

Fordham University
Center on Religion and Culture | Center for Ethics Education

New York, New York
April 12, 2011

MORAL OUTRAGE AND MORAL REPAIR:
Reflections on 9/11 and its Afterlife

PANEL III:
RESPONSES TO TERRORISM:
LAW, POLITICS AND THE MEDIA

Moderator

Russell Pearce, *Professor of Law, Edward & Marilyn Bellet Chair in Legal Ethics, Morality, and Religion, Fordham University Law School*

Panelists

Responding to Terrorism and Terrorists “In a Spirit of Brotherhood”?

Michael Perry, *Robert W. Woodruff Professor of Law, Emory University;*
University Distinguished Visiting Professor of Law and Peace Studies, University of San Diego

Islam and the Battle for the Soul of the Republic

M.A. Muqtedar Khan, *Associate Professor, Department of Political Science and International Relations, University of Delaware*

From National Solidarity to Partisan Acrimony: Politics and Patriotism

E.J. Dionne Jr. *Columnist, the Washington Post; Senior Fellow, Brookings Institution;*
Professor in the Foundations of Democracy and Culture, Georgetown University

CELIA FISHER: We are going to begin. You are all so good, eating quickly and getting here. Just reminders: Turn off your phones if they happen to be on. Once again, we will have people going down the aisles for your questions. We will have Panel III, which is going to be presenting now, and then all the participants will come up and they will dialogue with one another and we will have questions as well. For this panel we are fortunate to have as the moderator Russell Pearce, Professor of Law, Edward & Marilyn Bellet Chair in Legal Ethics, Morality, and Religion at Fordham University. Thank you, Russ.

RUSSELL PEARCE: Thank you very much, Professor Fisher. It is really an honor to be part of this wonderful panel and part of this very important and very moving and powerful conference. As Professor Fisher mentioned at the end of the previous panel, we are now going to transition into the responses. We are going to hear from three outstanding scholars about the responses in law, politics, and media, as well as consideration of methods from these perspectives of preventing future harms. Our three panelists are Professor Michael Perry, Professor Muqtedar Khan, and Professor E.J. Dionne.

Let me start with Professor Michael Perry. He is the Robert Woodruff Professor at Emory University and the University Distinguished Visiting Professor of Law and Peace Studies at the University of San Diego. I can say that in his two areas of specialty, human rights study and constitutional studies, he is one of the most important and influential thinkers in the legal academy. Welcome, Professor Perry.

MICHAEL PERRY: Thank you, Russ. I am very grateful for the opportunity to spend this afternoon with all of you. I'm sure I'm not thanking everyone I should thank, but thanks very much Celia and Michael and Peggy and Peter. The Web site for this conference states, and here I am quoting: “As we approach the tenth anniversary of the September 11th terrorist attacks, debate over methods of preventing

future harms while preserving our moral integrity has raised complex questions that touch upon issues of rights, redress, and our common humanity. This conference seeks to advance public dialogue and moral understanding as the country continues to grapple with these tensions.”

I want to say a few words this afternoon about navigating the tension between, on the one side, preserving our moral integrity and, on the other, preventing future harms. In particular, I want to say a few words about one important method, if we may call it that, for navigating that tension, one important method for preserving our moral integrity while preventing future harms. The method: respecting and protecting human rights. Two fundamental inquiries concerning that particular method are, I think, worth pursuing.

This is the first inquiry. In the decade since the September 11th terrorist attacks, how well have we — as in We the People of the United States — acting through our government, respected and protected human rights as we have tried to prevent future harms? Indeed, right now, even as we speak, how well are we respecting and protecting human rights as we try to prevent future harms?

Pursuing that inquiry, which I don't intend to do here and now, would require us to look closely at our government's practices over the past ten years and now with respect to several matters, including: torture and the related practice of rendition; excessive military violence, including excessive military violence against noncombatants, mainly in Iraq and Afghanistan; the degrading and otherwise inhumane treatment of prisoners; administrative detention without trial for an indefinite but often quite lengthy period; and discrimination against Muslims, including of course Muslim Americans.

Speaking of torture, as I was drafting these comments, the Center for Constitutional Rights here in Manhattan reported at the end of February that “the full panel of judges of the *Audencia Nacional*, Spain's highest court, rejected a Spanish prosecutor's effort to stop an investigation into the role of United States officials for torture on Guantanamo.” The Center then stated: “This is a monumental decision that will enable a Spanish judge to continue a case on the authorized and systematic plan of torture and ill treatment by U.S. officials at Guantanamo.” Geoffrey Miller, the former commanding officer at Guantanamo, has already been implicated, and the case will surely move up the chain of command.

Since the United States has not only failed to investigate the illegal actions of its own officials, and, according to diplomatic cables released by WikiLeaks, also sought to interfere in the Spanish judicial process and stop the case from proceeding, this will be the first real investigation of the U.S. torture program. “This is a victory for accountability and a blow against impunity. The Center for Constitutional Rights applauds the Spanish courts for not bowing to political pressure and for undertaking what may be the most important investigation in decades.”

Again, there are two fundamental inquiries worth pursuing, and it is to the second of those two inquiries that I now want to turn. Hereafter, when I say “preventing future harms,” I mean future 9/11-like harms, or at least future grave harms at the hands of 9/11-like terrorists.

Let us assume that in the context of our post-9/11 struggle to prevent future harms there is sometimes a serious conflict between two goals: the goal of preventing future harms and the goal of respecting and protecting human rights that are internationally recognized and to which we profess to be committed. If in the context of our post-9/11 struggle to prevent future harms there is never a serious conflict between those two goals, or if in particular situations there is no serious conflict between the two goals, then great, no problem. We can, without seriously inconveniencing ourselves, respect and protect human rights and thereby feel good about ourselves. We can feel good, in particular, about the state of our moral integrity.

But as I said, let us assume that in the context of our post-9/11 struggle to prevent future harms there is, at least sometimes, a serious conflict between those two goals. Some of our fellow citizens, probably many of them, believe, even though they do not all openly avow, that the need to prevent future harms trumps the need to respect and protect human rights when the two goals are in serious conflict. Some, many, of our fellow citizens would say that our commitment to human rights is not a suicide pact.

Here's the inquiry I want to pursue with you briefly. Why do some of us think that in cases of serious conflict, We the People of the United States fail to live as we should if in our struggle to prevent future

harms we fail to respect and protect human rights? Why are some of us, in the interest of respecting and protecting human rights, willing to risk occasional failures to prevent future harms? Why, in short, do some of us take human rights so seriously — some say too seriously? The tenth anniversary of the 9/11 terrorist attacks is an especially fitting occasion to pursue that inquiry.

The response I am about to sketch is only one response, but it is, I think, an important response. The importance of the response is enhanced, I think, by the fact that the response does not require any religious or metaphysical foundation. Let me assert here, without defending what I have defended elsewhere — namely, that one can recognize a horror as a horror, the horrors, for example, described in Yale historian Timothy Snyder's stunning, searing book *Bloodlands: Europe Between Hitler and Stalin* — without affirming any religious or metaphysical premises.

My response begins by looking back briefly at the largest horrors of the 20th century. The name of my state of origin, Kentucky, is said to derive from a Native American word meaning “a dark and bloody land.” An apt name for our century of origin is a dark and bloody time — indeed, *the* dark and bloody time. The 20th century, as someone said, was the bloodiest in human existence, not only because of the total number of deaths attributed to wars — 109 million — but because of the fraction of the population killed by conflicts, more than ten times more than during the 16th century. However, the list of 20th-century horrors includes much more than wars.

As the century began, King Leopold II of Belgium was presiding over a Holocaust in the Congo. It is estimated that between 1880 and 1920, because of a system of slave labor, the population of the Congo dropped by approximately 10 million people. From 1915–1923 the Ottoman Turks who were Muslim committed genocide against the Armenian minority who were Christian. Not counting deaths inflicted in battle, Stalin was responsible for the deaths of over 42 million people 1929–1953. Mao, over 37 million 1923–1976. Hitler, over 20 million 1933–1945, including over 10 million Slavs and about 5.5 million Jews. And I must add here that, if you haven't already read or, as I did, listen to on my iPod while I was running, [Timothy] Snyder's *Bloodlands*, I hope you will do so.

One need only mention these places to recall some more recent atrocities: Cambodia 1975–1979; Bosnia 1992–1995; Rwanda 1994; and in the early years of the 21st century, the Darfur region of Sudan. Sadly, there is so much more. For an exhaustive and exhausting account of the grim — indeed, horrific — details, one can consult the two-volume *Encyclopedia of Genocide*, which reports: “In total, during the first eighty-eight years of the 20th century, almost 170 million men, women, and children were shot, beaten, tortured, knifed, burned, starved, frozen, crushed, or worked to death, buried alive, drowned, hanged, bombed, or killed in any other of the myriad other ways governments have inflicted deaths on unarmed, helpless civilians, citizens and foreigners. Depending on whether one used high or more conservative estimates, the dead could conceivably be more than 360 million people. It is as though our species has been devastated by a modern Black Plague.”

In the midst of the countless grotesque inhumanities of the 20th century, however, there is a heartening story: the internationalization in the wake of the Second World War of human rights. The 20th century was not only the dark and bloody time, the second half of the 20th century was also the time in which a growing number of countries around the world responded to the savage horrors of the 20th century by joining together to establish systems for protecting human rights, thereby rendering the moral landscape of the 20th century a touch less bleak.

Of course, we must be careful not to overestimate what has been accomplished on the ground in virtue of the internationalization of human rights and careful to not to overestimate the strength of the human rights culture, as we may call it. Indeed, the profound importance of strengthening the human rights culture as a way of trying to prevent future horrors is a principal reason why some of us take human rights so seriously. It is a principal reason why some of us are willing to risk occasional failures to prevent future harms.

The profound importance of strengthening the human rights culture, understood as one important bulwark against future horrors, leads some of us to conclude that in cases of serious conflict We the People fail to live as we should if, in our effort to prevent future harms, we fail to respect and protect

human rights, and thereby weaken the bulwark that we hope will help us to prevent future horrors. The temptation to weaken that bulwark is ever present.

Article I of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that “All members of the human family should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.” Ever present, and especially strong in this post-9/11 era, is the temptation to respond to various political, economic, and/or military exigencies — greatly stressful exigencies, to be sure — by betraying our commitment to respect and protect human rights, our commitment to treat every human being in a spirit of brotherhood.

The horrors that we human beings have inflicted on one another just in the last 100 years alone are illustrative of the horrors, the dispiriting, mind-numbing horrors, that we human beings are capable of inflicting on one another. We Americans, it bears emphasis, are not genetic exceptions. We too are members of the species that has proven itself quite capable of, quite adept at, inflicting horrors on one another. We must remember that we too have that capacity, the capacity to inflict horrors on one another. We must not succumb to the delusion that we cannot become, that we are immune to becoming, moral monsters.

It is precisely our all-too-human capacity to inflict horrors on one another, and perhaps even to imagine that we have a transcendent warrant for inflicting horrors on one another, that constitutes the best reason, I think the most compelling reason, for us to take human rights so seriously, to the point even of risking occasional failure to prevent future harms. Making it taboo, doing everything we can, however little and often unavailing it may be, however glacial the progress may be, to socialize ourselves and other human beings, including Americans, to the view that it is taboo even in the context of greatly stressful exigencies to fail to respect and protect human rights, is surely one important way to try to minimize the possibility of future bloodlands and of lesser but nonetheless real horror.

Let me finish my comments by returning to the first of our two inquiries. In the decade since the September 11th terrorist attacks, how well have We the People, acting through our government, respected and protected human rights as we have tried to prevent future harms? Indeed, right now, even as we speak, how well are we respecting and protecting human rights as we try to prevent future harms?

Have we done and are we doing all that we can to strengthen and nurture the human rights culture, the acting towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood culture? Or, instead, have we weakened that culture, the culture that is, as I said, one of our most important bulwarks against future horrors? And, if we are not doing all that we can to strengthen and nurture the human rights culture, why are we not? Do we not know, have we forgotten, what we are capable of doing to one another? While we struggle to prevent future harms, are we overlooking this future harm, or are we discounting its possibility that we will become moral monsters? Is there a future harm that we should be more desperate to prevent than that we will become, like so many of our fellow human beings before us, moral monsters? Thank you.

RUSSELL PEARCE: Thank you very much for those provocative thoughts. Our second speaker today on this panel is Dr. M.A. Muqtedar Khan. He is Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science and International Relations at the University of Delaware. He is Founding Director of the Islamic Studies Program at the University of Delaware and a Fellow with the Institute for Social Policy and Understanding. He has been president, vice president, and general secretary of the Association of Muslim Social Scientists. Welcome.

MUQTEDAR KHAN: I have some bad news for basketball lovers. It is in danger of ceasing to be the favorite national pastime of this country. It's possible that it will soon be replaced with Islamophobia. Any given afternoon, if there is nothing interesting on TV, why not go and beat up your neighborhood Muslim, or at least stand in front of his mosque and tell him how much you hate him? It might be a good afternoon.

I want to thank the enchanting Dr. Celia Fisher for inviting me here and the various centers at Fordham who are hosting this event. We have heard a lot about the clash of civilizations and clash of values. I think we are not dealing with a clash of values, or even a clash *for* values. What we have really witnessed in the last ten years is a concerted effort, a clash, against values. It seems that both sides, whichever the two

sides are, seem to be competing with each other in downsizing their moral stature: “How rapidly can we give up our values?” seems to be the contest that is going on.

On September 11th, when Osama and al Qaeda not only attacked the United States, they actually launched a major assault on the moral fabric of the Muslim community. The reason they were able to do this is because they coincided the justification for their costly acts with justice. They appropriated the faith of Islam and they appropriated the causes of Muslims, which in my opinion and in the opinion of most Muslims are just. By appropriating just causes and acting in favor of those causes in an unjust fashion, they have created a moral dilemma for Muslims which they are having trouble, even now, coping with. How do we condemn bin Laden and his actions without losing the cause? That is a dilemma for an average Muslim on the street in the Muslim world.

How can we say that the United States has not committed crimes against us in the conduct of its foreign policy? How can we say that the Palestinians have suffered enough? If the United States thinks that freedom is the greatest virtue, then how can it stand against the freedom of any people? What are we waiting for? Why does the United States protect, promote, guard, finance dictators and monarchs and kings and caliphs and emirs while at the same time lecturing the same world about the virtues of democracy? So when Muslims look at the United States, they have a lot of trouble reconciling U.S. rhetoric and U.S. policies. They are very angry. That was the state before 9/11. Now add Iraq to that.

One of the best commentators in this country, the profoundest philosopher that America has produced in a long, long time, is Jon Stewart. [Laughter] He said something incredible about the war in Iraq. He said, “The next country that we are going to attack is Canada, because Canada is exactly like Iraq. It does not have weapons of mass destruction and it has nothing to do with 9/11.” [Laughter]

It was apparent to everybody in the world, except the United States and the 70 percent of the population that supported that war, a war which has reduced the population of Iraq — you should add that to your list — by 20 percent. The Iraqi population was reduced by 20 percent after the U.S. invasion of Iraq. Thousands and thousands of women have become prostitutes because they don’t know how to survive in freedom and democracy.

So for Muslims you have these issues:

- One, they feel that the causes that Muslims are fighting for are valid, they are justified. They see themselves as victims of violence, victims of justice. I have spent a lot of time promoting democracy in the Muslim world. I remember an old man telling me, “Why don’t you take some time off and also tell Muslims, instead of just preaching to us the virtues of democracy, how to defend ourselves from democracies, and just stop bombing us?”

So the causes are just. But the means that some Muslims have taken up are shocking. At first, I used to be so passionately angry at Muslims who used to deny 9/11. For many years I was sort of ostracized by my own community for stuff that I wrote about 9/11, condemning bin Laden and extremism and so on.

And then, a few years ago, I realized, *Oh my God, it’s such a great thing that Muslims deny 9/11*. I realized that Muslims cannot believe that Muslims could have done this in the name of Islam. They deny it not because of conspiracy theories or because of facts, but one reason is that they cannot morally accept it; they are not ready to accept that.

Of course there are contingent problems that go along with un-acceptance. The real time you are going to join a gym is when you look in the mirror and say, “Oh, my God.” If you don’t have that “Oh, my God” moment, there will be no reform. There will be no moral repair unless you have a moral outrage against yourself. You look at yourself and you say “Oh, my God,” and then you need to repair yourself. So Muslims are going through this. Unfortunately, they are not able to cope with it well. The entire anti-American — I don’t know what to call it — the circus that we witnessed in Pakistan recently over the Raymond Davis issue. It shows that there is tremendous anger in the Muslim world against the United States, especially in some parts of the Muslim world. No matter how many billions of dollars we throw at them, we are not going to get them to like us.

Now we have a lot of public opinion surveys. If you look at these surveys, you will find that Muslims are pretty rational people and their anti-Americanism is also pretty rational. When the tsunamis hit Indonesia, the first responders, the American soldiers, the anti-Americanism significantly declined in Indonesia, and it remains low even now. When we helped the Pakistanis after the earthquakes, the anti-Americanism declined. It only went up after we started competing with al Qaeda and Taliban in Pakistan. Who kills more civilians in Pakistan? They are doing pretty well; it's like half and half. So we can see that now anti-Americanism in Pakistan has gone up, and there is a direct relationship between what we do to them and how they think about us.

If you don't understand this connection between what we do to them and how they think about us, it is time for you to get back into the dating game. Go on a couple of dates and you will find out that there is a correlation in how people feel about you based on how you deal with them. This whole idea that "for no reason at all they hate us," you have to be mentally retarded or addicted to Fox News to accept that argument. The Muslim world has a lot of problems. The Muslim world is like a teen-ager with a lot of zits trying to cope with it. They have multiple crises. They have a crisis of governance. They don't know how to govern themselves. And those who are governing them are more corrupt than anybody else. Can you imagine what luck to have Assad and Gaddafi and Mubarak and bin Ali all at the same time, in the same decades?

- Muslims are having a crisis of legitimacy. They really don't know what to follow. Should we follow the West or should we follow the East? And if they follow the East, what is the East? The entire experience of colonization, which truncated Muslim history, disconnected the Muslims from their past and disconnected them from the rest of the world. So they have this nostalgic and romanticized notion that if they go back to Islam, they will thrive and revive again.

But whose Islam — the Islam of Saudi Arabia, the Islam of Iran, the Islam of Turkey? None of them are doing well anyway. So the whole idea that if we return to Islam we will do well, and then we watch people who return to Islam and who don't do well. And we watch people who turn away from Islam, like Turkey, who, after sixty years, are still considered a pariah and will not be accepted in Europe? The Turks tried really hard. They gave up their faith, they wore the hat, they changed the way they write. They became more secular than anybody else in the world for over half a century — and nothing; they are still Muslims and the Europeans are too good for them. So the lesson that the Muslims learned is becoming secular and modern also got you nothing.

So there is a crisis of authority, which way to go.

- There is a crisis of morality too. For example, I get into arguments as to how Muslim scholars today are afraid to talk about forgiveness, the profound principles of forgiveness which are in Islamic scriptures, because they don't want preachers applying them to Israel. They don't want people to start forgiving Israel. Before we had one and created the Palestinian state — "Let the political goals be achieved and then we will think of morality." So there is a moral crisis in the Muslim world. Some of the most corrupt countries are Muslim countries. In this multiple age of crises, we are trying to put the moral burden on those who cannot afford it.

And what about the U.S. response to it? The U.S. response was amazing. I actually wrote it down here. The U.S. response was: "We are innocent. We are superior. We are moral. We are great. We will continue to waterboard you until you accept us." This is fascinating. The United States was perhaps and is perhaps the world's most powerful country — not only in present times, but in history. Can you think of any country, any empire, any collection of countries and any collection of empires, from the past or the present, or if you have been kidnapped by aliens from the future, that could defeat the current United States?

The most powerful country, at the peak of its power in 2001 — it defeated the Soviet Union, defeated communism, defeated everybody — became so insecure that its own values became cumbersome. I mean in one stroke bin Laden got rid of four out of the ten Amendments and the Bill of Rights. That was the most shocking part.

For somebody like me, who has spent a lot of time advocating democracy in the Muslim world, the moment the U.S. abandoned its democratic principles in the wake of one attack — I said, “How can I go and preach to people who are attacked all the time to adhere to democratic values, because what the United States has just told me is that democracy is dependent on domination — ‘We will be democratic only when we are dominant, and when we are threatened we will give up our democratic values because we cannot afford them anymore.’”

There is a new show on NBC called *The Event*. I don’t know if anyone of you has watched this show. It is about aliens coming to Earth. And then we have a new president, a black president, a very liberal, wonderful guy, talking about human rights and civil rights, etc. It is amazing watching Obama change into a Bush — “If you’re not with me, you are against me” — so easily, so quickly. Power is corrupting, they say. I was so gung-ho about Obama. Recently, I was asked to evaluate his foreign policy towards the Muslim world. I see very little change. There seems to be more continuity than change in U.S. policies towards the Middle East. But nonetheless, what did the U.S. do? The U.S. trampled on its own values in order to fight a war to defend these same values.

The ensuing conflict between the U.S. and the Muslim radicals has jeopardized lives and property, but, more importantly, the very values in whose defense we kill and send our young ones to die. I am there fighting for your right to speak — “Yeah, but when I speak you put me away.” So what right are you defending? Today we live in very, very bad times if you are a Muslim living in the United States. We see a significant emergence of Islamophobia.

I have been commenting on Islamophobia for several years. One of my pet lines — you know, sometimes you have media calling you at 3:00 a.m. and 2:00 a.m., in the middle of the night and asking you, “What have you got to say?” So you have to have these things that you say without thinking and then turn off the phone and go back to bed immediately. One of those lines was: “Islamophobia in Europe is systematic whereas in the U.S. it is episodic.” That was my pet line. I would drop it and then go to bed. Then, one fine day I heard myself say it and I got up and said, “No, that’s not true anymore. We have a new form of Islamophobia in the United States.”

First of all, it is not episodic anymore, it is systematic. In any democracy, the rights of minorities are protected by laws, the lawmakers, and law enforcement agencies. As long as you have a professional law enforcement agency, as long as you have a Constitution which has liberal values and human rights enshrined in it, and you have lawmakers who respect their own Constitution, minorities should be safe no matter how many KKKs are out there. But today in the United States the top three threats of Islamophobia are laws, lawmakers, and law enforcement agencies.

You all know Peter King. Need I say more? It’s the lawmakers who are a threat to Muslim civil rights. It’s the laws that are being passed. Tennessee wanted to pass a law which would have made felons out of Muslims who washed their feet. I kid you not. It sounds so bizarre. Only in America, when you wash your feet and you are obeying the Shariah, that is a felony and you will be sent to prison for fifty years. That law did not pass.

But Oklahoma did pass a referendum. More than 75 percent of the population voted to pass a referendum to ban the Shariah. People don’t know what they are banning. If a Muslim says “killing is bad,” he is obeying the Shariah. Now you’re saying that if you think killing is bad, we will put you away in prison for fifty years. So what has happened is that you see it everywhere now. Not just on airlines while entering the country, but in schools, in businesses, etc., there is a systematic appearance of Islamophobia. We have to now factor it.

I grew up in India. I came second only once in my life, in the seventh grade, and I was very, very upset. It was obvious that it was the teacher’s fault. [Laughter] So my father looked at me and he said: “Look, you are ruining your entire summer. Let me tell you one thing. You are a Muslim. You have to work 120 percent and get used to 80 percent of the rewards. Either you can sit and cry about it or just get used to it. You will be very successful as you put in 120 percent; the 80 percent of it will be huge.”

I got used to living with that. But not everybody can. The reason why I came to the United States was because I didn't want to live like that, putting in 120 and getting 80 while everybody else was putting in 90 and getting 110. When I write my race, I write "white man without white privilege."

So what has happened is that this is becoming — now when I plan for my children's college and school, I plan for Islamophobia in it. It's one of the variables that I have to plan for. It is no more fringe; it has become mainstream. It is not just the Reverend Terry Jones who is a problem; Reverend Mike Huckabee is also a problem. We could end up having a mullah in the White House in two years. I know that he is serious about his presidential run because he started making stupid comments about Islam and Muslims which are factually incorrect. That's how you know a Republican is running for office now. He makes factually incorrect and prejudicial comments about Islam and Muslims.

Like the mosque at Ground Zero. It's not even at Ground Five. It's several blocks away. A funny thing about that is that the only actual place of worship in the World Trade Center was a mosque. There was a mosque in the World Trade Center for all these decades. I prayed in it when the mosque existed.

I don't want to go on more on this depressing note. Is all lost? No. I think the first step to moral repair is to acknowledge that there is a need for moral repair. And there is good news. I still feel that the United States is one of the greatest countries in the world. The reason why the U.S. is such a great place is because the gap between the United States ideals and the United States reality is narrower than the ideals and realities of other places. But what is happening is that this gap is widening rapidly and becoming scary.

For every Peter King there is a Richard Durbin. For every Rush Limbaugh there is a Jon Stewart. For every Glen Beck there is a Jon Stewart. For every Michael Savage there is a Jon Stewart. That is the problem — there is only one Jon Stewart. [Laughter]

So what can we do? I think what we need — we cannot rely on governments to pursue a moral agenda — they will never do that. What we need is a robust public sphere with people committed to moral values, even if it means that they are stringently and transcendently committed to moral values, who will follow these four things:

Number 1: The acts came from demonizing the Other.

Number 2: The value of self-criticism and keep the spaces for self-reflection open, that we should become the guardians of the moral space where there is self-criticism.

Number 3: Not demand from the Other what the self cannot uphold.

Number 4: Consistency. Consistency is the only key to ethical conduct. We cannot bomb Libya and ignore Bahrain and claim that this is a moral initiative.

Thank you very much.

RUSSELL PEARCE: Thank you. The next panelist is Professor E.J. Dionne, Jr. He is a syndicated columnist for *The Washington Post*, a Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution, and a Professor at Georgetown University. Welcome.

E.J. DIONNE: Thank you so much. I want to pay tribute to this great university and the Center for Ethics Education and also the Center on Religion and Culture. Thank you, Celia Fisher. I have to pay special tribute to my friends Peter and Peggy Steinfels, whom I have known for almost thirty-five years. I always tell my children that one of the few things good about growing older is that you get to have really old friends. For those of you who know Peggy, you know she is an unapologetic Chicago chauvinist, so in that spirit I am a Steinfels delivery vote, and I am very glad to be so. But also it's so great.

Anybody who savors irony and paradox must applaud the fact that it is the affable, hopeful, upbeat Scott Appleby who chose to remind us about the fires of hell. I thought that was a wonderful thing. I also appreciate his very subtle effort to make American sectarianism sexy. That was very impressive.

I want to say that there has been a fair amount of gloom about our country today. So I guess I want to be

a bit of a dissenting voice here, to suggest that the solution to at least some of our problems is to remember what was ennobling and inspiring about our reaction to 9/11. I also want to say up front that I think anger and outrage was an entirely appropriate response to the slaughter of innocents. The question is always what we do about our legitimate anger and outrage.

Lord knows, I do not want to represent the “Party of Pollyanna,” and I will be talking about a political whiplash that I think has damaged our country. But, while I am not a psychologist, as so many on that earlier learned panel were, I do think that the solution to individual and collective problems is usually found by drawing on our inner strengths and resources, and these in our country I think include a persistent faith in democracy, religious freedom, a long tradition of solidarity, and a strong instinct for self-correction and self-criticism. A lot of self-criticism was on display here today.

I was always fond of Winston Churchill’s observation that “Americans always do the right thing after first exhausting all of the available alternatives.” [Laughter] I do think we get there.

We all see 9/11 through our own lenses. For me one of the most important lenses is a little neighborhood called Belle Harbor in Rockaway, Queens. Many of you who are New Yorkers know this neighborhood. It is a neighborhood of Irish and also Italians and Jews. It is a neighborhood actually that sent a lot of people to this university, including my niece. It’s a neighborhood where my mother-in-law lives, where two of my brothers-in-law live. It’s a place where I have spent a lot of time. As many of you remember, Rockaway was one of the neighborhoods in the city that suffered very heavily on 9/11, partly because it’s a neighborhood full of firefighters; partly because a lot of people in the neighborhood worked at the Trade Center, quite a few at the firm Cantor Fitzgerald.

So when I found myself a week after 9/11 trying to sort out some questions, I turned to Rockaway. Incidentally, I think some of you may remember, and it’s always worth memorializing, the fact that two months and a day after 9/11 a plane crashed into that neighborhood, killing 200 Dominicans and five people in the neighborhood. It crashed two doors down from the house of one of my brothers-in-law, and a few doors down from my mother-in-law who was at the 9 o’clock Mass in St. Francis de Sales Church; it was a Mass that ended up not ending because of that crash.

At the time, I was trying to answer questions like — this was a week after 9/11 — Is religion the cause of the horrific events that engulfed our country, or was religion the solution? You remember the discussion: “Only true believers filled with hope that God would reward them with immediate entry into paradise could possibly be inspired to destroy their own lives and so many others” — that was on the one side.

Yet, as many Americans saw this tragedy worded as a religious impulse, our own response was religious as well. We poured into churches and synagogues and mosques to ask God’s consolation and help. I think President Bush’s most inspiring speech that week was not really a speech. It was a sermon at the National Cathedral.

So were we talking about different gods or different allusions? If faith is reduced to its uses and misuses, a profound skepticism was inevitable. But did this discredit faith? To get one answer to that question, I turned to a wonderful man, called Monsignor Martin Geraghty, who is the pastor at St. Francis de Sales. The week after I spoke with him, he conducted four funerals for victims of the attacks on 9/11.

I asked him if religious commitment can lead to fanatical and irrational acts. He replied very candidly: “It has happened,” he said. “It’s not what faith and religious commitment and an understanding of God in the world is all about. But the relationship between religion and psychology is too close. We can end up with fanatics.”

“What do we say about fanaticism in anything?” he added. “It has even been known to happen in sports once in a while.”

“The conundrum,” he said, “is that religion is so close to life that it’s always. It’s close to the life of people and groups and the power of nations and nation-states.” But he was clear: “It isn’t,” he said, “the midwife of violence.”

Now, I would just note that there was no sectarianism in his response, no Islamophobia, no vengeance; a searching for what this means for religious faith. I think it was clear that faith is suspect when God is harnessed to immediate human ends and identified solely with a personal or political or national cause, and it is more credible when it insists on aspirations beyond our own political movements or nations or communities.

I have thought back a lot. I went back and looked at what I wrote in that period after 9/11. I have been struck by how profound our reaction was and how quickly the nation changed. A year after 9/11, I remember being in a local sports store, and the jerseys for Michael Jordan, Ricky Williams, and Edgerrin James were all available at full price. The shirts embroidered with American flags and the words “United We Stand” were on the clearance rack.

Yet, that very same week, my son and I — he was then I think about ten years old — we were driving on the New Jersey Turnpike and we go off to stop at a convenience store. The owner, an immigrant from India, took a liking to my son and he gave him a gift. He gave him an American flag decal drawn from a pile near the cash register. My son insisted that we immediately stick the flag to the bumper of our aging Saturn.

I think big changes can be documented by small details. Consider that that store would not have had that stack of American flags, and the gift of a flag would not have had the same meaning to our son before 9/11. If you go back and look at the period of 9/11, it was remarkable that we did not immediately, I believe — and we could debate this in the course of today — look solely at whether, or even primarily, this was a difference between Muslims and Christians or Muslims and Jews. We talked a lot more about whether this was a difference in views of God and what God demanded, a difference within our traditions over whether it is possible to have strong beliefs and to respect the beliefs of others.

Rabbi Jonathan Sacks, the chief rabbi in Britain, gave a wonderful sermon where he said, “God is greater than religion.” “What would such a faith be like?” he asked. “It would be like being secure in my own home and yet moved by the beauty of a foreign place, knowing that while it is not my home, it is still part of the glory of the world that is ours. It would be knowing that we are sentences in the story of our people but that there are other stories, each written by God, out of the letters of lives bound together in community.”

But go back to the immediate days after 9/11. It’s really hard to believe when you go back and look. At the time, President Bush enjoyed levels of public support that had few precedents in the post-Vietnam era. The country was as united as it had ever been in the battle against terrorism.

The obvious was true: The war was brought to our soil, and virtually all Americans saw responding to the terrorist attacks as right and just, except for our pacifist brothers and sisters. But in those early days and weeks, President Bush did not simply take political advantage of those patriotic sentiments. He maintained his high level of popularity precisely because in those early days he abandoned some of the habits of his first months in office. He abandoned for a while the unilateralist tinge that colored so many of his foreign policy choices. Winning the battle against terror required an end to unilateralism and the construction of a broad international coalition.

Recall as well how much of the world rallied to our side after that attack — Muslims, Christians, Jews, and so many others. The need for such alliance raised the profile of Colin Powell, the quintessential coalition builder and who was the cabinet officer most popular among independents and Democrats.

The President, who had said he was not into nation-building, even showed signs of understanding this for a while in Afghanistan. It was, after all, our failure to help rebuild Afghanistan after the defeat of the Soviet Union in the 1980s that helped lay the groundwork for the very forces behind 9/11. It turned out that there was a practical side of humanitarianism.

Even President Bush’s rhetoric had special appeal in those days, in those early days, to his opponents. Early on he stood up in defense of the rights of America’s Muslim community — and I’ll be getting back to

that. In assailing the Taliban, he emphasized the aspects of its rule, its war against gender equality, its denials of religious liberty, its oppression of political opponents, that were most offensive not only to conservatives but to political liberals and the political Left.

In his speeches, Bush grafted the language of FDR and Harry Truman to the martial rhythms of Ronald Reagan. And he abandoned, even for a brief period, an approach to domestic issues which had rallied his base at the cost of pushing away his political opponents. In the months before the attack, the President was willing to win legislative battles by uniting his own party and picking off as few Democrats as narrow victories required. After 9/11, he sought broad majorities on emergency spending and a war policy.

Think about who we were as a people in those immediate days afterward. The polls showed that Americans overwhelmingly saw the country not on the wrong track but on the right track. David Winston, a Republican pollster, explained the reaction this way. He said: "People saw this as a horrible event. They think the economy is going to get worse. They think life is going to be tougher. But they also saw those firefighters stepping up to the plate. These were good people. They saw millions of Americans reaching into their pockets to make contributions. They saw passengers crashing that plane into the ground [in Pennsylvania] in order to save the lives of others. They saw people who acted as Americans who made them feel proud. And so, while a new fear was one product of September 11th, a new solidarity was the other."

By the way, I cannot help resist noting that so many of our heroes in the immediate days after 9/11 just happened to be unionized public employees. [Applause]

But another Republican friend of mine, Linda Duvall, was looking at the same numbers and she was a bit skeptical of how long this would last. What she told me at the time of bipartisanship — and this is her quote — "I don't think it is going to last." This is a very shrewd pollster.

Still, one other aspect of us is worth remembering. The complaints about America's alleged moral bankruptcy and hedonism were really brought low by the community spirit and the selflessness of those firefighters, rescue workers, and volunteers so evident in those days. Our celebrities, for a brief, brief moment, were not high-tech wizards of Hollywood beautiful people or hotshot investors, but those public employees who soared in our esteem simply by doing their jobs, and ordinary citizens who simply behaved as citizens should.

I remember also speaking about a week after 9/11 to a friend who was an ardent Democratic, a Democratic consultant. He was a happy warrior who loves to defeat Republicans, and he had absolutely no sympathy for President Bush. I asked him then what his attitude toward the President was after the attack. He replied: "I actually went into church and knelt down and prayed that he would be successful. He's ours. He's all we got. Pray God that he is going to do what is best for our country."

It's really jarring to jump to the America of five years after that. Five years on, the state of our politics was rancid. We were talking about the decline of America's standing in the world. We were talking about the failures of our nation's leaders. Understanding the hope and truly national feeling of determination during that extraordinary moment five years earlier I think is the only way to comprehend why hostility to President Bush became so strong later and why the country became more divided than ever.

The use of the nation's abhorrence of terrorism as a political tool was one cause of that alienation. By mid-2002, the fight against terrorism was a means for winning the mid-term election. A significant portion of the Republican National Convention here in New York in 2004 was given over to turning September 11th to the backdrop of the President's reelection campaign. And of course, 9/11 was used to justify a war in Iraq that the country, to judge by the polls before the war, didn't really want to fight and that has proven so costly to our nation.

Now, I could go on about this, and I certainly did in my columns over the years. But I'm not here to give a partisan speech. Yet, I do think we can only understand our current mood if we understand the political and moral whiplash we went through in the course of the last decade — from solidarity to fracture and division; from selflessness to a new celebration of materialism that collapsed in a heap in the financial

meltdown of 2008; from trans-partisanship — and that’s really what it is; it was more than bipartisanship — to partisan divisions so deep that there are now those who say our President was not born in this country and is lying about being a Christian; to broad agreement that the war in Afghanistan was just to anger and doubt about why we went into Iraq; from an openness to Islam and a President — and yes I mean George W. Bush — who described Islam as “a religion of peace” to a battle over the Islamic center downtown and a media campaign on some outlets that is designed to inspire fear of Islam and the fear over the spread of Shariah law in the United States.

We went from honoring public servants to battles over their rights; from faith in our nation’s future, even in the face of tragedy and catastrophe, to deep anxiety about where our country will stand in ten or twenty years. In the aftermath of 9/11, we knew in our bones that there was something exceptional about America. Now we have to talk incessantly about American exceptionalism as if we need to convince ourselves.

The 2008 campaign was a brief respite from these difficulties. Barak Obama inspired millions beyond even those who voted for him. There was excitement over a break with the immediate past, over a breakthrough in our long struggle to lay down the burden of race. And yes, there was even elation over the election of our first and only president with the middle name Hussein.

Recall the ubiquity of the word “hope” in that campaign and in the slogan “Change we can believe in.” I have always thought the word “believe” was as important as the word “hope.” There was a sense in the country that we needed a revival. And let it be said that in nominating John McCain, Republicans nominated a hero whose own personal suffering as a patriot inspired millions who did not vote for him. Yes, the Republicans nominated a man whose own selfless sacrifice as a POW did remind us of the sacrifices of the heroes of 9/11.

Unfortunately, understandable economic discontent, a reaction in the Republican Party against the best parts of the Bush legacy, and a persistence of divisions that predated 9/11 have prevented the breakthrough that we thought might materialize after 2008 and might bring us back to a period of solidarity. So what is to be done now?

First, I emphasized the many positive things that happened after 9/11 to emphasize that as a country we are capable of being our best selves, we are capable of solidarity as well as anger, of openness to others, a brotherhood and sisterhood across religious lines. That’s us too. We are not a perfect people. There are no perfect people. As Peter and Peggy have heard me say too many times, one of my favorite adages is Reinhold Niebuhr’s observation that “Original Sin is the only empirically verifiable doctrine of the Christian church.” So there are no perfect people. But there is a goodness in us that we should celebrate.

Second, God bless George Bush — yes, I just said that — for insisting that Islam and Muslims should not be demonized. I’d refer everybody to a wonderful recent essay by a historian, Gary Gerstle. It’s in a collection published by Princeton Press on the presidency of George W. Bush. Gerstle argues that President Bush developed a brand of Republicanism that he called a “religiously inflected multiculturalism.” He also referred to it as “the multiculturalism of the godly.” He said: “Bush sought to offer groups of minority voters reason to rethink their traditional hostility to the GOP.” He noted that “on questions of immigration and diversity, Bush was worlds apart from the social conservative wind of the Republican party that wanted to restore America to its imagined Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Celtic glory.”

“It was particularly notable,” Gerstle added, “that during a time in which the United States was at war and Europe was exploding with tension and violence over Islam, Bush played a positive role in keeping interethnic and interracial relations in the United States relatively calm.”

But in the medium term, Bush’s approach created a quiet backlash on the Right. I think that what we are seeing now, as I said earlier, is a reaction to some of the best aspects of the Bush presidency on the Right. It should disturb us that divisions over Islam have now become a partisan issue. Some colleagues and I recently did a survey in which we asked people whether they thought that Islamic values were compatible with American values. While 33 percent of Republicans completely agreed that American values were incompatible with Islamic values, only 11 percent of Democrats said this; 31 percent of conservatives said

this, only 8 percent of liberals and 16 percent of moderates.

I think it is very dangerous that this division over Islam threatens to become a partisan issue in our country. There are many Republicans who do not believe it should be, and I sure hope they begin to speak up. I want to close by saying we need to revisit Bush's words on Islam and we need to revisit the words of Rabbi Sacks and those of Father Kevin Madigan — is Father Madigan here today? — who spoke bravely on the Islamic center.

And the struggles for liberty and democracy now going on in the Middle East should remind us of what we share in common with millions of our Muslim brothers and sisters. And last, we are all tempted to use 9/11 for our own purposes, to push our own perspectives and our own political agendas. I am sure I am guilty of having done some of that in the last few minutes.

Perhaps, in the second decade after 9/11, we can stop using 9/11 and instead reflect on the lives of those who died at the Trade Center, at the Pentagon, and on that field in Pennsylvania; we can reflect on the heroism of those who served; and we can reflect also on those parts of the American spirit that allowed us to harness legitimate outrage to resilience and solidarity and service. My friend Monsignor Geraghty said at that time what I think we need to remember ten years on and always. "You can deconstruct everything," he said, "except suffering." Thank you.

RUSSELL PEARCE: All right. We have three questions before we move to the last panel. I really want to thank each of the panelists for their wonderful presentations.

The first question is this — and of course these are not my questions, they're your questions — and I don't even know where this question goes: "I have the feeling that electronic media has heightened polarization and diminished harmonization. Do you agree? And, if you do, can anything be done to return us to a balanced civilized world?"

E.J. DIONNE: I guess, since I'm in the media, I am going to have to be stuck with that good question. I think there is a chicken-and-egg issue here in terms of where the polarization comes from and whether it comes from media. I won't take the time, but I think we can see a sort of long progression going back to the 1960s. If you think of where the backlash against the supposedly liberal media began, I think some of it began in the coverage of the civil rights movement, where the mere portrayal of the pictures of nonviolent demonstrators being beaten in the streets had a real impact on the political debate. I also think, when my conservative friends say that the press and the media were not particularly kind to Barry Goldwater in 1964, they are probably right about that. My conservative friends forget that 1964 was a long time ago.

Since then, I think you have had a very effective conservative campaign both to push the mainstream media as we now call it, or the liberal media as my conservative friends would call it, in a different direction, and you had the creation of new conservative institutions — first, the rise of op-ed pages, where new important conservative voices appeared; then the rise of talk radio; then the rise of Fox News. I always like to remind people that Roger Ailes, before he started Fox News, tried to turn Rush Limbaugh into a TV show. As someone who does a fair amount of radio, you do know the phrase I think, "He was born with a face made for radio." I share that affliction. [Laughter] Rush just didn't work as television.

And so what you had with the rise of this conservative media was then an effort by liberals to catch up, because the mainstream media really weren't liberal in any sense compared to these new media. So slowly, first on the Web and then eventually in the evening house on MSNBC, you had a reaction. Now, I think in the end this may aggravate polarization, but it isn't the primary cause. I actually think that politics itself is the primary cause.

I think you can go back to the battle over the Clinton impeachment, which would have been bitter and divisive whether you had new media or not. I think our fights over the Iraq war would have been bitter whether you had new media or not. I think a conservative backlash against the election of President Obama would have been bitter whether you had new media or not. Now, I'm not making an alibi for the media here. I think there are problems. I think there is a tendency on the part of some of us to sort

ourselves and only look at the stuff that reinforces our own view. That's true right and left and center, although I think the poor centrists don't have as much overt media. But I think the politics, rather than the media, are at the heart of polarized politics.

RUSSELL PEARCE: Yes, please.

MUQTEDAR KHAN: If you look at the revolutions in the Middle East today, and if you take Facebook and Al Jazeera out of the picture, then there would have been no revolutions perhaps. So the question really is that the new media are not value- or politically neutral. Al Jazeera is getting hammered now because its coverage of Syria is unfair. It is more pro-regime on the coverage of Syria. Al Jazeera is basically sympathetic to the Palestinian cause, and any regime that is sympathetic to the Palestinian cause Al Jazeera will not criticize. And so what we realize is that the media bring politics with them.

But there has been a change, I think, in the consumer of news, and we are not shopping for information. Globalization has made information available to us, but it seems that people are shopping for affirmation of their own opinion. So people are shopping. And let me tell you that it still matters, because Glen Beck lost his show on Fox not just because he went crazy. He was crazy when they hired him. He lost his show because he lost his audience, because his ratings went down. So if people stop shopping for these opinions, they will lose their marketplace.

I think what is interesting is that the media is far more reflective of social trends than the driver of social trends in societies like the U.S., which are much more complex and have a public sphere that is well developed. In societies where the public sphere is not that well developed, then the media has a bigger role to play, like Al Jazeera does in the Arab world or Facebook did in the Iranian and Egyptian revolutions.

RUSSELL PEARCE: Next question. Let's start with Professor Perry: "While I respect your position about the importance of preserving human rights, should it be the government's job to risk the lives of its citizens with the hope of preserving human rights?"

MICHAEL PERRY: Some human rights are conditional. They state what government may not do unless certain conditions are satisfied. So, obviously, the right to freedom of religion is conditional; we are not going to permit government to insist that parents turn over their children for life-saving. No one who thinks seriously about the issue thinks that freedom of religion can be an unconditional right.

Other rights are unconditional. The right not to be subjected to torture or inhumane or otherwise cruel or otherwise degrading punishment is unconditional, and the United States and the other countries of the world have seen fit to commit themselves to those rights.

Then there is another distinction, the distinction between the rights that can be derogated in times of public emergency and those that may not be derogated in times of public emergency. So human rights are not all unconditional and they're not all non-derogable.

Having said that, there is a set of human rights in place that is internationally recognized and, at least as articulated in something called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the United States has committed to them as of 1992, along with 164 other countries. So if the United States thinks that in the face of, as I say, military/political exigencies it is permitted to decide for itself which of these rights it is going to respect and which it is not going to respect, that is toxic, that is subversive, that is corrosive of the human rights culture. It seems to me that we have to be very worried about that.

It is easy to respect and protect human rights when we are not sacrificing anything to do it. But if that is the only time that we are going to take human rights that seriously, then that's not very impressive. What is impressive is when we live by our commitments to respect and protect human rights even when it is costly for us to do so, even when it demands a serious sacrifice.

If you ask the question, "Why should we want to do that?" the answer I was trying to communicate to you is that we need to nurture the human rights culture, we need to socialize ourselves and others into the

human rights culture, because we are capable of becoming moral monsters — not just them over there, we are capable of that. We are not immune to that. And so we have to maintain the human rights culture, in my view, even when it is costly for us to do so. And if we are not willing to do that, then we are willing to take steps in the direction of unraveling.

You know, I'm sure all of us have thought about this. There are two ways our enemies can defeat us: our enemies can defeat us in material terms; but, even if our enemies don't succeed in defeating us in material terms, they can defeat us spiritually by turning us into something that we don't want to be.

I suppose some people look at some of the policies in Israel at this point in those terms, some of the Israeli Jews who are so opposed to the policies of the Israeli government and wonder whether the destruction of an aspect of the Jews may not succeed years after the Germans were defeated. So that can happen here, and that is why it is so important that we live by our human rights commitments even if it is costly for us to do so. I mean big deal if we live by them when it is not costly for us to do so.

RUSSELL PEARCE: Go ahead.

E.J. DIONNE: I thought Nick Kristof in *The New York Times* had a very good column in answering this question, where he said that it's better to be inconsistent and intervene when we can than to be consistently indifferent. I'm paraphrasing him. I think he's right.

I think yes, there are moments when circumstances are so dire, when thousands or tens of thousands face slaughter, that nations of the world that uphold human rights have a moral obligation to intervene if they can. I freely concede that "if they can" is where the rub lies. We are not always going to do it. We will do it with an eye toward our own interest. We will not be consistent about it, I'm afraid. But where we can make a major difference, I think there are circumstances in which this is a good and decent use of power.

Again, I don't think it's something we do best alone. I think it is something that we can do in concert with other nations.

MICHAEL PERRY: Notice what E.J. is talking about. E.J. is talking about when we deploy our power abroad to support those who are the victims of human rights violations by other governments.

E.J. DIONNE: The question was about risking the lives of our citizens, which I assume meant the use of military power.

MICHAEL PERRY: Well, in the context of my comments, you will remember, I was talking about our moral values and how to preserve them. I was using the vocabulary or the terminology of the gathering today that appears on the Web site, when we were told that there was a tension between our effort to prevent future harms and preserve our moral integrity.

I was saying that one way to preserve our moral integrity is to respect and protect human rights as we are preventing future harms to us. So the context I was thinking about was different from the context E.J. is talking about. Surely we do not want to say that in terms of our own actions, in terms of protecting our own interests, in our homeland we will respect and protect human rights only to the extent that we don't have to sacrifice to do that.

MUQTEDAR KHAN: The Prophet of Islam said that "none of you is a believer until you desire for your brother what you desire for yourself." I think that principle applies here too. The whole idea of human rights is that it is not rights which Americans deserve, it's not rights which Australians deserve; these are rights which all humans deserve, and they cannot be taken away from any. So rights are constitutive to the human identity. We cannot take it away from human beings.

If we watch a violation of human rights without doing something about it, we are compromising humanity. I think that with the dehumanization of those whose rights are being violated, the humanity of those who are silent observers, who do not act, is also compromised. I think if we don't protect the human rights of others, we compromise our own humanity.

E.J. DIONNE: Could I just say, Michael, very briefly if I could, I appreciate what you said, because you just showed that little questions on white cards are in their way a Rorschach test, because we each answered the right question but it was an entirely different question. I'd just like to underscore one sentence, "If we want respect for civil liberties around the world, we need to respect them at home even when it is hard." That is my answer to the other way of reading the little white card.

CELIA FISHER: Thank you. This was as amazing as we expected it to be. We are going to move into the next panel, so everybody just stand up and stretch, and I'm asking the speakers to come on up. Thank you. [Panel adjourned: 3:00 p.m.]