



JOURNAL OF HATE STUDIES

Hate and Political Discourse
Volume 10 • 2012

Preface to Vol. 10

John Shuford

Suggested Citation:

APA: Shuford, J. (2012). Preface to Vol. 10. *Journal of Hate Studies*, 10(1), 1-8. Retrieved from: <http://journals.gonzaga.edu/index.php/johs/article/view/175>.

Bluebook: John Shuford, *Preface to Vol. 10*, 10 J. HATE STUD. 1 (2012), available at <http://journals.gonzaga.edu/index.php/johs/article/view/175>.

ALWD: John Shuford, *Preface to Vol. 10*, 10 J. Hate Stud. 1 (2012), available at <http://journals.gonzaga.edu/index.php/johs/article/view/175>.

Preface

On behalf of the Gonzaga University Institute for Hate Studies, I am pleased to offer you Volume 10 of the *Journal of Hate Studies* (JHS), which is devoted to the theme “Hate and Political Discourse.” This is, in many ways, a special volume, and 2012-2013 is a special year too. We celebrate the 125th Anniversary of Gonzaga University, the Centennial Anniversary of the Gonzaga University School of Law, the 15th Anniversary of the Institute for Hate Studies, and the 10th Anniversary of the JHS. We mark these special occasions in three ways: the present volume; a special symposium held in Washington, DC in September 2012 to accompany this volume; and the international conference in April 2013 that will provide the contents of Volume 11.

About the Present Volume

This is the first volume of the JHS helmed by a guest editor. Robert L. Tsai, Professor of Law at the Washington College of Law, American University in Washington, DC, has performed this role exceptionally and assembled an excellent collection of peer-reviewed, original articles on our theme. Professor Tsai is an innovative, interdisciplinary voice in the areas of constitutional law, theory, and history, as well as wider currents of legal history and democratic theory. His first book, *Eloquence and Reason: Creating a First Amendment Culture*, “theorizes the rise of Americans’ modern First Amendment value system and the role of courts in sustaining that system.” His current research explores overlooked and failed constitutions as moments in the exercise of popular sovereignty within the American context. Of particular interest in Hate Studies, Professor Tsai considers racial constitutionalism in the Pacific Northwest, including the post-Aryan Nations tactical and philosophical movement to recover first principles of constitutional order and stake a claim to the American political tradition.

My deepest thanks go to Professor Tsai for all he has contributed to the growth of Hate Studies and to the advancement of the JHS as a primary venue for academic scholarship on hatred. This includes the special symposium on “Hate and Political Discourse,” held on September 27, 2012 at the Washington College of Law, American University. All of the authors published in the present volume were invited to Washington, DC to participate in this election-season event, which American University also made accessible worldwide through live and recorded streaming video. The symposium marks the first-ever JHS special event, the Institute’s first collaboration with another university, and thus the Institute’s first activity

ever to be held at another university. What a way to mark the first 10 years of the JHS and embark on the next decade!

Volume 10 begins with Professor Tsai's Introduction and continues with two articles that attempt to trace origins or root causes of hatred. In "The Individual Psychology of Group Hate," Willa Michener of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Center for International Studies seeks to advance understanding of one of the thorniest questions for Hate Studies: whether hate is an inborn capacity or some manner of learned attitude, emotion, or behavior. Focusing on the phenomena of group hate and the problem of revenge taken against members of the perpetrator's group (rather than the original perpetrator), Dr. Michener points out that although groups are culturally defined, the tendency to relate to groups is universal. While the identity of the group, including the group regarded as "the enemy" is learned, the construct of "the enemy" is an inherited category. With reference to ingroup/outgroup behavioral dynamics and the context of attacking or being attacked, Michener argues that ingroup members are prepared to experience an entire outgroup as "the enemy" and to be similarly experienced by outgroups as well.

"Irrationalism: The Foundation of Hate Propaganda" by Robert Lanning of Mt. St. Vincent University in Nova Scotia, Canada, also seeks out root causes of hatred. Dr. Lanning turns to the thought of major figures in the Frankfurt School of Continental philosophy and critical theory to examine hate propaganda "in terms of its basis in irrationalism as a philosophical orientation." The point is not that hate propaganda—its methods, strategies, and chosen targets—is irrational. Rather, hate propaganda's reliance on irrationalism as a philosophical orientation both contributes to its effectiveness (as it appeals to and foments irrationality) and presents "a limitation to thought and analysis."

Read side by side, Michener's and Lanning's theses support several important implications. While we might be able to address the problem of emnification by broadening the ingroup, the tendency to regard outgroups and their members as "the other" and "the enemy" is more persistent and difficult to address. When we scan world history and recent events, we see how cultural signifiers and political discourse may be manipulated effectively to either shrink or expand the ingroup, and to delineate outgroups either precisely or broadly. Anxiety over increasing pluralism and allocation of blame onto "minorities," for example, reflect ingroup/outgroup and zero-sum game concepts, and perhaps nativist, nationalist or racist beliefs too. However, such beliefs and conceptualizations do not automatically give rise to hate-filled political response; rather, such response is the product of political and cultural activities that manipulate beliefs and conceptualizations by presenting both a threatening "enemy" and a proposed

solution—attacking the “enemy” (e.g., for protective, defensive, galvanizing, or purifying ends). By creating or enhancing the sense of “the other” as “the enemy” that seeks to attack, and therefore warrants attack, it is possible to mobilize oppositional identities and campaigns of violent hatred. Political and other social institutions often participate actively in these dynamics or at least accept them tacitly.

Hate propaganda is particularly effective transforming fear of “the other” into oppositional hatred of “the enemy,” and here we offer Marla Stone’s essay “Italian Fascism’s Soviet Enemy and the Propaganda of Hate, 1941-1943.” Dr. Stone, a Fellow of the Stanford University Center for Advanced Behavioral Studies and Professor of History at Occidental College, traces the use and development of terrifying anti-Soviet propaganda by Italy’s fascist regime within its efforts to mobilize Italian popular support for the Axis war against Soviet Russia. In her article, Stone argues that the fascists used “a barrage of images intended to terrify the Italian population and rally it in a deep hatred of the Soviet ‘other’” and drew upon “deep-seated stereotypes about Russian lack of civilization, immutable biological flaws, and more recent tropes about Bolshevik barbarism and immoral ideology.” The fascist government and party turned to these cultural signifiers to depict “the communist” as fascism’s historic enemy and, more terrifyingly, a “racially degenerate, godless peril from the East bent on the destruction of Western civilization and on the desecration of the Italian family and the Catholic faith.”

Whether “the enemy” is external or internal, its fearsomeness, and thus the hate to which “the enemy” is subject, reflects its construction as degraded, defiled, and destructive; a menace that cannot be subdued with less than controlling, triumphant engagement supported by political action and violence. In “Blood on the Tongue: Reading Abjection in Nationalist Blood Libels from Nazi Germany to Hamas and the British National Party,” Damon Berry of the Ohio State University offers a novel comparative lens for this set of political and politico-religious nationalist examples, which he reads through French feminist Julia Kristeva’s theorization of abjection. Berry brings out “more overtly politicized” contemporary manifestations of blood libel in nationalist contexts and, through Kristeva’s theorization, its malleability for affixation to groups “signified as alien” within the majority/minority discourses of modern nation-states. In providing a discursive structure for relating “personal and communal fears about pollution and dissolution,” Berry contends, nationalist blood libel operates as “a folk reification mechanism which allows the segmentation of friend/enemy camps, rationalizes anxieties along lines of protectionism, and thereby mobilizes affects into political and often violent action.”

Continuing with the problem of anti-Islamism and contemporary Brit-

ish nationalisms, Jon Garland and James Treadwell, criminologists at the University of Leicester, England, contribute the article “The New Politics of Hate? An Assessment of the Appeal of the English Defence League Amongst Disadvantaged White Working Class Communities in England.” Garland and Treadwell focus on recent violent clashes in the United Kingdom involving “white and south Asian males, anti-fascist demonstrators, and the police,” surrounding the growth and activities of the English Defence League (EDL), a right extremist group that identifies as opposing “radical Islam.” Within Britain’s “post-politics” political and socioeconomic environment, mainstream political discourses have failed to reach out to “some segments of England’s marginalized and disenfranchised white working class,” the authors note. Garland and Treadwell find that some populations have turned to the EDL as a means in order to air their anger over socioeconomic and political disparities, which is focused on an “Islamic other” rather than on the classes and systems that give rise to and maintain such disparities.

An important area of inquiry for Hate Studies is the range of roles that non-political social and legal institutions play, or may play, in relation to hateful political regimes, including non-interference with such regimes, as well as intervention against them, within political order. Sometimes such regimes may depict the fearsome “enemy” not as a foreign, external threat, but rather as a racialized “other” within. In “Constitutionalizing Anarchy: Liberalism, Lynching, and the Law,” Daniel Kato, a political scientist at Kalamazoo College, finds in American legal history a powerful example of what he contends is the commensurability of liberalism and illiberalism within intersecting legal, political, cultural, and geographic spaces. Supported by a careful review and reassessment of specific case law, Dr. Kato contends that the U.S. Supreme Court once maintained an active policy of non-interference toward the particular racial violence of lynching. Although the Court did not strip the federal government of authority to enforce applicable law, it nonetheless acquitted lynchers and did not hold accountable those states where lynching persisted. Kato claims that the Court’s lynching jurisprudence carved out legally bounded regions or “zones” of lawlessness. The practice of lynching as racial terror received tacit acceptance (rather than explicit sanction) by law, and the Court’s non-interference stance in “zones” of lawlessness extended not only to illegal conduct and non-support for federal enforcement, but also to the specific geographic regions where lynching was prevalent, thus giving meaning to Kato’s construct of “constitutionalizing anarchy.”

Prevailing sociopolitical and economic conditions may influence the incidence, targets, and perpetrators of hate crimes, as well as the scope, dimension, and efficacy of legal responses to hate crimes. In “Defining

Characteristics and Politicising Victims: A Legal Perspective,” Jennifer Scheppe of the University of Limerick School of Law, Ireland, adopts a comparative approach to identify and discuss specific legislative challenges and problems involved in crafting or amending hate crimes law. With attention to the common law jurisdictions of England and Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland, Ireland, and Canada, Scheppe problematizes political inconsistencies that shape legal systems and render hate crimes legislation and legislative activity discriminatory, exclusionary, and politically charged as to which crimes and victims receive coverage and which do not. In seeking to establish a normative platform for the development of hate crimes statutes in various common law systems, Scheppe turns to the recent legislative experiences of the United States and the specific examples of criminal defense of provocation and equality legislation.

Even if our tendencies to identify groups and regard “the other” as “the enemy” happen to be inherited rather than chosen, important questions remain regarding what to do with those tendencies and how to live in response to them. Hate crimes legislation and enforcement offer one important range of responses, but many others reside in realms such as moral theory, youth education, and cultural and artistic expression. These other realms may have much to offer in terms of bolstering and advancing civil discourse and democratic participation. In “Combating Hate Through Young Adult Literature,” Rachel Dean-Ruzicka brings together influences in moral psychology and imagination, normative ethics, metaethics, and moral development as she considers whether young adult literature, and specific subgenres that include Neo-Nazi characters, might help readers “look beyond tolerance toward a cosmopolitan ethics of difference as a more sophisticated position for discouraging and combating hatred.” Dean-Ruzicka, a Britain Postdoctoral Fellow of Literature, Communication, and Culture at the Georgia Institute of Technology, points to the moral influence of narrative and literature in developing relational sensibilities, encountering varieties of moral personality, and discerning which values are—or are not—“worth living by.” On principled, consequential, and relational levels, Dean-Ruzicka questions a prevailing normative deference to tolerance (accompanied by a frequent association with cultural relativism) for its adequacy in combating hate, discouraging violence, and promoting values “worth living by.” Young adult literature that features Neo-Nazi and other white supremacist characters provides tools to “assess values that are not worth living by” and perhaps to develop a cosmopolitan ethics of difference, one that neither erodes “otherness” nor elides the distinction between “the other” and “the enemy.”

The volume concludes with a side-by-side review of two recent books, Thomas Pegrarn’s academically oriented *One Hundred Percent American:*

The Rebirth and Decline of the Ku Klux Klan in the 1920s and Arthur Goldwag's journalistically pursued *The New Hate: A History of Fear and Loathing on the Populist Right*. The reviews come courtesy of Rebecca Barrett-Fox, Professor of Sociology at Hesston College, book review editor for the *Journal of Hate Studies* and noted expert on the Westboro Baptist Church of Topeka, Kansas. The texts are timely, as is Dr. Barrett-Fox's lens for reviewing them. Barrett-Fox notes that the number of organized hate groups in the United States has increased over the past decade, contemporaneous with a rightward, more violent shift in American political discourse, both in rhetoric and tone. "The broad threat," she asserts, is "the shift toward behaviors . . . and rhetoric that undermine democratic participation and civil discourse." Reading Pegram's and Goldwag's new texts side-by-side, Barrett Fox draws an ambivalent set of conclusions. Those who are social targets of hatred may find no comfort in the predictability across time and region of the politics of hate and the political activism of hate groups. Similarly, those who measure social justice and social change progress in terms of eradicating longstanding phenomena of hate-based politics will likely find this predictability depressing. On the flip side, the predictability of the politics of hate and the political activism of hate groups may turn out to be "useful, for it provides a guide to the concerns of those who participate in hate groups, concerns that can then be defused via (anti-hate) activism." Indeed, we can engage in in-depth and comparative studies of how hate movements begin, become politically organized and operational, and ultimately decline.

The *Journal of Hate Studies*: The First Decade, the Next Decade

The publication of Volume 10 and the special symposium on "Hate and Political Discourse" mark crucial steps forward in a journey begun 10 years ago, when the Gonzaga University Institute for Hate Studies (then the Institute for Action Against Hate) introduced the inaugural volume of the *Journal of Hate Studies*.

Professor George Critchlow of the Gonzaga University School of Law served as the Institute's first director and later as the JHS's founding editor. In his Preface to Volume 1, Professor Critchlow described the trajectory of the *Journal* as providing a "vehicle for sharing insights from diverse perspectives about what hate is, and what to do about it" and linking a multidisciplinary array of authors, including "academics, professionals, activists, (and) others who have something significant to contribute to the evolving field of 'Hate Studies.'"

Since then, the JHS has published dozens of peer-reviewed articles coming from law, political science, sociology, religious studies, compara-

tive literature, education, philosophy, ethnic studies, American studies, criminology, psychology, anthropology, social psychology, history, international studies, critical theory, evolutionary psychology, Judaic studies, and other academic fields and disciplines. We have published the work of leading scholars on the study of hate, including Kathleen Blee, Barbara Perry, Neil Chakraborti, Randy Blazak, Steven Leonard Jacobs, and more. We have seen scholars engage an ever-widening scope of issues, questions, topics, problems, and methods. In recent years, we have seen marked increases in the number of articles submitted to the *Journal*, as well as the number of countries and continents from which submissions come to us. We take these trends as signs that many people worldwide are “doing Hate Studies” and that the impact of Hate Studies continues to grow.

In addition to promoting and bringing together leading academic scholarship on “what hate is, and what to do about it,” the JHS continues to provide a venue for the voices of leading practitioners, professional and policy experts, human rights activists, religious and spiritual figures, educators, and others. We have published interviews with Nobel Peace Prize nominee Izzeldin Abuelaish, human rights activist Nonie Darwish, Morris Dees of the Southern Poverty Law Center, anti-racism expert Jane Elliott, Holocaust survivor Eva Mozes-Kor, Geshe Thupten Phelgye of the Universal Compassion Movement and the Tibetan Parliament-in-Exile, and Carl Wilkens, the only American who chose to remain in Rwanda during the genocide and who saved hundreds of lives. We have brought our readers bibliographies, poetry, book and film reviews, and student scholarship.

We have also published the proceedings from two International Conferences on Hate Studies. For Volume 11, we will again devote the pages of the *Journal of Hate Studies* to that endeavor. On April 18-20, 2013, the Institute for Hate Studies, the Gonzaga University School of Law, and the Washington State Task Force on Race and the Criminal Justice System will host “The Pursuit of Justice: Understanding Hatred, Confronting Intolerance, Eliminating Inequality.” This collaborative conference links the 3rd International Conference on Hate Studies and the 2nd Conference on Race and the Criminal Justice System.

In doing so, we bring together the leading interdisciplinary academic forum on hate and directly related social problems with the combined social justice leadership of the Gonzaga Law School and the Washington State Task Force. The pairing of the Institute for Hate Studies, the Gonzaga Law School, and the Washington State Task Force will provide presenters and attendees with opportunities to align interests in understanding and addressing fear and ignorance of the “other” with interests in how these conditions manifest in hatred, intolerance, and inequality. The conversation will center on how these problems affect the pursuit of justice. For more information

about “The Pursuit of Justice,” including conference registration options and the Call for Papers/Proposals, visit <http://gonzaga.edu/pursuitofjustice>. We hope to see you in Spokane in April 2013!

In Gratitude

The publication of JHS Volume 10 also marks another important transition, though this one is bittersweet. This is the last volume with which Joanie Eppinga will be directly involved in editorial production. Ms. Eppinga has worn many hats over the years, as everything from copy editor to editor to points in between. No matter what the role, she has always performed it with wisdom, skill, and surpassing grace. She will continue to contribute special interviews, and we hope to see her name in the bylines of book and film reviews too. For not only is Joanie Eppinga a talented editor, she is an excellent writer with a clear voice and keen insight for Hate Studies.

John Shuford, J.D., Ph.D.
Managing Editor, *Journal of Hate Studies*
Director, Gonzaga University Institute for Hate Studies