

along with some Muslim countries, also vehemently opposed Outcome Document language calling on states to end capital punishment for children. The EU made this issue a top priority, sacrificing its position on reproductive health to win a weak paragraph calling on governments that have not abolished the death penalty to comply with relevant provisions of international human rights instruments, including the Children's Convention, which the United States has not ratified anyway.

So after all the blood, sweat, and tears, what did the United States under the Christian Right's leadership accomplish? The Christian Right has been celebrating the elimination of the word "services" from the text as their major victory. While the Right can accurately claim that it blocked progress on reproductive rights, in reality, it was not able to erode past gains because of the document's reference to Cairo and Beijing. In retrospect, the debate over "services" appears to be a straw man—a fabricated issue that drew all the attention and energy, but was not an issue for which the United States was willing to "fall on the sword." "Profamily" groups also failed to introduce through the U.S. delegates a family values agenda into the family paragraph. Given the fact that the Christian Right had the world's superpower in its pocket, and opponents of U.S. policy were seriously weakened, it is actually surprising that the Right secured so few victories. In fact, while it is of course important for progressives to assess gains made by the Right, perhaps the key question now is: why wasn't the Christian Right more victorious? If it is true that the United States could get almost anything it wanted and most likely did, its primary concerns would be those issues that it won clear victories on: undermining the rights-based

approach to children's issues, and blocking the abolishment of capital punishment for minors. Why then did the United States expend so much energy on the word "services?"

Clearly the removal of "services" helped the United States score points with the Christian Right, but both the delegation and Christian Right leaders must be well aware that reference to the Cairo and Bei-

It is possible that the United States finds the Christian Right a convenient smoke screen to hide policy stances it can less easily defend, especially to moderates and conservatives. For instance, it is easier for the United States to defend its stance on more controversial issues such as abortion and LGBT rights than to defend its opposition to economic rights such as universal healthcare for children and reducing childhood poverty, or continuing to allow capital punishment for offenses committed before the age of eighteen.

jing conferences negates that victory. While the U.S. Administration may be under strong pressure from the Christian Right, it may also have something to gain from collaborating with the Right. It is possible that the United States finds the Christian Right a convenient smoke screen to hide policy stances it can less easily defend, especially to moderates and mainstream conservatives. For instance, it is easier for the United States to defend its stance on more controversial issues such as abortion and LGBT rights than to defend its opposition to economic

rights such as universal healthcare for children and reducing childhood poverty, or continuing to allow capital punishment for offenses committed before the age of eighteen. Again, although U.S. opposition to child rights was controversial internationally, the U.S. public debate focused more on arguments based on sovereignty and parental authority rather than U.S. resistance to addressing child poverty, a theme more Americans might resonate with.

If true, the smoke screen theory could hold important implications for progressive organizing. For decades the Christian Right has galvanized lower-middle and working class conservative evangelicals to support political candidates that appeal to their social and religious concerns, but promote an economic agenda that benefits the wealthy and the upper-middle class at the expense of others. For this reason, the Christian Right has had less success in drawing Catholics and people of color to its agenda, although it is trying and has made some progress. Catholics are more supportive of antipoverty initiatives and the Catholic Church opposes the death penalty. For the sake of political expediency, the Right has to downplay its economic agenda so that it does not alienate its supporters and so that it can appeal to a wider base of support. Conversely, progressives could create a broad power base on economic justice issues that might split the Christian Right, drawing conservative Catholics and White evangelicals, especially the women in their ranks. More research is needed to evaluate the ways in which the Christian Right might be a smoke screen for the more basic economic agenda of the Right.²⁷

Proposing a Progressive Response

The working together of a global Religious Right presents new challenges for national and international progressive activists. Several areas of progressive organizing should be strengthened. First, progressives need to understand religious diversity and be willing to partner with religious organizations in reaching out to faith-based constituencies. In most societies, culture and values are largely shaped by religious views. Most sociologists now reject the theory of secularization that posited that societies would become less religious because of modernization. Robert Wuthnow, a scholar of American religion, speculates that evangelicals could very easily have become a liberal political force rather than a conservative one had progressives chosen to mobilize them.²⁸ Progressive organizing will remain weak unless it finds better ways of reaching out to religious groups and communicating through religious values while maintaining their firm stance on separating Church and State.

Progressive religious organizations will need to take leadership in helping other NGOs understand how religion can be both a positive and negative influence on society. The UN is just learning how to have conversations about the impact of religion on international issues.²⁹ September 11th, the AIDS pandemic, and debates over reproductive rights are examples of issues that require cooperation with religious communities to be resolved. Ecumenical Women 2000+, Catholics for Free Choice, and Religion Counts are groups that are leading the way on such debates. Religious organizations, in particular coalitions of liberal, moderate, and mainstream conservative religious groups, are well situated to hold Christian Right NGOs accountable for the misinformation they are spreading.

Progressives often fail to recognize that religious organizations, even conservative ones, hold diverse political perspectives. They either lump religious organizations together as being humane as symbolized by the Dalai Lama, or they see all of them as

oppressive and intolerant as epitomized by Jerry Falwell. All evangelicals, for instance, do not subscribe to the views of the Christian Right, as many mistakenly believe. Many support the UN's work and much of its social agenda. There are progressive groups such as Jim Wallis' Sojourners and moderate ones such as the National Association of Evangelicals. World Vision is an example of an NGO with a large conservative evangelical constituency that supports the work of the UN and that does excellent work on human rights. Such groups can bridge the gap between conservatives and progressives and can be strategic partners in advocacy work, especially when there is a conservative U.S. Administration.

The Republican Party is not monolithic either. Party moderates would probably be outraged to discover that UN conferences were being placed in the hands of hardliners. During his election campaign, Bush had to satisfy the Christian Right without losing moderates. Bush could only afford to turn the Special Session over to hardliners when these actions were done in the dark. Exposing them to the media might result in a political cost to Bush, undermining his self-portrayal as a "compassionate conservative" that fosters bipartisan efforts.

The fact that the Christian Right feels a need to be present at an institution it does not like reveals just how successful international progressive organizing has been. Those progressive organizations that have not yet considered the value of global involvement might reconsider. In the 1970s the Women's Movement recognized the power of organizing through the United Nations and building global women's networks. By organizing globally, they have put gender analysis and feminist issues on the agenda of international organizations, governments, multilateral organizations, and foundations. Other movements are also capitalizing on this, from the LGBT Movement to antiracist organizations.³⁰ The presence of large numbers of progressive organizations will be needed even more so now that the Christian Right presence is

growing. Progressive organizations, especially those in the United States where the UN is little understood, can also help by educating their constituencies about the importance of international cooperation and the UN's impact on issues such as women's rights, racism, development, economic justice, and the environment.

Just as the Christian Right learned its organizing strategies from the Left, progressives now need to learn from some of the successes of the Right. The Right has capitalized on technology from radio to the web and uses it to reach a broad grassroots constituency. They can mobilize their networks for a call in or letter writing campaign to Congress far better than groups on the Left. The Right has also cultivated a new generation of leaders for its movement. They invest heavily in college and youth organizing. Right-wing groups at the UN have trained young adults to do advocacy and involved them in their efforts in a way that few, if any, other NGOs have done.

Progressive NGOs, ever wary of attempts to regulate NGO participation at the UN, will need to find ways to ensure that U.S. political agendas do not dominate UN meetings and work against democratic participation and fair play in the process.³¹ NGOs will need to take the lead in designing guidelines for NGO participation that guarantee fair, balanced participation and access. At UN meetings, many NGOs have often focused on networking and educational exchanges and less on lobbying governments. Progressive NGOs now will need to spend more time on lobbying and on training one another in influencing UN meetings. Obtaining consultative status at the UN is one vitally important way to further a progressive agenda internationally.

If the United States continues to provide a platform for the Christian Right at international meetings, then in the next three to eight years we may see the advances made by human rights activists over the past two decades undermined or at least stalled. As it gains strength, the Christian Right coalition at the UN is influencing other UN meetings as well. Individuals associated

with the Heritage Foundation and the Independent Women's Forum were placed on this year's U.S. delegation to the UN Commission on the Status of Women, which meets every March.³² Conservative groups influenced the Special Session on AIDS held during the summer of 2001.³³ A strong "profamily" lobby has been present at the preparatory meetings for the UN's review of the Sustainable Development Conference, to culminate this summer.³⁴ As the world's lone superpower, with both financial and veto power, in a still evolving institution such as the UN, the United States carries significant weight in UN negotiations. When it becomes the voice of Christian Right groups at the UN, it further enables the Christian Right to export its brand of Christianity to the world.

Jennifer Butler is Associate for Global Issues with the Presbyterian Church (USA) UN Office, in New York City.

End Notes

¹ Concerned Women for America, "A New Sheriff in Town: U.S. Delegation delivers a definitive speech to U.N. General Assembly," *Highlights*, February 1, 2001. See <http://www.cwfa.org/library/nation/children/2001-02-01.shtml>

² Jennifer Butler, "For Faith and Family: Christian Right Advocacy at the United Nations," *The Public Eye*, vol. 14, nos. 2-3 (Summer/Fall 2000), pp. 1-17.

³ The World Family Policy Center (WFPC) has sponsored two international World Congress of Families (WCF) meetings, one in 1997, the second in 1999 just before Beijing +5. In 2003 they will have a third. The planning team boasts a wide range of leaders, including Munawar Saeed Bhatti who serves in the Permanent Mission of Pakistan to the UN, Archbishop Nikolay Balashof, representative of the Russian Orthodox Church's Department of External Affairs, Rabbi David Lapin of Toward Tradition, and Alan Osmond, eldest performer of the original Osmond Brothers. The Vice President of FRC, William Mattox and Austin Ruse of C-Fam, both of who were on the planning team of the second WCF remain on the team. Between 1999 and 2003 they will have hosted regional conferences in Washington, D.C., Arizona, California, and Alberta, Canada. "Profamily" leaders claim the Arizona meeting drew 1,000 participants.

⁴ Richard L. Berke, "Political Memo: Bush Shapes His Presidency with Sharp Eye on Father's," *New York Times* (online version), March 28, 2001.

⁵ See the Press Release #82, U.S. Mission to the United Nations, June 12, 2001, Statement by Ambassador E. Michael Southwick, deputy assistant secretary of state for international organization affairs, Preparatory Committee for the General Assembly Special Session on Children, June 12, 2001. The release states, "Concrete targets... should form the basis for our future actions for chil-

dren. We respect that for many countries; the CROC [sic. CRC] serves as this basis. However, we have chosen a different approach... this body should go forward and acknowledge that there is more than one way to frame our future actions for children. And action is needed here, not 'words, words, words' [to quote Hamlet]."

⁶ See Family Research Council, "UN Committee Takes Aim at Family Structure and Morality," *Culture Facts*, February 21, 2001. <http://www.frc.org/get/cu01b4.cfm#title7> See also the National Center for Home Education, "UN News Update," *HSLDA News*, June 14, 2001. <http://nche.hsllda.org/docs/news/hsllda/200106140.asp> The update states, "Among the United Nations international treaties and activities monitored by Home School Legal Defense Association is one of the most dangerous attacks on parental rights ever—the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC). Because the UN is holding a Child Summit this September, the CRC is taking center stage worldwide this year."

⁷ Sarah Stewart Taylor, "Fatherhood Movement Has Range of Ideology, Agenda," *Women's Enews*, May 23, 2002. See <http://www.womensnews.org/article.cfm/dyn/aid/584>

⁸ Timothy LaHaye, *Left Behind: A Novel of the Earth's Last Days* (Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, March 1996). LaHaye's book was on the *New York Times* bestseller list. LaHaye is the husband of Beverly LaHaye, the founder of Concerned Women for America, now seeking consultative status at the UN.

⁹ Major conferences include the status of children (1990), environment and development (1992), human rights (1993), population (1994), social development (1995) the status of women (1995), and racism (2001).

¹⁰ Cynthia Price Cohen, "The Drafting and Implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child," *ICCB News* (Winter 1996-1997), pp. 10-11. *ICCB News* is the newsletter of the International Catholic Child Bureau's North American Regional Office.

¹¹ See Cynthia Price Cohen, "Role of the United States in Drafting the Convention on the Rights of the Child: Creating a New World for Children," *Loyola Poverty Law Journal*, vol. 4 (Spring 1998), pp. 26-38.

¹² For more on "profamily" myths about the Children's and Women's Conventions, see http://www.ew2000plus.org/news_myths.htm

¹³ Cynthia Rothschild, *Written Out: How Sexuality is Used to Attack Women's Organizing* (New York: International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission and Center for Global Women's Leadership, 2000), pp. 34-35.

¹⁴ Susan Kilbourne, "Political Opposition to the Convention on the Rights of the Child," *ICCB News* (Winter 1996-1997), pp. 12-13.

¹⁵ Catholics for a Free Choice, *Bad Faith at the UN: Drawing Back the Curtain on the Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute* (Washington, D.C.: Catholics for a Free Choice, 2001), p. 18.

¹⁶ There is a rule-one of the few-that above all, NGOs requesting consultative status must be in support of the UN's mission and vision. See from ECOSOC Resolution 1996/31-49th plenary meeting-25 July 1996, Part 1), Arrangements for Consultation with Non-governmental Organizations, <http://www.un.org/esa/coordination/ngo/>

¹⁷ To obtain an application to become an NGO with consultative status at the UN go to <http://www.un.org/esa/coordination/ngo/Documents/application.htm>

¹⁸ For more information on the numerous successes of NGOs, read William Korey, *NGOs and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2001).

¹⁹ The following reflect "profamily" efforts to put the U.S. contribution to UNICEF's funding in jeopardy: C-Fam, "UNICEF 'Major Funder' of Group Promoting Abortion/Pornography for Children," *Friday Fax*, vol. 5, no. 3 (January 11, 2002). Also C-Fam, "UNICEF Work Imperiled by Associations with Pro-Abortion Groups," *Friday Fax*, vol. 4, no. 9 (February 16, 2001). Articles also appeared in the *Washington Times*

²⁰ The Child Rights Caucus, "Open Letter from the Child Rights Caucus to the Honorable Tommy Thompson, US Secretary of Health and Human Services and the US Delegation to the Special Session on Children." The Child Rights Caucus includes hundreds of national and international NGOs from around the world.

²¹ Interviews with UN delegates, and "Excusive Analysis of the Final Hours of the Outcome Negotiations," *On the Record*, vol. 3, issue 15 (May 20, 2002).

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ U.S. positions were made clear in NGO briefings and numerous news accounts of the proceedings. See also, The Child Rights Caucus, "Open Letter," op. cit.

²⁵ See William F. Felice, "Conceptualizing Collective Human Rights," in William F. Felice and Richard Falk, *Taking Suffering Seriously: The Importance of Collective Human Rights* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1995), pp. 21-34. A similar discussion in the context of implementing the Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination can be found in William F. Felice, "The UN Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination: Race, and Economic and Social Human Rights," *Human Rights Quarterly*, vol. 24, no. 1 (2002), pp. 205-236, 216. In 1993, the Clinton Administration accepted in principle the indivisibility of human rights at the UN World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna. However, that still has not led to ratification by the United States of the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights that was signed by the Carter Administration in 1977.

²⁶ The Bush Administration at other international meetings has supported reproductive services, most likely because they were not under pressure from the Right. See Gabrielle Engh, "US Charged with Hypocrisy at Prep-Com After Bush's endorsement of Reproductive Health Services in Quebec," *On the Record for Children*, vol. 3, issue 1 (September 10, 2001). www.ngosatunicef.org/OTR/v3/01a2.html.

²⁷ I am indebted to Glenn Zuber, an expert on the evangelicals and Christian Fundamentalism for our conversations that have helped me to flesh out this theory.

²⁸ Robert Wuthnow, *The Restructuring of American Religion* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), p. 185.

²⁹ See Geoffrey Knox, ed., *Religion and Public Policy at the UN* (Washington, D.C.: Religion Counts, 2002). The report can be ordered by calling 202-332-7820 or emailing religioncounts@earthlink.net.

³⁰ Rothschild, *Written Out*, op. cit.

³¹ Some of the progressive groups working at the UN include Ecumenical Women 2000+ <http://www.ew2000plus.org>; Catholics For Free Choice (<http://www.cath4choice.org>); the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission (<http://www.iglhrc.org>); and the Children's Rights Information Network (<http://www.crin.org>). Some other useful UN-related websites for progressive activists include: <http://www.un.org/womenwatch>; <http://www.ngosatunicef.org>; and <http://www.unhcr.ch/html/racism/>

³² Ellen Sauerbrey, 1998 Republican nominee for governor of Maryland, was appointed to head the delegation. Sauer-

Tilting at Faith-based Windmills: Over a Year in the Life of President Bush's Faith-based Initiative

By Bill Berkowitz

It may seem like several lifetimes ago, but it was only on January 29, 2001, when President Bush unveiled a cornerstone of his domestic policy agenda—"charitable choice." Amidst great fanfare and surrounded by Christian, Jewish, and Muslim clergy, the president unveiled his faith-based initiative, issuing an executive order creating the White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives (OFBCI).¹ He appointed longtime criminologist and political scientist, John DiIulio, to head up the operation.

The president's scheme aimed at eliminating any barriers that might prohibit faith-based organizations from receiving government funds to provide an array of social services. The initiative also offered tax incentives to encourage greater charitable giving. Lewis C. Daly, from the Institute for Democracy Studies, characterized the president's ambitious proposal as "a bold effort to transfer a sweeping range of government social services directly into the hands of America's churches."²

The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force's Policy Institute recently published a report titled *Leaving Our Children Behind: Welfare Reform and the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Community*. The study described "charitable choice" as the massive "transfer of tax dollars to religious institutions...[that] often would come with no demand for fiscal accountability, no requirement that religious institutions not discriminate, and no safeguard against recipients of social services being subjected to proselytizing and other forms of coercive activity."³

As originally proposed, the president's

faith-based initiative posed a major challenge to the separation of Church and State. In opposing it, Barry Lynn, executive director of Americans United for Separation of Church and State unequivocally declared that, "Bush's plan is the single greatest assault on church-state separation in modern American history. Funneling billions of tax dollars to houses of worship is certain to lead to lawsuits."⁴

The proposal highlighted the president's desire to unleash "armies of compassion" to deal with America's social problems. And it would build his credentials as a "compassionate conservative," a term he used repeatedly during the campaign. Stripped of alliteration, "compassionate conservatism" is the political packaging of the Right's long-term goals of limited government, privatization, deregulation and the creation of a new social contract. The president's initiative was an extension of the "charitable choice" provision woven into the 1996 welfare "reform" bill by then-Senator John Ashcroft, which allowed religious institutions, with little government oversight, to compete for government funds to provide welfare services.⁵

Assembling the Faith-based Team

The White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives created liaison offices in five Cabinet departments: Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, Justice, Education, and Labor. In addition to the appointments of longtime "charitable choice" supporters Tommy Thompson as secretary of health and human services and John Ashcroft as attorney general, the Administration stocked the White House Office and its branch offices with seasoned veterans of the conservative movement and the Religious Right. Some of the key appointments were:

John DiIulio: In the mid-1990s, DiIulio, a Democrat, gained a measure of notoriety and a seat at the conservative policy-making table due to his hard-line position on juvenile crime. When he predicted,

brey is known for a strong anti-choice stance, advocating limited government, personal responsibility, and free enterprise. The NGO members were Kate O'Beirne of *National Review*, Nancy Mitchell Pfothenauer, president of the Independent Women's Forum, and Winsome A. Packer, formerly of the Heritage Foundation. O'Beirne's experience is recorded in the *National Review*. See <http://www.nationalreview.com/kob/kob032102.asp>.

³³ Conservative groups focused mainly on the Special Session on Children meetings, which took place close to the Special Session on AIDS, but managed to have a significant presence at the AIDS meeting. "Profamily" analysis of their victories can be found in C-Fam, "Pro-Family Delegations Claim Victory on UNAIDS Declaration," *Friday Fax*, vol. 4, no. 28 (June 29, 2001).

³⁴ The sign-in list for the U.S. delegation briefing revealed that at least half of those present were from "profamily" groups. See also, Janice Shaw Crouse, "Stumbling Blocks on the Road to Johannesburg: Day 5-Thursdays High Jinks," *Daily Highlights*, April 5, 2002, (Beverly LaHaye Institute) http://cwfa.org/library/nation/2002-04_un/2002-04-05.shtml



Reprinted with the kind permission of the artist.

albeit incorrectly, that there would be a massive crime wave of “unprecedented brutality” by children and teenagers, whom he called a “generational wolf pack,” his star rose within conservative circles and the “we’re tougher on crime than you are” bunch in Congress. DiIulio resigned under fire, mostly from conservatives, in mid-summer 2001.

Don Eberly: Eberly, who served as deputy director for the Office of Public Liaison during the Reagan Administration, was named DiIulio’s deputy director. Eberly is one of the primary advocates of “civil society,” which will shrink government by handing over responsibility for the social safety net to faith-based organizations, corporate and community groups, and philanthropists. Eberly has written several books on the subject including, *Amer-*

*ica’s Promise: Civil Society and the Renewal of American Culture.*⁶ He was also a founder of the National Fatherhood Initiative (NFI) and author of *The Faith Factor in Fatherhood.*⁷ The NFI was founded in 1994 “to lead a society-wide movement to confront the problem of father absence.”⁸ The group’s mission is to “improve the well-being of children by increasing the proportion of children growing up with involved, responsible, and committed fathers.” Wade Horn, also a founder and former president of the NFI is assistant secretary for family support in the Department of Health and Human Services.

Carl Esbeck: Prior to his appointment as head of the faith-based initiatives office in the Department of Justice, Esbeck worked with the Federalist Society’s Religious Liberties Practice Group and was the director

of the Christian Legal Society’s Center for Law and Democracy.

Where’s the Beef?

Do faith-based programs really work? This critical question has been virtually overlooked in the debate over the president’s faith-based initiative. While most supporters have a sheath of anecdotes at the ready, there is no solid empirical evidence that religious institutions actually perform better than secular ones. Even John DiIulio admitted that there is no proof religious programs outperform nonreligious programs.⁹

Byron K. Johnson, a University of Pennsylvania criminologist with the Center for Research on Religion and Urban Society—a think tank started by DiIulio—expressed his doubts as well. During his earlier tenure at the Manhattan Institute,

Johnson had passionately argued that, “religious belief is a proven and powerful tool in combating community problems.”¹⁰ Later, he appeared to change his mind, telling the *New York Times* that, “we’ve created an office out of anecdotes.... From the left to the right, everyone assumes that faith-based programs work. Even the critics of DiIulio and his office haven’t denied that. We hear that and just sit back and laugh. In terms of empirical evidence that they work, it’s pretty much nonexistent.”¹¹

Dr. David Reingold of the Indiana University School of Public and Environmental Affairs is also skeptical about the so-called successes of faith-based programs. He compared the results of faith-based initiatives with school voucher programs in that both are self-selective. According to Reingold, religious institutions “are more likely to limit and filter the clientele they serve. It’s an extreme exaggeration to say that religious organizations are more effective.”¹²

In late February 2002, the Pew Charitable Trusts announced it had given \$6.5 million to the Rockefeller Institute of Government (RIG), based at the State University of New York in Albany, to establish the Roundtable on Religion and Social Welfare Policy (Roundtable). One of their primary tasks will be “to obtain a comprehensive, impartial body of research on... [the] complicated issues” surrounding faith-based initiatives.

Headed by RIG Director Richard Nathan, the Roundtable “will produce research on the capacity and effectiveness of faith-based social services, and on the important legal and constitutional issues surrounding government support of such activities.” The George Washington University Law School will join the Institute in the research, and Search for Common Ground, will play a “key role in the initiative’s major convening activities.”

Trouble in Faith-based Land

From the outset, many civil liberties organizations and gay rights groups expressed deep concern over the violation of the separation of Church and State and

the unlimited potential for discriminatory hiring practices by many religious organizations who are fundamentally opposed to hiring gays and lesbians. But unexpected opposition to the president’s initiative came from a coterie of Religious Right leaders including the Revs. Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson. They were troubled that the initiative would allow organizations like the Church of Scientology, the Nation of Islam, and the International Society for Krishna Consciousness to receive government support.¹³ Richard Land, president of the Southern Baptist Convention’s Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission, said he would not touch faith-based money “with the proverbial ten-foot pole.”¹⁴

Barely six months into the year the Administration’s initiative had hit the skids and the president turned for help to Michael Joyce, a trusted ally in faith-based matters. During his more than 15 year tenure at the Milwaukee-based Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, Joyce steered the conservative foundation from relative obscurity to a big role as major patron and initiator of right-wing social policy. The Bradley Foundation has shaped the debate on social issues including school vouchers, privatization, welfare reform, and “charitable choice.” Joyce, who had at the time recently resigned from Bradley, was brought on board “to undertake a private initiative to help get this legislation through,” Bush’s senior advisor Karl Rove told the *Washington Post*.¹⁵

Joyce followed a time-honored conservative organizing strategy. He quickly founded two new organizations and set out to raise millions of dollars. He set up the Washington, DC-based Americans for Community and Faith-Centered Enterprise (ACFE) to “advocate an expansion of charitable choice, tax credits, and other means of bringing faith-centered and community solutions to social ills.”¹⁶ US Newswire reported that the second organization, the Phoenix-based Foundation for Community and Faith-Centered Enterprise (FCFE), was intended to “study and promote policies that encourage corporations, philanthropies, private foundations

and individuals to provide resources to faith-centered and community groups... [and] encourage the full recognition and the vital role such groups must play in American life and culture.”¹⁷

In early July, Salvation Armygate undermined these efforts to put the initiative on firmer ground. The *Washington Post* revealed that Karl Rove and Don Eberly had been secretly meeting for several months with officials from the Salvation Army in order to win the charity’s political and financial support for the president’s initiative. In exchange, the Salvation Army wanted a firm commitment that “charitable choice” legislation would allow religious organizations to sidestep state and local antidiscrimination measures barring discriminatory hiring practices on the basis of sexual orientation.¹⁸

By mid-summer, after months of infighting and disagreements with religious conservatives, John DiIulio resigned as director of the White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. According to the *Washington Post*, DiIulio “originally hoped to serve for about six months, and health problems were making it difficult for him to continue.” He had hoped that the president’s plan would be enacted by then by Congress.¹⁹ In late-July 2001, H.R. 7, Bush’s Faith-based Initiative, passed in the House. Speaker Dennis Hastert admitted that the “thorny” issues—read “charitable choice”—would be left for the Senate to deal with.

The Hudson Institute’s Michael Horowitz summed up the Right’s reaction to DiIulio’s resignation by telling the *Washington Post* that he had been “the most strategically disastrous appointee to a senior government position in the 20-plus years I’ve been in Washington. He has taken what could have been a triumphant issue and marched it smack into quicksand.”²⁰ Marvin Olasky, the so-called “godfather of compassionate conservatism,” responded with uncharacteristic restraint: “I think John is a fine professor and students will benefit from having him back in the classroom.”²¹

The ball was now in the Senate’s court,

and conservative supporters were growing more disenchanted with the process. Olasky, apparently upset that the Senate would eviscerate the legislation, thus taking the “faith” out of the “faith-based” initiative, wrote an extensive early-August 2001 cover story exposing the administration’s strategy. In *World* magazine, the popular evangelical weekly he edits, Olasky revealed that the Administration had assured him early on that the Justice Department’s Carl Esbeck, “a master at writing vague language,” would finesse the discrimination issue and create an opening for proselytizing.²²

Folded into H.R. 7 was a voucher provision described by Michael Barkey, president of the Center for the Study of Compassionate Conservatism, as the “faith-based initiative’s saving grace.”²³ Clients would be given vouchers that could be redeemed for goods and services at the institutions of their choosing. According to Barkey, “[v]ouchers maintain a wall of separation between the government and the service provider, reducing the likelihood of organizational dependency [on government funds] or regulatory creep. And the government doesn’t support any particular religion through a voucher plan, only enables individuals to choose where to go for assistance.”²⁴

For many on the Right, vouchers seemed to be the answer. Even the Southern Baptists’ Richard Land changed his tune, calling the “voucherization” of the initiative “almost like a magic wand, [which] make[s] most of the church-state issues that are so thorny disappear.”²⁵

That was Then, This is Now

Where do things stand well over a year after the unveiling of the president’s initiative? The overwhelming generosity shown by the American people since the September 11 terrorist attacks rein-

forced the Bush Administration’s commitment to “charitable choice.” In early November 2001, the president sent a letter to Senate leaders urging passage of the “Armies of Compassion” bill before the end of the year. He asked for legislation “that encourages and supports charitable giving, removes unneeded barriers to govern-

The battle over “charitable choice,” the separation of Church and State, and government funding of religious institutions will not end with the president’s faith-based initiative. Conservative ideologues and Religious Right activists occupying key public policy positions within the Bush Administration have an enduring commitment to gut the already shredded social safety net and replace it with their version of “civil society.” With that in mind, there are likely to be more stealth, and not so stealth initiatives coming down the pike.

ment support for community and faith-based groups, and authorizes important initiatives to help those in need.”²⁶

While the Administration’s initial goals remained firm, the initiative had been sliced, diced, chopped, and pared down. The president gave Senators Rick Santorum (R-PA) and Joseph Lieberman (D-CT) the lead role in hashing out a compromise solution.²⁷

But opponents quickly responded to Bush’s letter. Americans United for Sepa-

ration for Church and State once again pointed out that the “charitable choice” provisions “violates the First Amendment. . . [by] undercut[ting] civil rights laws by allowing religiously based employment discrimination with tax dollars, pit houses of worship against each other in a bid for federal funding and could subject needy Americans to unwanted proselytism.”²⁸

Then, in early February, Senators Santorum and Lieberman announced they had settled on a proposal—the Charity Aid, Recovery and Empowerment (CARE) Act.

Despite the “compromise,” critics of “charitable choice” were still concerned. According to an MSNBC report, in place of “charitable choice,” the new proposal “makes it clear that a religious group cannot be denied a government contract simply because it has a religious name or because it has religious art, icons, scripture or symbols on display.”

The “compromise” version opens up government grants to religious organizations, but eliminates “charitable choice,” the most controversial aspect of the president’s faith-based initiative.²⁹ “Charitable choice” allowed religious institutions to compete for government funds to provide a multitude of welfare services.

CARE expands tax deductions for charitable donations and, according to *Church & State* magazine, provides about \$150 million for technical assistance to smaller charities, helping facilitate their ability to apply for federal grants. It also sets aside funding for a “Compassionate Capital Fund” aimed at developing more public-private charitable partnerships. The overall price tag for the plan is estimated at about \$12 billion.

In early February 2002, Bush introduced Jim Towey, as the new director of the OFBCI. A close friend of Florida Gov. Jeb Bush, Towey worked on Capitol Hill and

in Mother Teresa's ministry before becoming Florida's health and rehabilitative services director under Democratic Gov. Lawton Chiles. Towey also founded an advocacy group called Aging with Dignity in 1996.

Towey's appointment came more than six months after John DiIulio, citing family and health concerns, resigned as the first director of OFBCI. And, in a follow-up move, Bush de-emphasized the OFBCI by placing the agency under the wing of John Bridgeland, newly appointed head of the USA Freedom Corps.

The battle over "charitable choice," the separation of Church and State, and government funding of religious institutions will not end with the president's faith-based initiative. Conservative ideologues and Religious Right activists occupying key public policy positions within the Bush Administration have an enduring commitment to gut the already shredded social safety net and replace it with their version of "civil society." With that in mind, there are likely to be more stealth, and not so stealth initiatives coming down the pike.

Bill Berkowitz is an Oakland-based freelance writer covering the Religious Right and related conservative movements. You can read his column thrice a week at Working Assets' workingforchange.com.

End Notes

- ¹ See Executive Order: Establishment of White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/faith-based>
- ² See Lewis C. Daly, "Charitable Choice: The Architecture of a Social Policy Revolution," *IDS Insights* (September 2001), (New York: Institute for Democracy Studies), p. 1.
- ³ Sean Cahill and Kenneth T. Jones, *Leaving Our Children Behind: Welfare Reform and the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Community* (New York: Policy Institute of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, December 2001), pp. 49-50.
- ⁴ The Rev. Barry W. Lynn, "Bush Launches Unprecedented Assault on Church-State Separation, Says Watchdog Group—Giving Tax Dollars to Churches Violates Constitution and Will Lead to Lawsuits, Says Americans United," Americans United for Separation of Church and State Press Release, January 29, 2001. See <http://www.au.org/press/pr12901.htm>

- ⁵ Cathlin Siobhan Baker, "The (Not-So) Hidden Agenda of Charitable Choice," *Religious Socialism* (Spring 2000), pp. 1-5, 1.
- ⁶ Don E. Eberly, *America's Promise: Civil Society and the Renewal of American Culture*, (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1998).
- ⁷ Don Eberly, ed., *The Faith Factor in Fatherhood* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 1999).
- ⁸ See <http://www.fatherhood.org/>
- ⁹ "A Stark Truth for Policy Makers: Data Lacking to Support Claims of Faith-Based Social Program Success," *American Atheists*, April 25, 2001.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*
- ¹² *Ibid.*
- ¹³ Bill Berkowitz, "Faith-Based Fracas," *San Francisco Frontiers*, April 5, 2001, p. 14.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁵ Mike Allen, "Bush Aims to Get Faith Initiative Back on Track: Stricter Rules to Be Added For Use of Funds by Groups," *Washington Post*, June 25, 2001, p. A2.
- ¹⁶ "Two New Groups Founded For Faith Based Initiative," *US Newswire*, June 6, 2001.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁸ Dana Milbank, "Charity Sites Bush Help in Fight Against Hiring Gays: Salvation Army Wants Exemption From Laws," *Washington Post*, July 10, 2001, p. A1.
- ¹⁹ Dana Milbank, "DiIulio Resigns From Top 'Faith-Based' Post: Difficulties With Initiative in Congress Marked Seven Months at White House," *Washington Post*, August 18, 2001, p. A4.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*
- ²¹ *Ibid.*
- ²² Marvin Olasky, "Rolling the Dice," *World*, August 4, 2001. See http://www.worldmag.com/world/issue/08-04-01/cover_1.asp
- ²³ Michael B. Barkey, "Vouchers: Faith-Based Initiative's Saving Grace," *Intellectual Ammunition*, (September/October) 2001. See <http://www.heartland.org/ia/sepoct01/welfare.htm>
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*
- ²⁵ Laura Meckler, "Bill has a voucher plan; Provision got little notice," *Associated Press*, August 4, 2001.
- ²⁶ George W. Bush, President's Letter on 'Armies of Compassion' Bill, The White House, November 7, 2001. See <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/11/20011108-2.html>
- ²⁷ *Ibid.*
- ²⁸ "Bush Asks Senate Leaders to Move on Controversial 'Faith-Based' Bill, Says Charitable Donations are Down—Americans United Urges President, Congress Not to Advance Legislation That Violates Constitution," Americans United for Separation of Church and State Press Release, November 8, 2001. See <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/11/>
- ²⁹ "Charitable choice," as noted previously, was the provision tucked into the 1996 Welfare Reform bill by then-Senator John Ashcroft.

Antisemitism After September 11th

By Esther Kaplan

Introduction

To White supremacists across the United States, the September 11th attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon were a cause for celebration. On a radio broadcast that week, William Pierce, head of the neo-Nazi National Alliance, called the attacks "a direct consequence of the American people permitting the Jews to control their government and to use American strength to advance the Jews' interests at the expense of everyone else's interests."¹ He victoriously announced the dawn of a "new era," in which Jewish money, and Jewish manipulation of the media and the U.S. government are "no longer are enough to guarantee the Jews' continued hegemony."²

James "Bo" Gritz, a Patriot Movement leader and former Green Beret, suggested that it was the "high concentration of influential Jews" that made New York and Washington, D.C., attractive targets,³ an idea echoed by the likes of Swiss neo-Nazi Ahmed Huber and the Posse Comitatus militia in jubilant references to the attacks on "Jew York."⁴ As reports began to emerge of a surge of anti-Muslim violence across the United States, World Church of the Creator leader Matt Hale wrote to his listserve: "Now we have to help channel this hatred toward the Jews."⁵ He urged his followers to proselytize that the attacks were due to "the control of the United States government by International Jewry and its lackeys. Perhaps never before," he added, "have people been so receptive to our message."⁶

The Great Conspiracy

Hale may have had his finger to the wind. On September 17th, the Lebanese television station Al-Manar posted a story on its website claiming that 4,000 Israelis were absent from their jobs at the World Trade Center on September 11th, "based on hints from the Israeli General Security Apparatus," and that Israeli secret

police prevented Prime Minister Ariel Sharon from traveling to New York City the day of the attacks.⁷ The Anti-Defamation League (ADL) suggests that this number may have been plucked from the Israeli Embassy's statement of concern about the 4,000 Israeli nationals residing in New York City.⁸ By the next morning, when the story reappeared on an obscure U.S.-based website, the *Information Times*, it had become 4,000 *Jews*. Within days, the rumor appeared in newspapers and on listserves around the world—in Russia's *Pravda* (later retracted), in papers in Pakistan, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia,⁹ even circulating within the American Left, in emails with such credulous introductory remarks as “interesting but unconfirmed information.”¹⁰

According to Asghar Ali Engineer, a Bombay-based progressive scholar and activist who is an expert on communal violence in India, a version that the Mossad was responsible for the attacks was circulated broadly on e-mail networks in India and was widely believed, “especially among Muslims.”¹¹ Another version, accusing “Zionists” of plotting the attacks, was posted on a website linked to a ministry of the Qatar government.¹² The rumor made its way to jihad recruitment rallies in Peshawar (the capital of Pakistan's Pashtun-dominated North West Frontier Province) in late September, where Allama Noorul Haq Qadri, the Naib Amir of the Ahl-i-Sunnah Wal-Jamat called the attacks “a conspiracy of Jews to pit America against the Muslim world,”¹³ and in Rawalpindi (in Pakistani Punjab) in October, where Jamiat Ulema Islam (JUI) leader Maulana Fazlur Rehman explicitly blamed “the Jews” for the September 11 attacks and urged a U.S. probe into why 4,000 Jews were absent from the towers and why Sharon cancelled his U.S. visit.¹⁴ The Ahl-i-Sunnah and the JUI are two of the numerous jihadi groups that first gained ground in Pakistan during the regime of Gen. Zia ul Haq in the 1980s.¹⁵ The JUI repeated these tales at several other rallies in the following weeks, including one in Hyderabad (in Sind province) where according to the Pakistani English-language daily, the *Dawn*, a

leader called on JUI workers “to eliminate the American commandos and Jews.”¹⁶ The rhetoric of Jewish conspiracy had indeed found receptive audiences around the world.

Finally, it was adopted by the Taliban itself—in late November 2001, a Taliban security chief charged that the attacks were “the work of Jews trying to blacken the name of Islam;”¹⁷ an unsurprising development, given that Osama bin Laden had long before dubbed his forces “The World Islamic Front against Jews and Crusaders.”¹⁸

The Question of Violence

But if the rhetoric conjured up dangerous images of Jewish conspiratorial reach, it did not seem to be reflected in a dramatic rise in violence—at least in the United States. An ADL national poll conducted in November found no evidence suggesting that antisemitic attitudes had worsened in the United States as a result of the September 11th events.¹⁹ The ADL documented one serious September 11-related attack: A synagogue in Tacoma, Washington, was set on fire just days after being sprayed with graffiti blaming Jews for the terrorist attacks. Still, ADL spokeswoman Myrna Shindbaum says that there was no significant increase in anti-Jewish hate incidents in the wake of September 11th.²⁰ In fact, the ADL's 2001 audit noted an 11 percent drop in anti-Jewish incidents from 2000 to 2001, for a total of 1,432, including 555 acts of vandalism and 877 acts of harassment or physical assault, with no deaths.²¹

Contrast this number with those from the American Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, which recorded 520 violent attacks or explicitly violent threats—including six murders—directed against Arab-Americans in just the first two months after the World Trade Center attacks, along with several hundred cases of employment discrimination, numerous reports of racial profiling by police, and 27 airline expulsions in the same period.²² The Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund tracked an additional 77 violent attacks against South Asians in the first month after September 11th.²³ Despite the

popularity of conspiracies involving Israel and “the Jews,” Muslims, Arabs, and South Asians were overwhelmingly the targets of both street level violence and public and private sector discrimination in the United States.

But outside of the United States, many Jews and Jewish institutions did become the targets of vicious post-September 11 violence. The murder of *Wall Street Journal* reporter Daniel Pearl in Pakistan in February was the most notorious instance, and the most deeply disturbing. Although Nafisa Hoodbhoy, a former reporter for the *Dawn*, has persuasively argued that Pearl was singled out in great part for his investigations into the complex ties between militant Islamic groups and Pakistani intelligence agencies, it is almost impossible to believe that antisemitism did not play a decisive role.²⁴ One of Pearl's captors has admitted that his kidnappers were specifically looking for a Jewish victim. And reports that Pearl's likely coerced last words, just before his throat was cut, were “My father is a Jew, my mother is a Jew, and I am a Jew,” indicated that it was Pearl's very Jewishness that his captors sought to annihilate.²⁵

An attack in Tunisia produced the highest death toll of any post-September 11 attack on Jews, when an explosion at a synagogue on the island of Djerba killed 16 people.²⁶ Acts of violence and provocation began to appear in Europe much earlier, and though less gruesome than the murder in Pakistan, and less deadly than the attack in Tunisia, they were far more plentiful. A Muslim sheikh based in London, for example, recorded and distributed tapes immediately after September 11th calling for violence against Jews and urging young boys to learn to use Kalashnikovs.²⁷ There was an eruption of vandalism of synagogues and Jewish cemeteries in Germany and Belgium.²⁸

In October, vandals torched a Jewish elementary school in southern France, leaving behind a spray-painted message reading “Death to the Jews” and “bin Laden will conquer.”²⁹ The French incident was part of a wave of more than 400 attacks in that

nation on rabbis, synagogues, Jewish schools, and Jewish students documented in a report, “Les Antifeujs,” published in early March by SOS Racisme and the Union of Jewish Students of France.³⁰ After the report’s publication, the French violence seemed to escalate, and the final weekend of March was marked by a burst of attacks: a gunman opened fire on a kosher butcher shop near Toulouse, a young Jewish couple were wounded in an attack in Villeurbanne, vandals set fire to a synagogue in Strasbourg, and a dozen hooded attackers crashed two cars through the main gate of a synagogue in Lyon, ramming one vehicle into the temple’s main prayer hall and setting it on fire.³¹ These were followed by an organized attack on a Jewish soccer team in a Paris suburb in April, which left one person hospitalized. The young, masked attackers shouted “Death to Jews” as they assaulted the soccer players with sticks and metal bars.³²

But there is a critical component in the outbreak of anti-Jewish violence documented in “Les Antifeujs,” as well as in the incidents documented in a similar, global report from the Israel-based Stephen Roth Institute: both tie the upsurge in hate crimes against Jews not to the events of September 11th, but to a date a year earlier—the beginning of the al-Aqsa intifada, and Israel’s brutal response. In fact, those Lyon attackers were ramming their cars into the synagogue at almost the exact moment that Israeli troops were breaking down the walls of Yasser Arafat’s compound in Ramallah—in other words, the outbreak of violence that weekend in France closely matched the intensification of Israeli assaults in the West Bank. The Stephen Roth report documents more than 250 violent anti-Jewish attacks worldwide in the weeks that immediately followed the outbreak of the intifada in the final days of September 2000. “Up to October some 90 cases of extreme right violence were recorded,” according to the report, but “since October, Muslim activity has predominated . . . [This pattern] confirmed the potential of the Arab-Israeli conflict to escalate ethno-religious enmity between

Jews and Muslims worldwide.”³³ The report reminds us of a similar upsurge in attacks on Jewish targets in the early 1990s, at the beginning of the Gulf War, a conflict in which the U.S.-Israeli relationship was seen by some to be central.

The ADL’s 2000 audit of anti-Jewish violence echoed this same trend, with 259 incidents reported in October 2000, just after the intifada began, far more than in any other single month that year. At the time, ADL National Director Abe Foxman said, “When the crisis in the Middle East reached a fever pitch, Jews around the world and in the United States became targets for random acts of aggression and violence,”³⁴ a comment that became even more apt in the spring of 2002.

The question becomes: How do we interpret this violence and its relationship to the Israel-Palestine conflict? Did “events in the Middle East only set off [antisemitic hatred]” as Malek Boutih, president of France’s SOS Racisme, said in March? As he went on to say, “There is always a good reason to be anti-Semitic for those who want to be.”³⁵ Or has the identification between the State of Israel and Jews as a whole become so well established that these acts of violence should be understood more specifically as expressions of rage over Israeli policy? The evidence for both readings is fairly persuasive.

Strains of Classic Antisemitism

In addition to the international popularity of Jewish conspiracy theories about September 11th, there are other signs that anti-Jewish sentiment in Europe and the Arab world has strayed far from criticism of Israel and squarely into the territory of classic European antisemitism. The Saudi Arabian broadcast company, Arab Radio and Television, produced a multimillion dollar 30-part dramatization of the classic anti-Jewish forgery, *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, in time for a 2002 Ramadan broadcast, which according to Egyptian star Muhammad Subhi, “expos[es] all the Protocols of the Elders of Zion that have been implemented to date.”³⁶ A January 2002 article in the Egyptian government weekly,

Akher Sa’a headlined; “The Jews are Bloodsuckers and Will Yet Conquer America,” and included such choice lines as “A great danger threatens the United States of America. This great danger is the Jew . . . Why? Because they are vampires, and vampires cannot live on other vampires.”³⁷ A December 2001 comedy sketch on Dubai TV called “Terrorman,” depicted Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon drinking the blood of Arab children—a clear reference to blood libel myths that date back to the medieval Crusades, while cartoons in more than one Egyptian paper depicted the American Jewish lobby through images of shrunken, groveling, hook-nosed Jews that could have been lifted directly from Nazi literature.³⁸

Here in the United States, Sheikh Muhammad Gemeaha, then imam of the Kuwait-funded Islamic Cultural Center of New York City explained back in October that “only the Jews” were capable of the September 11th attacks, and that “if it became known to the American people, they would have done to the Jews what Hitler did.”³⁹

Ali Abunimah, vice-president of the Chicago-based Arab American Action Network, cautions that some of these translations are questionable.⁴⁰ In fact, all of the above translations—with the exception of the Gemeaha quote, which was verified by the *New York Times*—come from the Middle East Media Research Institute, a Washington-based pro-Israel outfit that a former CIA operative has called “selective . . . propagandists.”⁴¹ Abunimah also emphasizes that there are sounder voices in the Arab and Muslim communities who try to challenge these kinds of statements, and that some of the language about Muslims and Arabs in the U.S. and Israeli press is equally vile.⁴² And yet, he says, “a lot of anti-Israeli sentiment is indeed mixed with antisemitic rhetoric imported from the West.”⁴³

As Martin Lee documented in a recent report for the Southern Poverty Law Center, these images have not filtered into Arab culture by accident. Alliances between Muslims and Nazis date back to the years before World War II, when the grand mufti of Jerusalem sought an alliance with

Nazi Germany.⁴⁴ Since then there has been a history of Arab countries, especially Egypt, providing safe haven for Nazis and neonazis; of freelance neonazi shock troops joining the Palestinian and Iraqi causes; of wealthy Arab states such as Saudi Arabia and Libya financing American and European neofascists; and of Holocaust denialists from the United States and Europe seeking out audiences in the Arab world by sponsoring conferences and translating and distributing literature. Lee calls it a “peculiar bond” in its current form, that derives “in part from a shared set of enemies: Jews, the United States, race-mixing, ethnic diversity” and part from “the shared belief that they must shield their own peoples from the corrupting influence of foreign cultures and the homogenizing juggernaut of globalization.”⁴⁵ A key figure in the current alliance is Swiss neonazi Ahmed Huber, who is a director within Al Taqwa, the international banking group that apparently helped to channel funds for Osama bin Laden’s operations.⁴⁶

Israel and “the Jews”

At other times, antisemitism watchdogs may be reading sinister anti-Jewish ideology into articles and illustrations in the Arab media that may fairly be understood as straightforward criticism of Israeli militarism and the Israel-U.S. alliance. “There’s this idea that all of this anger must come from an external source, which is antisemitism,” says Abunimah, and “that somehow the occupation and the butchery couldn’t possibly explain the hostility toward Israel.”⁴⁷ Arab and Muslim identification with the Palestinian cause is intense, to say the least: popular demonstrations of outrage over Israeli aggression were so ferocious and widespread in March that they nearly threatened to destabilize the governments of Jordan and Egypt.

Take as an example, in this context, a cartoon posted on the ADL website from the Palestinian paper *Al-Ayyam*, which pictures Vice-President Dick Cheney with Stars of David reflected in his glasses. Does this image, as the ADL suggests, “promote the anti-Semitic canard that Jews con-

trol the U.S. government”? At one level, it does. On the other hand, the United States has, until recently, vetoed every UN resolution calling for Israeli withdrawal from the Occupied Territories, and Cheney himself has made remarks indicating, perhaps disingenuously, that Israel’s interests are at the center of U.S. foreign policy in the region, telling Sharon on March 25th that the United States was planning to attack Iraq “first and foremost for Israel’s sake.”⁴⁸ And how can one argue definitively that the Star of David symbolizes Jews in general, rather than the Israeli State in particular, when that symbol adorns the Israeli flag? As Abunimah points out, “People see Palestinians being brutalized every night on television, and the Apache helicopters being used in the attacks have Stars of David on them. Israel is the one who attached an ancient symbol to its violent, colonial operations.”⁴⁹

Middle East expert Phyllis Bennis, a senior fellow with the Progressive Policy Institute, describes the dynamic: “Israel the State, the army, the occupation uses the language of being Jews a great deal, and the symbols of being Jews, and often claims that what it does is in the name of all Jews. And in the Arab world, particularly among Palestinians, that language gets translated. So instead of saying, ‘The Israelis came and shot up my house and arrested my brother,’ they say, ‘The Jews came ...’ At a certain point it gets to be too much. Traveling there, I sometimes say, ‘You know, *Im* Jewish,’ and they reply, ‘But you’re from New York!’ For them ‘the Jews’ means ‘the Israelis.’”⁵⁰

This identification between Jews and Israel is reinforced by Israeli leaders and by most of the major Jewish organizations in the United States. At the height of Israeli incursions into the West Bank this spring, Sharon called the troop actions “a battle for the survival of the Jewish people.”⁵¹ Here at home, ADL’s Abe Foxman, is fond of saying “anti-Zionism is anti-Semitism, period,”⁵² while the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations push a hawkish pro-Israel politics on Capitol Hill that is out of step with the propeace American Jewish majority—despite the fact that

the conference claims to represent the entire American Jewish community.⁵³

In any case it needs to be said: Though identification with Israel is at least as intense for many Jews as identification with Palestine is for many Arabs, not all Israelis and diasporic Jews support the occupation or Sharon’s escalating brutality. A recent *Ma’ariv* poll showed that 63 per cent of Israelis support a ceasefire and a peace agreement that would establish a Palestinian state;⁵⁴ 45 per cent even support the evacuation of all Jewish settlements in order to accomplish this end, and support for Sharon has hovered between 35 and 62 per cent in 2002, hardly a ringing endorsement. Even as civilian Israeli casualties began to mount last fall, a poll by the New York-based Jewish *Forward* found that 51 per cent of respondents identified with Israeli “doves” rather than Israeli “hawks.”⁵⁵

Distinctions like these are easily lost in regions where the only encounters people have with Jews are shots of Israeli soldiers on the evening news. Mohammed Fadel, a member of the post-9/11 New York City-based organization, Muslims Against Terrorism, and a specialist in Islamic law, says that Egyptians of his father’s generation had Jewish neighbors, colleagues, and schoolmates, and there were Jews in prominent positions in the government—but that’s no longer the case. “One of the unintended consequences of Zionism,” Fadel argues, “is that you no longer have a social presence of Jews in the Arab world. And without any kind of reality check in society to limit the tendency of people to view their enemies in the worst possible way, it’s not hard to understand how antisemitic rhetoric can grow and spread.”⁵⁶

The increase in anti-Jewish violence over the past year and a half indicates that the tight identification of Israel with world Jewry has converted Jewish institutions, not just Israeli ones, into targets of violence. According to the Stephen Roth report, “In contrast to former Arab-Israeli clashes, the main targets of these attacks were not institutions identified with the State of Israel, but Jews and Jewish sites.”⁵⁷ But while this identification is indeed propa-

gated by racist neonazis, in their obsession with the so-called Zionist Occupation Government (ZOG), and by anti-Jewish propaganda in the Arab world, it is being forged in equal part by major Jewish organizations in the diaspora, and by the State of Israel itself.

The Silence of the Left

One might hope that the Left would be helping to disentangle this morass, by protesting Israeli incursions on the one hand and antisemitic attacks on the other, and helping to break down the identification of “Jews” with “Israel.” But outside of the Jewish Left, that is rarely the case.

In France, protests of the rising anti-Jewish violence have been attended primarily by Jews, but with significant support from Muslim organizations and Left activists from antiracist groups such as SOS Racisme. But such instances of left-wing solidarity are not widespread. Just after Jean-Marie Le Pen, leader of the racist National Front, came in second in the first round of France’s presidential balloting, Naomi Klein, a chronicler of the anti-corporate globalization movement, wrote the following in the London *Guardian*: “I couldn’t help thinking about the recent events I’ve been to where anti-Muslim violence was rightly condemned, Ariel Sharon deservedly blasted, but no mention was made of attacks on Jewish synagogues, cemeteries and community centers. Or about the fact that every time I log on to activist news sites like Indymedia.org which practice ‘open publishing,’ I am confronted with a string of Jewish conspiracy theories about September 11 and excerpts from the Protocol of the Elders of Zion.”⁵⁸ A recent glance at the Jerusalem Indy Media site also revealed an article by racist former Klansman David Duke, identifying him only as a former member of the Louisiana state Legislature.⁵⁹

Far from issuing overt expressions of solidarity against antisemitism, many on the Left have attempted to turn concern over antisemitism on its head. On the same Indy Media site, one encounters a graphic described as a “Zionazi flag” that flashes the

Nazi flag and the Israeli flag with an equal sign in between.⁶⁰

Similar images appeared on dozens of handmade flags and signs at a massive demonstration in Washington DC in late April against the Israeli occupation, where protesters also chanted “Sharon and Hitler, they’re the same; the only difference is the name.”⁶¹ In February, demonstrators in France carried signs reading “Sionisme = Nazisme.”⁶² A March 2002 email from a Pakistani progressive reads in part, “Looking at Sharon’s tanks going into Ramallah brings to my mind Hitler’s invasion of Poland.... The Israelis are behaving like Nazis now.”⁶³ This language has become commonplace.

Leftists could be seeing in Israel’s incursions the brutality of the Soviet Union, whose tanks rolled into Prague in 1968, or the bloody violence of the Indonesian occupation of East Timor. But they do not. Instead, leftists around the globe choose to compare Israel with Nazi rule, a choice that contains at least a hint of an attack against the Jewish experience.

Author and activist Melanie Kaye/Kantrowitz a member since its inception of the Middle East peace group Women in Black, says, “I’ve been uncomfortable with the Nazi language around the conflict for years. It feels like a desperate attempt to shake Jews loose from their identity as victims.”⁶⁴ The complication, as she points out, is that Israelis, too, have wrapped themselves in the language of the Holocaust in order to explain their military aggression. Undeniably, for Jews, this connection has an emotional basis in the deep-seated fear and anxiety produced by the Holocaust, and in the intense post-Holocaust yearning for a safe haven. But, decades after the end of Nazism, the idea that Israel is the one bulwark against threats to Jewish safety came to be used more cynically, as well. Peter Novick writes in *The Holocaust and American Life* that it was in the wake of the 1967 war, and especially after the 1973 Yom Kippur war, that “[Israeli] conflicts were endowed with all the black-and-white moral clarity of the Holocaust, which came to be, for the Israeli

cause, what Israel was said to be for the United States—a strategic asset.”⁶⁵

With Israel using the Holocaust to justify its military aggressions, the temptation has clearly become strong, within the movement against the occupation, to take that moral authority away. The trouble is this gesture has far too much in common with the work of Holocaust denials—usually overt antisemites—who try to paint the Holocaust as a victimization myth invented by Jews in order to veil Jewish power or to make false claims to being God’s chosen people.⁶⁶ If advocates of Palestinian rights hope to free themselves of charges of antisemitism, they must find ways to condemn the occupation that avoid any attempt to erase the violent and traumatic history of the persecution of Jews—or better yet, take a stand against antisemitism themselves. “It is precisely because anti-Semitism is used and abused by the likes of Sharon,” writes Naomi Klein, “that the fight against it must be reclaimed.”⁶⁷

Sorting it Out

The debate in Europe over the significance of the recent anti-Jewish violence highlights some of the truly difficult questions in understanding antisemitism during this period. In the wake of an attack on a German synagogue with explosives in late March 2002, local police said they were investigating both the German Racist Right and the possibility of “Arab terrorism,” while Rabbi Abraham Cooper, associate dean of the Simon Wiesenthal Center, called for an investigation into possible contacts between the two—each response reflecting a sense that the attack may be linked to deep historic currents of German antisemitism.⁶⁸ On the other hand, a significant leader in the French Jewish community, Theo Klein, argued that the anti-Jewish attacks there were not an antisemitic wave with ties to Europe’s Nazi past, but a spontaneous outburst by frustrated immigrants living on the fringes of society—many of whom are frequent targets of racial violence themselves. A former French Resistance fighter, Klein emphasizes

that the State has condemned, rather than endorsed, the attacks on Jews: Police guard synagogues, while presidential candidates—with the exception of the Far Rightist Jean Marie Le Pen—outdo each other in expressing outrage at the violence.⁶⁹

In late February 2002, Ariel Sharon remarked that with “the wave of dangerous anti-Semitism sweeping France . . . [French] Jewry could find itself facing great danger” and announced that Israel was preparing to welcome Jewish immigrants,⁷⁰ and several British and French intellectuals echoed Sharon’s alarm. But others have argued that the furor over antisemitism has wrongly conflated the reprehensible acts of violence with what one journalist called “one of the most vigorous media critiques of Israel’s policies in the European media in a generation.”⁷¹ As Peter Beaumont wrote in the London-based *Observer*, “For while the phenomenon of anti-Jewish sentiment and attacks in some quarters of the Islamic community in Europe is to be deplored, so too must be the effort to co-opt it as an alibi for Israel’s behaviour and to use it to silence opposition to its policies.”⁷²

As this article goes to press, Israeli aggression in the West Bank, and Palestinian suicide attacks against Israeli civilians, continue, with the horrible, lopsided death toll growing weekly. So, too, have attacks on Jews and Jewish religious institutions continued to escalate in France and Germany, and new reports have emerged of anti-Jewish attacks in Russia. One critical challenge for the Jewish community, and progressives everywhere, in responding to these situations in the months ahead is to reject fear-mongering by pro-Israeli sectors in the face of increasingly harsh international criticism of Israeli actions; to assert the distinction—rather than the identity—between Jews everywhere and the Israeli State; and yet to forcefully challenge truly antisemitic acts and statements wherever they occur. An end to the occupation would certainly clarify matters. As Klein said recently, “When a political solution for the Middle East conflict can be found, and a viable Palestinian state coexists with Israel, then we shall see

that the Muslim community in no way cherishes the anti-Semitic hatred that characterized the Fascist movement in France and Europe before 1950.”⁷³ If he is wrong, and attacks against Jews continue, then at least their nature will be abundantly clear.

A second challenge is to constantly test the lens through which Jewish victimization is being seen. “Any effective framework,” says Kaye/Kantrowitz, “must allow us to really see what’s happening to people, and who is really at risk.”⁷⁴ A vision of contemporary Jewish vulnerability that does not allow us to acknowledge the daily brutality being experienced by Palestinians under occupation, or the intensity of anti-Arab and anti-Muslim violence in the United States since September 11th is simply not adequate. Nor is one that refuses to take at least some solace in the Muslim groups who marched in solidarity with Jews to protest the antisemitic attacks in France, or the quiet but persistent Jewish-Muslim interfaith work that has taken place almost monthly in New York City, ground zero, since the World Trade Center towers collapsed. Timor Yuskaev, an academic fellow at the Interfaith Center of New York, speculates that, “In the long run, this is possibly a much more lasting legacy of the attacks.”⁷⁵ Perhaps he is being too hopeful. But alarmism has its dangers as well.

Esther Kaplan is an activist, writer, and radio producer. She is cochair of Jews for Racial and Economic Justice, a New York City-based social justice organization, and the cohost of Beyond the Pale, a Jewish public affairs program on WBAI radio in New York.

End Notes

- ¹ Anti-Defamation League, “Terrorism Strikes America: What They are Saying,” September 20, 2001. See http://www.adl.org/terrorism_america/saying_092001.asp
- ² Ibid.
- ³ Ibid.
- ⁴ Ibid.
- ⁵ ADL, “Terrorism Strikes America: What They are Saying,” September 13, 2001. See http://www.adl.org/terrorism_america/saying_091301.asp
- ⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Bryan Curtis, “4,000 Jews, 1 Lie: Tracking an Internet Hoax,” on Slate.com, October 5, 2001. <http://slate.msn.com/?id=116813>

⁸ ADL, “Terrorism Strikes America,” September 20, 2001, op. cit.

⁹ Curtis, “4,000 Jews,” op cit; See also ADL, “Anti-Semitism in the Egyptian Media: February 2001 - February 2002.” See http://www.adl.org/egyptian_media/antisem_feb_may_2001.asp

¹⁰ Email from Sally O’Brien, reporter and producer for WBAI radio in New York, September 27, 2001.

¹¹ Email interview with Asghar Ali Engineer, March 30, 2002.

¹² “ADL Calls on Qatar to Take Action Against anti-Semitic & anti-Jewish Reports Featured on Web Site Sponsored by Government Ministry.” See <http://www.adl.org/presrele/islme%5F62/3961%5F62.a.sp>

¹³ “Rally warns US against Afghanistan adventure,” *Dawn*, Monday, September 24, 2001. <http://www.dawn.com/2001/09/24/nat18.htm>

¹⁴ “Religious groups start recruiting fighters: Jihad against US,” *Dawn*, Saturday, October 6, 2001. <http://www.dawn.com/2001/10/06/nat5.htm>

¹⁵ The Pakistani media often collectively terms Islamic fundamentalist groups in that country as jihadi groups. The JUI (F) is a splinter group of the JUI headed by Maulana Fazlur Rehman. The JUI is a political party whose leaders are Islamic clergy.

¹⁶ “JUI asks workers to kill US forces,” *Dawn*, Wednesday, October 10, 2001. <http://www.dawn.com/2001/10/10/nat7.htm>

¹⁷ “Taliban offers \$50 million for Bush’s capture,” *Dawn*, Wednesday, November 12, 2001. <http://www.dawn.com/2001/11/21/latest4.htm>

¹⁸ “Bush enters rhetorical minefield,” *Dawn*, Saturday, September 22, 2001. <http://www.dawn.com/2001/09/22/int2.htm>

¹⁹ ADL, “ADL Poll: No Increase in Anti-Semitism in Wake of Sept. 11 Attacks,” November 2, 2001. See <http://www.adl.org/presrele/asus%5F12/3948%5F12.as.p>

²⁰ Interview with Myrna Shinbaum, April 1, 2002.

²¹ ADL, “ADL Audit: Anti-Semitic Incidents Rise Slightly in U.S. in 2000. Increase Linked to Mideast Conflict,” March 21, 2001. See <http://www.adl.org/presrele/asus%5F12/3776%5F12.as.p>

²² American Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, “ADC Fact Sheet: The Condition of Arab Americans Post 9/11” November 20, 2001. http://www.adc.org/terror_attack/9-11aftermath.PDF

²³ Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund, “World Trade Center and Pentagon Attacks: The Anti-Asian American Backlash,” October 11, 2001. See <http://www.aaldef.org/images/101101list.pdf>

²⁴ Nafisa Hoodbhoy, “Missing Links; There’s Much More To Daniel Pearl’s Murder Than Meets the Eye,” *Washington Post*, March 10, 2002, p. B1.

²⁵ Michael Kamber, “The Chosen One,” *Village Voice*, March 5, 2002, p. 55.

²⁶ Donald McNeil, Jr., “Tunisian Jews at Blast Site: A Starwart Remnant,” *New York Times*, April 15, 2002, p. A3.

Books Received

²⁷ "Government says police monitoring Muslim sheikh calling for violence against Jews," AP Worldstream, February 4, 2002.

²⁸ Victor Homolo, "Germany: Jewish Leader Cites Extremists," *New York Times*, November 21, 2001; "Belgian Government Condemns Brussels Synagogue Attack," Agence France Presse, April 1, 2002.

²⁹ Jocelyn Gecker, "New Book Details 405 Recent Anti-Semitic Acts in France," AP Worldstream, March 12, 2002.

³⁰ "Les Antifeujs," published by SOS Racisme and the Union des étudiants juifs de France. See <http://www.sos-racisme.org/antifuj.htm>

³¹ "Shooting in France in Wave of Anti-Jewish Attacks," *New York Times*, April 1, 2002, p. A6.

³² Suzanne Daley, "Gang Attacks Jews on Sports Field in France," *New York Times*, April 13, 2002, p. A3.

³³ Steven Roth Institute, "Anti-Semitism Worldwide, 2000/1." See <http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/annual-report.html>

³⁴ ADL, *Audit of Anti-Semitic Incidents* (2000). See http://www.adl.org/2000audit/2000_audit.pdf

³⁵ Gecker, "New Book Details," op. cit.

³⁶ ADL, "Anti-Semitism in the Egyptian Media," op. cit. See also Matthew Kalman, "Arab TV to Spotlight Anti-Semitic Program," *Chicago Sun-Times*, December 15, 2001, p. 4.

³⁷ ADL, "Anti-Semitism in the Egyptian Media," op. cit.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Jonathan Rosen, "The Uncomfortable Question of Anti-Semitism," *New York Times Magazine*, November 4, 2001, p. 48.

⁴⁰ Interview with Ali Abunimah, March 26, 2002.

⁴¹ Marc Perelman, "No Longer Obscure, MEMRI Translates the Arab World," *Forward*, December 7, 2001, p. 6.

⁴² Interview with Abunimah, op. cit.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Martin A. Lee, "The Swastika and the Crescent," *The Intelligence Report* (Montgomery: Southern Poverty Law Center, Spring 2002). See <http://www.splcenter.org/intelligenceproject/ip-index.html>

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Interview with Abunimah, op. cit.

⁴⁸ James Ridgeway, "Mondo Washington," *Village Voice*, April 9, 2002, p. 26.

⁴⁹ Interview with Abunimah, op. cit.

⁵⁰ Interview with Phyllis Bennis, March 26, 2002.

⁵¹ Serge Schmemmann, "13 Israeli Troops Killed in Ambush," *New York Times*, April 10, 2002, p. A1.

⁵² Abraham H. Foxman, "New Excuses, Old Hatred," speech to the Anti-Defamation League's National Executive Committee in Palm Beach, Florida, February 8, 2002. See <http://www.adl.org/anti%5Fsemitism/speech.asp>

⁵³ Michael Massing, "Deal Breakers," *American Prospect*, March 11, 2002, p. 18.

⁵⁴ "Most Israelis Unhappy with Sharon, Support Palestinian State," Deutsche Presse-Agentur, March 15, 2002.

Kathleen M. Blee

Inside Organized Racism: Women in the Hate Movement

(Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), hb, 272pp, with bibliography and index.

Ann Burlein

Lift High the Cross: Where White Supremacy and the Christian Right Converge

(Durham: Duke University Press, 2002), pb, 282pp, with bibliography and index.

Elizabeth Hartmann

The Truth About Fire

(New York: Carroll & Graf, 2002), hb, 248pp.

Ellen Messer-Davidow

Disciplining Feminism: From Social Activism to Academic Discourse

(Durham: Duke University Press, 2002), pb, 413pp, with bibliography and index.

Mike Prokosch and

Laura Raymond

The Global Activist's Manual: Local Ways to Change the World

(New York: Thunder's Mouth Press/Nation Books, 2002), pb, 324pp, with a "movement yellow pages," glossary, and index.

Dean E. Robison

Black Nationalism in American Politics and Thought

(New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pb, 171pp, with bibliography and index.

James Q. Wilson

The Marriage Problem: How Our Culture Has Weakened Families

(New York: HarperCollins, 2002), hb, 274pp, with index.

⁵⁵ See the survey conducted for *Forward* by Steven M. Cohen and Market Facts Inc., 10/28/01-10/31/01. <http://www.forward.com/issues/2001/01.11.09/survey.html>

⁵⁶ Interview with Mohammed Fadel, March 27, 2002.

⁵⁷ "Anti-Semitism Worldwide," op. cit.

⁵⁸ Naomi Klein, "Sharon's Best Weapon," *Guardian*, April 25, 2002. See <http://www.guardian.co.uk/Archive/Article/0,4273,4400973,00.html>

⁵⁹ David Duke, "No Anti-Semitism Here," January 2002, posted April 26, 2002. See <http://jerusalem.indymedia.org/news/2002/04/20814.php>

⁶⁰ Zionazi flag, posted by Free Palestine, April 23, 2002. See <http://jerusalem.indymedia.org/news/2002/04/15413.php>

⁶¹ Interviews with protest participants, April 8, 2002.

⁶² Nicholas Simon, "Jews in the Line of Fire," with accompanying photograph, *Jerusalem Report*, February 25, 2002, p. 32.

⁶³ Email Interview with a progressive Pakistani activist, March 20, 2002.

⁶⁴ Interview with Melanie Kaye/Kantrowitz, April 7, 2002.

⁶⁵ Peter Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1999), p. 156.

⁶⁶ Lin Collette, "Encountering Holocaust Denial," *The Public Eye*, vol. 8, no. 3 (September 1994), pp. 1-15.

⁶⁷ Klein, "Sharon's Best Weapon," op. cit.

⁶⁸ "German Community Leader Furious Over Synagogue Attack," *Jerusalem Post*, March 24, 2002, p. 7.

⁶⁹ Interview with Theo Klein, honorary president of the Conseil Représentatif des Institutions Juives de France (CRIF), France's Council of Representative Jewish Organizations, April 11, 2002.

⁷⁰ Yair Ettinger, "Sharon Angers Paris with Charges of Racism," *Ha'aretz Daily*, February 25, 2002. See <http://www.iht.com/articles/49257.html>

⁷¹ Peter Beaumont, "The New Anti-Semitism?" *Observer*, February 17, 2002, p. 28.

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Julio Godoy, "Gov't Urged To Stem Anti-Semitic Attacks," Inter Press Service, January 22, 2002.

⁷⁴ Interview with Kaye/Kantrowitz, op. cit.

⁷⁵ Interview with Timor Yuskaev, March 25, 2002.

Eyes RIGHT

WHO AM I? WHY AM I HERE?

Public Eye readers might recall these profoundly existential questions James Bond Stockdale, Ross Perot's vicepresidential running mate, raised in the debates leading up to the 1992 presidential elections. Well, 10 years later he has what we can only call a "delayed" response.

Rep. Tom DeLay of Texas, the House majority whip (the third ranking Republican in the House), while addressing a group of evangelical Christians at the First Baptist Church of Pearland, TX, on April 12, 2002, claimed that God was using him to promote "a biblical worldview" in American politics. He said:

"Ladies and gentlemen, Christianity offers the only viable, reasonable, definitive answer to the questions of 'Where did I come from?' 'Why am I here?' 'Where am I going?' 'Does life have any meaningful purpose?' . . . Only Christianity offers a way to understand that physical and moral border. Only Christianity offers a comprehensive worldview that covers all areas of life and thought, every aspect of creation. Only Christianity offers a way to live in response to the realities that we find in this world—only Christianity."

Source: "DeLay Criticized for 'Only Christianity' Remarks," By Alan Cooperman, Washington Post, Saturday, April 20, 2002.

THUMBS DOWN FOR THE PRESIDENT . . . AND ALL THE PRESIDENT'S MEN . . . AND WOMEN . . . AND DAD!

If you thought that George Bush's ratings skyrocketed after 9/11, William Lind, the director of the Center for Cultural Conservatism at the Free Congress Foundation, certainly didn't. Lind doesn't really like the president, especially his being a "conscientious objector" in "the war that really matters." And no, it's not the war on terrorism. And it's not just

the president either. Lind doesn't like half the president's cabinet, especially the "peacenik" Ashcroft, the "liberal" Powell, and the "featherweight" Rice. But then if you're an Old Right culture warrior you'd be worried too when the country is being invaded by Hispanics on one flank and faces the homosexual offensive on another, and the Army can't do a thing about it because it's emasculated by all the women they've let in. Can anyone save America? Lind sure thinks so. Who, you ask? In Lind's own words:

"My old friend and esteemed colleague, Paul Weyrich, is a strong supporter of President Bush. In fact, he played a leading role in defending the President from early critics, back in the days when some people took John McCain seriously. Paul continues to be quoted nationally in praise of Mr. Bush. His positive view of the President reflects what most conservatives now think: unlike his father, this George Bush is one of us.

Sorry, but I don't buy it. This is one of the few matters on which Paul Weyrich and I differ strongly. In my opinion, George II is a worse sell-out than George I. While George I sold out on 'no new taxes,' George II has sold conservatives out on something much more serious: the question of whether the hideous ideology of cultural Marxism, more commonly known as 'Political Correctness' or 'multiculturalism,' will reign over America in the 21st Century.

From the outset, this Bush Administration has twisted itself in knots to make sure it is as Politically Correct as possible (once again proving the old rule of Washington politics that Democrats reward their friends and Republicans reward their enemies.) It chose a liberal as Secretary of State because he was black and a featherweight to head the NSC because she is a black woman. It is likely to name a pro-abortion Hispanic to the first Supreme Court vacancy because he is Hispanic. President Bush is so careful to be photographed with 'minorities' that one begins to suspect they are models hired to travel as part of his entourage.

This 'conservative' President has done nothing about the problem of far too many women in our armed forces (the easiest way to make sure an army can't fight is to fill it up with women.) He won't abolish DACOWITS, though the troops would cheer him from the housetops if he did. The White House maintains a studious

silence on the homosexual's offensive against our traditional culture.

If one wants to see the depths of this Administration's cultural cowardice, one need only look at its policy toward the Hispanic invasion of our country. Far from enforcing our immigration laws and closing our southern border, George Bush's Republican Party is throwing itself at the Hispanics' feet. It now even offers Spanish lessons to state Republican leaders! I don't recall that even the weakest of the Roman Emperors ordered their legions to learn Gothic.

To real conservatives, the most important war is not the pathetic war in Afghanistan, but the culture war here at home, and in that culture war President Bush is a conscientious objector. Some other members of his Administration, such as the weak-kneed John Ashcroft, are out-and-out peaceniks. In fact, I can't find a courageous cultural conservative among the lot. Either the Bush Administration actually believes in cultural Marxism, or it lacks the guts to take it on. I'd guess the latter, since being a 'good Republican' seems to require that you believe in nothing at all.

If running away from the titanic battle between cultural Marxism and our traditional, Western, Judeo-Christian culture makes George Bush a good conservative, then it's time

Eyes Right continues on page 34

Eye LASHES

“Henry Kissinger once said, ‘The trouble with Senator Joe McCarthy is that he didn’t go far enough.’ He was exaggerating, of course. But I wonder.”

—William F. Buckley, Jr., in an interview, "Live" with TAE.

Source: *The American Enterprise*, January-February 2002, pp. 16-19, 17.

the word 'conservative' were retired. It will have become as empty and meaningless as the Bush White House. As for me, I'm glad I voted for Pat Buchanan. If you want to see what a real conservative believes, read his brilliant new book, The Death of the West. Can anyone imagine George Bush writing such a book? Or even reading it, for that matter?

Source: The Free Congress Commentary, "Sorry, But George W. Bush is No Conservative," By William S. Lind, February 7, 2002.

THE RIGHT VIEW OF ISLAM

Attorney-General John Ashcroft recently joined the ranks of overnight scholars of Islam and observers of Muslims, putting him in the august company of such notables as the Right Reverends Pat Robertson and Franklin Graham, and Indian Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee. Although Vajpayee, the prime minister of the world's second largest Muslim country, has probably been Muslim-watching far longer than his new cronies.

In an interview given to his fellow scholar/observer, syndicated columnist Cal Thomas, Ashcroft said, "Islam is a religion in which God requires you to send your son to die for him. Christianity is a faith in which God sends his son to die for you." Robertson, another authority on the Qur'an, remarked on his 700 Club broadcast that, Islam "is not a peaceful religion that wants to coexist. They [Muslims that is] want to coexist until they can control, dominate and then, if need be, destroy." Robertson was affronted by President Bush's lack of knowledge about Islam, and said, "I have taken issue with our esteemed president in regard to his stand in saying Islam is a peaceful religion. It's just not. And the Koran makes it very clear, if you see an infidel, you are to kill him." Franklin Graham, Billy's son and heir, declared that, "The God of Islam is not the same God. It's a different God, and I believe it is a very evil and wicked religion." Graham echoed Robertson's opinion saying, "I don't believe [Islam] is this wonderful, peaceful religion."

While the Christian-Muslim dialogue seems to have turned into a monologue (actually a tirade), the Christian-Hindu dialogue on Islam seems to have reached common ground. What's more, Indian Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee is evidently a

700 Club broadcast viewer. Days after his party's government, in the state of Gujarat, aided, abetted, and presided over the worst anti-Muslim pogrom in a decade with close to 2,000 Muslim men, women, and children raped, hacked to death, or burnt alive, Vajpayee addressed his Bharatiya Janata Party's (Indian People's Party) national convention, "Wherever there are Muslims, they do not want to live with others. Instead they want to preach and propagate their religion by creating fear and terror in the minds of others." Soon after the anti-Muslim bloodletting, the Gujarat school-leaving examination for English asked students to form a single sentence from a four-sentence paragraph. The paragraph in question read: "There are two solutions, one of them is the Nazi solution. If you don't like people, kill them, segregate them. Then strut up and down. Proclaim that you are the salt of the earth." Another question asked students to modify a sentence by removing the word "if" from the sentence "If you don't like people, kill them." Gujarat's Minister for Education, Anandi Patel, reported that the questions were selected at random. Unlike the pogrom victims!

Source: The Progressive Media Project.

<http://www.progressive.org/Media%20Project%202/mpaf2702.html>; "Unmasked Truth," Editorial, Times of India, Monday, April 15, 2002.

http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/articleshow.asp?art_id=6906609; "If you don't like people, kill them": Exam question stuns Gujarat.

<http://headlines.sify.com/809news2.html>

GUNNING FOR GAYS

This time, it's in Reno, NV, at the National Rifle Association's 2002 annual convention, where the men bear arms and the women bear children. "During a two-hour panel discussion attacking the media for distorting the views of gun-rights proponents, all but one speaker took an opportunity to slam gays and lesbians . . . in some manner." Debbie Schlus-sel, a conservative commentator who appears on Fox News and the Howard Stern Show, called Rosie O'Donnell (who recently came out as a lesbian and in support of LGBT adoption rights) a "freak." Schlus-sel went on to label "straight actor Jude Law, who she said admitted to hesitating before handling a gun for one of his films, as a 'girly man.'" Kellyanne Conway, a conservative pollster made the amazing discovery that, "The

media . . . has somehow forced changes in the public school curriculum [and as a result teachers are] so worried now about how many mommies Heather has that [they] run out of time." NRA national board member Grover Norquist, who is also a columnist for *American Spectator*, felt that the reason why the media was uninformed on the American people's support for gun rights was that gun owners didn't have annual pride parades to show off gun ownership as an alternative life style. Norquist was also adamant that liberals didn't want men to date girls!

Source: Steve Friess, "At NRA gathering, speakers ridicule gays," Gay.com/PlanetOut.com Network, Monday, April 29, 2002.

REVISITING COLONIALISM: GOING BACK TO THE GOOD TIMES

Paul Johnson waxes nostalgically of colonialism's history and outcomes in "Under Foreign Flags: the glories and agonies of colonialism." He points out that "white, English-speaking colonies" like the United States, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia are now among the richest countries of the world. South Africa missed being part of this list because it "attracted more immigrants from black Africa than from white Europe."

Nevertheless Johnson contends that Africa in general benefited greatly from colonial rule "[b]ut under independence, all came crashing down in hopeless ruin. . . . Black majority rule has failed virtually everywhere . . . and it is now clear that independence came a generation, or perhaps two, too soon. . . . Very little can be done to help these African states until they first provide themselves with responsible, representative, honest, and efficient governments." The one possible solution Johnson does see, in certain situations, is a return to colonialism. He argues that, especially in places like Somalia and Sudan, a return to a colonial order will be necessary in order to annihilate the "threat of terrorism."

Source: National Review, February 11, 2002, pp. 14-16.

FRIENDSHIP: THE SIMPLE SOLUTION TO SOCIAL INJUSTICE

A man coming out of a pharmacy sees a homeless man on the sidewalk, walks up to

him, notices they're wearing the same belt buckles and compliments the homeless man, "nice belt." Then he walks away feeling, "[t]he seed of friendship and connection was planted. Someone else may come along later and water the seed . . ." In "Befriending the Friendless," posted on the Christian Broadcasting Network's website, Karen O'Connor speaks of the Christian duty to befriend the "needy, hurt, persecuted, unlikely, difficult—even mean-spirited." The article runs with a picture of a thick-bearded brown-skinned man. He holds a sign that reads, "I need a friend."

Could friendship be the answer? It's so simple and beautiful! In fact it should become national policy! Let's all compliment the homeless man's shoes, organize a birthday party for the cantankerous shoe shiner, and accompany the woman who is visiting her son in prison.

Certainly friendship and even pleasantries have an important role in our lives, helping us to create deeper human connections. But a compliment on your belt buckle unfortunately does not fill your stomach, find you a roof for the night, or begin to address the reasons why people become homeless. O'Connor writes about the man who talks about his struggles to maintain a relationship with the bitter shoe shiner outside his store: "I overlooked a lot in Lou. . . . He'd get on a topic that bugged him and suddenly all the hate and disappointment bottled up inside would spill onto whoever was standing there." Too bad the storeowner ignored Lou's complaints. Perhaps he would have learned a little about the workings of oppression and the forces that create the "friendless."

Source: <http://www.cbn.com/living/family/relationships/occonnor-friendless.asp>

GIVING AN OLD FABLE THE RIGHT TWIST

The old fable about the ant and the grasshopper describes how during the summer, the ant toils at building its house and storing food while the grasshopper frolics in the sun and thinks the ant a fool. In the winter, the ant is fed and sheltered, the grasshopper dead. Stephen Goode updates this fable for 2002, in which:

"Come winter, the shivering grasshopper calls a press conference and demands to know why the ants should be allowed to be warm and well-fed while others are cold and starving. . . . America is stunned at the sharp contrast. How can this be, that in a country of such wealth this poor grasshopper is allowed to suffer so unjustly?"

Al Gore exclaims in an interview with Peter Jennings that the ants have gotten rich off the back of the grasshopper and calls for an immediate tax hike on the ants to make them pay their 'fair share.'

Jesse Jackson stages a demonstration at the entrance to the ant city, where the news stations film the group singing, 'We Shall Overcome.' Jesse then marches his demonstrators into the anthill, where they kneel to pray for the grasshopper and demand franchises and reparations for Jesse and his grasshopper friends.

Finally, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission drafts the 'Economic Equity and Ant-Grasshopper Act,' retroactive to the beginning of the summer. The ants are fined for failing to have an affirmative-action program for green bugs and, having nothing left with which to pay retroactive taxes, the ant city is confiscated by the government."

Yes, indeed, the parallels are obvious. African-Americans frolicked in the plantation sun, and enjoyed the beauty of an extended Jim Crow summer. They have irresponsibly not looked to the future, not toiled as Whites have in creating their homes and their nest eggs. Ah, the American Dream! More like the American Delusion!

Source: *Insight on the News (A Publication of the Washington Times)*, April 29, 2002, p. 4.

IN DEFENSE OF WESTERN MAN

Nearly 250 people gathered in Virginia for the fifth biennial American Renaissance conference, "In Defense of Western Man," in February 2002. Syndicated columnist Dr. Samuel Francis warned that non-Western immigration is creating a counter culture that will soon "outnumber and destroy us." His brilliant, profound solution was to "round 'em up and ship 'em out." Dr. Francis provided a critical analysis of reparations for slavery by explaining it as "nothing more

than a rationalization for black failure." What's more, it proved that "Western nations are rich because whites have high IQs." Francis concluded that, "We in this room are the Paul Reveres of our time. We are riding through the night, not just in a few New England hamlets but all through the world crying, 'White man, wake up.'" At long last, someone who boldly charges to defend the western White man. It just doesn't happen enough.

Source: *American Renaissance*, vol. 13, no. 4, April 2002.

THE LIBERAL DEATH GRIP

For all those that might have had the strange notion that right-wing conservatives controlled our entertainment and news media, Donald Wildmon, the American Family Association president, sets us straight! Wildmon wrote recently, "We certainly aren't surprised that Disney was once again front and center in the push to normalize homosexuality in our culture. . . . but it was sad to see Rosie O'Donnell using her star power to stump for the homosexual agenda. It further demonstrates the death grip that liberal elites have on the entertainment and news media institutions."

Source: <http://www.afa.net/activism/aa031502.asp>

Compiled by *Nikhil Aziz, Mitra Rastegar, and Taryn Levitt.*

HAIKU

Caesars of privilege
mobilizing resentment
democracy stabbed

bullies with lawsuits
whittle away at justice
equality blocked

demonized scapegoats
feeding angry bitter crowds
society starves

Chip Berlet



Order your copy of

Defending Immigrant Rights

an Activist Resource Kit available from PRA

Order by mail, phone or fax

Cost: \$15, low income \$10 (includes postage). Visa/Mastercard accepted. MA residents add 5% sales tax.

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

Phone _____ E-mail _____

Check enclosed (payable to Political Research Associates)

Please charge my VISA Mastercard

_____ Expiration Date _____

Defending Immigrant Rights is part of a series of Activist Resource Kits produced by PRA. If you would like information on other kits, please write to the address below or visit us at www.publiceye.org.

Political Research Associates
1310 Broadway, Suite 201, Somerville, MA 02144
Phone: 617-666-5300 Fax: 617-666-6622

Web: www.publiceye.org

- Inflammatory TV and newspaper ads by the Right blame immigrants for overpopulation and sprawl.
- The Right's armed vigilantes "protect" our borders.
- New anti-immigrant "security" measures target people of color and "foreigners."

Immigrant Rights on the Line

Since September 11th, immigrant scapegoating has increased, whether in the form of hate crimes, racial profiling, or federal legislation. This is the newest example of a long history of anti-immigrant activity.

Defending Immigrant Rights – A Resource to Help You

Defending Immigrant Rights, PRA's latest Activist Resource Kit, will help you:

- ✓ Understand the anti-immigrant movement
- ✓ Organize against right-wing campaigns
- ✓ Respond to anti-immigrant arguments
- ✓ Identify important opponents and allies

“A very timely guide for all activists concerned about the attack on immigrant rights. User friendly and full of information and resources.”

– Catherine Tactaquin, *Director, National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights*

The Public Eye

NEWSLETTER

Political Research Associates
1310 Broadway, Suite 201
Somerville, Massachusetts 02144-1731

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
BOSTON, MA
PERMIT NO. 54584

ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED