

THE STRUGGLE IS FOR LAND

BY IM

FOR THREE YEARS NOW, as an officer of the Republic of New Africa, I have gone around America talking to captive African people here about the struggle for land. Had I been talking about the struggle of the Azanians to free South Africa from the racist whites who hold it, and them, in subjugation, or had I been talking about the struggle of the Zimbabweans against the Rhodesians, or the brothers in Guinea or Mozambique against the Portuguese, I am sure no African in America would have had a difficult time understanding that each of these struggles is fundamentally a struggle for land. But I was not talking about these struggles.

I was talking about the struggle of African people in the United States. And I was talking about this struggle in the only context in which it can be a meaningful struggle — that is to say, a struggle that results in freedom, pride, power, and a good life for all our people. I was talking about this struggle in the context of land. Our struggle — no less than that of the Azanians, the Zimbabweans, the Guineans — is a struggle for land.

It is not that Africans in America who struggle for such amorphous things as our "rights" in America or "freedom," (where neither of these is connected to land) are perpetuating a fraud upon themselves and others. It is that their analysis of what is fundamentally wrong with American society misses the mark (what is wrong is that American society suffers from en-

trenched racism) or, upon a correct analysis, they have failed to reason through to the most feasible and logical solution: depart from American society.

Worse, the white nationalism which all people in America constantly imbibe has left many otherwise fine American minds among us, functionally unable to think of land — independent land, carved out of any part of what whites now call the United States — as a real part of our struggle for that wonderful but amorphous and elusive state called FREEDOM. Land for Zimbabweans, for Anzanians, for Guineans, for all the Africans in Africa — yes! But land for Africans in America? You can't be serious!

Well, we are serious. And where yesterday Africans in America hearing me and the other New Africans talk of land, might have, with some slight justification, considered the talk a mere academic curiosity, today — with the first African capitol in the northern Western Hemisphere since Columbus, consecrated El Malik and a building in Hinds County, Mississippi — talk of land for Africans in America is a function of a real exercise in political science. If there was doubt before that fateful consecration Sunday, March 28, 1971, there is no doubt now in the minds of Mississippi's verbose and uptight Attorney General A. F. Summer and most of the million other white folks in that state. And there ought not to be any doubt in your mind, fellow African in America: the struggle for land is, indeed and very much, on!

Wha
cessful.
upon f
cans in
from th
penden
of our s
tial pri
gle dep
which
are wor
can nat
who do
route of
late th
indep
two-fift
of these
derstan
about.

PERHAP track th
to thinl
goal of
a peopl
of cour
internat
if a pec
a long t
land as
is the n
acquire
folks sir
ple, we

IMARI ABUBAKARI OBADELE, I (s.n. RICHARD HENRY) President of the Republic of New Africa, has been incarcerated in Jackson, Mississippi since August 18, 1971, stemming from a shootout with the police at RNA headquarters in Jackson. Together with 10 other New Africans, Brother Imari was charged with murder, assaulting a federal officer, and treason against the state of Mississippi. A detailed account of the incident was

published in the October 1971 issue of THE BLACK SCHOLAR. The RNA is trying to raise Brother Imari's bail, which has been set at \$75,000. Brothers and Sisters who wish to provide support for the RNA may send contributions to the New African Prisoner of War Fund, 128½ So. Gallatin, Jackson, Miss. 39201, (601) 353-5513. Because of theft and harassment, it is suggested that all donations be sent by certified mail.

BY IMARI ABUBAKARI OBADELE

What is more, the struggle can be successful. A great deal, however, depends upon how fast and how completely Africans in America can un-track their minds from the inability to think about land, independent land as not only an integral part of our struggle for freedom but as an essential primary goal. For success of the struggle depends a great deal upon the support which those of us who now opt for and are working to build an independent African nation on this soil, get from those of us who do not now choose for themselves the route of an independent nation. (We calculate that those who do not now opt for independence may number as many as two-fifths of our people.) And the support of these people must be founded upon understanding of what the New Africans are about.

PERHAPS THE BEST way for people to un-track their minds from the slaving inability to think of land as a real and legitimate goal of our struggle is to understand how a people acquires claim to land. There is, of course, what we call the bandit rule of international law: this says, essentially, that if a people steals land and occupies it for a long time, the world will recognize that land as belonging to them. This, of course, is the manner in which the United States acquired claim to most of America: white folks simply stole it and held it. As a people, we Africans in America have been

cowed by this rule; we have cringed before it (and before the power of the beast) as if it were the only rule of land possession.

There is, fortunately, a civilized rule of land possession. It says that if a people has lived on a land traditionally, if they have worked and developed it, and if they have fought to stay there, that land is theirs. It is upon this rule of international law that Africans in America rest their claim for land — in America.

We have lived for over 300 years in the so-called Black Belt, we have worked and developed the land, and we have fought to stay there — against night riders and day courts, against cultural genocide and economic privation, against bad crops, and no crops, against terror and ignorance and the urgings of relatives to come North. In the Black Belt, running through the Five States that the Republic claims as the National Territory of the Black Nation (Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia and South Carolina) we have met all the criteria for land possession required of us by international practice, international law. We have, incidentally, met these tests too in cities of the North like Boston, Philadelphia, New York, Baltimore (though our precise locations in these cities have shifted through the years).

What the Republic of New Africa says, however, is that we give up our claim to these cities as *national* territory (that does not mean that all Africans have to move from them) in exchange for the five states

of the Deep South. In the North we are outnumbered almost two to one, though once we were an absolute numerical majority, because of the persistent genocide practiced against us for 100 post-slavery years. But we remain over half the population in Mississippi and a third in Louisiana, Alabama and South Carolina, and many Black Belt counties are overwhelmingly African.

The land mass in the Five States is nearly a quarter-million square miles. There are ports on the Atlantic (Georgia and South Carolina) and on the Gulf of Mexico and wondrously beautiful beaches there. There are riches in the ground that are untapped and marvelous things in the sea, besides the abundant and abused petroleum.

THE PROBLEM with international law is that there is nobody to enforce it — except the powerful. Powerful nations enforce international law only when it suits them — or when they are forced to. The essential strategy of our struggle for land is to array enough power (as in jui-jitsu, with a concentration of karate strength at key moments) to *force* the greatest power, the United States, to abide by international law, to recognize and accept our claims to independence and land.

The purpose of this strategy can be further simplified: it is to create a situation for the United States where it becomes cheaper to relinquish control of the Five States than to continue a war against us to take back or hold the area.

How do we accomplish such a thing?

The implementing tactics are various, but they revolve around a set of supporting strategies first laid out by me in the short book *War in America* and further illuminated in another small book called *Revolution and Nation-Building*. Chief among these strategies is the *limited objective*, an essential element in preparing before the war for a peace settlement that is an African victory. What we are saying here, in terms of the *limited objective*, is that in-

stead of insisting on the overthrow or destruction of the United States, we say, like Castro's Cuba before us, if we can achieve our freedom and independence with the United States still in existence, we will do so. (As step one.)

We are saying that our objective is not to overthrow the United States but to create our own nation. More, we are saying not fifty states, or twenty-five states, or even ten states — though by a rule of independence for unjust enrichment we are entitled to all the wealth of the American nation. We are saying five states, taken together, the poorest states in the nation, the states with the most black people in them, a mere one-tenth of the states in the Union (and *they* say we are one-tenth of the people), the area which the white American — with some 170 million of his number living *outside* of the area — is most likely to give up when he is forced to the point where giving up *something* will be a necessity.

THE DEVELOPMENT of foreign support, inside and outside of the United Nations, is another of the vital supporting strategies. The tradition reflected in Nkrumah's aiding Patrice Lumumba (in that they sought to align a number of small powers with the Congo) is founded in a sound dictum of political science: a small nation protects itself against a large nation by aligning itself with another large nation or with a group of nations. Thus, the Thirteen Colonies withstood the might of Great Britain because their alliance with France brought French (and Spanish) pressure to bear against England on the high seas and in Europe. The Egyptians in 1956 turned back a French and British backed Israeli invasion because of an alliance with the Soviet Union. Again, unlike the Dominicans after them, who had no counterbalancing foreign alliance and support and went down to an American invasion in 1965, the Cubans withstood several years of American military aggression (carried out by U.S. trained puppets). Finally, in

the mi
with a
Union)
ated se
the Un

Through
suppo
of the
quite
and s
China
world
For a
selves
positi
correc
clear:
we ar

"Fr
misty
other
speak
supp
land a
ter bu
treat
wrong
matte
the ti
proce
ond-c
Ther
vacuc
by we
law.

Th
work
"Ame
desce
can c
India
alists
man's
it too
zen"
a bla
wher
set o

THE BI

the missile crisis, because of their alliance with another great power (the Soviet Union) Cuba achieved a de facto negotiated settlement with the great power, the United States, which threatened her.

THUS THE REPUBLIC seeks actively the support of the African and Asian peoples of the world. We are not afraid to say quite openly that we seek the friendship and support of the People's Republic of China, the only nation of color in the world who presently boast nuclear power. For all these people (as well as for ourselves) it is essential that all our political positions with respect to our struggle be correct. We must be clear-headed and clear-spoken about what we want and why we are entitled to it.

"Freedom" cannot be amorphous and misty — it must be for land and sovereignty otherwise foreign powers have no right to speak in our behalf, let alone provide other support. For, unless the struggle is for land and sovereignty, it is a domestic matter between citizens of a nation who are treated right and those who are treated wrong, and it is to be settled as a domestic matter by them. (And we have suffered the tragic results of such a "settlement" process between us "first-class" and "second-class" citizens for over 100 years.) Therefore, our claim to land cannot be vacuous — it must be — and is, supported by well-accepted principles of international law.

Therefore, we cannot stand before the world unsure of whether or not we are "American citizens." No person in America, descendant of African slaves is an American citizen (unless he is a naturalized West Indian or South American). Black "nationalists" must come out of that delicious no-man's land where one has his cake and eats it too, where one is not an "American citizen" when it is popular not to be (i.e., in a black nationalist rap session) but is one when it is convenient to be — or when we set our goals in the "struggle for freedom."

We are not American citizens for two simple reasons. First, of course, American law as interpreted by the Supreme Court in 1968 and followed by Congress has never protected the African in America against the racially motivated oppressions and deprivations by individual white citizens. (Under the Fourteenth Amendment only the States, and not individuals, were enjoined from abridging the rights and freedoms of the Africans.)

Second, and more importantly, the Fourteenth Amendment, in an attempt to bestow citizenship upon the African, newly freed from slavery, incorporated the rule of *jus solis* "all persons born or naturalized in the United States and of the state wherein they reside." A sound principle of international law, the rule of *jus soli* was obviously intended to provide American citizenship for persons born in the United States through what might be termed "acceptable accidents" of birth. Thus, a person born in the U.S. as a result of his parents' having come to this country voluntarily — through emigration and settlement or, vacation travel or business — could not be denied citizenship in the country of his birth. He might have dual citizenship, gaining also the citizenship of his parents, but he could not be left with NO citizenship. His birth in the U.S. under such conditions would meet the test of an "acceptable accident."

By contrast, however, the presence of the African in America could by no stretch of justice be deemed "an acceptable accident" of birth. The African, whose freedom was now acknowledged by his former slave-masters through the Thirteenth Amendment, was not on this soil because he or his parents had come here of their own free will; neither he nor his parents had come vacationing or seeking some business advantage. Rather the African — standing forth now as a free man because the Thirteenth Amendment forbade whites (who had the power, not the right), to continue slavery — was on American soil as a result of having been kidnapped and brought here AGAINST his will.

What the rule of *jus soli* demanded at this point — at the point of the passage of the slavery-halting Thirteenth Amendment — was that America not deny to this African, born on American soil, American citizenship — IF THE AFRICAN WANTED IT. This last condition is crucial: the African, his freedom now acknowledged by persons who theretofore had wrongfully and illegally (under international law) held him in slavery by force, was entitled, as a free man to decide for himself what he wanted to do — whether he wished to be an American citizen or follow some other course.

The rule of *jus soli*, in protecting the kidnapped African from being left without any citizenship, could operate so far as to impose upon America the obligation to offer the African (born on American soil) American citizenship; it could not impose upon the African — a victim of kidnapping and wrongful transportation — an obligation to accept such citizenship. Such an imposition would affront justice, by conspiring with the kidnappers and illegal transporters, and wipe out the free man's newly acquired freedom.

THUS, THE FOURTEENTH Amendment is incorrectly read when its Section One is deemed to be a *grant* of citizenship: it can only be an offer. The positive tone of the language can only emphasize the intention of the ratifiers to make a sincere offer. On the other hand, the United States government, under obligation to make the offer, also had the power to create the mechanism — a plebescite — whereby the African could make an informed decision, an informed acceptance or rejection of the offer of American citizenship. Indeed, Section Five of the Fourteenth Amendment makes clear that Congress could pass whatever law was necessary to make real the offer of Section One. (Section Five says: The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.)

PAGE 28

The first "appropriate legislation" required at that moment — and still required — was that which would make possible for the now-free African an informed, free choice, an informed acceptance or rejection of the citizenship offer.

Let us recall that, following the Thirteenth Amendment, four natural options were the basic right of the African. First, he did, of course, have a right, if he wished it, to be an American citizen. Second, he had a right to return to Africa or go to another country — if he could arrange his acceptance. Finally, he had a right (based on a claim to land superior to the European's, subordinate to the Indian's) to set up an independent nation of his own.

TOWERING ABOVE all the other juridical requirements that faced the African in America and the American following the Thirteenth Amendment was the requirement to make real the opportunity for choice, for self-determination. How was such an opportunity to evolve? Obviously the African was entitled to full and accurate information as to his status and the principles of international law appropriate to his situation. This was all the more important because the African had been victim of a long-term, intense slavery policy aimed at assuring his illiteracy, dehumanizing him as a group, and de-personalizing him as an individual.

The education offered him after the Thirteenth Amendment confirmed the policy of dehumanization. It was continued in American educational institutions, despite Rogers and Woodson and DuBois, for 100 years, through 1965 and the successful textbook victory out of Detroit. Now, again following the Thirteenth Amendment, the education of the African in America seeks to base African self-esteem on how well the African assimilates white American folkways and values — a hardly more palatable de-personalization than that which occurred during slavery.

Worse, the advice given the African concerning his rights under international

law :
open
ship.
into :
ganizi
conven
latures
Fourtee
African
this w
strong
impor
circur
Fourt
tures
votec
appr
sense

TH
lacki
form
man
seco
a ch
tions
Afric
and
tion
Th
Afric
that
now
statu
law.
the j
accu
On
gove
Secti
to "e
zensl
fully
parti
wor
self-c
the c
Th
quat
dame

law suggested that there was no option open to him other than American citizenship. For the most part, he was co-opted into spending his political energies in organizing and participating in constitutional conventions and then voting for the legislatures which subsequently approved the Fourteenth Amendment. (Not *all* of the African's political energies were spent in this way. The pull of nationalism was strong even at that moment, and this is an important still-to-be-told story.) In such circumstances, the presentation of the Fourteenth Amendment to state legislatures for whose members the African had voted, and the Amendment's subsequent approval by these legislatures, could in no sense be considered a plebiscite.

THE FUNDAMENTAL requirements were lacking: first, adequate and accurate information for the advice given the freedman was so bad it amounts to fraud, a second stealing of our birthright; second, a chance to choose among the four options: (1) U.S. citizenship, (2) return to Africa, (3) emigration to another country, and (4) the creation of a new African nation on American soil.

The fact that today the Republic of New Africa exists means, among other things, that a large body of Africans in America now has accurate information as to our status and our rights under international law. It means that we as a people have the potential for providing ourselves with accurate and adequate information.

On the other hand, the United States government still has the obligation under Section Five of the Fourteenth Amendment to "enforce" Section One (the offer of citizenship) in the only way it could be rightfully "enforced" — by authorizing U.S. participation in a plebiscite. By, in other words, a reference to our own will, our self-determined acceptance or rejection of the offer of citizenship.

There are important ramifications. Adequate and accurate information being fundamental to an informed decision, it is

incumbent upon the United States, which heretofore used its great resources to misinform Africans in America about our status, options, and rights under international law, to make available to the Republic (and to those representing the other neglected options, emigration to Africa or some other place) the airways and other media for dissemination of information. The terms must be worked out on a mutual basis, the objective being to remove the severe technical handicap which U.S. power (flowing out of a white racist theft of and subsequent monopoly of wealth) imposes on those competing for the attention of the African mind in an atmosphere essentially controlled by white American nationalists.

There are further important ramifications. A genuine plebiscite implies that if people vote against U.S. citizenship, the means must be provided to facilitate whatever decision they do make. Thus, persons who vote to return to Africa or to emigrate elsewhere must have the means to do so.

THOSE OF US who feel this is just another way of begging for hand-outs from the powerful white United States government must remember our origins. We are the descendants of Africans wrongfully kidnapped and brought here by whites with the explicit complicity of the U.S. government and every arm of the United States law-making and law-enforcing machinery. The kidnapping was a wrongful act for which our ancestors and we as their heirs are entitled to damages. The enslavement was a wrongful act, for which our ancestors and we as their heirs are entitled to damages. The stealing of our labor was a wrongful act, as was the cultural genocide we suffered. We are entitled to damages — to reparations. The compensations we speak of are owed to us.

All the more is this true when one remembers that the Yankee fortunes which, during and after the Civil War, went into railroads, oil and the other fundamentals of the industrial revolution, were based

originally on commercial wealth earned in the Tri-Cornered Trade: Yankee bottoms from New England calling on the Guinea Coast for slaves; trading the slaves in the West Indies and the South; bringing North, in their place, tobacco, sugar, rice, molasses and finally cotton for processing in the North and in England. Resting two-thirds on slavery and slave labor, the wealth of the U.S. was a stolen wealth, its present manifestation the result of unjust enrichment. No law — and explicitly not U.S. law — sanctions the taking of property from one man (our labor, our liberty, our right to those important tools of competition: health, education, self-esteem and sanity) and the giving of this property to another man. As Attorney Daisy Collins argues so well: as a people and individually we have been deprived of property without due process of law.

WE HAVE SEEN, in World War I, Germany and other European countries assessed reparations and made to pay them to France and other countries for physical damage AND for the act of launching an “unjust” war. Again after World War II we saw this phenomenon routinely observed in Europe. We saw, further, the West German government give the new state of Israel 800 million dollars in reparations for crimes committed against Jews in Europe by another German government. To boot, the Israeli government which received the reparations was not even in existence when the crimes against the Jews were committed! Reparations is a well established phenomenon of international relations, with an ancient history far pre-dating World War I. We are entitled to reparations from the Americans even more than France was from Germany or the Jews from the post-Hitler German government.

Now, then, we repeat: an obvious and important ramification of the plebiscite is that there must exist the capability of putting its decisions into effect. If the decision is for U.S. citizenship, then that citizenship

must be unconditional. If it is for emigration to a country, outside of Africa, those persons making this choice must have transportation resources and reparations in terms of other benefits, principally money, to make such immigration possible and give it a reasonable chance of success. If the decision is for a return to some country in Africa, the person must have those same reparations as persons emigrating to countries outside of Africa — PLUS those additional reparations necessary to restore enough of the African personality for the individual to have a reasonable chance of success in integrating into African society in the motherland.

If, finally, the decision is for an independent new African nation on this soil, then the reparations must be those agreed upon between the United States government and the new African government. Reparations must be at least sufficient to assure the new nation a reasonable chance of solving the great problems of want and resource-poverty imposed upon us by the Americans in our status as a colonized people.

We were enumerating the supporting strategies for liberation of the New African land-mass. We spoke of the Limited Objective. We spoke of Foreign Alliances and Support. A third vital supporting strategy, already alluded to, is the winning of Internal Domestic Support, the winning of the understanding and support of those Africans in America who do not chose for themselves to come to New Africa.

Such Africans must understand — and fight for — the international law arguments we have just laid out: reparations as a right; the free and informed selection of our future courses, as a right; our right to the land. Such Africans must join New Africans in insisting upon U.S. participation in a genuine plebiscite — a plebiscite wherein the means to effectuate its results are conceded — as a logical matching of the First and Fifth Sections of the Fourteenth Amendment.

This, too, must be understood about the plebiscite. Traditionally a plebiscite is held

to decide lation. Th mir soug populatio dian sub-or remain Hitler-ma cided wh tion wou. can pleb. what dil internatic citizenship this rule Fourteen Africans ship are (and the tional U. ment mu scite.

On the in the ple must be themselves — carry 51% In either who vote other the right, fo courses.

WHAT, would be already s that land Mississippi Georgia. 100 years cans are (two to on seven mi said that the repa the notio to the la North, to claim as exchange

for emigra-
Africa, those
must have
parations in
ally money,
ossible and
success. If
some coun-
have those
migrating to
PLUS those
ary to re-
asonality for
able chance
African so-

or an inde-
on this soil,
hose agreed
ates govern-
government.
sufficient to
able chance
of want and
us by the
colonized

supporting
New African
Limited Ob-
Alliances
supporting
the winning
the winning
part of those
not chose for
Africa.

land - and
arguments
ations as a
selection of
our right to
join New
S. participa-
a plebiscite
its results
matching of
of the Four-

and about the
plebiscite is held

FEBRUARY, 1972

to decide the nationality of an entire population. Thus, the U.N. plebiscite for Kashmir sought to decide whether the entire population of this principality on the Indian sub-continent should become Indian or remain independently Kashmirian. The Hitler-managed Austrian plebiscite decided whether the entire Austrian population would unite with Germany. The African plebiscite in America must be somewhat different. We are guaranteed by international law (the rule of *jus soli*) citizenship in America, if we want it, and this rule has been incorporated into the Fourteenth Amendment; therefore, those Africans who accept United States citizenship are entitled to remain where they are (and they are entitled also to unconditional U.S. citizenship), and this entitlement must be encompassed in the plebiscite.

On the other hand, those Africans voting in the plebiscite for the New African nation must be understood to be speaking for themselves as a group and ONLY for themselves - even were the New Africans to carry 51% of the total vote or even 91%. In either case, the 49% or the nine percent who vote to be U.S. citizens or for a course other than New Africa, would have the right, for themselves, to follow those courses.

WHAT, THEN, OF THE LAND? What land would be the land of the nation? We have already said that the land of the nation is that land which today is called Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, Alabama and Georgia. Today in this land - because of 100 years of intense genocide - we Africans are outnumbered by whites by almost two to one (some 12 million of them, some seven million of us). But we have also said that this land belongs to us as part of the reparations settlement, incorporating the notion that we give up national claim to the land of the black ghettos of the North, to which we have nearly as good a claim as to the land of the Black Belt, in exchange for the full five states.

In Mississippi, however, and in all the Black Belt counties where we are over 51% of the population, we expect New Africa to win virtually 100% of the African plebiscite vote. This would give New Africa clear claim to the land where our people already are. It would solve immediately in Mississippi and all of the Black Belt - the question of land and open the door to a similar national acquisition of the rest of the Five States through immigration of New Africans from all over the United States.

But are we naive enough to believe that in this violent, racist United States, John Conyers and the other African U.S. Congressmen who have undertaken to help us, will be successful in achieving laws which effect a peaceful plebiscite and the peaceful ceding of the land to New Africa? In time of (relative) peace, we must prepare for war. An important supporting strategy is the development of Inherent Military Viability: the creation of an over-ground army, properly motivated, properly equipped, and able to meet and succeed at the kind of combat which may be forced upon us.

And what kind of combat is that? We have taken and are taking steps to eliminate the use of the regular military establishment against us. By publicly stating our case and its justification under international law, by publicly proclaiming our intention to achieve our aims - the liberation of the nation and sovereignty over our land mass - by peaceful means, the peaceful plebiscite, and by conducting ourselves in a fashion that reinforces our peaceful professions (and that also brings us the support of nations abroad and non-New Africans at home) we remove from the United States the pretext for military action. (Conversely, by contrast, Black Panther pronouncements and actions CREATE pretexts for U.S. military action, by the police, by being easily read as open military attacks upon the U.S. government and its sub-divisions.) The support of nations abroad and Africans at home means that any overt U.S. military attack upon us

could result in sanctions of all sorts from these parties against a guilty United States.

But this does not mean we are to be free of warfare with the United States' regular military establishment. We well remember the plans that were afoot during Kennedy's time to quietly invade China and destroy her nuclear facilities — with no declaration of war, no intention to acknowledge the deed as an act of the U.S. military. This teaches us that where the United States can secretly strike and get away with it, she will do so. Thus, our guard has to be up constantly against a pre-emptive military attack by regular U.S. military forces.

THEN THERE IS ALSO the prospect of action by the Mississippi State National Guard or elements of the state police forces. As I write this, Mississippi's Attorney General A. F. Summer has written to the U.S. Attorney General interpreting our presence in Mississippi as an "invasion" and an "armed insurrection." He has asked what the United States plans to do about it and has gone on to assure the U.S. Attorney General that Mississippi is quite willing and able to crush said invasion and rebellion, in behalf of the United States, if the United States does not act. This opens before us the possibility that state forces might at any moment be used against us.

(The reason for this turn of events is that on Sunday, March 28, the Republic of New Africa consecrated land in Hinds County, Mississippi, as the capital of the Republic. In all of our pronouncements we had made clear that until the plebiscite the capital would be operated much like the land of any business corporation in the state: we might fence it and have armed guards, but the whole was to remain subject to Mississippi and U.S. law. However, the white press of Mississippi and the Attorney General have taken a different view: we have, in their view, declared independence for the land. For our part, as of the moment, we have let it stand that way.)

PAGE 32

Our biggest threat comes from the white civilian armies, the Ku Klux Klan and those other semi-official forces who for one hundred years have done the dirty work of military oppression in the South. These forces we must be prepared to successfully engage and defeat at all times.

Some of us envision the possibility — indeed, the likelihood — that an engagement between us and local civilian armies or between us and state police agencies might escalate, at a given moment, into a general and sustained conflagration covering most of the area where New Africa has strength. It seems likely that die-hard whites, impervious to the rightness of our cause and determined to deny New Africa sovereignty over the land, would create situations leading to a general and sustained fight. Our policy, of course, is to delay or, if possible, avoid such a turn of events. But the simple, ineluctable truth is that, if we are to be free through sovereignty, we will ultimately have to fight.

HOW LONG A WAR? Who can say. Our strategy aims at a negotiated settlement; it leaves doors open for the United States for a saving of face: we do, after all, lay claim to the poorest states in the union, it is five states not fifty or twenty-five or even ten, and most white people (some 170 million) live *outside* of the area. These are reasons why the United States could reach a settlement with us. Fundamentally, too, it is important to remember that ALL white people believe they are smarter than we are: this is what the game is all about; when the white man ceases to feel that he is smarter, as a group, than we are, as a group, he ceases to be a white man. And, since he is smarter than we, it follows that he does not need to engage in lengthy warfare on American soil, where he has a great deal more to lose than we, in order to maintain control over us. Being smarter than we, he has the "simple" task of turning the new nation into a neo-colonialist sink.