



BlackEconomics.org[®]

“Dialogue on the Pros and Cons of Black American Nation Formation”

On Sunday, July 25, 2021, the two current **BlackEconomics.org** collaborators, B Robinson and Lindsey “Rob” Robinson, engaged in a general telephone conversation. We discussed not only about how each other were faring, but we also conversed about Black American issues. Given that “Nation Formation” is an important Black American issue, we discussed that topic. Our brief discussion of Nation Formation that day motivated a series of email exchanges on the topic over the next nearly two weeks.

The following is a record of those exchanges that reflects various angles from which the topic might be approached or attacked. It captures the many pros and cons that one might consider when discussing Nation Formation. Given that the two collaborators have somewhat countervailing views on the topic and have extensive work and domestic and international travel experience, the dialogue might represent interesting reading for many interested in the topic. Therefore, we present this dialogue on the **BlackEconomics.org** website, with the hope that it will stimulate additional consideration of the topic and written augmentation of the dialogue by readers.

We invite you to buckle up and become absorbed in an enticing read on the pros and cons of Black American Nation Formation.

Wednesday, July 28, 2021, 1:19 a.m. – B Robinson

Dear Rob,

It was great conversing with you on Sunday. Glad to know that you are doing well and still in the fight.

Our conversation included an incomplete discussion of “nation formation.” One of your comments was that “it won’t work.” That it constitutes “trouble” if implemented. You alluded to the bombing of Black Wall Street in 1921.

As you know, the **BlackEconomics.org** website includes several references to, and advocacy of, nation formation. The initial push for nation formation appears 12 years ago in

Chosen: Black America's Calling. Since that time, there are numerous additional references. One important reference is the initial version of the 2012 paper entitled "[All It Takes Is One](#)." That paper states unequivocally that, given the history, Black and White Americans can never live together forever in a peaceful and stable relationship—as long as the history can be read. One of the most recent references involves a somewhat elaborate analysis of nation formation in *Exodus: A Book for Black Americans Suggesting a Way Out and Up*. Obvious or not, I was persuaded on this topic by the teachings of Elijah Muhammad and of his student Malcolm X. The idea was buttressed as I traveled around the world during my working career—including a five-year stint with a US Combatant Command. The latter experience exposed me to planning strategically for war through war games. Considering all of this, I am still convinced that nation formation (in the US) is one of the best strategies available for Black Americans.

Keep in mind that this conviction is primarily based on nation formation under one of two primary mechanisms: (1) Land grabbing (a purposeful and voluntary migration of Black Americans to states with sparsely populated White inhabitants); and (2) the awarding of land to Black Americans by the US Government as part of Reparations, which would not only include land, but an agreement to provide materiel, other support, and training as required to prepare Black Americans to evolve our own nation. At least initially, these forms of nation formation do not “anticipate” that all Black Americans will opt to enter the Black territories/nation state. However, “sizeable numbers” would be involved. Let’s say no less than 10 million of the current 45 million Black Americans.

Why this conviction? Well, there are the following selected potential benefits:

- An increased measure of self-determination
- Avoidance of most racial discrimination other than the colorism that might remain within the culture of a Black nation.
- Potential economic advantages if the economy is designed and implemented properly—less unemployment.
- Avoiding European Americans’ efforts to destroy Black Americans through the media, drugs/medicine, food, incarceration, etc.
- An opportunity to educate ourselves properly.

And the list could go on.

If there are upsides, then there must be potential downsides:

- As you have pointed out, the occupied territories might be somewhat isolated and vulnerable. Obviously, it is always important to have access to the sea for trade and other purposes.
- A concentration of Black Americans might serve as a target for US military attacks/actions.
- Some forms of dependency on the US may linger for an extended period.

Your arguments against nation formation seemed to be based mainly on security concerns. Accordingly, I ask whether there is anything to deter White America from bombing sizeable

Black areas of influence in key municipalities today or in the future, much as was done in the case of the Tulsa Riots in 1921 and in Philadelphia in the 1960s? Going further, if Whites came to a decision to bomb Black Americans in large areas of influence in US municipalities in the future, then how would that be different from bombing a portion of a territory occupied by Black Americans that is ostensibly separated from the rest of the US—i.e., a state whose land was grabbed, or a separate national territory that was sanctioned by the US Government as part of Reparations? What other security concerns do you have about nation formation? Are there other (non-security) concerns?

Of course, I am not “wedded” with finality to nation formation, although it appears to be a logical strategy to me when planned and implemented properly.

Please take a few moments to lay out your opposition to nation formation as briefly outlined above.

Thank you very much for entertaining this request.

Sincerely,

Brooks

Friday, July 30, 2021, 9:32 a.m. – “Rob” Robinson

Brooks,

I wanted to go to the deal breaker.

While simply understanding how your proposition would put Black Americans in harm's way—and the more successful such a venture you suggest would be the more certain it would be for mass destruction. I must shift the angle to the thinking of the people of the sort that you worked for at the Combatant Command and any decision-maker(s) at that level and above. You, even you, faced with being responsible for the security of the United States would never agree to allow Black folk to congregate exclusively or almost exclusively in pursuit of the Three State Solution.

Once again, thank you for allowing me to " . . . think on these things."

Rob

(Contents of attached WORD file)

Proposition

Nation Formation: Could the United States government allow Black people to occupy a separate entity in the contiguous United States (Lower 48)?

Qualifying questions:

1. Would this separate geographical space set up as a sovereign nation?
2. If not, the question becomes moot because the U.S. Constitution and the body of law pertaining will not allow for the forced out-migration of White people out of a space of say, three states in the Mountain West. Nor could there be a forced migration of Black people to such a space.

So, the answer is no—the United States Government is prohibited from limiting in any way from controlling internal migrations. And . . . there is no conceivable legislation that would pass muster to get around these prohibitions against forced migrations.

For the purposes of exploring the likelihood of the United States Government allowing three states to be occupied as an all-Black state totaling say ten million people—or any number whatsoever—we should immediately consider the strategic implications of such an arrangement. Again, the answer would be no. Whether a sovereign nation or simply three contiguous states inhabited by all Blacks but still legally and politically a part of the 50 states of the United States, the answer is that, strategically, it would be the stupidest move that could ever be made by the United States.

Once you think in strategic terms, or you reflect back to the Cuban Missile Crisis, the possibility of a separate group of states as a homeland for Blacks in America becomes impossible to conceive.

It goes to a fundamental military concept related to force projection. If a nation is going to use military force against any other nation thousands of miles away, then the first imperative is to identify a point of entry. There must be some free space on the ground to land and embark aircraft. You must have access to ports to move equipment. Even if you are going to prosecute the aggression by use of unconventional warfare as in guerilla warfare you must have space on the land occupied by the nation you intend to attack and take over.

The United States or any other advanced nation would never carve out a space dedicated to a people they have oppressed for 400+ years inside this country that could be used by China, Russia, or Pakistan to use as the platform for taking over the United States.

If the United States Government will not agree to establish a homeland for Black Americans, for that possibility to become a reality would require a military victory by Black folk over the military force of the United States. That would be the most remote of all possibilities imaginable.

Now, in spite of all of that rationale, if the United States allowed that American Three State Solution to happen it would be something like Palestine and Israel, except continuous occupation by Federal troops. Both state and local governments would be under court-ordered supervision by the Federal Government for the most specious of reasons. State and local elections would become a farce because those state and local officials would be titular and not in fact. Pretty soon the people of those states would rebel like the children of Israel and say: “We rather go back to Egypt in slavery than to keep wandering around in this wilderness.”

Friday, July 30, 2021, 10:48 a.m. – B Robinson

Dear Rob,

Thank you very much for taking the time to respond to the questions posed.

I realize, however, that the initial propositions/assumptions posed in your response reflect a lack of clarity concerning what has been proposed in our writings to which I referred that go back at least 12 years. In essence, the set up to your response, and around which you develop your response, is not relevant to the reality that we propose. Simply put, I am not persuaded by your response. I am about to go out for a few. When I come back, I'll elaborate further.

But before I go out, here's an important point. As a war strategy, while having a point of entry might be preferable, it is irrelevant in the three-state solution paradigm. (By the way, we never developed or suggested three states. We didn't identify a number—just said states and pointed to a few as examples.) Consider that to use any number of contiguous or separate states within the lower 48 as a staging point (point of entry) by a foreign military power would require flying into US airspace. That, in and of itself, would not be allowed. As soon as a military threat would approach US airspace, jets would be scrambled to attack and SAMs (Surface to Air Missiles) would be fired. So, a point of entry is not relevant. Besides, the US, China, and Russian strategy—generally speaking—if they are to attack another major foreign power is to begin by firing missiles—either from their own country or from aircraft carriers located outside of territorial waters of the country under attack. After the missiles have weakened the target/enemy, then an entry point becomes a nonissue—you just walk into Jerusalem, just like John.

As I said, I will plan to clarify the first paragraph when I return from this brief outing.

However, once again, thank you so much for taking the time to respond. It has been very helpful.

Sincerely,

Brooks

Friday, July 30, 2021, 4:06 p.m. – B Robinson

Dear Rob,

Following up.

The two proposals that we have put forward are:

1. Blacks voluntarily migrating to states where the White population represents a small majority—less than 1.0 million. If Blacks migrate to these states voluntarily in sufficient numbers, then we could swamp the White population and make the territory defacto Black. The migration should be timed so that potential White migrators cannot offset our efforts. Following the logic, “when we move in, they move out” (because they just can't stand to be with Black folk), then there is no forced migration of Whites out of the

territory—it would be voluntary. Ideally, the migration should be timed around a national election or a taking of a census so that we obtain full credit for our new presence—politically and economically. There are key issues regarding such a migration: We address several of them in Chapter Five of [EXODUS](#).

2. The US Government, as part of Reparations, awards Federally-owned lands to Black Americans. This land could, theoretically, span multiple states. The process by which migration might occur to this Federally designated territory is addressed in EXODUS. It was also addressed in [CHOSEN](#)—the chapter on “Point Zero Nation Formation” has more details.

No doubt, these strategies may have flaws. However, those flaws are unrelated to the concerns that you raised.

As we go further into the future, I cannot think of any reason why Black Americans should refuse to occupy land (either through migration or assignment to which we would have to agree) because we fear mass destruction from the U.S. The further we go into the future, the lesser this concern is warranted. Why? Because the world is increasingly integrated. If the US responded to Japanese protest for Reparations and the naming of what was done to them as “Concentration Camps” by, in fact, rewarding the Japanese with Reparations, imagine the global outcry that would ensue should the US venture to directly harm Black Americans in a blatant act of violent racism. Moreover, the further we go into the future, the more other powers such as China, Russia, etc. stand to take issue with such an action or to leverage such action in order to further reduce US position in the world. I know that he is the devil, but **maybe** even the devil has limits. A fear that America would bomb a “Black American State” is equivalent to saying that America would bomb an African, Caribbean, or Latin American state on an unprovoked basis—which has not occurred (at least in the last 50 years). Of course, the US has bombed the hell out of some Middle Eastern and West Asian countries in recent times, but at least they concocted a motive; i.e., were “provoked.” Therefore, it seems reasonable that we would juxtapose fear about mass violence against us (the cost) against the benefits of “freedom.”

What are the benefits:

- A greater degree of self-determination.
- A chance to be out from under the thumb of a hard task master—yet still valuing work.
- A chance to govern ourselves.
- By the time we get to this point, we will all comprehend the deadly adverse effects of influence from the American media. We can prevent access to the American media (or at least minimize it) and create our own media in our own territory.
- A chance to develop our own economy (own currency with the seigniorage benefits) and the pace of development which may not follow a path of the rapid automation in order to preserve jobs and to emphasize our human capital strengths.
- An opportunity to learn to love each other again and become a “whole” people—to value and grow families and communities (areas of influence).
- A chance to build a social system that does not reward individualism over family and “community.”
- Freedom from the vagaries of most forms of racism.

- An opportunity to teach our own history and culture fully in the context of “public school systems.”
- A chance to grow up as a people and show the world that we can “make it up as we go along” as well as any other people.
- A chance to enjoy that GREAT DAY when we escape Egypt and find a new home in a Promised Land (Shabazzland/Zion).
- Much, much more.

In my view, an opportunity to enjoy these benefits (maybe the payment will come due) far outweighs the fear of being attacked/bombed. “I would rather be alive, free, vibrant, and in control of my destiny for a day than to live as a slave for a thousand years.” Granted everyone may not agree with this.

So, this is the basis of my response/argument. There are still flaws of course. However, to really discuss the topic, then it is important for us to be on the same starting page. In order to do this, I urge you to read the portions of the two books that were put forward.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Brooks

Friday, July 30, 2021, 6:15 p.m. – “Rob” Robinson

Brooks,

I read the 1st email after I wrote my response.

Just to give you a couple of thoughts related to force project in a scenario where Russia or China would attempt to take the U.S.

First, they could cooperate. Militarily, Russia could easily attack Alaska using conventional forces and win. It would be up to the US to unleash nuclear. If Russia controls Alaska and then attacks through Canadian airspace and there is bound to be some coordination problems with NORAD—mesh between U.S. and Canada. Second, the three states identified are right up against Washington state (Puget Sound) and then if you get a foothold or if the Russians/Chinese get cooperation from the Blacks in Idaho, Montana, Wyoming and can militia-style target and disable SAMs on the ground and then help to secure facilities or spaces for either amphibious insertions or movement of heavy equipment through ports in/around Seattle or Vancouver.

Hardly to belabor the point but task any Russian or Chinese war planner with developing an operations plan for an invasion of the United States and I just don't believe they would send ships with tanks around to New Orleans or Charleston or New York City. But if there was a physical space on the ground in the U.S., let's say Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, politically controlled

by Blacks, then these planners would try to use that space as a place to project the force. The US always planned to use Kuwait as a staging area for force projection. If the US determine the \$700+ billion Defense Department budget by identifying Russia and China as threats, then there is no way the U.S. will allow 400+ years oppressed people—Blacks—to control space on the ground in these United States.

(Contents of attached WORD file)



Creating a space in the United States where the population consisted of all Black Americans would require mass forced migrations of both Blacks into that space and Whites would be forced to out-migrate. Such an arrangement cannot occur in the United States because it would be both unlawful and unconstitutional. Whereas the United States government has perpetrated many, many atrocious violations of its own constitution in the oppression of Black people and Native Americans, we should agree that forcing White people to move out of Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho—or any set of three or fewer states of the United States will not happen.

If that leaves the alternative of Blacks moving to an area voluntary in order to gain a majority so that political power shifts to Blacks holding the majority, that scenario has already played out a number of times already—not at the state level but in the local jurisdictions—some cities and counties. There is no prohibition against that situation occurring. The United States Government cannot, has not prohibited such circumstances from happening. If there was an announced objective to have majority Black states to come into being, the United States Government can be expected to nullify such attempts through a number of legal and extra-legal measures to be instantly enacted. Beyond that, the U.S. Government probably would not have to act because states would pass their own set of laws to foil the strategy of achieving majority Black population. All they would have to do would be to change the length of legal residency. The states that I know require a residency of six months before voting or running for political office. States like Mississippi with 38 percent Black people already would make their residency requirement 24 months or even five years.

If the proposition turns on voluntary migration by Blacks, we can be sure that voluntary compliance for migration to achieve demographic domination (i.e., majority population) is a non-starter from the get-go.

We are talking about emigration not immigration. If we were talking immigration as in from Caribbean Islands, Great Britain, or the continent of Africa such an initiative might work. But that would require participation by the State Department, a DACA Rule that would pass muster by SCOTUS. . . on an on. If we play the scenario and stipulate three states with the highest percentage of Black people already those states would be Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana. Actually, it would be Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia. Nevertheless, we take Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana because they are contiguous and, fortuitously, New Orleans is one of the top three ports in U.S. Anyway, LA, MS, AL all have Black population share of 38%, 33% and 27%. It would take approximately two million black people to migrate to these three states to achieve a solid majority in each state with each state ending up being at least 55% Black. That's of course without White emigration into Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama.

When you transition from theory to reality of moving that many people you must confront the major questions:

1. Where are they coming from?
2. Since these states are lowly states in terms of employment, health care and education, why would anybody want to go there—White or Black?
3. What jobs are they going to?

The questions are too numerous, but without attempting to answer them the baseline reality is this—even before we get started:

- Black people are not interested in moving anywhere to achieve a majority population.
- For what??

Black people in Cuba? Maybe so. Materially they probably believe they would be better off. And they probably would be. What about Dominica? Yes. I know a few who immigrated here because they went to medical school or got training as a dental assistant and there are only so many dental assistant jobs on an island of 71,000 people. Trinidad & Tobago, ditto. Only so many lawyers needed on that island of 1.3 million people.

Black people—even those on welfare—live better than ninety-something percent of the rest of the world. Black people got their rent forgiven during COVID and got a \$1400 check. And “they living good in they neighborhood.” Why should they move to Mississippi for less EBT (Electronic Benefit Transfers)? Or less unemployment insurance or TANF (Temporary Assistance to Needy Families)? And why would an attorney in Atlanta leave Coca Cola or Delta Airlines, and move to Jackson, Mississippi and take a pay cut of 38%?

If the proposition is Black people voluntarily emigrating to of two or three states in order to give Black people potentially political leverage when their own economic well-being will diminish, the answer is: It ain't gonna happen.

If it's states with a very low number of residents right now such as Idaho, Montana and Wyoming let me just tell you there are less than 12,000 Blacks in either Montana and Wyoming and less than 21,000 in Idaho. Ain't nobody Black tryna go there.

No workable plan which would pivot on voluntary migration of Blacks in the number of millions in order to achieve even only majority Black population in, say three states.

Because . . .

Blacks are not interested in doing that. It would take years to brainwash enough Blacks to want to do so.

Sierra Leone and Liberia exist today because the United States Government did not want to give American Black people any space they could consider theirs—exclusively.

Saturday, July 31, 2021, 2:29 a.m. – B Robinson

Dear Rob,

Once, thank you very much for engaging on this topic. I plan to address your response in two parts—just as you did.

1. Military insecurity of nation formation

First, let's be real. In modern times and prior to the 19th or 20th centuries, most significant wars were determined and prosecuted after a “bank/er” agreed to finance wars. Starting in the 20th century, major wars have been financed by central banks. In other words, if you don't have the funds, then you cannot prosecute a war. If banking and money is involved, then we know that businesspersons must be part of the decision-making equation. Although the public may be sold a “bill of goods” concerning some revenge, justice, or political (defense of democracy) motive, in reality businesspersons and bankers decide that it is good for them to start and end a war. Never forget the role of Joseph Schumpeter's “creative destruction” in all of this. So, in the main, military generals don't start and end wars; businesspersons and bankers do. A related point is that the primary reasons why you raise the specter of Russia or China attacking the US is because you, like most Americans, know these countries as America's chief nemeses. The portrayal of these relationships as such by politicians and in the media, is mainly to keep a nation united on the domestic front. At the same time, you have to know that these nations are doing business all of the time. The US's most recent past president made it clear that he and the leadership of Russia were not at odds. It is also true that US and Chinese leadership are not at odds. Rather, politics and media present these antagonistic relationships in order to keep the home front united (there must be a common enemy). In the meantime, as you know, China was a major US trading partner—despite the recent trade war that occurred between the two countries in the late 20-teens. All of this is a smoke screen to confuse nations' citizenry concerning what is actually going on: Keep the world economy moving around (producing and consuming) so that the rich maintain their positions in the world's power structure. There are no real major enemies in the world today from an economic perspective. But reading the press would not inform one

accordingly. So, we don't have to worry about the US really fearing an attack from outside and, thereby, ensuring against an internal Black state serving as a staging point for such an outside attack.

2. Nation formation through territorial land grabs or as part of Reparations

The information that you cite in the file that was attached to your message is well known. All of the statistic that you cite and more are presented in an August 2019 Strategy Brief on the BlackEconomics.org website entitled, "[More Than A Conqueror: One Black American Strategy](#)." This information is also cited in Chapter 5 of [EXODUS](#)—the book to which you were referred on yesterday. Granted the data are somewhat dated because they are from the 2010 US Census. The fact is that, of the southern three states that you cite, Mississippi is the most promising; it would require the migration of a little less than two million Blacks to generate a Black majority. All of the remaining states that you cite would require a migration of more than three million. BTW, it is important to emphasize again that the strategies that we have proposed have **never** delineated a certain number of states (1, 2, 3, 4...). So, please don't get hung up on some three-state requirement. Also, please remember, as I know you do, the northward migration of Black Americans that began during the 19 teens, which lasted until about the 1980s. Millions of Blacks migrated from primarily southern rural areas to norther urban areas. Also, don't forget that starting after about the mid-1980s (following the oil embargo of the 1970s, which resulted in the Midwest Rust Belt), Blacks began an important reverse migration to the south and southwest, where industries continue to grow even today. So, let's be clear, Black people will migrate to opportunities. In the previously referenced Strategy Brief, we discuss migrating to one territory (state) at a time and then reassessing conditions. Why and Who could/should migrate? Yes, Black Americans could/should migrate to selected territories (states—and we lay out a logical and elaborate process for deciding on which territories (states) to migrate to in Chapter 5 of EXODUS) to capture the many benefits already mentioned in our message on yesterday (as noted, there are more benefits than those listed). The many benefits are too great and favorable to ignore—economic, social, cultural. Keep in mind that the states to which we referred in the Strategy Brief and in EXODUS require one-million or less to achieve a Black majority. Also, because they are US states those Blacks who are receiving government transfers in the form of economic and social benefits will not have to worry concerning a reduction in those benefits when they migrate. We highlight in the Strategy Brief and in EXODUS that the persons who could/should migrate could/should be those who are elderly or young who are unemployed or underemployed—migrate as a sacrifice for this nation of 45 million Black people. We point out that one million is a small number and that if a few hundreds or thousands lead the way and find the outcome to be favorable, then others will follow—just as in the two previous important Black migrations. The new territory could/would represent a new environment, a chance for a new start. In our opinion, this represents an opportunity for young Blacks who may find themselves unemployed or under employed. Jobs would/should not be an issue. With a larger population, the territories would grow automatically—population growth being a very important factor in economic growth. Besides and as already stated, if those who migrate were receiving government transfers, then those transfers would continue, meaning that there would/should be no major resource constraints. Another factor that will not be discussed in any detail is that migration may occur to avoid the perils of global warming. In addition, in the back of our minds was the idea that (again) major and minor Black church denominations could pick up this idea

and, through collaboration and coordination, recommend that some of their memberships (those unemployed or underemployed) relocate to the selected territory (state). Once one state territory is captured, then consideration could/should be given to moving on to capturing another territory. This is all voluntary and would involve no forced migration. Obviously, at least initially, Whites would remain part of the population. However, our assumption was that, as we poured in, Whites would depart. And even if they don't, then the territory would remain predominantly Black—Black controlled. Therefore, given the many prospective benefits (the economic, social, and cultural opportunities), in our opinion, there is no doubt that Black Americans could be inspired to migrate to a new territory. This all concerns voluntary migration.

If the US Government, on the other hand, opened Federally-owned lands to Black Americans (much as was done for the Northwest Territories under the Homestead Act of 1862) as part of Reparations, and offered to also provide materiel and other support for development, then I believe that there is no doubt that Black Americans who are not deeply invested in their current locations would certainly accept the opportunity. All that was mentioned above—or most of it—would apply in this case as well. As you know, large tracts of Federally-owned land are in the states that we discuss in Chapter 5 of EXODUS.

Importantly, both of these proposals/suggestions/ideas concern the future and will mainly involve action by those in younger generations—not our peers. Under appropriate circumstances, even I will consider moving to a state that is sparsely populated by White Americans.

Again, I urge you to read EXODUS. It will be a fast read given your familiarity with the topic and the statistics.

I await further comments from your side.

Once again, thank you very much for this exchange.

Sincerely,

Brooks

Thursday, August 5, 2021, 3:03 a.m. – B Robinson

Dear Rob,

Following up, do you have more comments as part of our dialogue?

I am inclined to clean up already contributed exchanges, add any additional comments, and compile (prepare) a “Dialogue on Nation Formation” for the BE.org website. I would provide it to you for your review before posting.

What are your thoughts about this?

Thanks!!!

Sincerely,

Brooks

Friday, August 6, 2021, 7:49 p.m. – “Rob” Robinson

Brooks,

1. History of less than successful offshore attempts to settle Black nation in Sierra Leone and Liberia and then Marcus Garvey. Yeah. History argues against the notion.
2. Domestically, Tulsa was preceded by the Trail of Tears as representative of Native resettlement gone tragically wrong and then the 200-year aftermath has been devastating. Finally, Japanese interment resulted in Reparations—maybe that's the model.

In a dialogue I would introduce these ideas. But no need to expand our previous point-counterpoint if that interferes with getting on with completing the dialogue.

However, there is no way to treat the topic without touching on why they won't come in even greater detail.

[Black household income is rising across the United States \(brookings.edu\)](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/black-household-income-is-rising-across-the-united-states/2021/08/06/)

This article shows Washington, D.C. leading at a median Black income of \$70,000+. But have you been to Jackson, MS? One hundred sixty-something thousand people and the median just south of \$40K. Jackson right at 80% Black. North of the city is where all the Whites moved out of Jackson to the suburbs. The population in the city is down from like, 180K to the 160+K in the last two decades. At \$40K and up them Black people ain't no more 'bout to move than the bruh's in Columbia, Maryland (Montgomery County), or in PG County—or DC proper. Black people and White people move for a job, not for hope.

We have every reason to believe there is no chance that Black people will of their own volition pursue nirvana—or a separate homeland inside these United States.

Looking forward to your final.

Rob

Friday, August 6, 2021, 8:21 p.m. – B Robinson

Dear Rob,

Thank you very much for the responding message.

Granted, past history has not served as a good predictor of nation formation success. But let us not forget the Black Christian tradition that says that we are “like the Children of Israel, who served under a hard task master in Egypt for 430 years, and then found their God, who made it possible through Moses to exit Egypt to Canaan.” Unfortunately, Black preachers preach about all aspects of that story, except about Black people (Israel) actually making it to the promised land. They abort the story at the point of “Pharaoh’s Army Drowning.” If they do take up the story beyond the point of entering Canaan, it is about the hard-headedness of the Israelites, which caused the 40 years of wandering, or they preach about the many battles that Israel had to fight against those who were already occupying the territory.

On the comfortable nature of many Black Americans, consider the excerpt from the 2015 [A Third Freedom](#) below:

descendants.²⁰ No doubt it is true that the average (median)

²⁰ Michael Fletcher (2014), “White People Have 13 Dollars for Every Dollar Held by Black Americans,” *The Washington Post*, December

29

income of the top 60% of African descendant households have income that constitutes about 90% of the median European American household’s income.²¹ The problem is

So, we concur on this issue, almost two-thirds of Black Americans are satisfied. However, that leaves a third who are dissatisfied and who might be willing to pursue greener pastures. Also, wealthy Black Americans who may attempt to straddle the fence may favor Nation Formation; i.e., those who are in business and see considerable business opportunities in a Black American state of some form—especially if they can also retain their business operations in the US proper.

Also, as we have noted multiple times, economic growth is part and parcel of the Nation Formation concept. Therefore, when operationalized properly, access to jobs should not be a problem in a predominantly Black state or nation state.

I plan to move forward with consolidating our dialogue in the near term.

Have a GREAT weekend!!!

Sincerely,

Brooks

Thus ended our nearly two-week dialogue on the pros and cons of Black American Nation Formation.

Now we invite you to write to us by email (BlackEconomics@BlackEconomics.org) concerning your own views about the pros and cons of Black American Nation Formation. Our plans are to append your comments to this dialogue and create an ongoing dialogue on this topic.

Thank you very much!

**B Robinson
08/27/21**

Your Views Will Be Appended Here in Chronological Order