

Katie Hopper
22 September 2017
Rosenberg Scholarship

Hate Through the Eyes of Montana Human Rights Network Through the Eyes of an Intern

Tucked away in downtown Helena, the Montana Human Rights Network hides on the third floor of an old bank. The elevator directory does not list their presence, nor does their website. Even members of the Network aren't sure where their headquarters are located. Sharing the floor with a few other NGOs, the Network is comprised of about five offices and a larger room set aside for data entry with boxes of papers eagerly waiting to be filed. An old metal safe sleeps in co-director Rachel Carroll Rivas' office. Behind the heavy door (and the spinning lock that is never to be touched) lie towering file cabinets and shelves stuffed with recordings. Since November of 2016, the staff has increased from five to ten. Some staff members work primarily from their Helena headquarters while others are in offices scattered across the state in cities such as Kalispell, Great Falls, Billings, and Missoula.

Every Thursday the conference room hosts a staff meeting where everyone comes together to discuss what they've been working on and whatever progress or setbacks they've encountered along the way. It's a laid back, friendly environment with a sense of humor that does not lack urgency. In a debate about whether or not signature gathering was a pleasant experience someone mentioned that the only way to cope with the activity would be with a flask. Co-director Kim Abbott joked that she always encourages drinking on the job, it's probably one of the more

effective ways to cope with the work they're doing. She immediately realized that an extra pair of ears were in the room and quickly assured me that they weren't alcoholics. Of course, I wouldn't blame them.

The Montana Human Rights Network isn't like most NGOs fighting for social justice. Most NGO's are focused on one issue; Planned Parenthood advocates for reproductive rights, Black Lives Matter fights for racial justice, and the Human Rights Campaign represents the LGBTQ community. MHRN's work spans these issues and more, including: abolishing the death penalty, economic human rights, LGBTQ equality, immigrant justice, reproductive rights, and fighting the right.

A multilateral approach enables the Network to maintain the energy and momentum required to keep social movements alive. Smaller, local NGOs often have a hard time sustaining the ebbs and flows surrounding these issues. Shawn, affiliate organizer of MHRN, describes the practice of NGO's as being, "in the work of putting itself out of business." If you ask an NGO what the main challenges they face are, you're likely to hear the f-word: funding. Social movements have ups and downs, moments when influx of support is high and others when progress is sort of in a standstill. The result is that smaller organizations often burn out and can't sustain long-term funding, resulting in termination.

The multi-issue approach of the Network allows them to maintain momentum, no matter the popular or urgent focus of the time. Founders Ken Toole and Christine Kaufmann started the organization with a view of long-term progressive social change. In order to accomplish that goal, the staff has remained consistent overall, jumping from about 5 to 10 since November of 2016 thanks to a

generous life insurance gift. However, that is not to say that funding is not an issue. Their funds come from all over, including individual members and larger donors. Although every little bit helps, they struggle maintaining consistent multiyear funding, which is mostly foundation funding. People don't particularly like funding research. Research director Travis McAdam says that donors *do* love the final products that research produce, such as reports like: *Drumming Up Resentment: The Anti-Indian Movement in Montana* and *Shooting for Respectability: Firearms, False Patriots, and Politics in Montana*. These reports resemble magazines, but instead of pages and pages of ads, they provide detailed accounts of movements. They included detailed histories, founders, members, their activity, first hand voices from the opposition, paired nicely with interesting analysis. The language of the reports is accessible to the average person and doesn't require a scholar to decode its rhetoric.

Their approach may be broad, but they are not disconnected. While geographically bounded by imaginary lines, their work is applicable no matter where are in the world. They use a framework of human rights, showing that it isn't about their Montana Constitution: it's about all human beings. The boundary is more to increase their ability to respond, make it overall more manageable. In addition to working with affiliates across Montana, such as Love Lives Here, they also work with groups in other states. People will often ask how then it 's different from the ACLU. Rachel has explained that:

...although they similarly have a broader scope of work, they use a larger framework but part of the difference is that they use civil rights, which is very specific to US civil rights and we overlap a ton and yet we're different. They hold those civil rights more fundamental...For us civil rights are a part of human rights, but so are economic rights and access to economic safety, etc. And so we might end up doing more work on some of those things than they

would, like healthcare for example. They have great positions and are sort of have to figure out a way to make it an argument. I think we offer a more cohesive piece of bringing together a lot of issues for the movement in Montana.

Montana's political boundaries offer stability in a rural state. The geography of this state has both advantages and disadvantages. The large distances between cities creates logistical and resource issues. However, as the fourth physically largest state in the US, Montana is home to a little less than a million people. Of these million people, almost all of them are white. With a small population, the Network is able to focus its energy on relevant issues, including those that impact non-white minorities. Montana is also typically a red state when it comes to elections, but it's also been described as a "purple" state. Cities tend to be blue and the more rural areas, red. Bozeman mayor Jeff Krauss describes Montana as a jelly donut, where the center, the jelly, is blue and the surrounding area, the rest of the donut, is red.¹ But there aren't many "purple" individuals; you're either one or the other. This state-by-state approach is an important piece of the national puzzle and a step towards the Network's desire for a larger social movement. You can't tackle it all at once and MHRN is trying to do their part.

The Network's work has two main functions, one of which is the proactive piece. Proactive work is one of the key ingredients in every progressive social movement. This includes facilitating events and challenging legislature. As a Network, they're comprised of individual members and local groups, playing multiple roles in the community. They make room for safe discussion while offering

¹ Dennison, Mike. "Is Montana a 'Red' or 'Blue' State? Lots of Both, Actually – and Very Much Divided." *The Billings Gazette*, The Billings Gazette, 3 May 2015.

a way for local folks to get involved. In times of crisis the Network is both responsive and a shoulder to lean on. They're a place that people turn to. Other roles include shining a light on bigoted, anti-democratic, and racist groups and simultaneously identifying and creating strategic plans to battle or promote policy initiatives.

But MHRN has a secret ingredient that adds a kick to their recipe for change: research. Their opposition research function puts a magnifying glass on the far right, allowing them to further understand where these groups are coming from. Combined with their proactive work, this allows them to go into an affected community, provide background, and context to locals and organize against it effectively. By connecting the dots they are able to look at an isolated incident and see how it relates to the overall movement. Their research system also allows them to track individuals and groups. When they input articles into their filing database system, they note the members of the opposition mentioned. This can be especially helpful because it helps them identify interesting connections. For instance, if a "wise use" member, someone in favor of the deregulation of all lands in order to utilize its resources (regardless of the resulting negative impacts of that extraction), that MHRN had already been tracking was mentioned in an article or newsletter for a white supremacist group, this information is important and is noted. This process can help identify otherwise unknown associations across groups.

Not only does their research serve their own organizational academic and investigational purposes, but it also doubles as a tool for education of the public. The Network helps people both understand what's going on around them and expose

individuals or groups trying to deny others their human rights, the true impact of certain legislation for example. They use social media such as Facebook and Twitter to help do this, but I think this is an area that definitely needs some work. Social media is an incredible new platform through which information can be easily shared and distributed to the masses. While there is a clear attempt to do so, the Network has not utilized the internet to its fullest potential. In order for their social media to be successful, their information projected needs to be clear, concise, and clever. Young people especially often don't click on links to full articles; they read the title of the article or 140 character long tweets. It's common for students to get their news this way and I think the Network would benefit greatly from taking advantage of this.

My Time in Helena

I spent a great deal of my time reading and writing in an uncharacteristically noisy coffee shop called the Hub just an elevator ride away from the office. If I wasn't reading, I was reading. My first week or so was spent playing catch up reading articles, press releases, and reports produced by the Network. I also spent a decent amount of time reading work that had yet to be archived and entered into their research database, then slid into their respective files. Paperwork waiting for their permanent homes is divided into categories by topic, subtopics, and keywords (a much more involved process than you would think). I primarily worked with the folders labeled "Far Right" and "Anti-Tribal." There were a variety of kinds of texts

that they collected, including newspaper clippings, academic articles, primary sources, inter-organization emails, and more.

I shared office space with Travis, although I spent a significant amount of time writing at the Hub or in the research room. Upon my arrival, I met with Travis and Rachel to discuss a possible project to undertake during my time there. We settled on a piece that analyzes how the anti-Indian movement fits into the hate frame and ways that it might not. In my final paper I describe the hate frame as follows:

Frames provide a way to think about and categorize complex issues. This particular lens is based on a common understanding that “hate is rooted purely in irrational, personal prejudice and fear of loathing of difference.”² In practice, hate separates “us” from “them,” using “them” as a nonhuman scapegoat. This frame has become extremely effective in gaining public support and awareness of individuals and groups that target minorities because of their invariable characteristics. It’s easy to condemn “hate groups” because they’re run by a few extremists who frequently use overtly racist and derogatory language. White supremacist groups, for example, slide into this frame easily and are widely acknowledged as hate groups. However, although it is too often viewed as just another conservative political movement, the anti-Indian movement also fits into the hate frame. I spent the rest of this piece providing examples of how the hate frame is well suited for the anti-Indian movement.

However, I also learned that there are ways in which the frame falls short. One of the most interesting examples I came across was the social normalization of racism, i.e. stereotypes, and everyday discrimination. The effect of this normalization is felt deeply in Wolf Point School District, located on the Fort Peck Reservation in Northeast Montana. The ACLU of Montana filed a 46-page long

² Whitlock, Kay, and Michael Bronski. “Beyond the Hate Frame: An Interview with Kay Whitlock & Michael Bronski.” *Political Research Associates*, Political Research Associates, 27 July 2015.

discrimination complaint³ against the U.S. Departments of Justice and Education. In 2015, “28 out of a total of 233 high school students [in Roosevelt County] attempted suicide at least once that year. In the spring of 2017, one Wolf Point student killed herself; a second was hospitalized after attempting suicide.”⁴ That means that over 1 in 10 children attempted to take their own lives as a result of bullying and harassment from both students and teachers. These statistics shocked me. In all of my four years of high school, there were only a few students who committed suicide and their deaths were felt deeply across our entire city, in every school and virtually every household. Being a small town, suicide attempts were also usually discovered via rumor. If even a few students attempted suicide, my town would have been shook and reacted intensely. But the fact that these 28 lives were Indian makes them readily dismissible. Does this make all of those guilty of ignoring this intense issue guilty of hatred? Kay Whitlock, co-founder of the Criminal Injustice blog, argues that:

...despite the good intentions of its many supporters, the hate frame focus on individuals and groups considered to be “extreme” in their political views and actions actually draws attention away from the structural inequalities, exclusions, and violence that are foundational to the ordinary workings of the so-called “respectable” public and private institutions.⁵

Because hate is regarded as having an irrational prejudice at its foundation, hate crimes are seen as irrational manifestations of hatred committed by extremists, lone

³ https://www.aclumontana.org/sites/default/files/field_documents/fort_peck_reservation_title_vi_doj_complaint.pdf

⁴ Woodard, Stephanie. “Civil-Rights Complaint Details Horrific—Even Deadly—Discrimination Against Native Kids.” *In These Times*, In These Times and the Institute for Public Affairs, 20 July 2017.

⁵ Whitlock, Kate. “Reconsidering Hate: Policy and Politics at the Intersection.” *Political Research Associates*, Political Research Associates, 2012. p. 3.

wolfs, and outliers. Shoving everything into the hate frame ignores systemic racism and attributes all actions of hate to unstable individuals in the fray, when really it runs much deeper. For instance, systemic racism helps explain how Native American men are incarcerated at four times the rate of white men, while Native American women are incarcerated at six times the rate of white women.⁶

The Network has been working on producing an updated version of their report titled *Drumming Up Resentment: the Anti-Indian Movement in Montana*, published in 2000. This report, along with others such as *Shooting for Respectability: Firearms, False Patriots, and Politics in Montana*, are available on their website. The reports read almost as a collection of essays that walks through the movements and paints a picture of the entire movement, usually beginning with a detailed history of the movement. I personally think these should be used in classroom settings and more widely available to the public. They make complicated movements straightforward and understandable to the average person.

After reading both of these reports and a long list of articles I had a lot to work with. The connectivity between movements on the right, with a primary focus on links between the wise use, militia, and anti-Indian movements, became really obvious, yet the connections were still a bit confusing and complex. As a result, my first draft was a whopping 16 pages long. Of course about a third of it was me talking in circles, over-explaining some things and under-explaining others.

⁶ Flanagan, Jake. "Native Americans Are the Unseen Victims of a Broken US Justice System." *Quartz*, Quartz Media, 27 Apr. 2015.

In researching the anti-Indian movement I learned a lot about the far right, including the militia movement (also thanks to Ken Stern's book *A Force Upon the Plain*), the anti-environment "wise use" movement, and white supremacy. I quickly realized how similar these movements are in their tactics, messages, and also individual members. One of the most interesting things I took away from this research is the far right's ability to hide their hateful intentions beneath sneaky rhetoric. They strategically frame their arguments. For example, there is an underlying capitalist individualistic view in all of these movements. The "wise use" movement advocates for the extraction and utilization of all available lands. Immediate personal economic growth will always trump long-term health, environmental, or cultural importance. Anyone who opposes the extraction of all available land is opposing *their* economic rights, *their* financial stability. Members of the "patriot" movement claim that the government is trying to take away *their* guns that they need to protect *their* family. In MHRN's report titled *Shooting for Respectability*, founder Ken Toole writes:

To the NRA, along with the gun rights movement as a whole, guns are a symbol of personal freedom and individual rights. Any effort to control guns, whether it is basic consumer protection or a response to urban gun violence, becomes a struggle about freedom. Inherent in this argument in this view is that we have already lost so much freedom.⁷

The militia movement's foundation is in this strong belief in individual rights and freedoms, but also deeply ingrained in this belief is the fear of the slippery slope that they claim follows any federal regulation of guns. This fear often results in extensive conspiracy theories. Moreover, they are anti-government on every front. The anti-

⁷ Toole, Ken. *Shooting for Respectability: Firearms, False Patriots, and Politics in Montana*. The Montana Human Rights Network, 2003, p. 4.

Indian movement holds hands with these other movements when their messages give them an advantage and help build momentum. Both the “wise use” and “patriot” movements have anti-government roots. The anti-Indian movement is very much so a concern for one’s personal wellbeing, prioritizing non-Indians over Indians. Anti-Indian activist and conspiracy theorist Elaine Willman spoke at an anti-Indian conference in 2015. Willman fears that “The proposed CSKT (Confederate Salish and Kootenai Tribes) Water Compact is the Revolutionary War for citizens of Montana.”⁸ She also claims that the Compact is “a template for federalizing all state waters and implementing communalism and socialism consistent with Agenda 21 and that it is intentionally aligned to spread tribalism as a governing system while eliminating State authority and duty to protect its citizenry.”⁹ Willman frames the Water Compact as a threat to the wellbeing of all non-Indians while simultaneously bleeding into other movements of the right. Both conspiracy theories and white supremacy often boil down to an anti-Semitic core. There are claims of a One World Government run by Jews, heavy Holocaust denial, and many more of these types of claims.

I had read so many things about the core racism demonstrated by Willman of the anti-Indian movement that I was a little bit blind. It all blurred together because the movements overlapped at just about every corner. At one point I was convinced that the hate frame had to be the perfect way to think about any and all racism that I

⁸ Tanner, Chuck. “Anti-Indian Escalation in Montana.” *IREHR*, Institute for Research and Education on Human Rights, 3 Nov. 2015.

⁹ Tanner, Chuck. “Anti-Indian Escalation in Montana.” *IREHR*, Institute for Research and Education on Human Rights, 3 Nov. 2015.

started to disregard other contributing factors. I realized that I hadn't read anything from another perspective and that's what my paper was really missing.

While the hate frame is an excellent way to view movements like the anti-Indian movement or white supremacy, it ignores a lot of glaring issues in our society. There is no one reason to explain it all. I read an interview with Kay Whitlock and Michael Bronski on Political Research Associates' website and I started questioning the hate frame entirely. Ken Toole, founder of MHRN, often talked about "margins to the mainstream" and how views that are considered too extreme or in the fray make their way to the political mainstream. This phrase really connected with sentiments in the interview where Whitlock says:

In fact, what is called "hate violence"—violence directed at vulnerable and marginalized groups—is not abhorrent to respectable society. On the contrary, respectable society has provided the models, policies, and practices that marginalize people of color, queers, disabled people, and in many respects, women. The hate frame disappears considerations of structural violence and substitutes in their place the idea that there are these crazed extremists, and that's who we have to go after.¹⁰

I hadn't considered the repercussions of defining hatred using adjectives like "irrational," creating a large gap between regular folk and these whack job extremists, when in reality the gap isn't so big. Loud voices, such as Donald Trump and Sarah Palin, draw the margins to the mainstream, normalizing these "extreme" views. Whitlock and Bronski focus primarily on the hate frame's implications on hate crimes and institutionalized racism. By characterizing crimes as "hate crimes"

¹⁰ Whitlock, Kay, and Michael Bronski. "Beyond the Hate Frame: An Interview with Kay Whitlock & Michael Bronski." *Political Research Associates*, Political Research Associates, 27 July 2015.

and increasing sentencing hate had been legally accounted for and taken care of, but it completely overlooks deep systematic issues.

That is not to say that the hate frame is not a useful tool. While it has its shortcomings, it still has value. But the world cannot be viewed from one lens; not everything fits into one box. After this mini-revelation, I realized that I hadn't even bothered asking the staff of MHRN whether or not they thought the hate frame was useful. It first struck me when I was interviewing co-director Kim and she said, "I don't use 'hatred.' I don't think it's useful. People think it's useful, this organization has thought it's useful and I recognize that. It's just not particularly descriptive to me." Travis had similar notions, although he did find value in the use of the term. However, he thought that talking about hate is only particularly useful when talking to people who had a similar understanding and definition of what kind of hate we're talking about, not hate in the way kids feel about asparagus. The overall takeaway from this encounter is that when talking about hatred you have to know your audience. Do you share common ground or are you talking to the opposition? Neither?

The word "hate" doesn't necessarily frequent conversations within the doors of the Montana Human Rights Network. They fight for universal human rights, rights that apply to anyone any where in the world. They exist to fight the opposition to these rights, whether it be harmful legislation or groups whose entire goal is to deny groups of people these rights. Talking about hatred with regard to white supremacist groups makes sense, it lays the groundwork for these groups to be possible. It provides a fertile soil in which this hateful ideology grows, develops,

morphs, and merges with vulnerable folk. However, hate is not intrinsic to the fight for reproductive or immigrant rights, affordable health care, or economic justice. While there may be hatred woven deep in these issues, hate is not on the forefront in the same way it is in, for example, racial justice work. Talking about hatred in these contexts may confuse the point that the Network is trying to convey and blur the connections between these rights as all being *human* rights. As Kim says, hatred isn't always useful.

Defining "hatred" is complicated. It's on a sort of spectrum, which embraces racism, prejudice, and bias. I encountered this spectrum firsthand with my uncle. My uncle grew up as an "army brat" and moved all around the world because his father, my grandfather, was in the military. He followed in his dad's footsteps and eventually became a Colonel. He retired in Hamilton, Montana and naturally I asked him why he wanted to live in The Middle of Nowhere, Montana. He responded with something like, "Well, I don't want you to take this the wrong way. Just know I've spent a good deal of my life traveling, being in the military in all. I really liked the lack of diversity here. There aren't a lot of Muslims. Muslims just aren't assimilating." He went on to try to defend his statement as I tried to, as kindly as I could, tell him how horrific what he just said about billions of people was. Luckily, my friend Caroline quickly tried to steer the conversation elsewhere.

His notion of "assimilation" really got me thinking. What did he mean by "assimilating?" It's the kind of a word that's tossed around and doesn't typically raise any red flags or come off as being a particularly hateful word. I dug deeper into assimilation with regards to the anti-Indian movement. Anti-Indian activists seek to

destroy Indian sovereignty and call for assimilation. Their notion of assimilation is racist in that it assumes the majority culture (white, European) is more valuable than all others. Assimilation in this context requires extinction of Indian culture and, therefore, the Indian people as they currently exist. Like the white supremacist movement, anti-Indian groups dehumanize the opponent:

If the Indians could be portrayed as savages without religion, subhuman, brutal killers of men, women and children, and as untamable, the easier it would be to assuage the collective consciences of the people. Manifest Destiny could then be enforced and the obstacles in its path, the Indians, removed by whatever means necessary, genocide included. ¹¹

Moving non-Indians to reservations was intended to slowly rid the United States of Indian nations.¹² The Manifest Destiny mindset, which was the idea that it was God's will for Americans of European heritage to expand west and then do what they wanted with what they had procured, still runs deep in the anti-Indian and other right-wing movements, especially when it comes the right to land and property rights. When it came to Manifest Destiny, taking over the land wasn't enough. Removing its occupants was implicit. I doubt that when my uncle complained about Muslims not assimilating he meant extermination, but as the anti-Indian movement demonstrates that is ultimately the goal hiding underneath this seemingly neutral rhetoric. Hate has a way of being sneaky.

My uncle spent most of his time with me trying to prove how moderate he was and he wasn't the evil man my mother, in his mind, must have made him out to me. I always knew him as a pretty odd, tough, straightforward military guy.

¹¹ Giago, Tim. "American Past is Genocide." *The Missoulian*, 15 July 1998.

¹² Ryser, Rudolph C. "Anti-Indian Movement on the Tribal Frontier." *Center for World Indigenous Studies*, Center for World Indigenous Studies, June 1992.

Everything was black and white to him. He also spent a good deal of time trying to tell me how “not racist” he was and that the military is merit based so it didn’t matter what color you, but other questionable comments would demonstrate otherwise. I noticed in this dynamic that I was a bit more forgiving of his Islamophobic and way too frequent sexist comments simply because he was my relative. At almost 65 years of age, my uncle had had a set of experiences that helped shape his views and values, which were seemingly set in stone I do not think my uncle is flat out racist, nor do I think he’s completely sexist. But he has his prejudices and they were made clear in his comments. My uncle is just one individual on this spectrum of hatred, but it’s hard to say where he lands.

It was really interesting to experience the spectrum of hatred first hand, especially when it’s being projected from a relative. It’s easy to condemn the opinions of strangers, but when you share DNA with someone who shares hateful notions it’s becomes personal. I was careful in my responses because he was my uncle but it made me realize that if relatives can’t have certain discussions, then how can opposing sides have meaningful discourse? Hate is stubborn.

There’s a lot of confusion to be had when talking about this spectrum of hatred. Rachel brought this up in our interview when she talked about how someone can believe in white supremacy without being a part of a white supremacist group. A person can hold certain prejudices without being racist. When does someone cross the line from prejudice to racist? To hateful? Are these the same lines? The needle shifts and the imaginary line separating everything from hatred is visibly crossed when there’s an action orientation. I conducted my first interview at

the Network with Rachel, one of the longest interviews from my time here. After the interview, I left with the notion that she was on the same page as I was in my then understanding of the usefulness of the hate frame. However, upon revisiting the recording of our discussion, Rachel was actually a bit skeptical:

The difference for us in hate activity is not just does someone think that someone else is less than or different but more does it allow us to talk about how or where those things fit on the social movement spectrum, the political spectrum, and what type of activism. Because just hanging out and being a racist is one thing, but being on that spectrum of being an activist in that larger movement and we can talk about extremes and mainstreams. I think sometimes talking about things in the hate frame it blurs that, it's not clear where that fits on the social political spectrum so I think it's an interesting thing that I've only most recently started really digging into more.

The Network's ability to critically analyze and morph their own views and positions is one of their strengths as an organization. While strong, they remain malleable.

I've always reacted to groups on the far right of the political spectrum with confusion. It's baffling that a person can dedicate their entire existence to destroying that of another human being. I don't think that anyone will ever fully understand hatred as it devours groups of people. These groups are made up of individuals and individual stories are easier to dissect, put under a magnifying glass, and understand. All human beings have different backgrounds and experiences that influence their likeliness to be sucked into the spinning funnel cloud of social movements and the same goes for being spit back out of it. Travis told me about a man named Floyd Cochran who was trying to get out of the Klan and looked to the Network for guidance as to how to take steps to do so. He told them his story and

explained that after already having been a member of the Aryan Nations, his wife gave birth to a baby with a cleft lip. To the Aryan Nations, this slight birth defect would ultimately require extermination. Cochran couldn't wrap his head around this. What did his newborn, innocent son ever do to them? And that's where he realized the true endgame. Cochran explained his revelation, "I couldn't reconcile that what they said about my son was any different than what I was saying about people who were born different than I was, there isn't any difference."¹³ Without this personal experience, Cochran wouldn't have had his aha moment. Without this experience he would still be a spokesperson for white supremacists, instead of sharing his newfound values.

Conclusion

My time in Helena was a valuable experience not only as a student intern investigating hatred, but also as a young adult developing my own views and opinions. I was exposed to the inner workings of an NGO comprised of wonderful, passionate, and intelligent people fighting for what they believe in: universal human rights. I read incredible articles and reports about different sectors of the far right and saw the efforts of the Montana Human Rights Network to respond and "fight the right." I witnessed how hate can be sly at times and unmistakable at others. The spectrum of hatred is complex and the Network attacks it from all angles. Although the Network is a state-based organization and doesn't fight hatred across the nation, their work is still valuable. My biggest takeaway from my time in Montana is that I

¹³ Snyder, Susan. "Ex-White Supremacist Condemns Hate Groups, Tells Why He Changed." *The Morning Call*, The Morning Call, 24 Apr. 1994.

believe that with a phenomenon as large and complex as hatred, the fight needs to start at the local level and work from the ground up. It takes a village.