Capstone First Draft

Jakob Becker

I have acted with honesty and integrity in producing this work and am unaware of anyone who has not

/s/ Jakob Becker

Constitutive rhetoric was once used to "reconstruct a working-class identity" into collective activism (Boyle 16). This kind of rhetoric helped create a unified identity of reactivity. In other research, radio hosts were found to use social othering to contribute to a sense of loyalty among listeners (Chisnall 667). I believe this can be represented in political and religious commentary. *Nick's Right Podcast* calls into being a certain kind of viewer who is loyal to them and therefore has similar beliefs. The rhetoric used in both of these instances were used to create a group of people brought together through religion and politics. *Nick's Right Podcast* does the same.

Christian right-wing influencers use religious and political language to engage audiences by using this "constitutive rhetoric" to push religious and political content. This approach to sharing content creates an imagined collective identity (Boyle 5). *Nick's Right Podcast* presents themselves in this way. They manipulate audiences as if they always already agree with them on religion and politics. Their content constitutes the reader into a community they feel welcome in.

They encourage their viewers to express their beliefs openly and engage in discourse, much like what they do.

Conservative candidates like to use the terms “we” vs “them” (boyle 9)(Chisnall 667). This kind of language produces identities that value the exclusion of others. I believe this can also be applied to the use of political and religious rhetoric communicated on social media. One way right-wing influencers do this is by discrediting intellectual arguments mainly to inspire hate with sexist and transphobic rhetoric (Lawless and Cole 151). They say this is just their right to freedom of speech, but retaliate when anybody else says it to justify oppositional claims. Using this perspective *Nick’s Right Podcast* is made a clear example of this.

Nick’s Right Podcast is similar to the functionality of Ben Shapiro's podcast. They both use more intimate settings to appeal to the viewer. They also identify themselves as conservatives and present themselves as victims of the left (Dowling et. al 18). They use an alternative media standpoint to gain trust from the viewers and they both promote this right-wing rhetoric on similar platforms.

One of the biggest themes featured in content like this and the recent political climate, is Islamophobia. The Trump presidency specifically regarding his politics and following can be thanked for this. We can relate Trump politics to *Nick’s Right Podcast* because they use a lot of the same rhetoric and merchandise. Christian Nationalism being the root cause of Islamophobia is what causes this combative nature towards Muslims. A result of this is Muslim politicians are constantly being criticized by Republican. According to the “‘It’s just straight bigotry’: wave of Islamophobic rhetoric looms over US midterm elections” Republican senator Tommy Tuberville of Alabama stated they had “to send a terrorist” to Washington. The common belief addressed in the article is that this fear comes from a fear of harm to America. They use the term terrorism to

identify this threat. According to the "2025 Islamophobia index" the use of anti-Muslim rhetoric has increased from 2022 to 2025. The main use of it was found to be primarily among white and hispanic men.

According to a survey done by the Pew Research Center, most US adults consider Islam to be more of a threat to America than any other religion. 76% of them being Republican and only 29% Democrat. This data also correlates to an increase of Anti-Muslim hate crimes being reported to the FBI. The study also found that 63% of Muslims reported experiencing religious discrimination as well, more than any other religion. They concluded a majority of these attacks are taking place online and among higher up representatives of the Republican party.

This can be a result of influencers using "a transplatform campaign supporting right-wing reactionary politics" (Gajjala et al. 464). Right-wing influencers were identified as coordinating digital activism through various digital enclaves. Research has also found that they do this with the type of content they produce and how they communicate it. For example, shaking their head in disappointment and rolling their eyes. Even informal body language like this contributes to emotional enticement. "If we are to understand how right wing news media can assert authority, it is only by examining their audience" (Juarez Miro 638). Depending on how a viewer resonates with representation like this, I will explore how it could result in a collective being developed in *Nick's Right Podcast.*

Nick's Right Podcast is one of these trans-platform right wing influencers that promote what it means to be a right-wing Christian. Their YouTube content – specifically how they communicate the relationship between politics, religion, and masculinity – is proof of this. This is demonstrated in their channel and the language and visuals they use in posts, merchandise, and videos. The content covers a wide range of commentary, but some of the main themes are

Islamophobia, Christianity and Conservatism. They use very harsh visuals and rhetoric to demonstrate these themes.

Podcasts are an effective medium because they now play a bigger role in society and culture than they ever have, they are becoming increasingly more relevant and mainstream. This is mainly due to the surge of True Crime podcasts that became super popular among young adults. This rise in popularity caused people to implement podcasts into their everyday life. The attention True Crime podcasts brought to the podcasting space made it a huge part of pop culture. Now people listen to podcasts while their working, cleaning, and exercising. The appeal is mainly due to the casual atmosphere of candid conversation. The original use of podcasts was mainly for discussion about culture and politics.

Aside from their YouTube channel, audiences interact with their content on Instagram, TikTok, and spotify. My research matters because it functions to inform viewers of the potential harm this rhetoric can cause. It also contributes to conversations about how constitutive rhetoric works, and how religion is made a political issue with ideology. I chose to analyze their YouTube channel because this is where all of their content originates from. It has all of the posts that are later posted on social media and it has all of the podcast episode in their original format - video.

Nick's Right Podcast **explained**

Nick's Right Podcast is based in Texas and maintains a presence online promoting their religious and political beliefs to viewers. Their main form of communication is a podcast that is promoted as stated on their YouTube channel: "two Nicks – one Gen X (Nick Keller) and one OG Millennial (Nick Rice) – go head-to-head on culture, politics, and everything in between." They promote this podcast on several platforms, all with links to newsletters, groupchats, and subscriptions. The main speaker/host is Nicholas Rice and he starts each podcast with the catch phrase: "Welcome to Nick's Right Podcast where Nick is always right." He then introduces his cohost Nick Keller and they both pray before starting each episode. Nick Rice is currently producing a movie called "4:26." It is "a supernatural thriller based on a true story, where storytelling, faith, and suspense intersect in a powerful way." He has also written three books.

In a story by "VoyageDallas" Nicholas Rice is interviewed about the early stages of developing the podcast and how it came to be. The article written on the story highlights that "The goal wasn't to manufacture outrage or talking points, but to highlight how two different generations can look at the same issues through completely different lenses." But this slowly changed as they started to create more of a collective perception on social issues and politics. Most of their podcast episodes consist of them both commentating on different issues through similar lenses regarding their beliefs around faith, masculinity and personal testimony (VoyageDallas). The article addresses this change as less about winning arguments and more "reflective" about "challenging ideas." Where listeners connect with conversations they recognize but rarely hear in public. Where Nick Rice used to be the one questioning Kellers' beliefs, he is now mutually discussing his beliefs.

Nick Rice states in his interview with VoyageDallas that they had a lot of issues with social media censorship and mainly says this because they were struggling to find the right

audience. He says this was still difficult even though “the conversations are thoughtful and respectful.” Their goal is primarily to “invoke meaningful conversation, not just names.” Meaning they do not care about popularity, they just want to preach their belief.

The Nick’s Right Podcast YouTube channel restates its channel description and links via substack at the top of their channel page. The description is followed by several buttons to subscribe, join the community, or pay for a membership. By subscribing, you get notified each time they upload. By joining the community, it redirects you to a page on the channel where you can post within and see other peoples posts within the community. By joining their membership, you have the option to pay $9.99 a month for “early access to videos.” or $14.99 a month for “Member shout-outs.” According to the YouTube Help Center, Each of these membership plans get exclusive access to custom “emojis, posts, badges, content and more.” For example, the $14.99 option gets you access to “Members-only Shorts.”

The content posted in the community page is mostly biblical scripture posted by “Nick’s Right Podcast.” But you are not allowed to post anything in the forum unless you are a subscriber. A lot of their posts are social commentary and news articles about politics and culture. They also attack other religions or groups that go against their beliefs. Along with each of these posts promoting different articles, they tell the reader that it supports them financially the more views the article gets. Saying “they do pay us for people to view this article.”

Nick’s Right Podcast merch advertises an array of products from T-shirts, hoodies, hats and mugs. The page consists of clothing that are consistent with their beliefs regarding themes of religion and politics, this is present in the text and visuals advertised on their products. Popular wording includes terms associated with Christianity, right-wing rhetoric and Islam. Viewers can

see this in a lot of the products descriptions and messaging. The advertising promotes the consumers ability to be proud of their belief and let everybody around you know.

They advertise their content as raw and unapologetic. They state outright, “Designed for believers who aren’t afraid to stand for their faith” they also go on to push their “purpose” onto the viewer. Messaging like this is also accompanied by encouragement to “share the message of Christ with confidence” in your everyday life. The description also communicates their values of faith, family, freedom and hard work. The theme of hard work is brought up a lot in these products and they advertise success as a result of it. The description also highlights the negative implications of entitlement and how it is a limiting factor to success.

Methodology

My methodology will involve a rhetorical critique of the *Nick’s Right Podcast* YouTube channel. I will look at a number of content ranging from their videos, posts, and merchandise. I can then identify themes of constitutive rhetoric used. By identifying consistent themes relating to religion and politics, I can better analyze how their arguments are made to draw the viewer into a collective discourse.

Schrock's communicative affordances can be applied to how YouTube operates in this way with its algorithm and monetization. The algorithm can works to bring groups of people together under the content that most appeals to them. This can be seen in the content titles and descriptions with the end goal of driving groups of people towards digital enclaves. *Nick’s Right*

Podcast does this by listing several links in their substack to private group chats and newsletters. This research highlights the process by which viewers are directed towards content like *Nick's Right Podcast* with the end goal of exposing them to their exclusive options.

By analyzing the videos featured on their YouTube channel I can make claims about how constitutive rhetoric is used in their discourse between each other. I will also analyze the audiences perception received in the comments and live call-ins. I can do this by using a similar methodology used in Boyle 2026, to identify how their religion and politics may be used to create social othering in their content.

I will also analyze the posts featured on their YouTube channel in order to make claims about the use of politics. Most of their content presented in their posts are commentary on politics and conservative beliefs. I can use the methodology implemented by Lawless & Cole, in order to make claims about Conservative rhetoric and how it contributes to right-wing ideology specifically inspiring hate.

Lastly, I will analyze their merch page, also featured on their YouTube channel. By identifying consistent themes in their depictions and visuals presented on their products. This will help me develop a claim about how *Nick's Right Podcast* brands themselves to the consumer. I can conclude by stating how they create a collective of supporters in their product descriptions, based on activism and reactivity towards opposing groups.

Analysis

In my analysis I will be arguing that podcasts like *Nick's Right Podcast* create and maintain a group believing their way of life is being threatened by liberal women and Muslims, I use constitutive rhetoric to identify these tactics. In my analysis I will identify how they express their belief and constitute the viewer as if they are someone who would go about it the same way they do. I argue that *Nick's Right Podcast* uses majority hate speech to constitute a group based on fear. Looked at one way, it might be the case that to be a part of this group, you must be an American who already believes white Christian men are being attacked in their country. However, I will show that the work of shaping this belief works through constitutive rhetoric to address people as if they believe these things, and then reinforces that through creating a space of communications where it would not make sense to believe otherwise. *Nick's Right Podcast* consists of majority conservative rhetoric that uses religion, masculinity, and political affiliation to constitute the viewer. Their main methods use logic and labels to promote a subculture online, driven by hate. They implement this method in their posts, podcast episodes, and merch featured on their YouTube channel. To represent these messages they use certain visual, textual, and physical language that creates a sense of mutual understanding among the viewer.

The main speaker/host is Nicholas Rice and he starts each podcast episode with the catch phrase: "Welcome to Nick's Right Podcast where Nick is always right." He then introduces his cohost Nick Keller and they both pray before starting each episode. This is a representation of their belief to always put faith first. However, the doubled pun also implies that because both of them are named Nick, Nick will "always" be "right" even against factual evidence. Starting off

with these two statements at the beginning of every episode, sets the groundwork for what content is being covered. Because these statements are repeated in every video, they create the implication that their faith and Nick being "right" has never been proven wrong. They use the term "right" as a double meaning to both express their logical correctness and political correctness.

The podcast was originally billed to be about two different generations arguing about differing beliefs relating to culture, politics, and "everything in between" (VoyageDallas). So how did it grow to be more of a combined view on culture with similar religious and political beliefs? Both Nicks barely argue between each other anymore and instead either discuss mutual understanding of an issue, or team up against people with opposing beliefs. In some of their older posts Nick Rice takes more of a cautionary stance during discussion rather than agreeing right away with Nick Keller (episode 7). He is instead asking questions and asking him to justify his claims. In some of their more recent content Rice clearly agrees with what Keller is saying and therefore engages in discussion of mutual agreement with little to no questioning. Of course, that means that within the space of the show, "Nick is always right" when he is surrounded by people who agree with him.

Before we get into analyzing the rhetoric more fully, it is worth note how this Christian conservative content is being related to Trump and their general perception of what he stands for in Republican politics. We can see this represented in not only Trump, but a majority of Republican politicians and influencers. In my analysis you will see several references to Trump as well as conservative belief. During Trumps presidential campaign in 2015, he called for a complete "shut down" of all Muslim immigration into the US, this also happens to be around the time that Nick Rice says he first started talking about politics. Trump was able to implement a

limited version of this plan as president, restricting immigration into the US from a number of Muslim countries. Both Trump and his Vice President have publicly spoken about their opposition of Muslims in congress. Republican Ted Cruz had also stated Muslims "hate Jews, they hate Christians, they hate capitalism, they hate America" (Gedeon 1). This kind of stance is referenced strongly in *Nick's Right Podcast.*

Christian Nationalism

Before I reference any of the merch in my analysis, it is worth noting that it seems a lot of the merch that was previously advertised on their YouTube channel has since been deleted. It is possible that their merch went against YouTube guidelines because they state that they will remove any monetization or content that goes against it. Some examples of this includes hate speech, vulgar language and misinformation. Luckily I had analyzed a number of the merchandise before it was removed from the channel.

Nick's Right Podcast merch includes a lot of Christian rhetoric expressing their beliefs. By wearing their merch, you are constituted into a group that does not practice their beliefs of Christian nationalism privately. The message contained in their merch, undermines and belittles other religious groups openly and unapologetically. Their merch places other religious beliefs as opposites to theirs, as wrong to their right. Nick's Right Podcast mainly uses Islamaphobia in this way.

They feature a "100% not Muzlim" shirt priced at $26.50. This product description does not describe the intended meaning of the phrase and instead just restates that the buyer should express their belief or "stance" and wear their merch proudly. Although it seems they want them

to do this without fully understanding what a phrase like this means. A phrase like this implies anybody who wears it is certainly not "Muzlim" therefore, *Nick's Right Podcast* makes it clear to the viewer that there is absolutely no room for Muslims in their community. They constitute a group that does not accept Muslim identity. The intentional misspelling of "Muzlim" even goes further to categorize this group as American. The misspelling is a symbol of an Americanized mispronunciation of the word "Muslim" commonly associated with American resistance towards Muslims. It is a disrespectful mispronunciation of the word that also means "darkness" in arabic (Elzanaty 1).

Their $29.99 "Jesus Is King" shirt has the same words pasted in big letters on the front. This shirt has about three different designs, and the phrase is consistent on other products. A phrase like this constitutes the buyer as unapologetic in expressing their beliefs. This is evident in their product description, stating "designed for believers who aren't afraid to stand for their faith." They also go on to encourage viewers to "share the message of Christ with confidence."

"Deus Vult" is also a very common phrase used in their products, usually accompanied by a cross. This phrase literally means "God wills it" in Latin and was used in the times of crusaders (Merriam Webster dictionary). According to Nick Rice himself, this phrase was used "whenever they [Christian crusaders] were taking out the marauding Muslims" (ep. 29 1:22:45). *Nick's Right Podcast* uses this phrase to promote the conquering of Muslims. Therefore, they constitute the buyer as a group of Christians in support of conquering Muslims. A more modern version of this could be, preventing them from "invading" the US.

In most of their debate-style YouTube videos using phrases like "vs" or "debate," they have at least two (not including the Nicks, who are also present) guests with opposing views. One of the guests often represents the views of *Nick's Right Podcast*, a Christian conservative

man. What inevitably ends up happening is both Nicks end up taking their side and it turns into a 3v1, sometimes even a 4v1 (ep. 44). In episode 37 of *Nick's Right Podcast* (*Can Sharia law threaten america? Christian vs Muslim Debate*) there is a debate between a Muslim and Christian about Sharia law. Even though the debate is meant to be between these two, the Nick's also get involved in the debate siding with the Christian. The title clearly states "Christian vs Muslim" giving the impression that it is a one-on-one debate (Christian not Christians). It is also worth noting that the Muslim representative brought onto the podcast for the debate, is also conservative. The guest is a conservative and also is the president of Muslims for Trump. He is an eye surgeon who identifies as a libertarian and he does a lot for the Muslim community. He even said some of the rhetoric coming out of the Republican party is losing the Muslim vote (5:45). The other guest on the Christianity side identifies himself as strictly religious and doesn't want anything to do with political discourse. Michael Pagano, is another Christian influencer and the Christian representative guest featured in this video. Matt (the Muslim representative) also states that he does not want to talk about religion because he believes the conflict is entirely political. Knowing this, Nick Rice still invited him on to talk about religion with a Christian guest his entirely based on religion. This proves *Nick's Rice Podcast* strategically chooses the kind of content they want to be exposed to audiences, even going on to ask Matt at the end of the podcast about his religion more in depth with more personal questions.

They make a lot of references to "Takia" throughout this video and categorize it as the main characteristic of Muslims seeking to take over the US. They believe it is a form of deceit that Muslims use to hide their faith and intentions from the general public. The belief is that it is mainly used in political discourse. This is what they call a grand plan to deceive people and subtly take power. This is what they believe the Quran is teaching Muslims (ep. 37 1:12:15).

The Nicks present Islam as a religious and political issue. They will take over "our" government and enforce their beliefs onto US citizens, using Sharia law. "It's not a religion (Islam), it's a terrorist group disguised as a political movement, disguised as a religion" (ep. 29 1:10:34). Their main justification for this is because they believe most Islamic dominated countries are implementing Sharia Law against Christians. However, this is ironic because this already what Christians are starting to do themselves. Christians in power are enforcing religion into society via education (the ten commandments in schools). *Nick's Right Podcast* is constituting a belief of the constitutional right to the separation of church and state, but only when it is applied to opposing religions. Nick Rice also says himself that he would vote to ban the hijab, but later states that Christians would not vote for such a banning (ep. 37 1:17:54). Even though he identifies himself as a Conservative Christian who believes in Christian values. By saying this, he is also saying that it is okay to abandon ones Christian values when it comes to Islam. Rice also identifies liberal candidates as majority Muslim, so if democrats win, it will be the first step of this Islamic takeover being put into place. Therefore, Nick Rice calls for the viewers to go vote red because they are already taking over our government (ep. 52 38:00-41:00). He is constituting a group of Americans to go vote red in order to prevent Islamic takeover.

This is how Interpellation functions, as stated by Althusser, it is the process of individuals being created as "ideological subjects" (Althusser 698). Interpellation is pertinent to my project because it shows what role ideology plays in this process. That is, personal beliefs and values can be bestowed on another between the creator and observer. However because interpellation is specific to individuals, I cannot directly use it to analyze the interpellation of a large group of

people. Which is why I will be centralizing on constitutive rhetoric and use the idea of interpellation to identify the ideologies being created in order to constitute the viewer.

Their posts also have a lot of themes regarding religion, specifically "anti-Islam." In one post they feature an article by *The Hollywood Reporter* that comments on the movie 'Run Hide Fight: Infidels' and it's reference of a retired Delta Force officer claiming "Muslims desire death and will use immigration and the wombs of our women to defeat the West." They end up featuring this article twice (Sept. 11 post 2). In another post titled "BREAKING NEWS" it highlights a proposal for the building of a new mosque and "Islamic academy." They go on to mention the proposed location in Celina, "Collins County's second major mosque project" in almost a month. They then restate the public outrage accompanied by the news. They imply that many more mosques will be made. They also address their concerns of "who will operate the academy, what children will be taught and whether its leadership believes the United States Constitution–or Islamic law–is the highest authority in America." They say this could cause "permanent influence in communities" due to oppositional values. They then call to action Collin County residents to organize and attend every public meeting to "demand" answers before the project moves forward (Sept. 7 post 1). Posts like these constitute a group identity of individuals who believe in the perception of Muslims coming into the US as a hostile take over of religion and culture. The comments consist of viewers calling for people to "wake up" and threatening that it's only the beginning. This is possibly due to the "FBI memo" claims presented to viewers by Nick (ep. 37 49:55). Which constituted a group feeling threatened by a "Muslim takeover" of America.

Nick's Right Podcast constitutes a public that believes Muslims will take away "our" American culture. They are "Worried about all the traditions and holidays, thanksgiving, the

football season going away or not having the freedom to go where I want to go and practice Christianity." What brings about this fear is seeing the mosques rising up around the country due to a Muslim majority (ep. 37 47:00). Therefore they tell the viewer to vote Republican to help prevent this from happening.

The content posted in the community page and "posts" tab is mostly biblical scripture posted by "Nick's Right Podcast." But, you are not allowed to post anything (with the exception of comments) in the community forum unless you are a subscriber. A lot of their posts are social commentary and news articles about politics and culture. Along with each of these posts promoting different articles, they tell the reader that it supports them financially the more views the article gets. Saying "they do pay us for people to view this article." Their posts operate to constitute a group that feels informed about the political state of the world while being able to support the channel. They do this by using Christian nationalism, conservative rhetoric, and masculine commentary. In analyzing the comments and post content, this group agrees opposite ideologies should not have power to change their American culture. They believe in freedom of speech, until it goes against their beliefs and culture.

Conservative Representation

Their merch expresses a lot of their beliefs regarding right-wing conservatism. They approach these products in a lot of the same ways they do Christian products. They constitute a group that unapologetically express their beliefs against the "radical left" and think of themselves as superior. Using a lot of hate speech, they belittle the liberal left. This is most likely

due to Trumps 2020 presidential campaign because they use a lot of the same rhetoric and aesthetic.

Rather than a common phrase, they also use a specific style associated with Trump's Make America Great Again campaign. Specifically bright red hats, with slogans like "Make America Christian Again", "Make Jesus First Again" and "Freedom" making up the majority of their headwear. This kind of rhetoric functions as an ideogram (McGee), subliminally associating them directly with Trump. By using this kind of messaging they are constituting the buyer into a group representative of Trump's beliefs and values he creates policies with.

During Trumps presidential campaign in 2015, he called for a complete "shut down" of all Muslim immigration into the US. He was able to implement a limited version of this plan as president, restricting immigration into the US from a number of Muslim countries. Both Trump and his Vice President have publicly spoken about their opposition of Muslims in congress. Republican Ted Cruz had also stated Muslims "hate Jews, they hate Christians, they hate capitalism, they hate America."

Political news regarding Trumps achievements and democratic backlash because of it (Sept. 11 post 1) is highlighted in a lot of their posts. One in particular attacks the accusations of manipulation in "Trump's 2024 election victory" by Elon Musk. The post is titled "ELON MUSK FIGHTS BACK" and addresses an Elon Musk documentary that implies Starlink was used to manipulate the election. The post informs the viewers of what legal action is taking place to fix the issue even though filmmakers are "protected by the First Amendment." But in this case they say that freedom of speech "does not protect defamation." They then say that they implied election interference without legitimate evidence and that Musk has every right to take legal action against them (Sept. 13 post 3). This post constitutes a group that denounces the election

interference accusations against Trump. This is confirmed by one commenter that says “he (Musk) will win.” The post constitutes a group that fights for freedom of speech, unless it goes against conservative achievement in politics. As labelling it as unfair they disregard the overall validity of the ideologies (Lawless et. al 4).

Their $14.99 “Raised Right Not Liberal” shirt is an example of how *Nick’s Right Podcast* uses the term “right” with a double meaning. The product description states “Not politically correct. Just politically honest.” and “this shirt is for those who believe common sense still matter.” This phrase alone tells us all we need to know about what they want their viewers to believe. They are constituting a group of people that believe common sense takes priority over fact and liberals are not taught this (Dowling et. al). Nick Rice says himself, that it’s almost a “badge of honor” to not go to college, and how much better public schools are compared to private schools (ep. 29 27:00). Their product description also states “hard work still counts, and personal responsibility isn’t outdated” and reference the importance of faith, family, freedom and hard work. This gives into a lot of masculine attributes that support the idea of being able to pull yourself up by your “bootstraps” (Catano 421) relating to hard work. The wording “Raised Right not liberal” implies liberals were never taught these values, and therefore don’t believe it. Since these values are also very traditionally masculine, it is reasonable to assume that they also don’t believe liberals can be masculine. According to this part of the product description, they also want to constitute a group of masculine men valuing faith, family, freedom and hard work.

Lawless, Rudick, and Golsan’s research analyzes Right-wing back lash towards U.S. academics being “too liberal.” The article argues that when conservative beliefs aren't implemented in academia, it becomes an issue of free speech. With regard to freedom of speech, conservatives say the education system should include diverse ideologies. As highlighting it as

unfair they disregard the overall validity of the ideologies (Lawless et al. 4). I believe this method can also be used to present conservatism as the minority when it is clearly the majority, therefor pushing ideologies into issues regarding politics and religion.

A variety of other posts also promote politically right-wing activists and specifically how they are being treated by the public in a negative way. For example, one of their posts highlight the defacing of a Charlie Kirk memorial headlining it as "ABSOLUTELY VILE" (Sept. 13 post). The post also includes hashtags "#News" and "#FoxNews." They go on to then link their newsletter, Patriot Mobile promo code and merch page. Majority of the posts about news and politics are accompanied by these hashtags and links. They clearly express outrage towards the vandalizers, but say it did nothing to erase or deface the Kirk "legacy". They frame Charlie as someone just trying to help society, and receives unwarranted attacks because of it. The comments seem to be assuming the vandalisers were liberals disrespecting the vision of Christ. Therefore they claim it to be the work of satan. This post constitutes a grouping of viewers who believe their enemy is satan and liberals are the disciples.

Dowling et al. (5) and Schulze (154) sheds light on how journalism takes part in political polarisation. Specifically, how right-wing creators on social media present themselves as an alternative trusted news source against institutional control. I think this can be applied to *Nick's Right Podcast* because it is an example of these political news sources. This could help me develop a claim about how *Nick's Right Podcast* uses constitutive rhetoric to create a community that dislikes institutional control in relation to religion and political affiliation. Even if they are the majority.

Their official logo for their podcast is advertised on a number of their shirts promoted on the YouTube channel. They promote it by saying that by representing the show you are

supporting independent media. In the description of this shirt they once again brand themselves as standing for faith, freedom, as well as independent voices. By wearing this shirt and the brand you are letting people know "you're part of the Nick's Right Podcast family." This constitutes a group of supporters who believe in freedom of speech and supporting independent media.

Masculinity and gender

Nick's Right Podcast represents their masculinity in how they talk about women and gender. They don't believe any person but a man should be put in charge and in positions of power. When women are given too much power they get "pampered" and their claims shouldn't be made as serious as they are. We can analyze this by looking at their commentary about the Cornell 7 and the Lindsey Clancy case.

They constitute a belief that women are now calling "anything SA" after commenting on the Cornell 7 (ep. 52 25:30-30:20). From this statement alone we can see how they constitute a group believing women are given too much power which gives them the ability to "deflect truth" as much as they want. This is implying that they also believe women should be set below men and should not be taken as seriously as men.

To prove this assumed perception we can also analyze their conversations about the Lindsey Clancy case. They believe people are siding with Lindsey Clancy because they don't believe a woman could do something like "murder her own children." This is possibly because traditional masculinity believes women are meant to take care of the children and home. They use this claim to justify why people are blaming the husband for actually doing the killing. Nick Keller states that there is a clear "victimhood mentality, no one understand me, and I'm all alone

in the world, so same Lindsey same" (ep. 52 47:00). This once again proves how they view women. They present this mentality as a threat to men and children, saying there are multiple "clones" that have resulted from this case. They also believe that these actions are mostly because men are trying to gain custody over the children after divorce (ep. 52 50:00). They then correlate majority of women to be liberals that believe men should have less rights. To express this threat they use an analogy of "100 women couldn't take out 5 guys."

In both of these cases *Nick's Right Podcast* presents their masculinity as superior to liberal woman. They place liberal women as a threat to masculinity and American society.

In episode 29 (*feminism*) they invite on an "anti-feminist" woman named Lilly Kate. Nicks introduce her as someone they think combats feminism very well. She says feminist ideology is one of the deadliest ideologies we've ever had in this world. Saying it was meant to be implemented in order to destroy what we already had. Breakdown the family, church, destroy femininity, remove men from their masculinity, kill babies at large. *Nick's Right Podcast* videos address gender mainly in videos like these, where they imply specific gender roles.

They specifically choose to adrees gender and masculinity when they think it is contrasting their religious beliefs. A lot of their posts attack other religions and even their own religion if they go against their belief, even going as far as attacking a methodist church's posting about modern interpretation of scripture. For example, they attack a post by the "Minnetonka United Methodist Church" titled "Mathew 25:35 TRANSlation" by associating it with "medical care, harassment and misgendering." They say this "replaces the actual words of Jesus" and that it does not accurately represent what Mathew 25:35 states. The main issue they have with this post is that "Christians are commanded to love others, but loving others does not give a church permission to rewrite scripture." They say the church is meant to submit to "God's

Word" instead of twisting gods words to "gain approval" (Sept. 11 post 3). They then say that by doing this, the church is actively representing a "different religion." One comment identifies the "changing" of scripture as a "hell worthy trespass". This is an example of how their content constitutes a group where any kind of opposition to their belief is seen as sinful.

Conclusion

I believe there is a big issue with how influencers use religious and political language to engage audiences by using this theory researchers call "constitutive rhetoric" to push religious and political content. It seems most *Nick's Right Podcast* content is meant to target young men and absorb them into a community of followers with the same ideologies and beliefs. In this rhetorical critique I expose how "Nick's Right Podcast" does this using religion and politics, sharing content that creates an imagined collective identity. By presenting themselves in this way they effectively manipulate audiences as if they always already agree with them on religion and politics. Their content constitutes the reader into a community they feel welcome in. They encourage their viewers to express their beliefs openly and engage in discourse, much like what they do.

As a young man I have personally experienced how interpellation and constitutive rhetoric work to try and create a collective/individual identity. Exposure to this content can cause toxic masculinity to manifest. I see this as harmful to society, especially within the concept of male loneliness. This is why I want to learn more and maybe educate others on how businesses

like this use messaging online. I want to analyze how their communication is structured to cultivate audiences like myself. I hope to analyze whether messaging and rhetoric play a role in how powerful a message can be to online audiences beliefs and ideologies.

It doesn't help that some right-wing political figures use aggressive communication in their campaign making it easy for right-wing commentators to just restate while still communicating the same message. "Donald Trump is not simply a presidential figure, but the embodiment of white supremacy,... racism,... xenophobia, Islamaphobia, homophobia, and more" (E. Castrellón et al. 936) because of this marginalized groups were found to be in a constant state of distress during his campaign and presidency. I say this is all communicated in a certain way using constitutive rhetoric not only by political figures but by political commentators as will. I will show how this works in *Nick's Right Podcast.*

Research finds that most voters consider religious freedom in their voting for the 2020 presidential election. The voters who believe this, were found to also be in favor of christian nationalism even if it strayed from the constitution (Perry, Samuel L., et al. 722-723). The research argues that while supporting christian nationalism, they are therefore contradicting their beliefs in religious freedom. I say this argument can be supported in my analysis of *Nick's Right Podcast* and how it addresses religion or communicates it to the viewer. They use these same kinds of contradictions throughout their content and disguise it as "common sense."

Some research also identifies how journalism and conservative activism is taken place in more intimate environments online in order to avoid professional journalism. The main way they do this is by pushing for more radicalized policy. Influencers like Ben Shapiro expose viewers to rhetoric that benefits their partisan interests (Maurer and Nuernbergk 18). I agree with how they identify the functionality of right-wing digital enclaves. By analyzing *Nick's Right Podcast* I can

also prove how rhetoric creates communities and maintains them by labeling their content as commentary rather than activism. By identifying the digital enclaves used by *Nick's Right Podcast* I can better support this theory.

Identity then starts to play a role in these individuals. They are then brought together into groups of people with shared value and intention to change society how they see fit. In identifying this I expose how *Nick's Right Podcast* posts and advertising is used to represent their ideologies to their viewers, to show that their in agreement. More specifically, their depictions and rhetoric of addressing islam and politics.

Nick's Right Podcast YouTube channel seems to have always and always will be about culture and the interplay between religion and politics that affect masculinity and American culture. They identify themselves as Christian conservative men and they use patriotism to express their belief. Using this method they have constituted 14.5k subscribers into a similar identity. With majority of them joining the channel in January of 2026. Most of their content around this time was focused on religion, politics, and gender. They started the channel in 2013 and now make around 44$ - 710$ a month. *Nick's Right Podcast* is able to monetize these messages through media, and it comes from the group of people they are constituting ("Nick's Right Podcast YouTube Statistics"). They post all of the same content featured in my analysis, on their social media and other platforms as well. On every platform they promote more intimate environments for subscribers and donators giving them exclusive access to be more involved with their brand.

Citations:

Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and ideological state apparatuses (notes towards an investigation)." *Lenin and philosophy and other essays* 127 (1971): 86.

Boyle, K. A. (2026). Calling the working-class back into being: The constitutive rhetoric of trade union leadership. *Sociology*, *0*(0), pg 1. https://doi.org/10.1177/00380385261432878

Burke, Kenneth, et al. *Equipment for Living: The Literary Reviews of Kenneth Burke*. Parlor Press, 2010.

Charland, Maurice. "Constitutive rhetoric: The case of the Peuple Quebecois." *Quarterly journal of Speech* 73.2 (1987): 133-150.

Chisnall, Michael. ""Shockjockery": How Transgression Builds Virtual Partisan Audio Communities." *Society*, vol. 62, no. 5, 2025, pp. 665–76, https://doi.org/10.1007/s12115-025-01130-8.

Dowling, David O., Patrick R. Johnson, and Brian Ekdale. "Hijacking journalism: Legitimacy and metajournalistic discourse in right-wing podcasts." *Media and Communication* 10.3, 2022, pp. 1-11.

E. Castrellón, Liliana, Alonso R. Reyna Rivarola, and Gerardo R. López. "We are not alternative facts: Feeling, existing, and resisting in the era of Trump."

Gajjala, Radhika, et al. "Uncovering Right-Wing Digital Enclaves and Reactionary Politics: A Feminist Multi-Method Examination of a Transplatform Campaign." *Communication Studies*, vol. 75, no. 4, 2024, pp. 464-81, https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2024.2349401.

Juarez Miro, Clara. "An Audience Turn in Right-Wing Media Studies: A Response to Competing for Cultural Authority." *Journalism Studies*, vol. 26, no. 5, Apr. 2025, pp. 638–42. *EBSCOhost*, https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2025.2454338.

Lawless, Brandi, C. Kyle Rudick, and Kathryn Golsan. "Distinguishing (the) right from wrong: Knowledge, curriculum, and intellectual responsibility." *Communication Education* 68.4 (2019): 481-495.

Lawless, Brandi, and Kristen L. Cole. “Troll Tracking: Examining Rhetorical Circulation of Anti-Intellectual Ideologies in Right-Wing Media Attacks.” *Communication, Culture, and Critique*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2021, pp. 149-65, https://doi.org/10.1093/ccc/tcaa035.

Maurer, Peter, and Christian Nuernbergk. "Journalism, Activism, and Social Media: Exploring the Shifts in Journalistic Roles, Performance, and Interconnectedness." *Media and Communication* 10.3 (2022): 1-4.

Perry, Samuel L., Landon Schnabel, and Joshua B. Grubbs. "Christian nationalism, perceived anti-Christian discrimination, and prioritising “religious freedom” in the 2020 presidential election." *Nations and Nationalism* 28.2 (2022): 714-725.

Schulze, Heidi. "Who uses right-wing alternative online media? An exploration of audience characteristics." *Politics and governance* 8.3 (2020): 6-18.

Schrock, Andrew Richard. "Communicative affordances of mobile media: Portability, availability, locatability, and multimediality." *International journal of communication* 9 (2015): 18-18.

Dowling, David O., Patrick R. Johnson, and Brian Ekdale. "Hijacking journalism: Legitimacy and metajournalistic discourse in right-wing podcasts." *Media and Communication* 10.3, 2022, pp. 1-11.

McGee, M. C. (1980). The “ideograph”: A link between rhetoric and ideology. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *66*(1), 1–16.

Lawless, Brandi, and Kristen L. Cole. “Troll Tracking: Examining Rhetorical Circulation of Anti-Intellectual Ideologies in Right-Wing Media Attacks.” *Communication, Culture, and Critique*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2021, pp. 149-65, https://doi.org/10.1093/ccc/tcaa035.

Gedeon, Joseph. “‘It’s Just Straight Bigotry’: Wave of Islamophobic Rhetoric Looms over US Midterm Elections.” The Guardian, 13 Sept. 2026, https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2026/sep/13/Republicans-Islamophobic-rhetoric-democrats

Catano, James V. “The Rhetoric of Masculinity: Origins, Institutions, and the Myth of the Self-Made Man.” *College English*, vol. 52, no. 4, 1990, pp. 421–36. *JSTOR*, https://doi.org/10.2307/377660. Accessed 19 Oct. 2026.

“Nick’s Right Podcast’s YouTube Statistics.” Social Blade, https://socialblade.com/YouTube/channel/UCmsRrkxGQFdmNucXw3txE7w

Elzanaty, Mira. “I Promise; It’s Muslim, Not Muzlim.” The Race Card Project, 28 Nov. 2017, https://theracecardproject.com/promise-Muslim-not-muzlim/

Dowling, David O., Patrick R. Johnson, and Brian Ekdale. "Hijacking journalism: Legitimacy and metajournalistic discourse in right-wing podcasts." *Media and Communication* 10.3, 2022, pp. 1-11.

McGee, M. C. (1980). The "ideograph": A link between rhetoric and ideology. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *66*(1), 1–16.

Lawless, Brandi, and Kristen L. Cole. "Troll Tracking: Examining Rhetorical Circulation of Anti-Intellectual Ideologies in Right-Wing Media Attacks." *Communication, Culture, and Critique*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2021, pp. 149-65, https://doi.org/10.1093/ccc/tcaa035.

Gedeon, Joseph. "'It's Just Straight Bigotry': Wave of Islamophobic Rhetoric Looms over US Midterm Elections." The Guardian, 13 Sept. 2026, https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2026/sep/13/Republicans-Islamophobic-rhetoric-democrats

Catano, James V. "The Rhetoric of Masculinity: Origins, Institutions, and the Myth of the Self-Made Man." *College English*, vol. 52, no. 4, 1990, pp. 421–36. *JSTOR*, https://doi.org/10.2307/377660. Accessed 19 Oct. 2026.

"Nick's Right Podcast's YouTube Statistics." Social Blade, https://socialblade.com/YouTube/channel/UCmsRrkxGQFdmNucXw3txE7w

Elzanaty, Mira. "I Promise; It's Muslim, Not Muzlim." The Race Card Project, 28 Nov. 2017, https://theracecardproject.com/promise-Muslim-not-muzlim/