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Preface

“I love mankind; it’s people I can’t stand.” This quotation from Charles Schultz’s Linus is brought to mind by the current volume of the Journal of Hate Studies. This year’s theme, “The Science of Hate,” has brought forth notions about how, under the auspices of some ideal that is sure to benefit humankind, science is used as a bottom line or a justification for horrendous behavior directed toward individuals or groups of individuals.

Like many other things, science is a tool. We choose the purposes to which it is put. We decide when our intellectual curiosity can, and whether it should, outweigh our humanity. Intellectuals, from Mary Shelley in Frankenstein to Oppenheimer in describing his work on the atomic bomb, have often referred to the allure of working out a puzzle that has never before been solved. Often the original purpose for solving the puzzle gets lost in the sheer power and ecstasy of problem-solving, of feeling one’s mind moving quickly and accurately around obstacles in order to find “the answer”—the ethical focus of the question having been lost on the way. These situations result in, as Oppenheimer put it, “the question of whether science is good for man.”

This question is one that can well be asked after reading any of the articles in this year’s Journal. We start on a hopeful note, with Edmund Glaser’s “Is There a Neuroscience of Hate?” Glaser, a professor in the Department of Physiology in the University of Maryland School of Medicine, acknowledges that thus far very little research has been done in the neuroscientific world to localize the origin of hate in the brain or to dissect its nature. Nevertheless, he offers excellent questions about how such studies might be conducted and muses about their implications in a way that evokes similar curiosity in the reader.

Science’s ability to answer difficult questions, and people’s use of it to pursue their own agendas, is addressed by James Mohr in the next article, “Oppression by Scientific Method: The Use of Science to ‘Other’ Sexual Minorities.” Mohr, the Interim Director of the Institute for Action Against Hate and Student Achievement Director of the Institute for Extended Learning, argues that various groups and individuals have conducted pseudo-scientific studies, or have distorted data, to present homosexuals as being the “other” and of an entirely different, and lesser, nature than heterosexuals. Mohr argues that this misuse of “science” is a way for heterosexuals to shore up their own identities by defining themselves as different from “inferior” homosexuals. He adds that these studies are based on heterosexist assumptions. “The study of homosexuality,” Mohr concludes, “is used by
organizations and individuals to justify limiting the rights and societal involvement of LGB individuals.”

Homosexuals were also “Othered” by the Nazis, as were Roma, Sinti, criminals, those with developmental disabilities, and, most famously, Jews. Steven Leonard Jacobs, Aaron Aronov, Endowed Chair of Judaic Studies and Associate Professor of Religious Studies at the University of Alabama, contributes to this volume with “Revisiting Hateful Science: The Nazi ‘Contribution’ to the Journey of Antisemitism.” Jacobs presents the Nazis’ scientific rationale and processes for extracting information from helpless and unconsenting victims in the name of the greater good. He does so specifically through an examination of the work of Otmar Freiherr von Verschuer, a eugenicist and geneticist who described Jews as being very much a race apart from non-Jewish Germans. The article finishes with three graphic and disturbing photographs from Shamash, which are highly effective in reminding us that, as Jacobs puts it, “the sciences, too, can be perverted by its practitioners in the service of hate itself.”

Having examined the topic of hate, we turn to solutions in “Social Justice Leadership in Action: The Case of Tony Stewart.” Written by Kathy Canfield-Davis, Mary E. Gardiner, and Russell E. Joki, all of whom are professors in the Department of Counseling and School Psychology, Special Education and Educational Leadership at the University of Idaho, the study examines Stewart’s strategies and successes in fighting the impact of a white supremacist group in northern Idaho. The authors conducted interviews with Stewart and those who worked with him in his attempts to minimize the influence of the Aryan Nations. They learned that Stewart, who helped form the Kootenai County Task Force on Human Relations, achieved positive results through education and through drawing in those who were opposed to racism in theory, but had been reluctant to act upon their beliefs, believing that if they ignored racist behaviors they would go away. The elements Stewart brought to his leadership included a vision of equity within democracy, a willingness to take risks, tenacity, compassion, and inclusiveness—qualities which helped him to be instrumental in disabbling a racist group in his community. The article concludes with the finding that educational practices and ongoing work may be vital components in the fight against hate.

Some would argue that rather than fighting against hate, we need to transform it—through transforming ourselves. In our interview with Buddhist monk Thupten Phelgye, who is the representative of the Dalai Lama in the Tibetan parliament-in-exile, Journal editor Joanie Eppinga asks Phelgye how we can counteract hatred. Phelgye answers by offering his view of what goes on inside a person who is consumed by hatred and how we can
best respond to keep ourselves from succumbing to the same destructive state of mind.

Jan Polek, a member of the Institute for Action Against Hate, reviewed Steven Baum’s *The Psychology of Genocide: Perpetrators, Bystanders and Rescuers*. Baum is a lecturer in the Department of Psychology at the College of Santa Fe. In discussing each of the three reactions to genocide, Polek explains, Baum reflects the way in which their behaviors during a time of stress reflect their behavior in everyday life. Polek notes that Baum “attempts to identify the common mental and emotional traits of each group and to show how these traits flow out of social and personal identity.” She commends the book’s overview, concrete suggestions, and scholarly approach, concluding that the volume is a valuable addition to our attempts to reach higher ground in our communal life.

Baum takes a turn as reviewer with Israel Charny’s *Fighting Suicide Bombing: A Worldwide Campaign for Life*. Baum reports that Charny describes suicide bombing as pathological, and those who engage in it as mentally ill. According to Baum, Charny decodes the politically-correct stance of being unwilling to indict particular aspects of Islamic culture or teachings because of a well-intended but exaggerated respect for other cultures. All honor cultures, Charny notes, have their pockets of pathology, and it does us no good to ignore them. At the same time, Baum heavily disagrees with other reviewers who accuse Charny of being Islamophobic, noting that Charny “bends over backwards. . . to implicate politics rather than religion.” Charny simply believes that “normal people want to live,” and draws his conclusions from that premise. In summary, Baum thinks that Charny’s is both the best book available on the topic and worthy of note.

The question of normality is further addressed in Edmund Glaser’s review of two books by Ulf Schmidt, a professor of Modern History at the University of Kent and a Research Associate at the Wellcome Unit for the History of Medicine, Oxford. Schmidt has written *Justice at Nuremberg: Leo Alexander and the Nazi Doctors’ Trial*, and *Karl Brandt—The Nazi Doctor: Medicine and Power in the Third Reich*. Here we revisit the question asked so often: How could seemingly normal doctors commit such heinous acts against humans in the interests of science? Glaser expresses the wish that Schmidt would have gone deeper in his attempts to probe Brandt’s thoughts and behaviors, but notes that what Schmidt called Brandt’s “idealism” can be seen in the statement Brandt made at his trial: “The demands of society are put above every human being. . . The individual person had no meaning whatsoever.” Again, this is the kind of misguided thinking that led to heinous actions being committed against individuals in the name of helping humanity.

Glaser’s review of Schmidt’s book about Alexander explains that
Alexander was a German-born doctor who immigrated to America and ended up being an expert witness who helped secure guilty verdicts against the Nazi doctors in the Nuremberg Medical Trials. Again Glaser mentions his chagrin at not finding more in-depth information in the book. Glaser, who was a photographer at the Nuremberg Medical Trials, had hoped to find information that would be highly revelatory about those involved, but was disappointed. He does note that the main character in each book is fascinating, but finishes with the assessment that Schmidt does a good job of showing the way and the ease with which an “abominable medical culture” was formed; however, he doesn’t show why people accepted that culture. Yet, as Glaser also acknowledges, the commentary concerning these regular people who chose to behave reprehensibly “will never be complete.”

In a continued exploration of the science of hatred, this volume concludes with Jan Polek’s review of Steven Tosco’s film *The Face of Fear*, which addresses the idea that evil is accompanied by particular physiological components. Polek suggests that the film relies too heavily on one case study, which is not enough to offer significant evidence either to support or refute the hypothesis. She also found the film pedantic and suggests that it is perhaps better suited to graduate students than to a general audience. Ultimately, according to Polek, this film does little to further our understanding of hate.

At the Institute for Action Against Hate, furthering our understanding of hate is one of our primary goals, coupled with a desire to use that understanding to combat and, ideally and eventually, eliminate hate and its disastrous repercussions. Toward that goal, this year we launched our first interdisciplinary course on hate: Why People Hate: Interdisciplinary Perspectives. The course, which was team-taught by five professors, explored the construct of hate from historical, psychological, sociological, organizational, and criminal justice perspectives. The goal of this course was not just to examine how the phenomenon of hatred is approached differently by various academic disciplines, but also how to tie these disparate approaches together in order to better understand how hatred works, individually and collectively.

Along with offering this class on hate, the Institute is exploring ways of going one step further. We are seeking to establish the first Certificate of Hate Studies offered at any university. This study of hate will involve, as Ken Stern put it in the 2003/04 volume of this journal, “inquiries into the human capacity to define, and then dehumanize or demonize, an ‘other,’ and the processes which inform and give expression to, or can curtail, control or combat, that capacity.” Through the completion of such a certificate, students can bring a deep understanding of hate and how it manifests itself
to any career field they choose to enter, including psychology, sociology, criminal justice, education, communication, law, and many others.

We are pleased to introduce the seventh volume of the *Journal of Hate Studies*. It is our hope that you will find this issue a relevant addition to your library and an important resource for studying the topic of hate.

James Mohr, Interim Director
Joanie Eppinga, Editor
Gonzaga University Institute for Action Against Hate