they want does not *align* with the political interests of the United States — that is, to the extent that their call for political retribution can be maddeningly frustrating and wrong. Indeed, how can *anyone* make sense of political murders and mindless assassination? According to Daryl Johnson (2019), who is an expert on domestic extremist groups:

There are often additional, nonideological factors in extremists’ decisions to turn violent. They may plan attacks as a misguided attempt at revenge or to confirm a messianic vision of themselves. In other words, extremist ideologies do not themselves cause violence. They do, however, encourage an actor to focus on what may otherwise be a target. They can create a narrative, supplying a sense of purpose and mission to the extremist actions. Finally, ideology may help define the triggering incident that precedes [their] attack (p. 23).

Apparently, some white supremacists are perfectly receptive to committing *murder*, if need be, for their *tribe* and ideological ideals. This is to say that their unpleasant beliefs or ideologies has *everything* to do with violence. Obviously, though, “Regardless of one’s political views, the threat of violence against any public official is unacceptable. Which is to say that threats against judges and members of Congress have rocketed...” (“Editorial Roundup: The Guardian,” 2025, p. 6), because of hateful rhetoric and deceitful creeds. Take for example, the attempted murder of U.S. Supreme Court Justice Brett Kavanaugh at his Maryland home by “Sophie Roske, a transgender woman charged under her legal name, Nicholas Roske” in 2022, who face “a maximum sentence of life in prison” (Kunzelman, 2025, p. 4B). As Associated Press journalist Michael Kunzelman (2025), reporting from “the [U.S.] Marshals Service,” writes:

Roske’s case underscores the pervasive threat of political violence in a polarized nation: The number of threats and “inappropriate communications” directed at federal judges and other court employees more than quadrupled over a seven-year span, from 926 incidents in 2015 to 4,511 in 2021... (p. 4B).

Of course, political violence of *any* kind is an awful thing, and it can be a *tragedy* for our public servants or government figures in the United States. Therefore, we should be upset by such disingenuous, harmful actions, as they (white supremacists) amplify their ignorance with conspiracy theories, *dog-whistling*, false equivalencies, and *outright* lies. Equally, white supremacists continuously cause *on-going* harm to politicians in thoughtless ways, as they try to justify their political violence. However, “Violence never advances [their] side of the political argument.” Furthermore, “Attempting to silence someone with whom you disagree does not make your case,” no matter what people think or believe (“Political violence has,” 2025, p. 2) (Note 21). Politicians, of course, are not immune to political violence, because they are also being attacked because of their politics.

To wit, conservative social media platforms blame “the left,” ridiculously accusing them (liberals) of embracing an “assassination culture,” while conveniently “forgetting that a Democratic Minnesota state legislator and her husband were [recently] shot and killed; and another Democratic state legislator and his wife were also shot in a politically motivated assassination” (“Political violence has,” 2025, p. 2), on June 14, 2025. The suspect, Vance Boelter, a white man, is a Republican and a MAGA supporter, who later “was charged with murder by state and federal authorities and is [currently] being held on \$5 million bail” (Quinn & Kantor, 2025, p. 19) (Note 22). Of course, Minnesota state legislator and former House Speaker Melissa Hortman and her husband Mark did not deserve to die (from gun violence), just because they were registered Democrats; but it happened, nonetheless, because of their ideological and political differences. And Vance Boelter, a true, violent *monster* was out of bound, perhaps thinking that it was okay to assassinate and inflict “unimaginable pain (death) and suffering” on innocent politicians of a different political party or suasion. Apparently, Boelter “had a list of several dozen Democratic lawmakers” (Quinn & Kantor, 2025, p. 19) that he wanted to murder, as if he was entitled to do so. Of course, these horrendous political attacks were eerily reminiscent of what happened to “San Francisco supervisor Harvey Milk and Mayor George Moscone” (Leovy & Marble, 2025, p. 4B) (Note 23), who were violently killed. To be honest, practicing a politics of violence almost always leads to injury or death. More importantly, violence “becomes particularly acute when political ideas are at stake” (Armitage, 2017, p. 13). Perhaps, as in the past, violent individuals don’t even realize the hurt, *mayhem*, and human destruction they caused or engendered. Or many chose to ignore these things. As political historian David Armitage (2017) writes, political violence (and wars) “are doubtless *inhumane* but they have been so widespread and persistent that some have suspected them of being essential to our humanity” (p. 9). What? Armitage (2017) goes on to ask, “What could be more characteristically human, yet more shamefully different from the habits of other animals, than inflicting aggression on your immediate neighbors” (p. 10). This particular controversy about violence reflects broader tensions between political enemies and different, ethnic groups.

Other notable omissions about recent political violence include, “The residence of Pennsylvania Governor Josh Shapiro, a Democrat,” whose house was “set on fire by an arsonist...” in 2025. Or “a hammer-wielding [white] assailant” attacking Speaker Nancy Pelosi’s husband, Paul, in their San Francisco home and the attempted stabbing of New York gubernatorial candidate Lee Zeldin at a campaign rally” in 2024 (Cortellessa, 2025, p. 6) (Note 24). And we must not forget how U.S. Senator Alex Padilla, a Hispanic Democrat from California, was pushed violently out of a conference room by current federal government officials, because he had the *audacity* to ask Homeland Security Secretary Kristi Noem an important, embarrassing question on June 12, 2025, “regarding protests in Los Angeles” (Chabria, 2025, p. 3). Going further in this specific analysis, we must ask: Do violent individuals have a problem of conscience when they make targeted attacks against other American citizens? Intentional or not, it is almost impossible to believe that some people have the gall to base their aggressiveness and violence because of politics. For example, the current federal government wants to violently crack down on *Antifa*, which is a group that doesn’t really exist; but *right-wing* conservatives and the Republican Party want to frighten the American people, as they serve-up, so to speak, *Antifa* as some kind of violent *bogeyman* against conservative *orthodoxy* and Republican politicians. What nonsense. Citizens of the United States should know that the so-called *Antifa* movement doesn’t have a specific rudder, as it lacks leadership and members in a recognized operation. Meaning, *Antifa* “is not a cohesive organization but rather,” it is “a loose, leaderless” ideological movement, “that brings together various individuals and groups under the banner of opposing fascism” (“Antifa,” 2025, p. 14) (Note 25). *Fascism*, of course is a “philosophy of government that stresses the primacy and glory of the state [or government] that stresses the unquestioning obedience to its leader, subordination of the individual will to the state’s authority, and harsh suppression of dissent” (“Fascism,” 2000, p. 565) (Note 26). Therefore, what exactly is wrong with being against *fascism*, and standing up to *authoritarianism*? After all, people who are fighting fascists, in non-violent ways, don’t go around murdering people indiscriminately, like white supremacists reported in this work.

To be clear, according to Cortellessa (2025), “America is a nation shaped by political violence and steeped in its aftershocks.” Also, “acts of brazen violence have been the grim drumbeat of [our] debased national politics” (p. 6). To settle this argument:

It is essential to confront this reality head-on. America is marinating in a culture of violence. Armed intimidation, once fringe, is increasingly mainstream. Men with rifles outside and inside of statehouses, politicians joking about assaulting rivals [and] rallies that invite attendees to beat effigies, calling the attack on the U.S. Capitol “tourism” — these are not harmless theatrics (“Civilized democracies,” 2025, p. 2).

We should be deeply saddened by the political incidents already mentioned in this work; and practicing a politics of violence will not end in unity or success, but only in more violence. Furthermore, bad political actors, like white supremacists, pose a foreseeable risk of violence toward descendants of Black slaves, indigenous people, the LGBTQ community, immigrants, and other people of color.

Conclusions

There are few things more destructive to our multiracial democracy than white supremacists; and because of this, there probably won't be any real *camaraderie* among different communities. Moreover, racially motivated attacks by *right-wing* extremists have had a chilling effect on our nation in terms of *race-relations* since the inception of the United States. Anticipating change, our country "was born of audacious ideals that all people possess inalienable rights, that liberty is inherent and that self-government can thrive in place of tyranny." The exception was Black American slavery, which is a *black mark* on our nation. Yet, "From the Declaration of Independence to the constitution, our founding documents proclaimed a vision that has inspired freedom movements across the world," with violence. However, we must "acknowledge what [these] same documents obscured" ("America's promise," 2025, p. 2). Meaning, when Thomas Jefferson wrote that all men were created equal, he wasn't talking about Black men and women who were being held violently in bondage without any rights. Furthermore, even in our Constitution, Black slaves were not even considered a whole person, but 3/5 a human. Nevertheless, "Our ancestors fought for the rights we now take for granted — facing [Black] slavery, [racial] segregation and disenfranchisement with courage and [ultimately] resolve. Yet today, the language of [white] victimhood blankets everything from micro-aggressions [or violence] to systemic inequalities that pale in comparison to historical injustices" (Alam, 2025, p. 1D) (Note 27), like the ones presented in this work. Of course, Black Americans and other people of color have been profoundly shaken by the racial and political violence and injustices wrought against them. In this respect, "the United States has faced tragedies that [should] remind us how fragile [racial and] political peace really is" (Lowe, 2025, p. 3). Moreover, the story of racial violence illustrates the *cruelty* of other humans toward one another. For example, Black Americans and other marginalized groups have become the *scapegoats* for the fears of white Americans. Why? Furthermore, the politics and ideological beliefs of white supremacists are built on racism, discrimination, inequality, white grievances, and suspicion of the "other" in the United States.

Additionally, white nationalists are "saying [that] the nation's infrastructure" should express the "progeny of European architecture." What rubbish. Moreover, white Americans are now "Decrying the influence of domestic and international "globalist" forces" (Behrmann & Bailey, 2021, p. 1D). Equally, white nationalists and conservative Republicans also argue that there is no domestic terrorism or social/political violence from white Americans or white supremacists. But this is not true, because "it is possible to draw a straight line between ideology and [violent] action" (Dewan, 2025, p. 18) by some white Americans. As already discussed, "The Department of Justice has removed a study on its *website* that found the "number of far-right attacks" outpaces "all other types of terrorism and domestic violent extremism" (Kochi, 2025, p. 2A) (Note 28). Hence, we must be *unequivocal* about being against the lies told about political and racial violence, as it can undermine our American, democratic priorities. After all, as David French (2025) writes, violence and "assassination can cost us our country." In other words, we can lose our democracy "when we stop seeing our opponents as human, when we crave vengeance [and violence] more than peace, when the motivation for our political engagement stops being [for] the common good of our constitutional Republic (or even just the security of our families) but is rather inflicting pain and anguish on our [so-called] political enemies" (p. 5) (Note 29). Indeed, Americans should be *vexed* by such dangerous *goings-on*. As far as racial and political violence is concerned, things might even get worse. Take for example, the false information by the editor of the conservative (online) publication, *The Daily Caller*, where Geoffrey Ingersoll argue that white, so-called "patriots should use force [or violence] because law enforcement officials do not adequately protect conservatives" (Mullin, 2025, p. 24). What? Ingersoll makes this statement without presenting a lot of credible evidence. Also, Ingersoll even fails to mention our nation's "Reckoning with the historically tense relationship between U.S. law enforcement, [some white Americans] and black people" (Salter, 2024, p. 6A), in general. Additionally, in history, because of white supremacy, we must note that people have been savagely attacked and assassinated, because of their priorities, politics, ideology — and skin-color; but we should *never* allow for murderous *zealots* to do what they want in the United States.

Sadly, racial and political violence has become a most significant, ugly thing in American politics. And as pointed out in this work, some individuals, like Geoffrey Ingersoll, believe that *violence* is a good thing or necessary if *anyone* defies the white nationalist's order or *orthodoxy*. So, are white extremists all about violence; and how can we *interdict* such rancid terrorist, murderous acts? And should we consider fighting racial and political violence a national emergency?

Although we should question the motivations of *heartless* people who commit violence, it is conceivable that we may never really know why they “handle disputes with bullets,” or the noose, to hang or *lynch* someone. There are a myriad of political and racial violent acts that we can cite over the years and decades of our nation — but “violence can encompass a broad range of [terrible] actions... making it difficult to quantify” (Dewan, 2025, p. 18). To be sure, violent engagements are not necessary. No doubt, “We can disagree passionately, but those disagreements should never escalate to violence” (“Political violence serves,” 2024, p. 2), no matter the circumstances. As former Democratic member of Congress, Gabrielle Giffords, who “was shot [in the head] while meeting with constituents in Arizona in 2011” cogently tells us, “Democratic societies will always have political disagreements, but we must never allow America to become a country that confronts those disagreements with violence” (Jansen, 2025, p. 2A). Also, we should *never* try to justify violence because of *toxic* racial or political differences. In no uncertain terms, we have the right to protest and criticize our governments — at all levels — in our polarized nation, as these rights are foundational in our Constitution. Furthermore, “violence is not criticism. It is not protest. It is not dissent. It is [outright] terrorism” (“Colorado terrorist,” 2025, p. 2). Therefore, we must reject and renounce all acts of violence and hateful rhetoric of retribution, as well as spiteful assassinations, to make a point, or to condemn our racial and political enemies, or even view law enforcement officials as political heretics or enemies. This is extremely important to understand, because as David Bobb (2023), who is president and CEO of the Bill of Rights Institute, tells us, “A 2022 survey found Americans rated political extremism and polarization as a leading concern, outpacing immigration, health care and unemployment” (p. 3). Finally, the time for excuses are over. And given our serious concerns about violence in the United States, what exactly should we do? Ultimately, with polarization and our nation on the line, we should do a better job in pointing out and controlling political and racial violence, while remembering our ugly past. After all, as a *Sun Editorial* states:

We owe it to the victims of political [and racial] violence to stop this cycle. That requires leaders of every persuasion to condemn political violence unequivocally, not just when it strikes their allies but whenever it emerges, no matter the target. It requires citizens to reject not only violent acts but violent rhetoric. And it requires a renewed commitment to the hard, unglamorous work of pursuing dignity, equality, compromise and coexistence — the corner stones of freedom and democracy (“Civilized democracies,” 2025, p. 2).

In the end, we might have more to lose than to gain. Also, we must not forget the terrible consequences of racial divisions and violence — which might result in death or demise of certain people. Unfortunately, we live in a nation of *lawlessness* — that is, especially when it comes the enduring the challenges of political and racial violence. Still, some might argue that violence in the United States cannot be easily purged. However, we must show *empathy* toward each other — and convey that violence of *any* kind is unacceptable. Governor Josh Shapiro of Pennsylvania states, “We have a responsibility to be clear and unequivocal in calling out all forms of political [and racial] violence, making it clear it is all wrong” (Levy, 2025, p. 6A). Unquestionably, we should worry about the well-being, safety, and fate of *all* humans and our different American communities.

References

- Alam, N. (2025, June 22). Is there greater virtue in victimhood than in victory? *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 1D).
- American Civil War. (2000). In *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Encyclopedia* (p. 49). Springfield, Massachusetts: Encyclopedia, Britannica, Inc.
- America's history — complete with its scars — must not be sanitized. (2025, September 26). *Las Vegas Sun*, Editorial in The St. Louis Dispatch (p. 2).
- America's promise requires facing its past, not rewriting it into myth. (2025, September 10). *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 2).
- Antifa: A useful right-wing bogeyman? (2025, October 3). *The Week* (p. 14). See also Bennett, B. (2025, October). The Brief: Silencing the Critics. *Time* (p. 14).
- Armitage, D. (2017). *Civil Wars: A History in Ideas*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Bailey, I. J. (2025, August 26). Yes, slavery was bad, Mr. President. Denying ugly truths about it is terrible too. *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 3).
- Baron-Cohen, S. (2011). *The Science of Evil: On Empathy and the Origins of Cruelty*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bates, S. (2025, July 3). Echoes of '60s political violence in U.S. loud. *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 5A).
- Behrmann, S. & Bailey, P. M. (2021, April 23). Are white nationalists gaining influence? *USA Today* (p. 1D).
- Biography-Crispus Attucks. (2014). Retrieved from <https://www.biography.com/history-culture/crispu...>
- Bobb, D. (2023, September 14). Polarization is harming a generation of kids. *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 3).
- Bouie, J. (2026, January 7). There is a sickness eating away at America democracy. *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 3).
- Burr, Aaron. (2000). In *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Encyclopedia* (p. 255).
- Carless, W. (2023, August 8). White supremacist group sues activist. *USA Today* (p. 3A).
- Carmichael, S. & Hamilton, C. V. (1967). *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America*. New York: Vintaged Books.
- Casner, N. (2001). Burr, Aaron (1756-1836). In *The Oxford Companion to United States History* (p. 92). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chabria, A. (2025, June 21). The gaslighting of Alex Padilla is already in full swing on the right. *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 3).
- Civilized democracies handle their disputes with ballots, not bullets. (2025, September 11). *Las Vegas Sun*, Sun Editorial (p. 2).
- Colorado terrorist attack is just latest in intolerable trend of political violence. (2025, June 6). *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 2).
- Cortellessa, E. (2025, September 29). American Crisis. *Time* (p. 6).
- Denwalt, D. & Arshad, M. (2024, October 3). DOJ to Review 1921 Tulsa Race Massacre. *USA Today* (p. 6A).
- Dewan, S. (2025, June 29). Political Violence Is a Chapter of the American Story. It Is Also Changing. *The New York Times* (p. 18).
- Dionne, E. J. (2023, July 18). If we want less rancid politics, we must think more about family and community. *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 3).
- Editorial from The St. Louis Post-Dispatch. (2025, October 1). *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 2).
- Editorial Roundup: The Guardian. (2025, September 21). *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 6).
- Editorial Roundup: The New York Times. (2025, September 28). *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 6).
- Fascism. (2000). In *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Encyclopedia* (p. 565). Springfield, Massachusetts: Encyclopedia, Britannica, Inc.
- Former Black Panther leader Brown dies at 82. (2025, November 30). *Las Vegas Review-Journal*, The Associated Press (p. 4B).
- Foster, E. (2025, November 28). A persistent miscarriage of justice in Tulsa Race Massacre. *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 3).
- French, D. (2025, September 14). The Circle of Political Violence Widens. *The New York Times* (p. 5).
- Gibbs, N. (2024, August 5). Unity is still possible in America, even now. *TIME* (p. 34).
- Ginsberg et al. (2023). *We the People: An Introduction to American Politics* (14th ed.). New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Goldberg, M. (2023, August 3). The radicalization of the young right. *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 3).
- Graef, R. (2017). *Ignorance: Everything You Need to Know About Not Knowing*. New York: Prometheus Books.
- Granderson, L. Z. (2025, January 1). Will we tell the American story, or just the founders' fairy tales? *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 3).

- Guynn, J. (2025, January 20). Anti-Asian violence is harming work life. *USA Today* (p. 6B).
- Healey, J. F. (2003). *Race, Ethnicity, Gender, and Class: The Sociology of Group Conflict and Change*. Thousand Oak, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Jacobs, K. (2026, January). Demolition Man. *The Nation* (p. 77).
- Jansen, B. (2025, September 12). Officials in U.S. politics becoming more at risk. *USA Today* (p. 2A).
- Johnson, D. (2019). *Hateland: A Long, Hard Look at America's Extremist Heart*. Connecticut: Prometheus Books.
- Kochi, S. (2025, September 22). Justice Department removes study on 'far-right attacks' from website. *USA Today* (p. 2A).
- Kramon, C. (2025, July 6). Confederacy group suing over exhibit. *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 2A).
- Kunzelman, M. (2025, October 4-5). Calif. resident gets 8-year sentence. *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 4B).
- Kurutz, S. (2026, January 4). In Love with an Attempted Assassin. *The New York Times* (pp. 1-7).
- Leovy, J. & Marble, S. (2025, September 26). Would-be Ford assassin Sara Jane Moore dies. *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 4B).
- Levy, M. (2025, September 17). Call to end violence, vengeance. *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 6A).
- Livemore, D. A. (2009). *Cultural Intelligence: Improving Your CQ to Engage Our Multicultural World*. Michigan: Baker Academic.
- Loury, G. C. (2002). *The Anatomy of Racial Inequality*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Lowe, L. D. (2025, November 15). The quiet triumph of a day without violence. *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 3).
- Mann, M. (2023). *On Wars*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Marche, S. (2022). *The Next Civil War: Dispatches from the American Future*. New York: Avid Reader Press.
- Miller, C. & Tischauser, J. (2025, Summer). We want all browns gone: Inside a white nationalist compound in Arkansas. *Southern Poverty Law Center, Investigative Update, White Supremacist Power* (p. 5).
- Mullin, B. (2025, September 28). Conservative Outlet Publishes Column That 'Explicitly' Calls for Violence. *The New York Times* (p. 24).
- Navarrette, R. (2025, May 29). D.C. murders were an attack on all Americans. *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 8A).
- Okihiro, G. Y. (2001). Challenging the Primacy of Race. In *The Oxford Companion to United States History* (p. 644). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pearl, P. (1999, March 1). In the Race Riot of 1919, a Glimpse of Struggles to Come. *The Washington Post* (p. A1).
- Political violence has to stop. (2025, September 12). *Las Vegas Sun*, Editorial in the Idaho Statesman (p. 2).
- Political violence serves only to escalate danger for all Americans. (2024, September 18). *Las Vegas Sun*, Sun Editorial. (p. 2).
- Poniewozik, J. (2025, November 16). A History Forged in Battles. *The New York Times* (p. 10).
- Quinn, L. & Kantor, W. G. (2025, June 30). Assassinated in Minnesota. *People Magazine* (p. 19).
- Reynolds, G. H. (2014, December 29). Politicians benefit from tribal warfare. *USA Today* (p. 7A).
- Riquier, A. (2025, September 12). Violence more prevalent in formerly redlined areas, research shows. *USA Today* (p. 5B).
- Salter, J. (2024, August 10-11). Michael Brown's death 10 years ago sparked change. *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 6A).
- Soodalter, R. (2023, August/September). Killed Without Cause. *The Progressive* (pp. 27-29).
- Svab, P. (2025, October). How Social Media Is Warping People's Relationship With Violence. *The Epoch Times*, Sample Edition (p. A4).
- Theories, A. (2021). *The New Heretics: Polarizing the Conspiracy Theories Polarizing the World*. London: Watkins.
- Tufekci, Z. (2024, August 4). Politicians Say We're More Divided Than Ever. It Could Be Worse. *New York Times* (p. 7).
- Violence. (1999). In *Black's Law Dictionary* (p. 1564). St. Paul, Minn: West Group.
- War. (1994). In *The Cambridge Encyclopedia* (2nd ed., p. 1172). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- War. (2000). In *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Encyclopedia* (p. 1773). Springfield, Massachusetts: Encyclopedia, Britannica, Inc.
- Yacovone, D. (2022). *Teaching White Supremacy: America's Democratic Ordeal and the Forging of Our National Identity*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Younge, G. (2025, October 19). We Return Fighting. *The New York Review* (p. 8).

Notes

Note 1. It should be noted here that ironically, General George Washington, who became the military leader of the American forces, “initially prevented black men from fighting in the Revolutionary War. Then, he relented and was in charge of a military that was maybe the most racially integrated in American history until the Korean war, according to [the famous] historian Eric Foner.” See Bailey, I. J. (2025, August 26). Yes, slavery was bad, Mr. President. Denying ugly truths about it is terrible too. *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 3).

Note 2. A monument for the Black *martyr* Crispus Attucks should at least be in the rotunda of our nation’s capital, not just in Boston Common, located in Massachusetts. See also Ginsberg et al. (2023). *We the People: An Introduction to American Politics* (14th ed., pp. 48 & 50). New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Note 3. The incident between Burr and Hamilton was violence at its worse, because Burr didn’t take too kindly of Hamilton’s harsh words about him. Burr was later charged with treason, but he was acquitted “on the ground that he had not committed overt treasonable act.” Nevertheless, Burr’s political influence waned and he died in obscurity, in New York in 1836, after living “in European exile for several years.” See Casner, N. (2001). Burr, Aaron (1756-1836). In *The Oxford Companion to United States History* (p. 92). New York: Oxford University Press.

Note 4. Also, our 3rd President, Thomas Jefferson, was “a slave owner — did not exactly adhere to the ideals he famously espoused: His own classically designed home was built by enslaved labor.” Jefferson also had his Black slaves beaten as well, which were acts of violence as well. See Jacobs, K. (2026, January). Demolition Man. *The Nation* (p. 77).

Note 5. According to Mann, “Individuals vary in propensity for violence. We all know people who are aggressive, others who are meek and mild. We [know] that a few soldiers like violence, for reasons of either sadism or heroism, but most soldiers do not” like violence. To be honest, “In many areas of social behavior, personality differences matter little.” See the same reference and page number.

Note 6. Yacovone also tells us that during the 1919s, “In Georgia, a white mob burned one [Black] man at the stake; in Louisiana, a throng tied a [Black] man to an automobile and dragged him to death; and in Alabama, whites hung [or lynched] an African American from a bridge.” Finally, in Arkansas, a Black veteran of the First World War (a frequent target of white rage) was “chained to a tree and shot forty or fifty times” for failing to yield a sidewalk to a white man. See the same reference and page number.

Note 7. As journalist Nancy Gibbs writes, “Our current crisis of division, once again manifest as violence, feels shocking but not sudden; the dread has been deepening for years, a defining quality of this century that [often] began with lies.” See Gibbs, N. (2024, August 5). Unity is still possible in America, even now. *TIME* (p. 34).

Note 8. According to Eric Foster, “By the massacre’s end, as many as 300 [Black] people were murdered. The property destruction was estimated at \$1.8 million in 1921 dollars. That equals \$33.2 million destroyed. In two days. To make it all worse, the [Tulsa] massacre was built on a lie.” See Foster, E. (2025, November 28). A persistent miscarriage of justice in Tulsa Race Massacre. *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 3).

Note 9. In 2023, the white supremacist organization Patriot Front “filed a federal lawsuit against a leftist activist, claiming he infiltrated their group and revealed their identities as members.” So, white hate groups are now using the Courts to protect their *racism*. The Anti-Defamation League calls the Patriot Front as a white supremacist group that “justifies its [racist] ideology of hate and intolerance under the guise of preserving the ethnic and cultural origins of its [white] members’ European ancestors.” See Carless, W. (2023, August 8). White supremacist group sues activist. *USA Today* (p. 3A).

Note 10. Columnist for *The Washington Post*, E. J. Dionne was right when he wrote that, “The untoward meanness out there (see any social media site) and the substitution of personal invective for argument are not just enemies of reasoned debate. They’re also barriers to problem-solving. Important public issues, notably gun safety [, violence,] and immigration, have become so ideologically charged that reaching consensus on sensible action has become closed to impossible.” See Dionne, E. J. (2023, July 18). If we want less rancid politics, we must think more about family and community. *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 3).

Note 11. It is unfortunate, but white supremacists perhaps think that Black Americans and other people of color are some kinds of *invasive species*, harming the larger white society, but nothing could be further from the truth.

Note 12. In addition, “A *guerilla war* is conducted by non-regular forces,” sometimes “avoiding direct engagement, designed to make a state ungovernable prior to a seizure of power.” See War. (1994). In *The Cambridge Encyclopedia* (2nd ed., p. 1172). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Note 13. *Tribalism*, of course, “is the default state of humanity: The tendency to defend our own tribe even when we think it’s wrong, and to attack other tribes even when they’re right.” What really matters to the tribe is assuming they know *everything*, political issues included. See Reynolds, G. H. (2014, December 29). Politicians benefit from tribal warfare. *USA Today* (p. 7A).

Note 14. About political violence being a threat, Gibbs writes, “People disagree profoundly about the source of the threat to [our] democracy, with voters on the left and right viewing each other as uniquely, historically dangerous — immoral, dishonest, and closed-minded. In [this] dark vision, gaining and holding onto power, and denying it to the opposition, is more important than any single issue.” See Gibbs, N. (2024, August 5). Unity is still possible in America, even now. *TIME* (p. 34).

Note 15. Although “the civil right movement is celebrated now, at the time, it was deeply unpopular. In May 1964, the year after the March on Washington and Martin Luther King Jr.’s “I have a Dream” speech, 75 percent of Americans thought that mass demonstrations were “more likely to hurt” the cause for racial equality than to help. In 1966, in the last Gallup poll that asked about King before his assassination, his unfavorable rating was 63 percent.” See Tufekci, Z. (2024, August 4). Politicians Say We’re More Divided Than Ever. It Could Be Worse. *New York Times* (p. 7).

Note 16. According to Riquier, unfair, government policies, like racial “redlining,” or segregation “practices were accepted and widespread up until the passage of the Fair Housing Act of 1968, making many black households and other people of color unable to access mortgage credit and home ownership opportunities. Extensive research in the past few years has suggested that the scars of redlining persist, particularly in terms of poorer health outcomes for residents of those areas.” See the same reference and page number.

Note 17. The point that appears to be missing is there is a *double standard* when white men commit various crimes of political violence, or otherwise, without the fear of repercussions. Jamelle Bouie, a columnist of *The New York Times*, put it best when he wrote, “Our history says that with enough power, and if you’re the right kind of American, you can escape consequence altogether and die a citizen in good standing.” See Bouie, J. (2026, January 7). There is a sickness eating away at America democracy. *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 3).

Note 18. There is little *angst* about their domestic terrorism and ideological echo chambers of political violence and white supremacy extremism.

Note 19. In a report, entitled “Strangers at Home: The Asian and Asian American Professional Experience,” nearly “two-thirds of Asian and Asian American professionals [said] the ongoing violence against their communities [had] negatively affected their mental health and nearly half [said] it [had] negatively affected their physical health....” See the same reference and page number.

Note 20. It should be noted that “the roots of violent acts are complex, but an environment conducive to political attacks may channel the propensities of potential perpetrators.” See the same reference and page number.

Note 21. It should be noted that, “the vilification of political sides on social media has exacerbated the increasing coarseness of our [political and racial] discourse.” See the same reference and page number.

Note 22. It should be especially noted here that Boelter also tried to assassinate Minnesota Senator John Hoffman and his wife Yvette, but the couple survived his heinous attacks.

Note 23. We should also bear in mind that the late and former psychiatric patient Sara Jane Moore on September 22, 1975, attempted “to assassinate President Gerald Ford in front of the fashionable St. Francis Hotel.” Meanwhile, John Lennon’s murder “came two years after” this time, and “John Hinckley, Jr. shot President Ronald Reagan a few months later,” according to journalists Jill Leovy and Steve Marble. See the same reference and page number. Also see Kurutz, S. (2026, January 4). In Love with an Attempted Assassin. *The New York Times* (pp. 1-7).

Note 24. According to Cortellessa, and the Capitol Police, since 2021, there has been more than 9,600 recorded threats against members of Congress....” See the same reference and page number.

Note 25. See also Bennett, B. (2025, October). The Brief: Silencing the Critics. *Time* (p. 14). We must keep in mind that, “A study of U.S. political violence by the libertarian-leaning Cato Institute found that right-wing terrorism has cause more deaths than leftist violence both over the past five years and since 1975.”

Note 26. It should be pointed out that, “Accusing all who hate real fascism as being far-left fanatics, or labelling all questioners of overt liberal values as being far-right extremists, when many are plainly neither, bears striking similarities to dismissal of anyone who questions the word of authority, even when deserved, as being a ‘conspiracy theorists.’” See Theories, A. (2021). *The New Heretics: Polarizing the Conspiracy Theories Polarizing the World*. London: Watkins. Pp. 161-162.

Note 27. Unfortunately, “the [current] administration’s zeal to [wrongly] sanitize [American] history as it relates to [Black] slavery and the Civil War is singularly [vile and] noxious. Along with bizarre moves to restore Confederate monuments and military base names (what other nation lionizes a vanquished military enemy?),” it attempts “to minimize the [violence and] horror and modern societal relevance of what has aptly been called America’s ‘original sin,’” which is Black slavery. See America’s history — complete with its scars — must not be sanitized. (2025, September 26). *Las Vegas Sun*, Editorial in The St. Louis Dispatch (p. 2).

Note 28. We should keep in mind that, The National Institute of Justice study, titled ‘What NIJ Research Tells Us About Domestic terrorism,’ notes that “since 1990, far-right extremists have committed [more violent crimes than] far-left or radical Islamist extremists, including 227 events that took more than 520 lives.” More importantly, “In this same period, far-left extremists committed 42 ideologically motivated attacks that took 78 lives....” See the same reference and page number.

Note 29. Bear in mind that, “progressives [and/or liberals] are [not] responsible for much of the political violence in the country,” but it is actually the fault of conservatives. See Mullin, B. (2025, September 28). Conservative Outlet Publishes Column That ‘Explicitly’ Calls for Violence. *The New York Times* (p. 24).

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

EARNEST N. BRACEY is a retired Army Lieutenant Colonel, with over twenty years of active military service. He was commissioned through Reserve Officer Training (*Distinguished Military Graduate*) at Jackson State University, where he graduated with honors (*Magna Cum Laude*), and received his Bachelor of Arts degree in political science in 1974. In addition, he received the Master of Public Administration in 1979 from Golden Gate University, his Master of Arts degree in International Affairs in 1983 from the Catholic University of America, his Master of Business Administration in 2009 from California Coast University, and his Doctor of Public Administration (with emphasis in Public Policy) in 1993 from George Mason University. Dr. Bracey also earned his Ph.D. in Education from Capella University in 1999.

A recipient of numerous military awards and civilian honors, he is also a graduate of the United States Naval War College and the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, and previously served as Director of Administration at the prestigious Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Washington, D.C. He was also recognized as Who’s Who Among America’s Teachers in 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006. Additionally, Dr. Bracey completed the *Graduate Management Development Program* at Harvard University in 2006. Dr. Bracey was initiated into *Pi Sigma Alpha National Political Science Honor Society* in 2006.

Dr. Bracey is professor of political science and currently teaches American Politics and Black American History at the College of Southern Nevada in Las Vegas. He was formerly Chair and Professor of Political Science at Jackson State University and Chairperson of the Political Science and History Department at Hampton University. He has also served as an editorial board-member for the *Nevada Historical Society Quarterly*. His work has appeared in professional journals and other publications, and he is the author of the books, *Prophetic Insights: The Higher Education and Pedagogy of African Americans*, University Press of America, 1999, *On Racism: Essays On Black Popular Culture, African American Politics, and the New Black Aesthetics*, University Press of America, 2003, *Daniel “Chappie” James: The First African American Four Star General*, McFarland & Company, Inc., 2003, *Places in Political Time: Voices From the Black Diaspora*, University Press of America, 2005, *The Moulin Rouge and Black Rights in Las Vegas*, McFarland & Company, Inc., 2009, and *Miles Davis and Jazz as Religion*, Lexington Books, 2021. He also co-authored the book, *American Politics and Culture Wars* (2001). He is also the author of the novels, *Choson* (1994) and *The Black Samurai* (1998), and the books of short stories, *Requiem for Black Folks* (2002) and *The Big Black Three* (2022).