



Then and *Now*

“Do It As Americans”

Do It As Americans

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THEN

I. History: Our Beginning	2
II. Introduction	3
III. Blending Of Cultures	7
A. Religion	7
1. European and West African Religions.	8
2. The Merger of the Religions and Spiritual Beliefs.....	9
B. Further Assimilation and Blending of Cultures.....	13
1. Americans of African Descent Forcefully Brought to this Country.....	13
2. Revolutionary War for Independence.	13
3. Harriet Ross Tubman. She is an example of how the need for liberty and freedom became a part of this newly developing nation.	15
4. 1861. Civil War.	16
5. Post-Civil War Assimilation.....	17
6. Spanish American War.....	18
7. WW I.	29
8. WW II.....	31
9. Post WW II.	35
10. 1950 Korean War.....	35
11. 1954 Brown v. Topeka Board of Education.....	35
12. 1970 President Richard M. Nixon	36

13. 1964 to 1973 Vietnam War. 36

IV. Civil Rights Movement..... 38

 A . History Leading Up to Civil Rights Act of 1965 38

 1. Leadership of Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. 38

 2. Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. overcame and conquered the forces demanding violence in response to the vicious acts of the segregationists..... 39

 3. History of Attempted Slave Rebellion..... 41

 B. Assessment of The Civil Rights Movement. 45

 1. African Americans or Americans of African Descent..... 47

 2. Examples of Individual Leaders. 50

V. Present Status of Religious Beliefs of Population of the United States Including Americans of African Descent. 53

 A. U.S. Religions Landscape Survey by the Pew Foundation in 2007. 53

 B. Was the formation of this Nation based on Religious Christian principles and beliefs? 56

 C. Are We Still A Christian Nation?..... 58

NOW

VI. Will the leaders of the churches and Civil Rights leaders continue to remain silent on President Obama’s past & current position on abortion, late term abortion and infanticide?..... 62

VII. Will the Civil Rights leaders and the Americans of African Descent support President Obama’s action in which he claims he as President has the authority to issue death warrants to kill U.S. Citizens without due process? 69

VIII. Current Status of Americans of African Descent in America..... 75

 A. Family Unit of Americans of African Descent..... 75

 1. Patrick Moynihan “The Negro Family” 75

 2. Professors Lawrence D. Bobo of Harvard and Camilla Charles of University of Pennsylvania. 76

3. Abortions 82

4. Dignity 83

IX. Future Political Strength of Americans of African Descent 86

 A. The Democratic Party..... 86

 B. President William J. Clinton..... 88

 C. President Barack H. Obama..... 89

X. Conclusion 94

 A. Where is the United States of America today?..... 94

 B. History is repeating itself..... 101

 C. Immediate Need for Americans of African Descent to Rescue America From the Politically Engineered Racial and Class Breach..... 103

THEN & NOW

"Shining City Upon a Hill"

Do It As Americans

30 AD. Est., Jesus' Sermon on the Mount, "*You are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hidden*" (Matthew 5:14).

1961. President Elect Kennedy "*We must always consider that we shall be as cities upon a hill...the eyes of all people are upon us,*"

1989. President Reagan "*... shining city upon a hill...but in my mind it was a tall proud city built on rocks stronger than oceans, windswept, God-blessed, and teeming with people of all kinds living in harmony and peace...*"

Who built the foundation of this "Shining City Upon a Hill" which has drawn people from every corner of the world?

Its ideals and principles have up to now represented to many the last best hope for mankind.

-THEN-

I. History: Our Beginning

Many believe settlers from the region of Great Britain primarily built the foundation of this nation. They did not do it alone; there was another co-founder of this nation.

The Declaration of Independence was issued in 1776 and this Nation was officially established in 1789. The first census was taken in 1790. The total population of the United States was 3,929,214, and the number of people who came from different regions and countries was:

- 1). 2,560,000. The region of Great Britain made up of England 2,000,000, Ulster Scot Irish 300,000, Scotland 150,000, Wales 10,000. Subtotal (65.6%)
- 2). 757,000. The region of West Africa. (19.4%)
- 3). 270,000. Germany (7%)
- 4). 100,000. Netherlands. (2.6%)

5). 15,000. France. (.03%)

6). 202,000. Others. (5%)

The two co-founders were from the regions of Great Britain and West Africa.

For every three persons from Great Britain (66%) there was one person from West Africa (19%).

This is not to say the other 15% of the population in 1790 did not contribute to the creation of this nation. In large part they brought many of the same or similar cultural attributes to the new nation as the region of Great Britain. It also would be accurate to say the two co-founders were Europe (80% of the population) and West Africa (20% of the population). The distinguishing cultural difference that set the region of Great Britain apart from the rest of Europe was the adoption of the English language and the English Common Law by all of the original Colonies. A large part of the Common Law equitable powers had their origin in the Ecclesiastic Courts of the Church of England, which was founded on the Christian Religion. One of the most forceful and appealing attributes of this new nation was its Constitution, which guaranteed religious freedom and the separation of Church and State. It needs to be noted that the Christian religion did not and does not exclude other religions; and, thus, was consistent with one of the cornerstones of the new nation, namely freedom of religion. The new nation was open to all people from all nations and religions, and that is one of the reasons the original settlers came.

II. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to show who founded this country and to further show the contribution of the original Slaves, who were brought from West and Central Africa, and their descendants to the development and formation of this nation. The descendants of African Slaves are referred to in this paper in a number of ways, which is influenced by how they are referred to by the source or persons that this paper is at that point discussing. The writer, when not following someone else's comment or lead, will use the phrase "Americans of African Descent" or "Americans with African Ancestors." When referring to a Black or White person or Slave and Slavery the first letter will be capitalized, except when referring to third (3rd) party material, which refers otherwise. Throughout this paper **Bold** is used as an editorial expression by the writer and not the quoted source, unless otherwise stated.

No attempt is made to fully show the true evils of Slavery and discrimination, including economic and judicial Slavery after the Civil War. This paper focuses on showing the positive of what the original Slaves and their descendants have accomplished and where these men and women are today. We cannot change history; and, if one forever focuses on the evil events of the past, one approaches a position that one's existence is based on one's victim status and not on what one accomplished and can accomplish in the future. Victim status carries a void of energy that invites future victimization if one makes it an excuse for poor performance and failure. For this country to survive, it is time for all of its citizens to move forward. Those who were victims and whose ancestors were victims must build on their successes, not on their victimization. Politicians and others use a victim's history or current status to try to influence and sway the victim's political allegiances, which may make that person a victim again.

Throughout this paper the writer has used military examples to show the positive characteristics of Americans of African Descent, with some exceptions. These examples were used because the final analysis comes down to effort and results. Results not only show how one performed in battle but also how one performed fighting alongside their comrades in arms, specifically White soldiers. Words describing what you are going to do or what you claim to have done mean nothing. One needs to look at the results and how you performed. In all the wars cited and referred to, the one primarily relied on in this paper is the Spanish American War in 1898. Small military units of Americans of African Descent had been used with significant success in the Revolutionary War, Civil War and American Indian War. The Spanish American War was the first time Americans of African Descent were used on the world scene and their success became public knowledge at the time.

Many differences existed between the cultures of the two Co-founders, the regions of Great Britain and West Africa. To successfully complete the creation and building of this new nation, each culture blended together changing and creating new values, beliefs, interests and objectives. The most obvious difference was between Slave Owners and Slaves. This has taken the longest and was the most difficult difference to remove from the new nation. The remnants of Slavery are still with us.

Charles C. Mann, the author of the book 1493 Uncovering the New World Columbus Created, sets out one aspect of the differences between the two Cultures; namely, their original relationship to each other. Mr. Mann states on page 402:

"From the beginning, Europeans had terrible things to say about: 'blacks,' but the disdain wasn't as monolithic as sometimes portrayed ... More important, the negative beliefs weren't racial in the modern sense - they didn't invoke an inheritable genetic makeup."

"Initially the Europeans brought African slaves to this country for economic reasons namely they had a higher survival rate from disease than the Europeans or Indian slaves."

Mr. Mann states at page 100:

*"Inherited malaria resistance occurs in many parts of the world, but the peoples of West and Central Africa have more than anyone else – they are almost completely immune to vivax, and (speaking crudely) about half-resistant to falciparum. Add in high levels of acquired resistance from repeated childhood exposure, and adult West and Central Africans were and are less susceptible to malaria than anyone else on earth. Biology enters history when one realizes that almost all of the slaves ferried to the Americas came from West and Central Africa. In vivax-ridden Virginia and Carolina, they were more likely to survive and produce children than English colonists. **Biologically speaking, they were fitter, which is another way of saying that in these places they were – loaded words! - genetically superior.***

Racial theorists of the last century claimed that genetic superiority led to social superiority. What happened to Africans illustrates, if nothing else, the pitfalls of this glib argument. Rather than gaining an edge from their biological assets, West Africans saw them converted through greed and callousness into social deficits. Their immunity became a wellspring for their enslavement."

The effect of economic forces in the creation of the Slave Society in the South is further shown by Robert Kagan, the author of the book, Dangerous Action, which was published in 2007. He stated at pages 189-190.

"As John Quincy Adams remarked, in words he would no doubt later wish to take back, 'Slavery in a moral sense is an evil; but as connected with commerce, it has important uses.'"

"Together these new circumstances transformed American slavery from an economically dubious proposition into a profitable business. There were times in the antebellum years when the South's cotton-

driven economy grew faster than the North's more diversified economy. Not surprisingly, southerners who in the 1780's and '90's had been willing to consider and even to welcome the demise of slavery — if some way could be found to save white owners from the wrath of freed slaves — were by the early nineteenth century more enthusiastic about defending their slave society. Moral qualms were tempered by the rush to exploit the lucrative possibilities of King Cotton."

The claim of mental and physical inferiority of the African Slaves which was developed into the components of "racism," came about as a direct result of the crops of tobacco and cotton. The Europeans who came to this country needed cheap labor. Indentured Servants from Great Britain had a limited term of obligation to work and were more susceptible than the Africans to diseases which decimated the early Colonies. Slavery for life was far different from Indentured Servants or Indian Slaves who were captured in armed conflict. Ownership of another person whom you had purchased was contrary to the Christian Faith, the Common Law; and, later, our Declaration of Independence and Federal and State Constitutions. To justify what they were doing, the White Slave Owners created and promoted the belief that African Slaves were genetically inferior. Therefore, to enslave them and their descendants for life was not wrong. The White Slave Owners adopted this view to relieve their guilt and to justify what they knew was wrong and evil. Notwithstanding what others in following years may have come to believe about racial superiority, those who conceived this concept knew it was wrong and not supported by facts. When racism was created in this country it was not based on a claim of inferiority; but was, in fact, conceived for economic reasons to justify Slavery.

The White Slave Owners in the mid 1800's found further support for their position in the writings of people like George Fitzhugh, a southern lawyer and intellectual. Mr. Fitzhugh attempted to justify Slavery as good for Slaves. He wrote a number of articles and books which justified Slavery on the grounds that it relieved the Africans from cruel Slavery in Africa. In the year 1854 he wrote;

"Slavery is a form, and the very best form of Socialism."

The use of a "Socialism cradle to the grave approach" by the White Slave Owners is now more than 150 years old and being spoken of as a solution to the lack of "equality" of the Slaves' descendants.

"Equality" includes various ingredients. One of the most important is "dignity."

You cannot legislate or decree all aspects of "equality." In the end, Americans of African Descent must all reclaim something that was taken from them when their ancestors were brought by physical force to this country and held in Slavery. That something is "dignity." The need for "dignity" is pointedly set out by author Laura Hillenbrand in her book Unbroken. The story tells of Louis Zamperini, a WW II survivor, having been shot down and stranded at sea for 40 days and surviving captivity for years in Japanese prison camps. In describing Zamperini's statements, she states how the prison camps were worse than struggling to survive at sea from exposure, lack of water, starvation and lack of hope of being rescued. The difference was that "dignity" was taken from prisoners by their captors in the prison camps. She states at page 183:

"On Kwajalein, Louie and Phil learned a dark truth known to the doomed in Hitler's death camps, the slaves of the American South, and a hundred other generations of betrayed people. Dignity is as essential to human life as water, food, and oxygen. The stubborn retention of it, even in the face of extreme physical hardship, can hold a man's soul in his body long past the point at which the body should have surrendered it. The loss of it can carry a man off as surely as thirst, hunger, exposure, and asphyxiation, and with greater cruelty. In places like Kwajalein, degradation could be as lethal as a bullet." ("Kwajalein" was a Japanese prison camp; "Louie" was Louis Zamperini).

III. Blending Of Cultures

A. Religion

Settlers from Great Britain brought to this Country their religion, legal system, and other customs. What was the character of the West Africans and what did they bring to this Country in its original development?

In many regions the only area of social interaction that Slaves were allowed to pursue was religion. Notwithstanding this claim of superiority by the White Slave Owners, the Slaves from Africa and their descendants went on to become co-founders of this new nation. One of the first institutions that began to blend the two cultures was the church and religion. The churches maintained and nurtured the religious teaching of Christianity that "all men are created equal."

It is not the purpose of this paper to compare the religions but to consider the impact and effect of the African concepts we call religion on the development of this country. One has to generalize, to a certain degree, about African religions

because there was not one centralized religion like "Christianity." There were many different religions and specific beliefs from different regions in Africa. These religions had many of the same core beliefs as Christianity. One example is that many Slaves were brought here from the Kingdom of the Kongo, which had converted to Catholicism in 1491.

The two sources which are specifically relied upon and quoted are Benjamin C. Ray's African Religions and Michael Sobel's The World They Made Together.

1. European and West African Religions.

In African Religions Mr. Ray describes European and West African religions:

xii:

"... most of what the West calls religion concerns spiritual beliefs, worship of gods, and social ethics..."

" In Africa, such ideas and practices are found not only in the worship of the gods but also in a wide range of cultural creations, such as stories of origin, healing rituals, funerary rights, divination séances, public festivals, and sacred sculpture, as well as witchcraft and sorcery practices."

The European churches had a centralized religion, Christianity. After the first century A.D., in order to maintain control, the Church interjected itself between one's death and the afterlife by teaching that only the Church could guide you to the afterlife through a process of purgatory and limbo. The primary reward that one would have was not necessarily to reunite with one's family and loved ones, but to be welcomed into heaven by one's God, and spend eternity in his presence.

Some say this teaching by the Church, at that time, was contrary to the original teaching of Christ to his Disciples. It is said that Christ and his Disciples taught that on death one's spirit passed immediately into the afterlife.

One of the most consistent beliefs from Africa was the belief of some form of afterlife in which one's spirit would, on death, be unified with the spirit of one's family and loved ones. This was also the belief that one's spirit remained in contact with the living on earth. It was also understood by some that all living things had a spirit of some form.

2. The Merger of the Religions and Spiritual Beliefs.

In some churches, Africans were not only in the congregations but also were active in the Church's operation, including preaching to congregations made up of Black and Whites. This assimilation and integration of the religions began its end in the late 17th Century and was finished by the close of the 18th Century. This ending of the assimilation and integration was caused by economic reasons, mainly the need for cheap and dependable labor for the cash crops of tobacco and cotton. If you are a Christian you cannot justify enslaving a race of people unless you believe that the race is inferior and that it is necessary and proper to protect them by enslaving them. You had to believe George Fitzhugh: "*Slavery is a form, and the very best form of Socialism.*"

An example of one significant ingredient that had penetrated the wall of separation between the races prior to the end of the period of assimilation was the emotion and uninhibited expression of one's faith by the Africans. To this day, emotion and uninhibited expression of one's faith is evident not just in Black Churches but also in various White Churches.

It is not claimed that the African's belief in Spirits and the afterlife changed Christianity or brought it back to what some say was its initial teaching, but it was a significant influential force in America during the Colonial times. Specifically, the belief that the gate to the afterlife was not controlled by the Church and that one did not have to go through a process of purgatory and limbo as described by some Churches to reach the afterlife.

Factual foundations of the aforesaid assertions are set out in The World They Made Together by Michael Sobel and the previously cited African Religions by Benjamin C. Ray. The reference to the specific source of certain factual statements is done because some people still believe today that Africans who came to this country were mentally and physically inferior. To show they were not inferior the writer includes the following quotes of the actual facts. Specifically, the Africans had their own advanced religious beliefs; which, as previously stated, addressed many of the same issues as Christians and in some ways were similar if not the same. To show the similarities with the various tribes, the names of the tribes which are referred to are in bold type.

African Religions by Benjamin C. Ray. Mr. Ray states:

At pages 4 & 5

*"The separation between the creator God and the first human beings, which is the turning point in the **Batammaliba genesis story**, is the*

decisive event in many other African creation myths. Although the accounts of this event are usually brief, they explain the most profound features of human experience: mortality, suffering and awareness of human finitude. African societies value the continuity of human life, from one generation to another and the social solidarity created by marriage and the bonds of kinship."

At page 7

*"The **Atout** believe that God gives life to human beings and that life returns to god when people die."*

At page 8

*"The **Manianga are a Kongo people** who live in the western part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo... The Kongo scholar Simon Bockie suggests that the story portrays death from old age as a kind of salvation; 'God is the cause; therefore nobody weeps. God has called him, for his days in this very painful world have been completed.' By contrast, premature death, which was not instituted by God, is like murder; its causes are social and supernatural and stem from human witches and malevolent sprits."*

At page 12

*"...When Christian missionaries arrived in the kingdom of **Buganda** in the 1870's and told the biblical story of Genesis, it already seemed familiar to the people who heard it. **The Buganda immediately recognized similarities with their own stories of creation, especially about the origins of marriage, death, children, and human suffering. As one Ganda Christian put it, 'Christianity did not teach us anything new about God but reminded us of something we already knew.'**" Ganda Christians began to adapt the story of Kintu and use it to express Christian teachings.*

At page 102

*"A well known **Yoruba** proverb states that; the world is a marketplace, heaven is home... Another proverb says, 'Do not tantalize me with heaven, we shall all go there.' This proverb*

indicates that heaven is the abode of the ancestors, where we remain until we are born again. Another proverb says that 'the human stay in heaven is much longer than the stay on earth... Taken together, these sayings portray human life as a fleeting visit to a foreign land, and impersonal place of potential conflict, in contrast to the homelike comfort of heaven, where we return to dwell with our family relations, the ancestors.' The "Yoruba" were from Southern Nigeria, which is part of West Africa.

The World They Made Together by Michael Sobel.

At page 171 *"Africans widely believed that humans were originally immortal.*

...There is a second and very different African tradition, this one much like the Biblical one, in which it is told 'that God forbade the first people to eat either a certain fruit, or eggs, or animals.' When they ate this forbidden food, 'death came to them' The similarities with the Biblical tale of Adam and Eve are such that many West Africans, encountering the Christian Bible, thought they recognized an old story of their own..."

At page 172

"...The seventeenth-century English were concerned about the cause of death as well. Their biblical 'myth' also suggested that human beings were originally immortal. When the Christians asked, 'How has death gained its empire over us?' the answer found in the story of Adam and Eve, like the second (less popular) African tradition, placed all the responsibility on human shoulders ...Death was the punishment for original sin..."

At page 210

"...The last decades of the eighteenth century were distinguished by a strange mix in race relations in Virginia. On the one hand the races were moving apart, but on the other, the period saw a peak in certain types of interaction. Given the shared experiences of such large numbers in the 1770's and 1780's, many more whites had heard black preachers, and some small numbers were ready to accept them as the official preachers at their 'white' churches."

At page 212

*"...In this period, at least two black men served as official preachers to Virginia Baptist 'white' congregations. Jacob or Josiah Bishop, who had been a slave in Northampton, was the official pastor of the Court Street Church in Portsmouth, serving from circa 1792 to 1802... 'Uncle Jack', born in Africa circa 1758, and brought to Virginia seven years later, became a well-known preacher in Nottaway County. Converted by Presbyterian John Blair Smith, he chose to become a Baptist... On the petition of whites he was formally licensed, preaching from 1790 to 1832... **Although whites and blacks did move farther apart toward the close of the eighteenth century, the influence they had on each other was deep and lasting.**"*

At page 213

*"...Throughout Virginia, and throughout the South, blacks and whites continued to share some religious experiences, but the great period of intensive mass interaction had passed. **It had, however, deep and lasting effect on both communities.**"*

At page 203

*"...Whites too changed their values and understandings. They became more 'open' to ecstasy and spiritual life, ready and willing to have 'experience,' and to share their experience with others. They opened themselves to communal criticism; something Africans may have had more experience with, among co-wives, secret society members, and at the chief's court. **And they came to accept death as the gateway to the continuation of the vision world they had already experienced, where their families awaited them, rather than as a terrifying unknown.**"*

The fact that religions of the two races merged together in many ways does not negate or diminish the brutality of Slavery and its long term effects.

Africans did not pass on to future generations their separate specific religious beliefs they brought from Africa. They did, to a large extent, merge their beliefs with the Christian Churches; and, in time, created their own "Black Christian Churches". This is not referring to "Black Liberation Theology" which is a product of a different time and different forces.

B. Further Assimilation and Blending of Cultures

The character of a group's culture is also shown by how its members individually and collectively deal with real time events. Examples of what the African Slaves brought to this Country and how the Americans of African Descent contributed to building this nation are as follows (no attempt is made in the short nature of this paper to be all inclusive but only to mention a few from a list of many examples).

1. Americans of African Descent Forcefully Brought to this Country.

The naked brutality of the conditions under which the original Slaves were brought to this country insured that the survivors' physical and mental gene pool was stronger than any other group of settlers; then, or in the future. Only the very physically and mentally strong survived. In addition, as mentioned earlier; and, as set forth by Charles C. Mann in his book 1493, the West Africans had developed a certain genetic immunity to the diseases and they were better able to survive. This genetic strength became part of this nation's genetic pool makeup.

2. Revolutionary War for Independence.

History is, in large part, silent on the involvement of Americans of African Descent in the Revolutionary War. The book, A Question of Manhood Volume 1, includes an article titled "Bearer of Arms; Patriot and Tory" by Sidney Kaplan and Emma Kaplan. Starting at page 165 they address the question of the involvement of Americans of African Descent. There were three Black Units in the Continental Army. One unit was from Rhode Island, one unit from Massachusetts and one unit from Haiti. One example was the Rhode Island unit which was made up of 90 ex-slaves and 30 free men. This unit distinguished itself in the Battles of Rhode Island, Red Bank, Points Bridge and Yorktown. The courage and dedication of the "black men" is shown by statements on page 186:

"In the attack made upon the American lines Colonel Greene, the commander of the regiment, was cut down and mortally wounded; but the sabers of the enemy only reached him through the bodies of his faithful guard of blacks, who hovered over him to protect him, and every one of whom was killed."

Colonel Green was White.

About all that is now known of Boston's all-black unit was recorded by Nell in 1855:

"At the close of the Revolutionary War, John Hancock presented the colored company, called the 'Bucks of America', with an appropriate banner, bearing his initials, as a tribute to their courage and devotion throughout the struggle. The 'Bucks', under the command of Colonel Middleton, were invited to a collation in a neighboring town, and, en route were requested to halt in front of the Hancock Mansion, in Beacon Street, where the Governor and his son united in the above presentation."

A sampling of documented examples where Black men were involved and their action was decisive in the outcome of the war are, as follows:

a. James Armistead was a Slave and he was an American double agent spy who provided information to Marquis de Lafayette and George Washington, which many maintain made it possible for the Americans to win the Battle of Yorktown. Some historians say it was the decisive battle that won the war.

b. Wentworth Cheswell, the son of a Slave, is reported on the same night and time as Paul Revere to have ridden in a different direction than Paul Revere to give the same warning that the British were coming.

Some criticize the Declaration of Independence, the Revolution and the Constitution as inconsistent and hypocritical with the continuation of Slavery. Others disagreed. Charles Miller, PhD, stated in his book, in 2007, The American Revolution and Slavery, the following:

At page 1

"Such a view simply does not survive objective historical analysis. The inspiration of the American Revolution provided the beginning of the end of slavery in the United States, culminating with a second epic conflict, the Civil War. The Civil War may, in fact, be regarded as the final chapter of the American Revolution."

The first draft of the Declaration of Independence by Thomas Jefferson included the following language that dealt with Slavery. Jefferson referred to the King of England as follows, again quoting Dr. Miller:

At page 3

"He has waged cruel war against nature itself, violating its most sacred rights of Life & liberty in the persons of a distant people who never offended him, captivating & carrying them to slavery in another hemisphere, or to incur miserable death in their transportations thither. This piratical warfare, the opprobrium of infidel powers, is the warfare of the Christian King of Great Britain. Determined to keep open a market where MEN should be bought and sold, he has prostituted his negative for suppressing every legislative attempt to prohibit or to restrain this execrable commerce and that this assemblage of horrors might want no fact of distinguished die, he is now exciting those very people to rise in arms against us, and to purchase that liberty of which he has deprived them, but murdering the people upon whom he also obtruded them; thus paying off former crimes which he urges them to commit against the lives of another."

This provision was supported by the delegates from Virginia and Pennsylvania. Virginia was the largest and most influential State and Pennsylvania was another major influential State. The Deep South and New England opposed the language, primarily South Carolina and Georgia, who wanted to keep the Slave labor and New England; whose shipping commerce was, in large part, dependent on the Slave trade continuing. Economics was once again a reason for not giving Slaves full citizenship.

The Constitutional Convention in 1787 was faced with a choice of compromise or failure to create a new government. A compromise on Slavery provided more time for the Country to attempt to fulfill the purpose of the Founders, as stated by Jefferson in his original draft of the Declaration of Independence, where he charged that the King had sponsored the Slave trade. Time passed and the leaders were unable to resolve the matter and the Civil War began in 1861.

3. Harriet Ross Tubman. She is an example of how the need for liberty and freedom became a part of this newly developing nation.

Kimberly Hayes Taylor in her book, Black Abolitionists and Freedom Fighters, at page 96 stated in substance the following. Harriet Ross Tubman, a Slave, in 1849 escaped to the North by way of the Underground Railroad and continued to go back to help others escape. She led over 300 Slaves to freedom and it is reported that not one was ever recaptured. When asked about her decision to escape from Slavery, Ms. Tubman stated:

"I had reasoned this out in my mind; there was one or two things I had a right to, liberty or death; if I could not have one, I would have

the other; for no man should take me alive; I should fight for my liberty as long as my strength lasted, and when the time came for me to go the Lord would let them take me."

Had Harriet Ross Tubman, as a co-founder of this Nation, restated Patrick Henry's call for "Give me liberty or give me death", or had she clearly stated her own claim to liberty and freedom? Either way she, as a spokesperson for her people, clearly stated their claim to liberty and freedom in this new nation.

4. 1861. Civil War.

Slaves survived until the Civil War as chattel, to be bought and sold as their owners wished. Those who survived did so because of their ability to deal with adversity. Again, only the physically and mentally strong survived.

U. S. National Archives and Records Administration, Black soldiers in the Civil War.

At the start of the Civil War, Frederick Douglass argued to allow the enlistment of black soldiers. He stated:

"Once let the black man get upon his person the brass letters, U.S., let him get an eagle on his button, and a musket on his shoulder and bullets in his packet there is no power on earth which can deny that he has earned the right to citizenship."

President Lincoln was afraid the Border States would object and also secede; and, thus, it took two years of war before the President changed his position.

In February, 1863 the governor of Massachusetts authorized a call for Black soldiers. They formed the 54th Massachusetts Infantry Regiment. This Regiment went on to prove itself in battle and was the subject of the movie "Glory". Six hundred Black soldiers stormed Fort Wagner which guarded the Port of Charleston in South Carolina. Almost one half of the charging Union Black soldiers were killed in the failed attempt to take the fort. In reflection, the storming of the fort was against impossible odds; but the troops, having been given an opportunity to show their character, met the challenge with honor and dignity.

Most Black soldiers were not allowed to fight. In the end, 198,000 Americans of African Descent served with 179,000 in the Army and 19,000 in the Navy. 40,000 died from combat, infection and disease. Even after missing the first two years, approximately 9.5 % of the Union Army and Navy was made up of Americans of African Descent. Approximately one out of every four Union

Soldiers was either killed or wounded. A large number died from infection and disease.

Col. O.T. Beard of the 48th N. Y. infantry wrote from Beaufort, S. C. on November 10, 1862:

"The colored men fought with astonishing coolness and bravery, I found them all that I could desire more than I hoped. They behaved bravely, gloriously and deserved all praise..."

5. Post-Civil War Assimilation.

After the Slaves were freed they accelerated their assimilation into the nation that they were helping to build. Examples of the progression of Americans of African Descent are stated in A Question of Manhood Volume 2, Negro Labor in the Western Cattle Industry by Kenneth W. Porter. He stated:

At page 109

"A white ex-cowpuncher-writer states that Negroes were hired largely for their ability to cope with bad horses which the white cowhands did not want to tackle. 'The Negro cow hands of the middle 1880s...were usually called on to do the hardest work around an outfit...This most often took the form of 'topping' or taking the first pitch out of the rough horses of the outfit...it was not unusual for one young Negro to 'top' a half dozen hard-pitching horses before breakfast.' Andy Adams, the cowboy-author and a man who was far from being a Negrophile, declared that the 'greatest bit of bad horse ending' he ever saw was performed by a dozen Negro cowboys who were assigned to ride a dozen horses which the white cowpunchers of their outfit were afraid to tackle. But each of the Negroes stayed on his horse till the animal was conquered."

Progress by Americans of African Descent was not without setbacks and the success of assimilation was met with resistance primarily in the South. The resistance was growing stronger not weaker at the turn of the century. The author of A Question of Manhood Volume 2, stated at page 320:

"The most important documentary evidence of African Americans' view of the political events in the 1890's is found in the more than one hundred and fifty black newspapers that were then published in the United States. Most of the papers supported the Republican Party, 'the defender of a free ballot.' Although the Republicans may have

been a weak and unreliable champion for black Americans after the Civil War, the Democrats were spearheading the onslaught against black rights in the South during the post reconstruction period."

At page 322

"Although segregation had existed during Reconstruction and had intensified in the following years, the 1890's witnessed a sustained effort to codify segregation in every aspect of life. One southern state after the other passed laws against vagrancy and contract evasion, while new forms of bound labor – the convict lease system, the chain gangs, peonage – flourished.

Lynching, an old American tradition that had long flourished on the frontier, gained new importance in the South. According to historian, Edward L. Ayers, 'The visibility and ferocity of lynching seemed to assume new proportions in the 1880's and 1890's.'"

6. Spanish American War.

The American battleship, U.S. Maine, was sunk on February 15, 1898 in Havana Harbor with a loss of life of 259 men. The sentiment was that Spain was responsible. The purpose of this paper is not to cover all military actions that the Americans of African Descent were involved in, but to describe the nature of the Americans of African Descent soldiers.

In the following examples, which are quoted herein, the Americans of African Descent are referred to as "Negroes" or "Colored." Whatever word is used will be adopted to deal with the subject addressed.

Regarding a statement given by Congressman White, Piero Cleijeses, the author of [A Question of Manhood Volume 2](#), stated in Chapter 16, "African Americans and the War against Spain":

At pages 323-324

"Concerned about the worsening conditions of southern blacks, Representative George Henry White of North Carolina, a Republican and the lone African American member of the U.S. congress, had addressed the House of Representatives on March 7, 1898. He expressed the grievances of his people and pledged their loyalty:

'The nation has not at all times given us that protection to which our loyalty has entitled us. This is painfully evidenced by the almost daily

outrages chronicled, showing lynchings, murders, assassinations, and even cremations of our people all over the Southland... But, regardless of the faults of this grand old Union of ours, we love her still, and if the nation should find it necessary to resort to arms and our present strained relations with Spain should develop into a war, I pledge you that the black phalanx is ready to be mustered in, one-half million strong.'

*The Colored American supported Congressman White's position and did not argue whether the nation should or should not go to war. It left this decision 'to the wisdom and patriotism of our representatives at the White House and Capitol.' What the Colored American desperately sought was to impress on the dominant race how eager the black man was to do his duty, to be 'foremost among those who contended for the preservation of the nation's **dignity** and honor at any cost. If no necessity for war arises, the colored man is a better American by reason of this test of his loyalty. If war should come, he will be the more strongly entwined in the warp and woof of the nation by reason of sacrifice and danger willingly endured.' When war finally beckoned in early April, the Colored American warmly endorsed it: 'we fight as brethren of one blood, and under one flag. We are all American citizens, bound inseparably by a common cause.'*

The offer to help their Country by the Americans of African Descent was not accepted by all the White people and leaders.

The authors further stated at page 325:

"However, the white press had a different definition of fair play. The Washington Post commented that a 'policy which puts arms in the hands of the negroes... results in the artificial exaltation of an inferior race,' and the Times (New Orleans) told blacks not to enlist 'for their own sake.'"

Notwithstanding the negative feelings demonstrated by some news sources, the Americans of African Descent were in the process of being assimilated into the nation's armed forces.

The Unwept, Black American Soldiers and Spanish-American War by Edward Van Zite Scott states:

At pages 24 and 25

"By the advent of the Spanish-American War, black regiments had an unusually large percentage of battle-tested veterans. In the years following

*the Civil War, a consistently high re-enlistment rate in black regiments and a correspondingly low 2 percent desertion rate were in striking contrast to an annual desertion rate among white troops of 30 or 35 percent. This may have been because the black soldier looked on the military as a career, whereas the white soldier frequently sought out the army only as a temporary refuge. For blacks at the time, the Army may have been the only real career opportunity, however limited, in the white man's world. A large number of white officers of black troops also remained with the same outfit for many years. Possibly they were overlooked by the high command, or perhaps the authorities felt it would be too difficult to find a willing replacement. **In any case, the overall result was intense unit pride, enhanced by increasing professionalism and superior performance, reinforced by a sincere desire among some black troops to show the world the potential of their race.**"*

At page 60

"Consequently, it was regular Army troops who shouldered the burden of attacking the well-entrenched Spanish Army, and among these regular troops were the four black regiments, the Ninth Cavalry and Tenth Cavalry, and the Twenty-fourth Infantry and Twenty-fifth Infantry."

At pages 60 and 61

*"As has been mentioned earlier, the black troops were seasoned veterans and would play a significant role in the fighting to come. Their effectiveness was further increased by **remarkable regimental pride and unity**. And, as will be seen, they also played a major and heroic role in battling the disease that gripped the U.S. troops after the Spanish were beaten."*

It is suggested that these examples of the military unit pride of the Americans of African Descent is an example of the desire of these men to take back their dignity.

The following are quotes and statements from the book History of Negro Soldiers in the Spanish-American War and the Other Items of Interest, by Edward A. Johnson, 2004:

At the beginning of the Spanish -American War the U.S. Army needed more soldiers. Congress authorized ten new regiments. President William McKinley ordered that five of the new regiments would be composed of Negroes. In the

Negro regiments the Field and Staff Officers and Captains were to be White, the Lieutenants could be Negroes.

The author stated:

At page 28

*"In the City of New Orleans, in 1866, two thousand two hundred and sixty-six ex-slaves were recruited for the service. None but the largest and blackest Negroes were accepted. From these were formed the Twenty-fourth and Twenty-fifth Infantry, and the Ninth and Tenth Cavalry. All four are famous fighting regiments, yet the two cavalry commands have earned the proudest distinction. While the record of the ninth Cavalry, better known as the '***** Ninth,' in its thirty-two years of service in the Indian wars, in the military history of the border, stands without a peer; and is, without exception, the most famous fighting regiment in the United States service."*

The following quotes and historic statements are only words and it may be difficult to obtain the feeling of the American Soldiers who were involved on the battlefield. To set the table of the actual moment, the following is included as an introduction of the contribution made by the Americans of African Descent soldiers.

There is nothing more symbolic of the pride of a fighting unit than the "Standard of the Unit," its "Colors;" or, as some say, its "Battle Flag." This represents the soul of the unit and all who have "fallen" and will "fall" in its efforts to reach its objectives of defeating the enemy. It is not necessarily a tribute to the objectives of the war but is a tangible symbol of the history and lost futures of the men of the fighting unit and what they have sacrificed.

The author stated:

At page 35

"There was Sergeant Berry, for instance, of the Tenth Cavalry...he rescued the colors of a white regiment from unseemly trampling and bore them safely through the bullets to the top of San Juan Hill. Now, everyone knows that the standard of a troop is guarded like a man's own soul, or should be, and how it came that this Third Cavalry banner was lying on the ground that day is something that may never be rightly known. Some white man had left it there, many white men had let it stay there, but Berry, a black man, saw it fluttering in shame and paused in his running long enough to catch it up and

lift it high overhead beside his own banner — for he was a color-bearer of the Tenth."

"Then, with two flags flying above him, and two heavy staves to bear, this powerful Negro (he is literally a giant in strength and stature) charged the heights, while white men and black men cheered him as they pressed behind. Who shall say what temporary demoralization there may have been in this troop of the Third at that critical moment, or what fresh courage may have been fired in them by that black man's act! They say Berry yelled like a demon as he rushed against the Spaniards, and I, for one, am willing to believe that his battle-cry brought fighting energy to his own side as well as terror to the enemy."

At page 40

The following is a Southerner's statement that the Negro Cavalry saved the "Rough Riders."

"Some of the officers who accompanied the wounded soldiers on the trip north give interesting accounts of the fighting around Santiago. 'I was standing near Captain Capron and Hamilton Fish, Jr.,' said a corporal to the Associated Press correspondent to-night, 'and saw them shot down.' They were with the Rough Riders and ran into an ambush, though they had been warned of the danger. If it had not been for the Negro Cavalry the Rough Riders would have been exterminated. I am not a Negro lover. My father fought with Mosby's Rangers, and I was born in the South, but the Negroes saved that fight, and the day will come when General Shafter will give them credit for their bravery."—Assoc. Press.

The following is an excerpt from the communication to the Daily Afternoon Journal of Beaumont, Texas, written by a southern White soldier.

Private Smith of the Seventy-first Volunteers, speaking about what he had seen at Santiago stated:

At page 41

"I am a southerner by birth, and I never thought much of the colored man. But, somewhat, now I feel very differently toward them, for I met them in camp, on the battle field and that's where a man gets to know a man. I never saw such fighting as those Tenth Cavalry men did. They didn't seem to know what fear was, and their battle hymn was, 'There'll be a hot time in the old town to-night.' That's not a thrilling hymn to hear on the concert

*stage, but when you are lying in a trench with the smell of powder in your nose and the crack of rifles almost deafening you and bullets tearing up the ground around you like huge hailstones beating down the dirt, and you see before you a blockhouse from which there belches forth the machine gun, pouring a torrent of leaden missiles, while from holes in the ground you see the leveled rifles of thousands of enemies that crack out death in ever-increasing succession and then you see a body of men go up that hill as if it were in drill, so solid do they keep their formation, and those men are yelling, 'There'll be a hot time in the old town to-night,' singing as if they liked their work, why, there's an appropriateness in the tune that kind of makes your blood creep and your nerves to thrill and you want to get up and go ahead if you lose a limb in the attempt and that's what those '*****' did. You just heard the Lieutenant say, 'Men, will you follow me?' and you hear a tremendous shout answer him, 'You bet we will,' and right up through that death-dealing storm you see men charge, that is, you see them until the darned Springfield rifle powder blinds you and hides them."*

Captains and Second Lieutenants in the Negro units were all White but the Lieutenants were allowed to be Black. The color of the skin of the above referenced Lieutenant is not known; however, he was not a Captain or Second Lieutenant.

At page 28

Colonel Roosevelt, as reported in the, *Colored American*, in his farewell address to his men stated in part;

"Now, I want to say just a word more to some of the men I see standing around not of your number. I refer to the colored regiments, who occupied the right and left flanks of us at Guasima, the Ninth and Tenth cavalry regiments. The Spaniards called them 'Smoked Yankees,' but we found them to be an excellent breed of Yankees. I am sure that I speak the sentiments of officers and men in the assemblage when I say that between you and the other cavalry regiments there exists a tie which we trust will never be broken."

At a later date, Colonel Roosevelt limited his endorsement of the Negro soldiers when he said that the Negro soldiers had needed the White officers to lead them. This fact is refuted by the Negro and White soldiers who fought at El Cagney, San Juan Hill and Las Guasimas. Being a White officer, Colonel Roosevelt may have had a number of reasons for saying the Negro Soldiers needed

White leadership to do so well in battle. Colonel Roosevelt was a politician who became Governor of New York and later President of the United States. If the facts of the battle at San Juan Hill had become public knowledge, that the Negro Soldiers had saved the "Rough Riders" from a deadly trap that Colonel Roosevelt had led them into, it is not known if it would have had an effect on Colonel Roosevelt's public position. The facts simply do not support Colonel Roosevelt's assertions. Eye witnesses described how the Negro soldiers fought when the White officers were killed or wounded. Two examples are as follows:

At pages 44-45

"The Twenty-fourth took the brunt of the fight, and all through it, even when whole companies were left without an officer, not for a moment were these colored soldiers shaken or wavering in the face of the fierce attack made upon them. Wounded Spanish officers declare that the attack was thus directed because they did not believe the Negro would stand up against them and they believed there was the faulty place in the American line. Never were men more amazed than were the Spanish officers to see the steadiness and cool courage with which the Twenty-fourth charged front forward on its tenth company (a difficult thing to do at any time), under the hottest fire. The value of the Negro as a soldier is no longer a debatable question."

"The Twenty-fourth took the brunt of the fight, and all through it, even when whole companies were left without an officer, not for a moment were these colored soldiers shaken or wavering in the face of the fierce attack made upon them."

In The Unwept, Black American Soldiers and the Spanish-American War Edward Van Zile Scott stated:

At page 120

"...When the white commander of Troop B of the Tenth Cavalry was injured, command of that troop was then taken over by a black non-commissioned officer, John Buck, who led the unit in its vicious assault that contributed significantly to the defeat of the Spaniards.

*Sergeant Buck was one of the first Negro soldiers to assume command of a company during the Cuban campaign. **Before the end of the war, however, similar performances by black non-commissioned officers became common.** A Spanish officer with the troops that made up the forces*

*that lay in wait for the Americans at Las Guasimas on June 24 later said: 'What especially terrified our men was the huge **American Negroes**. We saw their big, black faces through the underbrush, and they looked like devils. They come forward under our fire as if they didn't the least care about it.'*

The author of History of Negro Soldiers in the Spanish-American War, Edward A. Johnson (1860-1944), includes a poem in his book written by George E. Powell. The title of it was "The Charge of the "***** Ninth on San Juan Hill." One may take offense at the use of the "N-word" in the poem, but it was not used as an insult or slur. The author of the poem and the author of the book used it as a word for pride and statement of what the men of the Ninth Cavalry achieved and what this country acknowledged they achieved. The author of the book was an American of African Descent and was also a noted attorney, scholar, historian and politician. He was 38 years old at the time of the war. It is not known if George E. Powell was of African Descent but it is known that the author, Edward A. Johnson, was a strong, vocal, successful, advocate of advancement of Americans of African Descent.

The poem is written in tribute to the 9th Cavalry's charge on San Juan Hill to rescue Colonel Roosevelt's "Rough Riders." It is thirteen (13) stanzas, all of which are included, because this writer does not feel qualified to judge if any part could be left out. The poem starts at page 24.

1. Hark! O'er the drowsy trooper's dream,
 There comes a martial metal's scream,
 That startles one and all!
 It is the word, to wake, to die!
 To hear the foeman's fierce defy!
 To fling the column's battle-cry!
 The "boots and saddles" call.

2. The shimmering steel, the glow of morn,
 The rally-call of battle-horn
 Proclaim a day of carnage, born
 For better or for ill,
 Above the pictured tentage white,
 Above the weapons glinting bright,
 The day god casts a golden light
 Across the San Juan Hill.

3. "Forward!" "Forward!" comes the cry,
As stalwart columns, ambling by,
Stride over graves that, waiting, lie
Undug in mother earth!
Their goal, the flag of fierce Castile
Above her serried ranks of steel,
Insensate to the cannon's peal
That gives the battle birth!
4. As brawn as black—a fearless foe;
Grave, grim and grand, they onward go,
To conquer or to die!
The rule of right; the march of might;
A dusky host from darker night,
Responsive to the morning light,
To work the martial will!
And o'er the trench and trembling earth,
The morn that gives the battle birth
Is on the San Juan Hill!
5. Hark! Sounds again the bugle call!
Let ring the rifles over all,
To Shriek above the battle-pall
The war-god's jubilee!
Their's, were bondmen, low, and long;
Their's, once weak against the strong;
Their's, to strike and stay the wrong,
That strangers might be free!
6. And on, and on, for weal or woe,
The tawny faces grimmer go,
That bade no mercy to a foe
That pities but to kill.
"Close up!" "Close up!" is heard, and said,
And yet the rain of steel and lead
Still leaves a livid trail of red
Upon the San Juan Hill!
7. "Charge!" "Charge!" The bugle peals again;
"Tis life or death for Roosevelt's men!—

Mausers make reply!
 Aye! Speechless are those swarthy sons,
 Save for the clamor of the guns—
 Their only battle—cry!
 The lowly stain upon each face,
 The taunt still fresh prouder race,
 But speeds the step that springs a pace,
 To succor or to die!

8. With rifles hot—to waist—band nude;
 The brawn beside the pampered dude;
 The cowboy king—one grave—and rude—
 To shelter him who falls!
 One breast—and bare,—howe'er begot,
 The low, the high—one common lot:
 The world's distinction all forgot
 When Freedom's bugle calls!

9. No faltering step, no fitful start;
 None seeking less than all his part;
 One watchward springing from each hear,—
 Yet on, and onward still!
 The sullen sound of tramp and tread;
 Abe Lincoln's flag still overhead;
 They followed where the angels led
 The way, up San Juan Hill!

10. And where the life stream ebbs and flows,
 And stains the track of trenchant blows
 That met no meaner steel,
 The bated breath—the battle yell—
 The turf in slippery crimson, tell
 Where Castile's proudest colors fell
 With wounds that never heal!

11. Where every trooper found a wreath
 Of glory for his sabre sheath;
 And earned the laurels well;
 With feet to field and face to foe,
 In lines of battle lying low,

The sable soldiers fell!

12. And where the black and brawny breast
 Gave up its all—life's richest, best,
 To find the tomb's eternal rest
 A dream of freedom still!
 A groundless creed was swept away,
 With brand of "coward"—a time—worn say—
 And he blazed the path a better way
 Up the side of San Juan Hill!
 For black or white, on the scroll of fame,
 The blood of the hero dyes the same;
 And ever, ever will!
13. Sleep, trooper, sleep; thy sable brow,
 Amid the living laurel now,
 Is wound in wreaths of fame!
 Nor need the graven granite stone,
 To tell of garlands all thine own—
 To hold a soldier's name!

The Americans of African Descent had again proven themselves in battle, but progress was continually being reversed in their country at home.

One example of how the South continued to take advantage of the Black population in the South is set out by Douglas A. Blackmon in his book, SLAVERY By Another Name. This book shows how the laws and judicial system were used to impose a different type of Slavery in the South.

He states at pages 7-8:

"By 1900, the South's judicial system had been wholly reconfigured to make one of its primary purposes the coercion of African Americans to comply with the social customs and labor demands of whites. It was not coincidental that 1901 also marked the final full disenfranchisement of nearly all blacks throughout the South. Sentences were handed down by provincial judges, local mayors, and justices of the peace — often men in the employ of the white business owners who relied on the forced labor produced by the judgments. Dockets and trial records were inconsistently maintained. Attorneys were rarely involved on the side of blacks. Revenues from the neo-

slavery poured the equivalent of tens of millions of dollars into the treasuries of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Georgia, Florida, Texas, North Carolina, and South Carolina — where more than 75 percent of the black population in the United States then lived.

It also became apparent how inextricably this quasi-slavery of the twentieth century was rooted in the nascent industrial slavery that had begun to flourish in the last years before the Civil War. The same men who built railroads with thousands of slaves and proselytized for the use of slaves in southern factories and mines in the 1850s were also the first to employ forced African American labor in the 1870s."

In 1912 President Woodrow Wilson was elected and he continued the reversal of the progress made by Americans of African Descent. President Wilson was considered by many to be a "progressive;" and, more specifically, an "intellectual progressive." This did not extend to race relations. President Woodrow Wilson signed laws making interracial marriage a felony in the District of Columbia. Government offices were made segregated and President Wilson justified it and other acts by saying it "was in the negroes' interest." To say that segregation was in the "negroes' interest" suggests that President Wilson was afflicted with the belief that he knew what was best for Americans of African Descent. He clearly implied that they were incapable of knowing what was best for themselves. President Wilson was an educated person who did not have an understanding of history or the rights of people. He was a graduate of Princeton, had a Doctorate Degree from Johns Hopkins, and had been President of Princeton for eight years prior to becoming President of the United States. Could this background have laid the groundwork for his belief that he knew what was in the best interest of Americans of African Descent?

The gains of the Civil War and Reconstruction and the gains on the battlefields were lost by the politicians at the local level in the South and by the politicians at the national level in Washington, D.C. In the end it would take the combined effect of World War II, the U.S. Supreme Court ruling in *Brown v. Topeka Board of Education*, the action of a couple of U. S. Presidents, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to significantly move Americans of African Descent towards a level playing field.

7. WW I.

The following statement appears in MilitaryHistory.com, [Fighting for Respect, African American soldiers in WWI.](#)

“When World War I broke out, there were four all-black regiments: the 9th and 10th Cavalry and the 24th and 25th Infantry. The men in these units were considered heroes in their communities. Within one week of Wilson’s declaration of war, the War Department had to stop accepting black volunteers because the quotas for African Americans were filled.

When it came to the draft, however, there was a reversal in usual discriminatory policy. Draft boards were comprised entirely of white men. Although there were no specific segregation provisions outlined in the draft legislation, blacks were told to tear off one corner of their registration cards so they could easily be identified and inducted separately. Now instead of turning blacks away, the draft boards were doing all they could to bring them into service, southern draft boards in particular. One Georgia county exemption board discharged forty-four percent of white registrants on physical grounds and exempted only three percent of black registrants based on the same requirements. It was fairly common for southern postal workers to deliberately withhold the registration cards of eligible black men and have them arrested for being draft dodgers. African American men who owned their own farms and had families were often drafted before single white employees of large planters. Although comprising just ten percent of the entire United States population, blacks supplied thirteen percent of inductees.”

The following information is cited from Black History at Arlington National Cemetery.

For the most part, Americans of African Descent were kept in segregated units and used for support and not placed in the front lines because the military leaders said they were not tough enough to fight on the front lines. This shows the effect of the deception of the politicians on this country after the Spanish American War in 1898. An example of how this was wrong was shown by the 369th Infantry Regiment Unit formed from the N.Y. National Guard in Harlem. They earned the nickname the “Harlem Hell Fighters.” They spent 191 days on the frontline, longer than any other American Regiment in WW I. The 369th was awarded by the French Government the Trioxide Guerre for gallantry in action and 171 members of the 369th were awarded the Legion of Merit. The French did not have the view that Americans of African Descent were not tough enough to fight on the front lines. The 371st and 372nd Regiments made up of Americans of African Descent

were integrated under the 157th French Red Hand Division. The two Regiments were decorated by the French Government with the Croix de Guerre for gallantry.

Another example was:

“Corporal Freddie Stowers, a soldier, who served with the all-black 93rd Infantry Division, earned a Medal of Honor for leading his squad in an attack against entrenched mortar and machine-gun positions in France that had caused more than 50 percent casualties in his company. Killed in the attack, he received the award posthumously on April 24, 1991...”

8. WW II.

The leadership of the Military initially followed the same approach of not using Americans of African Descent in combat as it had in WWI. When the Americans of African Descent were given an opportunity to fight, they again showed their true ability and toughness. One example is The Tuskegee Airmen, an all-Black Fighter Squadron, (99 Fighter Squadron, 332 Fighter Group and the 477th Bombardment Group). The Tuskegee Airman showed that Americans of African Descent not only had the will and courage to fight but the ability to operate this country's most advanced aircraft successfully against the German's feared Luftwaffe. In many cases the assignment of the Tuskegee Pilots was to protect the bombers being flown by White pilots. With time, based on performance of the Tuskegee Pilots, some White bomber pilots were requesting the assignment of the Tuskegee Pilots to protect them on their bombing runs. The Tuskegee Airmen, who became known as the "Red Tails", were commanded and led by Col. B. Davis, Jr., one of the first Americans of African Descent to graduate from West Point. He later retired as a Three Star General. He stated about his men in his autobiography at pages 124-125:

“We took deep pride in our mission performance. ... Complimentary remarks from pilots, navigators, and other bomber crew members came to us by teletype or telephone ... Crews were quick to voice their praise of the Red Tails, as we had come to be known from the painted tails of our P-51s. They appreciated our practice of sticking with them through the roughest spots over the target, where the danger of attack was greatest, and covering them through the flack and fighters until they were able to regroup. They

particularly liked our practice of detaching fighters to escort crippled bombers that were straggling because of battle damage”

Lynn M. Homan and Thomas Reilly in their book Black Knights The Story of the Tuskegee Airman addressed the performance of the Tuskegee Airman at page 234:

“Much has been made about bomber groups requesting the 99th Fighter Squadron or squadrons of the 332nd Fighter Group to provide escort service for them...Dr. Florence Parrish-St. John in a telephone interview with Elliott Roosevelt asked that very question. According to Dr. Parrish-St. John. Roosevelt said, ‘We requested the 332nd. Boy they were terrific. We were just delighted to have them because we needed escorts and there were not enough people doing that.’ He praised the 332nd to high heavens. ‘Yes,” he said, ‘we did request them.’”

“The claim that the 332nd Fighter Group never lost an aircraft under their protection to an enemy fighter is difficult to substantiate with certainty. Reading through the thousands of after-action reports shows some close calls; many of the reports are certainly subject to interpretation. It can be said with certainty, however, that they achieved the distinction of never having lost a bomber to enemy fighters in more than two hundred missions with the 15th Air Force. This fact was acknowledged in a letter from Colonel Yantis A. ‘Buck’ Taylor to Colonel Benjamin O. Davis, Jr.”

The authors of Black Knights further stated at pages 234- 235:

“In the early days of the war, Allied bomber losses were horrendous; each time the bombers went out, losses of fifteen to twenty percent were routine. Certainly flak was a major cause, but the big, slow moving aircraft were also lost to the machine guns of enemy fighters. By the waning months of the war, the losses of Allied bombers had greatly diminished to less than five percent...”

The numbers do not lie. At one point the loss ratio of bombers was 15% to 20%. The allies reduced it to 5% by the end of the war. The Tuskegee Airmen were part of that reduction. They flew many escort missions for many Air Force bomber units and it is documented that for one of those units they lost “0” percent in 200 bombing missions of the 15th Air Force bomber unit.

At pages 236-238 the following general information is discussed.

In early 1949, the Air Force decided to hold its first Air Force Fighter Gunnery Meet at Las Vegas Air Force Base. The goal of the meet was to recognize the top performing fighter group as well as the top performing individual fighter pilots in the Air Force.

The meet began on May 2, 1949. The entries from the Tuskegee Airman were, Captain Alva N. Temple, First Lieutenant James H. Stewart, First Lieutenant James H. Harvey, and First Lieutenant Halbert Alexander, who was an alternate. They flew their nearly obsolete F-47 propeller-driven airplanes to Las Vegas on April 23, 1949. The Air Force had been gradually converting its fighter squadrons from propeller aircraft to jets. Several of the competing groups at Las Vegas were equipped with F-80 and F-84 jets. Others were flying F-51 Mustangs and F-82 Twin Mustangs.

The contest included aerial gunnery, panel gunnery, dive-bombing, skip bombing, and rocketry.

The 332nd Fighter Group (Tuskegee Airman) won first place. Captain Alva N. Temple, of the Tuskegee Airman, earned second place in the individual competition.

Col. Charles E. McGee was one example of the type of men who made up the Tuskegee Airmen. In tribute to him General Fogleman, USAF stated:

"After fighting, in World War II, Col. Charles E. McGee went on to fly and fight in Korea and in Vietnam. He racked up the highest three-war total of fighter missions of any Air force aviator — 409 missions...An American hero and an Air Force legend."

Col. McGee's Biography by his daughter, C. E. Smith, PhD, stated at page 61:

"Word of Tuskegee Airmen feats had spread and the bombers, so recently resistant to the idea of black pilots, changed their attitude: They now looked forward to seeing the Red Tails over head...They knew when they had Red Tails flying with them, they had protection from the Germans they could count on."

General Daniel James, Jr. was another example of the success of the Tuskegee Airmen. Thirty-seven years after his start as a Tuskegee Airman he was promoted to four-star General and assigned as Commander in Chief NORAD/ADCOM in 1975 where he served at the time of his death. He received the Arnold Air Society Eugene M. Zuckert Award in 1970 for outstanding contributions to Air Force professionalism. His citation read:

"fighter pilot with a magnificent record, public speaker, and eloquent spokesman for the American Dream we so rarely achieve."

These examples are just a small segment of what the other survivors of the Tuskegee Airmen achieved during and after the War. Because of limited space, no attempt is made to follow up on all the survivors of the Tuskegee Airmen. One can only wonder, if other units of Americans of African Descent were allowed to fight, how America would have benefited in the war and in the post war era.

As a result of the success of the Tuskegee Airman in the Air Force, it was ordered that the Air Force be desegregated in 1947 a year prior to President Truman's Order on July 28, 1948.

Other examples of how the Americans of African descent fought when they were allowed to fight, is shown in the records at Arlington National Cemetery. In these records Americans of African Descents are referred to as "black."

WW I

"By war's end, members of the black 92nd Infantry Division received more than 12,000 decorations and citations, including nearly 1,100 Purple Hearts, 16 Legion of Merit Awards, 95 Silver Stars and two Distinguished Service Crosses. They suffered more than 3,000 casualties. Two black division officers, 1st Lt. John R. Fox (left) and 2nd Lt. Vernon J. Baker (right), received belated Medals of Honor Jan. 13, 1997. Fox's Medal was presented posthumously."

WW II

"The black 761st Tank Battalion fought for 183 continuous days in more than 30 major assaults in the European Theater of Operations. After six nominations, the battalion finally received the Presidential Unit Citation in 1978... Staff Sgt. Ruben Rivers..., a black member of the battalion, received a posthumous Medal of Honor Jan. 13, 1997."

"Staff Sgt. Edward A. Carter II (left), a black non-commissioned officer who served with Company D, 56th Armored Infantry Battalion of the 12th Armored Division was awarded a posthumous Medal of Honor Jan. 13, 1997. Other black soldiers, who received posthumously Medals of Honor Jan. 13, 1997, were Maj. Charles L. Thomas, Pfc. Willy F. James Jr. and Pvt. George Watson."

"Dorie Miller, U.S. Navy Mess man aboard the US Arizona, was awarded the Navy Cross for shooting down four enemy airplanes during the attack on Pearl Harbor."

Notwithstanding the exceptional performance of the Black Units in combat, the Army remained segregated until 1944 when, because of the shortage of White replacements in the Battle of the Bulge, General Eisenhower ordered the use of Black soldiers to fill replacement needs of the White units. This was the first step toward official desegregation of the United States Army.

At home, Americans of African Descent worked in the factories and farms to supply the war effort and to continue to build the foundation of this Nation. They worked in a segregated society but they did not use that as an excuse for not contributing to the defense of their country. Max Hastings stated in INFERNO, at page 390:

"The proportion of black workers in war industries rose from 2 percent in 1942 to 8 percent in 1945, but they remained underrepresented."

9. Post WW II.

After the war, President Truman issued Executive Order 9981 on July 26, 1948 to end segregation in the Armed Forces. President Truman issued the Executive Order to bypass Congress because the South's representation in the House and Senate, all White Democrats, would likely have stonewalled any legislation.

10. 1950 Korean War.

When the Korean War broke out in June 1950 the U.S. Army units were still mostly segregated. Necessity again advanced desegregation. Initially, the U.S. Army was suffering heavy casualties and was threatened with being pushed into the sea. The Army Command again called on Black soldiers from all Black support units to fill the vacancies. They helped stop the advance of the North Korean Army and the Army had been forced to take another step toward integration of its units. The U.S. Army announced on July 26, 1951 its plan to desegregate.

11. 1954 Brown v. Topeka Board of Education.

387 U.S. 483, 74 S.Ct 686, 98 L. Ed. 873 (1954) The Supreme Court declared dual school systems to be unconstitutional. Separate but equal was not equal.

12. 1970 President Richard M. Nixon

Sixteen years later seven states continued to enforce the dual school systems. This was in defiance of the 1954 Supreme Court decision. No action had been taken by the prior Presidents from 1954 to 1970 to fully enforce the law to carry out the full mandate of the Supreme Court.

President Nixon on August 14, 1970 scheduled a meeting in New Orleans with the leaders of the seven non-compliant States: South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, North Carolina and Florida. After the meeting, President Nixon went on National T.V. and announced that the Supreme Court's mandate of Brown v. Topeka Board of Education would be fully enforced by the Federal Government. George P. Shultz, who had been in charge of the process, stated in the Hoover Digest, 2003 No. 2 that Senator Pat Moynihan wrote:

"[The President] declared 'The unitary school system must replace the dual school system throughout the United States...And I shall meet that responsibility.' Clearly this is what has been needed since the Supreme Court first spoke, and now it has happened. The authority of the President and the full support of the Federal government have been brought to bear."

And New York Times columnist Tom Wicker wrote reflectively in 1991:

"There is no doubt about it — the Nixon administration accomplished more in 1970 to desegregate Southern school systems than had been done in the 16 previous years, or probably since. There's no doubt either that it was Richard Nixon personally who conceived, orchestrated and led the administration's desegregation effort. Halting and uncertain before he finally asserted strong control, that effort resulted in probably the outstanding domestic achievement of his administration.

I believe he was absolutely right."

13. 1964 to 1973 Vietnam War.

Stolen Valor How the Viet Nam Generation was Robbed of its Heroes and its History by B.G. Burkett and Glenna Whitley states on page 454:

"Seventy five percent of the Americans of African Descent who served in Vietnam volunteered to go ...blacks tended to volunteer for combat at a higher rate than whites."

Americans of African Descent were falsely made to appear to be victims of the war. It was reported by a number of members of the press and authors of books like Bloods and movies like Dead Presidents that black soldiers were drafted from the ghetto and forced to fight in a war where black casualties were disproportionate to their percent of the population. Also see 1986 Frontline's television program called The Bloods of 'NAM. A number of people and organizations in the antiwar movement made this claim as one of the reasons for their objection to the war.

The authors of Stolen Valor stated at pages 461-462:

"By the time Vietnam rolled around, blacks were a major force in elite units composed of volunteers, such as the Airborne and the Marines. In Vietnam, African-Americans constituted up to a fourth of some elite units. That resulted in the outcry early in the war that the brunt of the combat effort fell disproportionately on blacks.

But data for the entire war shows there was no significant relationship between race and getting sent to Vietnam or an assignment to combat arms, according to a 1993 study for the Population Research Institute at The Pennsylvania State University. The study of enlisted men, called 'Who fought in Vietnam? An Analysis of Combat Exposure risk,' by researchers, Cynthia Gimbel and Alan Booth, examined several studies of black participation in the war and concluded that the research did not support the idea of disproportionate African-American service during the war, the idea that African-Americans had higher levels of combat exposure, or that they suffered higher casualty rates.

Their research indicated that black draftees had a significantly lower risk of being given a combat arms assignment than did white draftees."

At page 465

"For all the false rhetoric about the war taking the heaviest toll on African-Americans, it was in Vietnam that black soldiers had a chance to prove the leadership skills that had been there all along. It is a shame that what most people will remember about blacks fighting in Vietnam are the negative images from despicable movies like Dead Presidents."

The antiwar movement falsely made Americans of African Descent into victims. In doing so they again exercised control over Americans of African Descent and tried to take away their "dignity;" i.e.,

they were depicted as "victims" not "heroes," and as "victims" they needed the liberal politicians to take care of them.

IV. Civil Rights Movement

A . History Leading Up to Civil Rights Act of 1965

1. Leadership of Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.

Many historians say the final break from segregation and oppression, and the securing of the road to freedom, was the Selma March on March 21, 1965 led by Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.

The events that ended in the Selma March began with the killing of Jimmie Lee Jackson on February 18, 1965. James Bevel, a Southern Christian Leadership Conference organizer, organized a march from Selma to Montgomery to confront Governor Wallace.

The initial march on March 7th ended when the marchers, led by John Lewis and Reverend Hoseu Williams, were brutally attacked after they had crossed the Edward Pettis Bridge. Reverend King and other Civil Rights Leaders quickly took action for another march on March 9, 1965. They also went to Court to obtain the protection that would be needed to complete the march. Federal Judge Johnson issued a restraining order, preventing the march from taking place until he could hold further hearings. Reverend King led a symbolic march on March 9, 1965, which was designed not to violate Judge Johnson's order.

That evening, on March 9th, a mob beat and killed a White Unitarian Minister from Boston named James J. Reeb, who had come to join in the march. Reverend King rejected a call to meet violence with violence and continued to pursue a remedy in Court and through the President. The violence against the peaceful marchers opened the eyes of the nation. President Johnson seized the moment and presented new legislation (Voting Rights Act) and stated in an address to the Nation on March 15, 1965 to a joint session of Congress.

"...This was the first nation in the history of the world to be founded with a purpose. The great phrases of that purpose still sound in every American heart, north and south: 'All men are created equal'- 'Government by consent of the governed'- 'Give me liberty or give me death'."

"But even if we pass this bill the battle will not be over. What happened in Selma is part of a far larger movement which reaches into every section and state of America. It is the effort of American Negroes to secure for

themselves, the full blessing of American life...And we shall overcome."
"Equality depends, not on the force of arms or tear gas, but depends upon the force of moral right - not on recourse to violence, but on respect for law and order."

It was reported that Reverend King, in Selma, wept on hearing President Johnson's speech. President Johnson presented the proposed Voting Rights Act to Congress on March 17, 1965.

Reverend King's methods were successful. President Johnson had made his speech before a joint session of Congress on March 15, 1965 and Reverend King's followers prevailed in the Federal Court on March 16, 1965. The march then went forward led by Reverend King, John Lewis, Reverend William and other Civil Rights' leaders on March 21, 1965. The 1965 Voting Rights Act was signed into law on August 6, 1965.

The magnitude of what Reverend King accomplished leading up to August 6, 1965 must be measured against what would have happened if he had not been present to create and lead the nonviolent movement for equality and dignity.

2. Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. overcame and conquered the forces demanding violence in response to the vicious acts of the segregationists.

Reverend King was tested on many occasions. The sternest test involved demands for violent retribution when the segregationists bombed the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church on September 15, 1963 in Birmingham, Alabama, and three little girls were killed. Reverend King delivered the sermon at the funeral of the three little girls. He showed remarkable restraint and belief in his principles of non-violence when he said:

The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King, Jr. Edited by James M. Washington. "Eulogy for the Martyred Children," pages 221-223

"So in spite of the darkness of this hour we must not despair. We must not become bitter; nor must we harbor the desire to retaliate with violence. We must not lose faith in our white brothers. Somehow we must believe that the most misguided among them can learn to respect the dignity and worth of all human personality."

Reverend King closed the sermon with comments that showed the depth of his own sensitivity and pain for the families of the little girls.

"They died within the sacred walls of the Church after discussing a principle as eternal as love. Shakespeare had Horatio utter some beautiful words over the dead body of Hamlet. I paraphrase these words today as I stand over the last remains of these lovely girls."

"Good-night sweet princesses; may the flight of angels take thee to the eternal rest."

Epilogue: The doors of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church reopened on Sunday, June 7, 1964.

The "reentry" sermon was preached by a White clergyman, the Reverend H. Hester, Secretary of the Department of Missions, Alabama Baptist Convention.

An example of the forces for violence that had to be controlled is shown in a speech prepared for the March on Washington on August 28, 1963 by Mr. John Lewis. Mr. Lewis later was elected to Congress and serves in Congress to this date. Mr. Lewis was prevented by Reverend King and his supporters from giving the speech as initially written. Mr. Lewis made changes and toned his speech down but he stated, in part:

"We must get in this revolution and complete the revolution. In the Delta of Mississippi, in Southwest Georgia, in the Black Belt of Alabama, in Harlem, in Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia and all over this nation the black masses are on a march for jobs and freedom.

They're talking about slow down and stop. We will not stop. All of the forces of Eastland, Barnett, Wallace, and Thurmond will not stop this revolution. If we do not get meaningful legislation out of this Congress, the time will come when we will not confine our march in Washington. We will march through the South, through the streets of Jackson, through the streets of Danville, through the streets of Cambridge, through the streets of Birmingham. But we will march with the spirit of love and with the spirit of dignity that we have shown here today.

By the forces of our demands, our determination and our numbers, we shall send a desegregated South into a thousand pieces, put them together in the image of God and Democracy. We must say wake up America, wake up! For we cannot stop, and we will not and cannot be patient."

This speech, which was significantly toned down, still showed the raw signs of the tinderbox of violence which was fermenting with demand for change at the time. There were competing forces for change. One side preached answering

violence with violence as called for by Mr. Lewis and other leaders like Malcolm X. Violence was also called for by White segregationists as shown by their vicious bombing on September 15, 1963 of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church. On the other side were the forces led by Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., which called for a nonviolent solution.

Were the White segregationists trying to ignite open warfare when they bombed the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church 18 days after the March on Washington on September 15, 1963? If they did, they misjudged the dedication and influence of Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. and his followers.

Reverend King led the country back from the abyss of civil war and gave his followers hope; and, in the end, he defused the call for a violent response. By his nonviolent approach he brought about real change. In the Civil War this country suffered 600,000 killed. One can only imagine the cost to this country if Reverend King had not stepped up to lead his country.

Some say there was no underlying support for violence because of knowledge by the Civil Rights Movement that the violence would not prevail. However, history shows that there have always been simmering forces necessary to support an armed rebellion.

3. History of Attempted Slave Rebellion.

Over the years a number of Slaves attempted to organize rebellions and fight back to obtain their freedom. There were a number of armed rebellions. No attempt by the writer of this paper was made to cover all the rebellions but only to use a few to show the character of the Slaves who led and participated in these armed rebellions. All of the attempts by Slaves to use force to break free from the Slave Owners ultimately were unsuccessful. But, in defeat, the Slaves demonstrated character that is contrary to the stereotype as depicted historically. Three examples are as follows:

a) Stono, South Carolina, September 29, 1739

Spain controlled Florida and in 1739 it had announced that any Slave who made it to Florida would be free. The Stono uprising started on Sunday, September 29, 1739, in Stono, South Carolina. Approximately twenty (20) Slaves led by a young Slave named Jemmy seized a store and armed themselves with firearms from the store. They then marched off with a banner declaring their freedom. With a drummer drumming as they marched, they attracted more Slaves to the rebellion. Their number grew to approximately ninety (90).

It was reported at the time that the Slaves stopped and were celebrating with drinking and drunken dancing in an open field when they were caught and attacked by the South Carolina Militia. The mounted Militia defeated the Slaves and many of the Slaves fled back to their owner's property, although a number still tried to reach Florida. Most of those fleeing for Florida were captured or killed.

The pivotal question is, why were the slaves in the field dancing immediately prior to the first encounter with the mounted Militia? A number of historians and academics have not accepted the theory that they were fleeing to Florida, got drunk, and were caught and killed or captured. These historians and academics claim the initial 20 Slaves were declaring war on their captors when they began the uprising on September 29, 1739. Facts that support this assertion are:

1. The leader of the rebellion was a young literate Slave named Jemmy who was from the Kongo, part of West Africa. It is understood that he probably was Catholic. The Kongo had converted to Catholicism in 1491. The other initial 20 Slaves were also from that part of West Africa, which was engaged in wars in which firearms were used. When warriors were captured, some were sold into Slavery and brought to this country.
2. In Africa, dancing was part of the warriors' preparation for battle, even after firearms were adopted.
3. When the South Carolina Militia on horseback charged the Slaves, the original 20 Slaves went into a close defensive position the same way the Africans did in battle in Africa.
4. All 20 of the original Slaves perished, as did 20 of the charging mounted Militia. The Militia then hunted down those who had fled the battle and another 24 Slaves died. These numbers do not suggest scared, uneducated, undisciplined men fleeing for their lives, getting drunk and dancing in celebration of their freedom when they were caught and killed or captured.
5. These casualty numbers are the numbers of men (at least the initial twenty), some of whom were trained as warriors and knew how to operate firearms, but were out gunned and outnumbered. They were fighting for their freedom and they had declared war on their captors. They did not wait until they reached Florida to declare their freedom; they declared their freedom in the banner they marched under to the beat of drums from the very beginning of the rebellion.
6. After identifying Jemmy as the leader of the Stono rebellion, the South Carolina authorities tried to ban the Slave trade from Africa and only rely on American born Slaves. The reason is apparent. They knew it was not just an

attempt to escape but was a rebellion led by a Christian African Warrior and they did not want it to be repeated; nor did they want it generally known that it was, in fact, a rebellion.

A student recently studied the question of whether the Slaves were fleeing or rebelling and he concluded as follows:

"If the original group had simply stolen away into the night, perhaps the search effort would have been less intense. Being a smaller group, perhaps they could actually have succeeded in their attempt to flee. They purposely chose not to pursue this course to freedom, however. Instead, starting with their actions in the store, they decided to turn the event into a true rebellion. They gave up all hope of quickly fleeing in an attempt to destroy the inhumane system that had made their lives unbearable.

Some might say that the rebels' intent is ultimately irrelevant in that it does not change the important events of the rebellion. However, this intent is important in truly understanding the participants at Stono. Accepting that the rebels consciously decided not to flee but rather attack the system of slavery in South Carolina changes one's entire concept of the slaves who took part in the insurrection.

*Contemporary accounts and modern scholarship always return to the theory that the slaves, ultimately, were attempting to flee their captors and simply fought against slavery in the process. **Envisioning the rebels as attempting an overthrow of their slaveholding society rather than fleeing from it places them in an entirely new context. They do not appear as slaves running in fear from their masters but rather as powerful individuals willing to risk their lives to overthrow the culture that had enslaved them. Understanding the slaves' intent to rebel presents them as in control of their own fate. Instead of fleeing from one European society to another, the slaves at Stono decided to no longer play by either of the societies' rules. The fact that the rebellion was ultimately unsuccessful is irrelevant. The slaves at Stono did succeed in gaining true autonomy for a short time as they made decisions based on their own desire to regain responsibility for their own lives.**"*

The student concluded the Slaves were rebelling; and, in doing so, were making a decision to be responsible for their own lives. During that period of time

after the initial attack on the store and their defeat by a superior military force in an open field in South Carolina they controlled their lives and they were free.

This all occurred in South Carolina 36 years prior to Patrick Henry declaring "Give me Liberty or give me Death" and the Battles of Lexington and Concord.

b) The Gabriel Prosser Slave Revolt in 1800 in Virginia.

The revolt was planned for August 30, 1800 but a violent thunderstorm accompanied with enormous rain made the bridge at Brook Swamp impassable and the revolt was delayed. This gave notice to the Slave owners and State forces under Governor James Monroe. The State of Virginia mobilized the Slave owners and brought a brutal end to the revolt before it was started. Gabriel Prosser, who led the revolt, was captured; and, with many others, sentenced to death.

c) Assessment of Attempted Slave Rebellion.

Herbert Aptheker in his book, American Negro Slave Revolts reported that:

At pages 222-224

Governor James Monroe personally interviewed **Gabriel Prosser**. Governor Monroe reported that **Gabriel Prosser** seemed to have made up his mind to die and to have resolved to say little on the subject of the conspiracy.

A resident of Richmond declared, in a letter of September 20, 1800;

"of those who had been executed, no one had betrayed his cause. They had uniformly met death with fortitude."

An Englishman, Robert Sutcliff, who had traveled in North America in the years 1804-1806 stated in his book about an incident in Virginia. The title of his book was, Travels in some part of North America in the Years 1804-1806.

At page 50

That on the afternoon of September 25, 1804:

"In the afternoon I passed by a field (near Richmond) in which several poor slaves had lately been executed, on the charge of having an intention to rise against their masters. A lawyer who was present at the trials at Richmond, informed me that on one of them being asked, what he had to say to the court on his defense, he replied, in a manly tone of voice: 'I have nothing more to offer than what General Washington would have had to offer, had he been

taken by the British and put to trial by them. I have adventured my life in endeavoring to obtain the liberty of my countrymen, and am a willing sacrifice in their cause; and I beg, as a favour, that I may be immediately led to execution. I know that you have pre-determined to shed my blood, why then all this mockery of a trial?"

Defiance of tyranny in the face of overpowering deadly force is a Spirit that has and is a major building block in the creation and maintaining of our "Shining City Upon a Hill."

a) Was this Spirit born on September 29, 1739, 36 years prior to the first battle for independence at Lexington and Concord? Was it born in an open field in South Carolina by a band of Ex-Slaves, led by a Christian African warrior named Jemmy, who had declared war on their captors to gain their independence?

b) Was this Spirit reaffirmed and nourished by an African Slave, at his trial, in 1804 in Virginia when he stated "*...he had nothing more to offer than what General George Washington would have had to offer, had he been taken by the British and put to trial by them...*" The Slave further stated as he awaited his punishment of death for his action to end the tyranny of his captors.

"I have adventured my life in endeavoring to obtain the liberty of my countryman, and am a willing sacrifice to their cause..."

Has any patriot or poet said it better and more clearly in the ensuing 200 plus years?

B. Assessment of The Civil Rights Movement.

The civil rights movement was led by and participated in by many people, each building on the success of those who went before. No attempt is made in the limited space in this paper to give credit to all who contributed and deserve credit. In the end, the force of nonviolence promoted and helped bring about the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Voting Rights Act of 1965. The focus here is on the person who introduced and engineered the non-violent approach, Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.

Reverend King gave Americans of African Descent hope and a plan to end legal segregation. He successfully demonstrated to his followers and the nation how to achieve his dream. In doing so, Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. became one of the most dynamic and important leaders in this nation's history. Reverend

King accomplished this without having the power of the Presidency or any other official office. He accomplished it as a citizen relying on his Christian training and beliefs and rights as a citizen under our Constitution. In doing so he accomplished more than any other American leader in avoiding violence while bringing overdue necessary change and an end to legal segregation. President Lincoln freed the slaves but it cost over 600,000 American lives. Reverend King brought an end to legal segregation with minimal loss of life and without the country going through the violence and turmoil that was being called for by persons and organizations less qualified to lead. Once legal segregation was ended it set the stage for the decline; and, hopefully, someday the end of de facto segregation.

It needs to be understood that Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. is not just a great leader to the Americans of African Descent, but to the entire nation. He peacefully brought an end to legal segregation, saving the rest of the country the extreme turmoil and violence which would have occurred; and which, in all likelihood, would have altered history to our detriment.

One cannot fully examine Reverend King's successes without also noting the underlying forces in our society which require very close vigilance in the future. **Reverend King, in more ways than one, has demonstrated that this nation needs, at all times, to be a nation of laws and not a nation of men.** This is best shown by events and active action taken against him by men at the highest levels of power in our nation.

In What Would Martin Say by Clarence B. Jones and Joel Engel the authors stated:

At page 199

*"It's now well-known that the FBI unilaterally expanded its authority by hiding microphones in Martin's hotel rooms, hoping to catch him in recorded behavior that could be used, Hoover must've hoped, to discredit him as leader of the Movement. **Indeed, the bureau sent a copy of one tape to Martin along with a note that indicated it would be made public unless Martin — what follows is not a misprint — committed suicide.**"*

See also Taylor Branch's book America in the King Years 1963-1965 pages 555-556. The group, composed of Abernathy, Andrew Yong, Joseph Lowry, Bernard Lee and Reverend King, reviewed the tapes and package it came in.

"The group interpretation was unanimous: the package came from Hoover's FBI, with a letter demanding that king commit suicide before Oslo or be exposed with the 'highlights' tape."

Reverend King was scheduled to receive the Nobel Peace Prize in Norway 32 days after the tape and suicide letter were delivered to his home. The letter gave him 32 days to kill himself.

Why would the Director of the FBI want to force Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. to kill himself? Director Hoover and the FBI apparently felt they had sufficient evidence that showed that Reverend King was a Communist and was working against the vital interest of America.

The FBI wanted him to die but the Constitution stopped them from killing him themselves. If they could have killed Reverend King, what would have happened to those who would have stepped up to fill his position; namely, Ralph S. Abernathy, Andrew Young, Joseph Lowery, John Lewis, Hosea Williams, Jesse Jackson, Bernard Lee and others?

1. African Americans or Americans of African Descent.

The term, "African American," is currently used by many people to identify Americans who have any African ancestors. An example is shown by the President of the United States who holds himself out as an "African American," not "American" or "African English American" or "American with African Ancestors" or "American of African Descent." President Obama is reported to have responded on his census form that he was not multiracial but was African American. President Obama made the following statement on April 26, 2010:

"It will be up to each of you to make sure that the young people, African Americans, Latino and Women who powered our victory in 2008 stand together once again."

The use of this phrase is relatively new coming after President Johnson's statement at the signing of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, President Johnson stated:

"Thus, this is a victory for the freedom of the American Negro"

The initial origin of the phrase "African American" is addressed by Harvard Professor Randall Kennedy in his book, Sellout. Professor Kennedy states "Many champions of black advancement however have also become devotees of the one-drop rule (bereft of course, of its white supremacist intention)". Professor

Kennedy further quoted what Professor Christine B. Hickman of the University of Minnesota Law School wrote concerning the "one-drop rule" at page 14:

*"The Devil fashioned [the one-drop rule] out of racism, malice, greed, lust and ignorance, but in doing so he also accomplished good: **His rule created the African-American race** as we know it today, and while this race had its origins in the peoples of three continents and its members can look very different from one another, over the centuries the Devil's one-drop rule united this race as a people in the fight against slavery, segregation and racial injustice."*

Professor Kennedy further said:

"Long denounced as a method for protecting whites against the taint of Negro blood, the one-drop rule is now embraced by some devotees of black unity as a way of reinforcing solidarity and discouraging exit by "blacks" who might otherwise prefer to reinvent themselves racially."

Professor Hickman embraces the one-drop rule (if you have one drop of African blood, you are an African American) saying it is "accomplishing good."

To take this position that it is "accomplishing some good" is to march under the cloak of what Dr. Hickman herself calls the "*Devil's one-drop Rule*" fashioned by the Devil "...out of racism, malice, greed, lust and ignorance..." This position is consistent with a philosophy of those who only see evil through a standard that approves of everything that makes them look like victims. They need and morally demand that guilt be attached to their enemies and that anything that aids their position, even if it is evil, is now a virtue and is "good."

Slaves and their descendants were in this Country many years prior to a majority of the forefathers of many Europeans and other Regions. In the year 1790, 19.4% of the total population of this country was from Africa (primarily West Africa). Presently, most Americans are of a mixed heritage: English, African, Irish, German, French, Jewish, Italian, Spanish, Mid-Eastern, Hispanic, Dutch, Asian, etc. Initially, if you were from another country, you may have been called African American, Italian American, and Irish American and, etc. Traditionally the first generation born in this Country is called an American. If an American is of English and German heritage he is not referred to as English German American, but rather as an American. But if one of his children has a child with an American of African Descent, then many politicians and some academics will refer to the child as an African American. At some point everyone

will be an African American, which will be to the benefit of which political party? Could this be why our President calls for people to vote for him because they are African Americans?

The Americans of African Descent will have to determine why President Obama and others, like Professor Hickman, champion the use of the phrase, "African American."

Our President is not the first person or government to try to use the historic mistreatment of the Africans, their descendants, and other minorities for their political benefit. In the Revolutionary War, the British offered Slaves freedom and other benefits if they would fight with the British against the American Revolution. Some Slaves joined the British, most to their detriment, but the numbers were small when you consider the size of the Slave population at the time. In response to the British's actions, including the attempt to turn the Slaves and Indians against America, Thomas Paine responded in "Common Sense". In doing so he addressed the issue of trying to influence the Slaves (Americans of African Descent) to only consider their immediate self-interest and not work for the better good of their country.

He stated in "Common Sense" at page 27:

"If we omit it now, some Massanello may hereafter arise, who laying hold of popular disquietudes, may collect together the desperate and the discontented, and by assuming to themselves the powers of government, may sweep away the liberties of the continent like a deluge."

Thomas Paine went on to say in referring to the British:

"...the British, barbarous and hellish power, which hath stirred up the Indians and Negroes to destroy us; the cruelty hath a double guilt, it is dealing brutally by use, and treacherously by them."

It is understood that Thomas Paine's reference to "Massanello" was to Thomas Anello, a fisherman of Naples, who spirited up his countrymen in the public market place, against the oppression of the Spaniards, to whom the place was then subject. Massanello prompted his countryman to revolt, and in the space of a day became King. This nation (America) is not subject to oppression of a similar oppressive power or force unless you consider this Nation's Constitution and Bill of Rights as an oppressive restriction on the rights of the Government to care for and provide certain benefits to the people.

Do we have someone who is "laying hold of popular disquietudes?" Do we have a "Massanello" among us?

2. Examples of Individual Leaders.

In making this decision it is suggested that Americans of African Descent look for guidance from persons other than politicians and academics. Look to those who have distinguished themselves, not as victims, but by what they have attempted and what they have accomplished. Limits of space dictate that only a couple of examples can be listed here. The use of the examples of Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., William H. (Bill) Cosby, and Dr. Benjamin Carson does not suggest that they agreed or agree with the political conclusion of this paper, but only to restate their written opinion and statement of the phrase "African American."

a) Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.

Reverend King had used the phrase "Afro-American in "Where do we go from here: Chaos or Community?" to compare the two cultures. He did not use it to suggest maintaining separate races or entities. Reverend King used it to state the fact that our cultures, African and Western, have blended together. See page 588 of "A Testament of Hope" a book of collections of writings of Martin Luther King, Jr. edited by James M. Washington.

Reverend King, on the question of the relationship of Africa's Descendants in America, stated in the book, A Testament of Hope at page 588:

*"But we are also Americans. Abused and scorned though we may be, our destiny is tied up with the destiny of America. **In spite of the psychological appeals of identification with Africa, the Negro must face the fact that America is now his home, a home that he helped to build through 'blood, sweat and tears.'** Since we are Americans the solution to our problem will not come through seeking to build a separate black nation within a nation, but by finding that creative minority of the concerned from the oftentimes apathetic majority, and **together** moving toward that colorless power that we all need for security and justice.*

*In the first century B.C., Cicero said: 'Freedom is participation in power.' Negroes should never want all power because they would deprive others of their freedom. By the same token, Negroes can never be content without participation in power. **America must be a nation in which its multiracial people are partners in power. This is***

the essence of democracy toward which all Negro struggles have been directed since the distant past when he was transplanted here in chains."

b) William H. (Bill) Cosby

in an E-mail posted on February 25, 2010. Mr. Cosby stated in part:

"... We are not Africans. Those people are not Africans; they don't know a thing about Africa.

I say this all of the time. It would be like white people saying they were European-American. That is totally stupid.

I was born here, and so were my parents and grandparents and, very likely great grandparents. I don't have any connection to Africa, no more than white Americans have to Germany, Scotland, England, Ireland, or the Netherlands. The same applies to 99 percent of all the black Americans as regards to Africa."

c) Dr. Benjamin Carson

is the Director of Pediatric Neurosurgery at Johns Hopkins Medical Institute and an author, lecturer and public speaker. When he was appointed Director of Pediatric Neurosurgery he was the youngest, at age thirty three (33), to ever hold that position at Johns Hopkins. He gained worldwide recognition for his role in the first successful separation of Siamese twins joined at the back of the head. He also made many advances in pediatric Neurosurgery, including a procedure known as hemispherectomy where he gave children a second chance of life by removing part of their brain. At this Country's 200th anniversary the Library of Congress named him one of the eighty-nine living American legends. Dr. Carson is an American of African Descent who was raised in the inner-city of Detroit by his mother, who only had a third grade education. Dr. Carson's success was not given to him. His mother gave him the opportunity and motivation. He then earned it based on his individual efforts and performance in the field of Pediatric Neurosurgery, lecturing, public speaking, and writing. Success was not given to him and he never claimed it should be.

Dr. Carson stated in one of his books The Big Picture:

at page 176

"Because America's Diversity is so unique, we have much to gain by viewing that diversity as strength. We probably have more to gain in that way than any nation on earth. By the same token, if we continue to allow people with small minds to make diversity into a problem we have more to lose than any other people in the world.

It was once a matter of national pride for Americans to call our country a 'melting pot.' We pay homage to that part of our history in the inspiring national memorial we have created at Ellis Island, where millions of immigrants landed with nothing more than hopes and dreams in their hearts and what few possessions they could carry on their backs. I am well aware that during that era, many people were not truly integrated (literally or figuratively) into the "pot" because we were not all viewed as equally important ingredients of that uniquely American blend. That was unfortunate and wrong. Those old racist attitudes divided and weakened us all.

But new racist attitudes, sometimes disguised as racial and ethnic pride, can divide and weaken us as well. I know of no other nation on earth whose people describe and divide themselves into so many different cliques, so much so that few of us even consider ourselves 'American' anymore. It is more 'politically correct' to say we are Irish-Americans, German-Americans, African-Americans, Mexican-Americans, Japanese-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, Chinese-Americans, Italian-Americans, or some other brand-Americans. If we are not careful we may fragment and hyphenate ourselves into oblivion."

Why are Political leaders using the phrase "African American"? Why not use the phrase "Americans of African Descent?" or "Americans with African Ancestors?"

If this characterization of "African American" is accepted by Americans of African Descent, then the President and other politicians can continue to ask that a person vote for them because he/she is an "African American." Why does the President of the United States use this phrase in his call for mobilization of those who "powered" him to victory in 2008? Does this action by the President decrease or increase racial tension? Who will benefit in 2012 and future elections by an increase in racial, economic and class tension?

It is suggested that one give some thought to what the Spanish officer in the Spanish American War said when he was complimenting the fighting

ability of the American Negro troops. He did not call them "African Americans" he referred to them as "American Negro." But then again he was not a politician running for election.

V. Present Status of Religious Beliefs of Population of the United States Including Americans of African Descent.

A. U.S. Religions Landscape Survey by the Pew Foundation in 2007.

An example of the assimilation of Africans into American Christianity was recently set out at "The Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life." Americans of African Descent are referred to in the Pew Survey as African Americans; and, to avoid confusion, when referring to the Pew Survey the writer will use the phrase African Americans. In an analysis dated January 30, 2009 it was stated, relying on a U.S. Religious Landscape Survey concluded in 2007 by the Pew Foundation, that:

at page 1

"... While the U.S. is generally considered a highly religious nation, African-Americans are markedly more religious on a variety of measures than the U.S. population as a whole, including level of affiliation with a religion, attendance at religious services, frequency of prayer and religion's importance in life. Compared with other racial and ethnic groups, African-Americans are among the most likely to report a formal religious affiliation, with fully 87% of African Americans describing themselves as belonging to one religious group or another."

"... The Landscape Survey also finds that nearly eight-in-ten African-Americans (79%) say religion is very important in their lives, compared with 56% among all U.S. adults, ... Additionally, several measures illustrate the distinctiveness of the black community when it comes to religious practices and beliefs. More than half of the African-Americans (53%) report attending religious services at least once a week, more than three-in-four (76%) say they pray on at least a daily basis and nearly nine-in-ten (88%) indicate they are absolutely certain that God exists."

At page 6

"African-Americans are more likely to believe in God with absolute certainty (88% vs. 71% among the total population)."

The Landscape Survey in 2007 further showed the following: (Footnotes added in italics to clarify). Group (1) African American U.S. population. Group (2) Total U.S. population.

Group (1) Group (2)

Religious Composition of African-Americans	(1) African- Americans %	(2) Total Pop %
Protestant	78	51
Historically black churches	59	7
Baptist	40	4
Methodist	5	1
Pentecostal	6	1
Holiness	1	<5
Nondenominational	2	<5
Others	5	1
Evangelical Protestant Churches	15	26
Baptist	5	11
Nondenominational	3	3
Pentecostal	2	3
Restorationist	2	2
Others	5	1
Mainline Protestant churches	4	10
Catholic	5	24
Mormon	<.5	2
Orthodox	<.5	1
Jehovah's Witness	1	1
Other Christian	<.5	<.5
Jewish	<.5	2
Muslim	1	1
Buddhist	<.5	1
Hindu	<.5	<.5
Other World Religions	<.5	<.5
Other Faiths	<.5	1
Unaffiliated	12	16
Atheist	<.5	2
Agnostic	1	2

Nothing in particular	11	12
Don't Know	1	1
	100	100
Source: Pew Forum U.S. Religious Landscape Survey. Conducted in 2007, released in 2008		

Where is the Church that President Obama attended for twenty (20) years in these numbers? Stephan Thernstrom and Abigail Thernstrom stated in an article titled "Examining the United Church of Christ" as reported on line "Real Clear Politics:"

"Most black churchgoers belong to congregations that are overwhelmingly African-Americans and are affiliated with one of the historically black religious denominations such as the African Methodist Episcopal Church (AME) or the National Baptist Convention. Rev. Wright's Trinity Church, on the other hand, is a predominantly black branch of a white denomination that is not part of 'the African-American religious tradition'. The United Church of Christ...has a little over a million members; a mere 4 percent of them are black, fewer than 50,000 blacks in the entire nation worship at a UCC church."

The United Church of Christ is the only Christian Church which has, and still does, as a Church Policy, support abortion. Pew Forum: Religious Groups' Official Position on Abortion. September 30, 2008.

Why did 88% of the adult population of Americans of African Descent respond in the survey in 2007 that they are absolutely certain that God exists as opposed to 71% of the total population? Why did 79% of African Americans' adult population say religion is very important in their lives as opposed to 56% of the total adult population?

It is suggested that Americans of African Descent, in their journey from Slavery to the present time, have observed that; in fact, evil does exist. If evil exists they are absolutely certain that God exists, otherwise they must stand alone against the evil that they have experienced in this country in their journey from the docks of Charleston, South Carolina up until the present time.

B. Was the formation of this Nation based on Religious Christian principles and beliefs?

Many in this country question and some deny that this nation was formed on religious Christian principals and beliefs. Many of these people also deny that a God-Creator exists. These persons also maintain that, if a God-Creator did and does exist, they would be able to understand his being and they have not received sufficient proof. (If there is a Universal Creator they, as those created, would be able to understand their Creator.) Apparently the "Audacity" of this belief has not been accepted by 88% of the Americans of African Descent.

When people say this nation was created as a Christian nation, it is not to say that Christianity is the official religion of the nation. People are simply saying most of the people who originally settled here were Christian. The various States, therefore, adopted Christian principles and beliefs in establishing the laws by which to be governed. This included the Common Law of England. The Common Law of England was adopted by all of the original thirteen (13) Colonies. The Common Law includes equitable principals from the Ecclesiastic Courts of the Church of England.

An example of the Common Law, which includes religious Christian principles as being part of the fabric of this Nation, is set out in the following two Supreme Court Cases. The case of Vidal v. Girard's Executors 43.U.S. 127 (1844), which considered a matter under the Pennsylvania laws and constitution.

In an opinion by Justice Story, the Supreme Court made certain finding of fact that supported the proposition that the nation was founded on Christian principles. The Court found and stated on page 198:

"So that we are compelled to admit that although Christianity be part of the common law of the State, yet it is so in a qualified sense..."

The Court went on to define "*appropriate qualifications.*"

"It is also said, and truly, that the Christian religion is a part of the Common Law of Pennsylvania. But this proposition is to be received with its appropriate qualifications, and in connection with the bill of rights of that state, as found in its Constitution of government. The Constitution of 1790 (and the like provision will, in substance, be found in the Constitution of 1776, and in the existing Constitution of 1838), expressly declares, 'that all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; no man can of right be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry against his consent; no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience, and no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishment or modes of worship.'"

Church of the Holy Trinity v. United States, 143 U.S. 457 (1892), The Supreme Court 48 years later in 1892 referred to the Vidal case and cited its words:

"It is also said, and truly, that the Christian religion is a part of the common law of Pennsylvania."

The Supreme Court at pages 467- 468 construed the meaning of parts of the Declaration of Independence when it stated:

"Coming nearer to the present time, the declaration of independence recognizes the presence of the Divine in human affairs in these words:

'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness....We, therefore, the Representatives of the United states of America, in General Congress, Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name and by Authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare,' ... 'and for the [143 U.S. 468] support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the Protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred Honor.'

"If we examine the constitution of the various states, we find in them a constant recognition of religious obligations. Every constitution of every one of the 44 states contains language which, either directly or by clear implication, recognizes a profound reverence for religion, and an assumption that its influence in all human affairs is essential to the well-being of the community."

If the current Christian religion was claimed to be intolerant and aggressive to the existence of other religions or atheists, one could see a reason to try and declare this nation was not formed on religious Christian principles.

C. Are We Still A Christian Nation?

The President of the United States on April 6, 2009 stated in a speech while on a Presidential trip to Turkey that *"One of the great strengths of the United States is ... we have a very large Christian population – we do not consider ourselves a Christian nation or a Jewish nation or a Muslim nation. We consider ourselves a nation of citizens who are bound by ideals and a set of values."*

The President of the United States then stated on June 1, 2009 in an interview with a French T.V. correspondent prior to his trip to Egypt that America was *"...one of the largest Muslim Countries in the world."*

Notwithstanding what politicians say or imply, when this Country was formed it was formed as a Christian nation. A statement of what this country was based on was made by U.S. Supreme Court Justice David J. Brewer. Justice Brewer wrote the majority opinion in Church of the Holy Trinity v. United States, supra. He stated in his book, The United States a Christian Nation published in 1905 as follows:

"[I]n what sense can [America] be called a Christian nation? Not in the sense that Christianity is the established religion or that the people are in any manner compelled to support it. On the contrary, the Constitution specifically provides that 'Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' Neither is it Christian in the sense that all its citizens are either in fact or name Christian. On the contrary, all religions have free scope within our borders. Numbers of our people profess other religions and many reject all. Nor is it Christian in the sense that a profession of Christianity is a condition of holding office or otherwise engaging in public service, or essential to recognition either politically or socially. In fact, the government as a legal organization is independent of all religions. Nevertheless, we constantly

Speak of this republic as a Christian nation – in fact, as the leading Christian nation of the world."

Someone may want to advise the President that, when this country was founded, all of its citizens were not Christians and today all the citizens are not expected to be Christians. We were not a Jewish Nation, Muslim Nation, Buddhist Nation, Hindu Nation or a Nation of nonbelievers in 1776 or on April 6, 2009. We were and still are a nation founded on Christian principles and ideals.

A survey, American Religious Identification Survey of 2008, by Barry A. Kosmas and Ariel Keycard, principal investigators, concluded that the percentage of Christians in this country is declining.

Regardless of what some political leaders want to do, they cannot declare and announce to the world that Americans do not consider ourselves a Christian nation on the basis that the percentage of Christians in this country is declining. Our laws, Constitution, Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights are founded on Christian principles, and those do not change because of a population change. These documents include the Christian principles of "forgiveness and tolerance." Therefore, our leaders should not call for the citizens to be intolerant and unforgiving without them experiencing guilt for violating this country's principles. Intolerance and lack of forgiveness may be part of the leaders' principles but they are not in America's principles.

Someone may want to explain to our President that the Declaration of Independence, Constitution and the Bill of Rights are the foundations that reflect the principles upon which this nation was founded, built and developed. The Declaration of Independence cannot be changed and the method of modifying the Constitution is set out in the Constitution. Unless the President believes that the principles set out in these documents have been changed, his declaration that "Americans do not consider ourselves a Christian nation" is not accurate.

Will the leaders of the Churches of the Americans of African Descent support the President, who on April 6, 2009 announced to the world that "*One of the great strengths of the United States is ... we have a very large Christian population –we do not consider ourselves a Christian nation or a Jewish nation or a Muslim nation. We consider ourselves a nation of citizens who are bound by ideals and a set of values.*" **Or will these religious leaders stand up and ask our President if he believes this country's "ideals and values" are not based on "Christian ideals and values?"**

If President Obama does not believe this country's "ideals and values" are based on "Christian ideals and values," then ask him what he believes they are based on? Do you think anyone will ask?

The American Religious Identification Survey of 2008 showed a drop of the percentage of Christians in this country from 86.2% in 1990 to 76.7% in 2001 and 76.0% in 2008. The drop of 10% in 18 years is significant; and, unless there is an awakening by the public; specifically, our churches, of where our political leaders are trying to take this nation, the President may be able, at some time in the future, to tell the world that he and his followers have changed the Constitution and America is no longer a nation based on Christian principles.

He may then be able to say about America that *now* "... we do not consider ourselves a Christian nation." If an awakening is to occur, what group is in the best position, based on their beliefs, to stand up for Christianity? It would be that group in which 88% of the people are absolutely certain that God exists.

The President's statement on June 1, 2009 to an international journalist that "America was one of the largest Muslim countries in the world" is insulting to the Muslim countries and the American people.

What would the Founding Fathers say if they were told that an American President would announce to the world that "America was one of the largest Muslim countries in the world?"

A number of persons who are not Christian have stated they are glad this Country is a Christian nation based on Christian principles. The reason they gave was these principles guarantee that they will have the freedom to worship their own religion.

Jeff Jacoby, a Jewish columnist at the Boston Globe explains:

"This is a Christian country – it was founded by Christians and built on broad Christian principles. Threatening: far from it. It is in precisely this Christian country that Jews have known the most peaceful, prosperous, and successful existence in their long history."

Dennis Prager, a Jewish national columnist and popular talk show host, warns:

"If America abandons its Judeo-Christian values basis and the central role of the Jewish and Christian Bibles (its Founders' guiding test), we are all in big trouble, including, most especially, America's non-Christians. Just ask the Jew of secular Europe. Too many Americans do not appreciate the connection between American greatness and American Christianity."

Orthodox Rabbi Daniel Lapin of the Jewish Policy Center unequivocally declares:

"[I] understand that I live...in a Christian nation, albeit one where I can follow my faith as long as it doesn't conflict with the nation's principles. The same option is open to all Americans and will be available only as long as this nation's Christian roots are acknowledged and honored."

In fact, with foreboding, he warns:

"Without a vibrant and vital Christianity, America is doomed, and without America, the west is doomed. Which is why I, an Orthodox Jewish rabbi, devoted to Jewish survival, the Torah, and Israel am so terrified of American Christianity caving in. God help Jews if America ever becomes a post-Christian society! Just think of Europe!"

What would Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. say if he were told on April 3, 1968, the date of his *"I've Been To The Mountain Top"* speech where he stated that God (his Christian God) had allowed him to see the *"promised land,"* that 41 years later the President of the United States stated to the world *"America was one of the largest Muslim countries in the World."*

-NOW-

VI. Will the leaders of the Churches and Civil Rights leaders continue to remain silent on President Obama's past & current position on abortion, late term abortion and infanticide?

In 1966 Planned Parenthood gave the first Margaret Sanger Award to Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. Planned Parenthood in 1966 was a strong supporter of "Birth Control." Planned Parenthood did not support "Abortion." This is shown in its Planned Parenthood Pamphlet dated August 1963, page 1.

"Is birth control abortion? Definitely not. An abortion kills the life of a baby after it has begun. It is dangerous to your life and health. It may make you sterile so that when you want a child you cannot have it. Birth control merely postpones the beginning of life." "Is Birth Control Abortion"
Planned Parenthood Pamphlet, August 1963, p. 1.

Would any Church Leader or Civil Rights Leader in 2007 ever claim that Reverend King supported abortion? It would be unheard of and it would be expected that Churches and Civil Rights Leaders would lead the denial to protect the name and reputation of Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. The first point they would rely on was that you could not perform legal abortions in this country until 1973 when Roe v. Wade was decided by the Supreme Court. This is five (5) years after Reverend King died on April 4, 1968. Second, there is no written document in which Reverend King spoke favorably of or supported abortion or any person who says he heard Reverend King support abortion. Third, Reverend King specifically addressed the question of "infanticide" in his letter from the Birmingham Jail dated April 16, 1963 wherein he stated it was evil to allow a baby who was born alive to be put to death or be neglected and allowed to die. Specifically, Reverend King stated:

"...But the Christians pressed on in the conviction that they were 'a colony of heaven' called to obey God rather than man. Small in number they were big in commitment. They were too God-intoxicated to be 'astronomically intimidated.' By their effort and example they brought an end to such ancient evils as infanticide."

Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. did not support abortion and every national politician, minister and especially ministers of Black Churches and Civil Rights Leaders knew he did not support abortion, late term abortion or infanticide.

In addition, in 1966, when the award was given to Reverend King it was not publicly known that the person who had formed Planned Parenthood, Margaret Sanger, was a eugenicist who believed in purifying the races. Furthermore, in 1939 she had also created the "Negro Project" in the Birth Control Federation of America (BCFA). The project's objective was the restriction of Negro births, thus restricting the Negro population. Was she a racist? Before you can say a person is a racist you need to be able to prove it. There appears to be a difference of opinion, which would take too much space to answer and document in this paper. It is sufficient to state she was not a friend of the Negroes and a window into her objectives is shown by a documented letter Margaret Sanger sent to Dr. Clarence Gamble of Milton, Massachusetts on December 19, 1939. Dr. Gambler was one of the financial backers of the birth control movement.

"We would hire three or four colored ministers, preferably with social-service backgrounds, and with engaging personalities. The most successful educational approach to the Negro is through a religious appeal. We don't want the word to go out that we want to exterminate the Negro population, and the minister is the man who can straighten out that idea if it ever occurs to any of their more rebellious members."

No leader of Americans of African Descent, Civil Rights Leader, Minister or Political Leader would want to be associated with Margaret Sanger after they became aware of her plans and actions against the Negro population in America.

There is one exception: President Barack Obama.

President Barack Obama spoke on July 17, 2007 as a candidate for President of the United States before a Planned Parenthood Foundation Fund Raiser. President Obama had been under attack for his action as an Illinois State Senator in not only supporting abortion, late term abortion and infanticide; but actively working and using his power as a State Senator in support of abortions. He had used his power as a State Senator to stop legislation which would have allowed people to give medical aid to a child born alive after an unsuccessful attempt of a late term abortion, specifically after they failed to kill the child.

President Obama on July 17, 2007 in addressing the Planned Parenthood Action Fund stated:

"In 1966, the Planned Parenthood Federation of America gave its first Margaret Sanger Award to Martin Luther King, Jr. And in his acceptance speech, which was delivered by his strong and wonderful wife, Coretta, Dr.

King wrote, "Our sure beginning in the struggle for equality by non-violent, direct action may not have been so resolute without the tradition established by Margaret Sanger and people like her."

The statement in bold is the words of Reverend King as stated by his wife Coretta King in **1966** at the time of the presentation of the award. Candidate Obama in **2007** repeated these words of Dr. King forty-one years later in his campaign to become President in a speech before Planned Parenthood.

President Obama took the words of Dr. King and used them in his speech but in another context that supported President Obama's and Planned Parenthood's position on abortion, late term abortion and infanticide. President Obama stated:

" That struggle for equality is not over and now we are at one of those rare moments where we can actually transform our politics in a fundamental way. But it is going to take people as resolute as Mrs. Sanger and Dr. King — ... people like your own Cecile Richards — it's going to take young people like Ariana."

It is not known what Cecile Richards or Ariana had done to be included in the same category as Dr. King but it is known who Margaret Sanger was and for what she stood.

President Obama had the audacity to quote Dr. King's words, which Reverend King had used to lead the Civil Rights Movement in the 1950's and 1960's "... *the struggle for equality by non-violent, direct action...*" in support of his (President Obama's) and Planned Parenthood's record on abortion, late term abortion and infanticide.

President Obama did this fully knowing what he had actively done regarding abortion, late term abortion and infanticide in the Illinois Senate and what Planned Parenthood had done; Planned Parenthood was one of the leading abortion providers in the country. Planned Parenthood's record on abortions was: year 2005 - 264,963 abortions; year 2006 - 289,250 abortions and year 2007 - 305,310 abortions.

Examples of what President Obama had actively done while he was a State Senator in the Illinois Senate are as follows. He was faced with proposed legislation of what could be done to save the life of a child who had survived an attempted late term abortion and had been born alive. He opposed three legislative bills that would have given that child the right to receive medical care if the parents did not intervene to obtain care. As Nurse Jill Stanek stated, these children were

left to die normally by suffocation because they were premature and could not breathe properly without medical attention. Some of these children, if the parents did not want to hold them, were placed in out of the way places to die unattended. The time period was an average of half an hour to one and a half hours. In the example she gave, the child lived for only 30 minutes. She could do nothing but hold the child. Senator Obama had acted to prevent passage of the law which would have given the child the right to live. State Senator Obama in 2001, 2002 and 2003 opposed the bills in a number of ways; including by voting present, by speaking against them as a Constitutional law Professor, and by letting one bill die in his committee because of lack of action. When this same type of legislation came up before the U. S. Congress in 2002 it was passed in July and was signed into law on August 5, 2002. In the Senate the vote was 98-0 with no Senator dissenting. What Senator Obama objected to, the U. S. Senate passed 98-0.

What the U.S. Senate said (98 to 0) was legally, morally and ethically wrong State Senator Obama said was not wrong and he worked as a State Senator to allow the practice to continue.

Someone may want to remind President Obama that an abortion is "violent" and there is no way the words of Dr. King, asking for "non-violence", can be used to support President Obama's and Planned Parenthood's position on abortion, late term abortion and infanticide. In dealing with "infanticide" we are dealing with babies who were born alive as a result of a failed attempt to kill them and forced to die without any care.

In the speech, President Obama was claiming to promote himself; and, by implication, cleanse himself because he stands before Planned Parenthood and the world with such men as Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. and his wife, Coretta King. Specifically, this man who is now our President tells the world regarding the future success of Planned Parenthood in the year 2007, "...*But it's going to take people as resolute as Mrs. Sanger and Dr. King...*" President Obama puts Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., one of America's truly great leaders, on the same moral standard as Margaret Sanger and Planned Parenthood in the year 2007. Planned Parenthood had in the year 2007 performed 305,310 abortions and President Obama had contributed to, if not caused, the defeat of legislation in Illinois that would have protected children born as a result of a failed abortion.

For President Obama to do this in the year 2007, when everyone knew who Margaret Sanger was, is beyond audacity and beyond description and it gives one an open window into the mind and soul of President Obama and what he will do to promote himself and his causes.

President Obama further stated in his speech before Planned Parenthood on July 17, 2007:

"I have worked on these issues for decades now. I put Roe at the center of my lesson plan on reproductive freedom when I taught Constitutional Law. Not simply as a case about privacy but as part of the broader struggle for women's equality. Steve and Pam will tell you that we fought together in the Illinois State Senate against restrictive choice legislation-law just like the federal abortion laws, the federal abortion bans that are cropping up. I've stood up for the freedom of choice in the United States Senate ...

So, you know where I stand"

President Obama further stated:

'There will always be people, many of goodwill, who do not share my view on the issue of choice. On this fundamental issue, I will not yield and Planned Parenthood will not yield.'

Remember that Planned Parenthood is for abortion, late term abortion and refusal to aid a baby born in a failed attempt of abortion (infanticide) and President Obama stated:

"I will not yield and Planned Parenthood will not yield."

Will President Obama try and distance himself from his record on abortion, particularly late term and partial birth abortion and infanticide?

How long do you think it would take for President Obama to start changing the position he stated in his speech before Planned Parenthood on July 17, 2007?

It took less than three (3) months.

The New York Times Blog, [The Caucus](#), reported a speech by President Obama on October 6, 2007 in New Hampton, Iowa – They report he said:

"Now, this is one of those areas – again, I think it's important to be honest – where I don't think you're ever going to get a complete agreement on this issue. If you believe that life begins at conception, then I can't change your mind. I think there is a large agreement, for example, that late-term abortions are really problematic and there should be a regulation. And it should only happen in terms of the

mother's life or severe health consequences, so I think there is broad agreement on these issues."

President Obama is reported by Lifenews.com on April 27, 2008 to have said in an interview with FOX News Sunday:

"On an issue like partial-birth abortion, I strongly believe that the state can properly restrict late-term abortions. I have said so repeatedly. All I've said is we should have a provision to protect the health of the mother, and many of the bills that came before me didn't have that."

To clearly see what the President is saying one needs to understand that a partial birth abortion is a late term abortion except the method of ending the fetal life is done different. The Supreme Court in Gonzales v. Carhart, 550 U.S. 124 (April 18, 2007) stated the difference in the Syllabus:

"Congress passed the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003 (Act) to proscribe a particular method of ending fetal life in the later stages of pregnancy. The Act does not regulate the most common abortion procedures used in the first trimester of pregnancy, when the vast majority of abortions take place. In the usual second-trimester procedure, 'dilation and evacuation' (D&E), the doctor dilates the cervix and then inserts surgical instruments into the uterus and maneuvers them to grab the fetus and pull it back through the cervix and vagina. The fetus is usually ripped apart as it is removed, and the doctor may take 10 to 15 passes to remove it in its entirety. The procedure that prompted the federal Act and various state statutes, including Nebraska's, is a variation of the standard D&E, and is herein referred to as "intact D&E." The main difference between the two procedures is that in intact D&E a doctor extracts the fetus intact or largely intact with only a few passes, pulling out its entire body instead of ripping it apart. In order to allow the head to pass through the cervix, the doctor typically pierces or crushes the skull."

Justice Kennedy in his opinion stated a description of a partial birth abortion:

"Here is another description from a nurse who witnessed the same method performed on a 26 1/2 -week fetus and who testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee:

'Dr. Haskell went in with forceps and grabbed the baby's legs and pulled them down into the birth canal. Then he delivered the baby's body and the arms—everything but the head. The doctor kept the head right inside the uterus...'

'The baby's little fingers were clasping and unclasping, and his little feet were kicking. Then the doctor stuck the scissors in the back of his head, and the baby's arms jerked out, like a startle reaction, like a flinch, like a baby does when he thinks he is going to fall'

'The doctor opened up the scissors, stuck a high—powered suction tube into the opening, and sucked the baby's brains out. Now the baby went completely limp...'

'He cut the umbilical cord and delivered the placenta. He threw the baby into a pan, along with the placenta and the instruments he had just used.' "

To see where President Obama stands on later term abortions one needs to look to his prior action, not his words alone. Three times President Obama opposed laws in the Illinois Senate that would have protected a child born alive as a result of a failed late term abortion. At the time, President Obama opposed the legislation because he said it could cause the fetus to be considered a child which would then be used to restrict all abortions. President Obama is now saying he was only opposed to laws that restrict late term abortions because the laws do not protect the health of the mother. On this point one may want to review what President Obama stated in his speech before Planned Parenthood on July 17, 2007:

"I have worked on these issues for decades now, I put Roe at the center of my lesson plan on reproductive freedom when I taught Constitutional Law. Not simply as a case about privacy but as part of the broader struggle for women's equality. Steve and Pam will tell you that we fought together in Illinois State Senate against restrictive choice legislation-law just like the federal abortion laws, the federal abortion bans that are cropping up. I've stood up for the freedom of choice in the United States Senate

So, you know where I stand...

I will not yield and Planned Parenthood will not yield..."

Does anyone believe President Obama when he says he is only concerned about the mother's protection and that is the reason he opposed any restriction on

late term abortions? In Illinois he opposed three legislative bills over a period of years that would have given a child the right to receive medical care if the parents did not intervene to obtain care.

His stated reason then was if you protected the child of an attempted but failed abortion then this could lead to a restriction on all abortions.

The child was already born and had to be born for the legislative act to come into effect. The mother's health was not involved in any of the three pieces of legislation that came before Senator Obama when he was a State Senator in Illinois.

In President Obama's (then State Senator) objection to the protection of babies born as a result of a failed abortion as proposed by the "Born Alive Infants Protection Act," he stated his reasons. Remember when Senator Obama was against specific legislation he would vote "Present":

"I mean, It - it would essentially bar abortions, because the equal protection clause does not allow somebody to kill a child, and if this is a child, then this would be an antiabortion statute. For that purpose, I think it would probably be found unconstitutional...As a consequence, I'll be voting Present."

President Obama in his statements before the Illinois Senate did not mention his concern for the protection of the mother.

Does what President Obama says about abortion, late term abortions and infanticide depend on to whom he is speaking?

President Obama announced on February 27, 2012 a plan to have Congregation Captains in the Churches support his campaign for President. Will these Congregation Captains inform the congregations of the President's views on abortion, late term abortion and infanticide? The most accurate indication would be the answer to the following question.

Have the present Clergy of this Country ever mentioned to their Congregations the President's position on abortion, late term abortion and/or infanticide?

VII. Will the Civil Rights leaders and the Americans of African Descent support President Obama's action in which he claims he

as President has the authority to issue death warrants to kill U.S. Citizens without due process?

The history of the Americans of African Descent has provided a point of reference which the other citizens do not have. As stated on pages 46-47 of this paper, the FBI, under the direction of J. Edgar Hoover, tried to force Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. to kill himself because they believed he and his movement were in a conspiracy with the Communist Party and were a danger to this country's national interest. They could not kill Reverend King and his associates because they were American Citizens and the Government and the FBI believed our Constitution protected them. History is repeating itself today in a way that the Americans of African Descent can appreciate and recognize as dangerous. Specifically, their history of being initially enslaved, falsely charged for many offenses, and having been hunted down by the KKK and other mobs and killed. They won their freedom in 1865 in the Civil War only to have it taken away in the early 1900's. Their ancestors lived through the times when the mobs and the government handed out the death warrants against them without due process.

Current facts show that irony is delivering a chilling statement of what leaders do when they conclude that they are bigger than past events and know what is best for the protection and future of a nation. The KKK leaders felt they knew what was best for this country.

President Obama takes pride and credit for the drone attack in the Middle East which killed Anwar al-Awlaki, a U. S Citizen, on September 30, 2011. The President had issued a death warrant against him. The government agencies and the President had not presented evidence to a Court, either civilian or military, nor allowed Anwar al-Awlaki the right to have his attorney present to test the evidence. There had been no right of appeal. The fact that the evidence may have been overwhelming is not relevant. The process set the precedent for the future.

The catalyst for the current focus on the question was fueled by a speech by Attorney General Eric Holder on March 5, 2012 at Northwestern University School of Law. A legal analysis of the speech was issued on March 6, 2012 by Professor Jonathan Turley, who holds the "Shapiro Chair for Public Policy" at George Washington University. In addition, Professor Turley represents a number of litigants in many high profile cases. He works in both the academic and the real world of the law, and he is not associated with either extremes of the political spectrum.

Professor Turley's article is short and is recommended reading for all citizens, especially high school, college and law students; and, particularly Congress and the President. The article was published in the Foreign Policy Magazine and is restated in its entirety.

"On Monday, March 5, Northwestern University School of Law was the location of an extraordinary scene for a free nation. U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder presented President Barack Obama's claim that he has the authority to kill any U. S. citizen he considers a threat. It served as a retroactive justification for the slaying of American-born cleric Anwar al-Awlaki last September by a drone strike in northeastern Yemen, as well as the targeted killings of at least two other Americans during Obama's term.

What's even more extraordinary is that this claim, which would be viewed by the Framers of the U.S. Constitution as the very definition of authoritarian power, was met not with outcry but muted applause. Where due process once resided, Holder offered only an assurance that the president would kill citizens with care. While that certainly relieved any concern that Obama would hunt citizens for sport, Holder offered no assurances on how this power would be used in the future beyond the now all-too-familiar 'Trust us' approach to civil liberties of this administration.

In his speech, Holder was clear and unambiguous on only one point: 'The president may use force abroad against a senior operational leader of a foreign terrorist organization with which the United States is at war—even if that individual happens to be a U.S. citizen.' The use of the word 'abroad' is interesting because senior administration officials have previously suggested that the president may kill an American anywhere and anytime, including within the United States. Holder's speech does not materially limit that claimed authority, but stressed that 'our legal authority is not limited to the battlefields in Afghanistan.' He might as well have stopped at 'limit' because the administration has refused to accept any practical limitations on this claimed inherent power.

Holder became highly cryptic in his assurance that caution would be used in exercising this power—suggesting some limitation that is both indefinable and unreviewable. He promised that the administration would kill Americans only with the 'consent of the nation involved or after a determination that the nation is unable or unwilling to deal effectively with a threat to the United States.' He did not explain how the nation in question

would consent or how a determination would be made that it is 'unable or unwilling to deal' with the threat.

Of course, the citizens of the United States once consented on a relevant principle when they ratified the Constitution and later the Bill of Rights. They consented to a government of limited powers where citizens are entitled to the full protections of due process against allegations by their government. That is clearly not the type of consent that Holder wants to revisit or discuss. Indeed, he insisted that 'a careful and thorough executive branch review of the facts in a case amounts to due process.'

Holder's new definition of 'due process' was perfectly Orwellian. While the Framers wanted an objective basis for due process, Holder was offering little more than 'we will give the process that we consider due to a target.' And even the vaguely described 'due process' claimed by Holder was not stated as required, but rather granted, by the president. Three citizens have been given their due during the Obama administration and vaporized by presidential order. Frankly, few of us mourn their passing. However, due process appears to have been vaporized in the same moment—something many U.S. citizens may come to miss.

What Holder is describing is a model of an imperial presidency that would have made Richard Nixon blush. If the president can kill a citizen, there are a host of other powers that fall short of killing that the president might claim, including indefinite detention of citizens—another recent controversy. Thus, by asserting the right to kill citizens without charge or judicial review, Holder has effectively made all of the constitution's individual protections of accused persons matters of presidential discretion. These rights will be faithfully observed up to the point that the president concludes that they interfere with his view of how best to protect the country—or his willingness to wait for 'justice' to be done. And if Awlaki's fate is any indication, there will be no opportunity for much objection.

Already, the administration has successfully blocked efforts of citizens to gain review of such national security powers or orders. Not only is the list of citizens targeted with death kept secret, but the administration has insisted that courts do not play a role in the creation of or basis for such a list. Even when Awlaki's family tried to challenge Obama's kill order, the federal court declared that the cleric would have to file for himself—a difficult task when you are on a presidential hit list. Moreover, any attorney

working with Awlaki would have risked being charged with aiding a terrorist.

***When the applause died down after Holder's speech**, we were left with a bizarre notion of government. We have this elaborate system of courts and rights governing the prosecution and punishment of citizens. However, that entire system can be circumvented at the whim or will of the president. The president then becomes effectively the lawgiver or life taker for all citizens. The rest becomes a mere pretense of the rule of law.*

Holder was describing the very model of government the Framers denounced in crafting both the Constitution and Bill of Rights. James Madison in particular warned that citizens should not rely on the good graces and good intentions of their leaders. He noted, 'If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary.' The administration appears to have taken the quote literally as an invitation for unlimited authority for angels.

Of course, even those who hold an angelic view of Obama today may come to find the next president less divine. In the end, those guardian angels will continue to claim to be acting in the best interests of every citizen—with the exception, of course, of those citizens killed by them."

Jonathan Turley

Foreign Policy Magazine, March 6, 2012.

What is chilling is what happened when the Attorney General announced before the students of Northwestern University School of Law that the President had the right to order the deaths of American Citizens. This was not met by an "outcry" but by a "**-muted applause.**" Professor Turley noted:

"When the applause died down after Holder's speech."

Forty-seven (47) years after the failed attempt to kill Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. the Obama Administration claims it has the authority under the Constitution to have an American Citizen killed. Two other U.S. Citizens were also killed because they were with the terrorist who was a U.S. Citizen who was marked for death. They have killed U.S. Citizens when the U.S. Citizens were overseas and now the question is can they do it in this country without due process? The claimed authority to do this was discussed at a Congressional hearing on March 8, 2012. F.B.I. Director Mueller was asked if the Federal

Government had the authority to kill an American Citizen inside the United States. The Director of the F.B.I. responded "*I have to go back. Uh, I'm not certain whether that was addressed or not.*" Congressman Graves pressed the question and the F.B.I. Director responded "*I'm going to defer that to others in the Department of Justice.*"

The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as amended, created a Special Court to deal with espionage and terrorist threats from foreign sources. If there is not sufficient time to obtain Court action because "*we simply cannot afford to wait until deadly plans are carried out,*" then there is a process to take what is deemed necessary action and review the action by the Court within a certain time period. This way the Courts have control of what the Executive Department is doing. This act only dealt with "surveillance," not killing citizens. However, the process was established.

In January 2010, the Obama Administration began to consider the legality of attempting to kill Anwar al-Awlaki, who was an American Citizen. Nineteen (19) months later he was killed with a drone strike on September 30, 2011. Did the President and the Attorney General simply not trust the court system or was it a political decision?

It is reported that there is a Department of Justice memo which justifies the legality of killing American Citizens without any court action or due process. The Obama administration has refused to release it to the American People or the U. S. Congress.

Can one imagine what the founding fathers would say if they were told the government they created had established the authority to kill American Citizens without due process? Furthermore, that the President and the Government took the position that they did not have to tell the American Citizens on what condition and under what circumstances the President had the right to order their death?

What type of person thinks they are empowered with the wisdom, judgment and constitutional right to determine if a U.S. Citizen should live or die without due process?

What type of person thinks that it is wrong to water board foreign nationals captured on the battlefield, but this same person believes he has the authority to kill American Citizens without due process?

Do foreign nationals have more rights than American Citizens?

Will any one ask President Obama?

VIII. Current Status of Americans of African Descent in America.

A. Family Unit of Americans of African Descent

The current status of Americans of African Descent can be shown generally by examining the status of the most elementary foundation of any society; namely, its family unit.

A Pew survey that was made in 2007 concluded the following based on its survey:

at page 13

“Most African-Americans across all major religious traditions, including those who are unaffiliated, prefer a bigger government that provides more services to a smaller government providing fewer services. Significantly more African-Americans (79%) report that they prefer bigger government compared with the total population (46%), who are much more divided on the issue (43% prefer smaller government). And nearly eight-in-ten (79%) African-Americans say the government should do more to help the needy, even if it means going deeper into debt, while only 15% say the government cannot afford to do much more to help the needy.”

1. Patrick Moynihan “The Negro Family”

Why do (79%) of Americans of African Descent believe this? The answer is not a simple one. A number of noted individuals have advanced different theories. To start one should go back to Slavery and come forward and see how Americans of African Descent have been assimilated into the main stream of America. Of the different theories, one was written by Daniel Patrick Moynihan while he worked at the Labor Department in 1965. He published in 1965 a paper entitled “The Negro Family: The Case for National Action.” This paper makes a case for the position that the Americans of African Descent family unit has been unintentionally; but severely, damaged by those attempting to help with government family assistance programs.

Moynihan stated:

“The fundamental problem, in which this is most clearly the case, is that of family structure. The evidence – not final, but powerfully persuasive – is that the Negro family in the urban ghettos is crumbling. A middle class group has managed to save itself, but for vast numbers of the unskilled, poorly educated city working class the fabric of conventional social

relationships has all but disintegrated. There are indications that the situation may have been arrested in the past few years, but the general post war trend is unmistakable. So long as this situation persists, the cycle of poverty and disadvantage will continue to repeat itself."

The threshold question is what has caused the present problem of a significant segment of the population of Americans of African Descent being stationary in their economic and social integration into the main stream of their country? Moynihan says the family unit of the lower income bracket of Americans of African Descent needs to be reestablished to provide a foundation to take significant steps to resolve the problem.

In the forty-five plus years since Moynihan's report, the issue of the family unit has been heatedly debated, with no agreement on the problem or how to fix it. The untenable situation is that the problem of the continued division in society of the lower economic segment of the Americans of African Descent has not significantly improved in the last forty-five years. The gap may be growing wider. The focus of many who are closest to the problem and most able by position and intellect to solve the problem are spending their energy and resources to locate and define the present situation. In short, they are studying the problem in great detail and their results are impressive; but they have not come up with a solution other than intervention of the government, which Moynihan argued significantly contributed to the problem.

2. Professors Lawrence D. Bobo of Harvard and Camilla Charles of University of Pennsylvania.

Professor Lawrence D. Bobo of Harvard University and Professor Camilla Z. Charles of the University of Pennsylvania examined the problem in, Race in American Mind: From the Moynihan Report to Obama Candidacy. They also refer to the two groups as black and white. In dealing with what they say, this designation will be followed. They noted the position of Moynihan regarding the family unit.

They stated as reported in ANNALS, AAPSS, 621 January 2009:

"It is not our purpose here to rehearse or parse these well-worn debates. However Moynihan himself was well aware of the issue that hews close to our current preoccupations. As he wrote in the first page of the report as to why further progress for blacks would be difficult: 'The racist virus in the American Blood stream still afflicts us: Negroes will encounter serious personal prejudice for at least another generation.'"

"Our purpose is to analyze, if you will, the virus...."

It is understood that "virus" by definition *means "anything that corrupts or poisons the mind or character."* Webster's New World Dictionary, Second Edition. In this paper it means a "virus" that affects Americans.

To comment on their paper one needs to start with the meaning of two phrases which are used by Professors Bobo and Charles. The following is this writer's understanding of the meaning of the following phrases.

"Structural Barriers;" i.e., voting, property ownership, civil rights, education, housing, etc., which were erected against Americans of African Descent.

"Cultural and volitional deficiencies." This phrase appears to refer to stereotyping people in different ways. Thus, one can take down structural barriers which were placed as barriers to Americans of African Descent. One can endorse broad goals of integration, equality and equal treatment without regard to race and make "enormous," clearcut, and consistent improvements of black-white relations and still have people discriminating by stereotyping Americans of African Descent.

Professors Bobo and Charles in 2009 examined in detail where we are today and explained their conclusions with reliable evidence. They show that the "racial virus" is still with us though it manifests itself in different changing ways and it is, in part, fed by developing and changing events. There is evidence that some of the solution may contribute to solving one problem, such as "structural segregation," but contributes to other forms of discrimination, including *"cultural or volitional deficiencies."* Without examining in this present paper the full statements and arguments advanced by Professors Bobo and Charles, it is accepted that the facts and conclusions are correct as to where we are but it is not agreed why we are where we are. They correctly state where we are forty-five plus years after Moynihan's report. Two current examples of where we are, as stated by Professors Bobo and Clark, are housing and labor market.

At page 249 "Housing and Segregation."

"Forty years later, however, blacks in twenty-nine U.S. metropolitan areas—home to 40 percent of the total black population—experience 'extreme, multidimensional, and cumulative residential segregation' (Denton 1994, 49). Equally troubling is that this is nearly double the number of hyper segregated cities on record in 1980."

At page 251 "The Labor Market."

"The facts of racial inequality in the labor market are well known. On average, African Americans continue to earn lower wages and have higher rates of unemployment than whites, even after accounting for objective differences in human capital characteristics and other important factors..."

"...A more recent survey of employers in Atlanta, Boston, Detroit, and Los Angeles also found meaningful evidence of indirect or statistical discrimination against African Americans (Moss and Tilly 2001). While employers did not make blanket statements about different racial groups being better suited to particular jobs, roughly one in five employers surveyed believed that inner-city residents are 'poor performers' and said that their customers were biased (Moss and Tilly 2001, 152-53). Nearly half of the employers found fault with African Americans as employees –often citing a lack of motivation or problems associated with single parenting, welfare dependence, or the inner-city environment (Moss and Tilly 2001, 153)."

"...In another study, Pager (2003) conducted an audit study of the labor market in Milwaukee, Wisconsin which focused on jobs requiring little skill, and found applicant's race was more important than having been convicted of a crime."

"...Together, these results from studies using various methodological techniques in several locations offer compelling evidence of persisting racial discrimination in the labor market."

In Professors Bobo and Clark's, "Conclusion" they stated:

"The most positive aspect of the literature and research we have reviewed concerns the fundamental principles or norms that Americans expect to guide black-white relations. Here, the change is enormous, clear-cut, consistent, and we believe profoundly consequential. Most white Americans not only no longer endorse segregation, white privilege, and anti-black discrimination as rules that should guide black-white relations, but in fact endorse broad goals of integration, equality, and equal treatment without regard to race..."

What is striking is they found that *"the change is enormous, clear cut, consistent, and we believe profoundly consequential."* I understand this to mean enormous progress has been made in race relations. However, as they found under "housing" and "labor force," the country still has a large segment of the Americans

of African Descent community which is economically separate and distinct from the white communities. In addition, they are also separate and distinct from that part of the black communities which have made it out of the lower economic status that still exists for many of the Americans of African Descent. Then you compare that statement with the factual evidence of the continued discrimination and effect in the area of housing and labor force. This establishes clearly that some element of the problem has not and is not being addressed. What is that other element?

Professors Bobo and Clark state what they feel is the cause for this continued discrimination. It is identified as follows:

*"Yet, this facet of our culture and of individual psychological makeup is compromised or checked (or undermined) by a series of other cultural and individual psychological conditions (both of which have larger structural underpinning; see Bobo, Kluegel, and Smith [1997] for fuller elaboration). **Public policy issues raise questions of government authority, access to material and symbolic resource distribution and group rights and entitlements, the full sum of which greatly tests the readiness of many whites to incur potential costs or burdens of social change consistent with these new norms.** Moreover, negative racial stereotypes did not vanish; they merely became less categorical and less firmly rooted in ascription to natural or biological (as opposed to cultural and volitional) differences between the races. What is more, perceptions of fundamental structural and race-discrimination-based barriers to black advancement, while common among African Americans, were never embraced by large fractions of the white public."*

To state where we are does not necessarily solve the problem of what that other missing element is which continues to cause, or continues to prevent the elimination of, discrimination. It is incumbent on us to show how we can bring an end to the "racial virus" which is feeding racism. To do so one needs to go back to the time of the creation of "racism." It was created by the White Slave Owners to justify their enslaving a people (West Africans) so they would have cheap labor for their cotton and tobacco crops. As Charles C. Mann states in his book, 1493, the Slaves from Africa were not physically inferior; but were, in fact, physically superior, and that is why it was economically advantageous to enslave them. Their enslavement by the White Slave Owners took away their "equality" and "dignity." This "racial virus" was readily accepted by a large part of the Europeans and is still, in a much weakened way, a lingering part of our culture. It appears that the

"...change is enormous..." and is "profoundly consequential..." in reestablishing "equality", but this still leaves "dignity".

The politicians and leaders of the Americans of African Descent have, over the years, worked together to make it possible for the Americans of African Descent to break loose from the "Structural Barriers." In breaking loose they can and are reclaiming their freedom and right to "equality" which was taken away from their ancestors by the White Slave Owners. In doing so these same politicians and leaders of the Americans of African Descent have for different reasons, intentionally and unintentionally, caused and/or allowed the government to cause the "dignity" aspect of equality not to be returned to the Americans of African Descent. The fact that the results may have been unintended does not change where we are today. The government with its various programs has contributed significantly to the destruction of the family unit of the Americans of African Descent and made them dependent on the politicians and bureaucrats for the support and care of their families.

We have a situation where the "equality" phase (Structural Barriers) to freedom are being taken down and returned to the descendants of the original Slaves but the "dignity" phase to freedom is not being returned to the descendants of the original Slaves. The descendants of Slaves are also not insisting or demanding that it be returned because many have been seduced into thinking that it is good or at least acceptable that they are dependent on their government to receive and maintain their "equality".

Would any man with his "dignity" knowingly allow on a long term basis another person to tell him that you have to move away from your family so your family can be cared for by the government? If the answer is "no," then a lot of well-meaning people were very, very wrong more than sixty years ago. These people and their successors have not learned from their mistakes; and, in fact, have continued the policy which robs the "dignity" of the people they claim they are helping.

How have you helped a person if that person looks to the politicians and government to provide for them? This point is made by Deneen Borelli in her book, Blacklash. The words of a campaign supporter of President Obama at a rally in Florida in 2008 are quoted at page 69.

"It was the most memorable time of my life. It was a touching moment. Because I never thought this day would happen. I won't have to worry about putting gas in my car. I won't have to worry

about paying my mortgage. You know, if I help him, he's going to help me."

Statements like the above and other statements made that we "are going to Detroit to get free money from Obama's Stash" have a negative effect on the non-black community. These statements are picked up by the media and played again and again on the airways, especially on certain conservative media outlets. When this is heard by the public, it enhances what Professors Bobo and Clark termed "Cultural and Volitional Deficiencies." Namely, stereotyping the lower economic level of Americans of African Descent as people who expect the government and President Obama to take care of them at the expense of the rest of Americans. These statements provide the factual basis for some people to ridicule and stereotype a whole class of people because of the actions of the few. Disparity and ridicule are not compatible with "dignity;" and, as long as people are told that they need the government and the politicians to take care of them, it will be very difficult for those people, who are stereotyped, to regain their dignity.

Until you bring the family unit back for all Americans of African Descent, you will not solve the problem of racism. Until all the people in this country realize that all people are the same, there will be some form of racism. You will have racism because we will always have political leaders who will use race, class and income differences to promote racial and economic strife so the voters will support them. Some political leaders will always call upon voters to vote for them by noting how they are different. Different classes of people, who come from significantly different family structures, like housing and income structures, will often see each other as being different. Examples: subsidized or public housing with high crime rates as opposed to suburban single family housing with low crime rates. Many people, if they cannot identify themselves with another person, will have less empathy for that person's problems and feelings; and, thus, have less concern for their plight. Some politicians who feel they have the support of different segments of society, including Americans of African Descent, will always say:

"It will be up to each of you to make sure the young people, African Americans, Latinos and women, who powered our victory in 2008, stand together once again."

The present situation is creating two cultures; not only between black and whites but also between black and black. The two black groups, in a general sense, are made up of those Americans of African Descent who (1) have broken away and pulled themselves away from the need to depend on the government and (2) those

who are still struggling to reestablish their economic and educational independence after Slavery, the Civil War and Institutional Racism up to 1965; and the de facto Segregation that still exists today. Those who were still struggling have been offered a number of inducements to become dependent on the government. The results appear to be increasing the dependency of a certain segment of Americans of African Descendant, and reinforcing the belief in the need for the government to help even if it means the government goes deeper into debt. Specifically, the 2007 Pew Survey reported:

"...79% African-Americans say the government should do more to help the needy, even if it means going deeper into debt..."

This conclusion fits with the statement of Professors Bobo and Clark:

"Public policy issues raise questions of government authority access to material and symbolic resource distribution, and group rights and entitlements the full sum of which greatly tests the readiness of many whites to incur potential costs or burdens of social change consistent with these new norms. Moreover, negative racial stereotypes did not vanish; they merely became less categorical and less firmly rooted in ascription to natural or biological (as opposed to cultural and volitional) differences between the races."

This writer's conclusion is that Professors Bobo and Clark are saying Americans of African Descent, in this lower economic status, are entitled and that White people need to acknowledge this and they need to pay more. In taking this position, Professors Bobo and Clark are reinforcing in the White community a backlash that is perceived by Professors Bobo and Clark as cultural and volitional differences. If Professors Bobo and Clark are correct, the racial virus will be with this country for a long time; because, historically, a significant number of the White communities will not accept as correct the premise of "*access to material and symbolic resource distribution...*" entitlement, which apparently Professors Bobo and Clark advance.

3. Abortions

The family unit of a certain segment of Americans of African Descent has been destroyed through an incentive system that rewards, with benefits, if there is no man living in and with the family unit. You certainly can have a functional family without a male parent figure but it makes it much harder. Once the family unit is gone there is no family for children to be born to and in which to be reared. This has created a situation where children who were not raised in a family do not feel the need to be in a family when they have children. This is documented by an

article in the New York Times on February 16, 2012. The article stated nationally "73 percent of black babies are born outside marriage as compared to 29 percent of white babies born outside marriage."

In New York City, in the year 2009, 59.8% of the pregnancies of Americans of African Descent ended in abortions. See New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene.

Sixty percent; six out of every ten children of Americans of African Descent in New York City were aborted in the year 2009. Has anyone spoken out and taken action against this? In addition to the death of the unborn child, the mothers also suffer significant risk and injury. Examples of this are shown in a number of medical studies. The following are three examples.

2010 study by Natalie P. Mota in the Canadian Journal of Psychiatry found that:

"Abortion was associated with an increased likelihood of several mental disorders-mood disorders...substance abuse disorders...as well as suicidal ideation and suicide attempts."

2006 study by New Zealand researcher David M. Fergusson in the Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry found that the risk of suicide was three times greater for women who aborted than for women who delivered.

2005 study by Mike Gissler in the European Journal of Public Health found that abortion was associated with a six times-higher risk of suicide.

There are a number of other studies which support this information. When you put these studies in context with actual facts, as they apply to Americans of African Descent in New York City, one is faced with an untenable situation. In addition to the loss of life of 60% of the possible newborns, the women and teenage girls are suffering mental trauma which will be with them the rest of their lives. The effect on teenage girls must be staggering. What percent of the 60% are teenagers?

What does it say about those who run your government nationally and in New York City that they affirmatively work to authorize and support those who are causing the death by abortion of 60% of children conceived in your society?

4. Dignity

If 60% of children in your race are being aborted prior to or during birth, what affect does this have on your "*dignity*." Do your political leaders and your

government believe there are others more entitled to be born and live? Will anyone ask them?

The irony of the present situation is that the original White Slave Owners, when they enslaved the West Africans 200 to 300 years ago, took away their freedom which included their "equality" and "dignity."

"Dignity" is not something that only recently needed to be restored. The need for it to be reestablished has always been present. As previously stated at page 18 in A Question of Manhood, Volume 23, Chapter 16, page 323, concerning newspaper stories that led to the Spanish American War in 1898.

"...What the Colored American desperately sought was to impress on the dominant race how eager the black man was to do his duty, to be 'foremost among those who contended for the preservation of the nation's dignity and honor at any cost.' If no necessity for war arises, the colored man is a better American by reason of this test of his loyalty. If war should come, he will be the more strongly entwined in the warp and woof of the nation by reason of sacrifice and danger willingly endured. When war finally beckoned in early April, the Colored American warmly endorsed it: 'we fight as brethren of one blood, and under one flag. We are all American citizens, bound inseparably by a common cause'."

In the year 2009 "enormous" progress had been made towards the return to the descendants of the Slaves part of that which was taken when their freedom was taken away; namely, their "equality."

Their "*dignity*" component has not been returned or universally even asked for or demanded by a majority of the Americans of African Descent who are in the lower economic level of our society. This component of freedom; namely, "*dignity*," is held by those who say to the Americans of African Descent: "You need to rely on the liberal politicians and government for you and your family's needs." This action guarantees that "*dignity*" will not be taken back or returned and this economic group of Americans of African Descent will always be dependent on the liberal politicians as long as they control the government.

This is not to say that all social programs should be ended so "*dignity*" can be returned to those (white and black) dependent on them. What is needed is for the politicians and civic leaders to work together to resolve the problem. One only needs to look to 1996 when the Republican Congress worked with the Democrat President to pass "Welfare Reform." Some statistics are stated by Deneen Borelli in her book Blacklash.

At pages 84-85

"There were provisions and funds set aside for the very neediest and caps placed on term of collection.

Here's how that all played out. The number of welfare recipients decreased by 60 percent. Sure, it varied state to state. But the bottom line was that millions left the government plantation and unemployment and child poverty dropped. A study completed by the Congressional Budget Office in 2007 provided some insightful numbers. Families that dropped off the dole saw a boost in household income of a whopping 35 percent.

President Obama is systematically unwinding all of that effort as we speak. The numbers say it all. The stimulus bill will spend \$800 billion on means-tested welfare over the next ten years. So get ready for this: It is going to cost \$10,000 for each family paying income tax to provide \$22,500 for every poor person in the country."

Americans of African Descent are no longer dependent on the White Slave Owner who lives in the big plantation house. Many of those who are in the lower income segment are now dependent on the liberal politicians and the government for their survival.

They have unknowingly traded one Master for another. The present Master (liberal politicians) say vote for me because I supported and am still supporting action to continue to remove the "Structural Barriers." The "Structural Barriers" are your voting rights, property rights, civil rights, education, and housing rights so you could make "enormous change" in gaining back your "equality." The problem is that the liberal politicians have insured that the lower income levels of Americans of African Descent had to accept their concept of "equality" without the "dignity" component. As long as this economic segment of society is dependent on their government for their benefits, they will never fully regain their "dignity;" and, thus, never fully get back what the White Slave Owners took from their ancestors 300 years ago.

Remember the words of Louis Zamperini as related by Ms. Hillenbrand in her book Unbroken:

*"On Kwajalein, Louie and Phil learned a dark truth known to the doomed in Hitler's death camps, the **slaves of the American South**, and a hundred other generations of betrayed people. **Dignity** is as essential to human life as water,*

food, and oxygen. The stubborn retention of it, even in the face of extreme physical hardship, can hold a man's soul in his body long past the point at which the body should have surrendered it. The loss of it can carry a man off as surely as thirst, hunger, exposure, and asphyxiation, and with greater cruelty. In places like Kwajalein, degradation could be as lethal as a bullet." ("Kwajalein" was a Japanese prison camp; "Louie" was Louis Zamperini).

Any person who claims to have given you "equality" but has directly or indirectly prevented you from obtaining "dignity" is doing it for a reason. One needs to ask the question, why?

IX. Future Political Strength of Americans of African Descent.

As a result of the spirit of Selma that was created in 1965 and the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965; Americans of African Descent, after an incredible journey, obtained the legal means to enforce their right to vote. Americans of African Descent were now empowered to claim their seat at the table of power of this nation that they co-founded.

One national Political Party and two national politicians have tapped into this new voting power that was unleashed by the Voting Rights Act of 1965. They are the Democratic Party, President William J. Clinton, who claimed he was the first Black President; and President Barack H. Obama, who claims he was born as a result of the Spirit of Selma, Alabama, which brought about the passage of the Voters Rights Act of 1965.

A. The Democratic Party.

A majority of Americans of African Descent are conservative on social issues like religion and abortion, but they overwhelmingly support the Democratic Party which is significantly more liberal on social issues than the Republican Party. In Presidential elections the Democratic Candidates have historically, over the last forty-five plus years, always received 90% plus of the Americans of African Descent vote. The answer may be found in the way the Americans of African Descent arrived in this country and their development as a separate group socially and politically and the way they perceive how the political parties have reacted to their needs.

As previously stated, President Obama is calling for African Americans to support the Democratic Party and himself in the elections in 2012 because he is African American. He is also calling for redistribution of the wealth but he is doing it in a way to infer that the rich are not good citizens. He is saying the rich are not doing their fair share and some argue he is saying it might be necessary to

hunt them down and force them to do the right thing and pay their fair share. The rich have so much they can never use it all. Strong words, yes, but that type of action by the President and the Democratic Party needs strong words in response. The Occupy Wall Street demonstrators and Unions have already demonstrated their willingness to demonstrate against the perceived rich. Some will say this is an unfair attack on President Obama and the liberal left. If you do, please consider the following.

A picture is worth a thousand words. What President Obama is presently doing is graphically shown by the cover page of the September 24th - 30th - 2011 edition of The Economist. The Economist is not an extremist publication but a magazine which reports on how and what the world views are on various issues.

The cover page shows President Obama and several other men on horses leading a fox hunt. Along with many small dogs, these men are chasing the "foxes," which are large rich men and women holding desperately to bags of money. Running with fright in their eyes, they are trying to get away from President Obama and his hunters. President Obama is blowing his bugle to inspire the hunters. If anyone says this is overstating the facts and it is not fair to President Obama and the Democratic Party, look at the title written by the editors of The Economist.

The title of the picture is "Hunting the rich." Who are the hunters and who are the hunted?

Some may say The Economist is not an objective magazine and is slanted against President Obama. In the October 2008 issue The Economist specifically endorsed President Obama for President and stated if they had a vote they would vote for then Senator Obama.

President Obama and the Democratic Party, in promoting ethnic and class differences, are dealing with an explosive virus which, if unleashed, can destroy this country and the world. Ethnic and class differences, if relied upon by one group over another, have throughout history been the fuel for extreme violence. Either President Obama does not understand this or his desire for reelection has clouded his judgment; or he feels this form of conflict or threatened conflict is what is needed to carry out his policies.

An example of the tinderbox President Obama is playing with or using is set out by Max Hastings in his book INFERNO. This book deals with the largest and most vicious death-causing global conflict ever, the Second World War.

At page 449

Yugoslavia 1939-1944

"What took place in Yugoslavia during the war years was overwhelmingly an internecine ethnic and political conflict...Some 1.2 million perished... but a majority were killed by hostile ethnic or political groups of their fellow countrymen..."

At page 453

*"In a society in which rival nationalisms, feud and the cult of vengeance were endemic, by 1944 brutality was institutionalized. All the warring parties shared responsibility for dreadful bloodshed, **much of it inflicted upon people whose only crime was to belong to another race or creed.**"*

The Occupy Wall Street demonstrators and the Unions have announced and shown they are prepared to take to the streets to demonstrate for their rights, which includes the right for them to insist for everyone to pay their fair share. Will the Democratic Party ask "African Americans" to take to the streets with the Unions and Occupy Wall Street demonstrators to make everyone pay their "fair share?" They do not specifically call for violence but they do call to shut down the unfair system if the rich do not pay their "fair share."

How does a mob stop what President Obama and the Democratic Party declare to be an unfair system?

B. President William J. Clinton.

President Clinton was initially known as "The First Black President" because, early in his political career, he identified with the needs and causes of Americans of African Descent.

Candidate Obama was competing for the Democratic Party nomination against Hillary Clinton in 2008. President Clinton, in support of his wife, was campaigning against candidate Obama. President Clinton's influence among the Americans of African Descent was attacked by candidate Obama. President Clinton stated candidate Obama was, "playing the 'Race Card' on him."

If candidate Obama can successfully play the "Race Card" on President Clinton, what can President Obama do with the "Race Card" against other people?

Can you play the "Race Card" without being a racist? If you can, are you then relying on racism to advance your personal position just as the creators of the "one drop rule" also known as "the devil's one drop rule" did?

If you play the race card on a person you do not believe is a racist what does that make you?

C. President Barack H. Obama.

The Slaves, their ancestors, and the Civil Rights movement laid the foundation for the election of Americans of African Descent to high public office in this country. Many say President Obama was the first American of African Descent who had the character, ability and experience to overcome being an American of African Descent to be elected President. Therefore, he is an uplifting example to all, especially Americans of African Descent.

Was President Obama the first who had the character, ability and experience to be elected President?

To answer this question one must examine the history of other Americans of African Descent running for President.

Congresswomen Shirley Chisholm ran for the Democratic nomination for President in 1972, received ten percent of the votes within the party and won three primaries. After the campaign she was voted to be one of the ten most admired women in the world. She chose not to run for President in 1976. She went on to continue to serve as a very influential Congresswoman until she retired in 1982. President Obama was eleven years old in 1972.

Reverend Jesse Jackson ran for the Democratic nomination in 1984 and 1988. In 1984 he received 21% of the popular vote in the primaries and 8% of the delegates. In 1988 Mr. Jackson received 6.9 million votes in the primaries. He also won seven state primaries and, after winning the Michigan caucus, he was considered by many to be the frontrunner. He then lost the Wisconsin primary to Michael Dukakis who went on to win the nomination. In a 2006 AP-AOL "Black Voices" poll, Reverend Jackson was voted the most important black leader in the United States. President Obama was twenty-seven years old in 1988.

Governor Doug Wilder was a grandson of Slaves, Bronze Star winner for bravery in combat in the Korean War, and an attorney and State Senator in Virginia. He was elected Lt. Governor of Virginia in 1985 and he was elected Governor in 1989 for four years. He was the first American of African Descent to be elected Governor of a State since reconstruction. He did it in a State that was

still considered a Southern State. Governor Wilder inherited a \$2.2 billion budget deficit. His policy was to have a surplus in the State budget and he cut spending and he did not raise taxes. He is quoted as having said "*we should spend for needed services, not for nonsense.*" In 1991, during his term as Governor, he announced his candidacy for President. His policies were more conservative than the liberal wing of the Democratic Party, which was led by Jesse Jackson and Mario Cuomo. His policies were good for Virginia but were not accepted by the Democratic Party and their supporters. Governor Wilder also had limited success in raising money and he withdrew his name from consideration prior to the primaries. President Obama was twenty-four years old in 1985.

President Obama, on his record, was not superior to either of the three listed past Presidential candidates. What did President Obama have that the other three did not? He was the first to encourage the belief that he was born as a result of the Spirit of Selma and that he was, as stated by Congressman Lewis, "Barack Obama is what comes at the end of that Bridge in Selma." He also was the first to receive the enormous level of support that he received from the news media.

Candidate Obama stated in a speech on March 4, 2007 at the 42nd anniversary of Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.'s Selma March that he (candidate Barack Obama) was born because of what happened in Selma, Alabama. Without specifically saying it, he proposed himself as the successor to carry the spirit of Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. forward. Specifically, candidate Obama stated in part:

*"What happened in Selma, Alabama, and Birmingham also stirred the conscience of the nation. ...Barack Obama got one of those tickets...he met this woman... they looked at each other and they decided that we know that in the world as it has been it might not be possible for us to get together and have a child. But something stirring across the country because of what happened in Selma, Alabama, because some folks are willing to march across a bridge. So they got together and Barack Obama, Jr., was born. So don't tell me I don't have a claim on Selma, Alabama. **Don't tell me I'm not coming home when I come to Selma, Alabama...I'm here because somebody marched. I'm here because y'all sacrificed for me. I stand on the shoulders of giants.**"*

At the time of this statement by President Obama he was not the President. He was running for the nomination of the Democratic Party and he was not the first American of African Descent to run for President after the Selma March in 1965. In fact, the three previously listed, Congresswomen Chisholm, Mr. Jackson and

Governor Wilder all ran for President after the Selma March in 1965. All three by hard work, natural ability and sound judgment had reached the position to run for President. They did not believe or say that other Americans of African Descent had sacrificed for them.

Congresswomen Chisholm, Reverend Jesse Jackson, Governor Wilder, Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. and all the other Civil Rights leaders sacrificed for a far greater cause than Senator Barack H. Obama.

President Obama did not say "we," he said **"I'm here because y'all sacrificed for me. I stand on the shoulders of giants."** The question that naturally flows from this statement is why had the Americans of African Descent sacrificed specifically for him? Had he walked in the shoes of Slaves starting on the docks of Charleston, up through the brutality of Slavery, the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, Legal and Institutional Segregation, Spanish American War, World War I, World War II, and the constant battle against Injustice and Segregation up to and through and across the Edmund Pettus Bridge at Selma, Alabama in March 1965? Did he do anything to aid the passage of the Civil Rights Voting Act in 1964 and 1965? Had he displayed courage like those who marched on March 7, 1965? Had he sacrificed to advance their cause? What had he done to be the one who was individually selected to stand on the shoulders of giant men like Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.?

David Brooks, the N.Y. Times columnist, stated that he, based on his interviews with President Obama, believes President Obama is a "man of history." Someone should ask Mr. Brooks if a "man of history" would have to re-write history and change the facts so he could fulfill his place in history.

President Obama was born on August 4, 1961, the son of an East African student from Kenya, and he was three years four months old when Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., James Bevel, John Lewis, Hosea Williams, Jesse Jackson and others marched across the Edmund Pettus Bridge at Selma, Alabama in March of 1965. When President Obama says *"So don't tell me I'm not coming home when I come to Selma, Alabama I am here because some folks were willing to march across a bridge..."* someone may want to tell him you cannot come home to a place you have never been and you cannot claim to be born because of an event that occurred over three years after you were born. President Obama was three years old living in Honolulu, Hawaii, when "some folks marched across a bridge" and the spirit of Selma was created by Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., James Bevel, John Lewis, Hosea Williams, Jesse Jackson and others who bravely marched in the face of extreme violence including the death of a White Unitarian

Minister from Boston, James J. Reeb, as they crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge at Selma on March 7th and 21st, 1965.

President Obama's proposal, that he was there to lead, was apparently accepted by many of the leaders of the Civil Rights Movement and their supporters, the Americans of African Descent community and the liberal left. An example of this acceptance is set out in a book published in 2010 by David Remnick, Editor of The New Yorker. The book, The Bridge, which by its name and contents anointed President Obama as the leader to carry on Reverend King's Spirit of Selma. In the book's introduction Mr. Remnick quotes Congressman John Lewis, who was one of the civil rights leaders in the crossing of the Edmund Pettus Bridge on March 7th and 21st, 1965. Mr. Lewis stated in January 2009:

"Barack Obama is what comes at the end of that Bridge in Selma"

David Remnick, as a positive for President Obama, characterized the speech by President Obama on March 4, 2007 as "... *assertion of heroic continuity.*" (Webster defines "Continuity" – "Continuous, connectedness, continuous duration, and continuous flow – unbroken, coherent whole"). Mr. Remnick said the forgoing though he knew President Obama was born three years before the Selma March in 1965. To logically explain this comment by Mr. Remnick one needs to search for a word that includes a meaning opposite to words like objective and factual, and similar to words like worship and reverence.

If the Editor of The New Yorker, Mr. Remnick, chooses to answer this assertion he may also want to include a comment on the irony of a man who, based on the heritage of his father who came from Kenya in East Africa as a student in 1959 and stayed for five years, claims he is standing on the shoulders of a people primarily from West Africa and some from Central Africa originally numbering 757,000 (19.4% of the population) in 1790. What connection did Kenya in East Africa have with West and Central Africa prior to and after the year 1790?

It is like an American (candidate) in year 2007 whose mother was an American of African Descent whose ancestors came to America prior to 1790 and the American's (candidate's) father was from Italy who spent five years in this country in 1959 to 1965. That the American (candidate), at a meeting of people with ancestors from Great Britain, in asking for their political support in his political campaign to be elected President, stated that he, the American (candidate), was here to lead this nation. The basis of his connection to the ancestors of the people from Great Britain was because his father came to this country in 1959 from Italy and he, the American (candidate), now makes an "assertion of heroic continuity" of what the people from Great Britain had accomplished in America

starting back in the year 1620 and coming forward with himself, the American (candidate), whose father came from Italy in 1959. What facts exist of "heroic continuity" between people from Great Britain in 1620 and Italy in 1959? The color of their skin? Is the only similarity of East Africans and West Africans the color of one's skin? If not, what are they?

What other similarities is Mr. Remnick speaking of between the African Slaves who made up 19.4% of the total population in 1790 and their descendants with President Obama and his African ancestor who came to this country from East Africa in 1959 for five years? What is the "heroic continuity" Mr. Remnick?

- a) Did President Obama's father, who came from Kenya in East Africa, have any geographic connection with the Slaves from West Africa and Central Africa?
- b) Did they have similar religious beliefs?
- c) Did they have any of the same language, customs or social structure?
- d) What did they have in common other than the color of their skin?

Even though President Obama won the election by obtaining 52.8 % of the popular vote, the New York Times reported on February 23, 2009: "... *more than three-quarters (75%) of the people polled said they were "optimistic" about the next five years with him as President....*"

If 75% of the people polled were "optimistic" about President Obama's upcoming presidency, do you believe a significant number of them believed that they should look at Americans of African Descent (African Americans) as being different from other Americans?

On April 26, 2010, more than six months prior to the 2010 congressional election, President Obama stated publicly he is relying on the ethnic background of the voters to "power" the Democratic Party to victory against "... *the health insurance companies, the wall street banks and special interests.*" In relying on them he stated:

"It will be up to each of you to make sure that the young people, African Americans, Latinos and women, who powered our victory in 2008, stand together once again."

President Obama did not say vote for the Democrats because of their policies. He said vote for Democrats because of the voter's race, age and gender.

Is this a new variation of the "*Devil's one drop Rule*"? Namely, if you have one drop of African blood you are an African American; and, thus, we need you, as an African American, to power me (the leader of African Americans) to victory with your vote.

Someone may want to point out to President Obama that there is no difference between a Black person's blood and a White person's blood. As George E. Powell wrote in his poem in tribute to the American Negro soldier in the Spanish American War, specifically the Ninth Cavalry, in the next to last stanza:

"And where the black and brawny breast
Gave up its all—life's richest, best,
To find the tomb's eternal rest
A dream of freedom still!
A groundless creed was swept away,
With brand of 'coward'—a time—worn say—
**And he blazed the path a better way
Up the side of San Juan Hill!
For black or white, on the scroll of fame,
The blood of the hero dyes the same;
And ever, ever will!"**

X. Conclusion

A. Where is the United States of America today?

In 2012 Robert Kagan, an historian and writer, published a book entitled The World America Made. He states clearly where America is today and where it and the world stand in relation to each other. Mr. Kagan is also a Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institute and a Washington Post Columnist.

The World America Made illuminates a world which some may want to remain dark so they can achieve their own agendas. The light will need to be turned on for all the people to see what President Obama and the liberal left are trying to change in our country. The light will show the immediate and pressing need to make a choice to maintain "America as the Shining City Upon a Hill" as the inspiration for the World's people, the foundation for our civilization and the future of humanity. It is suggested by this paper that the appropriate people to turn this light on are "**The Americans of African Descent**".

The following are just a few excerpts from The World America Made. Mr. Kagan's book shows the significance of future elections. One cannot capture the wisdom and clarity of the book by a few quotes and a full reading is suggested.

At pages 6-7

"Would the end of the present American order have less dire consequences? That is a question worth asking now, as so many contemplate the prospect of American decline. A surprising number of American intellectuals, politicians, and policy makers greet that prospect with equanimity. There is a general sense that the end of the era of American preeminence need not mean the end of the present liberal international order. The expectation, if not assumption, is that the good qualities of that order – the democracy, the prosperity, the peace among great powers – can transcend the decline of American power and influence..."

"...What would it mean for the future if the international order were no longer shaped primarily by the United States and like-minded allied nations? Who or what would take America's place? ..."

At page 99 *"... Instead of realizing that great-power conflict and competition have been suppressed, people imagine that the great powers themselves are fundamentally changing their character, that institutions, laws, and norms are taking hold. **It is as if New Yorkers strolling through a safe Central Park decided that police were no longer going to be needed. The park is safe because the human race has evolved.**"*

At page 139 *"So Americans once again need to choose what role they want to play in the world order...They might well decide that the role they have been playing is too expensive. But in weighing the costs, they need to ask themselves: **Is the American world order worth preserving?**"*

At page 140 *".... We need to be aware of history, not to cling to the past, but to understand what has been unique about our time. For all its flaws and its miseries, the world America made has been a remarkable anomaly in the history of humanity. Someday we may have no choice but to watch it drift away. Today we do have a choice."*

We do have a choice and Americans need to choose what role they want to play in the world. They need to understand that this choice will irrevocably and forever change mankind's future; and, specifically, the future generations of this country.

Do we have a leader in President Obama who believes "America's World order is worth preserving?" Our President wants other countries to take the lead in being the point country on crises that can take down our World at any time without any advance notice. He does not want to commit his time and the assets of America to leading the World through the dangerous and treacherous future that the next generations must survive. President Obama has clearly stated by his actions that "America's World Order is (not) worth Preserving." In doing this, President Obama has given a new concept to World leadership. It is called "leading from behind." It is suggested that President Obama wants to disengage America's leadership role which will bring to an end America's World Order.

For President Obama to proceed with his plan of disengagement in the World he must maintain the one base of voters whom he feels will always continue to support him; namely, what he calls the "African Americans." If President Obama represents what are the core beliefs of a voting block then that is how democracy works; and, all other matters being equal, it makes sense for them to support him. The question is does President Obama represent the core beliefs and values of "African Americans." (Americans of African Descent) If he does not, should they as a voting block still support him?

In short, if you proclaim President Obama is the true representative of Americans of African Descent, then future Americans of African Descent will carry the significant responsibility and public accountability for President Obama's success or failure.

**Will History record that The Failures of President Obama are
The Failures of President Obama or the Failures of the
First American of African Descent President?**

**Do President Obama's core beliefs represent the beliefs and values of the
Americans of African Descent?**

President Obama was raised by his White mother and grandparents in a White society and educated in White schools, while he was in this country. This

may not be controlling in the formulation of his core beliefs and values. He still may have otherwise acquired the core values, honor, integrity, humility, sensitivity and leadership traits which Americans of African Descent have demonstrated by their conduct and action. An in depth study would require relying on what a person says which is not as reliable as what a person does or has done in real time decisions. Real-time decisions of a person are the best source of President Obama's core values.

One example is the Iranian revolt by the Iranian people on June 20, 2009. President Obama had already set the table of what the Iranian People expected from America in his prior speeches and actions in which he had stated that he represented "hope and change" and "yes we can." President Obama then stated in his Cairo speech on June 4, 2009 that America would "*support them everywhere.*" Specifically, he stated:

*"...But I do have an unyielding belief that all people yearn for certain things: the ability to speak your mind and have a say in how you are governed; confident in the rule of law and the equal administration of justice; government that is transparent and doesn't steal from the people; the freedom to live as you choose. **Those are not just American ideas, they are human rights, and that is why we will support them everywhere.**"*

Sixteen days after President Obama's Cairo speech, Nada Agha Soltan was killed on the streets of Iran by Iranian Government police. She and thousands of other Iranians were peacefully demonstrating against the recent fraudulent elections by the Iranian leaders. The Iranian people e-mailed and tweeted to the world pleading for help. The e-mails included pictures of Miss Agha Soltan and others being beaten and killed. The e-mails also included pictures of what people were writing on walls and streets. The words were of Iranian people asking President Obama "are you with us or against us." These pictures, videos and tweets were sent to America and President Obama and all around the World as part of their pleas for help. Time Magazine included a photo of others trying to save Miss Agha Soltan after she had been shot.

President Obama made no immediate response; but, as the World wide call for action grew, he responded. It is reported that the BBC said President Obama stated:

"I am deeply troubled by the violence ...I think the democratic process, free speech, the ability for folks to peacefully dissent, all those are universal values and need to be respected:

"... We respect Iranian sovereignty and want to avoid the United States being the issue inside of Iran."

Iran also had been and was still actively providing explosives and weapons which were being used to kill and injure American service people in Iraq and Afghanistan.

President Obama answered the pleas by the Iranian people He did nothing and was able to "*avoid the United States being the issue inside Iran.*" Because he did nothing, the internal revolution inside Iran was crushed and many Iranians died or were imprisoned.

President Obama had never actually said he was against them, so he seized on an opportunity three and one half months later to tell the World that he had supported Miss Agha Soltan and the Iranian people.

The opportunity was the announcement that the Nobel Peace Prize had been awarded to President Obama. This was announced on October 9, 2009 and the president made a statement that date acknowledging his receipt of the award.

When President Obama makes a statement or speech he often uses a method that is unique and to which a name has not been previously assigned. I will simply refer to the method as "Obamaesque." This is when President Obama makes a number of strong statements or refers to actions of others which are strong, accurate and clear statements and many times emotionally compelling. These statements may not be directly related to a certain position of President Obama. He blends these statements in with what he represents to be a correct statement of certain facts which may be false or only partially true; and, at a minimum, are self-serving to President Obama. Then, because the other statements are correct and emotionally compelling, his false and/or less than completely true statements are emotionally accepted as true; or, at a minimum, as not being incorrect. If you then question his integrity in doing this, you run the risk of being charged with being prejudice. Seldom does anyone fully publicly examine the specific facts.

An example of "Obamaesque Courage" is President Obama's statement on October 09, 2009 in which he receives the Nobel Peace Prize. The statement is first repeated in its entirety and then broken down to show how this deception works.

"This award is not simply about the efforts of my administration; it's about the courageous **efforts** of people

around the world. And that's why this award must be shared with everyone who strives for justice and dignity; for the young woman who marches silently in the streets on behalf of her right to be heard, even in the face of beatings and bullets; for the leader imprisoned in her own home because she refuses to abandon her commitment to democracy; for the soldier who sacrificed through tour after tour of duty on behalf of someone half a world away; and for all those men and women across the world who sacrifice their safety and their freedom and sometimes their lives for the cause of peace. That has always been the cause of America. That's why the world has always looked to America. And that's why I believe America will continue to lead."

The statement is separated into its different parts to show how the deception is orchestrated. First:

*"This award is not simply about the **efforts** of my administration; it's about the courageous efforts of people around the world. And that's why this award must be shared with everyone who strives for justice and dignity."*

What had President Obama and his administration done to warrant the Nobel Peace Prize? President Obama had made general speeches of "hope and change" and "yes we can." Add to this his Cairo speech on June 4, 2009 where he called for "freedom," "human rights" and he stated that "America would support them everywhere." Some will point to other speeches about obtaining peace, but there is nothing specific in any of them, so there is nothing to be against unless you are against peace and hope and change. After President Obama acknowledged that his Administration has made **efforts**, the President then sets the table to identify his **efforts** and other people's **efforts** from around the World. He then describes the nature of the other people's efforts as "*courageous ...who strive for justice and dignity.*" President Obama never says what his **efforts** were.

So we have President Obama standing on his self-created podium to acknowledge the Nobel Peace Prize. He calls forth and recognizes certain "courageous" people from around the World who have made "*courageous efforts for justice and dignity.*" The President then proceeds to describe some and name others whom he says should share the award with him at his self-created podium.

He described first a young woman who was killed on the streets of Iran in a peace march on June 20, 2009 three and one half months earlier. President Obama states:

“ for the young woman who marches silently in the streets on behalf of her right to be heard, even in the face of beatings and bullets”

President Obama fails to state the name of the young woman, Neda Agha Soltan, who had been killed marching silently in the streets of Iran. Even when President Obama uses the event of her death to invoke and prove his own entitlement to the Nobel Peace Prize he does not have the integrity to give her name, which would enshrine her spirit for eternity in the history of America. President Obama also fails to mention the name of the people and government who brutally killed her (Iran). If he had mentioned their names it might have offended the Iranian killers. President Obama also fails to tell the World why he refused to come to her and the other demonstrators' aid when they asked and pleaded for help on the internet and twitter. Their words and writings had been clear screams to the World: "President Obama are you with us or against us?"

Unfortunately for America, the world and the next generation of dictators and terrorists watched and saw President Obama say and do nothing.

President Obama then states further in his October 9, 2009 acknowledgment of the Peace prize the mention of a person understood to be a Burma political independent leader, Aung San Suu Ky. President Obama then mentions the American soldiers who are fighting and dying around the world. President Obama then closes with:

“ and for all those men and women across the world who sacrifice their safety and their freedom and sometimes their lives for the cause of peace. That has always been the cause of America. That’s why the world has always looked to America. And that’s why I believe America will continue to lead.”

Those are the people President Obama chooses to include on his self-created podium to acknowledge his Nobel Peace Prize and to share the prize with him.

President Obama then used them as examples of “*courageous*” and notes their “*strive for justice and dignity*,” which would entitle them to stand on his podium to receive the Nobel Peace Prize with him. The point being their “*courageous*” and “*strive for justice and dignity*” matched his, President Obama’s

"*courageous*" and "*strive for justice and dignity.*" This is the conclusion when one follows the process dictated by "Obamaesque Courage."

President Obama has taken the acts of courage of others and joined them in a ceremony where everyone, including him, will be honored for their courageous efforts. This creates two problems.

1. President Obama did not have the courage to mention the name of the courageous lady he asked to share the Nobel Peace Prize with him.

2. No one, including the President, identifies or attempts to identify what "efforts" and "courageous" acts were performed by President Obama.

History will record President Obama's "courageous" "...efforts" as not having the courage to say the courageous lady's name, *Nada Agha Soltan*

I wonder if Miss Agha Soltan and the other demonstrators who had died and been imprisoned believed President Obama when he said, as part of his acceptance speech of the Nobel Peace Prize, that

"... America will continue to lead"?

B. History is repeating itself.

Today, in the year 2012, history is repeating itself in a very urgent and dangerous way.

1.) Just as when Colonel Green, who was White, led the Rhode Island all Black unit in the Revolutionary War and was mortally wounded, his personal guards, who were Black, each still fought to their deaths performing the duty that they had undertaken.

2.) Just as in 1898 when, during the charge on San Juan Hill, Sgt. Berry rescued the White 3rd Cavalry's Colors (battle flag) from where it had fallen on the ground and lay as White soldiers passed it by in their charge on San Juan Hill. It had to be picked up and rescued by Sgt. Berry. Sgt. Berry was the Color bearer of the 10th Cavalry, an all Negro U.S. Military Regiment. Sgt. Berry then as reported by an eye witness:

"Then, with two flags flying above him, and two heavy staves to bear, this powerful negro (he is literally a giant in strength and stature) charged the heights, while white men and black men cheered him as they pressed behind..."

3.) Just as in 1898 when the "Rough Riders" led by a future President, Colonel Roosevelt, in both of the battles at San Juan Hill and El Cagney, needed the Negro Twenty-fourth Infantry, Tenth Cavalry; and, what some say, was at the time the most famous fighting regiment in the United States service, the all Negro Ninth Cavalry, to rescue them in the Spanish American War.

4.) Just as some of the White Bomber Pilots and Crews in 1944, who were preparing to leave on bombing runs over Germany, requested the pilots of the Tuskegee Squadron (Red Tails) to protect them.

Col. B. Davis, Jr., commander of the "Red Tails", stated in part:

"...They appreciated our practice of sticking with them through the roughest spots over the target, where the danger of attack was greatest, and covering them through the flack and fighters until they were able to regroup. They particularly liked our practice of detaching fighters to escort crippled bombers that were stragging because of battle damage"

5) Just as in all the unreported times when Black people helped White people and White people helped Black people, the time is here when the White people need help and are asking Black people for help.

6.) Just as Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. stated in Where Do We Go From Here?

"But we are also Americans. Abused and scorned though we may be, our destiny is tied up with the destiny of America. In spite of the psychological appeals of identification with Africa, the Negro must face the fact that America is now his home, a home that he helped to build through 'blood, sweat and tears...."

... America must be a nation in which its multiracial people are partners in power. This is the essence of democracy toward which all Negro struggles have been directed since the distant past when he was transplanted here in chains."

Reverend Martin Luther King Jr. is saying the power to which "all Negro struggles have been directed since the distant past when he was transplanted here in chains" is the power that comes from when "multiracial people are partners in power."

C. Immediate Need for Americans of African Descent to Rescue America From the Politically Engineered Racial and Class Breach.

President Barack H. Obama is now saying to Americans of African Descent: *"It will be up to each of you to make sure that the young people, African Americans, Latino and Women who powered our victory in 2008 stand together once again."* Specifically, President Obama and the liberal left want the power from racial groups to stand and act together for them in elections. He is not asking for what Reverend King asked for; namely, "multiracial support." President Obama is asking for support based on the opposite of "multiracial;" namely, support based on a person's "race."

President Obama and the liberal left are using race and class division to set in motion forces to bring about their victory in 2012 and in future elections.

One variable they cannot control is whether the Americans of African Descent follow the directions of President Obama and the liberal left.

The non-African Descendants in this Nation must now ask the Americans of African Descent to not take the bait from the liberal left politicians led by President Obama and not lead him to victory in 2012 and future elections because of their classification as "African American."

Is it time for Americans who have ancestors from Africa; who, as co-founders helped build this nation, to take their seat at the table with the rest of the Americans and when they take the seat to **remember the words of Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.:**

"...and together moving toward that colorless power that we all need for security and justice shall have true and lasting meaning."

Americans with ancestors from West and Central Africa climbed up from Slavery on their sheer will and determination so their future generation would be equals as part of the future of "The Shining City upon a Hill."

Some Americans of African Descent or Americans with African Ancestors will say we already have an "African American" at the table of power of this country and he is at the head of the table; namely, President Barack H. Obama.

What does President Obama have in common with the Americans of African Descent in this country?

1. Did his ancestors come from the same geographic area of Africa? No

2. Did his ancestors come from the same culture, including religion? **No**
 - i. Almost all Slaves and their descendents who were co-founders of this Nation came from West Africa and some from Central Africa.
 - ii. President Obama's African ancestor came to this country from Kenya in East Africa in 1959 and left this country in 1965.
3. Did his ancestors work to build this country in war and peace? **No.**
4. Did his ancestors suffer the brutality, deprivation, insults, and hardship of Slavery and discrimination? **No**
5. Did his ancestors have similar colored skin? **Yes**
6. Does President Obama call himself an "African American?" **Yes**

President Obama has only two of the above items in common with Americans of African Descent: color of their skin, and that he calls himself African American.

Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. would not agree with President Obama that the color of one's skin or that one's designation as an African should come before being called an "American." Nor would Reverend King agree that the color of one's skin should be a factor in determining how an American of African Descent should vote in the upcoming 2012 election and future elections.

Reverend King delivered a speech on April 18, 1959 in Washington D.C. to 26,000 high school and college students. The students were both Black and White who had gathered to march in support of the *Brown* decision that ended racial segregation in the Nation's schools. Reverend King stated:

"As I stand here and look out upon the thousands of Negro faces, and the thousands of white faces, intermingled like the waters of a river, I see only one face – the face of the future."

When Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. looked out upon the thousands of faces he did not see "African Americans" or "White Americans" he saw "Americans" and they were

the faces of "America's future."

When President Obama looks out upon the thousands of faces he sees only the color of the faces, and he thinks the "African American" and "Latino" faces will only see President Obama's face, because he is African American, as the face of "America's future."

President Obama and the liberal left will promise you many things if you become their soldiers to "power" them forward in 2012 and in future elections. We are not asking you not to support President Obama and the liberal left. We are asking you not to support President Obama and the liberal left based on racial and class differences and

if you support them do it through the Democratic process; do not do it in the Streets. Do it in a way that would fulfill the dream of Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.

The rest of the Americans cannot match President Obama's and the liberal left's material promises but they can insure that if the Americans of African Descent pull this nation back from the politically engineered racial and class breach, they and their future generation will have a secure place at the table of power they helped build as co-founders of "The Shining City Upon a Hill." President Reagan described this City when he said:

"...but in my mind it was a tall proud city built on rocks God-blessed, teeming with people of all kind living in harmony and peace."

It is time for Americans with African Ancestors who were and are co-founders of this Nation to take their place At the Table of Power with the rest of the Americans in:

**"The Shining City Upon a Hill,"
and do it as Americans.**

- 54th Massachusetts Infantry Regiment, **15**
 A Testament of Hope, **49**
 Abigail Thernstrom, **54**
 Agha Soltan, **96, 97, 99, 100**
Alan Booth, **36**
 Alva N. Temple, **32**
American Religious Identification Survey of 2008, **58, 59**
 Anwar al-Awlaki, **69, 70, 73**
 Ariel Keycard, **58**
 Arnold Air Society Eugene M. Zuckert Award, **32**
Atout, **9**
 B.G. Burkett, **35**
 Barry A. Kosmas, **58**
Batammaliba, **9**
 Benjamin C. Ray, **7, 9**
 Benjamin Carson, **49, 50**
 Birmingham, Alabama, **38**
Blacklash, **79, 83**
Bloods, **36**
 Born Alive Infants Protection Act, **68**
 Brown v. Topeka Board of Education, **ii, 28, 34, 35**
Buganda, **9**
 Camilla Z. Charles, **75**
Cecile Richards, **63**
 Charles C. Mann, **4, 12, 78**
 Charles E. McGee, **32**
Charles L. Thomas, **33**
 Charles Miller, **13**
 Christine B. Hickman, **47**
Church of the Holy Trinity v. United States, **56, 57**
 Civil Rights Act of 1965, **ii, 37**
 Clarence B. Jones, **45**
 Clarence Gamble, **62**
 Col. B. Davis, Jr., **30, 101**
Colonel Greene, **12**
 Constitutional Convention, **14**
Cynthia Gimbel, **36**
Daniel James, Jr., **32**
 Daniel Lapin, **60**
 David Brooks, **90**
 David J. Brewer, **57**
 David M. Fergusson, **82**
Dead Presidents, **36**
 Deneen Borelli, **79, 83**
 Dennis Prager, **59**
 dignity, **6, 15, 18, 19, 36, 38, 39, 78, 79, 80, 82, 83, 84, 85, 98, 99**
 Director of the F.B.I., **73**
Dorie Miller, **34**
 Doug Wilder, **88**
 Douglas A. Blackmon, **27**
 dual school system, **35**
 dual school systems, **34, 35**
Edward A. Carter II, **33**
 Edward A. Johnson, **19, 24**
Edward L. Ayers, **17**
 Edward Van Zite Scott, **18**
 Eisenhower, **34**
 Emma Kaplan, **12**
Eric Holder, **69, 70**
 Examining the United Church of Christ, **54**
 Fogleman, **32**
 Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, **73**
Freddie Stowers, **30**
 Frederick Douglass, **15**
 Gabriel Prosser, **43**
 George E. Powell, **24, 93**
 George Fitzhugh, **5, 8**
George Henry White, **17**
 George P. Shultz, **35**
George Watson, **33**
 Glenna Whitley, **35**
Gonzales v. Carhart, **66**
 Halbert Alexander, **32**
 Harlem Hell Fighters, **29**
 Harriet Ross Tubman, **i, 14, 15**
 Herbert Aptheker, **43**
INFERNO, **34, 86**
 J. Edgar Hoover, **69**
 James Armistead, **13**
 James Bevel, **37, 90**
 James H. Harvey, **32**
 James H. Stewart, **32**
 James J. Reeb, **37, 91**
 James M. Washington, **38, 49**
James Madison, **72**
 James Monroe, **43**
 Jeff Jacoby, **59**
 Jemmy, **40, 41, 44**
 Jesse Jackson, **46, 88, 89, 90**
 Jill Stanek, **63**
 Jimmie Lee Jackson, **37**
 Joel Engel, **45**
 John Lewis, **37, 38, 39, 46, 90, 91**
John R. Fox, **33**
 Jonathan Turley, **69, 72**
Josiah Bishop, **11**
 Kenneth W. Porter, **16**
 Kintu, **9**
 Laura Hillenbrand, **6**
 Lawrence D. Bobo, **iii, 75**
 Louis Zamperini, **6, 84, 85**
 Lynn M. Homan, **31**
 Malcolm X, **40**
Manianga, **9**
 Margaret Sanger, **61, 62, 63, 64**
 Mario Cuomo, **89**
 Martin Luther King, Jr., **ii, 37, 38, 40, 44, 45, 46, 49, 60, 61, 62, 64, 69, 72, 89, 90, 101, 102, 103, 104**
 Max Hastings, **34, 86**
 Michael Dukakis, **88**
 Michael Sobel, **7, 8, 10**
 Mike Gissler, **82**
 Natalie P. Mota, **82**
 Nixon, **35, 71**
 Obamaesque, **97, 100**
 Obamaesque Courage, **97**
Parrish-St. John, **31**
 Pat Moynihan, **35**
 Patrick Moynihan, **iii, 74**
 Paul Revere, **13**
 Piero Cleijeses, **17**
 Planned Parenthood, **61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67**
 President Johnson's, **38, 46**
 President William J. Clinton, **iii, 87**
 Professors Bobo and Clark, **76, 77, 78, 80, 81**
 Randall Kennedy, **46**
 Red Tails, **30, 32, 101**
 Reverend Jackson, **88**
 Reverend King, **37, 38, 39, 40, 44, 45, 46, 49, 61, 62, 63, 69, 91, 102, 103**
 Richard M. Nixon, **ii**
 Robert Kagan, **4, 93**
 Robert Sutcliff, **43**
Roe v. Wade, **61**
 Roosevelt, **22, 24, 25, 31, 101**
 Rough Riders, **21, 23, 101**
Ruben Rivers, **33**

San Juan Hill, **20, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 93, 100, 101**
Selma, **37, 38, 85, 89, 90, 91**
Sergeant Berry, **20**
Shirley Chisholm, **88**
Sidney Kaplan, **12**
Simon Bockie, **9**
Spanish American War, **i, 3, 17, 29, 51, 83, 90, 93, 101**
Stephan Thernstrom, **54**
Stolen Valor, **35, 36**
Stono, **40, 41, 42**
Taylor Branch, **45**

The Big Picture, **50**
The Case for National Action, **74**
The Economist, **86**
The Negro Family, **iii, 74**
The Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, **52**
The United States a Christian Nation, **57**
The World America Made, **93, 94**
Thomas Jefferson, **13**
Thomas Pain, **48**
Thomas Reilly, **31**
Tom Wicker, **35**

Truman, **33, 34**
Tuskegee Airman, **32**
Tuskegee Airmen, **30, 31, 32, 33**
Unbroken, **6, 84**
Vernon J. Baker, **33**
Vidal v. Girard's Executors, **55**
William H. (Bill) Cosby, **49, 50**
William J. Clinton, **85**
William McKinley, **19**
Willy F. James Jr., **33**
Woodrow Wilson, **28**
Yoruba, **10**