DETROIT NATIVE SUN
Enlightening the Community

We are already paying for the AI boom

By Ben Jealous
Source: Black Press USA Wire

Some states made data centers pay for themselves. Others handed the bill to you. Virginia settled this question in 1882.

Pull up your electric bill. Somewhere in that number, you are paying for a building you will never enter. Data centers are going up everywhere. They need enormous amounts of electricity. Somebody must pay to connect them and build the plants and lines they need.

Not everywhere. Texas requires the largest new power users to pay more of their connection costs and cut demand when the grid is strained. The data centers came anyway.

Ohio now makes large new customers pay for much of the electricity they reserve, whether they use it or not. Projections for new demand then fell sharply. Much of the emergency was companies holding space they might never fill.

Virginia chose differently. It gives data centers a tax break on their equipment. Good Jobs First estimates that subsidy cost Virginia schools $267 million in one year.

Illinois lawmakers let a similar bill die without a vote.

Neither list sorts cleanly by party. Before you file this as a new problem, meet my great-great-grandfather. Edward David Bland was born into slavery in Dinwiddie County, Virginia, in 1848. Thirty-one years later, he was helping write that state's laws.

He served three terms in the House of Delegates and sat on the Committee on Schools and Colleges. That was not a coincidence. That was the point.

Virginia was fighting over debt borrowed before the Civil War for canals and railroads. With interest, it had passed $45 million.

One side said pay every penny, whatever it took. They were called the Funders.

Virginia was starving its public schools to pay bondholders. The bondholders lived in New York and London. The children lived in Petersburg and Danville. The other side said the debt would be paid, but not out of the schoolhouse. They were the Readjusters. Black and white together. Farmers, freedmen, and a former Confederate general named William Mahone.

A man born into slavery and a man who wore gray were counting the same votes on one floor. They ran Virginia for four years. In 1882, they cut the state's share of the debt by roughly a third and refinanced the rest over 50 years.

Then they spent the difference. They put money back into public schools. They funded schools with Black teachers. They repealed the poll tax. They tore down the whipping post.

The Readjusters knew something we forgot. Whoever profits should not get to send the bill to whoever cannot say no. I am not against data centers. This country cannot afford to fall behind in artificial intelligence, and the reasons are not all about money.

I am against making working families subsidize the world's richest companies.

It does not always take a governor. A small town in Illinois capped a data center's water use, imposing penalties if it exceeded the cap. A town council did that. Now let me tell you how the Readjusters lost. That is the part we forget.

They were not beaten on the debt. They won that argument. In October 1883, their opponents warned that Black residents of Danville had gained too much power. On November 3, market day, a street fight became a shooting. Five men died. Four were Black.

For three days, armed white men walked the streets and kept Black Virginians from the polls. The election came that week. Democrats took both houses.

They never took the schools back. The new legislature left the school money alone. It left the whipping post gone. It left the debt settled. They did not undo the policy. They undid the voters.

In 1902, a new state constitution stripped most Black Virginians of the ballot for more than 60 years. They were not defeated by a better plan. They were defeated by a campaign that made white farmers fear Black farmers more than the men taking money from both.

It is the cheapest trick in American politics, and it has never once been out of stock. The people paying for these deals live in Loudoun County and Memphis, in white towns in Iowa and Black neighborhoods in Atlanta, in union halls and farmhouses.

They are already paying the same bill. They just have not been asked to fight it together. Somebody will work hard to make sure they never do.

My great-great-grandfather learned his letters at a night school for freedmen after the war. He was 17. Then he sat on the committee that funded schools so other children would not wait.

He knew exactly what a school was worth. Go find out what your state did.

Then find out who let it happen.

Ben Jealous is a professor of practice at the University of Pennsylvania and former president and CEO of the NAACP.

COMMENTARY: LSMFT! Lord Save Me from Trump

By W. Frank Wilson
Source: Black Press USA Wire

Frankly Speaking

Wow! Wow! Wow! The swamp drainers have truly stepped down to new levels of stupidity. You remember Weapons of Mass Destruction? We now have Weapons of Mass Distraction. Trump has introduced Dumbocrats and Communists into the conversation about Democrats and Democracy.

Trump lies so much, and his current strategy is to set up doubt about midterm elections because he and Republicans have no agenda!

He has no "Trump " card, but Iran has a strait! He called it a skirmish; it's now a War. He said five days; now it's five months. He said few casualties; now it's 18 deaths. He knew nothing about Project 2025 but hired its architects! Trump lies about the lies and often forgets these little inventions called cameras and phones

We see and hear and then see and hear the inconsistencies. I didn't like 45 and dislike 47 even more!

Originally published by Black Press USA Wire — https://thewestsidegazette.com/lsmft-lord-save-me-from-trump-2/

If you don't count it, you don't have to fix it.

By Julianne Malveaux

(Trice Edney Wire) – The Trump administration is not eliminating workplace discrimination. It is eliminating the receipts.

On July 23, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) proposed abolishing the EEO-1 report and five related workforce reports. For nearly sixty years, EEO-1 has required large private employers to report the race, ethnicity, and sex of their employees across major occupational categories. The information helps us see who gets hired, who advances, who remains clustered at the bottom, and who never gets through the door. Now the federal government proposes to stop collecting it.

This is far more than bureaucratic housekeeping. It is the deliberate destruction of evidence. Without data, disparities cannot be adequately documented; without documentation, discrimination becomes more difficult to prove. An administration already committed to declaring our nation colorblind will then be free to point to the absence of evidence—an absence it created—as evidence that inequality no longer exists.

First they deny inequality. Then they destroy the evidence. Finally, they declare the problem solved.

The EEO-1 report has been collected since 1966, just two years after the passage of the Civil Rights Act. Private employers with at least 100 workers, along with certain federal contractors with at least 50, have been required to provide workforce demographic information. Approximately 110,000 employers are covered. While that is less than 2 percent of the nation's nearly 6 million employer firms, these are among our largest employers and collectively employ a substantial share of the American workforce.

The proposed rule goes beyond private employers. It would also eliminate reports covering unions, state and local governments, public school systems, apprenticeship programs and institutions of higher education, as well as some of the recordkeeping requirements associated with those reports. The administration is not simply turning off the camera; it is also proposing to throw away the film.

The EEOC contends that these reports are burdensome, of limited usefulness and potentially unconstitutional because they classify workers by race and sex. That reasoning turns civil-rights enforcement on its head. In the twisted logic of this political moment, counting racial inequality is treated as a form of racial discrimination, while actual discrimination is rendered invisible.

Collecting information about race is not the same as discriminating by race. A thermometer does not cause a fever, nor does a scale cause weight gain. Data do not create inequality; they reveal it. Without data, claims of equal opportunity are little more than corporate advertising.

The EEOC estimates that eliminating the reporting requirements would save employers and the federal government about $278 million annually, including approximately $273 million for private employers. That sounds like a large amount until it is compared with the economic cost of workplace discrimination. Wage disparities, occupational segregation, biased hiring and blocked promotions cost workers—and the economy—far more than employers spend completing a report.

Furthermore, businesses already collect much of this information through their payroll and human-resources systems. The real burden may not be gathering the numbers but being held accountable for what those numbers reveal.

EEO-1 data are hardly perfect. The report does not tell us everything about pay, promotions, discrimination or workplace culture; it offers a snapshot rather than a full biography. Still, snapshots matter. They can reveal whether Black women are concentrated in administrative and support positions while white men dominate senior management. They can expose the distance between a company's carefully worded commitment to diversity and its actual employment practices.

Such patterns do not prove every individual allegation of discrimination, but they tell investigators where to look. They allow employers to identify problems before those problems become lawsuits, while giving researchers and policymakers a way to measure progress—or the lack of it. Eliminating the data will not make workplaces more equal; it will simply make inequality easier to conceal.

This attack on EEO-1 reporting is part of a broader war on facts. The Trump administration has attacked diversity, equity and inclusion programs, weakened federal contracting protections and attempted to purge race-conscious analysis from government. It apparently wants a nation in which racial inequality may be experienced but not measured, described but not documented, protested but not proved.

Black workers know better, and so do women who continue to encounter occupational segregation and unequal opportunity. We know that fairness cannot be measured by a corporate slogan or a glossy photograph featuring a carefully assembled rainbow of employees. It must be measured by who is hired, what they earn, where they work, whether they advance and who holds power.

Data are instruments of democratic accountability because they allow ordinary people to compare promises with performance. That is precisely why those who resist accountability want the numbers buried. The proposed elimination of EEO-1 reporting is not colorblindness but willful blindness—a declaration that the federal government would prefer not to know what is happening inside American workplaces.

Inequality does not disappear when government closes its eyes. When the people charged with enforcing equal opportunity stop collecting the evidence, they are not being neutral. They are choosing concealment over accountability and darkness over the illumination that data provide.

Dr. Julianne Malveaux is a DC-based economist and author.