

World Culture Chronicles of Aframerica

From the areas of:

Government

Geographies

History

Lifestyle

Language

Plight of the Australian Aborigines

The plight of the Australian Aborigines testifies to the challenges people of color around the world face against the powers of Western and European imperialism. Like many other cultures subjugated to genocidal methods of the West, the Aborigines confront their oppressors voicing many of the same concerns as Black Americans, Indians, and Africans. Below is a recent account of their struggle and afterward a history of the Aborigine culture.

Recently in the News: ABORIGINAL PROTEST FOR QUEEN - March 3, 2006

More than 500 protesters gathered outside Melbourne's Royal Exhibition Building to call on the Queen to sign a treaty with Aboriginal Australians.

The protest was arranged by an indigenous rights group, the Black GST Collective.

The Queen is attending a state luncheon at the Exhibition building in the inner Melbourne suburb of Carlton.

The protesters hope to invite the Queen to talks on a treaty with Aborigines, but if she did not accept the invitation, protesters will march to Government House where the Queen is staying.

The demonstrators will then deliver a summons to the International Criminal Court alleging that aborigines were the subjects of systematic genocide since white settlement.

Eight of the protesters, some dressed in furs performed traditional music for the crowd as a police helicopter circled overhead.

The demonstrators were monitored by a large police contingent.

Aboriginal History and Culture

The literal translation of the word 'Aborigine' is: the people who were here from the beginning. It is not synonymous (doesn't have the same meaning), as the word 'indigenous' as this means originating in an area (latin: indigena = in (in) + ginere (be born) in a particular place.

There is no written record regarding prehistoric Aboriginal Australia. Knowledge of the past is found in archaeological evidence and Aboriginal oral traditions, which have been handed down from generation to generation.

Therefore using reliable dates derived from archaeological evidence, theories of the initial colonization of Australia have been determined.

Prior to colonization, which began in January 1788, the Australian Aborigines lived a lifestyle based on their Dreamtime beliefs. They had survived as a race for thousands of years and their lifestyle and cultural practices had remained virtually unchanged during that time. We refer to this as the traditional period.

However colonization imposed changes on the Aborigines as people who lived in areas that were being settled by the Europeans, were forced off their land as towns and farms were developed. We identify the period in which the changes took place, as the historical period. The sort of changes that took place usually commenced with explorers entering the area of a tribe and being challenged by the people for trespassing on their land. The Europeans often (usually) responded by shooting at the people. Many were killed. When settlers followed the explorers and began felling trees and building farms, they restricted the ability of the Aborigines to move freely around their land. They also destroyed their traditional food sources.

These changes took place throughout the continent at different times. They began in the Sydney and Parramatta districts from 1788; in the Cowpastures (Campbelltown / Camden) area from the early 1800s and in the Illawarra district from 1815. Gradually - but with increasing speed colonization spread throughout the entire continent.

The settlers had arrived in this country to build a new life for themselves and their families and had 'no time for the Dreamtime'. In other words most were not interested in the affects colonization was having on the Aborigines. In fact they were often considered to be a pest and a nuisance. Many were killed by diseases such as influenza. Thousands were massacred to make way for farms and settlements.

On the other hand some Aboriginal people adapted to the Whitman's laws and the new lifestyle. In doing so, many were reduced to pauperism and were beggars. Others broke the traditional tribal lore's by accepting Brass Plates and by moving into the traditional lands of other tribes. In many cases they had no option in doing this as they were facing starvation or the gun.

Overall, the Australian Aborigines went through stages of being conquered through an 'invasion' and taking of their lands. Many adapted to the new lifestyle (when many became reliant on alcohol, tobacco and handouts of food and clothing. However the settlers were often contemptuous of the Aborigines and separated them from their society and the people became the fringe dwellers of society. Others were removed from their families and placed into institutions. From the late 1830s the remnants of the tribes in the settled areas were moved onto Reserves and Missions where they were 'managed' by White men and were forbidden from teaching their children their language and customs.

During the 1900s separation was an official government policy, which lasted for many decades and today, many Aboriginal people do not know their origins. In other words, which tribe they are descended from or the names of their parents and or grandparents. They are a lost generation.

Australian Aborigines - the original inhabitants of the continent - are one of the best known and least understood people in the world. Since the nineteenth century they have been singled out as the world's most primitive culture and the living representatives of the ancestors of mankind. Aborigines are therefore probably more familiar to the rest of the world than are the white Australians who immigrated to the continent from Britain and other European countries. In reality, Aboriginal culture, as anthropological work over the last hundred years has revealed, is a complex, subtle, and rich way of life. On our way toward describing and understanding Aboriginal art, we need to look briefly at this culture, what it was in the past and what it has become today.

Aborigines have occupied Australia for at least forty thousand years. They came originally from Southeast Asia, entering the continent from the north. (Present-day Australia, including Tasmania, was then one continent with what is now New Guinea.) Although Aborigines are *Homo sapiens*, biological isolation has meant that they are not racially closely related to any other people. Because of their relative cultural isolation, Aborigines were forced to develop their own solutions to the problems of human adaptation in the unique and harsh Australian environment.

The result was a stable and efficient way of life. Probably because of its effectiveness, the society was slow to change, especially technologically. This gave to Aboriginal Australia the appearance of unchangingness. The archaeological record reveals, however, a number of innovations, among them the earliest known human cremations, some of the earliest rock art, and certainly the first boomerangs, ground axes, and grindstones in the world.

The stereotype of Aborigines passively succumbing to the dictates of their environment has also been recently questioned. We now know that they altered the landscape in significant ways, using what has been called "firestick farming" to control underbrush growth and to facilitate hunting. Aborigines also altered species occurrence of flora and fauna by resource management and possibly assisted in the extinction of prehistoric animals.

The notion of pristine natives with a "pure" culture was an artificial one - many Aborigines had considerable contact with Melanesians and Indonesians long before the European colonists arrived in Australia. Aboriginal groups also influenced each other.

Waves of change swept the entire continent - changes in tools and implements, in social organisation, and in ceremonial practices and mythological concepts. Aboriginal culture was dynamic, not static. The Aboriginal culture of the last two hundred years, the period after the arrival of the colonists, has also been dynamic. This is why it is difficult to speak of a hard and fast dichotomy between Aborigines "before" and "after" contact with the Europeans. Nevertheless, it is useful to look at Aboriginal culture at the point of first contact and as it is today.

The population of Australia at the time of the arrival of the whites in 1788 was probably between 250,000 and 500,000. The pattern of Aboriginal settlement was like that for present-day Australians, except in the tropical north, with most of the population living along the coasts and rivers. Densities varied from one person for every thirty-five square miles in the arid regions to five to ten persons for every one square mile on the eastern coast. Residential groups ranged in size from ten to fifty people, with some temporary ceremonial gatherings reaching up to five hundred.

Most people tend to think of Aborigines as a unified, homogeneous group. Yet the Aborigines never used one collective term to describe themselves. No one individual Aborigine, in the precolonial past, would have known of the existence of many of the other Aboriginal peoples and regions of the vast continent of Australia, which covers nearly three million square miles - almost the area of the United States.

Recent scientific studies have concluded that the Australian Aborigines were the original Americans! In other words, the theory is that ATSI people were adventurers who arrived in the North American continent before the Vikings or Columbus. This theory states that the ancestors of the American Indians are Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians. "Separate studies by both Brazilian and US scholars

are revealing that the first humans to enter the New World more than 14,000 years ago were not Mongoloid peoples as has always been thought - but were instead people of the same race as present day Australian Aborigines."

Source from: Crystalinks.com

March 2006 By Aframerica

Reports of worldwide humiliation run rampant in western media as mainstream journalist slam the lives of Australia's oldest occupiers of the large pacific island. The Aborigines are not exempt from the racist undertones thrown by Caucasians at people of color. Like peacocks strutting proudly, every US media outlet raced to shame a people who are nothing more than victims of western oppression and racism.

Reports from ABC, New York Times, Washington Post, AP, Rutgers and more have launched at the chance to feel good about themselves all in a days work of degrading others. According to a report released from an Australian news agency -

"Aborigines are 13 times more likely than other Australians to go to prison, with poverty, unemployment and poor education behind a sharp jump in the number of indigenous jailings, a report said on Friday. The rate of Aboriginal jailings rose 32 percent in the six years to 2006, while black youths were 23 times more likely to be detained after a brush with police and the courts, a government study of Aboriginal disadvantage said."

The report mirrors reports in America, Europe, Africa, and other countries where Caucasians have laid their laws and rules down as the standard to live by. The term "Black youth" semblances whites' effort to shine the light of negativity on Blacks across the globe, while of course flaunting an innocent arrogance only Satan himself can display.

This is sad that whites have to resort to reducing a people as old as the land they live and originated from into something out of the "fourth world" fantasy of their own minds. To top it all off, they use the old "it's not our fault" game, claiming they, "blamed an indigenous-run state agency -- axed by the government two years ago -- for many of the failings, as well Aborigines themselves."

After that seriously psycho-denial statement, the report went on to further degrade the people by saying, "Let's be honest with ourselves and say a lot of this comes down to personal responsibility and people being responsible for their drug and alcohol behavior, the abuse they inflict on others, 'Brought told Australian Broadcasting Corp. radio."

The personal responsibility lecture used here in the states and everywhere people of color just so happen to be living substandard as compared to the whites who rule and control the resources, goods and services; which solidifies the Aframerica theory that where ever whites reside, the people whose actual land it is will fall to the brunt of cruel and oppressive domination.

Are the Native Americans nearly extinct because they lacked the characteristic of personal responsibility? Or have their population been reduced because of slow and subtle genocide against them by resource-greedy whites? Are Africans living in disease, poverty, and underdevelopment because of lack of

personal responsibility or because their land was raped, partitioned out and exploited for the lustful pleasures of whites?

Are Black Americans crowded into prisons, ghettos, and barely making a living because they lack personal responsibility or because they were shoved to the back of the line just after being released from 400 years of human bondage?

Let us be real here; it is amazing how this small piece of news testifies to the entire plan of western Caucasians. How they are out to destroy the psyche, reputation, and lives of anyone who are a shade darker than they. The hypocrisy is uncanny.

June 2007 by CR Hamilton

Ankh: The Original Cross

The Ankh is defined as: The symbolic representation of both Physical and Eternal life. It is known as the original cross, which is a powerful symbol that was first created by Africans in Ancient Egypt.

The Ankh is commonly known to mean life in the language of Ancient Kemet (land of the Blacks) renamed Egypt by the Greeks. It is also a symbol for the power to give and sustain life, the Ankh is typically associated with material things such as water (which was believed by Egyptians to regenerate life), air, sun, as well as with the Gods, who are frequently pictured carrying an Ankh.

The Egyptian king is often associated with the Ankh also, either in possession of an Ankh (providing life to his people) or being given an Ankh (or stream of Ankhs) by the Gods. There are numerous examples that have been found that were made from metal, clay and wood. It is usually worn as an amulet to extend the life of living and placed on the mummy to energize the resurrected spirit.

The Gods and the Kings are often shown carrying the Ankh to distinguish them from mere mortals. The Ankh symbolized eternal life and bestowed immortality on anyone who possessed it. It is believed that life energy emanating from the Ankh can be absorbed by anyone within certain proximity. An Ankh serves as an antenna or conduit for the divine power of life that permeates the universe. The amulet is a powerful talisman that provides the wearer with protection from the evil forces of decay and degeneration.

The loop of the Ankh is held by the Gods. It is associated with Isis and Osiris in the Early Dynastic Period. The Loop of the Ankh also represents the feminine discipline or the (Womb), while the elongated section represents the masculine discipline or the (Penis). These two sacred units then come together and form life.

Because of its powerful appeal, the Ankh was used in various religious and cultural rituals involving royalty. In the Treasures of Tutankhamun, the Ankh was a major artifact found in the tomb. The circle

symbolizes eternal life and the cross below it represents the material plane. The Ankh is called the "Crux Ansata," it is of Egyptian origin and can be traced to the Early Dynastic Period, appearing frequently in artwork of various material and in relief, depicting the Gods.

It is usually held to the nose of the deceased king by the Gods to represent the breath of life given in the after-world. The Ankh also resembles a key and is considered the key to eternal life after death. Its influence was felt in every dynastic period and survives as an icon possessing mystical power throughout the Coptic Christian era.

The Ankh possessed by each God had power associated with that God. The Ankh of the God is related to the protection of the dead, that of Sekmet, War, Hapi related to the living waters of the Nile and Amen, the spirit God, the breath of life.

For more information and research, check out the book

The Ankh- The African Origin of Electromagnetism

By Nur Ankh Amen

2004 by AfroStaff

No Ocean Wide Enough: Blacks Oppressed in Britain Too

Reading the Black Britain website is like reading any Black website in the US. It appears that Blacks in Britain are facing the same extent of bigotry that Blacks in America are.

Thus, one simple question arises to our brothers and sisters here in America who believe race relations is all good, can this resemblance of racism across the great Atlantic be used to further prove that oppression against Black people will obviously never die, and in fact is intensifying?

As the New World Order continues to secretly close in, it seems that Blacks worldwide are being positioned as second, possibly third class and are at some point going to have to pull together and stop trying to fit in or happily assimilate. The days of pleasing massa and bowing to the Queen must cease if we as Black people want to secure our future.

Most ironic are the issues faced by Black Brits, it is almost uncanny how they are fighting and publishing issues that mirror those here. Below are headlines from the Black Britain website, take notice but do not allow deja'vu to take complete control.

- Black Britain Headlines

- ID Card plans could criminalise black citizens
- Almost a third of black male population held on DNA database
- Black assassination in the media lecture Category
- In association with 100 Black Men of London
- New documentary aims to put black violence in context
- Oona King says there is a risk of increasing voter intimidation
- Tackling discrimination and promoting equality
- Churches essential in fighting racism
- African leaders demands debt relief and better access to European markets
- Political will of EU leaders questioned after their pledge to increase aid
- The 2005 Barbados Gospelfest promises to be one of the best yet!
- D'Angelo Sheperds Bush Empire, London
- Catch Nelly plus supporting acts performing live at the M.E.N. Arena Manchester

The same psychological oppression used here is in effect there also. Activist are defending against National laws that target Blacks, negative studies are being written about Blacks, Black organizations are being profiled, the political field is not level for Blacks, the fight against discrimination seems ongoing, the church is segregated, world affairs against Africa are a concern, and even the entertainment news seem to mimic that of American entertainment.

Is this the twilight zone or what? Beyond a doubt, this is not mere coincidence, but anywhere there is white rule and Blacks as a minority, we suffer. It has become obvious to many, and will become clear to others in the near future, that a campaign has been put into place that is attempting to categorize, label, and afterward isolated Black people from the rest of the world. How about giving Africa back to us and its resources, and leave us the hell alone?

Visit Black Britain and see for yourself.

Save the Children: What About Our Children

You have seen the commercials and infomercials about "Saving the Children" in poor countries such as some African countries, and the pictures they show of impoverished children and villages that lack food. And you have heard the sponsor's cry for 40 - 80 cents a day (the cost of a cup of coffee) to send and support these villages and children, and many people actually wonder if the money ever gets to the people in those villages, or how much can your small cents do for the people. This is the perception of a channel-clicking view. But have you ever thought deeply about this humanitarian campaign?

First, if you have ever asked the age-old profound question why does God let children suffer, the answer has been revealed with a profound answer, which is, God does not allow children to suffer, man does. The people in these villages are mainly in African countries in which Africa, being on the American hit list for modern day under-development, has suffered at the hands of Western Imperialism for centuries.

To strip a country of its most precious resources, deprive that country of the opportunities to advance into modern civilization, and then turn and provide charity to that country from the measly cents of the working rich is a crime against not only humanity, but against God. The hypocrisy at play here is historical in its roots. The Christian good-will attempt is a sad and pathetic example of American arrogance and practice of oppression.

Second, have you ever asked yourself what about the children in America? The Black children, the white children and any other deprived children that suffer at the hands of poverty and hunger. What Christian campaign is there who has organized for them? Well the answer to that is also profound and has been revealed many times, but not acknowledged as genuine enough to warrant real concern.

In America, it is a social disgrace to receive charity or to accept handouts from charitable organizations. So, if you are poor and impoverished in America, it is not because poverty actually exist, but because you are a social misfit irresponsible of providing for yourself. If this is not a hypocritical double standard if there ever was one. In other words, it is OK to be poor and accept handouts if you live overseas and suffer at the hands of American Imperialism, but not OK if you live in America and suffer by the same hands.

There are hundreds of thousands of children and families that suffer poverty and hunger in America. The news media would not have anyone know the stats because it would bring shame to the organizations and agencies that supposedly speak and support the poor. It would bring shame to the United States government as to how many people are actually suffering poverty in this so-called land of opportunity.

Furthermore, the Christian organizations in America are rich beyond any small country's dreams. Some churches in America bring in more annually than some countries in Africa. One man in America has more money than ten African countries and people would wonder why on God's earth would anyone on this earth ever suffer hunger. Shame, shame on these religious organizations and monopolies that prosper off the monies of working people and then offer to impoverished countries pennies a day.

At the judging of the nations when God comes to judge the earth, there will be such weeping and wailing at the state of the world that the cries will be heard beyond the borders of heaven. Churches and organizations that conduct these campaigns are nothing more than capitalist and religious imperialist themselves who get off on ego trips of being the Saviors of people they have always considered beneath them anyway.

2003 by C.R. Hamilton

China Rising

The United States is facing a rising crises the mainstream media has neglected to report; that China poses a possible threat to the States concerning the future world power and domination. Below is a continued study of the White Man's Relationship with the Yellow Man. In this study, we look at the current crises the world is facing on a global scale.

The Bush administration is unwisely threatening China by urging Japan to rearm and by promising Taiwan that, should China use force to prevent a Taiwanese declaration of independence, the U.S. will go to war on its behalf. It is hard to imagine more shortsighted, irresponsible policies, but in light of the Bush administration's Alice-in-Wonderland war in Iraq, the acute anti-Americanism it has generated globally, and the politicization of America's intelligence services, it seems possible that the U.S. and Japan might actually precipitate a war with China over Taiwan. - Global Policy Forum

China, Japan, and the United States are the three most productive economies on Earth, but China is the fastest growing (at an average rate of 9.5% per annum for over two decades), whereas both the U.S. and Japan are saddled with huge and mounting debts and, in the case of Japan, stagnant growth rates.

China is today the world's sixth largest economy (the U.S. and Japan being first and second) and our third largest trading partner after Canada and Mexico. According to CIA statisticians in their Factbook 2003, China is actually already the second-largest economy on Earth measured on a purchasing power parity basis -- that is, in terms of what China actually produces rather than prices and exchange rates.

The CIA calculates the United States' gross domestic product (GDP) -- the total value of all goods and services produced within a country -- for 2003 as \$10.4 trillion and China's \$5.7 trillion. This gives China's 1.3 billion people a per capita GDP of \$4,385.

China's growing economic weight in the world is widely recognized and applauded, but it is China's growth rates and their effect on the future global balance of power that the U.S. and Japan, rightly or wrongly, fear.

The CIA's National Intelligence Council forecasts that China's GDP will equal Britain's in 2005, Germany's in 2009, Japan's in 2017, and the U.S.'s in 2042. But Shahid Javed Burki, former vice president of the World Bank's China Department and a former finance minister of Pakistan, predicts that by 2025 China will probably have a GDP of \$25 trillion in terms of purchasing power parity and will have become the world's largest economy followed by the United States at \$20 trillion and India at about \$13 trillion -- and Burki's analysis is based on a conservative prediction of a 6% Chinese growth rate sustained over the next two decades.

He foresees Japan's inevitable decline because its population will begin to shrink drastically after about 2010. Japan's Ministry of Internal Affairs reports that the number of men in Japan already declined by

0.01% in 2004; and some demographers, it notes, anticipate that by the end of the century the country's population could shrink by nearly two-thirds, from 127.7 million today to 45 million, the same population it had in 1910.

By contrast, China's population is likely to stabilize at approximately 1.4 billion people and is heavily weighted toward males. (According to Howard French of the New York Times, in one large southern city the government-imposed one-child-per-family policy and the availability of sonograms have resulted in a ratio of 129 boys born for every 100 girls; 147 boys for every 100 girls for couples seeking second or third children.

The 2000 census for the country as a whole put the reported sex ratio at birth at about 117 boys to 100 girls.) Chinese domestic economic growth is expected to continue for decades, reflecting the pent-up demand of its huge population, relatively low levels of personal debt, and a dynamic underground economy not recorded in official statistics.

Most important, China's external debt is relatively small and easily covered by its reserves; whereas both the U.S. and Japan are approximately \$7 trillion in the red, which is worse for Japan with less than half the U.S. population and economic clout.

Ironically, part of Japan's debt is a product of its efforts to help prop up America's global imperial stance. For example, in the period since the end of the Cold War, Japan has subsidized America's military bases in Japan to the staggering tune of approximately \$70 billion.

Refusing to pay for its profligate consumption patterns and military expenditures through taxes on its own citizens, the United States is financing these outlays by going into debt to Japan, China, Taiwan, South Korea, Hong Kong, and India. This situation has become increasingly unstable as the U.S. requires capital imports of at least \$2 billion per day to pay for its governmental expenditures.

Any decision by East Asian central banks to move significant parts of their foreign exchange reserves out of the dollar and into the euro or other currencies in order to protect themselves from dollar depreciation would produce the mother of all financial crises.

Prepare for a changing of the guards.

Source From: <http://www.globalpolicy.org/empire/analysis/2005/0315chinapower.htm>

Europeans Should Go Home to Europe

Black Americans should defend themselves against ignorant attacks from whites and any others who would condescendingly demand that Blacks return to Africa if they do not like America; contrary, America rightfully belongs to the indigenous peoples, and whites are the true foreigners.

"The true geographical boundaries of "America" consist of North America, South America and Central America. "America" is actually two (2) continents which has the longest combined borders of all the continents and islands on the planet."

Contrary to what we are taught in the indoctrination institutions called public school, America was not discovered, it was already here and inhabited by a people who lived and operated a society. In fact, America was stolen, pillaged, and developed by Europeans into what we see now and the original people are now prisoners on their own land. The same happened in Australia, Canada, South America, and North and South Africa.

"The TRUE ORIGINAL REAL jurisdictional areas of the "America People" extend from the uppermost point of Alaska in the North West, down to the most lower point of Chile in the South West. Americas include the Bahamas, the Greater/Lesser Antilles, Haiti, Cuba, Dominica, Chile, Brazil, Honduras, Peru, Columbia, Borinquen (Puerto Rico), Uruguay, Argentina, Paraguay, Venezuela, Bolivia, Mexico, Guatemala, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Etc., Etc., Etc."

"America" certainly does not historically consist of the Genetically Deficient Caucasoid European Albino-Mutant races from France, Germany, Dutch (Holland) Ireland, England, Scotland and definitely not "Modern Day Israel. Who is the real foreigner? Who is the true Illegal Immigrant? A Russian is from Russia, A Frenchman is from France, A German is from Germany, etc. This would clearly mean that they would be from the continent of Europe?"

While movements fight to protect the rights of immigrants, remember that most white Americans came to this country on boats and were allowed free residency into the ghettos of New York. Do not forget that Blacks today are descendants of Africans who were brought here against their will. To be asked to return to that land is nothing more than an arrogant claim to ownership of America by whites, an unequivocally erroneous and unjustified claim.

July 2007 by Afro Staff

The European/American HIV Holocaust

The HIV/AIDS epidemic that has plagued Blacks in Africa and now America is realistically comparable to the Holocaust led by the Nazi Party of Germany. The motives and general intensions mimic one another too closely to leave any doubt, since the American white man is simply an extension of the European breed.

The psyche of the European breed operates on the mad scientist level when considering control of the world, its resources, and relations with other colors and cultures of humanity.

The first obvious difference in thinking is their belief of racial superiority. Next is their drive to systemize the world according to their schema, and last, their stratagem to annihilate entire existences of people.

Mainstream agenda is to deter otherwise logical thinkers away from any notion of an HIV conspiracy against people of African descent. Unresponsiveness against such suggestions is rising and such accusations are deemed ludicrous and viewed with a jaundice eye, to cause anyone who would seriously suggest such a conspiracy to look foolish and or mistrustful in the world's eye.

The masterminds of the American media supported by European correspondents and news media, already own the spotlight in the world where propaganda is concerned, thus much of the world is under a state of bemusement of Western misinformation. So as long as the majority of the world sees the accuser as insane, the Euro-American Holocaust can continue without guilt.

The Holocaust was the systematic, bureaucratic, state-sponsored persecution and murder of approximately six million Jews by the Nazi regime and its collaborators. In 1933, the Jewish population of Europe stood at over nine million. Most European Jews lived in countries that the Third Reich would occupy or influence during World War II.

By 1945, close to two out of every three European Jews had been killed as part of the "Final Solution", the Nazi policy to murder the Jews of Europe. The persecution and segregation of the Jews was implemented in stages.

Through the same medical systematic, bureaucratic, Euro-America sponsored persecution, has millions of African people died and is suffering at the hands of a carefully crafted plan of disease-inflicting genocide. Only will this system of murder be deemed comparable to the Holocaust in years to come, after the process has fulfilled its goal. However, as of today, it is merely a coincidence believed to be a self-inflicted plague that Blacks have brought upon themselves.

As the death rates rise in Africa and the HIV/AIDS cases increase here in America among Blacks, this new-age "Final Solution" of the Westerners will continue in hindsight by those being affected and by those doing the infecting, simply because the control of information is under the rule of a propaganda machine based in Europe and America. As long as western science pushes its scientific conclusions onto the world, not only Blacks but other cultures of the world is at its mercy.

After the Nazi party achieved power, state-enforced racism resulted in anti-Jewish legislation, boycotts, "Aryanization," and the Kristallnacht ("Night of Broken Glass") pogroms, all of which aimed to systematically isolate the Jews from German society and drive them out of Germany.

Africans infected with the virus are centralized in large groups (basically quarantined by colonial governments). The virus has struck various countries and tribes of Africa in almost a processed way. Many journalistic reports do not include any certain areas of Africa as a means of deterring the inquisitive mind as to the process and direction the disease will take next.

From nowhere, the spread made its way into Black America and became centralized without notice or insinuation from the media. Large urban cities were hit first, including Washington D.C., Atlanta, GA., and portions of New York are where most of the cases have occurred.

The fact that the virus spread among Blacks and not whites or rural and or suburban areas is never addressed in media reports. How the virus made its way into Black communities via unprotected sex, needles, and lack of medical treatment without brushing against suburban whites or Blacks would

reasonably raise questions in a thinking mind; However, not many people in American society are using their mind when it is being controlled by American television.

The term "ghetto" originated from the name of the Jewish quarter in Venice, established in 1516. During World War II, ghettos were city districts (often enclosed) in which the Germans forced the Jewish population to live under miserable conditions. Ghettos isolated Jews by separating Jewish communities from the non-Jewish population and from neighboring Jewish communities. The Nazis established over 400 ghettos.

The Germans regarded the establishment of ghettos as a provisional measure to control and segregate Jews. In many places ghettoization lasted a relatively short time. With the implementation of the "Final Solution" in 1942, the Germans systematically destroyed the ghettos and deported the Jews to extermination camps where they killed them. A smaller number of Jews were deported from ghettos to forced-labor camps and concentration camps.

Most ghettos (situated primarily in Nazi-occupied eastern Europe) were closed off by walls, barbed-wire fences, or gates. Ghettos were extremely crowded and unsanitary. Starvation, chronic shortages, severe winter weather, and the absence of urban services led to repeated outbreaks of epidemics and to a high mortality rate.

It will be a matter of time before Black Americans are herded like cattle into virtual concentration camps. The urban areas are no longer considered ghettos because political correctness have censored its meaning. Yet, large metropolitan cities are packed with Blacks and despite mainstream optimism, it has become more difficult to escape these modern day ghettos.

If the HIV/AIDS virus continues to grow among Black Americans and Africans, disguised as reparations, there will be a subtle move toward allotting Black people of the world a partial of land away from the rest of the Euro stock. Once this happens, who's to say that the wired fences and walls will not rise around Blacks and needed resources cut off in order to complete the "Final Solution" of Western occupation of the world.

Source from: <http://www.ushmm.org/>

2005 by CR Hamilton

Imperialism By A Checkmark

When checking your race and ethnicity on an application, you have five choices according to the government agency for Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity. The racial subcultures in America are collectively divided according to national origin, as nature would suggest, and anyone could look at the races of the world and separate them with no problem. The shades of Black, white, red, along with facial

features and physical stature, should make the task that much easier. But for the United States government the task may have proven to be a bit too advanced.

According to the United States government, if you are of European or Middle Eastern Decent or from North Africa, you can safely check "white." If you are "Black or African-America" you are considered "A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa" and should check "Black or African-America." How disillusioned is this philosophy?

First of all, how can North African be separated from the rest of Africa? Second, by what misguided geographical calculation did the Middle East end up under European jurisdiction? Either this is a brazen and shameless attempt of the Western World to claim the riches and glory of the cradle of civilization, or they are so insistent on creating a racial divide that their sense of intelligence have been severely dulled.

The Official Report:

Standards for Maintaining, Collecting, and Presenting Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity

This classification provides a minimum standard for maintaining, collecting, and presenting data on race and ethnicity for all Federal reporting purposes. The categories in this classification are social-political constructs and should not be interpreted as being scientific or anthropological in nature. They are not to be used as determinants of eligibility for participation in any Federal program. The standards have been developed to provide a common language for uniformity and comparability in the collection and use of data on race and ethnicity by Federal agencies.

The standards have five categories for data on race: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and White. There are two categories for data on ethnicity: "Hispanic or Latino," and "Not Hispanic or Latino."

1. Categories and Definitions

The minimum categories for data on race and ethnicity for Federal statistics, program administrative reporting, and civil rights compliance reporting are defined as follows:

-- American Indian or Alaska Native. A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America), and who maintains tribal affiliation or community attachment.

-- Asian. A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent including, for example, Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam.

-- Black or African American. A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa. Terms such as "Haitian" or "Negro" can be used in addition to "Black or African American."

-- Hispanic or Latino. A person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race. The term, "Spanish origin," can be used in addition to "Hispanic or Latino."

-- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander. A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands.

-- White. A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa.

Respondents shall be offered the option of selecting one or more racial designations. Recommended forms for the instruction accompanying the multiple response question are "Mark one or more" and "Select one or more."

If logic serves as a natural law, then any Middle Eastern person in their right mind would be offended by being lumped as a white European. Furthermore, if common sense reigns as man's most primitive sense for survival, anyone in his or her right mind would question the logic behind Africa. Egypt and all of North Africa are actually "Africa." And the people originally [or of national origin] from there are by nature considered "African." Duh! What has possessed the American government to commit such a haughty act of deception? This antic of the American government is one that definitely shows their future intentions for World Imperialism.

Source From: http://www.omhrc.gov/omh/sidebar/omb_datastats_1997.htm

2004 by C.R. Hamilton

Cities of our Future

Growing businesses and economy, universities that graduate students who see the world as a place of opportunity awaiting them to solve problems of humanity, address crises in fields of science, medicine, politics, and social and cultural relations without regard to race or color, this blossoming social powerhouse is a city becoming more fiscally and socially sound than Detroit, St. Louis, or Miami, Florida. Meet Nairobi, Kenya.

Founded in 1899, Nairobi is the most populous city in East Africa, with an estimated urban population of between 3 and 4 million. According to the 1999 Census, Nairobi is currently the 4th largest city in Africa. It is now one of the most prominent cities in Africa politically and financially. Home to many companies and organizations, Nairobi is established as a hub for business and culture. The Globalization and World Cities Study Group and Network (GaWC) defines Nairobi as a prominent social centre. Ranked at 58th in the Capital of the World rank of cities in order of their prominence, Nairobi is listed as a global capital as an economic and cultural powerhouse.

How many photos have we seen of poverty, starvation, and disease in Africa? How many American Christian non-corporations are profiting from the negatives of what many believe to be a destitute and barren land of a supposed backward civilization. And how many of our children turn their heads away from being African in nature out of shame for what they have been told is a horrible place.

Nairobi, as well as other major African cities, is growing in social and economic independence of British rule. Many indigenous African cultures are attempting to reclaim their lands and resources from European imperialism and join in world trade to bring their societies into the competing world of advanced technology. Though poverty does exist in Nairobi, as it does in any major city (New Orleans), the struggle against European underdevelopment is a struggle for the lives of Africans.

Known for its crowded slum area, which covers only 5% of the city, the slum stands in sharp contrast to the elegant homes, luxurious hotels and impressive office buildings found elsewhere in the city and are a mirror picture of the ghettos of Washington D.C. against the backdrop of U.S. government buildings. The fight for economic and social development in Nairobi is against the same dominating force that Black America struggles against in the United States; a war of class stratification.

Nevertheless, Nairobi is thriving despite the negative images portrayed by U.S. media and infomercials about poverty stricken regions of the country. There is technology, there is running water, there is cable television, phone and Internet service available for those who work and earn a living. Education is as normal as education in the US; the film and music culture is also prosperous as well as the arts, nightlife and dining atmosphere of the city. So why do we see all the negatives instead of the positives of living in African cities?

The answer is simple; to maintain a sense of control over the economic resources of Africa, the US must keep others (preferably Black Americans) from going there and possibly drawing a sincere desire to help develop and reclaim the land as home to the Black man and woman. If they can convince Blacks that Africa is a cesspool of poverty and disease, at the same time make them believe that America is the only place of pleasure and opportunity, they can remain in dominance of Africa's resources.

Black America in a collective rush could benefit many cities in Africa with the knowledge we have gained from living in America. Ripe for innovation and entrepreneurship, African cities, universities, and culture is an untapped market for true development as opposed to imperial exploitation by Christian opportunist and so-called humanitarians. If Christian groups truly wanted to stop poverty in Africa, they would not merely drop food baskets to the poor paid for by the funds of donors, they would move there and begin developing the infrastructure for those there and those to come.

Capitalist Christian preachers that preach prosperity in the United States yet exploit the poor of African countries by capitalizing from their poverty, are the worst of humanity and a disgrace revealing a psychotic sense of greed, power, and ignorance of God's will. By prostituting the living conditions of African children over the cable airways in the US gives them the total power to control what goes in and out of those countries. Black America must discourage this behavior and move to develop Africa, not use it for profit.

There is life in Nairobi and it can be a good life. Better than the lives of many Blacks in some of America's urban cities. More jobs, better schools, affordable housing, more opportunity to create business, help others, and live without the curse of racism. Limiting your world view simply to America media propaganda will destroy the minds and dreams of millions of Black children and well educated Blacks who want to make change in the world. Look beyond the cities around you and toward the cities of our future.

Feb. 2008 by Afro Staff

First, Second, Third World Ideology

In the period after World War II, many commentators spoke of three worlds, or styles of development: the first world consisted of the wealthy capitalist, democratic countries of Western Europe and the United States; the second world of Russia and its eastern European allies, with their Communist Party states; and the third world of poorer nations, such as Islamic and African countries, just emerging from colonization and now seeking their appropriate place in the world.

Today the term "third world" is frequently used with a negative, and much resented, connotation to designate poor, technologically backward, inefficiently organized nations. When the term first came to be used in the 1950s, however, it carried more inspirational connotations.

In the first wave of decolonization following World War II, newly independent nations emerged into a world bitterly and expensively polarized into two hostile, belligerent blocs. The United States mobilized a group of Western European nations, which were mostly wealthy or in the process of regaining their wealth after the war, following primarily capitalist free-market economic principles, and practicing democratic politics.

The USSR mobilized an opposing group of nations in Eastern Europe; these were less wealthy but possessed the basic material necessities of life under an economy commended by the state, which was ruled by the Communist Party. These two blocs, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact, respectively, confronted each other, heavily armed and actively competing in developing and testing nuclear weapons and delivery systems. They competed, too, for the support and alliance of the newly independent nations.

Many of the newly independent nations, however, advocated a third alternative, a "third world." Many wished to be non-aligned, to avoid taking sides. They felt that Europe and America put little value on human life, as two world wars had demonstrated. They urged disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament. At a time when the first two worlds were locked in an arms race to build first the atomic bomb, then the hydrogen bomb, and ever more powerful rockets to launch them.

They advocated state investment in such basic human needs as food, clothing, shelter, medical care, and small, "appropriate" scale technology, often through international assistance, rather than in the purchase of weapons.

With independence, each of these former colonies entered the United Nations, changing the size and complexion of that organization. Although race was not usually mentioned overtly in third world advocacy, almost all members of the "third world" were people of color, while the overwhelming majority of both first and second world groups were white. In 1955, third world representatives convened

by Jawaharlal Nehru (1889-1964) of India, Gamal Abdel Nasser (1918-70) of Egypt, and Marshal Tito (1892-1980) of Yugoslavia met at Bandung, Indonesia, to launch their collective entry into international politics.

Some first and second world leaders, especially the America Secretary of State John Foster Dulles (1888-1959), saw these third world positions as immoral refusals to take sides in what they regarded as the great ideological, quasi-religious struggles of the Cold War. But, generally, in the 1950s the term "third world" had a positive connotation.

The French academic Alfred Sauvy claimed to have coined the term as a parallel to the Third Estate in the French Revolution, which claimed to represent the vast majority of the nation that up to then had been ruled only by the first and second estates of clergy and nobility. The French journal of international economic and political development, *Cahiers du Tiers Monde* ("Journal of the Third World"), established in 1956, also chose its title as a proud call to a new global order.

Source From: *The World's History*, Spodek, 2001

2004 by C.R. Hamilton

Afromerica on Global Warming

“So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.”

And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth (Genesis 1:27, 28).”

Uncertified in scientific matters, Afromerica does possess the God-given attribute of common sense, for, there remains a spiritual connection between man and earth that science has yet to understand or reveal. That connection is one ordained before the foundations of the world and its matter is the very essence of common sense. Therefore, understanding the earth is man’s most basic instinct.

According to the above scripture, man was given the authority to replenish the earth, which means “to fill or make complete again or to inspire or nourish.” In the first instance, God implies that man should complete what He had started by adding to what is already there or restoring what he uses, and in the second instance, God is suggesting that man love the earth possibly as the man loves the woman God created along with him.

These two God-ordained rules given to man are large indeed. In essence, man has the spiritual authority to grow or improve the earth along with the phenomenal ability to have a divine connection to the earth even to the point of conversing with and nourishing it as a loved one.

In many cultures and in times past, this relationship between man and earth has endured, where man communicates with the earth through various means such as astrological patterns, sun, moon, and wind cycles, seasonal shifts, grumbles from within and outward displays of moody weather fluctuations. Ancient Afrikan and Indian cultures had this relationship with the earth.

Because they had this relationship, their spiritual awareness and physical well-being were at excellent levels. Though they had no telephones, televisions, cars, or Internet access, (and state-imposed propaganda was confined to smaller areas instead of worldwide), they lived longer because wide-spread disease was rare and it was easier for them to prepare for and survive the changes of the earth's moods, such as famine, drought, hurricanes, earthquakes, and other natural disasters, simply because they knew the signs, which was the language the earth spoke, and they listened.

Today, humanity's disconnect with the earth have left people vulnerable to these earth changes thus we know not what to expect. Science claims to have answers and humanity has developed technologically to attend to the needs and wants of people, but advancement have left off how to attend to the needs of the earth. Now, science has admitted to the world that we are unprepared for the next change in the earth's mood.

Global warming is the process by which greenhouse gases that humanity has produced during this age of the Industrial Revolution are now blocking the sun's heat and life-giving energy, which causes abnormal weather patterns, and the earth will eventually expire from lack of solar nutrition, and all life and humanity as we know it will slowly wither into the dust from which we came.

Western scientists are warning us that if world governments do not act now against Global warming, we could face major changes in the next 30 years. (However, reports from the early 2000s at one time placed the changes at 200 years or more away). In fact, there are contradictory scientific theories on Global warming amongst the world's (Western) scientist.

One group upholds it while another group does not see the earth's changes as a threat, at least not for hundreds of years to come. Granted, the earth does have changing cycles where it warms and cools, but these changes happen centuries and millenniums at a time and not over a decade or two at a time, such as scientist would have the world believe today.

As stated earlier, at one point the changes were not expected to effect us until 150 to 200 years from now, but now, since the Global warming conference convened on February 2, 2007, the census predict change could effect us in the next 30 years. According to the report, "hundreds of scientists from around the world released a report showing that global warming is accelerating, that human activity is responsible for this warming, and that it is likely irreversible for centuries, even if greenhouse gas emissions are stabilized." This is where Aframerica poses its theory.

First of all, we believe that this is all political, not geological. It is a 'Democrats hate Republicans and corporate capitalist venture' war that include liberal university scientist paid by liberal interest groups such as environmentalist to put pressure on big business, which in turn will tax the people more. We agree that the earth change cycles overtime, but not because of what humanity does. There earth is too big to absorb any impact from humans.

Already, however, according to news reports, states are passing laws that will eventually cause your taxes to rise as a result of emissions standards. In August of 2006, "Governor Schwarzenegger has embraced a cap on vehicle and industry emissions as a way to make California a trendsetter in fighting global warming. California's Global Warming Solutions Act aims to cut emissions to 1990 levels, or around 25 percent, by 2020 with an enforceable cap and mandatory reporting for top polluters."

What this means to consumers is that we will feel the backlash from Government regulation on private businesses who will in turn pass the cost over to us and we will be paying out the ass just to have a vehicle, appliances, and electronics that does not pollute or harm the environment, in addition to higher utility bills such as heating oil, electricity, and water. And this is only the beginning.

The Global warming scientist say "mid-range scenarios predict severe droughts and floods, more intense hurricanes and cyclones, pressure on fresh water and food supplies, increased spread of diseases, and rising sea levels that could displace hundreds of millions of people worldwide." Do you know what this means?

It means shortages in every area of life; and do you know who will suffer the most? The poor, which include underdeveloped countries and Black people. Imagine the repercussions from each of the above scenarios; remember Katrina? Remember how Blacks were left for dead or to die?

Now imagine this happening every year. Imagine shortages on food, higher food prices, the need for more Government regulated survival kits, medical insurance rates, availability to vaccines and medicines; shifts in demographics from weather-vulnerable cities to more weather-protected cities, away from coastlines, potential earthquake zones, and flood areas. Do you know who would get the chosen pick of the litter first? Whites and the rich.

Yes, Aframerica has a theory, which is the United States and its mother country and partner in crime Europe, is developing a plan to separate the world's people, not only by class, but by color. Aframerica believes that this theory has been hastened from 150 to 200 years to the next 30 years because something has to happen that will secure a particular gene pool of humanity before the return of the very God who devised this plan in the first place.

See, the current world rulers (Europe and America) are in dire straits where it pertains to the earth's resources. China and other countries are coming along and demanding more; once underdeveloped countries are developing and threats of take-over are becoming eminent. So the West has to devise a scheme that will streamline their operation and the only way to do that is trim the fat from society.

The war on terror backfired, racial oppression is backfiring, and the AIDS, Bird flu, West Nile and Mad cow disease plots did not quite fulfill their mission, so now comes the drastic measure, the old Global warming threat to humanity plan. Once enough controlled weather cycles are dispensed throughout the United States and Europe (enough to convince the citizens that something has to be done and the Government are the only ones that can save humanity by dismantling corporate capital, raising taxes and tightening control on individual freedom), then will the separation begin, slowly, yet definitely.

The problem, however, with the West' diabolical plot, is they ignorantly and arrogantly cropped the Creator from the picture. The relationship between man, God, and the earth is eternal and cannot be broken that easily. It can be shaken, but not broken. In their quest to assume the duties of God and ignore

the power granted to them by God over the earth, they will eventually escalate their impending judgment by reason of neglect and mistreatment of humanity.

In the end, the anticipated destruction of humanity by the earth changes will fulfill itself through God's judgment and not their own, and thus hinder their ability to create the chosen race. It will only give way to a more superior race of people; people graced with the original powers of oneness with the earth, and western science and all who paved the way for and submitted to Government control, will finally have the chance to experience Global warming. But it will not be an effect of greenhouse gasses or industrial pollution, no. It will be from the heat of eternal hell fire and brimstone.

Source from: <http://www.ens-newswire.com/ens/feb2007/2007-02-02-01.asp>

Feb 2007 by CR Hamilton

An Analysis of Capitalism

Capitalism is a term applied to economic systems in which individual persons or private corporations develop, own, and control much of a country's physical capital. Capitalism is also referred to as a Free-Market System, where individuals are free to decide what products to produce, how to produce them, whom to sell them to, and at what price to sell them. Thus, they have the chance to succeed - or fail - by their own efforts.

Capitalism owes its philosophical origins to eighteenth-century philosophers such as Adam Smith. According to Smith, in the ideal capitalist economy (pure capitalism) the market (an arrangement between buyer and seller to trade goods and services) serves as a self-correcting mechanism - an "invisible hand" to ensure the production of the goods that society wants in the quantities that society wants, without regulation of any kind (Business Today, 2001).

Though the dialectical concept of capitalism surfaced during the 1800's, the actual practice of capitalism began in the late 1400's - early 1500's during the time of the Protestant Reformation and the Catholic Counter-Reformation. While Martin Luther fought to split from the Roman Catholic Church, the Catholic Reformation supported the expansion of the economies of Europe throughout the world.

Within these historical developments many people can connect the discovery of America and the economic enterprise of slavery with the newfound Protestant religion and the worldwide expansion of Europe under Catholic rule. However, most modern day scholars of Europe and America will try hard to keep the two separate not wanting to afford the crime of human bondage to the religious values of the American founders or the eminence of the Roman Catholic Church.

Around 1900 the great German sociologist Max Weber, noticing that the economically advanced territories of England, Holland, and North America had all been Protestant, argued that Protestantism, particularly in its Calvinistic forms, was especially conducive to acquisitive economic enterprise.

According to Weber, this was because Calvinism theology, as opposed to Catholicism, sanctified the ventures of profit-oriented traders and moneylenders, and gave an exalted place in its ethical system to the business ventures of thrift and diligence.

But historians have found shortcomings in Weber's thesis. Although Calvin did indeed praise diligence and acknowledge that merchants could be "sanctified in their calling," he no more approved of exorbitant interest rates than Catholics did. Moreover Calvin argued vehemently that people should put their excess wealth at the service of the poor rather than piling up capital for the sake of gain or subsequent investments. Thus it appears that the "work ethics" necessary for economic success in commercial ventures did have some Calvinistic roots, but that Calvin's ideal merchant would by no means have been a great speculator or maker of fortunes.

Bearing in mind that the European economy had already made great strides forward in the High Middle Ages and was advancing again in the early modern period, not least because of the overseas ventures initiated by the Catholic powers of Portugal and Spain. Calvinism thus was at most just one of the many contributory factors to the triumph of modern capitalism and the Industrial Revolution (Western Civilization, 1983).

In the above excerpt, it is clear that modern day scholars seek to disassociate either Euro-religious faction with slavery or Christian world colonialism. And it is no mere coincidence that this religious/economic triad occurred during and around the same historical periods. The fact is, the religious and royal elitist of those times proclaimed loudly of their dedication and communion to God yet at the same time capitalized on the world's resources including the use of human-slave labor.

It was by the funding of the Roman Empire that Portugal and Spain set sail to new lands (particularly the gold coast of Africa) and the Americas, and by the exploratory ventures of the Calvinist religious rebels who escaped Europe and settled in North America. Under the indoctrination of the "Protestant work ethic" did American capitalism come about. Afterward the collaboration of capitalism and Christianity came about, by which America lives now.

2003 by C.R. Hamilton

An Analysis of Communism

In an historical sense, communism refers to all doctrines that propose a new social order in which everyone will hold property in common and there will be no private property. In recent years, communism has come to mean only the doctrine and practice of the Communist party in Russia and other countries.

The word communism comes from the Latin term *communis*, meaning common or belonging to all. It was first used about 1835. Secret revolutionary societies in Paris apparently coined the term. French conspirators used it to express the idea of the community, or common ownership and control, of all property.

Early Communism

The idea of common ownership of property goes back thousands of years. In Greece in the 800's B.C., the legislator Lycurgus is said to have passed laws abolishing poverty and riches by establishing economic equality. Plato, writing his *Republic* in the 300's B.C., called for a community of goods. A number of early Christians practiced some forms of community of property.

Many persons became interested in the idea of community of property in the 1500's. Sir Thomas More published his *Utopia* in 1516. In it, he proposed a government under which all citizens would share equally the wealth produced by industry. Some persons held that natural law demanded community of property. They looked for confirmation of their theories in stories of Indian life in America. Some reports asserted that many tribes appeared to live in a state of nature, practicing a common ownership of property.

In the 1800's, many communistic societies appeared in Europe and America. Most of them were based on religious beliefs, as in the Mennonite and Dukhobor communities. Many nonreligious groups took as their basis the teachings of the British reformer Robert Owen. Others followed Francois Fourier of France.

Marxian Socialism

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels of Germany adopted the word communism. Their *Communist Manifesto* of 1848 gave wide circulation to the word, and later served as the creed for the new revolutionary movement.

Marxian socialism claimed that all history showed a continuous warfare between the proletariat, or working class, and the ruling class. In Europe at that time, owners of factories, mines, forests, and farmlands had come to rule many countries, replacing the nobility.

According to Marxian socialism, the factory owners and managers cruelly exploited their workmen. They took part of the value of production their workers earned as their own profit. Marxian socialists believed that the working class was growing larger in numbers and sinking deeper in misery, while the bourgeois, or people of the middle class, were growing richer. Marx predicted that recurring periods of prosperity and depression would destroy capitalism. He called upon the workers to hasten the inevitable downfall of capitalism.

Economic history has exposed the errors of Marxian socialism. In the 1900's, the working class, at least in the Western World, has gained a higher standard of living, instead of sinking in misery. The middle class has grown larger, rather than smaller.

Wealth has become widely distributed, instead of concentrating in the hands of a few individuals. Several hundred thousand persons may own stock in a large corporation in the United States. Millions of workers

have come to own a share in management. And recurring cycles of prosperity and depression have not destroyed capitalism.

Socialism vs. Communism

A distinction gradually arose between socialism and communism. Most socialists advocated public ownership and control over all means of production and distribution. But they did not propose to abolish private property, and people would be allowed to own their own homes. Almost all socialists also believe that the socialized state could be achieved by gradual evolution, not by a violent revolution.

Communism, as it gradually developed in the minds and plans of such leaders as Lenin, grew more and more revolutionary than socialism. The communists proposed to destroy the capitalist system by violence, and to abolish private property. They approved the use of terrorism as a weapon in the revolution. They expected the workers to seize control in a revolution, to liquidate, or destroy, the middle class; and to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat, in which workers would govern each other for the benefit of society.

There would be a classless society, because the working class had destroyed all other classes. After the revolution was safely over, the state would gradually wither away. Citizens in the workers' republic would perform their duties without government direction. Many of these ideas represented major changes in Marx's ideas. They became known as Leninism.

Communists Imperialism

In 1924, the communists had set up the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, to include Russia and Siberia. They used the word socialist in their name, but meant what we would call communist. Later, Joseph Stalin gained control and used their position to win control of the Communist party and the state when Lenin died in 1924. He then proceeded to change Leninism, just as Lenin had changed Marxism. He made theories flexible enough to meet changing conditions. For example, he stated that the dictatorship of the proletariat must not disappear, but must become stronger, because the revolution was not safe from capitalism.

To make his dictatorship stronger, he created a police state controlled by the party to hold the Russian people in subjection. But instead of allowing all workers to share equally in the products of industry, communist bureaucracies gradually seized more and more for themselves.

After World War II, Russia forced communist dictatorships on the people of Eastern Europe and parts of Asia to form a "satellite" empire. A so-called "Iron Curtain" isolated this empire from Western nations. The Russians forced local communists in the puppet government to exploit their own people and resources to benefit Russia.

In 1948, communist Yugoslavia broke with Russia. Its president, Tito, condemned Stalin for changing the true spirit of communism to fit Russia's needs. Yugoslavia began an uneasy existence between Russia and the West. Poland's communist government won some measure of independence from Moscow after a rebellion in 1956. In the same year, Hungary began an all-out revolt, but Russian troops crushed it.

Source from: World Book Encyclopedia: Field Enterprises, 1962, pg. 725

2003 by C.R. Hamilton

White America's Damned Country

It has become comical to watch white America broadcast from their supremacist media posts reruns of Jeremiah Wright's sermon as a method to instill fear and doubt into the minds of propagandized whites in an attempt to destroy Barack Obama. You know the ones, the whites who are proud American "gun-totting Christians" - the oxymoron of the new millennium - and who are spellbound each year by the antics of American Idol yet are incapable of deciding on a president.

There are not enough, (correction, there are too many) words to describe the hypocritical double-standard (oxymoron intended) white America has substituted for intelligence during this political season. First they hate Hillary Clinton and now they love her, as long as it is enough love to defeat a Black man. Many whites say that Barack's being Black has nothing to do with the way they vote or for whom, but Black folks know better than that and have always known and expected America's racist tricks.

If Clinton becomes president, at some point it will dawn on these "gun-totting Christians" that for the past 20 years there have been either a Bush or a Clinton in the Whitehouse, which spells conspiracy loud and clear. But because of the heavy dose of media Ritalin dispensed on America's brains, they will take a pair of scissors to their nose for the sake of saving their supremacist face.

If McCain becomes president, it is still 20-plus years of Bush-Clinton because McCain is nothing more than a stand in for the Bush-Illuminati regime. It is the New World Order coming to life, which signifies and justifies the damnation of America. Because America is the leading force of world globalism and because they are the organizers of the new and fabricated Israeli state, they have set themselves as a prime target for the reign of an anti-Christ role in the world. They are fulfilling many biblical prophecies all to their own destruction. Unwittingly, they have inserted themselves ignorantly into God's foreordained plan.

Politics in America is a joke: a complete debacle of a democratic system and a stain on the concept of human government. Democracy is a powerful system if run correctly, but the leaders of the United States have turned it into a cesspool of dirt, hatred, and now a race-baiting rivalry. The obvious is too easy to see and if it escapes one, it is because their mind has been drenched in and overtaken by a sewage spill of media propaganda. Right is wrong and wrong is right, up is down and Black is white. The twisted tales of America today brings a lamenting trump on the future of all who partake in the tribulations of American duplicity. Talk about an axis of evil?

Listen closely at some political pundits (white-bred educated scholars of Ivy League universities) and the distorted words they speak. One says, "The American judicial system is the envy of the world." This statement was obviously made without regard to the injustice done to Black men by the American judicial system or the global statistics of America having the highest rates of executions, imprisonment, and

methods of torture in rank with North Korea, Iran, Syria, and other so-called third world countries considered as the Axis of evil.

Another pundit mentions, "God lead the Founding Fathers to design and write the Constitution..." including the part about Blacks being sub-human, which eliminated them from receiving government tracks of land given out during the land grabs of the 18th and 19th centuries, the establishment of credit-base companies and share holdings of railroads in Pennsylvania and throughout the country along with contracts to start airlines, television and radio stations, and not to mention having no rights by law to participate in the political system.

The past is celebrated where it pertains to the brilliance of the founding fathers yet it was they who sanctioned slavery, got rich off of and prospered from, and ordained the brutal beatings of Black men, women, and children for over 300 hundred years. They obtained wealth from withholding it from Blacks until 50 years ago - still to this day, and other pundits this very day claim there is no wrong in America and anyone who sees and warns of the coming damnation of this nation is unpatriotic should be ostracized if they mention the crimes whites have done and continue to do toward Blacks and even their own people.

The brainwashing that has been so diabolically and systematically activated over the general public is almost sci-fi equivalent: a bad nightmare that a heavily medicated population has been suffocated with is driving down human intelligence and being replaced with mind-numb animatronics who believe that God says love your neighbor but carry a gun just in case. Even America's white pastors cannot deny that there is a dark cloud hovering this country that at any moment will dispense harking angels proclaiming that that great country Babylon if fallen.

America, the most warfaring country in the world: bet your money that the troops will be a comin' home within the next 5 years and you will lose what little you have left from the economic security you once had. Bet your money, that the media you so love to trust will be filming and reporting the number of bombs dropped in Iran based on a trumped up charge of terroristic threats against the "free world," and you may come from under the peril of financial blight that has hit your home life and standards of living.

The Soul of Black Folk by W. E. B. DuBois is more than a book title; it is what sustains America from becoming empty of God's grace. To the spiritual novice, America is not in an advantageous state beneath the graces of God, in fact, the very Bible that the "gun-totting Christian" places his cold hand upon reports that "No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon" (Luke 16:13).

Either love your country and hate God or hold to your gun and despise the Ten Commandments, the concept of justice toward other men of all races, life at conception, abstaining from sexual deviance upon lascivious women, men who work that which is unseemly, and defiling the innocence of little children. All these are political issues and dilemmas that circle the socialistic atmosphere of the United States, and people believe that damnation is not a factor in the future of America? Please.

Without the cries for mercy, deliverance from oppression, and justice from the hearts and mouths of Blacks, this country would have no direct line to God and be void of any soul at all. There is no conscience that questions the acts of America's higher powers. There are no voices that plead for the rights of the people. There certainly are no politicians that can promise anything different than what we

see today or who even care to change what is now. Barack is lying and Clinton is lying. By the way, did you hear the one about the newscaster, the political candidate and the radio talk show host who says that Barack is an elitist? Have you ever laughed to the point that no sound came from your mouth? Well hear this.

No words can describe the sanctimonious stench of BS in this one; however, have anyone noticed that they are all elitist? They are all rich; they are all spoiled, rotten, greedy capitalist, finger-sandwich eating, Grey Poupon spreading snobs, from the newscasters to the talk show host. They all have bank accounts above six figures and are protected by homeland security officers, and they say Barack is an elitist. Damn! The white pot calling... It has become too easy to see the ignorance in today's so-called educated American.

There is a chance for redemption; however, it must come from the people. But if the people are as dense as those who vote for a lesser evil based on the lies and hatred against another, and who make decisions by reason of a blueprint of fear, they deserve what they get. But if the people decide to retake their minds by retaliating against the oppressor (the media and the politicians), America may have a chance at salvation that stems from true righteousness. But how many of us really believe that will happen. In fact, this country seems to be a glutton for punishment. They have brought upon themselves the spirit of famine when there is no famine.

Suddenly, there is a rice shortage, a global food crises, a threat against the ecosystem leaving us limited time to live on this earth. There are diseases with no cure, wide-spread poverty, shortages of this and scarcity of that, the threat of this and a real possibility of that. So if the damnation of America is to come soon, it will not only come as repercussion for the crimes against humanity, but as a result of their own proclamation of faith. So let it be known now and spoken, God does not damn a country just as God does not allow people to suffer. Damnation comes to anyone or entity as the result of their own doing. God does not damn America, America has damned itself.

Apr. 2008 by CR Hamilton

The Difference between Freedom and Imperialism

American patriotism assumes that a citizen of the United States concur with the idea of setting free a nation or group of people that the American government would define as oppressed under a cruel and communistic dictator of that country. Oppression under a dictatorial regime would mean the country's ruler is either committing genocide against his own people - by killing massive amounts of them, a form of "indentured servitude," or blatantly ignoring the needs of a certain people within that country.

If either of these events is reported to the American government, when it is in their best interest to stop such cruelty, the American government will intervene by committing American troops and applying policing to that country. Once all threats have been made from the American government toward the

dictator, and all diplomacy efforts are exhausted, the American government implements military force as a solution.

Giving all due respect to the efforts of America to desire peace throughout the world, the first problem with this whole scenario is the fact that America intervenes at all. No country is paying taxes to America to police their communities as much as America's own citizens do, so why respond to the beckoning of countries in trouble, over-extending our own resources and manpower?

Suspicion arises as to what motivates the American government to take on such responsibility. There are problems throughout the world in various countries and cultures that we have no knowledge of solving because of the country's own history. We cannot begin to understand the complexities of land partitioning between rival nations that have gone on for thousands of years. And it would be dangerous to try.

We cannot begin to know what sacred traditions - and possibly violations of those traditions - cause age-old wars between two or three cultures of humankind dating back long before Columbus stumbled onto the Americas. Therefore, how can we begin to know how to solve these problems using some new age form of anger management or conflict resolution?

If there is a blatant act of oppression going on anywhere in the world, it is probably due to a prophetic cleansing of the land of some sort, or uprising against a cruel leader. It has happened here in America, during the sixties, and will probably happen again in the near future. Yet, no country came to police the state of America neither during the era of racial oppression nor during slavery, so why does America feel it has to go to the rescue of other nations during their trials.

The answer is in the difference between freedom and imperialism. Freedom means being able to live life absent of slavery or bondage. Many countries live this way. Who says that any other form of government other than capitalism under a Democracy is oppression? This is what America would have people to believe, that anything other than a pseudo-Democracy is oppressive. Therefore, the definition of freedom on one side of the world is not the same as it is on the other side of the world.

Millions of children grow into their native cultures, live life void of America Democracy, and grow to see and believe that their society is no different from any other. The life they live is as normal to them as it would be to someone anywhere else. If a person were born in the eastern hemisphere under the rule of a communal society, they would deem that life normal, having food and raiment suffices.

Nevertheless, here in America we are taught that life anywhere else is more horrendous than life is here and that we should want no other life but here. Who knows what lies outside of America? Again, if born anywhere else, would not a person grow just as happy and content? The problem is the American definition of what life really is and the world's definition of life. America is not even one-third of the world's population, what room do we have to speak?

Indoctrinating its citizens with such knowledge - that America is the greatest and there is no other - is how they justify colonizing the world. Though it is no longer called colonizing or nation building, it is now under the politically correct term that pacifies its citizens, called coalition building. Whereby, America joins forces with other countries and persuades them toward the concept of Democracy.

This persuasion comes with promises of freedom - America's definition. The freedom of speech, religion, and the pursuit of happiness; in reality, it is an extension of the U.S. Constitution into other countries. Once any country falls under the rule of an America Democracy, they quickly become allies with America and supported by America financially, militarily, and culturally. Look at Japan, a once communist nation. Though they reign supreme in technology, their culture mirrors that of American culture, thus they are losing their own culture.

Other countries avoid the spread of Democracy and the vision of American imperialism and refuse to submit. Not that they are hardheaded or rebellious, these countries just do not agree with the way American society is run and would rather keep their own values and traditions. They may lack financially, but they are a healthier and happier people. And because they do not submit to America, they are then deemed potential enemies of America and make the list of future, troubled countries ruled by a dictatorial hand or iron fist. And the game continues.

Freedom comes from absence of oppression - something America itself has yet to eliminate - and imperialism comes from a desire to rule the world. Much like a mother who invades her daughter's home: she says she is there to keep the peace between her daughter and her daughter's husband, but her real intentions are to rule the home herself.

2004 by CR Hamilton

Warning Signs of Fascism

Below is an informal correspondence from an inquiring mind to an apparent mentor. The issue concerns the theory of fascism and how to answer someone who attributes this ideology to the society in which we live.

The answer from the mentor seemed researched from a specific author (look up if you like) who knew about the elements of fascism by past studies. The irony in this whole scenario is that the results of the study seem very similar to the structure and direction of American culture.

Think on these things and reflect on what life once was in this country and the changes it has taken on since. Are we living in a potential fascist country? Is America on the threshold of becoming a communistic society in no uncertain terms, or have we been living within this lifestyle all along?

Something to ponder...

Dear Kim:

I am 23 years old and just got a job in a social justice organization as a development associate. I have a portfolio of donors that I am in charge of, and I have a meeting with one of them soon. He has given \$1,000 for three years and I want to ask him for \$1,500. When I called to set up the meeting, he asked me what our organization was doing to address the rising fascism of our country. I know what fascism is in theory, but you can give me any specific ideas that I could incorporate into what I say to help answer his question? I am not that nervous about asking, but I do want to sound intelligent.

- Wanting a Winning Portfolio

Dear Wanting:

The first rule of any encounter where you want to appear knowledgeable in answer to a question is to ask the questioner what they think about the issue. In this case, you might say to the donor, "How do you see fascism on the rise?" and "What is the most important thing we can do about it in our organization?" To answer your question more specifically, I would suggest looking at the work of Laurence Britt who researched a number of fascist regimes looking for commonalities.

Besides the obvious Nazi Germany and fascist Italy, he studied Spain under Franco, Chile under Pinochet, Portugal under Salazar, and so on. A summary of his work has recently been published on a number of postcards and even t-shirts. (I have seen them in the Syracuse Cultural Workers catalog, among other places.) Some specific signs that Britt describes as the early warning signs of fascism are:

- Powerful and continuing nationalism
- Rampant sexism
- Corporate power is protected
- Labor power is suppressed
- Obsession with crime and punishment
- Controlled mass media
- Obsession with national security
- Religion and government are intertwined.

Good luck with your donor and with your work.

Kim

2004 by Afro Staff

Systems of Guaranteed Health Care

The United States is the only industrialized nation that doesn't have an extensive system of government guaranteed health services. Although the details of their systems vary, all industrialized countries other than the United States have a system of health care that guarantees benefits to all their residents.

Health reformers in the United States have often focused on Canada, our northern neighbor. Doctors in Canada are private, self-employed, fee-for-service practitioners. But, instead of being paid directly by consumers or individual insurance companies as in the United States, they are paid by a national health insurance system on a common fee schedule.

The fee schedule is negotiated in each province between provincial officials and the medical association. Hospitals also operate on budgets provided by the provincial government. Although Canadians pay higher taxes than U.S. citizens do, they pay a smaller proportion of their gross domestic product for medical services.

Great Britain began its National Health Service or NHS, in 1948; becoming the first Western society to offer free medical care to the entire population. General practitioners, who work out of a solo office or in a group practice, are the major health care providers in Great Britain and are paid a certain amount each year for each patient who is restricted by legislation. Patients may choose their own doctors.

When a patient needs special treatment or hospitalization, the general practitioner refers the patient to a specialist, who is paid a yearly salary by the government. Physicians may also take private patients, who tend to receive faster treatment and more luxurious facilities. Again, even though the British pay higher taxes than Americans, a smaller proportion of their GDP is devoted to medical expenses. In addition, survey data indicates that Britons overwhelmingly consider the health service to be a success.

Even though they are much poorer than the United States, most developing countries also provide free health care to their citizens. For instance, Kenya is a very poor country toward the bottom of the global stratification ladder. Yet it has a national health service that owns hospitals and employs doctors and other health workers and guarantees health care to all citizens.

Similar systems are found in other poor countries in sub-Saharan Africa and throughout the world. Unfortunately, because of the sharp differences between cities and the rural areas, only relatively small proportions of the population receive high quality health care. The best equipped hospitals and clinics are in the cities, where the most educated and wealthiest citizens live.

In addition, there are far from enough medical personnel. Kenya has only one doctor for every 20,000 citizens. In contrast, the United States has one doctor for about every 400 citizens.

Source From: Discovering Sociology, Stockard, 2000

2004 by the AfroStaff

Black America Leaves Home

At some point, a child must leave home and prepare a life for him or herself; thus is the situation of Black America. How long can children - long after they have left home - continue to leach from the parents?

Black politicians who fight for the causes of Black America constantly petition, lobby, and beg the American government for programs, laws and policies that will make life better for the Black masses, whom they claim to represent.

This dependency cripples the general Black population because every Black who cares and wants better will depend on the candidate of their choice to get them the things, and recognition they feel they deserve. Black leaders have taken on the generational burden of government dependency based on the "Right to Vote."

All this "Right to Vote" means is that, as long as we are exercising out so-called "Right to Vote" we are asking the government to do for us what we can actually do for ourselves if we actually thought it through.

For instance, what is wrong with laying the foundation of a new, Black government structure that would provide for our needs? Why can we not recruit the best talent the Black community has and partition duties out to them in order to establish a society within a society.

We are Black Americans, not African Americans because the generation here now is not from Africa but from here, thus we are Black people in America. This is the first form of identity we should acknowledge, that we are Black Americans. Once we know who we really are, we can begin again from a new position.

Since we are Black Americans, there is nothing extreme about creating a Black America within America. It has been done before where the people rise against the government and declare themselves separate and free from that government's rule. We live in such a country now.

After an extensive deliberation, Black leaders should author a document announcing their separation from America as a new nation, a Black nation that will handle the causes and future of Black America. This would remedy many social issues such as racism in American society because we will be where we ought to be and they will be where they want to be.

As a nation, we will act as a nation act, by creating a source of production and trading amongst other nations; building an economy and negotiating deals with others. We will enter the global economy just like every other nation. There are small nations around the world that survives with small populations and so can Black America, which, in fact, is a potential name for the new country.

Therefore, Black leaders, think out of the box and finally decide to stand on your own. Stop depending on the laws and policies of white America and work toward the goal of a new Black nation. If we stay latched on to those who would rather hinder us, we will rise no higher.

2004 by CR Hamilton

America, Britain, Merging as One

Has anyone notice that over the last 10-20 years, more British norms have subtly crept into American lifestyle, and vise-versa? From fashion and music to business, news and public policy, it is becoming harder to tell where America ends and Britain begins.

When BP the British Petroleum oil company moved into America in the late 1980s, (which by the way changed its name a few years ago), it marked the beginning of a slow merging of the two countries. Not that there is anything wrong, but suspensions should begin to run as to who the hell the America people are actually serving; the U.S. government, or Britain. Which begs the question, is America still under British rule to our own ignorance?

Notice that many more commercials feature British goods and services, more movies and television shows are adding British actors and accents to the script, more businesses are selling out to British companies, more news casters are British people and more fashion trends are making its way into Hollywood draping American actors in British attire.

It will take a keen eye to see what is going on but if observed carefully, one will see that a merger has begun and is gaining prevalence everyday.

There was a broadcast of the British Parliament on cable television a few years ago where Prime Minister Tony Blair argued with the members of the House of Commons. It was a comical display of relic 18th century America, which was scary because some of the members wore wigs like the American forefathers did. The scene signaled the revert back to colonial America, in other words.

Another major similarity in American lifestyle and Britain's is Britain's treatment of Blacks in Europe. One can read the headlines of racism in America and then visit a news source in Britain and find the same type racism going on. The story lines and situations are eerily similar.

Pertaining to government policy, Britain and America seek the same goals for public policy such as government (state) intervention into family, their policies on immigration, research studies on health, medicine, science, history of the world, and many, many other issues alike.

Furthermore, if comparing the value of the dollar and the euro, the economic markets and other economic factors that govern the countries, one will notice a pattern, one of wealth and riches superseding equality and both developing a permanent poor underclass.

Bush and Blair are weirdly similar, Euro-fantasy in both countries resemble one another, and treatment of other cultures and races are so obviously apparent that there is no wonder middle eastern countries target Europe and America with terrorism.

The merger is uncanny and people should take notice of what is happening. Hypotheses? America owes Britain money from century-old debts and Britain has decided that America must pay them back in cultural changeover, a large share of their business capitalist market, and media propaganda that is subtly engulfing America citizens without their knowledge.

May 2007 CR Hamilton

How America Creates Poverty

The argument for the strength of America's opportunistic system continually neglects to include government paternalism, which is the foremost cause of poverty in America. Whenever the government intrudes into the private lives of its citizens with no clear-cut plan to eliminate poverty, but only as a means to address a crisis, the result is usually poverty for the victim.

The government bureaucracies involved in family and individual lives are the ones that contribute to poverty in the country. Family law courts, the welfare system, the social services system, and the child support system, are all bureaucracies that take on the responsibility of regulating a household instead of the family itself having complete control.

When a man and a woman decide to end a marriage, the family courts find it necessary to decide the fate and future of that family instead of the man and woman. When children are born to impoverished young men and women, the welfare system intervenes as to what it would cost to clothe, feed, and shelter that child and from there takes that responsibility, leaving little to individual effort.

When a family becomes dysfunctional by any means, the bureaucracy of the social services bares the job of dismantling that family and determining the rest of their lives, and when a father or mother neglects to support their child, again, the federal government foots the obligation and bill.

Though each of the above are social issues that need addressing, the way the United States government has decided to handle these issues suggest that the government become the parent, guardian, or ultimate moderator in the matter. But because the government is too large of an entity to play parent, many people fall victims to a system of red tape and indifference.

Once the problem is addressed and the government solution is applied, there is little chance of recourse. The laws and policies are set in stone and change is unlikely. Therefore, despite the efforts of people to make better on whatever the case, they may remain under the guidance and paternalism of the government until their case completes the entire cycle.

For instance, once a judge has decreed that the wife gets the house and the kids, the law makes it final, even if the wife has other plans, or even if the wife trashes the house and abuses the kids. Once the name of a welfare recipient is entered into the database of the welfare system, that name is guaranteed assistance as long as it needs it, regardless of any other means of financial prosperity.

Once a father or mother is deemed unfit to support their child or children by the child support system, there is no getting out of that system because the court has ruled, regardless if the non-custodial parent ever meant to support the child or not. And once the state has taken a child into custody from their parent, that child is a ward of the state for as long as the state deems the parent unfit.

Not only does the government rule based on assumption, as in the mother deserves the kids or someone else is better fit to raise a child than the actual parent, they inflict monetary value on lives, which in turn imposes a financial burden and a burden of proof on the victim they have ruled against. This indifference and bias rarely changes as times change and never conforms to the stigma of "individual responsibility or ability" as the current trends would suggest, thus it becomes outdated and opens a door to judicial challenge.

Court rulings affect the ability of how people are to survive and if those rulings are based on assumption and are not assessed annually to determine change, then the victim is left to the compounding financial and or emotional punishment of that ruling. Even children suffer from those rulings because children grow and their relationships with parents and views about life changes. However, as stated earlier, court rulings rarely change.

Many people improve themselves over time, but the government only assumes they will not and leave no room for change in their policies. Parents change and get better and welfare recipients take responsibility. Criminals go straight and drug addicts get clean. Time goes on and trends and values change with time but the government is continually stuck in the consistent world of guesswork and red tape. Therefore, poverty is always inevitable and continues as a cycle.

2005 by Afro Staff

A New Scramble for Africa

A new "Scramble for Africa" is taking place among the world's big powers, who are tapping into the continent for its oil and diamonds. Tony Blair is pushing hard for African debt relief agreements in the run-up to the G8 summit in Scotland in July. But while sub-Saharan Africa is the object of the west's charitable concern, billions of pounds' worth of natural resources are being removed from it.

Instead of enriching often debt-ridden countries, some big corporations are accused by campaigners of facilitating corruption and provoking instability - so much so that organizations such as Friends of the Earth talk of an "oil curse".

Simon Taylor, director of Global Witness, which has been prominent in urging reform, said: "Western companies and banks have colluded in stripping Africa's resources. We need to track revenues from oil, mining and logging into national budgets to make sure that the money isn't siphoned off by corrupt officials." Looting of state assets by corrupt leaders should become a crime under international law, he said. "The G8 should take the lead in this."

The original Scramble for Africa took place in the late 19th century, when Britain, France and Germany competed to carve Africa into colonies. Today corporations from the US, France, Britain and China are competing to profit from the rulers of often chaotic and corrupt regimes. Investigations in three African countries rich in resources - Angola, Equatorial Guinea and Liberia - show how British-based companies have negotiated deals that critics say are against the interests of some of the poorest and most traumatized people on earth.

Focuses are on a big gas project in Equatorial Guinea; plans to exploit Liberia's diamonds, and western banks' readiness to provide Angola with huge oil-backed loans. In Equatorial Guinea, BG plc (formerly the British Gas state company) has closed a deal with the regime of President Teodoro Obiang to buy up the country's production of liquefied natural gas for the next 17 years. Britain's HSBC bank has been accused by a US Senate committee of helping Mr Obiang move cash from the country's oil revenues into financial "black holes" in Luxembourg and Cyprus.

The country is threatened with repeated coups by outsiders keen to get their hands on the oil wealth. In Liberia, which has been beset by civil war, LIB, a private London bank, was behind attempts to monopolize alluvial diamond production and the country's telecommunications. The UN and the World Bank have criticized the schemes as secretive and against the country's interests.

LIB has now withdrawn. And in Angola, the victim of an even more destructive internal war, one of the UK's leading development banks, Standard Chartered, has been accused of damaging the country's economy by providing record multibillion dollar loans which give a stranglehold over future oil production. A succession of scandals has already revealed how oil wealth was looted in billions from the former Abacha military regime in Nigeria with the assistance of western banks and bribes paid by US oil firms.

In Sudan and Chad, Chinese companies are moving in, backing and arming military rulers and building pipelines. And in France, the then state oil company Elf has been accused in corruption investigations of having paid kickbacks and encouraged regimes to run up debts as part of a deliberate "African strategy". Congo-Brazzaville, the fourth-largest sub-Saharan oil producer, was dominated by Elf, and now has the highest per capita debt in the world.

Global Witness says in a 2004 report: "Oil wealth [there] has left a legacy of corruption, poverty and conflict." The British government is pushing an international plan for disclosure by companies of how much they pay African rulers for their natural resources. The Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative has been praised by anti-corruption bodies. But campaigners say that on present evidence improvements in western behavior so far appear slight. And they fear the chances of these issues being raised as priorities at the G8 summit at Gleneagles in July remain bleak as EU countries quibble about levels of aid and the US balks at innovative schemes for debt relief.

Gareth Thomas, the international development minister, said Britain hoped to have 20 African countries signed up to the transparency code by the end of the year. "There is big political support for this program and we will be addressing the issue in the G8 summit communique," he said.

Source From: Guardian Unlimited

June 2005 By Afro Staff Research

America and the Stages of a Democracy

America's position in the world exceeds all other countries in terms of industrial development, technological advancement, prosperity, and military strength. In fact, America's leaders, echoed by their patriotic followers, proclaim to the world that the United States is the best country in the world to live. Political and media pundits brag on the opportunities America hands to the immigrant, fulfilling dreams of success not reachable in "poorer" more "underdeveloped" countries.

If not careful, a person - without possession of his or her own mind - would believe that this proclamation is true, that America is the best country in the world to live. Those facts indeed are true, however, where it pertains to industrial development, technological advancement, and prosperity. But what about values and principles?

In history, every country has followed a similar pattern and gone through a cycle of growth and decline. The concept of the "stages of a nation" was first recorded by Professor Alexander Tyler who wrote about the fall of the Athenian republic over two thousand years before the time the thirteen colonies were still a part of England. The concept is such:

"The average age of the world's great civilizations has been two hundred years. These nations have progressed through the following sequence: from bondage to spiritual faith, from spiritual faith to great courage, from courage to liberty, from liberty to abundance, from abundance to selfishness, from selfishness to complacency from complacency to apathy, from apathy to dependency, from dependency back to bondage."

Where is America in this cycle of growth and decline? If analyzed accordingly, one could place the current state of America somewhere between abundance and apathy. Its spiritual faith era is obviously over, which would have hit its high point around the time of the Puritans. This spiritual faith brought courage to the New World dwellers and they found strength to challenge their oppressor.

However, the liberty era has also come and gone. America's greatest point of liberty came during the Revolution against England and its liberation from the Motherland. America flourished during the abundant years [profiting off the labors of others] and were financially able to emerge a world super power, militarily. Afterward, America was the land of opportunity during the postwar years and this is when people flocked here to escape conquered leaders and dictators.

Thus, from abundance to selfishness, when political agendas began to partition the country legally according to interest group and race. The ruling authorities made sure the deserving got theirs thus creating a second-class structure, and a third-class structure, and so on, engraving in stone the epitome of selfishness.

Satisfied with the way the social structure was arranged, American leaders and gatekeepers became complacent. "This will be America." When the slighted began to be aware of their rights and were more educated toward what Democracy really, supposedly means, the ruling class tightened their words and actions with an apathetic overtone. Now, if you complain about anything you feel is wrong you are stigmatized as anti-American and or non-patriotic.

This brings us to dependency. How can a country become dependent, and on who or what? America will not become dependent on others or any one thing, but will be dependent on by many others, even around the world. What more testifies to this fact than America's presence around the world as police.

Once a country spreads itself too thin this leaves no room for domestic development, which further leads to chaos and up rise within the land. As far as values and principles are concerned, when America looks into the mirror it sees a leader, a rich and powerful leader. When the world looks at America, it sees either an international social worker or an enemy of all that is good and decent.

Bondage comes before and after the run of the historical cycle. Because of America's inhumane beginning based on slaves, tobacco, rum, and thievery, it was in bondage to itself by the power of evil. And once passed through the cycle of growth and decline, it will fall by the consequences of that evil.

Source from: <http://www.mcsm.org/democracy1.html>

2004 by C.R. Hamilton

The Black America that Could Have Been

Losing sight of the struggle for progress has become increasingly noticeable across the spectrum of Black America, young and old. All too often we get caught up in our own lives and forget that the plight for Black advancement is an ongoing crusade. Viewing the struggle from the current perspective one would be inclined to believe all is well, however, viewing it from a historical realm would place everything in its proper perspective. The following lecture recaptures the struggle for Black advancement from the 1920s unto this day.

This lecture was extracted from the University of Wisconsin's Department of History instructed by Stanley K. Schultz. The information is statistically accurate however may be slightly slanted toward the left. Aframerica will interpose comments amidst the lecture to balance the concepts and emphasize any points where the alternative Black movement may have made a difference in American society.

The difference between the Black America now and the one that could have been is extremely significant for the simple reason that an entirely different dogma of Black leadership demanded an entirely different agenda from the American government. The reason the government did not, and as of this day, refuse to meet the demands of the alternative Black Movement will be revealed within the Afroamerica Interpretations.

Civil Rights in an Uncivil Society

The modern civil rights movement emerged during World War II and eventually transformed the nation in the 1950s and 1960s. Much like the earlier civil rights movement of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the modern movement had different leaders with different visions and methods, from A. Philip Randolph, to Martin Luther King, Jr., to Malcolm X. This lecture explores the messages and actions of these three leaders, the history of the movement as a whole, and some of the most significant civil rights legislation.

Afroamerica Interpretation (AI)

Take note that the author mentions "different leaders" thus implying opposing ideologies among the Black leadership and population as a whole, which is true. The problem today is that mainstream America has lumped Black America into one category thus shutting out other voices; voices that have been crying aloud for the last 40 years only to be ignored by Black leadership and the government itself.

Article Continues

Civil Rights from the 1920s to World War II

In the decades after Washington [Booker T.], Du Bois, and Garvey had fought for racial justice, civil rights became a national issue. This new awakening to the problems of race in the United States resulted, in part, because of the continuing migration of African-Americans from the South to the urban North and West.

This migration remained relatively steady through the 1920s and throughout the Great Depression. During the 1940s, however, wartime production required more factory workers and the number of migrants exploded. During this decade, in fact, 1 million African-Americans moved from the South to the North. As a result of this migration, a third of all black Americans lived outside the South by 1950.

The rise of black ghettos in northern and western cities may have compounded the problems of segregation and discrimination, but they also allowed for the flowering of African-American cultural movements such as the Harlem Renaissance of the 1920s and 1930s. This literary, artistic, and intellectual movement, centered in New York's Harlem, kindled a new African-American cultural identity by celebrating black traditions and the black voice.

Some of the writers associated with the movement were Arna Bontemps, Langston Hughes, Zora Neale Hurston, James Weldon Johnson, Claude McKay, and Jean Toomer. Although not formally connected to the Harlem Renaissance, which was mostly a literary movement, jazz emerged concurrently out of African-Americans' musical traditions.

This internal migration was important not only culturally, but for at least two other reasons:

1. As more and more African-Americans migrated to northern cities, they became a powerful voting bloc, they captured the attention of white politicians, and they became increasingly assertive politically.
2. The migration stimulated a national movement for civil rights; many Americans began to realize that segregation and discrimination were no longer uniquely Southern problems.

Afromerica Interpretation

Here is the liberal slant mentioned earlier. Once Blacks migrated from the south to the north, this caused an up rise in violence from both southern whites and racist whites in the north. Blacks became the victims of lynching, blatant racism, and many other types of immoral acts of persecution.

The author did not mention this because it is one that any and all white Americans would rather forget and leave out of American history. Many Black movements appeared because of the violence only to be persecuted themselves because of their uprising. Marcus Garvey and his movement being first and foremost, and other militant factions of Blacks who banded together to fight against Klansmen and other racist white groups.

Many times politics were not an answer to this type of treatment of Blacks and many Blacks would rather not depend on the government to stop this persecution. They took up arms against such acts but were even challenged by government policing, and being shut down by government policies and laws.

Article Continues

The 1930s: The NAACP and the Courts

In 1909, a group of Americans committed to greater racial equality founded the NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People), the oldest civil rights organization in the United States. As the civil rights movement grew from a regional to a national concern in the 1930s and 1940s, the NAACP stood out as the leading representative of blacks in the nation. The organization built its civil rights strategies around two principles:

1. It had to appeal to the consciences of northern white Americans.
2. It also had to appeal to the interests of northern white politicians.

(AI)

At this time, during the lynching and violence against Blacks, the government sought out an answer from within the Black population itself. There came the NAACP, an organization whites could regulate from outside. This strategy was so the American public could establish an identity of Black America and apply it to the Black problems.

So whites chose Blacks who would "appeal to the consciences of northern white Americans" just like Booker T. once proclaimed as the slave mentality: "The Negro was to accept the biracial system and his

subordinate status. He was to seek advancement within the confines of his segregated black world. He was to develop the friendship of influential whites and use their assistance.

By cultivating habits of hard work, thrift, and honesty, he was to demonstrate his claim to wider acceptance and better treatment. Above all, he was never to present any organized challenge to the existing order of things or engage in movements which might be regarded by whites as detrimental to their economic and political interest."

Once white America succeeded in exalting a status-quo Black leadership, they could more easily regulate the Black agenda through that same leadership.

Article Continues

A. Philip Randolph and the March on Washington Movement

During the northern black migration, African-American sleeping car porters who worked for railroads were an important link between North and South. Porters traveled the country, had connections in the black communities in the rural South and in northern cities, and facilitated the northern migration.

The president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, a primarily black union, was A. Philip Randolph (1889-1979). Randolph was a prominent civil rights leader and labor organizer who fought constantly for the rights of African-American workers. In March 1941, Randolph proposed a new civil rights strategy: a massive march on Washington D. C., in which African-Americans and sympathetic whites would converge and demand an end to discrimination against blacks in employment and the armed forces.

Randolph's proposal disturbed President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The President had been trying to drum up American support for a war against Hitler and his brutal treatment of religious and ethnic minorities. Roosevelt feared that a civil rights march of this scale would bring unwanted attention to discrimination against African-Americans in the United States and embarrass the administration. FDR called Randolph to the White House for a meeting, where Randolph made the following three demands:

1. The immediate end to segregation and discrimination in federal government hiring.
2. An end to segregation of the armed forces.
3. Government support for an end to discrimination and segregation in all American employment.

Roosevelt refused to meet all of Randolph's demands, but the two men did reach a compromise. In June 1941, in exchange for Randolph calling off the march on Washington, Roosevelt issued Executive Order 8802, which created the Fair Employment Practices Committee (FEPC).

The President's order stated that the federal government would not hire any person based on their race, color, creed, or national origin. The FEPC was supposed to enforce the order to ban discriminatory hiring within the federal government and in corporations that received federal contracts.

As it turned out, the FEPC achieved very little, in part because the committee could not work pro-actively and could only investigate reports of discrimination after it had received a complaint. FDR was unwilling

to push the FEPC into vigorous action, since he was more concerned with winning the war and maintaining his coalition with Southern Democrats. Said Roosevelt:

"I don't think, quite frankly, that we can bring about the millennium just yet."

The wartime economy and the huge demand for labor actually did more to help blacks than the FEPC. As the wartime economy went into high gear, however, and more and more African-Americans migrated to northern and western cities in search of work, racial violence also increased. During the summer of 1943, for example, race riots exploded in army training camps, in Detroit, and in Harlem.

(AI)

Today, as it was then, whites place the Black agenda on the back-burner to address something they feel is more important. The statement, "The President had been trying to drum up American support for a war against Hitler and his brutal treatment of religious and ethnic minorities," demonstrates this fact. The racial problem has never been addressed from a moral perspective but only from a political, law-passing perspective if at all.

There were two ways that the American government could deal with the Black problem: 1) by brute force, when the more militant faction of Blacks decided to defend their rights and humanity, and 2) by legislation, that was half-ass passed through the deals made with their ready-made Black Toms. The reason they dealt more harshly with the militant faction than the Tom faction is because when dealing with the militant faction they would have to face themselves in the repulsive mirror of racism and bigotry, and this, whites can never do. Admit a wrong and actually do something to change.

Article Continues

CORE

In 1942, a group of civil rights advocates founded the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) on the University of Chicago campus. The creation of CORE marked the beginning of a mass movement for civil rights. Although early CORE membership was chiefly northern, and mostly white, the group took an active role in the Montgomery bus boycott, in lunch counter sit-ins, and in the Freedom Rides in Alabama, and eventually became a largely African-American organization.

(AI)

Groups such as these were used to give balance to the violence and to save face for whites. Instead of hearing the demands of the more militant faction of Black America and a group organizing against violence, with violence, whites made it a point to choose a more democratic strategy by assisting Tom Blacks in fighting against their persecutors.

This is how Blacks (especially the mindset of elitist Blacks today) were made dependent on liberal politics. These Blacks would rather depend on the strategies and policies of whites by allowing them to do the thinking for them than join forces with the militant faction of Blacks and make demands against the Federal government. There are not many, if any, militant Black Movements today that would threaten violence against local policing agencies because we have been overwhelmed with this dependency mindset to allow legislation to regulate our actions for us.

Article Continues

Civil Rights After World War II

At the conclusion of World War II, there were two reasons for optimism in the civil rights movement:

1. White alliances. Many white liberals were now committed to civil rights.
2. Election returns of 1946. Republicans won in many districts that had formerly been staunchly Democratic, proving to Democrats that blacks were a viable political group. By the decades of the 1940s and 1950s, the black vote had established itself as a political constituency comparable to big labor, big business, agriculture, and other special interest groups.

(AI)

Let's see, when did Blacks get the right to vote? 1965 right? So where does this guy get the idea that the "Black vote" had any power during the 40s?

Article Continues

President Truman and Civil Rights

As NAACP-sponsored court cases moved slowly through the legal system, events in popular culture were already breaking down the color bar. In 1947, for example, Jackie Robinson (1919-1972) joined the Brooklyn Dodgers to become the first African-American to play major league baseball.

President Truman also supported civil rights in politics and in the workplace. However, Truman's efforts to pass legislation met with mixed results. Truman wanted to make the FEPC permanent. Yet, in June 1946, it "expired" as a wartime agency and Congress refused to renew it. In July of 1948, Truman passed a number of executive orders to attack discrimination and segregation in federal employment.

Philip Randolph also pushed Truman to end segregation in the armed forces. During World War II, the navy had started to desegregate. The army, however, remained segregated until well into the Korean Conflict. In addition, Truman proposed a bill to make lynching a federal crime. Congress also rejected this proposal. Nonetheless, despite his many defeats, Truman was the first twentieth-century president to support actively civil rights legislation.

(AI)

Notice that it took the American government nearly 70 years after the emancipation of slavery to enact a law that outlawed lynching, and with reluctance at that. This says that a little more than 50 years ago, (even during the lifetime of people reading this now), America has come to the civility of actual human rights. Not wanting to hurt their political base, white politicians will refrain from doing something about America's racism before they will face the fact that what Blacks face in this country is nothing but racism.

This act of white politicians is not one of the past, but of the present. Reparations are an issue that Congress will not take seriously for another 20-50 years, even though many other countries have paid

retribution to the victims of their racist and violent acts of discrimination. We are still fighting a fight that will be looked upon years from now as not having been nearly over so why cannot Blacks today see the same urgency for continuing the fight?

Article Continues

Eisenhower and Civil Rights

By the time that Eisenhower entered the White House; the civil rights campaigns were beginning to take on a momentum of their own. Although Eisenhower showed little sympathy toward civil rights legislation, CORE and the NAACP continued to protest discrimination and a series of their cases were already in the legal pipeline when Eisenhower took office.

The most significant of these cases was *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*. In this case, the parents of Linda Brown, supported by the NAACP, sued the school board of Topeka, Kansas, to get their daughter admitted to the all-white schools that were closer to their home than the black schools. By the time this case reached the Supreme Court in 1954, other cases had joined it, so that the decision would have national repercussions. Conservatives were astonished when, on May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court came to the unanimous decision that

"in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal."

As an outcome of this decision, the court ordered school boards across the country to desegregate their schools "with all deliberate speed." This wording actually allowed many school districts to drag out the process of desegregation for years, although this was not the court's intent. Eisenhower disagreed with the decision, but knew that he was obligated to enforce what the Supreme Court said was the law of the land. Remarkably Eisenhower:

"I don't believe you can change the hearts of men with law."

(AI)

Again, a liberal slant places Conservatives in the spotlight as "astonished" at the decision of the Supreme Court in "*Brown v Board of Education*," when the most resistance to school integration came from Southern Democrats. It was northern conservatives, and many liberals, who fought against the south and their discriminatory views.

By attributing past and current acts of racism to the Conservative and or Republican Party is how the Democrats maintain control over the Black vote. One must be careful when reading or listening to mainstream American politics because much of it is slanted toward the left.

Article Continues

Montgomery Bus Boycott of 1956

Another event gave the civil rights movement even more momentum: the challenge to segregation in public transportation. In December of 1955, having been convinced to act by local civil rights leaders,

Rosa Parks, a black woman, refused to move to the back of a city bus in Montgomery, Alabama. She was arrested, which prompted fifty black leaders to meet in a Montgomery church to discuss their response.

Ultimately, they agreed to boycott the city bus system, an especially effective tactic since blacks made up 60 to 70% of total ridership. Eventually, the bus boycott was successful in desegregating city transportation. At the same time, the conference displayed a new, dynamic style of leadership best embodied by Martin Luther King, Jr. The boycotts organizers selected King, a 27-year-old minister, as their spokesperson. Said King,

"There comes a time when people get tired of being kicked around by the brutal feet of oppression."

(AI)

If Blacks today could come together on a common issue in order to make a change, a boycott is a good way to do it. Blacks make up a large percentage of many areas of American life and culture and if ever withdrawn from that area, could make a significant dent in the production of that area. For example, welfare. All Blacks could refuse public assistance thus sending that agency into a financial tailspin simply because the only way they can get funding from the government is if they dispense welfare checks.

The design of the welfare system by whites is one toward the destruction of Black families. Though many more whites are on welfare, they do not suffer from the many economical set-backs welfare brings as do Blacks. Alternatively, if Black leadership wanted to do something about the poverty among their people, they would design a system of their own that could assist underprivileged Blacks, i.e., an alternative system for Blacks by Blacks.

Another area where Blacks could change this country is in the credit card area. Refusing credit, thus refusing debt, would put more money into the Black pocket freeing more for community support. Instead of throwing money toward lavish Euro-lifestyles and culture, banks and the wealth of white corporate stock, Blacks could throw money toward the development of their own neighborhoods and businesses.

Furthermore, Blacks could change the family structure themselves by opting out of the child support system, which pits the Black woman against the Black man. They could purchase from Black owned businesses, fund urban public schools, support Black community programs for our children, design rehabilitation centers for our young Black men and women and devote skills to education and actually rehabilitating them.

Blacks are their own nation within a nation but the only way we would ever come together on any issue would be by first denouncing the structure of the American agenda for the Black individual.

Article Continues

Martin Luther King, Jr. and Malcolm X

The emergence of Martin Luther King, Jr. as a civil rights leader brought a new tactic to the movement: nonviolent resistance. This method of peaceful protest was a combination of the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi and Jesus. King described it as "a philosophy deeply embedded in our religious tradition."

Malcolm X (1925-1965) stood in sharp contrast to King and his philosophy of nonviolent resistance and racial integration. X was born Malcolm Little, the son of a Baptist preacher who followed Marcus Garvey. When he was a boy, members of a Klan-like organization murdered his father. He dropped out of school after the eighth grade and moved to Detroit, where he led a life of crime.

In prison, he encountered the religious teachings of Elijah Muhammad, leader of the Lost-Found Nation of Islam, an organization known popularly as the Black Muslims. Elijah Muhammad's message ran counter to the philosophy of integration. He argued that white men were devils and that blacks had to address their social problems alone.

Malcolm Little soon became a loyal follower and took "X" as his last name as a symbol of the identity stolen from the African slaves. Because of a growing rivalry, Muhammad suspended X from the Black Muslims in 1963. A few months later, X made a pilgrimage to Mecca, discovered that Islam and integration were not incompatible, and abandoned the argument that all whites were devils. He soon took the name El-Hajj Malik El-Shabazz and returned to America to found the Organization of Afro-American Unity. On February 21, 1965, Shabazz was leading a rally of his organization when he was assassinated by a Black Muslim.

(AI)

Thus come the true separation of Black America whereas it is today. There is a King faction of Blacks and an X faction in America. The King faction is the faction that is being supported by mainstream America because it is easier to control. The X faction had supporters such as the Black Panther party who took up arms against police to protect their neighborhoods against white violence.

White legislators are more willing to support the King faction because they are the modern day Uncle Toms who will submit to the wishes of what white America wants. They play by the rules and do not mind being put on hold while the government takes care of other business. Politicians and mainstream America never gives the X faction a second look because they are the Blacks who remind them of their past and of the racism they do at present.

Whites would rather forget the past and make citizens think that there is no racism so they must silence the X faction as much as possible. That's why there is no real leadership for Black America except for the tokens upheld by liberal whites. As long as mainstream America can convince Blacks that racism is subsiding, they can detain the X faction because they have the disillusioned Blacks on their side to argue their point.

Article Continues

Southern Resistance

In 1956, in reaction to the Brown v. Board of Education decision, over a hundred United States Congressmen from the former Confederate States signed a "Southern Manifesto," pledging to fight the Supreme Court's decision at every turn. In 1957, events in Little Rock, Arkansas, put southern resistance to civil rights to the test. Central High School was supposed to admit nine African-American students in September of that year. Arkansas Governor Orval Faubus placed the Arkansas National Guard around the school in defiance of the desegregation order.

Although President Eisenhower was no great champion of civil rights, he couldn't tolerate a direct defiance of the Supreme Court, so he sent federal troops to Little Rock and put the Arkansas National Guard under federal control. The black students entered the school, but met such strident protests and threats of violence that school officials removed them. As in other areas in the South, school officials in Little Rock decided to close the school for a time rather than carry out the desegregation order.

The Civil Rights Act of 1957

After the events in Montgomery, Alabama, and Little Rock, Arkansas, some liberal whites in Congress introduced the Civil Rights Act in 1957. They received little help from President Eisenhower, who stated:

"I personally believe if you try to go too far in this delicate field, that involves the emotions of so many millions of Americans, you're making a mistake."

Nevertheless, the act passed, due to the efforts of Senate Majority Leader Lyndon Baines Johnson. The Civil Rights Act accomplished two things:

1. It created a national civil rights commission.
2. It empowered the Justice Department to go to court to ensure that blacks could vote.

This was not a huge step, but it was the first piece of federal civil rights legislation since Reconstruction.

JFK and Civil Rights

The momentum for civil rights continued to grow during the Kennedy administration, although this was in spite--not because--of Kennedy. He was more concerned with maintaining the support of Southern Democrats, although three events eventually forced him to send a Civil Rights Bill to Congress:

1. 1960 Sit-ins - In Greensborough, North Carolina, four black college students sat at a segregated lunch counter. Local police officers arrested the students, who were followers of Martin Luther King and practiced nonviolent resistance. This event sparked a series of similar protests at lunch counters across the South.
2. 1961 Freedom Rides - An interracial group of CORE members and college students from the North traveled by bus down South to test the effectiveness of a 1960 Supreme Court decision which prohibited racial segregation in public accommodations, such as rest rooms, waiting rooms, and restaurants, that catered to interstate travelers.

Time and again, angry white southerners clashed with these protesters. In Alabama, for example, a mob of angry whites set a bus of protesters on fire and attacked passengers who tried to escape the flames. This event drew national attention, especially from middle-class northerners who were shocked by the brutal violence they saw on television. As a result, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy provided police escorts for the riders, although this did not prevent further violence.

3. 1963 protests in Birmingham, Alabama - Chief of Police Theophilus Eugene "Bull" Connor unleashed fire hoses, Billy clubs, and attack dogs on peaceful protesters.

All these events pushed JFK to take some action on civil rights, so he introduced the Civil Rights Bill in the summer of 1963.

Civil rights proponents believed that they could rally national support behind their cause by organizing another march on Washington. One of the organizers was A. Philip Randolph, who had planned an earlier march on the nation's capital during World War II, but who had called off the gathering after meeting with President Roosevelt.

(AI)

Historically, it has always taken extreme acts of either violence or direct defiance of American culture and laws to bring the government into action. Even today, society waits until something happens before they address an issue. With Blacks and Civil Rights, it took disorder to bring change.

If Blacks are to gain anything else in this America society today, it will also take defiance to mainstream culture. Radical acts of defying the norm will bring attention to the Black arena and force American gatekeepers of racial agendas to take seriously the continued racial problems this country faces.

Article Continues

Through the years following World War II, a March on Washington group had met annually to reiterate African-American demands for economic and social equality. Finally, in 1963, the time seemed right to carry out a March for Jobs and Freedom, designed specifically to advocate passage of a bill that had stalled in Congress. The march took place on August 28, 1963, and attracted over 200,000 black and white Americans. The culmination of the day was the soaring address of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King: "I Have a Dream."

The Civil Rights Bill was still in committee in Congress when Lee Harvey Oswald assassinated Kennedy on November 22, 1963. Kennedy's successor, Lyndon Johnson, who had been instrumental in the passage of the 1957 Civil Rights Act, pressured Congress to enact the new Civil Rights Bill as his major task. It was a formidable goal, but just one small step in Johnson's broad-reaching plan to build a "Great Society" in the United States. Johnson, in fact, is an extraordinarily important part of our story."

The Almost Great Society: The 1960s

Novelist Ralph Ellison, author of *Invisible Man*, once called Lyndon Baines Johnson "The greatest American president ever for the poor and the Negroes" and this is certainly the way that Johnson wanted to be remembered. This lecture focuses on the two domestic agendas Ellison had in mind: civil rights and the War on Poverty.

We will look at President Johnson's philosophies and political methods, explore how civil rights protesters convinced him to act in the interest of African-Americans, and discuss the consequences of the civil rights legislation that Congress passed during his administration.

Lyndon Baines Johnson (1908-1973) was President of the United States from 1963 to 1969. In Texas, Johnson was the state director of the National Youth Administration, a New Deal agency. He came to Washington D. C. as a devoted New Deal Democrat in 1937 when he was elected to the House of Representatives. He became a United States Senator in 1949 and the Senate majority leader in 1955.

Originally a rival of John F. Kennedy for the Democratic presidential nomination, Johnson ran and then served as Kennedy's vice president.

The death of JFK in November 1963 brought an entirely different man into the White House. No genteel, East-coast patrician, Johnson came from the hill country of Texas and lived up to that image; he was large, boisterous, arrogant, and driven. Johnson was a loyal Democrat who had risen through the party ranks to become a polished professional negotiator.

Observers dubbed his ability to manipulate his colleagues into supporting his legislation the "Johnson Treatment," which meant that he got right in his opponents' faces and used humor, statistics, whatever it took to "hypnotize" them into agreeing with his positions. As President, Johnson followed the legislative process very closely, down to the smallest detail. Due to his legislative skill and experience, Johnson was able to pass many of the bills that had proved unsuccessful for earlier Democrats and turned much of the modern liberal agenda into law.

(AI)

Keep in mind the term, "liberal agenda."

Article Continues

Civil Rights Legislation Under Johnson

One of the first pieces of legislation that Johnson pushed through Congress was the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It had three main parts:

1. The law barred discrimination on the basis of race in public accommodations in the United States - This included gas stations, restaurants, hotels, movie theaters, and airline terminals. The law made an exception for accommodations that served less than five people, an exception that came to be called "Mrs. Murphy's Boarding House."
2. It authorized the Justice Department to bring suit against states that discriminated against women and minorities.
3. It guaranteed equal opportunities in the work place - It was now unlawful for a firm of more than 25 to discriminate on the basis of "race, national origin, religion, or sex." This last provision became a point of debate in the 1970s as women fought to pass the Equal Rights Amendment. Many opponents of the ERA argued that non-discrimination in the workplace on the basis of sex was already part of the 1964 law, which made a constitutional amendment redundant and unnecessary.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was a huge step for the civil rights movement, but champions of racial equality still had work to do. By the middle of the 1960s, in fact, the focus of the struggle began to shift away from integration toward the political empowerment of African-Americans.

(AI)

The Civil Rights Acts of 1964 is an historical turning point in the advancement of Black America. But there is a flaw in its purpose and overall concept. First, as a result of the violence against Blacks in the

south and the refusal to admit them into white establishments was the bill passed. The law forced resisting whites to accept and acknowledge Blacks as a sort of social equal, which many of them were unwilling and unprepared to do. This caused much resentment toward Blacks.

From this resentment, the hate toward Blacks was intensified. This is analogous to an older sibling being forced to give up his toy to the younger sibling. It breeds contempt on the part of the older child. Had this solution been placed before the minds of any militant Blacks at the time, say Malcolm X, he would have refused it and rather settled for segregation and not integration.

This causes whites to think that all blacks want to be bothered with them and want to be near them, which is not true at all. But to increase the practice of integration, liberal whites forced upon the nation the "dream" of King and the practice of integration. While at the same time, there was an entire faction of Blacks who refused integration. However, to this day, this faction has not a voice.

The fact that most whites even today still resent the presence of Blacks places Blacks in the stigma that they are social leaches who want everything whites have. This is also not the case. There are many Blacks who would just as well take a partial of land totally separated from whites to begin an entire society of Blacks independent of white demagoguery.

Article Continues

Voting Rights Act of 1965

Violence in Selma, Alabama, highlighted the need for urgent action in the area of voting rights. Selma's county had 15,000 eligible black voters, yet only 335 had been able to register. In 1965, nonviolent protesters descended on Selma to march from that city to the state capitol in Montgomery. Governor George Wallace, who, in his 1963 inaugural address, had promised "Segregation forever!" sent in state troopers and violence ensued.

One civil rights worker was murdered by an extremist. In response to this violence, Congress passed the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which eliminated various barriers to registration--such as literacy tests--that White southerners had traditionally used to restrict African-American voting. President Johnson, ever the opportunist, publicly advertised the fact that he would sign the bill in the same room where, a century before, President Lincoln had signed a document to free slaves conscripted into the Confederate Army.

A New Direction in the Fight for Civil Rights

After passage of the Civil Rights Bill in 1964 and Voting Rights Bill in 1965, some leaders claimed victory for the civil rights movement. There was almost universal agreement up to that point on the cornerstones of the civil rights movement:

1. The goal was integration.
2. The means should be nonviolent.

After 1964, however, many civil rights advocates doubted that they truly had achieved the goal of full civil rights for African-Americans. More and more people began to disagree with integration and nonviolence. Malcolm X, for example, criticized Reverend Martin Luther King's appeals to follow Christian practice and to "turn the other cheek," and stated that Islam had allowed African-Americans "to stand on our own feet and solve our problems ourselves instead of depending on white people to solve them for us." From 1964 to 1968, many black leaders increasingly repudiated integration in favor of black separatism and non-violent resistance in favor of self-defense. As the decade went on, a definite rift began to form in the civil rights movement.

Stokely Carmichael was one of the leaders of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), which had begun as a non-violent, integrationist organization, instrumental in the sit-ins and Freedom Rides of the early 1960s. In 1964 and 1965, however, Carmichael and SNCC repudiated integration and passive resistance and called, instead, for the exclusion of whites from African-American civil rights organizations. Said Carmichael:

"I am not going to beg the white man for anything I deserve. I'm going to take it."

"Black Power" gradually became a new focus in the civil rights movement. In short, champions of Black Power asserted:

1. Blacks should do things for themselves rather than rely on the charity of White politicians.
2. Blacks should defend themselves and fight back if necessary.
3. Blacks should develop and emphasize pride in their own culture.

The Black Power movement called for, and helped institute black political parties, black-owned businesses and black cooperatives, and independent schools for blacks.

As Carmichael told increasingly sympathetic members of CORE,

"We don't need white liberals. We have to make integration irrelevant."

This thinking disturbed more conservative members of CORE as well as the NAACP, which had always emphasized the need for white allies in the movement.

The "Long Hot Summers"

By the mid 1960s, racial tensions had gone beyond sit-ins and Freedom Rides. A series of major riots--or rebellions, depending on your point of view--erupted during the latter part of the decade, including:

- 1964--Riots in Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant, New York City
- 1965--Riots in the Watts section of Los Angeles. Malcolm X killed in New York.

- 1967--Several dozen riots, including ones in Newark and Detroit.
- 1968--Martin Luther King, Jr. killed on April 4 and race riots--which King abhorred--broke out around the country.

In response, President Johnson appointed the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, also known as the Kerner Commission. The Kerner Commission found that the country was divided, along racial and socio-economic lines, into two societies: 40% of non-whites lived below the federal government's poverty line, black men were twice as likely to be unemployed as whites and three times as likely to be in low-skill jobs. The commission viewed this poverty as the cause of crime and civil unrest, concluding:

"chronic poverty is a breeder of chronic chaos."

The President, for the most part, ignored the findings of the commission, although he did push for the Civil Rights Act of 1968, the last significant piece of civil rights legislation of the era. The Civil Rights Act of 1968:

1. Barred discrimination in the sale or rental of housing (affecting 80% of the nation's total housing units).
2. Made it a federal crime to cross state lines to incite a riot.

The second point demonstrated an appeal to the emerging white backlash against the violent tactics of some black demonstrators. So, although, the Johnson administration made great progress in the realm of civil rights, it also paid homage to white conservatives by the end of the decade.

The "War on Poverty"

The advancement of civil rights for African-Americans was only one item on Johnson's ambitious domestic agenda. The second item was the "War on Poverty." In 1963, shortly before he was assassinated, President Kennedy had asked his economic advisors to draw up some proposals to address the problem of American poverty.

Johnson took up this charge after he succeeded Kennedy as President. In Johnson's first State of the Union address on June 8, 1964, he called for an unconditional war to defeat poverty. He expanded and revised the proposals given to Kennedy and developed the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The act included a variety of initiatives:

1. Head Start
2. Job Corps
3. Work-Study program for university students
4. VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America) - a domestic version of the Peace Corps

5. Neighborhood Youth Corps
6. Basic education and adult job training
7. CAPS (Community Action Programs) - CAPS turned out to be the most controversial part of the package, as it proposed the "maximum feasible participation" by poor people themselves to determine what would help them the most. CAPS was a radical departure from how government had run most social reform programs in the past.

The Economic Opportunity Act was bold legislation, but it received only about \$1 billion to divide among the various programs and remained critically under funded. By 1966, Congress appropriated \$4 billion for the programs.

Tax Cuts

In February 1964, LBJ shepherded another Kennedy plan through Congress: a \$10 billion tax cut. This policy was largely a success. Over the next several quarters, consumer spending rose \$45 billion, the GNP soared, and the federal government actually increased its revenue. As a result, most top policy makers accepted the tenets of Keynesian economics.

The Great Society

Following the tradition of using catchphrases to describe major domestic programs started by Franklin D. Roosevelt, President Johnson announced his "Great Society" during the presidential campaign of 1964. He described the Great Society as

"A place where men are more concerned with the quality of their lives than the quantity of their goods."

The Great Society had three central themes:

- Abundance and liberty for all.
- An end to poverty.
- An end to racial injustice.

These demands may have seemed radical, but not in comparison to the ideas of Johnson's Republican opponent, Barry Goldwater. Goldwater, the "Arizona Archangel," was an honest man, but his political views were more suited to the late nineteenth century than to the modern world. He called for the abolition of the progressive income tax, an end to public works, and an end to Social Security. Goldwater wanted to pare down the federal government to its size in the last century. Claimed Goldwater:

"Moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue...Our Republican cause is to free our people and light the way for liberty throughout the world."

To counteract this claim, Democrats portrayed Johnson as a man of peace and Goldwater as a militaristic kook not above using nuclear arms. Out of Goldwater's slogan, "In Your Heart You Know He's Right," they crafted "In Your Heart You Know He Might."

When the votes were counted, Johnson crushed Goldwater in the 1964 election. Johnson and his running mate, Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota, received 61% of the popular vote and won every state except Goldwater's home state of Arizona, and five states in the Deep South. LBJ's overwhelming victory also helped bring many liberal candidates into the eighty-ninth Congress. Historians often refer to this Congress as the "Fabulous Eighty-Ninth" for its great number of legislative successes. The "Fabulous Eighty-Ninth" accomplished the following:

1. Achieved the goals of the Fair Deal.
2. Achieved the goals of the New Frontier.
3. Introduced Medicare programs.
4. Passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.
5. Legislated a Housing and Urban Development program.
6. Ratified the highway beautification act, a pet project of Lady Bird Johnson, the First Lady.
7. Installed clean air and water regulations.
8. Ended the immigration quota system of the 1920s.
9. Set forth new city planning programs.

The Fabulous Eighty-Ninth Congress passed so much progressive legislation between 1965 and 1967 that it reminded many Americans of the germinal days of the early New Deal. Said Speaker of the House, John W. McCormack:

"It was a Congress of accomplished hopes, a Congress of realized dreams."

"If only it hadn't been for Vietnam..."

Had the United States not become involved in Vietnam, historians today would likely remember President Johnson for his leadership in passing civil rights legislation and for his declaration of a "War on Poverty." The Vietnam War, however, proved to be Johnson's downfall. The history and domestic impact of this war are fascinating and extraordinarily important.

(AI) Conclusion

The liberal agenda ended up being the preferred agenda of American culture because it is supposedly based on "Civil Rights" accomplished by "non-violence" and because it is the easiest method to implement and control. Resistance from Black militant movements brought out white mobs that were looking for the right time to commit acts of violence against Blacks anyway.

The riots of the summer were not a result of Blacks behaving as animals or as common crooks, but because they were fed up with the ways of oppression and violence against their communities. It is only natural to defend yourself against aggressive people. The Black Power Movement was a movement of self defense and independence, not one of dependence and subservience.

Had legislation went to Congress on segregation instead on integration, whites would have been happier and many more Blacks would have been also, and would be today. Blacks would have learned to funnel their money through their own neighborhoods instead of into white ones. They would have learned more unity instead of disunity.

The urban communities would have more and better funding if they were to self sustain themselves instead of depending on government money, which brings resentment from many whites against Blacks thus encouraging more subtle acts of racism. Blacks could have a stronger and deeper sense of pride about themselves instead of the self-defeatist mind-sets they have now. They would have stronger families and better male-female relationships because of a stronger sense of community.

The Black male would probably not be the brunt of the prison system because the labor force would have had to accept the achievements of Blacks not based on Affirmative Action laws and preferences but on personal achievement alone. There would be no arguments about reparations because the Black community would have owned much more in wealth than they do now for the simple reason that their money would have remained in their own segregated neighborhoods.

The Black Movement today is in total confusion because of the practice and laws forcing integration. Not that integration is a bad thing, all people should learn to live with and respect one another; however, forced integration brings resentment whereas natural integration would have brought a simple smooth assimilation and agreeance.

Think carefully. Had the other Black Movement been given the attention it deserved, the state of Black America would have been better off than it is today. We are not fighting against the actual laws on the books and the supposed way they are to make us free, we are fighting against a mind-set that does not want us around. This is the purpose of Black Power, to build upon a mentality that encourages unity amongst one another and peace with the other.

Source From: <http://us.history.wisc.edu/hist102/lectures/lecture26.html>

2004 by Afro Staff

The Impending Division of the United States

What are the Red, White, and Blue without the White? This past election ironically foretold the future of America. Though the Republican Party won by a near margin of 2% of the American vote, this means that 49% of Americans voters voted Democrat. This was the same scenario as in the 2000 election. Clearly, America is divided, and a nation divided will not stand.

The Red states have become known as "Jesus Land" while the Blue states are now simply "Undecided" (liberal). In fact, if you take notice of the electoral map, most northern states are blue, (including Canada)

and the rest is red. Not only is the geography displaying a pattern, but also the moral philosophy and beliefs are vividly apparent.

There is contention on the Democrat's side for red states because the red states believe in traditional values stemming from the Holy Bible. Moreover, there is abhorrence for the blue states coming from conservatives because they represent all that is immoral and indecent. This division is eventually going to bring about a serious discussion of a possible, physical separation and possibly two different "United" Governments.

If this transpires, in which direction would Black America go? Hopefully, and prayerfully, the Black nation would finally go their own way, and maybe capitalize on the division by beginning their own nation and writing their own Constitution. It would be heart wrenching for most of Black America to follow their voting constituency, the Democratic Party, and move toward the left, (and north) of the country.

It would also not be good to fear the conservative side because of fear of racism, and believing that they would once again enslave Blacks. That would not be wise to believe. At best, Blacks should shift to the conservative side simply for the sake of biblical values - being such a religious people and all. After all, if God were a true part of the conservative belief system, they would not enforce slavery on any people.

On the other hand, if living in a land devoid of God or moral values at all, there is more chance of enslavement, in the Devil's land. In addition, if living without values, who knows how extreme the rate of infectious diseases may be, or how high the murder rate would rise in addition to all other acts of immorality?

The looming division of America is on the horizon and deep within the symposiums of many of America's so-called analytical experts. Be not deceived. No land this divided with such bitter hatred ever stood long. Either a peaceful separation will have to be implemented, or there will be such an uprising in the near future it will mirror the revolutions of the 1700s.

2004 by CR Hamilton

Restraining the White Male Power Structure

The 2008 election looks like an animated tale of the nineteen sixties war against the white male power structure. While Blacks anticipate the hope of another social and historical breakthrough, women are themselves seemingly seeking a higher level of recognition, and white males are standing on the brink of losing a little more power to the minority sector of American society.

If history repeats itself, Blacks will take for themselves a larger piece of the American pie, women will branch out into more prestigious leadership roles over their white male counterpart, and the white male

will feel the threat of power loss and put into place a long term plan of the impairing of each, Black America and their rebellious women.

Like the sixties, the country has grown tired of the social atmosphere and sees the need for change; away from the white male dominated ideology of the world and how it should be run. No more war, no more economic partitioning among the select and no more can white men escape with all the profits. It is time for the minority to claim a stake in the country's prosperity.

The Hoover, Nixon, Reagan governing days are gone. The bootstrap conservative ideology has proven too discriminating and the gap between the rich and the poor must reduce. Generational changes are coming into play and the grandchildren of the former see no reason why all people should not have access to all things, equally.

Oh God, the hate that will ensue afterward. The white male will retreat to a dark closet and holler to high hell because he cannot deal with the thought of losing his power. However, he does have one last strategy that will and have upholden him as supreme. He has determined that his status as the better man is maintained as long as there is a group of people dependent on him to allot them a living wage.

Immigrant labor reaffirms that the white male still controls the wealth. As long as the public blames illegal immigrant issues on illegal immigrants themselves, they will never discover that the illegal immigrant issue is only the lingering arm of the white male power structure. The people will never realize that illegal immigrants only do the jobs white men will not do and that Black men and white women quit doing for them long ago.

His Black male imprisonment program hatched years ago have been uncovered because the good ole boy free masonry-backed judicial system was revealed. The world is aware of the treatment of Black males by the police state brutality taught in government academies, and the economic disparity of the poor was washed ashore in New Orleans.

The lives of an entire country of innocent people were violently disrupted by bombs and bullets for the sake of expanding American white male interest. Kids were killed, families were destroyed on both sides, and now we live by the mercies of foreign oil prices. Conservatism is done for at least the next 12 years, and this is what the world will see and believe.

The irony of it all, however, is that everyone has suffered except the, which is the white woman. Through it all she has somehow maintained power, escaped poverty, rose higher in corporate business and throughout the world, and at the same time managed to secretly return to the life she so vigorously fought to get away from during the sixties; the housewife and mother. Thus in the end, the next president of the United States will be the silent racist, and from behind her, the white male will still brandish power. And what will he do?

He will cut off his nose despite his face, put the country up for sale and disappear into the global world he has created for himself, seeking those who will assemble his product, wash his car and fetch his gin. But he can never hide because where ever there is poverty, war, or servitude, we know he is there or have recently left, so to win the war against the white male, the world must continue to fight against and eradicate those three evils.

Feb. 2008 by CR Hamilton

The White Man's Relationship with the Yellow Man

We know how the white power structure of the world feels about the Black man (Africans), and the Red man (Indians) and the Olive man (Middle Easterners), and we can basically measure those relationships by how the West deals with those certain cultures; however how much do we know about the white man's relationship with the Yellow man?

The last serious encounter the two had was the Vietnam and Korean Wars, neither of which a victory was determined accurately. Before that, there was the massacre of millions of men, women and children of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan, where the United States dropped an atomic bomb and obliterated their world (and who eventually submitted). But what about China?

The People's Republic of China was a major adversary of the United States during much of the Cold War. Today, it is a major challenge for U.S. policymakers as well as topic of heated debate in the post-Cold War era. China not only remains a Communist power, whose foreign and domestic policies clash with U.S. interests and values. It is also a rising military force and a major market for American goods.

Except for China's 1989 attack on protesters in Tiananmen Square, and the United States protest, there has been no real conflict between the two, or with China's Communist neighbor North Korea, until now.

There is a looming threat of a coming nuclear arms race involving more countries, North Korea being one. And the United States is depending on China and South Korea to assist in deterring North Korea from developing nukes and to rejoin talks. To date, however, as quoting from abcnews.com:

"Song, who is South Korea's top envoy to the nuclear dispute, also commented on reports that Washington warned allies that North Korea might be ready to conduct an underground nuclear test as early as June, with Song saying South Korea had received no such warning."

ABC also reported that the United States and Japan, meanwhile, agreed Monday in Washington to defer U.N. action to harness North Korea's weapons programs and appealed to China to try harder to get six-party negotiations resumed.

Once again, it seems that the U.S. will ignore any suggestions the U.N. makes concerning world affairs and take things into their own hands if need be. Even Condoleezza Rice has announced "I don't think there should be any doubt about our ability to deter whatever the North Koreans are up to, " which means "bring it on."

The problem with all this is that when America - the West - structure of capitalism is threatened, by a just as powerful and long standing government structure, Communism, at some point there is going to be a

clash. This is all about a quest for world power, which China believes they are atop the world in strength and power regardless of America's claim to the same.

Obviously, China is wise because they are rarely involved in a war somewhere in the world. They resourcefully limit their military usage throughout the world whereas the United States is spread thin all over the world.

The Bible mentions in "Revelation, 20:8", that in the last days, there will be two nations that will rise to rule the world in different times, one is called Gog, and the other is Magog. Well, interpreted through original Hebrew text, Gog represents the northern, Euro nation and Magog represents the Eastern, Indo-nation. Red China - and all the Yellow man - is a force to be reckoned with, and unless America decides to repent for the evil they have caused the rest of the world's colors of man, they will reap dreadfully, the wars of the end time.

2005 by CR Hamilton

The Break with the African Background

Quote from E. Franklin Frazier

In studying any phase of the character and development of the social and cultural life of the Negro in the United States, one must recognize from the beginning that because of the manner in which the Negroes were captured in Africa and enslaved, they were particularly stripped of their social heritage.

Although the area in west Africa from which the majority of the slaves were drawn exhibits a high degree of cultural homogeneity, the capture of many of the slaves in intertribal wars and their selection for the slave markets tended to reduce to a minimum the possibility of the retention and the transmission of African culture.

The slaves captured in the intertribal wars were generally males and those selected for the slave markets on the African coast were the young and the most vigorous. This was all in accordance with the demands of the slave markets in the new world. One can get some notion of this selective process from the fact that it was not until 1840 that the number of females equaled the number of males in the slave population of the United States. Young males, it will be readily agreed, are poor bearers of the cultural heritage of a people.

But the manner in which the slaves were held for the slave ships that transported them to the new world also had an important influence upon the transmission of the African social heritage to the new environment. They were held in baracoons, a euphemistic term for concentration camps at the time, where the slaves without any regard for sex or family and tribal affiliations were kept until the slaver came along to buy a cargo for the markets of the new world.

This period of dehumanization was followed by the "middle passage," The voyage across the Atlantic Ocean to the slave markets of the west Indies and finally the indigo, tobacco, and cotton plantations of what was to become later the United States. During the "middle passage," the Negroes were packed for sex or age differences, not to mention such matters as clan and tribal differences. In fact, no regard was shown for such elementary social, or shall I say human, considerations as family ties.

In the new world the process by which the Negro was stripped of his social heritage and thereby, in a sense, dehumanized was completed. There was first the size of the plantation, which had significant influence upon the extent and nature of the contacts between the slaves and the whites.

On the large sugar and cotton plantations in the southern states there was, as in Brazil and the West Indies, little contact between the whites and the Negro slaves. Under such conditioned there was an opportunity for the slaves to undertake to reestablish their old ways. As a matter of fact, however, the majority of slaves in the United States were on small farms and small plantations in some of the upland cotton regions of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas the median number of slaves per holding did not reach twenty; while in regions of general agriculture based mainly upon slave labor in Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee and the median number of slave holdings was even smaller.

Then slaves freshly imported from Africa were usually "broken in" to the plantation regime. According to the descriptions given by a traveler in Louisiana, the slaves were only "gradually accustomed to work. They are made to bathe often, to take long walks from time to time, and especially to dance; they are distributed in small numbers among old slaves in order to dispose them better to acquire their habits."

Apparently from all reports, these new slaves with their African ways were subjected to the disdain, if not hostility, of Negroes who had become accommodated to the plantation regime and had acquired the ways of their new environment.

Of what did accommodation to their new environment consist? It was necessary to acquire some knowledge of the language of whites for communication. Any attempt on the part of the slaves to preserve or use their native language was discouraged or prohibited. They were to set to task in order to acquire the necessary skills for the production of cotton or sugar cane.

On the small farms very often the slaves worked in the fields with their white owners. On the larger plantations they were under the strict discipline of strict overseers, who not only supervised their work but also in the interest of security maintained a strict surveillance over all their activities. It was a general rule that there could be no assembly of five or more slaves without the presences of a white man. This applied especially to their gathering for religious purposes. Later, we shall see how the slaves were soon introduced into the religious life of their white masters. All of this tended to bring about as completely as possible a loss of the Negro's African cultural heritage.

E. Franklin Frazier, *The Negro Church in America*. 1963

January 2006 By Afromerica

Africans Kings and the Slave Trade

Whites have resorted to using the "African kings sold Africans into slavery" theory to level off the Mid-Atlantic slave trade in order to transfer some of the guilt of slavery to African leaders and Blacks in America, and to argue the point of not paying reparations. Many blacks themselves have accepted this half-baked theory in defense of their modern day slave owners and would uphold the idiotic notion that whites are not totally to blame for slavery.

Though not historically proven as of yet, if African kings sold Africans to the Europeans as slaves, it does not mean that slavery would not have been if they had not sold them, or that the African kings initiated slavery and introduced it to the Europeans. If the theory has any truth, it is that Europeans sought after kings who would sell Africans as slaves because this was the European's primary market at the time.

Do not be an idiot in an idiot's world and believe that Africans share the blame for 10-20 million Africans being enslaved throughout the north and South American territories.

Like cable news and institutions of higher learning operate today, by paying and using the mouths of Blacks to spew their subtle bigoted and reverse racist rhetoric, the Europeans of that time used African kings to seek out and capture Africans and to sell them for a profit, if this is true. The same strategy of divide and conquer was used then, as it is used now and all based on the sum of money or something shiny.

The kingdoms of Northern Africa were established long before the coming of Europeans and the socio-economic atmosphere of Africa was much more developed than the European nation states, culturally and spiritually. The Europeans could not develop further in the Americas unless they interrupted the affairs of Africa and the Middle East by negotiating the deal of slave labor, seeing they themselves were incapable of physical work in certain climates and susceptible to certain diseases.

The kings of Africa had no motive for initiating slavery in the Americas or for the building of the European empire but were merely feeding the lust and evil needs of Euro-ethnocentrism, which was their only crime, if true at all. The reason whites and indoctrinated Blacks use the fallacious argument of the African kings is because they want so desperately to wipe away the stench and blood, and the memory of slavery from their hands.

If history tells a story through it all, it tells the story of a broken nation searching frantically for a way out of repaying and rebuilding what they have torn down, the African culture and history. Yet, do not look for any recompense anytime soon because it is not yet time nor is there enough judgment passed that would make the truth apparent to a people consumed with themselves to the extent of falsifying reality.

January 2006 By CR Hamilton

Black History Month Keeps the Negro Passive

Each February, "African-Americans" and their counterparts "white-Americans", force feed Blacks facts and information about what we have accomplished in American history. For the next month, watch the white-owned Black sites and pacified Black sites pay homage to a politically correct past.

The true Black America is not the Civil Rights crowd; it is the nationalist crowd. The crowd that has been silenced in the media and discouraged from following. The crowd that believes in justice, freedom, and charging our oppressors to pay (in deed and other) for the crimes against our people: The crowd that rejects pacifism, mockery, and apathy.

However, among the passive, there will be grand stagings and marches, erections of memorials, unveiling of statutes and paintings, programs for the little Black children in the public school system, memorable writings and commentaries in Black (and white) magazines, newspapers and websites, events around the nation about past and present Black leaders and what they have contributed to America in the "credit to their race" mentality: In essence, a grand mockery of Black people.

What have we acquired in this country other than the strength to survive? We have no wealth. We have no fortunes and but a little fame and that in entertainment and sports. Most will say, "we've come a long way," with a faint white voice heard from behind them in agreement. "Look at the great strides we've made with Civil Rights legislation and Affirmative Action and all."

This is all listless contempt in its most pink form. Are we rewarded for our efforts and accomplishments? No, we are simply remembered as a dead people would be, and the memories fade the next month and once again, reality sets in.

Is racism cut down another degree in America? No, it seems intensified each year because each year it seems more people, (whites) are resentful of Blacks having a month for recognition.

So, what exactly does Black History Month do for the image, economic, and social progress of Blacks in America? Nothing, it is a mere pacifier in the mouths of complaining Negroes who want what the white man has, the status, power, money, and respect they give to that very same white man.

More pathetic, are Black people who find any consolation in this negrorized month. No offense to the brothers and sisters who truly believe in its meaning and who take part in its ritual, but think about it, logically. It is a time for the rest of the resentful white America to reconsider how they feel about Blacks and for the deluded Blacks to rejoice in what they think is accomplishment.

There is history in Black America, however it is a grim history. Do whites remember that? Do Blacks? No, they would all rather forget about it and call it even. This is the honorable thing to do if peace is the goal. Nevertheless, no one person or race can escape the reality of reaping what they have sown, just like Iraq, some day soon, America will pay for disturbing that country and the people's lives.

White America will suffer for the crimes against the African slaves and their children and their grand children and every generation afterward. This crime against humanity is not wiped away from history no

more than the good deeds Blacks have done and all the contributions they have given to this country without reward, except for being robbed of their genius in innovations.

Blacks help to build this country and we are rewarded with a mere month of remembrance. The problem with this is there are too many blacks in America who would suggest the writer of this article tone it down, forget about it, let it slide, move on with their life, get over it. In another time, that would be the right thing to do if the writer received what was truly due him and his children.

2005 By CR Hamilton

Albert Cleage

During the 1960s, many religious leaders, led by Malcolm X and the Nation of Islam, sharply criticized the methods and advances claimed by the civil rights movement. By far the most vocal Christian minister advocating a more radical approach to obtaining civil rights was Albert Cleage, Jr.

Albert Cleage was born in Indianapolis in 1911 and grew up in Detroit. He received his B.A. from Wayne State in 1942 and his Bachelor of Divinity from Oberlin Graduate School of Theology in 1943. Cleage was ordained in the Congregational Church in 1943.

After a brief-and disappointing-term as pastor at an integrated church in San Francisco, Cleage returned to Detroit in 1951 and served at St. Marks United Presbyterian mission. He soon clashed with white Presbyterian leaders over issues of how he should lead his black congregation. In 1953, Cleage and a group of followers left to form the Central Congregation Church. They were committed to ministering to the downtrodden, and offered several programs for the community's poor.

Throughout the 1960s, Cleage was active in issues of education and black political leadership. By the late 1960s, his vision of Christianity had radicalized alongside the disappointments of the civil rights movement and rise of Black Power. He launched the Black Christian National Movement in 1967, which called for black churches to reinterpret Jesus' teachings to suit the social, economic, and political needs of black people. That Easter, Cleage unveiled an 18-foot painting of a Black Madonna, and renamed Central Congregational the Shrine of the Black Madonna.

In 1968, following a year of racial unrest in Detroit, Cleage published *The Black Messiah*, which detailed his vision of Jesus as a black revolutionary leader. In 1972, he published his second book, *Black Christian Nationalism*, and inaugurated the Black Christian Nationalist Movement as a separate denomination. The name was later changed to the Pan African Orthodox Christian Church (PAOCC), and Cleage changed his own name to Jaramogi Abebe Agyeman, meaning "liberator, holy man, savior of the nation" in Swahili. The PAOCC includes churches in Atlanta, GA, and Houston, TX, several cultural centers, bookstores, community service centers, and a working farm.

Jaramogi Abebe Agyeman died on February 20, 2000. The PAOCC continues his mission to uplift and liberate the Pan African world community through the teachings of Jesus, the Black Messiah.

2003 by AfroStaff

The History Channel Lies About History

For some strange reason, historians of the West in cahoots with media giants have decided that people and events in history should reflect a European semblance based on a European agenda, even from the beginning creation of the world and humanity. While watching the History channel or any cable channel that reflects on historic events, one would think there were no other people alive or that any and every advancement made in the world would not have happened if Europe were nonexistent.

From the Garden of Eden where the History channel portrays Adam and Eve as a European couple, the persona of God as an elderly white guy, Lucifer as a handsome young white buck, to the age of Roman rule throughout the Dark Ages until this day, the History channel finds it necessary, and amusingly so, to paint every one as either white or close to the Euro Persuasion.

Not only do they portray the characters as white but they connect any major events or significant discoveries to Europe and the West as having been present at the time or at least play some crucial role. There is no occasion in history whites will let get by without taking some credit for. This task, however, means they have to discredit the original innovators first before they implant themselves into the scene.

Major events that mark turning points in history, whether myth or reality, involve whites. Even if the events are horrible ones such as Alexander the Great's conquest of the East, which was filled with barbarous acts of murder of innocent people, women, children, and nations, they will twist the event to make it seem not so bad. Alexander was a greedy, murderous barbarian who sought for nothing more than to stretch Caucasian pillaging of the world to the ends of the earth.

Mythical gods and tales of astronomical innovation are glorified as things of beauty from ancient Greece and Rome, the so-called fathers of philosophy, mythology, and any kind of serious thought. Yet when discussing the ancient folklore of other cultures like Africa and Asia, the art is referred to as witchcraft, voodoo, savagery or cult-like, yet most - if not all - of the Greek mythology and tales are taken from older, more inspired cultures that existed long before Caucasians.

Lately, cable television has exalted historical events and places such as "Rome," "Troy", "Normandy", and other warring places and times and painted them as heroic acts of Western splendor or magnificence, profiling murderers and maniacs as heroes by delving into their psyche and giving them a identifiable personality thus explaining away their hideous acts as some sort of malformed psychopathological behavior only and not as a crazed sickness.

They claim that world wars were started and ended by Europe and America for good reasons. War, on their part, is necessary to spread the goodness of some kind or another European/American agenda of freedom and Democracy. They portray other cultures and nations as uncivilized beast or cruel dictators and government regimes that need reforming or civilizing, thus justifying any acts of Euro-conquest as good for mankind.

When Africa comes into view, it is always savageous and uncivilized; and when there are historical highpoints of Africa, the characters are somehow transformed into lighter shades of people who may have been of Euro-persuasion so to make the viewer believe that of course whites were there to make everything civilized.

It is a joke to watch whites attempt to Euronize the world and its history. It shows how arrogance can be as sinful as murder. Granted, Europe played a part in history but anyone with a sane mind knows that Europe stood on the shoulders of many already great nations and cultures and came eons after any real development of civilization. And anyone in his or her right mind knows that God is not an old white guy with a conservative agenda.

January 2006 By CR Hamilton

Illegitimate America

Grasp for a moment if you will, the fact that the continents of America do not lawfully nor justifiably belong to American-whites or Britain. Essentially and naturally, the continents belong to the indigenous peoples of the land. Euro-whites merely looted the Americas and other countries fulfilling their conquest of world imperialism.

The human race was naturally separated by lands and language: Africa to the Black man, East Asia and the Eastern Isles to the red man, the Middle east and cradle of civilization to the Olive man, the Americas to the yellow man, and the North to the white man. By divine plan, the Creator placed each ethnic group where He environmentally saw fit and for them to have dominion over their own land and resources for to trade, connect, and respect the other groups.

However, the white man's vision obviously stretched far beyond the scope and divine stratagem of the Creator because he has taken it upon himself to seize lands not naturally belonging to him. Such as parts of Africa, the Americas, the Middle East and many other lands and peoples the world may not know about.

After raping and industrializing to their satisfaction these stolen lands, kings and queens of Britain decreed that the lands and people would now belong to them, under their rules, statutes, and constitutions. Does this mean the lands rightfully belong to Britain or the white man? No. It means that oppression is all too real by way of strategically designed totalitarianism, colonialism, and theocracy.

Of the people born into these lands as a result of the white-man sowing his seed into the fertile grounds and mothers, they have a more than natural right to claim these lands as their own and live off the resources produced by the land. Unfortunately, the white-man disperses the resources unevenly with partiality toward his own.

On the highest grounds of these lands the indigenous people must stand and make their request made known of the Creator, that when the thief relinquishes the land back to the native peoples, He will inflict justice swiftly against the oppressor. That is the destiny and that is His law.

November 2005 By CR Hamilton

The Uncle Tom Millennium Museum of African American History

A Millennium Uncle Tom is a Black person who is encouraged by money via donations, contributions, or corporate sponsorship or promised media attention, to say things about Black people and or support causes against the best interest of Black people that whites would otherwise lose their jobs for or be marked as a racist.

The grand opening of the Uncle Tom Millennium Museum of African America History starts at the beginning of February every year from this point during the so-called Black History month to honor all Uncle Toms for their outstanding performances as sell-outs and turncoats to Black America and its struggle for liberation from American white supremacist oppression.

The following people are known Uncle Toms and Aunt Jemimas who have accepted generous financial contributions from white organizations and promises of media exposure and financing to poison and thwart the minds of the masses of Black America away from liberation, truth, and the ability to think for themselves. The list will be updated on a regular bases throughout the year and during February will feature the most prominent of the Uncle Tom faces and activities.

Our first featured Uncle Tom is the most current and undisputedly the most notorious of the latest of Uncle Tom sell-outs in American history, Robert L. (Bob) Johnson former owner of the Black Entertainment Television network, BET. A list of those to follow is posted below as to who to expect in the near future.

The Uncle Tom Antics of Robert 'Bob' Johnson

Bob Johnson, the nation's first black billionaire and founder of the BET cable television network, became rich by exploiting Black women through the voices of Black rappers in music videos that featured nothing less than soft porn. These videos are responsible for distorting and sexually polluting the minds of millions of Black children in America for over 20 years.

After destroying a generation of Black children and becoming America's first Black billionaire, Johnson decided he had made enough money off the backs of the Black lower class to turn over the filth of BET to Ms. Debra Lee, who continues in Johnson's legacy of Black child mind molestation, control and destruction.

Most recently, in a historical breakthrough of Black advancement, Barack Obama, a Black Kenyan, seeks support for his presidential campaign among Black voters. His political rival Hillary Clinton, the white woman and wife of William "Dick Willy" Clinton, received the undying support of Bob Johnson as well as his allegiance to destroying the Black community as he spoke in favor of Hillary against Barack in an attempt to destroy his reputation among the country. In a public speech of fleeting insanity and obvious white ass kissing, Johnson said:

"To me, as an African American, I am frankly insulted the Obama campaign would imply that we are so stupid that we would think Hillary and Bill Clinton, who have been deeply and emotionally involved in black issues - when Barack Obama was doing something in the neighborhood; I won't say what he was doing, but he said it in his book - when they have been involved," Johnson said.

Because of his outstanding performance as an A-1 Uncle Tom, Aframerica in celebration of Black History month, and co-sponsor to the new Uncle Tom Millennium Museum of African American History is proud (and sort of ashamed) to present Mr. Bob Johnson with this year's top Uncle Tom award and placement on the Museum's High Court photo gallery.

List of upcoming awards go to the following:

Bill Cosby

Larry Elder

Jesse Lee Peterson

And more

Feb 2008 By Aframerica

The Rape of the True America

The America in which we currently live is not the true America; it is the pseudo-materialization of Euro-culture and imperialism. The true America was originally a paradise inhabited by a people intertwined with nature, ruled by the gods of life. The tribes of original America consisted of the Aleuts, the Cherokee, the Zuni, Sioux, Mohawk, Aztec, and Inca peoples, before the coming of Westerners obsessed with greed.

When the first Europeans arrived in the fifteenth century, the Native American population was in the millions. But by the beginning of the twentieth century, after relentless subjugation and even acts of genocide, the "vanishing Americans" numbered a mere 250,000 (Dobyns, 1966; Tyler, 1973). The land they controlled also shrank drastically.

Euro-discoverers found the indigenous people passive and peaceful, in stark contrast to materialistic and competitive Europeans. Yet even as Europeans seized the land of Native Americans, they justified their actions by calling their victims thieves and murderers.

After the Revolutionary War, the U.S. government adopted a pluralistic approach to Native American societies and sought to gain more land through treaties. Payment for land was far from fair, however, and when Native Americans resisted surrender of their homelands, the U.S. government simply used superior military power to evict them. By the early 1800s, few Native Americans remained east of the Mississippi River.

In 1871, the United States declared Native Americans wards of the government and adopted a strategy of forced assimilation. Native Americans continued to lose their land, and they were well on their way to losing their culture as well.

Reservation life fostered dependency, replacing ancestral languages with English and traditional religion with Christianity. Officials took many children from their parents and handed them over to boarding schools, where they were resocialized as "Americans."

Authorities gave local control of reservations to the few Native Americans who supported government policies, and they distributed reservation land, traditionally held collectively, as private property to individual families (Tyler, 1973).

Not until 1924 were Native Americans entitled to U.S. citizenship. After that, many migrated from reservations, adopting mainstream cultural patterns and marrying non-Native Americans. Many large cities now contain sizable Native American populations. Overall, however, Native Americans control just a small share of the land they once owned. Current national median income reports that the 2000 family income for Native Americans was far below the U.S. average, and few Native Americans earn a college degree.

Source from: Society, The Basics, Macionis, 2004

2004 by AfroStaff

Keep Your Damn Apologies

A Black pundit recently commented on the Fox News network that when a writer begins name-calling in his or her articles, they lose all credibility with the reader. Well for those who hold his sentiments, you might as well go to another article now.

Nevertheless, what spineless, Uncle Tom, conformist, pacifist old Negro-spirited, slave-master-ass-kissing Black person sanctioned apologies from U.S. states as needed or even slightly wanted by Black America to make everything all good? Who told them this is acceptable? Who?

And what white person honestly believes that an apology makes anything different, heals any wounds, or corrects the injustices faced by Blacks today or at any time during America's enslavement and wicked treatment of African slaves and Black Americans? The guilt laid on the shoulders of whites will not move one hair as a result of a mere apology. Which begs the question – like a street-corner whore – what is Blacks suppose to say?

Presumptuously, as good Black Christians in America, we are suppose to forgive and forget, never again having any reason to challenge any more injustices done to us or our children from this day forward, is what whites would suppose. Neither are whites suppose to feel any more guilt or the burden of living the American dream in the face of any Black person while a large portion of the Black population live substandard lives.

Well, in the spirit of the resistant slave and speaking for many Black people who may feel what has just been said about this so-called issue of apologies for slavery; Keep your Damn apologies and stick them up your arrogant and condescending ass.

2007 by CR Hamilton

Black Names

Recent studies attempt to prove that Blacks with names such as Keisha, Jamal, or Natasha are discriminated against when an employer is browsing through a pile of resumes or job applications. Many suggest that Blacks who have those names are profiled and not getting a second look, the employer supposing the person carries a negative stereotype that comes with the name.

Many Black intellectualist have gone as far as to suggest that Blacks name their children "American" names so not as to appear too "Black" (ghetto) or ethnic. Well, from the perspective of many Blacks who are proud of their names, we say...to hell with what people think.

Your name is your identity and one should accept and be proud of their name, especially if it has Afrocentric relevancy. No other culture on this earth have altered their cultural traditions to fit in with Western ideology except the Black American. If whites and or employers would rather decide on the worth of a person based on their name, then let them; it only reveals their bigotry.

When Blacks begin to, or continue to have high rates of unemployment, this would definitely be a variable, which is not one that cannot be done away with if racism is supposedly dead in America. If this is true and Blacks are left out of the employment sector, or profiled in any other institution of American society because of their names, then one would have to question the authenticity of the claim "equal opportunity."

Should we be surprised?

August 2005 by CR Hamilton

The Language Barrier

Controversy has sparked over the way Blacks handle the "King's English." Even now, one of our own has publicly proclaimed the shortcomings of urban teens and some adults and how they talk. This criticism should not be surprising to anyone seeing how white America will use any tactic they can to demoralize Blacks.

Recently, on the Fox News channel during the O'Reilly Factor, Black dialect was under fire. The guest was a Black man - educator - who came on to discuss this phenomenon with O'Reilly but he ended up defending the efforts of urban Blacks, and all Blacks. The interview was originally about how Black kids are influenced by Rap lyrics, which supposedly influences the way they talk.

However, O'Reilly swung the topic to an all out attack on how Blacks talk overall. With 25 million people watching, O'Reilly literally humiliated Blacks (and his own intelligence) by criticizing the way any of us talk. It is this kind of publicity that keeps whites and others suspicious against any Blacks that apply for anything; if they cannot talk right, they are not worthy of anything.

This is just another excuse to be racist. Why care less about the "King's English?" If you can understand what is being said why should the way I say it matter? Blacks are not naturally European so why expect us to talk like Europeans? Ironically, many white youth and even more mainstream dialog are stolen from the Black dialect. There is nothing wrong with the way we talk; it is the whites who criticize us that make it seem appalling.

Talk like you want and walk like you want and to hell with people who believe otherwise.

2004 by AfroStaff

Illiteracy Does Not Necessarily Mean Unintelligent

When the white man uses the term "illiterate" to describe certain people, it is usually meant from a derogatory standpoint in reference to underdeveloped peoples, the third world and African nations, and more specific, some minority Americans who are of a darker hue. Nevertheless, remember that Webster is their Bible.

In the context of lacking understanding or knowledge of something unfamiliar to one's own culture or routine life, this does not constitute one being unintelligent or incompetent and does not warrant being labeled with what has become a dirty word in American society. The concept of illiteracy applies to many areas of knowledge, and is defined as:

Illiteracy

1: the quality or state of being illiterate; especially: inability to read or write

Illiterate

1: having little or no education; especially: unable to read or write

2 a: showing or marked by a lack of familiarity with language and literature b: violating approved patterns of speaking or writing

3: showing or marked by a lack of acquaintance with the fundamentals of a particular field of knowledge.

The most widely accepted definition of illiteracy (based on the root word, illiterate), would be number three: However, American society has given weight to number one as being the prime definition in the English language. Thus, if anyone fits the first definition of illiterate, they are considered uneducated and thereafter unobserved.

Because education is a pillar in the stretch for success in America, depending on one's level of education are we labeled and then shoved into a social class. The problem with this is the first definition is the most narrow-minded definition; it is based wholly on the "American standard."

Definition number three has a broader world view as referred to having a lack of knowledge in some area of a particular field or life in general. For instance, if one has "a lack of acquaintance with the fundamentals of a particular" culture, they would understandably be illiterate in that culture and not deemed uneducated in terms of academia, but merely in the confines of cultural literacy.

White Americans would be considered illiterate where it pertains to Chinese culture and traditions, yet the Chinese or any other choice of people are more inclined not to undermine the unknowledgeable one. We live in a society that has stipulated definitions according to their own dictionary which determines their world view overall.

America is illiterate in world relations because they assume that illiteracy of American culture and or Euro-culture means unintelligent. Thereafter, they take for granted the intellectual ability of anyone who lacks the knowledge of American academia. This is not only illiteracy, but displays a profound unitelligence on their part.

To know means to understand. A lack of knowledge means that one has yet to understand that knowledge but does not mean they can never understand that knowledge. Thinking is an art. If a nation of people lacks the ability to think and reason to the point they assume the abilities of others to be less than themselves based on knowledge of themselves, they have then on outsmarted themselves.

2005 by CR Hamilton

Reverse Racism: The Big White Lie

Before delving into this topic let us first define "racism." According to Webster (the epitome and author of white racism), racism means:

1: belief that certain races of men are by birth and nature superior to others 2a: discrimination against the members of one or more races based on racism b: race hatred and discrimination.

By the end of this essay we will have dismantled the concept of "reverse racism" and proved it to be a phrase concocted by the act of self-centeredness, arrogance, and the very essence of racism itself. And will ask all Black-Americans to totally ignore such a concept when hearing or reading about it simply because Blacks cannot ever be considered racist in a society where we will probably never have the means to act on this belief the way it was [en] acted upon us.

Do not be a fool. With words it is easy to label a person a racist because according to the definition all one has to do is believe they are superior to someone else thus making them a racist. But in the realm of American society and historical practice, the definition does not fit simply because the word takes on a more in-depth meaning when it is acted upon by acts of slavery, blatant oppression, and discrimination. From the racist mindset came these horrible acts.

Now if Blacks were to be considered racist in the equivalent form as that of white, we would have to have practiced either of the above atrocities on another race. This is why it is important to understand that Blacks can never be labeled racist in the real sense of the word, but by definition only. In other words, if Blacks are guilty of racism it can be in mind only and never in deeds. However, whites that claim Blacks practice reverse racism would have people to believe that we practice racism in the same form as they did and continue to do. This is the flaw and misconception of the entire theory.

Example, if I cheat on my wife and get caught, she and everyone else could definitely label me a cheater. I would be guilty of cheating and by the definition of a cheater - one who practices the act of adultery and or fornication with someone other than their spouse - and there is no doubt about my innocents. Now if

my wife turns around and cheats after, and only after I did, whether she does it out of spite or because she planned it, she would also be a cheater by definition.

However, if I cheat and have children by the other woman and live with the other woman, and treat my wife like a second hand rug and ignore our children to pay attention to my new children, these are acts as a result of cheating. If my wife never does these things with the person she cheats with, is she a reverse cheater? By definition yes, but by the actual practice, no. She can never be compared equally to me when and if she is ever referred to as a cheater. Who cheated the most or who cheated the worst?

But if I am trying to get others and her to believe that she is a cheater by the same standards as I, that would make me an extremely exaggerated liar and fabricator because she never went to the extremes that I did when cheating. In my act of cheating, not only did I commit adultery, but I also birthed bastards into the world, committed fornication by living with the other woman, openly neglected my responsibilities as a father, and disrespected my wife's woman and motherhood.

If my wife did none of that but cheated only, how can she ever be considered a cheater but by definition only? No person within his or her right brain would look at me and believe that my wife is a cheater more than I. And if my wife believes that she is a cheater because I said she was and by definition of the word cheater, she is not thinking clearly either. Same with reverse racism.

If a Black person believes that they are capable of reverse racism by the same standards as whites where it pertains to racism, they are very sadly deceived. And if there are any people in their right mind that would believe Blacks could ever be racist along the same standards as white, they too, have lost their ability to reason. Back to the drawing board white people, this will never stick except in your own minds. Which brings us to the point of self-centeredness and arrogance.

To force oneself to believe that a Black person can be racist along the same lines as whites is ludicrous. A Black person may believe they are superior but unless they have the same history for acting upon their beliefs, there can be no comparison. A deep-seated guilt has laid itself upon the consciousnesses of whites to the point that they are desperate to make someone else the oppressor. This is all that is happening.

In the example of my wife and I, out of sheer desperation, guilt, and shame would I go to such lengths to make her out to be as bad as I? This says a lot about my character. It says I am so selfish and so concerned about my own image that I would take drastic measures to destroy someone else just so I could feel better about myself. It also says that I am so arrogant that I will dismiss all that I have done to her and ask all witnesses to my acts to ignore what I have done and focus on her faults. What kind of person does that make me?

Black people: do not accept this into your brain as a possibility, that we are somehow guilty of "reverse racism." It is impossible based on the track record white racism. Any argument that may arise at the office or in the classroom can easily be refuted by pointing out that there is a huge difference in the dictionary's definition of racism and the actual practice of racism. We can be labeled as racist by word only, but never by deed.

2003 by AfroStaff

Puttin' On the White Voice

How many times have you found yourself 'Puttin on the white voice,' when speaking with someone white or in a position of what you feel is of importance? Unconsciously, more Blacks than not will change dialect at post conversation in order to appear intelligible to whites; the question is why.

Why do we (Blacks) have to upgrade our natural dialect to accommodate the white crowd? Since when did our method of speaking become of lower standard to the King's English and furthermore, does not meaning convey more than diction? In other words, if your point is of clear meaning, why try to whiten it up?

Some Blacks have a natural Euro-diction that places them inside the clique automatically while others have to work a little harder to attain that diction.

Mainstream standards proclaim that speaking proper English gives the speaker an advantage in certain circles of life and demands more respect, thus one should practice perfect diction. While that diction means nothing in the circle of Black conversation, it does make a difference around whites. Is this a good or bad thing?

It is a bad thing because it means Blacks have to adapt to white standards by shedding their natural, God-given character. It means that they set the standard for us and if we do not conform we can be shut out of the American dream.

It means that whites have no respect for Black people who have not 'mastered' a language that is not by nature our own language and will use that against us. It means that we live in a society that has not released the Black/white differences when adjusting for success.

Finally, it means that Black people who 'Put on the white voice,' have not come to the conscious reality that we are who we are and if they do not like it then it is too damn bad. If diction determines success yet meaning has no place, we live in a world that we will never fit into based on the sheer shallowness of a truly ignorant people.

May 2007 by CR Hamilton

Anti-American Sentiment

A new revelation of anti-American sentiment laid to the charge of "the Black church" by mainstream media has shocked many newscasters and politicians as well as many average Americans alike, throwing

their whole universe out of orbit. But let it be known, this sentiment comes not only from the Black church, but from all over the country and world. Surprise!

However, doing what they do best - applying racism to the topic - the elite white media will ignore all the anti-American sentiment streaming from white America and many other ethnic groups around the world, and point directly to Black America as being white-folk-hating reverse racist, which amplify their typical practices of racism they claim does not exist. They have even gone as far as blame Jesse Jackson for the racism in the country. How can white America blame a black man for America's racism? Easy, they are hypocrites.

It is understandable that self-evaluation can be an extremely hard thing because no one wants to see themselves as some kind of possible psychotic, and many psychologists will charge you a hundred bucks for that information. But denial, duplicity, and disillusionment run rampant among white America, especially the elitist in the media because they describe themselves every time they ascribe wickedness to leaders of foreign countries, terrorist, or domestic criminals.

For example, when describing a terrorist organization they will say, "Rebel groups want to control government not allowing Democracy to spread and the people to have freedom like here in America." However, if this sentence is analyzed thoroughly enough, it can easily be applied to America itself, such as, "American leaders want to control society through government by not allowing the people to make decisions through voting and to restrict freedoms by acts of congress such as "the Patriot Act."

When describing the restraint of civil liberties in other countries, American pundits will claim, "Third world countries limit women's rights by confining them to home while the men go out and vote, work, and get educated." Again, if this concept were applied to American society it could be read as, "American business limit the working poor's wages to a certain amount and oppress their ability to recourse by gaining protection from liability through government laws that protect businesses over the consumer and worker."

More Examples:

America represses Blacks and women by limiting their earning ability and paying white males more, according to yearly statistics.

People are starving in Africa and other parts of the world but people are starving in America also.

Americans have the best of everything yet have the highest individual debt to income they will never be able to payoff in a lifetime.

Americans have plenty of food yet are among the most wasteful people in the world and the unhealthiest.

Americans have the right to vote but the government has the last say.

America has the most powerful military in the world but has destroyed millions of people's lives, city infrastructures and daily societies throughout the world just to maintain that power.

There is plenty of opportunity in America, but the best opportunities can only be afforded by the wealthy.

There is corruption in many world governments, like there is corruption here in American government.

Dictators torture their people, yet America incarcerates more of its people (even its children) than any other country in the world.

Terrorist groups are heartless killers out to kill Americans in the name of their God, yet America has killed over a million (estimate 1,191,000) Iraqis rebel and civilians in 5 years in the name of Democracy, but that makes it OK.

The point is, each time a media reporter or pundit makes a negative statement about someone or nation in the world, listen closely and surely those same words can be applied to any situation headed by an American leader or entity.

To expect Blacks to not harbor some anti-America sentiment is almost ludicrous. And to think they are wrong for having any is even more foolish. There may be some who appear untouched, but guaranteed, once they reach a certain age, they will have been, or have at least perfected a serious pretension.

No doubt, America have added much to the advancement of the civilized world, but whites cannot take all the credit, yet they have and have all but discredited anyone other culture or race of people who helped develop this society. The irony is, when things begin to turn on a sour note, they find a way to blame those they once discounted. This is hypocrisy.

The day will come when the harvest will come forth and the steward will reap of the fruit of the fields; like all other countries, America will have to answer for its deeds, whether good or bad, and the leaders cannot escape this inevitable day, nor can the people. There is nothing wrong with praising the good of America or believing in and supporting its mission, but when critics come forth from within its gates, the leaders have to listen or else they will be guilty of oppressing the very people they claim to have given freedom.

Mar. 2008 By CR Hamilton

America: Love, Hate, Tolerate

September 11 peeled back a layer of the American image that either exposed her dark secrets to the world or confirmed some. Foreign and domestic relations within and without the country were tried by fire. And when the fire tries any entity, it will emerge either polished or extremely damaged. The events of 9/11 awoke America from a slumber, which sent forth a rallying cry for patriotism, stirred the scrutiny in cynics, and drew concern from the indifferent.

After the initial shock, the country scrambled to discern what this attack meant, and being a highly personalized people, many Americans took the attack personally. This was revealed mainly from the demeanor of news reporters, who supposedly represent the feelings of American citizens. Constantly,

they asked the question, "Why would anyone do this to us? What have we done and why are we hated by these people?"

The only reaction to such a blow to one's personal image and integrity was to seek comfort amongst friends, a type of rally for all other Americans who were now considering their own self-image. Patriotism became a market and American flags bent to the breeze all over the nation and stuck hard to the back of automobiles. Scholars and authors hurried to redeem the American pride by reviving the memories of soldiers and wars past.

Psychoanalysts thought long and hard about how to reassure American citizens of their worth and the reasons their country is to be loved by them. Books rolled off the presses and major media outlets exalted American tradition above any other news stories. Network and cable news followed "our boys" overseas for support and shined the limelight on them so back home could be proud of America's stance against this dreaded and barbarian attack.

Citizens had to be reminded why this country was so great. It offers freedom and Democracy, liberty and the pursuit of happiness in its raw form. It is the richest, most powerful, most advanced, and most sought after country for citizenship in the world. Opportunity flies high here and a child can become anything their little heart desires because our educational system teaches them so.

This revival of American patriotism lasted for a while but was soon muffled by the voices of criticism. The Bush Administration came under fire for unexplained decisions they made and wrong turns taken on the road of foreign affairs. Blatant obstructiveness for the American campaign "Shocked, Awed" and damaged international relations with some of America's long-standing allies thus questioning America's image and overall motivation around the world.

Once the news media realized that "our boys" were possibly in over their heads and especially after one of their own, David Bloom, died mysteriously on the battlefield, the media focus shifted from war coverage to a high profiled murder trial back within the states. However, internal problems once again reared bringing with it corporate scandal, racial profiling, and economic woes.

Along the timeline of these events, American citizens and the world began to answer the questions asked by the media, "Why is America hated?" From the terrorist perspective, America is the seed of evil and moral corruption. Islamic extremists are people who refuse to allow the moral values of America to spread into their lands and culture. It is not about jealousy of America's riches or their pretty, blue eyes and blond hair; it is about the lifestyles of Americans.

Age-old cultures such as Islam, China, Africa and India are cultures that have stood thousands of years before European existence. These lands have gods and traditions all their own and have survived from the earth's resources without any technological advancements of the last 100 years. The problem with Western science is that they believe the world could not survive without the so-called advancements of medicine, technology, and economic supremacy.

Democracy is a government structure that has a logical philosophy; however, in the hands of American lawmakers and politicians, and under the rule of capitalist logic, it is nothing more than imperialism, a concept that seeks absolute rule. Therefore, the contradictory foundation of American society gives it its ever-popular love-hate personality.

One could love America for its claim to independence from British control, but how long will that excuse last. Freedom of speech is a right of Americans, but limited, simply because any suggestions by the people are ignored. Freedom of religion is suppose to be a right but be realistic, one atheist can change all that regardless of the majority, thanks to the American judicial system of Civil Rights. Opportunity is available also but to a select group. The rich inherit opportunity while the poor have to seek it.

Domestic hatred for America has risen over the past 50 years. This is a fact the American media will not report and that lawmakers and politicians will never admit to. Racial discord still exist and is rising, wealth inequality is obvious and growing larger, and the immorality in the country is spreading like a disease. People are tired and crying out but for some strange reason, the ruling authorities ignore the cries.

In the meantime, terrorist know they have broken the stronghold of America and have found a weakness. As a result, Americans now live with less of the freedoms the country is so proud to proclaim. America's own government has had to tighten security throughout the country "for our own good" but is destroying the liberties America is supposedly built on. And people are pissed.

Thus, we live and tolerate from day to day. Never knowing when the next attack will be based on new information reported by the media. Fear and caution are being implanted into the minds and hearts of America's people. Because of this strained lifestyle, society will resort to more drastic forms of living; living as though every day is the last. Expressing every inner lust and imagination conceivably planted by the devil himself. Order and structure are being replaced by confusion of morality and an incompetent justice system making America a haven for evil. As the cycle continues without remedy, the arrogance of America's leaders will soon bring this country to its knees, begging for mercy. And God only gives mercy for whom mercy is due.

2004 by CR Hamilton

The "Whites More Likely To" Series

Recently, Afromerica published some articles on the weakest areas of white America, such as their drug-use habits, high school dropout rate, their obsession with partial-birth abortion, and their fascination with homosexuality.

We published these articles as rebuttals to all the negative studies they write about Black America, and for a change, turned the tables.

The articles were met with some resentment from white readers and Internet browsers. One email - the nastiest email - reads thus:

Reply - To: FUCKU@fun.com

Name: DRUGGIE

E-mail: FUCKU@fun.com

Subject Title: Whites are blacks

Content: who gives a fuck if whites are more likely or blacks you scum bags

This email and others like it, reveal that white cannot bare to see themselves as underachievers or degenerates, as they make Black America out to be. This shows that they can dish it out but cannot take it.

We are supposed to accept all the negatives about our lifestyles and us, but when we expose the truth about them, they get very upset and we are the "scum bags."

Well, Aframerica will continue the "Whites More Likely To" Series in full. The following articles are to come about the weaknesses and failures of white America:

1. Whites More Likely to be White Collar Criminals
2. Whites More Likely to have problems with their children
3. Whites More Likely to have abortions
4. Whites More Likely to be prostitutes
5. Whites More Likely to practice witchcraft and belong to cultic religions
6. Whites More Likely to be hate criminals
7. Whites More Likely to be homosexuals
8. Whites More Likely to be more race conscious than other races
9. Whites More Likely to be pedophiles
10. Whites More Likely to be rapist

...And more.

We at Aframerica realize that many people will suggest that we not stoop to their levels and degrade a group of people based on the immoralities they commit or insane behaviors they display, but Aframerica wants to first explain that we are not ashamed of what we are doing by publishing this series. We are doing it mostly for Blacks to regain a sense of self-respect so they will not walk through life believing they are some animal species unworthy of white company.

We hope you enjoy the series. If you have any suggestions, comments, questions, or statistics we can use, please submit them.

Thanks and Stay Strong through it all,

Why America is Hated: A Worldview of the United States

The United States - considered an extension of the Western world - is under constant scrutiny by other countries. In relation to economic and foreign political policy, technological advancement, military strength, and cultural trends, there are strengths and weaknesses in America's image and impact around the world.

Loyalist to America and its values contend that the United States is the greatest country in the world to live; the country of unfettered freedom, opportunity to fulfill dreams, and blessed of the most High God. As any native person to their land would, these loyalists' for America pledge themselves to defending and promoting the American way of life, as they are expected to. However, in recent years, belief in and loyalty to the American way of life is waning among its own citizens.

According to a poll from the Washington Post, "73 percent of Americans said the country is pretty seriously on the wrong track, while 25 percent said things are going in the right direction," which is a large portion of the people. Worldwide, the numbers are even larger.

Those who hold steady optimism are those who would rather not give up on the country and would rather believe that everything is honky dory [no pun intended]. They see no wrong in America's foreign and domestic policies and are convinced that if there are problems, the problems are not the cause of failed leadership or political policy, but rather, somehow, the fault of those who see things differently.

In other words, there are some people in America who think that the problems of America and Americans are caused by the people themselves for lack of personal responsibility and not because of going trends of apathy among law and policy makers toward the masses. Job outsourcing and insecurity, immigrant amnesty over natural citizenship, and foreign affairs that drain domestic opportunity are some of the major concerns of the public.

These same people arrogantly suppose and contend that America is the greatest country to live without regard to other countries where people live, survive, and succeed everyday, based on a lifestyle unlike that of the American lifestyle. They believe that there are people all around the world dying to abandon their homeland to come and live in the great America because their lands are filled with corruption, poverty, and disease. Yet this is deceptive thinking.

Although there are people around the world who desire to live in America and possibly as a result of their situation in their own land, this is not the common sentiment among people of the world. In fact, most people are happy with their life in their own country. It is the way they were raised and is all they know so they are content.

They see images and pictures of the American way of life and some are fascinated yet some are disgusted. Disgusted because some of the images are contrary to what they know as life and what they have learned as proper behavior.

Many optimist of American life (including the president) claim via mainstream media that if America is hated, it is because of jealousy of America's freedoms, or because of America's progressiveness in technology of lifestyle: they argue that radicals and anti-American terrorist organizations hate America because it condemns oppression, dictatorship and government rule; however, if examined closely, America practices these same things only in a more organized and less noticeable way.

Truth be told, (and testified by the recent poll of its own citizens) America is not hated because of the reasons quoted by mainstream optimist, but America is hated because America force their way of life on other countries and cultures disguised as Democracy and Freedom, regardless of whether that country desires America's ways or not.

Many times, American journalists traveling in other countries ask citizens if they like America and want to live there. The response is always the same and as expected. Most people do not want to move to America because they are happy where they are, yet some people do want to move to America. Those who desire to live in America, however, are those who are attracted to the seductive images of America's fun-loving lifestyles, while others are content with their lives where they are.

The optimist report the answers in favor of the American life as opposed to the reports of people who do not desire to live here for reasons of culture, dignity, and loyalty to their own country. Not everyone share the same views about America as the optimist in America does, furthermore, more people are adopting a more pessimistic view of American life, here and abroad.

Constantly, the opinions of people of other countries and cultures condemn American lifestyle and culture and flag it as immoral. Issues that American politicians and citizens debate daily such as abortion, laws protecting alternative lifestyles of homosexuality, gun violence, divorce, corporate corruption, poverty among children and the elderly, rampant imprisonment of its population (particularly people of color), failing public schools, which have dropped to double digits in world competitions, are just some of the reasons people of other countries and cultures have negative views of America.

When these views are formed into radical agendas to oppose and even wage war against America in order to protect their own cultures and lands, it is done not because of jealousy, but because of frustration and opposition to forced change, and in the case of culture, American culture is the culprit.

When viewing foreign affairs, people in other countries see America as an imperialist state seeking to impose on their way of life. In times past, America has moved in and taken over lands, forcefully occupied cities and nations, and spread what they believe people desire, Democracy.

According to the Eastern philosopher Oswald Spengler who authored the historical book "The Decline of the West", he said "Imperialism, of which petrifacts such as the Egyptian empire, the Roman, the Chinese, the Indian, may continue to exist for hundreds or thousands of years ... is to be taken as the typical symbol of the end. Imperialism is Civilization unadulterated. In this phenomenal form the destiny of the West is now irrevocably set." -- The Conclusion - Imperialism [p 27].

Paraphrasing Spengler, the West, not learning from Dynasties in times past, America in its lead to spread Democracy is on a downward spiral toward its end as a result of attempting to imperialize the world. The course by nature is "irrevocably set" and there is little chance of turning back, especially after the U.S. entered Iraq in 2003 to disrupt the lives of Middle Easterners. Since then, American citizens and other peoples of the world see the U.S. in a much negative light.

After 5 years of war and occupation in Iraq, "61 percent in this poll said the war was not worth fighting, and nearly two-thirds said the United States is not making significant progress restoring civil order in Iraq. However, there is no such general agreement about what to do." Yet the military remains there.

Now stranded in the Middle East with no clear way out, the United States face even more scrutiny by the world and possible retaliation from various type anti-America terrorist groups and possible hostile countries that have vested interest in Middle East affairs, such as China and or Russia.

Once public sentiment has reached such a low level of opinion, it signals a time for change. However, drastic change in policy by America's political leaders is something far from happening simply because those political leaders are the ones who are benefiting most politically and financially from the indifference of America oppression.

Control of the population is a necessity now to maintain a level of social divide among the leaders and the masses, which is a sure sign of modern day government fascism, oppression, and public control. At some point, the public sentiment will change outright and the mainstream media will not find positive people to profile on camera, and they will have to hire people to be positive, if they have not already done so.

June 2007 By CR Hamilton

Search Engine Terms Whites Use for Blacks

There is a phrase that goes "when you are sleeping, they are up thinking." Synonymous to this philosophy, the search terms googled or yahooed in by whites to get information on Blacks expose the minds of whites while many of us slumber through life unaware. Below are search engine terms found deep within the abyss of the cyber world that expose these thoughts.

These terms were typed in more than once, in fact, no less than 2 times and up to 13 times over a one month period. This means, of course, that more than one white mind share these sentiments, and who knows at what social-economic level. Though it is possible one of these terms were typed in by someone other than a white person, the odds are small.

Research to get our money

* spending habits of blacks (11 searches)

- * blacks spending on leisure (5 searches)
- * blacks spend money (5 searches)
- * marketing to black people (10 searches)
- * blacks spending habits (13 searches)

General Statements and Curiosity about Us

- * blacks are thieves (7 searches)
- * black people excision (7 searches)
- * black people as childlike (5 searches)
- * blacks complaining (6 searches)
- * minorities and juvenile delinquency (6 searches)
- * keep black man down (4 searches)
- * how to keep a black man down (8 searches)
- * the problem with african-americans (11 searches)
- * aids needles and blacks (4 searches)
- * why are blacks ignorant (5 searches)
- * why blacks where dew rag (2 searches)

About our Women

- * nigger mammy aunt Jemima (2 searches)
- * nigger women (9 searches)
- * black women are savages (5 searches)
- * nigger bitches (7 searches)
- * why are black women promiscuous (3 searches)
- * nigger slaves female (5 searches)

Racist Research

- * grinded nig (13 searches)
- * angry aryans (12 searches)
- * extreme hatred lyrics (5 searches)
- * niggers will be the end of America (2 searches)
- * niggers aryan race (5 searches)
- * killing niggers (5 searches)
- * run nigger run (13 searches)
- * nigga jokes (8 searches)
- * nigger (9 searches)

November 2005 By Aframerica Web Administrator

Blacks and Technology

The Internet information highway has thrown American and the world into another industrial type revolution. From computer programming and technology, information management, and Internet business communication to personal PCs and online home access, the computer age could threaten the progress of Black advancement unless we stress computer careers to our youth.

History has proven that Black Americans have always lagged in social, economical and educational progress whenever there is a groundbreaking change in American society. We somehow end up - despite protest and government laws - receiving the last of the goods after all is dispersed.

Not that Blacks are purposefully targeted for exclusion, (though this consideration is not beyond any doubt) but mainly because the Black community receives access to resources much later than the majority and only after the white community has had a chance to consume the best of the best.

It begins in the schools and if the urban schools receive less funding and support than suburban schools, then of course Blacks will lag behind the nation. While the majority of suburban schools have computer and Internet access in all classes, in addition to more Internet and computer base course work, the majority of Blacks schools still crack the textbooks open in most classes.

And when Blacks lag in technology or school test scores because new testing standards are designed with high technology in mind, the media and experts attribute it to some laziness or deficiency of Black

children. However, these stats change over time and Blacks do eventually catch on, but by that time the Black image is damaged and a new problem is created.

On the flip side of this scenario, there are many successful Blacks in technology, in the business field and in the knowledge of information systems. They realize that this new revolution is the future of the world and have leached onto its potential. More Blacks are becoming computer literate and Internet savvy in their personal lives.

Black Internet Stats

More than 10 million Blacks are online, about 45% of the Black population

74% of online Blacks say the Internet has had a positive effect on their children

Blacks account for roughly 8 percent of the online population, and the group will exceed U.S. Hispanics' Internet penetration by 2007

Top three online activities Blacks are #1: check/send email, #2: access news/headlines and #3: play online games

Blacks are active online consumers, purchasing more clothing/apparel online (48% vs. 41%) and more music/videos (44% vs. 39%) than the general online market

Blacks listen to music online and watch videos more than the general online market

Source: Nielsen//NetRatings, January 2003

Schools, parents, and Black role models should put forth more effort in encouraging Black youth to go into the computing field as opposed to Medicine, Law, and especially sports and music. The Internet and the hardware that the Internet is based on is the future of the world and if Blacks do not realize this fact in time, it could have a negative effect on our future.

2004 by CR Hamilton