LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Muslims must adopt unified stand against negative propaganda

Brother Bilal Ahmed al-Mujahid should be thanked for his letter entitled 'Muslims must quit being naive' (*Crescent International*, May 16-31, 1995). I agree with his suggestion that Muslims should get organized and consider taking legal action against people like Steve Emerson. The doctor with 'substantial earning' is willing to pitch in. However, if we could not unite on the *fatwa*, how will we unite on this cause?

Most likely, if one person takes such action, many Muslims and organizations will say that he is wrong. Unless we take united action under an umbrella organization, such legal action may create more dissension among ourselves.

Brother Mujahid must realize that the reason our 'enemies,' whether individuals, States or nations, are successful is due to our own inner weaknesses and in-fighting. During the days of the Uthmaniyyah emperor, Sulaiman the Magnificent, a play was about to be released in Paris, in which the Prophet, upon whom be peace, and his companions were to be ridiculed. When Sulaiman learned of this, instead of taking legal action in the international court, he sent a stern message that unless the play was stopped, his army would be knocking at the door of Paris. The play was immediately cancelled.

Within our ranks, we have puppets like Mubarak, Asad, Saddam, Salman Rushdie and Tasleema Nasreen. This is just the tip of the iceberg. There are many zeroes in the one billion Muslims who themselves are not sure about Islam and its values. They are the ones most deserving of our *da'wah*. Thus, unless we make ourselves strong and become united for a cause, suing one or two Emersons will not stop the media's terrorism against Islam and Muslims.

Finally, what Brother Mujahid calls my 'novel but simplistic' statement that 'the whole world should be divided into *Dar ul-Islam* and *Dar ul-Da'wah*' is not mine but from the writings of Imam al-Fakhr al-Razi.

Shahid Athar, MD
Indianapolis, IN, US

Accused, but not a terrorist yet

Re your page one story. 'US media's hatred of Muslims exposed' (*Crescent International*, May 1-15, 1995). While you are right to voice your concern over the alleged 'Middle East crazies' who were first credited with the Oklahoma City bombing, I would like to remind you that Timothy McVeigh has not yet been convicted of any crime, so to refer to him as a 'terrorist' is grossly improper. In Britain, the editor of a newspaper could be goaled for such an offence and, in fact, in 1949 the editor of the *Daily Mirror* was so goaled for such a contempt of court.

Another thing I would like to remind you of is that the hatred and venom which is directed at the Islamic world by certain American and, more generally, western elements is also directed at American and western nationalists generally. It is not, after all, such people who control the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*.

A Baron
Sydenham, London, UK

What is an average American?

As a loyal reader of the *Crescent International*, I was disturbed by a recent article entitled 'US media's hatred of Muslims exposed' (May 1-15, 1995). Most of the article was factual and well-written and, for the most part, I agree with its content. However, I feel that the writer exceeded the boundaries of professional journalism when he categorized the 'average American' as being 'as thick as a doorknob.' I am an American *Muslimah* and I can attest to the fact that I am definitely *not* 'as thick as a doorknob.'

We, as Muslims, must constantly battle against the many stereotypes that are placed on us. We should be the first to avoid stereotyping others, even those who may be considered hostile to us.

This writer's responsibility to the public was to report only factual information, not his/her own opinion on the subject, as this was not an editorial. Since the writer has a definite opinion as to the intelligence (or lack thereof) of the 'average American,' may I ask: What does the average American look like?

An American *Muslimah*
Florida, US

Chomsky ignores zionist control of US media

The *Crescent International* (May 16-31, 1995) ran an interesting review of Edward Herman's 'Beyond Hypocrisy: Decoding the news in an age of propaganda, including a doublespeak dictionary for the 1990s.' The author of the review, J A Pringle, mentions that 'The Doublespeak Dictionary is illustrated with wryly witty cartoons by Matt Wuerker, best known for his work in *Z Magazine* (where Herman also has a regular column on doublespeak.'

Z Magazine also published on a regular basis political works by Noam Chomsky, who also writes for *LOOT* (Lies of our Times) which is a supposed critique of the *New York Times*.

The *Crescent International* is one of the few papers that has the courage to tell the truth about the US media; ie, that it is largely controlled by the zionists. Why doesn't Herman or Chomsky ever mention who controls the media?

Why don't Herman and Chomsky ever admit that they are constantly preaching to the converted, as most Americans are nearly-illiterate and under the mind and emotional control of television?

What both Herman and Chomsky do is to freak and guilt people who care and make them feel even more hopeless than they do already.

A very clever tactic!

Josie Wallenius
Thunder Bay, ON, Canada