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. delegation 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 Beijing conference 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 gains because of the document’s reference to Cairo and Beijing.

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. 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.
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 the conservative one had progressives chosen to mobilize them. 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. September 11, 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 human 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 “compassionate conservative” that fosters bipartisan efforts.

The fact that the Christian Right feels 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. 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. 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 placeable on this year's U.S. delegation to the UN Commission on the Status of Women, which meets every March. Conservative groups influenced the Special Session on AIDS held during the summer of 2001. 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. 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.
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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). 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." 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."

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.”

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 anew 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.

Asembling 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,
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, America’s Promise: Civil Society and the Renewal of American Culture. He was also a founder of the National Fatherhood Initiative (NFI) and author of The Faith Factor in Fatherhood. The NFI was founded in 1994 “to lead a society-wide movement to confront the problem of father absence.” 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 Liberty 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.

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." 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 Dilulio 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 its 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, D.C.-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 Newsweek reported that a 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 Army gatekeepers 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 Dilulio resigned as director of the White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. According to the Washington Post, Dilulio "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 Dilulio'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
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] makes most of the church-state issues that are so thorny disappear.”25

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.

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 reinforced 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 governmental funding and could subject needy Americans to unwanted proselytism.”28

Then, in early February, Senators Santorum and Lieberman announced they had settled on a compromise—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 Toewy, as the new director of the OFBCI. A close friend of Florida Gov. Jeb Bush, Toewy 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 columns twice a week at Working Assets workingforchange.com.
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Antisemitism After September 11th
By Esther Kaplan

Introduction
The media and the general public have been the targets of a surge of anti-Muslim violence 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.” He evocatively 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.”

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, 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." 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 listserv: “Now we have to help channel this hatred toward the Jews.” He urged his fellow neo-Nazis 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.”

The Great Conspiracy
Hale may have had his finger to the wind. On September 17th, the Lebanon television station Al-Mannar 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. 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. 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, even circulating within the American Left, in emails with such credulous introductory remarks as “interesting but unconfirmed information.”

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 Mosad was responsible for the attacks was circulated broadly on e-mail networks in India and was widely believed, “especially among Muslims.” Another version, accusing “Zionists” of plotting the attacks, was posted on a website linked to a ministry of the Qatari government. 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,” and in Rawalpindi (in Pakistani Punjab) in October, where Jamiat Ulema Islam (JUI) leader Maulana Fazlur Rehman explicitly blamed “the Jews” for the September 11th attacks.

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. The ADL documented one serious September 11th-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 Shindelman says that there was no significant increase in anti-Jewish hate incidents in the wake of September 11th. 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.

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. The Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund tracked an additional 77 violent attacks against South Asians in the first month after September 11th. 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 anti-Semitism did not play a decisive role. Of Pearl’s captors, it is 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.

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. 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.

There was an eruption of vandalism of synagogues and Jewish cemeteries in Germany and Belgium. 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.” 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. 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 the synagogue in Lyon, ramming one vehicle into the temple’s main prayer hall and setting it on fire. 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.

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, “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.” 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,” 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.” 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, “explo[es] all the Protocols of the Elders of Zion that have been implemented to date.” A January 2002 article in the Egyptian government weekly, Akher Sa’a headlined: “The Jews are Blood-suckers 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....W hy? Because they are vampires, and vampires cannot live on other vampires.” A December 2001 comedy sketch on Dubai TV called “Terorman,” 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.

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.”

Ali Abunimah, vice-president of the Chicago-based Arab American Action Network, cautions that some of these translations are questionable. 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.” 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. And yet, he says, “alot of anti-Israeli sentiment is indeed mixed with antisemitic rhetoric imported from the West.”

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. Since then there has been a history of Arab countries, especially Egypt, providing safehaven 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 neo-fascists; 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.” 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.

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.” 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 newspaper 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 control 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 25 that the United States was planning to attack Iraq “first and foremost for Israel’s sake.” 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. Star of David on them. Israel is the one who attached an ancient symbol to its violent, colonial operations.”

Middle East expert Phyllis Bennis, a senior fellow with the Progressive Policy Institute, describes the dynamic: “Israel the State, the Army, the occupation use the language of being Jews a great deal, and the symbols of being Jews, and often claim 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, I’m Jewish,’ and they reply, ‘But you’re from New York!’ For them, ‘the Jews’ means ‘the Israelis.’”

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.” He is at home, ADL’s Abe Foxman, is fond of saying “anti-Zionism is anti-Semitism, period,” 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 majoriy—despite the fact that the conference claims to represent the entire American Jewish community. 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, 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.”

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 no longer the case. “No one is going to think of Zionism,” Fadel argues, “if you say ‘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.”

The increase in anti-Jewish violence over the past year and a half indicates that the high 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.” 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-Semitic 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 LePen—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 horrific, 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. O ne 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—that 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-Muslin 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 cohost of Beyond the Pale, a Jewish public affairs program on WBAI radio in New York.
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Filled High the Cross: Where White Supremacy and the Christian Right Converge
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.

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

He said:

“Religion is an American obsession. We often equate it with a political agenda. The personal relationship with God is being co-opted by the political Left. We must not let it happen. We need to maintain a balance. Theologically, Christianity is the only viable world view. It’s not the war on terrorism. And it’s not just the need to understand 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 G is a worse sell-out than George B. While George G sold out on ‘no new taxes,’ George G 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 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 a 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 ‘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 enacting immigration laws and closing our southern border, George Bush’s Republican Party is throwing itself at the Hispanic’s 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
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?


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

GUNNING FOR GAYS

This time, it's in Reno, NV, at the National Rifle Association's 2002 annual convention, where men bear arms and the women bear children. "Dueling 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 Schlussel, 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." Schlussel 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 gather 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 lifestyle. Norquist was also adamant that liberals didn't want men to date girls!


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. "But 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.


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, unlikeable, 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 pleasantry 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.dn.com/living/familyrelationship/)

O'Connor-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:

"Comewinter, 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's city, where the new 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!


---

**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
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

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
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