



Selected Writings

Angryindian – Rev. Sequoyah Ade

Author of *The Angryindian Reader* and host of *Voice of a Native Son*

This is a freely distributable e-book released under a Creative Commons license.

This is an **intelligentaboriginal Media** publication.
<http://intelligentaboriginal.atspace.org/>

Extreme Prejudice:

Examining Contemporary Genocide in America

Selected Writings

By

Rev. Sequoyah Ade, A.K.A., the Angryindian

Author of **The Angryindian Reader** and host of **Voice of a Native Son**

Contents

- Preface
 - Introduction
 - Author's Note
1. Incorporation and Resistance: Deconstructing Anti-Racist Opposition to Institutionalised Racism
 2. Historical Revisionism at Play in the Minds of the Establishment
 3. The Reality of Rosa Parks
 4. The Ghost of Grey Owl, 911 and Other Matters: In defence of Ward Churchill and the American right of dissent
 5. The New Revisionism: Michelle Malkin's legitimisation of American Racialism
 6. American Neo-Asian Eugenics
 7. The Passions of Suzie Wong Revisited
 8. An Innovative Affair of Genocide
 9. Wasi'chu Revisionism Studies 101

This e-book is dedicated to my parents T. J. and Gracia Mae, may they forever rest in peace in the new lands and rivers with the entirety of our ancestral line.

While I know this is not the life they had in mind for me,
They are an indelible part of each word printed.

For this I am eternally grateful.

Please forgive me as I have forgiven you for the love we were never able to express
to each other in this world of illusion and loss.

Preface

Like virtually everyone else that is born and raised in the United States, I grew up accepting European traditions, beliefs and moral authority without question. Cinematic frontiersman and American icon John Wayne killing three Indians racing towards him mounted on horseback with one pistol shot, good. Indigenous warriors defending their people from marauding White settlers, U.S. Army storm troopers and opportunistic gold miners, bad. This was the world I had come to resign myself to. A society constructed of wholesale violence, exploitation and racism founded on slavery and genocide. Factors I had no idea as a child would serve to shape and define how I and other people of colour are perceived and more importantly, to the manner in which we are treated.

As a youngster I was naturally shy, withdrawn and relentlessly persecuted. I grew up in a violent, economically depressed predominately West Indian district in New York City that displayed little tolerance for nonconformity. Generally speaking, while people worked and participated in many communal endeavours, intermarried and celebrated together, race and culture always mattered. Puerto Ricans battled people from the Dominican Republic despite their common ethno-cultural and historical ties; Jamaicans disliked those from Trinidad; people from Barbados detested Panamanians; folks from the U.S. Virgin Islands ostracized Guyanese immigrants and Haitians were hated by just about everybody. Homosexuals were vilified. Most people who could afford it owned a TV and assumed that all Arabs were PLO terrorists, so their stores in the community were almost never robbed. The two Chinese families that owned hand laundry shops in the community actually fared better than one would have expected given the circumstances. Their children, when not working alongside the family after school played with anyone who was willing with the parents seemingly ok as long as they stayed within their vision. Kids unlike their parents don't see race. The one very ancient Jewish

lady who predated the “White Flight” of the late sixties and refused to leave her home was respected as a bastion of the neighbourhood and respected as such. Hence, even the most wicked amongst the rabble thought twice before mugging her. Unlike other White people like the police officers and teachers who reminded us of our less than equal status, she accepted us. And we her.

At the top of this local hierarchy sat American Africans, (Blacks) who through their being born on U.S. soil and cheeky lies told to them by White men in powerful positions, considered themselves as many unfortunately still do, exceptional and “better” than the immigrant classes surrounding them. Provided of course that the immigrants in question are not of European descent. I later learned the hard way that such machinations only blinded us to what was really happening and how the implications of ethnic and, or cultural superiority actually maintained Eurocentric hegemony over us and anyone else White American society wanted to keep under thumb. In essence, we were trained through the pedagogical, cultural and political uses of psychological force, (i.e., the schools, the churches and the law) to validate our own oppression.

This reliance on psychological jujutsu is the glue that makes colonialism work. Without it, it is virtually impossible to control a people, nation or cultural group who still maintain a sense of identity and self-worth as human beings. With the nature of humanity among non-Europeans left up to inquiring minds in American academia, popular pseudo-scientific books such as the Bell Curve and political opinions by conservatives and liberals alike, it’s a wonder we’ve survived at all.

In fact *I* wonder how I managed to survive. Spawned via the union of a Native American/Filipino/European Jewish mother and Geechie/Native American father, my not fitting in was a forgone conclusion. Most people from my hometown were unfamiliar with Native Americans at the time and since I and my sisters looked discernibly different even from members of our own nuclear family we were burdened with more than our own share of inner grief. We carried on our backs the weight of 500 years of European incited inter-tribal warfare and the self colonialising pressure of enforced assimilation.

We fought amongst ourselves as much as we had to fight in the streets. When we were angry with each other, which was often, ethnic insults were used along with the usual immature invectives children employ pointing out physical and behavioural qualities the other did not have. Interestingly enough, our parents quietly condoned such intra-familial hatred. It took many years of working through the pain of this and numerous other infractions to realise that they were so steeped in their own internalised ethnic self-hatred that they considered such activity “home training,” honest no nonsense preparation for real world life. I was too inexperienced and too young to realise at the time that the strain I endured at home and in the real world would push me into frames of mind that nearly drove me to commit suicide. Where self-loathing, depression and alcohol failed, White supremacy nearly succeeded.

For a period lasting perhaps fifteen years I became the poster child for the ghetto Oreo. I was the epitome of an Uncle Tom, apologising to Whites for Black anger and desperation and chastising Blacks and Indians in particular for not being as “evolved” as I thought I was. What I was doing was unconscionable. But colonialism as practised in the United States has the power to make a normally rational people act like a fool and I played my role well. I was patted on the back so often my most of my shirts and sweaters had bald spots. I was an unassuming, non threatening brown-skinned male trying to catch a break. A walking advertisement providing evidence that the American system “worked.” I did my level best to retreat into a dream world of White social acceptance and invisibility and nothing, I determined would prevent me from reaching it.

I spayed “blond” highlights into my fro, watched the Brady Bunch so much that I knew the dialogue by heart and tried very hard to become what I thought I needed to be in order to gain White acceptance. I fully expected to finish school, work on Wall Street, marry a White woman, (or shack up with a White male partner) produce further diluted “evolved” kids and live hopefully in the condo or split-level duplex on my dreams. It took the Rodney King beating and several inebriated White acquaintances in my own home to remind me that I was acceptable so long as I conveniently remained dutifully in my place.

In truth we all used each other. My White friends used me as “proof” of their liberalism and in turn I used them as badges to show the White world that I was good enough to walk among them and have sex with their daughters. My usefulness however diminished at an alarming rate once I vocalised the colour of my discontent. I found myself in a matter of three days nearly friendless, devoid of moral or emotional support and on the brink of ending it all in the Shakespearian sense. The relationship I was involved in at the time never recovered from the shock. She remained but because she could not understand my emotional distress at being cut off from everything I had come to know, our time together was doomed to end. She stuck around intermittently for a few more years after that but the damage had already been done. Being Jewish from the other side of town she was no stranger to the bigotries and uncertainties of American life even in a looming metropolis such as New York. But my inability to articulate to her let alone comprehend for myself what was happening to me was just too much for her to bear. She faithfully sat through my episodes, quietly supportive yet asking herself, “is all this worth the effort?”

She obviously thought I was, at least for a little while longer. Eventually she too gave way to her own needs for inner peace and bid me farewell. I was too blinded by my pain to see beyond myself and in due course we parted finally for the last time. I have always considered myself the major loser in this affair and I have always hoped she managed to find someone who embraced her adoration as I at that time was unable. Unlike me, she was able to transcend the prejudice, injustice and hate colonialism produces in the hearts of people everywhere. Her intentions were pure, selfless and devoid of the unnecessary hype those around her espoused. Of all the awkward and discomfiting things I have done in my life to deal with my issues of acceptance and acceptability, losing her love remains my one major regret. And I vowed, once I got my act together to never allow the insidious practise of selective ethnocide to define my life again.

I have survived. I survived through the benevolent graces of people of all ethnic backgrounds kind enough to clean my wounds and righteous enough to tell me the truth despite the false information I was bombarded with on a daily basis.

Things were not always that way. My current activities challenging bias through anti-racist activism and Indigenist advocacy hark back to the activism of my youth. In speaking out and taking a stand against intolerance and bigotry in this nation state I am merely returning to my roots. I was raised in the midst of change. The ghost of Malcolm X still strolled the streets of Harlem in those days. I was a child held in my mother's arms when the announcement came across the radio that Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was assassinated. Wounded Knee was only a few years away and men in my community dropped the needle and formed groups to educate and to address issues Black people wanted recognised. I was born into a world agitating for liberation and I saw no reason why I should not add my voice to the masses that marched in the streets demanding a change to business as usual.

My first overt political act to me was of a personal nature. I had no idea that this undertaking would lay the foundation for the thoughts you will find expressed in this volume. As a skinny, fair-skinned and nappy-haired mixed-race fifth-grader I passed most of my time apart from attending school, (a total horrorshow if there ever was one) and developing my skills in artfully dodging the neighbourhood bullies by sitting at home reading extra material to buttress my classwork. It did not take long before I started realising that the books I bought second hand with my weekly allowance were contradicting the outdated textbooks we used in class. By the time I reached the fifth grade I began viewing the "system" as so many of us passively call it as something false.

The calculus I used was very simple: if Indian people were here before Europeans and African people and some Asians arrived here via institutional slavery, the idea of a freedom loving American nation was a sham, a lie of the highest order. And as someone baptised Catholic and advised in Sunday school that to lie was a grave sin against not just Jesus Christ, Mary and the Father, but truth itself; I made a decision no to go along with the programme.

It was a Thursday morning not unlike any other school day. Back in those days all school children were required to recite the liturgy of the Eurocentric Church of the White Father in America in the morning, usually before ten o'clock. Otherwise known as the Pledge of Allegiance, we were told that if we did not perform the daily ritual we were doomed to become bad Americans who would end up like those people not as fortunate to be here like say, the Chinese whom our teachers kept referring to as the Red Menace. But on this particular day for some reason, perhaps because I had read something that stirred me the evening before, I decided not to stand up and place my right hand over my chest. That first day, the auditorium monitor protested but did little else. But by the next day things were different. We entered as a class as usual, sat as a group as usual and waited for the principal to ascend the stage and lead the congregation, as usual. Like the day before I

remained seated and like the day before, the monitor protested. But unlike the previous day several of my classmates remained seated as well.

This time the monitor's protest was supported and enforced by the principal, several other teachers and most of the ladies that worked in the school's main office. All of the dissenting students, about six or seven of us (it's a little fuzzy since this was more than thirty years ago, so please forgive any inaccuracies) were taken to the office and our parents called. Brought before the principal and his assistant we were asked who gave us the idea to not stand and give respect to the flag. We all said to a man that no one convinced us or made us remain seated, that we had decided for ourselves and that in America no one could force another to do something against his or her will. Then, two of the boys alluded to the fact that I would tell them about the information I was reading and that it seemed to make sense to them not to support a flag that represented oppression for Black people. We, contrasting the people paid to mind us actually lived in the ghetto and could see the day to day brutality of poverty and ethnic bias. In other words they could say whatever they wanted, we knew from life experience that life for brown people in this world was a hard existence and no sugar coated explanations as to why were supposed to accept that injustice would suffice.

This affirmation of our civil and human rights earned us all a few days suspension and for me, a special place in the minds of the school establishment. I was summarily marked as a troublemaker and treated accordingly. My parents, especially my mother was livid. She was a staunch conservative who because of her light skin and genteel manner managed to land positions as a personal assistant to both Nelson Rockefeller and United Nations Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld and saw no reason to rock the boat. My father who had lived through Klan terror in the Deep South, racism in the U.S. Navy and arrived in New York City after World War Two travelling partly by horse and buggy saw things in a similar light but felt compelled to let my dissent slide at least this one time. As my father he was very concerned with my respecting him as such and defended my protest by reminding my mother that I was told not to lie and that if I read something that contradicted what they were telling me in school, I had a right to speak my mind about it. In his view, he would rather have a dissident radical living under his roof than a fool.

Such recognition was rare for me and still is to a large degree. In the case of my parents, our numerous differences and sometimes frenzied hatred for each other can be linked to the very subjects I discuss in this collection of writings. In other spaces where the ties that bind are more emotive, mental and bureaucratic rather than genetic, these issues are matters of consequence affecting each of us as members of the human family. And as such when one observes the levels of disunity within distinct ethnic groups visible in the United States and the liquidation of leaders valiant enough to call America on its rhetoric, one begins to understand that such dissent has to be. To not do so is a grave disservice to those men and women, Black, White, Indian, Asian and everything in between who have lost their families, homes and lives defending the very right to be human in this country.

This is not a book as such. It is a narrative of what it is like to be non-White in an overwhelmingly White environment. For those of us who carry the genetic material of

the first peoples of the world, this e-book will hopefully alert some to information they may not have been aware of previously. The rest, as they say is old hat. For many Europeans and those whom still regard America's obsession with Whiteness as a badge of eugenic elitism, it will mean very little. For such individuals I will never be able to prove a negative in their bigoted worldview to any appreciable degree. But if they decide to download this e-book for whatever reason, they are unwittingly showing that they know they have a problem with race and are somewhat willing to find a way to traverse the chasm without resorting to the bully boy reinforcement of institutional racism. .

If one person, just one, of any ethnicity, nationality, sexual orientation or religious/spiritual persuasion decides to discard or at least question the doctrine of unearned White privilege and power, I will rest easy knowing I made a difference.

That's about the best any of us can be expected to do.

Rev. Sequoyah Ade, a.k.a. The Angryindian

Introduction

One of the most insidious aspects of colonization is the false history it creates to legitimize and celebrate the exploits of the colonizer. Glorifying white male privilege, the stories we are told about our past are often divergent from history as it was actually experienced. Furthermore, colonial myths have proven to be extremely fluid with time. We can easily critique racism in the antebellum South but find its prevalence more difficult to identify in our contemporary world as it has adapted to a transformed society. Thus, in attempting decolonization, one of the greatest challenges becomes recognizing the ways in which we have internalized the erroneous stories of the colonial myth; the multifarious ways in which it has been integrated and continually recapitulated in our own lives.

The writings of Sequoyah Ade become an important tool in deciphering the reality of the current state of affairs that are often part and parcel of colonial mythology. Although the collection of poignant and well-reasoned essays varies in topic, they are linked thematically as they often stand in opposition to how mainstream media and historical narratives view society. Addressing varied topics such as the appropriation of Native culture within Euro-American Gay, Lesbian and Transgender communities in “An Innovative Affair of Genocide” to an investigation of the true indigenous origin of the name America in “What Does American Mean?” the essays offer intriguing examinations into the complexities of oppression we are surrounded by.

I initially became acquainted with Sequoyah while producing a film on the experiences of people that are of both African American and American Indian heritage. The piece looks at the difficulty of articulating a Black Indian or Afro-Native identity in a society in which one drop of Black blood erases all other ancestral ties and Native identity is determined by blood quantum. Throughout his involvement in the project, I was impressed by Sequoyah’s intensity, thoughtfulness and honesty in addressing issues of historical misrepresentation of indigenous and African American peoples and the intricacies of the ways in which colonization has shaped how we view race and identity. Also, as a Two-Spirited Black Indian producing knowledge for public dissemination, he illustrates that those most negatively impacted by the organization of society by race, class and gender are not incapacitated victims of history but in many ways, the most qualified and accurate in producing critiques of our society.

The aspect I find that resonates most profoundly in his writings is an underlying call for the recognition of our humanity. In his essay “Wasi’chu” Sequoyah, in response to a critique of his politics by a reader of Euro-American descent, writes:

“a human being is much more than just something skin deep.....Our true humanity lies in our congenital potential to perceive the essence of ourselves in others. In the final estimation, it may prove to be our only saving grace.”

His critique of race politics is an attempt for truth in an often nonsensical Eurocentric shaping of reality. By utilizing both intuition and intellect, he has produced a collection of thought provoking essays that inspire the reader to combat complacency.

Alicia Woods

*Alicia Woods is an educator and documentary filmmaker in the Pacific Northwest. Her latest project, "From Mashantucket Pequot to Makah." explores the complexities of Black Indian identity issues in America.

Incorporation and Resistance:
Deconstructing Anti-Racist Opposition to Institutionalized Racism

6.14.05

“I freed thousands of slaves. I could have freed thousands more if they had known they were slaves.”

Harriet Tubman

America as metaphor has been throughout its entire post-Columbian history an unremitting ideological arena on matters of ethno-cultural superiorities and the right of conquered peoples to seek emancipation from their subjugator. From the premeditated European invasion of the Americas in 1492 to its present status as singular global superpower, the United States has efficiently dodged its most obvious questions of national discomfiture. Indigenous ethnocide and displacement, informal as well as state-sanctioned Apartheid and government attempts at limiting births within non-European populations, activities collectively classed as genocidal by the international community since the end of the Second World War,ⁱ are commonly disregarded or at best, marginally treated as issues of little or no consequence.

An indispensable element central to this perspective is the xenophobic deduction that people of colour are by their presumed lesser dispositions, Divinely predetermined to capitulate to European peoples and interests. The theoretical lynchpin that underlies this specious conjecture is the belief that Western Ethnic assemblages, i.e., European peoples, represent an elite superlative diametrically superior to all other geographically separate ethnic populations. The dehumanizing characteristics inherent in such philosophies are generally regarded as aberrations of policy, rather than representative manifestations of unsubstantiated ethnocentric prejudices. The detail that racial bias is patently ubiquitous to Eurosupremacist colonial authority wherever it is found is ignored in favour of vociferous avowals to universal humanism and individual liberties. Yet the pragmatic evidence of such egalitarian moralism in the West is virtually non-existent in the historical documentation. As candidly clarified quite glibly by political historian William J. Durant, “The professed ethic of Europe and America is pacifistic Christianity; the actual ethic is the militaristic code of the marauding Teutons.”ⁱⁱ

The White Man's Burden Revisited

This brazenly nostalgic dichotomy commonly referred to in non-European parlance as “White makes Right,” says as much about the past as it does the present state of affairs. It is not at all accidental that discussions pertaining to questions of race and racial privilege are firmly framed within a conceptual structure that is functionally a precise facsimile of the very dynamics that engendered the repression in the first place. This is metaphorically equivalent to a court of justice in which the accused rapist rather than an impartial party sits in judgement of whether or not a sexual assault actually occurred. It is a functionally subordinate endeavour and calculated to operate as such.

As Malcolm X and many others have elucidated since the mid-1950's, matters of race and racial privilege as institutionalised within the Western socio-political dynamic are conceived exclusively upon Eurosupremacist theoretical parameters. This view is buttressed by the reality that deliberations on racism are by convention, narrowly concentrated upon superficial manifestations of ethnic hate rather than the conscious political exercise of exploitation and control. By centring debate on the results rather than the causes of racism, the arrangement itself is allowed to carry on surreptitiously under the guise of legitimate and progressive social advancement rather than an issue of obstructing socio-political justice. Thereby leaving the originating factors behind the malfeasance for all accounts and purposes functionally intact and replicating in practise.

This prototype is in and of itself highly symptomatic of the debilitating effects of xenophobic colonialist hegemony and indoctrination. The systemic destabilisation of targeted populations via coercive enforcement of Western cultural attributes corresponds directly to the compromising and self-defeating nature of the responsive themes proposed by a large margin of anti-Eurocentric nonconformists. The fact that articulation of this conundrum is rarely, if ever, found within the doctrines of "responsible" a progressive effort is not surprising. What is astonishing is that after 500 years of colonialist Eurosettler domination, only now is the neo-abolitionist movement aware of how invasive and incapacitating Eurosupremacist Pavlovian conditioning actually is.

How this situation has come to pass has never been a secret. The stated purpose of racially demarcated apartheid, that infamously quintessential embodiment of colonialism, was the institution of racial population controls. Period. In the course of deliberately waging campaigns of obliteration against the customary pedagogical means by which ethnic groups maintain their identities, the intended outcome was cognitive disconnection from their own inherited identities to one that approximates the maintenance requirements of the domineering entity. This process, the "benevolent assimilation" of half-devil, half-child people of colour, by and large reconfigures the intellectual potential of the colonised away from emancipatory pursuits towards a model that in effect becomes a self-colonising and therefore self-maintaining cog of the status quo.

The proof is in the pudding

Proactive as well as reflexive Eurosupremacist adherents predictably scoff at this deconstruction as misguided anti-White and even anti-civilisational propaganda and patently ignore that fact that the precedents for such psychological contortions can be readily found in the historical record. In actual fact, if we examine the subject attentively we can plainly distinguish that the current state of affairs is wholly one of premeditated mental conditioning and the not the end result of mediocre biology as argued by Herrnstein and Murray in their neo-eugenicist tome *The Bell Curve*.^{iv}

The formula of applying filial imprinting methodologies to affect population control was used to great effect in Germany as a major component of the National Socialist movement's propaganda machine. Founded in 1922, the Jungsturm Adolf Hitler (Hitler Youth) national-culture organisations which were mandatory for all "Aryan" youth made

Nazi indoctrination, Third Reich fidelity and anti-Jewish prejudice required by law. No serious historian today would claim that mind control of successive generations of German peoples was not the intended goal of the institution. Indeed, such allegations would now be regarded as revisionist and neo-fascist in tone and tremor and dealt with as such. The rationale behind the programme was to churn out thousands upon thousands of assembly line automatons that could be expected to accept totalitarian authority without question.

The classical British boarding school education utilized all through its colonial expansionist zeal is another blatant case in point. It proved so effective in cauterising the anticipated drive to repel unsolicited Western influence that the institution was employed extensively in India and Africa where the practise exists to this day. This programme of calculated sublimation was replicated in the U.S. against Indigenous populations in an attempt to “Kill the Indian and save the man.” This imposition led not only to the corporeal demarcation of Indian children from their communities but as designed, edged the trainees towards an implosive cycle of psychic divide that would in due course induce the Indigenous personality to morph into an entity that would enthusiastically reinforce its own ethnic detachment. Thusly, the Eurosettler provides himself with a hands-off maintenance system that preserves the stability of colonial power and racist status quo. Identified as the “Willie Lynch Syndrome” by many contemporary anti-Racists, the usage of psychological divide and conquer formulas should be seen for what they are. The establishment of eternally debilitating psycho-emotional factors that can still be observed within subjected populations and anticipated to persist in one form or another until the cycle is finally and utterly intellectually abated.

Prospects for change

Liberationist movements whether personal or collective have long utilised the tactical faux pas of structuring their self-determination efforts along Eurocentric conceptual lines of “legitimate” dissent. In lieu of an autonomously self-directed and therefore truly liberational strategy, those combating such marginalisations fritter away their efforts by seeking validation through expediency within the established “standards” of debate as laid out by the oppressor. The foundational thesis behind “race relations” as currently understood is by default a flawed faith of the oppressed. It is a theology of self-defeating concession and acquiescence that preserves academically as well as materially the colonialist's exploitative prerogative. It does not seek to remedy racial stratifications as such but on the contrary, dogmatically reinforces European racial privilege by insisting that associations between colonized and colonizer ought to be negotiated rather than dismantled outright as institutional strategies of discrimination.

Even many among the Europhile establishment have come to comprehend that human rights cannot, if they are to be taken literally, be restricted to a singular cultural representation without implying chauvinistic ethno-cultural superiorities. Nevertheless, the principle victims of such machinations as acknowledged by notables such as Sartre, Memmi and Fanon, are generally not in any position to effectively counter such manoeuvres. As a direct and intended consequence of European imposition and

barbarity, colonialized peoples are psychologically and spiritually castrated and in the main, incapable or unwilling to articulate this reality let alone admit that such counter-productive persuasions are pervasive in their own analysis.

At this point certain questions beg to be asked. If my analysis is empirically correct that non-European liberation movements and ideals are utterly tainted by Euro-colonialist doctrine and perspectives, what then can or should be done? This is not in any sense a recent query. European deliberations concerning abolition can reasonably be traced as far back as the 1772 court ruling declaring that any person upon entering England bound by involuntary servitude was deemed a free agent “Whatever may be the colour of his skin.”* Under Crown law however this ruling was not intended in any way to influence the commercial trade's behaviour outside of Britain proper. England continued to support the trade in its imperialist and colonial holdings; particularly in the new North American colonies that eventually became economically viable through agricultural growth due in large part to Indigenous and later, imported African chattel slaves. This contradiction in values, theoretically free in one enclave yet obligatorily condemned to servitude elsewhere the principle authority holds sway has served to define the dilemma bluntly.

The breath of the quandary as outlined in this work, the means by which emancipation movements and aspirations have been sabotaged from within, is so inopportunately multidimensional that a single paper cannot reasonably be expected to comprehensively address all the particulars involved. What has been made unambiguous is an ideological Achilles' heel that the author feels given sincere consideration and persistence can be made resilient in parity with its original structure. It presents a perspective that forwards not a cyclically defeatist alternative, but an autonomous call to arms in the name of universal human rights to liberty, peace, security and justice. Addressing a critically debilitating weakness in conventionally contemptuous neo-abolitionism is not a recipe for deliverance. Rather, it is a demystifying gnosis. Free to simply be. An endeavour the human spirit has exhibited from the moment humanity rose and explored his world beyond the expanse of Mother Africa. Justice demands that we all be reminded of this most omnipresent and human of commonalities.

Footnotes:

- i) See: Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide; adopted by the United Nations General Assembly Dec. 1948 becoming effectual in January 1951.
- ii) The Story of Civilization (11 vol., 1935-75; vol. 7-11 written in collaboration with his wife, Ariel Durant)
- iii) See: “The White Man's Burden” - Rudyard Kipling, 1899
- iv) “The Bell Curve” - Herrnstein and Murray, 1994
- v) “Official Report of the Nineteenth Annual Conference of Charities and Correction”- Capt. Richard C. Pratt, 1892
- vi) “The William Lynch Speech” - Origin and year of publication unknown. (Author's note: While I personally view the Lynch paper as fraudulent, I do however accept the thesis entailed as it is amply supported by historical as well as

literary factoids. The nature of the debate surrounding the paper is telling in that persons deriving or partial to the Eurosettler caste vehemently disdain the work itself rather than the points raised in the work. Generalizing comparisons to the “Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion” are while technically accurate, entirely and intentionally misleading. The intended goal behind the Protocols was anti-Jewish sentiment, not the exposure of subliminal mental colonisation.

*) See: Steven M. Wise - “Though the Heavens May Fall,” an account of a 18th century trial which led to the abolition of slavery in England

Historical Revisionism at Play in the Minds of the Establishment

1.09.2006

“Take away the Holocaust and one is stunned with admiration for the brilliance of Adolf Hitler.”

- Harold Convington

There is a widely held and insightful notion that there exists a recognised distinction between not knowing and not caring. Former Secretary to the United Nations Madeline Albright made this delineation painfully clear when asked by CBS' Leslie Stahl if the deaths of more than 500,000 Iraqi children directly attributed to U.S. imposed economic sanctions under President Bill Clinton's administration were accurate. Her reply: an emphatic and resounding "yes." She expanded her answer further by stating bluntly that the Clinton administration decided that the human toll exacted to "oust" Iraqi president Saddam Hussein from power was, "Well worth the cost."

Enter Washington Post columnist and conservative social arbiter George F. Will. In his latest diatribe against the National Collegiate Athletic Association's long overdue decision to offer more than lip service when addressing Indian unease at being exploited in the name of "good clean fun," Will's piece "Chief Among the Silliness" attempts to redefine efforts to eliminate ethnic insensitivity in college sports as political correctness run amok.

His documented disdain for multicultural oversight it appears extends to an unconcealed disregard for modern Native American realities least of all Indian self-respect. According to Will, Indians are a typically confused bunch fretting more about casino profits and other business investments than deliberate insults to their humanity. In assuming the colonialist's prerogative to define what is insulting to those affronted, Will is basically saying that Indian people are simply too dim-witted and inconsequential for these issues to matter to non-Indians nor anyone else.

If one is to believe Will, until liberals succeeded in persuading a handful of cynical Indians to view themselves as victims of ethnic stereotyping and that should be angry about it, Indian Country took pride in the attention and openly supported such typecasting. He trots out a handful of examples to validate his argument Native people are not actually offended by Indian mascots but in fact support their use. But these illustrations substantiate nothing but further evidence of the severity of the American Indian colonial condition that we are becoming accustomed to such dehumanisation and that some amongst us may even find worth in such monstrosities.

Likening the non-Indian NCAA to Orwellian thought-police, Will wants us to know that those who empower themselves to speak on behalf of Indians ignore the true sentiments of "real" Indians. Authentic Native Americans to Mr. Will embrace insult such as the Saginaw Chippewa who refuse to allow any "outside entity" to upset that nation's "rich relationship" with Central Michigan University or its players. These Indians characterize

the worst of Native America by not only acquiescing to our sub-caste social status in our own ancestral territories, but by augmenting that disenfranchisement and repression by validating a form of racism already codified in international law as genocide.

But the mascot issue goes further. It would seem that shamelessly conquering an entire continent by force and sadistically liquidating virtually its entire native population apparently isn't enough for Whites in the U.S. to feel convincingly self-assured. The distractive dynamics of ethnic misrepresentations presenting Indians as happy-go-lucky noble savages performing "war dances" for inebriated sports fans across the country apparently satisfies this lack of surety in White dominance over this society. So what we are dealing with here are in reality issues of White self-identity and significance rather than Indian. Racism requires that delineations need to exist between oppressors and oppressed and by denigrating Indians as vanquished symbols of White domination, Whites in turn experience respite in cryptograms that reinforce their self-image as an all-encompassing entity.

Indifference As Logical Disassociation

For Will and other conservative commissars like him, the flagrant reality that Indians are perceptibly dismayed by such representations is of no consequence. Will unflinchingly expounds on this supposedly enlightened apathy with all the logic of a Stalinist copywriter:

“If some Irish or Scots were to take offence at Notre Dame's Fighting Irish or the Fighting Scots of Monmouth College, what rule of morality would require the rest of us to care?”

He is implying of course that civilised relations between people can rationally take place within an overwhelmingly bigoted environment since there exists no empirical regulation obliging society to care. Mr. Will should be commended at this point for a certain degree of candour even though the rest of his column defies logic or common decency. He doesn't care if Indians are insulted. In post-Rosa Parks America, one could be forgiven for assuming that its society would have learned at least a little about institutional racism, the callousness of marginalisation and the injury such intrigues generate in the spirits of those so subjected. No, for Will, the bottom line about whether or not Indian mascots are injurious to Indians, society or both has always resides exactly where White interests level out. In other words, when they decide for themselves that these images and pet names are offensive they will extricate them and not before.

By acknowledging that he is aware of American Indian discontent over this matter while paradoxically positing a rationalization mocking those opposed to what has already been codified by precedent as illustrated at Nuremburg in 1946 with the execution of Julius Streicher and in black letter law in regards to the United Nations 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide, Mr. Will is indeed unambiguously defending anti-Indian ethnocide. And if that suggestion does not sit well with Indians, progressives

and guilt-ridden Whites, tough. Mr. Will wants us to believe him when says that he is not obliged to give a damn.

But he is concerned enough however to offer what could be called a desperate stab at suggesting a moral deficiency in the anti-mascot faction. He fails in this endeavour though he might have generated a chuckle or two in a few who opine that Indians are fond of buck-toothed fire red gnomes that purport to represent them since they are being "honoured" by such indignities. Will's piece offered not one explanation as to why it would be detrimental to society if this revolting humiliation ceased today. Instead, we hear objections to assessments that advise we cannot have an equitable and bias-free environment when surrounded by symbols of White power. Including the insinuation that such blatant bigotry in no way contradicts the just society Will and his neo-con cohorts vociferously profess to bear witness.

What George Will has written in effect should have been titled "A New Defence of Racism" rather than the patently prejudiced "Chief," a slur which only rivals Redskin for emotive malcontent in even the most Europeanised Native American. Will's article lays to rest any line of reasoning that purports to rationalize racism in America is a non-operative anachronism. Institutional racism is just that, institutional and inextricably woven within the American id.

At this juncture it seems commonsensical to ask what significance should be accorded to Indigenous Americans ensnared within such an arrangement. Indian people as a whole have been forced by circumstance into a multi-generational struggle against genocide, forced absorption and marginalisation. The efforts currently employed by Indigenous rights organisations and movements to address First Nations issues are not when viewed holistically exclusively an exercise in "Aboriginal uber alles" extremism. The struggle for land rights, environmental protections, an accurate accounting of pre and post-Columbian Indigenous history and moral opposition to Indian genocide up to and including the usage of dehumanising ethnic caricatures should be topics all people of Cartesian conscience should be concerned with.

Nuremburg set a precedent for what would be accepted as a universal understanding of common respect for the humanity of all peoples. The fact that the United States, the primary nation sitting in judgement through the Nuremburg tribunal executed German government officials and others for conditions that led to atrocities via a programme of xenophobic elimination in Europe while maintaining Indian reservations, Japanese internment camps and Jim Crow at home says much about Eurocentric hypocrisy. The victims of the Nazis were White. So in effect the skin colour of the victims of ethnic character assassination determines whether or not such imagery is damaging to the group in question. A decision reserved for White people, not those so exploited. This is the content of Will's quarrel: do not propose to the establishment that we are to give consideration to Indians; it interferes with my innate sense of superiority.

Ostensibly written to ridicule American Indian activists and non-Indian supporters as unrealistic reverse-racists of an "indignation industry," Mr. Will's callously tactless

commentary achieves exactly the reverse. His spurious and simple-minded defence of team names and imagery that disgrace this country's Indigenous inhabitants go much further than simple anti-Indian bigotries. Will's "White makes Right" approach absentmindedly and doggishly confirms the anti-mascot activist's assertion that insensitivity towards Indians as human beings is at its foundation an exercise in Eurocentric angst.

Will's discourteous nonchalance in downplaying White society's chauvinism while standing in the shadow of Chief Wahoo reveals in detail the inherent flimsiness of accepted Eurocentric presumptions and the limitations of neo-conservative compassion and character.

The Reality of Rosa Parks

11.03.2005

“I had not planned to get arrested. I had plenty to do without having to end up in jail. But when I had to face that decision, I didn't hesitate to do so because I felt that we had endured that too long. The more we gave in, the more we complied with that kind of treatment, the more oppressive it became.”

- Rosa “Lee” Parks

The legend goes something like this: The evening Ms. Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat on the Cleveland Avenue bus in Montgomery, Alabama to a white man in 1955, America changed. Weary from a long day of work at her department store job and divinely inspired by her sorely aching feet, she chose to defy Jim Crow and the obstinate White bus driver who demanded that she relinquish her paid seat within the boundaries of the “coloured” section to a White passenger. Refusing the driver’s orders, Ms. Parks was arrested and charged with violating Chapter 6, Section 11 of the Montgomery City segregation code, thusly inspiring what came to be known as the Montgomery Bus Boycott led by a charismatic but little known young minister named Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Found guilty of disorderly conduct and wilfully violating a city ordinance, she was summarily found guilty and charged 10 dollars in fines including an additional 4 dollars in court fees. Ms. Parks, a staff member of the local National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People (NAACP) chapter immediately appealed her conviction and officially challenged legal racial segregation in the state of Alabama. The rest as they say, is history.

Pragmatically, things were somewhat less a subject of happenstance and more a matter of tactics. It is not commonly recognised that Ms. Parks was a long-time civil rights advocate by the time of her protest. Although she did not officially join the NAACP until 1943, she was not blind to the dehumanising environment African people were living under in the United States. After meeting her husband Raymond Parks, a NAACP campaigner she married in 1932, Ms Parks began actively working to improve the lot of African people in the south. She eventually became secretary to the Montgomery chapter president, a position she held until 1957. The NAACP had speculated for years on how to address racial segregation in public transportation and other social institutions but never felt they had a legally solid foundation to present in court. Other people had strongly objected to lawfully enforced Apartheid through personal direct action but none of these individuals it was deemed was of the variety of character that could successfully win a case.

Rosa Parks was different. She was estimated to be exactly what the face of civil rights should look like. Neat, clean, dignified and resolute that what she was chosen to represent would be presentable to White as well as Black pundits with Whites taking precedence. It was believed that without liberal White support any legal action or expression of actual freedom as guaranteed by the Thirteenth Amendment would be doomed to failure or

worse. There were others leading the way such as Irene Morgan who challenged Greyhound Motors bus lines and Baseball great Jackie Robinson who defied United States Army bus segregation rules leading to his court martial in 1944. The legal arm of the NAACP initially built a case around a young high school student named Claudette Colvin who was cuffed and unceremoniously dragged from a city bus on March 2, 1955. However they later decided not to go forward with her litigation it was suggested due to her ensuing pregnancy which was further complicated by the fact the father was a much older man. Others have suggested that the sudden withdrawal of support was more likely a reflection of resentment for her indigent personal history, an image the professionally-classified NAACP was desperately trying to steer clear of.

Ms. Parks however was not lumbered with such issues. She was on all accounts a loving and devoted wife, an active church member and a recognised leader within the community. The subsequent Montgomery Bus Boycott of course was successful due to the financial strain it placed on the company and with that victory set the mould for what would be officially accepted as “legitimate” civil disobedience. Legitimate in the sense that the active civil rights movement was never at any time defensive in the face of White racist terror. Aside from Muslim Minister Malcolm X (El-Hajj Malik El-Shabazz) and organizations such as the Deacons for Defense and Justice, (DDJ) the civil rights movement was based on passive resistance and common acceptance of Eurocentric paradigms. A mission statement minority tolerant White Southerners as well as The Nation magazine reading liberals up North could agree on. In this manner with the existing status quo thus maintained, social integration and assimilation was achieved. The legal right to equality under the law, already guaranteed by the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments was again promised with the passage of the Civil Rights Bill supposedly resolving any further dispute on the issue. Ms. Parks is legitimately regarded as the spark that ignited the drive for equality for Africans and others slighted by the American system of Apartheid.

But is it really that simplistic to believe that the justice Ms. Parks represented in the face of belligerent and institutional White supremacy has been realized? Is it reasonable to take for granted that the passage of additional laws since reconstruction have any connection to genuine emancipation? And what of Ms. Rosa Parks the anti-racist activist? Would she approve of how her image and legacy would be manipulated by both those whom she set out to free from bigotry and oppression and those elements in the United States who vociferously utilize her struggle as a veil to masquerade their own Eurocentric agendas?

With the body of Rosa Parks lying in state in the Capitol Rotunda for two days this week, these questions deserve serious assessment. Standing American president George “Dubya” Bush, former President William Jefferson Clinton, housewife’s choice celebrity Oprah Winfrey and other proven Eurocentrically inclined personalities spoke of Ms. Parks as if they practiced the reformist principles that she endeavoured to actualize. The hypocrisy of Dubya the war president lamenting on the appropriateness of Ms. Parks’ protest against American double standards is staggering. This is the same president that conspired to illegally disenfranchise American African voters in two states two elections

straight. Falsified evidence to justify an illegal invasion and occupation of two sovereign nations, lied to the world community as well as the American public and literally left African, Latino, Indigenous and poor Whites to fend for themselves during America's worst natural disaster.

For Bill Clinton's part he played off his well manicured role well, employing his "White Negro" persona to the hilt for the benefit of those attending. Feigning a heartfelt personal commitment to African empowerment and achievement on one hand, while with the other accepting acclaim for enacting a bill that made racial profiling not only acceptable but federally mandated. He also waged war against the underprivileged at home and overseas, (in this case Slavs resisting American multi-national imperialism) busted unions, passed NAFTA and GATT, bombed a pharmaceutical plant in Africa and reneged on his promise to pardon American Indian Movement (AIM) leader Leonard Peltier but found it prudent to extend a full presidential pardon to Mark Rich, an embezzler who had fled the United States to avoid prosecution.

There were overwhelming doses of insincerity present at each event honouring this African heroine but my point has been made. What Rosa Parks symbolizes to the American mainstream is merely a shadow of who the woman really was and what she represents to those whom she remained in her seat for. The White power structure benefits greatly perpetuating the fallacious lie that they always knew that American Apartheid was wrong and that it just took Ms. Parks rebellious actions to remind them of that sordid fact. This nonsense has been sold to the American African population since the end of the Bus boycott and accepted by those who pathologically sense that without White direction the African public is essentially a mindless collection of plantation refugees seeking guidance from a higher power.

As the woman herself stated many years later "We still have a long way to go in improving the race relations in this country." She admired Nation of Islam leader Louis Farrakhan for his organising of the Million Man March and spoke well of Congressional Black Caucus principal Kweisi Mfume as well as others still actively involved in the struggle that never seems to end. Even when referring to the young African hoodlum who violated her home and assaulted her even after discovering whom she was, she highlighted the reality that Bush, Clinton and the American mainstream pretend does not subsist after so much officially racially-blind grandstanding. More work needs to be done and in a manner that actualises real freedom for people living under Eurocentric pressure.

This despite the efforts of the conservative and liberal extremes of the mainstream is the reality of Rosa Parks. Unlike those hogging the media spotlight from the woman that historically advanced the modern civil rights movement, Ms. Parks characterizes what individual people can do when they have had enough of dehumanising treatment and repression. Something much more salient than the vacant poetry of the nightriders camouflaging themselves as America's guardians of human rights for all.

Rest in peace Ms. Rosa Parks. Perhaps one day America will understand what you did to save it from itself.

***The Ghost of Grey Owl, 911 and Other Matters
In defence of Ward Churchill and the American right of dissent***

3.01.2005

“You do not become a “dissident” just because you decide one day to take up this most unusual career. You are thrown into it by your personal sense of responsibility, combined with a complex set of external circumstances. You are cast out of the existing structures and placed in a position of conflict with them. It begins as an attempt to do your work well, and ends with being branded an enemy of society.”

-Vaclav Havel-

Historically as well as politically, the United States has always represented to the temperate observer a rather peculiar and maddening array of inconsistent, vaguely liberationist dichotomies. On the one hand, individual freedoms are guaranteed and codified in legally defined terms as the supreme law of the land, yet the very visible and oft ignored repression disseminated towards those persons and associations that fall short of the established social order clearly illustrate that genuine freedom in the United States is an illusion. And despite vociferous claims to the contrary by right as well as left-leaning media commissars, the most sanctified of all democratic canons, the right to free speech, is again facing strong if not iniquitous resistance from those who claim to represent said liberties.

Whereas the debate surrounding free speech is as old as the republic itself, the right to unambiguously question the authority of the state and its institutions is what purportedly makes the United States truly free in to comparative mandates observed by other nations even within the Western comprehension of just government. Irrespective of all this, dissent in the U.S. has more often than not been met with audacious containment measures enacted by the state and private populace alike.

Henry David Thoreau immediately comes to mind, as does Dr. Martin Luther King, Marcus Garvey, Margaret Sanger, the homosexual rights movement and the more recent Seattle protests over the WTO. In each of these cases, free speech, the right to openly verbalize grievances to policies that effect the lives of those so governed, was suppressed by aggressive means in order to bring about the nullification and plausible denial by the state of the existence of opposing visions of democratic exercise.

Incessantly vindicated as justifiable conduct in opposition to the menace of perilously liberalist radicalism, subjugation of free speech under the rubric of national security, defence of the traditional family or any number of analogous anxieties that challenge the status quo has led to the curtailing of established civil liberties, particularly the freedom of speech by those in positions of influence and recognition.

Enter the case of University of Colorado professor Ward Churchill. Invited to speak at upstate New York Hamilton University on the problematic complications facing dissent in the U.S. in the aftermath of the Bush administration's passage of the Patriot Act, his

lecture was cancelled following the clamour over an essay he authored more than three years earlier.

In an essay that appeared on the Internet several hours following the 911 incidents and in due course developed into a book which has since been granted Honorary Mention by the Gustavus Myer Human Rights Award for exceptional writing on human rights, professor Churchill offered a critical and extensively researched deconstruction of U.S. military interventions and violations of international law since the inception of the republic to the present day. And in doing so, he logically concluded that the correlations between the historically documented insistence upon American global hegemony and the extremist anti-Western Al Qaeda terrorist attacks on New York and Washington D.C. share more than a fleeting resemblance.

In deference to a media statement made by then national spokesman for the Nation of Islam Minister Malcolm X in reference to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, professor Churchill's essay entitled, "On the Justice of Roosting Chickens" daringly elucidates the realities of Pax Americana, the ubiquitous resistance such imperialism engenders and the responsibilities of well meaning American citizens who brazenly claim a moral high ground in regards to human rights and political self-determination to deny the state such license. In post-911 America, such a caustic analysis can be anticipated to raise the hackles of the conservative undercurrent that serves to characterize American mainstream thought.

But the tone and tremor in the loquacious criticism directed towards Churchill has been as malicious and ethically despondent as anything the Goebells disinformation apparatus could ever manufacture. After being denied the ability to speak at the university engagement and facing enormous pressure to resign his tenured position as chair of his university's Ethnic Studies department, you would think that the hullabaloo would end there. No such luck, as there are now official as well as unofficial inquiries into Churchill's ethnicity, his academic credentials and his military record, which seems odd since none of these elements factor into what he has written or said and at no time have ever appeared to be a serious focus of dispute until his proposed speech at Hamilton University.

In retrospect, and I am quite certain professor Churchill would concur with this author, this was not a startling nor unanticipated reaction to his chosen vocation as a Native American activist. Ward Churchill has been a thorn in the side of the American consciousness for many years. His numerous essays chronicling European settler displacement and anti-Indigenous programmes which have resulted in the decimation of North and South American aboriginal populations are damning in that he refuses to grant Euro-Americans or deeply self-colonized Indians the luxury of feigning ignorance of Indigenous genocide. Intermix this with his extensive documentation of the abuses initiated by the covert FBI counter intelligence outfit COINTELPRO against the civil rights movement and other, more radical organizations and you have all the makings of a genuine political dissident, the cornerstone of the American ideal.

While he has long endured pointed criticism for his allegations many times before, this occasion stands out in that this is the first time issues of a personal nature have been advanced in the discourse pertaining to his political posture. Among the list of inaccuracies attributed to professor Churchill are questions surrounding his claim to Native American ancestry as well as his academic qualifications as a university instructor and mentor to new generations of Indigenist leaning, pro-Indian rights activists.

Therein lies the root of the problem. Professor Churchill represents in no uncertain terms a symbol of intelligent defiance to the mythology of American Exceptionalism foreign as well as domestic and particularly as it applies to Indigenous, or First Nations peoples. For Euro-Americans who are unaccustomed to viewing themselves as anything other than a rightfully privileged class entitled to exalted notions of grandeur, professor Churchill strikes a raw nerve. Not simply because he is correct in his assertion that America is an overbearing conglomeration of blatant political immorality and more often than not extreme social contradictions, but in his innate ability to articulate these paradoxes on a level that many of his antagonists cannot convincingly negate or ignore.

To refute the accusation that America is guilty of human rights violations from the moment Jamestown was founded up to the present day is to deny the entire historical record of the United States. It is utterly revisionist in practice to wilfully disregard the reality of the pre-Columbian Indigenous presence and the subsequent genocide that made European settlement and colonialization possible in the first place. While white supremacist David Irving is rightfully lambasted as an apologist for 1930's German lebensraum politik and the final solution, the media pundits, academic institutions along with the entire political structure of the U.S. are on the contrary credited for proliferating the lie that Indian extermination, or in more honest terms Euro-settler driven anti-Indian genocide, was and is, a favourable and unavoidable prerequisite to European ascendancy of the Americas.

If the reader cannot perceive the audacious contradictions inherent within these two readily observable paradigms, then you are simply not looking. If German atrocities stemming from the classification, isolation and extermination of European Jewry can be considered wrong, likewise, Native and African American examples of ethnic cleansing, group dissolution and identity invalidation are equally as wrong. And if European revisionists can be held responsible for promoting appalling and potentially dangerous anti-Jewish ideologies, America should be brought to task for undertaking similar endeavours. You cannot by way of Cartesian common sense condemn one set of circumstances that resulted in the deaths of millions of European Jews without applying the very same standards towards assessment of similar atrocities suffered by other, non-European ethnic parties ultimately and similarly singled out for eradication.

What's really at issue here is not whether or not professor Churchill has a right to express his political views as they are fully protected by the Bill of Rights, or whether or not he is really a "blooded" Indian or the suggestion that he has unfairly used that claim to gain his faculty position. It can also be reasoned that it is not entirely due to his insistence that American Indians are victims of Euro-settler genocide as others before and after him

have made similar declarations. The bottom line is that Churchill's uncompromising repudiation of American historical revisionism as it relates to the colonialist and anti-democratic record is far too self-convicting for the national consciousness to accept. And being that the political climate in this country traditionally offers diminutive opportunities for real, upfront dissension in the public discourse, conscientious anti-war objectors such as Churchill court the considerable risk of professional exclusion and attacks to their personal integrity and physical well-being.

Even in the earliest days of the republic, openly articulated differences of political or theological opinion were dealt with callously. In an attempt to thwart an upstart and adversarial Jeffersonian-led Republican Party in 1798, the Federalist controlled Congress ratified the Sedition Act, which criminalized all written and verbal protest of government representatives, policies or authoritative legitimacy. This move situated the legislative precedent for the passage of the Smith Act, the witch hunts of the Palmer Raids and the Federal Bureau of Investigation's unconstitutional counter-subversion activities to counter dissent in flagrant breach of the constitutional principles of democratic exercise in a free country. So in essence, the U.S. is technically no different than any other nation in the regard of freedom of speech and expression. And the body count of the dissenters either through defamation, incarceration or sanctioned assassination is execrably astronomical and afar from level headed deniability.

There are few things less accepted or less protected in nearly all observed human social organizations than a committed socio-political nonconformist. The stifling of individuals seeking to bring about a modification in the conventional scheme of things are more often than not the subject of intense social disdain that by fiat enables an environment that makes unwarranted and ruthless political persecutions possible. The functional objective behind circuitous insinuations of treasonous or treacherous endeavour on the part those so targeted is to effect a nullification of their basest functionality. By way of containment, social extrication and in innumerable cases homicide, the individuals victimized by such offensives are fundamentally made incapable to behave in a manner that would ensure an advantageous outcome to their purpose. And in the cases where murder has been enlisted as a tool to bring about a conceptual if not practical halt to changes being actualised or suggested, the methods used only elaborate the argument that defiance of autocracy, no matter what persuasion the offending body pretences to define itself as, is an imperatively compulsory enterprise.

The militancy of Dr. King is today regarded, at least within the generalist estimation, as the moral consciousness of the nation. Selective American history chooses to forget that he along with the leadership the entire civil rights movement were routinely derided as pariahs in the media and reviled in popular public opinion. And throughout Dr. King's career he was the target of local, often KKK staffed law enforcement and an FBI campaign pledged to discredit him that went so far as to mail him a letter suggesting that he commit suicide or be outed as a charlatan to the Black community. The Bureau through illegal wiretaps and paid informants learned of Dr. King's infidelities with several of the White female northerners who participated in Freedom Summer and other

SCLC activities and used the data to blackmail him into stalling various aims of the movement.

The minister was repeatedly accused of receiving directives and funds from Moscow and being the point man for a cabal of Black communists that J. Edgar Hoover repetitively alleged made up the vanguard of the civil rights movement. And despite the fact that the communist charges were never proven to be based on any substantiated evidence, the accusations nevertheless stuck. It is still seriously believed by a majority of hardcore conservatives that Dr. King represented a significant danger to the country for forcing the race issue and opposing the Vietnam conflict during a time of national crisis. Those of this mind frame in quite lucid terms emphasize without compunction that as far as they are concerned, King, like Malcolm X before him, got what he deserved.

I discern very little dissimilarity between this example from the recent past and the contemporary concentrated effort to discredit Ward Churchill over his analogy that some of the victims of 911 were legitimate targets because they were in effect, the “little Eichmanns” through which the system operates its imperialistically genocidal activities. One might be inclined to agree with the protest surrounding these remarks that the language professor Churchill employed to illustrate his opinions was insensitive and perhaps downright hateful. Conversely, one could also with a clear conscience peer through the looking glass of propagandistic fervour and recognize that Churchill's assessment is essentially accurate.

The vast majority of those centralizing their anger with Churchill over his ideological comparisons to Adolf Eichmann really do not truly understand who Eichmann was or his role in the Final Solution. Eichmann was not a major player in the hierarchy of Hitler's inner conspirator circle, he was an officer following orders through the military chain of command. His position as head of the Office for Jewish Emigration and sponsorship by the SS Race and Settlement Office was initially to manage the forcible emigration of Austrian Jews outside of the Reich. It wasn't until his promotion to the Gestapo and the subsequent Wannsee Conference that Eichmann was chosen as the administrator charged with coordinating transportation of all Jews not killed in roadside executions to concentration camps in Poland. He was eventually dispatched to continue his vocation in Hungary leading to the deaths of more than six million European Jews.

It was made clear during his trial in Israel for “crimes against the Jewish people, crimes against humanity, and war crimes” that Eichmann was not guilty of murder per se, but of initiating the machinations that enabled the genocide to go forward. As Eichmann himself declared in his own defence following his being found guilty on all counts, “I understand the demand for atonement for the crimes which were perpetrated against the Jews...But these misdeeds did not happen according to my wishes. It was not my wish to slay people. I did not persecute Jews with avidity and passion. That is what the government did. Nor could the persecution be carried out other than by a government. But I never... I accuse the leaders of abusing my obedience...Obedience is commended as a virtue. May I therefore ask that consideration be given to the fact that I obeyed, and not whom I obeyed.”

Like Julius Streicher, Eichmann was found guilty of voluntary association and material aid to the malevolent designs of others, not of personally committing actual and individual acts of murder. Both men were executed on those principles and debate as to the validity or ethnical questions of the findings of the respective legal bodies is a closed argument. What does this have to do with the Islamic militant attack on the United States? The Twin Towers were home to the regional offices of the Central Intelligence Agency and was obviously considered a justifiable target objective by Muslim extremists seeking to psychologically and materially cripple the American machinations of what they perceived as anti-Arab oppression. Citing the plight of the Palestinians and more than one million Iraqi deaths as a immediate result of U.S. led economic sanctions, they figuratively struck at what they considered to be the two most visible machinations of their oppression.

As the principle intelligence organization for the United States government, the CIA along with the Pentagon are responsible for carrying out courses of action as directed through Presidential foreign policy decree. The individuals so employed are not on the whole, personally involved in what those policies entail other than their expected duty to perform their assigned tasks. This is not to say that these mothers, fathers and friends deserved to die simply because they worked for the sectors of American government Islamic extremists accuse of committing act of violence against them, but it is to say that we must honestly ask ourselves why so many repressed Arabs consider America so evil that they look upon such violence as acceptable and further, warranted.

It is beyond dispute that the catastrophe of 911, like all such tragedies are wholly reprehensible and morally cannot be endorsed by people sincerely interested in correcting the many wrongs facing the downtrodden of the world. But it must also be said that when a people are facing overwhelmingly persistent and oppressive odds that threaten their autonomy and literal physical continuation, extremist ideologies and retaliatory responses against the originating principals are a natural by-product. This fact cannot within reasonably pragmatic terms be overstated, or for that matter as an issue of justice, avoided. As lamented by former Nuremberg Trial Counsel for the Prosecution lawyer Telford Taylor, "The laws of war do not apply only to the suspected criminals of vanquished nations. There is no moral or legal basis for immunizing victorious nations from scrutiny. The laws of war are not a one-way street."

The primary clarification used to impart the fictitious impression that America is within its rights when it consciously oversteps the established boundaries of rational parliamentary conduct foreign and domestic has been its own particular anti-colonial experience. One may tediously adjudicate in the contemporary sense that the American revolution was a milestone in human social development but at the time, such republican contentions were seen for what they were, reactionary responses to off-shore monarchic rule. All American schoolchildren are aware of this, so I find it perplexing that Americans as an assemblage fail to acknowledge the parallels between their own liberationist example and the struggles of those seeking similar redress against similar imperialistic conditions. Every day in the U.S. and increasingly more so abroad, the

rightness of the American revolution is presented as proof positive of U.S. respect and admiration for emancipatory theory and practice.

In the quest for substantiation of the validity of American insurrectionist comportment one may reassess the words of John Adams when he penned his interpretation of the efforts undertaken by the “Sons of Liberty” in 1773 when they tossed 342 crates of British East India Company Darjeeling tea into Boston harbour as an act of sabotage in defiance to British imperialism, “There is a dignity, a majesty, a sublimity, in this last effort of the patriots that I greatly admire.”

I find this sort of testimony immediately analogous to the sentiments of other liberationist idealists such as Ninotchka Rosca, Frederick Douglass and Susan B. Anthony in that while he is readily acknowledging that resistance to unfair governance is just, that there exists a unique and undeniable nobility in the act of dissent. The terrorist group Adams praised was not comprised of non-violent pacifists but militant revolutionaries willing to use violence to achieve their goals. For those readers lax on their American history, the Sons of Liberty were as far as the English were concerned, a subversive and violently radical terrorist cell dedicated to overthrowing lawful British hegemony over the American colonies.

Covertly operating under the motto “Join or Die,” members of the SOL attacked the private homes of Crown sympathizers, physically assaulted tax collectors, reduced government tax stamps to ashes and disseminated the seeds of revolution among the colonial population. Deemed at the time by the Crown and many American commoners alike to be an extremist cabal of anti-authority nihilists, today these insurgents are praised as “freedom fighters” and American patriots, something British university instructors characteristically scoff in the present day as “Yankee conceit.”

It should be acknowledged at this juncture that Professor Churchill nor anyone else with a vested stake in the Indigenous rights movement as a matter of principle advocates nor condones terrorism or seditious reactionary violent behaviour in any form, regardless of the perpetrators or the rightness of such causes. I have never known Professor Churchill to suggest that 911, or other similar actions are acceptable or permissible responses to American imperialism. On the contrary, Churchill has been openly criticized by the more radical Marxist elements of the left for not theoretically supporting their view that revolutionary violence is the only effective means of achieving bona fide change. I have personally heard him denunciate the concept of armed revolution as a reasonable or practicable solution and vividly remember his compelling disapproval for those who feel that violence is a magic pill that solves all political ills.

Those among the far right who customarily label anyone who disagrees with them as treasonous, Marxist or even worse, liberal, are barking up the wrong tree when applying these brands to Churchill. He has gone on record for identifying his politics as Indigenist, an Aboriginal concept obviously beyond their ken, and has equally condemned the Left as well as the Right for Aboriginal genocide and generalist suppression of free expression. One only needs to objectively review his extensively annotated volume of

work, something I'm certain most of his critics have failed to do, to understand the difference. And unlike his critics, his non-partisan commentary is directed evenly. The polemical and hypocritical right-wing cadre as personified by FOX News, Clear Channel and vulgar AM talk radio shock jocks like Michael Savage have yet to direct their slanted logic towards the extremists within their own ranks that bomb U.S. Federal buildings and abortion centres, distribute terrorist textbooks such as the Turner Diaries and disturbing literature praising the Divine for AIDS as a means of eradicating homosexuals, illegal substance abusers and African-Americans they maintain are leading the United States literally to Hell. Add to this lunatic mix President Bush's solemn disclosure that God personally instructed him to invade Iraq and you can, if you are a conservatively inclined jingoist, assume a conjectural license to act as impetuously brutal as you deem necessary in the name of righteousness, racism and nationalistic integrity.

All irrefutably discernible symptoms of the negative expressions of chauvinistic xenophobia the post World War Two Nuremberg trials were supposedly designed to punish and expose as anti-misanthropic folly. While conservative radicals like Watergate conspirator G. Gordon Liddy can unambiguously suggest on his nationally syndicated radio show that patriotic citizens are within their rights to violently engage government agents such as the ATF while acting on Federal warrants, peaceful protesters who make use of nothing more lethal than whistles and non-violent civil disobedience are treated as "enemy combatants" for disrupting the flow of traffic during a mass demonstration. The fundamentally contradictive thinking around all this ethical ju-jitsu is something you would think the constitution thumping talking heads would attack with the same fervour they accord their more liberal opposition. But instead these self-appointed Walter Winchells twist and exaggeratedly reinterpret right-wing phobias as righteous and obligatory resistance to immorality in government and society. An antiquated and exasperatingly inquisition-like absurdity that neo-cons steadfastly refuse to chastise.

It is no secret that professor Churchill and the Indigenous movement as a whole takes issue with the United States government as per its treatment of Indigenous peoples stateside and everywhere else the U.S. extorts its considerable influence. Having said that it should also be made clear that despite the polemical rhetoric of anti-Indian opponents who already believe that Natives exploit their histories of genocide to parasitically bleed the system, Indigenous activists have never called for retaliatory tactics to dismantle the U.S. government. What Natives and many progressive non-Natives have called for is the honouring of the 400 some-odd government-to-government treaties entered into and codified in the legal code of the constitution. Now, while Indians and their supporters are demanding no more than the Federal law be adhered to, ultra-nationalist White supremacist terrorist groups such as the Ku Klux Klan and the National Alliance are unfettered in their openly expressed contention that their grievances can only be addressed via a holy race war of sorts against a covert Jewish occupational cabal within the White House and the United Nations.

The ideological as well as material threat to the established order from extremists on the right is seemingly given a free ride by the Three Stooges, (Coulter, Limbaugh and O'Reilly respectively) and the Patriot Act and they have collectively found it easier to

fabricate spurious propaganda against legitimate, non-violent dissenters rather than acknowledge the anti-American mutineers who happen to share their penchant for biased and paranoid thinking. Any comparisons entertained in the political theatrics of jaundiced journalism and in Churchill's case, the potential for reactionary legislative hypocrisy, with the examples I just cited above should be regarded precisely for what they are, gibberish.

Simply put, Churchill is in no way shape or form a cheerleader for anti-American or for that matter, pro-American terrorists. Period. What professor Churchill has steadfastly advocated in his written and spoken opinions is the right of self-preservation for those peoples confronting genocidal antagonisms that are already recognized under black-letter international law at least since 1948 as unlawful, often interventionist aggression. He is an avowed and committed adversary of American policies that spawn terrorist activity here and elsewhere and this is perhaps his most fundamental offence in the eyes of many Americans regarding his blunt remarks about 9/11. He denies in no uncertain terms the ethnocentric premise that an Arab life is somehow worth less than an American one.

Under international law, the right of a state to arbitrarily diminish and re-define the value of a human life is forbidden. Human beings are not commodities to be exploited and discarded like any other material resource. Churchill rejects that sort of authority and by not playing into the "You are either with us or against" uber-nationalist patriotism game as expected of by most academics he has made himself a target, in the most literal sense of the word.

His line of reasoning is that the *raison d'être* put forward to rationalize American policies that breach accepted morality has been consistently indifferent to the human toll exacted by such policies. The rationalizations spun around questionable U.S. military target selections and foreign policies that result in immense piles of human collateral around the world are routinely justified as the wages of sin for those populations foolish enough to reject American authority. As explained quite glibly by former ambassador to the United Nations and U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright to CBS television's Leslie Stahl, the U.S. government decided that 500,000 Iraqi child deaths as a direct result of economic sanctions was an acceptable price to pay in order to remove Saddam Hussein from power.

If the American public is willing to accept such values when they are applied to other peoples, they should be not be alarmed when the very same ideologies are applied by others to this country. As sociologist Edgar Z. Friedenberg observed in 1966 when commenting on the willingness of the American public to tolerate state sponsored suppression tactics used against the counterculture, "Not only do most people accept violence if it were perpetrated by legitimate authority, they also regard violence against certain kinds of people as inherently legitimate, no matter who commits it."

Those persons who did not work for the CIA but were present in the Twin Towers and subsequently killed in the attacks essentially compute within the parameters of what the U.S. political and military vernacular apathetically characterizes as collateral damage.

The unfortunate and unintended victims of armed conflict resulting from the failures of reasoned international diplomacy. If this all strikes you as unsympathetic, arrogant and morally criminal, then imagine how it appears to those directly subjected to the end results of such “diplomacy.” The American public cannot idly remain silent while U.S. policy, acting in our name, persists in violating the sovereignty of other nations by flouting international law and engaging in imperialist interventions and economic exploitation that result in tens upon thousands and ultimately millions of deaths and not expect to reap the consequences. To entertain such illusions not only flies in the face of common sense or common decency, but in direct contradiction to the purported traditions of liberty and justice that serve to identify the American exemplar. It is prudent to revisit the oft-mentioned yet unheeded quote by Robert F. Kennedy in relation to the increasingly militant tide of the Black Power movement, “Those who make peaceful change impossible make violent change inevitable.”

It's past time to pay attention to the prophetic message inherent within that observation. Kennedy could no longer deny the obvious. If you push people eventually they push back. And you cannot complain when the aggression you dish out returns to haunt you. Quid pro quo. Common sense dictates that if you want terrorist violence, ethnic, gender and religious violence, all violence, to stop, bring to a standstill the reflexive inclination to use violence in the first place and respect the rule of law in regard to universal human rights. It really is that simple.

But for proposing such logic, professor Churchill has been ridiculed in the press, accused of intellectual fraud and treasonous anti-Americanism. One talk show host has gone so far as to call for his execution. But what is perhaps most ugly about the quarrel surrounding the professor is the question of whether or not Churchill is actually Native American or not. The more repulsive conservative retorts to his legitimacy as a scholar and proponent of Indigenist philosophy purport to expose him as an intellectual fraud operating under guise of an enrolled Native American tribal member. This is the polite version. The more common variety of anti-Churchill propaganda circulating about the media and especially on the Internet is decidedly racist and more to the point unapologetically so. In the public quibble over Churchill's ethnicity, right-wing pundits led by FOX News shill Bill O'Reilly and the redundantly invective lobbying Ann Coulter have taken institutional anti-Indian racism to new lows.

Coulter, a fanatical arch-conservative well known for grossly exaggerating not only the truth but her own bloated significance offered her habitually inappropriate two cents by titling her anti-Churchill diatribe, “The Little Injun that Could.”

Let's get real here for a moment. Injun, a pejorative generally omitted in polite conversation as a matter of decorum rather than political correctness is tossed about by Coulter freely and without reservation. Her use of the slur “Kemosabe” and the bizarre and racially insulting subtle suggestion that Churchill peddled Wal-Mart variety mass-produced works of art featuring Elvis Presley and Lakota notable Crazy Horse playing poker go far further than questioning professor Churchill's academic and moral character. In spite of affirmations by her and her legions of ditto-heads that she is not a racist,

Coulter's commentary hammers home the notion that Indians are merely anachronistic buffoons and in particular those vocal Indians who refuse to accept being categorized as anything more than a niggling remnant of the past.

Anyone, Native or otherwise who really believes in their heart of hearts that the Three Stooges are supportive respecters of Indian rights and America's responsibility towards its Indigenous people, is a certifiable dolt. And the sad fact that Indians working within the corporate media have decided to rally behind them and other professional anti-Indian haters is patently inexcusable. It is one thing to disagree with a fellow Native over differences of opinion and quite another to willingly participate in his lynching. Especially when the individual in question, unlike so many others of elevated station within the Native world's pecking order, candidly and bravely expresses publicly what we say in private about how shoddily our people are treated.

On this basis alone professor Churchill certainly deserves much more respect than he has been commonly accorded within the “responsible” sectors of Indian Country. Unlike the Dickie Wilson clones that envisage their aggressively inert acquiescence to White claims of eminent domain over Indigenous lands, identity and communal determination as verification of their “Indian-ness,” Churchill's position instead proposes an arguably conventional and honoured methodology in the best traditions of Indian leaders gone by resisting the genocidal intent intrinsically woven into such thinking. What these Vichy Indians represent in theory and in practise are the premeditated final stages of what Indigenist intellectuals such as Zitkala-Sa, have described as a “miserable state of cultural dislocation.”

As self-righteously expressed by the Board of Indian Commissioners in 1880 in support for the Indian boarding school system, “As a savage, we cannot tolerate him any more than as a half-civilized parasite, wanderer or vagabond. The only alternative left is to fit him by education for civilized life.” What the commissioners meant by education was the ethnocidal process of inducing a psychological obliteration of the offending ethnicity's personality into something more palatable and comparable to the invading entity's comfort level.

As mandated in government policies such as the Dawes Severalty Act, the supposedly benevolent assimilation of Indians into mainstream White society was all encompassing in that aspects of this compulsory absorption programme trickled down into virtually every institution, service or obligatory chore that involved the daily functioning of Indian life. The result was the illusory impression that being Indian is something solely defined by the arbitrary authority of the dominating culture rather than the centuries-old traditions of their own respective Indigenous communities. For Indians so lumbered by such intellectual frameworks, professor Churchill's insistence on speaking to the truth of Indigenous realities past and present is a shockingly distressing challenge to their own often unacknowledged and customarily un-admitted sublimation.

If you peruse the Native authored editorials and columns surrounding this most recent anti-Churchill crusade you'll note that as a rule of thumb, their derision is clearly of a

personal nature reminiscent of a supermarket tabloid rather than factually supported critical assessments of the issues he raises. The fervent readiness to ignore facts, deny reason and suffocate Native freethinkers such as Churchill who encourage self-examination as a means of identifying and addressing the hard questions is a clear indicator of the amalgamated Federal effort to induce a permanent and totalling self-imposed cultural implosion in favour of White colonialist needs. When conservative Indians decided to refute Ward Churchill's claim to Native identity purely within a construct set forth by a decidedly anti-Indian authority they are essentially conceding that Churchill's hypothesis is fundamentally correct. Indians have increasingly lost the cognitive ability to function on their own accord and will antagonistically assail attempts to encourage examination of their delusional assumptions of stability and respectability within the White power structure.

The racist and classically colonialist bearing of this sort of slander is beyond reasonable doubt and telling in that the bigotry inherent within such charges only serves to buttress Churchill's contention that the United States is at its core an anti-Indian machine that has for the past 500 plus years steadfastly denied the realities of Aboriginal human rights and self-determination. If one is to go by the garrulous contentions by many approved Native representatives that a person's degree of Indian blood is of no consequence to being "truly" Indian, then does it really matter if Churchill is 1/16th or perhaps 1/64th North American Aboriginal or perhaps not at all?

Unlike the majority of people lobbing insults, condemnation and death threats, I have personally met with the professor, talked with him, looked into his eyes and in parting, shook his hand. As far as I am concerned, Ward Churchill is Native. Now of course this my own personal opinion, but it is an opinion based on my own perceptions as a Native person and what I consider an innate ability to recognize my own people. How the predominately White, rabidly anti-Indian right wing suddenly became experts on Indian identity is beyond me. After 500 years of killings, rapes, enforced interracial "marriages" and involuntary sterilizations, how Indian are we supposed to look in the modern day? It is abundantly clear to me that these people know very little, if anything at all about Indian realities.

The real fraud being passed off here is the contention that these bigots care anything at all about Indian people or issues outside of attending their next local high school auditorium's Pow-Wow.

By what authority do they claim to know what an Indian is as opposed to someone who is merely pretending to be one? viewing Dances with Wolves several times over or hanging a dream catcher from your rear view mirror does not make someone an expert in qualifying who is and who isn't Native. These people simply do not know what they are talking about for if they did, they would realize that Churchill's physical appearance is for all intents and purposes no different than many other Natives of mixed ancestry especially in the Nation that Churchill claims to be a descendant of.

Professor Churchill is after all claiming blood ties to the Cherokee, perhaps the most admired of the “Five Civilised Tribes” in the annals of popular Americana. If the identity constabulary of the ultra right is so concerned with addressing the issue of plastic Indians in our midst, perhaps they should begin their pogroms in Oklahoma and North Carolina in an attempt to get to the heart of the matter. The three Federally recognized entities that comprise the whole of the Cherokee Nation are in a particularly poor position to play identity politics when many of their respective members smugly brandishing their Certificate of Degree of Indian Blood “White” cards (pun intended) look unmistakably Euro-American. And in light of the considerable reluctance amongst the Cherokee political and social infrastructure to recognize Indians who also share an African ethnic identity, the question of who really is Indian demands an answer that simplistic refutations of systematic racism or uncorroborated accusations of ethnic fraud do not easily answer away.

The challenging of professor Churchill's Cherokee ethnicity is a vindictive low blow designed to discredit the man as an activist and invalidate his considerable influence in the political arena of Indian and national politics. I for one find it odd that it has taken all this time for such questions to surface surrounding Churchill's self-identification as a Native American when it has long been public knowledge that Churchill was awarded an associate membership to the United Keetoowah Cherokee Band and was not extended the full rights and privileges accorded to federally enrolled tribal members.

This is not a big revelation and frankly never was. He was not the first and definitely will not be the last person of diminished Indian blood brought into a Tribal association through the back door. And with the Cherokee, An Indian nation that owned African slaves and took sides with the Confederacy, such practices seem to be par for the course and always have been. Since European missionaries first moved amongst the Cherokee and came to the uncanny conclusion that they were one of the lost Tribes of Israel, rapid cultural and religious conversions and intermarriage took place resulting in the Cherokee's swift decent into assimilation.

No other Tribe in North America can boast of so many European-looking members, associates and claimants, many of who supposedly only learned of their Indian ancestry later in life. So go figure. If the Cherokee princess great-grandmother parody has any weight to it at all it is in the seriousness of its acknowledgement that Federal Indian recognition and identity is more an issue of politics rather than one of ethnicity. And in the case of the Cherokee Nation, the move to redefine the constitution in 1976 was primarily economic in that by increasing the Nation's population, the Tribal government could request larger fiduciary allotments from the BIA to cover the increased membership. What they did was alter the official determination for what constitutes Indian ethnicity by declaring that anyone who could trace direct descent from the “Final Rolls of the Citizens and Freedmen of the Five Civilized Tribes in Indian Territory,” otherwise known as the Dawes Rolls, would be accepted into the Nation irrespective of blood quantum.

On all accounts the move was successful in that the Cherokee today number more than 165,000 strong and conceivably may be the most powerful Indian nation in the United States. For many un-enrolled Cherokee who for legal as well as racial reasons cannot gain official recognition, the reality that many accepted Cherokees are manifestly White in appearance and sentiment has quite a bit to do with their success as a Tribe and has a direct bearing on the Churchill controversy. In that if these other White looking yet officially recognized Cherokees could be accepted as Indian, Churchill, a self-identified Cherokee until proven otherwise, should be accorded the same measure of respect.

If the Keetoowahs felt comfortable enough to grant Churchill recognition, albeit a limited recognition, there must have been more to his claim other than his undeniable and vociferous support for Native causes. And since Tahlequah does not recognize blood quantum any longer, the issue as a matter of pointed discussion is moot. The uproar over Churchill's ethnicity is at best a red herring and a poor one at that. If Churchill can be flamed for ethnic vagueness, then arguably most of AKC pedigree card carrying Indian Country could be similarly challenged as to the legitimacy of their claim to Indian-ness if the only accepted prerequisite as mandated by the colonialist power is Federal recognition.

This analysis also extends itself to enquiries surrounding the accuracy of his scholarship in documenting anti-Indian policies, state repression and the social pressures imposed to support such measures. Aside from fellow academic Vine Deloria Jr., very few Native academics have ventured as far as Churchill in condemning the United States on its hypocrisies here or abroad. Professor Churchill stands out in this regard precisely because he is willing to verbalize and point out these contradictions in a way that makes sense. If the tone of his critique is brusque, one must take into account the intensity of the subject matter and honestly assess if there could be other, more viable and painlessly emotional alternatives to addressing the issues differently. And after doing so ask yourself if you really believe that those alternatives would work.

For more than 500 years, Indians have made a considerable effort through parley and concessionary losses in an attempt to negotiate a reasonably sustainable state of grace under colonial pressure. And in each of these instances Indians were the clear losers. What Churchill has done throughout the course of his literary career is document and deconstruct how all this misery for the American Indian and other populations equally railroaded has come to pass. And since the predatory zeal of the European expansionist exertion has been documented sparingly and in legalistically pallid language as a matter of dispassionate indifference, the claims lodged by Churchill's opponents in the university professorship fall short.

If the only means available for Indians to demonstrate that they are the victims of a perpetually ongoing genocide is to possess documentary material which only the White establishment is in a position to verify as "correct," then what we are dealing with here is a resolutely antiquated scheme by which the offending agent in question demands the right to define within its own narrow and inconsistent terms, what constitutes anti-Indian maltreatment.

In this conjecture, legitimate historical scholarship can only be seen within the narrow boundaries imposed by the established order, commutating that all published papers, legal actions and discourse surrounding the subject of Indian genocide can only be validated by way of the vetting processes of the very same institutions that initiated the abuses in the first place. The ludicrously slippery ethical slope the establishment relies on to shield itself from moral and legal self-conviction is no different than what U.S. State Department spokespersons routinely accuse the rest of the world of. And since professor Churchill is quite adept at dissecting such hypocrisies he is unsurprisingly accused of shoddy scholarship and outright fabrication of evidence in an effort to steer attention away from the topic at hand. An allegation that can also be easily attributed to the slew of inequitable and similarly unrelated non-sequitor subject matter chosen by his detractors to undermine his credibility.

Given the profundity of the controversy and the emotions involved, Churchill is in for a long, hard fight. He has said, and I truly hope he stands committed to this pronouncement, that he will not sit back and allow the winds of containment to prevent him from speaking his mind or continuing the struggle for universal parity of all persons, peoples and ideas. Good. And I for one intend to stand with him in this endeavour.

The New Revisionism Michelle Malkin's legitimization of American Racialism

10-15-2004

“That the barbarians recede or are conquered, with the attendant fact that peace follows their retrogression or conquest, is due solely to the power of the mighty civilised races which have not lost their fighting instinct, and which by their expansion are gradually bringing peace in the red wastes where the barbarian peoples of the world hold sway.”

Theodore Roosevelt, *The Strenuous Life*, 1901

Once successfully established as an independent republic, the United States of America has zealously sought to define itself as a socio-political archetype of human freedom and intellectual liberty.

The fact that the whole of U.S. history from front to back is literally riddled with racist driven physical and economic dispossessions, socio-political marginalisation and state sponsored genocide in one form or another is ostensibly beside the point. Not unlike conjectures supporting the existence of angels, flat-Earth theory and Creationist science, the aggressively chauvinistic philosophy of American Exceptionalism purports to provide a theoretical explanation for why the United States is exempt from any criticism that made shed light on it's internal as well as external contradictions.

Enter Michelle Malkin. A syndicated columnist and former editorial writer for the GOP-leaning *Seattle Times*, Ms. Malkin, (or is Ms. too politically correct for conservatives?) has raised a considerable storm of controversy recently within the Asian community by proposing in her new book, “*In Defence of Internment*” that the concentration-camp imprisonment of Japanese-Americans during World War Two was justified on the grounds of immediate national security concerns and reasonable suspicions in light of the ethnicity of the suspected internees. Conservative historians, David Duke and the FOX News Republican propaganda goon squad have redundantly raised the exact same security excuses before, so there is really nothing in Ms. Malkin book that is particularly refreshing.

What is novel however is that in writing it she has like other non-White American archconservatives actively ignored the American racial question by denouncing the reality of the issue itself. Ms. Malkin's book is merely the latest philosophical manifestation of a Dubya-era non-European American racial apologist expressly dedicated to explaining why such ethnic marginalisations are necessary and constructive to U.S. and global society.

With her frequent cable media appearances and nationally syndicated columns, Ms. Malkin appears to be making an earnest bid to eclipse former GOP darling and incessant flibbertigibbet Ann Coulter as the most prominent female propagandist of the Conservative right. Like Dinesh D'Souza, Ward Connelly and Dicky Wilson before her,

Ms. Malkin is building a career on perpetuating and legitimising institutional arguments for what used to be called in more honest days White Power.

“In Defence of Internment” ideologically ranks alongside D'Souza's “The End of Racism”, Murray and Herrnstein's “The Bell Curve”, Thomas Jefferson's “Notes on the State of Virginia” and the works of Alfred Rosenberg. More significantly it is perhaps one of the most racist tomes ever authored by a person of colour. As a political and social commentator Ms. Malkin goes to great lengths to appear objective and scholarly unbiased. By projecting herself as an arbiter of reason sincerely attracted to the common sense of ultra conservative ideals, she attempts to illustrate the logic of far-right racial arguments in a way no White person could undertake without risking the ubiquitous charge of racism.

With pats to the head from the likes of the Bradley Foundation, The American Enterprise Institute and the Bush administration, Ms. Malkin and the rest of her internally colonised self-serving flock represent a bewildering phenomenon within modern conservative discourse, non-Whites willing to cast their lot exclusively with the more racist elements of the White power structure.

RACIALIST OBFUSCATION

Short of directly attributing inferior non-Caucasian biology as the root cause of minority social disappointment in American society, Ms. Malkin chooses to take an utterly classical American racist train of thought: institutional racism in the U.S. is not and has never been the root of the race problem. She maintains like other aversive racists that America's race problem is primarily a creation of Liberalist fiction. She denies the claim that race has had any viable connection to past or present social, political or economic ills and asserts that minorities do a great disservice to America by complaining about something that does not exist. This perception relentlessly stresses that “victimisation culture” and White Liberal anti-racism policies are primarily responsible for minority social failures, not institutionalised White bigotries.

According to this view, the biases that do exist against minorities were, and are still, prudent and entirely valid on the grounds that minorities are statistically prone to social mediocrity. She submits such evidence as high crime rates, low educational achievement, dysfunctional family units and general anti-social behaviour to support this thesis. By focusing on the results of racism rather than the causes, she fraudulently purports to offer an impartial analysis that explains the White dominated status quo. Through reductionist sociological oversimplification, Ms. Malkin provides a de-facto validation for institutional White racism.

The fact that all of this gibberish smells of Social Darwinist nonsense peddled about as sound sociology doesn't seem to matter. On a strictly academic level the whole of such arguments would be regarded as the pseudo-scientific agenda of an extremist fringe were it not for the fact that such ideas are otherwise sanctioned in the public consciousness as practical actuality. The key push behind her commentary is the manufacturing of

convenient answers to ethnic marginalisation, not factual analysis. Ms. Malkin is in essence articulating a long held and widespread set of beliefs concerning presumed non-European inadequacies that challenge the assumed virtues of White exceptionalism.

Her complete and total personal acquiescence to pro-Euro-centric social constructions is overwhelming and it is clearly visible in all of her work. In contrast to the clear and unambiguous racist policies of South African Apartheid or Southern American Jim Crow laws, Malkin represents a Nuevo racism, a more logical and enlightened bigotry. By utilising broad generalisation, stereotypical assumption and liberal misinterpretation of historical data she gives effectual license to the continuation of a racialised social order.

For racials, the detail that ethnic minorities in America have had to contend with colonialisation, race-specific separatist legislation, social mortification and the White Citizen's Council is of no applicable significance. As many Conservative apologists have expressed openly, minorities enable a race problem by making reference to it. Anti-minority discrimination and violence they contend are the direct results of Whites being told they are oppressors.

This “abuse” as they describe it necessitates resistance and sometimes that resistance expresses itself in a volatile fashion. To paraphrase the old fable, the king has no clothes and does not want to be told that he has no clothes. Lynchings, fire bombings and other random acts of terror in the North as well as the South are attributed to “Nigger, Chink or Injun trouble”, rather than White apprehensions of actually having to share the nation's resources. So in the final estimation, White Power terrorist organisations such as the Ku Klux Klan and solitary racists like Timothy McVeigh cannot be viewed as exclusively iniquitous since they are merely reacting to anti-White minority and Liberal maltreatment. This is the type syllogistic logic that forms the straw man basis of Ms. Malkin's philosophy.

Ms. Malkin strongly empathizes with D'Souza's supposedly objective theoretical conclusions on race, class and gender hierarchies. Unlike Malkin, D'Souza makes a weak, but noticeable effort to at least appear fair, but the overriding effect of his work is exactly the opposite. Take for example his oversimplified rationalizations of American African social inequities by way of eugenic pseudo-sociology. Pointing out what he describes as “Black cultural pathologies” inherent within the group, D'Souza blames American and continental Africans for their retarded social positions rather than the overwhelmingly powerful political structures that put them there. The only non-European invited to participate in the 1994 White Preservation Conference in Atlanta, D'Souza promotes himself as a living example of the benefits of Euro-centric hegemony.

He contends unflinchingly as he did publicly on the PBS chat show Charlie Rose that minorities who actively reject White cultural values are in effect, insufferable non-entities that prefer victimization rather than individually responsible social participation. In other words, by resisting the assumed enlightenment of White cultural ideals and incorporation, minorities and American Africans in particular, should accept sole responsibility for their

misfortunes. The nonsensicality of his argument goes on to legitimise (according to his adherents) what he terms “rational discrimination” by the White dominated establishment as the natural result of a superior civilization coming into contact with culturally inferior populations. As he glibly observes in his work, “Illiberal Education”, “Racial division is the natural consequence of principles that exalt group equality above individual justice.”

To cite such beliefs as precariously analogous to classic Hitlerian eugenics is on one hand overtly simplistic but on the other, quite accurate in light of the evidence. A cursory examination of Mein Kampf reveals the very same racist presumptions Ms. Malkin addresses in her own treatises, only the principle targets and motivations are different. She cites inferior “cultures” rather than substandard “races” as barometers for estimating the inherent value of individuals and populations. The litmus test that measures these values is of course entirely European in nature and conceptually White in its scope. By arguing that non-European cultures are inherently and utterly deficient, European values inevitably take immediate precedence.

This distinction is very important in comprehending how non-European ethnic personalities can so strongly align themselves with such overtly malicious racist ideologies. For many of these non-White neo-segregationists, the issues of race and ethnic stratification are passé concerns in the modern geopolitical capitalist era. As mentioned earlier in discussing the speciously discriminatory assumptions of Mr. D'Souza, Conservative social and political evaluators blame the subjects of discrimination, not the unjust biases present within the system. It is entirely fair to equate such minds with defence attorneys that persist in faulting victims of rape for their predicament rather than the aggressor or aggressors that violated them. Again, this is a significant factor also observed in Nazism and unmistakably documented in their stated philosophy. If Jews left Germany under their own steam in the 1930's as Herman Goering suggested while sitting in the dock in Nuremburg, the Final Solution would never have manifested. He added to this by further insisting that he and his fellow defendants were at heart Zionists, and faulted “Jewish Bolshevism” for Germany's ruin rather than the racist policies that bankrupted haughty Germanic claims of a superior European ethno-cultural ideal.

For racist apologists and their revisionist philosophers, German Fascism represented an example of undisciplined state sponsored xenophobia, not an enlightened rational racism. They fault not so much the historical European anti-Jewish, anti-immigrant sentiments that made Nazism possible as much as the suggestion that the Party allowed itself little flexibility in deciding how best to address the issue. The distinctive approach that contemporaneously links these racist ideologies is the belief in the inherent right of ethnic and cultural superiors to compartmentalize themselves from the infidel menaces that they fear exist within their midsts. This revised version of classical racialism is unique in that it allows for non-Whites to exist within the White infrastructure provided they recognize and accept their less-than-equal status and assertively toil to sustain that very same system's racial quandary.

And in this capacity Ms. Malkin excels remarkably. As a Philadelphia born child of Third World Philippine immigrants, Malkin represents like D'Souza, Alan Keyes, Justice Clarence Thomas and others, a non-White, pro-racist model of post-Civil Rights era neo-segregationism. Her syndicated columns and media appearances are rife with disingenuous anti-immigration, anti-multicultural and anti-parity misinformation. Her work intentionally misrepresents the efforts of individuals and communities that make people like her possible to not only exist within White society, but to succeed. Without the liberalist, multicultural and progressive movements that preceded and surpassed 1960's Civil Rights legislation, Ms. Malkin like many Philipinos and other minorities in America would still be living under anxiously oppressive, racially divisive conditions.

The ludicrously simplistic defenses Ms. Malkin puts forward as “proof” that racism does not exist infrequently figure such empirical facts into her analysis. She simply ignores them as fictions of liberal propaganda. She doesn't just diminish America's racial history, she simply rewrites this history to suit her revisionist position. No less dishonest in her historical distortions than her contemporary David Irving across the pond, Malkin typifies the Reagan-era push to blur racial questions that contradict the American Exceptionalist myth of social equilibrium.

EXPOSING CONSERVATIVE NEWSPEAK

Ms. Malkin and other leading commissariat of the CONS, (Conservative Orators of Neo-Liberal Stupidity) routinely articulate such revisionist twaddle as sober scholarship and discourteously disparage any academically sound challenge to these ideas as leftist bitterness run amok. The only defence these pundits ever seem to employ is the oft-levelled charge of liberalism. I have yet to read one paper or hear one lecture from a neo-Conservative racist that has ever honestly addressed a direct challenge to their viewpoints. Instead of participating in levelheaded intellectual discussion, Conservatives habitually lob personal insults, baseless charges of treason and schoolyard bullying tactics as a means to avoid such debates. Take Ms. Malkin's condemnation of the reparations movement for one glaring example.

In her August 15th 2002 article for TownHome.com, “Get Out Your Reparations Calculator”, Ms. Malkin childes American African Reparations advocates as simply race-card baiting opportunists marketing slavery for a substantial monetary payoff. She then goes on to ridicule Defence attorney Sam Jordan for suggesting that Mumia Abu-Jamal, a former Minister of Information for the Philadelphia Black Panther Party for Self-Defence should receive a fair trial, something even his court records and many international observers clearly concur he did not receive. Ms. Malkin then enters the realm of the ridiculous by insensitively parodying the reparations issue by highlighting her Philippine background and asserting that she too is due reparations from various sources, in particular Spain, and encourages her White readership to do the same. While Ms. Malkin spends considerable energy openly belittling the personalities behind the reparations movement, she totally sidesteps the causes behind the issue. Her self-indulgent ad hominem attacks only serve to elucidate her proclivity for stretching and twisting the

truth. If truth can be summed up as virtue left entirely up to perception, then Ms. Malkin can be regarded as an expert fabricator.

The inherent disingenuousness of her arguments and the self-serving posture she exhibits when she puts forward such inaccuracies as contemporary social realities by default negate any value she attempts to convey. In the long run, anything she proposes in the arena of racism let alone Japanese-American internment, is a waste of ink. In order to discuss an issue you must first admit that the issue exists and in this regard Ms. Malkin fails miserably. For Conservatives, truth is not as important a factor as being right. And cognitive dissonance goes a long way in the insular ethno-specific groupthink paradigm that serves as Conservative philosophical representation.

“In Defence of Internment” and the entire scope of Ms. Malkin's work should be regarded precisely for what it is. An “enlightened” and non-objective Conservative defense for conventional racialism. If there is a distinction to be drawn between the instantly recognizable racism of the pre-Civil Rights era and the Nuevo racism of contemporary America, it is that the former reasoned no moralistic compulsion to appear fair and balanced.

Indeed, the totality of Anglo cultural presumptions of superiority as they relate to social interaction and distribution of power necessitates that such obvious prejudices only be viewed through the narrow constraints of Eurocentric bias.

The latter is much more dedicated to providing a psychological basis for social amnesia of the historical foundations of racism and the resulting inequities that account for the “race problem”. Ms. Malkin will no doubt take pride in my estimation that she has written a very dangerous book. Like the “Bell Curve”, she provides a means for White America to absolve themselves from any responsibility for creating and maintaining explicitly racist systems, policies, and social constructions. And in her own personal example of minority assimilation and capitulation she subsequently provides a living model for the new neo-American, a non-White safety valve that will protect and serve the pro-Euro-centric ideals and traditions that represent American racism and political exceptionalism.

“Sieg Heil”.

American Neo-Asian Eugenics

9-2004

In 1993 mainstream American news periodical TIME published what many considered a groundbreaking special issue entitled "America's Immigrant Challenge." The cover showcased an image of a woman that would come to represent in the eyes of most U.S. residents a vision of what is to come in regards to the ever-increasing mix of multi-racial relationships within an unrestricted multi-ethnic environment. Utilising the revolutionary Morph 2.0 imaging program, the "experts" developed an ethno-racial collage from a selection of diverse subjects, (American Aborigines, or Indians if you prefer were noticeably but not surprisingly left out of this selection) arriving at what readers could reasonably assume is the face of the near future: an Amer-Asian female with exotically tanned like skin.

As the e-mails and calls to TIME's editorial offices flooded in, many within their self-described sophisticated readership hailed the issue as a milestone in American race relations signaling the effective end to the "race problem" and the heralding of a new age. Perhaps, as many openly and gleefully suggested, a new race of people was on the horizon. Combined with the American ideals of justice and fair play they argued, America has graciously opened the door to a one-race nation leading an increasingly globalised planet as the sole benevolent superpower. One people, one race, one ideal. What the responses to TIME's issue on the whole did not query however was the concept of "ideal". Exactly what standard is being utilized in this melding of peoples and why is the range of qualifying factors so limited given the immense diversity of the human species in terms of not only race and ethnicity, but in regards to cultural and spiritual paradigms as well?

What I intend to argue in this essay will not sit well with most people who regard themselves as colourblind and accepting of all peoples and cultures. I present a challenge to these folk to examine their choices and positions in regards to the American racial politic and how those decisions effect the development of common social relations as well as the entire framework of economical, militarial, theological and political convention that defines and dictates how power is distributed here in the U.S. and around the world. I will also delve into the role Asia, Asian cultural and philosophical mores and Asian women in particular factor into this concept of one-racial idealism.

To understand the historic continuums behind American racialism it is necessary to examine the role of Western European colonialism and imperialism and the social implications such systems have manifested in their wake. The United States analogous to other much older Euro-colonial nation-states has created a myth of moral antiquity that serves to buffer its collective conscience and to formulate an idealistic internal as well as external impression. Most Americans and especially Euro-Americans have been loathe to accept that in the course of two short centuries their country has been profoundly guilty of excessive cruelty and violence towards entire populations in the quasi-religious quest for territorial, cultural, political and economic power. The first victims were Aborigines

as they represented and continue to represent a direct challenge to the European concept of land ownership and secondarily as a threat to Anglo-Saxon theories of racial and cultural superiority.

The next to suffer the insecurities of European self-identity were Africans forcibly imported to North America to labour in the burgeoning agricultural systems that eventually enabled a former British colonial outpost to mature into a cohesive nation that in turn imposed similar imperialistic controls over other, in many cases hopelessly defenseless populations. Under the rubric of Manifest Destiny, America has defended its brand of racism as natural, logical and in accordance with Judeo-Christian theological law. To oppose American imposition it was, and is, reasoned is to oppose God and civilization. To this day dissenters, no matter where they reside within the narrow spectrums that purport to encompass the whole of U.S. political thought, are labeled as enemies of civil society and personifications of a Luciferian evil on earth. And despite overtly simplistic social definitions and the constrained concision that comprises the standard of debate in the U.S., a public that still chooses to deny its own national realities readily accepts such glaring contradictions.

America, as a living example of freedom, benevolence and ethnically blind fair play does not exist and for that matter has never existed. Its aggressive acquisitive territorial aspirations aside for a moment; the U.S. has successfully cloaked its history, its internal contradictions and its unique brand of racism through a veneer of genteel respectability. Under the rationale of bringing civilization to formerly uncivilized populations, the U.S. has used genocide, forced internment, theological zeal and outright brute force to shape events and situations that offend its sense of self-identity as an ideologically perfect, morally unambiguous colonial empire.

It is this aggrandizing pro-European egotism that has shaped the modern concept of race and racism that defines much the 20th century. Former British colonies such as Australia, South Africa, Israel and Canada have all enacted laws and social structures designed to defend and solidify White racial power over native populations. Through conversion schools, enforced separatism of public accommodations and police-state tactics, natives and the individual Europeans that questioned such policies were kept in line by use of force and the continual threat of violent reprisal.

In every country European expansionism has entered, ethno-cultural differences and the diametrically opposite European conceptionalism of race became the primary factors supporting and legitimising colonial imposition and domination of subject peoples. As expressed by American presidents William McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt, non-White, non-English speaking and non-Christian peoples “needed” American intervention to rescue them from their own backwardness. Regrettably, few then and few today question that assumption with any real seriousness. This is not to say that there has not been consistent and dedicated resistance to colonially imposed racism, but it to suggest that such resistance has been in and of itself jaundiced by a psychology that still struggles to free itself from generations of colonial European mental conditioning.

Indeed, anti-colonial, anti-racist liberation movements since the post World War Two era have wrestled with the problem of what political philosophy or system of social justice they should adopt to effectively counteract decades of European rule. Many have openly adopted Marxian political models in an effort to wrest themselves from the obvious capitalistic elements of Western Colonial domination. However it needs to be said that such an ideology is in and of itself culled from a thoroughly European paradigm. Karl Marx and his collaborator Frederick Engels were Germans who themselves had internalized the concept of a Teutonic philosophical and cultural superiority over other European societies and traditions. Marx's main inspirations were Hegel, Heine, Feuerbach and Kant and they undoubtedly represent a decidedly German, arguably pro-European cultural list of thinkers. It must also be noted that their political goals were in direct opposition primarily to the effects of the European industrial revolution on economical class aspects rather than liberation from the racist effects of European colonialism.

This is not to say that Marxian thought is totally without merit, but I question the relativity of such a philosophy in regards to racial politics in Euro-colonial nations imposing clear and unjustified stratifications on subject peoples identified as ethnological undesirables. In other words, I question the validity of the general *modus operandi* prevalent in many liberation theologies that do not, or choose not to recognize that European, i.e., White conceptions of social justice have shaped their understanding of and opposition to European racial oppression and subsequent social controls.

The staggered history of effective resistance to ethnic stratification has demonstrated that it is virtually impossible to dissolve such authority by adopting the ideological formulas of the dominating power structure. The American Civil Rights movement is a perfect example of the inherent failures of such engagements. In the late 50's to mid 70's the movement had accomplished much in addressing the contradictions and falsehoods of the Constitutional American promise of equality amongst all men. It has also inadvertently perpetuated varying forms of the very same discriminatory practices found within the racist systems in which they engaged in direct conflict.

American Indians, Hawaiians, Asians and peoples immigrating from former Spanish colonial nations like Puerto Rico and Mexico were not only unobserved in their rhetoric, but subject to similar ethnic intolerances by many within the mainstream movement. This was readily apparent once the goals of federal legislative support for affirmative action in employment and anti-discrimination policies in housing and education were finally enacted. Despite enduring generations of involuntary servitude, institutional segregation and randomly subjected systematic violence, African victims began to psychologically identify with their oppressors. Many began to openly advocate expressly Anglo-zied forms of ethnic and cultural bias against other ethnic groups deemed by Whites as alien and in some distinct instances as in the case with Native Americans, inhuman. This direct mirroring of White racial and cultural beliefs can fairly be attributed to the colonialist practice of divide and conquer, but another quietly insidious element factored into this development.

The unique trauma of existing under the consistent stresses of being non-European within an overwhelmingly White environment naturally resulted in compellingly detrimental modes of re-characterisation. The constant pressure to redefine the African identity into a form that would relieve the pain of racial discrimination led to the adoption of White racial pathologies. Although they themselves were not of purely European descent nor fully accepted on their own human merits, they had through years of emotional, and physical isolation from the African continent began to view themselves as American. In due course of accepting their less than equivalent social value when compared with European Whites but by chance of birth upon U.S. soil, many individuals felt superior to other ethnic groups just as marginalised by White ethnic prejudices.

Only radical, more revolutionary philosophical political entities such as Malcolm X and the Black Panther Party for Self-Defense earnestly rejected these eugenic notions and unlike the conventional primarily middle-class anti-racism movement included equally marginalised groups such as homosexuals and women's rights into their programmes. This is an incontrovertible fact that has seldom been discussed when the history of the Civil Rights movement is explored. In hindsight this is partly due to an embarrassingly high level of subjective and selective ignorance with emotionally uncomfortable and highly competitive economic issues. But the roots of these paradoxical points of view amongst individuals and organisations theoretically committed to invalidating historical ethnic biases reside squarely within the ardently contradictory European concepts of cultural hierarchies and their relationship to social constructions of human identity.

This brings us back to TIME's special race issue and the model used on its magazine cover. After the dust had settled following the overwhelmingly glowing response from the public over the seemingly optimistic view the issue presented, voices from the periphery asked a immediately pertinent and insightful question: why did the cover model look so European? Other dissenters within the Asian community went further by insisting that the Amer-Asian features of the model and the fact that a female was used instead of say, a male and female set merely exhibits centuries of White male fetishism associated with Asian women as the spoils of Western and in this case, American involvement in Asian nations. In my opinion this is not a radical analysis but a reasonable charge that deserves an equally reasonable answer.

TIME magazine's editors were eventually compelled to admit after much prodding that the resulting computer hypothesis and imaging mock-up of the future face of America could have looked much different, (and much darker) than what was suggested by their cover. On the other hand what they were not willing to concede was that obviously racist Euro-friendly generalisations and assumptions of beauty and social standing were used in developing its prototype. The producers deliberately chose decidedly muted, Europeanised representations of America's non-European ethnic populations. Filipino, but not so Filipino; Arab, but with lighter, more Caucasian characteristics; Latino, but with blond hair and hazel eyes as opposed to the darker features commonly associated with South American natives and lighter-skinned Africans that reflected generations of rape and sexual servitude to White males.

These were the more acceptable racial phenotypes rather than realistic depictions of actual subjects reflecting the broad ethnic reality of the U.S. Then there were the non-racial but no less significant American class factors such as how and why people choose their partners according to economic status, education and religious belief. Virtually every facet of the subject surrounding interracial mixing and the resulting progeny of such mating clearly reflected not the reality of America's ethnic diversities, but the desired end results of such ethno-biological transformations. What TIME actually did was boldly present a thoroughly eugenic, non-conflicting and acceptably exotic phenotype that does not directly counter or offend long-standing Anglo racial sensitivities. So in the long run, TIME magazine has made an unambiguous attempt at redefining, within Euro-centric racial paradigms, a suggested template for how the “new face of America” should look.

This is not an isolated incident of racial insensitivity on the part of the magazine. In an earlier issue, TIME earned the well-deserved ire of anti-racist activists with another cover story that involved race, racism and the incessant fears within the American psyche towards African males. Both TIME and its main competitor, NEWSWEEK rushed to be the first news publication to hit the stands with the newly released arrest photos of O.J. Simpson who was officially charged with the grisly murder of his ex-wife Nicole Brown and her friend Ron Goldman. NEWSWEEK published the photograph straight, TIME however decided to visibly alter its copy by darkening Mr. Simpson's skin and features making him, and all other African men in the U.S. by fiat, appear much more sinister and frightening by adding to the already tense racial factors surrounding the case.

When questioned as to why TIME would stoop to such blatant levels of anti-African male propaganda, apologists accused a sensationalist press and African activists in particular for exacerbating racial hatred and playing the “race” card. Despite their claims to the contrary, TIME played on White insecurities and prejudices by presenting an image that accurately articulated at least one consistent social reality, America's inherently deep set fear of Black males. For all intents and purposes, TIME conveniently sidestepped any responsibility for demonizing the African community by openly utilizing racism as a factor in their journalism.

So when we re-examine the aforementioned “New American” issue, the exotic Amer-Asian female phenotype cover girl choice becomes crystal clear. What TIME and other mainstream advertising endeavors are suggesting is a watering down or “Whitening” of the American Asian population. I have explored similar social engineering themes in a previous work entitled “SUZIE WONG REVISITED” where I detailed the history and methods used by Spanish and Portuguese colonialists to “de-Indianize” or, breed-out of visible existence the native Aboriginal populations of Brazil and most of Latin America through aggressive programmes of enforced interbreeding with European males. I compared these methods with what I see as the current eugenic drive in the U.S. to “de-Asianize” its Asian population by way of soft but persistent insistence on White male/Asian female pairings rather than the old-style methods of forceful intermarriage and outright rape.

Given the history of belligerent American intervention in Asia, (the Philippines, China, Korea and Japan respectively) and the fact that Asians as an ethnological and diverse demographic drastically outnumber Europeans in substantial numbers; the potential threat posed by a unified Asian identity presents for Euro-supremacists and multinational corporations a significant dilemma. As the world becomes increasingly globalised, the former methods of imperialism typified by direct militarism can no longer be deemed workable. Modern imperialism has had to redefine itself by utilizing a variety of new techniques most notably the science of American propaganda through the use of modern media and advertising. By projecting a seemingly endless compendium of long established stereotypes harvested from White male fantasies, the caricature of the demure but sexually alluring and immediately available Asian female is displayed by mainstream media in the U.S. and abroad virtually unchallenged.

Reminiscent of 19th century French paintings that routinely depicted Middle Eastern and North African females in erotic harem environments as little more than sexual possessions of Arab sheiks and European adventurers, American media accomplishes similar results by showcasing the quiet acquiescence of Asian women to their White male consorts. In all but a very few examples the Asian female stands or sits discernibly lower than the White male and rarely speaks for herself. She quietly smiles and looks upwards in approval and resignation at her White male partner unequivocally suggesting servitude, compliance and a total lack of any real sense of individualism. Moreover her first and last name is usually of European origin immediately suggesting her “Americanness” and ability to thoroughly integrate into the U.S. cultural fabric.

This pattern is pervasively expressed in major and minor cinema, television, print ads and even commercially available children's cereal boxes. Nearly every mode of popular communication is inscribed with this racist motif. The implications these images represent to the Asian community are monumental. The precedence given to White male dominance in Asian-interracial relationships and the direct albeit subtle suggestion of Asian female insignificance indicated by such propaganda deeply interrupt and injure the structure of Asian familial, cultural and ethnic cohesiveness and identity. This is without a doubt the intended long-term result.

So it is incontrovertible that Asian women today as in the past present a viable and visible example of White male supremacy and domination. Asians as a group represent a contradictory marginalised but wholly acceptable “model minority” status provided of course they remain within their respective places. America touts William Hung and comedic films like “Harold and Kumar” as diversity in action while denying home ownership in all White communities to second and third generation American Asian families. But on the other hand White male/Asian female couples and families are adorned on banners in Seattle and New York City advertising exclusive condominiums and hip upscale restaurants. Americans flock to see love stories such as “Snow Falling on Cedars” Jet Li never got the chance to kiss the girl he fought an entire ghetto for in “Romeo Must Die.” Asian males are represented in Western media as either sexless, intellectually modern coolie stereotypes or criminal masterminds brutally oppressing

other Asians until confronted by the all-powerful White male Buddhist super-killer seeking justice.

It would be absurd to dispute that such overt symbolisms have no empirical effect on socio-ethnic relations or for that matter racial stereotyping. It is equally absurd to suggest that challenges to such racist illustrations are merely examples of reverse-racism or purely anti-White prejudices. If anything, such overwhelming and pervasive patterns thoroughly solidify the arguments of dissenters that assert these examples brazenly display a contemporary, although familiar manifestation of eugenic racial categorizations. Ethnic narratives in the United States will always exist as a problematic and symbolic thorn in the side of an error-ridden American mythology of racial impartiality. And since White males cannot seem to restrain their sexual urges despite their claims of racial superiority and repulsion to non-White populations, progenies of mixed-ethnicities will continue to proliferate and compel Whites to construct new, more innovative classifications that effectively attempt to preserve Euro-centric, or at least proto-European control over existing social entities even within a vast multicultural social setting.

As deplorable and despicable as these contentions are, they are genuine in terms of actual social dynamics as they relate to racial constructions and prejudices. Asian males have been metaphorically castrated in the United States and this has consequently classified them as non-essential non-entities within the general American social complex. A comparable context was affably expressed by Confederate leader Jefferson Davis when he theorized that the practise of African slavery dignified and exalted all White men by providing a yardstick by which to measure their own pre-eminence. In the process of diminishing and dehumanising the Asian identity and the Asian male in particular, the European has therefore assumed for himself the role of a superior in every conceivable circumstance. Be it cultural, racial or sexual, Whites have historically measured their own self worth by the degree to which they control other, non-European populations. By subjugating other races through coercion and by violence when coercion fails, the European ego is thusly assuaged and afforded value.

Whether in the form of early anti-Asian exclusionary acts limiting immigration; or State of California edicts outlawing Chinese customs and dress; Japanese internment or the even less talked about enforced servitude and eventual abandonment of Filipinos by railway firms in the U.S. Midlands not to mention the invasion of many Southeast Asian nations by American military forces, White America has measured itself against the Asian and other non-European groups over and over again and without quarter. And in each of these cases, no matter what the ethnicity or the expressed aversion to the supposed inhuman aspects of those chosen to be subjected, you can count on White male libidos imposing themselves on the women of those groups and the utilization of conversion modalities to reshape the offspring of these contacts as close as is humanly possible into a Euro-centric paradigm that will ultimately serve White interests. And the Asian female as well as the direction of the Asian identity in the U.S. and abroad regrettably resides at the crux of this latest attempt at eugenic ethnological social engineering.

The Passions of Suzie Wong Revisited

10—24—2000

Author's note: The commentary herein should be viewed as an analysis of a social issue and not as a rationale for justifying anti-miscegenation. I contend that racism, the sociological practice of one racial/ethnic group having political/ social / psychological dominance over others is at the root of the subject discussed.

As of late, at least since the mid-seventies, interracial dating and marriage has taken on a new openness. American movie audience attendance figures astounded the box offices and critics alike in the sixties when people actually paid to see “Guess Who's Coming to Dinner?” At the time of the film's release, interracial marriage was not just frowned upon but still subject to social and legal prosecution in most U.S. States and communities. Since the earliest beginnings of European conquest in North America, laws, proscriptions and punishments were drafted and executed expressly in the name of White racial purity. Laws prohibiting marriage between White persons and a “Negro, Mulatto, or Mongolian,” (Takaki, “A different mirror,” p. 205) projected colonial European phobias as a predicament of immense proportions. Oddly, while laws existed barring European - Aboriginal unions they were rarely enforced provided that the husband was White.

Such couplings were deemed acceptable in the xenophobic zeal to rapidly assimilate North American Indigenous populations deemed “salvageable” by Christian missionaries while conversely offering a steady supply of comfort women for pioneers. Colonialism makes for strange bedfellows. So does eugenics. Waffen SS officers were notorious for maintaining Jewish concubines, as were affluent White landowners in the before Jim Crow and long after in the American South preaching segregation by day while exploring and exploiting “brown comfort” in the evenings.

Arch-racist Dixiecrat and grand hypocrite Strom Thurmond proved in the end no different than other great White men of the South when it came to fulfilling his exotic sexual appetite for African women. Despite his not-so-secret bi-racial daughter's recent affirmations of his deep love and affection for her, Mr. Thurmond's record speaks for itself. Vociferous segregationist politics and ideological support for not only for the infamous Mississippi Sovereignty Commission but the Ku Klux Klan and White Citizen's Councils empirically contradicts Mrs. Washington's public statements. Mr. Thurmond's thoroughly American approach to racism was par for the course. Thurmond was not the first nor the last White supremacist recently exposed as a closet race-mixer. Thomas Jefferson was also posthumously caught with his hand in the cookie jar when forensic DNA proved what Africans in this country knew all along. In his often-quoted “Notes on the State of Virginia,” Jefferson implicitly rationalises and defends African slavery to French critics of the slave trade in the Americas nation by particularizing the genetic and psychological differences between the races.

The revolting “veil of blackness” Jefferson describes as foul and unbecoming in the Africans he owned must have also served as a powerful aphrodisiac seeing as Sally Hemmings and other slaves bore him several mulatto children. Since Hemmings herself was of mixed racial origin, hence, mulatto, she was considered “acceptable” enough to take with him to France.

Without question, European colonial history clearly proves that non-White women are viewed as legitimate and desirable vessels for White male sexual release. Counter arguments in the presence of such vast evidences are patently indefensible. This is not to say that there aren't earnest attempts in racist revisionism. These arguments are so purposefully misleading and insidious that I choose not to catalog them here. But in the interest of clarification I will specify one glaring instance and move on.

In 1967, the Supreme Court ruled anti-miscegenation laws unconstitutional opening the door to legal challenges that stripped said statutes from the books in Virginia and several other states. Cultural revisionists cite this action as America progressively and confidently facing its racial partition by leaving such baggage in the past. Nevertheless, during the circus-like climate surrounding the O.J. Simpson murder trial in L.A. County, discussion abounded on AM talk radio concerning the perils of race-mixing with hosts regularly fielding calls from angered listeners as to whether this proves that anti-miscegenation laws should make a comeback. So much for the purportedly bygone misunderstandings of American customary racist antiquities, the past is still with us.

The argument would seem to be that we, as Americans, have come quite a long way. But how far is far? It is relatively common today in the larger urban areas of the United States to see couples made up of different races/ethnicity mixtures, apparently undisturbed by the firmly held Western social taboos prohibiting such relationships. With the modern political/economic phenomenon of globalization and the usability of the Internet, many formerly very visible social barriers have been seemingly surpassed by acquiescence, signaling the triumph of humanism and unhindered freedom of expression. In the vociferous opinion of the average Western observer and syndicated conservative apologists, racial bigotry has devolved into a misfortunate aberration of a far-flung past.

However, appearances can be extremely deceiving. Especially in matters of race, culture, ethnicity and class stratification in American society. To charter members of the Euro-American power structure, the American social system is the marvel of the last two centuries and the modus operandi of the next. With cultural fairs, multi-ethnic film festivals and in larger cities, ample culinary varieties readily available, how they ask, can one condemn this country as not only racist, but inherently racist? Despite the fact that the commissars of the establishment through populist appeal and selective denial perpetuate the fallacies of racial harmony and justice in the U.S., non-Europeans still anxiously and with good reason anticipate future transgressions.

Indeed, the 21st century has already shown itself to be stagnantly engaged with the difficult subject of race. Asian actress Kelly Hu recently appeared as a guest on the chat show Jimmy Kimmel Live and found herself confronted with ethnic insensitivity on

national television. When Kimmel asked Hu what her nationality was, Kelly replied with a laugh, "Um, I'm American!" And then, Jimmy continued with, "No, I mean what's your heritage." Ok, strike one. He then asked her, "So did you know karate since you were a little kid?" Kelly curtly responded with, "Why is it that everyone assumes you know karate if you're Asian?" The audience seemed amused by this demonstrating their approval with laughter and clapping. The same thing happened on the now defunct Rush Limbaugh television program designed to augment his popular syndicated radio program. During a rant against political correctness, Limbaugh posted an illustration of what he termed "Uncle Tomahawk," a cartoon caricature comprised of African and Native American stereotypes. The artist's victim wore a full Plains Indian war bonnet, sported oversized lips and elicited two full minutes of laughter from the audience which was entirely made up of White, professionally attired ditto-heads.

So despite the assurances of purported Euro-centric "race experts" such as Dinesh D'Souza or the authors of *The Bell Curve*, race matters. Why it matters is always up for raucous debate but rarely up for committed action to effectively deal with it. Certain areas of the discussion can be brutally honest in its appraisal, but it is nearly always over shadowed by brand name apologist concessions rather than intelligent dissection.

The social phenomena, only now being discussed outside of closed circles is the preponderance of Asian female/European male dating and marriage in the U.S. Racism, charges of colonial brainwashing and Asian female sexual fetishism are touchy subjects independently and even more volatile when grouped in concert. During the mid-eighties the noticeable but not at all overwhelming number of interracial relationships between Whites and Africans, particularly relationships between White women and African males were issues of major public discourse. Today the issue has become the preponderance of romantic relationships between Whites and Asians, or more to the point, the particularly overwhelming occurrence of relationships between White men and Asian women. It is oddly peculiar and telling that the trend is unequivocally a one-way road.

The prevalent structure of the new miscegenation is between White men and Asian women, not the other way around. To state empirically that Asian male/White female relationships are not occurring with a greater frequency as well would be disingenuous. Certainly there are a plethora of visible exceptions, but the enormously disproportionate representations of White male/Asian female couplings are clearly supported by matrimony and census statistics. The official government figures differ however from other studies in that recent changes in racial/ethnic self-definition on Federal forms and school records are reflecting the new, although vague concepts of multiculturalism.

Nearly one in three children whose fathers are White and mothers African identified themselves as White, according to an analysis of 1990 census data prepared by Harvard University sociologist Mary C. Waters. That was roughly a 50 percent build up over 1980, when fewer than one in four of the children with African mothers and White fathers were identified as White. Accordingly, half of the children counted of White fathers and American Indian mothers were identified as White, while more than half of

the children of White fathers and Japanese or Chinese mothers were listed as White in 1990. The U.S. Census Bureau reports there were over 465,000 Asian Pacific Islander/white interracial couples married in the U.S. by 1990.

Since 1960, the percentage of white husband/API wife couples has increased from 61.6% to 71.3% of API/white couples, while the percentage of API husband/white wife couples decreased from 38.4% to 28.7%. Among several of the independent reports I reviewed for this piece, various statistics place the percentages of White male/American-born Asian female unions in the U.S. as opposed to Asian/Asian at roughly one in three. For foreign-born Asian females, the ratio is generally seen as greater than 50%. Non-married cohabitation estimates show that White males are the partners of choice as Asian women's cohabiting partners. Asian women are much more likely to cohabit with white men than men from any other racial group including their own. Nearly 45 percent of cohabiting Asian women have white partners, while less than 43 percent have Asian partners. At the time of this writing, independent studies report more than 67% of Asian females residing in the U.S., (recent immigrants and American-born Asians alike) choose to restrict their romantic choices towards White European American males exclusively, shunning Asian men as a matter of accepted practice.

Hiromi Ono of the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research (ISR) states her belief that Asian female stereotypes and the myth of White male superiority factor into why so many Asian women commit outside of their ethnic group. "There have been people who say that there is much more of an attraction for men, white men, towards Asian women, because of this sexual image that's been imposed upon them." Her collaborator, David Harris also contends in their joint research paper entitled "Estimating the Extent of Intimate Contact Between the Races" presented in 2000, that stereotypes are primarily responsible for the significantly lower percentage of Asian men dating whites. Their report noted that Asian men were more likely than Asian women to have Asian spouses. 79 percent of Asian men were married to Asian women while 16 percent of Asian men had white spouses. Of non-married cohabiting Asian men, slightly over 37 percent of Asian men have white female partners.

Why is this happening and why in such to an extreme degree and, why now? Asians have maintained a steady presence in North America for more than a hundred years. First as low-wage Chinese labourers and Filipino slaves sold to railroad companies, then hand laundries for cowboys to fast food providers to gold miners to "Two Wongs will make it White!" motifs for Abercrombie and Fitch T-shirts, (remember that one?) And throughout most of that period, Asian communities have lived a very discrete existence cloistered within tight knit traditional communities. Part cultural, part induced by American fears of Yellow menace. With such survivalist cultural discipline in place for so long, what finally encouraged and continues to encourage Asian women to abandon that separateness? And more importantly given the sketchy history between Asians and Anglos from the mysterious and barbaric West, (the classical Eastern perspective) why should such relationships suddenly become not merely commonplace, but now apparently socially mandated? Is this really a recent phenomenon or has it also occurred in the past? Is it feasible to assume that European colonialism and the utilization of racism in that

endeavor towards non-Anglo-Saxon populations may weigh in on this trend? And to what degrees can we attribute racism in these choices? What of the children of such unions, what special challenges may they face? And if this is an engineered design, who stands to benefit from such social planning? Let us review the beginning of Europe's colonial spread and the results of their contact with Native cultures where they have extended themselves.

Race-mixing and colonial social engineering With the colonial expansion of Europe during the last half of the 15th century, military and theological conquest of targeted populations nearly always resulted in some form of involuntary servitude. Along with the paternalistic nature of European based colonialism as opposed to the maternal social custom common to most Indigenous communities, it was assumed that the female members of these slave castes were by default, vessels for the sexual release of the master classes. Slave owners viewed this as a matter of exercising their prerogative to “possess” any female within their slave stables that they took to their fancy. Especially evident in the example of Brazil, very few Portuguese women were present during the early days of colonial occupation. Miscegenation, while rarely spoken of favourably aloud was common between Indigenous women and Portuguese males from the very beginning. Even after sufficient numbers of women from Portugal had immigrated to Brazil, interracial relationships of varying degrees still took place. However there were specific limitations.

European males were discreetly assumed in public and openly in private free to explore their sexuality by crossing the colour line. Paradoxically but not unsurprisingly they socially as well as legally instituted taboos preventing Native males and colonial females from doing the just same as their counterparts. For the females of such clandestine relationships, social condemnation and “untouchable” status were the normal punishments for such transgressions with certain death for the Native male mandated by law and clergy. Under European imperialist bids for domination of natural resources and free labour in far-flung foreign lands, this “slaver’s prerogative” became in many cases, official policy used to maintain positive control over populations resistant to colonialist control.

It took a bit of time but eventually the powers that were realized they had gained something tangible in allowing White males their way with the Native female populations. The offspring of these unions were naturally bi-racial and begrudgingly tolerated but became regarded as potentially useful pawns in their colonialist plans. Being raised in homes predominately European in attitude (i.e., dominated by the father's cultural life-ways) while Indigenous in essence (due to some degree of limiting cultural influence from the mother) such children regarded themselves as “White” even if they were not generally treated as such outside of the home. In Brazil and Mexico the focused creation of this Assimilado caste, provided a buffer between the colonial power structure and the Indigenous populations perpetually teetering on the verge of revolution. The assimilado’s basic function was to curry the trust of the common people who usually viewed the assimilado as one of their own due to maternal custom as opposed to the paternalism the assimilado child was reared with. Their assistance in quelling revolts and

redirecting the masses in areas where the colonialist would be harshly received proved an immense success. This practice was used to great effect in Indochina (Vietnam) by France and Belgium, in the Philippines, Cuba, Puerto Rico and Mexico under Spain and to a initial lesser but ultimately increasing extent by the United States in regards to North American Aboriginal populations.

But it's greatest achievements were seen in South America, where this new ethnic class in due course soon led colonial bids for independence from the mother nations. This social repositioning by the *assimilados* had two basic goals. First, by leading the fight for national independence, they were confident of ensuring their own elevated status within the new social caste system thusly enjoying the fruits of power while deftly avoiding the colonial system of Indigenous slavery. In Africa, the "In-betweens" informed the colonialists of movements plotted against them and other traitorous actions, but never gained any real or imagined independent status as in the South American example. The best an In-between could hope for was the vague and uncertain social status of "coloured" This racial classification was officially absent everywhere except in the Southern White dominated states of Rhodesia and South Africa where racial classifications were formally defined and codified into law. Certain Natives who were regarded as trustworthy were issued "class cards" by the French and Belgian colonial municipalities and in some cases sent to the colonial home country but these liberties were granted on "merit" rather than racial/ethnic identity.

The reader may be asking his or herself what South American colonialism this has to do with Asian women choosing White men almost exclusively over Asian males. On its surface, interracial dating and marriage can reasonably be viewed as the fulfillment of the American dream in that all are measured by their merit regardless of race. Maybe. Under the surface exists something much more murky. To understand a social occurrence or trend, it is prudent to view what conditions (past and present) have led to the current train of accepted social custom. To ignore the history of Europe's colonial deeds towards the objects of their control is revisionist and wittingly enabling the modern forms of racism (in the true sense of the word) to continue unhindered. Once one investigates which individuals become the most defensive of these pairings, it becomes clear that: (1) there is a definite power play in such relationships and (2) it serves the needs of the racial/social/economic upper classes and (3) it fills a need for the American male who must now contend with White feminism and an imagined loss of social control.

In a 1997 poll of American males by NEWSWEEK news journal, 48% of the White male respondents reported significant feelings of loss (personal, political and economic) and displayed attitudes described by one poll collector as "severe depression." For the average Euro-American male between the ages of 19 to 45, Asian women represent a "purity" and "moral fortitude" not found in European American women. What they really mean is that Asian women, especially those raised traditionally will be more likely to "submit" to pathetic American male notions of masculinity and paternalism and will offer little, if any, resistance to such chauvinism.

Even though this racist Western matriarchal point of view is well known to educated Asian women, many still make the decision to date, marry and bear children to the same people who have historically maligned their particular cultures and nations. Is the self-respect of Asian women so low or collectively non-existent as to allow such willing and complete submission to White male sexual pathologies? As evidence to this indignity take the case of Terry Nichols, co-defendant of Timothy McVeigh of Oklahoma Federal Building fame. There is no doubt that McVeigh and his partner in crime Nichols were White supremacists and active followers of the neo-Nazi themed World Church of the Creator and were in contact with militia groups littered throughout that network. Just divorced at age 35, Nichols went straight to the Philippines and registered with a mail-order bride agency. In Cebu City he assumed he found the ideal Suzie Wong, Marife Torres, a 17-year-old virgin daughter of a traffic officer. He placed his order paid the agencies fees and waited for delivery of his “bride”. When his package arrived almost a year later, Torres was six months pregnant with another man's child. While it is reasonable to assume that Nichols was upset with this to say the least, they carried on as a legally married couple for seven years. The winter of Nichols personal discontent with White racist middle-aged male hypocrisy ended with his wife testifying at her husband's Oklahoma bombing trial.

Marife testified on the stand that in 1995 she returned to the Philippines and considered considering ending the marriage and returning to school. Her reason? Terry was spending so much time with Timothy McVeigh she grew jealous and felt unappreciated. She made it a condition upon her return that Nichols would not spend so time with his pal McVeigh. Marife also testified that she traveled to gun shows with her anti-government husband and participated in hawking survivalist supplies to militia types. She sold firearms, military-grade foodstuffs, and plastic bottles of ammonium nitrate fertilizer. She obviously was quite well aware of Nichols' racialist pro-White, anti-Government views but stayed with him anyway. Is Marife unique? I don't think so. Here's another little paradox that never quite seems to come up in discussions concerning similar relationships. Terry Nichols is an avowed White supremacist, yet he went so far as to go to a Southeast Asian nation to seek a female companion, an action in direct conflict with his racial purity/separatist views. It seems racism and ethnic bigotry become diluted and permissive at the European groin level even for the separatist World Church of the Creator.

The A.P.A.C. (Association of Personal Advertisers and classifieds) released a March 4th 1999 report titled “The mail-order bride industry and it's impact on U.S. immigration.” In this very detailed report on the hideous practice of MOB's (Mail-order brides) they exposed the West's efforts to undermine native Asian social structures by flooding Eastern media with Western films, television and pop-culture in what Newt Gingrich's Washington D.C. think tank euphemistically coined Intellectual imperialism. By weighing the moral authority of the United States against the “immoral” cultures of Asian societies thereby directly throwing into question the legitimacy of their unique social customs. As the report outlined:

“Why do foreign women want American husbands? Many sources suggest that these women are searching for a “better life” in terms of socio-economic factors—they do, for the most part, come from places in which jobs and educational opportunities for women are scarce and wages are low. However, when the women themselves are asked this question, the answer generally indicates an attraction to American men (they look like movie stars) and an aversion to native men. Americans, they say, make good husbands while Filipino (Thai/Indonesian/Russian/etc.) men do not. Americans are thought to be faithful to their wives, while the native men are cruel and run around with other women. True or not, this is the perception.”

(March 1999 A.P.A.C. report)

With such uniquely American television pulp such as *Baywatch*, *Friends* and *Beverly Hills 90210*, the impression that foreign viewers receive is a sanitized, White dominant ideal of American life, shown from the view of colonial Euro-American sensibilities. In addition, the prevailing myth of the “Rich, American Joe,” (as popularized by C.I.A. sponsored radio programming directed towards populations resistant to American control, such as *RADIO MARTI* in Cuba and *RADIO ASIA*) leads many of these women desperate to escape their poverty brought to them courtesy of U.S. led multinationals business interests to “sell” themselves on the worldwide market as “Brides.”

This leaves Native men questioning their own self-worth, instigates the disintegration of the native social/ethnic culture, familial ties and expectations and throws wide open the gates of economic and sexual exploitation. The Philippines stands out as an acutely accurate example of such modern imperialism. Immediately following the Spanish-American war, the U.S. decided to “assimilate” the Philippine islands against the will of the population (including Cuba, Puerto Rico and Guam) and ended up fighting the three-year long Philippine-American war resulting in genocide against more than half of the Indigenous population. To further illustrate the indignities heaped upon the Philippine people following their eventual loss to the Americans, the United States made the Philippine campaign the centrepiece of the 1904 World's Fair held that year in St. Louis, MI. In what was enthusiastically termed a “parade of evolutionary progress,” visitors could inspect the “primitives” that represented the counterbalance to “Civilisation” justifying Kipling's poem “The White Man's Burden.” Pygmies from New Guinea and Africa who were later displayed in the Primate section of the Bronx Zoo were paraded next to American Indians such as Apache warrior Geronimo selling his autograph.

But the main draw was the Philippine exhibit complete with full size replicas of Indigenous living quarters erected to exhibit the inherent backwardness of the Philippine people. The purpose was to highlight both the “civilising” influence of American rule and the economic potential of the island chains natural resources on the heels of the Philippine-America War. It was reportedly the largest specific Aboriginal exhibit displayed in the exposition. As one pleased visitor commented, the human zoo exhibit displayed: “The race narrative of odd peoples who mark time while the world advances, and of savages made, by American methods, into civilized workers.”

Back in the Philippines, the American military forces installed a puppet government in which the first and each successive Philippine President was obliged to swear absolute loyalty to the U.S. and announced the first Western-based Democracy in Southeast Asia. To this day, the U.S. faces strong resistance from many native quarters in the islands due to their reluctance to totally leave the Philippines alone. The U.S. Government and its international business interests rely heavily upon pro-American media propaganda and its resulting psychological dependence for White American acceptance to keep organized opposition to U.S. influence at a minimum. The old Spanish and Portuguese tactic of creating an in-between caste (Hapa's,) the new old tactic of MOB's and a prosperous Assimilado class, insures the necessary internal as well as external support needed to maintain a positive and profitable atmosphere for America's interests, whether they be economic or military.

Philippine women married to White American males especially American military service personnel have proved themselves an asset to American imperialists by blurring these abuses. And the children that result from these unions have increasingly shown that they view themselves as "American" as opposed to Philippino and stridently assert their "model minority" status as bridges between the two nations. Thusly tilting the moral scales against Philippine independence activists they openly decry as anti-American, isolationist and racist. The effects of this assimilation can readily be seen in the organizations that have been created to specifically celebrate the inclusion of Phillipinos in the 1904 Philippine exhibition and the special and important "uniqueness" of Philippine-American intermarriages to international commerce. If true love is supposed to be the real basis of these relationships, why go to such lengths to embrace the dehumanizing and reprehensible aspects of the 1904 exhibition, express complete ignorance to the illegality of the Philippine-American War and further, highlight the aid such relationships lend to international businesses?

American companies with business concerns in the Philippines actively recruit Hapas to represent their firms in negotiations with Philippine nationals and openly encourage their White male employees to develop "personal relationships" with that nation's women. The assimilado system has obviously not disappeared. 'Visiting Forces Agreement' bullied through the Philippine senate under then President "Erap" Estrada clearly support this claim.

Suzie Wong or Madame Butterfly?

This leads us to question of why so many Asian women are overwhelmingly abandoning cultural traditions and exclusively associating themselves with European American men and culture. For the Asian female, it is seen as a ticket to the good life. A means to rise through racial barriers that would historically have prevented her from doing so on her own. By "whitening" herself, she assimilates easier, thereby securing a social status higher than that of a "traditionally Asian" woman. Her children will be more likely to receive a better education and suffer less social and economic stratification. More than likely, her family will benefit from her "partnering smartly" and use this new status ("our daughter married a rich American") to improve their lot. The Asian male /White female

end of the spectrum is still minute but the reasons and results give the impression of being the same. For those Asian men who “land a blonde,” they are said to have “arrived.” For the White male, it appears very simplistic, he obtains an exotic “piece” that will allow him to “be a man,” apparently something otherwise denied to him by White women. As evidence of the commonality of this racist attitude, I submit a snippet from a on-line MOB website aptly named “A Chinese Princess.”

On the index page, the site owner lists his reasons why White males should seek out Asian women:

“Women from Asia are charming. They are petite, soft, and gentle. It is such a pleasure to spend time with a woman who is charming and derives pleasure just from talking and listening to what you have to say. Women from Asia are feminine. They are normally Petite and slender with delicate bone structure. They typically have smooth, silky, hairless skin. Women from Asia are gentle. They don't bust your chops, when you are home a little late, or forget an anniversary. They let you know if they are unhappy with your behavior, but it is typically done in warm, friendly way so that arguments and hard feelings are generally avoided. Women from Asia appreciate a gentleman.”

“These women do not scold you, and call you a male chauvinist when you hold open a door for them. They appreciate politeness and thank you for it. Women from Asia appreciate the way western men treat their women. Asian men have a bad track records for the way they treat their women. They expect their women to serve them, to carry the heavy bags, to walk behind, to take orders from him, his son, and his mother. Western men, especially American men have very good reputations. We are world famous for treating women with respect and consideration. These traits are very appealing to any women who receives your letters. Women from Asia value marriage. They do not believe in divorce.”

“They marry for life. They believe in finding the right man and sticking by him, in good times and bad. Women from Asia value family. Family is all important. Husband, children, parents, relatives come first. Husband and children never take second place to her career. Women from Asia value tradition. If you have traditional values and like to do things the way they have been done before, your ways and beliefs are accepted and appreciated, not criticized. Women from Asia value maturity. If you are older than your woman, that's not a problem, it's a plus. Asian women respect maturity. It signifies wisdom, stability, experience and gentleness”

This is not, unfortunately, a minority opinion. To be fair, opinions among Asian males are as to be expected varied on the subject. However there does exist a certain amount reasonable resentment shared by a majority of Asian males. While not articulated openly, many Asian males consider the European men who exclusively seek out Asian women as typically low on the totem pole for what many Euroamerican women would actively pursue. As one Korean university student explained to me over latte's in Seattle's Capitol Hill area, “These guys are not models.” He and his friend were in agreement that White men who cannot “score” well with White women are likely to fare better with Asian women who as they put it, believe the “hype” of the sensitive, intelligent and handsome White man.

And while I try very hard to be un-opinionated in a personal nature when it comes to racial issues, it does appear that these men could generally appeal to Asian women who generalize ALL White American men as “better.” Propaganda has historically proven itself a powerful instrument that can go a long way in forming attitudes than Asian males collectively are an inept lot while portraying White males as exactly the opposite. As Professor Hamamoto of UC at Davis has commented: “Like I tell my class...the White man’s lust for the Yella woman stems from his imperial presence beginning in the Philippines, to occupied Japan...to Korea...to Vietnam, to Thailand....linked to this imperial presence is the system of military prostitution that has migrated overseas to the U.S. in the form of ‘Oriental’ massage parlors, dating services, and marriage brokerages. I understand the character ‘Ling’ played by Lucy Liu in this larger context. For Liu or any other Yella woman to feel flattered that the white man fetishizes her simply as an un-raced, ahistorical, universalized ‘human being’ is simply deluded.”

This “delusion” is not limited to Asian women seeking acceptance from the White power complex. American-born Africans in the Americas still suffer from this ‘please love me’ complex. As a child growing up in the ghettos of New York, I was under the impression that Black women were born with straight hair, while Black men were born with curly (or nappy) hair. Hair is such a volatile issue within the African community that it is rarely openly addressed, even amongst African people themselves in private. The internalisation of racial bigotry in regards to African self-identity still evokes violent images of “tribalism,” “savageness,” and any other negativism you can conceive of in regards to African peoples, cultures and life-ways. Africans have grown to regard their natural curly hair as “Ugly,” while straight hair implies “Class” and “Beauty.” One company even goes to the extent of marketing a lye-based hair straightening relaxer kit titled “African Pride” which paradoxically displays absolutely no pride at all except perhaps in being colonised. The hair issue is becoming somewhat of a moonchild within the Asian community in America also. Multitudes of Asian women are bleaching their hair and when questioned about it, have become increasingly belligerent in their defenses. Responses not unlike those of African women are offered when challenged as to their styling choices. The parallels are frightening and clear.

African women surgically reduce their lip thickness, lighten their skin tone and remodel their noses. Asian women choose to surgically round off their eyes and undergo breast enhancement. In both cases, the females of these two distinct peoples are attempting to achieve the same goals, trying to arrive at a Caucasian idealization of femininity. As writer Wena Poon has intelligently pointed out, it is appalling that increasingly large numbers of Asian women are ashamed to look Asian. Plastic surgery to simulate the pointed Western nose, or undergoing eyelid incisions that corrects(?) almond shaped eyes are all observable ciphers of Asians rejecting precisely what makes them Asian.

Succeeding this it is assumed, acceptance will come automatically. But at what price? In a nation that claims to embrace diversity, why should such stereotypical notions not only exist, but flourish virtually uncontested? Indeed, these very same racial/sexual complexes appear to be promoted by the very same institutions that installed these prejudices and

social castes in the first place towards specific goals. The primary objective is obvious, psychological control of minority populations within the spheres of U.S. influence.

The bigger picture is more troubling than many dare to openly articulate. With major media taking notice of the phenomenon, (Asian girl/White boy films and ads, even involving child models on breakfast cereal boxes) the American consciousness toward the Asian has softened. This makes American involvement in Asia far easier for the American tax payer to accept and when necessary, condone. By bringing the idea of an open Asia to the Westerner, support for the creation of Asian markets and investment by multi-national mega-corporations is seen as “beneficial” and “necessary” to American economic growth and beneficial to the nations involved.

Of course these same supporters know or care little for those subject to eventual cultural destruction in order for these new plans to function. While Starbucks and Nike shoes promise to improve the lives of Asian people in the eyes of Eurocentricists, little note is taken to the Indigenous peasant farmers in coffee producing countries eeking out a subsistence living working for foreign landowners, or the sweatshops on American protectorate islands in the South Pacific where high-end shoes and other clothing are constructed under slave conditions in clear violation of the United Nations charter on human rights. This is why to those who control international commerce, this trend is essential to their vested interests. The emergence of a twentysomething “Hapa” class has already shown its leanings by supporting the ends of the multi-national corporations and the imperialist needs of the west.

Personalities such as actress Lucy Liu and newscaster Connie Chung aggressively assert their “Americaness” while rarely if ever addressing the problematic complexities of being Asian in America or being Asian and female in America. And even, (in my opinion) more insulting to the Asian community is their conscious, concerted effort to align themselves with all things “Western” while enthusiastically rebuffing what is “Eastern.”

Who people choose to be with is a personal decision. I must logically concede that it would be foolish to assume that every such union is riding on these nefarious factors. I've personally known a few (really, only a rare few) such relationships that were based on all the normal things, attraction, mutual respect and a healthy dose of lust. However, to ignore or to deny the sociological fact that societal pressure strongly dictates who you may finally choose in the end run is juvenile and inherently perilous. 1930's German Jewry considered themselves thoroughly assimilated and therefore, “German.” They were proved very wrong in the end. Asians in the United States should take heed of this historical lesson in assimilation.

Ask Scientist Wen Ho Lee.

An Innovative Affair of Genocide

5-14-2003

Upon retrospection of life under 500 plus years of European colonialism, the exploitation of Indigenous territories, resources and life ways has achieved the goals set forth by the European invaders from 1492 to the present day. The evidence of this endeavor is painfully apparent in that if one were to visit the United States or Canada with no prior knowledge of the Indigenous pre-European historical presence on this continent, one would never realize that things were not always all so Anglo-Saxon. This erroneously whitewashed perception is instituted by the dominant culture and nourished by its mainstream media primarily serves to blur the lines between America's moral track record and its much more preferable "freedom" fable.

The misconstructions created by Europeans seeking emotionally palatable and extra-legal explanations to the Indians + land=genocide question has resulted in the popular American opinion that Indians never really existed and declares that Indians don't really exist at all anymore. The verity given to that question in the 21st century clearly indicates that this pattern of thinking is estimated to continue onward in the foreseeable future if only to illustrate its profound usefulness to the colonialist's desire to maintain power. One way or another, Europeans have universally conceptualized the principle that whatever belongs to non-Europeans somehow belongs to them by fiat of Providence or Social Darwinistic natural law.

This all translates into colloquial English as the Federal Indian Policy informally initiated by the first Continental Congress up to the present day. Acquiring the unmitigated subjugation of the entire Indigenous population of two continents wasn't enough. In this zeal to rationalize dispossessing and ultimately decimating more than 500 Indigenous nations in North America alone, the Wasi'chu went further by articulating the inherent right of Europeans to reinterpret Indigenous realities at will without regard and in direct contradiction of the xenophobically centered concept of White Supremacy. Unwittingly, by adopting the attributes of the conquered savage they conversely gave validity to the humanity of the peoples who created the values in the first place. Having realized this over time, the next logical progression in the European mind was to become Indian, but with clearly defined reservations that preserved the uniqueness of White supremacy.

This was initially undertaken upon Alberigo Vespucci's renowned expeditions along the southernmost coasts of the New World beginning in 1497. His notoriously little alluded to tome (in the modern day) *Quatuor Navigationes* (circa 1504-1505) elegantly and vociferously detailed a ripe, virgin land populated by savages and loaded with gold just waiting for intrepid European powers to plunder.

The actuality that there were long established societies in what is now Central and South America was of little consequence to the Portuguese explorer who was wholly in agreement with Voltaire's estimation that the Indigenous peoples of the New World were

not actually human, but the dregs of an incomplete humanity that the flawless Christian God in some way paradoxically goofed up on.

Under this colonialist paradigm, Vespucci misappropriated the Mayan term Amerrique, the collective appellation of the peoples who resided in that area under the gross misunderstanding that the word Amerrique was synonymous with gold. The word actually translates as Peoples of the lands of strong winds, a powerful term of immeasurable significance to the native inhabitants of the twin continents, but of inconsequential matter to the invaders.

By exchanging the Indigenous Amerrique for the Latin Amerigo, Vespucci thusly identified himself with the entire geographical area and everything within it thereby justifying the pilfering and obliteration of the Mayan people. The larcenous appropriation of Indigenous names was aside from territorial theft, another in a long line of systematic patterns of genocide that can be traced from the beginnings of European colonialist expansion onwards to the present day. Names, titles and other linguistic markers are the spiritual adhesives that retain within their adherence and continuation the essential history of a people or culture. To deny a people their inherent right to self-definition manifests in the certain eradication of the subject people as an existing entity.

Indomitably overlooked and scrubbed out from the myths purporting to the nobility of the bloody Euroamerican policy of expansion euphemistically hailed as Manifest Destiny is the principal detail that Indigenous intellectual ideas and cultural traditions along with territories were appropriated and reconfigured to the tastes of the Wasi'chu. Closely following Vespucci and his initial literary foundations for European colonialism, Euroamerican popular commercial literature eventually fashioned the eugenic genre of the White Indian, the first Euro-American folk hero.

The White Indian epitome parallels Edgar Rice Burroughs improbable White African King of the Jungle, Tarzan the Great in that the Eurocentric archetype embodied all of the basic biases and misconstructions necessary to explain a dominant White presence in non-European lands. James Fenimore Cooper's novels come to mind, as do the poems of Henry W. Longfellow, or the silver screen's critically lauded rendition of realism in *A Man Called Horse*. This is far from a complete list.

In all of these examples European males are portrayed as mavericks exemplifying the best ideals of European ethnic, moral and intellectual superiority with the added benefit of the independence of the Indigenous spirit. The latter view was used to great extent in defining the national spirit of the American revolutionary resistance to British control of its colonies, (the Boston Tea Party) and extended itself to the fanciful notion that by playing Indian an inherent 'ownership' of indigenous lands goes hand in hand.

In essence, the ideological groundwork was laid with the desired intent of creating a substitution of the Indian as a personage and as a viable entity, thusly removing not only any semblance of Indigenous eminent domain to lands as Europeans understood it, but to the literal identity of the Indian himself. This changeling has not gone away and if

anything has monumentally surpassed its predecessors in not limiting itself to playing Indian, but asserting an "Indian-ness" they assert biological Indians no longer possess.

The politics of Gay revisionism

Within the public discourse concerning the subject of the Homosexual orientation, Judeo-Christian-Islamic society has yet to comprehend that such people exist and possess the same natural, civil and moral rights as other individuals. Although Western society has liberalized dramatically in that it is much easier to live openly homosexual in most of Europe and the United States and bias directed toward gays is regarded as generally wrong in principle although such animosity still exists. Education on the subject is primarily responsible for this sea change, chiefly because it exposed the fact that it simply could not be assumed that the person standing next to you on the street was Heterosexual.

The infamously audacious Alfred Kinsey report estimated that one in ten persons throughout the American population were actively homosexual, a figure that is still highly debated. However in the 21st. century we recognize that if you include totally closeted bisexual persons, the figure multiples greatly. This visibility has acted as a safeguard shielding the gay community from more aggressively overt oppression. Much awareness has been given to the undisputable fact that individuals who deviate from conservative Heterosexual social and sexual practices face repugnance, hatred and collective marginalization. And for those who visually appear gender confused or somehow or other out of sync with what is perceived to be their assumed gender, this negativity can manifest itself in very sudden and abrasive forms.

Physical violence towards GBLTQ individuals and communities comprised roughly 36% of all bias related crimes reported nationally throughout the last decade. Of these reported incidents, (the statistics officially vary) occasionally the animosity resulted in the death of the victim. The cases of Brandon Teena, a genetically born female who lived as a male and the vicious murder of Matthew Sheppard come immediately to the front if only due to the reactions from the GBLTQ community due to the brutality of the crimes. While living under the pretext of Brandon in a rather smallish town in Nebraska Teena was enjoying a settled, comfortable life of acceptance and became romantically involved with a woman who cared for her, unconcerned with her gender identification. She, along with two others who were unfortunate enough to be friends with her were shot to death by two local males that had previously raped Teena to teach her a lesson.

In Sheppard's case, two Heterosexual couples enticed Sheppard into spending the evening with them and ended the ruse by beating him mercilessly and leaving him crucified on a desolate wire fence to die. Once one investigates the particulars of these cases it becomes impossible not to define these crimes as anything less than an assassinations. They were especially sadistic acts utilizing sexual assault and ultimately murder under the pretext of "protecting" themselves from a sexual predator. As illogical as all this sounds, the defense teams game plans in both subsequent trial cases resonated with the local community. Since the primary victims were Homosexual and the other victims were

acquaintances of a Homosexual, the Nebraska and Wyoming criminal justice systems dealt with the matters flippantly.

In the Teena murder case both killers received very short sentences and much sympathy from the community. In the Sheppard litigation, due to massive outcry from the GBLTQ nationwide the offenders received substantial prison time. The media fared no better than law enforcement in that the murders initially received very little direct attention despite the vicious severity of the attacks and only focused on the cases once public consternation compelled them to take another look. Political correctness aside, one would in truth find it prudent to acknowledge that the prevalence of such incidences of violence and the apathetic appreciation of anti- Homosexual traditions flaunts a frame of mind analogous to that of Berlin society in 1933. The acknowledge of such intolerance as conventionally acceptable as was made painfully clear by the Rev Jerry Falwell during the aftermath of the September 11th terrorist attacks.

Rev. Falwell openly blamed gays, Right-to-life groups and feminism as the reason Jehovah's vengeance manifested as Arab terrorism in New York and Washington and while he was remanded by many, his opinions resonated with the general population. Such sentiments serve to illustrate that America is far from the harmonious libratory society touted in it's well manicured outward face. Oppression continues although in muted forms having learned historically how to justify or blur the criminality of marginalization when such actions occur.

Running the risk in assuming that most, if not all of those who have fully read the above statement will have by now conjured mental images of the Tetric Waffens SS executing Jewish people randomly, kicking down doors and herding whole districts into railway cars for transport to the death camps of a Nazified Europe. While the allegory of SS jackboots is an overused and particularly harsh metaphor, it is used here for a specific reason. While as accurate and emotionally powerful as these images are, they are by fiat of the inherent eugenic conception of European and Euro American supremacy the ONLY particulars anyone cares to remember.

There has been a revision of sorts in that other victims of Nazi directed violence have been given their due with descendants of the Romany, Turks and the vociferousness of the Gay political lobby demanding equal time in discourse surrounding the European Holocaust. The politicized GBLTQ community came to realize that by not taking into account the losses incurred to Europe's Homosexual population the die would be cast for such horrors to reemerge again elsewhere. But that was about as far as the GBLTQ push was willing to go.

Customarily, Gay intellectuals will utilize the European Holocaust to elucidate the consequences of xenophobia; the rationalization of sexism; it's inherent relation to generalized Homophobia and will liberally sprinkle the debate with the GBLTQ's alleged solidarity with the various civil rights movements of the 1960's.

In reality there exists a submerged ambivalence to ethnic/racial matters within the GBLTQ community that really was never identified openly until the emergence of poet Audre Lorde who forced the issue into the open by condemning the Gay community for not attacking racism with the same fervor they employed towards Homophobia. She made light of the certainty that when such chauvinistic single-mindedness utterly subscribes itself to recognizing oppression solely as it relates to narrow, Euro centric and thereby colonialist paradigms, there exists a fundamentally iniquitous double standard. The accepted and enforced visualization of what consists of a real human being and how lacking that classification should relate to their level of humanity is a storm still brewing within the Euro American Gay community. There is a general assumption that the Gay community is much more liberal and accepting of difference than the mainstream society. Nevertheless, for non-Europeans that hypothetical egalitarianism is not so evident. Racial chauvinism in GBLTQ society strangely enough may have been the ideological inspiration for President Clinton's policy of Don't ask, don't tell.

Profess that racism in the gay community doesn't exist while maintaining a classical racial partiality not indistinguishable from the general social environment. Although the primary focus of debate on GBLTQ racism leans towards African Americans, Asians and Native Americans are not excluded from racial bigotry within the Gay community. Among Asians in Gay America the struggle against institutional sexual paternalism and the boy toy stereotype closely corresponds to the Suzie Wong syndrome imposed upon Asian women in the White Heterosexual world.

Racism within the GBLTQ community serves a dual function in that it also incorporates fetishes deeply rooted in classical European eugenic principles. Indeed, a quick visit to virtually any Gay bookstore will reveal display shelves stocked with magazines and DVD's showcasing White Gay males being dominated by powerfully built and enormously endowed African males with titles such as Slavery Reparations are a bitch! For Native Americans active in their local Gay communities the established view was that Indians no longer existed so we were unseen and unheard of in the general Gay discussion.

This changed however during a period in American history when mainstream society was being challenged strongly by a counter-culture that deliberately sought out non-European ideas in a struggle against a social system that they viewed as square and immoral. While many of these middle-class reared freethinkers looked furtively towards Asia's India for inspiration, Euro American Homosexuals sought social legitimacy not from the counter-culture but mainstream society.

Hinduism, despite its purported egalitarianism offered little ethical or theological support for Homosexuality and the general American mainstream would never accept such diametrically opposing cultural views. Gays were compelled to discover other alternatives.

The alternative proved to be a real surprise to all concerned principally because it came from a source previously regarded as extinct. Native Americans proved to be fertile

ground for a new form of exploitation in the pursuit of White Gay male acceptability. Through repeated study of the memoirs of George Catlin and other more scientific papers authored by experienced professional anthropologists, Gay activists in the mid-sixties began to use the documentation of the Native American Berdache to impart assistance to the naturalist argument legitimizing Homosexual behaviors.

The negativity of the term Berdache to Native Americans and the predictably gross misunderstandings surrounding these individuals did not factor much within the Gay political movement. Historically apathetic Eurocentric regard for Native American sensibilities and its associating disrespect was upheld and White is Right thinking prevailed. They had finally discovered something tangible and were prepared to take it as far as it could go. This version of Gay colonialism went on to redefine the existence of non-gender specific Aboriginal history and practice by forcing it to conform to Eurocentric forms of personal expression.

The literary assertion that the term Berdache be used to define Indigenous genetic males who lived and were socially accepted as women was the first casualty. Victims of their own petard, Euroamerican GBLTQ intellectuals themselves were limited by confining Homosexuality within a context of copulational passivity as opposed to the base meaning of the word meaning simple same-gender sexual attraction. This inability to circumvent the limits of their own cultural frameworks enabled the manipulation of the Indigenous non-specific gender identity entirely within a European construct exclusive of Aboriginal value.

Originally culled from the Semitic language denoting a sexually subservient young male usually in the context of male prostitution, the term unequivocally conveys the assignee as a bottom, thusly for the Euro American mind justifying the practice of passive anal-coital male to male contact within a defined cultural construction. Hence, creating a persuasive argument for Western acceptance of Homosexual people in line with historical and scientific observation.

As Transgenderist activist/author Leslie Feinberg writes, "Like a gift presented at a giveaway, Native people have patiently given me a greater understanding of the diverse cultures that existed in the Western hemisphere before colonialization". Berdache as a descriptive word works for White Homosexuals precisely because it serves their own interests and political agendas, not our own. The expression is universally viewed as a patent insult by Indigenous people to this day and is in no small part due to the negative and paternalistic connotations the word personifies.

The French who initially assigned the word to these non-Heterosexual persons as Europeans defined human sexuality, along with the Spanish were Catholic, and therefore exceedingly hostile to unguarded non-Heterosexual activity theologically as well as the threat it presented to male domination of women within European society.

Non-gender specific Indigenous peoples displaying affection openly were often killed as in the case of Vasco Nunez de Balboa's violent journey through modern day Panama.

Upon witnessing genetic males dressed and living as women, the good and honorable Catholic had dogs attack and render 40 Natives to pieces in full view of the "acceptable" Aboriginals stunned as to how such barbarism could be possible. For this, Balboa was revered back home as the personification of Christ's presence in the New World. This was by no means an isolated incident and unfortunately it wasn't the last.

The invaders habitual ignorance of the Indigenous cultures they encountered combined with their intolerance for Native American resistance to assimilation prompted the French to utilize the term to erode the standing of these individuals within their own ethnic social schemes. Basing the generalized European theory of Homosexuality upon constricted, pederastic interpretations of classical Greek Homoeroticism, the submissive Berdache was regarded with disgust and that opinion was fed into Indigenous societies that were already under attack from all sides at once.

While it did take quite a bit of time, ultimately Indians grew to be antagonistic and unsympathetic to these persons mirroring the biases of the colonial imposition. Divide and conquer exercises under the auspices of Christianity were the primary vehicle utilized playing on the importance given to spirituality among Indigenous peoples. Mission accomplished. So the Berdache became a black eye and remained hidden in Native American history by Euro American and eventually Indigenous efforts alike. Again, this made the non-Heterosexual Indian an easy personage to manipulate because there simply wasn't enough acceptable verifiable data from either the native or non-Native sectors to counter the offensive.

In the European quest and compulsion to assimilate, the non-specific gendered Indigenous populations were first subject to harsh marginalization primarily by Missionaries and later by Euro-aculturated Indians and ultimately disallowed almost totally from their own communities. Indigenous culture in North America was primarily passed on orally and even in cases of those who possessed a written language, the rule of thumb was and is that Euro centric paradigms supercede Native actualities in all fields including and not limited to sexuality. In spite of the labors by many within the Gay intelligencia who enthusiastically encouraged more research on the topic, interest was noticeably low on the subject of Indian matters in general.

This changed following the American Indian Movement stand off against the FBI and local Indian haters at Wounded Knee in 1973. Native American issues and causes were again front-page news and awareness of U.S. Federal Government sponsored mistreatment and violence towards the Indigenous population simply became too visible to ignore. Gay activists latched onto this opportunity by philosophically and morally claiming kinship with the Native American plight by way of the "outlaw" theory equating anti-Indian genocide with anti-homosexual repression.

Once this ideological framework had been constructed it made possible the development of the White Berdache that was now spiritually and socially satisfactory tolerable within a definable and well-documented cultural paradigm. The fact that the aforementioned archetype was not European at all was of little if any consequence to the pioneers of this

new comprehension. There has always been an assumption on the part of European colonialist thought that somehow whatever belongs to the parties subjected to their exploitation truly belongs to no one and therefore makes such co-option permissible and natural.

This falls right in line with the White Indian myth of old, a Euroamerican male that possesses all the "good points" or survival skills of the Indian but has never lost sight of his uniqueness, (i.e., whiteness, thereby preserving his privileged status). Similarly the White Berdache retains all the privileges of White male power with the added benefit of being allowed to be Gay without giving up the aforementioned status socially attributed to White males. Consider Norman Mailer's influential 1957 essay, *The White Negro*.

Published on the eve of the Civil Rights Movement, Mailer's essay declared that the African in America, isolated and criminalized by society made for the ideal prototypical Euroamerican rebel. Another subversive yet recognizable outsider that meticulously parallels Cooper's White Indian protagonist, Hawkeye only in this case the Indigenous drum soundtrack was replaced with Charlie Parker. For Mailer and the Beat Generation that inspired the hipster surge, the Negro was little more than a stock character, a typecast representing White society's alleged submerged self-identification.

"Hated from outside and therefore hating himself," Mailer merrily and expertly corresponded, "the Negro was forced into the position of exploring all those moral wildernesses of civilized life which the Square automatically condemns as delinquent or evil or immature or morbid or self-destructive or corrupt." Whatever.

The proliferation of the White Berdache

Those who engage in such moralistic ju-jitsu always most always proceed under the auspices of loftier goals such as the opening up of American society towards accepting diversity including Gay sexuality. Ultimately however they gain strength inherently from the colonialistic interpretation of universal property rights and how it relates to all things non-European desired by the occupying force, (i.e., cultural appropriation). Harry Hay, rightfully considered the Godfather of the modern Gay civil rights movement is also the spiritual founder of the Radical Fairies, a loosely knit Gay sub-cultural assemblage that purports to define itself as a Tribal Nation within the context of Native American spirituality as they believe it relates to Homosexuality.

According to legend, 1970, Hay (who also claimed to have had an Apostolic encounter with spiritual leader Wovoka, the prophet of the Ghost Dance in his youth in Nevada) journeyed to New Mexico in an attempt to make this connection by finding a real living Berdache, since real Indians are primarily seen as phantasms of the American past. While I could not find any evidence of Hay actually locating his Berdache among the Pueblos, in 1979 the first official gathering called the Spiritual Conference of Radical Faeries took place in Arizona headed by Hay, John Burnside, Don Kilhefner, Mitch Walker and openly gay writer Will Roscoe. More than 200 men took part in the meeting conducting

what they felt to be authentic Native American spiritual rituals sprinkled with various bits and pieces from other European traditions, mostly Pagan.

Euroamerican Gay males stood about in the desert dressed for the occasion. Scottish kilts combined with fringed buckskin boots and Southeast Asian body markings of warrior clans past were displayed alongside others dancing to Indian hand drums buck naked with feathers tied to their Indian braids and other appendages. Initially this hodgepodge of confused Wasi'chu pseudo-religious theology seems harmless and fun for those involved. Practicing bewildering rituals comprised of two parts of what they think is Sioux religion, Celtic sun worship, a dash of the I-Ching and three-eighths of revisionist sex-positive Christianity curiously appears to arrive at a sort of Gay version of the neo-Nazi World Church of the Creator.

Since that initial get together, the Radical Fairies movement has spread internationally, most notably in Germany, (which coincidentally also harbors a multitude of White Indians complete with buckskin attire and backyard teepees). By the 1990's the Men's Movement fueled by Robert Bly's idiotic tome IRON JOHN continued in the same vein as the Radical Faeries but left the door open to Homosexual activity within a Heterosexual context.

This provision allowed for Straight males the prospect of experimenting with Homosexuality without the stigma of being labeled as Gay within a supposedly tribal context. All of this activity was occurring under the elucidation of reviving the ancient, and blessed and accepted Queer tradition of the Native American Berdache as relayed by Roscoe, Katz, Feinberg et al. The whole point originally was to formulate a basis for eventual general American social acceptability by referring to the universality of the Homosexual in divergent cultures and traditions. While quite understandable and logical, this cannot be accepted as an excuse for misappropriating the spiritual definitions of Indigenous peoples, cultures or societies.

This endeavor to employ Native American tradition, culture and spirituality has recently been magnified by the push among the Gay political lobby to broaden the term Two-Spirited by equating the word with the supposedly reclaimed term, Queer. Despite the fact that Queer has never had any other connotation other than its considerable weight as an insult, Two-Spirit possesses very significant and culturally laden dimensions that do not translate into English within a single word or even several for that matter.

The very attraction of the word itself to non-Natives is precisely this linguistic ambiguity concerning the inherent cultural significance of the word. The exercise of creating exacting terminology amongst Western Gay academia is given tremendous importance and the struggle to find terms suitable to all non-Heterosexuals has since the 1970's and been the subject of many heated debates. The affronts Queer, Faggot and other similarly disparaging terms became the focal point of Gay political aspirations during the turbulent 1980's.

Amid the outbreak of AIDS and increasing violence towards the Gay population, invisibility was perceived as equivalent to a death sentence for the entire community and moves to challenge anti-Gay discrimination were disposed to changing that. The rationale behind politicizing the slur 'Queer' was co-opted from yet another non-European identity.

In this instance the African American community via their White owned and operated Rap industry artists and the selective media documentation of inner-city street life. They heard young Black males refer to each other affectionately as Niggaz and after the shock wore off, the new philosophy of reclaiming arose. In televised interviews African males claimed to be taking the sting from the word by using it among each other as a form of identification signifying the recognition of 400 years of oppression under Euroamerican domination.

Once more the Gay political propaganda mills of Queer Nation, ACT-UP and writers such as the Advocate's Michelangelo Signorile fabricated a new analogy that proposed that Queer and Nigger were inherently the same and that the Gay community would do well to imitate militant urban Black culture. The hypothesis reasoned that taking power away from the straight world by using the term openly would minimize the use of the very same word negatively.

The illusion of reclaiming was transitory since even for the liberal gay community up to the present day, Nigger still possesses all the venom of the past regardless of who utters it and no matter what the circumstances. Upon realizing this, the search was under way to find another term could be used to characterize an already over-defined classification of people. The labels Gay, Queer, Homosexual, Lesbian and Transgender historically precede but are now overshadowed by Intersexual, Bisexual and Questioning and a gaggle of others.

The European necessity to define something as fluid as human sexuality into recognizably organized titles has proven far too confusing leading to increasingly difficulty in Gay/Straight relations. The new Native American term Two-Spirit fit the bill perfectly. The intended objective behind the term Two-Spirit was a direct and unflinching attempt to regain control over a particular aspect of Aboriginal reality taken from said people initially by force and later by religious zeal. This new terminology is a spiritual definition and to ignore that most basic dynamic is to ignore the entire foundation that defines the whole of Indigenous character and identity. Two-Spirit is NOT a substitute for homosexual, period.

It is a modern Aboriginal term denoting the recognition of anywhere up to eight non-Heterosexual genders in accordance with North American pan-Indigenous life-ways. It is at its essence a sincere and bold attempt to define Indigenous realities in light of five centuries of colonial oppression. But the indisputable veracity of this being the case has no bearing on the mainstream gay movements adoption and unreasonable aggressive propagation of the term.

It has been appropriated and redefined into a preferably White image mirroring the imaginary White Indian facade of the past and present. The major argument used to defend this sexual imperialism is that Two-Spirit as a definable term has no recognized negative connotations and it wasn't as constricted as Homosexual, Bisexual or Lesbian. Along with the addition of all the exotic flavors and mystique of the romanticized long haired Native American Gay savage and you have all the makings for a mixed soup of New-Age pseudo-traditions and Gay establishment psycho babble laden with the intent of co-opting an identity that is blatantly not their own.

Colonialism equals genocide

Let's cut right to the chase. The bottom line of the matter is this: the use of the term Two-Spirit to signify a particular sexual identity by non-Indigenous people goes beyond the long established practice of intellectual co-opting by Europeans of Indigenous cultural observances. Co-option of the term Two-Spirit by non-Indigenous people is genocide. No matter how much goodwill is argued in the appropriation of the word, whether they be White gay male S and M practitioners tattooing themselves with unearned patterns of South Pacific warrior clans or the Radical Fairies performing bogus Sun Dances in leather bars; to any of a number of Euroamerican New-Age adherents that claim among other things to channel Indian ancestors such as Chief Joseph, the mainstream GBLTQ is perpetuating a classic genocidal practice of ethnic redefinition in line with that of the earliest European invaders to this continent. By not only adopting Indigenous trappings but by insisting that these very same customs and attributes are universally general and therefore open to usage and redefinition by Euroamericans, such acts merely appendage the stated attempt of the colonial White dominator to deracinate and effectively replace by way of identity the Indigenous populations of the Americas.

What was theirs is now ours including the very identities of a definable group of people who already suffer genocide by reason of colonial eminent domain. Of course, these imposters never openly articulate the values of White supremacy and similar eugenic ambitions.

On the contrary, they claim to be preserving these traditions by removing them from their current ethnic constraints by liberalizing them. In more polite liberal-intellectual circles such as "If it's White it's alright" perspectives are rationalized as one Fakir Musafa put it under the term, Modern Primitivism. The Fakir is a self-identified modern-day Primitive who identifies himself vaguely as a non-Indian yet says he was raised on the Blackfeet Reservation of Montana and enjoyed very intimate contact with their spiritual people where he developed an independent compulsion to alter his body with piercings and tattoos presumably of a tribal origin. He began altering his physical self in the late 1950's taking photos with an old Brownie camera to document his exploration into the "limits of human expression spiritual connectedness and love".

I became aware of the Fakir some years back through a documentary marketed as a trip through the bizarre titled "Bizarre Rituals -Dances Sacred and Profane" (1985) that centered on the photographic work of Charles Gatewood's study of unconventional

American life. The Fakir demonstrated several physical feats of endurance and the body's ability to place pain in perspective. The high point of the film was his performance of the plains Sioux Sun Dance assisted by Jim Ward, founder of the Gauntlet body-Piercing franchise. There was nothing traditional about the entire act, but the Fakir claimed that was the point.

That by adopting Indigenous methods and practices modern city-dwelling folks could return to their own bodies in a way denied to them by contemporary society. As much as I can honestly accept that he really believes in what he is teaching, (the Fakir conducts seminars internationally on the subject and versions of the practices ranging from body suspensions to total reconfiguration of the human body typically within an assumed indigenous framework) this still does not negate the fact that it directly contradicts his own stated objectives.

His call for a return to the "primitive" would be fine if those he taught were encouraged to return to their own cultural and ethnic primitivism. But like the Radical Faeries (which he is very closely associated with) and the satirical silliness of Bly's Men's Movement the fact that Native Americans are being ruthlessly exploited mind, body and spirit and even sexually by way of definition is a non-issue.

It's the same old song. This concern has become another in a long line of grievances Native Americans need to contend with. For the Indian people this issue should be of importance to Two-Spirited and non-Two-Spirited people alike for the stakes are high for all involved, not just the authentic Two-Spirited community. It is said that imitation is the most sincere form of flattery, but that was meant to apply to fair and equal circumstances between peers. White Gay males who enjoy Euro centric privilege and in turn perpetuate institutional racial marginalization towards Native Americans within the GBLTQ community are not our contemporaries.

Anyone who can testify to something to the contrary with a straight face is simply choosing not to see the obvious. While personally this writer as an Indigenous person finds nothing wrong with sharing cultural traditions and learning about other cultures and ethnic viewpoints, stealing a culture and its beliefs and bastardizing them for your own purposes while asserting that these actions are accurate and permissible is wrong. Capital W, wrong.

The damage inflicted by such actions has the direct effect of dismantling cultures and societies that already are teetering on the brink of dissolution through more direct genocidal procedures. The individuals and organizations leading America's new affair with genocide such as the Sun Bear Tribe and Vision Quest Inc. view genocide within a limited framework of only identifying genocide as mass murder while ignoring the black-letter definition of the term. This is as inappropriate as could be and such selective ignorance is directly responsible for more Native American self-colonialized identity decimation than U.S. Federal Indian Policy has been able to achieve in the latter half of the 20th century.

Genocide, literally the decimation or purposeful destruction of a recognized gene pool is not by any means limited to straightforward multiple murder. Genocide is not restricted to the European examples of Auschwitz or Sobibor. If the victims of the European experiment in race cleansing were only Homosexual, Romany or Turkish there is little doubt that the spotlight shone on the German perpetrated Holocaust would not be so bright. This discriminatory remembrance of who died and how and for what reasons further substantiates the notion among critics of the monopolization of the term genocide that ethnic eradication only resonates when it occurs to Whites.

The language of Genocide

As I've made painfully unambiguous early on in this essay, discrimination against Homosexuals is current, relevant to the broad-spectrum discussion on oppression in the United States and deserving of recognition as a specific crime of bias. Nevertheless, the politically active Gay community as such is conversely guilty of no less than genocide by assertively moving to incorporate the Two-Spirit identity into the general Gay rights movement against the objections of Native American people. The 1948 Convention to Prevent and Punish the Crime of Genocide, an international law, specifically defines the actions undertaken by the Gay rights movement in regards to the acculturation of Native American cultural identity as genocide.

A clearly defined classification universally recognized under black-letter law by every county on the planet (with the notable exceptions of the United States and Canada) yet selectively applied despite its proliferation in more than two dozen countries at this very moment. Genocide as a practice is something entirely and tenaciously misrepresented by different parties in spite of the fact that it is an international law under United Nations jurisdiction. Not a very old term it's originator, international Jurist Rafael Lemkin defined genocide as the purposeful destruction of a recognized ethnic group by way of eradicating any traces of it's existence. He was very clear and specific that genocide could occur without a single member of the targeted population undergoing the execution of the physical body. Genocide can and often does incorporate methods including and not limited to the destruction of a people's culture through eradication of the language and spiritual customs as these factors figure prominently in a culture's self-identity.

By appropriating Indigenous American spiritual practices such as the definition of the Two-Spirit and redefining these against the requests of the Native American and Native Two-Spirit communities in such a way as to be more agreeable to Euro centric whims effectively neutralizes whatever intrinsic value such practices possessed in the first place to the originating cultures. The purpose is to disassociate the term from its original connotation thereby severing that cluster's identity not only to the word but also to their own self-identification as a community.

Group dissolution inevitably follows due to enforced non-attachment to core values defined by the targeted culture as indicative of what makes one a member of one's own ethnic group. And further, this insistence on redefining the Indian by supplanting Euro American Indian realities in place of actual Native American authenticity runs contrary to

the avowed goals of respect and unlimited universal love touted by the ersatz Berdaches in the first place. It all runs right smack dab in to what has been termed in more honest days Manifest Destiny.

All of this serves to destroy what little remains of a tangible Native American culture and ultimately the Indian himself as a viable personage. Racial supremacy and its bedfellow genocide are not new and never really were. The Euroamerican insistence on pointing the finger of genocide to a specifically designed period in European history serves to redirect attention away from the origins of a continuous and systematic Indigenous genocide within the European context. And some of us non-existent, simple Indigenous savages know that.

Wasi'chu Revisionism Studies 101

8-11-2004

“Niathuau Ahakanith! Niathuau Ahakanith! / The Whites are crazy! The Whites are crazy!”

Lakota Ghost Dance chant - Wounded Knee, 1890

In the arena of Indigenous genocide and post-Colonial analysis, dismay and outright malice as expressed by those opposed to such deliberations is to be anticipated. Conservative personalities such as Dinesh D'Souza and Ann Coulter have built lucrative careers rancorously disparaging what they categorize as a Liberal assault on America. Cable TV network news programmes, talk radio and syndicated opinion editorials are inundated with irreverent diatribes attacking everything from gay rights to scholastic multiculturalism. British tabloid the Manchester Guardian regularly reports on the proliferation of websites and blogs devoted to far right ideology with a large percentage of these undertakings emanating from the U.S. Ironically, such overt animosity facilitates the arguments presented by those who resist precisely this sort of ethno-centric psychosis.

Direct challenges to this updated version of the White Citizen's Council is akin to the parable of informing the king that he has no clothes. Conservatives intuitively realize that similar to their universal belief in Creationism, they argue a position that is at once, nonsensical, chauvinist and thoroughly unsubstantiated. And despite the countless occasions the hyperbole has been laid bare for what it is, true believers continue to irrationally cling to their delusions.

It is perhaps fair to point out that this essay is in part a response to a recent correspondence to the Aboriginal Intelligence website. AI receives quite a bit of e-mail from around the world commenting on what they read here or on the original ANGRYINDIAN website. Most of the responses I receive are supportive and many are notifications on happenings within the Fourth World grapevine. Occasionally I also receive letters that are not so congenial and dangerously border on electronic assault. As stated at the outset, I anticipated a certain degree of antagonism when I founded ANGRYINDIAN and later when I upped the ante with AI.

Truthfully, most of the negative mail sent is by disposition so callused with prejudice I generally tend to briefly scan them and subsequently fling them into the trash folder. But sometimes I receive a real doozy of a letter that stands head and shoulders above the rest of the rabble. Here is the entire letter with names and e-mail addresses left out to protect the not so innocent:

To: angryindian@yahoo.com Date: Sun, 09 May 2004 22:41:55 -0500 Subject: About your site.

I hope you realize that you are a complete moron. There is a huge difference between the Holocaust and the extermination of the Indians during the times of Columbus until the 1700's. To even compare the two is an act of idiocy, not that you would be able to notice such a thing. The Europeans took care of a primitive race, and gave them a chance to cooperate and advance with them, but they naively refused. Had you half a brain, you'd be able to realize that had this even not occurred in history, you would not be able to complain about it, we wouldn't be nearly as advanced as we are today had America not been colonized by SOMEONE WHO KNEW HOW TO USE IT. Face it, Indians were too damn simple to help themselves, we came around and actually did something with the land, gave you a chance, and eventually forced you to HELP YOURSELVES. The only reason you are around is because the white man willed it to be, if they had wanted to kill off the Indians, they would have finished the job, there was no one around to stop us. We did all we could for you people, and you still don't like it, you are almost as bad as the negroes. Either way, just don't write anymore slander until you are done being a jackass and have decided to inform yourself upon the events of the past. People like you make me sick, they run around ranting about humanity and how things should be, when you have no idea how the world works. If life was all a big cake-walk, nothing would be learned, there would be nothing of the world we have now, we would still be living in caves, grunting at one another. Now please, shut the hell up and pick up a damn newspaper, unless you are too damn good for one of those, you FUCKING HIPPIE. If you would like to respond with some dumbass argument, feel free. But because I know you are in awe that someone finally figured you out, I don't expect a reply. So, have fun complaining and maybe ask your dad that runs the damn casino to buy you some webspace so you can get off of geocities, prick.

That's something, huh? What makes this letter stand out to me is that it is so overt in its antagonistic fanaticism yet so selectively ignorant of the "facts" surrounding his argument. The level of paranoid xenophobia expressed by this individual, (hereby referred to as the 'Letter-Writer') is not of the garden type variety usually overheard at your nearest militia gathering. The tone and tenor is much closer to the tirades of conservative student clubs on college and university campuses or representatives within the U.S. Senate. Most of the letters I get like this were it not for the lack of anything other than an e-mail address to respond to, would seemingly be mailed to me scribbled in crayon. This letter fixed my attention because it is so boldly belligerent in its assumption of a moral high ground in contrast to the material here he found so offensively liberal.

The other reason is that he begins his critique considering himself to be defending the sanctity of the European Jewish Holocaust experience. What this demonstrates is that he is apparently fairly educated although the rest of his missive sinks into utter illogical revisionist Hell. Paradox isn't surprising in these matters, but it is indicative of attitudes that still linger in an era that proclaims itself bias-free and progressive. And although he sounds like a bent mind affectionately thumping his copy of the Turner Diaries between re-readings of The Protocols of the Meetings of the Learned Elders of Zion, his letter reflects the soft underbelly of the White American psyche. And sadly, he is not alone.

Conservatism has had an astonishingly anomalous career in post World War Two American socio-political philosophy. Any person vaguely familiar with conservative opinions on awkward issues such as the death penalty, affirmative action and gay marriage habitually trace these ideas to McCarthyism, Christian fundamentalism, and Albert Pike in preferring to refute that such beliefs are indubitably weaved into the fabric of American day to day realities. They clutch to a very hidebound and practically religious world-view that estimates European cultural traditions as the only truly enlightened paradigm. A paradigm that allows for the de-humanising of those subjected to European aggression, social marginalisation and territorial displacement as distinct peoples prior to incursion.

It is a world-view that relies greatly on an inimitable readiness to distort truths, preserve stereotypes while applying glaring generalizations to those groups they deem objectionable. Unlike the unequivocal and clear-cut segregationist strategies that defined the America of the 20th century, neo-segregationism echoes the anxious voice of White uncertainty facing destabilization of their vise grip on the world at large. If former president Ronald Reagan can be considered the harbinger of this dreadful epoch, then Charles Murray and Rush Limbaugh can rightfully be regarded as amongst it's pre-eminent cadre of communicators.

The end analysis that conservatism can be a potentially dangerous creed is missing the point. The fact remains that such ideologies are frequently exonerated from recognizing any social responsibility for its more repugnant aspects. Its relentless and uncompromising xenophobic extremism is buttressed and emotionally embraced by reasonably rational and educated people who frankly should know better. This is the real dilemma. These are the very same people who rabidly devour tomes such as D'Souza's, "The End of Racism" and the Murray and Hernstein eugenics classic, "The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life."

Both of the above mentioned books rapidly attained best-seller prominence by articulating the already long-standing assumption within American society that non-Europeans are inherently and inexplicably inferior. What books like these and the private institutions that sponsor them assert is not new. What is new is that such factions are now facing unprecedented criticism from sectors that previously felt powerless before such obstinate forces. What Letter-Writer has presented quite bluntly, are the conjectures, fears and empirical insecurities of modern, post-Dread Scott era White angst. As explained quite candidly in a Washington Post interview with Council of Conservative Citizens CEO Gordon Lee Baum:

"We're only 9 percent of the world's population, white Europeans, and our country's going to majority nonwhite soon why can't European Americans be concerned with this genocideIs that racial to say that?" (1/17/99)

C.E.O. Baum, the Letter-Writer and other David Duke doppelgangers passionately project themselves as the arbiters of reason and stability. A vision of compassionate bigotry that endorses a warped variety of philanthropic humanism by offering a White

faced alternative to rampant multi-cultural political correctness. Conservative crusaders that glibly assume the facade of altruists of a simpler time when clarity was defined by Whites Only placards and separate lunch counters. The absurdity that such perverseness is not only outdated but insidiously exemplified as the sole voice of reason in common discourse offers this pathology the legitimacy it requires to remain corporal. Nevertheless, the lunacy of the far-right is being steadily undermined and rejected by the temperate determination of folks uneasy with articulations that eerily resemble a volume of Mein Kampf lite.

The malicious race baiting surreptitiously characterized by the American Enterprise Institute or the Hoover Institution's funding of revisionist literature epitomizes precisely what Raphael Lemkin articulated in his elegant dissertation, "Axis Rule in Occupied Europe: Laws of Occupation - Analysis of Government - Proposals for Redress". Mr. Lemkin is important in that he is the originator of the term genocide which he used in reference to the socio-political upheaval fascist Germany ushered across occupied Europe. Lemkin appropriately applied the accusation of genocide liberally, not only to describe policies of outright extermination against Jews, but also for less immediate yet central Nazi objectives as well. Lemkin's analysis comprehensively deconstructed Nazi policies intended to alter the ethnographic and economic landscape of post World War One Europe by promoting ambitious plans to "liberate" a supposedly puritan Aryan race from the stranglehold of inferior peoples too ignorant to comprehend their own irrelevance.

This oft-repeated thread of eugenic reasoning is the lynchpin of the entire revisionist argument and Letter-Writer observably fully subscribes to this gospel. The racism that motivates such assumptions makes allowable and uncomplicated the simplistic philosophical stereotyping of a less than human enemy. By creating a theoretical sub-human straw man to serve as figures of savagery to be overcome by the humanness of genocide, social marginalisation and ethnic hatred, European supremacists self-servingly find justification for their own unique barbarity. In their zeal to validate ethnic prejudices and other correspondingly unfair discriminations, conservatives concoct fables "proving" the inferiority of non-Europeans without citing any empirical evidence other than polemical and spuriously anecdotal claims to inferior non-White biology.

The espousal of philosophies that even Ayn Rand would find logically troublesome do not seem to trouble these commissars. "Normalcy," wrote Quentin Crisp, "means having the same diseases as those about you." And taking into account the obsession with group-think compliance surrounding the conservative belief matrix, they manage to gain emotive support from each other within their own collective obstination.

As an individual, Mr. Letter-Writer and the many others like him are emblematic of the modern American social debate. He stands before the specter of history culpable not only of the perpetuation of racism and colossal intolerance as expressed in his letter, but at least in spirit, he symbolizes the cruelty directed towards all victims of rampant Euro-centric hegemony. The German Third Reich was in hindsight not merely a perversion of a handful of calculatingly evil men, but actually the eventual manifestation of already

existing and not-so-latent attitudes exemplified by the revulsion discerned within Letter-Writer's correspondence.

His enraged epistle clearly demonstrates how misguided such opinions are and in exceedingly revealing ways. The genocide suffered by Aboriginals is justified in his view as a predictable and natural consequence incurred by the Indian refusal to “cooperate and advance” away their traditional life-ways in favour of European necessities. Only the absurdly ignorant could embrace let alone support such a racist position. He transcends the argument D'Sousa advocates when he implies that White stereotypes of non-European peoples are accurate, by going further and suggesting that these ignorant Indians owe American Europeans a debt for their Americanizing trials of de-culturalisation and obligatory extermination. The same ignorant Indians one could suppose that succeeded in conceptualizing and erecting the metropolises of Tenochtitla'n (now Mexico City) and Macchu Picchu; the political sophistication of the Haudenosaunee (Iroquois Confederacy) that profoundly influenced the founding fathers of the American Republic; the cultivation of fresh vegetable goods that ironically led to the population explosion of post-Columbian carnivorous Europe and the small detail of the Inca people actively experimenting with brain surgery at a time when European doctors were still routinely bleeding patients and relied on alchemy rather than observable science in their treatments.

There can be no reasonable nor logical excuse for such selective scholarship on the part of conservatives who attempt to define human worthiness in terms of ethnic superiority. Efforts to do so run the real risk of unscientifically proclaiming that White people are the sole litmus test for measuring human worth with other demographic entities rating discernibly lesser on an ever fluctuating and ambiguous race scale. Letter-Writer is quite well aware of this and injects personal insults to his harangue to add forcefulness to his specious line of reasoning. His boorish aggressiveness in confronting what he considers a “dumb-ass” argument is to him permissible because the target of his frustrated commentary is a savage and as such, this sort of treatment is seen as historically customary. And since he compares Indians to troublesome “Negroes,” (whether or not he realizes that I am a Black Indian or that Negro went out with the 8-track is unclear) anything that he may choose to declare is therefore warranted and entirely resultant upon my tacit refusal to allow him to feel like in is in control. Perceived loss of social control for many Whites is simply far too much to bear for some individuals.

Racist expression, whether passive or proactive is the reactionary re-assertion of power by which perpetrators who may in many instances lack any real control over their own particular insecurities attempt to gain equilibrium. It is much easier and a good deal more preferable to find fault with others instead of confronting one's own perceived shortcomings. The very nature of racist pathology necessitates the creation and maintenance of an adversary that can be readily subjected to reductive discriminations shifting focus from other glaring, more personal detractions. What this letter belligerently and loudly contends is simply this: “I” am better than someone else. As skillfully dissected by Algerian psychologist Franz Fanon, “Man is human only to the extent to which he tries to impose his existence on another man in order to be recognized by him.”

So it is clear that what we are dealing with here is an infantile and egotistic European yearning to actualize it's own aggrandized self-image at the expense of others. And it is reasonable to assume at most any cost.

If Letter-Writer ever musters up the courage to look at himself in the mirror without the benefit of his white hood, perhaps he may yet ask himself how long he can continue to travel this path of self-hatred by morally and materially subjugating others. I for one would be happy to lend a hand in helping him realize that being human is much more than just something skin deep. One's true humanity lies in our congenital potential to perceive the essence of ourselves in others. In the final estimation, it may prove to be our only saving grace.

© Sequoyah Ade

This is a freely distributable e-book released under a Creative Commons license.

This is an **intelligentaboriginal Media** publication.