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Contact us:
If you have any questions, comments, suggestions, concerns, criticisms, and so on, please feel free to e-mail Mr. Irucka Embry, the Newsletter Committee Chair of the Black Student Alliance (BSA), at iembry@utk.edu, or e-mail the BSA at bsa@utk.edu. Thank-you.

View the newsletter online:
http://web.utk.edu/~bsa/bsanewswar.html and/or http://web.utk.edu/~bsa/bsanewswar.pdf
**Affirmative Action: Aneisha Davis Interview with The Daily Beacon**

**Question [Sarah Stiles]:** What can you tell me about the policies on minority enrollment at UT?

Answer [Aneisha Davis]: Here is what I can tell you dealing with the issues you have raised. I don’t know the points system that the university uses to admit students to the University of TN. I have heard a lot of speculation on the topic, but I don’t know anything definite. Everyone knows about the points system, you know that points are awarded to you for certain reasons, such as your SAT/ACT scores, race plays a factor, and even if your parents are alumni, you get a certain number of points. The more points you have, the better your chances are of getting into UT. The issue of Affirmative Action being raised at U. of Michigan is that minority students are being awarded too many points just for being a minority. There are a lot of people here who feel like there are many minority students here who attend the university under these same conditions, i.e. that they would not have been admitted if they were not black, or Latino, etc. I think that the incentive grants and African American scholars are good ideas.

I know a lot of people who are not minorities look at these grants and say, well that’s not fair, but I think you have to look at the issue a little closer. If the world was a fair place then you would at least have a University of Tennessee campus with an enrollment that reflects the population of the state. We don’t have that here which means that somewhere down the line minorities are being left out of higher education and you have to ask yourself why. I think that is a question many universities, such as the University of Tennessee, are having to ask themselves and devise ways of compensating for the noticeable deficit in minority enrollment. I think the policies that you see being put into action are a result of this. I mean look at it this way...if you had a university like UT who has been predominately white for many years and they let students in based on their test scores and if their parents were alumni, you would continue to have a University that remained predominately white and that’s not fair. I guess I think everyone should have a chance at having an opportunity to be educated.

**Question: What are your feelings on campus diversity?**

Answer: I think that it is improving, but there is always room for more improvement. You have to ask yourself, exactly how diverse is this university when once you enter your upper level courses you rarely have more than 2 minorities in your class and hardly do you ever get a minority professor in your major.

**Question: Do you think race should be a factor in college admissions?**

Answer: I do, but it requires an explanation. I don’t think there are any students at any university who want to be admitted to school just because they are a certain race. People want to come to school to learn, but sometimes I think people are blind to some of the opposition many students face. My question is this: What do you do with all of those students who are intelligent, but have never gotten the chance to have a good education? How do you help those students and why are there so many...
minority students who seem to fit into this category? I think that if the world was a fair place then there would be no need for affirmative action, but right now there are so many people being excluded from the higher levels of education, with their exclusion having a direct connection to their race, that something has to be done.

**Question: Do you think UT does a good job with admitting minority students?**

Answer: I think they are trying, but I think there is room for improvement. There was a certain percentage that the University has been trying to reach for years that I don’t believe they have reached in relation to the Geier consent decree. [1] Let me explain a little better: People think that affirmative action is a quota or percentage system that says “You need to have so-so many minorities,” but it is not. It simply states that you have to give everyone a fair chance. Here is the point that people miss: COLLEGES RECRUIT PEOPLE and if they do not reach out to schools and parts of the state with a minority population, then you will never have a mixed population of students at your university. That is why recruiting is such a large issue at the University of Tennessee. The better they do at recruiting, then the easier it is to have more minorities at the University.

**Question: What could they improve upon?**

Answer: The better the racial climate is on campus, the easier it is to recruit minority students. There are many students that feel they don’t belong on campus and they go home. The University is trying to improve on this, but we have a long way to go. I say we because it takes every student and administrator here to make an effort to make our campus a warm and friendly place.

**Question: any other thoughts you have on this issue would be great.**

Answer: I just want to add that the Black Student Alliance is looking at having an open discussion on affirmative action. People can come with questions and we will try our best to answer those questions. We will have people here from the University of Michigan to talk about what is going on up there and also give out details about the march for affirmative action.

Thanks for contacting me,

Aneisha Davis
Senior in English and African American Studies
BSA President 2002-2003

Tennessee Board Of Regents
2001 Geier v. Sundquist Consent Decree Commitments

The following article is from the University of Tennessee-Knoxville campus newspaper, *The Daily Beacon*, and it uses some of the answers of Aneisha Davis in it.

“BSA president questions admissions” [1]

“UT needs better focus on minority admissions and admission policies, according to Aneisha Davis, president of the Black Student Alliance.”
"If the world was a fair place, then you would at least have a University of Tennessee campus with an enrollment that reflects the population of the state," Davis said. "We don't have that here, which means that somewhere down the line minorities are being left out of higher education. You have to ask yourself, 'Why?'"

Recently, two cases involving the University of Michigan and its use of race in admissions policies reached the U.S. Supreme Court. Davis said affirmative action is an important issue that needs to be addressed by college campuses.

"I think that is a question many universities, such as (UT) have to ask themselves," Davis said. "They need to devise ways of compensating for the noticeable deficit in minority enrollment."

Davis said diversity on campus needed to be questioned.

"Once you enter your upper-level courses, you rarely have more than two minorities in your class, and hardly do you ever get a minority professor in your major," she said.

In an effort to achieve diversity on campus, some schools, such as Michigan, have adopted a point system, in which out of 150 possible points a student can earn 20 points for being from an underrepresented minority while only 12 points for scoring a perfect score on the SAT.

Dean of Enrollment Services Richard Bayer said UT uses a much different system from Michigan's. He said the academic record is always the most important factor when UT looks at an applicant.

"UT admits all students based on four criteria," Bayer said. "Those are high school grade point average, based on 14 core courses required for admissions; standardized test scores, such as the ACT and SAT; and rigor of the high school curriculum."

"There is additional consideration given to students who take honors and (advanced placement) courses and other relevant factors such as the student's personal statement, extracurricular or leadership activities, background and rank in class."

Bayer said that race is looked at among "other relevant factors" and plays into the decision process to ensure campus diversity.

Davis said race should be a bigger part in college admissions.

"What do you do with all of those students who are intelligent but have never gotten the chance to have a good education?" Davis asked. "How do you help those students, and why are there so many minority students who seem to fit into this category?"

According to Davis, the answer is better recruiting tactics by the university.

"Colleges recruit people," Davis said. "If they do not reach out to schools and parts of the state with a minority population, then you will never have a mixed population of students at your university. That is why recruiting is such a large issue at the University of Tennessee."
"The better they do at recruiting, then the easier it is to have more minorities at the university."

Bayer said UT set up offices in Nashville and Memphis to help with recruiting, and the results have been promising.

"Last fall, our freshman class was 9 percent African-American, compared to approximately 7.3 percent the year before," Bayer said.

Davis said that while the university continues to improve on minority enrollment, there is still room for more improvement.

"The better the racial climate is on campus, the easier it is to recruit minority students," Davis said. "There are many students that feel they don't belong on campus and they go home. The university is trying to improve on this, but we have a long way to go.

"I say 'we' because it takes every student and administrator here to make an effort to make our campus a warm and friendly place.""

© Copyright The Daily Beacon

[1]
http://dailybeacon.utk.edu/article.php/9113
The Daily Beacon
Sarah Stiles, Staff Writer
Tuesday, February 18, 2003
Volume 92 Number 26
WAKE UP!
Irucka Ajani Embry

Since Affirmative Action is such a hot topic (though it is really a system of a larger continuum), in addition to whether we (the US/UK/Australian coalition) will expand the “War on Terrorism” War for Petroleum, Natural Gas, Power/Control, and so on to the people of Iraq, the people on the continent of Africa, the people of Latin America, and to people in other areas of the world to gather as many resources as the elites [1] can so as to secure domination of the world in due time, I’ll provide some insight into the deeper aspects of Affirmative Action.

Before that, some thoughts on the continuing Wars.

- STOP the WARS BEFORE they ESCALATE and ACCELERATE.
- People behind the uniforms (troops or soldiers) RESIST and become CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS and we’ll SUPPORT you. [2] Note: You will need a lawyer if you choose to act with your conscience.
- If there is a draft, all those available to be drafted should also become conscientious objectors as well. See Note above.
- Don’t pay your federal income taxes or your federal taxes on your phone bill, if you can do so, so as not to support the financing of this and other Wars. [3] Note: You will need a lawyer if you choose to act with your conscience.

Back to Affirmative Action

There is an aspect to the Affirmative Action debate that needs to be discussed and the U.S. Supreme Court should rehear this matter and hopefully REPEAL it.

What am I referring to? The Dred Scott v. John Sanford case that the Supreme Court ruled upon over a hundred years ago. “In 1856, the high court, promoting the position of slave-owners, made the Dred Scott decision. Blacks were proclaimed and adjudicated to be chattel, mere baggage, that could be transported from place to place. Despite all the later bloodshed, this decision is still on the law books [my emphasis]. In the process of U.S. Senate ratification of his appointment to the U.S. Supreme Court, in 1991, Clarence Thomas, an ‘Uncle Tom’ to some, mouthed off about ‘natural justice’ and was apparently just about to state in his televised hearings, that the Dred Scott decision was proper under his theory of ‘natural justice’. ” [4]

So since Blacks are still not LEGALLY considered to be full human beings, only property, then could the U.S. Supreme Court along with the U.S. Congress round up all of the “property” (Black people) and ship us off to a concentration camp [5] within the continental USA or to Guantanamo Bay where some of the detainees of the War for Global Domination/Resources (described before) are currently being tortured and interrogated at or to a prison since we are only “property” and thus cannot have any rights? If so, what are YOU going to do about it?

Speaking of prisons and property, the 13th Amendment to the USA Constitution did NOT outlaw enslavement. Read it for yourself here:

Passed by Congress January 31, 1865.
Ratified December 6, 1865.”
Note: A portion of Article IV, section 2, of the Constitution was superseded by the 13th amendment.

Section 1.
Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a PUNISHMENT [my emphasis] for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Section 2.
Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.”

The punishment could be for us demanding our civil and/or human rights and not recognizing our proper place as “property.” The Truth is that none of us know what will happen when the U.S. Supreme Court decides on the University of Michigan affirmative action cases and none of us know if the U.S. Supreme Court will bring back to light the Dred Scott decision.

What does all of this have to do with Affirmative Action? Plenty.

How can one declare civil and/or human rights if one is not considered to be legally a human being? How do we go beyond only rights and extend that to responsibilities as well? Why should we do that?

Malcolm X (El-Hajj Malik El-Shabazz) said some powerful words, in my mind, during his lifetime concerning civil and human rights that we need to consider today in terms of civil rights, human rights, and affirmative action:

• “I am not a racist. I am against every form of racism and segregation, every form of discrimination. I believe in human beings, and that all human beings should be respected as such, regardless of their color.”


• “The common goal of 22 million Afro-Americans is respect as human beings, the God-given right to be a human being. Our common goal is to obtain the human rights that America has been denying us. We can never get civil rights in America until our human rights are first restored. We will never be recognized as citizens there until we are first recognized as humans.”


• “We are not fighting for integration, nor are we fighting for separation. We are fighting for recognition as human beings. We are fighting for...human rights.”


• “Segregation is that which is forced upon inferiors by superiors. Separation is done voluntarily by two equals... The Negro schools in the Negro community are controlled by whites,... the economy of the Negro community is controlled by whites. And since the Negro... community is controlled or regulated by outsiders, it is a segregated community...Muslims who follow the Honorable Elijah Muhammad are as much against segregation as we are against integration. We are against segregation because it is unjust
and we are against integration because [it is] a false solution to a real problem.”
-Malcolm X in the WUST interview, May 1963 [10]

- **SPELLMAN:** Will you work with the so-called ‘established’ civil rights organizations?

- **MALCOLM X:** Well, we will work with them in any area and on any objective that doesn’t conflict with our own political, economic, and social philosophy which is black nationalism. I might add that I was invited to attend a civil rights group meeting where all of the various civil rights organizations were present and I was invited to address them in Chester, Pennsylvania. Gloria Richardson was there; Landrey, the head of the Chicago School Boycott, was there; Dick Gregory was there; many others were there; the Rochedale movement was there. Now my address to them was designed to show them that if they would expand their civil rights movement to a human rights movement it would internationalize it. Now, as a civil rights movement, it remains within the confines of American domestic policy and no African independent nations can open up their mouths on American domestic affairs, whereas if they expanded the civil rights movement to a human rights movement then they would be eligible to take the case of the Negro to the United Nations the same as the case of the Angolans is in the UN and the case of the South Africans is in the UN.

Once the civil rights movement is expanded to a human rights movement our African brothers and our Asian brothers and Latin American brothers can place it on the agenda at the General Assembly that is coming up this year and Uncle Sam has no more say-so in it then. And we have friends outside the UN—700,000,000 Chinese who are ready to die for human rights.”
-Interview with Malcolm X by A.B. Spellman in the *MONTHLY REVIEW*, May 1964 [11]

Malcolm X made a very True and enlightening statement concerning the relationships between dominant nations that needs to be reexamined today in light of current events:

- “I might point out here that colonialism or imperialism, as the slave system of the West is called, is not something that is just confined to England or France or the United States. The interests in this country are in cahoots with the interests in France and the interests in Britain. It’s one huge complex or combine, and it creates what’s known not as the American power structure or the French power structure, but an international power structure. This international power structure is used to suppress the masses of dark-skinned people all over the world and exploit them of their natural resources.”

-“Malcolm X, 14 February 1965 (taken from the essay “Malcolm X, our revolutionary son & brother.” by Patricia Robinson)” [12]
Research the *Dred Scott* decision and if you are fighting for Affirmative Action, remember these things:

- The U.S. Supreme Court needs to repeal the *Dred Scott* decision.
- “*Who Is Covered By Affirmative Action*: Veterans, disabled veterans, disabled people, people over 40, women, and racial and ethnic minorities. Yet, it has been proposed to REPEAL affirmative action for women and minorities ONLY.” [my emphasis]
- “*Who Has Benefited From Affirmative Action*: White men and women have benefited more than racial and ethnic minorities in state hiring and under alternative admissions criteria to the Universities. White women are the Largest Beneficiaries [my emphasis], while white men have benefited as veterans, the disabled, and people over 40. This benefit is particularly important for women, since many families are now two-paycheck families or are single paycheck families supported by women. Attacking women’s ability to earn a good paycheck is an attack on families.”


[1] The elites of the world are the “New World Order”/”Illuminati” who basically think that they control the world through our acquiescence in our own deaths/murders.


[3] [http://www.warresisters.org/resources _wtr.htm](http://www.warresisters.org/resources _wtr.htm)

War Tax Resistance Resources


“Excerpt from America’s Great Fairy Tales Part One” – 1/10/01 by Sherman H. Skolnick

[5] The original concentration camps were the reservations for the indigenous peoples of these lands. Adolf Hitler modeled the concentration camps after those used for the Native Americans because they were so successful at killing people culturally, thus spiritually.


The Constitution: Amendments 11-27

[7] [http://wwwunix-ag.uni- kl.de/~moritz/xquotes.html](http://wwwunix-ag.uni- kl.de/~moritz/xquotes.html)

[8] [http://afgen.com/malcolmx.html](http://afgen.com/malcolmx.html)


[10] [http://www.gilscottheron.com/malxquotes.htm](http://www.gilscottheron.com/malxquotes.htm)


“U.S. Slams German Minister For Bush-Hitler Comment”  
September 19, 2002

WASHINGTON (Reuters) – “President Bush’s spokesman on Thursday expressed outrage that Germany’s justice minister drew a link between Bush’s saber-rattling on Iraq to the tactics used by Nazi dictator Adolf Hitler.

Spokesman Ari Fleischer said the United States and Germany have long had a strong relationship, “but this statement by the justice minister is outrageous and is inexplicable.”

The regional Schwaebisches Tagblatt newspaper quoted German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder’s justice minister, Herta Daeubler-Gmelin, as saying “Bush wants to divert attention from his domestic problems. It’s a classic tactic. It’s one that Hitler used.”

The Bush administration has been none too pleased that criticizing the United States over Iraq has been a key campaign plank for Schroeder in his re-election battle but has refrained from publicly commenting on the issue.”

Source for this article:  
http://www.georgewalkerbush.net/bushtohitler.htm  
“U.S. Slams German Minister For Bush-Hitler Comment”

Other comments about the un-elected “President” and the United States of America:

“Canadian official called Bush ‘a moron’”

http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/world/africa/2251067.stm  
“US threatens world peace, says Mandela”

It is important that we know how we and our “leaders” are viewed around the world and as well that we listen to other people from around the world and loose our arrogance.

A similar article also appeared in the University of Tennessee-Knoxville campus newspaper, The Daily Beacon:  
“German official compares Bush’s tactics to Hitler’s”  
[http://dailybeacon.utk.edu/article.php?7245]
“BAMN Declaration against the War in Iraq”

- No to the War, Yes to Affirmative Action!
- To stop a racist war abroad, we must fight racism at home
- Stop the War against Iraq

Defying world popular opinion, the Bush administration is crashing ahead with their plan for a massive war, invasion and colonial occupation of Iraq. The antiwar movement can stop this war. We must build the popular movement bigger and broader.

For American opponents of the US government's war drive, doing this means that we must link the fight against the US war on Iraq to the fight against racism at home.

A civil rights movement is growing in the schools and on the streets of our country. Initially emerging in response to the attack on affirmative action in higher education, this new movement has broadened out to be a fight for full integration and equality throughout our society. From its origins this movement has opposed the on-going US war on Iraq.

The struggles of the Civil Rights Movement in the early 1960s inspired the antiwar movement in the later 1960s. The antiwar movement was bigger in part because more white people were willing to take and active stand against a war that put thousands of white soldiers at risk than had been prepared to take an active stand in defense of civil rights for black people. Despite that, the size and power of the antiwar movement created a context in which the civil rights movement was able to accomplish more and was able to achieve its most important gains. Martin Luther King recognized that fact when in 1967 he came out in opposition to the Vietnam War. He was attacked by virtually every newspaper editorial column in the country despite the obvious moral and strategic consistency of his position.

Both movements were weakened by the fact that they did not fight together. This division meant that the antiwar movement was not strong enough to stop the war in Vietnam for many years even after a majority of the American people no longer supported the war. This division also meant that the Civil Rights Movement was too weak to resist the backlash that began over the course of the 1970s to reverse the gains that the Civil Rights Movement had won.

The new civil rights movement must learn the lessons of the struggles of the past. The new civil rights movement needs to work closely with the most consistently antiracist elements of the antiwar movement.

It is a glaring injustice and an untenable contradiction for this society to have an aggressive affirmative action policy for black and Latino people (and poor people of all races) to kill and die in the armed forces at the same time as opportunities in higher education and in the professions are being narrowed further and further. Effective opposition to the war must include standing against this injustice.

An attack on educational and employment opportunities for oppressed people necessarily means an increase in repression in general in this society. The government's attacks on civil liberties will increase dramatically if the rightwing is allowed to get away with...
defeating affirmative action.

Building the mass movement and mass action are the methods that can win victory both in the civil rights movement and in the struggle to stop a new racist war on Iraq. We need popular antiwar and antiracist leaders who can speak the truth about these issues, leaders who can make clear how the issues are connected and know that it is the mass democracy of the street that is the power that can defeat the attack on affirmative action and a new US war in Iraq.

We call on all civil rights activists to participate in antiwar actions and activities and we appeal to the antiwar movement to come to the Civil Rights March on Washington on April 1, 2003 to coincide with the US Supreme Court hearing of the two University of Michigan affirmative action cases.

We must link these struggles. Together we can win.

BAMN (Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action & Integration, And Fight for Equality By Any Means Necessary) - 3/3/03; 3/19/03
“Bush Urges Supreme Court to Outlaw Affirmative Action and Effectively Kill Brown v. Board of Education”

By urging the US Supreme Court to outlaw affirmative action, the Bush administration is playing a front line role in the assault on integration in education. Without active "race-conscious" measures the University of Michigan, its law school and selective higher education across the country will be resegregated. The University of Michigan Law School, for example, is projecting a 73% drop in black student enrollment if its affirmative action program is eliminated. Separate and unequal educational opportunity based on race will define education from kindergarten through graduate and professional schools. Without active integrationist measures like affirmative action, Brown v. Board of Education, for all practical purposes, will be dead.

It is pure cynicism and hypocrisy for Bush to praise diversity out of one side of his mouth while urging the US Supreme Court to outlaw the actual programs that have desegregated higher education in America out of the other. The Bush administration, following the lead of Trent Lott, is now making its own segregationist mistake.

In his statement Wednesday, George Bush completely misrepresented the actual affirmative action policy in place at the University of Michigan and its Law School by wrongly and repeatedly indicating that quotas were involved in some way. To say that there is a 'race-neutral' method of addressing problems that stem from racism simply flies in the face of the facts.

The Bush Alternatives To Affirmative Action Have Failed in Florida and Texas

In Florida, Jim Crow educational segregation is being actively reestablished. Florida Governor Jeb Bush, eliminated the use of affirmative action in higher education in 2000 through the One Florida Plan executive order. It has in fact created two Floridas, separate and unequal - one for white students and one for black and Latina students.

Anticipating a drop in minority student enrollment at the flagship University of Florida Levin College of Law (UFL), Jeb Bush urged the creation of two new law schools at Florida's historically black university, Florida A&M University (FAMU) and its historically Latino, black, and Asian-American university, Florida International University (FIU). An all-black law school was created at FAMU in 1951 to circumvent Sweatt v. Painter (the 1950 desegregation suit launched against the University of Texas School of Law). The FAMU law school was closed in 1968 when the Civil Rights Movement forced UFL to finally integrate. The new FAMU and FIU Law Schools hearken back to Florida's old Jim Crow days. Recently opened, they have eight and eleven faculty members, respectively, compared to more than 100 faculty members at UFL. No serious opponent of segregation and inequality could support the Florida model.

In 1995, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals banned the use of affirmative action at the University of Texas School of Law (UTL) in the notorious Hopwood decision. Mexican-American and black students were dramatically underrepresented in enrollment at UTL even before affirmative action was
outlawed in Texas. The effect of the loss of affirmative action on minority student enrollment at the University of Texas School of Law was devastating. In 1997, the first year that UTL was banned from using affirmative action, first-year black student enrollment dropped from an already very low 7% down to 0.9% and Mexican-American student enrollment dropped from only approximately 11% down to 5.6%. This in the state of Texas which is now almost 50% minority.

The 10% Plan that Bush presided over in Texas assumes and reinforces the segregation and inequality in K-12. This "alternative" to affirmative action cannot even pretend to address the problems of segregation and inequality in professional and graduate schools. Remediing the fundamental institutional inequalities of race and sex in employment or any other aspect of life is entirely outside the scope or the 10% plan.

Claiming that 10% plan is "race-blind" is hypocrisy and falsification. The plan is entirely about race, only it uses the segregated character of K-12 schools in Texas a proxy - as a cheap politician's dodge - rather than addressing the sordid reality of racism, segregation and inequality in American education candidly and honestly.

If our side loses at the Supreme Court, the introduction of this kind of alternative used as a substitute for affirmative action on a national scale will be an utter failure and lead to a social crisis.

Source:
Affirmative Action: Dealing with a Stacked Deck
Bryant Creel

Note: If you disagree with what Bryant Creel writes, then please feel free to write me and I’ll pass the messages along to him.

When Affirmative Action was introduced back in the late 60’s, the idea was that it would be a way of preventing discrimination on the basis of race. Its solution seemed simple -- just guarantee the preferential treatment of minorities in the event of there being candidates who are equally qualified. In time the racial discrepancies in the numbers of people who are in desirable positions would be corrected. There was never meant to be a quota whereby equally or better qualified whites would now be the victims of discrimination instead of minorities. At the time I anticipated that Affirmative Action alone, if it were implemented, would lead to quotas and, by generating resentment, even further divide the races.

The problem was as obvious then as it is now. The probability that under any circumstances there would be two candidates for a position who are equally qualified is practically zero, and the advantage is generally going to belong to those candidates who grew up in solvent, relatively stable households with parents who are professionals with a college education. It was fairly clear that significantly increasing the numbers of minorities admitted to colleges or given coveted jobs would require often discriminating against better qualified candidates, many of whom had worked very hard to advance and individually had no share in the guilt for social inequalities. The reaction began with the Bakke decision in 1978, in which it was ruled that a white applicant to a U. of California at Davis medical student had been a victim of racial discrimination. It is surprising that the new rash of such legal actions did not emerge until fairly recently. Another historic event for Affirmative Action was the publication in around 1982 of the book Hunger of Memory by Richard Rodriguez; a new Ph.D. in English from the U. of California at Berkeley who quit the profession because he felt insulted by being given preferential treatment as a minority. It seems to me that Nina Simone was right when she observed that racial inequality here in the United States is as bad as ever; and the occasional, visible minority hire makes no fundamental difference.

That “racial” division is primarily class division should by now be abundantly clear; and in a situation where there is not equality of opportunity because of class discrepancies, discriminating against one group or another will always breed resentment and anger. In theory, merit is just as legitimate a grounds for preference as past racial inequality. In some cases it is more legitimate -- race alone becomes an arbitrary and illegitimate basis if it prevails to the degree that standards of competence become jeopardized, leading to the threat of degrading standards of skill and performance in the professions. The same threat is posed by lavish donations to alumni funds. How many children of well-heeled families indirectly buy their way into academic programs, not to mention jobs?

But either the category of merit or that of race/sex becomes an unfair basis for exclusion if all merit and all cases of racial background cannot be given preferential treatment, treatment which then ceases to be preferential in the current sense. Of course, these categories cannot be given equal
treatment in a society in which opportunity has not been made a right but continues to be the privilege of a minority, no matter how that minority is constituted racially. Everyone knows that the degrading effects of poverty and unemployment create circumstances that it is extremely difficult for individuals to overcome. It is also well known that all of those who have achieved exceptional academic merit are not necessarily products of economically unstressed households. One could actually take the view that under the present circumstances those who are meritorious and those who are ambitious victims of social and economic deprivation both constitute minorities, and these minorities proceed to compete with one another to achieve membership in a “super minority,” an economic elite that is oppressive to many just because it exists and is exclusive, shutting the door to large numbers of deserving and hard-working individuals. Americans want to be stars and reside in heaven enjoying the “good life” -- anything else is prosaic. Yet stardom is all in the mind, especially when it is a gain that is ill gotten to the detriment of others who are deserving as well.

Merit alone is not opportunity any more than money alone can buy merit. Many children of wealthy families are faced with insuperable psychological problems that prevent their advancing in the arena of academics, problems that are comparable to those that children of poor families have to face. The children of the affluent are often not motivated to work hard because they have been spoiled through no fault of their own. Children of poor families can be spoiled as well, causing the difficulty they have in competing to be severely increased.

Is simply eliminating Affirmative Action a solution to the present debacle? Will it not simply take us back to where we were before a cure for racial inequality was sought? Merit alone cannot be an adequate criterion for membership in the ranks of the “successful” or “potentially successful” unless racial minorities have all the advantages other groups have (in terms of background) and can compete fairly. If that equality were achieved, there would still be competition because of the individual factor, that is differences in will and ability and the circumstance that some people are simply not “cut out” for such-and-such a line of work or program of study. But what would be achieved by guaranteeing full employment, a humane wage, and equal access to social services (including medical care, child care, and care for the aged) would be that the playing field would at least be leveled to what is within reason. Otherwise, our human family (to coin Harry Belafonte’s preferred term) remains trapped in the impossible scenario of trying to distribute evenly a criminally inadequate number of healthy solutions in what is fundamentally a pathological situation.

The new benign catchword “diversity,” in spite of good intentions, only detacts from the need to directly confront the brutality of economic and social injustice and their materially and psychologically damaging effects (want, toil, depression, anger, demoralization, self-depreciation). The ideal of enjoying a natural diversity of individuality can only be realized in circumstances in which there is true equality of opportunity and not a deck that is stacked one way or another in order to feed an elitist social “star system.”
Looking critically to determine a brighter future
Irucka Ajani Embry

Who is the next target on our agenda? The people of Kuwait, Iran, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Israel, Palestine, Lebanon, Syria, Yemen, the Philippines, Liberia, Morocco, Egypt, Ghana, the Ivory Coast, Somalia, Sudan, Libya, Niger, Nigeria, Uganda, Tunisia, Rwanda, Angola, Zimbabwe, South Africa, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Korea (northern and southern), China, Russia, Georgia, Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Vietnam, Tibet, Burma, Kosovo/a, Turkey, [1] Albania, former Yugoslavia, Malaysia, Indonesia, Cambodia, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Pashtunistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, the Netherlands, France, Canada, Switzerland, Germany, Mexico, Guatemala, Panama, Nicaragua, Cuba, Chile, Brazil, Argentina, Colombia, Venezuela, Bolivia, Puerto Rico, Hawai’i, Alaska, Ireland, Northern Ireland, East Timor, and/or Washington, District of Columbia; the sovereign native nations of the U’wa, Maya, Afro-Colombian, Western Shoshone, Mon, Karen, Tavoyan, and/or any other sovereign indigenous nation; some other area in the United States of America AGAIN; and/or somewhere else in the world/universe? Or a mixture of the aforementioned areas? What gives us the right to determine who will die and who will not die?

Let’s remember that at least 60 countries were placed on a list to be targeted by the rulers of the United States of America and we’ve already had two overt MASSACRES against the people living in the fictive states of Afghanistan and Iraq and that the US military is currently in over 150 NATIONS around the world. [2], [3] As well, let’s also remember too international law and the US Constitution, which are being violated each time that we invade a sovereign nation or commit the act of murder in a sovereign nation or commit other crimes (such as genocide, war crimes, crimes against the peace, and crimes against humanity). [4] This is all being done in the name of the people of the Constitutional Republic of the United States of America – remember that. How did we get to this point? That’s right the events of 11 September 2001.

Who was really behind/involved in the continuum of 11 September 2001? Were the troops of the United Kingdom (U.K.), Israel, Pakistan, and/or the U.S.A. in Afghanistan or nearby on 11 September 2001? If so, why? Was Afghanistan bombed on that day? If so, why? And did you hear about it through the government entertainment complex (media)? If not, why not? Were any people from Israel arrested on 11 September 2001? If so, why? What do you truly know about the history of the formation of the fictive states of Afghanistan and Iraq?

“While Afghanistan has been defined as a ‘state’ in the modern political sense of the word since 1788, its statehood has largely been a fiction that has been preserved by the international community for purposes unrelated to the Fourth World nations inside. Britain fought three wars to put in place an Afghanistan to its liking in the 19th century. Russia fought its ten-year war to establish an Afghanistan to its liking ending in 1989 to prevent states leaving the U.S.S.R. on the Soviet southern flank. Pakistan took a stab at creating a state of Afghanistan to its liking after 1994 with the installation of the Taliban regime in hopes of creating a stable northern border. The United States of America and Britain have entered the Afghan theatre aiming to
The people of Iraq have been a target overtly and/or covertly continuously since World War One (1914-1918) or perhaps before then. Who decided how to break up the Ottoman/Turkish Empire at the end of WW I? What nations/empires were involved? What is the Sykes-Picot agreement? Are any of the same countries/empires that originally colonized the area that we call the “Middle East” currently involved there now? If so, which ones and why? [6]

Indeed, the United States of America and Britain are by virtue of their ‘new kind of war’ in Afghanistan engaging in ‘state rebuilding’ that is doomed to fail. The reason will be that no externally created state has succeeded in creating a stable state, and Afghanistan is a perfect example of past failures. If Afghanistan were carefully and systematically dismembered with the different peoples becoming realigned with their natural cultural groups and geography, the state of Afghanistan—unstable and destabilizing in the Central Asian region—would be replaced by the formation of a state of Pashtunistan, two enlarged states of Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and Turkmenistan and probably a new state of Balukistan. Where states are not possible the United Nations must assume trusteeship over the nations not agreeing to a state.

Central Asia is a region of the world that has for thousands of years seen historic movements of peoples. It has been the place of nomadic peoples who have cultures that reflect the rugged terrain of the high steps and majestic mountains. The peoples of this region include the Uzbeks, Kirghiz, Kazakhs, Pathan, Hazar, Tajiks, Balukis, Uygurs, Turkmen, Chahar Aimaks and the Karakalpak. These nations have defined the region in the past and they will define its future.” [5]
Hussein to bomb oil wells in Kuwait so that a corporation connected to Bush that originally installed the wells in Kuwait could profit from restoring the wells after the War? Did the U.S., the U.K., or both nations/empires continue to arm Iraq after the start of the Persian Gulf War? If so, why? Was that War much like the current “War on Terrorism” Terroristic Massacre (War) -- a war for energy resources (gas, petroleum), control of water and fishing resources, profiteering from weapons sales, and essentially a War to establish control and domination over people by targeting those that would dare speak out and up against the international power structure’s imperialism?

Were/are President Saddam Hussein and former President/CIA Director George Herbert Walker Bush involved in “business” dealings? If so, why? Did the U.S. arm BOTH Iran and Iraq at the same time during the Iran-Iraq War (Iran-Contra and Iraqgate)? If so, why? What other countries armed either Iran or Iraq or both nations? Why? How were the weapons funneled to Iran – through Israel and Ariel Sharon? Did Israel continue selling weapons to Iran even after the US embargo on Iran? If so, why?

Did the U.S. “intelligence” apparatus use the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) to spy on Hussein? If so, why? Is the current bombing and occupation of Iraq ILLEGAL, violating international law and the Constitution of the U.S.A.? How many people have been killed in Iraq because of the sanctions and/or the continuous bombings?

If Iraq has weapons of mass/limited destruction, how were they acquired? Was it that that US and other countries provided Iraq with the financing and/or the weapons themselves? Does Israel have weapons of mass destruction, thus violating United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 (calls for the removal of weapons of mass destruction throughout the Middle East)? [9] If so, how did Israel acquire such weapons? Why is Israel not being demanded to end its weapons programs?

Does the United States of America, United Kingdom, and other nations/empires have weapons of mass destruction? If so, why aren’t those countries required to end their weapons programs? Why don’t we demand that any nation that has weapons of mass/limited destruction destroy their stockpiles, stop selling/manufacturing/doing research & development for their weapons, and work towards peace and justice the world over – not War and Profits over Life?

Do we feel that it’s acceptable to try to assassinate Fidel Alejandro Castro Ruz, Saddam Hussein, Mohmmar Qadaffi, or any other leader of a nation – though it possibly violates international law and thus the US Constitution as well? [10] If not, then why have we tried to assassinate those leaders in the past and have assassinated various other leaders in the past and are currently trying the same? Do we want people to assassinate our “leaders”? If not, then why do we think that is OK to assassinate people in other countries or even here at home? Who are the rulers/elites of the United States of America/world and what are their connections to each other and past scandals, assassinations, Wars, economic downturns/depressions/recessions, and so on?

Is/are there any connection(s) between the Rockefeller/Clinton family (is Clinton a Rockefeller?), the Bush family, those that know the Bushes or Rockefellers/Clintons (through politics
or “business” dealings), Manuel Noriega, Saddam Hussein, Ariel Sharon, Bilderberg Society, the Order of Skull & Bones, Iragagate, Iran-Contra, Iragagate, Watergate, Whitewater, the “October Surprise,” the “Octopus,” the Savings & Loans scandal (S&L), the INSLAW Affair, the INSLAW PROMIS software, Wackenhut Security Corporation, the Carlyle Group, Nugan Hand Bank, the Vatican Bank, CenTrust Bank, the Banco Nazionale Lavoro (BNL), the Bank of Commerce and Credit International (BCCI), the Office of Naval Intelligence (ONI), the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the Department of War (Defense/Pentagon), the Department of Justice, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), the Mafias (Corsican, Sicilian, Chinese, Japanese, Jewish, Russian, and so on), Nazis brought to the US after WW II, Iraqi “dissidents” brought to the US after the Persian Gulf War, the worldwide drug cartels, Israel’s Mossad, Pakistan’s ISI, United Kingdom’s MI5, the Mena airstrip in Arkansas, the weapons/defense-offense/military industry, the current/past/future wars (covert and overt, declared and undeclared), coup d’états worldwide, drug trafficking/smuggling (including pharmaceuticals), assassinations, oil and gas corporations/profits, and so on? If so, what are the various interrelated connections? And as well, are there any connections between the aforementioned and the events of 11 September 1973, 11 September 2001, 19 April 1995, and/or other events in world history? If so, what connections exist? How do we stop the power elites – those that think that they rule the world? (Only because we still support them.)

What are alternatives to the current “War on Terrorism” Terroristic

Massacre (War) -- in which the continued war on the people of Iraq is just a piece of the puzzle? Puzzle – yes, that’s right – pipelines for petroleum and gas. Check out the various nations listed above and see what resources they have available and what corporations, militaries, and agencies have paid those places a visit in the recent months and years. If the Wars are to be stopped, though they have never ended, it will be up to those in uniform to resist and those at home, wherever that may be, to support them and help build a peaceful world to live in.

[1] Turkish Violations of International Law
http://members.fortunecity.com/turkeyhumanrights/Violate.htm

[2] “Terror war must target 60 nations, says Bush”
http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,3-315250,00.html

http://www.wartimes.org/current/5art7map.html

“New US Military Bases: Side Effects or Causes of War?”
http://www.counterpunch.org/zoltanbases.html

http://www.counterpunch.org/foley1.html
Legal Issues Arising from the War in Afghanistan and Related Anti-Terrorism Efforts

“Attack illegal, experts say”
http://www.theglobeandmail.com/servlet/story/RTGAM.20030320.ulaww0320/BNPrint/International/

The War in Iraq and International Humanitarian Law: Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)
http://www.hrw.org/campaigns/iraq/ihlfaq.htm

Lawyers Against the War
http://www.lawyersagainstthwar.org/

[5] “Afghanistan is a ‘fictive state’: Non-consenting nations are the key to the Region”

[6] “The U.S. and Iraq In Historical Perspective”

“Terrorism, Assassination and International Justice”
http://www.isisuk.demon.co.uk/0811/isuk/regpapers/no80_paper.html

[7] “‘No-Fly Zones’ and 1441: Theexperiment interviews Prof. Francis Boyle”
http://www.theexperiment.org/articles.php?news_id=1890


[8] “Producing the Proper Crisis: A Talk by Philip Agee”
http://www.serendipity.li/cia/agee_1.html

http://intellit.muskingum.edu/overviews_folder/oviewslegalasntn.html

[10] “The U.S. and Iraq In Historical Perspective”
http://members.tripod.com/Irucka/usiraq.pdf

The Sykes-Picot Agreement: 1916
http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/mideast/sykes.htm
“On Getting Along”
Howard Zinn

Note: This article is reprinted with permission of the author.

You ask how I manage to stay involved and remain seemingly happy and adjusted to this awful world where the efforts of caring people pale in comparison to those who have power?

It's easy. First, don't let "those who have power" intimidate you. No matter how much power they have they cannot prevent you from living your life, speaking your mind, thinking independently, having relationships with people as you like. (Read Emma Goldman's autobiography LIVING MY LIFE. Harassed, even imprisoned by authority, she insisted on living her life, speaking out, however she felt like.

Second, find people to be with who have your values, your commitments, but who also have a sense of humor. That combination is a necessity!

Third (notice how precise is my advice that I can confidently number it, the way scientists number things), understand that the major media will not tell you of all the acts of resistance taking place every day in the society, the strikes, the protests, the individual acts of courage in the face of authority. Look around (and you will certainly find it) for the evidence of these unreported acts. And for the little you find, extrapolate from that and assume there must be a thousand times as much as what you've found.

Fourth. Note that throughout history people have felt powerless before authority, but that at certain times these powerless people, by organizing, acting, risking, persisting, have created enough power to change the world around them, even if a little. That is the history of the labor movement, of the women's movement, of the anti-Vietnam war movement, the disabled persons movement, the gay and lesbian movement, the movement of black people in the South.

Fifth: Remember, that those who have power, and who seem invulnerable are in fact quite vulnerable, that their power depends on the obedience of others, and when those others begin withholding that obedience, begin defying authority, that power at the top turns out to be very fragile. Generals become powerless when their soldiers refuse to fight, industrialists become powerless when their workers leave the jobs or occupy the factories.

Sixth: When we forget the fragility of that power in top we become astounded when it crumbles in the face of rebellion. We have had many such surprises in our time, both in the United States and in other countries.

Seventh: Don't look for a moment of total triumph. See it as an ongoing struggle, with victories and defeats, but in the long run the consciousness of people growing. So you need patience, persistence, and need to understand that even when you don't "win," there is fun and fulfillment in the fact that you have been involved, with other good people, in something worthwhile.

Okay, seven pieces of profound advice should be enough.

Source:
http://www.zmag.org/sustainers/content/1999-03/mar7_1999.htm
7 March 199
“Call to Conscience from Veterans to Active Duty Troops and Reservists”

Note: This article was submitted as a guest column by Irucka Embry to The Daily Beacon before 17 March 2003 and the out-going Editor-in-Chief Cliff Hightower chose not to print it. For more information, check out http://members.tripod.com/Irucka/beaconrefuse.html. Thanks.

Statement to the Troops

We are veterans of the United States armed forces. We stand with the majority of humanity, including millions in our own country, in opposition to the United States’ all out war on Iraq. We span many wars and eras, have many political views and we all agree that this war is wrong. Many of us believed serving in the military was our duty, and our job was to defend this country. Our experiences in the military caused us to question much of what we were taught. Now we see our REAL duty is to encourage you as members of the U.S. armed forces to find out what you are being sent to fight and die for and what the consequences of your actions will be for humanity. We call upon you, the active duty and reservists, to follow your conscience and do the right thing.

In the last Gulf War, as troops, we were ordered to murder from a safe distance. We destroyed much of Iraq from the air, killing hundreds of thousands, including civilians. We remember the road to Basra -- the Highway of Death -- where we were ordered to kill fleeing Iraqis. We bulldozed trenches, burying people alive. The use of depleted uranium weapons left the battlefields radioactive. Massive use of pesticides, experimental drugs, burning chemical weapons depots and oil fires combined to create a toxic cocktail affecting both the Iraqi people and Gulf War veterans today. One in four Gulf War veterans is disabled.

During the Vietnam War we were ordered to destroy Vietnam from the air and on the ground. At My Lai we massacred over 500 women, children and old men. This was not an aberration, it's how we fought the war. We used Agent Orange on the enemy and then experienced first hand its effects. We know what Post Traumatic Stress Disorder looks, feels and tastes like because the ghosts of over two million men, women and children still haunt our dreams. More of us took our own lives after returning home than died in battle.

If you choose to participate in the invasion of Iraq you will be part of an occupying army. Do you know what it is like to look into the eyes of a people that hate you to your core? You should think about what your "mission" really is. You are being sent to invade and occupy a people who, like you and me, are only trying to live their lives and raise their kids. They pose no threat to the United States even though they have a brutal dictator as their leader. Who is the U.S. to tell the Iraqi people how to run their country when many in the U.S. don't even believe their own President was legally elected?

Saddam is being vilified for gassing his own people and trying to develop weapons of mass destruction. However, when Saddam committed his worst crimes the U.S. was supporting him. This support included providing the means to produce chemical and biological weapons. Contrast this with the horrendous results of the U.S. led economic sanctions. More than a million Iraqis, mainly children and infants, have died because of these sanctions. After having destroyed the entire infrastructure of their country including hospitals,
electricity generators, and water treatment plants, the U.S. then, with the sanctions, stopped the import of goods, medicines, parts, and chemicals necessary to restore even the most basic necessities of life.

There is no honor in murder. This war is murder by another name. When, in an unjust war, an errant bomb dropped kills a mother and her child it is not "collateral damage," it is murder. When, in an unjust war, a child dies of dysentery because a bomb damaged a sewage treatment plant, it is not "destroying enemy infrastructure," it is murder. When, in an unjust war, a father dies of a heart attack because a bomb disrupted the phone lines so he could not call an ambulance, it is not "neutralizing command and control facilities," it is murder. When, in an unjust war, a thousand poor farmer conscripts die in a trench defending a town they have lived in their whole lives, it is not victory, it is murder.

There will be veterans leading protests against this war on Iraq and your participation in it. During the Vietnam War thousands in Vietnam and in the U.S. refused to follow orders. Many resisted and rebelled. Many became conscientious objectors and others went to prison rather than bear arms against the so-called enemy. During the last Gulf War many GIs resisted in various ways and for many different reasons. Many of us came out of these wars and joined with the anti-war movement.

If the people of the world are ever to be free, there must come a time when being a citizen of the world takes precedence over being the soldier of a nation. Now is that time. When orders come to ship out, your response will profoundly impact the lives of millions of people in the Middle East and here at home. Your response will help set the course of our future. You will have choices all along the way. Your commanders want you to obey. We urge you to think. We urge you to make your choices based on your conscience. If you choose to resist, we will support you and stand with you because we have come to understand that our REAL duty is to the people of the world and to our common future.

To Sign this Important Call
Send Signature to or Contact Us @ Veterans Call to Conscience (or VCC) 4742—42nd Ave SW #142, Seattle, WA, 98116-4553
http://www.calltoconscience.net, CalltoConscience@yahoo.com

Funds Urgently Needed!
There has been overwhelming response to this statement from all over the world. It has gotten into the hands of large numbers of active duty troops. Funds are needed to print large quantities of leaflets and to get the statement printed in newspapers. Send your tax deductible donation to: TCLDF-VCC Fund.

Organizers Needed!
We need volunteers to get this statement into the hands of as many troops and reservists as possible—all over the world. Please post this statement on the web, especially on sites that GI’s & Soldiers visit. Anti-war, peace & justice groups, and religious groups that are situated close to bases and locations where troops live, including National Guard units and other reservists who are being called up.

Source:
http://www.calltoconscience.net/
Call to Conscience Website

Full list of current signatories is also on the website.