

Preface

The pueblo's elders called a council to decide what to do about the federal government's proposal for a land trade involving mineral rights. A fire burned at the center of the kiva's dirt floor, around which the twelve elders gathered. A traditional reflection stone sat on the open side of the fire, opposite the sipapu, which signified the opening in the earth through which the first people arrived from the unseen worlds. A ledge cut into the curved adobe wall held pots, drums, and bundles of dried corn.

The elders sat quietly for a while, until the chief unwrapped a bundle he had placed in front of him. He took out the talking stick, which looked like a pipe stem about a foot and a half long. Feathers and strands of turquoise were tied to one end and the other was wrapped in leather.

The council began as the talking stick was passed around the circle, each of the elders relating a tale or portion of the tribal history. Then the men sat quietly together without discussing the matter directly or apparently coming to any decision. After a prolonged silence they nodded, rose, and left the kiva. In the silence, they had "seen the truth of the council" and in this way evoked the appropriate decision.

This story is retold by Dr. Raymond Reyes and Dr. George Perrault in their article "Wholeness and Council: A Native American Perspective on Leadership." The authors conclude that the underlying intention of a council process is to move the followership and leadership toward community, rather than relying upon hierarchy, personality, or dominance. Council is about the creation of "a space in which obedience to the truth is practiced" (Palmer, 1983, p. 69).

The theme of community speaks clearly in the work of the Institute for Action Against Hate. Since our beginning in 1998, we have been blessed with an ever-growing circle of people of goodwill who join us in fighting hate through education, research, and advocacy. An early aspiration of the Institute was to create an academic discipline to study hate, and we formally began this process this year.

The Gonzaga University Institute for Action Against Hate hosted the first International Conference to Establish the Field of Hate Studies at Gonzaga University in Spokane, Washington on March 18-20, 2004. The conference was co-sponsored and supported by the American Jewish Committee, the Simon Wiesenthal Center, the Southern Poverty Law Center, the Kootenai County Task Force on Human Relations, the Alberta Civil Liberties Research Center, and regional educational institutions. We had 65 conference attendees and 200 attendees at the Banquet, which featured Morris Dees.

OBJECTIVE

The objective of the conference was to bring together individuals with recognized expertise from complementary academic fields to define the field of hate studies. This was a founding scholarly event for the field of hate studies, and the first international conference of its kind. The conference provided opportunities for meaningful academic scholarship via presentations, round table discussions, and scholarly papers.

THE CONFERENCE

The International Conference to Establish the Field of Hate Studies was a two-day event at Gonzaga University, designed to bring together leading academics and researchers with expertise relevant to Hate Studies. The presenters included:

Ken Stern, J.D.	Moderator and Keynote Presenter, American Jewish Committee
Raymond Sun, Ph.D.	History, Washington State University
James Waller, Ph.D.	Evolutionary Psychology, Whitworth College
Evan Harrington, Ph.D.	Social Psychology, John Jay College
Kathleen Blee, Ph.D.	Sociology, University of Pittsburgh
John Pawlikowski, Ph.D.	Religious Studies, Catholic Theological Union
Vernon Johnson, Ph.D.	Political Science, Western Washington University
Richard Foltin, J.D.	Law, American Jewish Committee
Bill Morlin	Journalism, <i>Spokesman-Review</i>

The conference began with a keynote address by Ken Stern, who presented on the need for an interdisciplinary field of hate studies. This was followed by panel discussions made up of the presenters listed above. Questions addressed by these presenters included:

- What should an integrated field of Hate Studies look like?
- What does the presenter's expertise or discipline contribute?
- What needs to be contributed by other fields?
- What are the next steps for creating the field of Hate Studies, for developing workable and relevant curricula on college campuses, and for integrating Hate Studies with institutions outside the academy?

2003/04]

PREFACE

3

Each presenter delivered a paper that served as a focus for discussion by other experts.

The panel discussions were followed by focus groups led by Institute board members, Bob Bartlett and Raymond Reyes (Defining and Developing a Field of Hate Studies) and James Beebe and George Critchlow (Scholarly Research and Writing).

The conference banquet featured Morris Dees, J.D., Chief Counsel for the Southern Poverty Law Center. In addition to developing ideas for Teaching Tolerance, the Center's education project, Mr. Dees devotes his time to suing violent white supremacist groups. Mr. Dees is well known in this area for financially bankrupting the Aryan Nations World Headquarters. Mr. Dees' presentation, which was quite well attended, was the perfect endnote to our conference.

The Institute presents the following articles as proceedings from the conference. Although the articles were reviewed in the editorial process, they were not peer reviewed, unlike those in our previous journals. This was a conscious collaborative board decision. We are pleased to present the varying perspectives and are truly grateful to the writers. This year's journal includes the following articles.

In "The Need for an Interdisciplinary Field of Hate Studies," Ken Stern discusses Bill Wassmuth's passion for justice and the origins of hate studies. Noting that hate has not been clearly defined, he offers a working definition before examining the topic through the lenses of various disciplines. He then addresses the possible effects of a field of hate studies and offers suggestions about how to make the new field a reality.

John Pawlikowski's article, "Religion as Hatred: Anti-Semitism as a Case Study," explores Christian hatred toward and action against Jews as an example of how religion can generate prejudice that leads to hatred. His explanation of the history of such antisemitism provides context for his argument. Pawlikowski concludes by noting that it is only when religion is embodied in its people that it is a powerful tool for social transformation.

In "The Social Psychology of Hatred," Evan Harrington discusses social psychologists' three primary approaches to studying prejudice, noting how context, interpersonal attitudes, and social grouping affect intergroup aggression. He also describes the importance of the empirical studies conducted in the field of social psychology in understanding hate-driven behavior.

Kenneth Hoover and Vernon Johnson begin "Identity-Driven Violence: Reclaiming Civil Society" with a brief review of the historical context of identity-driven violence. They discuss factors in individual and societal development, noting that studies in developmental psychology reveal that identity is built upon competencies, communities, and commitments. Their conclusion advocates for regional-local networks that use positive methods of promoting

diversity, suggesting that community action is the main front in the battle for a society in which people accept one another.

Sociologist Kathleen Blee examines the relative merits of considering racial hatred as an individual motive or as an outcome of social action in "Positioning Hate." She suggests re-examining the presupposition that those who join racist groups are necessarily motivated by hate and discusses the implications for scholarship and anti-racist politics if, in fact, hatred is not the primary or only motivation for joining and acting within such groups.

The educational component of hate studies is addressed by Phyllis Gerstenfeld in "Teaching a General Course on Hate Crimes: Challenges and Solutions." Gerstenfeld describes some of the challenges she has faced in teaching about hate crimes, including deciding on the scope of the class, finding appropriate texts, and encouraging class discussion. She discusses approaches she has taken to meeting those challenges and outlines some of the benefits of offering such classes.

Harold Fishbein explains in "The Genetic/Evolutionary Basis of Prejudice and Hatred" how three sets of genetic and evolutionary processes that lead to prejudice and discrimination—inclusive fitness, authority bearing systems, and intergroup hostility—evolved in hunter-gatherer societies. After discussing several studies that address reducing hatred in various ways, he notes that "individuation of self and others is effective in reducing prejudice" and advocates for the inclusion in curricula of methods that promote self-acceptance and a valuing of diversity.

In "Our Ancestral Shadow: Hate and Human Nature in Evolutionary Psychology," James Waller discusses the discoveries of evolutionary psychology in its search to understand human nature. He notes that our history reveals and results in aspects of human nature that predispose us to being able to hate. Until our evolution catches up with our current social situations, he argues, we must be able to understand and acknowledge that a capacity to hate is part of the human condition if we are to begin to address the problem of hate realistically in our social structures.

In "The Last Uncomfortable 'Religious' Question? Monotheistic Exclusivism and Textual Superiority in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam as Sources of Hate and Genocide," Steven Leonard Jacobs examines selected texts of each of the three major religions to reveal their attitudes toward their God and toward each other. He suggests a new way of reading these texts for those who wish to both "remain within and reach beyond" their own faith tradition.

In "Hate, Oppression, Repression, and the Apocalyptic Style: Facing Complex Questions and Challenges," Chip Berlet argues that understanding the interrelated dynamics of hate, apocalyptic dualism, institutionalized oppression, and political repressions is crucial to increasing the accuracy and effectiveness of our research. He notes that organized hate groups are not an isolated phenomenon, but spring from larger systems of oppression. We must be scrupu-

2003/04]

PREFACE

5

lous, Berlet declares, in examining ourselves as we embark upon the field of hate studies, taking care not to demonize or treat unjustly those whom we see as demonizers.

“Finding Light in the Darkness? Modest Suggestions Toward the Study of Hatred Through History” by Raymond Sun asks why we are drawn to studies of hatred and reflects upon the role historians can play in furthering these studies. Sun asks questions about the best methods and ultimate goals of hate studies, intending to provide a starting point for discussion. He notes the importance of keeping a human face in hate studies and hopes that eventually we will understand the reasons for and consequences of hate from a variety of angles.

In addition to the paper presentations, which provided the substantial scaffolding for the conference, there were numerous breakout sessions, which provided rich supplement to this event.

One breakout session was presented by a Gonzaga student, Julian Arguon, who contributed a student’s perspective to our last journal. Julian’s voice represented a non-academic, yet powerfully emotional session. He spoke as a student who has participated wholeheartedly in addressing issues of discrimination and racism on our campus.

Julian’s presentation began with the showing of *And We Stayed*, a video produced by the Academic Vice President’s office two years ago. The video presents the testimony of several students who have felt marginalized by experiences of racism and discrimination at Gonzaga. The reason it is important to address student angst is that this was our impetus for starting the Institute. The courage of the students in the video is underscored. Julian and others chose to work with Gonzaga’s justice committee to address problems identified in the video. And he continued to experience discrimination . . . and he stayed.

Following the showing of the video, Julian most eloquently challenged academics to also address these issues in a heartfelt, non-academic manner, to attend to the emotional component of hate and develop effective strategies for dealing with hate. There was an overwhelming response to the honesty and vulnerability presented.

Conference participants contributed greatly to discussions. Clearly, the need for community voices was heard, and specifically those of women, people of color, gay and lesbian men and women, and students. Although an academic discipline presents an intellectual perspective, our work represents all people and our respect for them can best be shown by including all people in this process. As we continue our work to develop an academic discipline, we have the opportunity to practice inclusion on all levels and, in that way, to create and maintain community.

The need for an academic discipline on hate studies has been presented at the Annual National Conference on Race and Ethnicity in American Higher Education (NCORE) for two years in a row. In 2003, Raymond Reyes and

Jerri Shepard presented at the NCORE conference in San Francisco. In 2004, Bob Bartlett, Raymond Reyes, Jerri Shepard, and Sima Thorpe presented at the NCORE conference in Miami. Both presentations were well received and board members decided that the NCORE conference is an important avenue for addressing this issue. The Institute has been invited to present a three-hour major workshop at the NCORE conference in New York City in June of 2005. Our intent is to formally continue the dialogue on developing a hate studies curriculum at the conference, and plan another Institute for Action Against Hate International Conference to Establish the Field of Hate Studies in 2006, on the east coast. Information on our work can be obtained at our web site, www.gonzaga.edu.againsthate.

Moving toward a global community, full of diversity and difference, requires a universal effort. The *Journal of Hate Studies* and The Institute for Action Against Hate are venues for confronting hate, and ultimately, preventing it through education, research, and advocacy in collaboration with professionals of like mind. This is no small task in a world of competing cultures and ideologies, dwindling resources, and widespread poverty. It is the responsibility of educators, professionals, and people of goodwill everywhere to collaborate in the effort to combat hate with unyielding determination. We can never stop questioning acts of hatred, which are often initially expressed as bias, discrimination, and stigmatization of marginalized peoples. Our work offers a challenge to create community as we continue to establish a space in which obedience to the truth is practiced (Palmer, 1993) in our efforts to combat hate.

We are pleased to offer the third issue of the *Journal of Hate Studies*. We hope you will find it to be a relevant and meaningful addition to your personal and professional libraries.

Jerri Shepard
Director
Institute for Action Against Hate

Reyes, R., & G. Perrault. 1993. Wholeness and council: A Native American perspective on leadership. *Proteus: A Journal of Ideas*, (spring), 45.

Palmer, P. 1983. *To know as we are known: A spirituality of education*. New York: Harper & Row.