

BRITE DIVINITY SCHOOL
TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY
FORT WORTH, TEXAS

E-HATE: HOW RELIGIOUS VIOLENCE IS
ADAPTING TO THE ONLINE WORLD

RELIGION AND VIOLENCE

CHSO 70163

BRIAN WOODDELL

MAY 29, 2008

INTRODUCTION

The media are a reflection on society. And in our technology-obsessed culture, reflections abound. The Internet age has made everyone's opinions and theories, no matter how far-fetched, available to the world's 1 billion Web surfers, of whom roughly 208 million live in the United States.¹ Although some forms of Internet communication—such as blogs and chat rooms and instant messaging—were new creations, many—such as e-mail, online newspapers and Internet phones—were simply digital face-lifts to pre-existing systems.

It is undeniable that the Internet has made many tasks simpler and faster. Instant, worldwide communication occurs at the push of a button. This has positive applications: We receive news seconds after events occur. We can be forewarned of natural disasters. We can keep in contact with loved ones around the world. But there are negative implications to the Internet's speed. Anyone can create a credible-looking Web site and disseminate to the world statements of questionable truth. E-mail allows users to send information—truthful or not—instantly to thousands of people.

Chain e-mail is the perfect example of untrue or partially true information that becomes viral. It's the digital version of the chain letter, one of the earliest of which was sent in 1795 by none other than Jesus Christ himself. The letter says it contains

¹ *The CIA World Factbook*, (2008), <http://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook> (accessed 23 May, 2008).

the true words of Jesus, which generally amount to a truncated, and rather doom-and-gloom, version of the Gospel message. It claims to have been found at the foot of Christ's cross 53 years after the crucifixion, and it's signed by the angel Gabriel.²

The content of today's digital versions has changed very little. Religion—especially Islam, Christianity and Judaism—is often the subject on these inbox plagues. There are a few common themes in religious chain e-mails: The United States is portrayed as a morally upright, often Christian, nation that is being victimized by some force that doesn't belong; Muslims, Jews, other religious minorities and liberal politicians are not to be trusted; the media (the news media, we can assume) are involved in a malicious cover-up of the actual truth; and there is something of which the general public is unaware that is being revealed by the e-mail, mainly because all mainstream channels are unwilling.³

Why examine chain e-mails? They are rarely factual, but they do contain some truth: Chain e-mails hold up a mirror to society, and they expose the general American opinion about current events. Their anonymity lets the authors make offensive and unfounded statements without the danger of negative consequences. And when it comes to chain e-mails that have been circulating since the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, such e-mails show how religious violence has impacted American attitudes toward religious and cultural minorities and how the memetic cycle continues.

²“Letter from Heaven. Jesus' sabbath letter. ‘... from Iconium.’ England, 1795. Link to scan,” (Paper Chain Letter Archive), http://www.silcom.com/~barnowl/chain-letter/archive/her795u_jesus_sab.htm (accessed 28 May, 2008).

³I make these statements based on my experience and based on databases from Snopes.com, TruthOrFiction.com and other Web sites that archive and research chain e-mails.

Before I begin my analysis, I must set up some ground rules. First, I have confined my study to chain e-mails, which I define as e-mails of dubious origin that have enjoyed wide distribution radii. It is impossible to determine exact scope of an e-mail's distribution, so I define a wide radius as the e-mail's being so ubiquitous that it brings the attention of a third party, such as an independent debunking organization or, in some cases, the news media, the government or someone targeted by the e-mail itself. Second, I have specifically targeted e-mails that deal with religious subjects. There are plenty of online rumors that deal with political voting records, illegal immigration and other hot-button issues, but they are not pertinent to my investigation.

I have taken great care to preserve the original language of each e-mail. I have adjusted for spacing, but not for grammar, spelling or punctuation mistakes. In addition, I have tried to suspend my political and religious beliefs in the middle part of my discussion.

ELECTRONIC EVIDENCE

Sept. 11, 2001

On Sept. 11, 2001, a group of Muslim men hijacked four planes and flew them into the two towers of the World Trade Center in New York City and the Pentagon in Washington, D.C. They were connected with a man named Osama bin Laden and a group called al-Qaida, names that would become household terms within the first week after the attacks.⁴ Within those first few days, Americans saw a simplistic duality: Muslims, a religious group that made up less than 1 percent of the U.S. population,⁵ were trying to kill Americans.

A chain e-mail from around 2003 is a perfect example of how many Americans viewed Muslims in the post-Sept. 11 world. It contains a supposed excerpt from the Qur'an, v. 9:11:

“For it is written that a son of Arabia would awaken a fearsome Eagle. The wrath of the Eagle would be felt throughout the lands of Allah and lo, while some of the people trembled in despair still more rejoiced; for the wrath of the Eagle cleansed the lands of Allah; and there was peace.”⁶

This e-mail and its fictitious excerpt from the Qur'an fit perfectly with Mark Juer-

⁴“Bush and top aides proclaim policy of ‘ending’ states that back terror; local airports shut after an arrest,” *New York Times*, 14 Sept. 2001.

⁵ *The CIA World Factbook*.

⁶“snopes.com: Quran 9:11,” (11 Dec., 2005), <http://www.snopes.com/politics/war/quran911.asp> (accessed 26 May, 2008).

Juergensmeyer's discussion of religious violence and the concept of cosmic warfare.⁷ The obvious association between the Qur'an and the Sept. 11 attacks links all of Islam with the destruction of the World Trade Center. It creates a clear dichotomy: Islam vs. the United States—part of an overall, cosmic struggle between wrong and right.⁸ It gives cause to American anti-Islam sentiment by providing justification from a book that most Americans would not consider to be divinely inspired. It also gives a rationale for anti-Islam violence by elevating American society over that of Islamic nations (one of the themes discussed in my introduction). After the destruction, or “cleansing,” of “the lands of Allah,” there will be peace.

A 2006 chain message says it is from a retired Delta Air Lines pilot who says he met one of the Sept. 11 attackers, Mohammad Atta, when Atta posed as a pilot on a Delta flight July 26, 2001.⁹ The e-mail contains some of the aforementioned markers of a religious viral chain message. Religious minorities and liberals are not to be trusted, and the general public is unaware of the real truth:

“The worst offenders were the Liberal detractors to the present administration, and right or wrong, this administration is at least taking the bull by the horns and fighting our enemies Nobody was taking this war seriously, and it seems everyone found fault with the US government rather than with those who attacked us.”¹⁰

The United States, a superior moral agent, is a victim:

⁷Mark Juergensmeyer, *Terror in the Mind of God*, (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2003), 148–166.

⁸Juergensmeyer, 172.

⁹“snopes.com: Mohammad Atta Sat in My Jump Seat,” (19 May, 2008), <http://www.snopes.com/rumors/jumpseat.asp> (accessed 26 May, 2008).

¹⁰“Mohammad Atta.”

“The Islamic world is no friend of the West, and although we may be able to get along with their governments in the future, the stated goal of Islam is world conquest through Jihad and it is the extremist Jihadists, backed and funded by ‘friendly’ Moslem governments, whom we have to fear the most.”¹¹

The author asks us to forgive him if he does not “embrace the Muslim world for the rest of [his] life” because of what they did to his country. Just like the previous e-mail presented, this e-mail’s generalizations create an us-vs.-them dichotomy that declares the whole Islamic world, not just radical Muslims, as the antagonist and the United States as the victim.

Muslims were not the only group blamed for the Sept. 11 attacks. A 2001 chain e-mail claimed that Jews, not Muslims, truly benefited from the terrorist acts and that 4,000 Jews were absent from their posts in the World Trade Center on the day of the attack:

“The only people who benefited from this act of terror are the Jews. This is not the first time Israel and the Jews have done something like this in the name of someone else to further their own selfish needs. They have even resorted to killing their own people to win public sympathy and support. This act is not beyond the capabilities and evil deeds in Israel. In this case it seems that it is clear to all that the Jews/Israel have the most to gain and should be considered as a possible source behind this act.”¹²

The U.S. Department of State issued a report in 2005 denouncing the rumor, saying that the “claim is totally false” and listing the names of 76 Jews who died in the Sept. 11 attacks. The Department of State reaffirms that it was indeed Osama bin Laden

¹¹ “Mohammad Atta.”

¹² “snopes.com: 9/11 Forewarned Jews,” (8 March, 2008), <http://www.snopes.com/rumors/israel.asp> (accessed 26 May, 2008).

and al-Qaida, not the Israeli government, that attacked the United States in 2001.¹³

Despite the falsity of the rumor, the e-mail is illustrative. Juergensmeyer says that in case of religious terrorism, “enemies have to be invented if they do not already exist.” When one is wronged, one looks for “a negative reference to which one can position oneself and over which one can hope to triumph.”¹⁴ What is fascinating about this case is that the author invents an enemy by redirecting blame from one religious group to another. We see here how elements religious violence can be reflected in the response of the victims of a violent act. An analysis of this Girardian cycle is forthcoming.

The War on Terrorism and the Iraq War

After the Sept. 11 attacks, U.S. President George W. Bush made two speeches that greatly impacted the United States’ role in world affairs. In the first, made Sept. 12, 2001, Bush committed his administration toward finding the party responsible for the terrorist attacks the previous day: “Make no mistake, the United States will hunt down and punish those responsible for these cowardly acts.”¹⁵ The second speech, which Bush gave March 17, 2003, expands the Bush administration’s goal to “advance freedom and peace” in the Middle East.¹⁶ “The security of the world requires disarm-

¹³ “The 4,000 Jews Rumor - U.S. Department of State,” (U.S. Department of State, 14 Jan., 2005), <http://usinfo.state.gov/media/Archive/2005/Jan/14-260933.html> (accessed 26 May, 2008).

¹⁴ Juergensmeyer, 174.

¹⁵ Elisabeth Bumiller, and David E. Sanger, “A Somber Bush Says Terrorism Cannot Prevail,” *New York Times*, 12 Sept., 2001.

¹⁶ *New York Times*, 18 March, 2003.

ing Saddam Hussein now,” Bush said.¹⁷ With these two speeches, Bush put his nation’s military against those who would commit violence in the name of religion.

The Iraq War and the War on Terrorism brought more e-mail rumors to our inboxes, and although the content dealt with a different conflict, they were identical in form to e-mails about the Sept. 11 attacks. There were still a strong sense of U.S. nationalism and a clear us-vs.-them theme.

One such e-mail, which was falsely attributed to retired Air Force Maj. Gen. Vernon Chong, began circulating in 2005. It examines the United States’ two wars and says that “[o]ur country is now facing the most serious threat to its existence, as we know it, that we have faced in your lifetime and mine (which includes WWII).”¹⁸ Its analysis continues:

“... Why were we attacked?

“Envy of our position, our success, and our freedoms. The attacks happened during the administrations of Presidents Carter, Reagan, Bush 1, Clinton and Bush 2. We cannot fault either the Republicans or Democrats, as there were no provocations by any of the presidents or their immediate predecessor, President Ford.”¹⁹

The author of this e-mail predicts the loss of some of the United States’ allies in Europe, as well:

“They will pick off the other non-Muslim nations, one at a time. It will be increasingly easier for them. They already hold Spain hostage. It doesn’t matter whether it was right or wrong for Spain to withdraw its troops from Iraq. Spain did it because the Muslim terrorists bombed their train and told them to withdraw the troops. Anything else they want Spain to do will be done. Spain is

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ E-mail to author, 31 March, 2008. A version of this e-mail can also be found at Snopes.com.

¹⁹ Ibid.

finished.

“The next will probably be France. Our one hope with France is that they might see the light and realize that if we don’t win, they are finished, too, in that they can’t resist the Muslim terrorists without us. However, it may already be too late for France. France is already 20% Muslim and fading fast.

“Without our support, Great Britain will go, also. Recently, I read that there are more mosques in England than churches.”²⁰

As with before, the truth or falsity of this e-mail is not the focus of analysis.

Instead, we must look how words are used. The author seems to say: We are morally right, and they are attacking us for no good reason. They will stop at nothing to destroy our way of life. This issue requires our full attention because it is more important than anything else in our history. And if we don’t do something, no one else will. The e-mail concludes:

“Lastly, I wish to add: at the risk of offending, I sincerely think that anyone who rejects this as just another political rant, or doubts the seriousness of this issue, or just deletes it without sending it on, is part of the problem.”²¹

The content of this e-mail reflects the mentality Juergensmeyer sees among the very people against whom the United States is fighting. Juergensmeyer writes:

“War suggests an all-or-nothing struggle against an enemy whom one assumes to be determined to destroy. No compromise is deemed possible. The very existence of the opponent is a threat, and until the enemy is either crushed or contained, one’s own existence cannot be secure.”²²

The e-mail’s claims that militant Islam is out to take over the world echo Christian Identity statements about the Jewish plot for world conquest, and they are not unlike

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Juergensmeyer, 152.

what Muslim terrorists have said about the West.²³

Heightened sensitivities led e-mail users to be duped by a message that circulated in 2002. The e-mail warns of phone scams by terrorist groups looking to “instill fear in the population” by stealing people’s identities by way of their phone numbers. The recorded voice—with a “Middle Eastern” accent—asks the other party to press “1” and, thus, agree to additional charges and financially support terrorist activity.²⁴

How does something so obviously false illustrate how religious violence has changed Americans’ perceptions? Don’t we have to look at the author’s motivation before we make any judgment call? Couldn’t the author have written the e-mail in a malicious attempt to fool people? The answer: The author’s original intentions disappear once the author clicks “Send.” At that moment, the e-mail is at the mercy of those receiving it. Its meaning is based on the recipients’ interpretations, and in forwarding it further, those recipients give it an implicit stamp of approval. In a way reminiscent of Paul Tillich, it doesn’t matter whether something described in a viral e-mail actually occurred; what matters is that the reader believes it happened.

Toward the future: the 2008 presidential race

The symbolic nature of chain messages caused public relations problems for political candidates in the early months of 2008, especially among Democrats. Sens. Hillary Clinton, D-N.Y., and Barack Obama, D-Ill., spent most of the primary vot-

²³ Ibid, 155, 157.

²⁴ “snopes.com: Terrorists Funded Through Telemarketing,” (13 April, 2008), <http://www.snopes.com/rumors/phone.asp> (accessed 27 May, 2008).

ing season locked in a dead heat for their party's nomination. The Democratic Party was offering voters a choice between a woman and a black man—either one a departure from past elections—so it's only natural that they would feel resistance. Rumors involving Clinton were nothing more than typical mudslinging. Her husband's two-term presidency meant that the American public was familiar with Ms. Clinton.²⁵ But Obama was little known outside Illinois, and his middle name, Hussein, caused quite a stir. And Obama's cultural ties didn't help many Muslim-wary Americans take a shine to the young candidate. Consider the following excerpt from an e-mail that began circulating in January 2008:

“Probable U.S. presidential candidate, Barack Hussein Obama was born in Honolulu, Hawaii, to Barack Hussein Obama, Sr., a black MUSLIM from Nyangoma-Kogel, Kenya and Ann Dunham, a white ATHIEST from Wichita Kansas. ... When Obama was two years old, his parents divorced. His father returned to Kenya. His mother then married Lolo Soetoro, a RADICAL Muslim from Indonesia.”²⁶

The e-mail tells its audience that “Obama takes great care to conceal the fact that he is a Muslim.” It explains that his religious influences are both Islam and Catholicism but that his step-father, Lolo Soetoro, pushed the young Obama toward radical Wahhabism, the same “RADICAL teaching that is followed by the Muslim terrorists who are now waging Jihad against the western world.”²⁷

“Since it is politically expedient to be a CHRISTIAN when seeking major public office in the United States, Barack Hussein Obama has joined the United

²⁵ In no way do I wish to discount rumors that were spread about Rep. John McCain, R-Ariz., or Clinton. Their lack of formal affiliation with Islam did not make them the target of religious or cultural criticism, so they are not pertinent to my argument.

²⁶ E-mail to author, 9 Jan., 2008. A version of this e-mail can also be found at Snopes.com.

²⁷ Ibid.

Church of Christ in an attempt to downplay his Muslim background. ALSO, keep in mind that when he was sworn into office he DID NOT use the Holy Bible, but instead the Koran. Barack Hussein Obama will NOT recite the Pledge of Allegiance nor will he show any reverence for our flag. While others place their hands over their hearts, Obama turns his back to the flag and slouches. Let us all remain alert concerning Obama's expected presidential candidacy.

"The Muslims have said they plan to destroy the US from the inside out, what better way to start than at the highest level - through the President of the United States, one of their own!!!! Please forward to everyone you know. Would you want this man leading our country?"²⁸

The content of this e-mail comes from a story that appeared in Insight Magazine in January 2007. The story was presented again as fact on Fox News. So widespread was the fallout of the print, online, broadcast and e-mail forms of this story that Obama's political team issued a formal denial of its accusations. The rebuttal says that Obama "has never been a Muslim, was not raised a Muslim, and is a committed Christian."²⁹

This e-mail rumor, as well as the news story that spawned it, contains all four themes that are commonly present in such hoaxes:³⁰

- **The United States is a moral, often Christian, nation that is being victimized by some force that doesn't belong:** This can be seen in the e-mail's emphasis on words such as "radical" and "Muslim." The e-mail's introduction refers to "what lies ahead of us here in our own United States," a statement that portrays Obama as an outsider. Not only that, he is connected to a group

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ "Debunked Insight Magazine and Fox News Smear Campaign | U.S. Senator Barack Obama," (23 Jan., 2007), http://obama.senate.gov/press/070123-debunked_insigh/index.php (accessed 27 May, 2008).

³⁰ All quotes from this list come from the same e-mail to the author, 9 Jan., 2008.

of outsiders that plans “on destroying the US from the inside out.” Obama, the e-mail says, is unfit to lead the United States because he is an anti-Christian, unpatriotic liar.

- **Minorities and liberal politicians are not to be trusted:** This point is obvious. Obama, a black Democrat, fits both of these categories.
- **The media are covering up something:** The e-mail states that “Obama’s political handlers are attempting to make it appear that he is not a radical.” The author seems to imply that Obama is manipulating the news media for his own purposes in an effort to turn attention from his Muslim past.
- **The general population is unaware of the true story:** The e-mail claims it reveals to its readers the real story of Barack Obama, a story that has not been (or cannot be) disclosed through normal channels. Readers are asked to spread the word by forwarding the message to their friends, and they are told to “heed this and pray about it and share it.”

The slander doesn’t end there. Another chain message, which appeared in March 2008, goes so far as to paint Obama as the anti-Christ, as backed by the “Book of Revelations”:

“The anti-Christ will be a man, in his late 40s, of MUSLIM descent, who will deceive the nations with persuasive language, and have a MASSIVE Christ-like appeal.... the prophecy says that people will flock to him and he will promise false hope and world peace, and when he is in power, will destroy everything. Is it OBAMA??”³¹

³¹“snopes.com: Is Barack Obama the Anti-Christ?” (24 April, 2008), <http://www.snopes.com/politics/obama/antichrist.asp> (accessed 27 May, 2008).

The language is clear. In addition to the common themes of religious chain e-mails, this example contains the language of religious violence. By employing the story of the Christian apocalypse, the author puts Obama at cosmic odds with God, Christians and, one could argue based on context, the United States. Furthermore, we can see the seeds of the scapegoat mechanism³² being sown. If Obama is the figurehead of an anti-American, anti-Christian force, decapitation, whether through political or unthinkable means, immediately becomes a potentially justifiable action.

³²My understanding of the scapegoat mechanism comes from René Girard, *I See Satan Fall Like Lightning*. I will discuss this further in my conclusion.

CONCLUSION

Allow me to first make some observations on the trends I noticed during my research. As I suggested in the introduction, a great deal of religious viral e-mails promote mistrust of liberal politicians, nonwhites and non-Christians. More broad, they tend to vilify anything but staunch “conservative”³³ attitudes and actions. They express paranoid, xenophobic views that often see anything nontraditional as a threat to the United States. Anti-conservative viral e-mails do exist, such as the vast number of chain rumors about President George W. Bush, but they rarely involve religious subjects. “Conservative” figures are rarely portrayed as threats to the United States’ identity or as offensive to God.

The rapid spread of chain e-mails is somewhat virus-like. They infiltrate the host, and they use intellectual trickery to spread themselves. They make their hosts feel a rush by revealing to them information that couldn’t be obtained through traditional means. Their content is dangerous and provocative, so it is readily accepted, but it only serves to mentally and emotionally damage the host.

Memetic violence

In *I See Satan Fall Like Lightning*, René Girard discusses an idea he calls “me-

³³The word “conservative” has a vague meaning, but I use it purposefully. Chain e-mails often place controversial subjects into the framework of oversimplified duality. Ideas are presented as Christian vs. non-Christian, American vs. un-American, conservative vs. liberal, white vs. nonwhite. I am using the vernacular in order to show its absurdity.

metic desire,” which is based on an “extremely significant fact: our neighbor is the model for our desires.”³⁴ Girard argues that mimetic desire and rivalry form the basis of mimetic violence. “When the first scandal occurs, it gives birth to others, and the result is *mimetic crises*, which spread without ceasing and become worse and worse.”³⁵ Girard connects mimetic desire and violence with a cycle of violence that results in the deaths of scapegoats, victims whose death temporarily absolves a community of its sins.

Girard’s *circulus vitiosus*, I believe, is reflected in religious chain e-mails. They provide a visual representation of mimetic contagion. Hostility against a certain group (in our examples, Muslims and Jews) is “so contagious that it spreads to the most diverse individuals,” but in a digital manner. The senders are not idiots, and they are not inherently hateful people, but they become caught up the mob. And with a flick of their index fingers, they beckon others to join them.

My case studies trace a period of seven years, beginning with the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks and ending with the current political climate. Throughout this period, I see Girard’s scapegoat mechanism in full force, as backed by the changing language in chain e-mails. We began with a clear enemy: Muslim militant organization al-Qaida and its leader Osama bin Laden. But al-Qaida was a shifty force. Its members blended in with the population, and its leader was nowhere to be found. Because of

³⁴ René Girard, *I See Satan Fall Like Lightning*, trans. James G. Williams (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 2001), 10.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 18.

this, public sentiment quickly expanded its hatred to include all Muslims, not just those involved with al-Qaida. Soon after, a replacement sacrifice was found: Saddam Hussein. Americans were assured that Saddam had helped al-Qaida. With him gone, we would all be safer. Saddam was the scapegoat until it was confirmed that he had nothing to do with the Sept. 11 attacks.

It was at this point that the two most recent sets of scapegoats were cemented. One subculture chose George W. Bush and his administration. It was their selfish warmongering, after all, that placed us in Iraq. He lied to us and tried to trick us by providing Saddam as a sacrifice for our blood lust, but he failed and now must pay for his actions. Another subculture chose to keep its focus on the Arab world. Muslims had attacked Americans, so it is our moral right to fight fire with fire. They are “cowardly,” as Bush said in his speech after Sept. 11,³⁶ and they have denied us our just revenge by hiding in caves and among innocents.

The anti-Bush group’s victory was already in the bag: Barring major legislation, there was no way Bush will be returning to the White House except as a guest. Their scapegoat had been slaughtered. The anti-Muslim group, however, was still looking for a sacrifice, which it soon created in Barack Obama.

For those who trust and author chain e-mails, Obama is the perfect scapegoat. It is much more convenient to blame an outsider, even one among the society’s ranks, for misdeeds than to turn a critical eye on society itself. Obama represents much of what is feared in the United States: He is a minority, he has connections to one of the

³⁶ Bumiller and Sanger.

world's most hated religions, and all he seems to talk about is changing the status quo.

The language of the e-mails we have read, especially those that deal with Obama, express a fear that U.S. society will be upheaved should the Muslim world be allowed to prosper or should Obama win the presidency. As Charles Bellinger writes in his book, *The Trinitarian Self*, a society, or, in our case, a subculture, that wishes to protect itself from fundamental change will “band together against the Other, the outsider, the evil one, the Great Satan.” “[Their] triumph over [their] enemy will ensure the protection of [their] way of life.”³⁷

The scholarly world might balk at the idea that something as banal as chain e-mail could reflect societal paranoia and the cycle and language of religious violence. But with analysis, it becomes clear that these e-mails contain elements of what Girard calls *mimétisme*, as well as the themes of cosmic warfare and enemy-making as discussed by Juergensmeyer. It is my sincere hope that Americans see online rumors for what they are: hateful lies that only serve to encourage xenophobia, ethnocentrism and divisiveness. Perhaps people will realize that they should think before they believe. And perhaps humans will discover that the ultimate sacrifice has already been made through the death of Jesus Christ.³⁸ My experience tells me, however, that the mimetic cycle will continue, leaving lives and souls in its wake.

³⁷ Charles Bellinger, *The Trinitarian Self*, (Eugene, Ore.: Pickwick Publications, 2008), 125.

³⁸ Girard, 138.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bellinger, Charles. *The Trinitarian Self*. Eugene, Ore.: Pickwick Publications, 2008.
- Bumiller, Elisabeth, and David E. Sanger. "A Somber Bush Says Terrorism Cannot Prevail." *New York Times*, 12 Sept., 2001.
- "Bush and top aides proclaim policy of 'ending' states that back terror; local airports shut after an arrest." *New York Times*. 14 Sept. 2001.
- The CIA World Factbook*. (2008). <http://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook> (accessed 23 May, 2008).
- "Debunked Insight Magazine and Fox News Smear Campaign | U.S. Senator Barack Obama." 23 Jan., 2007. http://obama.senate.gov/press/070123-debunked_insigh/index.php (accessed 27 May, 2008).
- E-mail to author, 9 Jan., 2008.
- E-mail to author, 31 March, 2008.
- "The 4,000 Jews Rumor - U.S. Department of State." U.S. Department of State, 14 Jan., 2005. <http://usinfo.state.gov/media/Archive/2005/Jan/14-260933.html> (accessed 26 May, 2008).
- Girard, René. *I See Satan Fall Like Lightning*. Translated by James G. Williams. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 2001.
- Juergensmeyer, Mark. *Terror in the Mind of God*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2003.

“Letter from Heaven. Jesus’ sabbath letter. ‘... from Iconium.’ England, 1795. Link to scan.” Paper Chain Letter Archive. http://www.silcom.com/~barnowl/chain-letter/archive/he1795u_jesus_sab.htm (accessed 28 May, 2008).

New York Times, 18 March, 2003.

“snopes.com: Is Barack Obama the Anti-Christ?” 24 April, 2008. <http://www.snopes.com/politics/obama/antichrist.asp> (accessed 27 May, 2008).

“snopes.com: Mohammad Atta Sat in My Jump Seat.” 19 May, 2008. <http://www.snopes.com/rumors/jumpseat.asp> (accessed 26 May, 2008).

“snopes.com: 9/11 Forewarned Jews.” 8 March, 2008. <http://www.snopes.com/rumors/israel.asp> (accessed 26 May, 2008).

“snopes.com: Quran 9:11.” 11 Dec., 2005. <http://www.snopes.com/politics/war/quran911.asp> (accessed 26 May, 2008).

“snopes.com: Terrorists Funded Through Telemarketing.” 13 April, 2008. <http://www.snopes.com/rumors/phone.asp> (accessed 27 May, 2008).