

Affirmative action does not make up for past injustice

By Keith E. Hakim

Conservatives may have a point concerning affirmative action. Why should marginally qualified white college students and blue-collar workers shoulder over 400 years of white supremacy alone? Haven't all whites — especially the wealthy ones — benefited from white skin-color privilege? Let's face it — liberal social programs, including but not limited to affirmative action, foist the burden of brutal white savagery on the most marginally qualified whites, usually students or the white working class.

The liberal social programs haven't been all roses for blacks either. These programs have made black beneficiaries feel as though their white persecutors, who have dealt them nothing but death and humiliation, are giving them something for nothing. Black students — already plagued with self-doubt — wonder whether they're really qualified. Worst of all, blacks face the charge that — like whites — they are beneficiaries of discrimination, reverse discrimination, that is. It's absurd — as if brothers and sisters getting into college under affirmative action amounts to 250 years of slavery, 90 years of Jim Crow and 25 years of neo-Jim Crow.

The liberal social experiment actually represents a sneaky reparations program without whites ever having to admit their collective misdeeds. It adds insult to injury to project the culprit as the benefactor.

Since no one but the WASP elite really appreciates affirmative action, I have a challenge for all fair-minded middle- and working-class white people: I will urge black people to abandon white-dominated, integration-oriented, give-away programs, if you urge white people to justly compensate black people for 250 years of slavery, 90 years of Jim Crow and 25 years of neo-Jim Crow.

The settlement could be a straight cash transfer for all the black exploitation. This means just compensation for all the labor hours put in by the slaves and just compensation for all the intellectual and artistic property ripped off by all the Elvis Presleys and Pat Boones. It means compensation for all the money ripped off through sharecropping and just compensation owing to all the black athletes of yesterday, such as Jack Jefferson and Joe Louis. It means back payment of the "black tax," which is the price hike that ghetto merchants and pawnbrokers charge black consumers.

This settlement would include compensation for the loss of society blacks suffered when they were stolen from their homes in Africa. It would also include loss-of-society compensation for family members who were separated from each other when the

slavemasters sold them separately to increase his profit. The settlement would include compensation for pain and suffering for the mothers, fathers, husbands, wives, sons and daughters of those blacks who were lynched at the hands of the white mob. The settlement would include compensation for the pain and suffering of those who endured the Middle Passage and those who did not.

It's estimated that at least 50 million Africans died on the trip between Africa and North America. Of course, the settlement would include interest and could not be taxed without consent. Punitive damages would be assessed against the descendants of slaveholders, Ku Kluxers, slumlords, redliners and all parties who caused black men to die in wars to advance U.S. interests.

Black people would not accept money obtained through the exploitation of other oppressed nationalities. Whites would have to tax themselves, or, as usual, borrow from the Japanese. Hopefully, this tax scheme could be severely progressive. Hopefully, poor whites and whites who fought white supremacy would pay the least, but, of course, this wouldn't be my concern.

Finally, blacks would have the option of choosing their own land base or remaining in the United States. Since black people toiled most diligently in the southeastern section of the United States, this land, quite naturally, would be most suitable. That means Arkansas, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana and Mississippi. Blacks, of course, would not be compelled to move to the black state, and, of course, peaceful whites would not be compelled to move away.

This is a bargain.

Whites would be relieved of the burdens of the black-faced but white-dominated social programs. Blacks would employ themselves, teach their own children the truth and control their own neighborhoods. Black-white interaction would be voluntary instead of compelled. No more busing, no more affirmative action and, best of all, no more white guilt. White people could righteously say they have settled their debts with blacks. Urban blacks, long alienated from society by poverty, forced segregation and media-vilification, would no longer strike fear in whites. Think of it, whites could reclaim their cities — without dispossessing anyone.

Now the liberals may oppose this reparations program because, of course, they justify their existence by championing so-called lost causes. Others also have a material interest in black exploitation. Urban renewal money might completely dry up, the social work industry might collapse, and agri-businesses — who profit



Illustration/Lisa Elias

from the food stamp programs might suffer losses. Also, the prison industry and the police apparatus might be scaled back. The mass exodus of black soldiers from the U.S. military might also cause some short-term problems. Weapons contractors would have fewer uniforms, boots, meals and rifles to supply. But this would represent only a short setback, because America still benefits from the exploitation of many.

If you don't accept my challenge, rest

assured that black-white relations will continue to be, at the very best, bumpy. White jubilation over freedom and democracy in Eastern Europe will continue to illustrate white American hypocrisy in black eyes.

Keith Hakim is a third-year law student.

Arlan Stangeland — A stange man in a stange situation



I'm in the mood to make fun of Arlan Stangeland, but first I should probably explain who he is. He's the congressional representative from northwestern Minne-

We shouldn't assume all private male-female communication is of a sexual nature, even if it was 341 phone calls. I don't even assume that — or care if — Gary Hart had an affair with the woman with whom he was "implicated."

But there's a level of hypocrisy to consider here: Arlan Stangeland isn't exactly a crusader for sexual freedom, much less birth control, much less sex education. And an opponent of government spending shouldn't be using federal money — the same money he would deny to a poor woman wanting an abortion — to subsidize his social life.

A more serious ghost from Stangeland's past emerged last Friday. Three years ago,

pany to hurry up unless he wanted publicity.

Again, an element of hypocrisy creeps in. Stangeland is an opponent of national health insurance. What would he suggest his victims do if they didn't have insurance and were turned away from an

"Arlan Stangeland isn't exactly a crusader for sexual freedom, much less

editions (on page three), and left out any reference to the victims' injuries. The Star Tribune didn't cover it at all. If this had been a black politician, especially one from Minnesota, the story would have been splashed across page one.

Rumors about alcohol and drug consumption would also have been included in a story about a black politician. Residents of Stangeland's district say they frequently see him drunk in area bars; he even introduces himself and shakes hands with constituents in this condition. He doesn't have a chauffeur or a KQ designated driver. And since he probably doesn't walk home to Moorhead from bars in St. Cloud or Detroit Lakes, it's logical to assume that he drives drunk. So, if the