

THE CONSPIRACY TO DERAIL BLACK MOTHERHOOD

Copyright 1998 by Keidi Obi Awadu for the Conscious Rasta Press. All rights reserved.

Media reviews are lauding the movie *How Stella Got Her Groove Back*, scripted from the book by author Terri McMillan. Black women need to celebrate their image in the cinema, and seeing Angela Bassett on the screen is such cause to celebrate. Yet, I will continue to abide by my 5-year boycott of Hollywood films because of what I perceive to be a long-founded corruption of black culture by many filmmakers, I have refused to pay theater prices to view new films, preferring to wait until Dollar Day at the local video rental shop—if I am to see these films at all. I understand why black women and men are flocking to see this film which I believe to be a depiction of *how they would see themselves as successful in America*. Nonetheless, I remain troubled by certain underlying themes that are recurrent in Hollywood's depiction of black success. Additionally, I admit to being no fan of Ted Danson's ex-girlfriend Whoopi who co-stars in the film *How Stella...*



There should be more films that celebrate black women, especially motherhood. Of course, I must admit to a bias here—my mother was a black woman; my wife is a black woman and she gave birth to three daughters who will one day grow up to be black women. Black mothers are the backbone of our survival throughout the hostile history. Despite the current disintegration of family models that had been with us for many generations, it is the commitment of black mothers that pulls the children through an often-fatherless environment. In defiance of increasing media assaults upon her character, often with assistance from her male would-be counterpart, the integrity of black motherhood stands as our best chance for survival against the negative influence of Western cultural decadence.

As a reproductive health researcher and would-be demographer (studying population patterns and how they shape society) I am absolutely convinced that a people's future is linked to the status of childbearing age women. Their health must be measured not only on the biological level but also as to psychological and spiritual states. In my 1997 book, *MISSING ASSETS: Cultural, Psychological and Biological Origins of Infertility*, I noted how fertility patterns were rapidly shifting for African Americans. As a consequence of a number of factors, black women in America had experienced one of the steepest declines in fertility that has ever been recorded in history. The factors which I cited as having contributed most to this decline included: urbanization, aborting nearly 40% of all pregnancies, use of synthetic birth controls, biological infertility (often the result of exposure to chemicals in our food and environment), the default of black men in the family unit and shifting priorities among women.

These shifting priorities are demonstrated in various manifestations. Among all groups in America, college educated black women have the absolute lowest fertility level. A number of black women and men have risen high in the corporate structure. For men this position potentially leads to stronger families for obvious reason—because he has become a successful breadwinner, there is more likelihood that he can comfortably support a wife and several children. Yet for the woman in such a position, her maintenance of the privileged position is potentially undermined by redirecting her attention away from the needs of the corporation

toward the demands of motherhood. In many ways the two priorities are mutually exclusive. Social scientists have long known of this phenomenon—the higher a woman rises in the business structure, the lower her fertility. Recall the model of the Angela Bassett’s character in *How Stella Got Her Groove Back*—that of an aggressive businesswoman. In the film she is the divorced mother of a single child. Though the facts have been hard to come about, I believe that in real life the beautiful 40-year-old Bassett is childless. It is not my place to condemn Ms. Bassett for her life choices or her career success. Yet, I know for a fact that social scientists, intending to deliberately orchestrate the decline of a group’s fertility, have long held that such childless role models should be held up for other susceptible women of the target group to emulate.

This brings us to the topic of *eugenics*. Eugenics science is defined as “race improvement through selective breeding.” The process was overtly common during the early part of the 20th Century. Eugenics programs were routinely carried out in European countries, including Austria, Switzerland, Norway, Finland, Belgium, Czechoslovakia and Germany. Yet, most of those nations modeled their eugenics programs after pioneering efforts and laws developed in the United States. Margaret Sanger, the founder of Planned Parenthood, was one of a number of prominent eugenicists which also included Francis Galton, Garret Hardin, E.M. East and Major Leonard Darwin.

There were two distinct eugenics phases during this century. The *Pre-Hitlerian* phase mandated race improvement as a function of the State, to be carried out using court authority and law enforcement. Thus the state ensured that mental defectives, the handicapped, habitual criminals and the chronically poor should have limited opportunity to reproduce their kind. Yet the rise of the abusive National Socialist (Nazi) regimes in Germany and throughout central Europe brought the practice of eugenics to a barbaric climax. Hitler’s minions extended race improvement to include despised ethnic groups, certain nationalities, sexual deviants and political groups. The Nazis ended up sterilizing women using machine guns, deadly poison and crematory ovens.

Despite such a grotesque display of their passion, the eugenicists did not quit—they went underground. In the *Post-Hitlerian* phase, the proponents of selective breeding have redefined the process by altering social norms and individual desires in order to achieve their outcome of lowered fertility for designated groups. This process, termed *voluntary unconscious selection*, functions by implanting in the minds of the target groups certain logic, desires and emotions that will accomplish the ends of lowered fertility. Rather than have the state enforce our breeding down, we will be taught throughout our lives that procreation is an impediment to achieving our desires. Under such a mindset, children are not seen as a source of wealth and satisfaction but are obstacles to other priorities.

Consequently, while African Americans were paying attention to a host of diversions, many of which have been *deliberately* projected as distraction, behind the scenes social scientists have been gauging declining fertility trends. In addition they have published various studies forecasting the potential outcome of this fertility shift as it relates to political, social and economic competition in the not-too-distant future. Their findings signal profound changes in the demographic makeup of the U.S. and the social consequences that would thus result. I’ll give a brief illustration.

Between 1960 and 1980, African American fertility declined by 47%, nearly half. In 1960 African American women bore an average of 4.17 children per woman. If that fertility rate had remained unchanged for three subsequent generations, then it would *hypothetically* have followed as such: **1960**—One black matriarch gives birth to **4.17 children**, half of which (2.09) are female; **1990**—those women, during their generation will complete their family size averaging 4.17 each, yielding **8.69 grandchildren** of the single matriarch), half of whom are female; **2020**—these 4.35 women bring forth **18.1 great-children** including 9.07 females; **2050**—the fourth generation gives birth to **37.8 great-great-children**.

But when the same exercise is carried out using the lowered fertility rate for 1980 of 2.22 average childbirths per black woman, we come to a radically different conclusion: **1980**—A single matriarch gives birth to **2.22 children** on average, half of which (1.11) are female; **2010**—The second generation, barely higher than a single female, then produces an average of **2.46 grandchildren** to our original mother, 1.23 of them female; **2040**—the third generation yields **2.74 great-grandchildren**, 1.37 female; **2070**—the fourth generation at the lower fertility rate gives birth to **3.04 great-great-grandchildren**.

As this mathematical model illustrates, by lowering the fertility 47% in one generation, four generations later the outcome of that shift is a decline of childbirths of nearly 92%. Now maybe you can see how sociologists are envisioning America under a *Hispanic* dominated culture. Hispanics are projected to become the largest minority early in the 21st Century and a majority by the end.

Behind the scenes, eugenics minded social engineers have been quietly manipulating our collective psychology. This has been doubly tragic for the black family. The imprisonment of vast numbers of childbearing age men, excluding men from the workforce and family responsibility, promoting decadent cultural models of behavior like recreational sex and homosexuality, poisoning the environment with sterilizing chemicals, and promoting the ideal of the childless (or one child) woman who is vital to the corporation—all of these combine to accomplish the modern eugenicist's goal of "*race improvement through selective breeding.*"

I've been criticized for stating that AIDS is a *hoax* perpetuated in service of population control. I have studied this subject for a dozen years and published many articles on the subject. Due to a background centered around reproductive biology I would hope that people would imagine that I have the ability to understand much of the [pseudo] science which is passed off as AIDS research. All of the establishment's solutions to the AIDS crisis will undeniably contribute to further lowering fertility among the compliant groups, unless (as in the case of homosexuals) that group has no fertility in the first place. One can thus now picture how the pandemic is abruptly shifting to become the black woman's crisis. AIDS has become a stigma on childbearing age black women. This notion of *ethnic determination* by HIV is not supported by valid scientific data.

Will there be any African Americans in the year 2100? This is a serious concern that should not be reacted to without deliberation. As I perceive the current trends, I'm pessimistic about the answer. Yes there will be people identified as "African Americans" at that time. Yet they will have very little cultural distinction or political clout; a tiny minority will *display* wealth yet the mass will have little economic clout beyond consumption. Teeming masses of African Americans will have quietly withered away. Left behind may be little circles of elites, composed mainly of athletes, entertainers and ethnic tokens within the corporations along with

a small but highly visible mass of black sufferers confined to urban ghettos, reminding Americans of why they feared the potential of a meltingpot with too much African blood in it.

A friend recently reminded me of the ancient Chinese curse: “**May you live in interesting times.**”

Why is this a curse? Because one has a moral obligation to get involved in history when they become aware of the perils it presents—such involvement invariably requires sacrifice or risk. Too often it demands suffering...but such struggle does have its rewards!