

Opinions

R A C I S M O R N O T Y O U D E C I D E

Minister Farrakhan never claimed to be a 'Malcolm X'

By Keith E. Hakim

Here's what's wrong with Johnny Hazard's piece titled "Despite rhetoric, Louis Farrakhan is no Malcolm X" (Nov. 17). First, with police shooting 13-year-old Asian kids in the back, with Yusuf Hawkins' racially motivated murder in Bensonhurst, N.Y., and with the mass beating of black college students in Virginia Beach, there must be a better way of undoing racism than castigating the Nation of Islam. Whom did the Nation ever lynch? Whose neighborhood did the Nation ever redline? Against what people did the Nation ever wage genocide?

Second, Hazard's piece has a flawed premise. Unlike Vice President Quayle, who attempted to garner support by associating himself with John F. Kennedy, Minister Louis Farrakhan never associated himself with al-Hajj Malik Shabazz (Malcolm X). The Honorable Elijah Muhammad resurrected Shabazz and Minister Farrakhan. Minister Farrakhan continues the Honorable Elijah Muhammad's legacy; Shabazz abandoned it. Therefore, Minister Farrakhan *might* not be another Elijah Muhammad, but he definitely is not another Malcolm X. He never claimed to be.

Third, Hazard wrote, "Ironically, King was more progressive than the Nation of Islam crowd because he understood the economic nature of racism." Wrong again. The single most distinguishing characteristic of the Nation of Islam, from a black perspective, is the Nation's message of economic self-determination. Considering the Power Program, the bean pies and the fish sues, the black community knows the Nation to have a definite economic thrust. M. L. King, by contrast, was essentially a social reformer.

Fourth, there's nothing trendy about the upsurge in interest among black youth concerning Shabazz. This is a response to the upsurge in white barbarism on American college campuses, including this one.

It's a response to Howard Beach, Virginia Beach, Smalley and Weiss, the Embassy Suites Five and, most recently, the savage murder of two Asian children.

This upsurge indicates that young people are no longer willing to depend on white largesse for material gains. It's an acknowl-

which an individual of one racial class causes displeasure among members of another racial class is not racism. Under that definition, any black person who speaks of America's genocidal crimes in unflattering terms is labeled a "racist." In the same way, people label everyone from

Racism does *not* necessarily mean animus or hatred. Before the American War, whites and blacks lived comfortably according to the diaries of slave hater Thomas Jefferson. Many whites, like Thomas Jefferson, thought so highly of their slaves that they granted them freedom in their wills. Blacks were nevertheless victims of Hazard emerges only when the su class attempts to alter the vertiginous archy racism requires.

Hatred is a sign of racism in disarray — not racism itself. Simply Farrakhan's speech evokes feelings of hatred in some people doesn't make him a racist.

I would like to offer an explanation why anyone who boldly asserts the existence of blacks is assailed as a philanderer or a criminal. It goes those old American laws forbidding one from assisting a slave to gain freedom. Any person, black or white, who attempts to disrupt the slavery or white supremacist hierarchy will come under attack from the white supremacists and their stooges.

Farrakhan, Dr. Abdul Aleem Khan, Spike Lee, the Black Law Association (BLA) and the African Cultural Center (ASCC) have been under fire because they are all helping slaves. Assistance of the slave class (slaves) is only permitted with assistance is severely limited, high-circled and actually bolsters white supremacist actions (e.g., affirmative action).

Certain forces sought to prevent Muhammad from speaking last year for one reason: He rips slaves away from their chemical dependence in Washington attacks Farrakhan because Khan does what is historically illegal currently taboo: He frees the slave the master.

Keith Hakim is a third-year law student.



Illustration/Quigley

edgment that power concedes nothing without a demand. And, of course, Shabazz demanded.

Fifth, Shabazz made a clear distinction between the imperialist/slave traders and the other "white" peoples he met in Akebu Lan (Africa) and the Middle East. It's true that Shabazz came to understand that "whites" living in Libya, Egypt, Palestine, Algeria, Turkey and other places were not devils, but he never came to any similar understanding about the colonial masters and slaveholders of Western Europe, America, Australia, South Africa and Israel. Shabazz still considered these people very devilish.

In fact, upon his return from Haff, a young white woman asked Shabazz if he would permit any white person to join his new organization, the Organization for Afro-American Unity. Shabazz said, "maybe John Brown." Brown is a white man who led an armed rebellion to overthrow the slavery. He was hanged.

Lastly, Hazard, like more and more people, uses the term "racism" in a very loose and erroneous way. Any situation in

the Rev. Al Sharpton to the Rev. Jesse Jackson as "racists."

Racism, however, has very definite characteristics. It means subjugation of one racial class by another. For Farrakhan to be a racist he would have to be, at least, preaching subjugation of whites. Farrakhan, however, preaches cultural pluralism and actual subjugation.

Racism means conspiracy to subjugate and actual subjugation. That means planned social, economic, military, religious and political subjugation of whites. It cannot be intelligently argued that the Nation of Islam is doing this. In fact, blacks have no history of harming or subjecting whites as a class. On the other hand, whites have written into their very Constitution that blacks shall be considered three-fifths of a person for purposes of taxation and representation of their white owners. Their Constitution also makes provisions for the return of runaway slaves. Their constitution is the bedrock of American law; it's the best evidence of a white racist conspiracy to subjugate other peoples.

Jews will not stay quiet in the face of hate-promoter

Editor's Note: The decision to write a rebuttal to the above piece was a difficult one. Normally opinions pieces from all sides are printed, then opponents are given space to respond. In this case, however, because of the threat to the long-term safety and well-being of the Jewish people, a threat that history dictates must not be ignored. If rebuttals (or concurring views) of this piece are received, they will be printed.

By Michael Olenick

Keith Hakim should name the "certain forces" who were opposed to Dr. Muhammad's speech on campus.

These "forces" are Jews, myself included.

The reason Hakim didn't mention us is because he arrogantly decided that we should not be able to define ourselves as a separate group.

Recent events are causing a rift in the U.S. African-American/Jewish population. On campus Jewish people are pained, and becoming angered, at the Africana Student Cultural Center, which repeatedly invites infamously anti-Jewish speakers to speak at the University.

It would appear to be more than a coincidence that every speaker ever brought by this group hates Jews, and that these speakers are willing to tell the world it should hate Jews, too.

It is true that these speakers originally came under the pretense that they were going to discuss legitimate and important subjects — drug abuse, domestic violence and racism — all topics that must be aired lest they proliferate.

But their actual message was different, very different.

First it was Louis "Judaism is a gutter religion" Farrakhan. "Minister" Farrakhan was recently quoted as saying he would crush and grind the Jews. He has also said

"Hitler was a great man."

It was upsetting to have Farrakhan spouting his Nazi rhetoric, partly at our expense through monies the Africana Student Cultural Center receives from the University. But we tolerated it.

Next came Steven Cokely. This great spokesman told his University audience that Jews are building gas chambers to kill blacks. He has also said that Jewish

decey without at least a token voice of protest. But in Minnesota, and especially at the University, they're in good company.

Remember Charles McGuigan? He is the former regent who was accused of making rabidly anti-Jewish remarks. If this man had made alleged anti-woman or anti-black remarks, there would undoubtedly have been an outrage. Instead, there was a half-hearted investigation — of which

can't afford, to see this happen again.

The fact is that there are more than twice as many African-American United States as there are Jewish the entire world. This fact, combined with Jewish traditions that dictate combat in the face of opposition, makes us a target for hate-mongers.

Many people do harbor anti-Jewish feelings, even if they don't. They've heard the myths, either from parents, friends or literature, and believe them.

There are those who will say that those same people can't do anything. They may define themselves — a culture or a religion — without a Jewish people for input.

People will say that blacks have time on Jews surviving in contemporary America. I'm absolutely sure that high percentage of Jews, including support programs designed to help at least curb, racism.

But the terrible history of black oppression is no excuse for blacks to oppress Jews.

There comes a time when a lion is drawn. There is a word in Hebrew on the holiday of Passover — it means, "We've had enough."

After the racist drive of Cokely, Muhammad and now Haff, time for people who want to protect and uphold justice to say this: history as our teacher, there are options left to us in the face of hatred. These options are stay quiet, usually be killed, or speak up and fight.

For obvious reasons, we choose the latter.

Michael Olenick is a junior in journalism and is the opinion columnist for The Daily.



doctors are injecting black babies with the virus that causes AIDS.

With Cokely's arrival, we smelled a sickeningly familiar breeze blowing across campus, a breeze of hate and intolerance toward us. But like our German ancestors, we remained quiet.

Then came Muhammad. This guy gave lofty advice to Mayor Marion Barry of Washington, D.C. last month, telling the mayor that if people see Barry "bowing down to the Jews," they'll lose respect for him. Maybe he was brought here to enlighten the 1,000 high school students and 300 college students with similar racial epithets.

In his piece, Hakim sinks to the level of these foul racists by not even mentioning that he is writing about Jews.

In many other states, Hakim and the Africana Student Cultural Center couldn't get away with such a vicious attack on

nobody I know can remember the outcome — and the case was closed.

The belief that Jews are money-grubbing people, willing to do anything (including enslaving black people) to get ahead, is one that has been perpetuated for a long time, and is, of course, completely untrue.

Nevertheless, the Jew-haters use these examples to show how Jews must be secretly manipulating things to get and stay ahead — thus the comments of Farrakhan, Cokely and Muhammad. These people tell their followers that there's a secret group of Jews that controls the world, then says, in effect, "kill the Jews and you'll get what they have now."

This theory would seem stupid if it hadn't worked so well in the past. Time and time again my people have been slaughtered after the words of Hakim and those like him influenced the masses. We don't want, and



You Do ALL YEAR, BILL?"

Selective dogma

Doug Guiles ("Fundamentalism isn't Christianity; it is a religion of hate, intolerance," Opinions, Nov. 21) put into words some of my frustrations with the fundamentalist Christian viewpoint. As well as apparently discouraging followers from looking for any truth outside certain translations of the Bible, the fundamentalist leaders seem to pick and choose within the Bible for those verses which support their world view.

For instance, fundamentalists claim homosexuality is against God's will because among the list of God's wills in the Old Testament is one against "men lying with men." But, only a few verses away, there is a law condemning the wearing of cloth made from mixed fibers.

When I see Jerry Fallwell giving up his non-iron poly/cotton shirts, then I will at least give him and his ilk credit for not indulging in religious hypocrisy.

Alice Cascorbi
Chem. stock room,
U Civil Service



cost of tuition:
ing for an
interested send
of your work to:

onist Hall

5455