

**CHAPTER EIGHT “B”
THE POWER OF HATE
AND ITS DESTRUCTIVE CONSEQUENCES TO THE HATER**

I have been developing the “Power Chart” for nearly two decades. However, from the start, one thing continually baffled me: that “hate” does not seem to fit the power dynamics of us in the United States. This is highly unusual and makes us quite unique.

According to its place on the “Power Chart,” “hate” normally occurs among individuals and peoples after some severe or extended breach in relations among various groups: war between nations, a strike between labor and management, a divorce between spouses, a walk out in a family, etc. This fact explains the hate witnessed among many ethnic groups who have been conflicted or at war for centuries. Consequently, we still can read about hate between the Sunnis and Shi’ites around the world, the French-speaking and English-speaking in Canada, the Serbs and Croats in former Yugoslavia, the Tutsis and Hutus in Rwanda and Burundi, and the Kalenjin and the Kikuyus in Kenya--or gays and straights almost everywhere.

In the United States, however, while we read about isolated incidents of hate among some people towards others, such as with immigrants, or sporadic hate crimes related to gays, despite the rhetoric involved, I don’t think it can be said these represent a sin that stains the national psyche. Given the more-pervasive forms of hate elsewhere, I found it especially surprising that hate does not exist among Blacks and Whites, given the history of slavery and the ongoing forms of racism that still divide us and perpetuate tremendous gulfs among us, both monetarily and attitudinally. Because of this lack of a kind of “national hate” among the races led me to wonder whether “hate” on the Power Chart should even be there.

Where Is Hate in the U.S.?

I saw hate among the races when I first began my ministry in Milwaukee. It civil disturbance (or “riot”) occurred in 2007; these gave rise to “marches” for open housing laws. Participating in these demonstrations enabled me to witness to lots of hatred—on both sides. Then, when I was sent to a “changing parish” in 2008 I saw 1,000 of its white families leave, as the blacks moved in. There was much hate at that time, but it subsided.

I saw it erupt quickly, only to subside, in 2008, when Michelle Obama, wife of one of the Democrats running for the presidency said in Milwaukee that “for the first time” in her “adult lifetime” she was proud of the United States because of the way people had come together. In response to the vicious attacks that came her way, she and her husband did “damage control” very quickly. Again the issue subsided.

Despite these “incidents,” it still puzzled me as to why hate between the races, especially the whites and the blacks, has not been more central to our mores in the U.S. Then I learned that the hate, which other groups might express outward, had actually been turned inward. This insight came in a surprising way.

I was sharing the “Power Chart” at a sabbatical program called *New Directions* in Berkeley, California. Participants came from all over the world, including various nations in Sub-Saharan Africa as well as the Caribbean Islands. When I came to address the dynamics of hate among groups of people in our various nations, an insight came to me: Could it be, I asked them, that African Americans who descended from slaves in the United States had turned their hate from their perpetrators and their descendents toward

their own members? Was this ethnic hatred unconsciously expressed in many parts of the black community via words like “nigger” and “ho” and perpetuated both in the language of the street as well as Hip-Hop and Rap?

This possibility led me to ask those from various nations in Africa and the Caribbean: “Do you have any word like ‘nigger’ in your first language?” Not one had any similar words or phraseology. Their characteristic self-respect as a people disallowed them from defining themselves as a people by such demeaning words, much less having a place for them in their lexicon. Consequently their collective consciousness was one of pride.

Around the same time, I read a powerful article in the March, 2007 *Ebony*: “Sex, Violence and Disrespect: What Hip-Hop Has Done to Our Women.” The author, Dr. Johnnetta B. Cole, President of Bennett College for Women and President Emerita of Spelman College, two traditionally “Black Colleges,” declared: “While gangsta rap, which emerged in the late ‘80s, is often described as a contemporary expression of youthful political radicalism, it seems as though the resentment, hostility and disdain that many young Black men feel toward the police and ‘the system’ have been directed at Black girls and women.” She noted the result: “The casual references to rape and other forms of violence and the soft-porn visuals and messages of many rap music videos are seared into the consciousness of young Black boys and girls at an early age.”¹

Indeed if this is the way collective hate exists in the United States, its expression is furthered by the way it is exploited in the media, filling the pocketbooks of contemporary descendants of the slave masters. Cole writes:

Gangsta rap is sometimes defended as a voice of the people and an instrument of change. Yet their messages, which may seem to rail against the establishment, are generally controlled by commercial interests and pose no real threat to the White power structure. Angry young men hurling epithets at their homeboys and female counterparts, and hymnotic songs and videos depicting mindless violence, conspicuous material excess and hostile sexism may be closer to representing new stereotypes of Black buffoonery than paving the way to Black progress. And those stereotypes have always made money for, and continue to fill the pockets of, their White creators.²

Despite such a debilitating pattern, a change may be occurring. Rap sales in 2006 slid 21 percent from 2005 and, for the first time in 12 years, no rap album was among the top 10 sellers of the year. One reason may be that a majority of young people believes rap has too many violent images. Indeed a poll of black Americans taken by the Associate Press and AOL-Black Voices in 2006 found 50 percent of respondents saying hip—hop was negative force in society.³

The Origin of Hate

In 1999, responding to a series of hate crimes in the United States, an ad appeared in major papers across the country. It pictured eight babies of different nationalities under the headline: “No one is born hating.” In other words, hate is an attitude that is nurtured; it does not originate from nature or birth. Hate is learned behavior.

Increasingly, I am coming to believe, the “I hate you” some children say to those with whom they differ, is an attitude that too many of us never abandon. Hate, it seems, comes so easily. Why is there so little tolerance in this nation and in our church for those who differ from us? Why do we so easily find ourselves developing the first element that

leads us to war we discussed in the previous chapter: labeling those with whom we differ as demonic? Why does such characterization of the other in demonic terms justify our hate toward them? How can we square this up when we know that the God we worship loves everyone, including the Devil?

During the presidencies of Bill W. Clinton and George W. Bush I became disheartened at the number of people who evidenced a very real, visceral attitude toward them that can only be summarized by the word “hate.” Such people did not just disagree with their policies; they hated the policy-maker. Robert Samuelson described well the dynamic: “Once disagreement turns into self-proclaimed hate, it becomes blinding. You can see only one all-encompassing truth, which is your villain’s deceit or stupidity. This was true of Clinton-haters, and it’s increasingly true of Bush-haters.”⁴ Certainly, as noted in the previous chapter about the ideology inherent on both sides in our culture-wars, unless we change the rhetoric about the “us” as righteous and the “them” being evil, hate will not be far behind. We will continue to point fingers at others (or at least one!), making these “others” the scapegoats of our hate.

In the chapter on violence I discussed Rene Girard’s theory about “mimetic desire.” While I don’t find it helpful as an overall theory of violence, I do find it applicable to the origin of hate. What haters seem to share in common, I find, is an almost visceral reaction or tendency to project responsibility for their negative situation on some other person or persons. Often this justifies their own hatred. One might even suggest that hate is the justification of violence; if hatred is justified toward those we define as “out of” respect, tolerance or grace, violence will be but a stone’s throw away.

When we hear about “hate crimes,” we usually think of an individual or small groups of individuals who perpetrate some kind of violence on (an)other(s) because they are perceived as belonging to a certain “out” group they have demonized in a way that justifies their violence toward them. Yet, we are beginning to realize, hate also is criminal in institutional and structural ways; not just something individual. Racial profiling is an example. People of color, especially African Americans, are often suspect just because *they are*. This becomes very evident when one listens carefully to the language of black men; they believe they can’t be public without being suspect. The same holds for people who dress differently because of their religious beliefs. Especially given the fear that pervades so many people in the United States, such people presumably from the Middle East seem almost destined to be hated, especially since September 11, 2001.

Tim O’Brien writes, “Hate crimes are not new, only the term is.” He continues:

The reality of human fear leading to anger, anxiety and eventually hatred is a process that has provoked violence for centuries. The fear of the different—whether that means gender, race, country of origin, religious beliefs, sexual orientation, age or whatever—is what fuels the fire of hate. Society is just as capable of committing hate crimes as are individuals. And sometimes individuals are simply reflecting the bias of their society when they act violently.⁵

When we make the “other” our enemy, it will not be long before the other is made “evil” and the rightful object of our hate. After all, haven’t we been told to hate all that is evil? Somehow, in the translation, we forget that we are not told to hate all who do evil; just the evil itself. Nevertheless, Thomas Merton has described the dynamic well: “We seek the cause of evil and find it here or there in a particular nation, class, race, ideology, system. We discharge upon this scapegoat all the virulent force of hatred, compounded

by fear and anguish, striving to rid ourselves of our fear by destroying the object we have arbitrarily singled out as the embodiment of evil.”⁶

Recalling René Girard’s theory of violence and its need for a “scapegoat,” such persons become the justified recipients of violence because they are perceived to personify evil itself. Often unconsciously we project onto these “others” our own evildoing or shame. In the process we destroy ourselves. In this sense Martin Luther King, Jr. had it so right: “The ultimate weakness of violence is that it is a descending spiral, begetting the very thing it seeks to destroy. Instead of diminishing evil, it multiplies it,” he believed. He added: “Through violence you murder the hater, but you do not murder hate. In fact, violence merely increases hate.”⁷

Besides the Girardian notion of mimetic desire as a key source of violence, a related theory regarding its source (at least in the sense we are discussing here) is found in the thought of Hannah Arendt. She theorized that the need for us to look at evil as though it can be objectified as something “out there” rather than having anything to do with the “in here” of myself actually perpetuates violence *itself* rather than resolving it. As she watched Adolf Eichmann on trial for his crimes in the Hitler regime—dressed in suit and tie—she sensed a kind of “everydayness” about it. It clothed itself with normality and respectability. This acceptance of brutality led her to coin the term: the “banality of evil.” It describes the way evil and violence can penetrate and overwhelm our psyche, be we individuals, groups or nations.

Evil and Violence as Partners

In 1991 *Time* magazine featured a cover dominated by a light black background dominated by the word “Evil” in dark black letters. Lance Morrow, one of the finest essayists of our time, wrote it. Acknowledging that evil (historically known as the *mysterium iniquitatis*) has always been bigger than any simple explanation, he seems to describe its source as I have done in this book: as something at the heart of negative relationships and abusive ways of power. Simply speaking, evil is negative power writ large. Although Morrow agrees that, “good and evil contend in every mind,” evil “comes into its own,” he discovered, “when it crosses a line and commits itself and hardens its heart, when it becomes merciless, relentless.”⁸ Evil has no conscience; no care.

A few years after this cover story of *Time*, another cover story on evil appeared in the *New York Times Magazine*. Written in the context of the Oklahoma City bombing, as well as other overpowering expressions of violence—including that perpetrated by my own city’s serial killer, Jeffrey Dahmer—its June 4, 1995 cover declared: “EVIL’S BACK.” Again, like myself and Morrow, its author, Ron Rosenbaum, searched for an explanation for the phenomenon of evil, supposedly so that an explanation of its origin might, somehow, offer us a way to be free of its clutches.

Rosenbaum started with Satan but indicated that this spiritual scapegoating often failed to give adequate attention to its source inside our own hearts, with a resulting abdication of personal responsibility. So he moved to a discussion of evil around its classic definition of “the absence of the good.” From here he sought out Mario Cuomo, former Governor of New York State. It was his insight connecting evil with violence itself that seemed to make most sense to Rosenbaum.

Beginning with his experiences of domestic violence, Cuomo found this one-on-one violence being replicated in the nation as a whole. He said: “This is the most violent society in world history. Have I seen evil? Absolutely. We see it more in this country

than in any country in the world.” When Rosenbaum challenged him, Cuomo insisted: “There’s more violence” in the United States “and that’s the real evil, the ultimate evil.”⁹ Violence is evil, he stated in a categorical way. If it is evil, we can recall what the U.S. bishops said: violence in any form is sinful. Consequently the evil or sin of violence is what we pray to be delivered from each day. But, despite our daily prayers to be delivered from it, violence remains our daily bread. Why?

Ten years after the *Time* magazine story by Lance Morrow and after Timothy McVeigh was granted a stay of execution for his part in the Oklahoma City bombing (because of procedural technicality) the idea of evil was probed by yet another cover story. This time it appeared with *Newsweek’s* red-dominated cover (the color of rage and violence). In bold letters, it asked: “EVIL: What Makes People Go Wrong?”

The differences between this essay and its predecessors, I think, can be found in its author’s argument that too-much scapegoating around evil has dominated our efforts to understand its power and influence in our regular lives. Indeed, Sharon Begley seemed to be saying: “Pointing one finger at the other finds four fingers pointing to you.” Studying scholars in fields as diverse as sociology, psychology, philosophy and theology, she discovered they “are reaching a far more chilling conclusion.” Simply speaking, most of us “have the capacity for horrific evil.” While this may be true, she also discovered that few of us consider our own thoughts, feelings and actions as evil. This made her ask: if “we all have the capacity for evil, why does it become a reality in only some?”¹⁰

We all know of the experiments done wherein participants actually become willing to do violence toward others under various guises. In this vein, Begley referred to an American Psychiatric Association meeting at which participants were told that a key trait in many evildoers was their inability or incapacity “for empathy.” Indeed, among those who may be truly considered evil-doers, their lives not only manifest the lack of care or empathy (especially through their indifference—which will be discussed in the next chapter), they evidence “a void where compassion should be: an evildoer like a serial sexual killer knows full well, but does not care a whit, what another feels.”¹¹ The parallel is also true: when hatred and evil surround us as negative forces, we can become free of their control to the degree we actually cultivate care, love and compassion. Hate and evil can no longer exist as overpowering forces in our lives when we refuse to replicate in our lives their manipulative, exploitative, dominative and coercive ways in our relationships. In other words, evil dies when we refuse to give life to the dynamics of control.

Justifying Violence in the Name of Overcoming Evil

A key reason why violence in our lives and world gets justified flows from the ever-increasing ways we, as well as political, ethnic and religious groups, continue to label anything that goes wrong as “evil.” This need not be limited to normally differing groups, such as Democrats and Republicans. It can happen within a Party as well, such as an incident during the 2000 Presidential campaign--when Senator John McCain said (but now disavowed) that two of his opponents, Pat Robertson and Rev. Jerry Falwell, were having an “evil influence” over the Republican Party.¹²

When a gunman killed himself and seven other people at a Baptist church in 1999 in Fort Worth, fellow Texan George W. Bush, then its Governor, stated: “It’s hard to explain how hatred lurks in somebody’s heart to the point where he walks into a church where children and adults were seeking God’s guidance and shoots them.” However, in

the same speech, he refused to place blame on rampant gun violence in America. Rather it came from “a wave of evil.” He added: “This man obviously was acting as a result of evil in his heart.”¹³

The conclusion of George W. Bush indicates another phenomenon that has developed in our approach to evil and our easy way of labeling evil as a power outside us. It is the way we dismiss those with whom we deeply differ or seriously disagree and too easily castigate them as “evil.” A powerful example of this can be found in the frequent use of the word after George W. Bush became President.

Despite the fact that it has been shown that the ideological justification for war after war begins with the perception of the enemy as “evil,” George W. Bush and his supporters still were able to stir up the citizenry in his 2002 State of the Union speech by calling three of them, Iraq, Iran and North Korea “the axis of evil.” In this President Bush sought to evoke a previous notion of evil applied to the Soviet Union by President Reagan—the “Evil Empire.” Indeed, Daniel Henninger, an op-ed writer in *The Wall Street Journal* opined:

I doubt that the role of evil . . . would have come up had not President Bush forced it into view. Starting on September 11 itself, Mr. Bush began to say in almost every public statement that the force confronting the United States, and the world, was “evil.” I have no recollection of another recent public figure placing this concept so insistently at the center of his thought, not even the Pope.¹⁴

The conclusion of Mr. Henninger and those who would uncritically accept his acceptance of the appellation of one’s enemies as “evil” is self-evident: whoever opposes this evil cannot be wrong. They are righteous and will have the blessing of that God who has promised to “deliver us from evil.” Equating people themselves rather than their actions with evil, we can move quite easily into justifying our own scapegoating. Thus, in his *Time* essay, Lance Morrow showed that, when anyone outside our “tribe” can be dehumanized and called evil a “perverse, efficient logic” takes over: the justification of doing evil against them.

Paradoxically, in his classic, *People of the Lie*, the late M. Scott Peck showed that those who operate in such a way, point their finger at others, blame or scapegoat them, and define *them* as “evil.” He wrote: “A predominant characteristic . . . of the behavior of those I call evil is scapegoating. Because in their hearts they consider themselves above reproach, they must lash out at anyone who does reproach them. They sacrifice others to preserve their self-image of perfection.”¹⁵

Violence, Evil and Hate Invading Our Hearts as Individuals and People to Our Own Detriment and That of the Planet Itself

A decade passed before I experienced in my own body a concrete manifestation of the infectious way the violence that Morrow envisioned in his 1991 *Time* essay could infect my life. I came to realize how easily we can succumb to corruption in our own bodies/souls by the disease of hate that can so easily pervade our body-politic, especially when we come to believe we, the innocent ones, are being attacked by “outsiders.”

The experience occurred when I happened to be in New York City on September 11, 2001. Like everyone else with an ounce of care, I was shocked and deeply grieved by what happened. But unlike many, I was surprised that I was not reacting with the resentment and rage that seemed to characterize much of the rhetoric, but with a deep desire to find another way of responding to the terrorist strikes that took place that day.

Neither did I find comfort in hearing the President and others declare that “our lifestyle” was at stake, because I knew that what they and I meant by “our lifestyle” reflected two very different worldviews. They saw the reason for the strikes as something without any context: pure jealousy of our values and way of life; I believed these “enemies” found flaws in our nation’s foreign policy, including military bases in their countries, our connections to their corrupt elites and our effort to use both our military and their corrupt dictators to keep our control of world markets at the cheapest price. This “sin” demanded our deaths. My thinking such thoughts was not helped when I recalled that September 11, 1973—18 years before—was the date of the U.S.-supported overthrow of the democratically-elected government of Salvador Allende of Chile. Again, this was done “to protect our national interests.”

Because I seemed surround by demands for revenge—which I believed would only increase the violence, I found myself wondering if I might be wrong. Maybe my worldview was distorted; maybe the President was right. Maybe our Government and ways of globalizing to ensure our “national interests” and our “lifestyle” did nothing at all to provoke such an attack. While tempted to think this way, I could not forget my travels abroad and the people I met who “hated” the United States, especially since the election of George W. Bush. Even my friends abroad did not “like” my nation.

As I felt this alienation and disconnectedness, I also continued feeling totally overwhelmed at the senseless act of misguided people who believed terrorism would assuage their hate. I felt increasing pain at the resulting loss of so many lives of both perpetrators and victims. I could not get out of my head and heart what must be occurring in the homes of the hearts of the survivors of the victims, especially when their pictures, their phone calls and last words to their loved ones were being shared with the world.

Two days after the attacks, I came to understand why I was feeling such overwhelming grief not only for the victims and their families, but for the perpetrators and their loved ones as well. Being in midtown Manhattan when the attack on the World Trade Center occurred, I was unable to see the smoke arising from Ground Zero, especially because the weather had been so perfect. Only when I’d go to 7th Avenue and peer down could I see the billowing smoke hiding the devastation. However, that day, September 13th, something changed.

The wind shifted.

As the wind came “uptown,” my eyes became sore, my nose filled up and my mouth felt very chalky. At first I thought I might becoming sick. But then a deeper awareness of an illness far more severe than anything purely personal pervaded me. I realized that it wasn’t just that the smoke from Ground Zero was getting into me; I understood what and, especially, who, now had come to constitute that smoke. Now becoming my body and blood were the perpetrators and the victims. Their penetration of my being made me realize in a way like never before how connected I was with them and they with me. This experience led me to connect beyond them to everyone in the universe. I was part of everyone and everything and all of these were part of me. I now had a choice: respond to their presence in me with hate or care, violence or compassion. If I chose care and compassion I could become one with them in a way that linked us to the divine energy at the heart of the universe. Any negative anger or violent thoughts that might have found home in my heart had to be removed in a renewed commitment to do

what I could do to stop the hate that too often is able to “make home” in our very bodies, individually, communally and as a people.

What I experienced in Manhattan that day made me recall the *Time* essay of Morrow ten years earlier. He noted then that religions over many centuries “developed elaborate codifications of sin and evil.” He continued with a prediction: the future would see the emergence of another, more cosmic, way of violence that would be getting named in the future: ecological violence. After stating that human beings have been “on the whole, a catastrophe to the animals” (just witness the ever-more rapid disappearance of species after species), he went further:

With the emergence of a new world will come a recodification of evils. Obviously offenses against the earth are coming to be thought of as evils in ways we would not have suspected a few years ago. The developed world, at least, is forming a consensus that will regard violence to the planet to be evil in the way we used to think of unorthodox sexual practices and partnerships as being outside the realm of accepted conduct.¹⁶

Morrow was prescient in his insight that we would soon be realizing there are moral implications for our “lifestyle.” In Catholicism this realization has come late, but with a strength which has pleased me, especially when I felt quite alone in my collaboration with others at the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility to address the issue of global warming with resistant and powerful companies like ExxonMobil (including allegations that we were trying to overthrow the free-enterprise system—another way of saying “our way of life”). Now Popes and the Vatican have said ecological integrity is a grave moral concern.¹⁷ Would that we might soon be delivered of the evil to people and the planet that our “lifestyle” has clearly wrought and which has evoked so much violence in the world as a result.

Attacking Hate

Hopefully, while the above ruminations allows us to keep “hate” in its place after “war” on our Power Chart, we also might conclude that, to keep peoples from moving to hate in their own lives, groups and institutions, they must make “war” on it. In other words, they must become proactive in the way they “arm” themselves to combat hate.

I came to this insight from reading a *New York Times* magazine cover-article on hate by the pundit, Andrew Sullivan. He rightly asked what, exactly, is the nature of this thing called “hate”? Despite the fact that we seem willing, even zealous, in our effort to “attack hate,” he still are quite conflicted regarding what we mean by hate. He wrote:

For all our zeal to attack hate, we still have a remarkably vague idea of what it actually is. A single word, after all, tells us less, not more. For all its emotional punch, “hate” is far less nuanced an idea than prejudice, or bigotry, or bias, or anger, or even mere aversion to others. Is it to stand in for all these varieties of human experience—and everything in between? If so, then the war against it will be so vast as to be quixotic. Or is “hate” to stand for a very specific idea or belief, or set of beliefs, with a very specific object or group of objects? Then waging war against it is almost certainly unconstitutional. Perhaps these kinds of questions are of no concern to those waging war on hate. Perhaps it is enough for them that they share a sentiment that there is too much hate and never enough vigilance in combating it.¹⁸

Following the Power Chart, hate is one of the most destructive and violent forms of power in the world; whether infecting individuals, groups or whole cultural entities, it becomes a disease with no effective vaccination, a pathology with little hope for a cure. Following our Power Chart, it occurs when fear of the other is compounded or exaggerated, when abuses continue, conflicts remain unresolved and anger about slights and unrequited efforts go unabated and fester. Continuing the “disease” or “pathology” metaphor for evil, Andrew Sullivan rightly concludes that the only way hate can be overcome is “not when the haters are punished but when the hated are immune to the bigot’s power. A hater cannot psychologically wound if a victim cannot psychologically be wounded. And that immunity to hurt can never be given; it can merely be achieved.” He concludes that, while “hate will never be destroyed,” responding to hate in this way, stops the hate in its tracks.¹⁹ Hate can only be conquered by the use of an alternative form of positive power. As Paul tells us in Romans, the only way to overcome evil is with the good.

Following the “butterfly effect,” I believe that our personal refusal to be part of the spiral of violence expressed in evil doing can have cosmic implications. In this I recall the 1991 discovery that Lance Morrow found about evil in his *Time* essay. Noting how evil is an expression of negative power or violence, and as such, is something that connects us all, making us morally responsible, the only way we can stop its contagion is by becoming free of its contagion by coming under a higher power. We no longer can live as bystanders, lest we be guilty of silent complicity: “The widening stain of responsibility for evil on a constricting planet changes moral contexts,” he wrote. The most powerful way we can personally address the macro-forms of evil and violence is to resist it in our own lives. “Microevil, the murder of an individual child, becomes part of the macroorganism: all the evils breathe the same air they have the same circulatory system. They pass through the arteries of the world . . .”²⁰ It’s up to each of us to find a way to open up these arteries through a kind of cardiac cleansing that begins in each of our hearts: lead us not into such a temptation; but deliver us from evil. Our prayer needs to be balanced with our attempts to find ways of becoming inoculated from this evil that seems to have invaded our planetary system—to the point of its own rapid demise.

Notes

¹ Dr. Johnnetta B. Cole, “What Hip-Hop Has Done to Black Women,” *Ebony*, March, 2007, 94.

² Cole, *Ibid.*, 96.

³ Nekesa Mumbi Moody, “Rap Backlash Making Waves,” *The Orange County Register*, March 6, 2007.

⁴ Robert Samuelson, “It’s Not Good to Hate, Especially Presidential Politics,” *The Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, January 2, 2004.

⁵ Tim O’Brien, SJ, “Institutional Hate Abounds,” *8th Day Centerings*, Spring, 2001, 2.

⁶ Thomas Merton, quoted in Kathy Nolan, OP, “Nonviolence: Power of Compassion,” *Eighth Day Centerings*, Winter, 2003, 4.

⁷ Martin Luther King, Jr., quoted in *Catholic New Times*, June 1, 2003.

⁸ Lance Morrow, “Evil,” *Time*, June 10, 1991, 51.

⁹ Ron Rosenbaum, “Staring into the Heart of the Heart of Darkness,” *The New York Times Magazine*, June 4, 1995, 58.

¹⁰ Sharon Begley, “The Roots of Evil,” *Newsweek*, May 21, 2001, 31-32.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 32.

¹² John McCain, quoted in David Barstow, “McCain, in Further Attack, Calls Leaders of Christian Right ‘Evil,’” *The New York Times*, March 1, 2000.

¹³ George W. Bush, quoted in Associated Press news item, “Bush Blames ‘Wave of Evil’ for Shootings

across Nation,” *The New York Times*, September 17, 1999.

¹⁴ Daniel Henninger, “‘Know Ye Not Me?’: The Face of Evil Is Seen, Defeated,” *The Wall Street Journal*, April 18, 2003.

¹⁵ M. Scott Peck, M.D., *People of the Lie: The Hope for Healing Human Evil* (New York: Simon & Schuster Touchstone Book, 1983), 73.

¹⁶ Morrow, “Evil,” 53.

¹⁷ See statement of Archbishop Celestino Migliore, delivered May 10, 2007 to the 15th session of the U.N. Commission on Sustainable Development of the Economic and Social Council on “Turning Political Commitments Into Action, Working Together in Partnership.” Zenit news service, May 11, 2007.

¹⁸ Andrew Sullivan, “What’s So Bad about Hate?,” *The New York Times Magazine*, September 26, 1999, 52.

¹⁹ Sullivan, 113.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 50.