

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

WHAT IT MEANS TO BE AMERICAN:

NEW POLL EXPLORES ATTITUDES IN AN INCREASINGLY DIVERSE  
AMERICA

Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, September 6, 2011

**Presentation of Survey Results:**

ROBERT P. JONES  
Chief Executive Officer and Founder  
Public Religion Research Institute

**Presentation of Report:**

E.J. DIONNE, JR.  
Senior Fellow, The Brookings Institution

WILLIAM GALSTON  
Ezra K. Zilkha Chair and Senior Fellow  
The Brookings Institution

**Respondents:**

JOSE CASANOVA  
Professor of Sociology and Senior Fellow  
Berkeley Center for Religion, Peace and World Affairs  
Georgetown University

MUQTEDAR KHAN  
Associate Professor  
Department of Political Science and International Relations  
University of Delaware

\* \* \* \* \*

## P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. DIONNE: I want to welcome everyone here today. I'm E.J. Dionne, a senior fellow here at Brookings. It's very good of you to come out and be with us and this is a very exciting survey.

We have said a lot after 9-11 that we had a new normal, that this had changed us in extraordinary ways, and in some ways it did, and this survey that you are about to hear more about talks about American's attitudes 10 years later. We feel more safe, marginally, but we feel we have less personal freedom, less respect in the world, but in many ways, perhaps, we didn't change and indeed some of the divisions among us before 9-11 have only been aggravated.

One of the things that we will talk about a great deal are partisan and ideological splits that have spread from issues such as taxing and spending to issues such as what the meaning of religious tolerance is, where we stand on immigration, how we adapt to new groups. We'll be talking a lot about generational divisions in the country, we'll be talking quite a bit about immigration.

I can't resist sharing G.K. Chesterton's observation that the United States has sought to make a nation "literally out of any old nation that comes along," and we have always struggled over this. We have always, in the end, managed to bend toward inclusion. There's a hunch that my colleague Bill Galston and I draw out of this survey that we will again, but we have also struggled over this question and there will be a lot

about this struggle as we have this conversation.

This survey and the report are part of an ongoing collaboration between the Public Religion Research Institute and the Project on Religion, Policy, and Politics here in the Governance Studies Department at Brookings. The survey was carried out by PRRI, and Bill Galston and I and all of us at Brookings remain grateful to Robby Jones and Dan Cox and all their great colleagues for a collaboration that goes back to a survey we did that might interest some of you on the relationship between Christian conservatives and the Tea Party. All this is available at both of our websites.

I also want to say that we are going to -- I want to welcome the C-SPAN audience and I want to note that you can participate in this discussion by Tweeting your question. It's #diversitypoll, all one word. I got that right, Christine, did I not? Yes, #diversitypoll, and Christine will be passing along your questions. So, not only will the people here participate, but we hope all of you who are listening will participate.

Thank yous often get left off at the end and so many people worked on this. I just want to say right up front that we at Brookings want to thank Corrine Davis, Christine Jacobs, John Sow, and Emily Lukin; at PRRI, Shannon Craig Straw, Amelia Thompson-DeVeaux, Sammy Holquist. We also want to thank Camdon Richards for some of the lovely charts that you see in this report.

Here's how we will proceed. Robby Jones will give one of

his patented, copyrighted, brilliant, PowerPoint presentations, which will give you a very good sense of what the survey actually found. That will be followed by Bill Galston. This report, as you'll see, comes in two parts. Bill will present the part that he and I worked on. And then I will separately introduce our respondents.

We are truly blessed, if I may use that in the context of a poll that bears on religion, that we will be joined by Dr. Muqtedar Kahn and Dr. Jose Casanova. I can't think of anybody better to respond to a survey of this sort, but I will introduce them later on in the program.

Right now I will introduce Robby and Bill and Robby will take it away. Robby is the CEO and founder of the Public Religion Research Institute. He writes Figuring Faith, a featured Washington Post On Faith blog, and is one of six members of the national steering committee for the religion and politics section at the American Academy of Religion. He holds a Ph.D. in religion from Emory University and an M.Div. from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. So, he is fully qualified across the board to offer the observations he is about to.

My friend and colleague, Bill Galston, holds the Ezra K. Zilkha Chair in Brookings' Governance Studies program where he serves as a senior fellow. He is also College Park professor at the University of Maryland. Prior to joining Brookings he was Saul Stern professor at the School of Public Policy at the University of Maryland and director of the Institute for Philosophy and Public Policy. You can tell by the title of that

institute that Bill knows everything there is to know about philosophy and everything there is to know about politics and he probably knows a fair amount about baseball, too.

We are very honored to have this collaboration with you, Robby, and it's great that you're joining us here at Brookings again. Thank you.

DR. JONES: Well, I'm delighted to be here to talk about the findings from the Pluralism, Immigration Civic Integration survey that was conducted by Public Religion Research Institute, our organization, and that forms the foundation for our joint report with Brookings Institution, "What it Means to be American: Attitudes on an Increasingly Diverse America Ten Years After 9-11." So, as E.J. said, we have some folks joining us via the C-SPAN audience and on Twitter.

The report -- the full top line questionnaire, the full report, can all be found on Public Religion Research's website at [www.publicreligion.org](http://www.publicreligion.org). You'll see it right there on the home page. You can click over to it and you can download all the information right there. And as E.J. said, I'll just repeat it for those just joining, we have the #diversitypoll, all one word, for those of you following along on Twitter.

E.J. has already said some things, I want to add just a couple more before jumping in. First, we want to thank the Brookings Institution, and particularly E.J. and Bill, for the ongoing partnership that's been so fruitful and really so much fun to work on together. As E.J.

mentioned, some of the findings that we have actually fleshed out in this survey, we first uncovered almost a year ago now with the American Values Survey, which is something we talked about here at Brookings, and we identified really these issues of attitudes towards Islam and immigration as emerging issues that were going to be coming more into the fore in public policy. And here we're making good, sort of, on some of the promises we made back then to sort of flesh this out and to see what was going on underneath the hood.

Want to say also a thanks to the Ford Foundation who has made sort of our ongoing partnership with the Brookings Institution possible. And also shout out to Dan Cox, who is the other principle researcher on this report.

So, just a couple words about the survey itself. This survey is just out of the field, so August 14th we were still calling people. That was the last day of the field period, so it was in the field from August 1st through August 14th. The results I'm presenting here today were based on telephone interviews with 2,450 Americans age 18 years or older, including 804 respondents who were reached by cell phone. So, the margin of error for the total sample is plus or minus 2 points at the 95 percent confidence interval.

So, the presentation I'm going to make today has three basic parts, a first part that talks about kind of where we are, looking back 10 years after 9-11, how do Americans perceive our safety, our reputation in

the world, and issues of security, tolerance, and pluralism, and then the second part, I'm going to delve into views of Islam and views of American Muslims. The third part will deal with views of immigrants and immigration reform, so kind of three big parts.

The key word here, I think, that you'll hear over and over are variations on a theme of "wrestling." Americans are wrestling with fear, but on the other hand they're also wrestling with acceptance, as E.J. alluded to, and you'll see the tensions between these two things going on across a number of the findings.

So, you know, Americans continue, then, to wrestle with issues of security, of tolerance, and pluralism, these issues that lay at the heart of what it means to be American. For examples, Americans strongly affirm First Amendment principles and respect for difference, but as you will see, they don't always -- or we don't always apply these principles evenly or consistently, particularly with regard to American Muslims and current immigrants, and the powerful forces of political party affiliation, political ideology, generational differences, and importantly television news media, are fueling large divides in the country.

So, let's start with the first section. Ten years after 9-11, where are we? We found that a slim majority of Americans, 53 percent, say that we are safer today than we were 10 years ago. There is some modest generational, gender, and education differences on the question, but majorities of Democrats and Republicans say that we are safer today

than we were 10 years ago.

Now, compare that to the other two questions that we had 10 years ago -- concerning 10 years ago. The first one here is: do we have more or less personal freedom than we had 10 years ago?

Overwhelmingly, 8 in 10 Americans say we have less freedom than we did 10 years ago. A very similar pattern on the question of respect in the world, 7 in 10 Americans say that we have less respect in the world than we did 10 years ago before 9-11.

And one other kind of broad picture thing before I go into specific questions about Islam and immigration -- Muslims and immigration -- is this broad support we find for tolerance, for principles of the First Amendment, that is religious liberty and separation of church and state.

The first one, we have near consensus on the question of religious books, and we had this year this kind of infamous event of a Koran burning or threat of a Koran burning. It turns out that almost nearly all Americans say that all religious books should be treated with respect, even if we don't share the religious beliefs of those who use them.

On questions of the First Amendment, religious liberty, separation of church and state, again, strong agreement, 9 in 10 say America was founded on the idea of religious freedom for everyone including groups that are unpopular, and two-thirds -- even when we had this statement fairly strong, we must maintain a strict separation of church



and state -- two-thirds of Americans agreeing with that statement.

So, again, broad support for principle, but, again, we're going to see some kind of inconsistencies in the application of what it means across a number of groups or what it requires of us.

So, start off with some attitudes, and what we see about attitudes towards Muslims in society, some clear ambivalence here. We had a series of questions that asked about comfort levels with different kind of activities by American Muslims. There's majority saying that they would be at least somewhat comfortable with Muslims doing a variety of activities, but as you can see, there's also a fair number of Americans saying they would have some -- at least somewhat uncomfortable with a number of these activities. So, going from right to left, a Muslim teaching elementary school has the highest level of support, about 6 in 10, saying they would be at least somewhat comfortable with that, but 4 in 10 saying that they would be somewhat uncomfortable.

The rest of the measures, a group of Muslim men praying in an airport, a Mosque being built near your home -- that one's obviously one that there's been a lot of news around this last year -- and a Muslim woman wearing a burka, those are much more closely divided and we'll see this play out across a number of issues.

Here's a big picture question about whether Muslims are an important part of the religious community and sort of thinking about acceptance: 54 percent, a majority of Americans say that Muslims are an

important part of the religious community in the U.S., however, about 4 in 10 disagree. Right? So a sizable minority disagreeing although a majority agreeing.

Another kind of question that's been in the news about Muslims wanting to -- agree or disagree, American Muslims ultimately want to establish Sharia law as the law of the land in the U.S.? Six in 10 Americans reject this proposition that Muslims want to establish Sharia law, so by a margin of 2-to-1 Americans disagree with this statement. However, again, 3 in 10, a sizable minority, agree with this statement. As we'll see later, there's also some very strong partisan, ideological divides on this question.

One other thing to note here is that 2011 has been an enormously active year on this question, that if, you know, a year ago it was the sort of mosque and Islamic center in Manhattan, this year it has really been the Sharia law. Forty-nine bills have been introduced in 22 states to ban Sharia law. And what we've seen is there's actually been an effect -- we asked the same question back in February, only 23 percent of Americans agreed that Muslims wanted to establish Sharia law as the law of the land. That number has gone up to 30 percent. So, it's still a minority, but the minority has grown just over the past year, probably not largely -- or somewhat in response to the activity on the legislative front in so many states across the country.

So, now I want to talk a little bit about divisions before

moving on to immigration here. There's a lot of information here but the most important thing to see on this slide is the pattern of responses. These are by partisanship -- it's the number of questions, the questions across the bottom are: American Muslims want to establish Sharia law in the country. Muslims are not -- this is the disagree side -- Muslims are not an important part of the U.S. religious community. And another question that we had about whether Islam is at odds with American values and way of life.

If you look at this you can see really large divides. The blue are self-identified Democrats and the tan color are independents, the sort of lighter red color are self-identified Republicans and the darker red color are self-identified Americans who identify with the Tea Party, and so you can see these really large divisions among the country on really all of these questions.

The other thing to note here -- just two other things to point out -- is, one, that the divides are actually bigger, particularly the negative side is bigger on questions about Islam than it is on questions about American Muslims. So, this question on the right here is about whether Islam itself is -- the values of Islam are at odds with American values and way of life. Two-thirds of those in the Tea Party, 63 percent of those who are Republican, agree with that statement. Only 4 in 10 Democrats agree with that statement. This question divides most of the American community.

We find the negative side a good bit lower, actually, on questions about American Muslims although the partisan divides are still here.

One other thing to point out here is that the divides are a little bit asymmetrical, that is, that Republicans are sort of more -- sort of further away from the general population than Democrats are on this question. So, Democrats average 8 points from the general population in a more positive direction across all these questions and Republicans average 14 points from the general population in a more negative direction on these questions.

We see the same patten -- the other -- so, this is partisanship -- we see a similar pattern on views of Islam and American Muslims, again, these are the same questions across the bottom, but by most trusted media source. I want to be really clear here, what this question is based on is we asked Americans who they most trusted to give them accurate news and information about current events and politics, which television news outlet. So among Americans -- and this chart is showing among Americans who chose different television news outlets to be the most trusted one, how their views, then, shake out on these various questions. And the main thing that you see here is that there's actually not a lot of difference by most trusted media source except for those who most trust FOX News. That's the red bar here that really jumps out. On all these questions, Americans who most trust FOX News are significantly

more likely than Americans who trust any other television news source to say that Muslims want to establish Sharia law, to say that American Muslims are not an important part of the U.S. religious community, and to say that the values of Islam are at odds with American values and way of life. It's a pretty stark difference here by media source.

Finally, before we move on to immigration, one other question, we tried to get a sense of how Americans evaluate religious violence, particularly in light of the tragedy in Norway, and trying to think about how do Americans react when the perpetrator is doing something in the name of Christianity versus when a perpetrator is doing something in the name of Islam, and what we found here is a double standard. And I mean that in the most descriptive light, that there is literally a different standard applied when the perpetrator is a self-identified Christian versus the perpetrator being a self-identified Muslim. And the way it shakes out is this, that 8 in 10 Americans say that when a person commits violence in the name of Christianity they are not really or truly Christian. So, 8 in 10 just reject out of hand their claim to be Christian.

Americans do not apply that same principle to a perpetrator who does something in the name of Islam, right, so less than half of Americans, say -- 48 percent say that when someone does -- when someone commits violence in the name of Islam that they are really Muslim, so a pretty stark difference in how Americans evaluate religious extremism and religious violence when it happens in the world. This

hopefully makes some sense about how the coverage went, sort of, in the wake of the tragedy in Norway.

So, views on immigration and immigrants. We'll see some of the same patterns really showing up here. So, similar to the kind of comfort slide I had earlier, we had a set of questions about general American attitudes about what they think about immigrants. Very strong numbers of Americans, nearly 9 in 10, saying immigrants are hardworking; 8 in 10 saying immigrants have strong family values. On the other hand, there's some kind of reservations, things that at least could be interpreted negatively, 7 in 10 say immigrants -- say they mostly keep to themselves and a majority actually say that immigrants do not make an effort to learn English here. And, again, there's some strong partisan divides, particularly on the question of learning English in the country with Republicans more likely to disagree that they make an effort to learn English, Democrats more likely to; same thing for ideology, not surprisingly.

Another general question which paints a similar picture, kind of backs that up, what do Americans think about the kind of overall impact of immigrants on society? Well, a majority, 53 percent, say that newcomers to American society strengthen American society. However, you should be able to see a pattern here, about 4 in 10 say that newcomers actually threaten traditional American customs and values. Again, partisan divides here, 6 in 10 Democrats say that Americans

strengthen -- that newcomers strengthen American society. Fifty-five percent of Republicans say that the newcomers threaten American society. So, the majority is on the opposite sides of this question among partisans.

This translates, really, into some real tensions when we come to policy questions of how to handle particularly the problem of illegal immigrants in the country, what approaches should be taken. On the one hand, if you ask just an agree/disagree question about a support for a path to citizenship, a majority of Americans, 56 percent, say that the best way to handle the problem of illegal immigration in this country is to allow them to have a path for citizenship, legal resident status with an eventual path to citizenship. At the same time, 51 percent say the best way to handle the illegal immigration problem is to make a serious effort to deport all illegal immigrants, right. So we have a little bit of inconsistency here in the way that Americans think about, but both of these things are true at the current state.

By the way, just as we saw an increase in the numbers on Sharia law over the past year, we polled on the same question about support for deportation in March of 2010, it was far below majority support, it was in the 40s. I don't have the number right in front of me, but it was low 40s of support for deportation. The number has now climbed to majority support on the other side since March of 2010.

However, when we put these two things head-to-head, we

see a kind of different picture, so these are just kind of asking them individually. When we put them head-to-head with a presumption that the border would be secured on both sides of the question and we sort of ask respondents to choose head-to-head in a question, which do you think is the best way, a, secure the borders and provide an earned path to citizenship or secure the borders and arrest and deport all the illegal immigrants, the secure the borders and provide an earned path to citizenship side strongly outweighs the other side. So, when they're put head-to-head and you ask people to choose, with the presumption that the borders would be secure, 6 in 10 Americans say provide an earned path to citizenship rather than deport all illegal immigrants. But as you can see there's a lot of room to play here in the joints of these questions.

Setting up a very similar pattern, I'm going to look at partisanship and media consumption patterns across a number of questions here. Again, we're going to see very similar patterns in partisanship and also media. This one's on partisanship. Across the bottom I have the question about whether one favors the Dream Act, that is allowing illegal immigrants brought to the U.S. as children to gain legal resident status if they join the military or go to college. Six in 10 Americans overall support that. You can see the strong partisan divides, again, Democrats are in blue, Republicans in light red, and Tea Party affiliates in the darker red.

Second question is, favor a path to citizenship -- this is the



kind of a standalone question -- allowing undocumented immigrants who've been in the U.S. for several years to earn legal working status and opportunity for citizenship in the future. And finally, disagree with deportation -- this is the disagree side of deportation so they'd all run the same direction. We should make a serious effort to deport all illegal immigrants back to their own countries, those who disagree, again what we see here, Democrats at least 6 in 10 favoring the Dream Act, favoring a path to citizenship and disagreeing with deportation; on the Republican side, 4 in 10 -- only 4 in 10 -- agreeing, only 3 in 10 disagreeing with deportation; and those who are affiliated with the Tea Party, a little bit lower even on all of those. But again, the same pattern, you see really strong kind of partisan divides on these questions.

Again, if we look at media consumption patterns here, see kind of a very similar pattern as well with, again, FOX News is in red here, public television viewers on the right here -- sorry, those who say they most trust FOX News -- be very careful about that -- in the red, those who say they most trust public television way over here in the darker blue, and we've kind of generally tried to arrange them in order. and on all these questions on immigration we see a very similar shakeout with those who say they most trust FOX News, much less likely than the general public to favor the Dream Act, to favor a path to citizenship, or to disagree with deportation. The one thing that's a little different here is that those who say they most trust public television viewers stand out a little bit more --

stand out a lot more on this question than they did on attitudes towards Muslims. So, we see 7 in 10 of Americans who say they most trust public television standing out here on this question and favoring all these things and disagreeing with deportation.

So, finally, support for -- I just want to kind of lay out something on religion here, and say a little bit of something about the Dream Act as maybe opposed to more comprehensive reforms. This is also in the report, that opposition for the Dream Act, that is allowing sort of younger immigrants who are in the country illegally to sort of gain legal resident status if they join the military or go to college, actually has a little bit -- sort of there's less intense opposition and there's a little bit broader support for that question than the kind of more comprehensive question about immigration reform. And I just want to sort of put up some religious differences here, and what we see here is that all religious groups in the country with the exception of white evangelical Protestants support the Dream Act. White evangelical Protestants stand out as being a slim majority in opposition to the Dream Act.

Okay, so one slide for the road ahead and then I'll turn it over to Bill Galston, is what happens when we look at the millennial generation and what do they seem to suggest about how that generation may resolve -- or push Americans to resolve some of these conflicts. I'm going to look at one question on Islam, one question of -- kind of big, broad picture question on Islam and one on immigration. On this question

about whether Islam is at odds with American values and public life, if we look at the contrast between millennials and seniors, you basically see they're on opposite sides of this question. So, with millennials, those are Americans 18 to 29 years of age, those are people who are sort of as young as 8, 10 years ago, right, at 9-11, and they were ages 8 to 19 10 years ago, so kind of came of age in that era. And so they're majority in support of -- or majority disagreeing with the statement that Islam is at odds with American values whereas seniors agree with this statement. And on the question of -- kind of a big picture question on immigration, again, the difference is even starker here, that two-thirds of millennials, nearly, say that newcomers to the U.S. strengthen American society while a slim majority of seniors say that immigrants threaten American society and traditional values there.

So, you know, one thing to say, again, to kind of go back to, I think, the big picture questions, it really is Americans wrestling, I think, between fears and acceptance, right. And we see this on the front of immigration, we see this on the front of the place of American Muslims in society, and attitudes around Islam, and, you know, we also see, I think, some indication here that the millennial generation may have a little bit of a different take than older Americans and may influence where we go from here.

So, with that I'll turn it over to Bill. (Applause)

DR. GALSTON: Well, as has been the case with previous

instances of this very fruitful collaboration, E.J. Dionne and I were so inspired by the survey and its findings that we decided to commit a few acts of interpretation, and so we have, you know, we have five, brief, mini essays on specific topics to contribute to the mix.

E.J. began his remarks by quoting Chesterton, well, I guess I can too, and that is, you know, Chesterton also famously described America as “a nation with the soul of a church,” and that raises the question, well, which church? And the answer is, that the unifying religion of America is Americanism. And, you know, so the question is, how do you get to be a member in good standing of the American church and who decides, and how capacious are the boundaries of the American church? And that essentially is the question that this wonderful survey probes.

And let me make 5 points in 10 minutes. First point, the United States is committed at its core to the idea of free exercise of religion and respect for diverse faiths, but that commitment historically has been tested by successive waves of new religions, either homegrown or coming to the United States through immigration, that have tested the boundaries of a doctrine that was originally developed within Protestantism in the 19th century, conspicuously Mormons and Catholics, and today Muslims. And our argument is that public attitudes towards Muslims today, to the extent that they encapsulate reservations about Muslims, combine some of the features of 19th century attitudes towards Mormons and 19th century attitudes towards Catholics on, you know, the

opposition to Mormonism was less theological than it was practice-based. There were specific Mormon practices, particularly polygamy, which the first -- the very first platform of the Republican Party in the 1850s described as one of the twin relics of barbarism; slavery being the other.

In the case of Catholics, it was more theological and doctrinal. First, the belief, that was not without foundation, that the Catholic church in the 19th century was officially opposed to liberalism and democracy; and secondly, the belief that it demanded loyalty to an authority other than the supreme authority of the Constitution of the United States. And Mormons and Catholics had to adjust, as did the United States, in order to bring them within the framework of free exercise. And we would argue on the basis of this survey that attitudes towards Muslims today combine reservations about specific practices, you know, for example, the wearing of the burka, which evokes a great deal of discomfort, as Robby has just indicated, along with broader fears about the incompatibility between the values of Islam and the values of the United States.

On the other hand, you know, there is evidence of building inclusion. You have majorities believing that Muslims are an important part of the religious community, even larger majority saying that too many Americans regard all Muslims as terrorists. And as we've just seen, the proposition that Muslims want to institute Sharia law is rejected 2-to-1 by the American people.

So, wrestling -- America is wrestling with Islam, and Islam with America, and this is part of an oft-repeated historical pattern.

Second point, I can be much briefer, and that is that the sorts of tensions that this report is focused on, having to do with Islam and also immigration, are not just freestanding issues. They have been integrated into the framework of growing political and partisan polarization in the United States that has developed, really, over the past four decades. So, you know, as Robby has put it, the issues of Islam and immigration have now become part of the broader fabric of America's culture wars.

With regard, and this is my third point, to immigration, there is a very interesting tension revealed in this survey between, on the one hand, a diffuse majority in favor of fairly capacious and comprehensive immigration reform, but, on the other hand, an intense minority that opposes it. There is more intensity on the against side than there is on the favorable side, and American party politics, political institutions, have a way of giving disproportionate influence to intensity, and that has to do not only with party primaries, but the fact that if intensity tends to show up among those parts of the population that are disproportionately likely to participate in the political process from the word go, then you have what we in fact see on the issue of immigration, that is this tension between the aggregate numbers, on the one hand, and the actual rhythm and feel of the political competition on the issue.

Point four, which is really intriguing, what we call the Mormon Factor. While it is the case that Mormons are still less widely accepted than Jews and Catholics, it is nonetheless the case that two-thirds of Americans -- 67 percent to be precise -- approve of Mormons. It is also the case that the hostility to Mormons is equally prevalent among liberals and conservatives, for very different reasons. Approval rates for Mormons, nine points higher among Republicans than Democrats, and what we call the white, evangelical surprise. The conventional wisdom, not entirely without foundation in the 2008 presidential campaign, was that evangelicals were the heart of the opposition to Mormonism, and it turns out, this survey reveals, that only 34 percent of white evangelicals regard Mormons as Christians.

However, 66 percent of white evangelicals approve of Mormons, and what that suggests is that there are features of Mormonism other than theology, probably having to do with family values and a very traditional lifestyle, that these cultural features of Mormonism trump theological reservations, even in the minds of white evangelicals who are about as likely to approve of Mormons, almost precisely as likely to disapprove of Mormons, as the population as a whole.

Fifth and finally, age and education. As Robby's charts have already indicated, there does tend to be a very strong age and education effect influencing attitudes towards Islam, immigration, and a number of other cultural and religious issues as well. So, the survey indicates all of

the expected correlations with regard to African-Americans, Hispanics, Muslims, immigrants, patterns of social relations, and the importance of religion itself. But, and this will be my concluding point, there were some surprises. We did not -- we expected to find a much bigger divide between the youngest and the oldest Americans on the issue of whether reverse discrimination, discrimination against whites, has become as important an issue as discriminations against minorities. We expected to find a significant gap on the question of whether discrimination against minorities remains an important issue in American politics and society today, and also on the question, the very dramatic question, of whether Muslims who commit acts of violence are indeed Muslims, and the survey did not reveal the kinds of age effects that one might of expected.

And so, there are real discontinuities by age and education, but also some important continuities. And with that, I will subside.

(Applause)

MR. DIONNE: Thank you very much, Bill. If I could just reiterate to our audience that if you want to ask a question or post it to send, it's #diversitypoll. I think we might, Christine, begin with one of our questions from outside the room when we get to the Q&A.

I'm grateful to Robby for mentioning the Ford Foundation as supporting both of us, and I particularly want to thank Sheila Devaney, who's been a real friend to us. She has a passion for these issues and also a deep and broad knowledge of these issues. That's a really good



combination and we are very grateful to her.

I also want to welcome my friend Melissa Rogers, who's a nonresident senior fellow here at Brookings and a partner with Bill and me on many of our religious and public life -- religion and public life projects.

If we had polled other students of religion, religious pluralism, and religious freedom and asked, who should we invite or whom should we invite -- I guess somebody will help me on that -- to be the respondents on this survey, they would have come up with Dr. Muqtedar Kahn and Dr. Jose Casanova, without any of those demographic breaks. It would have been very close to unanimous.

Dr. Muqtedar Kahn is associate professor in the Department of Political Science and International Relations at the University of Delaware. He is the founder of the Islamic Studies program at the University of Delaware and was its first director from 2007 to 2010. His most recent book is, *Debating Moderate Islam: The Geopolitics of Islam and the West*, and he will be our first respondent.

Dr. Jose Casanova is one of the world's top scholars in the sociology of religion. That's just not a nice thing you say in an introduction, that is actually true. He is a professor in the Department of Sociology at Georgetown University. He heads the Berkley Center's program on globalization, religion and the secular. He has published works in a broad range of subjects, including religion and globalization, migration and religious pluralism, transnational religions, and sociological

theory.

And so I welcome first Dr. Kahn and then Dr. Casanova, and thank you so much for being with us.

DR. KAHN: Thank you, E.J., and thank you, Robert, for inviting me to this exciting discussion. I am also delighted to be back at Brookings. I used to be a fellow here for a long time.

There are several such surveys that are coming out about Muslims and Muslim attitudes about American and about American attitudes toward Muslims, and for me who is consuming all of these surveys, it's an emotional rollercoaster.

I looked at a recent survey by Gallup, which says that 80 percent of American Muslims approve of Obama. Maybe they are not reading the news. Sixty-six percent of American Muslims say they are thriving and they are happy to be here, and they are doing better than anybody else. And in terms of religious tolerance towards others, American Muslims score more than anybody else, just one point above Mormons in the U.S.

That made me very happy. And then I looked at this survey and I'm really very depressed, but let me tell you the good news first. The good news is that regardless of the nature of the favorability that is reported, it has become obvious that attitude towards Islam, and attitudes toward Muslims, has become a constitutive element of American identity. You cannot be an American without having a position on Islam and

towards Muslims, and the kind of position you take about Islam and towards Muslims, will also define the kind of American you are. So, in that sense, Islam is here, has become a part of America's social, cultural, and political identity and its fabric.

So, that is the most interesting thing that I find. Attitudes can change, attitudes can weary, sometimes data looks different if the question is framed differently. That's the first thing.

The second thing that I found was that most of the findings, as least to me, were not surprising. They were confirming of some of the suspicions we have and the trends that we have observed based on several episodes. Now we have the numbers that confirms the fears or hopes, depending on how you look at this.

The number 47 percent, that 47 percent of Americans disapprove of Islam and Muslims, particularly disapprove of Islam, has been quite stable, actually, since 2002. The first time I saw that was in a Pew Study survey in about 2002 and confirmed again and again and again. So, that is constant. But what has changed is why they disapprove of Muslims, and that is, to me, the most dangerous and most frightening thing.

When you asked people in the past why did you disapprove of Muslims or Islam, the 47 percent who did disapprove talked about terrorism, now they talk about Sharia. That is dangerous because terrorism is an ephemeral thing. If politics changes, if Bin Laden is killed,

if al Qaeda is destroyed, then that source of disapproval, that source of insecurity which prompts unfavorable attitudes towards Muslims can diminish or disappear. But if the source for disfavorable attitude towards Muslims is Muslim adherence to Sharia, then this is never, ever going to disappear. I just spent a whole month, every living moment of that month, trying to apply the Sharia in my life. The whole point of Ramadan is to fast, to pray, to think of God, to internalize and externalize the Sharia, and Muslims do that every year they will do that. So, living by the Sharia is an important aspect of Muslim life, and if they are going to be disapproved because of that, then we are going to have a perennial problem. And I think that is something we need to do unless we do a better job of educating Americans about what the Sharia is.

In my opinion, 90 percent of the Sharia is already applied in the United States: thou shall not kill, thou shall not cheat, thou shall not lie. I sometimes wonder if those who oppose the Sharia, if they find out that murder is prohibited by the Sharia, will they approve? Killing, robbing, creating corruption in society, all of these things are prohibited by the Sharia.

I have one more comment about this Sharia business. It is amazing, this attitude towards the Sharia, especially by those who are more religions, Christians, and those who are on the side of the Republicans. For several decades, nearly 100 million Americans have struggled hard to implement two elements of the Christian Sharia --

banning abortion and preventing gay marriage -- and they failed. So, how do they expect less than 2 percent of Muslims -- Muslims are less than 2 percent of American population -- how do they expect less than 2 percent of the population to implement the entire Islamic Sharia in America?

Muslims have failed to implement the entire Islamic Sharia in countries where they have struggled with 100 percent Muslims: Pakistan 95 percent Muslim, Iran 95 percent. They haven't been successful in implementing.

The point is really that Sharia is just a prop, an attempt to say we just don't like Islam and Muslims, I don't know, and I don't care. But if you want to have an excuse, well, here is one, let's try Sharia. And I think that is what it is.

I have one non-Islam related observation about this report, which I find perplexing and interesting. The favorability numbers towards African-Americans is 89 percent. Nearly everybody. Ninety percent is a huge number. So, why is race an issue in this country? Why do people feel that there is institutionalized discrimination in this country? And what it tells me is that maybe there is no connection between favorability and institutionalized discrimination. So, it's quite possible that you could have disfavorability, numbers very high towards Muslims, in the U.S, without having institutionalized discrimination against Muslims. That is why you find that Muslims in America are much, much, much happier than this data should suggest. That is why two out of three American Muslims say they are thriving even though there are nearly half of Americans say they don't

like them, because there is perhaps no connection between surveys which measure favorability and institutionalization of discrimination, et cetera.

The second thing that I found interesting is that Mormons enjoy higher favorability rating than Muslims, while Atheists don't. I'm assuming that a majority of Mormons and a large number of atheists are white, so how does the religion/race dynamics play out in this connection? I don't understand that. Perhaps in future studies, Robert, you could try to flesh that out. That even though atheists are white, they are disliked compared to Muslims; and even though Mormons are white, they are liked more than Muslims.

There is an interesting finding in this report, which is the marriage between knowledge and prejudice. This is fascinating. The people who claim that they know most about Islam are the people who are most ignorant, in my opinion, but also most prejudice in their own opinion about Islam. So, knowledge, apparently, is nurturing prejudice, and that is because of our uniquely new institution called FOX News. People who seem to watch FOX News and trust it most think that they know more about Islam than anybody else and have extremely unfavorable ratings towards Muslims. That is really fascinating.

In the last two, three years, especially since the advent of the World Trade Center mosque issue at Park 51, Islamophobia has become a campaign strategy for the Republican Party. Notice nobody now cares whether Imam Rauf is raising money or not for the mosque at

WTC. It was only until November that it was such a big issue. I wrote in October that, wait, let the elections get over, nobody will worry, but if the Imam doesn't build it quickly, then we will see that issue come up again as we get closer to the next election.

So, Islamophobia, in combination with FOX, has become a campaign strategy for the Republican Party. Without prejudice toward Muslims, Herman Cain would have no status in this entire Republican nomination debate. He seems to be a one-point candidate. I want to create jobs, I don't know how. I know how to hate Muslims, I can show you how. That seems to be his entire campaign strategy.

The second thing that I want to point out is that if you look at this data about media, you find that -- and this number is very disturbing -- Americans who trust broadcast news networks are least likely to report knowing a lot about Muslims and Islam. So only 7 percent of people who watch broadcast news say that they know about Islam and understand them, but people who seem to watch FOX News seem to claim that they know a lot about Islam and they are prejudice towards Muslims. So, I think that a lot of mischief that is being caused by FOX News is the dividends of the stuff that broadcast news are not doing. If the mainstream news channels did a better job of educating Americans about Islam and Muslims, then I think that vacuum of knowledge will not be exploited as much by FOX News.

And that is an important lesson, I think, from this report. I

also want to talk about the good guys. At first when I read the report the first time I was constantly distracted by all the negative. When I read the second time, this is what I read -- I said, oh, my god, while bigots will be bigots, the good guys are also scary. The non-bigots are also -- for example, if you look at this data on the question on feeling of comfort with Muslims in society on various issues -- Muslims wearing burka, Muslims building mosques, Muslim men praying at airport, et cetera -- those who seem to be uncomfortable are 48, 56, 45, 40 percent. Those are really very high numbers and even from those who are Democrats and those who watch public television and those who do not watch FOX News, the numbers of ignorance about Islam and prejudice of Islam continues to hover around 30 percent.

So, while we can blame FOX and rightwing leaders and preachers for fostering and nurturing a discourse of hate against Muslims, probably, but the others are also not doing very well. And that, to me, is also a worrisome issue, especially for American Muslims who do see America as their home. The idea of permanent deportation is not possible, now nearly 40 percent of all American Muslims are indigenous Muslims and within another 10, 15 years, a majority of American Muslims will be indigenous Americans. So, this whole idea that we will continue to be unaccepting of Islam is disturbing.

I also would like to ask a question to the -- how am I doing on time?



MR. DIONNE: I think close, because we want to open it up.

DR. KAHN: I also have one question to the study, is that the attitudes, the data that I'm interpreting as perhaps prejudicial, how much of that is being effected by the general political climate in this country, the polarization that is taking place in the United States, the perception that Obama is not really one of us and this foreign guy from Africa who sometimes wears a turban is taking over our country? You know, Obama is the only guy I know who is converting to Islam in slow motion, you know. At one point he was 13 percent Muslim, now he's 20 percent Muslim. I think by 2012 -- by the time we are polling in November, he will be 50 percent Muslim.

So, this -- and then the joblessness, the insecurity about the economy, and I think a major global restructuring of the United States as a less powerful economic and military entity, I think this whole shock that we are not the big honchos that we used to be, all of that, I think, is also manifesting in the prejudices towards primarily Islam and Muslims. And I think that perhaps while it is quite possible that these surveys may be underestimating the amount of prejudice there is towards Muslims, because nobody wants to tell people that, look, I'm a bigot, on the phone when they answer these questions, but even though they might be underestimating the prejudice against Muslims, it is also quite possible that it is superficial and is reacting to the current economic and political environment, and I think that once things get better, these numbers will

get better, too.

Thank you. (Applause)

MR. DIONNE: While Dr. Casanova works his way up again I want to remind the viewers they can comment at -- or question at #diversitypoll. We invite dissent as well as questions, from any point of view, including, perhaps, Muslims who are Republicans or FOX News viewers. Thank you for joining our conversation.

Dr. Casanova, it's an honor to have you here, too.

DR. CASANOVA: It's a pleasure to be here and I am very thankful for the invitation. I have four brief points or comments, which I hope two minutes each will be probably sufficient.

First, the relation between private opinion and public opinion. What we actually call public opinion is privately held opinion made public by such surveys and polls as this one. So, the question is, what is the relation between private opinion and public opinion? Does private opinion change by being made public? And what are the reinforcing loops between media, private prejudices, both in the positive sense of prejudgment, that we need to know anything, but also in the negative sense of not right views of things?

So, what is most striking in the survey results is the striking reinforcing loop between media -- the media we watch -- and the prejudgments we have, and especially, of course, this comes extremely striking in the case of FOX News. And one question I have is, do we have

any evidence that when public opinion is made public, ever leads to change in our prejudices, or are we only reinforcing when we see ourselves already in certain groups? I'm a liberal so I see myself -- I have the right liberal attitude. I'm a conservative, so the public opinion results only reinforce that I belong to the right group.

It's a very interesting. I don't think that every public opinion exposure leads to changing prejudices. And this, of course, is a very interesting issue.

The second point is the striking coincidence between views, opinions, attitudes, prejudices towards Muslims and towards immigrants. The striking consistency occurs in all groups in America: religious groups, white evangelical Protestants, Catholics, black Protestants, but also liberals and conservatives. They have very similarly favorable or unfavorable view toward Muslims and towards immigrants. And this is striking because in America Muslims and immigrants are two radically different groups, unlike in Europe where Muslims and immigrants are one in the same group: most immigrants are Muslims, and most Muslims -- almost all Muslims are immigrants. In America, Muslims are a very, very small proportion of immigrants and even one-fifth of Muslims are not immigrants but African-American Muslims.

So, the fact that the two groups are put together is in itself interesting. Imagine if actually they will be the same group. Then of course the prejudice will be only double, which is what -- imagine -- which

is what happens in Europe, because in Europe to be Muslim, to be immigrant, and to be ethno-racially other, are exactly the same thing. Imagine if in the 19th century blacks and Catholics had been the same group, then most Catholics were blacks and most blacks were Catholics, or imagine today most Muslims were Hispanics and most Hispanics were Muslims. Then of course the prejudice would be the nativism, would be of course very, very striking. But in these respects it is very interesting to us this question of how the two things are linked together.

And this leads to the third point, which is what is striking, again, is the change in attitudes, prejudice that we have seen in the last four decades. Let's say very favorable views of Catholics, 83 percent of Americans have favorable views of Catholics; 84 have favorable views of Jews. The same amount, practically, favorable views of African Americans, 89 percent. Imagine the difference between the '60s and now.

And most strikingly, Hispanics: 82 percent of Americans have favorable views of Hispanics, which, of course, it leads me -- they are called Hispanics rather than Latinos. I'm not sure what are the wordings of Hispanics and Latinos would make a difference. And this is most striking given the relatively less favorable or ambivalent views towards immigrants and the association, of course, of Hispanics and immigration.

But here, the important issue is how the general favorable American attitude towards immigration and towards religion is a good thing for the minorities -- for the religious and the immigrant minorities in

the country. The prejudice would be much worse had it not been this case. And we see it, for instance, how the Muslims -- although less favorable views -- still 58 percent of Americans have favorable views of American Muslims; not of Islam, but of American Muslims. Much higher than the views of atheists. Only 45 percent have favorable views of atheists, while 46 percent have unfavorable views. And this of course -- again, the most striking difference with Europe, wherein Europe you have the fusion of religious prejudices, secular prejudices, politically right prejudices, leftist prejudice. So the feminists, the extreme right, the Catholic center, liberal secularists, all of them gang up on Muslims. And Islam is viewed negatively by all the groups.

Thank God in America we are divided. And it's not us versus them, but it -- we are divided. And, therefore, we cannot gang up on them. So in this respect today nativism in America, like in the 19th century, is easily unviable. It's a majority view. Because precisely American society is changing so dramatically. But also, precisely, because -- I mean, this is good because the tyranny of the majority is not possible. It will be precisely the tyranny of the majority, because the tyranny of the Protestant majority and the white majority in the 19th century, this is not possible today. Our society is not anymore a binary society. It's racially much more diverse.

It's interesting that Asians do not even appear in this category. The Asians have disappeared; they're invisible racially. They have become

whites. Wherein the 19th century we know that the Asians, Chinese, were the most racially discriminated in nativist attacks, the source of nativist attacks.

Finally -- and this leads me to the fourth and final point -- about the future, about the millennials. Are they so more open, more tolerant because they themselves, as the report points out, are the most religiously and ethnically diverse generation in the history of the country? And this is probably one interesting point. Or is it also because they are so young? Namely, the question is, is this only a question of cohort and as they grow older they will also become less tolerant of diversity? And this, of course, is the issue about young people being less religious. Young people are always less religious than older people, and they become more religious as they get married and have children. So this we know, and this has been an issue that they -- and they really always argue against people using the evidence that the next generation was being less religious, therefore, the American people is going to be in the future less religious because the new generations are less religious.

I think that here is a combination of both factors. And the interesting question is to desegregate what is characteristic of this generation because they are millennials, because they are young, and because they represent the future direction of the country.

Thank you. (Applause)

MR. DIONNE: Thank you so much. I had this philosophical

question that crossed my mind, Professor Casanova. If someone expresses a private opinion in the forest and there's no pollster around to record the view, is it public opinion? What a wonderful presentation, to both of you.

I want somebody to bring a mic to Christine, who will read a question. Oh, she's got it. But before you go, Robbie just wanted to put a few other numbers on the table in response to the presentation. And then we'll go to our Twitter feed, and then we'll open it up for questions. But we'll keep also going to our viewers on C-SPAN.

Robert.

DR. JONES: Thanks, E.J. And thank you, Dr. Casanova, Dr. Khan. Really appreciate the insights. There's more on the table than I can respond to, but I do just want to take a couple of moments that may help kind of put a few more things on the ground related to things that Dr. Khan and Dr. Casanova raised.

One is the source of -- is about knowledge, knowledge of Islam in particular, and knowledge about the beliefs and practices of Muslims. The source of knowledge matters, right? Interestingly enough, Dr. Khan said and it is true that those who say they most trust FOX News report knowing more than those who trust some other news sources.

However, on this question, we actually have two groups that say they know more than others. And the other group is public television viewers, right? Who tend to be on the opposite end of the opinion

spectrum on this particular question. So what we have is kind of those who say they most trust public television saying that they know a lot, and those who -- however, the numbers are quite small even for those two groups. Still, most say they don't know a lot. But they are higher for those two groups. The difference is that those who say they most trust FOX News are about twice -- that cohort is like twice the size of the group that says they most trust public television. So there's a kind of asymmetry in that regard.

The other thing I wanted to just raise is how much is this, you know, sort of affected by the polarization in the country. And I just want to reemphasize this point. I do think that it's right, as Dr. Khan said. That just to kind of put an explanation point on this. That having an opinion on Islam and an opinion on immigration and immigrants as well is becoming a kind of defining feature of American public debate, and how people sort of, you know, locate themselves in kind of ideological circles and partisan circles as well. And that, I think, is going -- we kind of identified that as a looming issue about a year ago, and we think we've got evidence that that's coming more into fruition.

Finally on the question that Dr. Casanova raised on correlations. You know, on these kind of views on Muslims and Immigrants. We do see very striking patterns. However, it's clear that it's a complicated correlation. So when we actually ran some correlation analysis to see if favorability of Muslims was kind of connected with -- the



correlation is statistically significant but very modest --

MR. DIONNE: Between what and what?

DR. JONES: Between favorability of Muslims and favorability of, like, Hispanics, for example, that the correlation is statistically significant but very, very modest. It means it's there but it's very complicated. It's not a 1-to-1 correlation. There's different dynamics happening in that debate.

And then the last thing I would say about this that both of you raised is this kind of high favorability rating and maybe ambivalence on the policy issues, right? That it doesn't translate in a 1-to-1 direction. That's absolutely true. One thing I would want to say about this is a couple reasons. And it's clearly the case that, you know, when these are all telephone surveys that people call and sort of answer and there's a human being -- a stranger on the other end of the line asking questions.

There's something that sociologists are always talking about is a social desirability effect that may inflate numbers. We know, for example, that the number of people who attend religious services -- who report they attend religious services on a weekly basis is probably about double the number of people who are actually there on any given Sunday, right? (Laughter) And that's because there's a kind of desirability effect, and there probably aren't enough pews to house the number of people who say that they actually attend religious services on a weekly basis in America.

But nonetheless, people understand -- but understanding the direction that a social desirability effect works is actually quite interesting and important and tells us something. So if in fact there's a social desirability effect inflating, for example, the favorability numbers it tells you something about what people expect is acceptable in society today. And that actually matters for how these debates run.

The very last thing about millennials, cohort, or life cycle, this is a huge debate in sociological circles about whether, you know, people as they get older, get kids, get a mortgage, they become more conservative. There is some evidence that we have that this generation is less -- you're right, every new generation is less religious. The younger generations, because they tend to join churches when they have kids, that sort of thing. But there's some good evidence that this generation is less religious than even previous generations were at this point in time in their life cycle. So there's something new and different happening with religion and being unaffiliated in the millennial generation.

And this generation is also more diverse. And just one point on that, that one of the things that we find is to be predictors on these issues is also true on issues like gay and lesbian rights, that social relationships matter for people's views. And in fact, when we run regression models to kind of try to tease out what are the most important independent predictors of one's views on this -- on these kinds of issues, that relationships matter. So, for example, in both -- it's true in both the

cases of immigrants and Muslims that never having contact with someone Muslim is a high predictor of having a sort of negative view toward Muslims.

The same is true never having contact with Hispanics is kind of a high predictor -- independent predictor -- holding all kinds of other things constant. So, there's certainly some sense that the millennial generation being the most diverse generation we have seen ever is that those things -- as long as those social relationships stay intact as they move through their life cycles and the way they are now will continue to be a factor.

MR. DIONNE: I just have to share a conversation I once had with a French pollster who observed that Americans over-report attendance at religious services because they feel guilty when they don't go. And the French under-report attendance at religious services because they feel guilty when they do. (Laughter) I have no idea if this is a scientific finding, but it was a wonderful observation.

DR. CASANOVA: It is not only in France, but all over Europe. This is a typical social desirability in European things that to be modern means to be secular, therefore, they should not be as religious as they are. And they always, when you ask them, they tell you 30 percent may go to church regularly but only 20 percent admits being religious. So, always this self-description as religious is lower than the actual practice.

MR. DIONNE: I love finding data for an anecdote.

(Laughter) Thank you so much, Professor.

Bill, I'll give you a chance to respond. Can we go to our Tweet first? Or do you have something you need to feel --

DR. GALSTON: You were misreading my body language.

MR. DIONNE: Oh, good.

DR. CASANOVA: If I may --

MR. DIONNE: Christine, go ahead. From our --

SPEAKER CHRISTINE: Thank you so much. The Twitter Tweets were very focused on unpacking the relationship more between media consumption and the views expressed in the survey, which, Rob, you kind of went over this already a bit.

But just again, Neil Saroka with the Progressive Change Campaign Committee here in Washington wanted to see if there was any deeper analysis or exploration of the causation between media consumption and viewership and religious opinion. So, kind of a chicken and the egg thing. Did FOX cause viewers to have negative perceptions? Or does the data just show that those with negative perceptions watch FOX.

And then secondly, another question that came up came through the Inter-Faith Alliance. One of their followers wanted to know of the 12 percent who don't think religious freedom is a foundation of the U.S., what exactly do they believe in? And did you actually do some exploration of that as well?

MR. DIONNE: Thank you.

DR. JONES: Well, I'll take the second one. We did not ask a follow-up question of what they do think it was founded on. We have some other data that -- we have, you know, a fairly high number of Americans who will say -- and given this data it would actually probably overlap some. I would say that America is founded on a Christian nation, right? That would be the alternative to that question rather than founded on religious liberty. And again, there's probably -- I kind of have to do the analysis, but there's probably some overlap between people who would say in some ways even if it's inconsistent.

The other question on causation is, you know, the thing that sort of just haunts political scientists of kind of sorting out the causation. We can't fully sort out ---- and correlation is not causation, right? That's the mantra of kind of social science.

And -- but what we can say, -- kind of the closest that we can do is, we did run some regression models to at least tease out whether there were kind of other intervening variables that were somehow explaining it, for example.

MR. DIONNE: You're talking about the FOX News?

DR. JONES: Sorry, it's the FOX News, sorry. I'm back on the media question about whether media influences views or whether people who already hold certain views gravitate toward certain media because they hold those views and they're going to get them reinforced.

We can't fully sort that out at all. And just again, to be clear, our questions are about most trusted media sources, not about frequency of use, but people who say they most trust this television news source.

But what we can say, just on the Muslim side, is that when we ran some regression models holding a lot of other demographic variables constant, what we see is that trust in FOX News does show up to be a solid independent predictor of views on Muslims and views on Islam. And that's holding constant -- being conservative, being Republican, region, gender, education, a bunch of other demographic variables like that. That still doesn't sort out the issue of causality. But what it does sort out is that it's not some intervening variable actually explaining that, that it's actually -- there's actually watching FOX News or sort of most trusting FOX News is an independent predictor apart from -- in fact, it's twice as powerful as any other thing in the model, including being conservative, living in the South, other kinds of things that you might think of that would be strong predictors.

DR. CASANOVA: Could I quickly add something to that?

SPEAKER: Yeah.

DR. CASANOVA: One of the interesting things about FOX is that the second-biggest owner of FOX is a Muslim, Prince Al-Waleed of Saudi Arabia. So that's an interesting fact. For him it's a profit-making enterprise, and then he gives \$20 million to various universities to combat what FOX is doing. (Laughter) Figure that out.

But I think that if you look at broader media studies you will find that the reader has changed. Today, we don't go looking for information. We are shopping for evidence that will confirm our pre-existing opinion on certain issues.

So, I have a feeling that FOX's audience is pre-selected by the attitudes they already have. What FOX does is legitimize by a pretense of, look, I have this information and I have this expert on Islam who will simply come here and verify your worst fears about Islam. So, I think that these media sources are merely combating to confirm the prejudices and opinions that the consumers already have.

MR. DIONNE: We were speculating about this at breakfast with some folks. And on the one hand, as Robbie, I think, importantly underscored that FOX News or media consumption question generally is partly attitudinal as well as behavior, but our speculation was that a given audience may go in 65/35 on one side and come out 80/20. So that you don't have the complete change in view, but perhaps a reinforcement of views. But again, this goes beyond the confines of our survey into trying to figure out what it means.

So, who in our actually present audience? Sir. Well, let's bring a mic right up to the front. Our old friend, Mr. Mitchell.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you. Garrett Mitchell from *The Mitchell Report*.

When we -- I use the royal "we" -- last met with your earlier

survey on American values, I think, it seems to me that Bill Galston made the observation that one of the most salient pieces of information that came out of that was -- and I believe it was as he made it, he looked toward the White House, and said it would be important for someone who understood this survey to understand the importance of American sectionalism. Today -- and by the way, there seem to be some moves by the President shortly thereafter that suggested that maybe he had understood that.

So, today Bill begins his presentation by quoting Chesterton. America, a country with a soul of a church. And then said that that church is America or Americanism. And I wonder if you could flesh that out a little bit for us? What does that mean? And whether that's directed at the White House or candidates in other parties. What is the takeaway? What does that really mean?

MR. DIONNE: You will take that exceptional question.

DR. GALSTON: How much time do we have? (Laughter)  
Let me be inadequately brief. But I will stay very close to the survey itself in an effort to answer that question.

As we -- as E.J. and I reflected on the survey, thinking about our essays, we narrowed a very rough and ready answer to your question down to three propositions. Number one, a broad acceptance of American constitutional principles and values. Now obviously there's a big zone of contestation there, but there's also a big zone of agreement



among Americans in a rough and ready way as to what those are.

Second is buying into the American dream, however temporarily counterfactual that commitment may be, in the sense that people who want to become Americans are expected to embrace the values of hard work, personal responsibility, family responsibility, contribution to your community, et cetera, that general basket.

And third, you are expected to accept one of the principle symbols and practices of American unity, that is the English language. And so the finding in the survey that a lot of non-immigrant Americans have reservations about a lot of immigrant Americans on the grounds that they stick to themselves and don't learn English and are seen as forming enclosed communities. That is a big problem.

So those are three propositions about the religion of America being Americanism that I think are completely consistent with the findings of this survey.

And let me -- you know, let me take the opportunity to, you know, to draw out some of the implications of the parallel that E.J. and I drew between the position of Catholics in America in the 19th century and the position of Muslims today. It may very well be that when you simply looked at American Catholics in the 1870s and '80s and '90s at the time when there was rum, Romanism, and rebellion, controversy about the Blaine Amendment, and things of that sort, that what people thought about -- what non-Catholic Americans thought about Catholics, namely they had

theocratic tendencies which, you know -- theological objections to liberal democracy and constitutionalism, fealty to some foreign entity, the Pope. All of those may have been counterfactual beliefs.

Nonetheless, American Catholics took those negative sentiments seriously and did their part to rebut them. And one of the things that I think that representatives of the American Muslim community should ask themselves is whether they now have a historical task that they did not choose but must, nonetheless, discharge to rebut propositions that stand in the way of their full acceptance and integration. In the case of American Catholics, it meant not only rebutting falsehoods but also making important doctrinal shifts that removed some of the points of disagreement.

There are things that Muslims in America could do in this -- you know, in the next two decades of the 21st century to pound home the point that there is a distinction between living a life according to Sharia as an individual or as a community as opposed to the theocratic impulse to inscribe it in the law of the land. Because that actually was the question in the survey. It wasn't -- it had nothing to do with the private or communal observance of Sharia. It had everything to do with the expansion of that to the legal and constitutional framework of the United States. And there were similar fears about Catholics in the 19th century.

So, it seems to me that you told half the story, but there's another half of the story. You know, there is a reciprocal responsibility on

the part of the Muslim community. And I'm making that point especially because I am struck as a student of American history by the fact that the reaction against American Muslims after 9-11 was not nearly as severe as the reaction against Japanese Americans after December 7, 1941. And I'm struck by the fact that, you know, that President George W. Bush, who has come in for his share of criticism, did a lot more than FDR did to blunt the force of prejudice against such groups.

You know, so there has been some reciprocity on the non-Muslim American side. And I think that there's room for sort of a broader dialogue here.

MR. DIONNE: Could I just say very quickly -- do you want to come in on that? I just want to say very quickly one of the things that heartened me looking at these numbers was thinking about history. Because I do think two things. One, on the language front there has -- was always a view that the new immigrant groups weren't assimilating fast enough on language grounds. We've always had foreign language media going way back in our history.

And secondly, the parallel between Catholics -- you know, anti-Catholic feeling and anti-Islamic feeling just strikes both of us as very, very strong. And as Bill suggested, there has been change on -- if you will, there was change over time on both sides of that, though it took a very long time. One can measure the distance between the Al Smith campaign in 1928 and the John Kennedy campaign in 1960. That was a

lot of years.

Nonetheless it did eventually change, although I suppose if you are a Muslim American that's an awfully long time to wait. But it did happen.

Dr. Khan?

DR. KHAN: I don't think anybody who has any kind of a leadership position in the American Muslim committee will disagree with what Bill has to say. In fact, the community has been acutely conscious of this for more than a decade and a half. For example, the perception that Islam and democracy are incompatible, and I dedicated 10 years of my life to make a point that it is not. And that entailed two things: one is diffusing the misconceptions of Islam out in the media, but also required a reformative interpretation of the faith itself. So, what you are suggesting is to change perceptions of Islam but also transform the very practice of Islam. So both of those happen on the issue of Islam and democracy.

In 1999, there is significant amount of American Muslims who are saying that democracy is covered on belief and now it's not even an issue. No one even talks about it.

Similarly, there are other aspects of -- which I -- this is not the place to discuss Islamic reform, but American Muslim leaders and Imams and thinkers have been working incessantly on this issue. What is the challenge is that the community is small, the media scrutiny as a result of 9-11 is extremely intense, and we also have this phenomenon of

ongoing integration and new converts. So by the time you have educated your main base, the base has expanded with people who are coming from other parts of the world. And so while Muslims are busy engaging the media, they also don't have the resources and time to reeducate the new entrants into the community. And I think that is a challenge for American Muslims, no doubt about it.

MR. DIONNE: Dr. Casanova, and then we'll open it up and Christine can report. I'm going to bring in several questioners at once in the next round, so a lot of people can get in.

DR. CASANOVA: If I may add an instructive comparison again with Europe. In both cases, Muslims were invisible before September 11, but for very different reasons. In America they were invisible because they were very successfully integrated as individual immigrants. They have higher levels of education and income than the average American. They have no demographic concentration. There were no Muslim neighborhoods. They were invisible.

They only -- so September 11 made them visible for good and for bad. Finally there were no prejudices, there were no opinions, because they were unknown. The only visible was the nation of Islam. This was the only public visibility of Islam in America prior to September 11.

In Europe they were invisible because they were Turks, Pakistanis, and Maghrebs. There were no Muslims in Germany before 2000. There were no Muslims in Great Britain, there were no Muslims in

France. They became Turks and then they became Muslims. Pakistani's became Muslims and Maghrebs became Muslims. Today there are no Turks in Germany, there are only Muslims, where before there were only Turks and no Muslims. This is a very interesting comparison. So there were very clearly prejudices against them as ethnic groups, but others only religious groups. Now it has changed and is a prejudice against Islam itself that has become the most important characteristic.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you for that acute observation. That's very helpful.

Let's go right across the middle here. The lady in -- is that sort of red? Please. And if you could say who you are, that would be great.

MS. DAUGHTRY-WEISS: Sure. Lisa Daughtry-Weiss. I noticed that you said that the survey said that the most positive indicator for acceptance of Muslims was social contact. But in rural areas, obviously, there are not as many Muslims. And I wondered if you looked into that and I wondered particularly about the role of faith leaders or national faith leaders in particular in speaking positively about Muslims as a way of countering Islamophobia. Or what sort of counter -- other ways that you saw would be posited to counter?

MR. DIONNE: And could we pass the mic over there? Could somebody stay with the mic? This gentleman over on the left and then that gentleman up there. Right there. Thank you.

Left only in geographic sense from up here. I have no idea where your views are.

SPEAKER: You've commented that the America is founded on the principle of religious freedom. Also that we see decline of religious practice in the millennial group. And in that that informs our morality, what is the forward-looking -- what is that suggesting for our forward-looking view?

And I would raise the question specifically, do we have any idea or any reaction about what we as Americans are willing to accept in our society? So, if we have the perception that Muslims are terrorists, are we willing to accept acts of violence against that community? Is that where this is heading?

I would just raise that as a community question that we need to consider seriously.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you very much. Robbie, there was an interesting question on that subject in the survey that Robbie can report. Sir, thank you.

MR. KRAUT: Alan Kraut. I teach immigration history at American University and I'm a nonresident fellow at the Migration Policy Institute.

I'm wondering whether or not you've taken your data and contextualized it with other opinion data of an earlier era. For example, a lot of the questions you ask and the responses you got are remarkably

similar to some of the Gallup polls that were conducted about Jews in the late 1930s. Very, very similar. And I think it would make an interesting comparison to do that and that it would enrich what you're saying because, in fact, there's been enormous progress in diminishing anti-Semitism. And perhaps would offer Dr. Khan some optimism as well as the pessimism.

And then, what about the issue of recession and war? One of the things I thought was missing from the presentations was any mention of the kind of economic tensions that arise from recession and that often, at least in earlier waves of immigration, have led to an intensity of nativism and an intensity even of prejudice against particular religious and racial groups.

Thank you.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you, that's a great point. I just did our survey -- there is very strong approval for both Catholics and Jews. Jews are one point ahead of Catholics, which has absolutely no statistical significance, but is a great fact to use at a cocktail party.

Go ahead.

DR. JONES: And it gives us bragging rights on the eighth floor of the Brookings Institute. Who has the highest favorability rating, right?

SPEAKER: Yes.

DR. JONES: Trivia question, yes. I get that.



So first of all on the social contact question. You're, of course, right. That Muslim population, as Dr. Khan has pointed out, is less than 2 percent of the population and geographically concentrated, right? So it's not evenly spread over the country. So, Make Friends With a Muslim Day is probably going to have limited, you know, nationwide effect. I think that that's right.

You know, fortunately, I mean, I don't have too many practical things, but I can say this, that the effect is there, as I said. The sort of -- what's mostly there is having never talked with a Muslim is sort of the effect that stands up as an independent predictor of views about Muslims.

However, it's less strong on the -- there's a sort of heartening thing here. It's a little bit less strong than it is knowing -- having never talked to Hispanic influences -- anyone who is Hispanic influences views on immigration. So those relationships, the stronger independent effect is on the immigration side, which may be good news for Muslims. It's still there, but it's not as powerful. The things ahead of it, you know, again are media -- trust in media, conservative ideology, living in the South. All of those are a little bit more powerful than independent predictors than having never talked with a Muslim.

But on the practical front the other, I think, piece of it is that there's no -- I don't see a silver bullet here. Because there's also no education as I pointed out earlier. It depends on what the source of

knowledge is, right? It's not just getting facts out there, you know, are going to completely solve the problem. So I think that it has to be a sort of, you know, more general familiarity with Islam that's maybe less, you know, ideologically driven and sort of more -- it's a great role.

I used to be in higher education. It's a great role for higher education, right? To kind of do some of this to kind of give objective studies about Islam, about Muslims in America. And we're seeing some things like, you know, where does, for example, the history of Muslims in America show up in primary and secondary school textbooks? That's a question. Is that part of the curriculum or not? Is that part of the American story? And that's really the biggest thing here. Is that part of the American story or not? And I think one of the things we'll see with millennials is that it will increasingly be part of the American story.

Just one little anecdote. We talked about President Bush. As far as I know, President George W. Bush was the first President to use the word "mosque" in a speech in the context of saying American churches, synagogues, and mosques. He included in the kind of landscape in a speech shortly after 9-11. And that's -- I think that in itself is a significant marker of inclusion of those institutions in society.

On the question of Gallup context, you're absolutely right. A survey just came out of the field August 14, so on academic timeline we are sprinting to get the results out. But you are absolutely right, kind of doing that kind of contextual thing. Be really, really interesting. And kind

of nailed down the points.

But E.J. and Bill actually make these points quite well. Not with data, but sort of make the points in the essay in the section that they write. We don't have trends on recession and war. I wish we had longer trends on these particular questions to be able to sort that out.

On the millennials point being less religious, I want to make one quick thing here. Millennials are less religious, but it means -- by that I mean that they are -- and on a number of measures. But they are unaffiliated. Officially kind of -- that doesn't mean that they're atheists, right? It means that they're unaffiliated. There's a big number that fall under the kind of spiritual but not religious category. If you asked them if religion is important to their lives, a large number of them will say yes. So they're not sort of anti-religious, I want to be kind of clear about that. They're kind of unaffiliated, formally unaffiliated. This generation is not joiners anyway. But it's a sort of less hard stance, it's not an anti-religious stance at all. It's just sort of not being formally affiliated with religion.

And E.J., there was one other question on the table.

DR. KHAN: Do you mind going into the social contact, maybe?

MR. DIONNE: Just one more quick point. The question in the survey that too many -- I'm sorry, the question in the survey that too many Americans believe that Muslims are terrorists, something like that. If you could just report the number. Which goes on, if you will, the positive

side of the ledger in terms of views, but still is split.

DR. JONES: Right.

MR. DIONNE: I didn't find it in the --

DR. JONES: It may not be here. So, let me locate that.

You can take the other point. I'll give it to you.

DR. KHAN: I had a very interesting conversation with a colleague of mine who was talking about Muslims and violence in the Philippines. And he kept saying, but our Muslims are not like that. And I said, what do you mean "our Muslims"? And he said, I mean American Muslims. I said, they are our Muslims? And he said, yeah.

I understand what you are trying to say. But let me tell you that even those who don't know Muslims would like to say that our Muslims are better than Muslims in Europe and our Muslims are not like the Muslims of Iran.

So even those who have had no contact with Muslims will be predisposed to having a slightly positive attitude relatively speaking. But all surveys clearly show that anybody who knows a Muslim personally has very positive views about Muslims and does not have strikingly high unfavorable views about Islam.

But in the Republican Party it's very interesting, even those people in Texas and Oklahoma who have never met Muslims. But if they listen to somebody say, like Rick Perry who is very close to the Araham or Christie from New Jersey. These are people who are not talking in the

Islamophobic language.

So I have a feeling that if Muslims can reach out at least to leaders and opinion makers, the fact that not every American can know a Muslim can be sort of affected by Muslims knowing who shapes their attitude and their opinion makers. So the task for American Muslims, particularly, is really gargantuan.

MR. DIONNE: Just this one piece of data. Tell me how much time we have left, because I do want to go back to our Twitter feed if somebody could -- so we'll end -- we'll begin and end with Twitter. If somebody could bring Christine a mic, just pass along this one piece of data.

DR. JONES: Yeah, so just real quick. Just one other thing that I could have included in the sort of, you know, positive views about Muslims section that just didn't make it there for time. But we also had a question about -- that said too many Americans think that all Muslims are terrorists. Do you agree or disagree with this statement? Six in 10 Americans agree with this statement, that too many Americans think that all Muslims are terrorists. So there's also a clear sense that a strong majority of Americans think that Muslims have been judged in a fairly harsh manner at this point. Four in 10 disagree.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. Christine, and then we'll bring in a couple more. We have nine minutes, so we're in good shape.

SPEAKER CHRISTINE: Thank you. This comes from a

blogger here based in Washington.

The U.S. Muslim population seems to generally describe themselves as thriving and part of the American social fabric, despite the negative views that are described in the report. Does this reflect that they're an insular community and not aware of some of the popular perceptions about them?

MR. DIONNE: Dr. Khan?

DR. KHAN: Well, when I looked at those numbers the question that kept bothering me that have American Muslims become so socialized and so politicized that they're gaming these surveys when they are being asked question. Are they answering in a strategic way? But then I thought that maybe everybody answers questions in a strategic way. I always do. You call me and I --

MR. DIONNE: But you're a social scientist.

DR. KHAN: Right, but I always say, okay, what is he trying to find out? Let me tweak his data. (Laughter) So, but I think that that is one possibility.

But the other thing is that American Muslims, particularly immigrant Muslims, when they contrast their lives in the U.S. from where they have come, it is America at its worst has been better than many of the places that they have come from at its best. So, even though they recognize that there is high Islamophobia, see getting -- the worst thing that can happen to you is being asked to get off a plane or someone

giving you a ticket when you don't deserve it or a condescending remark. And if you're illegal, then you get locked up, but that's a different issue. So, but back home in many of these countries, you could be tortured for a similar non-offense. So for American Muslims, especially immigrants, realize that they are doing financially better and they are doing very well on the scale of discrimination.

And plus, all American Muslims realize that they are free to practice the kind of religion they want in America as opposed to other Muslim countries. Even in so-called Islamic countries there is only a certain kind of Islam which is permitted for practice. So, religious freedom is the first thing that hits immigrant Muslims. The second is economic opportunities. And in spite of the recession, they are really doing well.

MR. DIONNE: Great. And thank you for that point, because I do think understanding -- Dr. Casanova made this point about the difference between America and Europe in this respect. That the -- on the whole, people who are part of the immigration from Muslim countries have been -- have done well in the U.S. And I suspect these surveys do not -- are not a reflection about the existence of prejudice or they are a reflection on success in the United States, for the most part.

DR. KHAN: I lived 22 days in Oxford as a fellow, and nearly 20 years in the U.S. I have more incidents of discrimination and racism that I experienced in 22 days in England than I have in 20 years in the U.S. This is a fact.

MR. DIONNE: Wow. Peggy, over here. If we could bring a mic. And then let's do three questions. Here, back there, our friend, and over here. I'm sorry, way in the back. Forgive me. My former student, I hope you'll forgive me.

MS. ARTASIAM: Peggy Artasiam. I'm congressional correspondent with the *Hispanic Outlook on Higher Education*. And I write a lot about immigration and, especially with Hispanics, immigration is about jobs. It's about work. So, naturally with your orientation here towards religion, I think you tend -- the tone seems to be more that immigration is a civil right. And I would love to see in some of your questionnaires if you -- if what percentage of Americans think that immigration is a civil right, which, of course, it isn't. And how many think that being here in the country illegally is a civil right?

This kind of orientation makes immigration a moral issue when it's really about jobs. So there -- I also agree with the gentleman behind me that there was a lack of the impact of a recession. So another, I think, leading question that would be interesting is how many Americans think that illegal immigrants take -- are doing jobs that Americans do? Or do they really think that all illegal immigrants do jobs that Americans won't do or don't do or can't do? And I think you would get a different feel about it.

There's this feeling about if you enforce immigration law and labor law, it's anti-immigrant. And I don't think it is. I think we're talking



about job opportunities, especially in a recession.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you very much. Rachel, and then pass it back to my former student. I feel terribly guilty, he's brilliant. Go ahead.

MS. LASSER: Will do. Rachel Lasser, imminently with Hattaway Communications on Monday.

I wanted to first start by thanking Robbie and E.J. and Bill for another very thoughtful poll, and all of you presenters for a very insightful presentation. It was great.

Dr. Khan, my question is really focused at you. You talked about how broadcast news could play more of a role in educating Americans, perhaps, about Muslims. And you know, I was -- wanted to turn it back to what you thought the President should be doing. Today the front page of the *Post* obviously has an article, "Feeling Ignored at Home," talking about how Muslims are noting that President Obama hasn't visited any mosque yet since he was President. And I'm wondering whether you had any insights about what the President could be doing, maybe innovative ideas. And also, whether the Muslim community has been in touch with television and sort of Hollywood. Because you know, we've all seen the role that television shows in Hollywood have played with gay rights, for example.

MR. DIONNE: Just pass it right back, go ahead. And then this gentleman over here. If we could bring a mic to him and we'll get

them both in. Go ahead.

MR. SIMANTELLI: Nick Simantelli from Faith and Public Life. Just a quick question for Robbie back on the FOX News correlation stuff.

Did you find in the survey what percentage of those who trusted FOX News identified as well as Independents or Democrats? And were there enough of them that you saw the same kind of difference that you saw amongst FOX News Republicans versus others to kind of suggest it's a stronger variable, if there were enough of them?

MR. DIONNE: Proving he was brilliant at Georgetown.  
Thank you very much. Sir?

MR. MASUGI: Ken Masugi. I teach down the street here. I have an anecdote in search of a polling question, but on the way it smacked into Bill Galston. And I had a student just this last summer who is an Egyptian academic and so I asked him about the Mubarak and so forth. And he seemed very urbane and how much he loved to visit Paris. And after this exchange, I asked him what about this post-Mubarak poll that said that an overwhelming majority of Egyptians favored the death penalty for converts from Islam. And he said, oh, yes, absolutely. Anyone who would renounce his religion is capable of any crime whatsoever. And I was astonished. So I asked him to spell it out, and he was very adamant.

And so I'm wondering whether the polling question you

raised on Sharia law actually touches on this attitude or whether you have any other data about the attitudes of Muslims in America, whether they adhere to the overwhelming majority of sentiment in Egypt as detected by that poll or --

MR. DIONNE: Thank you very much, that's a good question. What I'd like to do is give everyone a shot at responding to these questions and making a closing comment. And I'll start with -- I'll just go right down the panel with Dr. Casanova.

DR. CASANOVA: We must remember that weeks before September 11, President Bush and President Fox of Mexico were trying to fix the immigration problem. They were trying to introduce dual citizenship to Mexican immigrants in America. So, it was unthinkable after September 11.

But what I want to point out is the fusion or the bringing together -- the linking of the two issues, immigration and Islam, is one, of course, of the consequences of September 11; that securing the borders became a particular issue after September 11 and immigration in securing the borders. The two issues now, of security and jobs, of course in the recession.

So it is the superimposition of all these three issues: immigration security, Islam, and of course, jobs. That is what is making these two issues so critical in political debates in the United States.

MR. DIONNE: Dr. Khan.

DR. KHAN: I want to start by commenting about the media. If you look at the media before 9-11 and after 9-11, there has been an exponential improvement in positive coverage of Islam. The media has done thousands and thousands of positive stories. Some great ones like the *Faith and Empire* by PBS. Nearly every *Mystery* and *Law and Order* shows have done positive episodes on Islam and Muslims, et cetera. But this is a huge country with a short attention span, so there needs to be more than what is being done.

Not only that, but Muslims have become part of the media. Any Muslim who could put together three sentences became an op-ed columnist for some major media. (Laughter) So every faith blog, *Washington Post*, and *Salon.com*, *The New York Times*, every newspaper has Muslims writing. So, there is Muslims are not implicated in the media and its coverage.

In spite of that, these negative attitudes towards Muslims are sort of enduring because of what is happening overseas. One explosion or one mosque being blown in Pakistan, one Pakistani immigrant trying to blow up Times Square, and then all the positive work that has been done for a long time is completely negated.

So, that is one of the reasons why I think these negative attitudes endure because the shock impact of negative image is continuing to come. It's not just 9-11. Lots of horrible things continue to happen in the Muslim world or here. So I think the media is really doing a

pretty good job, but it needs to do more.

To give you an example in terms of movies, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation did something called the *Little Mosque on the Prairie*. This is a fantastic comedy show that has been going on for several years. It's a shame that nobody even brought it to the U.S. It's there. All you have to do is beg and you'll get it. So, that is something that there has been no sustained effort at combating this.

You know, even Iran's government did a great job of sustained attempt to combat anti-Semitism in Iran by producing the most expensive public television show of an Iranian falling in love with a Jew when they were -- during the period of the Holocaust in Paris. And it was embarrassing that there has not been such a significant effort in the U.S. to genuinely combat this.

The second point I want to make is about the Sharia question. When Muslims are asked about implementation of Sharia, when you ask a Muslim, do you want to see Sharia implemented they are thinking, yeah, the most important thing is believing in one god, praying five times, fasting. So, everywhere in the world Muslims will want Sharia. But when others who are non-Muslim think of Sharia, they think of the Taliban, they think of the burka. So there are these two different things that Muslims and non-Muslims are talking about when they are talking about the Sharia.

So I suspect that even for a long time, Muslims are going to

have a problem on how to combat this negative perception about Muslims with regard to Sharia implementation because I suspect in private a large number of Muslims would like to see Sharia implemented, whatever it means, which means that they are allowed to pray, they are allowed to fast, they are allowed to build Islamic schools, and their daughters are allowed to wear hijabs. But that doesn't mean that we want your daughters to wear hijab and we want to force you to fast and force others to pray. That's not what they are thinking.

So I think that with Sharia, I think it's very dangerous the way it's being handled in the media. And I think it will continue to endure for a while before American Muslims become more strategic about it and others become more compassionate in addressing this issue.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. Bill?

DR. GALSTON: Well, time being short let me just pick up on Ken Masugi's point because I do think it is an example of a doctrinal problem that serves as an irritant -- a symbolic irritant, to be precise.

The classic American understanding of free exercise of religion is -- includes the proposition that you are free both to join a faith community of your choice and to exit from that faith community without any civil disabilities or penalties in the eyes of the law. And so, the proposition that apostasy should be punished by death is a direct affront to free exercise of religion as Americans understand it.

And if I were to give -- to follow up on the analogy with

Catholicism, you know, I would urge as a doctrinal matter that Muslim theologians in America do some real work on the question of what the stance towards apostasy should be. And that is not a simple matter, I know, but it is very fundamental. Because, you know -- because to have, you know -- to have a majority of Muslims in a Muslim majority nation standing firmly for the proposition that apostasy ought to be punished by death scares Americans.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. Could we -- I want to move -- I just -- we have to close down because we're running over time. I'm sorry. I knew that would open up a big discussion. Robbie Jones to close.

DR. JONES: Great. Well, thanks for all the questions. I won't be able to get to all of them, just in the time we have. Just one thing, you're absolutely right about, you know, immigration being related to jobs. The -- and we have asked in the past about immigrants who do jobs others don't do. And I can get you the number of the last time we asked that question if you want that; I don't have it off the top of my head. As I remember, it's a sizeable number of Americans who say that immigrants do jobs that Americans don't do. Don't -- that Americans won't do, is I think the way we asked the question. But I can get you the exact question wording after we're done.

And we do -- on immigration, we did try to ask that question in multiple ways. So, to kind of get the complexity of the answer so we could kind of, you know, see not just one shot at it, but here's how it looks

if you ask it different ways, and report it out on all of them so you can see it.

On the FOX News connection and can we break it down any further, we can't break down just with -- because of sample size limitations, we can't break down Independents or Democrats who say they most trust FOX News. That's mostly because that group is dominated by self-identified Republicans. Most of the group is in that -- so those groups are just too small to break down.

The one thing to say, though, which I just want to emphasize here is that those who say they most trust -- Republicans who say they most trust FOX News are sort of more opposed on both immigration and on sort of favorable attitudes towards Muslims. Republicans who watch any other -- who say they most trust any other news source actually look like the general population on this question. So it makes quite a difference not only in the general population, but even among more conservative groups that FOX News, the effect continues to have an effect there.

The last thing I think I wanted to say is just a kind of bigger point, that, you know, if we kind of step back, I mean what I think we're seeing here is -- you know, again to go back to this term of wrestling, wrestling with fear, wrestling with acceptance, wrestling with fundamental principles that go back to the founding of the country. And this -- the idea of American exceptionalism was raised. And I think it kind of goes to why the stakes are high here, because in our previous survey that we released



here in partnership with E.J. and Bill and Brookings we did find that a high number of Americans say that America has a special place in human -- that God has granted America a special place in human history. And one of the things we see here is Americans really concerned about how recent immigrants, particularly Muslims and Latinos, are changing American society.

One interesting little tidbit that I'll leave you with is a little bit of a conundrum. That when we asked a question about whether immigrants were changing -- recent immigrants were changing American communities, so on the ground, people's local communities, I had about 4 in 10 saying that they were changing American communities a lot. And the country was sort of split on whether it was -- slim majority saying it was a good thing, but again, about 4 in 10 saying it was a bad thing, and big partisan divides.

When we asked about American society, interestingly enough we got higher rates saying that they were changing American society than we did changing communities on the ground. So there's a perception gap here that even if on the local level people aren't seeing such high levels of change. They're seeing -- they're sensing or having a perception that immigrants are changing American society.

Interestingly enough, same division, about 52 percent saying a good thing, about 4 in 10 saying a bad thing. Big partisan divides and big generational divides on this question. And the interesting thing there is

that there was an ideological divide on the question about society, about changing -- perceptions changing society. There's no ideological divide of changing community. So that's a kind of interesting tidbit I'll kind of leave you with in these kind of differential perceptions of on the ground versus a kind of more symbolic thing. What -- how does this change America and what we think of as American?

MR. DIONNE: I just want to close by saying Americans often have complicated views on important questions. Not only because of polarization, but also because they are torn, cross-pressured, and still working through what they think. So beware of anyone who says confidently "Americans think that," unless they add "Americans also think that." And I want to salute Robbie for reminding us of all of those, also.

And I want to thank Drs. Khan, Casanova, Galston, and Jones, and all of you and our Twitter audience and our highly-informed C-SPAN audience for joining us today. Thank you very, very much.  
(Applause)

\* \* \* \* \*

## CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

/s/Carleton J. Anderson, III

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2012