Written by **Staff** on May 20, 2019
Published in the May 20, 2019 issue of the New American magazine. Vol. 35, No. 10

Inside Track

Some Mixed-race South Africans Believe Apartheid Was Better Than Now

RapidEye/iStock/GettyImagesPlus

When the term “rainbow nation” was coined by Archbishop Desmond Tutu after South Africa’s first fully democratic national election in 1994, it was hoped that South Africa would move on from its past and become a nation where all races, ethnicities, and creeds would have a say in how the nation was run. Twenty-five years later, it hasn’t worked out that way.

“It’s all about the blacks. The rainbow nation is a big lie,” Dalene Raiters, a South African mother who is not white, told the *Daily Mail* April 25. Raiters is one of South Africa’s mixed-race people, known as “coloured.”

“We are not part of this country. We were marginalized during the apartheid and even now,” said Raiters, who lives with nine others in a tiny one-bedroom house with a hut in the backyard in Eldorado Park — a majority coloured suburb of Johannesburg.

Her sister, who also lives in the house, described the situation. “We are not black enough,” said Elizabeth Raiters. “Our people live like mushrooms. Four generations under the same roof.”

In 1994, when the African National Congress (ANC) came to power, the various non-white races felt that their time had come, and that the ANC would finally look out for their interests. According to Keith Duarte, who also resides in Eldorado Park, that hasn’t been the case: “We all felt that the ANC would represent us, would be inclusive. It was the biggest mistake ever.… We need to be treated equally.”

“The blacks have all the opportunities,” said Janice Jacobs, a 49-year-old pastor’s wife. “We were much more comfortable during the apartheid. They would provide us with a school pack with all the stationery. We had nurses in the schools. There was order and discipline. If you set a place alight, you would end up in jail,” Jacobs remembered.

“The apartheid government used to look after education, health, housing. [This] government does not look after us. I prefer apartheid.”

Written by Staff on May 20, 2019
Published in the May 20, 2019 issue of the New American magazine. Vol. 35, No. 10

By James Murphy

Trump Announces U.S. Withdrawal From UN Arms Trade Treaty

AP Images

During his April 26 speech to the NRA-ILA Leadership Forum at Lucas Oil Stadium in Indianapolis, President Donald Trump revealed that he will end the participation of the United States in the United Nations' Arms Trade Treaty (ATT).

"Today, I'm proud to announce another historic step to protect your Second Amendment rights," the president told those gathered to discuss the future of the right to keep and bear arms.

Then, after telling the audience that he had not informed the NRA-ILA leadership in advance that he intended to make this praiseworthy parting of ways with the UN, President Trump spelled out his motivation for abandoning the ATT:

So, in the last administration, President Obama signed the UN Arms Trade Treaty. And in his waning days in office, he sent the treaty to the Senate to begin the ratification proc-ess....

I am officially announcing today that the United States will be revoking the effect of America's signature from this badly misguided agreement. We're taking our signature back. The United Nations will soon receive a formal notice that America is rejecting this treaty.

As part of this decision, I will sign right now, in front of a lot of witnesses — a lot — it's a lot of witnesses — a message asking the Senate to discontinue the treaty ratification process and to return the now-rejected treaty right back to me, in the Oval Office, where I will dispose of it.

Americans determined to defend their right to keep and bear arms should pay close attention to the news, hoping to hear that the president has taken the necessary steps to fulfill his promise and to withdraw completely and permanently from the United Nations' Arms Trade Treaty and from any and all agreements that would infringe on the rights protected by the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

By Joe Wolverton, II, J.D.

New American

Written by Staff on May 20, 2019

Published in the May 20, 2019 issue of the New American magazine. Vol. 35, No. 10

Economy Trips Up Forecasters Again, Grows at 3.2 Percent

honglouwawaviaiStock/GettyImagesPlus

As recently as March, many economic forecasters were saying that the U.S. economy for all intents and purposes had stalled in the first quarter of 2019. At the time, the consensus of Blue Chip economists was first-quarter growth of 1.5 percent, while economists polled by MarketWatch were slightly more optimistic, at 2.3 percent.

However, the U.S. economy astonished them all. According to the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), the U.S. economy grew at an annualized rate of 3.2 percent in the first quarter of 2019. The BEA noted in its April 26 report that the economy continues to fire on all cylinders: "The increase in real (inflation-adjusted) GDP in the first quarter reflected positive contributions from personal consumption expenditures, private inventory investment, exports, state and local government spending, and non-residential fixed investment."

As a bonus, the BEA also reported, inflation remained tame, with price increases coming in at 1.3 percent on an annualized basis. Also noted was the fact that the government shutdown took 0.3 percent growth out of the economy in the first quarter. In other words, the economy is even stronger than the BEA reported.

In addition to the Blue Chip consensus coming in at *half* of what the BEA reported, the Atlanta Federal Reserve's "nowcast" of the economy, which estimated first-quarter growth at just 0.3 percent in early March, tried to play catch-up ball as new numbers started coming in. Nevertheless, the Atlanta Fed's GDPNow estimate for the first quarter of 2019 still missed the mark, coming in at 2.7 percent.

The consumer, responsible for much of GDP, is happy. According to the University of Michigan, consumer sentiment remains at record levels, while consumer long-term financial outlook has reached its highest level since 2004 — 15 years ago.

As the economic expansion enters its 10th year — also a record — the economists tracking its rebound are still lagging behind. Just as the economy appears to be getting its second wind, economic forecasters are huffing and puffing just trying to keep up.

By Bob Adelmann

Written by **Staff** on May 20, 2019
Published in the May 20, 2019 issue of the New American magazine. Vol. 35, No. 10

San Francisco's Housing and Homeless Crises at "Boiling Point"

San Francisco is a city of contrasts. It boasts glorious views of the Golden Gate Bridge and the Pacific Ocean, and it also offers the stench and disgusting sight of piles of human feces on its sidewalks. It is a place filled with great wealth and striking poverty, with tech billionaires and Silicon Valley companies existing alongside an aggressive panhandling homeless population. While a city full of investors waits nervously on a new wave of initial public offerings (IPOs), drug users shoot up in the streets for anyone — be it tourists, businessmen, or schoolchildren — to see.

It is a place where the middle class is disappearing because housing prices have risen so high that average citizens simply cannot afford to live there. "We're definitely at the boiling point, whether it's the housing crisis, whether it's the quality of life, which is exacerbated by the worst traffic congestion in America, or the affordability crisis," said City Supervisor Aaron Peskin on April 22.

San Francisco-based companies Pinterest and Lyft recently went public, and Uber and Slack, also headquartered in the city, are expected to announce IPOs soon. Those IPOs will likely create dozens of new tech millionaires, and the worry is that those newly wealthy will scoop up all the available housing in the city.

According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, a family of four with an income of $117,000 per year is considered low income in the Bay Area counties of Marin, San Mateo, and San Francisco. In San Francisco and San Mateo Counties, the California Association of Realtors estimates that prospective buyers would need a yearly income of $350,000 in order to buy a home.

Recently, a home that was listed as "Beyond FIXER, home is CONDEMNED, enter at your own RISK," in the East Bay community of Fremont fetched a price of $1.23 million, well over its asking price of $1 million.

Soon, you'll have to be a millionaire to even live in San Francisco, and a multi-millionaire if you wish to thrive in the city.

By James Murphy