

SPECIAL COMMENCEMENT ISSUE

Bowdoin College

Brunswick Maine



THE BOWDOIN PATRIOT

VOLUME 1, NUMBER 6

MAY 25, 1984

Is Jesse Jackson an Anti-Semite?

by Jonathan H. Newman '84

Jesse Jackson's protege, Muslim minister Louis Farrakhan, has further provoked the controversy surrounding Jackson's relationship with the Jewish community. The altercation began when journalist Milton Coleman reported that in a personal conversation with Jackson, the Reverend had referred to Jewish people as "Hymies" and to New York City as "Hymietown." Following this admission, Minister Farrakhan called Milton Coleman's wife and warned her that "The same punishment that's due this no good filthy traitor, you get it yourself. One day soon we will punish you with death." In addition, Farrakhan publicly warned the Jewish people not to interfere with the Presidential campaign of Jackson. Farrakhan then concluded his press conference by referring to Adolph Hitler as "a very great man."



Jackson and Farrakhan

When questioned by the press if he would repudiate his ties to Farrakhan, Jackson said that he would stay by his colleague. Jackson noted that Farrakhan's statements may have been unfortu-

No Compromise

by Stephen P. Laffey '84

I've been pondering over what my last words to the class of 1984 will be. I could leave you with a specific solution to one of the many world problems — as I have in the past. But I feel as though my last message should be more general, more philosophic, so that I might be remembered for my attempts to change people's minds instead of being called for my views on any particular subject.

Since I arrived at Bowdoin I have constantly been told that life requires compromise. One must "give a little" now in order to get what one wants later. I have no objection to compromising particulars with people. When I want to play tennis at 2:00 p.m. but my partner can't make it until 3:00 p.m. then I am willing to compromise the time of our match. But notice what is being compromised and what is not. The moral principle being used is that a promise to attend on time will be kept. If we agree to play at 3:00 p.m. then I will be ready at 3:00 p.m. and no later. The moral principle is not up for compromise — nor should it ever be.

Today, compromise has come to mean a concession of one's moral values. Many people here at Bowdoin attempt to use what is known as the "Art of Smearing" to try to get others to compromise their beliefs. They say "You can't possibly believe that Capitalism is the answer to today's economic problems — why nobody believes that!" These people think that they can turn others into moral cowards by smearing them in public. But this is precisely when one must be extreme and answer "I sure as hell do!"

There are many people who are too weak to live by any moral principles; they decide what is best by their own irrational whims and desires. These cowards attempt to justify their actions in two ways. Firstly, they try to bring others down to their way of life by exhorting them to compromise their values. Secondly, these moral milksops say that no one can be wholly good so please don't accuse me of being all bad. It is these same ingrates who belittle

people who have clear, simple answers to the world's problems. They accuse others of seeing things in black and white, as if that was bad, impossible, or somehow wrong. What these poltroons are really saying is "Please don't discriminate between right and wrong."

This philosophy of compromise is taught at many colleges, of which Bowdoin is no exception. There are textbooks in freshmen economics that discuss Capitalism as though it were a failure. There are teachers here who see no difference between the Soviet totalitarian system and the American free enterprise one. They regard the invasions of Afghanistan and Grenada as one and the same.

I will not compromise my moral values with these "new isolationists." When rational people compromise their values with the irrational it is only the latter that can gain. For example, if you were to agree with some thug that if he only took some of your possessions in return for your not calling the police, you would be surrendering your recognition of property rights. And what value did you receive in return? Once this thinking becomes permanent on both sides the only question remaining is when the hooligan will be back for the rest of your property.

It is the immoral action of compromise that has led our country into its present position: a Government that interferes with individual rights, a foreign policy that, until recently, accommodated the spread of communism, and workers who seek the largest salaries for the least amount of work.

I will say here and now that I do see things in black and white — that I do discriminate between moral and immoral actions. The compromises that this country has made to the moral flinchers must be stopped. We must strive to return our country to the position it occupied before 1930 — one of limited government, free enterprise, and rational values.

Stephen Laffey is a member of the Class of '84; he will attend Harvard Business School in the fall.