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FACULTY ADVISORS' NOTES

An article from the Spring 1994 edition of Uhuru produced heated response among many KSU readers. Critics have raised concerns about the article’s scholarly accuracy, alleging racism, anti-Semitism, and hate speech. Meanwhile, supporters have expressed agreement with many of its basic points. In the middle of this controversy, some KSU students, faculty, and staff—Black and White—who read the article wondered what was the big deal, while others who had not read it were left to make judgments based on media coverage, since, for some reason, copies had vanished literally overnight from their distribution points across campus.

As the magazine’s advisor, I made a verbal commitment at the outset of the controversy to allow all concerned members of the KSU community to respond in writing in order to 1) correct any perceived errors on the writer’s part, and 2) elaborate in whatever way they deemed appropriate on the context of this controversy. Instead, during fall semester 1994, the response took the form of a full-page ad in the Daily Kent Stater, composed by the Campus Campaign for Civil Discourse and accompanied by 300 signatures from “concerned” KSU faculty and staff. (I was informed by more than one associate on campus that several signatories had never read the article, but signed as a result of pressure or because they thought it was the politically correct thing to do.) Whatever the reason may have been, through all the emotional and verbal exchanges at meetings and through all the media coverage of the controversy over the summer of last year, resolution has not been achieved.

The involvement of the academy via the Faculty Senate, coupled with the momentum to establish the ad in the Stater, prompted the present response in the form of a special issue of Uhuru. This opportunity has become what one co-authored article refers to as “a teachable moment.”

The conditions underlying this controversy have been around for some time, but the article fanned them into a flame here at KSU, as it was viewed as another of a series of attacks on the offended group. This publication is a special opportunity for elaboration on many of these variables from diverse viewpoints. Certainly, some articles will upset some readers, and this is understandable. I hope that an open-minded assessment of the entire content of this journal will ultimately prove informative and beneficial to all.
Although the controversy will not be resolved here alone, it is hoped that this special edition will be a significant step in the articulation of specific concerns deemed to be of relevance to the writers and the readership at KSU.

Unfortunately many of those who were so emotionally and vocally involved in the condemnation processes alluded to earlier did not take advantage of this opportunity to put their positions on paper for the education & scrutiny of all in the campus community. There were fewer submissions than we had anticipated. Some of this reluctance apparently is due to a communicated perception that “The source [i.e., Uhuru, The Black United Students and the Department of Pan-African Studies] is tainted.” Nonetheless, the majority of the submissions we did receive are of substantive value and we are pleased to include them. As the saying goes, “The moving pen writes and, having writ, moves on. Nor can all your piety and wit lure it back again.” I believe that the readers will agree that the submissions were received and handled in a professional and even-handed manner.

The editorial board decided that, because some members of the campus community had not been able to read the controversial article and because all of the contents of this edition were related to it, it was appropriate to reprint the piece in its original form. The initial proposed Faculty Senate resolution, my response to it, and the final approved resolution are also included, as well as the contents of the Stater ad.

I wish to gratefully acknowledge the efforts of the editorial board for this special edition, and I would especially like to recognize Ms. Christina McVay for her additional time in editing, scanning, copying, and re-editing the computer disks for the printer preparations. Recognition is also due to Provost Myron Henry, along with others, for his willingness to fund this production effort, despite countervailing pressures. To Enloe and Adisa, I am grateful for your tolerance, your sacrifices, and your commitment as students, and as representatives of the BUS organization, in this special edition.

To all of you others who supported our efforts at promoting knowledge and understanding of the contested issues, as well as for your contributions toward the achievement of this teachable moment.

I Thank You.

E. Timothy Moore,
Faculty Advisor
EDITORS' NOTES

Racism, anti-Semitism, intolerance, and ignorance; these words have echoed in the halls of KSU in recent months, more so than ever before. The accusations have swept this campus into a whirlwind of controversy. In this special edition of Uhuru, the editorial board would like to address the concerns of the campus community, taking the first step to having open and honest dialogue. There were many people in the KSU community who didn’t want this special edition to be. Fortunately, however, there are also civic-minded individuals on this campus who are truly committed to “civil discourse,” thus bringing the idea of a special issue to fruition. The editorial board can only hope that this journal is read in its entirety and with an open mind. Who know’s where this special edition will lead?

It is only fitting that we, who have been falsely identified as “racist” and “anti-Semitic,” initiate this dialogue. Not existing in a vacuum, of course, the individuals that make up the editorial board of Uhuru hold their own positions, which may or may not be different from those of our critics, but in the spirit of “uhuru na mazungumzo (freedom and civil discourse),” we have created a forum for the Kent State community to contribute to this dialogue, regardless of opinion.

Unfortunately, many people on all sides of the issue have chosen not to participate for whatever reason(s). This raises the question of whether or not this university at any level is truly interested in “community,”“tolerance,” “understanding,” or any one of a number of principles that Uhuru, Black United Students, and the Department of Pan-African Studies have been so vehemently accused of not having.

In spite of the lack of cooperation, however, Uhuru would like to thank everyone who did participate by contributing to this journal. The efforts put forth to compose this work have been diligent, and some of them, in the eyes of some people, confrontational (the original editors’ notes have been revised for inclusion as submissions to the journal, after concern over their tone), but by all accounts, fruitful and greatly appreciated.

Uhuru dedicates this issue to those generations that are to follow.

To Maat be True!

Adisa A. Alkebulan,
Enloe Wilson,
Editors
The Paradox of European Jewry

Terrence Shropshire

In 1933, there was a radical shift in the balance of power in Europe and the world was about to become witness to one of the most horrific crimes ever committed against mankind. Rarely had there ever been such a callous, malevolent, premeditated attempt to remove an entire race of people from human existence. By 1945, over one-third of all of the world’s Caucasian Jews had been stuffed into ovens—as the world watched. In all, approximately eleven million Caucasian Jews, Gypsies, and other “undesirables” had been eliminated. The magnitude, the ramification, of this crime, as a result of the fascist dictatorship of Adolf Hitler, is one that is practically incalculable and immeasurable to most individuals. This event sent shockwaves throughout the globe, and the residue of this unspeakable horror can still be felt, directly and indirectly, by all of us at this very moment.

Being an individual of African descent, I can naturally empathize with any group of people who have fallen, and who continue to fall, prey to truly grotesque manifestations of oppression and arbitrary abuses of power. The Jewish Holocaust was a crime that can never be forgotten, and we must all ensure that something like this is never repeated.

VICTIMS ONLY?

The world’s Caucasian Jews have portrayed themselves throughout history to be victims of oppression and slavery of the Empire of Ancient Egypt, who had to be rescued from bondage by Biblical Moses; victims of Ancient Roman imperialism; victims only during the Spanish Inquisition; victims only of tyrannical European governments during medieval times; more recently, victims of Hitler’s totalitarian regime; victims of Stalinist Russia; victims of Caucasian “Christian” supremacist groups like the KKK; victims only of “vicious” Arabian nationalism in the so-called Middle East; and victims of alleged anti-Semitism, first by Minister Malcolm X, then by Minister Louis
Farrakhan, then by Blacks in general. The latest Black to be accused of alleged anti-Semitism is, of course, Dr. Khalid Abdul Muhammad. This is viewed by many persons of color as extremely hypocritical, for Jewish anti-Black, anti-Arab behavior and words, whether it is on a local, national or international scale, whether historically or contemporarily, is NEVER denounced by Jewish organizations. Today, Caucasian Jews claim that they are victims of anti-Semitism in America, Canada, Eastern Europe, Western Europe, Western Asia, Africa, South America, etc... Do we see a pattern here?

One gets the impression that, after filtering in all of this information, that Caucasian Jews have never as much as lifted a finger to harm one strand of hair of anyone in the history of their existence. Is this portrayal even remotely realistic or plausible?

Jews have undoubtedly been victims in their history, but according to many historians, including many of their own, Jews have exercised (what some call) an inordinate or disproportionate role in the decimation, defilement, cultural colonization, enslavement and genocide of many of the world’s people up until today; and how the same people can have the audacity—the mitigating gall—to perpetually illuminate or highlight their own victimization while conveniently “forgetting” their role in the destruction, murder and dehumanization of millions of others is beyond my ability to comprehend. As a matter of fact, a strong case can be made that Jews’ historical relationship with Blacks/Africans has been venomously and perniciously anti-Black. The fact is that there has been a concerted effort to disguise, distort, or marginalize this information as anti-Black behavior. For far too long, a huge veil has been draped over the other side of Caucasian Jewish culture and history, meticulously hidden from public consumption or scrutiny.

It’s time to lift that veil.

THE SO-CALLED CHOSEN PEOPLE:

Michael Bradley’s, *Chosen People of the Caucasus* eloquently discusses the issues of true Jewish origins, delusions, deceptions and historical role in the Slave Trade, genocide and cultural colonization. This book is an effort to destroy all of the myths, Biblical folklore, and Hollywood fantasy attached to Jewish culture. This is a follow-up to Bradley’s first selection, *The Iceman Inheritance*, which reveals the anthropological data to support the theory that the collective Caucasoid (white persons) have a predisposition for extreme violence and aggression, and have a higher level of psychosexual maladaptation which manifests itself through
racism, sexism, and aggressive behavior. This, Bradley asserts, is a result of their glacial evolutionary experience during the last, and brutal, European Ice Age—an experience unique to the collective Caucasoid. Bradley asserts that the Caucasian Jews are also the descendants of these people of the caves (better known as the Neanderthals).

The lecture of the Chosen People points out, for starters, that the "overwhelming majority of contemporary Caucasian/European Jews, contrary to popular and erroneous beliefs, have no historical or genetic relationship to ancient Palestine at all; most of them are the descendants of the Russian-steppe tribesman, from the dark caves of the Caucasus mountains, who were converted to Judaism en masse around 740 A.D., and were later pushed into central and eastern Europe by the Mongol Invasion." What Michael Bradley maintains, in essence, is that the vast majority of modern Caucasian Jews HAVE NO RELATIONSHIP TO THE ORIGINAL HEBREW ISRAELITES. With this in mind, if the Caucasian Jews descended from ancient Eurasia, in the mountainous zones, then their claim and cry (after WW II) for a land in ancient Palestine, in the Middle East, looks absolutely absurd, ludicrous, grotesque.

The Kazir-steppe tribesman conversion origin of most of modern Jewry is a fact discovered by Jewish scholars and Jewish historians and accepted by almost all Jewish scholars. For more information about the history of Hebrew Israelites, check out Dr. Yosef ben Jochannan (an African Jew), author of We the Black Jews: Witness to the White Jewish Myth, and Dr. Martin Bernal's, (a Caucasian Jew) Black Athena: the Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization.

SPANISH INQUISITION AND AFTER: AGGRESSORS AND VICTIMS SIMULTANEOUSLY

During the infamous and torturous campaign called the Spanish Inquisition (which began in 1350), Spain had begun a series of conversion drives to convert all Caucasian Jews to Christianity. The Inquisitors employed brutal and gruesome tortures against Jews not only because they were Jews, BUT BECAUSE OF SLAVE DEALINGS, and sometimes, for that alone. By 1460, Spanish Jews were importing 700-800 slaves yearly into Portugal. Clearly, the issue of Black enslavement and its connection with Judaism played a significant role as the subject of charges leveled at Jews during the campaign.

Seymour B. Liebman, a Jew, revealed in his book, The Jews in New Spain: Faith, Flame, and the Inquisition that "On August second, 1492, more than 300,000 Jews were expelled from Spain, ending their five-century involvement in the
Black hostage trade in that region. In fact, Jews amassed large fortunes in dealing in Christian slaves and became quite prominent within the Spanish hierarchy.”

By 1450, according to Carl Rhein’s book, The Jewish Almanac, “with the exception of certain parts of Italy, Western Europe had closed its doors to Jewish people. The expulsion of Jews by European governments was not unusual, with most of the complaints centered around economic exploitation, monopolization, and sharp practice—and not so much because of their religious doctrine.”

Caucasian Jews had immense influence in the expansion of Europe that began in 1492 and culminated in world domination. Bradley’s Chosen People asserts that four “conversos” (Jews who had supposedly and voluntarily converted to Roman Catholicism after the Spanish Inquisition) “put up most of the money to finance the first voyage of Christopher Columbus. After 1550, many of the conquistadors were Jewish and, as such, took part in the most brutal episode of genocide and extermination the world has ever witnessed (the decimation of Native American people).” But this type of demonic behavior wasn’t just relegated to North America, Central and South America as well as the Caribbean Islands also felt the evil wrath and onslaught of the European (Jews and Christians alike)—as Bradley stated in his first book, The Iceman Inheritance. “The successful Europeans stayed in Europe... and Europe opened up her prisons and released her garbage onto the known world.” “By 1592,” according to the book, The Columbian Exchange, “over three hundred of the Native American original tribes had been completely slaughtered and decimated (in other words, made extinct) by enslavement, starvation, war, and disease.” Jews were in great numbers in the New World during the slaughter of the Natives, participated in the slaughter, then were there in great numbers afterwards to sweep up and reap the enormous benefits.

Sir Jeffery Amherst, a Jewish military commander, had a pathological hatred for the “heathenous” and “barbaric” red Native peoples, so, according to the book, The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews (edited by the Nation of Islam, citing Jewish texts and books), this venomous hatred drove him to devise a monstrous and diabolical plan to PURPOSELY PUT THE SMALLPOX DISEASE INTO BLANKETS AND GIVE THEM TO THE NATIVE AMERICANS, OSTEINSLY TO DEPOPULATE THE NATIVES. It worked...like vanishing cream. The Native Americans all but disap-
peared from existence. No remorse, no scruples. With the potential “Indian” labor force depleted, Africans were then brought to be the interminable burden-bearers of Caucasian aristocracy—Jews and Christian alike. And according to their own scholars, Caucasian Jews were right there at the top, financing, trafficking, slaughtering, trapping, and hauling millions of defenseless Africans like a herd of sheep. Axiomatic is the fact that millions of Africans didn’t even survive the trip due to truly inhumane, ghastly conditions onboard the ships. The manifestation of villainously, atrociously wicked minds was at work to pull something like this off. Interestingly enough, not a whisper or reference to a certain fact has entered our public school system, or that of higher learning; and that is this: Jews were major participants in the slaughter of Native Americans, and were major participants in the greatest human tragedy history knows, (no, not Hitler’s Holocaust), the Trans-Atlantic African Slave Trade.

Which brings me to my next point.

Estimates state that as high as 100 million African were killed (depending on your source) in the West Indies, Central and South America, Europe, the Caribbean, etc. during the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade. “Jews played a significant role in this infamy,” Michael Bradley states, “a role that contemporary Jews have the propensity to deny, disguise, and distort in favor of their own victimization in Nazi Germany 450 years later.”

I won’t dare allege that Jews first conceived of the idea of slavery, and neither were the Jews alone in the participation of the Holocausts of Native Americans and Africans. What I am asserting is what Dr. Yosef A.A. ben Jochannan stated best in his book, We the Black Jews: Witness to the White Jewish Myth: “Jews have been conclusively linked to the biggest criminal endeavor ever undertaken against a race of people—a crime against humanity—the Black African Holocaust. They were major participants in the entrapment and forcible exportation of millions of Black African citizens into the wretched and inhuman life of bondage for the financial benefit of Jews.” THESE ARE FACTS SUPPORTED BY THEIR OWN SCHOLARS, HISTORIANS, AND RABBIS. The effects of this unspeakable tragedy are still being felt among the people of the world at this very hour. The immense wealth of the Jews, as with most of the Caucasian colonial fathers, was acquired only by the brutal subjugation of Black Africans purely on the basis of skin color—a concept unfamiliar to Moses.

Rabbi Bertram W. Korn wrote
this during the era of slavery in America, in his selection, *Jews and Negro Slavery in the Old South*: “It is realistic to conclude that any Jew who could afford to own slaves (and needed them) would do so. In fact, Jews participated in every aspect and process of the exploitation of the defenseless Blacks.” (for an actual partial list of those Caucasian Jews who owned slaves, refer to the book, *The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews*, pp. 214-311). This work is supplemented by another Jewish Rabbi, Arthur Hertzberg, in the selection, *A History of the Jews in America*, with a most shocking pronouncement: “Jewish Clergy never discussed Black slavery until 1860, and then primarily in favor of it... As was to be expected, the Jewish Clergy in the South, WITHOUT EXCEPTION, ENDORSED THE CONFEDERACY.” In Dr. Jacob Rader Marcus’, *Studies in American Jewish History*, he states that “Most antebellum Jews, those in the North as well as in the South, cared little about the moral issues of human bondage” (even though they’d been through persecution so many times themselves), and not only did Jews accept this demonic doctrine, but Dr. Marcus admits, “some of them helped to formulate and circulate it.”

Caucasian Jews outnumbered their Caucasian Christian brethren in the number of slaves owned by almost two to one. And even though there was a terrible degree of resentment between Caucasian Christians and Caucasian Jews, the Jewish population profited enormously nevertheless.

**REMEMBER: The lion does not sleep with the tiger, but they are both members of the cat family.**

During the Civil War, many Jews, of course, fought with, or were sympathetic to the Confederacy. In the aftermath of the Confederacy’s humiliating defeat, Caucasian Jews fought to restore White Supremacy and were instrumental in the establishment, and then perpetuation of the horrors of Jim Crow-ism. For reference, this era of American history is further analyzed in the book, *The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews*, in the chapter entitled, “Jews, Slavery, and the Civil War.”

**ISRAEL AND SOUTH AFRICA: AN UNHOLY, UNGODLY ALLIANCE**

The full extent of military cooperation between the political state of Israel (occupied Palestine) and the barbaric, blatantly racist regime of white South Africa has been kept secret by both sides, but significant aspects have been revealed. According to the Stockholm Peace Research Institute (SPIRI), military, political, economic, and social allegiance between South Africa and
Israel began as early as 1962, but they began talks as early as the mid-1950s (keep in mind that this is only TEN YEARS AFTER THE JEWISH HOLOCAUST CAME TO A CLOSE). This is according to the book, The Anti-Apartheid Reader (edited by David Merselstein and written by Ben Beit-Hallahmi, pp. 329-333). “In 1962, the political state of Israel began selling rifles, mortars, electronic equipment, and missile boats to the country of South Africa. It has also been reported that the political state of Israel sold South Africa radar stations, were remodeling all of South Africa’s armored tanks, and that the political state of Israel was training white South Africans to suppress the majority Black African uprising.” This most shocking account is followed up by another book entitled, The Unnatural Alliance, by John Adams, in the chapter titled, “A Marriage of Money,” which reveals that once all trade is taken into account, the political state of Israel is South Africa’s oldest, longest, and most faithful trading partner (the political state of Israel is the leading investor and the leading exporter of valuable resources and equipment out of white South Africa). Mr Adams also points out the fact that the 130,000 South African Jews are the highest per capita contributors to Israel in the world. The book also reveals that most of white South Africa’s military weaponry and military strategy was developed by her biggest benefactor, the Jewish political State of Israel.

Mr. Simha Ehrlich, then Prime Minister of Israel, has been quoted as stating this to a delegation in South Africa: “Israel would serve as a convenient way station for South African products, which would be exported first to Israel and then re-exported to the U.S.A. and other countries, avoiding higher taxes and political boycotts to the benefit of both countries.”

Question: Just where were the Jewish Anti-Defamation League or other Jewish defense organizations hiding when all this was taking place? And why haven’t they ever spoken out to denounce, reproach, castigate, or scrutinize the perniciously and atrociously anti-Black, anti-Arab, anti-Native American behavior manifested by their own people? And, as such, what right do they have to malign and vilify any alleged anti-Semitic language or behavior if they can’t clean up their own house? You mean to tell me that the world’s Caucasian Jews have never done wrong to anyone at anytime in anyplace? Or don’t the Jews speak out unless one of their own if attacked or affected? Perhaps I just hit it right on the nose. Do the Caucasian Jews only take care of themselves and continue to discard, and defile,
and trash, and defecate on the rest of the world? Don’t be fooled by the facades and affectations, for they have not behaved like friends or benevolent allies to African, Arab or Native-American people. These are the works of those who should be described as enemies of our people, our struggle, our children, and our future.

As if this weren’t enough, the political state of Israel has been collaborating with the South African Apartheid since the late 1950s in the production of nuclear weapons, and by now, the political state of Israel and South Africa may have one the highest proliferation of atomic weaponry anywhere in Western Civilization.

AGENT PROVOCATEURS: SPIES AND STOOLPIGEONS

One of the issues that I am most incensed and indignant about concerning the Caucasian Jew’s historically anti-Black behavior, is the fact that during the civil rights movements of the 1950s and 60s, the Jewish community put on a magnificent and spectacular facade and veneer pretending to be our most honored allies, while simultaneously, a prestigious Jewish organization was involved in the illegal intelligence gathering operations (spying, wire-tapping) of civil rights organizations and leaders. Those individuals who were, unknowingly, to unlawful scrutiny included El Hajj Malik El-Shabazz (Malcolm X), The SCLC, SNCC, and the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. The organization that is responsible for this debauchery was none other than the Jewish Anti-Defamation League, B-nai B-rith. This was first revealed in the New York Times in the summer of 1992. I have yet to hear one syllable, not one iota, not one breath denouncing this type of behavior by other Caucasian Jews, or other organizations. It is becoming painfully obvious to me that the international Caucasian Jewish community will never speak out against the misconduct, impropriety, or malfeasance of any of the members of the Jewish race or religion, whether it is in the United States or in the political state of Israel (occupied Palestine). Yet the very same community would call upon the support of others to denounce alleged anti-Semitism (as if Caucasian Jews are the only Semites), and the so-called hatred of Minister Louis Farrakhan, Dr. Khalid Muhammad, the Palestinian PLO, Greeks, Germans, Egyptians, Syrians, etc. If the Caucasian Jewry continues to prove to be impotent and incompetent in her ability to reprimand or renounce those members or her faith who disregard the humanity of others, then these same Jews should not expect anyone to respect or protect their humanity or
even shed a tear when something catastrophic happens to them.

FINAL ANALYSIS:

It is long past the time when the Caucasian Jewish "mystique" should have been subjected to objective scientific scrutiny. The world can do without the mystique, the myths, and the delusions that have caused a whole hell of a lot of human tragedy, throughout the annals of history in collectively deranged, maniacal acts of anti-human, anti-spiritual behavior. It is my desire, however, to reconcile the differences between Africans and Jews. Jews claim to want peace, tranquility and serenity...it is my presumption that African people desire the same things. But we must come to the realization that there can be no peace, and there will NEVER be peace, as long as our relationship is continually built upon injustice, lying, thievery, murder, hypocrisy, duplicity, deceit and the distortion of historical facts. There can never be peace as long as there are those evil persons who have the intestinal fortitude to use the name of God to facilitate one's racist, narrow-minded mentality and gutter practice of religious doctrine. We must all remain vigilant or cognizant for those who use the name of God to facilitate murder, oppression, imperialism, international warfare, the taking of someone else's land, or the acquisition of power and wealth. The only route to racial, ethnic, or religious reconciliation is through the distribution or dissemination of truth of facts. Truth is a prerequisite to racial reconciliation. Any person or persons attempting reconciliation without truth is a person or group of people majoring in futility and wasteful effort, which will only serve to exacerbate the animosity between the races and may militate against ethnic harmony.

Terry Shropshire,
Sophomore, University of Akron
An Historian’s Response to Terry Shropshire

Dr. Kenneth Calkins

In last spring’s issue of Uhuru Terry Shropshire quite rightly wrote that “truth is a prerequisite to racial reconciliation.” Unfortunately, a careful examination of Shropshire’s own article suggests that he himself is extremely careless in his pursuit of the truth. Those who read his piece, entitled “Paradox of European Jewry,” will recall that one of its most striking characteristics is the large number of quotations and citations of authorities that are included. When one scrutinizes these sources, however, one soon discovers that Mr. Shropshire apparently had little interest in conveying what they actually say about the issues he addresses. Of the seventeen direct quotations I have been able to check, for example, only one is completely accurate. Some of Shropshire’s errors seem to be simply the product of slipshod scholarship. On other occasions, however, it would appear that quotations were altered with a calculated intention to mislead the reader. Whereas he quotes John Henrik Clarke as having written, for instance, that “the Jews of Europe played a greater role in their [i.e., Black Africans’] enslavement, oppression, and colonization than other Europeans,” we discover that Clarke actually claimed merely that “the Jews ... played the same role ... as other Europeans” [my emphasis].

One of the reasons for his difficulty in providing accurate quotations, however, is that in at least six cases he has not gone directly to the sources himself, but has rather used quotations which appear in a book published by the Nation of Islam entitled The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews. In several of these instances he mixes in the polemical rhetoric of the anonymous authors of this work or even becomes confused about what sources they are quoting. When he does read his sources, Shropshire has a tendency to misunderstand what is being presented. Readers of last spring’s Uhuru will recall that one of his most dramatic charges, given special emphasis by being printed in bold capital letters, was that sir Jeffery Amherst, “a Jewish military commander,” developed and implemented “a monstrous and
diabolical plan” to infect Native Americans with smallpox in an effort “to depopulate the natives.” Anyone familiar with European or American history will recognize immediately that 18th century Britain was not likely to have placed the command of its armed forces in North America in the hands of a Jew, and of course Amherst was not a Jew at all. But the most striking thing about this blunder is that in support of his claim Shropshire cites The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews which, despite its attempts to portray Jews in the most negative light possible, does not describe Amherst as a Jew. (We only have room here to describe a few such examples. For additional details, see my “Notes on Shropshire’s Use of Sources,” which follow.)

Still another way in which Shropshire misuses his sources is illustrated by his references to James Adams’ book The Unnatural Alliance which deals with the relationship between Israel and South Africa. Shropshire is here intent upon attacking “the Jewish political state of Israel” for its commercial and military ties to the oppressive South African apartheid regime. He cites Adams as describing Israel as “South Africa’s oldest, longest, and most faithful trading partner” and as asserting that “the 130,000 South African Jews are the highest per capita contributors to Israel in the world.” Now, Adams does say something of the sort, but Shropshire both vastly oversimplifies Adams’ analysis and leaves a great deal of relevant information out. Adams writes, for instance, that though South Africa’s “published trade” with the rest of Africa was six times as great as that with Israel in the early 1980’s, if unreported trade is included, “it is probable that . . . Israel may be South Africa’s largest trading partner” [my emphasis]. Adams also points out that Israel’s relationship with South Africa varied radically over the years, noting that between 1961 and 1973 Israel publicly condemned apartheid and voted against South Africa on various occasions in the U.N., changing its policy only after twenty-nine of thirty-two Black African states, responding to the entreaties of Arab leaders after the 1973 war, severed relations with Israel. Finally, Adams reports that a great many South African Jews vigorously opposed apartheid even to the point of joining underground movements and engaging in sabotage against the South African state, a fact which Shropshire, of course, ignores.

Shropshire justifies his assault upon Jews by claiming that “for far too long, a huge veil has been draped over the other side of Caucasian Jewish culture and his-
tory, meticulously hidden from public consumption or scrutiny. “It’s time,” he asserts dramatically, “to lift that veil.” Here again we must question Shropshire’s devotion to the truth, for many of the authors he cites are Jews. These authors clearly did not devote their time and energy to exploring the involvement of their coreligionists in such activities as the slave trade in order to “drape” a “veil” over them. Quite to the contrary. He himself quotes (or rather misquotes) Bertram Korn’s presidential address to the American Jewish Historical Society more than three decades ago in which Korn discusses the involvement of some Jews in slavery and the slave trade in an extremely frank and critical manner and urges other scholars to follow his lead. Shropshire also cites Jacob Marcus, another noted Jewish historian, who elsewhere in the same work that Shropshire misquotes emphasizes that there had been a recent trend (i.e., in 1963!) in Jewish historical research toward the study of “the American Jewish attitude to slavery and abolitionism.” In other words, Shropshire’s own sources provide impressive evidence against one of his major theses.

Another of his central themes is his claim that most modern Jews are “Caucasians” who, he insists, “have no relationship to the original Hebrew Israelites.” In coming to this conclusion Shropshire has relied primarily upon two works by Michael Bradley, who begins the first of these, The Iceman Inheritance, with the frank statement, “this book is racist.” Shropshire cites approvingly Bradley’s claim that the so-called “Caucasian Jews” are, like other “Caucasoids,” “descendants of [the] people of the caves (better known as the Neanderthals).” To a German historian like myself, this sort of argumentation sounds frighteningly similar to the Nazis’ description of the Jews (and other “lesser races”) as Untermenschen. Of course, as he does elsewhere in his piece, Shropshire appears to be confused or at least inconsistent on this point. On one occasion, for instance, he directs his complaints at “the members of the Jewish race or religion.” But if there is a “Jewish race” (a conception, by the way, which is clearly a product of nineteenth century European anti-Semitism), how can most Jews be Caucasians who “have no relationship to the original . . . Israelites?” On the other hand, if he is angry at “members of the Jewish . . . religion,” why has he made no effort to explain how any particular teaching or characteristic of Judaism might be related to the crimes he claims Jews have committed?

But perhaps the most disappointing aspect of Shropshire’s
polemic is that an author published in a journal such as *Uhuru* would take such a Eurocentric approach to his subject. His eagerness to denigrate Jews and to blame them for nearly every problem imaginable places him directly in the mainstream of the centuries-old tradition of Western anti-Semitism. His rhetoric, charging Jews with “secrecy,” “duplicity,” “deceit,” “hypocrisy,” “thievery,” and “murder,” echoes phrases to be found throughout the vast library of Western diatribes against Jews stretching from the era of the triumph of Christianity in Rome over the tirades of Martin Luther on down to Hitler’s *Mein Kampf*. I would urge him, and those readers who may have been drawn to his views, to free themselves from this unsavory product of Western culture. Hopefully, Mr. Shropshire, who is clearly a very intelligent and articulate individual, will eventually recognize the great advantages to be gained by looking at the world from a fresh point of view and will thereby escape from such ugly relics of past prejudice and injustice.

NOTES ON SHROPSHIRE’S USE OF SOURCES
Prepared by Kenneth Calkins, History Department

A university serves many purposes, but the most fundamental of these is the teaching and encouragement of scholarship. One of the ways in which this is accomplished is through *criticism* by professors of their students’ work. Normally such criticism occurs in the relative privacy of the classroom. Terry Shropshire’s article, however, was not presented in such a setting. Rather it was published in a very public forum and in a form which suggested that it was based on serious scholarship. Many students and at least some professors were impressed by Mr. Shropshire’s scholarly pretensions. It was from this perspective that I concluded that it would be appropriate for me as a member of the faculty to check Shropshire’s sources just as I would those of a student in one of my classes and then to publish my findings for the benefit of those who may wish to evaluate Shropshire’s article from the point of view of the scholarly values Kent State University is committed to propagating. What follows, therefore, are the notes I made in the course of my efforts to track down the sources Shropshire mentions in his piece. My objective here is not to polemize against his conclusions, but rather to comment upon his use of sources and thereby, hopefully, to contribute to the teaching mission of the University.
P. 35, first featured quote in the middle of the page reads: "Through the history of the practice, Jews have been involved in the purchase and sale of human beings... Jews were among the most important slave dealers in European society.' Solomon Grayzel, 'Jewish scholar and historian 'A History of the Jews', p. 312'' [Actually, the first sentence is a direct quotation of editorial material included in The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews, prepared by The Historical Research Department of The Nation of Islam (Chicago, 1991), p. 9. The authors of this work then go on to quote Grayzel's statement that "Jews were among the most important slave dealers," adding "in European society" themselves. Note that Shropshire has mis-spelled Grayzel's name. Grayzel's book was first published in 1947.]

P. 35, second featured quote in the middle of the page reads: "The principal purchasers of slaves were found among the Jews... (T)hey seemed to be always and everywhere at hand to buy, and to have the means equally ready to pay.’—Lady Magnus, Jewish writer, ‘Outlines in Jewish History’" [This quotation is obviously taken from Secret Relationship (p. 9) which reads as follows: "Lady Magnus writes that in the Middle Ages, ‘The principal purchasers of slaves were found among the Jews... (T)hey seemed to be always and everywhere at hand to buy, and to have the means equally ready to pay.’” The passage quoted appears in Lady Katie Emmanuel Magnus’ work, Outlines of Jewish History (Philadelphia, 1890), p. 107. It is to be found in the chapter entitled “The Break Up of the Roman Empire: Some of its Consequences.” It thus does not refer to Africans as Shropshire’s parenthetical addition suggests. Moreover, both Shropshire and the authors of Secret Relationship misrepresent the tenor of Magnus’ statement. She writes: “The principal purchasers of slaves were found among the Jews. Jews were so widely scattered by this time that they seemed to be always and everywhere at hand to buy, and to have the means equally ready to pay. They were the kindest of masters.” This is an extremely unsophisticated book which the author has done her best to “keep... simple enough for youthful readers” (p. vii).]

P. 35, third featured quote in the middle of the page; this quotation is accurate except that Shropshire adds the word “Spanish” before “conquistadors.”
P. 35, second full paragraph in first column; referring to Michael Bradley’s *Chosen People from the Caucasus* (Chicago, 1992), Shropshire writes that “the lecture of the ‘Chosen People’ points out, for starters that the ‘overwhelming majority of contemporary Caucasian/European Jews, contrary to popular and erroneous beliefs, have no historical or genetic relationship to ancient Palestine at all; most of them are descend- dants of the Russian-steppe tribesman (sic), from the dark caves of the Caucasus mountains, who were converted to Judaism en masse around 740 A.D., and were later pushed into central and eastern Europe by the Mongol Invasion.” [Although Bradley repeatedly says something like this in his book, Shropshire is almost certainly “quoting” the following passage on pp. 25-26: “The lecture (Bradley is referring here to a lecture he gave at Vanderbilt in 1991.) also pointed out that the vast majority of contemporary Jews have no historical or genetic relationship to ancient Palestine at all; most of them are descendants of Russian steppe tribesmen who were converted to Judaism en masse around 740 A.D. Being of highly aggressive Caucasoid genetic stock, modern Jews could be expected to be highly aggressive in consequence.” I include this last sentence to give some indication of the tenor of Bradley’s argument.]

P. 35, first sentence of the final paragraph in column one is a direct quotation of a sentence on page 26 of Bradley’s *Chosen People*, though not identified as such by Shropshire.

P. 35, toward top of the second column; Shropshire’s statement that “by 1460, Spanish Jews were importing 700-800 slaves yearly into Portugal,” almost certainly is taken from *Secret Relationship* (p.9). Here the authors quote Henry L. Feingold, *Zion in American* (N.Y., 1974), pp. 42-43, as follows: “Jews who were frequently found at the heart of commerce could not have failed to contribute a proportionate share to the [slave] trade directly or indirectly. In 1460, when Jews were the masters of the nautical sciences in Portugal, that nation was importing 700-800 slave yearly.” The quotation of Feingold in *Secret Relationship* is accurate, but Shropshire’s statement that Spanish Jews were importing 700-800 slaves yearly into Portugal is not supported by either Feingold or the authors of *Secret Relationship*. [Incidentally, Shropshire’s parenthetical note at the top of this paragraph that the Spanish Inquisition...
“began in 1350” is inaccurate. The Spanish Inquisition was established in 1478, though the “campaign” against Jews certainly began earlier. Shropshire undoubtedly derived his date from Secret Relationship (p. 12) which states that “Spain began a series of conversion drives to convert all Jews...” in 1350. The statement in Shropshire’s next sentence that “the Inquisitors employed brutal and gruesome tortures against Jews not only because they were Jews, BUT BECAUSE OF SLAVE DEALINGS, and sometimes for that alone” almost certainly comes from Secret Relationship (p. 33) where the authors claim that “more than once, Jews were accused not just of being Jews, but for slave dealing and sometimes for that alone. . . .”

P. 35, farther down the second column; Shropshire writes: “Seymour B. Liebman, a Jew, revealed in his book, The Jews in New Spain: Faith, Flame, and the Inquisition, that ‘On August second, 1492, more than 300,000 Jews were expelled from Spain, ending their five-century involvement in the Black hostage trade in that region. In fact, Jews amassed large fortunes in dealing in Christian slaves and became quite prominent within the Spanish hierarchy.’” [In fact, this is a direct quotation of editorial comment in Secret Relationship (p. 11). The authors of that work do have a note to Liebman’s book, but on the page cited (32) Liebman is simply describing the departure of Jews from Spain and says absolutely nothing about slavery or the slave trade. Elsewhere in his book (published in Coral Gales, 1970), Liebman makes passing reference (pp. 135, 191) to the involvement of Jews in the slave trade on behalf of the kingdoms of Spain and Portugal. Liebman also mentions in passing (p. 221) the collection of funds to purchase the release of Jews from slavery.]

P. 35, still farther down the second column; Shropshire writes: “By 1450, according to Carl Rhein’s book, The Jewish Almanac, ‘with the exception of certain parts of Italy, Western Europe had closed its doors to Jewish people. The expulsion of Jews by European governments was not unusual, with most of the complaints centered around economic exploitation, monopolization, and sharp practice—and not so much because of their religious doctrine.’” [I assume that this is taken from Secret Relationship (pp. 10) which reads: “The expulsion of Jews by European governments was not unusual, with most of the complaints centered around economic
exploitation, monopolizing, or ‘sharp practice.’ By 1500, with the exception of certain parts of Italy, Western Europe had closed its doors to Jewish people.” The following sentence which introduces “a partial record of the countries and dates of the Jew’s (sic) expulsion from various European communities” ends with a citation to *The Jewish Almanac* which is coedited by Carl Rhein. The pages cited do indeed include an annotated list of expulsions, but not the statement attributed to this book by Shropshire; in fact, it appears nowhere in the book as far as I have been able to determine.

P. 35, final paragraph in the second column; Shropshire writes: “Bradley’s *Chosen People* asserts that four ‘conversos’ (Jews who had supposedly and voluntarily converted to Roman Catholicism after the Spanish Inquisition) ‘put up most of the money to finance the first voyage of Christopher Columbus. After 1550, many of the conquistadors were Jewish and, as such, took part in the most brutal episode of genocide and extermination the world has ever witnessed (the decimation of Native American people).’” [In fact, Bradley writes (on p. 17) as follows: “Four ‘conversos,’ Jews who had supposedly and voluntarily converted to Roman Catholicism, put up most of the money to finance the first voyage of Christopher Columbus. In the early days of the conquest of the Americas, from 1494 to about 1550, Jews were a numerous minority, if not an actual majority, of the so-called Spanish colonists that settled in the New World. Many of the ‘conquistadors’ were Jewish and, as such took part ....,” etc.]

PP. 35-36; Shropshire quotes Michael Bradley’s *The Iceman Inheritance* (N.Y., 1991) as follows: “The successful Europeans stayed in Europe ... and Europe opened up her prisons and released her garbage onto the known world.” [In fact, this appears to come from the “Introduction” to Bradley’s work which was written by John Henrik Clarke. Clarke writes as follows (p. xvii): “The Europeans who were successful in Europe generally stayed in Europe. What was referred to as the New World was brought into being by a large number of people who were failures at home. It was once said that Europe dumped its human garbage can into the New World. In spite of some exaggeration, there is some truth in this statement.” Incidentally, Bradley begins his book (p. 1) with the statement, “This book is racist.” The work is essentially a polemic
directed against the destructive behavior of the “Caucasoids” and an attempt to explain the origins of that behavior in terms of the “Caucasoids’” “Neanderthal” inheritance.

P. 36, top of the first column; Shropshire presents the following quotation: “By 1592, according to the book, *The Columbian Exchange*, over three hundred of the Native American original tribes had been completely slaughtered and decimated (in other words, made extinct) by enslavement, starvation, war, and disease.” [I have not been able to find anything close to this statement in *The Columbian Exchange: Biological and Cultural Consequences of 1492*, by Alfred W. Crosby, Jr. (Westport, 1972). Chapter two, however, stresses the disastrous impact of the conquest of the Americas upon the local population. His central point is that because the natives had been so isolated from the rest of humankind they were inevitably extremely susceptible to the diseases brought to their lands by Europeans and Africans. The book includes no discussion of the role of Jews.]

P. 36, first full paragraph of the first column; As Shropshire indicates, he bases his retelling of the notorious Amherst incident on *Secret Relationship* (pp. 11-12), but he has misread his source. Jeffrey Amherst was Commander in Chief of all British forces in North America when Indians attacked various British outposts in 1763. Upon being informed that smallpox had broken out among those besieged at Fort Pitt, Amherst, who was in fact a fanatical hater of Indians, suggested that efforts be made “to send the smallpox among the dissatisfied tribes.” This was accomplished by giving two blankets used by infected patients to Indian emissaries. This was an unconscionable act, but can hardly be attributed to Jews nor can Jews be held responsible for the decimation of the Native American population. Contrary to Shropshire’s dramatic charge, Amherst was not a Jew. Moreover, the authors of *Secret Relationship* don’t claim that he was. They do try to tie in Jews by noting that Jewish tradesmen, among others, supplied the British troops. Their main source is a rather superficial book by I. Harold Sharfman entitled *Jews on the Frontier* (Chicago, 1977). Sharfman includes a copy of an invoice (p. 38) indicating that the firm of Levy, Trent & Co. was paid by the local commander to replace the items that had been given to the Indians.
P. 36, second full paragraph in the first column; Shropshire writes: "Jews played a significant role in this infamy," Michael Bradley states, "a role that contemporary Jews have the propensity to deny, disguise, and distort in favor of their own victimization in Nazi Germany 450 years later." [This is the first fully accurate quotation I have found. The statement appears on p. 18 of Bradley's *Chosen People*.]

P. 36, bottom of the first column; Shropshire quotes Yosef Al ben-Jochannan's book *We the Black Jews: Witness to the White Jewish Myth* (Baltimore, 1993). This is an extremely disjointed, poorly-written, and polemical work. To quote the author (p. 318): "I must reemphasize the fact that all of my writings to date are complete (sic) with emotion. This is equally true for the facts, objectively and subjectively, that I have found to be necessary in order to analyze the documents for the historical basis I have used in my hypotheses." He is primarily concerned about the mistreatment of "Falashas" or black Jews. The book contains many photographs, clippings, documents, etc. I have perused it and have not found the statement quoted by Shropshire, but it could be there. If anyone else desires to take up the search, a copy is to be found in the reference section of Kent State University's Trumbull Campus library (DS 135 .E75 B46 1993). Note also Shropshire's reference to this book at the bottom of the first column on p. 35.

P. 36, top of the second column; Shropshire writes: "Rabbi Bertram W. Korn wrote during the era of slavery in America, in his selection, 'Jews and Negro Slavery in the Old South': 'It is realistic to conclude that any Jew who could afford to own slaves (and needed them) would do so. In fact, Jews participated in every aspect and process of the exploitation of the defenseless Blacks.'" [This is a direct quotation from *Secret Relationship* (p. 213). The authors of this work are quoting Bertram Korn's presidential address to the American Jewish Historical Society more than three decades ago. The words "In fact" have been added by the authors of *Secret Relationship*. In his address Korn is critical of the fact that "previous students of the American Jewish scene have appeared to be reluctant to investigate the question of Jewish participation in the slave system." He sets out to rectify this deficiency, and his work is frequently quoted in *Secret Relationship*. His address was published in the *Publications of the UHURU NA MAZUNGUMZO* 23.

P. 36, middle of the first paragraph, second column; Shropshire writes: “This work is supplemented by another Jewish Rabbi, Arthur Hertzberg, in the selection, ‘A History of the Jews in America’, with a most shocking pronouncement: ‘Jewish clergy never discussed Black slavery until 1860, and then primarily in favor of it. ... As was to be expected, the Jewish clergy in the South, WITHOUT EXCEPTION, ENDORSED THE CONFEDERACY.’” [This is taken from Secret Relationship, p. 143. The first part of the ostensible quotation of Hertzberg is in fact a close paraphrase of editorial material in Secret Relationship which reads: “Jewish clergy did not even discuss Black slavery until 1860, and then primarily in support of it.” The authors of Secret Relationship then quote Hertzberg starting with “As was to be expected...” They cite Arthur Hertzberg, The Jews in America: Four Centuries of an Uneasy Encounter (N.Y., 1989), pp. 123-124, for this quotation. Unfortunately, our library does not have this book, and I have not been able to check it elsewhere.]

P. 36, one third of the way down the second column; Shropshire writes: “In Dr. Jacob Rader Marcus’ ‘Studies in American Jewish History’ he states that ‘Most antebellum Jews, those in the North as well as in the South, cared little about the moral issues of human bondage’ (even though they’d been through persecution so many times themselves), and not only did Jews accept this demonic doctrine, but Dr. Marcus admits, ‘some of them helped to formulate and circulate it.’” [These quotations are taken from Secret Relationship (p. 147), but Shropshire has misidentified the second quote which is from Korn rather than Marcus. Marcus’ statement is quoted in Secret Relationship from his book of collected studies and addresses entitled Studies in American Jewish History (Cincinnati, 1969), p. 38. This particular study is a historiographical essay entitled “Trends in American Jewish Historical Research” which was originally published in 1963. The entire sentence reads: “The centennial anniversary of the Civil War stim-
ulated a series of studies on the American Jewish attitude to slavery and abolitionism, and it is now clearer that most antebellum Jews, those in the North as well as in the South, cared little about the moral issues of human bondage.” Korn’s statement comes again from his presidential address of 1961 (p. 216). The entire paragraph in which it is found reads as follows: “But men like Marx Lazarus [a Southern opponent of slavery, K.C.] were outright anomalies. The Southern intellectual scene in the main, was a drab, monochromatic landscape of unquestioning adherence to the dominant Southern doctrine about slavery during the two decades before the Civil War. Jews not only accepted this doctrine; some of them helped to formulate and circulate it, although their role was by no means a significant one.” Incidentally, it hardly needs to be pointed out that the fact that leading Jewish historians such as Marcus and Korn were writing in this vein in the early 1960’s contradicts Shropshire’s major premise (p. 35) that “a huge veil has been draped over the other side of Caucasian Jewish culture and history, meticulously hidden from public consumption or scrutiny.”

P. 36, final paragraph of the second column; Shropshire here is citing an article by Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi, a lecturer in psychology at Haifa University, which first appeared in New Outlook (March/April 1983) and was republished in a condensed version in The Anti-Apartheid Reader, edited by David Mermelstein (N.Y., 1987), pp. 329-333. Shropshire’s second sentence reads in part: “According to the Stockholm Peace Research Institute (SPIRI), military, political, economic, and social allegiance between South Africa and Israel began as early as 1962, but they began talks as early as the mid-1950’s. . . .” [The relevant passage in Beit-Hallahmi’s article (p. 331) reads: “According to the Stockholm Peace Research Institute (SPIRI), military cooperation between South Africa and Israel started as early as 1962, when Israel sold South Africa 32 Centurion tanks.” Shropshire then goes on ostensibly to quote Beit-Hallahmi as follows: “In 1962, the political state of Israel began selling rifles, mortars, electronic equipment, and missile boats to the country of South Africa. It has also been reported that the political state of Israel sold South Africa radar stations, were remodeling all of South Africa’s armored tanks, and that the political state of Israel was training white South Africans to suppress the majority Black African uprising.”]
accurate quotation. It is a paraphrase of some of the material Beit-Hallahmi includes in the paragraph on p. 331 to which I refer above. See also my comment below on the first featured quotation in the middle of page 37.]

PP. 36-37, Shropshire cites James Adams’ book *The Unnatural Alliance* (London, 1984) claiming that “In the chapter titled, ‘A Marriage of Money’ [Adams] reveals that once all trade is taken into account, the political state of Israel is South Africa’s oldest, longest, and most faithful trading partner (the political state of Israel is the leading investor and the leading exporter of valuable resources and equipment out of white South Africa).” [In fact, Adams treats his subject with considerable sophistication and does not really say what Shropshire claims he does. In the chapter to which Shropshire refers, for instance, Adams states (on p. 19) that, “according to the International Monetary Fund (IMF) South African trade with Israel represented only 0.6 per cent of the former’s total exports and only 0.5 per cent of its total imports, which is small in comparison with South Africa’s trade with the United States, West Germany, the United Kingdom and Japan. It has also been suggested that South Africa’s trade with the Soviet Union in gold and diamonds is greater in value than the total trade with Israel. Exports to South Africa represent only about 1 per cent of Israel’s total exports, and imports from South Africa are only around 2 per cent of the total. . . . The trading relationship can be further put into perspective by examining the volume of South Africa’s trade with the rest of Africa, which at the moment is currently six times South Africa’s current published trade with Israel.” Shropshire apparently bases his comment on the following paragraph, in which Adams adds: “However, all is not quite what it seems. The official figures take no account of the trade in diamonds and military equipment. Military sales are considered too sensitive to be discussed publicly, while all diamond sales by South Africa to any country are kept confidential. While it is impossible to place an accurate figure on the true total volume, it is probable that, when all trade is taken into account, Israel may be South Africa’s biggest trading partner.”] Shropshire states in his next sentence that “Mr. Adams also points out the fact that the 130,000 South African Jews are the highest per capita contributors to Israel in the world.” [On p. 7 Adams does indeed say something along these lines. He writes: “In 1948, there were around 118,000 Jews in
South Africa (a figure that has remained virtually static ever since), and they made up the largest percentage of Zionists in the Jewish population of any country in the world. Their contribution to Zionist funds was second in the world only to that of the United States, and proportionately was three times larger.” Adams also points out, however, that many South African Jews opposed apartheid. On p. 8 he writes that “as time went by, the Nationalists grew more entrenched, and as their policy of apartheid became more visible, there was increasing disenchantment within the South African Jewish community. They began to leave in increasing numbers, and today this group of emigrants forms the core of opposition to the new Israel-South African rapprochement.” On p. 9 he comments that “many of the younger and more militant Jews felt it was impossible to remain silent about the injustices of apartheid. More socially aware and often better educated than other white Europeans in South Africa, the young Jews who did not leave for Israel provided a useful source of recruits to the more militant underground movements that carried out a campaign of sabotage within the country in the 1950’s and 1960’s.” He also points out that from about 1961 until 1973 the Israeli government engaged in a campaign to win friends in Black Africa during which it publicly condemned apartheid and voted against South Africa on various occasions in the UN. The impact of the wars of 1967 and 1973, however, as well as concerted efforts by Arab governments to influence Black African leaders through offers of aid, etc., led to a reversal of this Israeli policy. When, after twenty-nine out of thirty-two Black African states severed relations with Israel, Adams writes (p. 15), Israel and South Africa renewed their close relationship.

P. 37, first featured quotation in the middle of the page; in the first part of this quotation Shropshire comes close to quoting accurately the statement by Beit-Hallahmi which I quoted above, but he transposes Israel and South Africa and adds “white” before South Africa. He also adds “the political state of” the second time in the sentence fragment without using parentheses to indicate that it was not in the original. The second part of the quotation is inaccurate insofar as he lumps together citations from Newsweek and The Daily Telegraph. The relevant passage in Beit-Hallahmi’s article reads: “According to Newsweek, Israel has sold South African (sic) rifles, mortars, electronic equipment and missile boats. And according to
report (sic) in the *Daily Telegraph*, Israeli technicians have built an electrified ‘wall’ along South Africa’s borders and Israel is remodeling all of South Africa’s armored vehicles.”

P. 37, second featured quote in the center of the page; John Henrik Clarke is quoted as writing as follows in the foreword to Bradley’s *Chosen People*: “Today, a large number of Black Americans think of the Jews as the People of the Book, and they look more favorably on them than on other Caucasians. These poorly informed Blacks do not know that the Jews of Europe played a greater role in their enslavement, oppression, and colonization than other Europeans.” [Actually, Clarke writes (p. 111) “...that the Jews of Europe played the same role (my italics, K.C.) in their enslavement, oppression, and colonization as other Europeans.”]

P. 37, first full paragraph in the first column; Shropshire writes: “Mr. Simha Ehrlich, then Prime Minister of Israel, has been quoted as stating this to a delegation in South Africa: ‘Israel would serve as a convenient way station for South African products which would be exported first to Israel and then re-exported to the U.S.A. and other countries, avoiding higher taxes and political boycotts to the benefit of both countries.’” [This is taken from the article by Beit-Hallahmi (p. 330). He identifies Ehrlich as Finance Minister rather than Prime Minister and describes a visit to South Africa in February 1978 during which he announced “that Israel would serve as a convenient way station, etc.” Shropshire quotes Beit-Hallahmi almost correctly here, but he doesn’t recognize that Beit-Hallahmi is paraphrasing Ehrlich rather than quoting him.]

P. 37, second column; Shropshire criticizes the claimed involvement of the Anti-Defamation League in intelligence gathering operations directed against civil rights organizations. He mentions that this was first reported by the *New York Times* during the summer of 1992. I have checked the *Times Index* cursorily for 1992 without success, but assume that something about this subject can be found there. The most substantial discussion of these charges that I have discovered thus far is to be found, interestingly enough, in an extremely critical article by Dennis King and Chip Berlet entitled “ADLgate” which was published in the Jewish publication *Tikkun*, Vol. 8, No. 4 (July/August 1993), pp. 31-36, 100-102. The authors point out
that ADL operatives have been accused of spying on radical Jewish organizations as well as some of the traditional civil rights groups. See also a response by Abraham H. Foxman, National Director of the ADL, published in the letters column of Tikun, Vol. 8, No. 6 (Nov./Dec. 1993), pp. 5-6.

Dr. Kenneth R. Calkins, Professor, History, Kent State University
One of the chief indictments of Jews by Nation of Islam scholars is that they played a "significant" part in the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade. While Shropshire admits that Jews neither conceived of the idea of African slavery nor were they the only participants, he trumpets the charge that Jews had "an inordinate and disproportionate role" in the killings of 100 million African slaves. (See note 1.) Are Jews more culpable than gentiles for slavery in the New World? Shropshire notes that The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews provides a "partial list,” running almost 100 pages, of Caucasian Jews who owned or traded in slaves. But a companion list of Caucasian gentile slave owners would cover tens of thousands of pages. In the American South in 1830, according to economic historian Lee Soltow of Ohio University, 225,000 out of 625,000 (36 percent) white families owned slaves, while Ira Rosenwaike of the University of Pennsylvania found that 240 of 322 (75 percent) Jewish households, all urban, owned slaves. (See note 2.) So how can Shropshire possibly be correct when he states that “Caucasian Jews outnumbered Caucasian Christian brethren in the numbers of slaves owned by almost two to one?” Proportionately, twice the number of Jewish households owned slaves, but can one build a case against Jews as a group because 240 families in the American South owned a few domestic slaves?

If Jews were not prominent as slave holders, were they “major participants” in the financing, shipping, and auctioning of slaves, as Shropshire charges? That Jews were active in the trans-Atlantic trading world of the 16th and 19th centuries is a fact, and slaves were one of the important cargoes. But European Jews were only bit players in this nefarious trade. The Dutch West India Company of Amsterdam, the largest govern-
mentsponsored trading firm in Latin America, had only 7 Jews among its 167 "principal sharehold-
ers." (See note 3). The Spanish, Portuguese, and French govern-
ments banned Jews entirely from participating in the lucrative colo-
nial trade in the 17th century and the Dutch and British severely restricted them. (See note 4.)
According to Jacob Marcus of Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati and the leading expert on colonial American Jewry, "Jewish participation was minimal in the slave trade with Africa." (See note 5.) Merchants in the dominant trading center of Newport, RI imported over 100,000 slaves on 934 ships between 1709 and 1807, but the most prominent Newport Jew, Aaron Lopez, whom Bradley singles out, only commissioned 14 ships carrying 1165 slaves. This was 1 percent of the total number of slaves brought in to Newport in the key century of the trade. (See note 6.) Lesser Jewish merchants were also involved, although no one has confirmed the numbers.

The facts are undeniable. Jews were not the instigators or major players in the enslavement of Africans, either as traders or owners, and contemporary Jewish scholars have not been silent about the involvement of their ancestors. Shropshire and his Nation of Islam tutors need to look again at the facts of history.

Dr. Robert P. Swierenga,
Professor, History, Kent State University

1 The 100 million figure is not correct. Michael Bradley, Chosen People from the Caucasus (1992), p. 17, writes: "It has been estimated reliably that between ten and fifteen million Africans and American Indians perished in slavery between 1494 and 1865. But some estimates range as high as 100 million." Shropshire picks the grossly exaggerated 100 million.


3 Abraham V. Goodman, American Overture, 81.


5 Jacob Rader Marcus, The Colonial American Jew, 2: 703.

Legitimizing
Hate

Stephen Weinberg

The appearance of “Paradox of European Jewry” in the spring 1994 issue of Uhuru is not unique. Similar incidents have been occurring frequently across the country as of late. The rhetoric takes aim at Jews, placing them in their common historical role as scapegoat. At issue here is not only a matter of great controversy, but also of great concern. It is of concern, because now hate is being legitimized in the classroom. At many universities, and Kent as well, resources are being diverted into programs that are distant and separate from the main campus community and its goals. These programs abandon academics and instead allow ideological indoctrination to flourish. The result of this has been racist dogma justified behind the tutelage of a multicultural education, and its various offshoots.

Last spring, when former Department of Pan-African Studies Chairperson Edward Crosby said of “The Paradox” that “It’s not hate to us,” he was expressing one of the central tenets of multiculturalism (see note 1). Cultural relativity has been used to justify many actions in the past, from the Crusades to what we have been seeing here at Kent in the form of many controversial speakers. But cultural relativity is itself a danger, because it serves to deconstruct any notion of universal values and universal knowledge. It is the belief that one knows the truth about the most important things, and at the same time, the belief that one knows there is no absolute truth to any opinion. So I can say I know something to be true, but you cannot say the same, and you especially cannot say something is false. This is dangerous, because the first opinion asserts that the quest for truth is unnecessary while the second asserts that it is impossible. Therefore, even though “The
Paradox” contained 17 quotes, and 16 of them are factually inaccurate when compared to the original source, they might still be true.

However, supporters of articles such as “The Paradox” are able to continue supporting their logically invalid view. Anyone who disagrees with them has simply soaked up the views of what is perceived as the dominant, oppressive societal view. Therefore, opponents are unable to see the truth, because they are products of a society that disallows alternate views of the truth, or in this case, hate. This circular reasoning enables supporters of articles like “The Paradox” to not only attack the opinions of their critics, but the right of their critics to disagree.

Race is, of course, the basis for cultural relativity. It is founded on the belief that race determines culture. In that sense, a Swede could not move to Mexico and assimilate into Hispanic culture. However, this presupposes many issues as well. The error in multiculturalism here is that it believes that civilization and culture, i.e. opinions, are racially determined. Or people think the way they do because of race. Because all races are equally good, all opinions must also be equally good. Ironically, there is a parallel between modern cultural relativity and the racism that justified slavery. In the past, people assumed racial inferiority and then concluded that whole cultures were then inferior. Today, people assume the movement just goes in a positive direction. But in either case, opinion is still racially determined, and if that is true, then the theory is racist. In that case, because of my culture, which is racially based, my opinion about “The Paradox” is equally valid. This is extremely dangerous in the field of education, and, unfortunately, it is the basis of multiculturalism. It presents ignorance as the equivalent of knowledge, based on race.

Many people have argued that the views expressed in “The Paradox” are widely held in the black community and are, therefore, valid. It is this claim of a racial view that has attempted to legitimize “The Paradox.” It is not a personal identity that identifies with such a view, but rather an ethnic identity. In a liberal democracy such as America, ethnic identity is neither a person’s primary identity nor the foundation of equal values. The philosopher Stephen Rockefeller wrote: “To elevate ethnic identity, which is secondary, to a position equal in significance to, or above, a person’s universal identity is to weaken the foundations of liberalism and to open the door of intolerance.” By making the claim of legitimacy based on ethnicity instead of individuality, the claim allows for the reduction
of all groups to the level of common stereotypes. And as "The Paradox" has shown, the door of intolerance has been flung wide open.

The intolerance is best noted in the manner that charges that "The Paradox" is anti-Semitic are refuted. Again, the charges are refuted in a manner that is racially based. Because "The Paradox" has been shown to be historically inaccurate, the only possible claim for its validity must be made on ethnic grounds. Of course, it would be equally absurd to believe that every member of an ethnic group shares the same opinions put forth in the article. But like the vanguard of the proletariat, a radical few are leading the charge.

Ever since the controversy started, the Daily Kent Stater has been littered with letters in support of "The Paradox." Why now, the letters ask, does the campus community decide to react against hate? There certainly have been expressions of hate in the past with no reaction or perceived reaction having taken place. There was the now infamous anti-gay exhibit in the Student Center last spring (which was quickly taken down once the group whose name was misused realized such). There were anti-black flyers posted on campus, and Arthur Jenson spoke of the inferiority of blacks. Ironically, Black United Students requested to bring Michael Bradley, an American Indian anthropologist, who makes the same claim, only about whites. The accusation of inaction is again based on race, not the universally shared identity of humanity. No one spoke up either when Leonard Jeffreys spoke on campus, or when Kwame Ture appeared twice, as well as various Nation of Islam speakers. There was very little rumbling when Khalid Muhammad spoke, and only a few bothered to picket the event (as was the case with Jenson). But again, Khalid was justified by race when introduced, and Mwatabu Okantah said, "I’d like to thank the media for making this more than it really is." Again, "It isn’t hate to us." Hatred in any form is deplorable, and should be criticized whenever it is faced. Hindsight proving clearer, such racist activities should have been condemned. Unfortunately, past wrongs cannot be changed. If that were the case, history would forever be changing. For the critics of those that are opposed to "The Paradox," they should be glad that something is being done about racism this time rather than worrying about what did not happen last time. Otherwise, their claim once again falls on race—our victimization has been worse than your victimization.

That is exactly what is happen-
ing in the education of cultural relevancy. A cult of victimhood has developed where people are able to claim status based on past sufferings of a particular culture or ethnic group. These claims come in the form of being able to say, because your culture victimized my culture, yours is inferior and immoral. Therefore, because my culture is morally superior, i.e., we have done nothing except fall victim to aggressive cultures, I can say anything I please. In a twist of logic, what was once used to deconstruct and elevate the values of one culture, is now used to deconstruct and devalue another culture, that culture being the one to criticize hate. It is precisely the belief that racism is objective wrong that allows one to say that “The Paradox” is hateful. That objective value is what has drawn the most fire. Thus, a group could commit ritual murder, clitorectomies, and even slavery, and all could be considered legitimate within the context of the culture. George Reisman wrote:

> It should be realized that those who take this view do not regard as the essential evil of Nazism its avowed irrationalism, its love of force and violence, and its acts of destruction and slaughter. All this they could accept, and do accept in the case of other cultures, such as that of primitive tribes, ancient Egypt, the civilizations of the Aztecs and Incas, the Middle Ages, and Soviet Russia. What they hold to be the evil of Nazism was its assertion that Nazi culture was superior to other cultures. The claim of superiority of one culture over another is the one evil in their eyes. Needless to say, of course, it is only on the basis of the recognition of objective values that one can seriously condemn Nazism—not for its absurd claims of superiority, but as a primitive, barbaric culture of the type one would expect to find among savages (see note 2).

It is then in this sense that if people continue to elevate what is not universally shared, that is, ethnicity, to the level equal to, or above, what is universally shared, i.e., one’s status as an individual, then terror such as Nazism, Stalin’s purges, the Khmer Rouge, or the civil strife in Rwanda must be legitimized because it occurred in the context of a particular culture. If these are legitimized, no claims against any actions that are perceived to be racist can be made. It then follows that groups as a whole cannot claim value to their beliefs and certainly cannot claim equality in any sense. When all becomes culturally relative, and an objective truth about hate has been discarded, then the door of intolerance will have been opened. Let us hope we can only close that door.

Steven Weinberg,
Senior, Political Science, Kent State University

1. Currently, multiculturalism is a trend in education designed around the notion
of inclusion. While many proponents of multiculturalism argue stridently that what is being implemented is not true multiculturalism, nonetheless, what is being imposed across the country in the way of diversity programs, is done under the guise of multiculturalism. It is a philosophy that race and culture are synonymous and that the two color all primary opinions. It is important to note that all multiculturalists view race and culture as a right of inclusion because previously ignored races and cultures provide an alternative opinion. Thus, multiculturalism is racially based.

2. Are You Politically Correct?
*Debating America's Cultural Standards,* Beckwith, Francis J. and Michael E. Bauman, eds., 210-1.
All faith is false,
all faith is true.
Truth is the shattered mirror strewn in myriad bits;
while each believes his little bit the whole to own.

- The Kasidah of Haji Abu El-Yezdi
As the elected leadership of the faculty of Kent State University, the Faculty Senate expresses its deep concern about the publication of “Paradox of European Jewry” by Terry Shropshire in the spring 1994 edition of Uhuru. We find this article to be marked by virulent anti-Semitism and devoid of reasoned argument or responsible scholarship. In our opinion, this article represents a blatant attack upon the values of the University and should not have been published in a periodical which is supported and publicly endorsed by major offices and programs within our institution.

We call upon those who have supported this publication in the past to review its editorial policies with its editors and their advisors before agreeing to provide such support in the future.

Proposed Faculty Senate Resolution- Version 1:

As the elected leadership of the faculty of Kent State University, the Faculty Senate expresses its deep concern about the publication of “Paradox of European Jewry” by Terry Shropshire in the spring 1994 edition of Uhuru. We find this article to be marked by virulent anti-Semitism and devoid of reasoned argument or responsible scholarship. In our opinion, this article represents a blatant attack upon the values of the University and should not have been published in a periodical which is supported and publicly endorsed by major offices and programs within our institution.

We call upon those who have supported this publication in the past to review its editorial policies with its editors and their advisors before agreeing to provide such support in the future.
future.

We call upon our colleagues to strive even more actively than in the past to teach our students the methods and values involved in the scholarly pursuit of truth and commit ourselves to do the same.

-Proposed May 11, 1994
by Senator Kenneth R. Calkin

May 18, 1994

Mr. Robert Johnson, Chair,
Faculty Senate Executive Committee

To The Membership of the Faculty Senate:

A recent article published in the Spring 1994 issue of Uhuru Magazine on the “Paradox of European Jewry,” by Terry Shropshire, has created a controversy which was brought to your attention via a Proposed Senate Resolution during your last meeting of Wednesday, May 11, 1994. I also have been involved with numerous meetings with numerous representatives of concerned individuals and groups in this regard since that time. It is my sincere hope that the following information will aid in resolving this matter.

In my opinion, the impact of this particular article has been exacerbated by the prior events of previous semesters at KSU, since the initial arrival of Leonard Jeffries years ago, followed by Kwame Toure (Stokely Carmichael), and, more recently, Khalid Muhammad.

Some of the more essential points that the resolution addressed and responses to them are listed hereunder:

“The article is marked by virulent anti-Semitism and racism.”
The writer of the article does make reference to the linkages between the Caucasian Race and the Jewish Religion and Culture in Eurasia. The claims by many of this article’s critics are true on this point, and from their perspective, they are justified in expecting a disavowal of these references.
As Faculty Advisor of the Uhuru Magazine, this is not, has never been, and will never be, a viewpoint that is held by myself, or the editorial board, to show intolerance toward, or to denounce the Racial, Ethnic, Cultural, Religious, or Sexual Background of Any Human Group on the Face of this Earth.

“This is a blatant attack on the values of the University” (Diversity). This, in my opinion, is not an attack on the University, but is rather, an individual’s expression of his opinion on the printed pages of a student publication with a long history of publishing a variety of student opinions on many topics. I have been aware of this since 1969, through all of the printed publications of the Black United Students, from the Black Watch and Spectrum newspapers (to which I became Advisor in 1979), to what became the Spectrum, and now the Uhuru Magazines.

Articles in previous issues were often intense, because the magazine has always been a vehicle for the expression of creative literary, poetic, photographic, illustrative, etc., expressions by the various minority populations at KSU.

Due to the fact of institutional racism and other forms of bigotry and hatred that are a part of our larger society, our magazine has allowed for the articulation of perceived or experienced levels of frustration and anger that students have felt, and do feel, toward segments of the society or within its smaller microcosm, the university. We would also accept such articles by anyone that inform or challenge other students, faculty, curricula and course materials which African Americans or other people feel attack, as well as celebrate, their or anyone else’s collective humanity.

“The article is devoid of reasoned argument and responsible scholarship.” President Cartwright, in her recent response to this controversy which was read before the Faculty Senate on Wed., May 11, stated that, “this university has a special obligation to equip students with critical thinking skills and a basic understanding of diversity so that they will be able to function effectively in the workplace and in society, so that they will respect differences while promoting common understandings.” This is the goal that I support with every fiber of my being, because the education that I have received, and which I transmit to all of my students, is based on this goal. I would hope also, that this same position is taken on the part of other faculty in terms of what they teach in the classroom.

There is a constituency, however, in the Black community and elsewhere, whose day-to-day reality is grounded in frustration and anger, very much like the attitude that is embodied in Mr. Shropshire’s words. They are here on this campus
as well. Society has created them, and we as educators can impact and change them, if we can reach them, and teach them, to redirect that anger into knowledge and understanding of TRUTH, that will empower them to become constructive, instead of destructive in their future words and subsequent deeds.

*Uhuru* is a student publication, not a refereed scholarly journal, and it is not a publication of the Department Of Pan-African Studies. Shropshire does not purport himself to be a scholar, nor is his article, in my estimation, written in a traditional scholarly manner. Beyond text and author acknowledgements and occasional page references, there also is no evidence of footnotes or a bibliography. He is a student who in my estimation has read several cited sources in the preparation of this article. The conclusions that he has reached are his own and are not reflective of the collective views of the *Uhuru* staff, the organization of the Black United Students, or the Faculty of the Department of Pan-African Studies.

Here we have a student (who apparently, by the way, attends Akron U.) that submitted an article deemed by some to be devoid of reasoned argument. I personally have not read any of the books that are cited, but in the Black community, there are many who are still bitter from past and present injustices, just as the membership of the Jewish community continues to be, as evidenced by this particular controversy. These other African Americans, however, who in their exposure to these same authors, have reached the same conclusions, and have decided to challenge the past and current misrepresentation of them by society and academia.

I have come to understand that an allegation was also presented to the membership of the Faculty Senate which tended to either directly or indirectly imply that the Department of Pan-African Studies was in some way responsible for “This type of shoddy scholarship,” as evidenced by this article, or some statement to this effect, which led the accuser to some such conclusion. As the Chair of Pan-African Studies, let me state unequivocally that there is no room in our curriculum for acts of bigotry, racism, or intolerance, and whoever has visited our department’s classes or our Cultural Center’s programs would know that this is true, instead of judging us from a distance. We are interested in opening students’ minds, not closing them, and I invite any of you to come and see for yourself.

A group of concerned Faculty and Administrators met with me recently and have written this: *We see in this article a harmful process. It is limited in its scope of the issues, highly selective in its sources, it appeals to a superficial emotional response, it is a highly slanted version of history, and uses fallacious generalizations leading to a continued dependence on stereo-*
types.”

I invite anyone to take this article and disprove it in an empirical and scholarly manner to show that indeed Mr. Shropshire and all of the points that he raised, or the authors/texts he cited were in actuality what your assertions suggest. You have my word as Faculty Advisor, that the next issue of Uhuru Magazine will contain a segment devoted to your responses.

I and the Uhuru staff, as much as you, want to know and share in the TRUTH in our pages. “uhuru,” in Kiswahili means “FREEDOM,” and that’s what truth can do for us all!

Respectfully Submitted,
E. Timothy Moore, Acting Chair, Pan-African Studies
Dr. Alene Barnes-Harden
Dr. Francis Dorsey
Dr. Kwame Nantambu
Dr. Meli Temu

Substitute Resolution- Version 3:

As the elected leadership of the Faculty of Kent State University, the Faculty Senate expresses its deep concern about an increase in intolerance on our campus as well as in society at large. This has been reflected during the past semester by, among other things, anonymous racist flyers which have been distributed across campus, an anti-Gay/Lesbian display in the Student Center, and denigrating depictions of female leaders. Conspicuous among these events has been the publication of “Paradox of European Jewry” by Terry Shropshire in the spring 1994 edition of Uhuru. We find this article to be marked by virulent anti-Semitism and devoid of reasoned argument and serious scholarship. As such, it represents a direct challenge to both the University’s academic values and its commitment to encouraging respect for diversity.

All expressions of bigotry, prejudice, and hatred threaten the peace and well-being of particular members of our commu-
nity. As such, they have no place on our campuses. The tar-
gets of such attacks must know that they do not stand alone.

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate condemns
all such attacks as inconsistent with the values and standards
of the University community. In light of the critical impor-
tance and sensitivity of each of these issues, we call upon all
Faculty members to teach our students the methods and
values involved in the scholarly pursuit of truth and commit
ourselves to do the same.

-Passed July 18, 1994

The following is a Statement for the Record made by Dr. Richard Feinberg
at the conclusion of Faculty Senate’s July 18th meeting:

“I hope we see the resolution as a first step rather than an end
point. Errors in judgment have been highlighted and appropri-
ately censured. Now comes the more difficult and more
important task of learning from our shared experience so that
we can help build empathy and understanding among all
constituencies within the university community.

I particularly wish to thank Acting Chair Tim Moore of the Pan-
African Studies Department for his thoughtful letter and in-per-
son comments to the Senate. I take his comments as an invi-
tation to begin the process of constructive dialogue and
bridge-building which is necessary if we are to heal wounded
sensibilities and minimize the likelihood of similar crises being
repeated. I hope that each of us in his or her own way will
take advantage of the offer and do what we can to make it
work.”
Before addressing this issue, it is imperative that I exonerate all of those that are typically identified as being the culprits behind any and everything that an Afrikan student or Afrikan organization individually does. The intent of this letter is not to express the views of the Department of Pan-African Studies, the executive board of The Black United Students or the editorial staff of *Uhuru* Magazine. I must also say that if for some reason you are offended by this letter, then this letter is most certainly addressed to you, but this is by no means a sweeping indictment. This letter is simply my summation of the events that have transpired as a result of *Uhuru* Magazine’s documented article, “Paradox of European Jewry,” authored by Terry Shropshire. Faculty Senate drafted a ridiculous resolution condemning the article, and a number of other Kent State faculty and staff have proposed an ad called “Campus Campaign for Civil Discourse,” condemning so-called hate speech and writing on our campus. My intent is not to debate how well or how poorly the article was written, but to address this issue, not only locally, but on a larger scale. The article has been said to be anti-Semitic, racist, irresponsible scholarship, devoid of serious and reasonable scholarship, and a blatant attack on the university’s values on diversity. It is interesting for me to see a student literally “do his homework” and present documented material, which has been done many times in the past (the discussion of the Jewish involvement in the Afrikan Holocaust, i.e., European slave trade, is not new) and cause such a tremendous backlash for digging up this history, his history. Incidentally, one doesn’t have far to dig to get this information, it can be found in the university library.

Let us further discuss this resolution and Faculty Senate’s sudden concern over issues that are not relevant to the purpose of Faculty Senate. The resolution states that the article is “marked with virulent anti-Semitism.” Really? Well, maybe the resolution should condemn the anti-Semitic Jews that provided most of the research done to complete the article and most other scholarly research on the subject. I call them anti-Semitic to be facetious, of course, but to call them anti-Semitic is just as ridiculous as to call the article anti-Semitic. Why is it racist or anti-Semitic for Afrikan people to discuss their own history? Don’t we have that right? The truth is some European Jews participated in our
Holocaust. It is an issue that has been researched time and time again, showing the same results. If this university is truly committed to diversity, which I believe it not to be, but for the sake of argument let’s just say, this university must first deal with truth, because there can be no diversity without it.

Intolerance, please! This proposed ad as well as Faculty Senate’s resolution is a joke. And I suggest that it is racist for these reasons: Faculty Senate and most other faculty and staff are unqualified to accurately and truthfully say that the information in this article or any other publication indicating Jewish involvement in our holocaust is inaccurate. What Faculty Senate calls intolerance on Uhuru’s behalf, I call ignorance on theirs. Ignorance does not even elude the President of this university, for she also made similar uneducated comments in regards to the article.

This is a very touchy subject among European Jews and Judeophiles, but let us reason with one another (deja vu) to discuss this relevant issue; in the Afrikan community, it is not an attack on Jews but a well researched issue that draws this painful conclusion, that is, painful to some Jews, I would suspect, considering the harassment that Uhuru has publicly received. If an article was written in Uhuru regarding some Afrikans’ involvement in the enslavement of their own people, which is another issue being discussed in the Afrikan community, would the article be condemned by Faculty Senate for being anti-Afrikan, or would Faculty Senate even care? I think not to both. As long as Afrikans stick solely to discussing themselves, the magazine would be just fine, but the minute an Afrikan discusses the forbidden truths and discusses non-Afrikan Jews, they want to condemn it. Most of the faculty and staff wouldn’t even know what Uhuru was, had the article not been written. Secondly, this university has a history of problems, needless to say, which far outweigh this exaggerated issue. There has been racism on this campus since the first Afrikan set foot on it, and it still exists today. Why has Faculty Senate singled out this issue. Faculty Senate as well as the supporters of the advertisement ignorantly labeled Shropshire’s piece racist. Fine, but let us be consistent. Since Faculty Senate has changed its focus and taken on the responsibility of stamping out racism and anti-Semitism, it should stamp it out everywhere. It should identify everyone who is responsible for acts of so-called racism, anti-Semitism and intolerance, and not just make reference to them in a racist resolution and advertisement.

You have so boldly identified Uhuru; let us identify everyone. As homophobic and racist as other students have been and continue to be,
why not call them to the carpet? Perhaps because they are some of your own. Faculty Senate is not concerned with a pursuit of truth, as they claim in their resolution. If they were, they would be well read on the subject and not condemn the article based on their ignorance. All of a sudden they’ve become experts on the Afrikan Holocaust. Yeah, right. Faculty Senate acted inappropriately as ignorant racists, and other faculty, staff, and administrators are nothing more than bureaucratic hypocrites, who are no more interested in diversity than Faculty Senate. Label us intolerant—how dare you? You are the ones who refuse to seek the truth or even consider opposing “opinions,” no matter how factual or documented those “opinions” might be.

In conclusion, I condemn Faculty Senate and every single supporter of this deceitful “Campus Crusade for Civil Discourse” for this act of racism, as well as all who have inappropriately named Uhuru, PAS, and BUS as anti-Semitic or racist. Furthermore, I would suggest to Faculty Senate that the next time you decide to condemn Uhuru, perhaps you may want to invite the editorial staff, who is autonomous from the Black United Students executive board, to discuss the issue rather than condemn us behind our backs. Let us stop this ludicrous talk about some mythical diversity that is supposedly the goal of this university. We must deal with the truth first, which may lead to tolerance, and then diversity just might follow... On second thought, why don’t you get another buzz-word and pretend that this university is something else that it is not. 

Uhuru magazine is a vehicle for Afrikans to express themselves, and no resolution or advertisement could ever suppress the thoughts and beliefs of the Afrikan community at this university, for we just would not allow it.

Adisa A. Alkebulan,  
Senior, Pan-African Studies
In response to the Uhuru controversy, the following full-page advertisement appeared in the Daily Kent Stater on October 12, 1994, followed by the signatures of 300 members of the Kent State University faculty and administration.

Campus Campaign for Civil Discourse

As members of the University community with professional commitments to sound scholarship, civil discourse, and a tolerant campus environment, we want to publicly express our distress with the increasing violation of these values on campuses across the country including our own. A case in point is the blatantly anti-Semitic article, “Paradox of European Jewry”, which appeared in the Spring, 1994 issue of Uhuru, a Kent State University student publication.

Many questions have been raised about how we can and should think about and respond to such discourse on our campus. The President and Faculty Senate have already replied with public statements and resolutions which we applaud. As concerned faculty, staff, and members of campus ministry at Kent, we propose to elaborate on their efforts by addressing in greater detail five of the critical issues which have been raised vis-a-vis this article, the scholarship and point of view it reflects, and the appropriateness of the forum in which it appeared.

1. Aren’t writings and opinions such as those expressed in the Uhuru article protected by the First Amendment? Although agencies of government under First Amendment rights can not prevent the publication of such material, journal advisors can make editorial staffs sensitive to the issues involved and journal editors can choose to publish or not to publish submitted articles. If the decision to publish is made, journal editors can exercise the additional option of disclaiming and/or rebutting scholarly indefensible or offensive material.

Once defamatory speech from any source enters the public arena, as it did in this instance, it is the obligation of all members of the University community to identify it for what it is and condemn its ugly presence on our campus. Special vigilance is indicated when
the harmful product is packaged in a publication bearing the University’s logo, where it inevitably reflects on the entire institution and those who help fund the journal’s public distribution.

2. Isn’t this article simply the misguided opinion of a young student engaged in the learning process associated with writing for a student publication? Furthermore, haven’t we all been exposed to far more virulent extremist statements than those made in this article? The primary challenge for the reader remains the message and not the messenger. We cannot abdicate the obligation to expose faulty pseudo-academic methodology or shirk the responsibility of denouncing the point of view espoused by the article.

How inaccurate or intolerant does an article have to be to warrant a strong and direct public denunciation? In the context of our University’s repeated and public avowal of high standards of both scholarship and sensitivity to diversity and given the University forum in which the article appeared, we believe the language is beyond any reasonable doubt sufficiently erroneous and strident to warrant alarm and condemnation.

3. Is the Uhuru article any more serious than hateful name-calling or epithets scribbled on campus walls? It is more insidious and therefore more dangerous. Defamatory graffiti is immediately identifiable as the hate speech it is. The article presents itself in scholarly format, claims objectivity, and takes on the guise of the legitimacy conferred by appearance in a University sponsored publication. The text includes token conciliatory remarks that give it a deceptive split personality and the arguments put forward stake out a position of simply presenting “the facts”. The proverbial wolf in sheep’s clothing is a special threat to an open University community.

4. Isn’t the Uhuru article a legitimate expression of frustration and rage against racism and exploitation? No. Racism and exploitation are real problems which require solutions. Such answers can not emerge from writings or speech which simply turn on others and demonize them as members of individual ethnic or religious groups. Nor will solutions to current
problems evolve from historical distortions or fabricated conspiracies. Offensive comments like the ones included in this article drive a wedge between those allied in the fight for social justice. Wittingly or unwittingly, such writing does the work of hate groups in our society.

5. **Doesn’t the article in question facilitate opportunities for “education” and “dialogue”?**

The opposite conclusion more accurately reflects the experiences many of us have had as we find that hurtful language creates polarization, suspicion, and mistrust among University colleagues, making dialogue more difficult. Furthermore, articles such as the one in question pose a peculiar educational dilemma. Refuting them point by point elevates an inflammatory and academically indefensible article to the level of a serious scholarly document. Not responding opens the door to claims that silence confirms the validity of the data and charges as presented. However we choose to respond to this difficult problem, the moral and educational message we must transmit is that articles of this kind are unworthy and unwelcome in a diverse academic community such as ours.

Fractured civil discourse is difficult to mend. We conclude that healing begins when we agree as a community that our University’s commitment to diversity means that public pronouncements from whatever source and especially in University-sponsored forums, will be judged by a single standard: does it defame a group of people because of their race, ethnicity, religion, sex, sexual orientation, or physical limitations? If so, it is unacceptable and will be treated as a threat to the legitimate mission of our University: to create an environment which encourages civil and scholarly discourse and promotes a tolerant and healthy academic campus environment.
PAN-AFRICAN FACULTY AND STAFF ASSOCIATION RESOLUTION

The Pan-African Faculty and Staff Association (PAFSA) is opposed to bigotry and condemns all of its many manifestations. While this is one of the basic principles of the organization, PAFSA also encourages the intellectual freedom of students to engage in inquiry. In addition, PAFSA recognizes the essential developmental nature of acquiring a critical and cautious approach to assimilating and disseminating information. Therefore, students as well as seasoned scholars may arrive at conclusions which are unpopular and poorly grounded. Hence, to reprimand a student’s effort at formulating an opinion in the exercise of pursuing academic freedom is detrimental and counterproductive to the mission of higher education.

During the recent controversies surrounding the publication of Terry Shropshire’s “Paradox of European Jewry,” Uhuru 6/4 (Spring 1994): 34-37, 42, a great number of mean-spirited exchanges occurred. PAFSA urges a moratorium on these bitter exchanges. In order to build community, form alliances, and create spaces for safe debate, PAFSA calls for multiple dialogues. Such actions would allow for examination of the specificity, parallels, and intersections of Jewish and African oppression in the diaspora.

An essential component of community building is recognizing differences and taking risks to challenge and support them as a process toward mutual understanding and respect.

PEACE,
Pan-African Faculty and Staff Association
Executive Board

-Passed October 13, 1994
WHEREAS: The Kent State University Administrative Code, rule 3342-4-31, paragraphs (D)(1) & (2) states, "(1) A university is a forum for the scrutiny and exchange of ideas. Therefore, the university encourages student organizations and university departments to invite speakers to the campus. (2) Registered student organizations and university departments must register all off-campus speakers with the scheduling office in order to assure orderly calendaring and to facilitate the event. The scheduling office shall establish operational procedures to accomplish this purpose but such procedures shall not impose limitations based upon the subjects to be discussed, or the background, or the past associations of the speakers," and;

WHEREAS: It is with great pride and honor that Kent State University's Black Graduate Students Association recognizes Kent State University’s Black United Students and the Uhuru Magazine in their attempts to expose the Kent State University community to ideals and ideas of a diversified nature, and;

WHEREAS: Black United Students and the Uhuru Magazine commit to serving and unifying the Kent State University Community by presenting educational, social, and cultural programs, and;

WHEREAS: Black United Students and the Uhuru Magazine initiate appropriate actions by addressing relevant issues in hopes of eliminating or reducing impediments to Kent State University students, now

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: We, the Black Graduate Students Association, with great cogency, support Black United Students and the Uhuru Magazine and their inalienable right to exercise the First Amendment of the United States of America.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: This Association confirms our stance in support of Black United Students and the Uhuru Magazine duly receiving all rights and privileges in accordance with University policy.

-Passed October 13, 1994
...There is much trouble in the village.
many of our elders are the living dead among us.
i see fear in their spirits and echoes in their empty thoughts.
when i encountered the beast,
there was no one there to protect me,
but i saw the ghost of my sullen elders
shaking their heads below the horizon,
as if they were afraid to rise above it.
which one of these shiftless entities has been my chief?
and why has not she guided me in my misguided youth.
are the children of the village being punished by our silent council of elders.
for now,
we must fend for ourselves.
but i will not curse those elders who abandoned their warrior children,
but pray to our God that their consciences find peace and pray to our God that we remain on our journey of constant struggle,
and one day feast on the fruits of our tedious labor.
Speaking of Paradox

Christina McVay

Amid all the commotion at Kent State last spring over Terry Shropshire's article, "Paradox of European Jewry," I fear many of us educated white folks are missing the forest for the trees. Early on, there was some talk about the University or Faculty Senate imposing some sort of direct or indirect censorship of whatever comes out of the Department of Pan-African Studies. Shutting up those people over there would appear to be the simplest way of getting rid of the problem; but aside from the fact that censorship is probably unconstitutional, it does not look very good. So a group calling itself the Campus Campaign for Civil Discourse bought a two-page ad in The Daily Kent Stater in order to censure the publication. To censure means to officially rebuke or blame, or to severely criticize or condemn.

Neither approach will solve the problem, because both ignore the bigger picture. Anyone who pays any attention to the black press in this country knows that this particular article was pretty tame. Shropshire, after all, attempted some balance by emphasizing that the Jewish Holocaust was a terrible episode in modern history. (I hasten to add that I was dismayed by the obviously inaccurate historical references and appalled by his characterization of Judaism as a "gutter religion," as I would be if any of my Jewish friends were to so label Islam—in any of its forms.) My point is that while we can, one way or another, ban this sort of writing from our campus, we can neither ban it from the black press nor banish this sort of thinking from the minds of black Americans. And while many blacks do not
buy into it, the numbers of those who do would surely astonish many of us. Furthermore, I suspect that censuring the article—and by extension, the Department of Pan-African Studies—will add to the numbers of blacks who do buy into it, as condemnation will only strengthen the "siege mentality" that has always existed to one degree or another—and with good reason—in Black America.

The big question (albeit the harder one) is why significant numbers of blacks are thinking and writing these things. This is a tough, tough question, to which I can only offer a few ideas based on my own experiences and observations. But it all boils down to the pervasive and longstanding ignorance of whites (including Jews) regarding the black experience, and, more importantly, the refusal to acknowledge that there is much in that experience worth learning. In a PBS special, the Italian poet and Jewish survivor of Ausschwitz, Primo Levi, spoke of how, many years after the war, Germans would ask where he had learned such good German and then walk away when he answered, "The concentration camp." Levi commented, "The most infuriating thing was that they didn’t want to know. . . ." Yet many of us (and an even greater number of our white students) roll our eyes at the subject of the oppression of blacks in our own country, as if to say, "Oh, God, here we go again. Why don’t they just stop complaining and get on with their lives? Besides, it’s all over and done with. It was a long time ago—and we weren’t even there—so they should just drop it."

What if this were a typical response to the subject of the Jewish experience? And why isn’t it? I ask this because it seems to me that, as crude or petty as it appears on the surface, the victimization issue is at the core of what many of us want to call black anti-Semitism. (We should note, by the way, that blacks do not argue there was no Jewish Holocaust. That’s white skinhead territory. Blacks do not deny that Jews have been horrifically persecuted—they know all too well what white Anglo-Saxon types are capable of.) I have seen "dialogues" between Jews and blacks break down into arguments over who has suffered more. To me, as a descendant of the oppressors of both peoples, such arguments can appear downright silly, but let’s think about it from the
black perspective: Why does the U.S. now have a National Holocaust Museum but no national museum dedicated to the people upon whose backs this country was quite literally built? (And if we did have one, would throngs of Americans visit it, as they do the museum in Washington?) Why do taxpayers say nothing about the billions of dollars we send to Israel every year but begrudge every dollar that goes to inner-city schools? Why had six out of the twenty white students in one of my classes last spring seen “Schindler’s List” while none had seen “Malcolm X,” which had been in the theaters a few months longer? Why are Jews called the Chosen People? And does that mean that their suffering counts for more than that of blacks? Why is the Jewish Holocaust treated with awe and respect, while the African Holocaust is passed over as though it is insignificant? In short, why do we believe we must remember the gas chamber but not the auction block?

Moreover, from the black perspective, it surely seems the ultimate paradox that American Jews—acknowledged victims—are living very well these days, while it’s no secret that our black community is wrestling with a myriad of very serious problems (and being blamed for them, too). When Henry Louis Gates spoke here last spring, he alluded to the negative repercussions of integration, which obviously took some of us educated whites in the audience by surprise. Again, we are guilty of not paying attention to what blacks have been thinking. They have been re-evaluating the civil rights movement for quite a while, and, yes, some are skeptical now about the motives behind Jewish participation in that movement. Personally, I am attracted to the values and aims of the civil rights movement and its leaders, but who am I—who are we—to tell blacks they must adhere to those values and aims—or to tell them anything else, especially regarding their own interests? The days of whites telling blacks what to think, if they ever really existed, are long gone. From a black perspective, it seems that “... the white academy fears the loss of control over black intellectual progress. Afrocentrists are concerned with freeing black minds from Eurocentric hegemony. ... Because some black people are intelligent enough to listen to white scholars with skepticism, white academe is
forced to run to people like Henry Louis Gates, Jr., and others to serve as mouthpieces for the chastisement of Afrocentrists... (Marlon M. Bailey, Fellow, Macalester College, St. Paul, in a letter to the editor of The Chronicle of Higher Education, 4-27-94)

I believe there is resentment against Jews among members of the black community, although I'm not convinced that it is any more heartfelt than resentment against whites in general. Furthermore, to the extent that it exists, we should have seen it coming several years ago when blacks appropriated the term “holocaust” to refer to the transformation of the African continent into a source of brute labor for the white man. But, as usual, we weren’t paying attention.

Out of this resentment and, yes, anger, has come a desire to reveal Jews as more than simply long-suffering victims, but as victimizers as well. There is clearly exaggeration in Shropshire’s article. While it is probable that some Jews were involved in the slave trade and that some were slave-owners, population numbers alone indicate that major Jewish responsibility for the African Holocaust is quite unlikely. I fear that dubious distinction belongs forever to my people.

An integral part of Jewish history is pride in their rich traditions and heritage, as well as in the central role they have played in Western Civilization in the accumulation of knowledge (i.e., the basis for empowerment in the modern world). That is as it should be, for in the worst of circumstances, these have served as sources of the strength necessary for survival and resilience. On the other hand, when blacks were stolen from Africa, their traditions and heritage were quickly (and intentionally) stripped from them, and they were denied by law access to the white man’s knowledge. As Frederick Douglass stressed in his Narrative of a Slave, the key to the white man’s power over blacks was to keep them in “mental darkness,” or, as others have called it, “perpetual childhood”: ignorant of their own past, blind to the possibilities of any sort of future, and dependent on the white man. We whites like to think that we fought the Civil War in great part to free the slaves. But what we actually did at the end of that war was leave five million or so illiterate human beings to their own devices—with no capital in a capitalist
economy. Can we call that freedom? We promised each male adult 40 acres and a mule, then even reneged on that. And as if that weren’t bad enough, we enacted laws designed to further deny the great multitudes of blacks access to knowledge (i.e., the key to power) and, hence, much likelihood of gaining any capital.

In A Man’s Life, black journalist Roger Wilkins wrote regarding his own education in the 1940s, “the Supreme Court was still contorting itself to carry out the separate-but-equal facade mandated by the late-nineteenth-century decision in Plessy v. Ferguson.” Any educated person today recognizes that separate-but-equal schools were an ugly joke; the Supreme Court declared them as much in 1954. Still, it is debatable how much good that did. When I was in grade school here in Portage County in the late fifties, we white folks were pleased to say we never played the separate-but-equal game. Black students always went to school with whites here. Nevertheless, I clearly remember being a bit jealous of the three or four black kids who were always in my classes, because they never got called on and never had to do math problems at the board.

As long as they didn’t disturb the class, virtually nothing was expected of them. At the time, I thought they were pretty lucky. In junior high, I had no classes with blacks, because by then they had been tracked into the “slow classes.” Years later I realized that this was in reality nothing more than neglect and indifference, not just on the part of the teachers but the system as a whole. In short, most blacks my age did not have equal access to education, and, hence, its rewards. And while some black youth in America today do receive good (or at least adequate) educations, I can’t imagine anyone really believing that what we’re giving kids in inner-city, predominately-black schools is an education. Yet after centuries of denying black Americans knowledge of the world around them and, more importantly, knowledge of themselves and the African heritage they have every right to, we have the audacity to shake our heads and wonder why blacks are embracing Afrocentrism and writing ugly things about us!

I was truly taken aback several years ago when it was made clear to me that blacks were so tired of butting their heads against the door to west-
ern education, that, once they decided to cast off that “perpetual childhood” by re-invigorating their own heritage, they didn’t care whether we approved or not. Of course, Langston Hughes announced this “new” attitude decades ago in his essay, “The Negro and the Racial Mountain”: “We younger Negro artists who create now intend to express our individual dark-skinned selves without fear or shame. If white people are pleased, we are glad. If they are not, it doesn’t matter...” Of course, most of us weren’t listening to him either. White America has little choice now, since we have blown all kinds of opportunities to do the right thing, but to accept that there is coming a new black America, created for blacks by blacks, both out of and despite our neglect. Personally, I congratulate them on their hard-won independence of the mind.

According to a book club ad, a new book, The Holocaust in Historical Context by Stephen T. Katz, “compares the Holocaust to other instances of persecution” and proves that the former was “phenomenologically unique.” There is no question in my mind that this attempt to commit genocide against an entire people was unique in the history of the world. But I would add that white America’s ongoing efforts to keep black America “in mental darkness” is also a uniquely horrendous instance of persecution, perhaps especially because—though there were and are notable exceptions—those efforts by and large worked. And the whole nation will pay—is paying, in myriad ways—for the welcome mat our forefathers neglected to put out after emancipation, as well as for that mule they refused to give up.

Given this backdrop, the notable exceptions mentioned above—those blacks who have managed to hurdle the barriers—have to be recognized for what they were and are: truly extraordinary human beings. Several white colleagues, including a few Jews, have asked me in recent months, “Why don’t these blacks quit picking on Jews and put their own houses in order? They should be working to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps, just like ________” [fill in the name of any notable black exception]. In his book, Race Matters, Cornel West writes,
tires hardly exist. They rarely, if ever, examine the innumerable cases in which black people do act on the Protestant ethic and still remain at the bottom of the social ladder. Instead, they highlight the few instances in which blacks ascend to the top, as if such success is available to all blacks, regardless of circumstances. Such a vulgar rendition of Horatio Alger in blackface may serve as a source of inspiration to some... But it cannot serve as a substitute for serious historical and social analysis...

Conservative behaviorists also discuss black culture as if acknowledging one's obvious victimization by white supremacist practices... is taboo. They tell black people to see themselves as agents, not victims... [C]omforting advice, a nice cliche for downtrodden people. But inspirational slogans cannot substitute for substantive historical and social analysis. While black people have never been simply victims, wallowing in self-pity and begging for white giveaways, they have been—and are—victimized. Therefore, to call on black people to be agents makes sense only if we also examine the dynamics of this victimization against which their agency will, in part, be exercised. What is particularly naive and peculiarly vicious about the conservative behavioral outlook is that it tends to deny the lingering effect of black history—a history inseparable from though not reducible to victimization. (13-4)

This brings my argument full circle: if we educated white folks had been paying any attention to “the dynamics of this victimization,” we would have seen that “their agency” would most logically be exercised through a phenomenon like Afrocentrism. Allow me to add, while Shropshire’s article is indeed a product of Afrocentrism, that does not mean all Afrocentrists agree with everything he says. Their attitudes are as varied as are those of Western scholars.

Difficult as it may be, I am convinced that these are the kinds of things we must bring ourselves to talk about. These are emotional issues, but none of us should allow our emotions to guide our responses. Some readers may think I have simply made excuses for some very reprehensible behavior. So be it. I have tried to shed some light on why we are now seeing these things. For white readers who have followed me this far, the logical question is, how should we respond? First and foremost, we must listen—even to things about ourselves we don’t like—and then be willing to discuss (and, yes, argue) the issues in a truly civil manner. But to do that, we whites in particular must be willing to take a look at ourselves from the other fellow’s perspective and then to make some needed changes in ourselves.

60 Spring 1995
As it stands now, many of us educated white folks are still lying to ourselves and to our students about our past. We hold up those “notable exceptions” as examples of what all blacks could do, if they’d just try a little harder (many blacks hear behind those words “if they would just play the game our way”). Still worse, we allow our students (and ourselves?) to believe that most white Americans were and are good people who have always supported and stood up for equal rights. The truth of the matter is, while those few who really hated joined the KKK or some such group, most “good white folks” were and are indifferent to what has been happening (and not happening) to blacks in this country. I remind you, in closing, of Elie Wiesel’s words: “The opposite of love is not hate, but indifference.” Our nation, especially those of us in education, must take steps to ensure that no more generations of Americans of any color are allowed to pass through our educational system without gaining the same reverence and respect for the black experience that most of us have for the Jewish experience. It is the very least we owe them.

Christina McVay,
Instructor, English; Instructor,
German, Kent State University
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Jews, Africans, and Human Liberation: Reflections on Terry Shropshire’s “Paradox of European Jewry”

Dr. Richard Feinberg

More than a semester has gone by since Terry Shropshire’s publication of “The Paradox of European Jewry.” Still the controversy rages in full force. The discussion has been painful for all parties; emotions have been frayed, and tempers periodically have flared. Nonetheless, the Kent community owes Shropshire and Uhuru a debt of gratitude for raising important issues and forcing us to talk about them openly. The views he articulates are held by others, and to confine them to private conversations in dormitory rooms, apartments, street corners, and hallways will not make them disappear. Only if they are confronted publicly and honestly might we resolve the animosities to which the essay gives expression.

The article has called forth cries of protest from a variety of quarters. But while indignation at Shropshire’s incendiary language is understandable, the sound and fury obscures complex problems. Critics have focused on the accuracy of Shropshire’s statements, but few have asked what he was trying to accomplish. (The answer is not self-evident.) Nor do they question why, along with many other African Americans, he accepts so readily and repeats with such conviction negative portrayals of whites in general, and Jews in particular. To attribute this to “reverse racism” or “anti-Semitism” does not address the question; rather, it substitutes a label for an explanation. Unless animosity toward whites and Jews is biologically inherited (and there is no credible evidence for such a proposition), it must be explained in terms of life experiences. And if this is true, then the solution will demand exposure to a different set of life experiences.
WHAT WAS SHROPSHIRE HOPING TO ACCOMPLISH?

The "Paradox of European Jewry" itself is paradoxical. Shropshire's objective as stated in his final paragraph is laudable: "to reconcile the differences between Africans and Jews" (p. 42). Moreover, he opens his essay with a ringing condemnation of the Nazi holocaust, characterizing it as "a crime that can never be forgotten, and we must all ensure that something like this is never repeated" (p. 34). Yet, the bulk of the essay consists of just the kinds of accusation that the Nazis used to justify their persecution of Jews, portraying them as a monolithic, immensely wealthy group which amassed its wealth by cheating and exploiting others. To this he adds that Jews were major players in the genocide directed against Africans and Native Americans. Furthermore, he makes his case in terms that are insulting and provocative. In one striking passage, Shropshire asks rhetorically, "Do the Caucasian Jews only take care of themselves and continue to discard, and defile, and trash, and defecate on the rest of the world?" (p. 37). He answers with the following advice: "Don't be fooled by the facades and affectations, for they have not behaved like friends or benevolent allies to African, Arab or Native-American people. These are the works of those who should be described as enemies of our people, our struggle, our children, and our future" (p. 37).

This hardly is the kind of language calculated to "reconcile differences," and far from ensuring that the holocaust will never be repeated, it engenders just those feelings that created it. One might infer from this apparent contradiction that Shropshire was dishonest about his intentions. I prefer to think that he was trying to enunciate some genuine concerns, and that a combination of frustration, anger, and reliance on a less-than-balanced reading list made him oblivious to the emotional impact that his words would carry. But what might he have meant if not a mindless, neo-fascist anti-Semitic diatribe?

First, I would remind white readers of the systematic racism, oppression, and discrimination suffered by Africans and African Americans at the hands of Europeans for the past 400 years. The nature of the oppression has changed a great deal over that time, but even in the 1990s, it remains a fact of life. African Americans continue to be plagued by prejudice, insult, ridicule, suspicion, deficient health care, shoddy education, and myriad forms of economic discrimination. No one, therefore, ought to be surprised that many evince anger at the dominant society. Not all whites are
guilty of discrimination, but given the experience of many African Americans, it is often prudent to anticipate the worst. As an American of predominantly European ancestry, I dislike being accused of racist attitudes and acts by people who don’t know me. But I understand why others feel the way they do, and were our positions reversed, I can’t guarantee that I would be more gracious than is Shropshire. Given the history of race relations in America, the burden of proof of good intentions should not be on those of African descent.

Jews have also suffered much oppression through the course of history, and like African Americans, many have become extremely sensitive to perceived slights. Furthermore, Jews and blacks have often shared the same oppressors: according to both Nazis and the Ku Klux Klan, there is little difference between Africans and Jews. What seems to bother Shropshire is that some Jews call upon historical oppression as a license for self-righteous indignation, and they are sometimes so caught up in their own suffering that they fail to notice when their actions injure others. I have heard comments from Jews regarding Arabs (and occasionally blacks or other peoples of color) that are as blindly hostile as the most offensive passages in Shropshire’s essay.

This is not to say that all Jews are narrow-minded bigots. Many have supported liberation movements here and elsewhere. Some have risked, and even sacrificed, their personal well-being to promote the cause of civil rights. But Jews are no more homogeneous than any other group. Jews I have known, and known of, include some of the greatest scoundrels and most brilliant heroes of the struggle for a humane world.

HOW ACCURATE IS SHROPShIRE’S PORTRAIT OF “EUROPEAN JEWS?”

For the most part, I will leave discussion of historical details to historians and focus upon logical and anthropological issues. (For a useful overview of some of the historical arguments and literature, see Cudjoie 1994; Davis 1994. Calkins [this volume] provides a careful assessment of Shropshire’s sources and the accuracy of his quotes.) There are, however, many points at which the several lines of argument converge.

Perhaps the essay’s greatest fault is its propensity to generalize about “Caucasians,” “Jews,” or “Caucasian Jews.” For example, Shropshire says that “Jews have exercised an inordinate or disproportionate role in the decimation, defilement, cultural colonization, enslavement and genocide of many
of the world’s people up until today” (p. 34). He claims that “Jews amassed large fortunes in dealing in Christian slaves” (p. 35). He asks rhetorically, “Or don’t the Jews speak out unless one of their own is attacked or affected?” (p. 37). And he asserts “that the international Caucasian Jewish community will never speak out against the misconduct, impropriety, or malfeasance of any of the members of the Jewish race or religion” (p. 37).

Although Shropshire carefully avoids the claim that all Jews were involved in the slave trade or “amassed large fortunes,” his wording implies that most were and did; that this was the rule and not the exception. His assertion that Jews never criticize each other is even more categorical.

The fact, however, is that any generalization about a group encompassing millions of people is bound to be wrong. There undoubtedly were Jews involved in the slave trade. Clearly, some Jews have become quite wealthy. Historically, perhaps, some even became rich through participation in the slave trade. Those involved deserve to be repudiated by anyone concerned with human justice. On the other hand, it seems unlikely that Jews played a major role in the slave trade if for no other reason than that they always were a small proportion of the European population, and through much of history, they were a pariah group, living on the fringes of society.

The slave trade was a hideous business, and all participants were guilty of a crime against humanity. That is the case regardless of their religious or ethnic identity and how representative (or non-representative) they were of their respective communities. But they deserve to be condemned because of what they did, not for who they were. Conversely, our admiration for the civil rights workers murdered thirty years ago during Mississippi’s Freedom Summer should be neither raised nor lowered by the acts of others who may have shared some of their religious convictions.

Shropshire indicts “the Jews” not only for the slave trade but decimation of Native Americans. Thus, he cites the case of Jeffrey Amherst, a supposedly Jewish British military commander during the “French and Indian War,” who distributed small pox-infected blankets to the Ottowa (p. 36). As in much of what he writes, Shropshire calls attention to a loathsome chapter in our history but draws spurious conclusions.

Amherst may have been responsible for the first intentional use of biological warfare in world history. His actions ought to be condemned by every person with a shred of social consciousness. One may
justly question who were the real “savages” in European/Indian encounters on this continent. And his story raises telling questions about European arrogance in dealing with non-Western peoples.

On the other hand, it seems unlikely that a British lord and military commander during the mid-18th Century was Jewish. Nor does the name Amherst indicate a Jewish background. Granted, names can be deceiving. But even if he were Jewish, it would neither make his actions more nor less detestable. And to hold all Jews accountable for Amherst’s misdeeds is equivalent to prosecuting every African American because a black man shot a group of white commuters last year on the Long Island Railroad.

Shropshire’s claims that “After 1550, many of the [Spanish] conquistadors were Jewish” (p. 35) and “Caucasian Jews outnumbered their Caucasian Christian brethren in the number of slaves owned by almost two to one” (p. 36) are similarly implausible, and the conclusions he draws from these “facts,” even were they true, are based on the same dubious logic.

I agree with some of Shropshire’s criticisms of Israeli foreign policy. But Israel’s harsh treatment of Palestinians, as well as its support of South Africa’s (former) white minority government and other repressive regimes around the world, is hardly secret. Not all Jews are Zionists, and I have known many Jews who are appalled by Israel’s role in world affairs.

Shropshire recites charges that the Anti-Defamation League engaged in spying on black leaders during the 1950s and 1960s. In fact, there is evidence to implicate the ADL in spying on white liberals and radicals as well as blacks (King and Berlet 1993). Any group at times can become overzealous and misguided, and the ADL is by no means immune to this danger. However, to dismiss support of “the Jewish community” for the Civil Rights Movement as a “magnificent and spectacular facade and veneer” (p. 37) is an insult to those who gave their time, energy, and resources, who went to jail, and in some cases gave their lives in the pursuit of human liberation.

In a somewhat different vein, Shropshire invokes Michael Bradley to try to demonstrate a biological basis for European imperialism and militarism. According to Shropshire, Bradley “reveals the anthropological data to support the theory that the collective Caucasoid . . . have a predisposition for extreme violence and aggression, and have a higher level of psychosexual maladaptation which manifests itself through racism, sexism, and aggressive
behavior.” This supposedly is the result of having evolved in Europe during the last “ice age,” in addition, he asserts that “the Caucasian Jews are also the descendants of these people of the caves (better known as the Neanderthals)” (p. 35).

As a professional anthropologist, these assertions strike me as bizarre. Anthropological data reveal that psychological differences among groups of people are due almost entirely to cultural, not biological factors. Mental capacity has no demonstrable connection to complexion. In fact many anthropologists are now convinced that race, as a biological category, does not exist. (As a cultural category, it obviously does.) Modern Europeans may or may not be descended in part from Neanderthals; anthropologists continue to debate whether Neanderthals became extinct or were absorbed into other human populations. But however that debate concludes, we have little knowledge of Neanderthal behavior and still less of their psychology. Suffice it to say that every continent has had its share of violent, aggressive, maladjusted individuals. Fortunately, all regions also have had those who were and are cooperative, considerate, sociable, and empathetic.

In this respect, Shropshire’s assertion that “the international Caucasian Jewish community will never speak out against the misconduct, impropriety, or malfeasance of any of the members of the Jewish race . . . “ (p. 37) takes on special significance. Contrary to Nazi propaganda, and the view of even some Jews, there is no “Jewish race.” Aside from modern challenges to the scientific value of the race concept itself, Judaism consists in a set of beliefs and practices that are passed on through the process of cultural learning. It is not a biological characteristic. There is no Jewish gene or set of genes. As Shropshire acknowledges, some Jews are African, some Semitic, some Caucasian. Were one to search, it would undoubtedly be possible to find Jews in East, South, and Southeast Asia, and among Native Americans. Moreover, Shropshire claims that European Jews are descendants of “Russian-steppe tribesmen” (p. 35), some (but not all) of whom converted. If that is true, then Jews and many non-Jews share similar genetic makeup, and they cannot be biologically distinguished.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Perhaps the most important lesson to emerge from this discussion is that all groups are made up of individuals who vary in personality as well as social and moral sense. Therefore, we would
do well to evaluate each other as individuals rather than as members of large, undifferentiated groups.

Further, we all should avoid the trap of vying for the title of The Most Oppressed. Each community is predisposed to feel its own oppression as the worst. I have heard claims to this “honor” from gay activists and women as well as blacks, Jews, and assorted other groups; and each offers plausible arguments in support of its position. But to the extent that we can all refrain from fighting over who has suffered most and support each other in the quest for justice and equality, everyone should benefit.

In addition, I would say to African Americans that I can understand why you might find it difficult to trust persons of European ancestry. Given your experience, we have little standing to insist that you trust us. *I can only ask that you give us a chance to earn your confidence.* Still, it is worth remembering the words of Reverend Ben Chavis as recently recorded in Nation of Islam newspaper *The Final Call*. There Chavis, then Director of the NAACP, observed:

Today, Black Americans celebrate the memories of both Malcolm and Martin, despite their different approaches in the fight for racial equality. . . . One also cannot forget the vital contribution made by the Jewish community to the civil rights movement. There has been a long and honorable alliance that should continue between the Black American and Jewish communities. (Chavis 1994:25)

At the same time, I would call on whites, and particularly Jews, to avoid over-reaction. Yes, many blacks are angry at you, and in some cases their assessment is perhaps unfair. But in the contemporary United States, they also have little institutional power and limited opportunity to cause you serious injury. I’d be more concerned about the equally virulent anti-Semitism expressed by former president Richard Nixon in the recently released *Haldeman Diaries* (Haldeman 1994), to which I have heard surprisingly little response. While Nixon is no longer with us, others sharing his opinion of both Jews and blacks are still around and in positions of real power. They pose a threat to both groups, and both are well advised to join together in resistance.
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We have said repeatedly at Kent State University that we want to build community. We have said we are committed to cultural diversity. Yet how did we behave when the controversy erupted over the *Uhuru* article, “Paradox of European Jewry,” written by Mr. Terry Shropshire? Tempers flared and shouting matches ensued. People who were friends behaved like enemies. Many Black students and faculty and others felt psychologically lynched. For all practical purposes the commitment to community building and cultural diversity were gone with the proverbial wind. Shame on us!

On an equally serious note, we do appreciate the concern that has come forth from the academic community as a result of the *Uhuru* article. However, we do not see the ad, “Campus Campaign for Civil Discourse” placed in the *Daily Kent Stater*, and the argumentive, bashing, name-calling discussions that have been held as a productive response for an academic community. What has occurred and is currently happening is hurtful and counterproductive to the building of community at Kent State University, and has caused many of us to question colleagues we thought we knew. The situation could have been used as a teachable moment for the author of the article, for students, staff, and faculty. Further, it could have served to build deeper understanding and community. However, the publication of the article has resulted in people drawing lines in the sand and engaging in detrimental, spiteful exchanges which have served only to polarize the University community—individuals, groups, organizations, and departments. Jewish persons are angry about what they perceived to be anti-Semitic expressions and the administration’s allowing it to continue on campus. And African
Americans are angry at the Jewish and University negative response (University polarization and punishment of African Americans) to critical investigation into African American cultural heritage and the freedom of expression that comes forth as a result of that investigation. Additionally, African Americans feel that, unlike other groups, they are not accorded the freedom to listen to so-called controversial speakers (i.e., Kalid Abdul Mohammed) and are punished for doing so.

In order to learn from this experience, it is important to understand what has occurred and why. Further, it is important to identify strategies to eliminate current misperceptions, reduce tensions, and build understanding.

As we examine what has taken place on this campus relative to Blacks and Jews, the issues are complex and multifaceted. As African American educators on a predominantly White campus we would like to offer several of our perspectives of the events that occurred. These perspectives have to do with ethnic identity development; Afrocentric worldview perspectives; issues of oppression and power; and the developmental phases of becoming a scholarly writer. We will comment briefly on each of these.

Ethnic identity models describe a process of movement from denial, devaluation, or lack of awareness of the oppressed part of one’s ethnic identity to an acceptance and integration of the oppressed part of self into one’s whole identity (Atkinson, 1983; Cross, 1971; Helms, 1990; Parham, 1989; Ponterotto, 1991; Myers, Speight, Highlen, Cox, Reynolds, Adams, and Hanley, 1991; Sue, 1981). From all indications, Mr. Shropshire was engaged in uncovering new and clearly disturbing information about his cultural history. This information had a profound impact upon him. It will forever change his view of his cultural history. A cultural history is very personal and is a manifestation of one’s essence. When that is stripped from a people, it results in a stripping of one’s very being. When one discovers/uncovers empirical data that counters one’s former assumptions about self-identity, one cannot help but feel a sense of betrayal (i.e., Jewish people participated in the slavery of African people). Anger is a natural response. We understand the anger.

Secondly, the Afrocentric worldview perspective is found in the works of many nationally renowned African and African American scholars. Dr. Molefi Asante, who in a recent speech stated that underlying White peoples’ reactions to and interactions with African Americans are two
doctrines, 1) African Americans are an inferior people, and 2) African Americans have contributed nothing to society or world civilization. Keep in mind that most African Americans are assaulted daily by these two principles. Often these doctrines become a part of their ethnic identity. These two doctrines are clearly manifested when Jewish individuals and other members of the University community want to decide for African American people on campus which speakers are acceptable for them to listen to (as though they are not intelligent enough to listen and scrutinize for themselves the positive and negative, beneficial and detrimental, factual and emotional aspects contained in the information delivered); when the Jewish community wants to tell African American people how to respond to African American speakers (as though they are so childlike, they must be informed of how to act); when White people, the Jewish community, and some members of the University community label an Afrocentric perspective as revisionist history and pseudo-academics (due to their assumption that African people have contributed nothing to world civilization); and when some members of the Jewish community and others purport that teachings in the Pan-African Studies Department are anti-Semitic or anti-White (as though faculty have nothing better to do than to teach hate education and fabricate data about African and African American history). These messages do little to foster harmony or build community.

The Afrocentric perspective is here to stay in spite of its unsettling effect upon many in the community of scholars. In this regard, we are reminded of the reaction to Copernicus when he stated that the earth is not the center of the universe and that the earth was just one of many planets circling the sun. He shook up the whole academic ideology of the time. He challenged a fundamental belief system that had been in existence for a long time. Many persons responded angrily and with disbelief to that information. However, there were too many factual examples that, over time, lent support to what Copernicus had stated. Other truths had to be reckoned with and met without fear. In recent centuries (1400’s to 1900’s), Eurocentrism has been the center of all thought (West, 1993). Now comes a time when Afrocentrism is challenging this primary way of viewing the world. Afrocentrism (which is saying that African people have contributed significantly to civilizations and is uncovering truths that have been covered up far too long) is shaking up our whole academic ideology. Many
people are responding with fear, a natural reaction. Responding to new information is often frightening and intimidating. However, other truths exist and must be accepted on their merits.

Thirdly, models of power and oppression clearly delineate that to overcome oppressive forces, alliances must be built. What has been felt is a misuse of power whereby a unified University body has come together to, not only condemn the article without understanding why it was written, but to punish African American faculty, staff, and students through such means as changing rules concerning invited speakers, exacting pressure to limit and monitor the activities of the Pan-African Studies Department, Black United Students, and Uhuru, and maintaining an environment that alienates and polarizes African Americans from the University community. The only remedy for that is to build alliances. These alliances can be formed through the recognition of commonalities among groups and sensitivity to and understanding of the differences that do exist. The current flap surrounding the Uhuru article demonstrated that, for the moment, there would be no major attempt to understand our differences and certainly no attempt to identify commonalities. The misperceptions and accusations only leave hurt feelings that will remain unless some structure or format is in place for positive and constructive exchanges.

Fourth, acquiring the skill to write in the scholarly manner acknowledged and valued by the University system is a developmental process which requires practice and time. In most classes where students have research papers, they begin with some questions or issues around a topic area. They then go out to seek information about the topic area and try to respond to the questions. Although information may come from a variety of sources, most students obtain their information from articles and books in the library. As students gather information, they organize the information in such a way as to write and explain it clearly. They cite references where exact material from others is stated. Conclusions are then made based on the information gathered. Is this not what the author of “Paradox of European Jewry” did? If any one of us had had the same question—Did Jewish people participate in the slavery of African people?—and went to the Kent State Library to look for an answer, information in our library would lead us to the same conclusions as Mr. Terry Shropshire (the content of many KSU books have already been checked).

We know, of course, that the
style of writing varies from person to person and, regardless of content, can have a significant impact upon the reader. The issue in this case seems to be with the style or manner in which the content was delivered. However, an environment that condemns a student's efforts in seeking information to understand a question or issue and in formulating and expressing an opinion based on the data found, is counterproductive to the goals and objectives of a university. Students must be encouraged to ask questions, raise issues, and seek new knowledge without fear of retaliation from the academic community. At the same time, educators must be sensitive to the developmental process and must demonstrate responsibility in providing criticism in a constructive manner. This did not happen.

In summary, it is certainly worthwhile to reflect upon the Uhuru article and the effect that it has had upon our community. However, as the shouting subsides, we must go beyond the boundaries of the article and the post-article experiences and consider this matter within a much broader context. Indeed, the vehement response to the article is a clue that there are issues that go well beyond the debate that we are currently having. We believe that the larger context of this discussion reaches into the core of our most deep-seated beliefs, emotions, values, and apprehensions. This is further complicated by the underlying political dynamics of the situation. Briefly, the Uhuru "controversy" taps into: (1) deeply held, and perhaps troubling, beliefs about personal identity and culture, from both African American and Jewish perspectives; (2) apprehension about confronting negative images and stereotypes about people from different cultural backgrounds (i.e., anti-Semitism and racism); (3) apprehension about emerging/new knowledge which challenges traditional belief systems (i.e., Afrocentrism vs Eurocentrism); and (4) the universal value of and desire for personal recognition and affirmation (i.e., a people's attempt to uncover the riches of its cultural heritage). The complicating political dynamics have to do with the University's need to deal effectively and fairly with two ostensibly opposing forces and to remain in the "good graces" of both groups.

The fundamental questions which face the academic community at this point are: What have we learned from this? And where do we go from here? We should have learned something about the difference between cultural diversity and cultural understanding. The Uhuru issue is a shining, albeit unpleasant, manifestation of the explosive nature of cultural misunderstanding. On the one hand, many of us
were not able to appreciate a young Black male student’s sincere attempt to uncover information about his culture and heritage. And on the other hand, many of us were not able to understand the Jewish community’s outrage at inflammatory, derogatory comments which were perceived to be anti-Semitic. Upon reflection, we, as an academic community, did not immediately respond as productively as we might have. It appears that, with few exceptions, many of us were taking sides, standing on the sidelines, effectively tearing down bridges instead of building them. As a result, neither the African American community nor the Jewish community has been well-served during this dilemma. Rather than using this controversy as an opportunity to teach, we have, for the most part, chosen to preach, to posture, to polarize and to finger-point. Yes, Kent State University has cultural diversity, but, like in the rest of society, it is far from achieving any semblance of cultural understanding. And it seems axiomatic that any attempt to build community will require a genuine attempt to build cultural understanding.

Where do we go from here? We should note that many of the academy’s more recent attempts to deal with the controversy are commendable. Committees have been formed, informed speakers have been invited, and roundtable discussions have been held. However, it is after the committee reports have been filed, the speakers have gone home, and the roundtables have been cleared, that our “real” and most difficult work must begin. We must remember that we who live and work at Kent, are left with the powerful residual effects of the issues that will erupt again if left unattended. We have African American students who have said repeatedly that they feel “punished” because of the Uhuru issues and other activities. Faculty in the Department of Pan-African Studies are still reeling from public pronouncements that they teach the concepts found in the Uhuru article (read: anti-Semitism) in their classes. Jewish faculty, students and community members feel that Kent is harboring and permitting anti-Semitic behavior to occur without consequence. If we fail to forthrightly address these matters, we do so at our own peril.

There are no easy solutions to these problems. By the same token, there is no escape from them. Our task is to make the best effort possible within the confines of our institution. Following are some thoughts for our collective consideration which reflect “a basis for action”:

Structure opportunities for a series of candid conversations about race and eth-
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necity which includes willing participants from different racial and ethnic backgrounds. Hopefully, over time, these continuing difficult dialogues will lead to some measurable degree of understanding among different groups.

In addition to the traditional committee structure, put in place a rotating “think tank” consisting of faculty, students, and administrators which has the task of developing an action agenda specifically related to crossing boundaries of race and ethnicity.

Follow our own admonition to “inquire, learn, and reflect.” As academic leaders, we need to set an example for our students by extending ourselves across cultural boundaries. Do we attend/participate in activities where we can learn something meaningful about a culture or race different from our own?

These are not new ideas; nor are they original. The point here is that we need to come together as an academic community and do the best we can to foster a climate of understanding and appreciation of differences. So in the spirit of reconciliation, we extend the invitation to dialogue and to action.

Dr. Marlene Dorsey,
Dean, College of Continuing Studies,
Kent State University

Dr. Anita P. Jackson,
Associate Professor, Counseling & Human Development Services;
College of Education, Kent State University
This Teachable Moment

Enloe Wilson

Since the initial furor over the publication of "The Paradox of European Jewry" in the Spring 1994 issue of Uhuru I've had the opportunity to take in an experience that has been definitely sobering, if nothing else. Anticipating the inevitable flurry of slings and arrows, I resolved early on to 1) remain respectful of elders and peers on all sides of the "discussion," knowing that everyone is entitled to his or her own view, 2) remain open-minded and humble, yet firm, 3) be aware of enemy "shenanigans" (in plain sight and undercover), and 4) speak only when necessary. Coupled with an endless rotation of Marley, Coltrane, and Joni Mitchell, this posture has carried me through the ordeal, sanity reasonably intact.

. . . And as the time rolled around for me to write this editorial, I remembered the advice of all those who said, in so many words, and justifiably, "Let 'em have it!" Well, to them I say, I'll demonstrate as much civility as has been afforded us.

The opposition's overall approaches, or points of dissent, have conveniently changed a number of times along the way, from focussing on "those [bad African American professors] over in Ritchie Hall who must be brain-washing young [negroes] with this kinda stuff!" (. . . until it was pointed out that the author hadn't ever attended classes in the Department of Pan-African Studies), to focussing on this as an "Afrikan/Jewish" issue (until someone figured out that they could round up a bigger posse by calling it a "humanitarian" issue), to focussing on the article as a cesspool of "untruths" (until it was discovered that, humbly admitted mistakes notwithstanding, a notable body of similar works can be found which investigates similar matters and yields similar results), to focussing on the author not being "a sound scholar" (until it was pointed out that, remarkably, he was a mere college sophomore). But through it all, there were some who questioned the true motivation of the onslaught.
If, for example, the author had written an exposition vehemently denying *any* and *all* European Jewish involvement in the Afrikan Holocaust, support of the South African apartheid government, or COINTELPRO operations, would those not be untruths? Of course, they would be... and what circus would have stepped forth so eagerly then? Many have speculated as to whether the true underlying source of discomfort has been Shropshire’s supposedly elaborate excursions in “twisted logic” or “alternate truths,” or the fact that a student of color (especially an Afrikan student) had the nerve—the gall—to study a component of a European people’s history and to be forthright in expressing alarm at what he found.

Via the same stock of characters, questions have arisen as to whether such works are detrimental to Kent State University’s invisible, albeit apparently present, sense of “community,” whether *Uhuru*’s editorial staff “did its job” by allowing such “hate” to be printed, or whether such an effort should have appeared in a publication funded in part by the university. Consequently, one should be ever mindful that given the amount of funding such a university receives from the state (not to mention our purses) for each African American full-time equivalent juxtaposed with the amount of currency they subsequently receive in the way of curriculum, programming, etc., such pro-active forums are more than “justified” in being present, unfettered, and alive. Mentionable is the fact that if faculty and administration (current and emeritus) across the board historically “did their jobs,” indeed, there might be little or no need for the Department of Pan-African Studies, Black United Students, and *Uhuru* Magazine—each of which are lassoed together and attacked on a semesterly basis (until, of course, the university needs to flaunt its “tokens”), each of which represents the greatest devotion of any bodies of effort involving objective cultural discussion, and each of which was born of diligent, taxing, Afrikan student effort, and not, interestingly enough, of the “community-building initiatives” of the KSU faculty and administration.

Pretending for a moment that a diverse university community is actually a priority, perhaps the university would see an improvement in, or at least a formation of, a sense of community if reactionary organizations, student cliques, and the selectively-liberal-guilt-suffering individuals who have come running in search of saintliness in search of change their paper allegiance to “community” into blood, sweat, and tears—in lieu of maligning the few groups that already have done
so; classic among these reactionaries being the Campus Campaign for Civil Discourse. But through nine months of spewing propaganda, and the composition of a handy full-page catalogue of foes (a unique point in KSU history), perhaps the most profound and memorable statement made by this body is that out of 300 signees, a remarkable two would (could?) go on to produce and present any written work addressing the questions at hand—a profound statement, indeed.

There were those, however, who did choose to actively use the ordeal as a time of inquiry and learning. A catalyst for a prolific discussion and a phenomenal learning experience has been triggered, and Uhuru does take pride in being the driving force. In closing, I would like to thank all those students, organizations, faculty, and administrators, who, in rising above the mayhem of reactionary individuals and interest groups, have taken part in the true precepts of finding truth in discourse, thereby assisting in this issue. We all have very much to learn. Let us allow all those who sit about helping to propagate the silent suffering of some, and their bedfellows who belch forth vilifications riddled with hypocrisy, igno rance, and half-hearted conviction, march off to their own destruction.

To Maat be true!
Lessons Learned

Adisa A. Alkebulan

To say the least, the controversy surrounding the “Shropshire Article” has been a learning experience for this editor. On the one hand, I learned that not being Jewish and discussing deplorable acts committed by some Jews will cause a backlash. On the other hand, although I had never claimed to be an expert on Jewish involvement in the Afrikan Holocaust, this “controversy” forced me to do research in which I probably would not have engaged, only to find that some Jews did, in fact, profit greatly from the enslavement of Afrikan People. The opposition now confirms Jewish involvement after doing their own research. Yet, although I learned a great deal on the subject, I still feel that the lesson learned was not the lesson the opposition intended to teach.

Although the notion of Uhuru doing a “special edition” was bred out of Terry Shropshire’s article “Paradox of European Jewry,” given the events that led up to this “special edition” and given its submissions, this “discourse” transcends Shropshire’s article. No longer is it about Jewish involvement in the Afrikan Holocaust, if in fact it ever really was. No, there is a much larger issue at stake here. Shropshire’s article gave many people in the Kent State community the opportunity to attack Afrocentricity in general and the Department of Pan-African Studies and Black United Students in particular. Neither DPAS nor BUS had anything to do with Shropshire’s feelings or his “motives.” In fact, Shropshire neither took classes in DPAS nor was he an active member of BUS. But then, this issue is much larger than Terry Shropshire as well. The article published in a student publication has also transcended students. The discussion was actually among Kent State University’s faculty and staff, and the student editors were not even invited to the discussions.
One student did, however, make a public statement in opposition to *Uhuru*. The fiery, young Steven Weinberg, in a viewpoint in the student newspaper, illustrated his naïveté, and, incidentally, he further illustrates his confusion in this journal.

Considering all of the attention aroused by the article, I was quite surprised that we did not receive more submissions from the opposition. After all, an advertisement appeared identifying at least 300 “concerned” individuals condemning the article. I had imagined at least half of them (150) would submit. We did not even receive 5 submissions from the individuals who signed the advertisement, which by the way was supposed to come out with a “bang”— but it was quite a dud.

This “special edition” gave the Kent State community the opportunity to “put up or shut up.” For the most part, they shut up. For a university that allegedly seeks “civil discourse” and dialogue, it did not take the first opportunity for real open and honest dialogue. Which brings up the question, does the university truly want open and honest dialogue?

I was also quite surprised that a college sophomore received so much attention and criticism from our “distinguished” professors. I would hope that Ken Calkins, who led the charge, will make himself available to proofread my papers as well, before I submit them for a grade. Some professors attacked Shropshire as if he were one of their peers, and he is not. Obviously, Shropshire’s article was flawed, but his article turned into a playground for Ph.Ds, some in emeritus positions, to get their intellectual “rocks off.”

In talking with a professor in the School of Psychology, Educational Foundations and Special Services, not only did he tell me that *Uhuru*, DPAS and BUS were one racist and anti-Semitic organization, but he also informed me that there was great concern among the campus community concerning the former editor of *Uhuru* (Idris Syed) being Arab. Why would there be concern? Aside from the fact that Syed is Asian, not Arab, why on earth would that even be an issue? I found that to be the most anti-Semitic comment during this entire “controversy,” considering that Arabs are a Semitic people. The comment did not surprise me— often, these accusers are guilty of what they accuse *Uhuru* of being guilty of. It is an interesting phenomenon to place oppressed people in the position of defending themselves against being racist and anti-Semitic. Personally, if I tell you that I do not hate you, and you don’t believe me, it is no longer my concern. No longer will I exert my energy on such counterproductive
tactics. The *Daily Kent Stater* also took part in demonizing *Uhuru*. Perhaps unwittingly, they provided inaccurate information in every single article that they printed regarding the controversy. Some were simple misquotes, others were blatant lies.

I must ask myself, has the proverbial "lesson" been taught? I would have to say no. At least, not the intended lesson. *Uhuru* has been unmoved in its policies. If someone elects to write an article dealing with Jewish, Christian, or Muslim involvement in the Afrikan Holocaust, there is a chance for it to be published. The editorial staff of *Uhuru* is concerned with our readership, not our critics who could not care less about Afrocentricity (regardless of what Afrocentricity is), or people who do not read *Uhuru*, anyway. When our faithfuls have a problem with *Uhuru*, that is when we will look at our policies, and no time sooner. *Uhuru* is about freedom. Shem Hotep!

——

Adisa A. Alkebulan,
Assistant Editor, *Uhuru*
New Vision: From Projects to Pyramids

Mwatabu S. Okantah

No one knows the master class quite like the enslaved. No one can know the descendants of the master class quite like the descendants of the enslaved. In American terms, no one knows white people quite like those of us who are black and American born. Most white people would be “shocked” by the number of black people who would insist that “we know whitefolk in ways they can never know themselves.” In our lives, this is not a matter of perspective or opinion so much as it is our reality. It never occurs to most white people that we have to study (and understand) them if we are to have any chance of survival living in a white-people-dominated society.

I am well aware that the very “controversial” nature of my comments will probably offend some. At the very least, still others will experience some discomfort. I do not fear the “consequences” of my right to “free speech.” I do fear the consequences of remaining silent. What can only be described as white power is so pervasive in this society, it is so intrinsic and fundamental an element of this nation’s social psychology, white people do not even have to think about it. They do not have to openly acknowledge it, although some do. Most white people are not even conscious of its parameters. In America, white power is taken for granted. European-Americans generally operate from a perspective that assumes (before the fact) its position is the correct point of view in the world. So, I understand, fully, that I stand directly in the face of a fierce and formidable adversary. My truth, however, suggests a real black man has to do what a black man has to do.

It is sweetly ironic that I find myself back at Kent State; and, once again, it is here where I am compelled to “dig in” and fight. This particular round of the same old battle has been twenty-four years in the making. I will not be dismissed as an untutored student this time around. Our case that reality in this nation has always been defined in European terms is undeniable. The United States of
America was conceived, first, as an extension of England. In more general terms, it was established as an extension of Europe. We know America has always been a country for Europeans—for white people. This is, fundamentally, a European settler nation established in what they conveniently termed the "New World." That indigenous peoples were already here merely required the writing of a new, fabricated history to replace the ancient story that was already well into its own process of unfolding—a story whose rich beginnings had already been told.

Who can deny that Americans of European descent essentially define and maintain the status quo in this country? As an American institution, KSU can only reflect the society that produced it. Strained race relations at this university must be viewed from within the larger, national/international context. If any kind of true mutual understanding and respect is to be achieved, that larger context must also be viewed in proper historical terms. This campus does not exist in a vacuum. So-called "minorities" have been marginalized on this campus for the same reasons they have been marginalized in this society. The unique diversity of black people has been made virtually invisible on this campus in terms that Ralph Ellison eloquently described thirty years ago in his now classic novel, *Invisible Man*. Non-white/non-European peoples are more figments of the collective white imagination than real in America.

Writing in *Black Books Bulletin* (Winter 93/94), in response to an article, "Black Demagogues and Pseudo-Scholars" (New York Times, 7-20-92) by Henry Louis Gates, Jr., John Henrik Clarke places this misused charge of black anti-Semitism in perspective when he effectively argues:

What is now being called anti-Semitism among a newly awakened Black intellectual class is that they are beginning to look at the people referred to as Jews as part of the totality of European world dominance. We are not saying that the European who is a Jew is any more of an imperialist than any other of the Europeans, but that he is basically the same. We are not saying that the role of Jews in the slave trade was any different than other Europeans, but it was basically the same. When they saw the opportunity to make money in the slave trade, they took advantage of this opportunity the same as other Europeans in the same business.

For many of us, then, the conflict is not between "Blacks and Jews," as our more ethnocentric opposition wants everyone to believe. It is a conflict between white people and peoples of color. Europeans and/or European-Americans who happen to be Jews are just white people to us. For the most part, and, for the great majority of black people, they are indis-
tistinguishable from their non-Jewish white counterparts. The modern African experience in this so-called New World has been shaped by a violently imposed European subjugation.

In the western hemisphere, slavery and racial oppression have been practiced by Europeans who have professed to be both Christians (Protestant and Catholic) and Jews.

I agree with Prof. Clarke when he writes,

It is about power and the emerging expectations of most of the world’s people who until recently were mainly ruled by Europeans or people of European extraction. The one thing the conflict is not about is anti-Semitism. There is a worldwide Black-White conflict which is part of the broader conflict between European and non-European people. African people are on one side of that conflict, and the people we refer to as Jews are on the other side. . . . and the part that Jewish people still play in maintaining European worldwide power, and not anti-Semitism, is the basis of the conflict between us. This conflict will become more fierce and tragic as non-European people challenge the power of European people all over the world.

On this campus, the reality of the relationship between African-Americans and European-American Jews mirrors this larger, global context. All of the public-talk and all of the public posturing about diversity, civility, free speech and dialogue will continue to be meaningless to us so long as the full range of black opinion is ignored, dismissed, belittled or misrepresented. Given the attack on Terry Shropshire’s article, “Paradox of European Jewry,” and the subsequent impugning of the integrity of the faculty and students of the Department of Pan-African Studies, I am left to demand to be told why the vocal opposition is so selective in its focus. When was the last time KSU’s faculty senate debated or drafted a resolution condemning the matter-of-fact visibility of Confederate flags on campus? What is their position on Native American feelings concerning the demeaning Chief Wahoo symbol? And why such deafening silence from my esteemed Jewish colleagues whenever they are asked to condemn the state of Israel’s relationship with the former apartheid regime in South Africa? Why was there no hue and cry in the face of Zionist cooperation with the former Nazi Afrikaaner South Africans? Where were their signatures then? Empty charges of anti-Semitism will not make these questions go away.

Americans of European descent present themselves as experts on everyone’s reality except their own. They scrutinize everyone’s flaws, save their own. They give no explanations to help us understand why Europeans behave the way they do. I learned very early on during my undergraduate study in KSU’s English department that the standard European claim to that
which they call "universal" values is a grand illusion. It is clear that when white people speak of universal values, they are speaking of their own values. When they speak in solemn tones about "mankind," or "humankind," they are really speaking of their own kind. On this same level, when European-American Jews speak of their participation in the Civil Rights era, they never speak of the true nature of their relationship to black struggle. They never speak of their motives. They always speak of those two slain Jewish civil rights workers, as if their sacrifice constitutes the pivotal sacrifice of that period. We are always asked to forget the significance of our own dead. We have paid too high a price to not remember.

Jews always present themselves to us as our saviours. They most always speak to us in the same paternalistic terms their non-Jewish white counterparts traditionally use. In his article, "The Misguided Search for Black/Jewish Unity," published in Freedomways (Second Quarter, 1984), Lenni Brenner writes:

Even excluding the millionaires and the other upper class types, generally speaking, the typical class relationship between a Black person and a Jewish person is one in which the Jew is in the superior social position. Few Jewish students have the experience of being taught by more than one black teacher, if that. Few Jews patronize black-owned stores. Fewer still have utilized the services of a black attorney or a black physician. The number of Jews with black landlords must be minuscule, and has there ever been a Black person who had a Jewish maid?

African-Americans and European-American Jews live in distinctly separate realities. It is revealing that most Jews are loathe to admit this fact. When they speak to us about dialogues, they are really speaking about having us acquiesce to their point of view.

Brenner also states:

It is the Jewish past, with its long history of persecution and its now vanished blue collar tradition, that lends an air of initial credibility to the notion that masses of Blacks and Jews can be united in a coalition. But when we leave aside the historic factor and examine the contemporary class character of the two groups, the prospects for coalescence are revealed as illusory. Those people, Black and Jewish, who are advocating a mass Black/Jewish bloc fail to notice that the interests of a predominantly affluent group and a predominantly working-class and poor group are not, and cannot be the same.

This was borne out during the 1970s when major Jewish groups opposed the idea of affirmative action in their support for the Alan Bakke case.

It is clear that the faculty senate, as well as those people lending their signatures to the "Campus Campaign for Civil Discourse" have no real sense of Americans of
African descent as people. I am sure several would say that they have “black friends,” or “black colleagues.” I would be surprised if most did not live in “lily white” neighborhoods. To us, it appears their arrogance is exceeded only by the level of their ignorance. Not only have their actions been predictable, but they suggest more about their own intellectual bankruptcy than they could ever reveal about an article written by an undergraduate student. It suggests aspects of their true nature in the same way minstrelsy revealed the true character of an earlier generation of European-Americans.

That Jews are uncomfortable when we speak of the power they wield inside African-American integrationist based groups, or in the area of African-American Studies, is a problem they will have to adjust to and face. Jews have traditionally exerted the kind of influence in the NAACP, for example, that they would never allow an “outsider” to exert inside any Jewish organization. The NAACP’s highest award—the Springarn medal—is named for one of the Jews who helped found and define that organization. And what African-American scholars are acknowledged as authorities in the area of Jewish Studies in the same way names like Melville Herskovitz, Herbert Aptheker, August Meir or Lawrence Levine are respected “experts” on the Black experience. The point here is not that these men have not produced good work, but where is the balance?

Our Movement did not stop after the 1960s. Some of us realized we did not have time to assume anointed, token positions in the so-called mainstream and then wax nostalgic. The forward movement of our historical experience continues to demand that black people do more than just study and learn from our history. An emerging 21st century demands that we become makers of history in our present, or in what the traditional Africans called the “Eternal Now.” We have overcome too much as a people to become confused or distracted now. In the final analysis, the question of a “Black/Jewish” alliance is a non-issue, and being overly concerned with the shallow and hypocritical pettiness of bodies like the KSU faculty senate is a distraction we can ill afford. We are not opposed to forming alliances. We are saying that no healthy coalition can be formed from a position of weakness.

In The Challenge of Blackness, a book of essays published in 1972, Lerone Bennett, Jr. places our task in proper perspective when he writes, “It is necessary for us to develop a new frame of reference which transcends the limits of
white concepts. It is necessary for us to develop and maintain a total intellectual offensive against the false universality of white concepts, whether they be expressed by William Styron or Daniel Patrick Moynihan.” Put another way, we are fully capable of using our own compass to locate and place ourselves on the “map of human geography” in terms that make sense to us.

The real tragedy in all of this is that, while the struggle to liberate ourselves within white society has forced this nation to reevaluate and improve itself, those who would defend the status quo fail to admit the positive impact of the black struggle on this society. From our perspective, America has never been the free and open society it claims to be. High and noble-sounding American words have not yet been translated into reality. The social and academic environment here at KSU is no less hostile. In too many ways, conditions on this campus have not changed for black people since my student days. What has changed, however, is the way in which many of us see the unhealthy reality that confronts us. It is on this level that we are most misunderstood.

We do not hate white people. We do not have the time. Most of us do not have the inclination. We grow to understand it would be too easy, too logical, and, it would waste precious creative energy. That so many white people seem to think we can be so easily moved to hate them is instructive. This may explain why European-America only pays attention to us when we leap out of their fear-driven dreams and onto their television screens. It may surprise and disappoint white America to learn of the growing numbers of black people who are determined to remove, and are removing, this society’s blinding whiteness from our eyes and from our lives. We acknowledge this country as the land of our birth, but at some point in each day of our lives, America reminds us this has never been our home. Our citizenship has always been conditional at best.

Returning to Bennett’s The Challenge of Blackness, we read, “Blackness is a challenge because it tells us that we must rise now to the level of teaching this profoundly ignorant and profoundly sick society. In order to do that, we must create a new rationale. We must create a new rationality, a new way of seeing, a new way of reasoning, a new way of thinking.” This is a nation in need of spiritual healing. America is a more open society today, because descendants of once enslaved Africans have forced Americans of European descent to change their evil ways. We understand that our struggle has opened the door for the multi-
tudes Europe so easily labelled “others.”

Kent State University is a more diverse institution today because the children of those descendants of once enslaved Africans have forced this university to transform its rhetoric into concrete reality. Here, too, the historical struggle of BUS and the Department of Pan-African Studies has opened doors for those students the managers of this institution designated as “Blacks and other minorities.” Because I have returned to KSU, and because I now teach and work in the “House that BUS Built,” I look around in wonder and I know we have become the new reality that can make a hostile environment a better place. Like the Paul Robesons and the Fannie Lou Hamers before us, we stand here the tallest trees in our forest. In the face of all the false allegations, I consider the loyalty of our white student population and I am reminded to continue directing the center of my attention toward the black light of our cultural heritage.

We understand, and we have come to move as healer-educators among our people. We know the reality of healing our sick, black selves can only work to make this white-people-dominated society a better society. That it will, indeed, become better in spite of the resistance of those white people committed to the status quo simply informs the awesome historical task awaiting the mighty power of our black hands. We have much work to do. Each of our generations has its unique role to play. The reality is we are winning our struggle. Ultimate victory is within our reach. The time now calls for patience, a steadfast resolve, and a new vision.

We are also descended from those ancient black people who founded Kemet (aka Egypt). No longer are we limited by the tyranny of Greek, Roman, Arabic or slave mentality terms. A new generation of Pan-African world scholars has literally turned the status quo upside down, which, in reality, is to return truth rightside up. No more Sphinx. Her-Em-Akhet has been restored to his proper place in our historical experience. Heru is once again seated on the horizon of our consciousness. The real struggle is between our spiritual higher and our animal lower Self. The new vision is ancient. It is borne of our journey from the pyramids into oblivion; through our break-up into fragments; through those infamous Doors of No Return; through steaming New World plantations; through urban concentration-camp, brick-bush projects; through a renewed self-discovery and forward into the future, building pyramids once again.

We should take comfort in
knowing that the scholars represented by the “Campus Campaign for Civil Discourse” are descended from the same tradition of Western thinkers who once forced Socrates to drink hemlock; who once argued that earth was the center of the universe; who once taught that the earth was flat; who continue to teach that Europe is a continent, and Columbus did discover a New World. How can they be surprised when growing numbers of us are standing up to proclaim their tradition of scholarship is dubious at best? What would make them think that we would look to them for answers to anything?

The active motion of our history must come full circle, and, like our ancient, Kemetic ancestors, we will have to bring light to another generation of bewildered, spiritually immature Europeans. Our unfolding destiny suggests our truth will shine, once again, with the intense brightness that will light the world. We have done nothing for which we should feel ashamed.

Mwatabu S. Okantah, 
Instructor, Pan-African Studies
POSTSCRIPT

The birth of this volume followed a lengthy and difficult pregnancy. It was conceived during discussions among Kent faculty and staff in the aftermath of Terry Shropshire’s article, “Paradox of European Jewry.” The idea was to promote a wide-ranging conversation, giving all parties to the controversy an opportunity to air their concerns in an atmosphere free from the shouting and recrimination that have permeated campus discourse over the past several months. We felt that a literary format would be more constructive than face-to-face encounters during the early stages of this process. Upon further discussion, we concluded that the most appropriate venue would be Uhuru, in which the original article appeared. In order not to interfere with the magazine’s regular publication schedule, we agreed that a special issue would provide the most suitable outlet. Provost Myron Henry and others offered the financial support necessary to bring such a publication about.

To promote confidence in the integrity of the special issue, an editorial advisory board was created, consisting of four KSU faculty to work with Uhuru’s editor and assistant editor. In October 1994, student editor Enloe Wilson and faculty advisor Tim Moore sent out a call for contributions. Initially, submissions were slow in coming. Many who had been associated with the magazine were unconvinced of the value of a special issue, and many who had been offended by Shropshire’s article suspected that their contributions would not be handled with professionalism and fairness. We are gratified that, despite the initial doubts, this volume contains a wide variety of viewpoints and explores most of the most pertinent concerns.

The Editorial Advisory Board comprised a group of people each of whom held strong opinions about how the volume should be put together. As divergent views were aired, meetings sometimes became emotionally charged. However, all board members were committed to resolving disagreements amicably. In the process we came to appreciate the skills, experience, expertise, and strongly held convictions that had brought the six of us together. Concerns were discussed openly, in an atmosphere of mutual respect and understanding; and in the end, we all were satisfied that our interests were appropriately addressed. Perhaps the process, as much as the product itself, is an exemplar of the kind of discourse and community we hope to achieve—one which values hon-
est differences, yet is able to transcend them to create a product that is greater than the separate contributions.

Essays in this volume were all written in response to Terry Shropshire's "Paradox of European Jewry." Yet they vary greatly in tone and perspective. All take firm positions; some are strident, even contentious. Every reader will undoubtedly take umbrage at some of the contributions. Most readers also will find much with which they agree. This is as it should be. We do not expect conformity; rather, we hope to encourage members of the KSU community, despite heartfelt differences, to enter into conversation. The fact that we are talking with each other and exchanging ideas with a common commitment to mutual understanding is an important first step. We believe that we have helped to open a few doors; now it is up to others to walk through.

Dr. Richard Feinberg, Christina McVay, E. Timothy Moore, Mwatabu S. Okantah; Editorial Advisory Board
APPENDIX

Notes: African-Jewish Relationship—Something to Cherish?
Terrence Shropshire

Fate of the Jews: A People Torn Between Israeli Power and Jewish Ethics, Roberta Strauss Feuerlicht:

Memories are short. The Jew as beneficiary of slavery is rarely mentioned by Jewish historians. Black-Jewish history seems to begin only in the 1960s, with Jews marching and dying in the civil rights movement, only to be ungraciously dismissed by ungrateful blacks.

The truth is never that simple. As Jews came to America, they accepted what they found, whether it was slavery or segregation. (188)

If other nations are to be judged by their treatment of Jews, Israel must be judged by its treatment of Jews. In the Jewish state, there is neither religious nor ethnic pluralism. (228)

The Sephardim (Asian Jews) are Israel’s underclass... The Sephardic problem is one of both class and color. The Israeli upper and middle classes are largely white Ashkenazim; the Israeli lower class is largely dark and Sephardic. (229)

If the Sephardim (Asian Jews) are a reproach to Israel’s democracy, the Falashas (African Jews) are a reproach to Israel’s conscience. (236)

White Jews could not cope with the concept of black Jews... Unlike other Ethiopians, the Falashas have a Jewish homeland to escape to, but the Jewish homeland doesn’t seem to want them. (237)

In 1974, an American writer reported that someone in the Israeli embassy in Addis Ababa told him that “the plight of the Falashas (African/Ethiopian Jews) was a domestic problem of Ethiopia in which the Israeli government does not interfere.” By the same logic, the Holocaust was a domestic problem of the Nazis, and the plight of Soviet Jews is a domestic problem of the Soviet Union. (238)

When an Israeli politician visiting Ethiopia was asked for assistance...
by a group of Falashas who wanted to emigrate, he suggested that Ethiopian Jews solve their problems by converting to Christianity. (237)

Americans who pressure Israel on behalf of the Falashas (African Jews) are scorned; they have been asked if they would want their daughters to marry one. (240)

Historically, the relationship between Jew and black in America has not been one of equality. Jews were traders and masters; blacks were merchandise and slaves and servants. In America, there is no record of a black man who traded in Jews or a black who owned Jews. (186)

...only one Jew ever worked as an overseer, but possibly a greater proportion of Jews than Christians were slave owners... Just as a disproportionately large number of Jews were slave owners, a disproportionately large number of Jewish merchants sold slaves as they would any other goods. Several of these merchants were prominent in their communities: an acting rabbi, the president of a congregation. (73)

If other nations are to be judged by their treatment of their Jewish minority, Israel must be judged by its treatment of its non-Jewish minority. If it is hard to be a Jew in Israel, it is even harder to be an Arab. (242)

American Jewry and the Civil War, Rabbi Bertram W. Korn

The (Jewish) Record, however, became a vicious spokesman for anti-Negro prejudice:

We know not how to speak in the same breath of the Negro and the Israelite. The very names have startlingly opposite sounds—one (Africans) representing all that is debased and inferior in the hopeless barbarity and heathenism of six thousand years. . . .

Israel, Imperialism and Racism, A. W. Kayyali

Zionism is a colonial movement based on racist, supremacist and distant religious notions. (Introduction)

*Read chapters entitled 1) "Israel and South Africa: A Comparative Study in Racism and Settler Colonialism," 2) "Israel and South Africa: The Racists Allied"

The Jewish Community in South Africa [is] around 110,000 of a total of four million. Their importance in white politics, however, is far more
than mere figures would suggest. They are extremely active in the spheres of business, mining and banking, the cornerstones on which the wealth of the white community has been built. (292)

It is a relationship—between two racialisms whose very raison d’etre is the disposition of the other—that makes the Israeli–South African alliance so deep, so dangerous and potentially so durable. (298)

Zionism and Racism

On 10 Nov 75, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted resolution 3379 (xxx) determining that Zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination, and that one of the suggestions made repeatedly was for some continuing effort to further the elimination of racism in all its manifestations, especially Zionism and Apartheid, two sides of the same coin... [t]hat the racist regime in occupied Palestine and the racist regime in Zimbabwe and South Africa have a common imperialist origin, forming a whole and having the same racist structure and being organically linked in their policy aimed at repression of the dignity and integrity of the human being. (249)


We the Black Jews: Witness to the White Jewish Race Myth, Dr. Yosef ben-Jochannan

For as long as I can recall, white Jews in America have vehemently denied the existence of any legitimate African Jews, recognizing only fellow Caucasian Euro-Jews from any place. Furthermore, white Jews have only conditionally accepted Black Jews of North Africa and Southwest Asia. Thus, the so-called entry of Ethiopian Jews into Israel under the nefarious terms, “Exodus” and “Moses,” fooled no one who is familiar with the history of the white Jews in Israel and West Asia. From 1947 C.E., white Jews, officially through Israel’s Knesset (parliament), consistently denied “The Right of Return” to Black Jews. Of course, white Jews from anywhere, everywhere on the planet, particularly from the former Soviet Union, were freely admitted.

To add injury to insult, even the disgusting requirement that all Ethiopian Jews must be circumcised (by European/white Jews) in order to be accepted as Jews upon entering Israel is racist. To require all adult
males of the Falasha community to have their “penis pricked,” symbolically or not, was and still is Jewish racism and religious bigotry. Such racist beliefs are no different than those inflicted upon European Jews by their fellow Caucasian Europeans, Christians, Muslims and atheists, etc., which eventually led to Europe’s Holocaust. (Forward)

The Chosen People of the Caucasus: Jewish Origins, Delusions, Deceptions, and Historical Role in the Slave Trade, Genocide and Cultural Colonization, Michael Bradley

In the early days of the conquest of the Americas, from 1494 to about 1550, Jews were a numerous minority, if not an actual majority, of the so-called “Spanish” colonists that settled the New World. Many of the “conquistadors” were Jewish and, as such, took part in the most brutal episode of genocide and extermination the world has ever witnessed: within a century of 1492, the Native American civilizations had been destroyed and the population decimated by enslavement, starvation and disease. When Native American labor grew scarce because of genocide, Africans were forced into the New World tropics to slave in the mines and on plantations. (17)

Other Reading Selections

A call number listed for any of the following books indicates they can be found in the Kent State University Library. (After this, there will be absolutely no excuse for the “distinguished” professors, administrators, and other members of the community to use ignorance, amnesia or slight memory loss as a justification for not speaking about these issues).

1. Israel, South Africa and Black Africa: A Study of the Primacy of the Politics of Expediency, Kunirum Osia (dt771.17 084)
2. Israel and South Africa: Legal Systems of Settler Dominance, Sheila Ryan and Donald Will (hd8660 r92x 1990)
3. Zionism, Imperialism and Racism, A. W. Kayyali (ds149 z72x)
4. The Rise of Israel: The Intensification of Violence (ds149 j57)
5. Zionism and Racism: The Proceedings of an International Symposium (ds119.7 z5x)
6. American Jewry and the Civil War, Dr. Rabbi Bertram W. Korn (e540J5 k67)
7. Jews and Negro Slavery in the Old South, Dr. Rabbi Bertram W. Korn (e441 k65)
8. Unnatural Alliance, James Adams (dt 771.17 a32 1984)
9. Anti-Apartheid Reader, David Mermelstein (dt779.952 s66 1987)
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10. *African Origin of Major Western Religions*, Dr. Yosef ben-Jochannan (bL2400 b43 1991)
11. *The Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Theodor Herzl (ds149 h5253 1962)
13. *Israel: A Colonial Settler State?*, Maxime Rodison (ds149 r54513)
14. *Israel Foreign Policy: South Africa and Central America*, Jane Hunter (ds119.8s6 h86 1986)
15. *Israel and South Africa: The Progression of a Relationship*, Richard P. Stevens
17. *Jews in South Africa*, Gustav Saron and Louis Holtz
18. *We the Black Jews: Witness to the White Jewish Race Myth*, Dr. Yosef ben-Jochannan (ds135 e75 b46)
19. *Welcome Back Home*, Dr. Yosef ben-Jochannan
21. *Fate of the Jews: A People Torn Between Israeli Power and Jewish Ethics*, Roberta Strauss Feuerlicht (e184.j5 f48 1983)
22. *Zionism and Palestine Before the Mandate: A Phase of Western Imperialism*, Richard P. Stevens (ds149 s679x 1972)
25. *The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews*, Nation of Islam (e185.61 s3984)
26. *Israel in Black Perspective*, Robert G. Weisbord (e185.615 w345 1985)
28. *Chosen People of the Caucasus*, Michael Bradley
29. *World Conquerors: The Real Criminals*, Layos Marschalko (ds141 m273x)
30. *Israel and the Developing Countries: New Approaches to Cooperation*, Leopold Laufer
31. *Africa and the West: Elements of Free World Policy*, Arnold Rivken
32. *Settler Colonialism in Southern Africa and the Middle East*, George Jabbour (ds119.7 j22)
33. *African Zion: The Attempt to Establish a Jewish Colony in the East Africa Protectorate (1903-1905)*, Robert G. Weisbord (ds135.a25 w43)
34. Black Anti-Semitism and Jewish Racism, Nat Hentoff (e185.615 b54)
35. Bittersweet Encounter: The Afro-American and the American Jew (e185.61 w39)
36. Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization, Dr. Martin Bernal (df78.b398 1987)
37. The Iceman Inheritance, Michael Bradley
38. The Jews in New Spain: Faith, Flame and the Inquisition, Seymour B. Liebman
39. The Columbus Conspiracy, Michael Bradley
40. The Jewish Almanac, Carl Rhein
41. A History of the Jews, Solomon Grayzel
42. Outlines in Jewish History, Lady Magnus
43. South Africa's Foreign Policy, James Berber
44. Jews in American History: Their Contributions to the United States, 1492-1950, Martin Rywell
45. Arabs, Israelis and Kissinger: A Secret History of American Diplomacy in the Middle East, Edward Sheehan
46. The Settler and the Savage: A Tale of Peace and War in South Africa, Robert Ballantyne (ps1059.675 s74x)
What do I say to you?
May I have a frank, open exchange
of ideas with you?
Can we dialogue
in the very near future?
The pendulum between opinion and truth
swings so rapidly,
understanding seems near
to impossible.
Does our diversity
make it impossible
to define and redefine?

The Native American Chief, Seattle, tells us:
All things are connected like the blood which unites one family.
All things are connected.
Whatever befalls the earth befalls the sons and daughters of the earth.
Man did not weave the web of life: He is merely a strand in it.
Whatever he does to the web, he does to himself.

It is important
that we tackle
complicated issues
for the complicated,
yes, highly emotional
answers.

So many migrations,
intermingleings
of people
through time.
What meaning can we derive
from it all?

We have never met.
But can we have a defining hour?
A teachable moment?
You can get to know
something about me.
My hopes. Your hopes.
Your dreams. My dreams.
Your struggles. My struggles.
Your “on becoming.” My “on becoming.”
Can we talk?
It is a beginning.

-Joan P. Dashield,
Associate Professor, Nursing