

Oppression in the making.....

**1791 Article 4 US Constitution:** The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized. This made it possible for "reasonable" searches that were targeted towards those of color. Mainly African Americans. Today we still see "justified" illegal searches based off race and social class.

**1830 The Indian Removal Act (Legislative action):** In 1830 Congress, urged on by President Andrew Jackson, passed the Indian Removal Act which gave the federal government the power to relocate any Native Americans in the east to territory that was west of the Mississippi River. Though the Native Americans were to be compensated, this was not always done fairly and in some cases led to the further destruction of many of the already diminishing numbers of many of the eastern tribes. Many Native Americans in this process were hurt, tortured, jailed or killed. The fact is, Congress dehumanized Native Americans by taking their land against their will. The land that they were given was additionally stolen back from them when precious minerals and natural resources were discovered. Once again, they were asked to be relocated against their will. Those who didn't were hurt, tortured, jailed or killed.

**1854 The People Vs. Hall (CA Supreme Court):** This California Supreme Court case ruled that the testimony of a Chinese man who witnessed a murder by a white man was inadmissible, largely based upon the prevailing opinion that the Chinese were "a race of people whom nature has marked as inferior, and who are incapable of progress or intellectual development beyond a certain point, as their history has shown; differing in language, opinions, color, and physical conformation; between whom and ourselves nature has placed an impassable difference" and as such had no right "to swear away the life of a citizen" or participate "with us in administering the affairs of our Government." We have to ask, what kind of message did this send? The dominant discourse in 1854 instilled a "classism" mentality that marginalized all Asian cultures in America. Are Asians still subject today to racial prejudice and overtones?

**1857 Dred Scott Vs. Stanford (US Supreme Court):** In March of 1857, the United States Supreme Court, led by Chief Justice Roger B. Taney, declared that all blacks -- slaves as well as free -- were not and could never become citizens of the United States. The court also declared the 1820 Missouri Compromise unconstitutional, thus permitting slavery in all of the country's territories. Taney -- a staunch supporter of slavery and intent on protecting southerners from northern aggression -- wrote in the Court's majority opinion that, because Scott was black, he was not a citizen and therefore had no right to sue. The framers of the Constitution, he wrote, believed that blacks "had no rights which the white man was bound to respect; and that the negro might justly and lawfully be reduced to slavery for his benefit. He was bought and sold and treated as an ordinary article of merchandise and traffic, whenever profit could be made by it." Even though it was later overturned, the ruling and support displayed a "racist" ideology of privilege and power. We have to question how anyone or group that believes they are superior to others due to ethnicity, should make decisions that impact every living person in the United

Sates. Is there any excuse for anyone or group to think this way? As a person of color, a man and parent.....its hard to believe there is.

**1862 Emancipation Proclamation in DC (Legislative Action):** The proclamation declared "that all persons held as slaves" within the rebellious states "are, and henceforward shall be free." Despite this expansive wording, the Emancipation Proclamation was limited in many ways. It applied only to states that had seceded from the United States, leaving slavery untouched in the loyal border states. It also expressly exempted parts of the Confederacy (the Southern secessionist states) that had already come under Northern control. Most important, the freedom it promised depended upon Union (United States) military victory. This proclamation insured reimbursement for slaves given up for what was considered "lost property". What kind of legislative action compensates another for "giving" up their "ownership" of another human being? An American legislative action that was considered legal.

**1862 Homestead Act (Legislative action):** Signed into law by President Abraham Lincoln on May 20, 1862, the Homestead Act encouraged Western migration by providing settlers 160 acres of public land. In exchange, homesteaders paid a small filing fee and were required to complete five years of continuous residence before receiving ownership of the land. After six months of residency, homesteaders also had the option of purchasing the land from the government for \$1.25 per acre. The Homestead Act led to the distribution of 80 million acres of public land by 1900. What really happened? 50 million acres of formerly indigenous land in the west, having been violently invaded by U.S. soldiers in violation of treaties was distributed by the Government for low cost to white settlers only. And 100 million acres of indigenous land were given away free to railroad developers. Pure racism. This system of advantage benefitted Caucasians only. And it was all done legally.

**1882 Chinese Exclusion Act (Legislative action):** In the 1850s, Chinese workers migrated to the United States, first to work in the gold mines, but also to take agricultural jobs, and factory work, especially in the garment industry. Chinese immigrants were particularly instrumental in building railroads in the American west, and as Chinese laborers grew successful in the United States, a number of them became entrepreneurs in their own right. As the numbers of Chinese laborers increased, so did the strength of anti-Chinese sentiment among other workers in the American economy. This finally resulted in legislation that aimed to limit future immigration of Chinese workers to the United States, and threatened to sour diplomatic relations between the United States and China. This resulted in the banning of skilled and unskilled Chinese laborers. History have proven that when other ethnic cultures have contributed to society, their value and skills were just as equal or superior. Why does the dominant race group feel threatened when this happens? Does history repeat itself with this kind of thinking?

**1924 Johnson Reed Act (Legislative action):** The Immigration Act of 1924 limited the number of immigrants allowed entry into the United States through a national origins quota. The quota provided immigration visas to two percent of the total number of people of each nationality in the United States as of the 1890 national census. It completely excluded immigrants from Asia. This created an immigration quota system based on national origins. "Nordics" were favored over the "inferior" races of Asia and Southern/Eastern Europe. Do you see what ethnic groups today are affected by DACA?

**1934 The National Housing Act (Rosevelt's New Deal):** President Franklin Roosevelt signed the National Housing Act into law on June 27, 1934. The purpose of the law was to "encourage improvement in housing standards and conditions, to provide a system of mutual mortgage insurance, and for other purposes." The law created the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation (FSLIC) [1]. *This act was created during the "Great Depression". The intentions to provide loans was never the question, but to what ethnic groups did not benefit from Rosevelt's New Deal. Because of the FHA underwriting standards, non-whites are discriminated against for housing and investment in communities. This still happens today in America, it is called "redlining".*

**1942 Japanese American Concentration Camp (Executive order 9066):** In an atmosphere of World War II hysteria, President Roosevelt, encouraged by officials at all levels of the federal government, authorized the internment of tens of thousands of American citizens of Japanese ancestry and resident aliens from Japan. Roosevelt's Executive Order 9066, dated February 19, 1942, gave the military broad powers to ban any citizen from a fifty- to sixty-mile-wide coastal area stretching from Washington state to California and extending inland into southern Arizona. The order also authorized transporting these citizens to assembly centers hastily set up and governed by the military in California, Arizona, Washington state, and Oregon. Although it is not well known, the same executive order (and other war-time orders and restrictions) were also applied to smaller numbers of residents of the United States who were of Italian or German descent. For example, 3,200 resident aliens of Italian background were arrested and more than 300 of them were interned. About 11,000 German residents—including some naturalized citizens—were arrested and more than 5000 were interned. Yet while these individuals (and others from those groups) suffered grievous violations of their civil liberties, the war-time measures applied to Japanese Americans were worse and more sweeping, uprooting entire communities and targeting citizens as well as resident aliens. *This executive order forces 110,000 Japanese Americans into concentration camps. What groups today could this happen to in America? Less than 80 years ago an executive order (President's order) to remove a group of people based off their ethnicity into concentration camps against their will.*

**1971 Nixon War on Drugs (Presidential initiative):** The term was popularized by the media shortly after a press conference given on June 18, 1971, by United States President Richard Nixon—the day after publication of a special message from President Nixon to the Congress on Drug Abuse Prevention and Control—during which he declared drug abuse "public enemy number one". That message to the Congress included text about devoting more federal resources to the "prevention of new addicts, and the rehabilitation of those who are addicted", but that part did not receive the same public attention as the term "war on drugs". However, two years prior to this, Nixon had formally declared a "war on drugs" that would be directed toward eradication, interdiction, and incarceration. Today, the Drug Policy Alliance, which advocates for an end to the War on Drugs, estimates that the United States spends \$51 billion annually on these initiatives. *So what really happens? It violently targets and imprisons people of color disproportionately through today. For the next two orders. Google them and you will find racism.*

**2017 Border security and immigration enforcement improvements (Executive order)**

**2017 Protecting nation from foreign terrorist entry into United States (Executive order)**

