

JOURNAL OF HATE STUDIES

GONZAGA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE FOR HATE STUDIES

Volume 8

2009-2010

Number 1

Director
John Shuford

Editor
Joanie Eppinga

Book Editor
Steven Baum

Copyright © 2010
by Gonzaga University Institute for Hate Studies

The *Journal of Hate Studies* is published annually by the Gonzaga University Institute for Hate Studies. The purpose of the Journal is to promote the sharing of interdisciplinary ideas and research relating to the study of what hate is, where it comes from, and how to combat it. The Gonzaga Institute for Hate Studies is operated under the auspices of Gonzaga University in Spokane, Washington. The views expressed in the Journal are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the Gonzaga Institute for Hate Studies, Gonzaga University, the institutions with which the authors are affiliated, or the editors.

The Journal welcomes unsolicited manuscripts (including essays and shorter pieces) and suggestions for improving the Journal. Manuscripts and other communications should be sent to: Director, Gonzaga Institute for Hate Studies, Gonzaga University, Spokane, WA 99258-0043.

The annual subscription rate is \$25. To order, please send name, mailing address, and check to: Gonzaga Institute for Hate Studies, Gonzaga University, AD Box 43, Spokane, WA 99258-0043.

For more information about Gonzaga Institute for Hate Studies, please visit our website: <http://www.gonzaga.edu/againsthate>

GONZAGA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE FOR HATE STUDIES
Board of Advisors

James Beebe
Professor, Doctoral Program,
Leadership Studies
Gonzaga University

Deborah Booth
Professor,
School of Education,
Gonzaga University

Kathryn Canfield-Davis
Assistant Professor,
University of Idaho, Coeur d'Alene

Dennis Connors
Associate Professor,
Organizational Leadership
Gonzaga University

George Critchlow
Associate Professor,
Gonzaga University School of Law

Joanie Eppinga
Editor, *Journal of Hate Studies*

Ron Hammer
Graduate Assistant

Eva Lassman
Community Representative

Bobbie League, *Chair, Board of
Advisors, Institute for
Hate Studies*
Spokane Guild School

Loreen McFaul
McFaul Consulting

James Mohr
*Interim Director,
Institute for Hate Studies*

Molly Pepper
Assistant Professor
Management
Gonzaga University

Jan Polek
Community Representative

Mary Lou Reed
Human Rights Education Institute

Raymond Reyes, Board Advisor
Associate Academic Vice-President
for Diversity,
Gonzaga University

Jerri Shepard
Associate Professor, Education
Gonzaga University

John Shuford
Director, Institute for Hate Studies

Hayley Sterling
Graduate Assistant

Kenneth Stern, Director on
Anti-Semitism and Extremism,
American Jewish Committee

Sima Thorpe, Director,
Community Action &
Service Learning,
Gonzaga University

Bradley Veile
Social Studies Chair,
Lakeside High School
Plummer, ID

James Waller
Professor, Psychology
Whitworth College

INSTITUTE FOR HATE STUDIES
JOURNAL OF HATE STUDIES
Volume 8, Number 1

EDITORIAL BOARD

Steven K. Baum
Book Review Editor,
Journal of Hate Studies

Carole Baumgartner
Gonzaga University

James Beebe, Ph.D.
Gonzaga University

Michael Collender, Ph.D.
Gonzaga University

George Critchlow, Ph.D.
Gonzaga University School of Law

Joanie Eppinga
Editor, Journal of Hate Studies

Evan Harrington, Ph.D.
Chicago School of Professional
Psychology

James Mohr
Interim Director,
Institute for Hate Studies

Jan Polek
Community Member

Michael Poutiatine, Ph.D.
Gonzaga University

Raymond Reyes, Ph.D.
Gonzaga University

Jerri Shepard, Ph.D.
Gonzaga University

Kenneth Stern, J.D.
American Jewish Committee

Sima Thorpe, Ph.D.
Gonzaga University

James Waller, Ph.D.
Whitworth College

PEER REVIEW BOARD

Brean Beggs, J.D.
Paukert & Troppmann, PLLC

Daniel J. Distelhorst, Ph.D.
OD Consultant and Interculturalist

Vernon D. Johnson, Ph.D.
Western Washington University

Yitzchak Kerem, Ph.D.
American Jewish University

JOURNAL OF HATE STUDIES

Volume 8

2010

Number 1

CONTENTS

Preface	<i>John Shuford</i>	1
<i>Articles</i>		
Crimes Against the “Other”: Conceptual, Operational, and Empirical Challenges for Hate Studies	<i>Neil Chakrabarti</i>	9
Places for Races: The White Supremacist Movement Imagines U.S. Geography	<i>Barbara Perry & Randy Blazak</i>	29
My Homeland, My Diaspora: Iranian Jewish Identity in Modern Times	<i>Orly R. Rahimiyan</i>	53
The Internet’s Promise to Improve Bias-Crime Reporting: The Case for Including Bias Crimes on Official Crime-Reporting Websites	<i>Jordan Blair Woods</i>	87
<i>Bibliography</i>		
Holocaust-Denial Literature: A Sixth Bibliography	<i>John A. Drobnicki</i>	103
<i>Interviews</i>		
Forgiveness: The Key to Self-Healing— An Interview with Eva Mozes-Kor	<i>Joanie Eppinga</i>	131
Last Man Standing: The American Who Stayed During the Rwandan Genocide— An Interview with Carl Wilkens	<i>Jerri Shepard</i>	143
<i>Film Review</i>		
The Changing Face of England: Marc Isaacs’ <i>All White in Barking</i>	<i>Jan Polek</i>	153

Call for Papers and Submission Guidelines

The 2011 Journal of Hate Studies will be publishing papers from the 2011 International Conference on Hate Studies, to be held April 6-9, 2011. Please consider submitting a paper to present to the conference. We hope to see you there.

The second International Conference on Hate Studies builds upon the successful 2004 initial conference. This conference will convene leading academics from multiple disciplines from around the world, law enforcement personnel, journalists, educators, representatives from governmental and non-governmental organizations, human rights experts, community organizers, activists, and others to discuss hatred from multiple perspectives. The lessons learned and plans which emerge will help educators, researchers, law enforcement, advocates, and others better analyze and combat hatred in its various manifestations.

Our theme this year is *Interdisciplinary Approaches to Understanding the Nature of Hate, Crafting Models for Combating Hatred, and Implications for Practice*. We are looking to explore this theme through the four main areas of education, research, practice, and advocacy. Papers from different theoretical or disciplinary lenses are invited such as those from history, communications, psychology, social psychology, evolutionary psychology, anthropology, sociology, criminal justice, law, biology, business, economics, theology, religious studies, political science, literature, philosophy, education, and more.

Submissions are typically expected to be between 5000-10,000 words. Submissions should include one hard copy and an electronic copy in MS Word format. Please do not submit PDF files. Submissions should be presented in APA format and contain endnotes rather than footnotes.

Address submissions and questions to the Gonzaga University Institute for Hate Studies, AD Box 43, 502 E. Boone Avenue, Spokane WA 99258-0043; email address: againsthate@gonzaga.edu; phone: (509) 313-3665

Preface

INTRODUCTION

The Institute for Hate Studies at Gonzaga University is pleased to offer Volume 8 of the *Journal of Hate Studies*, the theme of which is “The Other Among Us.” It is a timely topic, no doubt, as nativism, racism, and extremism boil over in America’s immigration debate. This volume considers those issues as well as a wider range of perspectives on engagement and disengagement with “the other” in our society, culture, and lives.

Imbedded in this volume’s theme are myriad questions. Who is the “other” among us, and what does it mean to be an “other” or to be “othered”? Why does the “other” become so, and how exactly does “othering” unfold and play out? What is the distance between what we owe and how we treat the “other” among us? What, if we can receive the message, does the “other” have to say—or offer—to us?

One of the most powerful explorations of these and other questions in recent popular culture comes from Alfonso Cuarón’s *Children of Men* (2006). That film, based on P.D. James’ 1992 novel, portrays a world in which humanity has resigned its highest ideals, lost its sense of meaning, and all but given up hope. The film is set in the United Kingdom circa 2027 amidst economic collapse, environmental devastation, and global conflict. Our homeostasis (if humanity is thought of as a single living entity) has been so corrupted that civilization and the human race are slowly but surely dying. People have become infertile, and with the last human offspring born nearly two decades earlier, our species is unlikely to survive the century’s end. With our biological nadir comes the existential question—*for what do we live, and why do we go on at all, if there is no future, no apparent hope, no posterity?*

If ever the answer were “to live peaceably, with compassion and love for others, in whatever time we are given,” one might hope that humanity would realize that the time had come when faced with its own extinction. Yet in the world of *Children of Men*, humanity has either failed to answer the existential question or, worse yet, failed to try. Quotidian life in Western society of the 21st century is alienated and dystopian. Cities are hectic, crowded, polluted, repressive police states. All around, warfare motivated by habit, grudge, and desire (for control, or liberation, or mere survival) rages on. Rather than wait for the squalid last days, some simply take *Quietus*, a suicide tablet (“You Decide When”).

From the island nation in which *Children of Men* is set, isolationist hatred radiates out to whatever remains of the world beyond. Millions of

global migrants (or “Fugees”) who seek refuge, asylum, or respite from suffering in the remaining civil societies are the targets of persecution. Fugees are routinely rounded up and sent off to detention camps, even executed. Anti-Fugee paranoia, stoked by advertisement and propaganda, is omnipresent so that anyone even suspected of being a Fugee faces blame, hostility, and hatred. Yet, as the story unfolds, a Fugee who is “othered” in multiple dimensions bears, literally, the hope of humanity and the promise of posterity: a newborn child. Might history be reversed and humanity be restored?

One need not look far into the world of *Children of Men* to see reflections in the mainstreaming of nativist anxiety over race, immigration, and social change in our times. In mid-July 2010, two female employees of the Utah Department of Workforce Services distributed an anonymous “illegal immigrant” list to state officials and media outlets. The list included the names (most of which are of Hispanic origin), addresses, social security numbers, phone numbers, dates of birth, workplaces, and other personal information for some 1,300 Utah residents whom state employees suspected of being undocumented immigrants. The names of the residents’ children were also included, as were the due dates for those pregnant women whose names appeared on the list. Accompanying the list was a letter that demanded immediate deportation of those named persons.

Around the same time, a group identifying itself as the “North Iowa Tea Party” paid for a local billboard that visually and rhetorically situated Barack Obama (“Democratic Socialism”) between Adolf Hitler (“National Socialism”) and Vladimir Lenin (“Marxist Socialism”). Meanwhile, “Birther” allegations against President Obama arose once again, now as backed by Louisiana Senator David Vitter. The NAACP passed a resolution that condemns the “racist, extremist” elements of the Tea Party, and suspicions of a strategic alignment between “Birthers,” the Tea Party, and the GOP have grown in public opinion and political commentary circles. Also stirring from the political right are calls to end “birthright citizenship” for the U.S.-born children of undocumented and unauthorized immigrants. Such change that would require overturning established constitutional law and narrowing the “territorial personhood” protections found in the 14th Amendment.

Most prominently, as this volume goes to print, Federal Judge Susan Bolton issued a preliminary injunction against several provisions found in S.B. 1070, the popular name for Arizona’s effort to implement a state-level immigration regulatory scheme. S.B. 1070 amends existing laws and includes a large number of new laws (such as the creation of a state-level trespassing violation for unlawful presence) which are widely regarded as the toughest set of immigration reforms and legislation in decades. The

U.S. Department of Justice argued that several aspects of S.B. 1070 violate the Commerce Clause and the Supremacy Clause, conflict with foreign policy, and are preempted by federal law (because, in relevant part, the preemption doctrine holds that federal law impliedly preempts state law when the latter conflicts with a federal regulatory scheme). Opponents also point out that some aspects of S.B. 1070 might be unconstitutional as applied if their enforcement leads to or relies upon racial profiling.

S.B. 1070 is premised on theories of states' rights, concurrent jurisdiction, and concurrent enforcement; Arizona contends that states have authority to enforce immigration law and make laws (consistent with federal law) to punish and prevent "illegal immigration." Arizona alleges that S.B. 1070 is necessary because inadequate border security and enforcement have left the state vulnerable to human trafficking, drug trafficking, and other gang activity, as well as less-specific problems. Nine other states (Alabama, Florida, Michigan, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, and Virginia) and the Northern Mariana Islands filed an *amicus* brief in support of Arizona's law. Opinion polls show that about 60% of Americans surveyed nationwide, and over 70% of Arizonans, support it as well.

Still, for those who wish for peace, the recovery of our highest ideals, and the re-humanization of ideological and political opposites, there is reason for hope. Evangelical Christian leaders are increasingly joining Roman Catholic, mainline Protestant, Muslim, Jewish, and other religious group leaders who oppose S.B. 1070 and support comprehensive immigration reform on grounds of scriptural authority, ethical principle, and basic compassion. As we look to the future, we see that the United States in 2050 will be a nation without a racial majority population. Roughly 80% of America's population growth over the next four decades will come from foreign-born persons and their U.S.-born children and grandchildren.

Might we yet reverse our recent history and restore our humanity? Might we yet reclaim or perhaps discover anew our higher selves in relation to each other?

ABOUT THIS VOLUME

We hope you will find this volume to be a relevant and meaningful addition to your personal and professional libraries. Featured are several academic articles, two interviews, a film review, and an annotated bibliography that deal with historic contexts and contemporary concerns, ranging from Holocaust survival and denial, to genocide and post-genocide responses, hate and bias-crime, white supremacy and nativism, and the influence and experience of "othering" and "otherness" in identify forma-

tion. Brief summaries of each contribution and their respective contributors follow.

Neil Chakraborti is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Criminology at the University of Leicester. He has published numerous books and articles on hate crime. His article for this issue of the *Journal of Hate Studies*, "Crimes Against the Other: Conceptual, Operational, and Empirical Challenges for Hate Studies," was written after he attended a meeting of the American Society of Criminology, where he was struck by how widely accepted the notion of hate crimes has become. Chakraborti notes that "hate crime cuts through numerous themes central to social scientific enquiry," and that this article draws from the emerging data and knowledge to outline some of the main conceptual, operational, and empirical difficulties being addressed by researchers and policy-makers. Chakraborti is British, but the issues he confronts are international in scope, and he suggests that they must be addressed from international and interdisciplinary perspectives that will increase our understanding. In this article, Chakraborti explores the nature of the problems and questions within the field, as well as how we can use them to guide dialogue about hate crime. He assesses the progress made within the field of hate crimes and suggests that criminologists must "scrutinize its practical application to ensure that the core values at the heart of the hate crime movement are not diluted or subverted."

Those values, which largely are focused on helping and finding justice for real victims as well as eliminating hate crime, are also embraced by Drs. Barbara Perry and Randy Blazak, professors at the University of Ontario Institute of Technology and Portland State University, respectively. Their article, "Places for Races: The White Supremacist Movement Imagines U.S. Geography," warns that we must be aware that white supremacists have chosen particular geographical areas to claim and defend, and that hate crimes often are perpetrated out of a desire to defend the borders. The authors explain, "What we offer here is an exploration of the spatial imagination among the white supremacist movement, an analysis that sees racially motivated violence and other related activities as, in part, contestations over space and the interpretation of those spaces." They outline the history and the thinking behind the desire of many supremacists to orchestrate separate geographical spaces for different races, and various plans that have been proposed to make that desire a reality. Finally, they note that "the fear of losing America to immigrants and others encourages a defensive posturing and a need to erect walls, symbolic and otherwise. To understand hate crimes, an understanding of how people define their space as 'theirs' is key." The perception of people of different races as "other" is behind the desire of Supremacists to be separate.

The notion of relegating some people to a particular and inferior status

is also addressed by Orly Rahimiyan, a Ph.D. scholar at Ben Gurion University of the Negev. Rahimiyan posits that too often one group defines the identity of another group living among them. In her paper, “My Homeland, My Diaspora: Iranian Jewish Identity in Modern Times,” Rahimiyan asks who decides whether a particular group belongs in or has a claim to a particular area. She focuses specifically on the self-identity perceptions of Iranian Jews under the Iranian Islamic Republic. She asks whether Iranian Jews are first Iranians and incidentally Jewish, or whether it is the other way around. Further, she refutes common misperceptions about the relationships between Iranian Jews and their government and culture. Finally, she attempts to assess the “otherness” of Iranian Jews, asking, “Are they the ‘other’ upon which Muslim Iranians construct their Iranian identity?” Rahimiyan concludes that, despite the internal and external tensions that are present in being an Iranian Jew, people who classify themselves as such are able to combine the concepts and embrace both identities; though they have an attachment to Israel, they consider themselves true Iranians rather than something “other.”

Jordan Blair Woods, a graduate of Harvard and UCLA who is pursuing his doctorate at Cambridge, England, also addresses the notion of the “other” in his article, “The Internet’s Promise to Improve Bias-Crime Reporting: The Case for Including Bias Crimes on Official Crime-Reporting Websites.” Woods suggests that some victims of hate crime may be reluctant to report those crimes due to various facets of being “othered,” including cultural and language barriers, a fear of further victimization at the hands of law enforcement, and fear of deportation. Woods makes a compelling argument that people should be able to report bias crimes via the internet rather than only in person, as is currently the case. Such a development would allow those who feel separated from the mainstream culture an equal forum to voice their experiences.

A particularly egregious form of “othering” is demonstrated by those who claim that the Holocaust never took place, those who allege that the Holocaust “story” was dreamed up by Zionists in an attempt to win influence, sympathy, and money from those who are “taken in” by their tale of woe. In alignment with a desire to set the record straight, John Drobnicki, a librarian at The Queens Borough Public Library, in Jamaica, New York, has compiled a sixth bibliography of works about and by Holocaust deniers. The bibliography, which supplements five previous such bibliographies compiled by Drobnicki, covers books, articles, DVDs, videos, and websites. It is broken down by geographical area, by medium, and by intent. The bibliography is a welcome tool in the struggle to refute those who repudiate the historical horror that was the Holocaust.

Another tool in repudiating Holocaust denial is the interview with a

survivor. The *Journal's* editor, Joanie Eppinga, traveled to Terre Haute, Indiana to interview Eva Mozes-Kor, who was, along with her sister Miriam, one of the "Mengele twins" at Auschwitz. Despite being treated as something entirely alien and subhuman in the camp, Mozes-Kor has emerged with a spiritual message of grace: Forgive your worst enemy, and it will set you free.

Similar sentiments are expressed by Carl Wilkens, witness to the Rwanda genocide, in his interview with Jerri Shepard, Associate Professor in the School of Education at Gonzaga University and former director of the Institute for Action Against Hate. Though the things he witnessed were abhorrent, Wilkens argues that witnesses and perpetrators alike must be rehumanized, and that we must learn to emphasize our common humanity rather than our differences. He suggests that service is an excellent tool for making a person a colleague rather than something "other."

According to "The Changing Face of England," a review by Jan Polek, solutions for the tensions raised by changing demographics are lacking in *All White in Barking*, a film by Marc Isaacs about the effects of immigration on a small English town. Polek notes that the documentary has a fascinating premise, and that Barking may well serve as a microcosm of what is happening in many places. However, she objects to certain technical elements and thinks that at 113 minutes the movie may lose viewers' attention. Though "it has its hopeful moments," Polek writes, she suggests that the film leaves the viewer with the sense that acceptance of the "other" is not going to happen anytime soon in Barking—or perhaps anywhere.

ABOUT THE INSTITUTE

The Institute for Hate Studies advances the interdisciplinary field of Hate Studies and disseminates new theories, models, and discoveries about hate—including how to understand, prevent and combat it in its various locations and manifestations. The Institute provides a cross-disciplinary framework for theory, research, education, leadership, policy, and practice, which it seeks to advance throughout North America and worldwide. In addition to the *Journal of Hate Studies*, the Institute organizes cross-disciplinary academic courses, provides student research awards, hosts public events, and offers other scholarly resources.

In April 2011, the Institute will host the second International Conference on Hate Studies. Our theme is "Interdisciplinary Approaches to Understanding the Nature of Hate, Crafting Models for Combating Hatred, and Implications for Practice." We will explore this theme through four main areas: education, research, practice, and advocacy. The conference, which builds upon the successful initial conference of 2004, will convene

2010]

PREFACE

7

leading academics in multiple disciplines from around the world, as well as educators, human rights and civil rights experts, journalists, law enforcement personnel, representatives from governmental and non-governmental organizations, conflict resolvers, community organizers, and activists. We look forward to seeing you in Spokane!

Finally, this is the first volume of the *Journal* with which I am involved. As such, I want to acknowledge the many contributions and tireless leadership of James Mohr, the Institute's immediate previous director. As Jim moves to chair the Institute's board of directors, he joins other previous directors, including James Beebe, George Critchlow, and Jerri Shepard, who sit on our board. The ongoing involvement of our founders and prior directors strengthens both the Institute and the field of Hate Studies. For this, I am most grateful.

John Shuford
Director
Institute for Hate Studies

