The Pennsylvania State University

The Graduate School

College of the Liberal Arts

NOSTALGIC NATALITY AND THE POLITICS OF HOMECOMING

A Thesis in

Communication Arts and Sciences

by

Anthony J. Irizarry

© 2018 Anthony J. Irizarry

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Arts

August 2018

The thesis of Anthony J. Irizarry was reviewed and approved* by the following:

Bradford Vivian
Professor of Communication Arts and Sciences
Thesis Adviser

Rosa Eberly
Associate Professor of Communication Arts and Sciences

Stephen H. Browne
Professor of Communication Arts and Sciences

Kirt H. Wilson
Associate Professor of Communication Arts and Sciences
Director of Graduate Studies in Communication Arts and Sciences

*Signatures are on file in the Graduate School.

ABSTRACT

This thesis seeks to centralize nostalgia's active role within moments of publicly perceived crisis. Specifically, it positions nostalgia at the intersection between pain, home, and *ethos* in order to exemplify nostalgia's ability to construct and implement specific visions of home from which populations can seek out new political and cultural beginnings. The thesis explores the relationship between *algos*, *nostos*, and *ethos* within three distinct yet thematically connected case studies: Paris in the aftermath of the November 2015 attacks, Austin, Texas in the aftermath of February 2017 ICE raids and subsequent passing of Senate Bill 4, and Charlottesville, Virginia in the wake of the August 2017 Unite the Right rally and protests. Through these case studies, this thesis ultimately argues for nostalgia's role as an active force that frames people's judgment of the present and makes possible visions of a better future. Chapter One situates nostalgia as a distinctively rhetorical phenomenon through a centralization of *algos* within the aftermath of the November 2015 Paris Attacks. Chapter Two seeks to solidify nostalgia as a rhetoric of both homecoming and homelessness by examining the public and legal discourse that established the conditions for the Austin, Texas ICE raids and the passing of Texas Senate Bill 4, which prohibited sanctuary cities from the state. Chapter Three explores the ethics of dwelling within the context of Charlottesville, Virginia and the debates, rallies, and protests surrounding the removal of Robert E Lee's and Stonewall Jackson's statues from Emancipation Park. Through these three case studies, this project attempts to answer the following questions: What are the political and material implications of accessing nostalgia as a means for beginning again? Whose nostalgic visions are allowed to influence and shape a people following moments of crisis? What does nostalgia do to the stability of a people's *ethos*? Nostalgia provides populations with the means to work toward beginning again amidst moments of crisis. A nuanced understanding of this process, then, will hopefully enhance the way rhetoricians and public memory scholars engage the politics of homecoming and the rhetorical mechanisms of nostalgic natality.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.. 1

Chapter 1. BEGINNING AGAIN THROUGH *ALGOS*: *A MOVEABLE FEAST* AND THE NOVEMBER 2015 PARIS ATTACKS.. 19

Chapter 2. HOME, HOMELESSNESS, AND *HOMO SACER*: MATERIAL EFFECTS OF NOSTALGIC APPEALS... 46

Chapter 3. REBIRTH OF A NATION: *ETHOS*, DWELLING, FORGETTING, AND THE ETHICS OF NOSTALGIA.. 69

Conclusion.. 93

Bibliography.. 99

Introduction

> For certainly up to this time it has been proved by many examples that all those thus sent away had become convalescent either in the journey itself or immediately after the return to the native land; and on the contrary, many for whom means were lacking for a return to the native land had gradually, with spirits exhausted, breathed out their life, and others had even fallen into delirium and finally mania itself.
>
> -Johannes Hofer
> *Medical Dissertation on Nostalgia*,
> 1688[1]

Swiss physician Johannes Hofer coined the term nostalgia in 1688, yet its rhetorical power has been employed for millennia. From antiquity through the present day, nostalgia has evoked visions of an idyllic place existing outside of the present moment where populations can feel at home. From this home or native land comes a clarity with which populations can deliberate and seek out better futures. Yet the art of nostalgia cannot be separated from a politics of homecoming.

To "be at home" is to feel safe and secure, to understand where one dwells and from where one can make ethical judgments within the present for hope of achieving a better future. To be at home is ultimately a privilege, however, as Hofer himself alluded to. Those unable to return home due to a lack of means "breathed out their life," while others fell into "delirium and finally mania itself." The inability to dwell at home was met with violent ends. This much remains true today.

Nostalgia has existed as a powerful rhetorical device for as long as rhetoric has been studied, yet it still remains grossly underrepresented in the work of our discipline. The subject of nostalgia has been tangentially treated by memory scholars within rhetorical studies, though the

---

[1] Carolyn Kiser Anspach, "Medical Dissertation on Nostalgia by Johannes Hofer, 1688," *Bulletin of the Institute of the History of Medicine* 2 (1934): 390.

bulk of work in nostalgia comes from outside the discipline – from historians, sociologists, philosophers, and literary scholars. Existing scholarship in memory studies and rhetorical studies writ large displays a problematic gap in the work of public nostalgia, especially as it relates to the politics of homecoming and natality following moments of crisis. In response, this study seeks to centralize nostalgia's active role within moments of publicly perceived crisis. Specifically, this study positions nostalgia at the intersection between pain, home, and *ethos* in order to exemplify nostalgia's ability to construct and implement specific visions of home from which populations can seek out new political and cultural beginnings. Through this framing, the study ultimately argues for nostalgia's role as an *active* force that frames people's judgment of the present and makes possible visions of a better future. Nostalgic appeals may achieve this through the construction of an idyllic past that gives authority to a specific cultural, national, and historical dwelling-place. This dwelling-place maintains the foundations of a population's *ethos*. Because nostalgia can be employed on a cultural or national scale, however, any attempt to dictate the borders of dwelling and the process of homecoming simultaneously establishes the conditions for exclusionary means to be used with violent political and material ends.

Johannes Hofer coined the word nostalgia in 1688, which comes from the Greek *nostos* (home, homecoming) and *algos* (suffering, pain), as a curable medical condition found in homesick soldiers. The word's origins are rooted in war and pain and their relationship to home. The memory and images of home, however painful, allowed for the Swiss soldiers diagnosed by Hofer to retain a familiar identity. In some cases, these soldiers were tasked with avoiding symbols of home – songs, images, and landscapes – but in the most severe cases a trip home was prescribed as remedy. The further from home a soldier went, the stronger the bout of nostalgia.

In order to be rhetorical, however, nostalgia demands definition beyond that of a curable medical condition. Svetlana Boym defines nostalgia as "a longing for a home that no longer exists or has never existed," while Barbara Cassin defines nostalgia as "rootedness and uprootedness."[2] My own definition of nostalgia draws from Cassin, Boym, and Hofer. Nostalgia is indeed an uprootedness, a removal from a home. That removal is painful, as is the desire to return to it. But the home one longs for does not have to be real, and as this study will show, *nostos* will be idyllic yet impossible, conceivable yet unobtainable. Moreover, *nostos* predicates itself on clear notions of inclusion and exclusion, and this manufactured divide produces nostalgia's most dangerous elements. This is seen most clearly in moments of perceived crisis. The nostalgia at play within this study surfaces in response to perceived crises – be it a terrorist attack, a legislative act that harms entire populations, or a rally of hateful, racist people that goes unchecked by the president of the United States.

The three case studies within this project highlight the public nature of nostalgic appeals. Each employment of nostalgia gives shape to specific *topoi* around which entire communities, cultures, cities, and nations are able to contest and dictate their relationship with a communal identity and work toward creating specific visions of home that survive beyond the individual. Hannah Arendt suggests that in order for a public to exist, "it cannot be erected for one generation and planned for the living only; it must transcend the life-span of mortal men."[3] Each attempt at homecoming and beginning again through nostalgia suggests a perceived survivability of *ethos* that goes beyond a single generation. This is ultimately how nostalgia maintains itself as

---

[2] Svetlana Boym, *The Future of Nostalgia* (New York: Basic Books, 2001): xiii; Barbara Cassin, *Nostalgia: When Are We Ever at Home?* trans. Pascale-Anne Brault (New York: Fordham University Press, 2016): 7.

[3] Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1998): 55.

an active rather than passive force. Individual nostalgia has its roots in medicine and science, yet public nostalgia has its roots in the rhetorical tradition.

Finally, my use of nostalgia as an active force for beginning again is predicated on the notion that it is part of the human condition to desire natality. This line of thinking originates from Arendt, who masterfully articulates,

> The life span of man running toward death would inevitably carry everything human to ruin and destruction if it were not for the faculty of interrupting it and beginning something new, a faculty which is inherent in action like an ever-present reminder that men, though they must die, are not born in order to die but in order to begin.[4]

The desire for natality is ultimately what allows nostalgia to push populations toward new beginnings, but it is also what allows dangerous means to be used on the behalf of such beginnings.

Nostalgia contains within its etymology a paradoxical relationship between inclusion and exclusion. Boym posits, "*algia* – longing – is what we share, yet *nostos* – the return home – is what divides us."[5] Through the exploration of the November 2015 Paris attacks, the Austin, Texas ICE raids and Texas Senate Bill 4, and finally the rally and protests in Charlottesville, Virginia, nostalgia will begin to take shape as a simultaneous vehicle of invitation and division, of safety and danger. Through these three case studies, this project works to illustrate the danger that comes with articulating and acting on mythic origins for the sake of moving forward. Nostalgia does not just prove dangerous for those who find themselves dislocated from a given origin but creates a danger for those emplaced by these origins in the first place.

---

[4] Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 246.
[5] Boym, *The Future of Nostalgia*, xv-xvi.

Nostalgia ultimately gives shape to this study through two presuppositions that connect all three case studies: the threat of homelessness that is produced through moments of crisis – be it physical, ethnic, cultural, national, linguistic, or historical homelessness - both strengthens and centralizes the rhetorical influence of nostalgia on a paralyzed people's ability to move forward; and nostalgia manifests in any attempt to begin again through the forced stabilization of a people's memory of their origins. Through these two presuppositions, this study seeks to answer three major, intimately linked questions: What are the political and material implications of accessing nostalgia as a means for beginning again? Whose nostalgic visions are allowed to influence and shape a people following moments of crisis? What does nostalgia do to the stability of a people's *ethos* or, as the case studies will illustrate, the very idea of citizenship within the nation-state? Answering these questions will require further consideration of the relationship between home, origin, and *ethos*, the creation of cultural, national, and historical borders of inclusion and exclusion as a result of nostalgic appeals, and the effects of an *algos* that moves a people toward an idyllic home and origin from which it can begin again.

These questions and topics are explored in detail through three case studies: Paris in the aftermath of the November 2015 attacks; Texas in the wake of the Austin, Texas ICE raids and the passing of Senate Bill 4, which bans sanctuary cities in the state; and finally, Charlottesville, Virginia, in the events surrounding the rally and protests centered around Charlottesville's City Council's decision to remove Robert E Lee's and Stonewall Jackson's statues in Emancipation Park. These three case studies, though they exist chronologically close together, span a large tract of geographical space. However, each case study mirrors the others through its demonstration of nostalgia's dangerous, perhaps even volatile, potential to dictate a people's *ethos* immediately following the perceived destruction of a people's home in the present. Paris,

Austin, and Charlottesville all demonstrate a destroyed *nostos*, clear *algos* in response to this destruction, and visible dividing lines that help foster feelings of inclusion and exclusion during the process of beginning again. Divided geographically, all three case studies remain intimately linked thematically.

The subsequent pages are dedicated to an engagement with existing literature on nostalgia as rhetorical device as well as its various parts - home, *ethos*, and pain. This is followed by a synopsis of this study's methodology.

Nostalgia in Rhetoric, Nostalgia as Rhetoric

In rhetorical studies, nostalgia has received scant direct attention. Out of the handful of scholars to address nostalgia, Kimberly K. Smith develops the most in-depth analysis of nostalgia as a rhetorical device. Although her careful development of the device traces its roots back thousands of years to Homer and Confucius, she contends nostalgia as we understand it began in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as a medical and psychological condition.[6] Her major intervention reveals nostalgia to be a progressive ideology that distorts history for political gains. Smith argues

> Specifically, nostalgia accounts for the troubling persistence of those dissenting voices – conservatives, agrarians, and traditionalists of various sorts – that oppose the "progressive" rationalization and mechanization of the means of production. The claim that such opponents are suffering from nostalgia both explains and delegitimates their political stance. Thus nostalgia is a rhetorical artifact of the politics of industrialization. As such, the concept bears the unmistakable imprint of progressive ideology.[7]

---

[6] Kimberly K. Smith, "Mere Nostalgia: Notes on a Progressive Paratheory," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* Vol. 3, No. 4 (2000): 505-27.

[7] Smith, "Mere Nostalgia," 506.

Through this Marxist interpretation of nostalgia, Smith marries the rhetorical device with ideas of industrialization and modernity. This marriage is problematic for several reasons.

In order to understand nostalgia's influence on a people, it becomes paramount that we understand its origins in a society. By relying on industrialization and modernity as prerequisites for nostalgia's rhetorical power, Smith is denying nostalgia's influence prior to the eighteenth century. If this is true, how would she explain the rich tradition that saw both ancient orators' and philosophers' continuously craft nostalgic golden ages as models for their respective city-states to see themselves against? Maurice Halbwachs looks at this rhetorical move as a foundation for understanding the very frameworks of collective memory. He posits, "Not only the old, but all people… instinctively adopt in regards to times past the attitude of the Greek philosophers who put the golden age not at the end of the world but at its beginning…. There is a kind of retrospective mirage by which a great number of us persuade ourselves the world of today has less color and is less interesting than it was in the past…."[8] Nostalgia as a way to locate where a people should begin again following moments of crisis is a rhetorical move which dates back well past the eighteenth century. In his *Areopagiticus*, Isocrates carefully constructs the present state of Athens as one on the brink of potential disaster. Through this destabilizing of the present, he is able to harness the power of nostalgia to guide his Athenians away from crisis and towards the golden days of Solon, Cleisthenes, and the Council of the Areopagus. This is not the only case where nostalgia is employed prior to the beginning of Smith's timeline. Ekaterina Haskins, in her analysis of Plato's *Menexenus* and Isocrates' *Panygericus*, argues "Whereas incongruities between events and their descriptions in the *Menexenus* suggest that the language

---

[8] Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, trans. Lewis A. Coser (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1992): 48.

of praise is a dangerous fiction, Isocrates seizes upon winged words of popular mythology to reassert a sense of community among the Greeks."[9] Haskins alludes here to Isocrates' nostalgic construction of an idyllic home during times of trouble as a cultural commonplace worthy of collective identification.[10] Since the early days of rhetoric's study and practice, nostalgia has been central to its development. Nostalgia did not originate, as Smith proposes, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Although each of my case studies focuses on a time following Smith's date of origin, it proves impossible to fully develop nostalgia's mechanisms in shaping identity and home within each environment without any acknowledgment of the rich history of nostalgic rhetoric dating back through Ancient Greece.

Further, if we are to determine the extent of nostalgia's dangerous potential in shaping identity and home, we must move beyond the understanding of nostalgia as merely a reactionary progressive ideology dependent on and constitutive of industrialization and modernity. What gets us closer to nostalgia's rhetorical nature is the conception of nostalgia not as anti-industrial or anti-modern but as anti-urban. This resonates more closely with rhetorical scholars on the theoretical spectrum of nostalgia's constitution. Stephen H. Browne illustrates the construction of non-urban sites as sites of deliberative power through his notion of the pastoral voice – a voice removed both spatially and temporally from the urban environment forced politically impotent by periods of crisis. Browne defines the pastoral as the following:

> Pastoral, moreover, entails a reconfiguration of time and space, which takes the present and relocates author, text, and audience in a different realm. By abandoning the confusion of the near world, pastoral presents a world of clearer,

---

[9] Ekaterina Haskins, "Philosophy, Rhetoric, and Cultural Memory: Rereading Plato's 'Menexenus' and Isocrates' 'Panegyricus,'" *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* Vol. 35, No. 1 (2005): 38.

[10] Haskins analysis looks at Plato's and Isocrates' views on philosophy through their responses to the Peace of Antalkidas.

> simpler meanings. As a rhetorical strategy, however, pastoral must address current issues by redefining the terms of public action and rhetorical judgment.[11]

The pastoral voice gives authority to the past, but more importantly it demands from its audience a return to the past in order to move forward. This proposed theory is not necessarily antithetical to Smith's notion of nostalgia as reactionary to industrialization and modernity, but where Smith relies entirely on these two buzzwords, the pastoral is not predicated on anything other than the time and space of urban environments. Greg Dickinson furthers the tension between nostalgia and urban through his work on suburban dreams and construction of the good life.[12] Again, nostalgia works as an invitation away from urban environments, both temporally and spatially, although this time instead of dealing specifically with crisis, Dickinson looks at nostalgic construction of home in order to combat anxieties of suburban populations. Finally, Shawn J. Parry-Giles & Trevor Parry-Giles argue for Bill Clinton's use of political nostalgia, which carries rhetorical significance in part through Clinton's (re)construction of his rural roots.[13] In all of these examples a distinct relationship exists between nostalgia and urban but not between nostalgia and industrialization or modernity. Not only does this shift in nostalgia's understanding help us depart from Smith's thesis and expand on nostalgia's rhetorical power beyond the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but it allows us to also understand the significance of nostalgia's prevalence in urban environments such as Paris, Austin, and Charlottesville. I am not

---

[11] Stephen H. Browne, "The Pastoral Voice in John Dickinson's First *Letter From A Pennsylvania Farmer*," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 9 (1990): 47.

[12] See Greg Dickinson, "Memories for Sale: Nostalgia and the Construction of Identity in Old Pasadena," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 83 (1997): 1-27; *Suburban Dreams: Imagining and Building the Good Life* (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2015); and "The *Pleasantville* Effect: Nostalgia and the Visual Framing of (White) Suburbia," *Western Journal of Communication* 70, No. 3 (2006): 212-233.

[13] Shawn J. Parry-Giles and Trevor Parry-Giles, "Collective Memory, Political Nostalgia, and the Rhetorical Presidency: Bill Clinton's Commemoration of the March on Washington, August 28, 1998," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* Vol. 86, No. 4 (2000): 417-437.

trying to argue that nostalgia is only present within urban environments, however. Nor am I trying to argue that nostalgia helps create the divide between urban and rural or suburban environments. The cities explored in the thesis merely indicate a greater visibility of nostalgia within urban environments.

Nostalgia's rhetorical roots go beyond its relationship to urban environments, modernity, and industrialization, however. Nostalgia is rhetorical, in part, because of its inseparable connection with home. While home may look like many things to many different people, cutting through these conceptions is a shared understanding of home as a place of safety and stability. Dickinson posits that nostalgia for one's home is indeed a nostalgia for "fond memories of hometown and the warmth of secure familial relations."[14] In his analysis of Old Pasadena, this nostalgic American home manifests in part through fifties diners and Main Streets, which both symbolize a nicer, safer time, as well as the perceived stability of character and social relations.[15] While Dickinson's analysis uncovers a very specific view of home, especially considering the image of home in the 1950s looks very different depending on one's race, gender, and socioeconomic status, what pervades is a sense of safety and stability in the face of uncertainty.

The idea of home as a place of safety and stability is strengthened in the face of an increasingly dangerous and uncertain world. Dickinson examines suburbia's own looming dangers and uncertainties, what he calls "postmodern anxieties," which prompt individuals in response to

> attempt to create private and public spaces that feel safe. This sense of safety can be created through a wide variety of performances, including locking doors and windows, hiring private security forces, living behind fences and gates, and

[14] Dickinson, "Memories for Sale," 13.
[15] Dickinson, "Memories for Sale," 15.

> limiting diversity within residential areas. Central to this creation of a sense of safety is the deployment of a spatial imaginary reminding residents that the space in which they live, work, shop, and play is, in fact, safe.[16]

Whether a home is actually safe or stable is not the issue here. There is a spatial imagination that drives individuals to buttress the home with that which makes it safe and stable. In this sense, home becomes the *understanding* that one belongs to a place where she can be safe and stable, especially in the wake of a crisis.

But what happens when this understanding, this imagining of home in the wake of danger, paradoxically produces danger? What happens when the safety and stability of some rests on the exclusion of others? What happens if a people, through legislation or cultural practices, are denied access to a place of safety or stability? Nostalgia's relationship to home within this study provides evidence to the exclusion – and the danger that comes from exclusion – inherent to the *nostos* in nostalgia.

The danger inherent to home's exclusionary ways raises concern if we are to understand home as moving beyond a physical place. If safety and stability are what constitutes the home, then home does not necessarily need to be a physical place. Instead home can persist in language. Following the end of WWII, Hannah Arendt was tasked with reconciling ideas of home after Nazi Germany took hers away from her. When Arendt was asked in an interview whether she misses pre-Hitler Europe, which understandably would never exist again, the political theorist answered, "The Europe of the pre-Hitler period? I do not long for that, I can tell you. What remains? The language remains."[17] When any semblance of a physical home, even the memory

---

[16] Dickinson, "The *Pleasantville* Effect," 216.

[17] Hannah Arendt, "'What Remains? The Language Remains': A Conversation with Günter Gaus," in *Essays of Understanding,1930-1954: Formation, Exile, and Totalitarianism*, ed. Jerome Kohn (New York: Schocken Books, 1994), 12.

of this physical home, is lost through physical or traumatic destruction, safety and stability must transform through a new medium. For those like Arendt, this new medium is language. Arendt chose to speak German even while living in the United States. The German language connected her to a home when nothing else could, which allowed for the values of home to remain in Arendt's life. Arendt justifies her continued use of the language while living in America, despite the traumatic connotations attached to German words in the aftermath of WWII, by arguing, "The German language is the essential thing that has remained and that I have always consciously preserved… It wasn't the German language that went crazy. And, second, there is no substitution for the mother tongue."[18] For Arendt, there can only be one mother tongue, and that mother tongue provides the safety and stability of a home, even if one's physical home no longer exists. However, even here home cannot exist without the work of exclusion. The German language separates Arendt from non-native German speakers. Arendt finds home in her inclusion in a language that cannot include everyone. Yet one's language does not always provide inclusion. In the case of non-English speakers living in Texas after the passing of SB 4, language becomes a mark of political exclusion. Language, then, can provide the very wedge that splits home from character.

The connection between one's character and her perceived home is strong and intimate. This is because one's home provides the origin from which *ethos* emerges. Michael J. Hyde sees *ethos* as a dwelling place which "define[s] the grounds, the abodes or habitats, where a person's ethic and moral character take form and develop." [19] *Ethos* is a place that grounds and shapes a person's or people's identity. It provides a launching off point – in short, an origin – from which

[18] Arendt, "'What Remains? The Language Remains,'" 13.

[19] Michael J. Hyde, "Introduction: Rhetorically, We Dwell," in *The Ethos of Rhetoric*, ed. Michael J Hyde (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2004): xiv.

we begin to form a system of morality, ethics, and politics. Although *ethos* should be understood within this study as Hyde articulates, the dwelling place can certainly be linguistic, as is the case for Arendt. This ultimately allows Arendt to retain her identity through the German language. When Arendt went back to visit Germany years after the war, she found joy and comfort from hearing people speak German widely and freely. She states, "But the general, and the greatest experience when one returns to Germany – apart from the experience of recognition, which is always the crux of the action in Greek tragedy – is one of violent emotion. And then there was the experience of hearing German spoken in the streets. For me that was an indescribable joy."[20] Arendt was experiencing the stability of a shared language and shared understanding of its mechanisms, while she felt safe speaking her mother tongue freely and without concern of judgment or persecution. Home exists through language for her as a launching point from which she can identify herself amongst and against other people when a physical home no longer exists. With a home intact, *ethos* remains intact, allowing the origins of Arendt's identity to remain known by and accessible for her.

This study is not focused on recovered or preserved homes and origins however, for that is not what nostalgia is most concerned with. If Arendt is able to retain her home, albeit through language, then she cannot be nostalgic for home. Nostalgia is the desire for a home – and through it, an *ethos* – perceived as lost. With the source of one's ideal ethic and moral character out of reach, nothing remains but a drive towards this ideal. But if nostalgia is concerned with the formation of an ideal *ethos*, what is the force that drives one toward this ideal?

Algos functions as the force that gives nostalgia movement toward an ideal home and *ethos* where one can feel safe and stable again. It is a dynamic pain inherent to nostalgia that

[20] Arendt, "'What Remains? The Language Remains,'" 15.

derives from a spatial and temporal severance of home and character and the consequent desire to suture that disconnect. *Algos*, as Boym posits, is what we all share through nostalgia. It is the driving force that pushes disparate groups of Parisians, Texans, Virginians, and Americans toward a dwelling-place from which they can begin again. The yearning for home's safety and stability found within *algos* is predicated on a constant feeling of danger and instability. Dickinson, Carole Blair, and Brian Ott attribute security and stability to place, whereas the larger undistinguished space surrounding place signifies openness, freedom, and threat.[21] This "threat" of undistinguished, borderless space - of a potential homelessness - is what fuels *algos*. In light of a crisis, the threat becomes more pronounced and nostalgia becomes as potent as ever. *Algos* proves difficult to satiate, however, leaving its nostalgic subjects in a perennial search for an unobtainable ideal.

Methodology

This project seeks to analyze nostalgia's dangerous potential inherent to the process of beginning again amidst threats of homelessness. In order to accomplish this, the project will engage myriad sites of analysis. Nostalgia is not found within a single text but instead weaves through a larger political, cultural, and historical context that shapes three distinct but interrelated moments in time and space. Therefore, this project will employ the help of popular and legislative discourse, executive orders, newspaper articles, memoirs, interviews, social media campaigns, memory texts, and existing historical, political, philosophical, and rhetorical

[21] Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair and Brian L. Ott, *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials* (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2010): 23.

scholarship to better understand nostalgic attempts to begin again and the politics of homecoming.

Chapter One situates nostalgia as a distinctively rhetorical phenomenon through a centralization of *algos* within the aftermath of the November 2015 Paris Attacks. In the days and weeks following the attacks, copies of Ernest Hemingway's *A Moveable Feast* were seen on memorial shrines throughout the city as well as in the hands of readers at bars and cafes. The prevalence of *A Moveable Feast* was so strong that by the week following the attacks, the nostalgic memoir had topped the list of book sales on Amazon's French site. [22] As this chapter will demonstrate, *A Moveable Feast*'s resurgence following the attacks functions as just one of several points of access for understanding *algos* and its ability to drive populations toward idyllic places of judgment following crisis. This chapter utilizes newspapers, interviews, and social media alongside Hemingway's memoir to examine how a people can use an ideal, fictional depiction of home as a way to reconstruct a coherent Parisian identity in the wake of a lost *nostos* and an encompassing *algos*. Further, this chapter works to suggest a potential reading of nostalgia that, at the very least, spans the Atlantic. Parisians adopting the nostalgic view of an American illustrates a *nostos* that can be understood, though not obtained, by both Parisians and Americans. As further case studies will show, the mechanisms that produce a nostalgic home and *ethos* are not unique to Paris but are instead universal to each case study, no matter the geographic location.

---

[22] Alison Flood, "Hemingway's Paris memoir rises to No 1 in France following terror attacks," *The Guardian*, November 20, 2015, https://www.theguardian.com/books/2015/nov/20/hemingway-paris-memoir-no-1-france-following-terror-attacks-a-moveable-feast.

Chapter Two seeks to solidify nostalgia as a rhetoric of both homecoming and homelessness. This chapter examines the public and legal discourse that established the conditions for the Austin, Texas ICE raids and the passing of Texas Senate Bill 4, which prohibited sanctuary cities from the state. By engaging these sites through the lens of potentiality, violence, and language, this chapter focuses on the contested understandings of national home and identity that result from threats of physical, linguistic, and national homelessness. The goal of this chapter is to show that while nostalgia is centered around ideas of safety and stability, this construction of a bordered *nostos* will inevitably lead to the emplacement of homeless bodies.

Chapter Three takes the forwarded theoretical developments of the previous chapters and applies them to Charlottesville, Virginia. This chapter examines the ethics of dwelling and historical homelessness inherent to nostalgic appeals through the various slogans, speeches, press conferences, and political and popular statements that came out of Charlottesville and the events of August 2017. The emphasis placed within these myriad responses consequently aided in the symbolic construction of Charlottesville as dwelling-place. The public discourse that came out of Charlottesville ultimately produced three distinct sides to the debate - those who inhabit whiteness and white supremacy, those who want to protect Confederate symbols based on their historical and cultural importance, and those who wish to remove Confederate symbols as a means for forgetting racism from their historical consciousness. Each side drew its shape and borders through a distinct understanding over the role of confederate statues within Charlottesville as dwelling-place, specifically taking sides over the efficacy of *damnatio memoriae*, or memory damnation, as it applies to statue removal within Emancipation Park. A closer examination into this division allows for the three *topoi* of *ethos*, dwelling, and forgetting

to give shape to a more nuanced understanding of the events of Charlottesville as well as the city's symbolic topographical transformation as dwelling-place. It additionally allows for those events to tell us about the ethics of historical homelessness and nostalgia within democratic society.

Through these three case studies, this project attempts to answer the following questions: What are the political and material implications of accessing nostalgia as a means for beginning again? Whose nostalgic visions are allowed to influence and shape a people following moments of crisis? What does nostalgia do to the stability of a people's *ethos*? These questions are complex, yet the threads of their answers can certainly be plucked from the fabric of Paris, Austin, and Charlottesville. Nostalgia provides populations with the means to work toward beginning again amidst moments of crisis. A nuanced understanding of this process, then, will hopefully enhance the way rhetoricians and public memory scholars engage the politics of homecoming and the rhetorical mechanisms of nostalgic natality.

Finally, it takes the work of multiple disciplines over a course of centuries to get at the true nature of nostalgia. This project only wishes to temporarily harness the force of nostalgia in order to shed light on its implications within the framework of the project's three case studies. As such, certain intersections must regretfully be omitted from this thesis for the sake of brevity. Most notably, though nostalgia has a rich relationship with traditions of faith, including certain traditions that will be analyzed within this project, the time it would take to develop this relationship proves unfeasible for this thesis. Nostalgia can be traced through the rhetoric of many religions and structures of communal identification. This project merely hopes to illuminate further avenues through which nostalgia may be better understood within such

rhetorics. The proper exploration of these avenues, however, must fall outside of the bounds of this project and into the hands of those interested in such fruitful endeavors.

Beginning Again Through *Algos*: *A Moveable Feast* and the November 2015 Paris Attacks

On November 13, 2015, 130 people lost their lives and several hundred more were injured in a series of coordinated attacks carried out across Paris. As the city mourned its losses in the following days and weeks, memorials sprouted throughout the city. Flowers, candles, and various mementos lined the walls of the attack sites, providing a much needed buttress of love and support for the places and people destabilized by the attacks. Among the memorials' various artifacts were copies of Ernest Hemingway's *A Moveable Feast*, the nostalgic memoir of his time in Paris during the 1920s. The memoir, which illustrates a Parisian cityscape existing 90 years prior to the attacks and published 51 years prior, may at first seem like an odd choice for placement among the memorial sites, especially considering its author was not even French. Yet sales of Hemingway's *A Moveable Feast* soared in the wake of these attacks with orders increasing from an average of 10-15 copies per day to 500, amounting to 8,500 copies ordered in just a few days. A week after the attacks, the memoir had topped the list of book sales on Amazon's French site.[23]

As this chapter will demonstrate, *A Moveable Feast*'s resurgence following the attacks functions as just one of several points of access for understanding a larger phenomenon shaping both the cultural and political response to November 2015: *algos*. *Algos*, which stands as this chapter's central focus, exists as a painful longing that arises out of the forced destabilization of one's *ethos* following moments of crisis. *Algos* cannot be reduced to mere pain or longing, however, for these perceived synonyms carry with them potentially misleading or even

---

[23] Alison Flood, "Hemingway's Paris memoir rises to No 1 in France following terror attacks," *The Guardian*, November 20, 2015, https://www.theguardian.com/books/2015/nov/20/hemingway-paris-memoir-no-1-france-following-terror-attacks-a-moveable-feast.

destructive connotative meanings; pain and longing are terms mired in ideas of individualization, paralysis, and the past. Instead, *algos* should be understood as a rhetorical device that prompts collective judgment in the present and action towards a better future. In short, *algos* becomes necessary for populations who seek to begin again.

The rhetorical role of *algos* within nostalgic appeals has traditionally evaded appropriate attention. Svetlana Boym argues that *algos* is a shared emotion among all nostalgics, claiming "…The sentiment itself, the mourning of displacement and temporal irreversibility, is at the very core of the modern condition [of nostalgia]."[24] *Algos* pushes people toward an ideal origin, allowing that origin to serve as a model on which future action is based. As a result, *algos* should not be understood merely as noun but should be understood as a verb as well. In the case of the Paris attacks, the attacks themselves did not just cause pain for the people of Paris; the attacks pained the people backwards toward a place where pain no longer exists: a Parisian golden era represented in part by Hemingway's memoir. *Algos* is action, and it is the duty of rhetorical critics to judge what that action does for those attempting to begin again. As such, this chapter explores the following questions: what does *algos* do to the stability of home, *ethos*, and the relationship between the two? How does *algos* effect the process of beginning again after a moment of crisis? Through the exploration of these questions, the larger questions regarding nostalgia's efficacy as a means for beginning again, as well as nostalgia's effect on the stability of a people's, culture's, or nation's collective identity will hopefully begin to surface.

This chapter argues for an enhanced understanding of the rhetorical influence of *algos* within nostalgic appeals. In the case of the Paris attacks, *algos* reveals itself within three interrelated sites inherent to nostalgic appeals: through the spatial and temporal destabilization of

---

[24] Svetlana Boym, *The Future of Nostalgia* (New York: Basic Books, 2001), xv-xvi.

home in the present caused by a moment of crisis; within the drive to recreate the idyllic home of the collective past following a moment of crisis; and through the exclusive practices that crystallize out of any attempt to re-stabilize the present *ethos* based on a mythic and fictionalized origin. It becomes impossible to process the aftermath of the Paris attacks without first understanding the various ways *algos* gives movement to those who have just been paralyzed by crisis.

Algos is not accessed through a single text – neither Hemingway's memoir nor its location in the memorial sites fully capture its rhetorical significance. Instead, *algos* envelops an entire community destabilized by crisis and permeates the cultural moment of the November 2015 attacks. In order to analyze this moment, then, this chapter first looks to the night of the attacks and the immediate aftermath in conjunction with scholarship on place, space, and home to show the relationship between home and *ethos*, as well as how attacks on one's home signal a severing of *ethos* from dwelling place. Next, the chapter analyzes *algos's* effect on Parisian construction of and movement between painful present, mythic past, and utopic future following the attacks, using Isocrates's *Areopagiticus* as an illustrative model. Then, the chapter uses Hemingway's memoir to show how *algos* helps to create the necessary juxtaposition between fictional past and experienced present – a juxtaposition that prompts judgment and action towards a better future. The chapter concludes with a look at the legacy of the November Paris attacks to highlight how *algos* resonates through practices of exclusion caused by nostalgic appeals. Only through a strategic examination of multiple sites of post-crisis response can the presence of *algos* and its role within the November 2015 Paris attacks shed light on nostalgia's rhetorical efficacy as a means for beginning again.

Algos *and the Home*

Having offered a general account of the relationship between *algos*, home, and *ethos* within the introduction, it behooves us now to review and extend how specific elements of this relationship manifest within the November 2015 Paris attacks. In particular, this section will address the significance of the severance between home and character and how that severance can be understood as rhetorically significant. Although nostalgia as a curable medical condition has since been delegitimized, the idea of pain stemming from a severance with the home still holds value today. It is hardly surprising, then, that Parisians were inflicted with nostalgia at a moment of extreme pain and conflict – a moment of severance between the home they knew in the past and the threat of homelessness they faced in the present.

The threat of homelessness is made visible when a city's symbolic meaning shifts as a direct result of an act of terrorism. This act of terrorism struck Paris on November 13, 2015. Beginning with an explosion outside France's Stade de France at 9:20 p.m., a series of attacks carried out by three teams targeted six locations in less than an hour, killing 130 people and injuring over 350 more.[25] Three explosions occurred just outside France's soccer stadium, killing all three suicide bombers and one other victim. President Francois Hollande was attending a soccer game at the stadium where France was playing Germany in an international friendly match. Meanwhile, two more teams of attackers targeted various restaurants and the Bataclan Concert Hall in the Xth and XIth arrondissements - neighborhoods in the city center. The attacks

---

[25] "Paris Attacks: What Happened on the Night," *BBC*, December 9, 2015, http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-34818994.

officially ceased three hours later when officials stormed the Bataclan to confront the attackers who had taken hostage the attendees of a concert being held at the venue.[26]

One does not need to strain to imagine how a home could be perceived as lost following a series of attacks carried out in its center. Out of the six targeted sites, almost all occurred within the city center rather than the surrounding *banlieues* (suburbs), signaling an attack not on the citizens, but on the city itself. Economics professor and *Le Monde Diplomatique* contributing writer Rabah Ghelazi drafted a response to the attacks that articulated his own fear of symbolic homelessness in the attacks' aftermath. He writes:

> Daesh (ISIS) targeted [Paris's] youth and civil society at its progressive core. Instead of attacking tourist, conservative or governmental areas, the assassins preferred the Xth and XIth arrondissements where the population is known to be tolerant and open-minded, places where people of different ethnic and social background are used to mixing and enjoying themselves. And by targeting the Stade de France, the attackers chose a national monument where our best memories are still vivid: those of a multi-ethnic but very French team, representing all of us, which won the FIFA World Cup in 1998. The assassins aimed at attacking all of us, at a time when French society is fragile, divided and threatened by many communitarian fractures.[27]

The attacks did not target individuals but instead attacked those monuments symbolic of both French and Parisian memory and values. The Stade de France symbolizes a locatable pride derived from a multi-ethnic team winning a World Cup, whereas the Xth and XIth arrondissements represent a tolerant, culturally diverse, and vibrant Parisian identity. Because of

---

[26] Adam Nossiter, Aurelien Breeden, and Katrin Bennhold, "Three Teams of Coordinated Attackers Carried Out Assault on Paris, Officials Say; Hollande Blames ISIS," *The New York Times*, November 14, 2015, https://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/15/world/europe/paris-terrorist-attacks.html.

[27] Rabah Ghelazi, "For One Indivisible French Republic," *Le Monde Diplomatique*, December 7, 2015, http://mondediplo.com/outsidein/for-one-indivisible-french-republic.

the attacks, the meanings attached to these monuments risk losing resonance, and the very meaning of the term “Parisian” begins to lose clarity.

This abrupt change to the dwelling places from which Parisians take their name has a significant rhetorical impact if we are to consider Paris and its stadiums, concert halls, restaurants, and streets sites of memory.[28] Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, and Brian L. Ott posit that a site of memory, what they call a memory place, helps construct preferred public identities and offers a sense of sustained and sustaining communal identification. Memory places are capable of “bringing the visitor into contact with a significant past, [through which] the visitor may be led to understand the present as part of an enduring, stable tradition,” while “the seeming stability of the place may still foster a sense of cross-temporal community.”[29] Although Dickinson et al. focus their project on the construction of specific memory places that invite identification from visitors, such as museums and monuments, cities may also act as memory places in the sense that they invite visitors to access a specific communal identity (Parisian and its anchored connotations) and share in tradition and a communal past (food, architecture, language, fashion). Whether the memory place is a stadium, a concert hall, or an entire city does not matter here; what does matter is that memory places provide a dwelling place, however ephemerally, through which identification with the place’s represented past, present, and future lends itself to the construction of a person’s character. When a memory place is destabilized, the character of its citizens is thrown into flux.

---

[28] According to Pierre Nora’s massive, multi-volume *Lieux de mémoire* project that meticulously chronicles France’s memoryscape, this justification is warranted.

[29] Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair and Brian L. Ott, *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials* (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2010), 27.

Algos, and indeed nostalgia, rely on an intimate relationship between character and home. Writing about the rhetorical influence of "suburban imaginations" on the American *ethos*, Dickinson argues, "We never simply experience space or place in a vacuum. Our experiences are always conditioned by a host of previous experiences, including our immersion in media images."[30] Place and space both invite and structure experience and identity, providing the foundations for the construction of an *ethos*.[31] The home is central to this idea. In America, suburban imaginations "offer individuals an *ethos* that directly engages deeply felt anxieties of postmodern suburban life."[32] In order to combat the postmodern anxiety of suburbia, individuals attempt to create and maintain the suburban home as a space of safety, which leads to locking doors and windows, living in gated and fenced communities, and hiring private security forces.[33] Ideas of an ideal suburban home lead to the performance of these actions, according to Dickinson, yet it could be argued that a desire for safety is not a direct response to postmodern anxieties but a desire intimately associated to the very idea of home. Homes are safe spaces, at least in name. Of course, actions ranging from domestic abuse to war complicate this notion of home as a safe space, but then these actions also often lead to the redefinition of home toward something that can salvage home's connection to safety and comfort.

In Paris, ideas of the city, Parisian imaginations if you will, structure an *ethos* derived from specific values drawn from its physical space. For Ghelazi and others, this imagination has come to include diversity and tolerance. Yet even more foundational and universal, this

---

[30] Greg Dickinson, "The *Pleasantville* Effect: Nostalgia and the Visual Framing of (White) Suburbia," *Western Journal of Communication* 70, No. 3 (2006), 214.

[31] For further discussion of *ethos* as dwelling place, see *The Ethos of Rhetoric*, ed. Michael J Hyde (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2004).

[32] Dickinson, "The *Pleasantville Effect*," 216.

[33] Dickinson, "The *Pleasantville Effect*," 216.

imagination includes the idea of safety. The outdoor terraces and active nightlife inherent to Parisian identity – an identity reinforced by Hemingway's *A Moveable Feast* - both attest to this and explain the number of deaths and injuries accrued in an attack beginning at 9:20 p.m. and ending after midnight. Safety and comfort belong in the Parisian imagination, but the Paris attacks threaten to shift this imagination altogether and consequently the very *ethos* that comes from calling Paris home.

Ethos can be defined as character deriving from a specific dwelling place. As such, one definition of *algos* might read as the pain caused from the severance of *ethos* from its dwelling place. One's identity is indeed severed when her city, her physical dwelling place, shifts its symbolic meaning. But what happens to the relationship between city and citizen when the city is attacked? What happens when the borders of identification are breached? Musing on public memory in the context of 9/11, Edward S. Casey describes a split of place into two distinct sites whenever a city is attacked: place-of trauma and place-of-sanctuary. The specific sites of attack become places-of-trauma within the city; they are "wounded places," according to Casey, where the "wound… was to *the body of the place of the polis*."[34] A place-of-trauma produces *algos* for citizens of the attacked city, pushing them toward places-of-sanctuary, the place one goes to "flee or retreat from the scene of trauma itself."[35] Citizens must reconstruct the symbolic borders of their home after their city has been attacked. Spatially, the city must be reconstructed into clear places-of-sanctuary amidst more threatening places-of-trauma.

---

[34] Edward S. Casey, "Public Memory in Place and Time," in *Framing Public Memory*, ed. Kendall R. Phillips (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2004), 40. Emphasis in original.

[35] Casey, 40.

The distinction between place-of sanctuary and place-of trauma becomes increasingly more difficult when the very dwelling-places – the apartments and houses of the citizens – become susceptible to invasion. While Paris as home lost its connection with safety and comfort the moment it realized it was being targeted by violence, the private home of each Parisian similarly lost its connection with safety and comfort immediately following the attacks when the French Government quickly declared a state of emergency in hopes of more efficiently hunting down the attackers. The locations of these attackers were unknown, and the state used this as rationalization for painting the entire city as a potential place of threat and further violence. As a result of this state of emergency - the first of its kind since 1961 during the French-Algerian War - citizens could be kept in their homes without trial, police could conduct searches within homes without warning, and any website deemed a problem could be blocked.[36] Within 48 hours of President Hollande declaring a state of emergency, 168 homes were raided and over 104 people had been placed under house arrest, while 23 arrests were made and 31 weapons were confiscated.[37] The home was quite literally being invaded and uprooted by these new measures, making a spatial distinction between place-of-sanctuary and place-of-trauma, and between home and homeless, impossible.

The home as a bordered, secured place loses its value as a home when police are allowed to enter at any moment or a potential terrorist on the run could show up and cause further

[36] Andrew Griffin, "France State of Emergency Declared for Three Months, Allowing Authorities to Shut Down Websites and Giving Police Sweeping New Powers," *Independent* November 19, 2015, http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/france-state-of-emergency-declared-for-three-months-allowing-authorities-to-shut-down-websites-and-a6740886.html.

[37] Angelique Chrisafis, "France Under First Nationwide State of Emergency since 1961," *The Guardian*, November 16, 2015, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/nov/16/france-nationwide-state-of-emergency.

damage. Dickinson et al. attribute security and stability to place, whereas the larger undistinguished space surrounding place signifies openness, freedom, and threat.[38] While openness and freedom are not inherently negative aspects, they certainly provide an antithesis to safety and stability. The homes of Parisians, both the personal residences and the city itself, lost their borders in the aftermath of the attacks. Through the destabilization and blurring of the home into free, open, and threatening space, the concept becomes meaningless and is consequently lost. From this loss, *algos* begins to take shape.

Past, Algos*, and Future*: *From Isocrates to Hemingway*

So far, this chapter has maintained that the relationship between home and *ethos* is an intimate one whose severance results in the surfacing of *algos*. As a result of the Paris attacks and the state's immediate response, the spatial conception of home had been completely destabilized while its connection to Parisian *ethos* had been severed. Yet this severance may be better understood through an examination of the temporal destabilization of home following the attacks. In the days following the attacks, Paris Mayor Anne Hidalgo spoke at a meeting of French mayors gathered in Paris. During her speech, Mayor Hidalgo declared, "Our enemies, we do not fear them any more than we respect them – but we must fear the feelings they might inspire in us: the feeling of fear that distorts, the anger that disfigures and the doubt that divides."[39] This allusion to the "fear that distorts, the anger that disfigures and the doubt that divides" is an allusion to Paris's present, a present filled with *algos*. Soon after this declaration,

---

[38] Dickinson, Blair, and Ott, 23.

[39] Anne Hidalgo, "Paris, Our Paris, is Suffering but Alive," *The Guardian*, November 20, 2018, https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/nov/20/paris-attacks-mayor-speech-terrorism-anne-hidalgo.

however, Mayor Hidalgo evokes the original philosophy of the French Republic – liberty, equality, fraternity - as a base from which French society will move forward. She states

> We will remain standing and will remain ourselves, we will continue to show the world our collective Parisian identity, attached as we are, as is all humanity, to *liberté*, *egalité* and *fraternité*, attached to our singularity in the world as much as our openness to the world – and attached, finally to our art of living passionately in peace.[40]

With the absence of a stabilized home in the present, temporal borders often have to be established and transgressed. This transgression allows for new and better homes outside of the present moment to exist as potential spaces of deliberative possibility. Mayor Hidalgo tells her audience who Parisians have been in the past and will be in the future based on the foundations of the French Republic. Through those three hallowed words first uttered at the birth of the French Republic, the mayor can evoke the past as a means for understanding Paris's projected future.

The temporary evocation of France's democratic origins lends authority to a temporal place existing outside of the present, allowing this place and its evoker to speak of a possible future no longer mired in crisis. This evocation mirrors what Browne calls the pastoral voice, a rhetorical move that "entails a reconfiguration of time and space, which takes the present and relocates author, text, and audience in a different realm. By abandoning the confusion of the near world, pastoral presents a world of clearer, simpler meanings."[41] The pastoral allows Mayor Hidalgo, and indeed Hemingway's memoir, to speak authoritatively in the aftermath of the Paris attacks by transporting audiences away from the present place-of-trauma. However, the pastoral

---

[40] Hidalgo, "Paris, Our Paris, is Suffering but Alive."

[41] Stephen H. Browne, "The Pastoral Voice in John Dickinson's First *Letter From A Pennsylvania Farmer*," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 9 (1990): 47.

voice would not be possible without a force projecting audiences into a different temporal realm. *Liberté*, *egalité*, and *fraternité* would not need to be evoked for remembrance had there not been any fear, anger, or doubt in the present. The pastoral voice and construction of a new home outside of the present necessitate *algos*'s existence within the present.

Algos allows for transgression between temporal realms in part because it helps shape those realms in the first place. The present is given a shape only through differentiation with past and future, yet this differentiation cannot occur absent of violence. Hannah Arendt sees this algic shaping of temporal realms as the result of past and future pressing upon each other at a specific location - the present. Arendt artfully illustrates the point as she claims, "The two antagonistic forces are both unlimited as their origins, the one coming from an infinite past and the other from an infinite future; but though they have no known beginning, they have a terminal ending, the point at which they clash."[42] From this explanation, it becomes impossible to separate *algos* from the very concept of present. The present is born out of two forces colliding. The past and future do not saunter up to one another and shake hands over coffee, thus birthing the present. They attack each other indefinitely without exhaustion. In this light, the present could be understood as something radically different from past and future through its position as a place under attack, always crumbling under the pressure of colliding forces, forever lacking the stability and safety necessary for the construction of home. It is unique because of its instability, its eternal finitude.

However, the present could also be viewed as radically different from past and future because, through *algos*, action and judgment become necessary ways of departure from this painful realm. In her speech, Mayor Hidalgo states, "I can also tell you that if Parisian society is

---

[42] Hannah Arendt, *Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought* (New York: Penguin Books, 2006), 11.

injured, it knows how to change when tested, in order to survive but also in order to live – to live in peace and respect by honoring its ideals, subscribing to its values and admitting its culture."[43] The present moment, according to Mayor Hidalgo, has become a moment that simultaneously necessitates change and makes change possible. Arendt speaks to this when she frames the present as a "small non-time-space in the very heart of time," where "unlike the world and the culture into which we are born, can only be indicated, but cannot be inherited and handed down from the past; each new generation, indeed every new human being as he inserts himself between an infinite past and an infinite future, must discover and ploddingly pave it anew."[44] For both Mayor Hidalgo and Arendt, the present becomes the realm from which we can begin again because it is the realm that necessitates change in the first place. It is the realm in which a people is both tested and forced to adapt toward more favorable conditions. That desire for natality derives from a collective *algos* produced through the eternal birth of the present. If the present was born outside of algic forces, then we would not need to start again, nor would we need to look outside of the present condition for models from which we can begin again. As it stands, the present always risks becoming a place-of-trauma from which we must escape. If the present is understood as a place-of-trauma, any place-of-sanctuary must be found outside of the present.

This temporal destabilization through algic forces, which turns collectives toward past and future in order to begin reconstruction, has functioned rhetorically for millennia. In fact, efforts to destabilize the present as a rhetorical means for inciting action has existed for as long as there have been rhetors. One of the first and best to employ *algos*'s rhetorical potential was Isocrates, who uses *algos* as a driving force in the *Areopagiticus*. Within this speech, Isocrates

---

[43] Hidalgo, "Paris, Our Paris, is Suffering but Alive."
[44] Arendt, *Between Past and Future*, 13.

attempts to persuade his fellow Athenians to model their sickly society after the mythic, idyllic Athenian society from the days of the Council of the Areopagus. In order to get his audience to hear his plea for an appropriation of past societies, he must first convince them that the present is unstable and a potential place-of-trauma. Despite Athens holding onto a stable and peaceful present period, Isocrates argues otherwise as he claims, "But as for myself, it is because of these very things that I am anxious; for I observe that those cities which think they are in the best circumstances are wont to adopt the worst policies, and that those which feel the most secure are most often involved in danger."[45] In the opening paragraphs, Isocrates is working to dislodge his audience from the secure and stable borders of the present, instead suggesting the present is in danger from a combination of future threats and present complacency. He continues, "And it is to be expected that acting as we do we should fare as we do; for nothing can turn out well for those who neglect to adopt a sound policy for the conduct of their government as a whole."[46] Isocrates performs his own attack on his city, albeit a constructive rather than destructive attack.

Algos as a force for change manifests from a severance between home and *ethos*. While Mayor Hidalgo utilizes a pre-existing *algos* to help re-legitimize ideals of the French Republic and assure her audience that Paris is capable of change, Isocrates has to manufacture a severance before his audience could experience *algos* and work toward understanding a change is even necessary. An unsafe and sickly Athens severs Athenians from a temporal home in the present, which Isocrates wants them to experience. As their home has been proven unworthy and unsafe to live in, Athenians must look elsewhere in time and place for sanctuary. Before offering his own answer for the ideal location of a new Athenian home, Isocrates delivers a final death blow

---

[45] Isocrates, "Areopagiticus," in *Isocrates Volume II*, ed. and trans. George Nolan (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1929), 105-107.

[46] Isocrates, 111.

to the present by claiming, "For the soul of a state is nothing else than its polity… And yet we are quite indifferent to the fact that our polity has been corrupted, nor do we even consider how we may redeem it."[47] With the severing of Athenian *ethos* from a desired dwelling place in the present, Isocrates is ready to offer a new, utopic Athenian home constructed simultaneously by *algos* and a manufactured desire to escape from it.

Like the Parisians who take solace in an idyllic home re-constructed out of *liberté*, *egalité*, and *fraternité*, the Athenians become susceptible to projected homes modeled after an idyllic place-of-sanctuary – homes which promise an escape from *algos*. For Isocrates, the ideal home is the one that most closely resembles Athens under the rule of Solon, Cleisthenes, and the Council of the Areopagus.[48] After firmly establishing the need for a new home, Isocrates transitions into his call for a return to this mythic golden age, positing, "For I find that the one way – the only possible way - which can avert future perils from us and deliver us from our present ills is that we should be willing to restore the earlier democracy which was instituted by Solon… a government than which we could find none more favourable to the populace or more advantageous to the whole city."[49] Isocrates paints an idyllic picture of a past Athens that produced ideal, virtuous, and noble citizens. Through a carefully constructed, mechanically executed depiction of the past, he crafts for his Athenians an achievable and obtainable home, one directly opposed to but entirely dependent on a painful present. This home, once constructed, can serve as a dwelling-place from which Athenians can begin again.

---

[47] Isocrates, 113.

[48] The Council of the Areopagus had supreme rule of the state under Solon and Cleisthenes, while its members consisted of "ex-archons, who, after successfully passing an examination at the end of their terms of office to determine their fitness, became members of the Areopagus for life." Isocrates, 126-127.

[49] Isocrates, 113-115.

Algos lends increased visibility to the juxtaposition between past and present so that the distinction between place-of-trauma and place-of-sanctuary becomes evident. Isocrates carries out this juxtaposition between past and present throughout his discourse, making the dual temporalities co-dependent. Towards the end of the *Areopagiticus*, he claims, "Furthermore, under the discipline of the old days the citizens were so schooled in virtue as not to injure each other, but to fight and conquer all who attempted to invade their territory. We, however, do the very opposite; for we never let a day go by without bringing trouble on each other, and we have so far neglected the business of war that we do not even deign to attend reviews unless we are paid money for doing so."[50] *Algos*, in this instance, seeps into the splintering Athenian identity of ideal past and actual present.

Once the co-dependence of idyllic past and painful present is firmly established, a utopic future can provide additional shape to the present, making its severance with a desired *ethos* clearer than ever. Isocrates alludes to this utopic future home in his concluding statements. He states, "Now I have come before you and spoken this discourse, believing that if we will only imitate our ancestors we shall both deliver ourselves from our present ills and become the saviours, not of Athens alone, but of all the Hellenes."[51] The future of Athens relies entirely on a collective move to the past in order to begin again. Athenians are moved out of the present through algic forces, even if those forces were manufactured by Isocrates' rhetorical savvy. But this pain derives from a perceived homelessness in the present and the exigent need to look for a new home outside of it. The present is not worth living as is, which forces the Athenians to

---

[50] Isocrates, 157.
[51] Isocrates, 157.

construct their home with the idyllic walls of a mythic past and windows looking toward a utopic future.

Although a manufactured *algos* through the words of Isocrates carries a different weight than a series of coordinated attacks that ended 130 lives and wounded hundreds more, *algos*'s ability to drive people out of the present and toward past and future persists. This is exemplified by the words of Danielle Mérian, an elderly French woman whose interview shortly after the Paris attacks has been acknowledged as the catalyst for Hemingway's resurgence into Parisian life. She states

> It's very important to bring flowers to our dead. It's very important to see, many times, Hemingway's book, *A Moveable Feast*, because we are a very ancient civilization, and we will hold high the banner of our values, and we will show brotherhood to the five million Muslims who exercise their religion freely and kindly, and we will fight against the 10,000 barbarians who kill, they say, in the name of Allah.[52]

Like Isocrates and Mayor Hidalgo, Mérian positions her audience to look backwards for reinforcement, to be reminded of the values of an ancient French civilization and the Paris of Hemingway's memoir. These are the sites that hold the building materials necessary for a new home, and they will help Paris re-establish itself in the future, which Mérian also alludes to. "We *will* hold high the banner of our values, and we *will* show brotherhood to the five million Muslims who exercise their religion freely, and we *will* fight against the 10,000 barbarians who kill, they say, in the name of Allah." These future actions illustrate the type of Paris Mérian wants for its citizens. What is missing from this interview, as is the case following an *algos*-

---

[52] Flood, "Hemingway's Paris," *The Guardian*. This interview has been translated into English by a variety of news sources. The original interview with Mérian is readily available online.

inducing attack on the home, is mention of the present. Even when she talks about the importance of bringing flowers to the dead and reading a *Moveable Feast*, she is highlighting ideals for future action based on an explicit reinforcement of values and ideals taken from the past. The present is absent from her language as the present home is in ruins. In its place is a more idyllic past and an even stronger hope for a utopic future, consequently prompting citizens to look backward and forward for what has been lost in the present. *Algos* both constructs and is strengthened by these pasts and promises of better futures. Populations are moved to different temporal realms where they can attempt to escape a place-of-trauma for a place-of-sanctuary and acquire building materials for beginning again. These building materials, and indeed the escape from *algos*, proves illusive, however, prolonging *algos* and its effects in the perennially unstable present.

Algic Judgment from a Fictional Home

Though perennially unstable, the present will ultimately exist as the place from which judgment can be possible. While homes exist most readily outside of the present, it takes a collective judgment – one fueled by *algos* – to escape the present as place-of-trauma. *Algos* drives its homeless sufferers to search for homes outside of the present as a means for making judgments within the present; following the Paris attacks, one such home was offered to Parisians by Ernest Hemingway. *A Moveable Feast*, translated in French as *Paris est un fête*, or Paris Is a Celebration, began appearing in memorial shrines placed outside of the sites of the attacks shortly after the attacks had ended. The resurgence of the memoir in the days and weeks following the attacks was partly due to Danielle Mérian's viral declaration, but if the spike in the book's sales are any indication, the embrace of Hemingway's Paris was widely felt in and around

Paris at the time. A spokesperson for Folio, the memoir's publisher, claimed "There was a strong rise [on Thursday], with 1,600 books going out of our stocks… We also received many orders from groups such as Fnac and Amazon, amounting to 8,500 copies. Usually, we sell between 6,000 and 8,000 copies a year."[53] Though this spike in sales suggests a significance to the memoir's presence in Paris after the attacks, it still begs the question: why would Parisians look to a work of fiction as a potential origin point for their present and future? As this section will demonstrate, sometimes fictional places of origin become necessary sites from which we begin again.

Hemingway nostalgically illustrates Paris within *A Moveable Feast* as an idyllic landscape both forming and formed by his youthful days as a journalist. Written in the 1950s and published posthumously in 1964, Hemingway's memoir tracks the people and places encountered during his tenure in Paris during the 1920s. As the story goes, the memoir came out of the discovery of old notes and notebooks stored within several old trunks left by Hemingway in the Paris Ritz for over 30 years.[54] From these notes, vignettes of Hemingway's Parisian experience were brought to life. In his opening chapter, titled "A Good Café on the Place St.-Michel," the author describes the following scene:

> It was a pleasant café, warm and clean and friendly, and I hung up my old waterproof on the coat rack to dry and put my worn and feathered felt hat on the rack above the bench and ordered a *café au lait*. The waiter brought it and I took out a notebook from the pocket of the coat and a pencil and started to write. I was writing about up in Michigan and since it was a wild, cold, blowing day it was

---

[53] Flood, "Hemingway's Paris Memoir Rises to No 1 in France Following Terror Attacks."

[54] Mary Hemingway, "The Making of the Book: A Chronicle and a Memoir," *New York Times Book Review*, May 10, 1964, http://www.nytimes.com/books/99/07/04/specials/hemingway-mary.html. This origin story has since been contested.

> that sort of day in the story… But in the story the boys were drinking and this made me thirsty and I ordered a rum St. James. This tasted wonderful on the cold day and I kept on writing, feeling very well and feeling the good Martinique rum warm me all through my body and my spirit.[55]

The above scene sums up the memoir quite nicely. Despite Hemingway's apparent lack of money (he wrote often about his lack of money and even devoted an entire chapter to hunger), the author is still able to enjoy the simple pleasures of Parisian life: a good café, good drinks, and a good spot to read, write, and be lost in one's thoughts. It takes no money to stand outside a restaurant window and observe James Joyce eat with his family, so even the poor can enjoy Paris, according to Hemingway. From the very first pages, *A Moveable Feast* paints an idyllic Parisian landscape based on a culture made accessible to everyone.

Like the Athens of Solon, Cleisthenes, and the Council of Areopagus depicted by Isocrates, however, *A Moveable Feast* is ultimately a fiction.[56] In her comprehensive account of *A Moveable Feast* and its creation, Jacqueline Tavernier-Courbin writes, "The question of accuracy is therefore challenging, particularly since Hemingway both insisted that his memoirs would be based on documentary evidence and on an excellent memory… and, paradoxically, emphasized in the many drafts of the Preface that the book is, and should be read as fiction."[57] Tavernier-Courbin writes at length about the presence of fiction and creative liberties in Hemingway's memoir. She acknowledges the difficulty to distinguish between fact and fiction but asserts that some claims do not hold up. In particular, Tavernier-Courbin attacks the starving

---

[55] Ernest Hemingway, *A Moveable Feast* (New York: Scribner, 2009), 17.

[56] Solon and Cleisthenes lived a few hundred years before Isocrates, allowing Isocrates to take creative liberties in his articulation of the golden age from which his Athens should model itself. No person could recount the nuanced life of a society existing centuries prior with any real accuracy, so this should come as no surprise.

[57] Jacqueline Tavernier-Courbin, *Ernest Hemingway's A Moveable Feast: The Making of Myth* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1991), 66.

artist trope present throughout the memoir, claiming that the Hemingways were actually quite well off. "…Based on Hadley's income alone," writes Tavernier-Courbin, "they were about ten times as rich as the average worker in France, if only a little over twice as rich as the average worker in the United States."[58] In the end, the Paris of Hemingway's recollection is not so much a truthful presentation of the city as it is an embellished re-presentation. Yet just because something is not truthful does not necessarily mean it cannot be real. For Hemingway, this vision of Paris had to be real. Likewise, for the people of Paris suffering from an attack on their city, the nostalgic memoir had to contain an obtainable reality, even if that reality departed from the realm of truthfulness.

The fictional nature of Hemingway's memoir does not debunk its rhetorical significance for the reconstruction of Paris following the attacks. Instead, the fictional nature becomes a necessary component for separating the Paris of Hemingway's memory from the Paris of November 2015. Forwarding Tavernier-Courbin's assertion that *A Moveable Feast* should be seen as a fiction, American literature professor Boris Vejdovsky writes in the wake of the Paris attacks

> It's a book that's predicated on nostalgia, that's predicated on a world that's already gone… It presents us with an ideal vision of Paris. You have access to an authentic Paris through the experience of the streets, the food and the [romantic] relationships that the protagonist describes in the book. These are not things that we experience firsthand when we go to Paris now, let alone after what happened on Friday.[59]

---

[58] Tavernier-Courbin, *Ernest Hemingway's A Moveable Feast*, 90-92.

[59] Rachel Holman, "Sales of Hemingway's 'A Moveable Feast' Surge After Paris Attacks," *France24*, November 24, 2015, http://www.france24.com/en/20151124-france-earnest-hemingway-moveable-feast-sales-soar-after-paris-attacks.

Vejdovsky depicts two Parisian cityscapes that appear to be mutually exclusive; the elements of Hemingway's Paris cannot be found within the Paris of today. But this split, made visible by the *algos* of the present, is precisely what becomes necessary for populations to move to action. There needs to be two Paris's, one good and one bad, one lost and one undesired, one fictional and one truthful, in order for *algos* to propel populations into the process for beginning again. The fictional yet realistic account given by Hemingway allows for populations to visualize what Paris should become again, even if it never was in the first place. Even if the nostalgic home of 1920s Paris never actually existed, it still functions as a seemingly obtainable origin from which sufferers of the Paris attacks can begin again. If they can recreate Hemingway's Paris, then the place-of-trauma can once more be a place-of-sanctuary. It can once more be a home.

Any fictional depiction of Paris must first make itself available as a space for judgment before it can carry any sort of kairotic potential for beginning again. The necessary connection between work of fiction and site of judgment seems at first to be silly and unstable, if at all possible. Yet the connection made itself clear following the Paris attacks. Less than a week after the attacks, Parisians had begun to rally for a night of eating and drinking, reverberating the slogan "*Je suis en terrasse*," or "I am on the café terrace."[60] In search of reconstructing what had been lost through the attacks, citizens gathered to perform what they saw to be part of the Parisian imagination – eating, drinking, and feeling safe on the very terraces that had been attacked in the days prior. Amidst a state of emergency and a looming war with ISIS on the horizon, Parisians harnessed the *algos* produced from the attacks to defy the present and represent their past through a night of eating, drinking, and remembering. Additional slogans that

[60] "Parisians Rally to Cafes and Bars to Defy Isis After Terror Attacks," *The Guardian*, November 17, 2015, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/nov/17/paris-rally-cafes-bars-memory-victims-defiance-isis-terror-attacks.

spread across social media included "*Tous au bistrot*" ("Everyone to the Bar") and "*Paris est un fête*," which comes directly from *A Moveable Feast*'s French translation.[61]

These slogans of playful defiance, though not all stem explicitly from Hemingway's memoir, are certainly reflected through the memoir's *ethos*. Each slogan – from *Paris est un fête* to *Je suis en terrasse* – highlights Paris as a feast ready for consumption. Emphasis was placed on the city's food, music, and nightlife more than anything else, allowing for Parisian culture to shine through the aftermath of the attacks. This imagining of Parisian culture as the origins for the city's rebirth helps reinforce a common *topos* between *A Moveable Feast* and the discourse surrounding the attacks and their aftermath. Like Hemingway and his rum St. James, so too can Parisians consume their city through its cultural offerings. For both Hemingway and the Parisians flocking to bars and terraces after the attacks, Paris's *ethos* seems to be understood as something that is accessed through consuming, through feasting on the city's offerings, especially when that ability to feast is threatened by crisis.

Through the centralization of cultural consumption within Paris's *milieu*, Hemingway's memoir can help reinforce a Parisian imagination of its idyllic home, consequently allowing for a fictional dwelling-place to become a deliberative place-of-sanctuary. Browne's analysis of the pastoral voice lends itself to the understanding that embellished, if not entirely fictionalized spaces can serve as necessary sites of deliberation during moment of crisis. Browne claims that the pastoral "promotes a certain kind of attitude, a posture which exhibits the ideals of a Golden Age for present purposes."[62] The Golden Age, which is golden precisely because it cannot

---

[61] Anne-Elisabeth Moutet, "My Paris, One Week After the Terror Attacks, *The Telegraph*, November 21, 2015, https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/12008842/My-Paris-one-week-after-the-terror-attacks.html.

[62] Browne, "The Pastoral Voice," 47.

tarnish and cannot tarnish because it is rooted in fictionalized myth, becomes a rhetorical device capable of directing judgment during moments of crisis. This is done through the use of *topoi* that are able to ground fictional sites in reality. Although texts like *A Moveable Feast* are seen as literary, they carry within themselves *topoi* from which literary public spheres can develop. “In tracing the recurring *topoi* of public arrangements about texts usually considered literary…” argues Rosa Eberly, “I reveal for study the rhetorical and discursive processes through which actual people, reading and writing publicly about provocative novels, endowed fictional texts with the capacity to effect social and political change.”[63] Through Mérian’s evocation of *A Moveable Feast* in her interview, as well as the memoir’s evocation through social media slogans and its placement in temporary memorials, Hemingway’s Paris gained the potential to effect social and political change through its production of various *topoi*. From these rhetorical commonplaces, judgments can readily be made between 1920s Paris and 21st century Paris.

In particular, two *topoi* – home and crisis - establish the juxtaposition between these two Parisian cityscapes with *algos* making the *topoi* visible. French journalist and Paris native Anne-Elisabeth Moutet frames the evolution of text messages she received over the week surrounding the attacks as a series of hurried questions about her safety that, within a day, shifted to invitations to go out, despite official advice to stay indoors. “This was my Paris,” Moutet writes, “and my parents’: a place of joy and fun, of contempt of authority and enjoyment of life, still playing out, just a few streets back from the blood-soaked sites of carnage.”[64] Paris as home, for the French journalist, is synonymous with a defiant livelihood rooted in cultural consumption. It is a place of joy and fun, while the crisis produced through the attacks can be understood as the

---

[63] Rosa Eberly, *Citizen Critics: Literary Public Spheres* (Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2000), 6.

[64] Moutet, “My Paris, One Week After the Terrorist Attacks.”

absence of joy and fun. Through this understanding of home and crisis as *topoi* fundamentally attached to the ability or inability to enjoy one's self, to either go to the bistro or sit on the terrace, the Parisian imagination soon becomes a cultural understanding of home rather than an explicitly political one. The *algos*-fueled move toward cultural ideas of home rooted in consumption and livelihood allow for Hemingway, an American author, to influence a city and represent its idyllic values. His memory of Paris is able to provide a place-of-sanctuary from which Parisians can begin again, even if that memory is ultimately a fiction. Any attempt to access this memory as a place-of-sanctuary and a space for deliberation is done so through topoi, which make judgment possible, even from works of fiction. *Algos* makes visible the *topoi* around which judgment commences, allowing for action towards a better future – one devoid of crisis and trauma – to begin. Finding themselves culturally homeless, Parisians can find their perceived homes in the lines provided by Hemingway. From this place-of-sanctuary, Paris can begin again.

A Tale of Two Paris's

Algos is not merely pain as feeling; it is pain as action. *Algos*, which is produced by an attack on one's home, forces the individual, collective, or city to hark backwards and actively seek a new home from which they can begin again. *Algos* acts against paralysis by providing the grounds from which judgment can begin and populations can move forward. This chapter attempted to explore the ways through which nostalgic action can take place after moments of crisis through the production of *algos*. *Algos*, and through it nostalgia, have the potential to be extremely constructive. The people who flocked to the terraces and bistros as an act of defiance show how nostalgia can help foster action geared towards the realization of a better future. However, nostalgia can also produce very dangerous results for populations attempting to begin

again. The unobtainability of Hemingway's projected Paris-as-home within *A Moveable Feast* (How can one fully obtain what does not exist?), suggests that *algos* may never be completely satiated and thus provides movement in perpetuity. The Paris attacks created a spatial and temporal untethering from home that cannot be quickly mended. This untethering certainly has the potential to provide more mobile and fluid identities as Parisians seek out new symbolic dwelling-places; in this way, *algos* can be thought of as a productive rhetorical device and not a destructive reaction to targeted acts of violence against one's home. But the untethering and search for a better home can also lead to the strengthening of national, cultural, and ethnic borders. In the aftermath of the attacks, alongside the flocking to terraces, there was also a strengthening of these borders.

Nostalgia has the potential to be dangerous and violent when left unchecked. Svetlana Boym proactively suggests that "unreflective nostalgia breeds monsters."[65] France has a history with Islamophobia and only experienced a rise in cultural and state-sponsored Islamophobia once the attacks took place. Following the Paris attacks in 2015 and the attacks in Nice and Rouen the following year, there have been over 3,500 raids conducted with only six leading to further investigations. According to Nick Riemer of *Jacobin*, "In December [2015], authorities in Eure et Loire admitted that they were targeting Muslims on a purely 'preventive' basis, without any specific evidence against them."[66] Following the attacks, subsequent house arrests in and around Paris were placed predominantly on Muslims, while many Mosques were ransacked by police. Even at temporary sites-of-sanctuary such as the sites where memorials were placed for people to remember and mourn their lost loved ones and fellow citizens, there were incidents of

[65] Boym, *The Future of Nostalgia*, xvi.

[66] Nick Riemer, "The Roots of Islamophobia in France," *Jacobin*, August 29, 2016, https://www.jacobinmag.com/2016/08/burkini-ban-islamophobia-valls-france-secularism-islam/.

Islamophobia directed towards Muslim mourners.[67] The Muslim population in France is not a negligent size but instead boasts the largest Muslim minority population in Europe (excluding Russia) with over five million people. An attack on Islam and Muslims is quite literally an attack on the country itself. *Algos* makes visible particular *topoi* around which judgment can take place, but it also makes visible the privilege and potential violence that is inherent to nostalgic appeals. *Algos* is shared by all following an attack on a people's home, but the reconstructed home sought after through nostalgic appeals is naturally bordered, making exclusion a guaranteed outcome.

Beneath the actions of citizens following a moment of crisis is a very specific kind of pain directing them toward action. When the symbolic meaning of a dwelling place shifts and the present becomes unstable, *algos* drives a search for meaning and home into the past with sights on a better future. *Algos* both establishes and allows the transgression of the present into different temporal realms, gilding the ages before and after, while simultaneously positioning the present to be a time and place unsuitable for living. Ultimately, how we understand the home's relation to place, time, and *ethos* becomes entirely dependent on *algos* following any perceived moment of crisis.

In the end, Paris may be a moveable feast, but *algos* is what moves us toward that feast. The sooner we begin to look to where it drives us, the sooner we may begin to understand ourselves and our projected futures.

---

[67] Adam Nossiter and Liz Alderman, "After Paris Attacks, a Darker Mood Toward Islam Emerges in France," *New York Times*, November 16, 2015, https://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/17/world/europe/after-paris-attacks-a-darker-mood-toward-islam-emerges-in-france.html.

Home, Homelessness, and *Homo Sacer*: Material Effects of Nostalgic Appeals

On February 9 and 10, 2017, U.S. Immigration and Custom Enforcement (ICE) agents arrested and detained 51 Austin-area residents as part of an immigration initiative known as "Operation Cross Check."[68] While some of those arrested were identified as having previous convictions, 28 were marked as "non-criminals," sparking concern, confusion, panic, and protest among citizens in and around the Texas capital.[69] As it would later be found out, 81 more arrests had been made by ICE agents in the Austin area during the following two days, putting the total number of arrests made over a four day period at 132.[70] Three months later, The Texas legislature passed a bill known as Senate Bill 4 (SB 4), which put a ban on "sanctuary cities" and made Texas the first state during the Trump administration to pass legislation of this kind. These two events – the February 2017 ICE raids and the passing of SB 4 – exemplify the central argument forwarded by this chapter: nostalgic appeals possess inherently violent and destructive material effects whenever the state seeks to legislate and enforce the borders of home and homecoming.

The previous chapter demonstrated how *algos* drives homeless populations backwards in time toward an ideal home and then forward again toward a new beginning following moments of crisis. *Algos* is what unites all nostalgic populations through its role as movement and action,

---

[68] Philip Jankowski, Tony Plohetski, and Melissa B. Taboada, "ICE Confirms 51 Arrests in Austin-Area Operation," *Austin American-Statesman*, February 13, 2017, http://www.mystatesman.com/news/local/ice-confirms-arrests-austin-area-operation/fV4sC3gB0EC1qMfCyA5PDL/.

[69] Tony Plohetski, "Austin No.1 in U.S. – For Non-Criminals Arrested in ICE Raids," *Austin American-Statesman*, February 22, 2017, http://www.statesman.com/news/austin-for-non-criminals-arrested-ice-raids/R8suKsN9kUIjnpz10S2DII/.

[70] Gus Bova, "ICE Arrested Nearly Three Times as Many Immigrants During Last Year's Austin Raid Than Previously Reported," *Texas Observer*, January 25, 2018, https://www.texasobserver.org/ice-arrested-nearly-three-times-as-many-immigrants-than-previously-reported/.

but nostalgia's connection to home, or *nostos*, is just as important. When populations are pushed toward judgment through algic forces, they are always pushed toward a place from which judgment and deliberation become possible. This chapter explores the relationship between citizens and a national conceptualization of *nostos*, the ideal place from which people can dwell, participate in civic life, and begin again. Specifically, this chapter will illustrate how privileging specific national ideas of *nostos* ultimately grants nostalgia a dangerous, divisive, and violent character.

This chapter examines the rhetorical significance of *nostos* through the legal policies, executive orders, and public discourse that gave shape to the ICE raids and SB 4 and their controversial reception, as well as the two events' legal and material consequences, in order to argue the following: the very potentiality of homelessness, by definition, signifies an already lost home. Immigrants, refugees, and asylum-seekers in Texas are stripped of a home in both a physical sense and a linguistic sense whenever specific, exclusionary visions of a national *nostos* are articulated. Homelessness transcends a loss of shelter, then, to become an embodiment of one's disconnect with any notion of safety, stability, and belonging within the borders of the nation. When placed within the context of Trump's nostalgic campaign to "Make America Great Again," this potentiality for homelessness informs a greater understanding of widespread national disenfranchisement and the politics behind national belonging.

Nostos as home and homecoming risks the production of danger, division, and violence, because with the demarcation of home comes the demarcation of homelessness. In fact, any nostalgic appeal seeking to construct a home from which a population can begin again will simultaneously exclude and displace those themes, beliefs, ideologies, and peoples that do not fit within the nostalgic construction. President Trump's efforts to "Make America Great Again," an

explicitly nostalgic appeal, have become intertwined with a xenophobic anti-immigration campaign that has included the initiation of several travel bans and an attack on sanctuary cities.[71] His reconstruction of America and American is predicated on exclusionary rhetoric, policies, and actions. Although this nostalgic appeal is egregiously ahistorical (When was America ever great? When was America ever a country without immigrants? When was America ever safe from harm?), it still taps into a constructed past - a past that appears to be great simply because it exists outside the present moment of crisis – that serves as a model for beginning again. The policies enacted by the Trump administration as well as those enacted by state legislators in support of Trump's policies seek to recreate America as a place-of-sanctuary for its population. But what happens when someone's place-of-sanctuary becomes an other's place-of-trauma? What happens to ideas of national belonging and citizenship when the construction of a national home simultaneously creates, or is even built upon, a national homelessness? What are the implications when America as *nostos*, a place of safety, stability, and belonging, can only exist alongside America as *anostos*, a place of no return, a place devoid of safety, stability, and freedom of action?

This chapter addresses such questions by examining home primarily through the lens of its antithesis: homelessness. Although the case study for this chapter falls under the nostalgic appeal of Trump's MAGA platform, neither Trump nor his vague idea of nostalgic home will be the area of focus. Instead, this chapter will focus on the various manifestations of homelessness that are produced when Trump's vision is localized to areas where state-sponsored xenophobia

---

[71] See Donald J. Trump, *Executive Order*, No. 13768, January 25, 2017, https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-enhancing-public-safety-interior-united-states/; Donald J. Trump, *Executive Order*, No. 13769, January 27, 2017, https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-protecting-nation-foreign-terrorist-entry-united-states/.

has the greatest material effects – areas where, as Gloria Anzaldúa so viscerally illustrates, "the Third World grates against the first and bleeds."[72] Specifically, this chapter examines the public and legal discourse that potentializes ICE raids and widespread homelessness within the borders of this nation. How does a national nostalgic appeal effectively reconstitute the borders of a sanctuary city into a zone of grating and bleeding where home and homelessness become virtually indistinguishable, while residents of this zone lose agency over their legal and national identity?

In order to track the relationship between homelessness and nostalgic appeals, this chapter first looks to establish the border as a rhetorical construct that can potentialize, demarcate, and solidify a national and legal home as well as a national and legal homelessness, before examining how this construct functions when applied to Texas and the U.S.-Mexico border. It then contextualizes homelessness and border-drawing within the executive orders and public and legal discourse that made the Austin ICE raids and SB 4 possible, specifically tracking the ways homelessness helps explicate national nostalgic appeals' material effects through the lens of potentiality, violence, and language. This chapter concludes with a brief discussion of the implications of national nostalgic appeals and what we risk when we decide to begin again.

On the Border of Home and Homelessness

Any articulation of a national *nostos* carries with it the potential to sever citizens from a national home. When the Austin ICE raids and passing of SB 4 into law combine to strip

---

[72] Gloria Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza* (San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 2012), 25.

millions of Texas residents of a home in every sense of the word, the newly found homeless are made so explicitly through a statewide and national articulation of Texas and America as *nostos*. Homelessness becomes a central *topos* within the discourse surrounding these two events, as it is a central *topos* through which nostalgic appeals can be examined. An enhanced understanding of homelessness as it relates to the ICE raids and banning of sanctuary cities becomes paramount, then, if we are to track the political, ethical, and material implications of nostalgic appeals.

Homelessness can certainly be understood as the inverse of home: if home is the feeling of safety, stability of identity, and belonging, then homelessness is the perennial absence of safety, stability, and belonging. However, it becomes impossible to fully conceptualize one without the other. As we saw with the Paris attacks, home is best understood through the perspective of a perceived homelessness following a given crisis. Understanding that one is no longer safe and stable allows for more concretized visions of home to take shape, even if those homes are ultimately unrealizable.

To examine home alongside homelessness, however, is to examine the various positions of privilege amongst nostalgic populations. As the Paris attacks and the various responses illustrate, reconstructing a home favors the privileged. Muslim populations in and around Paris faced potential exclusion from the post-November reconstruction of Parisian and French identity as episodes of Islamophobia increased. The initial homelessness was shared by most (if not all) Parisians following the attacks. Yet any sense of a return to home, illustrated in part through a physical return to the very terraces and bistros that had been recently attacked, was a sense of return felt by only a select few. As the celebration in the face of the attacks commenced, various measures of heightened security and surveillance were being enacted. A state of emergency, which lasted almost two years, allowed for police forces to raid houses without a warrant, while

a law passed in 2016 allows police and prosecutors to use electronic eavesdropping technology on potential targets.[73] Because suspected terrorist targets would likely be suspected members of ISIS, these new measures allow for populations with an increased exposure to profiling and surveillance - Muslim citizens in particular – to continue feeling an invasion and destruction of home well after the attacks end; these populations risk losing any feeling of safety when they are doubly exposed to any future attacks alongside an increased likelihood of police raids, surveillance, and cultural prejudice; these populations become at risk of having a destabilized *ethos* and sense of belonging when their homes, be they personal, cultural, or national, exist as potentially indefinite places-of-trauma. A more critical look at homelessness alongside home, then, especially as it relates to ideas of citizenship and national belonging, will help create a sense of just what – as well as who - is at stake when we employ nostalgia as rhetorical device.

Before moving forward, let me first clarify that home and homelessness take different forms under different circumstances. The various forms of home and homelessness found within this project cannot be understood as identical through each case study. While *A Moveable Feast* alluded to a particular model for what Paris could become again (even if it never was in the first place), the memoir represented a blueprint for more of a cultural home than any explicitly national, ethnic, political, or historical home. It did not inform policy or ideas of citizenship explicitly, but instead provided cultural ideals for the reconstructed image of Parisian and French culture. I am not trying to argue here that the resulting displacement of certain populations and values did not affect people's national ties to their city or state, nor am I advocating against a discontinuity in Parisian and French memory following the attacks; what I am trying to articulate

[73] Alissa J. Rubin and Elian Peltier, "The Paris Attacks, 2 Years Later: Quiet Remembrance and Lasting Impact," *New York Times*, November 13, 2017, https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/13/world/europe/paris-november-2015.html.

here is that home and homelessness are not monolithic terms, and the distinction between a cultural, national, and historical home(lessness), although opaque at times, is necessary to make if we are to grasp the depth of nostalgia's rhetorical implications. As such, the transition away from Paris's cultural reconstruction of home and into America's and Texas's national reconstruction of home must take into account the fact that when a different species of homelessness is at stake, the discourse and judgment surrounding the potential homelessness must also shift accordingly. The material effects produced by the ICE raids and SB 4 highlight the implications of employing a specific kind of nostalgia – a national nostalgia – and the resulting home and homelessness to which this nostalgic rhetoric lends itself.

Cutting through all definitions of home and homelessness, however, is the necessity of borders. Although homes do not need to be physical sites, they will always be bordered. Barbara Cassin asks us, "When are we ever at home? When we are welcomed, we ourselves along with those who are close to us, together with our language, our languages."[74] A home should be thought of as a place of belonging, a bordered *locus* that provides a feeling of safety and stability of identity for those who find themselves inside. Cassin's provocation and answer do not rest on any material place but rather a bordered sense of identity, belonging, and shared language. A border here functions as that which contains and gives shape to one's sense of belonging.

However, homelessness does not simply mean a lack of borders, an open space free of identification and prone to threats.[75] Homelessness, especially national homelessness, requires the presence of borders. J. David Cisneros posits that a border "should be thought of more

[74] Barbara Cassin, *Nostalgia: When Are We Ever at Home?*, trans. Pascale-Anne Brault (New York: Fordham University Press, 2016), 63.

[75] For the distinction between bordered place and un-bordered space, see Dickinson, Blair, and Ott, *Places of Public Memory*, 23.

broadly than as a territorial or juridical boundary – not only as physical but also as figurative or ideological…. Borders are important because they help us define who is a citizen and who is not, who belongs and who is 'alien,' indeed, what citizenship is and what it is not."[76] In this definition of border, two subject positions are inherently produced: citizen and alien. Both subject positions are found within the confines of national borders, yet each position's connection to home is radically different. The alien is homeless in another's country, a foreigner only in relation to the land she currently resides in. Meanwhile the citizen is at home politically and nationally, safe and comfortable in the knowledge that she (should) have the protection of the law and government. Though the distinction between alien and citizen proves to be far murkier than the above definition proposes, what survives Cisneros' articulation of borders and citizenship is that borders help to distinguish between who belongs and who does not. Any nostalgic articulation of *nostos* on a national level relies on the presence of material borders to distinguish where *nostos* begins and ends. Material borders simultaneously help to produce ideological and political homes as well as the ideologically and politically homeless. Often, homelessness becomes the product of lost symbolic borders even as material borders grow stronger. This is why we must look at the material border as the site of symbolic loss of borders, home, and identity.

The Politics of Texas Homecoming and Border-Drawing

Homelessness becomes possible through a national, albeit artificial, construction of borders. Nostalgic appeals on a national level can solidify these borders to produce a feeling of

[76] Josue David Cisneros, *The Border Crossed Us: Rhetorics of Borders, Citizenship, and Latina/o Identity* (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2014), 4-5.

inclusion and safety, while they can simultaneously transform these borders in frighteningly exclusionary ways, allowing the citizen to become an alien. Few places display this tension between inclusion and exclusion inherent to border-drawing more than the U.S.-Mexico border, where families who have remained physically stationary for centuries find themselves nationally and politically dislocated and relocated depending entirely on where they are located historically. In Texas alone, residents over the past few centuries have found themselves within the borders of the Spanish, French, Mexican, and Comanche empires, as well as the borders of the Texas Republic, the Confederate States of America, and the United States of America.[77] Ideas of citizenship and national belonging prove to be a point of contention in the state of Texas, with material and symbolic borders displaying ever-shifting levels of porosity for as long as the state has possessed any semblance of borders. Cisneros argues, “Citizenship rests in part on ‘bordering,’ demarcation, exclusion, and alienation. In this sense, citizenship takes shape through and helps materialize both internal and external borders, and borders help to define citizenship.”[78] This idea of internal and external borders working in tandem to demarcate the at-home from the homeless and the citizen and native from the foreign alien is further developed by Etienne Balibar, who argues that “borders are in fact both internal and external, or subjective and objective, i.e. imposed by state policies, juridical constraints, controls over human mobility and intercourse, but also deeply rooted in collective identifications and the assumption of a common sense of belonging.”[79] While the borders of Texas have historically possessed a porosity, they have always provided a hegemonic site of struggle over citizen and non-citizen, native and

---

[77] For arguments that Texas fell under the realm of a Comanche empire, see Pekka Hämäläinen, *The Comanche Empire* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008).

[78] Cisneros, *The Border Crossed Us*, 6.

[79] Etienne Balibar, “At the Borders of Citizenship: A Democracy in Translation?” *European Journal of Social Theory* 13, No. 3 (2010): 316.

immigrant, and home and homeless. The question over who is allowed to identify with and belong to Texas ultimately becomes a struggle over who is allowed to call the United States home.

If borders help to dictate a sense of belonging and collective identification inherent to the idea of home, as Cisneros and Balibar both suggest, then competing memories attached to the bordered place serve to disrupt and contest the durability of the borders themselves, as well as those bordered by them. The very signification of Texas as home suggests a hegemonic memory reproduced by those who see the land as "Texas." To some, the land is not Texas but *Aztlán*, or the mythic home of the Aztecs. Evoking *Aztlán*, as members of the Chicano Movement often did to challenge American claims of sovereignty over Chicana/o and Latina/o populations along the borderlands, does not merely signify alternative claims to the same homeland; accepting the legitimacy of the American Southwest as the original home of the Aztecs throws into flux the very idea of immigrant, regardless of legal status.[80] When Texas is seen as *Aztlán*, migration into the state becomes, as Gloria Anzaldúa proposes, "a return odyssey" that first began in the 1500s with the arrival of the Indians and *mestizos* from Mexico and continues through today.[81] Immigrants become natives returning to their homeland, while natives become immigrant occupiers.

So why are the people made homeless by ICE raids and SB 4 seen exclusively as immigrants to Texas and not returners to *Aztlán*? In part, this has to do with a state-sponsored forgetting. Bradford Vivian suggests that the act of forgetting can work to "constitute occasionally necessary, even indispensable aspects of those cultures of memory from which

---

[80] See *El Plan Espiritual de Aztlán*, a 1969 manifesto of the Chicano Movement.
[81] Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera*, 33.

public institutions derive their purpose and authority."[82] The authority of the United States rests on clear notions of citizen and non-citizen, yet the cohesion of nations are not constituted by legal demarcations alone. Oftentimes, state-sponsored forgetting becomes a necessary tool for reinforcing specific national memories that aid the social construction of national citizen. As Benedict Anderson famously argues, nations are imagined communities, because "the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion."[83] National cohesion rests on a social imagination rather than any strictly political act or legal document. As such, the imagination of Texas as both part of the United States and *Aztlán* works to weaken the national legitimacy of both nations as well as the borders that produce them; the sovereignty of one nation takes away from the sovereignty of the other. As the ICE raids and SB 4 demonstrate, the sovereignty of the state over immigrant populations relies on the banishment of any competing national borders within Texas. The memory of *Aztlán* is stripped of any legitimacy by the state, granting federal agencies complete sovereignty over questions of legality and national belonging.

The result of this site of political struggle and state-sponsored forgetting is what Anzaldúa articulates as the production of a population who is simultaneously at home and not at home, both rooted to the land and at constant risk of being uprooted. Non-white residents of the borderlands find themselves politically, economically, and culturally oppressed by those who have fewer historical claims to the land but greater sovereign power. The residents of the borderlands are "refugees in a homeland that does not want them," writes Anzaldúa, who "find a

[82] Bradford Vivian, *Public Forgetting: The Rhetoric and Politics of Beginning Again* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2010), 12.
[83] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London and New York: Verso, 2016), 6.

welcome hand holding out only suffering, pain, and ignoble death."[84] This quotation summarizes the experience of those who find themselves stuck between home and homeless as a result of looming ICE raids and the lack of sanctuary cities. As the following sections will demonstrate, however, the space between home and homeless is ultimately a fiction. The very potentiality of becoming politically and nationally homeless, a potentiality that has certainly existed for many in Texas well before the events of 2017 but has now grown even more likely to actualize, already signifies a lost home. Those unable to feel safe and secure within the borders of the state have already lost their connection to home, all for the sake of the safety and security of those who claim to be making America great again. As Boym warns us, "unreflected nostalgia breeds monsters."[85] It also breeds its victims.

Homelessness in the wake of ICE Raids and SB 4

If home and homelessness are both predicated on the active construction of bordered places, then what happens to the relationship between home and place once sanctuary is no longer guaranteed? How can nostalgic visions for a state and country simultaneously produce *nostos* and *anostos* using the same borders? Most importantly, what are the material effects when national conceptions of *nostos* are articulated and localized through legal and public discourse? This section works through these questions by placing the Austin ICE raids and SB 4 within a larger narrative pertaining to *nostos* and sanctuary before analyzing the material effects of the events through the lens of potentiality, violence, and language.

---

[84] Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera*, 34.
[85] Boym, *The Future of Nostalgia*, xvi.

Both the Austin ICE raids and the passing of SB 4 can trace their roots back to local and federal discrepancies over the future of sanctuary cities made under the Trump administration. Though the exact legal definition of "sanctuary city" is unclear, even to the very administration imposing limits and threats on the various cities they cannot define, a sanctuary city can generally be understood as any city that does not fully comply with federal immigration efforts.[86] In other words, sanctuary cities tend not to view the policing of immigration as their local law enforcement's primary focus. Though sanctuary cities do not necessarily seek to harbor those who may have arrived without proper documentation, their status as places of non-compliance with federal mandates on immigration allow those within their borders to feel a stronger sense of *nostos* than would otherwise be possible. Sanctuary cities provide temporary enclaves where bodies of immigrants have a smaller chance of being policed as the bodies of criminals.

In an effort to put pressure on sanctuary cities, President Trump passed Executive Order 13768, which tasks the Department of Homeland Security with compiling and releasing weekly reports detailing any forms of non-cooperation between localities and federal immigration efforts.[87] This executive order was passed on just Trump's fifth day in office, though he had made the banning of sanctuary cities an explicit part of his MAGA campaign.[88] For Trump, America as *nostos* had no room for sanctuary cities nor those that they harbored.

---

[86] Alan Gomez, "A Multimillion-Dollar Question: What's a 'Sanctuary City?'" *USA Today*, April 26. 2017, https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2017/04/26/multi-million-dollar-question-whats-sanctuary-city/100947440/.

[87] James Barragán, "Abbott Angry as Travis County Tops New Federal Sanctuary Cities Report," *The Dallas Morning News*, March 20, 2017, https://www.dallasnews.com/news/immigration/2017/03/20/travis-county-denied-bulk-nations-immigrant-detainer-requests-fueling-sanctuary-cities-debate.

[88] Ahmad Al-Dajani, "Current Developments in the Executive Branch: Sanctuary Cities Under the Trump Administration, The Frontlines of the Battle for Immigration," *Georgetown Immigration Law Journal* 31, No. 3 (2017): 665-666.

Soon after Executive Order 13768 was passed, Austin, Texas could be found within the list of non-cooperating localities in the weekly reports. The report from January 28 - February 3, 2017 had the following to say about Travis County, of which Austin is the county seat:

1) Willing to accept requests accompanied by a court order
2) Willing to accept requests when the subject of the detainer request is charged with or has been convicted of Capital Murder, First Degree Murder, Aggravated Sexual Assault, or Continuous Smuggling of Persons[89]

These two acts of non-compliance were part of a policy enacted by Travis County Sheriff Sally Hernandez in January 2017 in hopes of retaining a certain level of sovereignty apart from the federal government over issues pertaining to immigration. In a video statement posted on the *Travis County TX* YouTube channel, Hernandez states, "Travis County Sheriff's Office deputies and resources will be focused on serious criminals and true threats to public safety, regardless of immigration status. We will work with federal immigration officials, but this office will not increase our liability or set unwise public safety priorities simply to ease the burden of the federal government."[90] This statement and her policy, carried out in the midst of SB 4's movement through Congress, was seen as an act of non-compliance by both Texas Governor Greg Abbott and ICE, which ultimately led Abbott to threaten Sheriff Hernandez's removal, and more severely, authorize the arrest of 132 undocumented immigrants in Travis County a month later.[91]

---

[89] U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, *Weekly Declined Detainer Outcome Report for Recorded Declined Detainers Jan. 28-Feb. 3, 2017*, 23, https://www.ice.gov/doclib/ddor/ddor2017_01-28to02-03.pdf.

[90] "ICE Policy," YouTube, posted by Travis County TX (January 20, 2017): 2:30-2:53, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7i0sVnW_h_w.

[91] Lyanne A. Guarecuco, "Abbott Threatens to 'Remove' Travis County Sheriff if She Does Not Fully Cooperate with ICE," *Texas Observer*, January 25, 2017, https://www.texasobserver.org/abbott-remove-sheriff-hernandez-sanctuary-cities/; Guarecuco, "Federal Judge: ICE Conducted Austin Raids in Retaliation Against Sheriff's New Policy,"

In direct response to Sheriff Hernandez's policy, ICE agents detained 132 undocumented immigrants in a February 2017 raid carried out across the Austin area. Of those 132 people, 60 were described by ICE as "non-criminal."[92] Moreover, instead of conducting immigration checks within Travis County jails, ICE agents pulled over people who appeared to be in the country illegally, and went to homes and businesses to arrest their targets.[93] This operation marked a move away from targeting undocumented criminals and toward targeting undocumented people writ large.

In a further attempt to strip any semblance of sanctuary from undocumented residents in Texas, State Legislature passed SB 4 in May 2017, making acts like Hernandez's policy illegal and allowing federal immigration agents to enact raids and investigations unencumbered by local forces and administrations. Furthermore, SB 4 includes a "show me your papers" provision that allows for local police officers to question the immigration status of anyone they detain. Although the bill had been in Congress months before the February ICE raids, its passing marks the official stripping of any protection from ICE and federal mandates against immigrants. In conjunction with the ICE raids, this bill essentially writes into law homelessness for the millions of immigrants currently residing in the state. When ICE agents can storm one's home, even if that someone has never committed a crime; or when ICE agents can enter one's place of work and arrest them on the spot; or when ICE agents can stop someone on the street because they fit

---

Texas Observer, March 20, 2017, https://www.texasobserver.org/federal-judge-ice-conducted-austin-raids-in-retaliation-against-sheriffs-new-policy/.

[92] Bova, "ICE Arrested Nearly Three Times as Many Immigrants During Last Year's Austin Raid Than Previously Reported," https://www.texasobserver.org/ice-arrested-nearly-three-times-as-many-immigrants-than-previously-reported/.

[93] Plohetski, "U.S. Judge: ICE Said Austin Raid was Because of 'Sanctuary' Policy," *Austin American-Statesman*, March 20, 2017, http://www.mystatesman.com/news/judge-ice-said-austin-raid-was-because-sanctuary-policy/dHWeSUd7nyp0XPJ6HcW8NP/.

the description or speak the language of a potential suspect; when a federal agency has this much power over a population, and local forces can do nothing to legally prevent such acts from happening, the sheer uncertainty of home and potentiality of homelessness guarantees a loss of home for those within Texas borders. Without sanctuary, the bordered place becomes a place-of-trauma, disallowing the possibility for home to exist in any form.

Potentiality transforms uncertainty over the status of a place-of-sanctuary into certain homelessness. Home is predicated on a feeling of safety and security. When one no longer feels certain that they will be protected from a violence caused by complete federal sovereignty, then they can no longer feel at home, even if that violence is never actualized. This is because the potential to actualize sovereignty over someone is to possess sovereign power. Conversely, the potential to lose one's home is to have no home whatsoever. Giorgio Agamben theorizes the relationship between potentiality and sovereignty, claiming

> Potentiality and actuality are simply the two faces of the sovereign self-grounding of Being. Sovereignty is always double because Being, as potentiality, suspends itself, maintains itself in a relation of ban (or abandonment) with itself in order to realize itself as absolute actuality (which thus presupposes nothing other than its own potentiality). At the limit, pure potentiality and pure actuality are indistinguishable, and the sovereign is precisely the zone of indistinction.[94]

The potential to actualize power creates a zone of indistinction in which those underneath the sovereign cannot know when, where, or how power will be actualized. In this zone of indistinction, the sheer potential to do something holds enough power to equalize its actualization. When ICE agents raided streets, homes, and businesses, the potential of their reach

---

[94] Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sace: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 47.

created a perception of homelessness as it instilled a sense of fear and instability in any and all potential targets.

Though a sense of fear and homelessness is inherent to nostalgic appeals, this sense is accompanied by a promise of *nostos* for the appeal's intended audience. The fear and instability instilled in those seen as potential targets of ICE raids, however, is a fear and instability met with the promise of *anostos*. To become a potential target in a national campaign to make a nation's borders safer and more secure is to become homeless within those very borders, even if the potentiality is never actualized. This is because potentiality has material effects. In a final act of protest and dissent, Texas Senator Sylvia R. Garcia (SD-6) spelled out the current effects of "show me your paper" policies that would be further actualized if SB 4 were to pass into legislation. She argues

> When immigrants, or citizens with immigrant family or friends, fear that peace officers are acting as immigration agents, they will stop reporting that they have been the victims of, or witnesses to, crimes out of fear of deportation. It's already happening in Houston as reported by Police Chief Art Acevedo. The number of Hispanics reporting rape is down 42.8% from last year, and those reporting other violent crimes has registered a 13 percent drop. No specific statutory prohibition will eliminate this fear.[95]

Sen. Garcia's report highlights the material effects of potentiality. Immigrants or citizens with immigrant family members and friends are uncertain of their protections when interacting with law enforcement agencies. Because of this, reports of crimes go down, and feelings of safety and stability are further removed from the people affected by these policies. They have no idea if law enforcement will protect them or not, if them or a loved one will be detained or deported. In this

---

[95] Sen. Sylvia R. Garcia, "Reason for Vote," *Senate Journal: Eighty-Fifth Legislature – Regular Session* (Austin, Texas), May 3, 2017, 1617.

zone of indistinction, potentiality becomes sovereign power, while the potentiality of homelessness becomes homelessness.

The homelessness guaranteed by its very potentiality simultaneously guarantees an exposure to violence. Along with the report made by Sen. Garcia, there have been reports of decreased health clinic visits and increased numbers of unreported sexual assaults in the months following the ICE raids. El Buen Samaritano, a faith-based nonprofit that provides medical, wellness services, and educational classes to about 10,500 Central Texans, with about 91 percent of those being Hispanic, reported a 50 percent drop in clinic visits immediately following the February ICE raids and a steady decline ever since. Meanwhile, Austin nonprofit SAFE, which functions as an immigrants rights shelter serving mostly Hispanic people, has reported an 80 percent increase in unreported sexual assault cases over a three-month span following the raids compared to the same span in the previous year.[96] Fear of being arrested, detained, deported, as well as the fear of exposing a friend, family, or loved one, has resulted in the increase of sexual and physical violence. The very potentiality of losing one's home within national borders has all but guaranteed a bodily and psychological violence that comes with homelessness.

The products of state-mandated homelessness under attempts to re-create a national *nostos* are inheritors of violence. They are what Agamben describes as *homo sacer* – those who arise from a loss of guaranteed safety and stability and a permanent threat of violence. Agamben ascribes to the *homo sacer* an inherent exposure to violence when he claims, "This violence – the unsanctionable killing that, in his case, anyone can commit, is classifiable neither as sacrifice nor

---

[96] Nancy Flores, "Area Nonprofit Fearful After 'Sanctuary Cities' Law's Passage," *Austin American-Statesman*, May 12, 2017, https://www.mystatesman.com/news/local/area-nonprofits-fearful-after-sanctuary-cities-law-passage/u3dwbKfiX6VDKYqMdNg5MK/.

as homicide, neither as the execution of a condemnation to death nor as sacrilege."[97] When Hispanic people are unsure whether they can report a crime without being persecuted or visit a medical clinic without being exposed to harm, it allows violence to be enacted on them by anyone – state, nation, or individual – without repercussion. Agamben pursues the role of violence and the *homo sacer*, positing "The sovereign sphere is the sphere in which it is permitted to kill without committing homicide and without celebrating a sacrifice, and sacred life – that is, life that may be killed but not sacrificed – is the life that has been captured in this sphere."[98] SB 4 and the continued threat of ICE raids concretizes a violent, sovereign sphere to which undocumented immigrants and their friends and families are exposed. As long as they remain in this sphere, they do not have access to safety and stability. Stripped of this, they become homeless.

Under a national *nostos* that guarantees violence for some within its borders, language cannot serve as a sanctuary for the homeless. Language is capable of binding together populations without physical homes, as Arendt articulates with her felt joy at the sound of her mother tongue upon her return to Germany. Despite losing her physical home – Germany was physically and politically destroyed as a result of WWII, leading to the redrawing of its borders into West Germany and East Germany – remnants of home had been realized through the exchange of the mother tongue. In this sense, home survives within the language of the homeless, preventing those like Arendt to be truly homeless. Yet non-English or ESL speakers in Texas do not share this luxury. Mario Garcia-Castro and his brother, David, were two of the 132 detained people in the Austin ICE raids. According to statements made by their public defender,

---

[97] Agamben, *Homo Sacer*, 82.
[98] Agamben, *Homo Sacer*, 83.

the two were "heading to their construction jobs when ICE officers stopped them outside their apartment building in Southeast Austin. The officers said they were looking for someone else but asked about the immigration status of [the men]."[99] From this report, it becomes clear that an exchange of language had occurred, and it was only through this exchange that an arrest was made. Being asked about their immigration status necessitates a response in English that will satisfy ICE agents. Answering in a different language, such as Spanish, would prompt suspicion and further intensify the chances of risk, whether in the form of physical harm, arrest, or deportation. In this state of exception, certain languages become dangerous to articulate, thus destabilizing their connection to safety. Without safety, the language can no longer serve as home. Instead, it becomes a sort of hideout, always at risk of being discovered and its occupants always at risk of arrest or worse.

Nostos is realized through a political language. When sanctuary is no longer guaranteed, politics strip the home away from those without the proper political language. In instances like the one above, the proper political language quite literally becomes English. Without it, one becomes unable to fully interpellate herself into the political sphere, leaving her vulnerable to the state's sovereign power over her ability to act. Anzaldúa describes the consequences of this inability to act due to a linguistic disconnect in a scene depicting a field in South Texas. She writes

> In the fields, *la migra*. My aunt saying, '*No corran*, don't run. They'll think you're *del otro lao.'* In the confusion, Pedro ran, terrified of being caught. He couldn't speak English, couldn't tell them he was fifth generation American. *Sin papeles* – he did not carry his birth certificate to work in the fields. *La migra* took

[99] "Austin ICE Raids: Meet the Immigrants Arrested," *Austin American-Statesman*, March 2, 2017, http://www.mystatesman.com/news/austin-ice-raids-meet-the-immigrants-arrested/0zJbGbdRFJms6Q2A1k2iDI/.

> him away while we watched. He tried to smile when he looked back at us, to raise his fist. But I saw the shame pushing his head down, I saw the terrible weight of shame hunch his shoulders. They deported him to Guadalajara by plane. The furthest he'd ever been to Mexico was Reynosa, a small border town opposite Hidalgo, Texas, not far from McAllen.[100]

In the above passage, political home and national belonging are rooted entirely on the ability to speak English. Pedro, an American, is deported based on a linguistic disconnect. He is positioned as an illegal immigrant because he has not conformed to the political language of the United States. Jacques Rancière claims that politics "consists in transforming this space of 'moving-along', of circulation, into a space for the appearance of a subject: the people, the workers, the citizens. It consists in re-configuring space, that is in what is to be done, to be seen and to be named in it."[101] Individuals are transformed into subject positions within the sphere of politics, yet these subject positions are not fixed. This means that those at risk of becoming *homo sacer* are not just the detained immigrants but are anyone who could be perceived as a threat to the state through their undocumented presence or through their aiding of undocumented immigrants. More importantly, subject positions are now shaped by the ability or inability to cooperate with the demands of immigration officials, who automatically take the absence of English as a risk and signifier of the undocumented. The potential to become *homo sacer* becomes wrapped up in one's command of the English language and is increased through ICE raids as well as local authorities' inability to prevent these raids as a result of SB 4. Potential for violence, for subjectification of the *homo sacer*, permeates the lives of those within Texas borders, stripping them of the security and stability of home, including the home found within language itself.

---

[100] Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera*, 26.

[101] Jacques Rancière, *Dissensus: On Politics and Aesthetics*, ed. and trans. Steven Corcoran (London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015), 37.

Instead, this absence of home through the very potential of homelessness recreates the *homo sacer* of Texas as a perennially homeless, unprotected subject constantly at risk of violence from individuals, state, or nation.

Conclusion

On May 7, 2017, Texas Governor Gregg Abbott signed SB 4 into law during a Facebook live post, officially making Texas the first state to ban sanctuary cities, and the most recent state to create a sense of homelessness for a large portion of the population. Stripping away the home from many Hispanic people among other populations is yet another act of disenfranchisement enacted by state and national governments under the guise of providing safety and stability for its citizens. Yet SB 4 is unique in the fact that the very idea of sanctuary has been made illegal. When borders are no longer able to signify sanctuary, where can one dwell? Where can one feel at home?

This chapter examined the legal acts, public discourse, and executive orders that made the ICE raids and SB 4 possible, as well as the violent and deconstitutive consequences of these events that guaranteed homelessness for countless people in Austin and across Texas. The case study highlighted the role played by potentiality, violence, and language in manufacturing homelessness whenever national nostalgic appeals have been localized, legislated, and enforced. Homes can no longer remain within Texas for many caught inside America-as-*nostos*; sanctuary for some citizens mandates the stripping of sanctuary from others. When state policies fashion themselves in the image of nostalgic campaigns to make a country safe, stable, and great again, they will inevitably produce the potential for violence and homelessness for those now without sanctuary within the reconstructed borders of this articulated *nostos*.

Nostalgic appeals possess inherently violent and destructive material effects whenever the state seeks to reconstruct the national borders of *nostos*. To make America great again begs the question, for whom? With what land, policies, and language will America become great again? With what memories will America become great again? These questions point to the dangerous nature of nostalgic appeals, especially as it relates to homelessness. For every reconstructed home has the potential to produce cultural homelessness, as we saw with the Paris attacks; every home has the potential to produce national homelessness, as we saw with SB 4 and the Austin ICE raids; and every home has the potential to produce a historical homelessness, as we will see in the next chapter with discourse surrounding the removal of confederate statues. Arendt attributes to the human condition the gift of natality, positing that we are not born just to die, but in order to begin.[102] Indeed, nostalgia's function is not to preserve, nor is it to long for. Instead, nostalgia's function is to begin again following a crisis, to use the past as a model for birthing a new life in a new world. Natality necessitates something to perish, however, which is to say that if nostalgia functions to begin again, it simultaneously functions to kill something or someone off. When a people are denied their homeland or any other, they cease to be a people. They are killed and reborn as the immigrant, the homeless, and the *homo sacer*. They are homeless in a bordered place, born again into a life they did not choose. *Anostos*: a place of no return. The place of the *homo sacer*, a product of nostalgia.

[102] Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1998), 246.

Rebirth of a Nation: *Ethos*, Dwelling, Forgetting, and the Ethics of Nostalgia

On May 21, 1924, Robert Edward Lee's statue was unveiled to a cheering crowd gathered on a plot of land in Charlottesville, Virginia that would come to be known as Lee Park. Nearly a century later, the same statue would receive back its veil in the form of a black tarp – punishment for inciting violence and aiding in the murder of an individual.

The continued legacy of the Confederate States of America made itself painfully visible during the weekend of August 11, 2017, when Lee's statue served as the rally point for a White Nationalist "Unite The Right" rally - a rally that culminated in part to protest the removal of Lee's and Stonewall Jackson's statues from what is now called Emancipation Park. This rally led to the death of Heather Heyer and the injury of dozens more. The fight over Lee's statue by rallygoers and counter-protesters was ultimately a fight over nostalgic visions for this country. It was a fight over origin and national belonging. It was a fight over the survivability of a people and nation in the face of *algos*, *anostos*, and destroyed *ethos*. It was a fight over the privilege to dwell – a privilege that will become the central object of interrogation throughout this chapter.

In instances of nation-building and national reconstruction, nostalgia becomes a central constitutive force. Nostalgia is, after all, an active force that helps stabilize a community's origins so that they may begin again from an ideal place. However, nostalgia, through its curation of a home from which a people can begin again, must also manufacture a homelessness within its borders. In the previous chapters we have seen how *algos* moves populations toward idyllic places of judgment when a home is perceived as lost as well as the way homelessness is furthered through the very act of judgment evoked by nostalgic appeals. Throughout this study, the examination of *nostos* and *algos* inherent to nostalgic appeals has simultaneously implied the centrality of dwelling as it pertains to inhabiting a home from which one can begin again. The

privilege of dwelling is synonymous to the privilege of belonging within *nostos* – the place from which we can judge and engage in civic activity. Without this privilege of dwelling, we become homeless and unable to engage in political life.

In the case of Charlottesville, a specific species of homelessness, historical homelessness, became the key *topos* around which publics fought for their survival. Clinging to antithetical historical homes, protestors and counter-protestors proceeded to clash through violent acts precisely because their points of origin – the historical roots of their *ethos* – were at risk of erasure. To remember as a nation simultaneously necessitates forgetting. What, and who, gets to be remembered by a nation is precisely what is at stake through nostalgic acts of national constitution. What and who get to be in a nation is precisely why the study of nostalgia's rhetorical prowess is also a study in ethical judgment.

To begin again through nostalgic appeals will always come with a set of ethical quandaries. Without a home from which it can derive its *ethos*, a people ceases to be a people. Is it ever ethical, therefore, to take away a people's home? If so, when? Further, if we are to understand the construction of public memory to be a didactic act, then what elements of the past *do not* deserve to be taught? In what instances do a people, or in the case of Charlottesville, a nation, need to forget a past in order to ensure a future? In short, when must we let nostalgia dictate the privilege of dwelling for some over the privilege of others as a necessary means for reconstruction?

This chapter addresses such ethical quandaries by looking at the various slogans, speeches, press conferences, and political and popular statements that explicitly addressed Charlottesville and the events of August 2017 in terms of dwelling and historical homelessness. The emphasis placed within these public responses consequently aided in the symbolic

construction of Charlottesville as dwelling-place. Through these various sites, this chapter is able to thoroughly examine the potentiality of historical homelessness inherent to competing nostalgic constructions of home and dwelling found in the discourse surrounding Charlottesville and the removal of Lee's and Jackson's statues from Emancipation Park. Although this potentiality carries with it the risk of violence, it also carries with it the chance of reconstituting a more democratic citizenry through the construction of a more inclusive and inviting dwelling-place. Therefore, this paper ultimately argues that the historical homelessness produced through nostalgic reconstructions of dwelling can lend itself to a rhetorically and ethically constructive reconstitution of any democratic society seeking to begin again.

This chapter will first develop the relationship between *ethos*, dwelling, and forgetting as a means for understanding the rhetorical significance of historical homelessness within nostalgic appeals. It then applies this relationship of *topoi* to the events of Charlottesville. The public discourse that came out of Charlottesville ultimately produced three distinct sides to the debate - those who inhabit whiteness and white supremacy, those who want to protect Confederate symbols based on their historical and cultural importance, and those who wish to remove Confederate symbols as a means for forgetting racism from their historical consciousness. Each side drew its shape and borders through a distinct understanding over the role of Confederate statues within Charlottesville as dwelling-place, specifically taking sides over the efficacy of *damnatio memoriae*, or memory damnation, as it applies to statue removal within Emancipation Park. A closer examination into this division allows for the three *topoi* of *ethos*, dwelling, and forgetting to give shape to a more nuanced understanding of the events of Charlottesville as well as the city's symbolic, topographical transformation as dwelling-place. It additionally allows for

those events to tell us about the ethics of historical homelessness and nostalgia within democratic society.

The events of Charlottesville are not entirely unique to the city – both the presence of Confederate symbols and their removal across the South have provoked ire and protest amongst many of the nation's population. Yet Charlottesville is illustrative of how nostalgic constructions of home, especially as it concerns the presence of Confederate symbols within that home's borders, can manifest in its most violent form. Moreover, Charlottesville serves as exemplar for examining the public processes of symbolic contestation and transformation which help construct the borders of any city as dwelling-place and as *nostos*.

Ethos and the Rhetoric of Dwelling

The Charlottesville Unite the Right rally began August 11, 2017, when 250 "mostly young white males" gathered on the University of Virginia's Nameless Field around 8:45 p.m.[103] As the rallygoers began their tiki torch-lit march across campus, shouts of "blood and soil," "you will not replace us," Jews will not replace us," and "white lives matter" reverberated off of the buildings of a university founded by Thomas Jefferson when Robert E Lee was just twelve years old. Rallygoers were soon confronted by counter-protesters when the two groups met at the rotunda of Thomas Jefferson's statue on campus for an exchange of shouting and shoving. Violence escalated a day later when a much larger gathering of people numbering in the thousands rallied around Robert E Lee's statue at Emancipation Park. The statue's removal had been proposed by various organizations, residents, and city officials over the past few years,

---

[103] Joe Heim, "Recounting a Day of Rage, Hate, Violence, and Death," *The Washington Post*, August 14, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/2017/local/charlottesville-timeline/?utm_term=.030d0cb33011.

leading the Unite the Right members to adopt the statue as a symbol of protest.[104] Within 24 hours of the rally's culmination, confrontations between a collective of protestors – which included members of the alt right, white nationalists, and neo-Nazis – and counter-protestors – which included members of the Black Lives Matter movement among other local and national civil rights organizations – had led to the injuries of dozens of people as well as the death of Heather Heyer, victim of a white nationalist's intentional hit-and-run.

Symbolic transformation of any dwelling-place will prove to be a polarizing process that produces polarized publics – the fact that Lee's and Jackson's statues remain veiled but standing in their original place in Emancipation Park nearly a year after the Charlottesville rally attests to this lack of compromise between sides. The issue has become so divisive that people will literally kill over it, as was demonstrated in Charlottesville, while crews across the country, from Austin to Pittsburgh, have waited until the dead of night or early morning to remove statues from parks and campuses as to avoid confrontation and violence. But what role do Confederate symbols actually play in the shaping of these actions and reactions? What really is at stake when a Confederate flag is waved or removed from the grounds of a state capital or city courthouse, or when a park or street name is changed from that of a Confederate general to someone deemed more progressive, or when a statue that has existed undisturbed for nearly a century suddenly risks removal? In short, what motivates such uncompromising views in public debates surrounding the proper place for Confederate symbols in 21st century America?

The actions and reactions surrounding statue removal stem from the role played by Confederate symbols – the flag, the statues, the place names – in anchoring a people to their

---

[104] Jacey Fortin, "The Statue at the Center of Charlottesville's Storm," *The New York Times*, August 13, 2017, https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/13/us/charlottesville-rally-protest-statue.html.

perceived history. James Young provocatively claims that by themselves, these symbols hold little value, "but as part of a nation's rites or the objects of a people's national pilgrimage, they are invested with national soul and memory."[105] The removal of Lee's and Jackson's statue as well as the renaming of Lee Park to Emancipation Park work to sever the constructed soul or memory of the South, the Lost Cause, and the Confederate States of America from an *ethos* derived from such memories. What the following sections will demonstrate, then, is how negotiating and claiming the symbolic, material, and historical topography of Charlottesville effects a people's *ethos*, and indeed its home. Control over a place's symbolic meaning leads to the control over its history, its invited identities, and its potentiality for home or homelessness. With Charlottesville serving as an illustrative case study of a larger national conversation concerning the role of the Confederate legacy in America, we begin to see a debate over who is allowed to shape and retain a historical home within the borders of the nation. At the center of this debate is a negotiation of *ethos* and the privilege of dwelling.

Ethos is intimately linked, even rooted to place. It is architectural in nature, according to Michael Hyde, which allows individuals to transform deliberative space into "dwelling-places" that "define the grounds, the abodes or habitats, where a person's ethics and moral character take form and develop."[106] From Hyde's definition we begin to understand *ethos* as spatial in nature, but more importantly we begin to parse out the relationship between character and dwelling. Where one rhetorically dwells helps to inform their moral positioning, their ethical leanings, and their deliberative possibilities. This is not to say if someone lives in a certain place, they are

---

[105] James E. Young, *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993), 2.

[106] Michael J. Hyde, "Introduction: Rhetorically, We Dwell," in *The Ethos of Rhetoric*, ed. Michael J Hyde (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2004), xiii.

destined to act or think a certain way. Instead, dwelling refers to the active emplacement of someone's character. Dwelling means to deliberately inhabit a place where one feels safe and secure in their character – where someone feels at home. From this dwelling, deliberative possibilities emerge. We argue from inside our rhetorical dwelling-places, which means if our dwelling-places are altered or threatened in some way, so too are our *ethos* and deliberative capacities. Without a rhetorical dwelling-place, we become rhetorically homeless.

Dwelling affords *ethos* more than one definitional direction as it can be used both as a verb and a noun. Dwelling-as-verb may refer to what was highlighted in the previous paragraph: to emplace oneself rhetorically, to root one's character to a moral and ethical position from which one can feel safe and secure in their identity and from which one can comfortably participate in civic life. Through this process we come to understand who we are as a people as well as who we are not; it is what allows us to recognize plurality, what Hannah Arendt views as the keystone of all political life.[107] Dwelling does not necessarily require a physical rootedness or border drawing, however. Instead, one can dwell in a rhetorical commonplace, or *topos*. Rosa Eberly suggests that *topoi* act as "rhetorical bioregions of discourse," living and growing rhetorical commonplaces from which publics can speak on a given exigence.[108] Dwelling-as-verb mobilizes *topoi* in order to establish an *ethos* that does not need to be rooted in physical location. When the Unite the Right rallygoers chanted "White Lives Matter!" across UVA's campus, they were dwelling in and acting from the *topos* of whiteness. How they perceive their moral character and position within civic life is shaped by this dwelling within whiteness. However,

---

[107] Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1998), 7.

[108] Rosa Eberly, *Citizen Critics: Literary Public Spheres* (Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2000), 6.

certain rhetorical topoi, whiteness included, are made more readily available depending on where they are geographically accessed, making the physical location of dwelling just as important as the process of dwelling.

The second form of dwelling is dwelling-as-noun. A physical dwelling, such as the campus of UVA, Emancipation Park, or the city of Charlottesville, can provide its inhabitants an *ethos* through its very demand for inhabitation and identification. Yet as each example highlights, dwelling here acts as a bordered, identifiable, accessible, and ultimately rhetorical phenomenon. Dwelling-as-noun resembles traditional understandings of place, or something given meaning through its interplay between location, memory, and inhabitant.[109] The land in and of itself does not necessarily shape its dweller's *ethos*. Instead, the landscape must first be given rhetorical significance. UVA, Emancipation Park, and Charlottesville are all specific places imbued with rhetorical significance. A dwelling never merely is – it is always made. Once made, it can in turn make.

Dwelling, either as emplacement or place, retains its connection to *ethos* through the rhetorical work of public memory; dwelling requires a connection to the past for the sake of legibility and moral grounding. Public memory offers such legibility and rhetorical significance by the nature of its publicness. Edward S. Casey posits that to be a part of public memory, indeed to dwell in public memory, is to "be understood right away, without hesitation or interpretation, in its basic signification."[110] Public memory affords us the proper language for knowing and

---

[109] I use place as is defined by Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, and Brian L. Ott in *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials* (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2010). The authors define place as "bordered, specified, locatable, and named" (23).

[110] Edward S. Casey, "Public Memory in Place and Time," in *Framing Public Memory*, ed. Kendall R. Phillips (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2004), 19.

understanding both our past and ourselves. It allows us to connect to our past and from that connection dwell in it and allow it to form our *ethos*. “The way we understand the past,” writes Carole Blair and Neil Michel, “…implicitly underwrites our understandings of who we are or who we should be in the present and future.”[111] Dwelling is to root oneself to something that goes beyond the individual. It means to be emplaced in something knowable and collective, to be a part of the *koinos cosmos*.[112] The rallygoers had to dwell in a place that was publically understood for their message to hold any sort of significance. To have rhetorical legitimacy, however, meant this dwelling had to simultaneously perform as both emplacement and place, making it doubly dependent on public memory.

Various topographies and geographies can be transformed into rhetorical dwelling-places once they have been imbued with memories of their own. However, this transformation requires active and ongoing memory work. The legacy of the Confederate States of America never manifested overnight but instead was slowly and deliberately naturalized into the landscape of the nation. This was done in part through the accretion of memory sites erected over the span of a century. Following the 2015 Charleston, South Carolina massacre, the Southern Poverty Law Center made an effort to tally Confederate symbols across the nation. They reported over 1,500 “publically sponsored symbols honoring Confederate leaders, soldiers or the Confederate States of America in general.”[113] Surprisingly, this tally did not include another 2,600 markers deemed “largely historical in nature” – markers which include battlefields, museums, and cemeteries.

---

[111] Carole Blair and Neil Michel, “The Rushmore Effect,” in *The Ethos of Rhetoric*, 159.
[112] Casey, “Public Memory in Place and Time,” 25.
[113] Booth Gunter, Jamie Kizzire, and Cindy Kent, “Whose Heritage? Public Symbols of the Confederacy,” *The Southern Poverty Law Center*, April 21, 2016, https://www.splcenter.org/sites/default/files/whoseheritage_splc.pdf.

This means the total number of Confederate memory markers peppering the national landscape stands in (at least) the thousands, giving the Confederate legacy both visibility and legitimacy.

The relationship between memory marker and dwelling-place is not only rhetorically significant but has historical precedent as well. The control over public symbols has been in effect for millennia, helping guide the ethical and didactic nature of public memory. The Romans enacted what they called *damnatio memoriae*, or the damnation of memory as a way of shaping their historical consciousness. For them, to strike someone from memory simultaneously meant to teach Roman subjects the lessons of history so that they could act as better subjects. The deconstruction of someone's memory – usually that of an emperor or prominent figure - necessitated not just an act but an understanding of the act's significance. The first recorded act of memory sanctions deployed by the senate occurred after the suicide of Tiberius' brother Gaius Gracchus in 121 BCE. According to Harriet Flower, "the sanctions, when combined with simultaneous summary executions and confiscations of property, represented an attack on the social, political, and economic status of the targeted individuals and their whole families."[114] By the time Nero received the first official *damnatio memoriae* enacted against an emperor, the practice of carrying out memory sanctions was a well-received and understood practice.

Any attempt to construct or transform a dwelling-place through the use or abuse of symbols carries with it an invitation for contestation. Flower argues that the first memory sanctions "prompted the plebs to move outside the targeted memory space of the *nobiles*, in order to reveal that they still had their own memory world, and that it might be just as political as that sanctioned by the senate or the noble families, while being more ubiquitous and much harder

---

[114] Harriet Flower, *The Art of Forgetting: Disgrace and Oblivion in Roman Political Culture* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 67.

to control or even to define."[115] The role of public memory was taken seriously by Romans, and the act of deconstructing a memory was never met with unanimous approval. This contestation, however, speaks to the level at which public memory and its manipulation were understood to be rhetorically effective. Resistance helped legitimize certain memory markers' role in transforming the dwelling-place in which they were found.

Constructing and transforming the didactic message of a dwelling-place has always relied on the work of public memory and its material markers within the landscape. Young suggests that a monument "necessarily transforms an otherwise benign site into part of its content, even as it is absorbed into the site and made part of a larger locale."[116] As markers and makers of memory, Confederate symbols transform the otherwise benign landscape into a dwelling-place with particular histories, values, beliefs, and borders of identification. When a plot of land in the middle of Charlottesville simultaneously accrues the name "Lee Park" and the statues of two Confederate generals, it becomes a dwelling-place whose meaning could not be divorced from the Confederacy and what it stood for, namely a rogue separatist nation centered around slavery and white supremacy.[117] Through the park and statues' materiality and geographic location, those who use this dwelling-place to dwell in the memory of the Confederacy must also dwell in Charlottesville, in Virginia, and in the South. Physical location, memory, and dwelling cannot be divorced from one another. When any of these are altered, *ethos* is thrown into flux.

---

[115] Flower, *The Art of Forgetting*, 80.

[116] Young, *The Texture of Memory*, 7.

[117] Civil War historian David Blight suggests that "as long as we have a politics of race in America, we will have a politics of Civil War memory." David W. Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2001), 4.

Dwelling – both as emplacement and place – constitute a people's *ethos*. How we understand the world around us and our place in it relies on our ability to dwell. Political life, therefore, requires dwelling for its very survival, yet without a place to dwell, *ethos* and the possibility to engage in political action are put at risk. What the following section will demonstrate is how the privilege of/to dwelling is articulated in the discourse surrounding Charlottesville and its aftermath. As evidence will show, dwelling becomes wrapped up in *topoi* of forgetting, home, and homelessness as a way to explain the stakes of controlling the legacy of the Confederacy, both in Charlottesville and beyond.

Forgetting to Remember, *Remembering to Forget*

Though dwelling constitutes a people's *ethos*, this constitution will also always be an active process. What it means to dwell in a certain place simultaneously requires judgment grounded in the needs of the present and a historical understanding of the past and how that past shapes the dwelling-place. As such, memory attached to a dwelling-place always carries with it a didactic function. How a people remember its past dictates its very constitution as a people and as a nation. Arendt argues that a people must "take conscience of itself according to its history" before it can become a nation; "as such it is attached to the soil which is the product of past labor and where history has left its traces."[118] The connection between a people and its collective political identity will consequently evolve and shift whenever a people's memory of its past is altered. To dwell, to emplace oneself in that collective *ethos* known as nation, necessitates a simultaneous dwelling in a past that goes beyond the self. As such, memory of the past is open to change depending on the needs of the present, though its manipulation can prevent some from

---

[118] Arendt, "The Nation," in *Essays of Understanding,1930-1954: Formation, Exile, and Totalitarianism*, ed. Jerome Kohn (New York: Schocken Books, 1994), 208.

dwelling within it. This places extreme importance on the maintenance of a continued remembrance as it is understood through a collective or national framework, for without it a people loses its sense of being. Without a history to dwell in, we become historically homeless.

How we remember ourselves and our home within history, however, sometimes necessitates us to forget. Acting as two sides of the same rhetorical coin, forgetting and remembering function simultaneously to steer us toward a specific understanding of our past. Bradford Vivian posits that forgetting can "provok[e] us to recognize the inherent selectivity of normative public memories and imagine anew, with each passing generation, what our objects of memory should be, whereas collective remembrance can become so inflexibly doctrinaire in form and content that it amounts to a grossly simplified projection of former events."[119] To grow as both a people and a nation requires us to critically engage and sometimes forget aspects of public memory that hinder such growth. This was demonstrated within the Roman act of *damnatio memoriae*. Similarly, the rhetorical significance of forgetting cannot be written out of the discourse of Charlottesville.

Though three sides emerged from Charlottesville – the white supremacists, the supporters of Confederate symbols, and those against Confederate symbols (and white supremacy) – all three sides utilized forgetting as a way to frame their privilege of dwelling in Charlottesville and, through Charlottesville, America. Jockeying for moral and ethical position, each side entered into a public discourse in an attempt to reframe America as *nostos*. Each side, threatened with a historical homelessness, strengthened the borders of its historical home and its historical future.

---

[119] Bradford Vivian, *Public Forgetting: The Rhetoric and Politics of Beginning Again* (University Park: The Pennsylvania University Press, 2010), 10.

Idioms of forgetting were first mobilized by white supremacists to reclaim Charlottesville and America as a dwelling-place with whiteness as its foundation. From the moment the Unite the Right rally began on UVA's campus, each chant made by white supremacists echoed a fear of being forgotten in the face of a changing national memory-scape. The utterance of "blood and soil," "white lives matter," "you will not replace us," and "Jews will not replace us" all evoke a dwelling-place not immediately associated with Charlottesville and the University of Virginia. The slogan "blood and soil" was readily deployed as a slogan of Nazi ideology, as was the anti-Semitism behind the slogan "Jews will not replace us." Through their chants, however, white supremacists reshaped UVA and Charlottesville as a dwelling-place intimately linked to racism, anti-semitism, and Nazi Germany. Owen J. Dwyer calls this addition of symbolic value to a pre-existing landscape "symbolic accretion." Memory sites are targeted by activists, according to Dwyer, "because these sites are at once authoritative and yet susceptible to re-writing and appropriation."[120] Through symbolic accretion, Unite the Right rallygoers were able to appropriate Charlottesville's symbolic meaning and emplace their own ideological dwelling-places onto its landscape. This act brings to the forefront the possibility for Charlottesville to be a Southern town more closely associated with a Confederate legacy than had previously been understood. When these chants are allowed to be uttered, Charlottesville no longer signifies a progressive enclave that was recently voted "Happiest City in America."[121] Instead, it becomes an enclave for neo-Nazis, white supremacists, and members of the alt right to make themselves visible. Charlottesville's connection to its past is a continuous act of curation; remembrance of

---

[120] Owen J. Dwyer, "Symbolic Accretion and Commemoration," *Social & Cultural Geography* 5, no. 3 (2004): 425.

[121] Megan Garber, "Why Charlottesville?" *The Atlantic*, August 12, 2017, https://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2017/08/why-charlottesville/536700/.

this past demands various acts of strategic forgetting. Charlottesville's progressive identity is forgotten so that the whiteness and geographic location of the city can be more readily remembered.

Ironically, the strength at which these rallygoers rooted themselves to a dwelling-place of whiteness and white supremacy simultaneously weakened their legitimacy of dwelling in Charlottesville. By the end of the weekend, members from all sides of the debate had publicly denounced the white supremacists and their appropriation of Charlottesville. The first group to fight for remembrance that weekend was quickly marked for forgetting within the national *ethos*.

The strength of symbolic accretion for white supremacists rests on the continued presence of Confederate symbols in Charlottesville. The beginning of Confederate symbol removal across the nation begun precisely because of the relationship between Confederate symbols and white supremacy. When Dylann Roof shot and killed nine black members of an A.M.E. church in Charleston in 2015, he claimed to have wanted to start a race war.[122] Soon after the shooting occurred, pictures of Roof began circulating across news media outlets. More often than not, news stations began circulating a particular image of Roof, where he can be seen staring into the camera with a gun in his right hand and a Confederate flag in his left. The presence of Confederate symbols in Roof's possession paired with his desire to inflame a race war seared white supremacy to the surface of these Confederate symbols. Within a month of the incident, the Confederate flag was removed from South Carolina's Capitol grounds. White supremacy dwells in Confederate symbols, which allows groups like neo-Nazis to use these symbols as a means to symbolically accrete Nazi ideology onto the Confederate legacy. Without these objects

---

[122] Gunter, Kizzire, and Kent, "Whose Heritage?"

of memory, symbolic accretion becomes less visible, and the link between white supremacy and Charlottesville as dwelling-place loses resonance.

Prompted by the presence of white supremacists at Charlottesville as well as the massacre at Charleston, whiteness and white supremacy could no longer be passively forgotten by those wishing to dwell in Charlottesville and the memory of Lee and the Confederacy. Instead, a separation between white supremacy, Lee, and the Confederacy could only be managed through an active and strategic forgetting. This was and continues to remain the strategy for those in support of retaining Confederate symbols as a means for remembering history and keeping the symbols within the borders of America-as-*nostos*. In response to the confrontation at Charlottesville, Donald Trump displayed the power of forgetting when he condemned protestors and counter-protestors alike for their actions, stating that violence on all sides was equally deplorable. In the same press conference, Trump attempted a similar rhetorical move to legitimize the right of Lee's dwelling in Charlottesville through selectively forgetting the connection between white supremacy and Lee's statue. The President initially claimed that there were people in the Unite the Right rally who actually were just there to protest the taking down of what they perceived to be "a very, very important statue and the renaming of a park, from Robert E. Lee to another name." This was immediately followed up by this argument:

> George Washington was a slave-owner… So will George Washington now lose his status… are we going to take down statues of George Washington? How about Thomas Jefferson? What do you think of Thomas Jefferson? You like him? Ok, good. Are we going to take down his statue? So you know what, it's fine. You're changing history, you're changing culture.[123]

---

[123] Dana Farrington and Barbara Sprunt, "Transcript: Trump Shifts Tone Again on White Nationalist Rally in Charlottesville," *NPR*, August 15, 2017, http://www.npr.org/2017/08/15/543769884/transcript-trump-shifts-tone-again-on-white-nationalist-rally-in-charlottesville.

In this statement, like many other statements made in defense of Confederate symbols, Trump employs rhetorical forgetting to re-establish Lee and the park as a dwelling-place undeserving of change or erasure on the grounds of historical and cultural significance. Confederate statues are not about white supremacy, according to Trump, but instead are part of the nation's history and thus belong within the borders of American *nostos*. Moreover, they are symbolic of heroic individuals – heroic *American* individuals - whose represented values are worthy of emulation. To remove a statue becomes a distinctly anti-American effort to remove a part of history and culture.

Yet neither remembering nor national belonging rely entirely on the presence of monuments. Moreover, to remember through a monument or any other medium of memory is simultaneously to forget, and often is the case that remembering the Confederate States of America through these monuments aids in a collective forgetting of white supremacy's connection to the South and the U.S. more generally. But this historical silencing of white supremacy allows Trump and other proponents to separate Lee from his distinctly anti-American roots and instead place him on a par with distinctly American figures. "So, this week it's Robert E. Lee," Trump quips. "I noticed that Stonewall Jackson's is coming down. I wonder, is it George Washington next week and is it Thomas Jefferson the week after? You know, you really do have to ask yourself, where does it stop?"[124] By comparing Lee and Jackson to Washington and Jefferson rather than the white supremacists and neo-Nazis who gathered around their statues, Trump transforms two Confederate figures into American figures. This helps silence connections between the two men and slavery, treason, or white supremacy. Moreover, it helps legitimate Confederate memory's privilege of dwelling within American memory. While white

---

[124] Farrington and Sprunt, "Transcript."

supremacy and patriotism cannot dwell in the same place, Lee, Jackson, and patriotism can. Through a severance of historical connection, a Confederate dwelling can coexist with an American dwelling. Stripped of a historical home, white supremacy has no place in Trump's vision. Yet neither do those who suffered at the hands of white supremacy.

Trump further strengthens the forgetting of Lee's relationship with white supremacy by conveniently forgetting what the park's name was changed to. Lee Park was changed to Emancipation Park several months before the Unite the Right rally in 2017 as part of an ongoing effort to remove explicit memories of Lee's veneration and memory from Charlottesville as dwelling-place.[125] By removing the word "emancipation" from his statement, Trump fails to place the word in relation to Lee. A change from Lee to Emancipation signals a difference between the two signifiers and their signified meanings. When the name change is paired with a City Council decision to remove Lee's statue, Emancipation is established as a clear departure from Lee. Through Trump's omission of naming Emancipation Park, Lee's name and image avoid an antithetical connection with emancipation, thus allowing him to survive untarnished through Trump's rhetoric. Those who dwell in Lee's memory are able to retain their historical home in the eyes of the President, while those who cannot dwell in Lee's memory are discouraged from a historical dwelling in Charlottesville and all it stands for.

Forgetting is further employed by those supporting the removal and erasure of Confederate symbols as a way to reconstruct Charlottesville as a more socially and racially inclusive dwelling-place. Calls to remember political injustice and the racial politics of the Confederacy are forwarded as a way to move past it. In this way, proponents of statue removal engage in what Vivian sees as a type of "public dialogue, debate, and advocacy end[ing] in

---

[125] Fortin, "The Statue at the Center of Charlottesville's Storm."

collective ratifications to discontinue or reject customary forms of remembrance instead of public proclamations to honor and sustain them."[126] For this side of the debate, forms of remembrance matter more so than memory's specific objects. Support for the removal of Lee's statue, therefore, is not a call to forget Lee as much as it is a call to forget Lee as a hero and dwelling-place for a people's *ethos*. Framed in this way, statue removal helps us to "save our icons of remembrance from hardening into idols of remembrance."[127]

Calls for the removal of Lee's statue preceded the Unite the Right rally and drew support from local residents and politicians alike. Local student high school student Zyanha Bryant was quoted saying "My peers and I feel strongly about the removal of the statue because it makes us feel uncomfortable and it is very offensive."[128] Meanwhile, Vice Mayor of Charlottesville Wes Bellamy had become a proclaimed champion of Confederate monument removal by 2016 when he helped organize the committee that would ultimately propose the official removal of Lee's and Jackson's statues from Emancipation Park. By the time of the Unite the Right rally, Lee's dwelling in Charlottesville had proven antithetical to many residents' dwelling.

Charlottesville required active forgetting of Lee if it was to rebuild its status as dwelling-place for a more inclusive and progressive populace. Leading up to the rally, Mayor Mike Signer claimed, "We want to change the narrative by telling the true story of race through public spaces. That has made us a target for groups that hate that change and want to stay in the past, but we will not be intimidated."[129] Removing Lee and Jackson's statues and changing Lee Park to

[126] Vivian, *Public Forgetting*, 13.
[127] Young, *The Texture of Memory*, 14.
[128] Fortin, "The Statue at the Center of Charlottesville's Storm."
[129] Madison Park, "Why White Nationalists Are Drawn to Charlottesville," *CNN*, August 12, 2017, https://www.cnn.com/2017/08/11/us/charlottesville-white-nationalists-rally-why/index.html.

Emancipation Park certainly allow for the narrative of Charlottesville as dwelling-place to shift toward a more inclusive place, as Signer suggests. But Signer also mentions that he wants to "[tell] the true story of race" while those against his vision for a changed narrative "want to stay in the past." In an interesting rhetorical move, Signer separates truth as it pertains to race from the past as dwelling-place. Vivian argues that "renewal of the public's *vita activa*… follows from the fitting expression and collective ratification of a revised historical consciousness."[130] By telling the true story of race through a simultaneous denunciation of racists' refusal to leave the past, Signer rewrites Charlottesville's historical consciousness in favor of a racism that can be left in in the past and a racial politics that can be told into the future. Through the removal of statues and the changing of park names, Charlottesville attempts to inscribe itself as a dwelling-place scrubbed of racism but not race. This attempt is not synonymous with a forgetting that racism ever existed within its borders. Instead, Charlottesville's decision to remove Confederate statues marks a new point of origin from which the city and its people can attempt to understand themselves and their history without feeling the shame of racism. Those who dwell in racism can no longer dwell in Charlottesville's history, according to Signer. When white supremacists take conscience of their history through the lens of Charlottesville's rewritten *ethos*, they can no longer find their dwelling-place there. In effect, they become historically homeless.

Each side - white supremacists, supporters of Confederate symbols, and opponents of Confederate symbols – activate forgetting's rhetorical power in order to dwell in Charlottesville. How they shape the historical consciousness of Charlottesville as dwelling-place presupposes a privilege of dwelling. Be it through symbolic accretion, reverence, or an attempt to produce a more inclusive place, forgetting becomes central if a people is to emplace itself in a home from

---

[130] Vivian, *Public Forgetting*, 82.

which it can participate in political life. As the above examples show, however, not everyone is able to simultaneously dwell in Charlottesville and claim it as their *nostos*. For one or more sides to remain at home, the other(s) must go. Forgetting allows this casting out to be made, but the question of *whose* dwelling is privileged above all others ultimately becomes a question of ethical concern.

Conclusion: The Ethics of Dwelling

Though the city of Charlottesville passed a proposal to remove Lee's and Jackson's statues from Emancipation Park, they still remain where they've stood for nearly a century. Now only a veil that hides their silhouettes marks any acknowledgment of a topography whose place as *nostos* remains sharply contested. In order for dwelling to be understood and capable of producing an *ethos*, it must first become public. By nature of its publicness, dwelling forces *ethos* and the history through which it is understood to be contestable. As the future of Charlottesville's statues and the thousands of Confederate memory sites found across the country remains unclear, so too does the state of Charlottesville's and America's projected *ethos*.

This chapter provided a detailed analysis of the public discourse that helped produce three distinct, competing sides to the debate over the future of Charlottesville and America as dwelling-place. In doing so, it maintained that historical homelessness produced through nostalgic reconstructions of dwelling can lend itself to a rhetorically and ethically constructive reconstitution of any democratic society seeking to begin again. Through the active contestation of Charlottesville's Emancipation Park and the statues found within it, residents and non-residents attempted to dictate a specific historical consciousness in order to reshape the symbolic meaning of Charlottesville and America as dwelling-place.

To reiterate a central question first proposed in this project's introduction, whose nostalgic visions are allowed to influence and shape a people following moments of crisis? Though the continued contestation over historical consciousness proves that more than one side of the debate is allowed to influence and shape a people or at least has the opportunity to do so, it still begs the question, whose nostalgic visions *should* influence and shape a people following moments of crisis? This draws in the questions proposed at the beginning of this chapter: is it ever ethical to take away a people's right to dwell? If so, when? If we take public memory to be didactic, then what elements of the past *do not* deserve to be taught? In what instances do a people need to forget a past in order to ensure a future? At what point does it become ethical to let nostalgia write a group into historical homelessness? These questions never have clear-cut answers. However, they become easier to address once we grasp the end that we attempt to reach by asking such questions in the first place: that is, to begin again as a people and nation. As such, the answer to each question rests on our ability to begin again through such means.

The removal of Confederate symbols from the landscape of Charlottesville and cities across the United States will not remain uncontested, nor will it doom the memory of the Confederacy to oblivion. Instead, it forces those who remain attached to such objects and the memories they produce to find alternate forms of dwelling. Many have proposed moving the statues to museums or locations less strongly associated with the city, municipality, or state. Like the Roman emperors subjected to *damnatio memoriae* before them, figures like Lee and Jackson will not be forgotten; they merely will lose their legitimacy as dwellers of the cities they once proudly stood in, while they will help lead to the historical homelessness of those who once looked to these figures for a moral and ethical dwelling-place.

Stripped away from its place in the hearts and souls of a people, the legacy of the Confederate States of America reveals itself as a legacy predicated on treason and the preservation of slavery. Continuing to allow space in American public memory for such a legacy simultaneously delegitimizes the strength of America's symbolic and political borders and allows the Confederacy's values to help shape the *ethos* of a people. It is a legacy that values heteronormative, white moral superiority. While that memory remains both accessible and state-sponsored, the marginalized groups who have historically, politically, and culturally experienced homelessness in America will be discouraged from ever properly dwelling in America.

Is it ethical to rewrite the historical consciousness of the nation so that some may be forced out of a historical home? Was it ethical for Muslims to inadvertently be written out of Paris's golden era following the November attacks, or the undocumented people and their friends and families in Texas to be denied access to Aztlán or a historical belonging to a state whose borders of inclusion have been redrawn countless times? In either case, we have witnessed violent and dangerous material and political implications whenever a city's or nation's historical consciousness is rewritten. Similarly, to rewrite the history of Charlottesville and this country so that our origins point to racial inclusivity over supremacy necessitates that some people lose their right to dwell. However, if those people who are stripped of a historical home so that this nation may seek a better future are those who have historically propagated the very violent and destructive acts that marginalized people now and historically have faced; if those people who are stripped of a historical home first drew their homes along racist, sexist, or hyper-nationalist borders; or if those people who are stripped of a home historically dwell in a rogue nation whose existence was born out of an antithesis to the United States and racial equality, then it is ethical to reconstruct our historical consciousness and our national dwelling-place around their

exclusion. We inherit our dwelling-places, but we can improve on them, for that ability is what separates any democratic society from a totalitarian state. Improving on our dwelling-places ultimately becomes the ethical way, indeed the only way, that we as a democratic people and nation may begin again.

Conclusion

This thesis has been concerned with the rhetorical significance of nostalgic natality and the politics of homecoming. Through the examination of *algos*, *nostos*, and *ethos*, and their effects on the production of cultural and political mobility following moments of crisis, this project has argued that beginning again through nostalgia produces a potentially dangerous rhetorical move with violent political and material consequences. However, nostalgic natality proves to be effective in lending movement to populations paralyzed by crisis. As such, nostalgic natality should ultimately be understood as a constructive rhetorical force for those seeking to begin again. The remaining pages are dedicated to a review of the thesis's main arguments, followed by a suggestion of some of the project's implications for scholars of rhetoric and public memory.

This thesis has actively contested the frivolous and apolitical connotations associated with nostalgia – connotations that have certainly effected its lack of uptake in rhetorical studies and scholarship on public memory. Johannes Hofer first coined the term nostalgia as a curable ailment in 1688. While nostalgia has since been debunked as a legitimate sickness or disease, it still has the potential to debilitate a people if left unchecked. The politics of homecoming create the conditions by which violent political and material consequences can arise whenever a people or nation attempt to construct the border between *nostos* and *anostos* and dictate the privilege of dwelling. Though supported differently from chapter to chapter, the evidence within each case study points to these conditions and their consequences. The first chapter demonstrated how *algos* fueled a concerted effort to reclaim Paris as home, but that concerted effort was accompanied by an increase in Islamophobia and heightened security measures that target Muslims and displace them both culturally and politically from Paris-as-*nostos*. The second

chapter illustrated how the public and legislative reconstruction of Texas and America as a safe and stable place was predicated on the banning of sanctuary cities and the criminalization of certain bodies within the state's borders. The third chapter highlighted the privilege of dwelling within America's historical consciousness but revealed that America's *ethos* currently allows for the continued veneration of white supremacy within the borders of its dwelling-place. In all three chapters, the exclusionary, violent, criminalizing, and disenfranchising effects all surface upon a closer examination of *algos*, *nostos*, and *ethos* within nostalgic attempts at natality. When nostalgic appeals produce these ailments within a given city or nation, then perhaps Hofer was not far off in his initial diagnosis. Yet Hofer was too narrow in his classification, for nostalgia is not simply an ailment to be cured. Nostalgia can also function rhetorically as a cure in and of itself. It provides a cure for populations seeking to lift themselves out of moments of crisis and into a new beginning. As such, nostalgia should not be seen as means to an end but rather a means to a beginning.

This thesis has maintained nostalgia's efficacy as a means for natality through three separate chapters. Each chapter examines a different site of nostalgic natality and the politics of homecoming. The first chapter examined how populations seeking out a new beginning in the aftermath of crisis are given movement through a temporal and spatial severance between *nostos* and *ethos*. This severance, *algos*, encompasses a place-of-trauma and prompts collective judgment toward a better future. It cures a political or cultural paralysis by making visible a clear place-of-trauma and a place-of-sanctuary as well as the various *topoi* around which populations can deliberate and craft a better future for themselves and future generations. *Algos* lets those who are suffering to find sanctuary and take measures to ensure their survivability. In the case of Paris, Austin, and Charlottesville, the politics of homecoming dictate an increase in *algos*-driven

discourse and legislative measures that actively try to cure *algos* and produce a feeling of safety and stability within the borders of each dwelling-place.

The second chapter looked explicitly at the politics of homecoming and the material and political effects of a state-sponsored articulation and enforcement of *nostos*. The production of a cultural, national, or historical feeling of safety and stability through nostalgic appeals also maintains the production of a homelessness for certain populations emplaced within the reconstructed borders of *nostos*. The very potentiality of homelessness within any popular or legislative articulation of *nostos* is a guarantee of violence on a political, material, and linguistic level. When a people is denied its homeland or any semblance of homecoming, it ceases to be a people. Its members are made culturally, nationally, and historically homeless. Without a home from which to judge, they cease to have agency over their *ethos* and activity within political life.

The third chapter analyzed the relationship between *ethos*, *nostos*, and a historical consciousness that fuels populations' understanding of themselves and their role within a particular dwelling-place. Situated between *nostos* and *anostos* is a privilege of dwelling that determines a population's projected *ethos*. Dwelling is a public and contested act that draws upon and actively shapes any community's historical consciousness. Nostalgic appeals give legitimacy to the symbolic and topographical construction of specific dwelling-places from which communities reconstitute their past, their present, and their projected future. Those seeking to begin again following a moment of crisis must first dwell before any attempt at natality can commence.

Nostalgia requires an ongoing stabilization and bordering of *nostos* for it to function as a site of judgment and a legitimate dwelling-place. However, it is not univocal. Hannah Arendt posits that "The end of the common world has come when it is seen only under one aspect and is

permitted to present itself in only one perspective."[131] The act of nostalgia does not provide one aspect for dwelling nor one perspective from which populations can begin again. Instead, it functions as a stabilization of certain *topoi* around which people can seek out better futures. The call for a return to *liberté*, *egalité*, and *fraternité* following the November 2015 Paris attacks allowed for an idyllic origin of the French Republic to shape the paths taken by Parisians in the attacks' aftermath. The return to the terraces and bistros was an explicit act upon *liberté* and *fraternité* as it pertains to Parisian identity, even if that act was an act of privilege. Meanwhile, specific visions of cultural and political *egalité* could certainly be credited with steering the 2017 French election away from the openly Islamophobic candidate Marine Le Pen of the National Front and towards the election of centrist Emmanuel Macron.[132] These effects of the attacks should not be seen as mere reactions to crisis but should instead be seen as acts directly influenced by an attempt at nostalgic natality. Parisians were driven by an *algos* derived from the attacks, which allowed them to harness nostalgia and make visible the *topoi* by which France could deliberate on its historical consciousness and projected *ethos*. No one aspect of the past nor one perspective toward the future resulted from this nostalgic attempt to begin again.

Even active constructions of homelessness do not erase the polyvocal nature of nostalgic appeals. Soon after SB 4 was passed into law, a list of local entities – cities, counties, and civil rights organizations – filed lawsuits against Texas and SB 4.[133] Making America great again is an ongoing, contested discussion. When a border town, Texas's largest cities, the Mexican

---

[131] Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 58.

[132] Juan Cole, "The Crucial Role of Islam in the French Election," *The Nation*, May 8, 2017, https://www.thenation.com/article/the-crucial-role-of-islam-in-the-french-election/.

[133] Juilán Aguilar, "Federal Appeals Court's Ruling Upholds Most of Texas's 'Sanctuary Cities' Law," *The Texas Tribune*, March 13, 2018, https://www.texastribune.org/2018/03/13/texas-immigration-sanctuary-cities-law-court/.

American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, and the ACLU all work together to contest specific visions of safety and stability within the borders of Texas-as-dwelling-place, it reveals a parallel nostalgic vision for what it means to be American and what it means to be safe, secure, and great. Active contestation of ICE raids and SB 4 allows for more inclusive borders of *nostos* to be articulated, while it allows for the *topos* of greatness to reconstruct bodies of immigrants as bodies of humans rather than bodies of criminals or *homo sacer*.

Finally, nostalgic constructions of historical origins maintain room for contested and polyvocal articulations of dwelling-place. The debate over Confederate symbolism and its role within America-as-dwelling place certainly functions as a debate over the limiting of voices, but it does not function as a fight over vocal singularity. Instead, the debate highlights a contestation over the ethics of history. History serves a didactic purpose; it becomes imperative that we actively craft an ethical and morally sound historical home from which we can learn and base our future actions. The removal of Lee's and Jackson's statues as well as the renaming of Lee Park to Emancipation Park exemplify this need for an ethical historical home and consciousness. Lee and Jackson have not been doomed to historical oblivion nor have those who found connections with these two figures and the legacy of the Confederacy. Instead, nostalgic visions for what it means to call America home require a historical departure from the veneration of those values upheld by the Confederate States of America and its perceived heroes. Though Lee and Jackson will likely remain in America's national memory, they should not remain a part of American *ethos*, for the ethics of historical dwelling simultaneously become the ethics of nostalgic natality. Part of this ethics relies on the continued maintenance of a polyvocal articulation of *nostos*, though that articulation may require active curation.

Nostalgic natality and the politics of homecoming possess several more implications for scholars of rhetoric and public memory. First, the role nostalgia plays in guiding populations away from crisis and into attempts at natality should inform scholars on the importance of rhetorics of crisis, home, suffering, and dwelling. Moreover, the topic of nostalgia and nostalgic natality should reveal the intimate link between cultural, national, and historical constructions of home and homelessness in informing a sense of political belonging. How home and homelessness are constructed across different sites provides evidence of a more nuanced sense of citizenship and political and cultural belonging. Finally, nostalgia should draw more critical attention from public memory scholars interested in how character and memory politicize and make one another legible. Nostalgic appeals have shaped populations' construction of self and community for millennia, well before Hofer first coined the term. It is more than a debunked ailment or a recurring literary motif. Nostalgic appeals carve coherent narratives into the fabric of society's memory; they give legibility to any historical consciousness and direction to a people moving into the future, especially when the movement follows a moment of crisis.

Nostalgia is ultimately about home and how constructions of home inform a cultural, political, and historical reality for those found within home's borders. Only when we are home can we can make sense of the world around us. Only when we are home can we begin again.

Bibliography

Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Translated by Daniel Heller-Roazen. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Aguilar, Julian. “Federal Appeals Court’s Ruling Upholds Most of Texas’s ‘Sanctuary Cities’ Law.” *The Texas Tribune*. March 13, 2018. https://www.texastribune.org/2018/03/13/texas-immigration-sanctuary-cities-law-court/.

Al-Dajani, Ahmad. “Current Developments in the Executive Branch: Sanctuary Cities Under the Trump Administration, The Frontlines of the Battle for Immigration.” *Georgetown Immigration Law Journal* 31, No. 3 (2017): 665-673.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London and New York: Verso, 2016.

Anspach, Carolyn Kiser. “Medical Dissertation on Nostalgia by Johannes Hofer, 1688.” *Bulletin of the Institute of the History of Medicine* 2 (1934): 376-391.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books. 2012.

Arendt, Hannah. *Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought*. New York: Penguin Books, 2006.

--- *The Human Condition*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1998.

--- “The Nation,” in *Essays of Understanding,1930-1954: Formation, Exile, and Totalitarianism*. Edited by Jerome Kohn. New York: Schocken Books, 1994.

--- “‘What Remains? The Language Remains’: A Conversation with Günter Gaus.” In *Essays of Understanding,1930-1954: Formation, Exile, and Totalitarianism*. Edited by Jerome Kohn. New York: Schocken Books, 1994.

“Austin ICE Raids: Meet the Immigrants Arrested.” *Austin American-Statesman*. March 2, 2017. http://www.mystatesman.com/news/austin-ice-raids-meet-the-immigrants-arrested/0zJbGbdRFJms6Q2A1k2iDI/.

Balibar, Etienne. “At the Borders of Citizenship: A Democracy in Translation?” *European Journal of Social Theory* 13, No. 3 (2010): 315-322.

Barragán, James. “Abbott Angry as Travis County Tops New Federal Sanctuary Cities Report.” *The Dallas Morning News*. March 20, 2017. https://www.dallasnews.com/news/immigration/2017/03/20/travis-county-denied-bulk-nations-immigrant-detainer-requests-fueling-sanctuary-cities-debate.

Blair, Carole and Neil Michel, "The Rushmore Effect," in *The Ethos of Rhetoric*. Edited by Michael J. Hyde. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2004.

Blight, David W. *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Bova, Gus. "ICE Arrested Nearly Three Times as Many Immigrants During Last Year's Austin Raid Than Previously Reported." *Texas Observer*. January 25, 2018. https://www.texasobserver.org/ice-arrested-nearly-three-times-as-many-immigrants-than-previously-reported/.

Boym, Svetlana. *The Future of Nostalgia*. New York: Basic Books, 2001.

Browne, Stephen H. "The Pastoral Voice in John Dickinson's First *Letter From A Pennsylvania Farmer*." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 9 (1990): 46-57.

Casey, Edward S. "Public Memory in Place and Time." In *Framing Public Memory*. Edited by Kendall R. Phillips. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2004.

Cassin, Barbara. *Nostalgia: When Are We Ever at Home?* Translated by Pascale-Anne Brault. New York: Fordham University Press, 2016.

Chrisafis, Angelique. "France Under First Nationwide State of Emergency since 1961." *The Guardian*. November 16, 2015. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/nov/16/france-nationwide-state-of-emergency.

Cisneros, Josue David. *The Border Crossed Us: Rhetorics of Borders, Citizenship, and Latina/o Identity*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2014.

Cole, Juan. "The Crucial Role of Islam in the French Election." *The Nation*. May 8, 2017. https://www.thenation.com/article/the-crucial-role-of-islam-in-the-french-election/.

Dickinson, Greg. "Memories for Sale: Nostalgia and the Construction of Identity in Old Pasadena." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 83 (1997): 1-27.

--- *Suburban Dreams: Imagining and Building the Good Life*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2015.

--- "The *Pleasantville* Effect: Nostalgia and the Visual Framing of (White) Suburbia." *Western Journal of Communication* 70, No. 3 (2006): 212-233.

Dickinson, Greg, Carole Blair and Brian L. Ott. *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2010.

Dwyer, Owen J. "Symbolic Accretion and Commemoration." *Social & Cultural Geography* 5, No. 3 (2004): 419-435.

Eberly, Rosa. *Citizen Critics: Literary Public Spheres*. Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2000.

Farrington, Dana and Barbara Sprunt. "Transcript: Trump Shifts Tone Again on White Nationalist Rally in Charlottesville." *NPR*. August 15, 2017. http://www.npr.org/2017/08/15/543769884/transcript-trump-shifts-tone-again-on-white-nationalist-rally-in-charlottesville.

Flood, Alison. "Hemingway's Paris memoir rises to No 1 in France following terror attacks." *The Guardian*. November 20, 2015. https://www.theguardian.com/books/2015/nov/20/hemingway-paris-memoir-no-1-france-following-terror-attacks-a-moveable-feast.

Flores, Nancy. "Area Nonprofit Fearful After 'Sanctuary Cities' Law's Passage." *Austin American-Statesman*. May 12, 2017. https://www.mystatesman.com/news/local/area-nonprofits-fearful-after-sanctuary-cities-law-passage/u3dwbKfiX6VDKYqMdNg5MK/.

Flower, Harriet. *The Art of Forgetting: Disgrace and Oblivion in Roman Political Culture*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

Fortin, Jacey. "The Statue at the Center of Charlottesville's Storm." *The New York Times*. August 13, 2017. https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/13/us/charlottesville-rally-protest-statue.html.

Garber, Megan. "Why Charlottesville?" *The Atlantic*. August 12, 2017. https://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2017/08/why-charlottesville/536700/.

Garcia, Senator Sylvia R. "Reason for Vote." *Senate Journal: Eighty-Fifth Legislature – Regular Session*. Austin, Texas (May 3, 2017): 1573-1626.

Ghelazi, Rabah. "For One Indivisible French Republic." *Le Monde Diplomatique*. December 7, 2015. http://mondediplo.com/outsidein/for-one-indivisible-french-republic.

Gomez, Alan. "A Multimillion-Dollar Question: What's a 'Sanctuary City?'" *USA Today*. April 26. 2017. https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2017/04/26/multi-million-dollar-question-whats-sanctuary-city/100947440/.

Griffin, Andrew. "France State of Emergency Declared for Three Months, Allowing Authorities to Shut Down Websites and Giving Police Sweeping New Powers." *Independent*. November 19, 2015. http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/france-state-of-emergency-declared-for-three-months-allowing-authorities-to-shut-down-websites-and-a6740886.html.

Guarecuco, Lyanne A. “Abbott Threatens to ‘Remove’ Travis County Sheriff if She Does Not Fully Cooperate with ICE.” *Texas Observer*. January 25, 2017. https://www.texasobserver.org/abbott-remove-sheriff-hernandez-sanctuary-cities/.

--- “Federal Judge: ICE Conducted Austin Raids in Retaliation Against Sheriff’s New Policy.” *Texas Observer*. March 20, 2017. https://www.texasobserver.org/federal-judge-ice-conducted-austin-raids-in-retaliation-against-sheriffs-new-policy/.

Gunter, Booth, Jamie Kizzire, and Cindy Kent. “Whose Heritage? Public Symbols of the Confederacy.” *The Southern Poverty Law Center*. April 21, 2016. https://www.splcenter.org/sites/default/files/whoseheritage_splc.pdf.

Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory*. Translated by Lewis A. Coser. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Haskins, Ekaterina. “Philosophy, Rhetoric, and Cultural Memory: Rereading Plato’s ‘Menexenus’ and Isocrates’ ‘Panegyricus.’” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* Vol. 35, No. 1 (2005): 25-45.

Heim, Joe. “Recounting a Day of Rage, Hate, Violence, and Death.” *The Washington Post*. August 14, 2017. https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/2017/local/charlottesville-timeline/?utm_term=.030d0cb33011.

Hemingway, Ernest. *A Moveable Feast*. New York: Scribner, 2009.

Hemingway, Mary. “The Making of the Book: A Chronicle and a Memoir.” *New York Times Book Review*. May 10, 1964. http://www.nytimes.com/books/99/07/04/specials/hemingway-mary.html.

Hidalgo, Anne. “Paris, Our Paris, is Suffering but Alive.” *The Guardian*. November 20, 2018. https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/nov/20/paris-attacks-mayor-speech-terrorism-anne-hidalgo.

Holman, Rachel. “Sales of Hemingway’s ‘A Moveable Feast’ Surge After Paris Attacks.” *France24*. November 24, 2015. http://www.france24.com/en/20151124-france-earnest-hemingway-moveable-feast-sales-soar-after-paris-attacks.

Hyde, Michael J. “Introduction: Rhetorically, We Dwell.” In *The Ethos of Rhetoric*. Edited by Michael J. Hyde. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2004.

“ICE Policy.” YouTube. Posted by Travis County TX (January 20, 2017): 2:30-2:53. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7i0sVnW_h_w.

Isocrates. “Areopagiticus.” In *Isocrates Volume II*. Edited and Translated by George Nolan. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1929.

Jankowski, Philip, Tony Plohetski, and Melissa B. Taboada. "ICE Confirms 51 Arrests in Austin-Area Operation." *Austin American-Statesman*. February 13, 2017. http://www.mystatesman.com/news/local/ice-confirms-arrests-austin-area-operation/fV4sC3gB0EC1qMfCyA5PDL/.

Moutet, Anne-Elisabeth. "My Paris, One Week After the Terror Attacks," *The Telegraph*. November 21, 2015. https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/12008842/My-Paris-one-week-after-the-terror-attacks.html.

Nossiter, Adam and Liz Alderman. "After Paris Attacks, a Darker Mood Toward Islam Emerges in France." *New York Times*. November 16, 2015. https://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/17/world/europe/after-paris-attacks-a-darker-mood-toward-islam-emerges-in-france.html.

Nossiter, Adam, Aurelien Breeden, and Katrin Bennhold. "Three Teams of Coordinated Attackers Carried Out Assault on Paris, Officials Say; Hollande Blames ISIS." *The New York Times*. November 14, 2015. https://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/15/world/europe/paris-terrorist-attacks.html.

"Paris Attacks: What Happened on the Night." *BBC*. December 9, 2015. http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-34818994.

"Parisians Rally to Cafes and Bars to Defy Isis After Terror Attacks." *The Guardian*. November 17, 2015. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/nov/17/paris-rally-cafes-bars-memory-victims-defiance-isis-terror-attacks.

Park, Madison. "Why White Nationalists Are Drawn to Charlottesville." *CNN*. August 12, 2017. https://www.cnn.com/2017/08/11/us/charlottesville-white-nationalists-rally-why/index.html.

Parry-Giles, Shawn J. and Trevor Parry-Giles. "Collective Memory, Political Nostalgia, and the Rhetorical Presidency: Bill Clinton's Commemoration of the March on Washington, August 28, 1998." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* Vol. 86, No. 4 (2000): 417-437.

Plohetski, Tony. "Austin No.1 in U.S. – For Non-Criminals Arrested in ICE Raids." *Austin American-Statesman*. February 22, 2017. http://www.statesman.com/news/austin-for-non-criminals-arrested-ice-raids/R8suKsN9kUIjnpz10S2DII/.

--- "U.S. Judge: ICE Said Austin Raid was Because of 'Sanctuary' Policy." *Austin American-Statesman*. March 20, 2017. http://www.mystatesman.com/news/judge-ice-said-austin-raid-was-because-sanctuary-policy/dHWeSUd7nyp0XPJ6HcW8NP/.

Rancière, Jacques. *Dissensus: On Politics and Aesthetics*. Edited and Translated by Steven Corcoran. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015.

Riemer, Nick. "The Roots of Islamophobia in France." *Jacobin*. August 29, 2016. https://www.jacobinmag.com/2016/08/burkini-ban-islamophobia-valls-france-secularism-islam/.

Rubin, Alissa J. and Elian Peltier. "The Paris Attacks, 2 Years Later: Quiet Remembrance and Lasting Impact." *New York Times*. November 13, 2017. https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/13/world/europe/paris-november-2015.html.

Smith, Kimberly K. "Mere Nostalgia: Notes on a Progressive Paratheory." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* Vol. 3, No. 4 (2000): 505-27.

Tavernier-Courbin, Jacqueline. *Ernest Hemingway's A Moveable Feast: The Making of Myth*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1991.

Trump, Donald J. *Executive Order*. Number 13768. January 25, 2017. https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-enhancing-public-safety-interior-united-states/.

Trump, Donald J. *Executive Order*. Number 13769. January 27, 2017. https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-protecting-nation-foreign-terrorist-entry-united-states/.

U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement. *Weekly Declined Detainer Outcome Report for Recorded Declined Detainers Jan. 28-Feb. 3, 2017*. 1-35. https://www.ice.gov/doclib/ddor/ddor2017_01-28to02-03.pdf.

Vivian, Bradford. *Public Forgetting: The Rhetoric and Politics of Beginning Again*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2010.

Young, James E. *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993.