Patriot Acts

Tony Platt and Cecilia O'Leary

We are at the gravest of moments.
— Senator Robert Byrd, October 10, 2002

I woke up this mornin' and none of the news was good.
— Steve Earle, *Jerusalem*, 2002

For a nation to be, in the truest sense, patriotic, its citizens must love their land with a knowing, intelligent, sustaining, and protective love.... And they must not allow their patriotism to be degraded to a mere loyalty to symbols or any present set of officials.

— Wendell Berry, February 9, 2003

Introduction

THE NEW CENTURY HAS USHERED IN PROFOUND CHANGES IN THE PAX AMERICANA, both in the global aspirations of the American Empire and in the realignment of political and ideological power within the United States. Right-wing internationalists now play a decisive role within the Bush administration and public discourse over foreign policy doctrines.[1] The ascendancy of hawks is complemented by the decisive shift to the right in domestic policy. The conservative program, initiated in the Reagan years, emphasizes lowering the cost of labor, regressive tax cuts, reductions in environmental regulations, gutting of affirmative action and welfare benefits, and expansion of the military and criminal justice system (Wallerstein, 2002). The Bush administration, strengthened by decisive Republican victories in the midterm elections (November 2002), promises to fulfill these policy goals, with the Right now occupying significant positions of power in Congress, the Department of Justice, and key government departments.[2]

Under the banner of patriotism, the Right is making full use of its power within government and its influence in civil society to put ideas into action. Within

---

TONY PLATT (amplatt@earthlink.net) is professor of social work at California State University, Sacramento, and author of *E. Franklin Frazier Reconsidered*. CECILIA O'LEARY (cecilia_oleary@csumb.edu) is associate professor of history and co-director of the Oral History and Community Memory Institute and Archive at California State University, Monterey Bay. She is author of *To Die For: The Paradox of American Patriotism*. Both are members of the Editorial Board of *Social Justice*.

months of September 11, 2001, the government propelled far-reaching antiterrorist legislation through Congress with minimal debate, gave the domestic intelligence apparatus unprecedented powers, justified racially motivated arrests and curtailment of civil liberties in the name of national security, and created a new federal bureaucracy to combat terrorism.

The history of the United States is filled with examples of the use of orchestrated state-sponsored campaigns to limit political dissent, rally a populist nationalism, and justify policies of repression in the name of national security during times of international crisis. Precedents for the government's invocation of prescriptive patriotism can be found, for example, in the crackdown on the pacifist movement during World War I, the roundup of Japanese Americans during World War II, and McCarthyist witch hunts during the Korean War. The current initiative to expand and justify "homeland security" evokes earlier campaigns, but it is also different in some important respects.

First, the speed and scope of changes in policies, institutions, and government bureaucracies is unprecedented. Second, the collapse of the Democratic Party and serious opposition within government and the organized political system has given the Bush administration carte blanche to implement an agenda that will have long-range structural consequences, not easily checked or reversed. Third, unlike previous conventional wars — in which there is a targeted enemy, clear rules of engagement, and time-limited goals — the "war on terrorism" is open-ended, multifaceted, and unlimited. "This is not a linear war; this is not a sequential war," explained General Richard B. Myers, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. "We have a notion of things we would like to happen, but it's not in the sequential sense or this linear sense that our brains tend to work in" (quoted in *New York Times*, October 23, 2001: B2).

Our focus in this essay is on the extraordinary changes that have taken place within the repressive state apparatus since September 11, and on the cultural expressions of patriotism that inform and justify the rollback of post-Watergate reforms and chilling of civil liberties. We examine coercive and prescriptive measures taken in the name of patriotism during times of war in the 20th century before assessing the consequences of the 2001 Patriot Act and related changes in policy and government. We conclude with a discussion of the contemporary discourse of right-wing nationalism and the possibilities for reviving a progressive tradition of patriotism that stands for "a vigilant distrust of any determinative power" and an insistence on "asking the hardest questions in our darkest hours."[3]

Patriotism in Historical Perspective

An historical overview of the 20th century suggests that a militarist patriotism — propelled by an activist nation-state, shaped by the demands of war, infused with racism and gendered images of masculinity, and narrowed by political intolerance of dissent — has more often than not undermined the very ideals it

purports to protect. In the U.S., where being an American is seen as a choice rather than a birthright, cultural authority to determine what the flag stands for has far-reaching consequences. Patriotism is a powerful cultural phenomenon, which not only generates solidarity, unity, and remembrance, but also mistrust, divisions, and amnesia. For patriots, loyalty to family, friends, religion, and place are subsumed under allegiance to one's country. But who decides what the flag represents and the country for which it stands?[4]

Although patriotic symbols and rituals might appear consensual and neutral, they are neither fixed, nor timeless, nor monolithic. Until nationalism became a government-dominated affair in the early 20th century, there had been considerable debate among a spectrum of groups over the meanings of patriotism. When President Wilson's administration joined forces with right-wing organizations and vigilante groups during World War I, progressive interpretations were marginalized and the government enforced a specifically chauvinist conception of the nation. It was during this period that the institutional and ideological basis for what later became the national security state assumed its modern form.

Concerned about the peace movement's broad appeal, President Wilson criminalized opposition through the Espionage Act and made criticism of the war, the flag, or the government illegal under the Sedition Act. During the war, African Americans were lynched — even as Black troops fought in France — and "100 Per Cent Americanizers" attacked German immigrants and other "hyphenated Americans" by banning books, shutting down newspapers, and allowing no language other than English to be spoken in the public schools. "The war has set back the people for a generation," concluded Senator Hiram Johnson. "They have bowed to a hundred repressive acts" (in Goldstein, 1978: 242).

During World War II, there was little opposition to the "good war," but the government nonetheless meted out stiff jail sentences to conscientious objectors and imprisoned over 110,000 Japanese Americans, despite the government's inability to prove a single act of treason (Zinn, 1995: 407). In the late 1940s, President Truman launched a far-ranging security program that subverted constitutional liberties and legitimated extensive political repression under the Cold War banner of anticommunism. Senator Joseph McCarthy, the national spokesperson for ferreting out "un-Americans," finally misjudged his power when he accused General Marshall and General Eisenhower in 1951 of "serving the world policy of the Kremlin (Litwack and Jordan, 1991: 748–753). But the damage to American democracy had already been done: lives lost, careers destroyed, spying on fellow citizens, and wholesale violation of constitutional liberties, all in the name of assuring national security.

During the Vietnam War, 1961 to 1973, the national security state responded to broad-based opposition movements with overt and covert repression. The FBI launched COINTELPRO operations — targeting its most vicious tactics against Black organizations, infiltrating antiwar groups, sending undercover agents into

university classrooms, authorizing electronic surveillance of domestic "subversives," and commissioning agents provocateurs to disrupt legal organizations and demonstrations.[5] Conservative patriots expanded the cultural rhetoric of "un-Americanism" crafted during the Cold War by demanding that dissenters "Love It or Leave It."

The Vietnam War generated a profound divide over the meanings of civic loyalty. The crisis in American nationalism deepened when Richard Nixon became the first president forced to resign in U.S. history (Goldstein, 1978: 461). In the 1980s, President Ronald Reagan sought to overcome the "Vietnam Syndrome" and distrust of government — aggravated by public exposure of the illegal Watergate break-ins under the Nixon presidency — through visionary calls to "dream heroic dreams" and hard-talking rhetoric adapted from the genre of movie westerns. Reagan called for a military buildup against the "evil empire" of the Soviet Union and used the religious Right to try to discipline the morality of the nation (Slotkin, 1992).[6] In 1988, George Bush literally and figuratively wrapped himself in the flag, leading campaign audiences in pledges of allegiance aimed at consolidating the association of patriotism with the Republican Party (Goldstein, 1995: 200–201). But while both Presidents Reagan and Bush promoted a deeply conservative, racist, and ideological patriotism, post-Cold War nationalism meant little more to most people than a "choice between hedonisms: tax cuts or spending" (Packer, 2001: 15). That is, until the destruction of the Twin Towers and loss of civilian lives on the morning of September 11, 2001.

Homeland Security

In the aftermath of September 11, the Bush White House revived and expanded the national security state with unprecedented speed and minimal debate. In a period of about 14 months, Congress passed wide-ranging antiterrorist legislation and created a new antiterrorist federal bureaucracy; the White House authorized the revival of military tribunals and gave broad powers to intelligence agencies; and the Department of Justice gave the green light for FBI surveillance and roundups of thousands of suspects. The democratic safeguards that were put in place by Congress in the aftermath of the Watergate scandals in the 1970s have been eviscerated, replaced by draconian measures that recall the infamous Palmer raids of 1920–1921, when thousands of labor and political activists were rounded up and held without trial or bail (Sigal, 2002: 27).

After only two days of debate and in an atmosphere of national hysteria, Congress passed the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism (USA Patriot Act), and President Bush signed it into law in November 2001. The act reduces constraints on the government's ability to conduct searches, deport suspects, eavesdrop on Internet communications, monitor financial transactions, and crack down on immigrant violations. A new crime, "domestic terrorism," is so vaguely defined

that it could be applied to acts of civil disobedience (Larder, Jr., 2001; Rosenfeld, 2002: 1). Many state legislatures are following the lead of the federal government by passing antiterrorism legislation that blurs distinctions between terrorism and political protest, and gives authorities broad powers of surveillance (Pell, 2002: 20–24). As of February 2003, the Justice Department has drafted new legislation that is intended to expand the scope of the Patriot Act, including the ability of the government to retract the citizenship of people who support terrorist organizations (Clymer, 2003: 9).

One year after passage of the Patriot Act, the Senate approved the creation of the Department of Homeland Security by a 90 to 9 vote, the most significant change in the federal bureaucracy since President Truman created the Department of Defense to fight the Cold War in 1947. Under this legislation, 170,000 employees will be transferred from various agencies and put under the authority of a new cabinet-level secretary, Tom Ridge. The new department creates an intelligence system with parallel powers to the FBI and CIA, but with closer ties to the White House (Firestone, 2002: 1; Stevenson, 2002: 1). The Bush administration, for example, intends to create a centralized system for monitoring the Internet as part of the responsibilities of the Department of Homeland Security (Markoff and Schwartz, 2002: 16).

With a right-wing attorney general in charge of the Department of Justice, the FBI has recovered the powers that it exercised during J. Edgar Hoover's regime, when political policing took precedence over crime fighting. Under John Ashcroft's leadership, "the prevention of terrorist activity is the overriding priority of the Department of Justice" (Ashcroft, 2002). He moved quickly to oversight a "wartime" reorganization of the Department of Justice in order to "reallocate resources...to the front lines of this battle...against terrorism" (Deputy Attorney General, 2002). The events of September 11 enabled the Bush government to consolidate policies that were already on the table. For example, Ashcroft had previously directed federal agencies to routinely reject requests for documents under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), a reversal of a much more open policy established by the Clinton administration. The backlog of FOIA requests has increased dramatically with the Bush administration's penchant for secrecy (Clymer, 2003a: 1). Similarly, in the name of antiterrorism, Ashcroft has moved to exert ideological control over the Bureau of Justice Statistics and National Institute of Justice, two departments that typically operate without direct political interference (Butterfield, 2002).

As in the 1970s, when FBI agents were pressed by their superiors to overreach their authority and manufacture evidence of revolutionary plots by African American and student activists engaged in constitutionally protected protest, so today senior FBI officials are "demanding that agents nationwide become more aggressive and single-minded in hunting terrorists" (Lichtblau, 2002a: 1). According to Amnesty International, many of the 1,200 people detained shortly after

September 11 were denied basic rights of due process, including the right to know why they were being detained.[7] In March 2002, Amnesty documented the use of prolonged solitary confinement and lack of access to attorneys (Reuters, 2002: 11). Not one of these detainees was charged with conspiracy or an act of terrorism.[8] Although the scale of detentions is unprecedented since World War II, the dragnet has not targeted groups suspected of distributing anthrax, which most experts attribute to homegrown, white American terrorists (Thomas, 2001: B8; Fagan, 2001: 6).

By early November 2001, federal investigators had contacted more than 200 college campuses to collect information about students from Middle Eastern countries (Steinberg, 2001: 1). Local police departments have also been required to investigate the status of some 5,000 visitors and immigrants, who are sought for questioning by the FBI.[9] Meanwhile, the FBI is encouraging its field agents to more aggressively pursue terrorist leads in the country's 2,000 mosques (Lichtblau, 2003a: 13) and the Justice Department, as part of its effort to influence programs at the local level, has even enlisted the ineffectual "neighborhood watch" program in the fight against terrorism.[10]

Due to the crackdown, thousands of Iraqis living in the United States are now monitored as part of domestic counterterrorism efforts (Johnston and Van Natta, Jr., 2002: 1). Many — nobody knows the exact number — young, male Muslims living in the United States are under surveillance and the FBI is actively trying to recruit informers in Arab-American communities (Shenon and Johnstone, 2002: 1). A secret federal "no-fly" list, apparently designed to keep suspected terrorists from boarding planes, has been used to harass political activists (Gathright, 2002: 1).[11] In November 2002, the attorney general issued an order requiring virtually all male noncitizens over the age of 16 who come from over 20 mostly Arab and Muslim countries to be interviewed, photographed, and fingerprinted by federal immigration agencies (Broder and Sachs, 2002: 16). By January 2003, more than 500 men had been detained, primarily for visa regulations. The policy of targeting men based on national origin, says Amnesty International USA, "is tantamount to racial discrimination" (Madigan, 2003: 1).

The current multi-fronted war against terrorism has led to a pervasive chilling of civil liberties. Immigrants — particularly Arabs and Muslims, who fear being targeted as "un-Americans" — fly flags from taxis and stores to prove their loyalty and ward off racist attacks, as well as limit appearances in public. Their displays of defensive patriotism are warranted: hate crimes against Muslims increased significantly during 2001 to 2002 (Schevitz, 2002: 1; Lichtblau, 2002b: 20). As of January 2003, thousands of immigrants have been arrested based on racial profiling and over 1,000 have been detained without access to lawyers or being formally changed.[12] Attorney General Ashcroft has ruled that the government has a right to indefinitely detain immigrants for legal violations unrelated to terrorism and those from the Middle East seeking asylum (Swarns, 2003a). During the last

five months, nearly 130,000 male immigrants and visitors, mostly Muslims, have been questioned and registered by government authorities, "the largest effort to register immigrants in decades," notes the *New York Times* (Swarns, 2003b: 1).

Homeland security measures go beyond the borders of the United States. The government has imprisoned hundreds of "foreign combatants" from the war in Afghanistan in hastily constructed outdoor cells at Guantánamo Bay, Cuba.[13] They are denied the rights of prisoners of war under the Geneva Conventions. Under prodding from the Red Cross, there have been some minimal improvements in the treatment of prisoners (Seelye, 2002: 12). At the same time, it has been reported in the press, including the *Washington Post*, that the CIA and Special Forces have been using torture on terrorism suspects in overseas "interrogation centers" or moving prisoners to countries, such as Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Morocco, where torture is routinely used (Press, 2003: 11–16).

The administration is also moving quickly to integrate domestic and international intelligence-gathering operations. At the Pentagon, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency is creating a massive database, known as Total Information Awareness (later changed to Terrorism Information Awareness), managed by another resurrected right-winger, John Poindexter, the former national security adviser to Reagan, whose felony conviction in the Iran-Contra scandal was overturned on a technicality by a federal appeals court (Johnstone, Risen, and Lewis, 2002: 1). It was also reported in February 2003 that the government intended to house the counterterrorism units of the FBI and CIA in the same complex, thus enabling the CIA to gather intelligence within the United States, a role that was made off limits by Congress in the 1970s after disclosure of extensive spying on progressive organizations (Lichtblau, 2003b: 12).

More significantly, the Bush administration has de facto repealed President Ford's 1976 executive order banning political assassinations. In August 2002, Defense Secretary Rumsfeld signaled that he intended to use Special Forces in covert operations in countries where the United States is not at war (Shanker and Risen, 2002: 1). By November 2002, President Bush authorized the CIA to hunt down and assassinate a "high-value target list" of leaders associated with terrorist groups, a reversal of a policy that was put in place in the wake of post-Watergate scandals (Risen and Johnstone, 2002: 1). According to journalist Seymour Hersh (2002: 73), the Rumsfeld faction is committed to toughening up a "peacetime military leadership that was Clintonized." As part of this new resolve, the administration announced in November 2001, without consulting Congress, its intention to use secret military tribunals to try noncitizens charged with terrorism. "Mr. Bush," commented the *New York Times* (2001), "is eroding the very values he seeks to protect, including the rule of law."

The courts have generally backed up the government's antiterrorism legislation and policies. By November 2002, a federal appeals court had approved the Justice Department's use of wiretaps authorized under the Patriot Act (Lewis,

2002: 1). In January 2003, a federal appeals court defended the Bush administration's right to indefinitely detain an American citizen captured as an "enemy combatant" and deny that person access to a lawyer (Lewis, 2003a: 1). With Republican domination of Congress, we will soon see a further shift to the right in the judiciary (Newfield, 2002: 11–16). Recently, the Supreme Court's leading conservative, Justice Antonin Scalia, has been emboldened to speak out in public in defense of "strict constructionism" and the role of "divine authority behind government" (Wilentz, 2002: 21; Associated Press, 2003: 19). Also, Theodore Olson, the government's right-wing Solicitor General, is using his office to roll back the last vestiges of affirmative action policies in higher education (Fineman and Lipper, 2003: 26–29). The Bush administration is now committed to packing the higher courts with right-wing ideologues, a strategy that will have long-range repercussions for both the Supreme Court and judicial endorsement of executive policies.[14]

By February 2003, the Bush administration had achieved extraordinary changes in the repressive capacities of the state through executive orders, federal legislation, and administrative reorganization. The expansion of the national security state has taken place without committee hearings in Congress and without a serious investigation of why intelligence agencies and the Justice Department failed to prevent the attacks of September 11. Moreover, the government has equated the sporadic, admittedly spectacular acts of terror by al Qaeda — described by Perry Anderson (2003: 12–13) as the "isolated remnant of a mass movement of Muslim fundamentalism" — with the "spectre of a vast and deadly conspiracy, capable of striking at any moment" at the nation's heartland, and thus requiring wartime measures. But, as we know from the past, actions taken in response to "immediate" emergency situations typically have long-term, enduring structural consequences. For example, the reorganization of the government to fight the Cold War in the 1940s was used to purge the domestic left. "In the name of fighting terrorism," concludes Human Rights Watch in its January 2003 critique of the United States, "human rights are dispensable."[15]

Defending the Canon

In times of war, as we noted earlier, the federal government has always attempted to manipulate the discourse of patriotism to rally political support and limit dissent, and it has been no different in the aftermath of September 11. What is striking in the current situation is the prominent role played by right-wing intellectuals inside and outside the administration.

During the flush years of an exuberant 1990's dot-com economy, being an American had meant little more than the freedom to consume. Then, overnight, September 11 changed the political-cultural landscape. A resurgent patriotism swept the U.S. as people found themselves hungry for symbols and eager to communicate a deeper sense of national belonging. Reasons for flying the flag

varied: some people were motivated by a deep-seated sorrow at the loss of life; some sought to profit off the crisis; some to mobilize the country for war; some to defend themselves against intolerant attacks; and others to reclaim the flag for progressive ideals. Today, the cultural terrain of patriotism is again contested as the government's war against terrorism has expanded to include pre-emptive strikes and assassinations abroad, with national security interests trumping civil liberties at home.

Despite the rapid growth of a diverse antiwar movement in the early months of 2003, the Right has accomplished its domestic security agenda with little opposition from a demoralized Democratic Party and a mostly complicit mass media. "The Democrats are merely increasing their reputation for passionless feebleness," observed Anatol Lieven (2002), "whereas the Republican nationalists are full of passionate intensity." Mainstream television moved quickly after September 11 to stifle voices of political dissent.

"People have to watch what they say and do," warned Ari Fleischer, the White House press secretary, shortly after Bill Maher, the host of ABC's "Politically Incorrect," made a comment in September 2001 about the cowardly nature of American cruise missile attacks on Middle Eastern targets. Two companies withdrew their advertising from the show and Maher was forced to make an apology.[16] A year after the attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon, the Bush administration was still accusing Democratic critics of the government's foreign policy as "not interested in the security of the American people" (Hulse and Purdum, 2002: 1). The government's promotion of the slogan "United We Stand," argues Susan Sontag (2002: 31), is designed to equate "dissent with lack of patriotism."

In 2003, right-wing patriotism once again dominates the national political discourse, fuelled by rightist intellectuals and professional organizations that move easily within and around government circles. The Bush administration has rallied conservative legal scholars and think tanks, such as the Washington Legal Foundation, to defend the president's right to diminish civil liberties in times of national crisis (Glaberson, 2001). In the name of national unity, the Right has actively promoted what Joan Didion (2003: 54) calls "a belligerent idealization of historical ignorance." This discourse resumes in new form an earlier campaign successfully waged against "political correctness" in the 1980s, with many veterans of the "culture wars" shifting their focus from attacking affirmative action to promoting a prescriptive, militarist patriotism. It was not much of a stretch for William Bennett (Reagan's Secretary of Education) and Lynn Cheney (wife of Vice President Dick Cheney) to add a lack of patriotism to the multitude of sins practiced by progressive intellectuals. In 1984, they were articulating the "vital role" of the university as "conveyor of the accumulated wisdom of... Western civilization" (National Endowment for the Humanities, 1984). In 2001–2002, they were searching for signs of disloyalty in academia.

After September 11, right-wing intellectuals were quick to produce popular books promoting an unquestioning brand of patriotism: Roger Rosenblatt's *Where We Stand: 30 Reasons for Loving Our Country*, William Bennett's *Why We Fight: Moral Clarity and the War on Terrorism*, and Dinesh D'Souza's *What's So Great About America*. D'Souza (2002), who became a neo-con celebrity through his attacks on affirmative action in the 1980s, has turned his attention to defending the benefits of modern colonialism and the virtues of the West.

In November 2001, the right-wing American Council of Trustees and Alumni — whose national board includes Lynne Cheney — issued a list of faculty considered "the weak link in America's response to the attack" of September 11. A shoddily researched hit piece, *Defending Civilization* attacked the ideas of progressive intellectuals for being "short on patriotism and long on self-flagellation" (American Council of Trustees and Alumni, 2001). Similarly, a Web site — Campus Watch, created by Daniel Pipes — posted "dossiers" on professors and universities that promote "left-leaning...groupthink" on Middle East politics (Lewin, 2002: 26).[17]

The Right has particularly targeted the educational system and youth for infusions of lockstep loyalty. The White House launched a series of initiatives aimed at prescribing patriotism among the nation's 52 million schoolchildren, including a call for students to take part in a mass recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance on October 12, 2001 (Milibank, 2001: 2; Rubenstein, 2001: 7). On the first anniversary of September 11, the conservative Fordham Foundation posted on its Web site a thinly disguised attack on the National Education Association and liberal curricula. The usual array of leading conservatives — William Bennett, Lynn Cheney, James Q. Wilson, Richard Rodriguez, and others — accused educators of being "long on multiculturalism, feelings, relativism, and tolerance but short on history, civics, and patriotism" (Fordham Foundation, 2002). Bush's proposed federal budget for 2004 backs up the Right's ideological interventions with unprecedented support for conservative educational projects, such as the Department of Education's "Teaching of Traditional American History" initiative and a campaign by the National Endowment for the Humanities to fund the celebration of "American heroes" (Craig, 2002, 2003).

Contesting Patriotism

While a jingoistic, intolerant patriotism dominates the country's official discourse — as demonstrated in the shift to the right in political power, the collapse of liberalism within the Democratic Party, the creation of new repressive institutions and policies, and the growing influence of right-wing intellectuals — a resurgent popular movement came to life during the weekend of February 15 and 16 as literally millions of activists took to the streets from New York to Melbourne. "They raised banners of patriotism and dissent," reported the *New York Times*, and "sounded the hymns of a broad new antiwar movement" (McFadden, 2003: 1). The

Times concluded that "there may still be two superpowers on the planet: the United States and world public opinion" (Tyler, 2003: 1). Before and during the U.S. war on Iraq, grass-roots organizations not only led hundreds of thousands in street protests, but also effectively lobbied public officials and political institutions. Local councils in Los Angeles, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, and more than 100 other cities and counties passed resolutions opposing unilateral declarations of war against Iraq and in support of diplomatic solutions to the crisis (Whitaker, 2003: 9).

Within antiwar groups, there has been a far-ranging debate about whether to concede the flag to the Right or renew a progressive tradition of patriotism that goes back to the Civil War. To achieve a military victory, the Union needed to abolish slavery in the heart of the Confederacy. Lincoln's issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863 transformed the war's mission and fundamentally expanded the meaning of patriotism from a willingness to die for one's country to the reciprocal obligation of the nation to make the ideal of liberty into a reality. At stake was whether patriotism would be grounded in aspirations to freedom and equality for all Americans. A progressive patriotism emerged out of this historical moment, a patriotism that does not blindly follow "my country right or wrong," but critically holds the nation accountable for putting its ideals into practice. This tendency was renewed during World War II, when African Americans fought a "Double V Campaign," demanding that the American government deliver democracy at home, as well as abroad.

After September 11, many people, new to feelings of patriotism, experimented with flying flags with peace symbols or placing a United Nations flag or Earth First flag next to the Stars and Stripes. Posters, in six different languages, went up in many towns declaring "No Racist Attacks" and "Our Community is a Hate-Free Zone." In the San Francisco Bay Area, many neighborhoods organized candlelight memorials amid flags, flowers, and signs quoting U.S. Representative Barbara Lee's words, "As we act, let us not become the evil that we deplore" (Nakao, 2001; Harder, 2001: 25). During public antiwar events in February 2003, it was quite common to see protesters carrying national icons remade into symbols of protest. "These colors don't run the world" was the message of a tee shirt decorated with the American flag, while bumper stickers proclaimed "Peace is Patriotic" from the back of cars. During the war in Iraq, billboards urged people to "Support Our Troops: Bring Them Home."

Most challenges to right-wing patriotism suggest that it is possible to make nationalism serve goals of freedom and equality, to make this country "be the dream it used to be," in the words of Langston Hughes' 1936 poem, "Let America Be America Again." Others evoke the tradition of radical internationalists, such as Emma Goldman and early 20th century socialists, equating all forms of patriotism with "national egotism" and advocating a new "spirit of humanitarianism" that reaches out "across all artificial barriers in the common work for liberty

and equality for all."[18] We see this international perspective today in critiques of the revival of the "imperial presidency," in opposition to the United States' "obsession with the evil of other people," and in recognition of the need for a "global declaration of interdependence" (Johnson, 2003: 7–9; Berry, 2003; Davis, 2002). It will require this kind of visionary movement to reverse the extraordinary gains made so quickly by "a cadre of neoconservative war-lovers," who believe, in the cautionary words of political scientist Chalmers Johnson (2003: 9), that the United States is predestined to be the "New Rome, a colossus unconstrained by any values, loyalties, or ideals of international law."

May 2003

NOTES

1. This shift is reflected in the hard-line influence of Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, Richard Perle, John Poindexter, and Paul Wolfowitz. On the rise to power of "radical nationalists," see Lieven (2002).

2. Influential rightists include John Ashcroft as attorney general, Theodore Olson as solicitor general, and in the Senate John Warner heads the Armed Services Committee, Don Nickles the Budget Committee, and Orrin Hatch the Judiciary Committee. For the realignment of power in the Senate, see *New York Times* (2002).

3. The first quote is from popular writer Wendell Berry's antiwar statement, "A Citizen's Response to the National Security Strategy of the United States of America," which appeared as a full-page advertisement in the *New York Times* (February 9, 2003: 5); the second quote is from popular songwriter and singer Steve Earle from the notes to his compact disk, *Jerusalem*, Artemis Records, July 4, 2002.

4. Unless otherwise noted, references to the history of patriotism are drawn from Cecilia E. O'Leary (1999).

5. For a short summary of patriotic excesses in the name of internal security, see Harden (2001); see, also, Goldstein (1978: 524–525, 535, 538–539) and Platt et al. (1982).

6. Ronald Reagan's 1981 Inaugural Address is quoted in Gerstle (2001: 359–360).

7. In late November 2001, pressured primarily by the press, Attorney General John Ashcroft issued the names of 93 people charged with crimes and an accounting of 548 people in custody (Lewis and Van Natta Jr., 2001: 1).

8. For an in-depth report on the dragnet and detentions, see "A Deliberate Strategy of Disruption," *Washington Post* (2001: 1).

9. Some police chiefs, including the acting chief in Portland, Oregon, refused to participate in the dragnet on the grounds that it violates the state constitution (Wilgoren, 2001: 1).

10. A Web search using "neighborhood watch + terrorism" produced 22,400 hits on March 12, 2002. The Justice Department has allotted a $1.9 million grant to local sheriff's departments to train some 15,000 groups on how to spot suspicious activities (Eggen, 2002). Journalist Jonathan Yardley (2002) thinks that this program will be about as effective as Gerald Ford's call to children to quickly close refrigerator doors as a way to tackle the energy crisis.

11. According to a lawsuit filed by the American Civil Liberties Union, some 339 people have been stopped and questioned at San Francisco airport alone since September 2001 because their names appeared on the no-fly list (Lichtblau, 2003c: 15).

12. Assistant Attorney General Michael Chertoff has justified the withholding of names of

persons charged with immigration offenses on the dubious grounds of privacy and to prevent "terrorists" from exploiting such information (Clymer, 2003a: 1).

13. According to Agence France-Presse (reported in the *New York Times,* January 31, 2003: 11), more than 600 prisoners were detained at the base as of January 2003.

14. Despite the controversy surrounding Senator Trent Lott's defense of Strom Thurmond's segregationist past, the Bush administration quickly decided to re-nominate to the federal appeals courts Judge Charles Pickering, Sr., a trial judge from Mississippi who switched to the Republican Party in 1964 in protest of the Democratic Party's antiracist policies; Priscilla Owen, a Texas conservative; and Miguel Estrada, a conservative lawyer without experience on the bench (Lewis, 2003a; 2003b).

15. The Bush administration is cited for its detention of "enemy combatants" without formal charges or access to attorneys, closed-door deportation hearings of terrorism suspects, and refusal to abide by the Geneva Convention in the treatment of prisoners held at Guantánamo Bay (Brinkley, 2003: 10).

16. Fleischer is quoted in the *New York Times* (September 28, 2001: B8). See, also, McKinley (2001: E1).

17. The Campus Watch Web site can be found at *www.campus-watch.org*.

18. From the magazine *Mother Earth* (1912), cited by O'Leary, 224–225.

REFERENCES

American Council of Trustees and Alumni
2001 *Defending Civilization: How Our Universities Are Failing America and What Can Be Done About It*. Washington, D.C.: ACTA (November).

Anderson, Perry
2003 "Casuistries of Peace and War." *London Review of Books* (March 6).

Ashcroft, John
2002 "Coordination of Information Relating to Terrorism." Internal memorandum, U.S. Department of Justice (April 11).

Associated Press
2003 "Scalia Attacks Church-State Court Rulings." *New York Times* (January 13).

Berry, Wendell
2003 "A Citizen's Response to the National Security Strategy of the United States of America." *New York Times* (February 9).

Brinkley, Joel
2003 "Report Says U.S. Human Rights Abuses Have Eroded Support for Efforts Against Terrorism." *New York Times* (January 15).

Broder, John and Susan Sachs
2002 "Facing Registry Deadline, Men from Muslim Nations Swamp Immigration Office." *New York Times* (December 17).

Butterfield, Fox
2002 "Political Influence on Crime Data Agencies." *New York Times* (September 23).

Carter, Bill and Jim Rutenberg
2002 "Fox News Head Sent a Policy Note to Bush." *New York Times* (November 19).

Clymer, Adam
2003a "Government Openness at Issue as Bush Holds on to Records." *New York Times* (January 3).
2003b "Justice Dept. Draft on Wider Powers Draws Quick Criticism." *New York Times* (February 8).

Craig, Bruce
2003 *National Coalition for History Update* 9,5 (February 3).
2002 *National Coalition for History Update* 8,46 (November 22) (rbcraig@historycoalition.org).

Davis, Wade
2002 "We Need a Global Declaration of Interdependence." *Toronto Globe & Mail* (July 6).

D'Souza, Dinesh
2002 "Two Cheers for Colonialism." *San Francisco Chronicle* (July 7).

Deputy Attorney General
2002 "Reorganization of the Department of Justice." Internal memorandum, U.S. Department of Justice (May 1).

Didion, Joan
2003 "Fixed Opinions, or the Hinge of History." *The New York Review of Books* (January 16).

Earle, Steve
2002 *Jerusalem* (compact disk). New York: Artemis Records (July 4).

Eggen, Dan
2002 "Neighborhood Watch Program Shifts Focus." *Washington Post* (March 6).

Fagan, Kevin
2001 "Hate Groups May Be Anthrax Attackers." *San Francisco Chronicle* (November 1).

Fineman, Howard and Tamara Lipper
2003 "Spinning Race." *Newsweek* (January 27).

Firestone, David
2002 "Senate Votes, 90–9 to Set Up a Homeland Security Dept. Geared to Fight Terrorism." *New York Times* (November 20).

Fordham Foundation, Thomas B.
2002 "September 11: What Our Children Need to Know." Washington, D.C.: Fordham Foundation. www.edexcellence.net.

Gathright, Alan
2002 "No-Fly Blacklist Snares Political Activists." *San Francisco Chronicle* (September 27).

Gerstle, Gary
2001 *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Glaberson, William
2001 "Support for Bush's Antiterror Plan." *New York Times* (December 5).

Goldstein, Robert Justin
1995 *Saving "Old Glory": The History of the American Flag Desecration Controversy*. Boulder: Westview Press.
1978 *Political Repression in Modern America: 1870 to the Present*. Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing.

Harden, Blaine
2001 "Flag Fever: The Paradox of Patriotism." *New York Times*, Week in Review (September 20).

Harder, Dan
2001 "The New Old Haight." *San Francisco Chronicle* (October 4).

Hersh, Seymour
2002 "Manhunt." *The New Yorker* (December 23–30).

Hughes, Langston
1936 "Let America Be America Again." *Esquire* (July).

Hulse, Carl and Todd S. Purdum
2002 "Daschle Defends Democrats' Stand on Security of U.S." *New York Times* (September 26).

Johnson, Chalmers
2003 "Who's in Charge?" *London Review of Books* (February 6).
Johnston, David and Don Van Natta, Jr.
2002 "Agencies Monitor Iraqis in the U.S. for Terrorist Threat." *New York Times* (November 17).
Johnston, David, James Risen, and Neil Lewis
2002 "Administration Begins to Rewrite Decades-Old Spying Restrictions." *New York Times* (November 30).
Larder, George, Jr.
2001 "U.S. Will Monitor Calls to Lawyers." *Washington Post* (November 8).
Lewin, Tamar
2002 "Web Site Fuels Debate on Campus Anti-Semitism." *New York Times* (September 27).
Lewis, Neil A.
2003a "U.S. Is Allowed to Hold Citizen as Combatant." *New York Times* (January 9).
2003b "Delayed Debate Starts on Judge Picked by Bush." *New York Times* (February 6).
2003c "Federal Judge Again Fuels Partisan Fight." *New York Times* (January 9).
2002 "Court Overturns Limits on Wiretaps to Combat Terror." *New York Times* (November 19).
Lewis, Neil A. and Don Van Natta, Jr.
2001 "Ashcroft Offers Accounting of 641 Charged or Held." *New York Times* (November 28).
Lichtblau, Eric
2003a "F.B.I. Tells Offices to Count Local Muslims and Mosques." *New York Times* (January 28).
2003b "F.B.I. and C.I.A. Are Set for a Major Consolidation in a Counterterror Overhaul." *New York Times* (February 15).
2003c "Government's 'No Fly' List Is Challenged in a Lawsuit." *New York Times* (April 23).
2002a "F.B.I. Officials Say Some Agents Lack a Focus on Terror." *New York Times* (November 21).
2002b "Bias Against U.S. Arabs Taking Subtler Forms." *Los Angeles Times* (February 10).
Lieven, Anatol
2002 "The Push for War and the Ascendancy of Radical Nationalism." *London Review of Books* (October 3).
Litwack, Leon F. and Winthrop D. Jordan
1991 *The United States: Becoming a World Power*. Vol. 2. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
Madigan, Nick
2003 "Complying, Anxiously, With an I.N.S. Roundup." *New York Times* (January 13).
Markoff, John and John Schwartz
2002 "Bush Administration to Propose System for Wide Monitoring of Internet." *New York Times* (December 20).
McFadden, Robert D.
2003 "From New York to Melbourne, Cries for Peace." *New York Times* (February 16).
McKinley, Jesse
2001 "Comedians Return, Treading Lightly." *New York Times* (September 26).
Milibank, Dana
2001 "Bush Makes a Pitch for Teaching Patriotism." *Washington Post* (November 2).

Nakao, Annie
2001 "Flag Waving a Cause for Introspection." *San Francisco Chronicle* (September 22).
National Endowment for the Humanities
1984 *To Reclaim a Legacy*. Washington, D.C.: NEH.
New York Times
2002 "Back in Charge: A New Lineup Takes Shape in the Senate." *New York Times* (November 7).
2001 "A Travesty of Justice." *New York Times* (November 16).
Newfield, Jack
2002 "The Right's Judicial Juggernaut." *The Nation* (October 7).
O'Leary, Cecilia E.
1999 *To Die For: The Paradox of American Patriotism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Packer, George
2001 "Recapturing the Flag." *New York Times Magazine* (September 30).
Pell, Eve
2002 "Homeland Security X50." *The Nation* (June 3).
Platt, Tony et al.
1982 *The Iron Fist and the Velvet Glove: An Analysis of the U.S. Police*. San Francisco: Global Options.
Press, Eyal
2003 "In Torture We Trust." *The Nation* (March 31).
Reuters
2002 "Group Reports Mistreatment of Detainees." *New York Times* (March 15).
Risen, James and David Johnston
2002 "Bush Has Widened Authority of C.I.A. to Kill Terrorists." *New York Times* (December 15).
Rosenfeld, Seth
2002 "Patriot Act's Scope, Secrecy Ensnare Innocents, Critics Say." *San Francisco Chronicle* (September 8).
Rubenstein, Steve
2001 "Nation's School Children Pledge from Sea to Shining Sea." *San Francisco Chronicle* (October 13).
Rutenberg, Jim
2003 "Outflanked Democrats Wonder How to Catch Up in Media Wars." *New York Times* (January 1).
Schevitz, Tanya
2002 "FBI Sees Leap in Anti-Muslim Hate Crimes." *San Francisco Chronicle* (November 26).
Seelye, Katherine Q.
2002 "For America's Captives, Home Is a Camp in Cuba, With Goggles and a Koran." *New York Times* (January 20).
Shanker, Tom and James Risen
2002 "Rumsfeld Weighs New Covert Acts by Military Units." *New York Times* (August 12).
Shenon, Philip and David Johnston
2002 "Seeking Terrorist Plots, the F.B.I. Is Tracking Hundreds of Muslims." *New York Times* (October 6).
Sigal, Clancy
2002 "John Ashcroft's Palmer Raids." *New York Times* (March 13).
Slotkin, Richard
1992 *Gunfighter Nation: The Myth of the Frontier in Twentieth-Century America*. New York: Atheneum.
Sontag, Susan
2002 "WAR? Real Battles and Empty Metaphors." *New York Times* (September 10).

Steinberg, Jacques
2001 "U.S. Has Covered 200 Campuses to Check Up on Mideast Students." *New York Times* (November 12).
Stevenson, Richard
2002 "Signing Homeland Security Bill, Bush Appoints Ridge as Secretary." *New York Times* (November 26).
Swarns, Rachel L.
2003a "Illegal Aliens Can Be Held Indefinitely, Ashcroft Says." *New York Times* (April 26).
2003b "Fearful, Angry or Confused, Muslim Immigrants Register." *New York Times* (April 25).
Thomas, Jo
2001 "U.S. Groups Have Some Ties to Germ Warfare." *New York Times* (November 2).
Tyler, Patrick E.
2003 "A New Power in the Streets." *New York Times* (February 17).
Wallerstein, Immanuel
2002 "The Eagle Has Crash Landed." *Foreign Policy* (July-August).
Washington Post
2001 "A Deliberate Strategy of Disruption." *Washington Post* (November 4).
Whitaker, Barbara
2003 "Los Angeles Council Adopts Resolution Against Iraq War." *New York Times* (February 22).
Wilentz, Sean
2002 "From Justice Scalia, a Chilling Vision of Religion's Authority in America." *New York Times* (July 8).
Wilgoren, Jodi
2001 "Michigan 'Invites' Men from Mideast to Be Interviewed." *New York Times* (November 27).
Yardley, Jonathan
2002 "Ashcroft's Broken Watch." *Washington Post* (March 10).
Zinn, Howard
1995 *A People's History of the United States, 1492-Present*. New York: Harper Perennial.