

A 'Native' Reply to the racist Reparations and Repercussions article in Sunday Sun April 15th 2007

Dear Editor,

I hope that my reply will be published soon - before people in Barbados forget that the 'Reparation repercussion' article by Bob Verdun which appeared in the April 15th Sunday Sun is mistakenly believed to be true by Barbadians who do not know any better; although I am sure the closet racists in our Society have already congratulated themselves on this thinly veiled Eurocentrist propaganda piece.

I have no idea what publication Mr. Verdun was the Editor of, but if it was the Aryan Nations Journal his article would make sense to me, as anyone can peruse their website - and see that Mr. Verdun's essential arguments against native Peoples are identical to those aired by the white supremacist organizations of the world.

If you doubt me, read over his article and insert Australian Aborigines or New Zealand Maori or even Bantu South African - and you can pretty much recycle the same article; with a few minor omissions (such as the '2010 Winter Olympics', '4% of the population' - in the case of the Bantu who are more numerous, 'looking like Chinese', 'Totem Poles'; and 'Casinos').

Human beings the world over made war upon and enslaved their neighbours, this is not peculiar to any one ethnic group

The problem is - the knife cuts both ways, and most Europeans have done a poor job stewarding the PLANET EARTH - much less a mere continent as Bob claims we 'natives have', who started the Industrial revolution - which has led us to Global warming today? Who started the two World Wars? Which race is still the only one to ever use weapons of Mass destruction on another? Which race left it's own lands and spread over the entire earth dispossessing every other race of their own lands - claiming 'they civilized the savages and developed the lands of others because the lazy natives were not doing anything with their countries'. I scratch my head at this point...but I'm pretty sure it was not any of us 'ambition less natives'.

Mr. Verdun says there were no truly native people in the Americas, only immigrants.

Dutch Afrikaners said the Bantus were immigrants into South Africa - only the 'Bushmen' were native there, so basically any supporter of Bob should accept that Zulus have no more rights to live in South Africa than the former architects of Apartheid, similarly the Aborigines of Australia who arrived there 50,000 years ago have no more rights than the Europeans who arrived there less than 300 years ago - that goes for the Maoris of New Zealand as well. But wait a minute, were there any truly original inhabitants of Europe? As far as I know the Caucasoid race did not evolve into the present day Homo sapiens in Europe - so why then are the majority of the millions of Black & Brown skinned immigrants to Europe being deported each year? Surely they - being fellow immigrants - have just as much right to live in Europe as well.

I am just a young man of 33, and Bob might be twice my age or more, but my understanding of International Human Rights - having been part of the process since 2000 with various United Nations and Organization of American States entities and a little training to present cases at the World Court prods me to offer this simple explanation for those willing to learn before condemning: Genetically speaking - current theories support that between 15,000 and 30,000 years ago - the biological nomadic ancestors of Native Americans arrived in the Americas from Asia - BEFORE any other race or ethnic group. Furthermore, ALL the Native American tribal nations existing today evolved as culturally distinct ethnic groups IN THE AMERICAS, so to simplify further - no Arawak, Carib, Dine or Cherokee, etc walked over the Bering Strait into the 'New World', all of our our languages, religions, cultures, tribes etc originate HERE - giving us a connection to this Hemisphere no-others will ever fully understand - or respect - it seems.

Under International laws the FIRST human inhabitants of any territory - are recognized as the NATIVE/INDIGENOUS people of that territory. And any other other group who dispossesses the native/indigenous peoples of their sovereignty and establishes de-facto rule over them and begins to settle the native lands with their own non-native population - is a COLONIAL OCCUPATIONAL POWER. And as such - the colonial occupational power and its heirs - do not "allow the natives to claim vast tracks of land for their exclusive use", on the contrary - the Colonial Occupational Powers (or their Neo-Colonial heirs) are eventually forced to officially legally recognize that the lands they illegitimately took possession of - do in fact after all belong to the native people they dispossessed in the first place - and so vast tracks are RETURNED to the rightful owners.

As to the comment about natives being criminals, if each race stood before God on judgment day - do you honestly think that it will be Native Americans, Pacific Islanders or Africans who will have the most crimes to answer for?

All for your information and guidance

Damon Gerard Corrie