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Open season on black boys after a verdict like this

by Gary Younge

*Calls for calm after George Zimmerman was acquitted of murdering Trayvon Martin are empty words for black families.*

Gary, why should calls for calm even be necessary in a Democratic Republic governed by the rule of law?

That shows that America still has a long way to go before it actually achieves the modern society, that many claim it is.

*Let it be noted that on this day, Saturday 13 July 2013, it was still deemed legal in the US to chase and then shoot dead an unarmed young black man on his way home from the store because you didn’t like the look of him.*

Gary, we all know that Zimmerman didn't like the look of Martin. That is not in dispute. But he didn't shoot him dead when he saw someone he didn't like. He shot him dead while Martin was bashing his head on the pavement.

Gary, that is also ... not in dispute.

*The killing of 17-year-old Trayvon Martin last year was tragic. But in the age of Obama the acquittal of George Zimmerman offers at least that clarity. For the salient facts in this case were not in dispute.*

Gary, judging by your conclusion as to why Martin was killed, because Zimmerman didn't like the way Martin looked, the salient facts are still in dispute ... inside your head.

*On 26 February 2012 Martin was on his way home, minding his own business*

Gary, how do you know he was minding his own business? Were you there? Do you have secret sources that none of the rest of us are privy to?

You have no way to support that assertion. You are merely stating what you want to be true.

*armed only with a can of iced tea and a bag of Skittles.*

Gary, he wasn't armed with a can of iced tea and a bag of Skittles; he was carrying them. You phrased it that way in a deliberate attempt to manipulate your audience. It's obvious that you are very biased. What's just as obvious, is that you make no effort to conceal that bias. Isn't that the opposite of what they taught you in journalism classes?

*Zimmerman pursued him, armed with a 9mm handgun, believing him to be a criminal. Martin resisted.*

Gary, right there - see what you did?

You skipped from "Zimmerman pursued him" to "Martin resisted."

Did Martin resist being pursued? No. That doesn't make sense.

Then what did Martin resist?

The way you wrote it, Zimmerman pursued Martin and then Martin resisted being attacked. Yet there was no evidence to indicate, that that is what happened. That is only what you want your readers to believe happened. You are assuming facts, not in evidence.

*They fought. Zimmerman shot him dead.*

Gary, you just skipped from "they fought" to Martin's dead. How convenient that you ignored all the photographic evidence showing the injuries to the back of Zimmerman's head and on his face.

This is no different than debating a Creationist. They too ignore all evidence that weighs against their position, and only present a biased, one-sided view.

*Who screamed. Who was stronger. Who called whom what and when and why, are all details to warm the heart of a cable news producer with 24 hours to fill. Strip them all away and the truth remains that Martin’s heart would still be beating if Zimmerman had not chased him down and shot him.*

Gary, you just listed only one reason that Martin's heart would still be beating. There are many things both men could have done differently which would have resulted in Martin's heart still beating.

And you employed your infamous "skip the details" technique again. The way you wrote it, Zimmerman ran down Martin and killed him; once again leaving out the part where Zimmerman was getting his head bashed in.

Gary, Martin's family could not have written a more biased essay than this one.

*There is no doubt about who the aggressor was here.*

Gary, it would have been more honest to say that, *in your opinion* there was no doubt about whom the aggressor was.

But then why start being honest now when you are doing such a good job of pimping for Martin.

*The only reason the two interacted at all, physically or otherwise, is that Zimmerman believed it was his civic duty to apprehend an innocent teenager*

Gary, apprehend an innocent teenager for what? Obviously, you can't apprehend an innocent teenager because you would have no grounds to do so, and would be liable for a lawsuit. So that assertion fell flat on its face.

*who caused suspicion by his existence alone.*

Gary, what was it about Martin's existence that caused Zimmerman to become suspicious? His race? If that was the only criteria, then what about all the other blacks in the neighborhood? Did he chase any of them? Why not?

But that's what you are trying to persuade your readers to believe, isn't it? But your position makes no sense. There is no evidence that Zimmerman was chasing black people around the neighborhood.

Zimmerman stated why he was suspicious. He even notified dispatchers of his suspicions. Clearly, out of all the black people in the neighborhood, it was Martin's actions that aroused Zimmerman's suspicions.

*Appeals for calm in the wake of such a verdict raise the question of what calm there can possibly be in a place where such a verdict is possible.*

Gary, if you don't believe peace is possible after a verdict goes against your side, then you fit the definition of an Anarchist.

Hang on Gary, and I'll find some email addresses for you where you can contact like-minded folk and maybe you can set up some militia training exercises out in the woods.

*Parents of black boys are not likely to feel calm.*

Gary, why single out black parents? Are you claiming they are more prone to violence? Are you claiming that when things don't go the way they want, that they will resort to destroying property and hurting people? Or are you just projecting your own feelings?

*Partners of black men are not likely to feel calm. Children with black fathers are not likely to feel calm.*

Gary, this essay proves that you are the one who doesn't seem to be very calm. This essay borders on an incitement to riot. That's probably why your newspaper had it removed.

*Those who now fear violent social disorder*

Gary, this essay proves that you, not only don't fear it, but don't mind provoking violent social disorder when things don't go the way you want them to.

*must ask themselves whose interests are served by a violent social order in which young black men can be thus slain and discarded.*

Gary, what do you mean by "thus" slain? You're trying to manipulate the audience again, aren't you?

And Gary, how was Martin "discarded?"

Is that your term for describing the fact that the entire jury did not agree with you? So they "discarded" him?

*But while the acquittal was shameful it was not a shock.*

Gary, this essay proves that it was. No, I didn't mean shameful; I meant a shock.

*It took more than six weeks after Martin’s death for Zimmerman to be arrested*

Gary, I prefer that law enforcement take the time necessary to do their job diligently rather than bow to pressure from idiots like you to rush to judgment.

*and only then after massive pressure both nationally and locally.*

Gary, thanks for admitting that the case, likely would not have even gone to trial if not for the pressure of special interest groups pressuring investigators.

The verdict exonerated those investigators, and slapped the faces of the special interest groups who used political pressure (that you just admitted to) to force investigators to change their initial conclusion. A conclusion that proved to be correct.

*Those who dismissed this as a political trial (a peculiar accusation in the summer of Bradley Manning and Edward Snowden)*

False analogy, Gary. Those cases couldn't be any more different than Zimmerman-Martin.

*should bear in mind that it was politics that made this case controversial.*

Gary, you already admitted that. It was a typical criminal investigation until special interest groups got involved.

*Charging Zimmerman should have been a no-brainer.*

Well Gary, you'll have to forgive me for having more confidence in trained police detectives than in a know-it-all writer with a history of black activism.

*He was not initially charged because Florida has a “stand your ground” law whereby deadly force is permitted if the person “reasonably believes” it is necessary to protect their own life, the life of another or to prevent a forcible felony.*

See Gary, you *do* know why there was a delay in arresting Zimmerman. So what was the point of complaining earlier about the delay in arresting Zimmerman?

*Since it was Zimmerman who stalked Martin,*

Gary, you purposely used the word "stalked" to invoke, in readers, the picture of a weird person who hunts innocent victims. Neighborhood Watch volunteers do not deserve to be called stalkers. But when you are trying to manipulate an audience, stalker is just the right word, isn't it?

*the question remains: what ground is a young black man entitled to and on what grounds may he defend himself?*

Gary, defend himself from what? Do you have evidence not available to the court?

*What version of events is there for that night in which Martin gets away with his life?*

Gary, there are many. One that comes to mind is for Martin to have simply talked to the Neighborhood Watch volunteer. You know what might have happened? The two may have ended up friends.

You laugh, because that thought runs contrary to what you want your readers to believe. But in reality, that could very well have happened. And even if not friends, after a brief chat, they would have both likely gone their separate ways, and when passing each other in the future, maybe waved, or at least acknowledged one another.

*Or is it open season on black boys after dark?*

Gary, now that your side has lost the case, you think people are going to go out and hunt "black boys" after dark? What makes you think people *want* to go out and kill black boys after dark? Is that your opinion of white and Hispanic people and what they want?

*Zimmerman’s not guilty verdict will be contested for years to come.*

Gary, no it won't. The trial is over and your side lost.

You sound like the Republicans after their humiliation in the 2012 election.

*But he passed judgement on Trayvon that night summarily. “Fucking punks,” Zimmerman told the police dispatcher that night. “These assholes. They always get away.”*

Gary, thanks for providing even more proof that you are only going to present one side in this biased, piece of crap, essay. Martin made a lot of racist statements too, as admitted in court. Where are those quotes, Gary? Did I miss them?

Give me a minute Gary, and let me go back over your essay. Nope. Still don't see them.

Gee, I wonder why?

You quoted Zimmerman as saying "fucking punks" and "these assholes." Either of those insults could have referred to an Asian, Hispanic, Black, or Caucasian person; so those words cannot be considered racist.

However, according to Martin's girlfriend, Martin referred to Zimmerman as "a creepy-ass cracker." That does not refer to an Asian, Hispanic, or Black person. That is an insult directed specifically at white people.

So you ignored an obvious racial slur while simultaneously attempting to convert general insults into racist slurs.

Gary, you are a dishonest piece of shit. That insult applies generally to a person of any race, but in this context, I'm directing it specifically at you.

*So true it’s painful. And so predictable it hurts.*

Gary, nothing I said will have any effect on you. We both already know that. But people need to learn how to evaluate biased, one-sided crap when they see it.

The Guardian pulled your essay. But they wouldn't have been put in that position to begin with, if you had only learned to control your own biased feelings.

As long as horrible journalists like you, continue to be given a pulpit where you can influence people, our nation will continue to be divided. It's hard enough to unite Americans without scum like you; but it's nearly impossible ... with scum like you.

It's depressing to realize that you actually get paid for the crap you write.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

THE SCIENCE SEGMENT

Modern humans did not settle in Asia before the devastating eruption of Sumatra’s Mt. Toba 74,000 years ago

When did modern humans settle in Asia and what route did they take from mankind’s African homeland? New research refutes a recent theory, that there is archaeological evidence for the presence of modern humans in southern Asia before the super-eruption of the Mount Toba volcano in Sumatra.

One of the most catastrophic events since humans evolved, it happened approximately 74,000 years ago. A team of archaeologists excavating in India claimed to have found evidence that modern humans were there before the eruption – possibly as early as 120,000 years ago, much earlier than Europe or the Near East were colonized. These findings were based on the discovery of stone tools below a layer of Toba ash.

Now researchers have published a rebuttal of this theory. In doing so, they have been able to draw on a much greater body of DNA evidence than was previously available. By using the mitochondrial DNA of today’s populations and working backwards, and by drawing on a wide variety of other evidence and research, researchers were able to make much more precise estimates for the arrival of modern humans in India.

The evidence suggests dispersal from Africa and settlement in India no earlier than 60,000 years ago.

Close archaeological similarities between African and Indian stone-tool technologies after 70,000 years ago, as well as features such as beads and engravings, suggest that the slightly later Indian material had an African source.

There were people in India before the Toba eruption, because there are stone tools there, but they could have been Neandertals – or some other pre-modern population.

The replacement of the presumably archaic humans living previously in South Asia by modern people with these new technologies appears analogous to the replacement of Neandertals by modern humans in Europe and western Asia 50-40,000 years ago.”
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FAMOUS QUOTES

JON STEWART (No biography - previously quoted)

"I have to say, as someone who is not a Christian,"

it's hard for me to believe Christians are a persecuted people in America.

God-willing, maybe one of you one day will even rise up and get to be president of this country - or maybe forty-four in a row.

But my point is, they've taken this idea of no establishment as persecution,

because they feel entitled, not to equal status, but to greater status."