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Abstract

Fifty years ago Dr. DuBois, on the urgings of the U.S. Federal government, participated in several cultural and scholarly conferences in Haiti where he gave a series of four speeches on the topic of colonies and peace. In a speech entitled Colonialism, Democracy, and Peace After the War, given in the summer of 1944, DuBois extended the definition of colonialism to include those nations, or groups of people, who would have most, if not all of the structural features of classical colonialism, but because of special circumstances, could not be defined as colonies in the 'pure' sense of the term as it was understood and used then. DuBois would use the term semi-colonialism, i.e., semi-colonies to describe this 'special relationship.'

In this speech, DuBois would include the African American people. In doing so, DuBois would repeat a charge that had been previously made by Gov. Arnall of Georgia, who described the structural relationship between African and Euroamericans as a colonial arrangement.

It would be another eighteen years before the 'internal colonialism' paradigm would appear in another scholarly work to describe the African American experience. This time Dr. Harold Cruse would make the reference in an article entitled, "Revolutionary Nationlism and the Afro-American."
Throughout the late 1960s and early 1970s many African Americans and other American scholars would use this paradigm to explain the African American 'condition;' (J.H. O'Dell, Robert Staples, Robert Blauner, William K. Tabb, Tom Hayden, C.J. Munford, James Turner). But in the 1980s, with the exception of Dr. Robert Allen's book, *Black Awakening in Capitalist America*, this model would 'disappear' from the scholarly scene without being fully developed or its interpretative potential being fully exploited.

During its academic 'heyday' this hermeneutical paradigm would be utilized to explain various aspects of the African American 'condition.' While it was widely used by many scholars, it was narrowly applied. Most, if not all, of the early domestic colonial theorists concentrated on the limited structural aspects of the model and, therefore, over simplified its paradigmatic appropriateness to the detriment of African American emancipation.

I will extend the limited works of early 'internal colonialist' theorists and, by utilizing the classical colonialism analogy methodology, will seek to establish and prove that there are other endemic areas of correlation between African Americans and other colonized people; thereby, justifying the use of this model and the claim that African Americans are a colonized people.

My thesis is a simple one. If African Americans are colonized, then one should find a correlation between 'classical' colonial theory and the African American condition. I will expect to find corollaries between the African
American condition and other colonial situations such as segregated housing, language discrimination, the use of the military/police as dehumanizers, intimidators; structural racism as a component of the social makeup, socioeconomics as a negative determinate of African American psychology, the rise of African American nationalism, etc.

If I find evidence of these and other corollaries, then I will attempt to develop a strategy of decolonization applicable to our 'condition' within the context of the American liberal democratic colonial society. Thus, the title of my dissertation, Decolonization, Democracy and African American Liberation: A Call for Nationalist Politics.
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Preface

This work is polemical, assertive, philosophical and argumentative. It is a call to 'arms without being chauvinistic;' it is racial without being racist; and, informative, without being weighed down by data. It tends to be sermonizing, absolutist, essentialist, wishful, and evangelical. While I admit to these anticipated charges, I must, and I have, formed a defense. My defense is simple. It is my position that the African American people are a colonized nation and, up to the date of this writing, they have not consistently addressed this very visible fact of life. Until they do, I fear that they will continue to be exploited, oppressed, decimated and, eventually, their contributions to the evolution of humanity may become lost again in the annuals of history.

Thus, I find myself agreeing with the words of Marable Manning (1983) who said, "My judgments in certain circumstances may appear to some too harsh, too extreme, too utopian, too subjective. Very well. The times we live in call for harsh measures, both behind the cloistered towers of the university and in the streets" (Manning, Preface). I, like other intellectuals who have made a commitment to the liberation of African people all over the world, have consciously decided to forego the road of comfort and accommodation. I have decided to speak with a clear and unequivocating voice on the problems confronting African people, since these problems are also my own.
Presently, the African American nation is plagued with all of the problems confronting any colonized people. They are plagued with needless economic underdevelopment, disease, miseducation, political impotency, deculturation, and various forms of individual and social psychological disorders; caused in part by the imperatives of colonial imperialism and structural racism. African Americans are currently suffering from acute superexploitation and national maldevelopment. In a country as rich as the U.S., African Americans find themselves having a Third World existence. In essence, as our elder scholar W.E.B. DuBois, (1969) noted, "To be a poor man is hard, but to be poor in a land of dollars is the very bottom of hardships" (DuBois, 49-50). African Americans are experiencing needless hardships and only they can correct them, not others.

DuBois said this almost one hundred years ago. Yet, despite all of the talk of African American progress, as Haki Madhubuti (1989) has noted that, "simply put, Black people in the United States are powerless. As a part of the political body, Black men do not have much of any power to speak of, as a culture unit we do not make important life-giving or life-saving decisions about general Black life on a mass level. Black men are not able on a national or mass level to protect Black women, educate Black children, employ Black youth, clothe Black families or house Black communities. Our input into a "Black" foreign policy is traitorous. Our relationship to Black women is fast approaching the point of disaster. Black economic-political clout on the world
level is minuscule and our understanding of the forces that regulate our lives is embarrassing—especially since we are supposed to be the "most educated" and the most creative and talented tribe of Black men in the world"(37).

A major contributor to our powerlessness is the [mis]education that we, as a people, and our intellectuals in particular have received throughout our incarceration here in colonial America. Our [mis] education (as our elder scholar Carter G. Woodson termed it), has rendered our intelligentsia intellectually and creatively impotent. It has retarded them from developing alternative solutions to our condition. What is more unnerving is that Africans (Americanized, diasporian and continental) have the longest continuous history of intellectual thought in the world.

During our peoples gravest times and most difficult challenges, it was the African intellectual who challenged all obstacles seeking to overcome them in order to bring the best of God's universe to bear on the human condition. In the dark times of the 1960s, African Americans again needed answers to their condition and it was the brave students and intellectuals who again sought to answer their sufferings. It was during the outward Survival Thrust (that seems to be so pronounced in African people), inappropriately called the "Black Power" movement,* that Afrocentricity was

* Throughout this dissertation I will use the terms false-consciousness, natural and Black Power. Therefore I think that its appropriate that I define and explain my usage of these terms to avoid confusion and add clarity to this dissertation. I agree, and have used these terms in accordance, with the definitions used by Afrocentric psychologist Robert L. Williams.

Williams (1981) defines consciousness, on the one hand, "as any
organized and made a thrust forward to answer the clarion call of African American people for order and centering.

Out of this crisis period emerged a revolutionary paradigm that was to reshape the consciousness of African Americans and refocus the intellectual activities of the Black intelligentsia. Afrocentricity was to become the dominate new paradigm of this century and, as such, continues to force changes in the U.S. and the African American community.

Williams (1981) defines consciousness, on the one hand, "as any individual and collective resistance to or protest against oppression; on the other hand it means Black pride and Black power" (Williams, 58). As such, throughout this dissertation, any behavior that does not actively engage in revolutionary protest, resistance to oppression, or displays what can be regarded as anti-survival, or anti-collective behavior, is considered being false-consciousness. Throughout this discourse, black liberation and consciousness are meant to be interchangeable.

Thus, what has been labeled the "Black Power movement," should properly be called the era of heightened Black consciousness in that it meant that African Americans understood that they could not "stand idly while strangers and foreigners describe our "dilemmas," our personality, explain our past cultural heritage, describe our language, build Black theory and impose their norms on us which were not forged from our personal Black experience" (Williams, 63). The 1960s renewed this struggle for self (collective) definition and resistance. It, therefore, was a era of consciousness raising which extends beyond the confused and limited phrase of "Black Power."

I have utilized the meaning of "natural" as defined by Williams and other Afrocentric psychologists. Williams uses the term "natural" as, "behaviors that are exhibited by the organism in its purest, unadulterated forms. Unity, communality, spirituality and rhythm are natural states of Black people. Disunity, individualism, disorder, etc., are pathological states of Black people brought on by oppressive conditions" (Williams, 63).

Thus, any behavior that is exhibited by African Americans that tends to go against these forms of behaviors are not natural, and therefore, should be eradicated through not yet established and institutionalized afrocentric processes.
As a revolutionary paradigm, Afrocentricity seeks to redirect, to make knowledge socially symmetrical to the life-world of the African American people. It was out of this investigative period that many African American cultural scientists began to use a form of political language that was appropriately suited for this model. The hope was that this new language would become institutionalized and therefore, repetitive stimulating debate and giving rise to unique solutions.

Kemetic thought, in the form of Afrocentricity, once again became the intellectual paradigm for the African people. As such, it began anew to reshape and reconfigure the world symmetrically for African people. Since its formalization, Afrocentricity has sought to challenge old distortions and provide new and innovative solutions to mankind's problems. While it was primarily a philosophy to correct the [mis]education of African people, its applications and answers are suited to the human condition.

Currently, all disciplines of academia are undergoing an Afrocentric scrutiny. The last to do so, on a sustained basis, is the discipline of political science. While much has been written on the political condition of African Americans, very little has been done to offer an alternate formulation of African American political theory. One reason for this, has been the reluctance of African American political scientists to challenge the hegemonic paradigms used by Eurocentric political scientists to describe the American polity or the African American condition.
Consequently, concepts and models have continued to be used that have directly led to our powerlessness. The Eurocentric models and concepts, that have become institutionalized, and therefore accepted by many members of the political science community, have promoted distorted images of America and the political position of African Americans.

Given this, it is my belief that if African Americans are to effectively engage in a politics that will result in their liberation, then African Americans will have to develop a political language, along with different concepts and models, that will empower them.

In the discipline of political science, an alternate model was constructed to explain the African American political experience during the revival of African intellectualism on an organized and focused basis during the 1960s. The Internal colonialism model was used by many African American (Afrocentric) political scientists to explain what they considered to be the life-experiences of our people.

As a model of political economy, internal colonialism was used in a very limited structural way. Thus, it underwent needless attacks and, for some unexplained reason, eventually lost its currency. In its scholarly absence, many African American political scientists continue to use a language to describe the political arrangement between African and Euroamericans that implicitly describes a colonial relationship.
Therefore, in an attempt to empower African Americans, I have resurrected this model. It is my hope that by using it I will provide the African American political science community with some issues that will facilitate their developing more viable solutions to America's racial problems.

I begin this dissertation with a brief discussion of the "Black Power" era, noting that it was filled with turmoil, conflicts, confusion and strife. This served as the seed bed for revolutionary ideas. Like other revolutionary epochs, it also was a period of intellectual and human evolution: it was a time of crisis and growth. I argued that it was the proper time for nurturing the growing discontent among African American intellectuals seeking solutions to the "Negro Problem."

Chapter two is devoted entirely to the internal colonialism model, and to the expansion of its narrow usage. Throughout this chapter, I seek to illuminate the utility of the model by using various analogies between the African American condition and other colonized people. My object is not only to illustrate the universality of the model, but also to show its appropriateness in describing the African American condition. After having illustrated the scope and appropriateness of the model, I then proceed to ask two very pertinent questions; that is, "how do a people decolonize themselves and what are the most expedient ways to do so?"
Chapter three lays out the terrain upon which this struggle should be waged noting that the decolonization struggle is historically determined and has always been polycentric and multilayered. If this dissertation is to extend our understanding of internal colonialism, then I feel that it is essential that relevant topics, ones that are not verifiable by empirical data, be discussed and connected such that the comprehensiveness of the model be realized. Beginning with chapter three, I seek to connect the topic of decolonization with interrelated aspects of colonialism.

Chapter four is devoted to the discussion of imperial-colonialism and African American economic underdevelopment. In this chapter, I dismiss the notion that welfarism, or other palliative economic programs, i.e., job stimulus programs, are sufficient to meet the economic developmental needs of African Americans. It is my position that until some form of meaningful and massive capital transfer takes place between Euro and African Americans, there will continue to be an imbalance between them which will continue to divide our nation.

Chapters five and six are devoted to two strategies that have dominated all decolonization struggles: legal gradualism and revolution. In chapter five, I wanted to show that legal gradualism, as a strategy which attempts to change the relationship between oppressed humanity and their oppressors, is inappropriate. Furthermore, I attempted to show that this has become the
primary focus of the African American liberation struggle and therefore is limited and defeatist.

Chapter six is devoted to the topic of revolution. I argue that the idea of revolution has historically undergone a terminological change. African Americans will also have to redefine revolution. While all revolutions are successful in bringing about change and continuing human evolution, it is essential that African American overcome several counterrevolutionary intracommunal behaviors if they are to successful. One of the central questions asked and discussed in this chapter is whether violence need be the definitive determinate of our revolutionary struggle? It is my belief that, while violence is critical to the decolonization struggle, but because of our unique situation, African Americans may, for the first time during the decolonization era, have an opportunity not to rely on violence in order to bring about revolutionary change.

Chapter seven is a crucial chapter in that it undertakes the discussion of African American identity and psychology. It is my firm belief that African Americans will have to undergo a psychological transformation if they are to engage in a successful decolonization movement via race-specific politics. I make the argument that it is no longer useful for African Americans to discuss their psychological makeup in individual terms, but rather it is now important for them to see their identity and national psychology in terms of a collectively. More importantly, I attempted to discern whether African
Americans have engaged, unconsciously, in a collective form of political behavior (legal and non-legal, i.e., riots, rebellions) based on an undefined or inappropriately labeled collective identity.

Chapter eight is written to dispel the notion that African American nationalism is an abhorrent form of politics engaged in by social malcontents. I take the position that African (Black) nationalism is not only appropriate, but that it should become the dominate ideological force within the African American community. I do not seek to document its long glorious history in this society, but instead choose to look at two specific eras of its development: the 'Golden Era', i.e., the 1850s, and the "Black Power era. I then undertake a discussion which attempted to project nationalism to its (seemingly) logical extension: collective objectification, i.e., nationhood.

Chapter nine is devoted to the discussion of nationalist politics in a colonial situation, and how nationalist politics should become the political philosophy of African Americans. I argue that while historically African Americans have experienced difficulties in their attempts to develop a Black political party, they have nonetheless continuously sought its development: even when engaged in legal organized politics via the traditional two party structure. I argue that the development of a Black political party is not only in accordance with the principles of democracy, but would enhance its fulfillment. I close the chapter with a discussion of conventionalism and the
call for a plebescite designed to answer the question of African American
nationhood.

Throughout this dissertation I seek to blur the lines between
scholarship and conversation; between me the observer and the observed.
This may cause the reader some difficulty, for that I seek their indulgence. My
reasoning for this is simple. I believe that any work, regardless of the
discipline, undertaken by a colonial subject, on the topic of colonialism is
autobiographical and, therefore, will by genre, be subjective and reflective. To
ask for detachment is impossible, and needless. I care about the outcome of
this project and, I care about the subject matter. This does not hinder me. To
the contrary, it forces me to be more precise and sure of my positions since I
will have to live the results, by relishing in the rewards or suffering the
consequences of faulty analysis. I consciously seek to intermix the I with the
we; the they with the me; the their with the our. I seek to become a part of the
conversation; a part of the discussion, not from the authoritative (if that is
possible) position of the author, but rather, as an individual subjected to the
analysis, a part of the problem and the solutions; as an acted on subject. I seek
self analysis. As such, this project is in affect, therapeutic.
Chapter 1

Foundations: A Quest For Direction and Meaning

Black Power: A Search for Definition and Meaning

The decades of the 1960s and early 1970s, for many Americans, was a time of turmoil, national strife, personal disturbance and individual growth. For the nation, which was experiencing a divisive and seemingly unwinnable war overseas, there were conflicts in our ethnic neighborhoods, rampant unemployment within the African American communities, rising inflation, political instability, civil disobedience, protest marches and, demands for political reform; in all, this era presented many challenges and was filled with promise. As such, out of this confusing and troubling era, came much to be thrilled about, much to be hopeful about and thankful for.

This era has given us a new perspective from which to see the world, and opportunities for social change. While many were dismayed about these troubling times, many students of political science saw this period as a time of great possibility. For these students, the turmoil, turbulence and strife represented a time of deeper significance.

Unfortunately, because many of these larger social forces involved African Americans, "and because they came at a time when the call for Black Power was receiving national attention, many black and white Americans erroneously identified the concept of Black Power with violence and
lawlessness" (McCartney, 1992, ix). Regrettably, many people failed to see the many lasting contributions and foundations for change that were being made and established by the proponents and followers of the "Black Power" movement. Many Americans failed to see the revolutionary changes that were taking place on an individual and communal level inside the African American community, or to appreciate the contributions of this era in the many ethnic communities of this nation, if not around the world.

Many fail to recognize or appreciate the rise of political, cultural and economic nationalism among African Americans that continues to impact the African American nation and the larger society. Many Americans ignore that amid the confusion and strife, so often associated with that era, that there were new ideas being born. The "Black Power" era, like the many other revolutionary eras of the past, continue to reveal its positive aspects in the present. The ideas of the French Revolution, of Cromwell's seventeenth century English Civil War, of Mao's revolutionary China, of Castro's Cuba, and of Jefferson's, Madison's and Washington's America, all were developed in times of social unrest. The "Black Power" era was no different.

Politically, many African Americans were demanding an end to political domination and useless coalition politics that they associated with the various civil rights organizations of that time. Thus, many members of both the Euroamerican liberal coalition, and the African American bourgeois-nationalist coalition, feared the usage and implications of the slogan "Black
Power: because, it clearly signaled that their tactics of legal gradualism, accommodation, patronage-politics and integration had failed (Cruse, 1968; Madhubuti, 1978; Williams, 1987; Clarke, 1991; Nkrumah, 1970; Bell, 1987; Akbar, 1981; Baldwin, 1985). Members of the African American community were demanding that African Americans now lead and direct their own political organizations.*

Culturally, for many, the "Black Power" movement was cultural nationalism rooted in resurrected African cosmology. For them, if "Black Power" was to have substance, it would have to mean more than the replacement of white officials with Black officials. If the "Black Power" movement was to have substance, it would have to be cultural and express an African consciousness.

In part, the proponents of the "Black Power" movement demanded that the sociopolitical become wedded to the cultural. They understood that the movement could not last if it were ever severed from, or failed to adopt, a

---

* For a good discussion see, David Danzig, "In Defense of Black Power," Commentary, 1966. Danzig argues that "Black Power" for some early advocates, was primarily a political movement that signaled the end of accommodationist politics, and the reemergence of traditional African American race-specific block politics, i.e., nationalist politics. It meant that the new African American political behavior would be defined along racial lines. It was a neo-traditional form of political nationalism.
cultural dimension." For others, the "Black Power" movement represented an inner journey in search of themselves. For them, "Black Power" meant the creation of a 'living culture' through self-knowledge. It meant that identity and culture had to become symmetrical. The "Black Power" movement/era for them was a deeply personal phenomenon that could only end in the paradoxical spiritual death and rebirth of a person. They understood that the cultural quest and resurrection, that some were demanding, would be shallow if it was not followed by, or in conjunction with, a personification of one's identity, of one's culture. Thus, for some, the "Black Power" movement became a quest for individual identity.

While some have come to see these events in hindsight, too many others still fail to connect this era to any lasting systemic intellectual movement. It is in the intellectual arena that the currents of the various "Black Power" movements continue to have the greatest impact and lasting significance in people's lives. Hence, it would be a tragic mistake if the academic implications and aspects of the "Black Power" movement are not discussed.

The basis for this work can be traced to the ongoing "Black Power" movement. As such, it is an attempt to focus on the demands articulated in that era. As is well-known, the "Black Power" movement, along with other

events, signaled a loss in confidence in the higher education system. It entailed an educational crisis.

**Black Power, The Student Movement, Black Studies and Academic Crisis**

It would be a disservice to the "Black Power" movement, and to the Student Movement, if we attempt to separate one from the other, since they were interconnected, each being an extension of the other.

The Student Movement brought the struggle for social justice that was taking place in the larger society to the academic community. In essence, the same political struggle for self-determination that had been carried on for voting and housing rights, rights to public accommodation, human dignity, freedom and liberation, was now being carried on for academic relevance. For the student-activists, the issues were the same.

Contemporary Americans should remember that the Student Movement was directly responsible for the creation of Black Studies, various other ethnic studies programs, and women studies programs throughout America. These contemporary programs are the successful extension of the "Black Power" movement, and are reflective of the values and goals of that era. As a consequence of this phase in the struggle, human and social evolution is continuing today around the globe; and Black Studies programs, irrespective of their divisive potential, continue to elevate African American consciousness.
Black Studies programs owe their success to earlier academic struggles carried on by African American scholars during the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s. In fact, if not for those early intellectuals, and the many masterful works that they produced, the transition to Black relevant studies, during the 1960s, would have been more difficult. Thus, it is these historical works that serve as a constant source for directing our current research. Black Studies evolved out of, and builds on, the long intellectual tradition of many of our pre-Black Power intellectual struggles. It was on those academic struggles that Black Studies emerged as a self-defined academic discipline during the 1960s, (Karenga, 1993).

It was during the riotous stage of the "Black Power" movement that the students decided to challenge the racist, oppressive authority of the universities, and the social role that they were preforming. Thus, the Student Movement expressed itself in four distinct ways; [1] the civil rights movement; [2] the Black Studies movement; [3] the Free Speech movement, and; [4] the Anti-War movement.∗

∗A good example here is the events that took place at San Francisco State college in 1966. The rebellion in Watts along with the "Black Power" movement ushered in a more racially self-conscious and assertive activism among the Black students there, which resulted in the Negro Student Association changing its name to the Black Student Union, (BSU), among other things.

From 1966 through 1968, the BSU began to assert itself more and began to make demands that reflected its racial consciousness and commitment to the community. The student activists demanded a Black Studies Department, developed a Black art and culture series at the experimental college, demanded special admissions for a given number of African American students, financial aid, and demanded to play an active role in the selection of personnel.
Black Studies programs reflected the social and academic mission that African American student activists felt was essential and missing from their studies. The student activists demanded that the universities and African American instructors teach what was then called the "Black experience" in its current and historical unfolding. These students also felt that the universities should create and assemble a body of knowledge that would contribute to African American intellectual and political liberation and develop a cadre of intellectuals who were dedicated to community service. Furthermore, they felt that the university administration should cultivate and maintain a mutually beneficial relationship between the university and the community and establish Black Studies as a legitimate, respected and permanent discipline.

Black Studies is a "systematic and critical study of multidimensional aspects of Black thought and practice in their current and historical

At SFSC these demands were resisted by the college administration as was the proposal developed by Nathan Hare, who had been appointed the coordinator of Black Studies in February of that year. As a consequence, in November of 1968, the students called for a series of strikes aimed at forcing the administration into conceding to their demands. Out of these strikes many other Third World groups were formed and began to unite with the BSU. Finally, at the end of 1968, the students won and the first Black Studies program was established at SFSC.

Many other universities, e.g. Northwestern University in Chicago, Harvard University, etc., had been watching the developments as they unfolded at SFSC and eagerly awaited the outcome. When it became clear that the students were able to get the administration to give in to their demands, other universities would experience similar movements. For African American students around the country, "Black Power" and the Student Movement were seen as connected stages in the liberation of their people. By 1969, most of the major Euroamerican or Black universities had some form of Black Studies programs.
unfolding" (Karenga, 1993:21). As such, it manifests its relevance in seven basic ways. For our discussion, the two most important points relate to the Europeanization of human consciousness and the development of an alternate social science. With regard to the first point, Karenga (1993) had this to say,

by Europeanization of human consciousness and culture is meant the systematic invasion and effective transformation of cultural consciousness of various people of the world by Europeans through technology, education, and the media so that at least three things occur: [1] the progressive loss of historical memory; [2] the progressive disappearance of themselves and their culture as a result of a conscious and unconscious assessment of themselves using European standards, and; [3] the progressive adoption of a Eurocentric view not only of themselves, but also of each other and the world to the detriment of their own humanity and the increasing degeneration of the cultural diversity and exchange which gives humanity its rich variousness and internal creative challenge (20).

The African American students challenged the creation and usage of knowledge. Their challenge to its formation and usage, signaled that there was an academic crisis and that they had lost confidence in Eurocentric scholarship. Accordingly, they demanded a new academic paradigm.

Eurocentric Social Science, The Sociology of Knowledge and Oppression

Many African American social scientists, who were writing and working in the various fields of study during those times, and after, have charged that orthodox Eurocentric social science, in the generative sense, has

They have argued that orthodox Eurocentric social sciences, as they relate to non-European people, are filled with structural and theoretical flaws that render them useless in a struggle for African American liberation. Some of the characteristic flaws of orthodox Eurocentric social science are the development of normative standards based on a numerical minority population, i.e., middle-class white-males; the use of particularistic opinions as universal facts, the undue primacy of individuals over the group, the celebration of competition over cooperation, the promotion of the material over the spiritual and the preference of the rational over feelings.

Akbar argues that "oppressed humanity has failed to realize that in the garb of "science," the western world has utilized a social and psychological paradigm that functions to legitimize the assertion of their racial and national superiority" (Akbar, 1984: 400). Orthodox Eurocentric social science has become an effective tool in the oppression of African Americans and other non-European peoples. The further away a group of people are from Eurocentric paradigmatic norms, the more likely that group is to be considered deviant. Therefore, for Akbar and other Afrocentric scholars,
Eurocentric social science is "an ineffective instrument for human growth and liberation" (Akbar, 403). To remedy this Akbar suggests the development and usage of an alternate paradigm, one that is based on African centeredness, i.e., Afrocentrism, to direct African American social scientists in their research and writing.

Robert Staples concurs with Akbar's argument concerning the inappropriateness of Eurocentric social science for the liberation struggle of African Americans. Staples (1973) like Akbar, maintains that,

historically, sociology and the other social sciences have been used as instruments of racist ideology. In the South there was a proliferation of studies that "objectively" reached the conclusion that Blacks were inherently inferior to whites. These research studies were employed to justify the subordination of Blacks through political disenfranchisement and racial segregation (164).

Citing the works of many noted Eurocentric sociologists, (e.g., Auguste Comte, Herbert Spencer, Charles Darwin, Frank Giddings, etc.) Staples (1973) argues that the Eurocentric social scientists, as a member of a racist society, participates in racist institutions, and develops views of Black people partially derived from these relationships, along with his racist socialization. In the words of the existentialist philosopher Albert Camus, "men cannot condemn themselves. Therefore, we must do it for them (167).

Staples, like Akbar, argues that "if white sociology is the science of oppression, Black sociology must be the science of liberation" (168). Staples,
Jones and Akbar argue that orthodox Eurocentric social scientists, shrouded in the concept of "objectivity," have conducted research that has *proven* African Americans innately inferior to Euroamericans.

The knowledge presented by these and other Eurocentric scholars, is the result of information acquired through psychological, sociological and physiological research. For example, as late as 1992, the federal government was funding a research project to determine if there was a biogenetic link between violent behavior and African Americans.*

This project and countless others suggests that orthodox Eurocentric social scientists have and still continue to use their talents/skills/education to fashion modern day folktales. These technicians have consciously, or unconsciously, contributed to the folktales that help to maintain the negative images of African Americans.

---

*As late as February 1992, as reported in the April 1993 issue of *Psych Discourse, Vol. 24, No. 4*, a group of Eurocentric psychologists were applying for, and had been granted, funds to conduct a study to identify potential violence in African American children. According to Peter R. Breggin, M.D. and Ginger Ross Breggin in their article entitled, *The Federal Violence Initiative: Threats to Black Children (And Others)*, "Psychiatrist Frederick Goodwin announced a governmental plan to identify at least 100,000 inner city children whose alleged biochemical and genetic defects will make them violent in later life." It was reported that this initiative is to be the government's number one mental health funding priority. The funding for this research was based on research conducted by Dr. Goodwin on rhesus monkeys. Dr. Goodwin is noted to be the government's highest ranking psychiatrist. Goodwin compared the behavior of African Americans to that of rhesus monkeys. According to Breggin, Goodwin "compared the inner city to a jungle that is going backward in evolution, and inner city youth to rhesus monkeys who only want to kill each other, have sex, and reproduce."
It seems reasonable to assume that as long as America stays divided, and each ethnic group stays isolated in its own community, Euroamericans will continue to rely on, and orthodox Eurocentric social science folktale technicians will continue to produce, false distorting images of African Americans. And, until the African American community produces a cadre of intellectuals who will counter these distorted images of our people, Euroamericans will continue to have the upper hand in the production of the African American image.

This and other racist research projects clearly illustrate why, according to many Afrocentric/African American social scientists, the development of an alternative social science is needed to assist in the liberation of African American people. For Staples, Jones, Akbar and many others, African Americans are oppressed by racism, classism, sexism, discrimination, elitism and colonialism, and when these negative forces are combined in one society and represent the ideologies of a ruling-race-class, they make the acquisition of realistic factual knowledge for social change difficult. The oppressor class, the colonizer class in this society, has been able to conceal the nature of this society from the oppressed by hiding and disguising knowledge in synonymic and euphemistic language. "Europeans not only colonized history, they colonized information about history. They propagated a concept that is still with us.
That concept is that the Europeans are the only people who have made anything worthy of being called history," (Clarke, 1991, 247). They have, up until very recent times, been able to control the production and acquisition of knowledge.

As in all societies, but more so in an oppressive colonial society, knowledge and ideals are used as weapons. According to Adler (1957),

ideals not only arise under specific conditions, but are also used under specific conditions, not necessarily the same. In every culture they are used as weapons, either instrumentally or manipulatively. In the former there is regard for the validity of the ideal used; the social cohesion that will result; and, the minds of those who are being influenced. In the latter case only the end in view is considered; the truth or falsity of the ideal is irrelevant, and the minds of those who are to be influenced are held in contempt (402-3).

In a colonial society, knowledge has a dual purpose; the science of knowledge itself becomes a duality. When knowledge is hidden from the oppressed and used to maintain oppressive conditions by the dominant class, knowledge is often used for propagandistic purposes. According to John C. Merrill et. al., knowledge becomes a tool to be used to 'propagate;' that is, it is used to "spread their own biases and opinions....attempting (intentionally) to affect the attitudes and actions of their audience" (Merrill, 1990, 36). It is used to deceive and distort reality. It becomes a weapon designed to dehumanize and render the colonized impotent while promoting the 'rightness' of the
colonizers position. Knowledge, in the context of the colonial experience, is designed to create the delusion of superiority in the colonizer and inferiority in the colonized (Fanon, 1968; Nugugi, 1986; Memmi, 1965; Jan Mohomed, 1986; Brantlinger, 1986).

It is for this reason that I intend to argue, along with many other African American social scientists, that there seems to be a real and profound crisis in academia, and the only way to solve it, to the benefit of African Americans, is for them to develop their own body of knowledge, an alternate social science.

**Toward Establishing and Defining an Afrocentric Social Science**

Vasu Reddy et al made the timely argument that one of the ways that the orthodox Eurocentric social science has become a tool used in the domination of people is through the useful, but arbitrary, formations of rigid disciplines or, by restricting the interdisciplinary approach used by many Third World scholars. This has led to the colonization of Third World intellectuals who were seeking alternative ways to approach particular problems. Breaking down these arbitrary barriers is an essential step in destroying Eurocentric hegemony. According to Reddy (1990),

> At both a cognitive level (through creating a more integrated approach) and at a practical level (where a little knowledge of social anthropology, for instance, can avoid the absurdities of development economics), we believe that breaking down the barriers between disciplines can lead to breaking down Eurocentrism(2).
For African Americans, this alternative approach would mean the negation of the 'particularistic' way that Europeans/Americans see the world to the exclusion of our cosmological vision. To continue to use their ideologies, disciplinary interests, or paradigmatic norms, will only continue to distort our perceptions of self, and the nature of our political environment. Based on our experiences, what we seek is surely different from their goals.

African Americans "must develop a social theory consistent with a revolutionary black ideology so that what we know will be worth knowing" (Alkalimat, 1973, 178). Eurocentric social science has offered a set of terms to explain African Americans and their experiences based on sterile analytical theories that have attempted to classify social reality and not explain it. An Afrocentric social science must have a unique language that will facilitate in raising our consciousness.

"Our understanding of the world must take full account of our past and propel us into the future with glorious possibilities" (Alkalimat, 182). It is

*Alkalimat argued that, "the conceptual framework presented as white social science reflects an equilibrium model of society based on evolutionary change. All things happen in due course as the society evolves to a higher level based on more universal and rational standards of operation. The concepts of black social science reflect a conflict model of society bound together by coercion and changed by revolution. To put it in more pointed terms, the white concepts are based on the myth of salvation for the jailer, while the black concepts more directly speak to the reality of getting black folks out of the jail, [italics mine], "(188).
time for African Americans to "get on with the work of constructing a social theory giving us the power and strategy to struggle toward capturing that spirit and bring such a new revolutionary Africa into human history" (Alkalimat, 182).

One of the limitations to the development of a proactive social science devoted to the liberation of African peoples, has been the professional constraint placed upon African American scholars. It is, therefore, necessary for African scholars to construct an alternate progressive social science paradigm upon which their emancipatory sciences can be constructed.

Afrocentricism should be the paradigmatic basis for our social science. The Afrocentric model does not attempt to substitute one paradigmatic model for another, i.e., the African male for the European male. But "Afrocentrism is utilized from the perspective that Africa constitutes the primordial context for human growth and liberation" (Akbar, 404).

The Afrocentric model utilizes Africa as the ontological conception of man, in that, Africa is the most natural" of human concepts. Although the models primary purpose is to liberate African Americans, it can be used by humans worldwide. Afrocentrism is not a comparative model and it should not be seen as a model to be contrasted with the Eurocentric model. In fact, the Afrocentric model antedates the Eurocentric paradigm and utilizes a

* Please note my definition of 'natural' as defined in the introduction of this dissertation. In this circumstance, I use the term to denote, pre-Euro-Asian influence or domination.
different normative base. "The norm of the Afrocentric model is nature. The normative characteristics of this social science are based upon the exquisite order of human nature" (Akbar, 404) where as the normative base of Eurocentrism is the European male.

Such a social science would not fit with the conceptual disciplinary social sciences of the Western tradition. Nor does it have as of yet the approval of being 'scientific' as understood in the western tradition; but, it is "more consistent with the philosophical, religious and symbolic of many enduring human societies" (Akbar, 405).

This new social science does not yet have the paradigmatic specific language of Western social science but, it is more consistent with the multidimensional, holism of humanity. Thus, it ignores the rationalistic, positivistic and reductionist orientation of Western social science that has a tendency to divorce self-consciousness from culture. By giving primacy to the rational over the affective, Western scientists have conducted some of the most hideous 'scientific' research on humankind to date.

The new paradigm that is being advocated here is based on, and is an extension of, the crisis of confidence arising out of the "Black Power" era. Afrocentrism is a logical extension of the "Black Power" movement and attempts to meet the demands that were put before the university community by African American students for a more relevant academic
curriculum that would assist them in fulfilling their academic and social missions.

The call is for a more experientially relevant social science, and one that utilizes a language that reflects this experience. At this point, it is clear that many African American social scientists have lost confidence in orthodox Eurocentric social science claiming, in part, that they are loaded with racist concepts, and therefore, are useless for human growth and development.

In short, the challenge to the authority of the Euroamericans, which occurred during the consciousness raising era of the "Black Power" movement, extended itself into the academic community and demanded the development of a new approach to understanding African Americans and humanity. It was in this academic and social climate that the Afrocentric paradigm developed.

Crisis of Confidence, And the Development of a Revolutionary Paradigm

Thomas Kuhn can contribute to our understanding of how crisis in confidence can/has, lead/led to the development of the Afrocentric paradigm. According to Kuhn, a paradigm is composed of a series of assumptions that guides the research/work of the scientific community. These basic assumptions are basic ideological issues, shared beliefs about the subject matter, agreement on the range of questions to ask, shared methodology in teaching of those shared assumptions agreement on frame of
reference, belief in the competence of their community and the community's knowledge of how the world works (Khun, 1970).

When in the normal course of scientific advancement/investigation, a certain group of 'facts,' or anomalies persist, and the 'normal' scientific paradigm has no answer for it/them, then within certain segments of the scientific community questions concerning the viability of the paradigm begin to arise. When that happens, a crisis in confidence emerges. Out of this crisis in confidence arises the need for the development of an alternative paradigm. Out of this crisis, a scientific revolution takes place. According to Kuhn (1970),

in these and other ways besides, normal science repeatedly goes astray. And when it does, that is, the profession can no longer evade anomalies that subvert the existing tradition of scientific practice-then begin the extraordinary investigations that lead the profession at last to a new set of commitments, a new basis for the practice of science (6).

For those who develop, or participate in the extension of the new paradigm, it entails a change in the rules governing the practice of the normal science and a reflection of much of their, or others prior work. Consequently, they know, like those who continue to use or have confidence in the old paradigm, exactly what it is they are looking for.

* According to Khun, new theories emerge from three types of phenomena. They are[1] phenomena that are already well explained by the existing paradigm, [2] phenomena whose nature is already known, but can only be explained through the usage of the new paradigm, and; [3] "the
If this new paradigm is to become valid, it must be prescriptive and able to make predictions where the other one could not. Even then, this new paradigm may not necessarily replace the older one entirely, but simply add to, or extend, its validity. Often, new paradigms replace older ones because the older one’s made claims that they cannot substantiate, and therefore, betray scientific standards (Kuhn, 1970, 99).

Often the new paradigm is incompatible with the one that it replaces because there are usually very substantive differences within the two competing paradigms that prohibit their compatibility. These substantive differences are the result of the source of methods the problem field or the change in standards of solutions. According to Kuhn (1970), "the reception of a new paradigm often necessitates a redefinition of the corresponding science" (102).

A revolutionary paradigmatic change results in a new vision for those who adopt the new paradigm and later participate in developing it into a 'normal' science. Those who utilize, or accept this new paradigm, and therefore work to transform it into a 'normal' science, begin to see the world differently, to see it anew. For them, everything is different, and consequently, they can never return again to the old way of seeing things (Kuhn, 112).

recognized anomalies whose characteristic feature is their stubborn refusal to be assimilated to existing paradigms." Kuhn maintains that it is the last phenomena, "that gives rise to new theories" (Kuhn, 1970, 3).
This paradigmatic shift has taken place within the African American intellectual community and currently is being used for scientific investigation. While Kuhn's argument was primarily for the 'natural' sciences, it has been applied by him and others to the social sciences as well. And, therefore, it can justifiably be used to explain the development of Afrocentricity.

What started as a crisis of confidence among the African American students over social and political issues, rapidly spread to the African American intellectual community. In their attempt to satisfy the academic demands of the African American students, the African American intelligentsia reinvigorated the historical challenge to Eurocentric scholarship that began during the 1930s and 1940s and culminated in the development of a refocused Afrocentricism.

What inspired the creation of this refocused thought, was the inability of the 'normal' Eurocentric paradigms to reconcile the persistent incompatibility of African American physiological, psychological, sociological, and political behavior, to the distorted paradigms of the time...* 

* In an article written by Anthony Flint of the Boston Globe, and reprinted in the Sunday, December 5, 1993 issue of the Honolulu Advertiser, it was revealed just how extensive the inability to communicate has grown between Afrocentric scholars and Eurocentric scholars on the one hand, and how resistant and threatened Eurocentric scholars in particular and Euroamerican people in general are by the Afrocentric movement.

In that article, Flint reported that Boston University President John Silber "touted his resistance to "faddish" intellectual theories." By "faddish" theories, Silber was speaking about many fields of scholarship that challenged 'established' traditional standards of
Afrocentric scholars are no longer able to abandon their new paradigm, nor are they able to see the world as it once was. Therefore, what had begun decades earlier, has now developed into a full blown paradigmatic revolution that has the potential to change the course of human growth and liberation.

Afrocentricity, Crisis and Confidence: Seeing the World Differently

If a colonized people are to be successful in their decolonization struggle, it is critically important for them to develop an ideology that connects all of the conflicting forces that have combined to make them the unique nation of people that they are. This new ideology must provide the people with a new way of seeing the world. In other words, they must reject the old philosophies and ideologies that support[ed] the former oppressive society (Nkrumah, 1964, 68).

The purpose of an ideology is: to unite the total society, give form and purpose to institutions; direct people, institutions and therefore the society, replace the existing ideology that currently dominates the society; abolish the existing social order; seek to maintain/defend the new social order and, provide a total reordering of society. There can be two opposing ideologies in a society but there cannot be peaceful coexistence. This is important to African American intellectuals seeking to 'justify' Afrocentrism. As Kuhn, and now

university scholarship, i.e., Afrocentrism, multiculturalism, deconstructionalism and Feminism.

The reoccurring charge against these movements was that they were 'politically motivated,' and therefore were not truly unbiased, free or objective.
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Nkrumah maintain, new ideologies/paradigms make paradigmatic or ideological intergroup communication impossible.

Ideologies seeking to bring a specific order into a new social order, manifest themselves in several essential areas. Nkrumah (1964) maintained that,

"the ideology of a society displays itself in political theory, social theory and moral theory, and uses these as instruments. It establishes a particular range of political, social and moral behavior, such that unless behavior of this sort fell within the established range, it would be incompatible with the ideology (59)."

Consequently, there are some political behaviors that are either incompatible or compatible with the desired objectives of the new ideology. All ideologies tend to be totalizing and, therefore, they will manifest themselves in the history, literature, art, religion and class structure of society. If the ideology is intended to be integrative, that is, intended to unite the actions of millions of people, then its instruments will be oriented towards social control, which implies social obligation and unification.

Ideologies are instruments of philosophy that are used as a cohesive force within the society. The cohesive ideology that would connect all of the

*It achieves its cohesive mission in one of two ways. [1] as a theoretical statement that is paralleled by a specific social-political constructor, or [2] as a political philosophy or, ethics. As a political philosophy, it lays down certain unifying ideals for our pursuit and fortification that attempts to unite all of the members of society into a cohesive collective and directs them towards unified social-political action, i.e., nation building.
overlapping and seemingly different forces that had created contemporary Africans is *Consciencism*. I will not discuss all of the various nuances of philosophical consciencism here, but will only concentrate on the political aspects that impacts directly on our discussion.

Nkrumah provides African Americans with some valuable insight as we seek to transform our reformist oriented decolonization struggle into a revolutionary one. A leader who attempts to lead his country through a revolutionary decolonization struggle must know that politically a society cannot be transformed through *reformism*. Changing its rules is insufficient. To do this would leave its foundations in place. If we are to change our social reality, and transform this society and it's cultural practices, then African Americans must develop means that will transform the ethical, moral, and ideological foundations of this country.

African American political scientists need to think very seriously about developing an ideology that gives rise to a political philosophy that attempts to support the egalitarian tenets of our traditional West African societies, and is simultaneously in tune with the complexities of our American heritage. This is our greatest challenge. As colonized people, we, like our continental African brothers and sisters, are faced with the divisive forces of oppression that are endemic to the colonial situation (Nkrumah, 1964). Social growth, or change does not take place in a static situation. Societies do not remain the same; they too undergo a process of dialectics. It is through the active
overcoming of the negative forces of colonialism that we African Americans will grow. It is by overcoming the tensions that are endemic to the colonial situation that African Americans will become independent. Only positive action can overcome the negative reality and actions of static colonialism. Every social revolution must have an intellectual revolution. In fact, it is erroneous to talk in terms that suggest a separation; revolutionary change is total and all encompassing.

We African Americans must also have an intellectual revolution that coincides with our 'physical' decolonization struggle. It must also give rise to the dignity of our people who will struggle for our independence. The intellectual component of the struggle must celebrate our people where American colonialism has denigrated, dehumanized and deculturated them (Nkrumah, 78).

Afrocentrism is the philosophy that attempts to unify the various strands that make us the unique people that we are. Afrocentrism is the correct and only logical organizing intellectual, social and political philosophy for African people in this society who are still willfully striving for a correct center and meaning. Afrocentricity offers African Americans a new way of seeing the world and their place in it. It is the proper answer to the paradigmatic crisis that our students and intelligentsia discovered during the "Black Power" movement (Asante, 1991, 2-3).
Afrocentricity is founded on the central belief that African American people are, at a deep structural level, still African people. We therefore have, like all other Africans of the diaspora, no matter where they are located, share one African Cultural system, (Uya, 1987; Stuckey, 1987; DuBois, 1900; Baldwin, 1985; Madhubuti, 1978; Diop, 1978; Karenga, 1988; Williams, 1987).

The argument for the centrality of our basic culture does not negate the particularistic impact that our environment has had on how we display our basic cultural behavior. According to Asante argues that, "all African people participate in the African Cultural System although it is modified according to specific histories and nations. In this way, we know that Yoruba, Asante, Wolof, Ewe, Nubia, and African Americans possess values and beliefs derived from their own particular histories yet conforming to the African Cultural System" (Asante: 2).

As an ideology that sees a distinct African nation in this society, a nation that has been rejected by the ideologies and structures of America, Afrocentrism is a recognition of our separate identity. It is an ideology that captivates the rhythms of African life in America and throughout the diaspora attempts to connect the various tensions that have molded us into the people that we are and, therefore, it is a centralist philosophy. That is, it places Africa correctly at the center of our lives. By becoming our correct
center, Afrocentrism replaces Europe as the source for solutions to our condition.

Afrocentricity is not a hatred philosophy, but a transformative and conversion philosophy attempting to transform a negated people into a people who are conscious of themselves and the world around them and empower them with the ability to transcend the negativity of their immediate surroundings while providing them with the necessary basis to continue their struggle for liberation. It accomplishes this by eradicating and replacing the falsehoods of Euroamerican nationalism with tenets that can be traced to our ancient and contemporary history; while ignoring the Eurocentric preoccupation with color. According to Asante states that, "afrocentricity, ... is only superficially related to color, it is more accurately a philosophical outlook determined by history" (Asante, 27).

It, therefore, demands that revolutionary decolonization be predicated upon the colonized African American nation negating all other forms of foreign thought and fantasies. It attempts to construct a counter-colonial consciousness in the minds of African American people, such that they cease engaging in counter nationalistic behaviors.

---

"According to Asante, "Afrocentricity is the belief in the centrality of Africans in the post modern history. It is our history, our mythology, our creative motif, and our ethos exemplifying our collective will" (Asante, 1991, 6).
Another major focus inside the polycentricism of Afrocentric philosophy is the principle of Nija. Nija is the reconnection of African spirituality, and positive/victorious thought with African Americans and Africans throughout the diaspora. When one accepts Nija, "all things seem new, old things no longer please or seem adequate" (Asante, 22). The formative basis of Nija started centuries ago. Its origins are in the beliefs and behaviors of our elders here in America, the diaspora and on the continent.

Nija behavior is distinctive, noticeable in the behavior that its believers display. Nija philosophy encourages that African Americans sacrifice their individual self for the welfare of the community. Believers are not concerned primarily with their own individual survival but, in fact, neglect their well being for the sake of the 'Tribe.' This was displayed by some of our greatest ambassadors, i.e., Booker T. Washington, Sojourner Truth, Martin Delaney, Martin L. King, etc., our nationalist politicians, i.e., Frederick Douglass, Marcus Garvey, Malcolm X, Paul Robeson, etc., and among our freedom fighters, i.e., Nat Turner, Cinque, Gabriel Prosser, Andry, and Denmark Vesey.

Afrocentric scholars are also activists who are compelled to strive for victory. They are not content to retell the oppressive nature of this society, but are activated towards victory, i.e., through the incorporation of Nija. They remember the scolding of our learned elder scholars such as Carter G. Woodson when he said, "real education means to inspire people to live more
abundantly, to learn to begin with life as they find it and make it better, but the instruction as far given Negroes in colleges and universities has worked to the contrary" (Carter, 1990, 20). He instructs us to see through the propaganda taught to us in these universities.

When scholarly-activist groups begin to see things in a different light, then they can agitate for change. It does not take the entire community to generate this awareness, it only takes the 'Talented-Tenth' that our scholarly elders called for. As Asante said, "give us 250,000 conscious and willful Afrocentrists and a revolution will take place in our attitudes and behavior" (Asante, 31). What makes this so profound is that, if given the rudiments for change, we then can create another 250,000 activist-scholars who will then multiply into another 250,000, thus creating and recreating themselves and the society that we seek.

African American people need an accurate ideology based on their understanding of the world to counter the self-fulfilling normative Eurocentric based social sciences that are designed to promote white nationalism while negating and contributing to the decimation of us as a people. African Americans must break out of the subjectivity that has been imposed on them through the usage of an oppressive and defeatist political language that is asymmetrical to our life-world and limiting in its possibilities. We need to create our own reality. African Americans need to
develop a new political language with the proper reflexivity of today, so that we can construct a dialogue with other Americans based on facts and not mythologies, or wishful thinking. We need a new political language that speaks to our reality and not other people's reality.

Language, Liberation, Cosmology and Political Science: The Conflict Model

One of the more important aspects of our political struggle is the development of a language that reflects the political, social, and economic existence/reality of our people. A people's worldview subjectively is based in/on the language that they use to reveal it. If a people use a language that does not reflect their life-reality, then they are prone to create false images, draw false conclusions, or exist under illusions. There is a positive connection between mental liberation, language and a people's struggle for political, economic and social freedom.

This is a theme that will be repeated throughout this analysis. According to Asante, "our liberation from the captivity of racist language is the first order of the intellectual. There can be no freedom until there is a freedom of the mind... language is essentially the control of thought. It becomes impossible for us to direct our future until we control our language" (31).

As an instrument of control, language is something that African Americans must command; our political language must become functional and reflective of our reality. "If the language is not functional, then it should
have no place in our vocabulary. In every revolution, the people have first seized the instruments of idea formation and then property production,” (Asante, 31). We must seize the instruments of idea formation just as other revolutionaries did before us (French, Chinese, Africans and Cubans).

Our revolutionary political language must not confuse, it must not project a life-reality that is mythological and asymmetrical. It must be a language that empowers and liberates. A political language that enables the intellectual and the layperson to understand their life-reality, such that, in the face of Eurocentric mystification, they are able to reinterpret correctly and refute the whitewashing of our oppressed conditions (Asante, 1991).

It is time that we break away from the Eurocentric language that has inhibited our liberation struggle.* Our revolutionary language must speak to/of the conditions that have united to oppress us; instead of using one that attempts to negate our real life political existence.

Political language is not value-free, nor is political behavior. The language that any given people use reflects ideologies, confers power, disempowers, mystifies, distorts, maintains political stability, or destabilize a regime. It is through the usage of language that a people gain an understanding of reality: language creates our reality, political or otherwise.

*It does this by approving/allowing/legitimizing gradualistic incremental changes; by seeming to suggest and give primacy to the notion of internal causation; and by lending itself to making questionable coalitions with 'outsiders' who have greater influence on the direction of the struggle and the remedies that should be sought.
The connection between political meaning and language is mediated through the environment that its users are in, and is constructed by it. In other words, political meaning is constructed through the images that are invoked by the usage of language.

Our understanding of ourselves and others, is determined by the political images that we construct through language. Understanding our political efficacy and faults is constructed through political language. What is, or is not, is a result of the language that we use to portray those values about ourselves and our institutions.

As such, language becomes a reification, an entity that somehow becomes an obscure and perverse objectification absent its primary function to facilitate human interaction. "While language, consciousness, and social condition are replete with contradictions, they shape each other so as to make it possible for people to live with themselves, with their moral dilemmas, and with chronic failure to resolve the dilemmas and the contradictions," (Edelman, 1985, 19).

Language is used to control thought and to minimize the need for a people to use or develop an interpretative language. It can construct and deconstruct reality and, thereby, alter meaning. It is my position that the political language used by Euroamerican political scientists has assisted in mystifying, distorting and deconstructing political meaning for African Americans. Therefore, African Americans must construct an alternate
political language that evokes images that will empower them in their political struggle. In short, African Americans need new images and concepts that reflect our political reality.

Afrocentricity makes such concepts and images possible because it posits that Africa should be considered the center for African Americans and not Europe. Politically, that translates into a language, a political theory, that places our traditional West African political institutions at the center of our rediscovery. I do not wish to propose a political system here that would be based on the traditional values of our ancient continental West African societies pre se, as much as I would like to use those value systems as a basis for formulating a neo-traditional political philosophy/theory. That is, I wish to project a political language that is reflective of the political existence of the African American oppressed nation, such that, it will facilitate the development of a political theory aimed at our empowerment. As part of this project the 'evolutionary model' of the American polity that has been conveniently used by Eurocentric political scientists will be rejected and, in its place, I would like to advance the 'conflictual model', as suggested by Alkalimat, as the proper paradigm for understanding the African American political existence.
The Political Science Discipline and African American Liberation

"Political science as a discipline historically has not seriously concerned itself with the politics of America's various minority groups, particularly Black and Latino politics" (McClain, 247).*

The orthodox Eurocentric field of political science has continuously maintained a position that refuses to respect African American political behavior as important. It has ignored, or has not given recognition to the study of African American political behavior. Any work that was conducted on their political behavior was initially done by African American politicians. In fact, it was not until Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, the first African American to receive his Ph.d in political science, (1934), that a trained political scientist

---

*It is important to note that, of all the 'cultural sciences' in general, political science has been the last to undergo a sustained Afrocentric scrutiny. In fact, political science has been the last of the cultural sciences, even in the Eurocentric schools, to deal continuously with the African American experience. The Eurocentric schools of political science have consistently ignored African American political behavior; or, when they did study it, they, like the other Eurocentric disciplinary social sciences, have devoted too much of their time attempting to prove the deviance of African Americans or inappropriately shifted the locus of political inquiry away from politics, i.e., the art of governance, to system maintenance, i.e., to government, which are not the same.

While it is admitted that the orientation and thrust of Euroamerican social sciences in general, and political science in particular, is simple in its forwards thrust, it, is "confusing in its sociometry," (Walters, 1976, 29).
devoted a scholarly work to the area of Black politics. Euroamerican obstinacy towards conducting research on African American political behavior has resulted in intellectual battles that still persist (McClain, 248).

Research into African American political behavior can be divided into four distinct and overlapping eras; with the fourth being subdivided into two separate movements. I will not discuss each generation of study here, but I

* In an article entitled, The Negro in the Political Life Of The United States, The Journal of Negro Education, Vol. X, No. 3, 1941, Dr. Bunche describes for the first time the political life of African Americans. In this article, it was first revealed that the African American political experience; [1] was controlled by regionalism; [2] controlled by terrorism; [3] was limited to national electoralism; [4] served as a threat to the ruling Eurocentric polyarchy; [5] was restrained by various structural barriers, "i.e.," poll tax, all white primaries, etc.; [6] took the characteristics of political patronage in the north, and; [7] illustrated the autocratic and anti-democratic nature of the American society.

** For more information see, McClain, Paula D. and Garica, John A., Expanding Disciplinary Boundaries: Black, Latino and Racial Minority Group Political Science, American Political Science Review, Vol, 87, No. 3. In this article McClain and Garica divided into [1] the first generation; [2] the second generation; [3] the third generation; [4] the fourth, and; [5] the fifth generation. The first generation was characterized by writings by pre/post reconstruction nationalist politicians. These were usually pamphlets or memoirs that exhorted African Americans to unite and rebel; or, they were the writings of reconstruction politicians reflecting on their experiences. This period extended to the 1940s and included the early writings of Dr.s Bunche, Gosnell and Wilson.

The second generation of writers, concerned themselves primarily with the topic of Black leadership. The focus of much of this limited work was concentrated on attempting to discern the nature and effectiveness of Black leadership. Some authors sought to use a strictly Eurocentric school approach, while others sought to study African American leadership from a purely African American perspective. What emerged from this bifurcated approach, was a confused understanding of what African American leadership was. This confused understanding would generate several different conceptual theories
will simply say, that African American political science is in a confused state, so confused that many Eurocentric scholars, (both black and white) are attempting to come to some agreement on just what Black Politics is or is not.

For example, during the fourth generation, (post-civil rights era to the present), it was decided that a multiplicity of approaches would best reveal just what "Black Politics" was. This generation included the Marxists school headed by Marable as well as the rational choice theorists headed by Dawson and Wilson. Marable attempted to cast the African American political experience in class reductionist terminology and Dawson attempts to reclassify traditional political consumerism in new terminology. Given the plethora of approaches and topics used/covered under the rubric of Black Politics, one is left to ask, "what is the orientation of the field?"

There are two basic ways of accessing the abundance of research being conducted in the area of Black Politics. One is to say that it shows that the field is growing, dynamic and open to alternate theories; and this is good; the other is to argue that due to the multiplicity of approaches, one becomes confused and is forced into asking questions such as, "What is black politics" "is there seriously lacking a line of research that questions the frameworks" or, "can we be satisfied in knowing that open debate is contributing to the

utilized to understand African American leadership. They were, [1] the protest/accommodationist approach/theory;[2]the ethnic approach/theory, and;[3] the pluralist/Black research approach/theory.
development of Black Politics becoming a 'normal science' in the Kuhnian sense?"

Mack Jones puts forth the timely criticism that the subfield of Black Politics has suddenly become 'mainstream,' and as such, seemingly has lost its original orientation. There now is a confusion of terms and tactics due to this mainstreaming of the field, and it is time that we African American political scientists reassess the path the field is now traveling (McClain, 1993).

A good illustration of what has happened to the field of Black Politics is discussed by Hanes Walton, Jr. et al (1992). According to them, many researchers have missed or distorted much of the political dynamics within the African American community due to their own preconceived ideas.

Using the studies of both Gosnell and Wilson on urban politics of African Americans in Chicago, Walton et al maintain that Gosnell's work is a credit to the field, in that "the conclusion that he came to resulted from data he collected in the community and showed an even handedness that would be missing from Wilson's work whose research seemed guided by conservative and neoconservative ideas and appears more to be interpretation than scholarship," (Walton, 227). Wilson's study is another example of a Eurocentric researcher coming into the community and having little regard for the results. His work exemplifies what the African American Afrocentric-activist-scholars must guard against.
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Most of the work on African American political behavior came after decades of being ignored by Eurocentric scholars. It was written during the last half of this century because many orthodox Eurocentric political scientists were concerned with the political attitudes of African Americans after the era of the revolts (1965-72). Much of the work was conceptualized and theorized as 'protest politics.' It is interesting to note at this point, that the major emphasis of many of these works was on the topic of how to maintain government stability and not politics.

This limited and often overly concentrated research indicates a genuine lack of concern by the political science community. When Eurocentric scholars did become interested in the area, their work was often overly concentrated in areas that affected their myopic disciplinary concentrations, i.e., maintaining stability, emphasis on elites, structural-functionalism, etc.: As such, there is a predominance of work on electoral and protest politics, and leadership. Much of the work has racist overtones; was celebrated by Eurocentric Academic journals, ignored particular African American 'special interests,' conceptualized along the methodological imperatives of Eurocentrism, lacked factual creditability and, seriously lacked a historical perspective.

Given the inadequacy of research by Eurocentric political scientists and the discipline, and having a majority of the work overlooked or omitted from critical review by the major Eurocentric journals, one is left to ask, "why
do Eurocentric political scientists, and the Eurocentric political science community avoid or fail to study African American political behavior?"

Ernest J. Wilson III provides us with an answer. Wilson maintains that Eurocentric political science has been/is overly concerned with stability, elitism, and quantitative factors/analysis, i.e., electoral politics. It is also often racist, has major methodological and substantive flaws that inhibit it as a field from being relevant to the major concerns of the African American community and, has not been willing to fund major studies on African American political behavior.

In addition, Wilson (1985) argues that leading institutions, important tenured professors and college administrators have often attempted to dissuade bright students away from the field, or, "from using black materials," (606). Or, they have diminished the importance of "Black Politics" and discouraged the study of it "by the structure of incentives in the system-teaching positions, research slots, coloration with senior colleagues, or tenure decisions" (Wilson,606).

As a result, political science as a discipline has not made a major substantial contribution theoretically to the understanding of African American political life-reality.

It might be the orientation of the field or those who are in it that continues the lack of interest in African American political behavior. In any case, "given the pluralist and often racist realities of ethnicity in America,
even in the academy, blacks themselves need to exert more leadership in raising these issues within political science" (Wilson, 605).

Perhaps the question why so little work as been done in the political science community or African American political behavior" is a misguided one. According to Mack H. Jones (1992), one should be concerned with the broader question of why political science as a discipline has such limited relevance and utility for describing and explaining political life in America in such a way that would yield prescriptive insights for those interested in developing programs for black advancement (26).

For Jones, and this is crucial in understanding his argument and the position taken by other conflictual paradigm theorists, Eurocentric political science is based on the worldview of those who are in an adversarial relationship with African Americans. Consequently, Eurocentric political science serves their 'preservative goals'. Therefore, "American political science cannot simultaneously serve the needs of its antagonist, the Black society seeking to overturn white dominance" (Jones, 27). * This is because, as Jones says (34),"the structural arrangements are not analyzed or evaluated as

*Jones' formulation runs counter to the commonly held Eurocentric principle that their views have universal utility; arguing that political science as a discipline is based on an objective criterion and was therefore, value-free. Jones rejects this line of argumentation noting that there are two dimensions to all social sciences, [1] the consciously normative dimension, and; [2] the scientific objective dimension. For Jones, and many other Afrocentric scholars, "the substantive content of a people's social science is determined by the consciously normative assumptions with which the process of knowing begins rather than by the science," (Jones, 27).
historically determined and historically conditioned agencies or as structures designed to facilitate the pursuit of certain topics to the exclusion of others, but rather, the structural arrangements are presented as ends in themselves."

When the maintenance of institutional stability takes precedence over the handling of our political/experiences, those who work within the existing dominant paradigm are forced to explain our clearly persistent and enduring problems "as an accident of history going back to the days of chattel slavery on the one hand, or as the result of the inappropriate behavior of black themselves, on the other" (Jones, 135).

As such, "there is no "one thing wrong" with the discipline;" (Walton, 33) but, what becomes clear is that we need to develop our own descriptive and prescriptive political concepts that are based on our own cosmology and are anchored in our experiences here in America. African Americans need a new political language, concepts and theories that can be utilized to liberate. We need theories that are formulated by our own Afrocentric political scientists that lend themselves to understanding the nature of African American political socialization and participation. African American political scientists need to develop concepts and theories that shift the locus of the discussion away from an overconcern with government, to understanding politics and, to the understanding of how African American political behavior is influenced by economics and culture.
This reorientation of our political inquiry is only possible if African American political scientists/intellectuals have the liberation of our people as their only and primary goal. Seeking equality with Euroamericans on their terms will not facilitate our liberation, nor will utilizing their terminology, paradigmatic constructions, or their political, economic, social, and cultural values. In other words, we have to leave Eurocentrism behind.

Some would argue that African Americans have no worldview, that any African American worldview, at best, is only a synthesis of Euroamerica's. Such an understanding is incorrect, because, "all people who perceive themselves as a distinct, historically determined people and, who are perceived by others to be so, will have a correspondingly distinctive worldview. The fact that there may be considerable similarities in the worldviews of proximate peoples indicates nothing more than there is a certain correspondence between worldview and lived experiences" (Jones, 36).

When people are in an adversarial arrangement, the worldviews of those involved in such an arrangement, will be and are different. Thus, the political descriptive and prescriptive objectives that are derivative of their adversarial worldviews would be different.

From an African American point of view, the American society must be viewed as a hierarchically ordered society, with whites on the top and African Americans on the bottom. In addition, our condition is seen as the
result of the political-economic arrangement of this society, and not as a historical accident or aberration. Starting from this normative base, a different set of arguments will hence ensue.

The political arrangement between African Americans and Euro-Americans must be seen as a struggle between the two groups. A struggle characterized by the desire of Euro-Americans to maintain their dominant position and African Americans attempting to replace them. By changing the locus of attention from system maintenance, to understanding of the political economic arrangements, as suggested by the conflictual model, attention is refocused and the concentration becomes politics, and the correct nature of the 'polyarchy that currently rules this society, and the political-economic arrangements between the two groups.

Before I continue elaborating on this most important change of focus, it is important to respond to two interrelated charges levied against Afrocentric scholars, which were also levied against the brave African American students during the initial call for academic and social relevance; i.e., over the validity of Black Studies programs. These charges are that Afrocentric scholarship is laden with normative assumptions (i.e., that it is not value-free), and, hence, it is racist, distorting and oppositional.

Value Free Social Science and African American Racism

The value-free charge is just another of the mythologies that Eurocentric scholarship has used to justify its racist claims against non-
European/American people throughout the centuries. Eurocentric scholarship is laden with its own values and Euroamerican scholars have tried unsuccessfully to indoctrinate non-Europeans/Americans with the fallacy of their subjective worldview as being applicable to the universal needs of humankind.

Alvin W. Gouldner argues against the notion of a value free sociology, (social science), maintaining that its original purpose was nationalistic and temporal. It is Gouldner's contention "that among the main institutional

'. According to Gouldner, when Weber first advocated that sociology be value free, he did so out of a grave concern for, [1] the German state; [2] state control of the universities; [3] professors who did espouse values in their teachings and might/do attract students and therefore enhance their professional careers, and; [4] it would serve as a sort of free trade act.

It is worth noting that Weber's primary purpose was to depoliticize the university community and thereby allow it to continue work uninterrupted. Furthermore, Weber's goal was to strengthen the German state. I am not sure that the call for value-free social sciences today is not to achieve this same purpose. According to Gouldner, "actually, however, Weber aimed not at curtailing but at strengthening the powers of the German State, and at making it a more effective instrument of German nationalism (Gouldner, 1962, 203).

If African Americans acquiesce to the pressure put on them by the state, through its ideologues at the university and in the other institutions of the colonial state, i.e., the media, and cease advancing the Afrocentric paradigm, they will only enhance and strengthen the colonial state and undermine the decolonization struggle. Furthermore, it will only allow Eurocentric hegemony to continue uncontested.

Another equally important aspect of the value-free doctrine was its moral component. That is, its original attempt was to free intellectuals from the environmental constraints in which the social scientists worked, thus, allowing them to make better value judgments. This could have meant a more authentic morality, hence allowing some to transcend the morality of their community. While all of these were possible, Gouldner argues correctly that it had just the opposite effect. That is, "it invited men to stress the separation and not the mutual connectedness of facts and values: it had the vice of its virtues" (Gouldner, 204).
forces facilitating the survival and spread of the value-free myth, was its usefulness in maintaining both the cohesion and the autonomy of the modern university, in general, and the newer social science disciplines, in particular" (Gouldner, 1962, 201).

African American social scientists are not locked inside academic institutions isolated from our communities, nor are we, or should we be, afraid of making judgments and criticizing society. We live in the world, and as such, we must become/remain scholar-activists and engaged. The crisis that effects America today also affects us in a special way. It is up to the Afrocentric social/cultural scientists to propose alternatives solutions to those which currently exist. As Gouldner says, "social science can never be fully accepted in society, or by a part of it, without paying its way; this means it must manifest both its relevance and concern for the contemporary human predicament. Unless the value-relevance of sociological inquiry are made plainly evident, unless there are at least some bridges between it and larger human hopes and purposes, it must inevitably be scorned by laymen as pretentious word-mongering" (Gouldner, 205).

For African American scholars the message is clear. There is no such thing as a value-free social science. The African American scholar must remain true to the scholar-activist tradition started by elder scholars and demanded by brave student-activists during the Black Power/Student Movements of the 1960s. They must continue to defend their people against
the continuous assault from Eurocentric scholars who seek to distort the positive image of their people.

**Breaking Intellectual Ties and Forming New Vistas For Liberation**

Fanon exhorts the intellectuals of the Third World to leave Europe behind and to forget their old dreams of emulation. He reminds them that it was the Europeans who talked of human rights and the dignity of humankind and, yet, killed, raped, and exploited hue-mans everywhere that they encountered them:

> that same Europe where they were never done talking of Man, and where they never stopped proclaiming that they were only anxious for the welfare of Man; today we know with what suffering humanity has paid for every one of their triumphs of the mind (312).

According to Fanon (1963), "each generation must out of relative obscurity discover its mission, fulfill it, or betray it. In underdeveloped countries the preceding generations have both resisted the work or erosion carried on by colonialism and also helped on the maturing of the struggle today," (206). It is the responsibility of Afrocentric scholars not to remain tied intellectually to the Euroamericans and the task of Afrocentric political scientists is to develop new, bolder and more accurate models and concepts to describe the condition of our people. Only then will we be able to discover more meaningful solutions. We must do this even if it means, "learning how to stand alone, unpopular and sometimes reviled, and how to make common cause with those other identified as outside the structures, in order to define
and seek a world in which we can all flourish.... *For the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house*” (Lorde, 1983, 99).

One such alternative is presented by Alkalimat, who by using his conflict paradigm makes the argument that the true political relationship between African Americans and EuroAmericans is colonial; that the African American people are a colonized people and that it is time that we decolonize the political terms used to describe our political life-world. Euroamericans have devised a set of terms, a language to facilitate their domination and to obscure the political reality of America. Below are the terms that Alkalimat insists are more accurate than those currently used.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Terms of White</strong></th>
<th><strong>Terms of Black</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>social science</td>
<td>social science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro (non-white)</td>
<td>African (black)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregation</td>
<td>Colonization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokenism</td>
<td>Neo-colonialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Liberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>Africanization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The problem confronting the African American people is colonialism and, if they wish to understand or eliminate those forces that have combined to imprison them, they should use terms consistent with the political reality of their society. The struggle for African Americans is not to seek equality, but liberation. Like Fanon, Alkalimat understood that "the process of

---

* List provided by Dr. Alkalimat's, pg. 179 in his essay cited earlier in this chapter.
decolonization is more toward liberation, that process of becoming independent and completely positive about one's self and one's community. It also involves social structures, enabling the black community to have complete control over its destiny through all political, economic, and social institutions" (Alkalimat, 184).

There is no freedom to be found for African Americans in the present socio-political arrangement and they will have to return to their own sociocultural-political traditions for inspiration and models in order to resurrect a different political arrangement. More importantly, as I will explain in the next chapter, in the immediate future African Americans need to refocus their attention to issues of politics and away from government.

Concluding Remarks

In this chapter I have argued that the roots of the Afrocentric movement can be traced to the Black Power movement/era which carried over into the academic community. It was during this time that the challenge was put forth by the brave student-activists for a more relevant curriculum and more involved and activist African American scholars.

In response to this dual challenge/demand, African American intellectuals renewed their historical struggle carried on during the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s by our elder scholars. In doing so, they began to challenge the validity of the Eurocentric paradigm that dominated the various disciplines that impacted on the African American people's ability to understand
themselves. During this phase of the movement, African American intellectuals discovered several consistent themes in Euroamerican "Scholarship" which together, rendered false images of African Americans and therefore, made many of the Eurocentric disciplines in the social sciences suspect and ultimately useless in the cause of African American liberation.

The discipline of political science in particular, has been viewed as quite problematic because it has not adequateley studied African American political behavior, recruited or trained African American political scientists, engaged in the production of positive images, contributed to the production of useful theoretical imperatives which could be utilized in our liberation struggle. In other words, the discipline, as a whole, has not accurately assisted in providing answers to our condition. To the contrary, it has promoted Eurocentric values and political objectives consistent with maintaining social and political stability and, hence, Euroamerican domination.

In the next chapter, I will examine this alternative vision and argue that the language of internal colonialism is the best way to approach the condition of African American in the U.S and, begin the process of liberation.
Chapter 2

Internal Colonialism and Who We Are


In 1944, W.E.B. DuBois, upon the urging of the United States government, attended and participated in several scholarly and cultural conferences in Haiti. During these conferences, DuBois delivered a series of four papers in French that were later translated but never published. The subject of those four essays would be expanded upon later in a book.

In those essays (and later in his book), DuBois discussed the growing threat that possessing and acquiring colonies would present to world peace. In doing so, DuBois drew upon an argument that had been circulating in America for some fourteen years. The argument was that the Southern portion of the United States was an internal colony of the industrial North. Here, DuBois was repeating a charge made earlier by the then governor of Georgia, Ellis G. Arnall, who said that "we cannot continue as a nation to treat thirteen million of our citizens as semi-colonials" (Aptheker, 1985, 229).

For those who were in attendance at the conference, it would be the first time that an analogy was made between classical colonialism and the internal arrangements between citizens within the same polity. And, it was the first time outside of the United States that an African American scholar
extended the definition of what constituted a colony. For DuBois, a semi-colony was defined in broader terms than commonly used to define 'classical' colonialism. According to DuBois (1985),

"first of all I am deliberately using the word "colonial" in a much broader sense than is usually given it....Beyond this narrower definition, there are manifestly groups of people, countries and nations, which while not colonies in the strict sense of the word, yet so approach the colonial status as to merit the designation semicolonial....There are other groups, like the Negroes of the United States, who do not form a separate nation and yet who resemble in their economic and political condition a distinctly colonial status (229)."

As a hermeneutic tool, domestic colonialism was to become a widely used device by many scholars inside of America and around the globe. Consequently, it stimulated a great deal of interest and caused considerable confusion. In fact, the more widely it became used, the more confusion surrounded its applicability.

For instance, the issue of colonialism was at the center of the post-World War I debate between the American administration and the colonial empires of Europe. The "Salt Water Fallacy," as it was called then, was a fierce debate over America's claim of being the defenders of any people's right to self-determination and the limited definition of what constituted a colony. Many European nations argued that "colonialism was not confined to relationships overseas and that the situation of American Indians, if not blacks, was colonial in essence" (Stone, 1979, 255).
This historical charge is central to my argument.

Most early internal colonialism scholars were drawn from various fields of study and had a variety of interests. Unfortunately, many contemporary and early domestic colonial theorists are/were primarily interested in the structural aspects of colonialism as it manifests[ed] itself inside nonindustrialized nations. Currently, there is a concerted move to study the process of colonialism inside industrialized nations. Consequently, no longer is the term colonialism restricted to the discipline of international relations or to underdeveloped countries.

Just as domestic colonialism, as an analytical paradigm, was/is growing in acceptance, it also has its opponents. There are a variety of reasons why the model is being discounted, and there seems to be no single group who is most adamant about their opposition to it. There are no "definitive conclusions about the broad merits of the internal colonialism thesis. It does suggest that internal colonialism raises almost as many questions as it answers and, in this respect alone, it certainly has fulfilled a valuable function" (Stone, 258).

I am not concerned with the extent to which internal colonialism has or has not been used. I am concerned with how domestic colonialism has been narrowly defined and, consequently, the subsequent confusion that has risen around the model.
John Walton has made an attempt at clarity but, like the others who objected to its usage, Walton too often reverts to narrow and simplistic terms and applications in trying to define the concept. He, like others, is overly concerned with the 'exactness' of its applicability and, therefore, seeks to use it in areas that can only be empirically 'proven.' As a consequence, Walton, while finding the paradigm useful, restricts its usage to structural analysis. Accordingly, his analysis ultimately suffers from economic or class reductionism while repeatedly ignoring other salient features. By doing so, Walton, unconsciously, adds to the creditability of those who charge that these forms of domination can best be understood by using a marxist paradigm as opposed to applying the domestic colonialism model.

Walton (1975) defines internal colonialism as "those domestic structures of inequality whose origins lie in the interface between internal conditions and external influences stemming from metropolitan economies. Internal colonialism has reference to both a process whose central characteristic is exploitation, and to the patterned consequences of the process in the form of socioeconomic inequality" (Walton: 35). My concern is not with his definition, as it is with his dogmatic reliance on empirical evidence used as his validation methodology.

According to Walton, the model has been used in four distinct ways. They are, [1] domestic analogy; [2] perpetuation of inequalities after formal independence; [3] intranational exploitation of a culturally distinct group,
and; [4] domination of a dependent majority by a privileged minority. I, like Walton, agree that some of these usages tend to confuse as opposed to inform or distinguish. In fact, some like two and four, tend to suggest "neocolonialism," which would be a better term to describe a situation in which a single or collection of groups continue to exploit members of their society after formal independence.

The fourth category can also open "itself up to charges of vagueness and all-inclusiveness" (Walton, 33). Walton is correct in suggesting that internal colonialism, as an analytical model, has generated much concern and confusion and, therefore, is in need of reformulation. But, Walton's attempt to do so, as mentioned, remains tied to economic structuralism, which has limited hermeneutic potential. This approach allows him to identify critically important definitive and essential aspects of domestic colonialism, as a 'purely' economic exploitative system; but, such a narrow application too easily lends itself to charges of overlapping.

Another flaw that I find in this narrow definition, is the notion that internal colonialism is only applicable to 'underdeveloped' Third World countries. This particular approach, by too many past domestic colonial theorists, has led to the erroneous conclusion that 'classical' marxist analysis is the only feasible approach to take when attempting to explain the structural inequalities between distinctive segments or ethnic groups within industrial societies.
Therefore, I find numbers one and three most promising and will use them as the basis for my analysis, as have other contemporary African American colonial theorists. One and three are most applicable to the unique circumstances in which African Americans find themselves. According to Walton's (1975) analysis, "internal colonialism as a domestic analogy to the forms of social and economic domination characteristic of "classical Colonialism. Conceptually, is the weakest usage of the term" (31).

I find his objection misguided, positionally obvious, and too narrow. It is precisely from a comparative perspective that one should find corollaries between classical and internal colonialism. To argue for absolutes, and to depend on data that can only be empirically justified, is to miss much in the real world and run the danger of scientism; to say nothing about missing many of the unique manifestations and features of domestic colonialism.

Domestic colonialism reveals itself in other areas that resist the preciseness of empirical validation. It will manifest itself in those areas of the society easily explained away as abhorrent behavior, racial prejudice or problems of socialization and adjustment. Or, which have been attributed and consigned to marxist analysis.

It is argued, and rightly so, that domestic colonialism produces many other disorders in society that contribute to the maintenance and uniqueness of colonial exploitation, and only through a comparative analysis is it possible to establish its applicability. So, in culturally and ethnically plural
societies, where there is a potential for exploitation, it is absolutely imperative that one establishes, for prescriptive purposes, the exact substructure upon which these exploitative conditions are built. Domestic colonialism is the paradigm that allows us to explain accurately the exploitative nature of a society as well as identify the appropriate substructure.

**Colonization is a Process and is not Restricted to Time or Space**

When most scholars and laymen think of colonization, they immediately think of distance. They think of a distant land with strange and exotic names and people. But what DuBois and those who were involved in the "Salt Water Fallacy" were alluding to, was a process and not a place. Domestic colonialism theorists reject the narrow exclusive definition of colonialism which restricts its usage and terminological meaning to a spatial requirement. As far as DuBois was concerned, colonialism would now be defined as a process and thereby be released from its spatial constrictions in order to meet new conditions in the modern era, i.e., after WWII.

In this redefinition, DuBois concurred with another of his contemporaries, E.A. Walker (1945) who said that, "there would still be colonies in fact even were the name discarded to-morrow. Colonial empires will not cease until the peoples of the earth get on more equal terms with one another in every vital respect.," (4).
Like DuBois, and other internal colonialism theorists, Walker understood that the process of exploitation would continue even if the term changed.

Due to advances made in this area, we now know that what had been called colonialism should properly be termed imperialist-colonization, two separate and overlapping processes united to dominant a people. While the particularity of this historical phase should not be overlooked, it is important, as O'Dell argues, not to "miss the many varieties." He continues on to say

* In an article entitled, Colonialism's Back—and Not a Moment Too Soon, written by, Paul Johnson, which appeared in the April 18, 1993 edition of the New York Times Magazine, Johnson wrote that "we are witnessing today a revival of colonialism, albeit in a new form. It is a trend that should be encouraged, it seems to me, on practical as well as moral grounds."

Johnson, in typical imperialist fashion, continues on with this line of argumentation to blame the various neocolonialist problems facing the Third World, and particularly Africa, on the victims. Johnson argues in predictable prerogator fashion that the colonies prior to the age of decolonization were [1] on their way to responsible membership into the modern world; [2] were better off under colonial rule; [3] that the world would be a better and safer place if colonialism was reinstituted not under indirect rule, but under direct colonial intervention; [4] that the United Nations Security Council (made up of former imperialist-colonizing countries), should mandate "Trusteeship" to certain countries, such as, Britain, France, India, China, America, and France and, [5] that Somalia, Angola, and other African countries were ready for immediate colonization.

For a good discussion on how the term has changed see, Henry C. Morris, History of Colonization. The MacMillian Company, 1908.


that a people may be colonized on the very territory on which they have lived for generations, or they may be forcibly uprooted by the colonial power from their traditional territory and colonized in a new territorial environment so that the very environment itself is "alien" to them" (O'Dell, 1967, 8). O'Dell makes an important argument in saying that "in defining the colonial problem it is the role of the institutional mechanisms of colonial domination which are decisive" (O'Dell, 9).

Hence, territory is just a stage, an arena in which the process of colonialism is conducted. Thus, the environment is not the qualifier or ultimate determinator in the colonial process; it is the structure of the institutional arrangements that matter most. Consequently, internal colonialism "constitutes a special variety of the colonial problem and the solution to this problem must take into account its uniqueness as well as that which it has in common with the general problem" (O'Dell, 9).

From O'Dell's point of view, "the United States has long since become a colonial power and is today the number one colonial power in the world," (O'Dell, 12-3). In addition, currently the U. S. is engaged in transforming the direct-rule relationship with the African American colonies into a neo-colonial relationship. And it is this transformation which has added to the continuous criticism over the utility of the paradigm. To make this transformation more palliative and to render its nature more obfuscating, America is currently engaged in producing a cadre of political, semi-economic
bourgeois-nationalists and military elites and non-elites (i.e. new house slaves) to assist Euroamericans in their policing of the Third World and colonized African Americans. Clearly, this is a complicated process involving transformations in the economic, socio-political and cultural arenas. It is to this specific operation of colonialism that I now turn to.

Internal Colonialism and Culturally Distinct Groups; Reoccurring Themes

Pablo Casanova utilizes the internal colonialism paradigm to explain the presence of structural and non-structural forms of inequality between the indigenous Indians and the Mestizo/Ladino population of Mexico. Casanova maintains that the unequal structural relationship that currently exists between these two distinct groups developed during, and emerged from, the Spanish colonization period. According to Casanova (1965),

> Internal colonialism corresponds to a structure of social relations based on domination and exploitation among culturally heterogenous, distinct groups (33).

While domestic colonialism is distinguishable from 'classical' colonialism, its primary purpose is the same: economic exploitation. Casanova maintains that domestic colonial societies are also distinguishable by other exploitative correlatives that are not explained by other interpretative paradigms. But,

---

*Casanova identifies several areas of correlation between classical and internal colonialism. Casanova maintains that internal colonies correspond to the process of classical colonialism, in that they have the existence of dual socioeconomic systems based on domination and exploitation; that this domination and exploitation is based on cultural heterogeneity, that this exploitation will affect an entire group of people and not different segments of that group,
the narrow restrictive language of Eurocentric disciplinary social science prevents many Third World scholars from developing models that will assist them in understanding their societies; and thus, they too often let these scholars determine the models to be used, and therefore determine the conclusions to be reached. He, like other internal colonialists theorists, argues that many members of 'mainstream' social science are simply resistant to the usage of the concept of colonialism to explain and/or describe the intranational conditions and arrangements between two groups within the same polity because 'colonialism' has always been used in the discipline of international relations.

Casanova not only resists this academically restrictive definition of colonialism, but also the judicial-political definition as well. While he does admit that these two definitional forms are useful, he also finds them prohibitive. They are useful, in as far as they provide one with a comparative tool, but become prohibitive when and if they prevent cross disciplinary utilization.

that the politics of a colonial society is based on racism and domination, that the mobility of the dominated group is regulated and restricted, that the dominated groups culture is denied and economic mobility is based on the acceptance of the superordinates groups cultural values, that the dehumanization and thingification of the dominated group accompanies the economic deprivation of that group and, colonial societies tend to be plural societies, where each group voluntarily restricts contact with other groups. Thus, for Casanova, in the presence of these other structural and social inequalities, it is more accurate to describe the social system as colonial.
A judicial-political methodology employed to determine the existence of internal colonialism suggests a territory without self-government, where you have an unequal relationship between those who rule themselves and those who do not. It suggests a territory in which the administration and responsibility for administration is a concern of the state which dominates it, and the dominated lack meaningful participation, in the election of officials of higher administrative bodies (rulers are assigned by the dominating country, region or segment of the population). The utilization of this methodology would reveal that the regulation of rights, social privileges and economic situations are determined by another group or oppressive societies. This methodology has proven to be very useful when the colonized people are culturally, linguistically and racially different.

The economic arrangements between the various ethnic groups in a domestic colony are exactly the same as in classical colonial situations. This suggests, an economic arrangement based on uneven development caused by exploitation, the presence of a single crop economy or single sector development, a monopoly in import-export trade, exploitation of natural resources and fiscal policy, the exclusive control of profits and, economic mobility is based on the extent to which the dominated group has acquired features of the dominant group's culture (Casanova, 1965).

The task for domestic colonialist theorists is to determine to what extent, if any, these characteristics and others are present in the particular
society that they are studying. Casanova provides us with yet another set of exploitative and oppressive conditions that will typically be found in domestic colonies. The list provided below can be used as basic criteria to establish the existence of a domestic colonial process.

a]. Deformation and dependence of the native economy
b]. Decapitalization
c]. Migration, exodus and mobility of the 'natives'
d]. Reinforcement of the dependence (judicial, political, military, and economic measures)
e]. Social discrimination (humiliation and oppression);
f]. Linguistic discrimination
g]. Judicial discrimination
h]. Political discrimination (lack of political control by the 'natives' in own municipalities)
i]. Discrimination in union-hiring policies
j]. Fiscal discrimination (taxes and excises)
k]. Discrimination in official credit
l]. Policy reinforcing the combined systems of exploitation


Rodolfo Stavenhagen applied some of the same criteria supplied by Casanova in an attempt to explain the relationship between the indigenous Indians of Mexico and the Ladino population. What Stavenhagen discovered was the presence of several of Casanova's elements of discrimination based on the evolution of classical colonialism into domestic colonialism.*

*Stavenhagen finds culturation dehumanization, forceful removal of the indigenous population from their traditional homelands, economic advancement and social mobilization based on assimilation, the presence of a dual economic structure based on exploitation and domination, political domination, intracommunal and intercommunal racial stratification and, the destruction of the indigenous economy and the forcing of the people into wage dependency as important components of*
I will not discuss all of the various nuances of his argument, but emphasize his most important contribution. According to Stavenhagen, internally colonized people are both classified, identified and exploited by the forces of a capitalism and colonialism. He argues that "those Indians who for various reasons were absorbed by the larger society, therefore, quit the aforementioned colonial relationships to become integrated simply in a class structure" (Stavenhagen, 70). Based on this analysis, one can draw the conclusion that classism is not the exclusive method of identifying a people or the only means of exploitation in a capitalist society; but rather, its a temporal and interchangeable exploitative classification/system/process. In fact, class categories and capitalist exploitation can co-exist along with colonial arrangements and processes of exploitation. The subtle (not always subtle) distinction being that, in internally colonial societies, class labels/identities and social, political and economic roles are applied to individuals, and

the Indian/Ladino relationship. Through various schemes of land reform, the Ladino population established the same dichotomous relationship of development and underdevelopment, based on monopoly and exploitation, that existed during classical Spanish colonialism.

It is this unique feature of many industrial-capitalist societies, i.e., being both obviously capitalist and subtly colonial, that has contributed to the proclivity among colonized scholars to accept the economic structure as being dominate. Therefore, they engage in a class reductionist mode of analysis instead of looking at the particular historically determined developmental underpinnings of their particular societies to extract the colonial structures that determine the macro economic and political arrangements between the two opposing groups.
colonial distinctions/identities/roles are reserved for and used to exploit entire groups (Stavenhagen, 73).

Classism and colonialism often co-exist in societies that have emerged, or developed, out of former classical colonial situations, or other exploitative environments, such as slaveocracy. At the same time, the axioms/imperatives of colonialism tend to retard and prevent the full development of class relationships, and restrict the mechanisms for their amelioration, i.e., unionism. More importantly, class stratified societies do not exclude the existence of domestic colonialism (Stavenhagen, 76). In fact, domestic colonialism enhances the development of capitalism and adds to its exclusiveness. Thus, making it more attractive by obscuring its exploitative ubiquity. In such a complex industrial system, the colonized, as a group, will always be less fortunate and more visibly impoverished. And, for those who only have scant identifiers with the elite colonizers (usually racial), this will make them more complacent and easily controlled and/or influenced by colonial demagogues who appeal to their delusionary economic, racial and social advantages.

While I have concentrated so far on societies in the Western Hemisphere, i.e., Mexico, the application and usage of this paradigm has not been restricted to just these societies. It has found utility in countries on the European continent as well. In many of the societies where the domestic colonial paradigm has been applied, many striking similarities and parallels
have been discovered that validates its usage as a paradigm for analysis. For instance, Jack E. Reece has found the internal colonialism paradigm very useful in explaining the historical relationship between the Bretons and the French. Reece uses linguistic discrimination as his analytical tool.

According to Reece, France is engaging in several typical colonial practices. Currently, France is developing of a single-crop economy on the traditional lands of the Breton-speaking population in order to promote their dependence on French finished goods, forcing the Bretons into a system of wage-labor and away from subsistence farming. They are promoting the development of various educational, military and political forms of discrimination to enforce their domination and, using various chemical (alcoholism) means to maintain their political and economic control. The French are using various acculturation policies against the Bretons to encourage them to use French cultural practices as a means to socioeconomic mobility. They are encouraging and engaging in massive depopulation schemes designed to destroy and/or reduce the viability of Brittany's cities.

By creating and utilizing various transportation devices, France has turned Brittany into a cheap labor market colony where many of the able-bodied men go into Paris seeking and finding low paying jobs. As a result of these and other policies, the French are turning the population of Brittany into a colony comprised of women and older people (many of them retirees from Paris). The result of these various colonial practices has been the
decapitalization of the region which has increased strong feelings of ethnonationalism among the Bretons. Consequently, the Bretons are engaging in a violent struggle to end the domination of the Francophones (Reece, 1979, 277).

Citing reoccurring arguments put forth by many ethnonationalists, Reece concludes that Brittany is a domestic colony of France. He maintains that the Bretons most often feel their colonial status culturally and linguistically. The French often claimed that the Bretons are biogenetically inferior to them because of their inability or refusal to use French, or because of their alcoholism. The French began a policy of militarizing the homelands of the Bretons and initiated a policy of class and ethnic stratification in employment. Most professional occupations, i.e., judges, lawyers, bankers, corporate managers, teachers and other skilled jobs are reserved for the Frenchmen, or Gallicized indigenes, while unskilled jobs are reserved for the Bretons, i.e., fisherman, farmers, peasants, or 'petty clerks.'

The political arrangement between Brittany and Paris also resembles that of other domestic colonial situations. Brittany is currently being ruled indirectly. In other words, the political decisions that affect the lives of Bretons are made by a parliament that consist of many ineffective ministers who do not serve the interests of the Bretons against the French. As a consequence, Bretons "condemn this practice and point to it as important
evidence of Brittany's political domination by an imperial metropolitan France" (Reece, 288).

Another example of internal colonialism is reflected in the struggle between the Francophones and Anglophones in Quebec. According to McRoberts (1979), the relationship between these two culturally distinct groups would best be described as an internal colonial relationship. He finds evidence of various overlapping stages of indirect/direct political rule, economic discrimination based on cultural distinctiveness. He also found evidence of language and employment discrimination rooted in ethnonationalism. There was class and social stratification based in cultural and ethnic difference and economic and geographical displacement stimulated by labor migration. There were also rebellions and revolts produced by the emerging salience of ethnonationalist sentiments among the Francophones. More importantly, McRoberts discovered the existence of internal colonialism and classism and surmised that this phenomena was due to the region having emerged from a historically 'classical' colonial past.

Due to the active participation of the Federal government in creating uneven economic underdevelopment between the British in Ontario (the metropolitan society), and the French majority in Quebec, (the economic colony of Ontario and British ruled Canada) the French are suffering from the effects of a single sector economy. According to McRoberts "the Federal government has, for its part, tended to be more responsive to the economic
needs of Ontario, and has thus both reinforced Ontario's advantage and undermined the Quebec's government's efforts" (McRoberts, 299).

McRoberts goes on to reveal that the development of the colonial relationship between the British core (his term) in Ontario and the French periphery (again his term) emerged as a consequence of conquest and recolonization of the French majority in Quebec by the British in 1759. After the conquest, the British began to engage in several familiar colonial processes all designed to exploit the French of Quebec. Politically, the British began a neo-colonial policy whereby, they utilized a traditional elite class and converted them into political puppets for them (McRoberts, 1979). As a result of this process, the clergy and the seigneurial class enjoyed more political power than they would have enjoyed under the Ancien Regime according to McRoberts. These neo-colonialists have promoted the existence of, and enhanced the domestic colonial rule of the Anglophones.

What emerges from these examples is a clear repetition of certain forms of 'classical' colonial behavior that suggests the existence of domestic colonialism (behaviors that will clearly distinguish it from other familiar categories used to explain exploitative societies). For instance, it is clear that in these artificially pluralistic societies which have emerged from a past from communities that practiced cultural and linguistic discrimination, this practice becomes a means of denying socioeconomic mobility to one group while enhancing the economic mobility of another group, or employs
acculturation processes to promote socioeconomic mobility, which is suggestive of the colonial process. When these societies engage in deculturation, dehumanization/thingification of members of an ethnically different group, while utilizing legal, military and economic institutions to promote and maintain socioeconomic and political domination, it is safe to say that they are colonial.

The historical record clearly shows these societies will use cultural norms, values and differences to promote and reinforce domination and/or discrimination. They will actively engage in economic policies to produce uneven economic development between regions, i.e., cities/rural, or, city and suburbia, along cultural differences, will encourage the displacement of culturally distinct groups of people to convert them from economic sufficiency (usually in rural areas) to economic dependency, (via wage labor in economic centers) and, use concepts of superiority and inferiority based on cultural differences to maintain positions of domination and economic exploitation.

Internal colonial societies have created artificial classes and colonial features that co-exist in a symbiotic relationship. Internal colonizers will use cultural differences to establish and maintain political dominance based on direct or indirect rulership principles by entering into neo-colonial tutelage policies with traditional elites to facilitate their exploitative policies. When
we witness, with consistency, the presence of these features, it is safe to say that one is looking at a domestic colonial process.

The African American Condition and The Classic Colonialism Analogy

**Methodology**

Walton dismissed the colonial analogy approach as being the weakest approach of the four to prove the existence of domestic colonialism. But, for American domestic colonial theorists, the colonial analogy methodology has proven to be a more descriptively and prescriptively viable approach in accurately describing the African American condition. American domestic colonial theorists have used this paradigm to understand various aspects of the African American situation which they claim could not have been accurately explained by utilizing others models.

They have utilized it to explain racism, the legal system, the social role of the police, and other security institutions, the ubiquity of violence, the socioeconomic condition of African American people, the struggle over land between oppressed people and those who oppress them, the rise of ethnonationalism among the oppressed, the struggle for social equality between oppressed people and those who resist their struggle, the existence and maintenance of Ghettos, the dichotomous nature of the American economic system and, the sociopsychology of the African American people.

Harold Cruse, for instance, makes the argument that African Americans have always been a colonized people. Cruse maintains that the era
of slaveocracy should be considered the 'formative years' of American
domestic colonialism. Like DuBois, Cruse recognized that the only difference
between the African American colonial condition and other classically
colonized people is geographical. Instead of America colonizing Africans in
their own lands, Euroamericans brought the Africans and other
non-European people to this country. Consequently, "the only factor which
differentiates the Negro's status from that of a pure colonial status is that his
position is maintained in the "home" country in close proximity to the
dominant racial group" (Cruse, 77).

Thus, African Americans satisfy two of Walton's criteria which
contribute to their 'uniqueness.' African American colonization evolved out
of a historically oppressive environment, i.e., slaveocracy, and African
Americans are a distinct ethnic group. The only thing that was needed for
the successful implementation of African American colonization was state
assistance.

The existence and maintenance of domestic colonies depends on the
economic policies of the state towards the imperialist-capitalist elites. The
assistance of the state in the development of the internal colonialism process
is in fact, crucial. "Open and concessionaire policies contribute to internal
colonialism in specific ways. Tax allowances, suspension of import duties,
unrestricted local borrowing and profit repatriations are just a few of the
concessions that enhance the oligopolitical position of foreign corporate
investors" (Cruse, 76). If one looks at the South as a distinct (foreign) region, as it was considered by the industrialized North, then this quote accurately describes the economic-political arrangement/policy that the federal government pursued after the Civil War. It can be easily established that the federal government and the northern capitalists, through private and public economic policies, provided the crucial economic stimulus for the creation, development and maintenance of American internal colonialism. "With the defeat of the South, the slavery system was transferred from the private sector of the economy to the public sector. Blacks then became wards of the military (Freeman Bureau), the church (American Missionary Association) and the state (Northern Republican Party). Once the Blacks were no longer private Southern property, but public property, the negro questions was rephrased....," (Madhubuti, 1978, 33). It was now demanded that solutions be found to the "Negro Problem."

Seeking solutions would dominate the public policy debate during the reconstruction period. Some of the familiar policy considerations were foreign colonization, separated intranational feudalism (employ them where they were), domestic colonization, segregation or assimilation/integration. The federal government, unrestrained by any social institutions, again sought to allow economic considerations to lead and decide this debate. Thus, Euroamericans decided to colonize the African American people. Immediately following the Civil War, they engaged in and enacted several
social, economic and political policies designed to convert African Americans from feudal subjects into colonized citizens.

Democracy would not be a deterrent to the development of African American colonization. In fact, it became, along with capitalism, a major contributor to the success of the process. "The immense wealth and democratic pretensions of the American way of life have often served to obscure the real conditions under which the . . . Negroes in the United States live. The Negro is discriminated against and exploited. Those in the educated, professional, and intellectual classes suffer a similar fate. . . . This is much more than a problem of racial discrimination; it is a problem of political, economic, cultural, and administrative underdevelopment" (Cruse, 76).

Ethnic discrimination became the major mechanism for underdeveloping the African American nation. The unique forms of discrimination that African Americans face on a daily and continuous basis (i.e., racism) in every segment of the American polity led to their economic underdevelopment and political impotency. Cruse argues that, "of course, the national character of the Negro has little to do with what part of the country he lives in. Wherever he lives, he is restricted. His national boundaries are the color of his skin, his racial characteristics, and the social conditions within his subcultural world" (Cruse, 78).

Cruse goes on to use the domestic colonialism paradigm to explain and justify the rise and existence of ethnonationalism (i.e., African American
nationalism, among African Americans. According to his thesis, African American nationalism was a reaction to the combined forces of domestic colonialism, racism, the socioeconomic forces of America and the success of nationalist liberation struggles in the Third World. Like Madhubuti, Cruse maintained that African American nationalism will eventually become the empowering force that will facilitate the liberation of the African American people, and that, the rise of African American nationalism would be further enhanced by the failures of bourgeois nationalism (Cruse, 1968).

Internal Colonialism and the Formation of Intraethnic Class Divisions

One feature has been repeatedly observed by many domestic colonial theorists is the formation and creation of dubious and artificial classes inside colonized communities. The creation of "social" classes are useful to the imperial-capitalist-colonizers in so far as these social class stratifications confuse and obscure the lasting and essential bipolarity of capitalist societies and, thus, lead to the development of false-consciousness and faulty analysis. In colonial situations, because of the expansion of classism, the colonizer is able to achieve greater control over the colonized and therefore, make nationalist cohesion more difficult (Fanon, 1967; Parenti, 1989). As argued

* My argument here is simple. In colonial societies, and especially here in America, the criterion for determining class status has changed. Traditionally, class status, was determined by ones relationship to the means of production; now, it is determined by other factors, such as, education, income, profession. Thus, the socialization of class distinctions. Class identity has become confusing if not meaningless.
earlier, classism and colonialism are not exclusive to one another; in fact, they often exist in a symbiotic relationship. And the former usually evolves from the latter. This is particularly salient in industrially developed societies. The creation of intra-ethnic classism in the African American colonies is a result of, and designed to facilitate, the continuation of colonial oppression. Class stratification is a useful device for the control of colonized people.

Like the neocolonialists collaborators of classic colonialism, today's African American bourgeoisie-class was created for the exact same purpose. Allen compares the rajahs, princes, sheiks, and chiefs to the traditional bourgeois of the African American community (teachers, professionals, preachers) in function and purpose. From among this color aristocracy*, Allen singles out the preachers to illustrate the divided loyalties, and the ethnic and cultural dislocation that this created class suffers. Allen (1990) argues that,

> it cannot be denied that the black preacher is often identified as an "Uncle Tom," a collaborator. He is seen as a traitor to the best interest of his people. This is not a role which the black minister consciously assumed(12).

The African American middle-class, according to Allen, finds it easy to work with the Euroamerican colonizers and often shares many of their values as a

---

consequence of miseducation. This is a theme that is repeated by many colonial theorists.

Allen notes that some will object to the usage of the colonial model, arguing that the African American community is now achieving great gains in social, economic and political power. Allen dismisses this argument by suggesting that, the *power* that the African American community, or some of its members, have received corresponds completely with the traditional neo-colonial phase in other colonized societies such as Ghana. Like in other colonized societies, this ethnic-classism divides the community along economic lines, creates a 'buffer group' that prohibits direct contact and confrontation between the colonizers and the colonized, creates a false illusion of equality, promotes the development and persistence of a false-consciousness in the minds of the colonized and, actively assists in the maintenance of colonialism.

As noted by Carmichael, et al, these conditions will continue to advance and, as a result, African Americans will remain, as all other colonized people, oppressed unless and until there are some radical political changes made in how we select and elect our own leaders. Thus, for Allen, and other domestic colonial theorists, ethnonationalism and revolutionary behavior are inevitable.
Violence as a Structural Component of Internal Colonial Policy and Practice

Currently there is a polycentric and multilayered debate being waged in the United States concerning the ubiquity of violence. Violence, or the spread and undefined nature of violence, has taken center stage in our public and private discussions. Many who are engaged in this debate have taken the position that violence is a structural component of the American polity and, as such, American citizens are more likely to engage in violent acts to solve their individual problems, as the government has done to resolve its problems. Some of these writers argue that the U.S. has always had a tolerant attitude towards the usage of violence, and therefore, violence should be seen as a normative behavior (Iglitizin, 1970; O'Dell, 1967; Satre, 1963; Smith, 1977).

Those who take this universalist position argue that all humans have a potential for violent behavior, and if there is a tolerant social attitude towards its usage, humans are inclined to see violence usage as an acceptable form of problem-solving and will defer to it as opposed to other forms of problem solving strategies.

Others argue that even if this is so, violence and democracy are antithetical to each other, in that, democracy as a political tool, portents that conflict resolution can and should be done through nonviolent democratic structural methods. One such person is Iglitizin (1970) who argues that,

what happens when day-to-day operation of the American system falls far short of
the high criteria implied by ...model of democracy? There obviously exists a large gap between ideal and practice when there are large groups of people who: (1) have not adequately socialized the majority values and beliefs; (2) are subject to malaise and anomie rather than to active involvement in the system; and (3) feel that since they have no part in making the laws and rules which govern their behavior, there is no obligation to obey them (180).

Violence has been, and is, a principle facet of the American democratic process. The use of violence, or the threat of its usage by the state, has been both effective and ineffective. America's history has demonstrated the utility of, and the tolerance for, violent individual, institutional, governmental and social behavior. For example, during the Westward expansion, the labor movement and the civil rights movement, violent behavior, as a problem-solving method, played a critical role in resolving the conflicts between the opposing groups. And, for those who have been left out of the democratic process, locked out of the economic mainstream, America's proclivity to sanction violent behavior throughout its history has demonstrated how beneficial violent behavior can be (Iglitzin, 183).

As this debate continues, there is a tendency to limit our focus and therefore limit our understanding of its causes. When we think of violence, we usually think of its most obvious and overt form; that is, individual violence directed against another person. But rarely do we think of it in its several covert forms, i.e., in its psychological, institutional, or other hidden
forms. Rarely is the debate focused on "social systems based on caste, slavery, colonialism or those that tolerate urban ghettos" (Iglitzin, 177). Thus, we are prone to focus our attention on either the biogenetic or sociogenetics of the individual, and therefore away from the system.

Those who are engaged in the public debate on the ubiquity of violence have given the impression that violence affects the whole society equally. They fail to state that violence serves the interests of a specific segment of the ruling polyarchy. They, like Iglitzin, fail to address the political aspect of violence directly by omitting the race factor.

In other words, what is conspicuously absent from their critique is the racial dimension. Many, when discussing violence in America, fail to attach it to the formation of the Euroamerican ruling polyarchy and, therefore, generalize its usage. In fact, the usage of violence has a primary and particular political function in this society. Violence in all of its various manifestations, i.e., organized, unorganized, individual, group, official or quasi-official, when directed against certain ethnic and oppressed groups in American or, as in any other oppressive society, is political and racial. The African American community more than any other segment of our society, has been subjected to various forms of structural violence, and to miss or ignore this fact is to miss much about violence and colonialism in this society. The introduction of drugs, the creation of high levels of underemployment, the promotion of economically motivated crime and political disenfranchisement, along with
failure to develop or utilize the human resources within the African American colonies are all forms of violence. So too is the refusal to eradicate the high levels of curable diseases that currently are killing many of our older people and infants. The usage and continuation of substandard housing and the presence of police colonialism/brutality are all, and should be seen as, forms of structural violence conducted against the African American community; and must become a part of our public discourse.

Robert Staples correctly notes that political violence is "violence used in the interest of political and economic elites" (Staples, 18). Violence is and shall remain, even in its individual manifestations, political; "It would be more accurate to see violence as a political act, because it reflects one's status in the society, not the objective fact of physical injury inflicted upon a person" (Staples, 19).

Defining violence in its particular context allows internal colonial theorists to see African American violence, in all of its manifestations, as a reflection of colonial dynamics. It is clear to them that the American society

---

For an extended discussion on this point see, Michel Foucault, Discipline & Punish: The Birth of Prison, Vintage book N.Y., 1979; in particular note part two.

Foucault argues that the punishment of crime is more of a political act than a judicial one. Its purpose is to send the message of absoluteness of authority to the masses. Initially, corporal punishment took the form of punishing the criminal's body, i.e., decapitations, amputations, maiming, etc. Later, punishment would become mental. Now the authority would deny the person their freedom by locking them up in prisons where they were under constant surveillance. Increasingly, society became accustomed to surveillance, and began to accept that the leader had the political authority to punish them.
as a colonial society sanctions, uses and punishes violence based on the relationship one has to the colonial administration.

Another way to view the intracommunal violence that currently grips the urban colonies is to see it as a manifestation of colonized pre-revolutionary behavior as predicted by Fanon. Currently, the debate seems content to deny reality by attempting to make African American males the icons of violence in America. Anyone vaguely familiar with America's history and aware of the current ubiquity of violence knows that violence is not restricted to the African American colonies, or committed primarily by African American males. At the same time, violence can be seen as essential for the creation, maintenance, destruction, and eventual liberation of both the colonizer and the colonized caricaturized people. Therefore, violence can not simply be understood as a method of changing the physical relationship between two opposing forces; violence has a distinctive humanistic character.

Violence has a liberatory quality to it that extends beyond the physical liberation of a country. It is psychologically humanistic. According to Fanon (1963),

at the level of individuals, violence is a cleansing force. It frees the native from his inferiority complex and from his despair and inaction; it makes him fearless and restores his self-respect (94).
Violence becomes a form of humanistic therapy for the dehumanized colonized people. It liberates them from the confines of inhumanity, where self destructive violence dominates, into the realm of humanist compassion that repudiates aimless violence and loss of human life. Sartre (1963) understood this sociopsychological function of violence as well:

the native cures himself of the colonial neurosis by thrusting out the settler through force of arms. When his rage boils over, he rediscoveres his lost innocence and he comes to know himself in that he himself creates his self. Far removed from his war we consider it as a triumph of barbarism; but of its own volition it achieves, slowly but surely, the emancipation of the rebel, for bit by bit it destroys in him and around him the colonial gloom (23).

Through the armed struggle, death and rebirth occur. Two people die, one physically and the other sociopsychologically. Like Fanon, Sartre understood that violence was not only a destructive divisive force, but it was also a creative and unifying force. While it destroys an oppressive people and the system that oppressed them, through engaging in violent acts, it also creates a new people; freeing them from the neurosis of colonialism and uniting them in organized struggle.

Violence is a transcendent force that removes the country and its people, through the spilling of blood, from the savagery of colonial resistance into the arena of national civility, thus, making it possible for them to unite with the universal family of humankind. Zahar argues that "at this stage of
direct, sanguinary revolt, violence lacks as yet a political and strategic orientation; for the time being it has a sociopsychological function, and in this form, it is a necessary pre-condition for the organized liberation struggle (Zahar, 1974, 82).

One can then make the argument that violence, as understood by Fanon, is reproductive. Violence has always been employed, in various forms, by the colonizers (in the initial seizure of the land, in maintaining colonial domination, for discrimination against the colonized, through military brutality and, as a mechanism in the dehumanization process). Later, violence begins to duplicate itself in the psyche and social structure of the colonizers and, in the minds and actions of the colonized. Violence and its usage is viewed by the colonized as the surest way to achieve their liberation (Zahar, 1974, 98).

The logical extension of spontaneous violence is organized violence. Just as the colonizers logically extend their usage of violence into various institutions to maintain their illegitimate, usurped and privileged position, the colonized will ultimately use it to retake their rightful position in the community of humanity. Revolutionary violence does for the nation what spontaneous violence did for the individual. Just as individual spontaneous violence served as a therapeutic function that set the people free from their individuals neurosis, organized revolutionary violence bestows upon the
collective the right to self-determination, which sets all collectively free (Zahar, 79).

Like its classical progenitor, domestic colonialism relies on structural violence in various forms to maintain itself. Like the classic colonizers, the domestic colonizers also utilize violence, in its overt and covert manifestations, to exploit African Americans economically. African Americans, like the Bretons, the Canadian French of Quebec and the Mestizo Indians of Mexico, have been subjected to the various forms of violence endemic to colonialism. What has to be done on a national level is to educate the African American community so that, we, as a people, can shift this national debate away from its narrowly focused nature and place it in its correct social context. While we should be concerned with the personal dimensions and manifestations of violence, let us not forget that there are different reasons and purposes for its ubiquity. "Violence is not good or evil. It is necessary today that we have our Nat Turners on the street corners of every ghetto, but where are our John Browns" (Lester, 1969, 42). In essence, where are those individuals who will convert this behavior into an organized struggle with a clear objective in mind. Why should we spend time on the debating the relative merits or demerits of violence usage when the social environment dictates such behavior?

While many of our people are willing to engage in sporadic semi-organized acts of violence without it being connected to a larger movement,
we still do not have those who are willing to develop, or act in an organized revolutionary manner. As we are witnessing, sporadic violence is too easily isolated, becomes removed from, and tends to invalidate a larger revolutionary movement/struggle. Consequently, the sporadic violence that is engulfing the urban colonies has become an effective tool for the reactionary elements of the colonizers community. They have used this form of violence to justify their interventionist, fascist behavior to remove vital elements from the struggle, and to solidify forces within their community that constrain the legitimate aspirations of the colonized people. Sporadic violence now, as it always has been, has become counter-revolutionary, creating a climate of stagnation and useless tension.

Until we view America as a colonized nation, and act politically to correct our condition, while engaging in extra-political behavior, individual acts of resistance will only result in legal repression. As such any violent act that is not connected to a larger movement is useless to our cause, and must be seen as counter-revolutionary.

Colonialism, Crime, and Punishment: A Case of Legal Discrimination

Due to the colonial makeup of this society, the legal system is constructed to preserve the illegitimate interests of the colonizers. As colonial subjects, African Americans are held in a contemptuous position and have historically been denied justice. In colonial America, or any other colonial society, equality under the law is an impossibility. Having the power of
definition (to define what is and what is not a crime), the colonizers define acts that are justified acts of resistance as illegal acts of undefined violence (Staples, 1975, 6). "White collar crimes, when committed against colonized people or their property, will be either lightly punished, or not punished at all," while crimes committed by the colonized are oppressively punished. African Americans are punished for non-homicidal crimes more severely than Euroamericans who commit violent crimes, are given harsher sentences for the same crimes committed by Euroamericans and do not commit interracial crimes in the same proportion as Euroamericans.

Unfortunately, African Americans do commit the same types of crimes as other colonized people. Their homicide rate is ten times higher than Euroamericans. "This is the period when the colonized terrorize and beat each other, while the colonizers' policemen have the right to assault the native with impunity" (Staples, 19).

In addition, like other similarly colonized people, African Americans suffer from various institutional forms of judicial violence and discrimination. They lack adequate legal representation, are underrepresented in the jury system and suffer from legal domination at the hands of Euroamerican judges who represent the system and not justice. In

* For more information see, Manning Marable, "How Capitalism Underdeveloped Black America," South End Press, Boston, MA., 1983. In particular see, chapter nine, section II. In this chapter, Marable discusses and documents several instances of Euroamerican violence committed against colonized Africans where the criminal behavior went unpunished.
fact, as Bruce Wright (1987) noted, most of our judges and lawyers come from
conservative backgrounds and communities far removed from the daily lives
of oppressed African American criminals, which renders them unfit and
uncaring to judge effectively in such circumstances. In fact, these judges have
become "the assembly-line feeders of the prison system. The result is the
warehousing of offenders. The neighborhoods from which they come are
neighborhoods transferred to the prisons" (Wright, 13).

As a consequence, African Americans are political prisoners, who
receive unjust punishments. As political prisoners, African Americans are
incarcerated three times higher than other groups, given the death penalty
for non-capital punishment crimes and, given the death penalty if the victim
is Euroamerican (Staples, 22).

If America is a colonial society, will bourgeois remedies be able to solve
our problems when they have not been able to solve the inequalities that

* Also see, Robert Chrisman, Black Prisoners, White Law, The
Black Scholar, April-May, 1971. Chrisman makes a similar charge and
argues that African Americans are outside of the law and they "are
either victims or else prisoners of a law which is neither enforced nor
designed for us—with repressive intent," (Chrisman, 45).

Chrisman also argues that regardless of the nature and legal
category of the particular crime that an individual or group of African
Americans may or may not have committed, they all are political
prisoners, in that, "their condition derives from the political
inequality of black people in America. A black prisoner's crime may
or may not have been a political action against the state, but the state's
action against him is always political" (Chrisman, 45).

Also see, Manning Marable's How Capitalism Underdeveloped Black
America, South End Press, Boston Ma., 1983. In particular, see chapter
four.
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continuously confront the colonized masses in other colonial situations? In the face of continuing injustice, at the hands of the American colonial justice system, what African Americans must do is politicize the creation of a decentralized parallel legal structure in our communities. What we need, even though it already exists to our detriment, is legal pluralism." As we push for nationhood status, this, and other dimensions of legalism, will become more salient.

African Americans must have the American legal system decentralized. Until then, it is important that we push for inclusion into all levels of the present system. As colonized people who have had their traditional legal systems destroyed, African Americans must develop one."

---

*. For a good extended discussion of legal pluralism see, Salley M. Merry "Legal Pluralism, Law and Society", Vol. 22, No. 5, 1988. In this article Merry argues that every society is legally pluralistic. She defines legal pluralism as having two or more legal systems that co-exist within the same polity. Merry borrowed this definition/model of legal systems from classical colonial societies. This model has not been fully accepted by many legal, political and social science scholars. Merry states that she has/is constantly running into problems, or useless debates over the validity of this model when trying to apply it as an interpretive paradigm to describe, or explain, the modern legal system of America.


** See, Scott Clark, Racing Away from Georgia v. McCollum: the case for an "All-Black System of Criminal Justice," National Black Law Journal, Vol. 13, No. 1&2, 1991-1992, pg. 29-60. Clark concludes that, due to the persistence of racial injustice in the American criminal justice system it would be only reasonable for African Americans to push for their own criminal justice system. Clark argues that even in the face of legal remedies, injustice still disproportionally effects African American defendants and the courts seem willing to allow this
By utilizing the domestic colonial paradigm, we can conclude that the reasons for the persistence of certain crimes within our communities are not atypical of colonized people. Furthermore, the criminal behavior of the African American offender, while clearly anti-social and therefore undesirable, is understandable and is not biogenetic but, rather, induced by certain social inequalities endemic to colonialism.

While I have used the domestic colonial paradigm to explain various aspects of crime, violence and the legal system, the next question is, "has the domestic colonialism model been used to explain the persistent reoccurrence of rebellious behavior by African Americans?" As I have argued, organized revolts, rebellions or revolutions are the 'logical necessary' extension to spontaneous violence or suicidal behavior by the colonized.

Internal Colonialism, African American Revolts & Decolonization

The major model of Black colonization is the powerless ghetto, i.e., the process of ghettoization. Ghettoes have a long standing history that is denied by the permanent nature of ghetto residency by the African American people. Clearly, ghetto residency is less a matter of choice than it is a restrictive policy

---

to continue. He bases his argument on historical precedence maintaining that this plural system existed and was effective during the first reconstruction period.
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by the colonial administration.* African Americans have employed various strategies to gain either control of the urban colonies or to escape from them (Blauner, 89). A recurring means of gaining control of the ghetto has been the use of riots or rebellions.

Riotous and rebellious behaviors have been met with an organized campaign of confusion, designed to discredit its political purpose. African and Euroamericans who have engaged in this counter-rebellious propaganda, have sought to characterize these revolts against the government as a desire, on the part of the colonized either to share in the economic well being of America or to become integrated fully into America’s mainstream, and not as a desire to seek autonomy or liberation. Neither of these conclusions are accurate, in that African Americans have continuously sought either to gain control over territory (i.e., community control) or to expel foreign elements who are exploiting their communities.

* In their now classic book, The Black Metropolis, St, Clair Drake and Horace R. Cayton, (Harper & Row, Publishers, N.Y., 1945) argue that all ghettoes are colonized communities. They also argue that eventually all residents escape from them, that Euroamericans set the standards for the mobility for colonized residents, the existence of colonies, i.e., ghettos, have a direct effect on the property values of the affluent communities that surround them, the colonies are stigmatized, their residents are blamed for the conditions in them and these sections are usually older and more difficult to keep up and, when African Americans move into these areas, they are there for longer periods of time.

Drake argues that the reasons why African Americans are restricted to these areas, are due to racism and America’s internal apartheid policy. He notes that while the African American population grow, the communities, boundaries remain the same. Restricted by law and income, the colonies became ‘undesirable’ and the residents soon reflect the stigma of the community.
As such, "riots are being increasingly recognized as a preliminary, if primitive, form of mass rebellion against colonial status" (Blauner, 89). While it may be fashionable and even accurate to recognize the linkage between colonial status and rebellious behavior, it is equally important that we recognize and denounce the counter-revolutionary spontaneous behavior being carried on by loosely connected groups of people that lack organization and direction. What was and is important about the riots, and this is to confirm Fanon's thesis, is the revolutionary potential that these spontaneous acts hold.

Colonial conditions inside domestic colonies produce rebellious behavior just as the exploitative conditions cause classically colonized people to rebel: there is no difference. From this point of view, we gain a different perspective on the persistence of riots as well. Consequently, what we have been erroneously calling riots should be correctly called revolts and rebellions, in that they are aimed at denouncing and challenging the legitimacy and authority of the colonial administration and not just directed against Euroamericans. What this suggests is that, given the correct political

Historically, riots have played a crucial function in our society. Interracial riots have been critical in helping the Euroamerican colonizers to maintain their control and social privileges in America. Only recently have riots taken on a distinctively Black iconography. Historically, riots were initiated by Euroamericans against the African American community. There has been, with the exception of recent times, no decade when Euroamericans have not used this form of terrorism to intimidate, and otherwise attempt to control, the African American people. For a detailed discussion see Lee E. Williams and Lee E. Williams II, The Anatomy of Four Race Riots, University of Mississippi Press, Jackson, Miss.
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climate and the existence of a political group to seize upon those movements, riots can be organized into revolutionary decolonization struggles.

Classical & Internal Colonialism and Police Behavior: An Analogy

"It is impossible to understand the police institution without discussing its fundamental role within the context of the U.S. capitalist system and its various supportive institutions" (Smith, 1981, 36). I am in agreement with Smith to a certain extent. I agree that we cannot understand the role and function of police institutions outside of their social context, but I would like to extend his analysis a great deal further. It is important that we remember the unique character of the American colonial system.

As far as I am concerned, the role of the police, and other security institutions in this society cannot and should not be separated from the colonial nature and structure of America. The police in 'colonial' America serve the same purpose that the military/police serve in traditional colonial situations. The police in America and in other colonial situations, are used by the colonizers through various official and quasi-official means to maintain an atmosphere of oppression by projecting the image of absolute control, which is designed to instill in the colonized a sense of powerlessness. The presence of the police, by keeping the colonized under constant surveillance, tends to reinforce their inferior socioeconomic status, while assuring the colonizers that social and residential segregation will be strictly enforced and controlled.
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The police are able to accomplish these goals due to their unchallenged, unrestrained, authorized and encouraged use of brutality.* There is no difference in the behavior of the police as described by Fanon when he says that "in the colonial countries, on the contrary, the policeman and the soldier, by their immediate presence and their frequent and direct action maintain contact with the native and advise him by means of rifle butts and napalm not to budge" (Fanon, 38), and the authority that the police exercise, according to Smith when he says that, "not only are the police expected to inquire, to observe, and to detain, but they are expected to use violence and force, even deadly force, if deemed appropriate" (Smith, 46).

What is the difference in what Fanon (1963) describes when he says,

A few jeeps leave headquarters and bring back some ten Algerians picked up at random in the street or, more frequently, in a nearby door. One after another, in the presence of the suspect who is the only one of interest to the police, these men are going to be tortured to death. It is felt that after five or six such

* Also see, David Rudovsky, The Criminal Justice System and The Role of the Police in the Politics of Law, cited elsewhere. In this article, Rudovsky argues that "the police are not subject to meaningful legal restraints and, the courts have legitimized police conduct that protects prevailing social and power relationships rather than impose the kinds of legal restraints that should exist in a democratic society (Rudovsky, pg., 443)." Rudovsky also maintains that through several forms of illegal actions the courts have reinforced the social and political discriminatory practices of this society, while providing the police with laws that allow them to act with legal impunity. For instance, the courts have consistently allowed the police to violate the civil rights of many oppressed members of the African American colony, as well as other members of the oppressed citizenry of this society.
and what Albert Reiss, Jr. observed and wrote about in his essay entitled, "Police Brutality—Answers to Key Questions," when he (1968) said:

The police station, however, is more than just a series of cubicles called interrogation rooms. There are other rooms and usually a lockup as well. Many of these are also hidden from public view. It is not surprising, then, that one-third of all observations of undue use of force occurred within the station. The lockup was the scene of some of the most severe applications of force. Two of the three cases requiring hospitalization came about when an offender was "worked over" in the lockup.

or what Smith (1981) said,

Following situations where police have been killed or shot, or when some form of street crime against white owned businesses or others have taken place, the police-when unable to find the right suspect-will roam black and minority communities looking for some innocent person on whom to pin the blame.

There is no difference. They all occurred under similar circumstances: colonialism. The only difference, if we wish to count this as a difference, is the language used to describe the behavior of the police. The tactics and goals are the same. There is as great a tension between the police in America's colonies as there was in traditional colonies. The tension between the police and the colonized community was the major cause of the rioting that occurred in this
country as late as 1992, in Los Angeles. * According to Tony Martin (1993)

the police have been the cause of more Black-initiated riots than any other factor. The Houston Riot of 1917 began when white policemen manhandled a Black woman and brutalized the Black soldier who came to her aid. The Chicago Riot of 1919 began when a white policeman refused to apprehend white persons who had stoned a Black boy to death as he swam in Lake Michigan. The Watts Riot of 1965 in Los Angeles was triggered by the excessive force used in arresting a Black man for alleged drunk driving. The Detroit Riot of 1967 started as a reaction to police brutality accompanying the arrest of 70 to 80 African American patrons of a speakeasy. The "Rodney King" Riots of 1992 were no different. They were caused by blatant police brutality compounded by an incomprehensible verdict on the side of bigotry (30).

As early as 1968, in The Report Of The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, members of the Commission concluded that:

deep hostility between police and the ghetto communities is a primary cause of the disorders surveyed by the Commission. In Newark, in Detroit, in Watts, in Harlem-in practically every city that has experienced racial disruption since the summer of 1964-abrasive relationships between police and Negroes and other minority groups have been a major source of grievance, tension and, ultimately, disorder(299).

* As early as 1981, Congressman John Conyers, Jr. wrote in an essay entitled, Police Violence and Riots, The Black Scholar, 1981, that the reasons for the riots in Miami in the summer of that year had been caused by "a persistent pattern of police violence and brutality in Miami. The black community knew it. The police knew it. Even the city's insurance company knew it" [Conyers, pg., 4].
The police institutions in our society use the same tactics to dehumanize African Americans in our colonies as the military used in Algeria, South Africa, and Ireland. In all of these places they use/used random pickups, abusive language, brutality, physical death and torture. All natives in these colonial situations were viewed as suspects and, therefore, were subjected to a wide range of dehumanizing behavior typical of colonial societies.

In colonial America, the police have engaged in several tactics to defend themselves from charges of police brutality and repression. They have formed police organizations, engaged in intimidation towards policemen who dissent, used the courts to silence opposition to their behavior, supported terror organizations such as the Klan, spied on their opposition and, become involved in politics to support right-wing politicians. And when faced with dissenters inside their own ranks, it is not uncommon for them to display hostility towards those who dissented. According to Smith (1981), "dissenting officers are viewed as betrayers of the profession, unpatriotic and disloyal" (Smith, 51). This is the type of behavior which according to Fanon must accompany colonialism because it "cannot be understood without the possibility of torturing, of violating, or massacring"(66). Police brutality is another of the euphemistic phrases used for torture, and professional disloyalty is another way of calling one unpatriotic.
The current police institutions owe their origin to the various state militia that were organized in the slave states to control the movements of the slaves, to return runaways to their owners, quell slave revolts and patrol the roadways between the northern free states and the slaves states during the formative years. Current policing theory and behavior towards the African American community evolved from the philosophy that "national military power would be invoked to quell black insurrection and to remand fugitive slaves when and if it became necessary (Berry, 1971, 15).

Again, this evolution of 'police colonialism' evolved from a pre-colonial environment. Repressive policing institutions were specially important and necessary during the *formative years* when the ratio of slaves to slaveholders disproportionately favored the slaves and the fear of slave rebellions was widespread. In such an atmosphere, oppressive laws and institutions were needed to discourage any attempts by slaves to seek their freedom and to create a sense of security in the Euroamerican public. "A ruling class, subjected to periods of panic arising from doubt of its ability to maintain its power, may be expected to develop very complex and thorough systems of control. The American slaveocracy did develop numerous psychological, social, juridical, economic and militaristic methods of

suppression and oppression" (Aptheker, 1987, 53). It is my position, and many other African American scholars, that Euroamerica has continued to develop these complex security institutions to suppress the African American liberation struggle.

Since 1968, the Euroamerican colonizers, through their various security institutions, have been involved in removing the African warrior class from our midst. The political institutions of this society are conducting a war against our people. This undeclared war has been and is being condoned by many members of the Euroamerican community due to the hysteria surrounding the growing intensity of the pre-revolutionary violence that is overflowing the boundaries of our urban colonies and engulfing this nation. This call for counter-revolutionary behavior has been widely represented as the only available means of hopefully controlling violence. This war, which is being conducted against our warriors, and one which we African Americans are reluctant to recognize or become actively engaged in, threatens to fragment our people at a crucial stage in our historical struggle.

Most recently, after a twenty year propaganda campaign conducted by right[reich]-wing elements in this nation, especially the republican party, to create a climate of intolerance, fear, and pro-fascist sentiment, the Euroamerican colonizers were successful in passing the largest anti-revolutionary crime-bill in the history of this repressive nation. In a desperate attempt to counter the liberation struggle of African Americans and
other repressed people here in America, Colonial Administrator Bill Clinton signed a $30 billion fascist bill designed to control this universal movement that is currently gripping this nation (Thompson, 1993, Welsing, 1993). For example, the colonial administration will spend $8.8 billion to hire an additional 100,000 cops, and another $8.3 billion to build more prisons, boot camps and other alternative incarceration institutions. And to pay for this, the administration is planning on cutting 250,000 public service jobs (Revolutionary Worker, September, 3, 1994, 3).

At the time of this writing, various reactionary conservative elements within the republican party are promising that they will alter the bill even more. They are promising to remove many of the preventive features of the bill and replace them with even harsher punishment provisions. In every imperialist society, violence is waging out of control and in typical fashion, these societies are reacting accordingly.

Interestingly, this seems to be a universal war being waged against the African communities in every country that has an internal colony of Africans. In London, under the Thatcherite monetarist government, the African community has been targeted for the same type of repressive actions by their police as the communities here in America and in other colonial societies. According to Bridges (1983),

Police against black people, for example, documented 150 separate incidents from different parts of the country concerning police malpractice in such areas as raids
on black clubs and meeting places; mass stop-and-search operations conducted against black communities by Special Patrol Groups and the illegal Immigration Intelligence Unit; arbitrary and violent arrest of black individuals and entry into black homes; and the subjecting of black persons held at (or even visiting) police stations to violence and verbal abuse, long periods of detention without access to lawyers and relations or even basic medical attention, forced confessions and fabricated evidence, and routine fingerprinting and photographing.

Since 1967, here in America, the incarceration and death rate of the African American male has been constantly rising, and this is not by accident. Between 1978 and 1990, the number of black males who were victims of homicide averaged 7,300 a year. The rate of incarceration during this same period averaged 121,000* annually. The result has been a shrinking population of men and the creation of what William Julius Wilson calls "concentration camps of females, older people, children and those who are chemically dependent."

The Euroamerican colonizers have either killed, imprisoned or mentally or physically destroyed the African American males in the

---

colonies. All one has to do is read the results of Wilson's work to see how successful the war has been for the white colonial-nationalists of our society.

African and Euroamericans have been locked in a war and seemingly, the African American community has been losing. The statistics seem to confirm that position. It is the warrior class here in America and in Britain, the same class that was stolen from Africa, that is being decimated and targeted for incarceration and death at the hands of white reactionary colonizers and their official organizations of repression. Ironically, it is the group that any nation must depend on to defend itself from its enemy. Thus far, the African American people have done very little to stop this slaughter.

Seemingly, African American people do not understand deep self-respect. And according to Dr. Francis Cress Welsing, a noted afrocentric psychologist, "Black people are going to have to learn the meaning and practice of deep self-respect (Welsing, 1993, 83). Not only do they not understand the meaning of self-respect, they, as a nation of people, are not practicing it either. What they are engaged in is a form of counter African-Survival Thrust behavior. They, as a nation, "do not understand what is


The success of this policy of decimation can be measured in this statement. According to Wilson "trends in the MMPI for the nation as a whole showed that unlike white woman, black women, particularly younger black women, are confronting a shrinking pool of economically stable, or "marriageable," men, [Wilson, pg., 96].
going on. In our impotence and ignorance, in our powerlessness and frustration, we start getting mad, fussing, crying, rhyming, begging with picket signs, rioting in misdirection, hooping and hollering, moaning in our churches and preparing again to vote for any white man who smiles at us even though he lies to us. These behaviors are all absolutely useless" (Welsing, 85).

And while we are engaging in these meaningless forms of behavior, those engaging in the white supremacy system are killing our warriors. And we, as a nation of people, are in no better position currently to see or stop the slaughter of our warriors than we were when they were lynching our males during the reign of terror called the 100 years of lynching. The slaughter of our males has continued unabated. According to Welsing "the Black collective still does not have a greater understanding of the current "open hunting season" on Black males than it did two or three decades ago" (Welsing, 84).

She maintains, that this war will continue unless we engage in a form of behavior that puts a stop to the slaughter. When we "have a disciplined self-and group-respecting response to the specific war being waged against us, there can be no progress, no peace or no courage (Welsing, 85). What the African American people must do is to engage in nationalistic politics/behaviors, designed to stop this slaughter of our warrior class. But
this is no easy task, as every revolutionary action has been faced by severe police reaction.

In Britain, for instance, after the revolts of 1981, the Parliament passed a Police Bill that gave the police institution broad and discretionary powers to control the *African colonies* in London. These powers allowed them to conduct frequent stop-and-search operations, conduct intensive surveillance of individuals and political groups, to seek evidence in the homes of friends and relatives of suspected militants, set up road blocks, where the police can forcibly stop people and search them for weapons and any other devices; allow the police to detain an individual up to four days on suspicion, so that they can go search for evidence of wrong doing, seal off an area for seven days and, increase the number of foot patrols in the community. In addition to these powers, the Bill created more centralized policing measures and units, such as the District Support Units (DSU).

Similarity in America, during the 'era of revolts,' in 1965 President Johnson paneled a "Commission on Enforcement and Administration of Justice headed by Attorney General Nicolas Katzenbach" (Smith, 39). The commission created the "Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (L.E.A.A). Since its inception, this agency is to police departments what the Pentagon is to the military" (Smith, 39). L.E.A.A. has spent millions of tax payer's money on equipment and education of police personnel in an attempt to make the 400 various police departments in this country more
effective and centralized. In furtherance of its goals, L.E.A.A. has helped to create various paramilitary counter-revolutionary, (terrorist), teams such as the S.W.A.T. using technology and methods learned from the Army during the Vietnam counter-revolutionary conflict.

Finding success and a welcoming ear among the colonizers who accept their usurped positions (conservatives), the various police institutions have created highly secret organizations to spy on the colonized and "political activists." In our society, we have created what "may constitute . . . the largest army of police spies in the U.S." (Smith, 48). Leading this list of spy organizations is the super-secret organization known as the Law Enforcement Intelligence Unit (L.E.I.U).

This is a little known and highly secret organization with enormous intelligence gathering capability and poses a great danger to the civil liberties of U.S. citizens and others living here (Smith, 39).

This 'red-squad' and others like it, are posing a threat to the liberties of this entire nation and consequently, America is experiencing a massive movement towards totalitarianism. Jacques Rupnik argues that totalitarianism is "the concentration of power in the hands of a few and the lack of democracy, making social control impossible" (Rupnik, 1988, 265). And nothing has facilitated this movement towards totalitarianism more than the mythology of 'law and order which is a euphemism for counter-revolution.
Seemingly, the Euroamerican public is so willing to accept this lie, out of a fear of losing control, that it has allowed the formation of secret police institutions inside of their democratic systems, only to find that they themselves have become victimized. To understand this is to understand the creation of L.E.A.A. and L.E.I.U. and other super secret police intelligence organizations in our society as we move towards a 'police-state.' The colonial regime, by its nature, is a totalitarian regime it must create and maintain these types of repressive organizations if it is to stay in existence. The process of colonialism is compatible with any political philosophy and will utilize any regime to further its ends, even a democratic regime. The privileges of democracy are reserved for those in the mother-country (the Euroamerican communities). But in a domestic form of colonialism, there is constant tension between the reality of totalitarian repression and libertarian democracy.

* For a good argument concerning the reemergence of the American police state, see, Herb Boyd, Blacks and the Police State: A Case Study of Detroit. The Black Scholar, February, 1981. Boyd argued that prior to the increase in minority policemen, there were wide spread charges of police brutality that led to deaths and riots. Immediately after the riots which occurred in Detroit, the police department began to hire more African Americans and women. But faced with a shrinking source of revenue, the city was forced to lay off a number of these new police officers. As a consequence, many of the programs that had been effective in controlling crime and creating a better relationship between the community and the police, i.e., foot patrols, were eliminated.

Faced with budgetary problems, the city has witnessed a resurgence in official and quasi-official terrorism by Euroamerican police persons and the Klan-Nazi coalition. Boyd cites several instances to illustrate the severity of the problem.
The colonized, those who are denied the benefits of this libertarian mythology, are necessarily involved in attempting to obtain that which would confer on them the legal recognition of humanity. To successfully maintain an exploitative system, the colonial regime employs and creates terror organizations. Because of the struggle between the dominant and the dominated in our society, there is a need for police repression and oppressive institutions. As Euroamerica struggles to achieve a balance between control, security and democratic freedoms, the very institutions created to maintain control present the greatest threat to those liberties they supposedly seek to maintain (Heller, 1988). Yet, the existence of these super secret police organizations only become conflicting and troublesome to society when they conflict with the prevailing ideology. For example, when they clash with the imperatives of a libertarian democratic state. Domestic colonialism and democracy do not and cannot co-exist. One either maintains the colonial society and subverts the principles of democracy or changes the colonial society to realize full democratic privileges. In other words, it is not possible to achieve, a harmonious blend between them. "Secret police and secret organs of investigation cannot even in principle be democratized," (Heller, 137). Every American citizen needs to learn what members of the colonized community have learned the hard way, that community control and political pressure will not correct the totalitarian course on which we are headed.
The various police intelligence agencies have resisted every attempt to control them, while they themselves have actively courted right-wing politicians and extremist groups and spied on those who oppose them and their selections:

*The police have very consciously begun to link up more with the racist right wing movement, organizing for the ruling class in its stepped up assault on the rights of people. The police today are working, perhaps more than ever before, to protect and serve those who are in power as well as those in the right wing movement who are organizing at the behest of those in power (Smith, 43).*

Not only have they been involved in controlling the colonies, they have spread their surveillance to include community groups, political parties, civil rights organizations and any other organizations that threaten the status quo of bondage.

The African American community has been directly under an assault from the various intelligence organizations, police institutions and military branches of this government. The C.I.A., the F.B.I. and many other intelligence organizations have engaged in activities that were meant to destroy its struggle for freedom.

Hoover's F.B.I. was notorious for spying on our civil rights and social protest organizations. He and his F.B.I. conducted a secret war on the civil rights movement during the failed second reconstruction period as it did during the era of the 'Red Scare.' And during both eras, the African
community was seeking social justice via any organization that would allow them to participate as equal partners or to give them a platform on which to wage their historical fight. According to Kenneth O’Reilly (1989),

Having engaged the civil rights movement during the voting litigation campaign of 1961 largely on his own terms, Hoover would spend the next two years skirmishing with the movement on every imaginable front and expanding the only Negro Question responsibility that he felt comfortable with—domestic political surveillance of anyone, black or white, who undermined the peace and quiet of his Bureau and the internal security of his America by struggling for racial justice (77).

While we, the colonized citizens of this society, have tolerated intensified surveillance, the white colonizers of this country and Britain, and in every society that has experienced increased police and political repression, have also been forced into the circle of repression. They have experienced a severe loss of liberties and freedoms, witnessed the escalation of spying on their communities and their organizations, and fallen into the net of police political control. In Britain, "the police capacity for political control of the community will also be greatly enhanced by a new legal power to conduct general searches for evidence in premises of organizations and persons not themselves suspected of any crime" (Bridges, 38). According to Smith (1981), the L.E.I.U. has been conducting similar intelligence activities on "political protest groups" (Smith, 49).
The African communities here in America and in Britain have been subjected to these criminal and quasi-criminal activities conducted by various police organizations, under the guise of protecting the communities and the larger society from the growing spread of violence. Under the guise of 'law and order,' a euphemism for repression, the legislatures of colonizing countries have granted the police institutions broad discretionary powers which they, (police organizations), are abusing. They are assaulting our people, killing our men, illegally searching our homes, illegally arresting our people, and verbally abusing relatives and suspects.

The police in our communities have been seen, by many colonized African Americans, as an army of occupation and not as protectors of their legal and human rights. James Baldwin (1961) stated that the police are "like an occupying soldier in a bitterly hostile country; which is precisely what, where, he is, and is the reason he walks in twos and threes" (66). They are the domestic colonizers military and must be viewed in that light. Any other paradigm except the internal colonialism paradigm leaves us seeking solutions for their criminal behavior in the wrong places. It leaves us still wondering why this behavior directed against Africans everywhere is systemically being conducted by the police and other military organizations with impunity.

What is the difference between the behavior of the police as described by Fanon, "the settler or the policemen has the right the livelong day to strike
the native, to insult him and make him crawl to them" (54) and the behavior described by Reiss, "without questioning him, they shoved him into a phone booth and began beating him with their fist and a flashlight. They also hit him in the groin. Then they dragged him out and kept him on his knees... Don't you like us Nigger? I like to beat niggers and rip out their eyes" (Reiss, 14). Again, there is none, and other paradigms, except the internal colonialism model, have been unable to explain adequately this brutal, systematic, condoned behavior. Seemingly, there is no other way to view the violent behavior of the police but through the lens of domestic colonialism.

The only difference in the behavior of the police here in colonial America and in Britain, or in any other classical or domestic colonial situation, is geography. Therefore, the only difference is the language used to describe the behavior. One cannot separate the behavior of the police institutions from the environment that creates the behavior. America is a violent nation and as Staples (1974) argues, a "nation with a tradition of violence resorts to a police state first to insulate Black skinned people from white contact and, second, to restrain and to keep the Negro from breaking out of the reservation in the case of violence (31).

Until the African American community obtains its freedom, they probably never will see the police as Euroamericans do. Because, as I have attempted to show, the police do not serve our interests; they serve the interests of the Euroamerican colonizers. As a repressive institution, and
since we suffer from what Blauner calls 'police colonialism,' why should African Americans view them favorably? They should not; and they correctly do not."

**Internal Colonialism: The Case of Structural Racism**

Racism is an integral part of classical and domestic colonialism. Racism is not abhorrent to the colonial society, nor are the racists; both are crucial to the maintenance and creation of modern colonialism. Racism is a multifaceted phenomenon that empowers and creates, destroys and dehumanizes. If one is to charge that a people are domestically colonized, then one must establish that racism exists as a structural component of that society.

It is my belief that racism is a structural component of this society. I will not discuss all of the various arguments surrounding the existence of racism in America. What I will argue is that racism is permanent and interwoven

---

* Blauner confirms the findings of Smith, Reiss, Bridges, Staples and others when he says that, "the police constrict Afro-Americans to black neighborhoods by harassing and questioning them when they are found outside the ghetto; without provocation they break up groups of youths congregated on corners or in cars; and they continue to use offensive and racist language no matter how many seminars on intergroup understanding have been built into the police academy. They also shoot to kill ghetto residents for alleged crimes such as car thefts and running from officers of the law(Blauner, 98).

Blauner continues on to say that the police engage in unequal law enforcement; official intimidation and unofficial punishment; and are the key agents in the power equation. The police "do the dirty work for the larger system by restricting the striking back of black rebels to skirmishes inside the ghetto, thus deflecting energies and attacks from the communities and institutions of the larger power structure."
into the fabric of Americana (so permanent that many scholars believe that is useless to think of America without racism or to struggle against its effects). For example, (although he does not agree that it is useless to struggle against racism) Derrick Bell argues that while racism is permanent, and to struggle seems hopeless, it is a struggle that African Americans "must continue even if—as I contend here—racism in an integral, permanent, and indestructible component of this society (Bell, 1992: xiii).

Fanon reveals that racism is a facilitator. It is structurally and philosophically crucial to colonialism; it empowers the colonizers and justifies their exploitation. It is not subjected to regionalism and it is a medium through which the colonizers deculturate a society. It is also the means by which the colonizers dehumanize and inferiorize the colonized. In a colonized situation the racists are psychologically more in tune with their environment than those who attempt to avoid this illness. All colonial societies are racially stratified and it is useless to say that portions of it are or are not racist. America is a colonial racially stratified society and it is just as useless to say which region is more or less racist. "A society has race prejudice or it has not. There are no degrees of prejudice. One cannot say that a given country is racist but that lynching and extermination camps are not to be found there. The truth is that all that and still other things exist on the horizon" (Fanon, 1964, 41).
The racially motivated deculturalization of the colonized by the system will eventually force the colonized to restore their own culture and demand reciprocity from the system. Racism, therefore, becomes a medium for resurrection and reprise. This becomes an inevitability in that the colonized can never escape the racism of the colonial situation.

In the modern world, the exploitation of mankind has been (although not exclusively) made possible by the logic of racism. Racism is designed to render those from whom one is extracting illegitimate wealth and privilege, inferior. Therefore, "every colonialist group is racist " (Fanon, 40) and, "the racist in a culture with racism is therefore normal. He has achieved a perfect harmony of economic relations and ideology " (Fanon, 40).

At the core of racial oppression in any racially stratified society is privilege and privilege is the essence of colonialism. Therefore, racial oppression is logically linked to privilege, social stratification and colonialism. To understand colonialism, whether domestic or classical, is to understand that racism is structurally linked to them both. "To generate privilege, certain people have to be exploited, and to be exploited they must be controlled—directly or indirectly. The mechanisms of control, ranging from force and violence to legal restrictions to cultural beliefs, ideologies, and modes of socioeconomic integration are, therefore, central to an understanding of oppression"(Blauner, 22).
America is a society that is based on the racial restrictions of non-Euroamericans, imposed through various methods. Ours is a society that is racially stratified such that the privileges that Euroamericans enjoy are directly connected to the denial of those same privileges to non-Euroamericans. According to Blauner, "the racial restrictions that strike at people of color in America result in a system of special privilege for the white majority (Blauner, 22).

It matters less whether certain forms of overt racism presently occur in America or that it is confined to different regions of this society; what matters is that racism benefits Euroamericans and not non-Euroamericans. While racial privilege was conferred on all Euroamericans as a group, it did not manifest itself equally across their socioeconomic stratifications. It does however provide economic privileges, even though unequal, to all classes, most notably to the benefit of the middle and upper classes.

But the bottom-line is that racism is a necessary logical component of any racially stratified society where one racial group enjoys socioeconomic and political privileges derived from their racial makeup. When racism comprises a central position of a society, as it does in America, "racism cannot simply be viewed as a set of subjective irrational beliefs that might be overcome through more and better contact, communication, and understanding" (Baldwin, 133). We all have to remember that "the United States was founded on the principle that it was and would be a white man's
country. Nowhere was this insistence expressed more clearly than in the hegemony of Western European values in the national consciousness and in the symbolic forms that have expressed this cultural hegemony—institutionalized rituals, . . . written history, the curriculum of the schools, and today the mass media" (Baldwin, 31). The ghettos (domestic colonies) are not the product of 'blind' market forces as many would have us believe. If the colonized non-Euroamericans are to be exploited and the Euroamericans are to continue to enjoy unrestricted privileges, then the two opposing racial groups must be separated. One must be able to discern from certain socioeconomic factors who is, and who is not, privileged in a society that suffers from 'classism' and colonialism. So, ghettos serve as both a symbol of class status, and as a symbolic colonial icon.

To eradicate racism, to destroy ghettos, would mean to end domestic colonialism. "As more and more people of color refuse to play the part of victims of racism, the contradiction between their shifting orientations and white dominated institutions intensifies. The refusal of racism forces change in education, in employment, in politics, and in other institutions" (Blauner, 43).

These changes will not be fast enough for some (African Americans), and too fast for others (Euroamericans) and consequently, there is constant tension between the forces for change and those who wish things to remain the same. This tension at times explodes into violent eruptions that remain
ever present in colonial societies. The question that African and Euroamericans are confronted with is best stated by Blauner. "In a racial or colonial capitalist society where the racially oppressed are a numerical minority, how can racism be overcome when the majority of the population gains from it and presumably will defend these privileges as rational and objective interest, [italics mine]" (Blauner, 44).

Blauner closes with an observation worth noting for those of us who are seeking a solution to our condition in America. He argues that the traditional solution that was available to 'classically colonized' people, i.e., the expulsion of the colonizer from their society, is not available to the colonized African Americans. Therefore, what is to be done to solve their racially, colonized condition?

**Internal Colonialism and African American Deculturation**

It has been argued by several domestic colonalist theorists that deculturation is an essential part of the colonizing process. All ethnic groups, all domestically colonized people, experience various forms of deculturation. Deculturation is crucial to domestic colonialism, as it is in the 'classic' case. It is now for us to determine to what extent, if any, that the African American people have experienced this same phenomenon.

The most severe form of deculturization did not take place in 'classical' colonial societies, but rather here in the United States. The chronology of African American colonization runs longer than in any other colonial or pre-
colonial environment. Hence, the deculturation process has been more complete and devastating to the African American people. According to Blauner, "recall that American slavery lasted 250 years and its aftermath has lasted another 100. Colonial dependency in British Kenya and French Algeria lasted only 77 and 125 years, respectively" (Blauner, 92). In these 350 plus years, African Americans have lost their language, religion, national loyalties, customs, motifs, myths, political orientation, and their identities. As a consequence, as Blauner notes, "in the wake of this more drastic uprooting and destruction of culture and social organization, much more powerful agencies of social, political, and psychological domination developed in America" (Blauner, 92). Given this, the colonizers in this society have had a greater opportunity to create confusion in the minds of the African American colonized people. Consequently, African Americans suffer from cultural ambiguity.

Again, we find evidence that the domestic colonial paradigm corresponds to the life-reality of African Americans and is, therefore, appropriately applied.

* In his essay entitled, Black Bi-Culturality, Amuzie Chemezie correctly defines Bi-Culturality as "living by two cultures. To live by two cultures is to share the same values, attitudes, beliefs, tastes, artifacts (material culture), etc., and to be guided by the same norms and social expectations as prevail in both cultures," [Chimezie, pg., 224]. Chimezie argues that if being American is to share certain European values, beliefs, etc., then for African Americans, it means to "embrace two antithetical identities," [Chimezie, 224].
I will not endeavor to look into every cultural nuance of the deculturalization here, but, will undertake the issue of language. As we have seen in the cases of France and Quebec, language discrimination was a critically important component of their domestic colonial situations. Casanova and Stavenhagen also made mention of linguistic discrimination in the Mexican colonial situation. Hence, it might again be fruitful in our inquiry here to see if African Americans have had similar experiences.

Internal Colonialism, Language Discrimination and African Americans: The Case of Ebonics

The true language of the African American is Ebonics. That is, "the language with which you first got your consciousness; thus, for African Americans this would be Ebonics. . ." (Asante, 4). For every group/person, it is critically important to the maintenance of their cultural center that they receive all instructions, ideals, and philosophies in their own language. For African Americans, while it is important for them to struggle for the legitimacy of their 'true' language, it is just as important that they acquire another traditional African continental language from which they could project these ideas and philosophies. Language, in a non political sense, is a crucial tool for the survival a person/group. As Memmi (1965) said, "the most urgent claim of a group about to revive is certainly the liberation and restoration of its language" (110).
According to Williamson-Ige, the term ebonies, "was derived from "ebony," meaning black, and "phonics," indicating sound—thus black speech sound" (Williamson-Ige, 1984, 22). Ebonics was first coined by a group of conference members attending the "Cognitive and Language Development of the Black Child" conference that was held in St. Louis Missouri, in January of 1973. They defined Ebonics as:

the linguistics and paralinguistic features which on a concentric continuum represents the communicative competence of West African, Caribbean, and United States slave descendants of African origin. Ebonics includes the various idioms, patois, argots, ideolects, and social dialects of these people. It is thus the culturally appropriate language of Black people and is not to be considered deviant (Williams, 1975, 100).

Ronald Williams argued that Black English (hereafter called Ebonics), is critical to the survival of African Americans. Because of their position in America, African Americans, like any other colonized people, are naturally bi-lingual, if not, tri-lingual.

In his book, The Colonizer and the Colonized, Albert Memmi argues that "in the colonial context, bilingualism is necessary," (Memmi,110). He argues that it is a survival tool that makes it possible for the colonized to exist in the colonial situation. Memmi concurs with Chimezie's thesis when he says that the "possession of two languages is not merely a matter of having two tools, but actually means participation in two psychic and cultural realms. Here, the two worlds symbolized and conveyed by the two tongues are in conflict; they are those of the colonizer and the colonized" (Memmi, 111). Memmi notes that the tongue of the colonized must yield to the language of the dominate group.

Also see, Robert L. Williams and Wendell L. Rivers, Ed., Ebonics:the True Language of Black Folks, The Institute of Black Studies, St. Louis, Missouri, 1975, in particular see, Orlando L.
Williams makes the point that Afrocentric scholars cannot afford to take the position that their work is not political and that includes the controversy surrounding Ebonics. Language discrimination is politically motivated and serves a crucial component of colonial exploitation. Everything that is central to the African American liberation struggle impacts on the Euroamerican sociopolitical structure.

Ebonics has a history that extends back to the linguistic patterns in West Africa, and this pattern is shared by Africans throughout the Diaspora. Ebonics is a hybrid language composed of basic West African linguistic patterns and European languages. The initial formation of this hybrid language arose out of a need by West African peoples to communicate with Europeans during the slave trade. Due to the linguistic continuity of these peoples, this new hybrid language quickly spread and became a functional part of this society. James Mc Ginnis states that "by the end of the Civil War, Taylor's article entitled, Black Language and What To do About It: Some Black Community Perspectives. In that article Taylor argues that African Americans have no choice about what language they are going to use naturally. According to Taylor, Ebonics is a historical determinate of African Americans cultural identity and has been a part of their cultural milieu longer than the English spoken by Euroamericans. Taylor argues that "ebonics was developed from a synthesis of pidgin, southern english forms, West African dialects and standard english. It is not to be confused with, or denigrated as a substratum of White english. It is not like Africans here in this country have a choice as to what language they are going to speak. They speak several languages as it is; they speak fluent dialects. They in fact speak Black Standard english, White english and slang. They are able to switch dialects without much trouble. Dialect switching is a common observed phenomenon, especially among older and better educated Blacks (Taylor, 1975)."
blacks in America spoke plantation Creole, non standard Black English, and standard English. These varieties of English were forged by the social conditions of plantation life and the social life of the slave and freemen who lived in the urban centers" (McGinnis, 1975, 9).

Being an oppressed people, the African American true language has been denigrated and determined inferior. Therefore, it has been called illegitimate for usage in public instruction, politics, the socioeconomic and cultural areas of society. The denigration of Ebonics, according to Williams, is used primarily to dehumanize and continually deculturate African Americans. As in any other colonial situation, the motives for it are exploitative. As a result, African Americans have learned that the use of their language is not economically feasible. Therefore, as a form of survival, they have been forced to learn Standard English. Williams (1975) notes that blacks have a fundamental grasp of what it means to be black in America and what our struggle is all about. For most blacks, as perhaps with most other Americans, to speak standard english, whatever it may or may not be, is an economic necessity. Blacks who are struggling to survive and to make a way for themselves in business and industry are also striving to acquire that speech and language which they have come to associate with success (58).

Williams argues that it is not economically wise to educate African American children in Ebonics, maintaining that African American children must continue to be educated in standard English if they are to survive in the
economic world of Euroamerica. Despite this position Williams argues that Ebonics will continue to be critically important to African American life.

Here, Williams understands that even when African Americans use standard English, they still have a 'street version' that carries a different connotation and as Afrocentric scholars attempt to do research in their communities, they better understand this unique language. As Afrocentric scholars, we must remember that Ebonics is important to African Americans and its retention and legitimation are politically important to them. It is a vital component of our cultural identity, preforming an essential function in maintaining meaning and national identity.

It is true, as Dorothy K. Williamson-Ige argues that, the many controversial issues surrounding Ebonics have not been resolved, even after various theories have been advanced and conclusions drawn. But all the controversies are politically motivated. All of "these theories suggest that black language attitudes and actions have developed as such due to either black inferiority or cultural disadvantages rather than because of politics" (Williamson-Ige, 24). For Williamson-Ige, the contest over Ebonics usage is essentially a question of self-determination. To allow others to define, label and otherwise dismiss our language is not acceptable. "Black people cannot afford to have their lives and their theories separated from the practical politics of the classroom and society" (Williamson-Ige, 24). "As long as we have two separate societies in contact and conflict, we're going to have two
separate languages" (Williamson-Ige, 26). African Americans have the right to define their language, and to dismiss those erroneous challenges to its usage. Ebonics "must be studied and conclusions drawn from the worldview from which the language originates" (Williamson-Ige, 26). Williamson-Ige concludes by saying that "Black scholars have responded to the political realities that nurture negative cultural attitudes towards black language. Black theorists have also expressed self-determination in their right to analyze the phenomenon of black communication for themselves" (Williamson-Ige, 28).

The issue of definition is an issue of power. Those who have the power will ultimately attempt to impose their will on other people, and the primarily purpose of the controversy surrounding Ebonics is to deny the distinctiveness and legitimacy of an African American culture. Nowhere is this struggle over/for power more evident than in the controversy surrounding our true language; just as it has been for other colonized people. The struggle over Ebonics is social, economic, educational and political. And therefore, "we must be very clear about defining the condition under which

---

*See, Grace Holt, "Black English: Surviving the Bastardization Process," Robert L. Williams, Ed. Ebonics: the True Language of Black Folks. St. Louis, Missouri, 1975. Holt makes the point that cultural differences have produced different results concerning the appropriateness of Ebonics. She also sees the struggle over Ebonics as a political struggle for self-determination and cultural integrity. Arguing that, "the right to redefine black English under the impeachable premise that definition must flow from self-knowledge: that definitions imposed by those only on the perimeters of Black culture can at best, be but half truths,"(Holt, 64).
Black people are forced to survive and the aspects of language most useful in self-definition " (Holt, 1975, 72).

Like the other linguists, Holt too dismisses the notion of cultural depravity and lack of intelligence as the reasons for the persistence of Ebonic usage in African American children and people.

Not surprisingly, there has been much talk surrounding the topic of Ebonics, intelligence and educational utility. Like the Bretons in France, the French in Quebec, and the Indians in Mexico, African Americans have suffered linguistic discrimination and our language has been denigrated and assailed for the same sociopolitical-economic reasons as theirs. Like others who live in a domestic colonial situation, the colonizers here have sought to associate our true language with ignorance and low intelligence as a means to deculturate us and to promote their cultural hegemony. We too have suffered like the Bretons from an educational policy designed to deny us the educational advantages that could be derived from public instruction given in our language. Our children who use Ebonics are also being labeled illiterate, ignorant and deprived.

There is no such 'objective' entity as intelligence. As a colonized people, African Americans should know that there is no objective worldwide agreement on the definition of intelligence, and the 'standardized' tests that have been used to determine intelligence, were never designed for universal usage. More importantly, the tests that are currently used here in America on
all children are culturally biased and based on norms that do not fit the life-reality of African American children (Smith, 1977). It would be most useful for African Americans and other Third World scholars and people to remove the findings of I.Q. tests from the eyes of the beholders and to place them where they belong: with the people who are being tested. According to Smith (1977), "if we are to take mental retardation out of the eyes of the beholder and place it where it belongs, the best place to begin, where racists and the bigoted misuse of worthless I.Q. tests and mislabeling of Black children and third world people are concerned, is with the abolition of the racist I.Q. tests and the label "mentally retarded" altogether" (27).

Since its application, the Binet and Simon test has done more to mislabel African Americans and other Third World children in our educational system than any other measurement device. Smith argues that this test was never designed to be universally used. Its universal application has been more an indication of Eurocentric hegemony and aggression than its utility as a 'measurement' device. It cannot possibly measure something that does not exist outside of its cultural utility. "There emerges nowhere in the literature any evidence or record of there having ever existed a universal definition of intelligence, or evidence of "intelligence" having existed as a universally manifested overt social phenomenon. Therefore in actuality (except as a concept) "intelligence" does not and cannot be said to have ever existed" (Smith, 6).
There is still no standardized definition of intelligence and the mislabeling of our people and children is/has been politically motivated. African Americans, like similarly colonized people, have suffered from linguistic discrimination that labeled them 'mentally retarded,' forced them into inferiorizing bi-lingualism, devalued their own linguistic cultural heritage, and promoted socioeconomic exploitation. All this proves yet again the appropriateness of the domestic colonial paradigm to explain the African American condition.

**Segregated Housing And Internal Colonialism: The African American Case**

Much has been written about the ghetto and the people who reside there. There have been those who have studied everything about ghetto residents from their language, to the formation of their families. They have studied the economics, the politics, the violence, social and individual and collective pathology, i.e., the culture of poverty, and ways of correcting these multiple problems. As individual pieces, they have resulted in a fragmented picture of the ghetto, failing to capture the holistic dynamics of ghettoization. In sum, and more to the point, most of the literature on African American residency in substandard housing argues that the situation is due to their economic impoverishment and thus, effectively shifting the cause away from the system to the victim.

In contrast, I argue that several generalizations can be made about the relationship between ghettoes and the metropolitan society. First, the
ghettos are the consequence of a systematic legitimated process. Second, ghettos exist because those who rule our society refuse to extend to those who reside in these internment camps an equal share of the wealth and power of this society. Third, they serve a necessary social, economic and political function in this society. That is, "in a class society part of one's evaluation of his own position as favorable stems from the distance between his income and standard of living and those of people who have less. This distance measures his success (Tabb, 1970, 34). Fourth, the nature of the relationship between the ghettos and 'mainstream America' is one of exploitation and oppression. Fifth, the existence of ghettos and the nature of the structural relationship between the residents of ghettos and the metropolitan society will not change unless the imbalance between the two different and separated societies is changed.

In order to change this relationship, there must be agreement on the problem. There must be agreement that the structural relationship between the ghettos and the metropolitan society is one of dependence caused by colonialism. Everyone will have to agree that ghettos are in fact internal colonies that are the result of a systemic process that began during the formative years (slavery), and has progressed to the extent that we see today. Afrocentric scholars must convince the many intellectuals and other leaders of this society who refuse to accept, in the face of a preponderance of evidence, that African and EuroAmericans have a colonial relationship.
The domestic colonial relationship that exists between the Euroamerican and African American communities can be easily seen by looking at the segregated housing and interwoven economies of both groups. Ghettoes do not exist in strict isolation from the metropolitan society and the nature of this relationship is one of development and maldevelopment or superexploitation. America's economy, when viewed as a single entity, is both rich and poor, developed and underdeveloped, segregated and integrated. It is a strange country. While we are a rich nation, large sections of our housing is substandard and many of our people impoverished. And most of this substandard housing is the residential homes of non-European Americans (many of them being African Americans).

Ghettoes are illegal refugee camps used to intern African American refugees who have been forced into exile as a result of the official terrorist activities conducted against them by government sanctioned official and quasi-official organizations such as the Klan, slave patrols, i.e., state and local police, F.B.I. and the restrictive legal practices by the federal, state and local colonial governments. Ghettoes were traditionally converted temporary housing for ethnic Europeans, who immigrated to this country after created or, natural disasters occurred in their own homelands. But they now have become permanent housing for Africans, who seek asylum for social, political and economical reasons. Some of the residents of these internment camps are fleeing persecution from intranational domestic oppression.
Many of the internees fled various forms of persecution after the two failed internal reconstruction periods. Some are new national arrivals from economic oppression after the two world wars who were forced to leave their native homelands in the South. Many came North hoping to escape terrorism, tyranny, starvation, homelessness, and social discrimination at the hands of various oppressive political regimes. Unfortunately, those who came North found political repression waiting for them. They soon learned that there was oppression, exploitation, terrorism, tyranny and death in the North as well.

Upon arrival, they discovered that they again had their lives threatened by the socially sanctioned activities of brutality and racism. They found out that they were forced to reside inside clearly defined areas and their mobility was restricted by laws and social practices. They noticed that they were being controlled by absentee landlords that were no different than their former feudal masters.

Therefore, ghettoization is a process that is not the result of the innocuous 'culture of poverty' nor is it the result of the 'pathological' behavior of those who reside there, as is often given by the ideologue of oppression as an excuse for the persistence and permanence of ghettos.

More correctly, ghettoization is the necessary component in the dualism that is attributable to colonialism. Ghettos are the economic opposites to the opulence of the metropolitan society. They are the physical
representation of poverty and maldevelopment. The permanence of ghettos are not accidental but are the result of an illegal process of legitimimized exploitation, conducted and sanctioned by the various levels of our colonial governments. "In other words, slum profits depend on collusion between city agencies and landlords: in return for non-enforcement of the codes, the slumlords take the blame for the slum and enable the city to evade the political ire of the ghetto" (Tabb, 16).

Ghettoes remain "because important segments of white society profit from such arrangements" (Tabb, 11). Ghettoes prevail because they are maintained for the economic benefit of the imperialist-colonizers and the Euroamerican society in general. They exist because slum landlords, even when proven guilty of various local and federal violations, make a reasonable profit from this illegal activity. Supposedly, even as unpleasant as ghettoes physically are, "slum owners persist in their business because they make an adequate return, and it is possible for the more disreputable and dishonest to do fairly well" (Tabb, 14). They last because of the complicitous relationship between those who make their living off the illegal housing practices that characterize ghettoization and the lawmakers of this society.

In fact, ghettoization is a very lucrative enterprise in this society. The lack of enforcement of national and local housing codes, oppressive police practices, job discrimination, exploitative economic consumerism, induced
crime and created violence, all make the existence of ghettoes profitable and persistent:

the single most crucial factor in ensuring the profitability of slums is segregation. Timothy Cooney, a former city official in New York, gives a cynic's advice on "how to build a slum": "The importance of renting to minority families cannot be overemphasized...they are the key...The all-white sections are essential to successful slum development. They must be maintained (until we decide to turn them into slums). The reason is obvious. With a 'white only barricade (or other slums) surrounding our developing slum, there will be no escape for our selected tenants (Tabb, 14).

As a result of this illegal enterprise, ghetto landlords expand their businesses and turn previous viable communities into permanent refugee camps for the exiled African Americans. They are allowed to continue this illegal practice with the complicity of those in government who refuse to enforce housing violations because it will reduce the margin of profits for those who make their living off of African American refugees.

As communities are transformed into ghettoes (refugee camps), the process of ghettoization takes over. The result of this process is high crime, low city services, poor education, depopulation of the males and the resulting feminization and infantization of poverty and the community, decapitalization, inadequate health care and, the creation of a cheap labor reserve. All of these are followed by a process of social anesthetization. The
community is infected with liquor stores, pharmacies, and quasi-legal drugs (cocaine, heroine, speed).

Ghettoization is a process of victimization and colonial exploitation and must be seen in the context of a repressive society. It is the result of a colonial society that has used apartheid as a means of separating and controlling the colonized Africans. Ghettoization is the objectification of the conscious intent of the colonial government and Euroamerican colonizers to draw a physical boundary line between themselves and oppressed people. It is the conscious and deliberate policy of the Federal Housing Administration and other local and state organization to keep profits up for large segments of their society and the colonized citizens out of the social, political and economic mainstream.

Through illegal mortgages, lending practices, insurance policies and redistricting, ghettoization has been maintained by the Federal Housing Administration of this society. Lending institutions refuse to provide mortgage insurance to homeowners in blighted areas, thereby, denying the possibility for home ownership to Africans living in the ghettos, and keeping them in an economic dependent condition, since land ownership is a source of wealth and economic empowerment. At the same time, white flight is and has been financed by the FHA.

It is one of the great post-war scandals that lavish, but discreet, subsidies have been provided for the homes of the middle-class and the rich in the form of cheap,
federally guaranteed credit, income tax deductions, and other genteel doles which effectively exclude everyone with income less than $8,000 from the benefits (_tabb, 14).

Of course inflation has raised the price, but the practice still persists today. Ghettoization provides for the lavish lifestyle that the colonizers of this society enjoy. Up and down the economic strata, Euroamericans profit from this business. This is clearly analogous to the exploitive relationship in colonial societies. What is the difference in Kenneth B. Clarks description of the ghetto and of Fanon's description of the Algerian colony? I would say none. Kenneth B. Clark (1965) describes the ghetto in the following manner,

The most concrete fact of the ghetto is its physical ugliness—the dirt, the filth, the neglect. In many stores walls are unpainted, windows are unwashed, service is poor, supplies are meager. The parks are seedy with lack of care. The streets are crowded with the people and the refuse.... but hundreds of bars, hundreds of churches, and scores of fortune tellers.

Another important aspect of the social dynamics of the northern ghettos is the fact that all are crowded and poor;... Problem of the black man is universal, the world over (29-30).

While Fanon (1963) describes the colonized community as,

The town belonging to the colonized people, or at least the native town, the Negro village, the medina, the reservation, is a place of ill fame, peopled by men of evil repute. They are born there, it matters little where or how; they die there, it matters not where or how. It is a world without spaciousness; men live there on top of each other, and their huts are built one
on top of the other. The native town is a hungry town, starved of bread, of meat, of shoes, of coal, of light. The native town is a crouching village. a town on its knees, a town wallowing in the mire. It is a town of niggers and dirty Arabs (39).

They are similar, they are the same. They both are products of the same social system; they are both descriptive of colonialism. Both situations are descriptive of the paradoxically symbiotic relationship between two totally different nations of people attempting to reside under one political system. Ghettoization is a systematic process that involves every level of government. As mentioned, the reason for the existence of ghettos are economical, political and not accidental.

**Internal Colonialism and Political Consequences**

Throughout this chapter, I have argued that the African American people are a colonized nation and as such decolonization is the only reasonable form of behavior in which they can engage. Thus, the answer to the question, "who are we?" must be, that we are a colonized people living inside the most successful imperialist-colonizing nation to date. We are a colonized nation that finds itself still engaged in a historical struggle for liberation. African Americans are colonized nation of people that are, in many ways, not prepared for this struggle but, a nation that has no other choice but to struggle for its freedom.

I have argued that the evolutionary model of America does not adequately apply to the political life-reality of the African American
community, and that the conflictual model, from which the internal colonialism paradigm derives its orientation, does. I have argued that in many ways, this is an adequate lens by which to view the African American experience. Consequently, I reject the solutions offered by those who ascribe to the equilibrium model (interracialism/integration). For these will not solve our problems as they have not solved the problems of other colonized people.

If one believes that segregation is the problem, then, either integration or annihilation would be the solution. Segregation is not the problem that many Afrocentric scholars believe to be the basis of our condition. I believe that the problem is domestic colonialism. Therefore, neither integration or various other policies aimed at bringing about social or formal equality will prove to be adequate solutions to the many problems endemic to colonization. I believe that decolonization is the only correct solution. "The process of decolonization is more towards liberation, that process of becoming independent and completely positive about one's self and one's community" (Alkalimat, 1973, 184).

It is very important for us Afrocentric scholars and our people to remember that "our essential goal must be one of freedom from white people and their oppressive, dying system, and not equality with them." (Alkalimate, 185). If African Americans are to accomplish this goal, they must have a new constitutional convention that will offer policies and programs to restructure this society. If African Americans are to accomplish their goals, they must
reorient America and themselves. We must reAfricanize our people and our basic intracommunal institutions so that we can challenge this system and offer to our people a clear alternative.

Our goal is to bring a *new* hue-man into creation and to offer and develop an alternative social structure to the rest of America and the world. "In-as-much as we acknowledge that we are Africans in the Americas who have suffered the tortures of colonization, then it is appropriate that once we are free we will reorient ourselves to who we really are (and have always been)" (Alkalimat, 186). Thus, the following chapter is devoted to a systematic analysis of the decolonization process, in hopes of determining what an appropriate decolonization process might be for African Americans which would make such a reorientation possible.
Chapter 3

Decolonizing America: A Point of Reference

_Liberation Discourse: in Search of a Paradigm_

Anyone vaguely familiar with the history of African Americans is aware that central to their understanding of themselves, and their position here in America, is the continuous debate concerning their liberation. This debate has been carried on by laymen and intellectuals alike without any serious breakage in frequency. While it is admitted that this discussion has been prevalent, and is still relevant, it is also true that because of its centrality, the debate has become confused, fragmented, contradictory and contentious.

Consistently, those directly or indirectly involved in this debate, have failed to place it inside an interpretative framework through which adequate and viable solutions can be pursued. Essentialism or absolutism have also been problems. Various factions, certain of their own solutions and rejecting all others have seen themselves as the "vanguard" group. In fact, the major obstacle to our progress, thus far, has been the inability of the various groups to cooperate with one another due to ideological, tactical or individual differences.

If the decolonization struggle is to move beyond this current ideological impasse, then each of these groups must "act and learn through mutual respect rather than give orders, which is crucial to the struggle. Such
cooperative egalitarian action, such mutuality, is itself a victory" (Childs, 1989, 9). And this I would add, at the fear of sounding absolutist, is something that must be done if we are to avoid continued stagnation.

Having argued that African Americans are a colonized people, it should be understood that their struggle is similar to that of other Third World people struggling against colonialism. African Americans can now begin to define their liberation struggle in terms that reflect this new awareness. In this chapter I will argue that the African American revolution is nothing other than a decolonization struggle. As such, it will be very similar to other decolonization struggles while having its own particular dynamics. Accordingly, African American nationalist leaders must attempt to answer many related questions surrounding this unique type of struggle. Clearly, there are lessons to be learned and arguments to be made concerning the wisest way to proceed, given America's unique circumstances.

Is There a Systemic Process to Decolonization?

The term decolonization was not coined until the twentieth century. Even then, during the height of modern decolonization struggles, the term was not used or recognized by many leaders on the continent of Africa and Asia who were engaged in colonial liberation movements (Chamberlain, 1985, 1). After all, the seeds of decolonization had unconsciously begun in the minds of colonized peoples the moment that their countries were colonized.
Nevertheless, decolonization has become "commonly understood to mean the process by which the people of the Third World gained their independence from their colonial rulers" (Chamberlain, 1) almost entirely after the Second World War.

While these struggles were particular to each colony, they all had a systemic progressive character. Seemingly, all went through various stages before the colonized countries finally received their independence. But the persistent themes were resistance to decolonization on the part of the colonizers and persistence on the part of the colonized.

The colonizing countries attempt[ed] various manoevers in order to avoid the eventuality of decolonization. Many tried to impose a 'time-table' on the decolonization process, and their national policy on the topic wavered between 'instant or protracted liberation' (Walker, 1945). In fact, the decolonization process, seen from the community of the prerogators, is understood as an 'experiment' to be conducted by themselves. Walker concludes that scheduled liberation is useless, and his conclusion supports my contention, that anyone involved in decolonization struggles should "let experience be their only guide, since reason might mislead them (138).

---

*I use this term to describe an attitude that seemed to emerge form the readings of classical colonial theorists. Writers like, Walker, Maunier, Morris, Furnivall, Luthly, etc.. The attitude seemed to be quite a matter of fact, in discussing the naturalness of Europeans to rule the world. It seemed that they had been given a prerogative to do so. Thus I coined the term prerogators.*
The argument for either type of decolonization 'experiment' centered around familiar concerns of power, prestige and exploitative privilege. The primary concern of the imperialist country was how to maintain economic exploitation. None of the two groups involved in the national debate was necessarily interested in the welfare of the colonized. In France, for instance, both groups were interested in the national image and "grandeur" of France. Paul Sorum (1977) argues that "a crucial task of the advocates of decolonization, therefore, was to convince the French that decolonization was not a sign of and contribution to the decadence of France, but rather a means to renewed greatness"(Sorum, 204).

Interwoven in the national debate over decolonization was the problem of greed, decadence, and the loss of world prestige. Those who advocated maintaining their possession, feared that loss of 'empire' would bring about economic ruin, social decadence and eventual loss of power and prestige in the world-community of imperialist-colonizers. The differences between the debaters was not over whether France should continue to play a role in international affairs, but over methodology: that is, what would be the most advantageous means to facilitate her continued colonial position. Many involved in the national debate were concerned over the loss of revenue and lost opportunities for the youth of France, or, social continuity. Without an empire, many felt that France would become another pauper state on the continent of Europe.
In other words, "to abandon Algeria, . . . is to condemn France to decadence; to save Algeria was to put a stop to the frightful process of degradation; it was to return to our country; to its people, to its youth, their chances and their future" (Sorum, 205).

Ultimately, the Imperialists-colonizing countries had to abandon their colonies because the colonized people/masses carried on a persistent revolutionary struggle against foreign domination. It was only after protracted revolutionary struggles, carried on by nationalists, that France, England and other imperialist countries began to resort to other more sinister methods of exploitation. As Sorum (1977) argues, "all great powers realize[d] now that their future, their salvation, and the possibilities of their world action depended no longer on the domination of others but on their own internal development, above all, and on "cooperation" with the former colonial people" (206).

Many imperialist-colonizing countries have tried various schemes designed to give colonies an opportunity to participate in power sharing; sometimes they even have integrated them into the commonwealth. Although these accommodationist strategies were labeled differently, they were either centralized or decentralized intervention by the ruling countries, i.e., direct or in-direct rule.
When these various tactics/strategies also failed, decolonization struggles have gone through various progressive stages leading up to a violent struggle. The length of time between in-direct confrontation and armed struggle depended entirely upon the nature of colonial rulership in the colonies. As Chamberlain (1985) notes, "the diversity of governmental practices adopted by the colonizing powers naturally influenced the form which decolonization was to take in different territories" (4).

During these delaying tactics, colonies were subjected to various intermediate stages of direct rule or its leaders were offered monetary concessions by the ruling countries to delay, if not cancel, the liberation movements. Some colonizing countries allowed the colonies to experience self rule on some internal matters and also granted them limited economic autonomy. According to Fanon (1963), "today we know that in the first phase of the national struggle, colonialism tries to disarm national demands by putting forward economic doctrines. As soon as the first demands are set out, colonialism Pretends to consider them..." (208).

Eventually, due to violent resistance by the colonial regime to the request of the colonized for some form of power sharing, and the insistence by the colonized to exercise self-determination, there occurs a dramatic rise in nationalist sentiments among the colonized people. National[ist] consciousness, as a consequence of the decolonization struggle, becomes a bifurcated phenomenon that splits along either reformist or revolutionary
lines. Before yielding to revolutionary nationalist, or before granting full independence, the colonizing countries court and/or support non threatening reformist nationalists.

Chinweizu describes this period as "an elite affair. It is a matter of genteel petitioning to colonial authorities to reform their rule, soften their depositism and admit the traditional and petit-bourgeois factions of the African elite to their councils" (Chinweizu, 1975, 115). After some meaningful, but yet symbolic protestations, the imperialist-colonizers usually acquiesce to these palliative demands and allow some meaningless political reforms.

Decolonization struggles consequently enter into various stages of negotiations, protests, boycotts, demonstrations, various acts of sabotage, sporadic violent eruptions and, then mass struggles. In most decolonization struggles, because of the ethereal violent atmosphere that engulfs the colonial environment, armed struggle is always possible, and the threshold between demonstrations, fueled by nationalist sentiments and armed struggle, is easily crossed. This happened in India as Chamberlain noted on August 16, 1946, on 'Direct Action Day' called for by the Muslim leader Jinnah, when violence erupted leaving four thousand people dead in Calcutta.

Too often, decolonization struggles become fractionalized intracommunal struggles among various ideological groups seeking control of the country after independence. These groups are usually aided by, or
caught in, either of the two major white nationalist ideological camps, (i.e., communism or capitalism) and tend to delay the freedom that was fought for during the liberation struggle. Aside from that, decolonization struggles are usually long protracted efforts that can span decades but eventually, if the national desire is strong enough for independence, the colonies prevail.

All this suggest that Euroamerican colonizers will employ various tactics to forestall the eventuality of loosing their privileged positions and power. They will use *divide and conquer* strategies employing religion, regionalism, educational, classism, and gender differences to defeat liberation movements. The national liberation movements must be aware of these tactics and find ways to effectively limit their effects.

**The Tabula Rasa Of Decolonization and The African American Liberation Struggle**

The process of decolonization is an unorganized, polycentric process that defies linear progression and clearly defined processes. Nonetheless, it is aimed and oriented towards a definite goal: national liberation. "Decolonization, which sets out to change the order of the world, is obviously, a program of complete disorder" (Fanon, 36). The decolonization movement should be viewed as a tabula rasa upon which one can write any script or program. It is a process that is historically defined and must come out of the cultural context that gives rise to it.
Therefore, when we look for the historical examples similar to our present struggle, we must be very careful not to rely on false analysis. *African Americans must place their current struggle within the present Afrocentric context and assess the extent to which past decolonization tactics are relevant.*

It can be argued that the failure of the second-reconstruction period [1945-90], was due to the combined failures of the liberal white establishment and the African community to institutionalize neo-traditional African American nationalism. Our present reluctance to advocate and to Africanize our political and social institutions are examples of inappropriate Afrocentric compliance and behavior. By acting in this counter-revolutionary manner, we are forestalling our decolonization struggle.

The importance of the second reconstruction period lies not so much in the failures of, or our reliance on, the polycentric white liberal segment of this society but in our inability to understand fully the extent of social investment on the part of Euroamerican liberals. Absent a clear understanding of the nature of this society, one is bound to rely on the "liberal" establishment in America that is composed of multi-interest subgroupings, each with its own group agenda.*

---

* For an extended and insightful discussion on this point see Raymond Aron, *The Opium of the Intellectual*, The Norton Company, N.Y., 1962. In particular see chapter 1 where Aron argues that the liberals never were and never will be a monolith. Aron maintains that they have always been a coalition of groups, each with its own political agenda. He continues on to say, that the Liberal left in America is historically been different in meaning and function than the liberal left in France. Aron maintains that to rely on them is to be counter-revolutionary
As a whole, the white liberal establishment is not interested in the transformation of the American colonial society.

The intellectual or progressive bourgeois might want the barriers between himself and the colonized to fade; those are class characteristics which he would gladly renounce. But no one seriously aspires towards changing language, customs, religious affiliation, etc., even to ease his conscience, nor even for his material security (Memmi, 37).

As such, this group, which is composed of the colonial middle-class, often "rejects the "extreme" solutions of radical social change, and this makes sense since such radical social change threatens its own well-being. A more equitable distributing of income might mean that he would have less" (Ryan, 28).

The object of the decolonization process, is to reorganize completely the former colonial society and not to reform it. As such, the absolute goal of the decolonization struggle is to bring forth a new person and to create a new society, which is antithetical to the desires of most groups within the colonizers' community. The two goals [to bring forth a new person and a new society] are inseparable and interwoven. Social transformation is dependent upon personal transformation and not on maintaining old psychological forms of dependency.

just as it would be to rely on the proletariat. According to his thesis, both group are reformist oriented and that the American capitalists have demonstrated an ability to control and coopt them, by giving them monetary or other concessions.
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This means a change in the relationship between African Americans and the Euroamericans and a transformation in the cultural patterns of this society. As far as I am concerned, this is only possible if African Americans objectively and subjectively change their identity. That is, a psychological transformation must take place. In order to accomplish this reordering, Fanon argues that the replacement of the colonizers with the colonized must take place. He describes this replacement process in the following manner,

in decolonization, there is the need of a complete calling into question of the colonial situation. If we wish to describe it precisely, we might find it in the well-known words: "the Last shall be first and the First last." Decolonization is putting into practice of this sentence. That is why, if we try to describe it, all decolonization is successful(37).

The decolonization process therefore necessarily becomes totalizing and absolutist, affecting all personal and institutional relationships, requiring alterations in or abandoning old friendships and behavioral patterns. It means employing different strategies that will in effect change the culture, education, language, politics, economics and the psychology of the colonized people. It is a restoration and renaissance at the same time. It transforms the former culture from a mummified useless commodity into a "living tradition" (Onwuanibe, 1983, 145). It is transformative and humanistic. It is a violent process that seeks to end various forms of violence. It liberates both humanity and society. It is an ending and a beginning. The decolonization
struggle is an overlapping process that has no clear lines of demarcation. Its beginnings and endings are blurred together into an ongoing continuum.

Decolonization, therefore, is a struggle that defines itself as it proceeds towards conclusion. Decolonization movements usually do not end with the physical expulsion of the colonizer. Too often, the struggle results in intracommunal struggles between different ideological camps over the direction of the nation, such as civil wars, long after the colonizers have been expelled. It is impossible to delineate just exactly when it begins or it ends. How any particular decolonization struggle proceeds is entirely left in the hands of those who are writing the script of national liberation struggle from day-to-day. The historian will be the one who finally reads and re-records its story. Upon the tabula rasa of decolonization, any liberation script can be written.

Violence, Colonialism, Decolonization and African Americans

Decolonization is a violent event and violence is necessitated by the very totalitarian nature of colonialism. Just as colonialism is maintained through violence, the process of decolonization is made violent by a desire to destroy the colonial structure on the part of the colonized people and the refusal of the colonizers to recognize the humanity of the colonized while insisting on maintaining their position. Consequently, decolonization movements cannot go unnoticed by the world community.
Decolonization is the violent meeting of two opposing forces brought together by the reality of colonialism. Neither side is willing to give in to the desires of the other, neither side is capable of giving in. One side attempts to forestall the inevitable, the other pushes for its conclusion. The masses make decolonization struggles possible; they make them unavoidable. In the objective dimension, violence becomes a zero gain phenomenon for both groups of combatants. The native and the colonizer begin to escalate the number of combatants; the implements used in the struggle and all living and inert 'things' become military targets. It becomes a reactionary movement where little proactive behavior is displayed, both groups losing its ability to act; both caught in the vortex of non-negotiable violent struggle, to only suffer psychological destruction (Fanon, 1963, 249-310).

This psychological destruction affects both the colonizers and the colonized, during and after, the violent phase of the struggle. Both are helpless to resist the allure of victory at all cost, and neither one is capable of accepting defeat. According to Aron (1962),

This reign of violence will be the more terrible in proportion to the size of the implantation from the mother country. The development of violence among the colonized people will be proportionate to the violence exercise by the threatened colonial regime (88).

Violence becomes a living entity that dictates the nature and quality of the struggle. Nothing remains 'normal,' even by colonial standards. Violence becomes progressional and totalizing. It passes through several distinct
phases from individual acts of resistance characterized by acts of spontaneity, to organized acts of national resistance.

In this respect, violence creates a national consciousness in the mind of each individual person. It is through the unifying capacity of violence that the nation is built, nationalism is forged. That is, the national and individual identity of a people is recognized as they struggle to overcome various points of opposition to their collective identity. It is through the collective struggle that the ethos of a people is developed. It is through the violent struggle for self-actualization, that self-identity is developed for groups and nations. Because, for the colonized people violence "constitutes their only work, invest their character with positive and creative qualities. The practice of violence binds them together as a whole, since each individual forms a violent link in the great chain, a part of the great organism of violence" (Fanon,93).

As therapeutic as violence can be, it also can cause major difficulties if relied on to maintain the liberation struggle. The reasons which make the 'natives' fight in the first instance are not good enough to carry the protracted war of liberation to its desired conclusion. Although African Americans are very willing, it seems, to engage in violence for revenge, we must be aware that we too could become just as racist and dogmatic as those we oppose. These sporadic violent acts have not yet been connected to a protracted, clearly defined and organized, liberation struggle with a political agenda.
Violence for us, just like it was for Fanon, must become more than the burning of buildings and the killing of people. It must also be connected with an uncompromising struggle for essential principles (Onwunibe, 11-13).

In our zealously to be free, we, as a nation, if we are not careful, could begin to slide down that slippery slope to 'othering' Euroamericans, which has always led to repressive politics, mass murder, dehumanization and eventual genocidal behavior. Intellectual defense of organized violence as a tactic is warranted, but we also need critics who are charged with the task of keeping humanism in our drive for liberation..* Let us always remember that liberation is a "process" and not a goal obtained automatically by the newly independent nation. As Fanon has argued, the act of closure on the empire is only possible when national consciousness "is enriched and deepened by a very rapid transformation into a consciousness of social and political needs, in other words, into humanism" (Fanon, 204).

Accordingly, the use of violence and other tactics employed by African Americans to gain community control should properly be seen as territorial claims. In addition, rioting, cultural nationalism, the politics of community control, a call for the stoppage of police colonialism, and reparations, must be considered parts of the decolonization process.

* There needs to emerge within the African American community a nationalist group that would politicize their liberation aspirations, put forth a political agenda, and connect the various reactionary elements that are engaging in acts of aimless violence and direct them towards revolutionary liberation objectives.
Violence, as a tactic, is also an integral part of all decolonization struggles even though it cannot, and must not, define the whole process of liberation. Ultimately, it is the connection between revolutionary struggle and psychological liberation of which the African American community must become cognizant if they are going to decide *rationally* on a *proper* course of struggle. A change can only come about when the colonized decides that colonization must end—in other words, there must be an act of will. As said, violence is an important component of this act of will. Still, the question that confronts African Americans is what strategy will best achieve their decolonization goals? How best to wage a successful struggle for liberation? Should it be one of violence or non-violence? These and other questions have to be answered.

**Non-Violence and Decolonization**

The decolonization of India had a profound affect on the dismantling of the British colonial empire. The success of the decolonization struggle by the nationalists in India also had a deep influence on the emerging nationalism of the continent of Africa. So much so that "Chief Awolowo of Nigeria wrote in 1945, "India is the hero of the subject countries. Her struggles for self-government are keenly and sympathetically watched by colonial peoples. . ." (8). The decolonization struggle of India was important for several reasons. It was important because it began the *scramble* by other British colonies for their freedom, demonstrated the various stages of
'protracted' liberation struggles, made evident the uniqueness and universality of each movement, posed a serious question concerning the utility of violence, showed the relationship between violence, civil disobedience and political organization, showed the futility of legal-gradualism, and showed the importance of unified nationalistic behavior. Indian liberation was achieved after years of political, military and economic struggles. Independence was gained when the famous Indian lawyer, turned nationalist, named Mohandas K. Gandhi infused his philosophy of non-violence into other nationalist movements. While Gandhi's nonviolent philosophy did not become influential among other nations and leaders seeking liberation throughout the continents of Africa or Asia, it was to have a direct and lasting impact on the liberation struggle here in America. Martin L. King said that he came upon the philosophy of non-violence while attending theological seminary.

Driven by a desire to eradicate social injustice, King, who had studied philosophy and theology, became disenchanted with the philosophical limitations of both liberalism and religious neo-orthodoxy because "liberalism was too optimistic concerning human nature, neo-orthodoxy was too pessimistic" (Washington, 1991, 36). King then turned to and found the necessary linkage between the optimism of liberalism and the pessimism of religious neo-orthodoxy in the teachings of Gandhi.
King turned to Gandhi's non-violent philosophy because it was proactive and effectively dealt with what he considered to be the twinniness of mankind's nature. That is, mankind's apparent capacity for both compassion and violence. King was looking for a humanistic philosophy that would encompass activist theology and progressive social change. For him, the non-violent philosophy combined them both in a unique way.

In 1954, in Montgomery Alabama, King got his opportunity to put his adopted philosophy to work. It was during the bus boycott that he became convinced of the power of nonviolent resistance. King (1991) said that, "living through the actual experience of the protest, nonviolence became more than a method to which I gave intellectual assent; it became a commitment to a way of life" (38).

As a tactic for social change, and decolonization, nonviolence, for King, was the only possible alternative. He understood that those who were receiving benefits from the system would violently resist any changes. Because of the inequalities in wealth, implements of war, and numerical [population] superiority, nonviolent struggle was the only pragmatic choice.

* Also see, article written in 1957, entitled, Nonviolence and Racial Justice, which also appeared in James M. Washington, ed., Testament of Hope, Harper San Francisco, N.Y., 1991. King argued that because of the two opposing positions taken by African Americans and Euroamericans, violence would be a 'natural' inclination. King argued that, "the alternative to violence was nonviolence:" In fact, King dismissed the use of violence and instead advocated that only nonviolence could lead to the racial justice that African Americans are seeking.
that African Americans could make. According to King (1991), "for practical as well as moral reasons, nonviolence offers the only road to freedom for my people. In violent war, one must be prepared to face ruthlessly the fact that there will be casualties by the thousands" (55). The survival of the African American community was a paramount concern for King, and their survival was at the core of his nonviolent philosophy. King understood that during the African American struggle for freedom, African Americans would be confronted with violence from Euroamericans and that the nonviolent tactic was the only solution to this fundamental problem.

While one can applaud King for his humanistic approach and beliefs, he can also be blamed for making the strategic mistake of converting a tactic into a principle, which prohibited him from shifting tactics to meet the different political terrain and circumstances necessitated by revolutionary dialectics. King complicated this mistake by not taking into account the psychological confrontation between the two oppositional groups in shifting terrains, especially the different temperament of the northern urban colonized African American. King's tactic was good for the South, but inappropriate in the North. The differences in geography, temperament and circumstances required different tactics, which King could not meet due to his commitment to non-violence. Unlike King, Malcolm X was not faced by this philosophical impasse. He understood the difference in the psychological
nature of the urban colonized person and thus was not hampered by the
philosophy of nonviolence.

According to James H. Cone, Martin and Malcolm wanted an end to
segregation, an unqualified liberation for African Americans, an end to
discrimination, and wanted self-determination for their people. As far as
Cone (1991) was concerned,

the differences between Martin's and Malcolm's approaches were due partly to
geography. Each developed a strategy for freedom that was appropriate for the
region in which he worked. They complemented each other in that they
spoke to different groups of people in their community. King addressed his
message primarily to southern black Christians; Malcolm to northern blacks
who were either indifferent to or alienated from Christianity (33).

The nonviolent, direct action approach advocated by King was ideal for the
feudal South, but proved to be inappropriate for the urban North and the
African Americans who occupied the urban colonies.

Like Fanon and Malcolm, King understood that punitive racial
violence was not sufficient to carry a struggle for liberation through to its
completion. Something else was needed; the movement required an ideology
that would motivate the people into creative social action. For King, it was
the moral humanism of nonviolence.
For King, unlike Fanon and Malcolm, violence, was a divisive force that only led to frustration, defeat, and massive death (Cone, 33).

Unlike King and Gandi, Fanon dismisses the utility of nonviolence as a decolonization strategy. Fanon also expressed a humanistic concern for oppressed and tormented colonized people; but, he maintained that revolutionary violence was the only way to objectively and subjectively liberate them.

Fanon also expresses a humanistic concern for the oppressed and tormented colonized people. But, he maintains that revolutionary violence was the only way to begin the process of liberation objectively and subjectively. As far as Fanon is concerned, non-violence is an act introduced by the colonial bourgeoisie in an attempt to forestall the inevitable. The reluctance on the part of bourgeois colonized nationalists to employ, advocate or evaluate objectively the utility of violence, reflects on their political and personal pusillanimity as well as their ideological and political dependency on the West.* As Fanon, (1963) said, "non-violence is an attempt to settle the

* In defense of Dr. King, it is fair to say that he understood the difference in being a leader who was chosen by the 'establishment' and one chosen by the people. While one could say that Dr. King represented, because of his tactics, the interest of the colonizers, nationally speaking, Dr. King was not, in the pure sense of the term, a neo-colonialist. But, he was a reformist, who had been drafted by his people and used by the capitalists colonizers to further their interest. For a good discussion concerning Dr. Kings position on this topic see his book, Where Do WE Go From Here: Chaos or Community? New York: Harper & Row, 1967. In particular, see Chapter entitled, Black Power Defined.
colonial problem around a green baize table, before any regrettable act has been performed or irreparable gesture made, before any blood has been shed" (61). It is an attempt by them and the liberal colonizers to come to some form of compromise, allowing, colonial exploitation to continue unabated and having just substituted one group of oppressors for another surrogate group.

In America, nonviolence has not led to the social changes that King or other civil rights activists sought. While universal humanism is desirous and necessary as a universal normative-ordering concept or, as a universal transcendent philosophy that tends to reduce the negatives of nationalism, as a social, economical and political orientation for a colonized people, especially during their liberation struggle, it has a tendency to be divisive and deflective of a counter nationalist consciousness so necessary for protracted struggle. As potentially dangerous as it is and sounds, decolonization struggles must be temporarily narrow in their nationalistic focus and thrust.

Violent struggle and nonviolent resistance as liberation tactics have been used to decolonize different colonial societies, and which method would best expedite our liberation has been debated by many generations of African Americans. I think that this is a futile debate. Non-violence may be a tactic used under certain circumstances. But its status cannot be elevated beyond that. Violence (and violent tactics) are necessitated by the logic of colonialism.
As mentioned before, it is both a "cleansing force" which pits colonizer against colonized directly as well as a threatening tactic called upon by the dynamics of anti-colonial struggle. Therefore, to exclude it from the decolonization process through a commitment to non-violence prima facie is not only a misunderstanding of the nature of colonial face-to-face struggle, but also bad strategy.

**Compromise as a Strategy of Decolonization**

Compromise is an efficient device used by the bourgeois nationalists to facilitate their personal aggrandizement and consolidate their political control. The politics of compromise is a politics anchored in, and dependent upon, reformism and political timidity. It is a cosmetic tactic employed to disguise neo-colonialist indirect rule. Throughout the history of this nation, when it comes to Euroamerican interest or our rights, Euroamericans have always chosen their concerns. For example, during the formation and writing of the Declaration of Independence, after the Civil War, i.e., the Hayes-Tilden compromise, the Kansas-Nebraska Act, compromises have always eventually benefited Euroamerica to our detriment.

As a form of reformist politics, compromise is a politics of division that polarizes the society and pits the nationalist against the integrationist. As divisive politics, it is therefore acceptable to the colonizers, in that it does not immediately threaten their continued illegitimate positions.
Thus, the colonizers as a class will support the bourgeois nationalists and thrust them into leadership positions.

The national bourgeoisie has been known to separate themselves from the various forms of nationalist resistance so prevalent in the villages, i.e., ghettoes, during revolts, and the national bourgeoisie have repeatedly been known to denounce the behavior of the masses as senseless or destructive but never useful. As a class of political and economic elites, the national bourgeoisie will advocate commissions, additional police protection, and even endorse counter-revolutionary measures under the rubric of law and order in support of colonial exploitation. It will bemoan the loss of property and cringe over the potential loss of life in the face of the implements of war that the colonizers display. As such, the bourgeois nationalists will acquiesce without a murmur being made in opposition.

The members of national-reformist bourgeoisie are beaten from the start and they demonstrate their incapacity in their every day lives. They are accommodationist-integrationist, and seek coalition politics as an alternative to nationalist movements. They continually dismiss nationalist politics and repeatedly denounce the political and cultural behavior of the masses. The bourgeoisie nationalists i.e., the neocolonialists, advocate and engage in politics for politics sake and not for liberation. They endorse the present political structure relying on a functionalist interpretation of democracy
while denouncing any measures that will decentralize the democratic process. While they give lip-service to revolutionary change, they, as a class, are too willing to reconcile themselves with exploitative practices of colonialism (Cruse, 1968).

Any potential nationalist leader should understand the relationship between bourgeois accommodationist politics and colonial capitalism. The axioms of capitalism, political accommodationalism and consumerism, will place demands on that capitalist-colonizers to force change and put an end to the reactionary violent behavior by the political and military elites. Capitalist greed and a search for political stability are two factors that create a need for reformist politics. Even in an improvised and underdeveloped state, or better yet precisely because of their condition, the colonized people still represent a potential exploitable class of consumers. According to Fanon (1963),

the colonial population is a customer who is ready to buy goods; consequently, if the garrison has to be perpetually reinforced, if buying and selling slackens off, that is to say if manufactured and finished goods can no longer be exported, there is clear proof that the solution of military force must be set aside. A blind domination founded on slavery is not economically speaking worthwhile for the bourgeoisie of the mother country. The monopolistic group within this bourgeoisie does not support a government whose policy is solely that of the sword (65).
Bayard Rustin, one of the leading civil rights bourgeois nationalists of that era, demonstrated that he understood the importance of the reformist struggle to the capitalist class here in colonial America. Rustin (1964) said,

> in a highly industrialized, 20th-century civilization, we hit Jim Crow precisely where it was most anachronistic, dispensable, and vulnerable-in hotels, lunch counters, terminals, libraries, swimming pools, and the likes. For in these forms, Jim Crow does not impede the flow of commerce in the broadest sense: it is a nuisance in a society on the move (and on the make) (25).

Rustin, true to the confused goals of the civil rights struggle, goes on to make a problematic argument on the goals and tactics of the reformist oriented civil rights era. According to Rustin (1964), "at issue, after all, is not civil rights, strictly speaking, but social and economic conditions. Last summer's riots were not race riots; they were outbursts of class aggression in a society where class and color definitions are converging disastrously" (26). Instead of seeking liberation for our people, Rustin, like other reformist integrationist leaders, is interested in seeking social equality and not liberation. As such, this group of leaders has become psychologically dependent upon Euroamericans and continuously seek to engage in coalition politics as anemic partners. Lacking in political vitality, based on a solid biogenetic political base, they unfortunately believe that absent the input of Euroamericans our liberation struggle is bound to fail.
Unable to engage in a politics of selfishness, one based in revolutionary nationalist sentiments, the interracialist-accommodationist buffer class lapses into a universal humanist politics and dialogue. This class often attempt to couch its particularistic politics, which is reflective of the unique position of the African American colonized community and its own specific problems, into a universal humanitarian discourse. Rustin, in typical language, dismisses the tactics of some" mislabeled revolutionaries," i.e., Malcolm X, S. Carmicheal, Huey P. Newton, because, as he understands their demands and relative impotencies, he maintains that they were engaged in "no-win tactics." Rustin's dismissal of these tactics and the leadership of "militant" reformist groups, went beyond criticizing their tactics and their apparent lack of historical continuity. His continuous attacks on these immature nationalists regressed into a diatribe based on a profound inability to see anything other than interracial coalition politics as viable. His dismissal and anti-nationalist phobia is based on and inclination towards integrationist-bourgeois nationalism and the politics so characteristic of this ideological buffer-class.

In another essay Rustin questions several myths surrounding black nationalist behavior. He questioned the myth of unity, of Black Capitalism, of Reparations, of black studies, of violence and, of separatism. Remaining true to the civil rights dogma, Rustin dismisses all of these nationalist inclinations
as defeatist in the coalition politics that he so dearly treasured. Speaking on
separatism, Rustin (1970) has this to say,

> even if separatism were psychologically sensible-which it is not—it does not make political sense. The only reason the civil rights Bills of 1964, 1965 and 1968 were passed was because Negroes had allies in the labor movement, the liberal community and in religious organizations. It was only this coalition of forces that had the power to defeat the Republican-Dixiecrat coalition...(121).

Rustin goes on to belittle all nationalist sentiments and behavior. For him and other 'buffer' group members, African American unification can only be understood in very narrow monological discourse. After reading of Rustin’s works, it is clear that national unity for African Americans, because of their atomistic and decentralized existence, can only be through compromise and coalition politics.

Like King Rustin relies on the religious community and the morality of mankind to prevent Euroamerican violence. This despite the manifest proclivity of the colonizers to abuse the spirituality of the colonized people in the name of compromise and coalition politics. Negotiation and situational compromise may indeed be a part of liberation politic but this must be premised on the assertion of a separate and independent African American national identity. Compromise and coalition politics cannot, and must not be, the building block upon which emancipatory politics is built, to the exclusion of all other means.
History has shown, here in America and in other colonial environments, that compromise, nonviolent civil disobedience and liberation do not complement each other. It is an inevitability that nationalist behavior, including violent struggle in all of its various forms, has successfully brought about an end to colonial domination. Unfortunately, bourgeois timidity and political impotency is also an unfortunate aspect of the liberation process. Consequently, it should be expected that African American bourgeois nationalists will attempt to impede our liberation struggle with their predictable obsequious political, economic and cultural tactics.

Decolonization: Breaking the Chains of Dependency

As we have discussed, colonialism is initially a totalizing enterprise, as such, the former independent society becomes dependent upon the metropolitan society for its newly imposed and acquired way of life: this is by design (E. A. Walker, 1945; Furnivall, 1956; Morris, 1908; Fanon, 1963, 1964; Nkrumah, 1963). What I have been discussing thus far is the strategies that colonies have employed to physically remove the colonizers from their country or to bring about social change. I now must turn my attention to how former colonies break the other areas of colonial dependency that linger on long after the struggle for physical independence is over.

Decolonization is an attempt to break the various modes of colonial dependency that have been established as a result of the colonial experience. I
use the language of the possibility because history clearly demonstrates that liberation is not always simply an act of physical removal. Too often, long after the wars of liberation are over, colonialism adapts and changes its complexion. It remains well established in its most recent developmental form: neocolonialism or economic colonialism. Colonial dependency remains intact in all of its manifestations during this intermediary phase and due to the ethnicity of the leaders, it is more difficult to eradicate. Now the oppressor is one's own people.

Ali A. Mazrui clearly reveals the difficulties and layers of decolonization and dependency. Mazrui argues that there are two basic layers of colonial dependency with which the colonies have to contend during the decolonization struggle. According to Mazrui (1980), "a society could thus be dependent on another structurally in either the economic, military, or political sense, or it could be dependent on another culture in terms of values, tastes, techniques, and borrowed ideas" (84).

Economically, dependency can be structured in two basic ways. A colonial society can either be horizontally or hierarchically dependent. Economic dependency is fostered by, and is a result of the development of a single crop economy and an over reliance on it. This means that the prices and exchange rates are determined outside of the producing country, where they become manipulated by the economic imperatives of the mother country. (Nkrumah, 1963; Blauner, 1970; Tabb, 1970; Morris, 1908; E.A.
Walker, 1908; Furnivall, 1956). For African Americans, we must seek ways that will break our economic dependency on the Euroamerican society. We must change our single crop economy (labor), into a more diversified system (see chapter 4 this document). As far as I am concern, the economic arrangement between Euro and African Americans is the same as any other colonial economic relationship. That is, one of economic dependency brought about by created underdevelopment. The question for us is how to become economically independent? This is not to suggest that Euroamerica does not have a role to play in this redevelopment process, but that the politicization of this redevelopment is primarily the responsibility of African Americans.*

Military dependency is not a recent phenomenon and unfortunately it is more sinister and crippling to the independence of the former colony. It is a multilayered form of dependency that relies on national insecurity as an alibi. Military dependency "can take the form of dependency in weaponry, or in capital for buying weapons, or in training and skills, or in troops and other combat personal. The most prevalent is dependency on supply of weaponry or technology" (Mazuri, 85). In fact, America has spent more money in aid to Third World nations in the form of military assistance than any other form of aid. The U. S. has equipped, educated, and installed more fascist regimes than democratic ones (Parenti, 1989; Stavrianos,1981). The sinister purpose of
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this form of aid has been to combat nationalist movements and to keep Third World nations within the orbit of American imperialism.

Political dependency takes on two distinct forms either direct or indirect political rule. Political dependency, after physical decolonization, will resemble the previous political arrangements that existed under colonialism but in more covert ways (neocolonialism). It is often a multi-dimensional phenomenon that manifests itself in various ways. It displays itself in the way that a nation organizes its political institutions, in the political arrangements that it makes after independence, and the political ideology that it organizes itself around. Political decolonization, if it is to be total, often means breaking away from the ideological, intellectual, and philosophical values of the former 'ruling' society, while creating neo-traditional political institutions and developing a corresponding political normalizing process to replicate the new political ideologies. In essence, political, social, economic, and psychological decolonization is based on the reestablishment of a society's traditional values, such that, it will give rise to the 'new person' for which Fanon argues.

**Breaking the Cultural Dependency of Colonialism**

According to Ngugi Wa Thiong'o (1986),

> the biggest weapon wielded and actually daily unleashed by imperialism against that collective defiance is the cultural bomb. The affect of a cultural bomb is to annihilate a people's belief in their names, in their languages, in their environment, in their heritage of
struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves. It makes them see their past as one wasteland of non-achievement and it makes them want to distance themselves from that wasteland (3).

The object of the cultural bomb is to make the colonized believe that European culture has the answers to their national deficiencies. It forces them to question the moral righteousness of their struggle, and to question whether triumph and victory are nothing but delusions suffered by a decadent and lazy people or moral malcontents. In essence, "imperialism presents itself as the cure and demands that the dependent sing hymns of praise with the constant refrain: Theft is holy" (Ngugi, 3). The cultural bomb is designed to destroy a people's confidence in themselves, their society, their liberation struggle, and in their traditional values. It asks that they commit cultural suicide by accepting those cultural values of their oppressors. For domestically colonized people, like African Americans, the choice is not willfully theirs to make. They, because of their colonial situation, are forced into bi-culturality.

Elliott P. Skinner (1980) argues that, "the most difficult task for future generations of Africans will be to end the state of psychological and structural dependency that has survived the end of colonialism" (71). His concern is that Africans and other colonized people might find themselves heirs to what he calls a 'hybrid' culture that has been imposed upon the world as a
consequence of colonization, and then, worldwide multinational penetration.

The result of this continuing process has been a pervasive cultural dependency on the West by many colonized people. "Cultural dependency affects values, taste, skills and ideas" (Mazuri, 87). The question for Mazrui, and one that is relevant for the decolonization process of African Americans, is how do we measure cultural dependency? For him there were two standards: [a] objective, and [b] subjective. Objectively, he says it can be determined by "how far an African has become a black European in dress, language, ideology, and style." Subjectively, Mazrui says it can be measured by "how far the slaves realizes that he is a slave and seeks to rebel against his condition" (Mazuri, 88).

The next question, given this cultural dependency, is how are they going to achieve social justice for everyone in their/our society and translate that into effective foreign policy. Mazrui (1980) offers five different strategies for accomplishing this task. Mazrui said "in my view, the process of decolonization involves the following five processes: indigenization, domestication, diversification, horizontal interpenetration, and vertical counterpenetration" (93).

For example, indigenization for African Americans, would mean instilling every institution that impacts on their communities, if not their lives, with the Afrocentric ideology. African Americans should seek to
become more Afrocentric in their worldview and impose this worldview on all members of their community and advance an intracommunal policy based on it's values.

Economically, African Americans should begin to develop economic strategies that are designed to stimulate product development and exportation in order that we might break our trade dependency. This vertical counterpenetration policy will effectively alter the price imbalance that determines our wages, national growth and import deficiency while stimulating economic growth and national autonomy.

In a similar manner, Fanon argues that the only alternative is to establish a national culture, to throw oneself into one's mummified culture. This reculturation process is a violent muscular, psychological, racial and revalorization process where the 'native intellectual' attempts to exceed his 'local cultural boundaries' and establishes a 'national culture.' This process is tenuous, incomplete, and does an injustice to the existing culture of the colonized. Historically, this reculturation process will ignore the current culture, choosing instead to reach backwards attempting to resuscitate a mummified culture frozen in time. That is, it is not a "living culture;" one that has undergone a continuous self-actualization process. The culture that is needed will be both traditional and innovative.

Among African Americans, the creation of such a neo-traditional African culture is the task of the Afrocentric scholars. In essence, they must
engage in cultural nationalistic behavior. They must become, in part, cultural nationalist because of the prominent role that culture plays in the American society, and in the revolutionary process. This is the continuous task of all African intellectuals. This was the task undertaken by the early continental Afrocentric nationalists (Nkurmah, Kenyetta, Sengor) and our own African American cultural nationalists, (Robeson, DuBois, Garvey). According to Fanon (1963),

The native intellectual who has gone far beyond the domains of Western culture and who has got it into his head to proclaim the existence of another culture never does so in the name of Angola or of Dahomey. The culture which is affirmed is African culture. The Negro, never so much a Negro as since he has been dominated by the whites, when he decides to prove that he has a culture and to behave like a cultured person, comes to realize that history points out well-defined paths to him: he must demonstrate that a Negro culture exists (212)

The cultural renaissance of the 1960s was just another example of unconscious decolonization. The back-to-Africa nationalist cultural movement that reemerged then, and is continuing today, is just another example of dying colonialism. Afrocentric scholars must become activists and propagandists in this rejuvenative process. Decolonization demands that the colonized African American intellectual/people begin anew to build a national culture that has its foundations in Africa:

The Negroes who live in the United States and in Central or Latin America in fact experience the need to attach
themselves to a cultural matrix. Their problem is not fundamentally different from that of the Africans. The whites of America did not mete out to them any different treatment from that of the whites who ruled over the Africans. We have seen that the whites were used to putting all Negroes in the same bag (Fanon, 215)

At the same time, while this is being demanded, and may even be desirous, we cannot allow this reversion to be permanent. We cannot allow this to be the end of our national or cultural growth. Our emersion in traditional West African culture must be temporal, not lasting. We cannot go against the forces of dialectics that colonialism and the subsequent decolonization struggle create. The dialectical currents of colonialism and decolonization movements demand that we constantly change and move with those changes. To reemerge ourselves, yes; to become entrenched, no." But this position of course is very ambitious, as well as contingent. While we must begin to

|. For a good extended discussion on the problems inherent in the normalization process in the creation of identities and politics, see William E. Connolly, Identity/Difference: Democratic Negotiations of Political Paradox, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, N.Y., 1991, especially chapter three, (Liberalism and Difference), where he argues, that power determines and influences the identity of an individual and impacts on the identity process, "i.e.," normalization process. As such, this normalized and constructed identity/identity process, becomes a tool used by the state to maintain order and control. Consequently, the ideologies of individuality and individualism become incongruent and oppositional.

My position is this, can the African American nascent nation, develop a normalization process that recognizes the human need for individuality, and at the nascent stages of our movement/nation building afford to have divergent and oppositional identities without fragmenting the movement, which is so dependent on solidarity, due to national insecurity. I think so. I am convinced that our nationalists leaders must be guided by the knowledge that this process, this identity is only, and can only be, temporal. 173
develop a national cultural identity, one which will be only temporal, we cannot narrow this understanding to become restrictive. We must allow for the creation of alternate cultural identities. The major problem with this understanding is, when does a national leadership decide to loosen up its nation building hold on creative cultural nationalism? When is the nascent nation strong enough to allow for inclusion of alternatives, and therefore, interpenetration from other cultural influences and identities? Must newly normalized cultural nationalist identities always negate other identities inside the philosophical or physical boundaries of nascent societies? I think not.

Like many other aspects of the African American condition, their cultural identity is interwoven with Euroamericans, and thus, is influenced by them and vice versa. I understand that all identities are fluid and not fixed, but I am demanding that initially, African Americans, especially during the nascent stages of our struggle, become restrictive in this crucial process fully aware of its potential liabilities.

We must not let our fight for national culture become divorced from the conditions that are presently affecting us. We must remember that "the colonized man who writes for his people ought to use the past with the intention of opening the future, as an invitation to action and a bases for hope," (Fanon, 232). By doing so, we maintain the revolutionary awareness and the national consciousness that is necessary for protracted struggle. We
the Afrocentric scholars, as pointed out earlier, must be activists. We have to engage continuously in educating ourselves and our people to the necessity of having a neo-traditional living culture. We must be vigilant in keeping the struggle open to worlds events, but narrow in our goals at the onset. It is a paradoxical struggle, difficult, but not impossible. Recognize all of the world’s diversity, but include few.

The African American people must reinvent their culture, taking those things that are positive from it to form a contemporary individual and national identity. This reinventing can begin with assuming traditional West African names and move on to more complicated institutional arrangements such as marriage and beyond. These few areas mentioned are of course in no way exhaustive and are merely intended to illustrate the enormity of the task. The point is that if the process of decolonization is to make a new person, then African Americans must begin in the cultural arena first.

African Americans must wage a bifurcated struggle. First, as with all other decolonizing efforts, African Americans must attempt to reinstate and reinstitute their traditional concepts of self. That means, attempting to create a neo-traditional African person who psychologically and socially adheres to the African principle. Second, they must reconstruct their society to fit that neo-traditional person, while developing a normalization process to replicate this political and social identity. In essence, we must objectively and subjectively reconstruct ourselves. We must engage in a struggle for self-
actualization based on self-knowledge. As such, our self-actualization will bring us into confrontation with the Euroamerican institutions that have control over the distribution of power and wealth in this society. This confrontation does not necessarily entail the conscious task of restructuring this society in totality at the onset. It is my belief that this will happen as an after process of restructuring our own particular segment. Clearly, by the very fact that we exist and live in the same polity with our oppressors, we will force changes.

As a way to begin, the African community can take on the destructive components of America and reAfricanize them as we have done thus far. The only difference is that it will be a conscious Africanization process on our part. The key to our future self lies dormant in our past. We must call forth the lessons hidden in our history and revitalize them to assist in our present reconstruction. If our decolonization efforts are to be successful, then history, culture, and philosophy must mesh together to furnish us with a holistic portrait of the neo-traditional African person for the next millieum.

"Decolonization, as we know, is a historical process: that is to say that it cannot be understood, it cannot become intelligible nor clear to itself except in the exact measure that we discern the movements which give it historical form and context" (Fanon, 36). If deculturization is the result of colonialism, then reculturization must be the source of our decolonization. Afrocentric scholars have continued to push forward our search for Africa's influence on
our community. As a result, we now understand the circular effect that traditional African cultural has had on our behavior. For example, we have maintained a connection to our African past in our spirituality via the 'ring shout,' and other forms of Africanizing Christianity. According to Stuckey (1972),

Like musical instruments at play, the women and the exhorted preached to each other, conveying a Christian message through African form. They preached with pleasure until "she sprang aloft with such vehemence that three other women took hold of her skirts, as if to hold her on earth." Still she leaped and twisted and threw her arms about falling and rolling about "amid convulsive groans."...

This scene calls to mind the relationship of the preacher to his congregation in the sanctified churches of Chicago and Harlem, where the congregation is on its feet responding to the preacher, dancing and shouting. Moreover, Melville and Frances Herskovits, in Rebel Destiny, note similarities between Surname blacks, those of the Gold Coast of West Africa, and blacks in sanctified churches in the United States, where the "saints" dance and shout (55).

Because of formative colonialism (slavery), apartheid, and racism, the African community has been able to maintain elements of their Africanism

---

For a good discussion of the circularity of Afrocentric thought, and its effect on current behavior see, Nacie Caraway, Segregated Sisterhood, The University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville, Tenn., 1991. While Caraway's book is limited in understanding the fullness of the process and its implications for the future of cross cultural movements, her work nonetheless attempts to trace the impact of traditional African thought on contemporary African American womanist behavior.
They, like all colonized people, have found a mechanism to release the muscular tensions that colonialism forces them to deny. The ring shout, for West African peoples, has been a permissive and protective group function. It is a critical element of cultural retention and violent release. It is a substitute for social acceptance and normal environmental exorcisms (Fanon, 57).

The early African Americans took our native ring shout and applied it to the only group function that the formative colonizers allowed, i.e., the church. African Americans have taken a Christian religious ceremony reconfigured it and consequently have been able unconsciously to retain elements of our African identity.

Just as we needed a release from formative colonialism, we African Americans need to recognize that the religious and social custom of dancing in groups and shouting during our religious rituals, entertainments, ceremonies and customs that bring about 'violent' emotional outbursts, are examples of our ways to cope with colonial neurosis as well as a cultural heritage that we have retained. What we have to do is consciously to reaffirm this Africanism. This is one of the crucial tasks of decolonization; to prove and establish a national culture (Fanon, 1963; Stuckey, 1991; Douglass, 1969; Baldwin, 1985).
Language: an Essential Tool in the Decolonization Process

Language must become a major focus of our current cultural revitalization and African American revolutionary struggle. Afrocentric scholars must be aware of its importance and embrace their own language for its potential in forging a national identity. They must be cognizant that Ebonics, their natural language, has retained much of our traditional African language structures. They must know, as Smith (1977) informs us, that "Ebonics is the linguistic continuity of Africa in Black America and this is a linguistic fact" (Smith, 10).

Afrocentric scholars must strive to maintain the purity of their language, find ways to incorporate it in their work, and accept it when others find it useless. They must separate it from the denigrated position of ignorance and dismiss all of the various theories that are designed to impose foreign standards on African American linguistic patterns.

Theories like Verbal Deficiency that "considers black language slovenly, . . . (for our language), is an issue of nonstandard, inferior, deviant speech that should be eradicated by speakers who wish to progress in society" must be rejected (Washington-Ige, 18). We can no longer allow other people to bastardize, (Ige's term), our language. We cannot allow them to impose their outside opinions on our language, or its users. We must resist the funnellation of our language by either the Creolist, Transformationalist, or the Ethnolinguists, who seek to compress our language through the
influences of Europeans. Ebonics is an African language with traditional African language patterns. It must be reincorporated into its 'natural' cultural-historical linguistic environment.

*Funnellization is a process designed for Eurocentric aggrandizement; whereby, Ebonics is reduced to a non-standard language status funnelled through standard English.* Once our language goes through the process of funnellization, it becomes a bastard form of English. We must be aware that the struggle over language goes directly to the question of self-determination, continued mental and cultural colonization and, political power. To speak in our own accepted tongue, is critical to the issue of decolonization.

The struggle over language is a political struggle that is meant to oppress the colonized and to instill in them a sense of worthlessness, while promoting the myth of Euroamerican superiority. "The domination of a people's language by the language of the colonizing nations was crucial to the domination of the mental universe of the colonized" (Ngugi, 16).

The denigration of the native's language serves more than to simply deny the native's sense of belonging, of selfhood and culture, it is a means of oppression and domination. Language discrimination is a political process that promotes dehumanization. It also serves as a subtle way of inferiorizing the native; of making them mentally to deny themselves and to internalize self-hate. Most importantly, it helps to create the monoculture for which the colonizers superficially strive. It confirms his psychological superiority.
This is no less of an issue here in colonial America. It is meant to deny our culture, our selfhood and our sense of being. It is a political and economic struggle meant to facilitate the administration of America's domestic colonies just as it is in all colonial situations.

The entire bureaucracy, the entire court system, all industry hears and uses the colonizer's language. Likewise, highway markings, railroad station signs, street signs and receipts make the colonized feel like a foreigner in his own country (Memmi, 106-7).

African Americans are bilingual. They can speak and do speak 'standard English' and their native language: Ebonics. Therefore, to demand the acceptance of our own unique language is an act of resistance. The usage of one's own language is essential if a people are to begin to view themselves differently. Language is a medium through which any people understand the world. It is the medium that relays images of themselves and their environment. Therefore, it is an interpretative medium through which a people develop and express their cosmology.

For African Americans, the issue of language is more complex than other colonized peoples, simply because of the extent to which we have been exposed to the colonial deculturation process. African Americans must first struggle to legitimize their first language, then establish or adopt an African language for government. The latter can facilitate the unification of Africans and place our political struggle here in colonial American within a unified
I think this is critical in developing a broader concept of ourselves. We must reestablish the traditional connection between our language and the language of other continental Africans because, "language, any language, has the dual character: it is both a means of communication and a carrier of culture." (Diop, 1990, 13). As such, if our reAfricanization is to be complete, this is one area in which many of our linguistic specialists can assist.

The development of a language is the product of an evolving culture and involves the making of a culture. It is the repetitious doing and saying that creates a culture. Ebonics allows me to speak with myself, my community, my nation and the universe in my own particular way. It is both universal and particular. But this speaking to the world must be in my own culturally produced, subjective way, not the way of another. To speak in the ways of another, to use his concepts, is to speak like him and not like myself. Therefore, it is to be mentally dominated and to continue our mental colonization. It is to be a caricature of him.

To use the dominant language to the Euroamerican is to continuously evoke those negative images of me that his language reinforces. To carry the negative images of me is to maintain mental colonialism. To speak in my own tongue, to produce my own images of myself is to decolonize my/our
mind[s]. Speaking Ebonics will free African Americans from the psychological colonialism that their language and culture imposes on me. More importantly, it can assist in the development of political concepts to be used in our liberation. This is why the issue of language is so profound, it directly goes to the issue of a new people that see themselves as they make themselves.

To be creators, we must recreate and create a language of resistance, a unified language of struggle and one that reflects our current stage of struggle. Accordingly, the struggle over the appropriateness of our language is over a principle that African Americans must not relinquish because, "the right of self-definition in the field of Black English and the necessary power to decide how it will be used to address problems of understanding and interpretation are vital and should be non-negotiable" (Holt, 1975, 64). This goes directly to the issue of our humanity.

We must decolonize our understanding and usage of our language, while building the institutions that will foster the teaching and development of a traditional African language in our schools, communities, institutions and customs. We must politicize the controversy surrounding our language usage as it is an important device to bring about the revolutionary climate so necessary for our liberation.

The same can be said about literature which has been a subtle form of colonization and inferiorization. It has become an essential device used by
colonizers to transform the African into a Negro, the African nationalist into an irrational militant, the revolutionary into a reactionary; and the men and women of the community into savages. It is the creative genre of colonial mythology. "When fact and fiction fuse into an intentionally homogeneous whole, mythology becomes the norm" (Churchill, 1992, 19). It is the deliberate distortion of history, contemporary and ancient, which creates critical consciousness and images that makes literature so sinister. Literature is an important element of the deculturation process. It is a vital ingredient in transforming the African American or other indigenous people into modernities stone age dwellers.

This is why to effectuate a more comprehensive decolonization process, literature must play a role. Just as literature has been instrumental in our domination, it can be just as instrumental in our decolonization. Instead of bemoaning our colonial status which characterized our protest writings of the 1940s and 1950s, i.e., the Harlem renaissance novels such as Native Son, Manchild in the promise land, and Nobody knows my Name.

The revolutionary literature that our struggle now demands must be "the taking up and clarification of themes which are typically nationalist"
(Fanon, 240). We must now develop a combat literature, to go beyond the battle of our canons to be included into the American canon as discussed by Gates. While this is important for its revolutionary potential, we must not get bogged down in mere 'literary contributionalism.'

It is time that our novelists, essayists and intellectuals answer the question posed by Memmi, "for whom shall he write, for what public" (Memmi, 108). The issue here is not so much language per se, as it is the topic. It is the communicative function of language that "imitates the language of real life, that is language in production" (Ngugi, 13). African Americans must now begin to write for a new African American. Speaking in a language that they understand and one that will speak to their new consciousness. Our new literature must be motivational, it must be revolutionary, A literary genre that will inspire our people toward revolutionary struggle. This new genre of literature must celebrate them as they fight for their liberation. It has to be uncompromising, and yes it must be, in a temporal sense, chauvinistic. Our literature must be like rap music. For rap is a live music, in many respects it is a propagandistic music of living

* During the 1960s a major intellectual move was the rewriting of African American history which essentially was aimed at demonstrating the contributions of African Americans to human evolution. While it is important, as a defensive measure, to know that African Americans have contributed to the advancement of the American canon, this I feel is counterproductive if it becomes the major thrust of our writing. We can become too involved in this all important aspect of the struggle and fail to advance an innovative and revolutionary literary program. What we need now is a literary movement that will provide new images for our people to strive for. Images that attempt to show us in a more positive light; one that emphasis our struggle and our victory.
communicative speech; rap music is the African American new talking drums: "Black American's CNN" (Newsweek, 1992, 51). Rap is a literary genre of 1990s liberation; an innovation of classical African oration. It is a neo-traditional form in the mold of continental African traditionalism. Rap music a revolutionary fusion of several components of African culture that now are pushing the African American revolutionary cultural thrust towards its logical extension. It is speaking in terms that reflect the historical and contemporaneous struggle of our people. The language of rap (in most instances), is a language of awareness and rebellion, giving African Americans images of positive resistance.

What all of these things mean in concrete terms can only be understood through an analysis of the culture of resistance in African American communities.

Resistance, African American Ethos and Emerging Nationalism

If we take the position that a people are known by the struggles in which they have been engaged and these struggles not only define them, but shape the nature of their society, their resistance to oppression has always been at the core of the African American national identity. They have always been known as a people who have resisted being oppressed, despite facing
excessive forms of repression. As such, the African American ethos has been partially shaped by this legacy.*

Throughout their history in this country African American people have engaged in various forms of resistance. For example, there was day-to-day resistance which was a conscious form of behavior carried on at different levels and employed multiple strategies. According to Karenga (1993),

... this form of resistance reflects the daily refusal and challenge with which Africans confronted the enslavement system and included sabotage, i.e., breaking tool and destroying crops, shamming illness or ignorance, taking property, spontaneous and planned strikes, work slow-downs, self-mutilation, arson, attacks on whites and poisoning of slaveholders and their families. Also, this form included suicide and infanticide which was designed to prevent life in enslavement of both parent and child.... A common form of resistance was flight (129)

This passage clearly illustrates that resistance was neither solely individual or collective. Day to day resistance was often dependent on expediency and was generally sanctioned and assisted by the African collective. When not engaging in individual resistance, African Americans engaged in various forms of collective resistance. African Americans formed cultural organizations, churches, newspapers and self-help groups, led revolts, created organizations that assisted in individual or mass escape, i.e.,
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the underground railroad as well as legislating and organizing to officially and unofficially overthrow slaveocracy.

African American resistance to colonial oppression has been continuous and layered. It has attracted secular as well as ecclesiastical leaders. What is making the new thrust for liberation more promising, with the exception of a few individuals, is the unification of all strata of the community along philosophical and political lines. The afrocentric movement is becoming a dominant ideological force that is refocusing the historical struggle and orientation of African American people.

Throughout most of the formative years, and during the two reconstruction periods, Euroamericans were able to fragment the liberation movement of African Americans. But, just as other imperialist countries were unable to sustain their divisive thrust, Euroamericans are unable to succeed in their divide and conquer tactics. Consequently, racial nationalism, assisted by the afrocentric philosophy and ideology, is unifying all the strata of the African American nation. Intellectuals and laymen are becoming reunited: the head is being reconnected to the body.

The Role of the Intellectual in the Decolonization Struggle

Intellectuals occupy an important and pivotal role in any liberation struggle. Their role is essential if the movement is to succeed. The role of the colonized intellectuals is a multi-layered and multidimensional one. The colonized intellectual must be, in their actions, transformative, innovative,
unifying, interpretative, educational and therapeutic. They must be the guardians of the values and aspirations of the liberation struggle, and the culture that gave rise to the resistance movement. The liberation struggle literally fails or succeeds on the ability of the intellectuals to influence the goals of the struggle.

Every liberation struggle has been led and assisted by a cadre of intellectuals who have helped in the development of a living culture, and directed and become engaged in revolutionary political education. When confronted by the prolongation of the struggle, when the goals are in doubt, it is up to the intellectuals to educate the masses and to provide therapy designed to correct uncertainty. According to Fanon (1963), "once again, things must be explained . . . ; the people must see where they are going, and how they are to get there. The war is not a single battle, but rather a series of local engagements; and to tell the truth, none of these are decisive" (141). They must be therapists and liberation task-masters, innovators and historical chroniclers.

If the liberation struggle is not to become fractalized by internal contradictions, regionalism, and delayed by manichean simplistic analysis, then intellectuals and revolutionary political leaders must strive to unify the masses and educate people. Too often liberation struggles become stagnate because of the ineptness of the colonized intellectuals to educate and become educated in the struggle.
Too often they have become estranged from the source of their political strength and wait for the movement to come to them, instead of them reaching out and seizing the opportunity to lead. They become inert because the leadership becomes elitist and regional, believing in the doctrine of organizational formalism and 'western rationality,' having received their formal education in western institutions. But as Sékou Touré (1972) points out, the intellectual cadre plays a crucial role throughout the decolonization struggle, and without its leadership and assistance, the movement would become stagnated and ruptured. In part, the success of the struggle is contingent on its ability to embrace and project its own intellectual solutions to the common problems facing the nation. To do so, Touré felt that the intellectuals had to be well grounded in their own culture. The success of the struggle was determined by social-psychological forces that either integrated or isolated the intellectual cadre from society and the unfolding struggle. It is essential for intellectuals to be one with their deep internal self and the culture that surrounds them. All foreign values and ideologies that create divisions between them and their bio-genetic, environmentally produced commonality, i.e., community, nation, "race," have to be eliminated.

To become effective, the intellectual cadre and its environment have to be interconnected, making culture, intellectual activity and revolutionary struggle inseparable. Therefore, absent a clear cultural grounding, the intellectuals would be ineffective and isolated from the people and the
struggle when they are needed the most. The importance of culturally produced leaders, and the impact of cultural circularity cannot be overstated. Revolutionary humanism demands a reconnection of intellectuals and the people to their cultural traditions. Both Touré and Fanon maintain that culture, intellectual cadre and political education all must become interlocked in the decolonization struggle.

Such interlocking would make the African American intellectual less of an interpreter of our culture and more of an analyst of the society in which we live. The intellectuals become educators, unifiers, activist, and scholar-theoretician. They can only do that if they understand adequately the social forces that are at work and how their struggle fits into the dynamics of social evolution.

It is up to the intelligentsia to interpret social reality so that every segment can understand the goals of the liberation struggle. It is this group that helps set and define the goals of the struggle. And "without specific goals plotted on the political, economic, and cultural fronts, the nationalist wing will wither away in isolation to be swamped..." (Cruse, 467).

Cruse (1968) maintained, and I agree, that too many African American intellectuals act like retarded children who will continue to produce useless programs and endorse policies of "civil rightism and racial integrationism" (475). Consequently, the African American liberation struggle is at an "impasse precisely because it lacks a real functional corps of intellectuals able
to confront and deal perceptively with American realities on a level that social conditions demand" (472). As argued before, the current political landscape demands that African Americans engage in certain "absolutist," narrowly defined and focused forms of political behavior. As selfish as that may sound, for the immediate future it is necessary and therefore in need of an organized cadre of intellectuals.

The humanistic orientation that is demanded by the integrationist philosophy, as currently advocated, does grave disservice and disruption to our movement. For our current political leaders to advance this doctrine, in any of its manifestations, shows a profound ignorance and lack of adequate culturation. This social philosophy has never worked, and seemingly, never will. Why remain tied to it? Why not try something that is workable and acceptable to everyone except those who are entrenched?

**Ideology, Theory & Practice, and Decolonization**

What emerges clearly from our discussion is that our liberation struggle needs a core group of leaders/intellectuals who will accurately define the content and limits of our decolonization struggle. Absent this core group, [any] struggle is destined to make repetitive mistakes and become stagnated. This core group must have an accurate understanding of the surrounding environment in all of its manifestations, and then convert that understanding into revolutionary action. According to Karenga, reality must be seen as a totality and as social, material, historical, contradictory, knowable
and changeable. Absent an understanding of its complexities, one is likely to
deal with one or more aspects and not in a comprehensive and successful
manner.

I will not attempt to deal with every facet of Karenga's argument here,
but I must say that the problems concerning the direction of our movement,
prior to the development of the Afrocentric philosophy and worldview were
that our African American intellectual and bourgeoisie class did not develop
an accurate worldview that corresponded to our political reality.

As Cruse and others have argue, they failed to grasp the principle
contradictions of this society. They never challenged the capitalist nature of
America, nor, were they willing to suggest an alternate economic or political
construction that coincides with the African philosophical tradition
(Nkrumah, 1968). According to Karenga (1975), "the principle contradiction in
every capitalist society is the one between the social (collective) character of
production and the private character of ownership, between those who
produce and those who pocket the wealth; those who work and those who
walk away with the profit" (29). The African American
leadership/intellectuals have never been able to resolve our pro-capitalist
stance with their call for revolutionary social change and therefore, our
struggle has been contradictory and ineffective. They, as a class, have too
often been inclined to use analytical tools and offer alternative social
constructions based on foreign ideologies or philosophies.
I am not going to argue for a socialist readjustment of this society here, but, we are saying that we have not developed an accurate social theory/ideology to deal comprehensively with the principal internal and external contradictions that confront our decolonization struggle. All societies and, therefore all struggles, have both internal and external, primary and secondary contradictions; and if the intellectual class cannot understand these contradictions and propose into a comprehensive theory for social revolutionary change, then they and the struggle will not succeed. To know reality is to change it, and to change it is predicated on one knowing it. As Karenga says, "reality is, finally, knowable and changeable at the same time. To begin to know reality is to begin to change it. For to begin to know is to begin to eliminate ignorance and acquire a consciousness that is a definite loss to the oppressor and a definite gain for the oppressed" (29).

If one wants to change reality, to change society, then it is incumbent that one become engaged in struggle, unincumbered by a false reading of reality and with a clear understanding between primary, secondary, internal and external contradictions. The colonized intellectuals must understand that contradictions are universal, absolute and particular. Contradictions are everywhere, in all things, specific and distinct at the same time.

Reality is socially determined and, therefore it is subjected to human modification and influence. Reality, therefore, is social and not alien to the particular circumstances that produce it. Consequently, reality is not isolated
from the contradictions of the world and is rooted in world social construction. Intellectuals must construct theories, ideologies that account for the various forces that impact on their particular struggle. For example, how does one reconcile the tensions between race and class, between African America's orientation towards socialism inside a capitalist country or, those tensions resulting from their attempt to construct a decentralized social democracy inside an autocratic colonial polity?

Nkrumah, argues that any decolonization struggle must develop an ideology that will be both cohesive and coercive. Any successful decolonization struggle is dependent upon an ideology that will combine all of the various complimentary and contradictory elements that create any particular struggle and the people involved in the struggle. This ideology must have the potential of uniting the colonized community into a cohesive society which will be capable of waging a protracted decolonization struggle.

His thesis is simple but profound: philosophy is or should be rooted in society, emanating from human contact with the environment. According to Nkrumah, "philosophy could very easily be divorced from human life. It becomes so abstract in certain Western universities as to bring its practitioners under the suspicion of being taxidermists of concepts"(Nkrumah, 29).

Philosophy, ideology and social cohesion are interconnected and essential for revolutionary decolonization. If the colonized African
Americans are to decolonized themselves and transform themselves from a loosely connected decentralized group of people, into a conscious nation, then it will be necessary for them to develop a cohesive ideology, i.e., Afrocentricism. This philosophy has to connect the various elements that have created African Americans and unite them for revolutionary action. According to Nkrumah, "social revolution must therefore have, standing firmly behind it, an intellectual revolution, a revolution in which our thinking and philosophy are directed towards the redemption of our society" (Nkrumah, 78).

Any successful decolonization struggle must produce an ideology that will not just simply renounce the ideologies of the former society, but must necessarily be capable of defending the new society that the struggle hopes to bring into existence. This ideology must bring the total life of the society into being and, it therefore, matters not whether it is written or merely held as a belief system by the nation, nor does it have to be produced by a few like minded people. What is important is its transformative, regulative and unifying capabilities. This new ideology must be capable of doing what all ideologies do: unite a people into a cohesive organic collective. Thus, "the ideology of a society displays itself in political theory, social theory and moral theory, and uses these instruments. It establishes a particular range of political, social and moral behavior, such that unless behavior of this sort fell
within the established range, it would be incompatible with the ideology" (Nkrumah, 59).

An ideology that attempts to unite millions of people implies that it is also an instrument of social control and, therefore makes coercion a desirable aspect of society. And the acceptance of this ideology will be based on the willingness of the people to adhere to the ideologies being offered. It must be noted that while initially this philosophy will take on the characteristics of absolutism, this threatening posture must only be temporal. Social dialectics, and the desire for stability and permanence, demand that a more universal humanistic philosophy be allowed to emerge.

If African Americans are to be successful in their decolonization struggle, they need a transformative, coercive ideology that will unite and direct them towards their objective. They are now developing such an ideology: Afrocentricism. As a revolutionary ideology, it attempts to unite all of the different contradictory forces that have combined to make the African American people who they are. As a transformative ideology, Afrocentricism attempts to convert African Americans from an undefined amphorous people lacking unified organized political direction into a unified cohesive nation with a continuous history, and recognizable political orientation.

Afrocentric philosophy argues on the one hand that, there are certain forms of behavior that are inconsistent with the ideas of African people, and on the other hand, advances the notion of "oneness" so essential to
revolutionary behavior. Afrocentricism attempts to break the mental chains of American colonial oppression in the minds of the African colonized nation, while giving them a worldview that incorporates them and their struggle into a larger context. It attempts to place African humanistic principles at the forefront of African American consciousness, so that it can direct their political behavior.

**Decolonization and Decompartmentalizing the Worldview of the Colonized**

Reality reveals itself as a totality entity: it is both particular and general, internal and external. Various forces will impact on the subjective and internal forces to shape our particular version of reality. Like all other people, regardless of their social positions, African Americans are shaped by worldwide forces and, therefore, as a nation, African Americans are also in need of a cosmology that will allow them to decode and unite all of the contributing and contradictory elements that have molded their reality.

One of the more salient and sinister aspects of colonialism is its ability to isolate the colonized community, and thus, prevent them from developing a world consciousness which inhibits their understanding of how they fit into the world scheme. Decolonization is an attempt to reverse this compartmentalized narrow worldview of the colonized, and expand their role and knowledge in shaping the world. In short, decolonization attempts to transform the colonized people from isolated and acted upon irresponsible agents into universal actors.
The history of African Americans reveals that they have always known, or sought to know, how they were connected to a larger world movement. Historical African nationalism had various philosophies that illustrate accurately that our elder nationalists understood or conceived of themselves in world terms. Pan-Africanism was such a movement. During the consciousness raising 1960s era, many African American nationalists, freed the liberation struggle of African Americans from its national boundaries and connected it to other worldwide freedom movements.

Even within the civil-rights organizations came some voices that connected our struggle to worldwide liberation movements, and some that thereby challenged America's oppressive role in denying freedom to its own citizens and to other people of color around the globe. For instance, according to King (1992),

There is at the outset a very obvious and almost facile connection between the war in Vietnam and the struggle I, and others, have been waging in America (232).

King's words expressed the growing international consciousness among the African American people concerning how their struggle connected to Third World liberation struggles. His words are also important because they illustrated profoundly the intracommunal unity between the conservative-bourgeois-traditionalist element in the African community and the nationalist-radical-militant faction that occurred as a result of the "Black
Power" movement during the 1960s. Having said that, it is important to note that the major difference between these two coalition groups was and still is over tactics; the former group pursuing ineffective solutions and the latter unable to formalize a program for change (Cruse, 1968).

Nevertheless, it is important to reiterate that, by speaking these words, King had now put himself in the same threatening class with other more militant members of the black nation (i.e., Malcolm X, S. Carmicheal, H. Rap Brown, and E. Cleaver). He was now no longer safe. He was now a statesmen for revolutionary humanism. He demonstrated that he understood political reality in its fullness:

> there is an intimate interdependency between the struggle of Third World people inside the U.S. and the struggle of Third World people around the world. Both components are necessary if complete liberation from racial and economic oppression is to be achieved (232).

If one point is clear about the time period in which King and other African elder statesmen were living, it is that the African community again renewed its sense of belonging to a larger whole, clearly understanding the worldwide implications and connections of their practices. They, on a national scale became mobilized to oppose apartheid, oppression, social discrimination, bigotry, racism and colonial compartmentalization.

They threw off the shackles that were restraining them and began the difficult and unique struggle to redefine themselves and Euroamerica. In the tumultuous era of the 1960s, one point remains clear: even in
misunderstood, orchestrated, intracommunity strife, there was a single-minded pursuit of our liberation. The only disunity, one that has characterized our struggle historically and currently, was over the issue of methods and tactics.

We make this reference to the 1960s because it represents an era when African Americans nationally reintensified their struggle for their freedom. Out of that time came a clear recognition that our cause, like that of other colonized people, i.e., the Vietnamese, was connected to world-wide white-nationalism and oppression. Out of that era came the message that America, like all other imperialist-colonial countries which have military colonies, would take colonized "black young men who had been crippled by our society and send them eight thousand miles away to guarantee liberties in Southeast Asia which they had not found in southwest Georgia and Harlem" (233).

Out of that time frame came a clear recognition that we were no different than any other hue-men in the face of white international domination and oppression. And to some, out of that time came the message that we must take similar steps as other colonized people to assure our freedom. Decolonization was to become the name of our struggle and not civil rights or integration.

When King spoke those (mentioned earlier), profound words, it became clear to everyone that he had made the decision to add his voice to the cause of shaping the world; that he had decided to become a world actor
and he proceeded to correct the compartmentalized narrow nationalistic vision of our people. Consequently, he too had to be eliminated. But, his world consciousness had transcended the limited goals of national 'civil-rights advocacy. In many respects, Dr. King had finally liberated his mind.

**Between Struggle and Liberation: Neo-Colonialism**

Fanon maintains that between the final liberation of the colony and the initial struggle for independence, there is a period when certain bourgeois nationalists take advantage of the struggle and the zealosity of the people. These bourgeois-nationalists continue to rape the nation economically and promote political impotency. Fanon calls this period neocolonialism. The neocolonialist period is characterized by the continuation of ideological, economical, cultural, educational, and political domination of a colony by those who remain psychologically tied to their former colonial oppressors.

The neo-colonial bourgeois-nationalist, now occupy the seats of power previously held by foreign rulers. The mother country rules through various groups of colonized elites who are forced into becoming intermediaries between the former colonizing countries and the people. This becomes their historical mission in the struggle for liberation.

This is the group that remains tied to the decadence of the western world. They are motivated by self aggrandizement and characterized by political impotency, ideological impunity, moral ineptness, and psychological and cultural misorientation. Thus, they continue to exploit the colonized
people. These are the people who suffer from the colonially produced psychosis that renders them useless. The colonizers will exacerbate regional, class, educational, religious, gender and age-group differences to intensify internal division, endorsed, celebrated and promoted by this dependent class. According to Fanon (1963),

colonialism, which had been shaken to its foundation by the birth of African unity, recovers its balance and tries now to break that will to unify by using all the movement's weaknesses. Colonialism will set the African people moving by revealing to them the existence of "spiritual" rivalries.... The missionaries find it opportune to remind the masses that long before the advent of European colonialism the great African empires were disrupted by the Arab invasion (160).

The neocolonialist stage allows the former imperialist colonizing country to claim neutralism, and non-responsibility for the actions of these lackeys, and the continued disintegration and destruction of the country. During this stage in the decolonization struggle, the colonizer will use propaganda, financial concessions and various forms of inducements, military terrorism, and ideological tactics to forestall national unity. And its reign of terror and covert attempts to maintain control are facilitated by the national bourgeoisie.

Directed by purely selfish ends, the national bourgeoisie give lip service to the nationalist sentiments of the masses and then begin a campaign of confusion. They begin to foster a false national consciousness in the minds of
the people by implementing programs and promoting policies that are designed to forestall liberation and the formation of a national identity. In summary, they as a class, have been known to distrust the people politically, avoid comprehensive economic development, defeat political decentralization policies, maintain the unequal vertical economic trade arrangements; develop political institutions along suggested western patterns, and accept without question the validity of western designed development programs and philosophies.

Economically, imperialist countries have utilized several interrelated mechanisms to gain control over the economic destiny of the former colony. They include finance and industrial capital, foreign aid for economic
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Throughout his detailed research Cheru argues that it is the autocratic dishonest neo-colonialists that have taken the wealth of the nations for their own personal aggrandizement. Cheru maintains, correctly I might add, that in order for the African continent to develop certain things must take place.

First the leadership has to be held responsible for their political actions; second, that the private agricultural sector must be given special support in very key areas; third, that the creditor nations must renegotiate their loans, or make them grants; that the export-generated economic development programs have to be rethought, and that the people of African should not be forced into choosing between national autonomy and development.

The export generated economic development problems that confront the people on the continent are very similar to those faced by African Americans. African Americans also face the problems of illness, poverty, food shortages, housing, and other problems that continental Africans face. Our problem is more acute in that, African Americans exist inside the most powerful economic and military colonial society in this world.
development, international import and export mechanisms and technical assistance in the creation of certain key industries as well as what Nkrumah calls, the 'invisible trade' mechanisms that directly affect the economic independence of a colony. In addition, as discussed by writers such as Parenti, a variety of secret activities are used to manipulate directly or indirectly the politics of neocolonies.*

A good example of this type of secret activities has been intelligence organizations shrouded in humanitarianism, i.e., the peace corp. As a humanitarian organization, it has been expelled from various countries because of its illegal intelligence gathering activities. According to Nkrumah (1965), "since its creation in 1961, members of the Peace corps have been exposed and expelled from many African, Middle Eastern and Asian countries for acts of subversion or prejudice. Indonesia, Tanzania, the Philippines, and even pro-West countries like Turkey and Iran, have complained of its actives" (248).

From gathering intelligence, to spreading negative propaganda, the imperialist countries have exploited the many weaknesses of the bourgeoisie and have continued their exploitation. But the activities of these various covert agencies, and the distorted work of the United States Information

* For more information see, Michael Parenti, The Sword and The Dollar, St Martin's Press, New York, 1989. Also see Norm Chomsky Turning the Tide, South End Press, Boston, Ma., 1985.
Agency" does not indicate the power of the imperialists, but rather, as Nkrumah (1965) said, "all these examples prove beyond a doubt that neo-colonialism is not a sign of imperialism's strength but rather of its last hideous gasp. It testifies to its inability to rule any longer by old methods" (253).

It is the colonized masses who will determine the success or failure of the decolonization struggle and it is for their support that the nationalist must fight. Since they have not been fully exposed to, nor believe in the myth of their inferiority or the superiority of the imperialist, the masses remain the final arbitrator of the colonial struggle. It is the ghetto residents who understands that it is the system that is responsible for their economic and political impotency and not themselves.

It will be the African American masses who will demand change and not compromise, rejecting the argument that places the blame on them while exonerating the system. It is the intelligentsia, unfortunately, that ascribes to the myth. It is the colonized elites who have been the surrogates of the imperialists, and it is they who have continued the colonial oppression during the neocolonialist stage throughout the Third World and here in colonial America.

*According to Nkrumah the U. S. Information Service in 1965 employed 12,000 people and had an operating budget of $130 million, that allowed them to operate "110 radio stations, 60... outside the U.S. broadcasting propaganda to countries in African, Asia, and Latin America from installations on land, or on "off-shore stations on American ships" (Nkrumah, 249).
The colonizers are currently attempting to carry out this same policy of division and destruction in Somalia, and Anzania (South Africa) and here in America. All one has to do is look at the history of the American Holocaust to see its historical workings here in carceral America. In the African American community, Euroamericans are currently fashioning a neo-colonial war against us.

They are using individuals of the "Buffer Negro class", as neo-colonialists and anti-nationalist propagandists. This group, continues to demand restraint from colonized African Americans while they promote and advocate interracialism and legal gradualism as a cure to our oppressive conditions. According to Haki Madhubuti (1978), this is the class which has "acquired all the trappings of the whites at the expense of their selfness (black manhood or womanhood), and as a part of this they are put into positions by other whites to speak for the majority of Blacks" (43).

These are our Ron Browns, Vernon Jordans, and Clarence Thomas.' These are the voices that reflect the aspirations of Euroamericans and not African Americans. These are our neo-colonialist politicians who rule over the African American colonies in place of EuroAmericans in the absence of truly African nationalist politicians/leaders.

Neo-Colonialism and The Politics of Decolonization

Immediately following independence, the political leadership can be divided into three basic groups. They are, the traditional rulers, the western
educated elite; and the radical nationalists. These are basically the same three groups that Fanon described. Therefore, I will not discuss them again in totality. I will however discuss the second group, since this group is currently ruling the African American colonies. This group of internally colonized western educated elites and their foreign counterparts, are currently destroying the independence of many newly liberated countries throughout the Third World and are retarding the development of an African American nationalist political agenda in our society (Cruse, 1968, 1987; Cheru, 1992; Madhubuti, 1978; Williams; 1987).

What is most important about this group is that they generally come from the traditional elites of a given colonial society and are taught "in the ways and means of European liberal capitalist democracy" (Saidin, 1979). After they have been selected and identified for their new roles, the next step is to select the best structural form of government to effectuate colonial in-direct rule.

* Saidin Identifies this as a four stages process: [a] Reinforcing and extending the infrastructure of the colonial economies; [b] Making sure by conventions and agreements that the colonial economic institutions and arrangements would be left intact; [c] Reinforcing these institutions with new and even more powerful ones, and with strings of foreign aid; and, [d] Nursing an African entrepreneurial middle class, the economic counterpart of the bureaucrats and politicians; whose interest would coincide with those of the imperialism on which they would still depend for their prosperity.
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Once installed, these newly 'placed' leaders continue the colonial exploitation of their own people and maintain a socially fragmentary policy. Throughout the Third World, nation after nation has experienced neo-colonial rule which led them to ruination and national disintegration (Cheru, 1993). Therefore, the primary political task facing the political activists or the nationalist party during the neo-colonial phase of the decolonization struggle is to achieve the development of a national will among a formerly atomized group of people. How to bring about national coherence to a society that was systematically destroyed by the colonizing countries is the essential task confronting the revolutionary intellectual cadre.

This is a very difficult task since colonialism initially destroys the indigenous social and political structures necessary for political cohesion and direction. According to Furnivall (1956),

> under direct rule the whole organic edifice of native polity collapses, and there remains no unit more comprehensive than the village.... On this plan the people are easier to govern, as they have no bond of union, but the same process, as we shall notice later, makes them less capable of self-government. The point immediately relevant, however, is that it constitutes the first, or political, stage in the disintegration of society (297).

Given this, decolonization struggles must address the reunification of the national polity and restore those indigenous institutions that can reestablish
national and historical continuity while creating a national will [consciousness].

More importantly, the question is how to develop a national will and institute a form of self-government in a society that had been previously destroyed by colonialism. That is, how does one 'educate' the colonized people, such that, they can govern themselves as a unified polity.

Lacking in political sophistication and knowledge, bourgeois nationalists will continue the policies, and maintain the institutions, of the former colonizing countries. They fail to educate and organize the people for armed struggle or fail to decentralize the political process and institute indigenous political philosophies. In such circumstances, the bourgeoisie is usually distrustful of the people, likely to develop single party political structures. In all likelihood, it will also engage in political repression.

This group is unable to develop a national consciousness in the minds and heart of the nation, since it has not yet come to terms with its own identity. Too often they have not developed a cultural grounding sufficient to meet the task of struggling for political independence.

Saidin asks a very relevant series of questions that must be addressed if this phase of the decolonization struggle is to be understood:

above all we must seek an answer to the crucial question: Why, in the end, did people in positions of leadership let themselves become the agents of their own nation's bondage? More exactly, how were brown leaders seduced into copying the behavior and even the attitudes of the
white men who had mistreated them so cruelly and disdainfully for so many years (90)?

He answers with the all too familiar reason; acculturation and continued psychological dependency. Consequently, many of these leaders equate economic growth and autonomy with political independence (Saidin, 91).

This is because the values that the neo-colonialists perpetuate are those of the imperialists. They believe in and foster the belief of economic growth, capitalism/communism, cultural, political, and ideological Eurocentricism. They also display many of the psychological anti-self disorders. In essence, they articulate and actualize the cosmology of the European/Euroamerican. Thus, they reinforce and have internalize their own inferiority and the *myth* of European/Euroamerican superiority.

In the colonial situation, this manicheanization was common place, overt and everywhere physical; in the neo-colonial situation, it becomes covert and psychological. Assisted by a western elitist educational and acculturation indoctrination process, neocolonialists, both native and foreign, find an area of affinity for one another that transcends their colonial positions. These foreign and domestic neocolonialists develop a symbiotic relationship that is tenuous and destructive to both groups and the colonial society, but, one that is eagerly entered into by both groups: both helpless and mesmerized by the legacy of colonialism.
Carmicheal & Hamilton discuss the colonial relationship that controls the political arrangement between African and EuroAmericans. In their classic analysis, Carmicheal & Hamilton make the critical distinction between mere political participation and controlling or making political policy. According to their analysis, African Americans, while able to participate in the politics of this society, are relegated to the neo-colonial role of political endorsement and not policy formation. As such, "politically, decisions which affect black lives have always been made by white people—the "white power structure" (Carmicheal, 7).

Carmicheal & Hamilton continued to unravel the nature of the political arrangement between African and Euroamericans and come to the conclusion that our political arrangement is analogous to that of other neo-colonialists societies. They argue that in America, political rule has been reconfigured from crude direct rule to a sophisticated form of indirect colonial rulership, where the political interest of the imperialist country (Euroamerican society) are now being carried out by native political figures (African American elites):

In other words, the white power structure rules the black community through local blacks who are responsive to the white leaders, the downtown, white machine, not to the black populace. These black politicians do not exercise effective power. They cannot be relied upon to make forceful demands in behalf of their constituents and thus nullify any bargaining power the black community might develop (9-10).
Continuing on the same theme, Williams makes the following assessment of our political leaders and the role that they play in prohibiting the development of an effective political agenda along nationalist lines: "One of the major reasons we are in such a non-negotiable position is that all our Afro politicians, negro leaders, Black spokesmen, aspiring leaders and community mouthpieces were all "trained" and "educated" by white people and therefore their analysis of our problem is from a white-European perspective." (Madhubuti, 1978,43).

**Successful Decolonization and National Consciousness**

Suffering from isolation, depersonalization, dehumanization, disillusionment, continued exploitation under the guise of independence, and controlled by forces that they have little control over, forced into regressive tribalism, and yet relied on for the success of their independence movement, that in many ways has let them down, it should come as no surprise to anyone that in newly independent societies, there is a lack of national cohesion and no apparent national will (consciousness). It should be no surprise that absent an aggressive educational program, conducted by truly nationalist leaders, the situation will continue.

Fanon makes it clear that those leaders, who rely on the West for their support and ideological and philosophical platform and ideas, have not the economic or intellectual capacity to create an atmosphere for the development of a national consciousness and are relying on the masses for
the continuation and development of a liberation movement and a political program to support it:

This native bourgeoisie, which has adopted unreservedly and with enthusiasm the ways of thinking characteristic of the mother country, which has become wonderfully detached from its own thought and has based its consciousness upon foundations which are typically foreign, will realize, with its mouth watering, that it lacks something essential to a bourgeoisie: money (Fanon, 178).

Restricted by lack of money, ideals, political knowhow, and divorced from their people, these neo-colonialist rulers continue to promote policies that deepen the social disintegration that I discussed earlier. They mask the plunder of the society behind the rhetoric of other technicians and bureaucrats who, like themselves, are useless. The net result is the formation of a society without a social consciousness or sense of purpose.

Renato Constantino makes the argument that during the neocolonial stage, absent a sense of national identity, led by nationalist politicians who are well grounded in their own cultural identity, these societies becomes, "societies without purpose." Constantino (1978) maintains that a society without purpose results in a

people habituated to abdicating control over basic areas of their national life, unaccustomed to coming to grips with reality, prone to escape into fantasies; and a leadership with voluntarily chooses Western solutions for Philippine problems—partly because it is intellectually conditioned to believe in
such solutions and partly for personal expedience;... (165).

A neocolonial society is prone to be controlled by idleness, and its people plagued by confusion over the distinction between consumerism and economic development. Facilitated by the misguided discourse of national economic growth, the people erroneously adopt various economic development programs that are dictated to them and not internally determined. All this results in confusion between political reality and the meaning of economic prosperity.

Constantino suggested that the only way to cure the ill-effects of neocolonialism is to create a national consciousness among the populace through an educational program implemented by a dedicated leadership who is committed to democratic decentralization. He argues that only by developing a national consciousness [will], can a neocolonial society become cohesive and independent (Constantino, 171).

Constantino concludes by arguing for internally developed nationalist policies and programs created by nationalist leaders who would seek national welfare while rejecting personal aggrandizement and promoting foreign economic interest. The formation of a national identity is contingent upon the success of a vigorous educational program carried out at every level of the society.

Constantino recognizes that his society, like the colonized African American nation, needs an economic development and social re-structuring
program along egalitarian lines, and not the transferring of material and monetary riches from one group of foreign exploiters to another indigenous group of capitalist exploiters. Canstantino, like Fanon, Cruse, Williams and other colonialist theorists, calls for a decentralized democratic state. Like the Philippine nation, the African American nation "must break away from the history of colonial relationships under which the metropolitan powers assured their development by extracting the surplus of poor nations" (Constantino, 1978, 187).

In many ways African Americans have gone beyond the notion of nationhood and, yet, they remain divided over this crucial question. The understanding of their distinctive 'nationhood' is a matter of historical fact. What remains for them to accomplish, like in all neo-colonial societies, is the transformation of its national understanding into various nationalist programs. This is an essential point that must not be forgotten in our struggle for national liberation and radical social reconstruction here in America. Afrocentric scholars must remember that everything done in the name of decolonization is political. As Walker (1945) so aptly notes, "however important the economic and social aspects of the colonial problem may be, the future of colonies is ultimately a question of politics" (136). There is nothing that is done in the name of decolonization from changing one's name, Africanizing our institutions, seeking inclusion into the political arena based on cultural particularisms, or demanding reparations for crimes
committed against our nation that is not political. And, as Fanon has told us, 
all are successful in that, they all represent a form of resistance.

Decolonization is a multilayered and polycentric process/struggle that 
requires political, economic and cultural reeducation and indigenization. If 
any decolonization struggle is to be successful, it has to have the direction and 
commitment of its people, all of its people. And no group is more important 
than the intellectual and elite class. That is not to say that the masses are not 
important, but it is to say that this class has been exposed to the 
deculturalization process more than others and must play a critical and 
pivotal role in the struggle.

While it is difficult to predict the course of any decolonization 
process/struggle, one can say, as history has shown, that there are some things 
that a people should avoid. There are many similarities between all 
decolonization struggles and, yet, all are different. Therefore, to say with 
assurance that this or that should or should not be done is incorrect. History 
has shown us that successful decolonization struggles have avoided certain 
policies and practices. Therefore, if the African American decolonization 
struggle is to be successful, then it is important that we too avoid certain types 
of practices in the future and try to adopt those that have proven successful.

Thus far I have spoken in general ways about the nature of 
decolonization and why it is important for us to see our movement in those 
terms. Now, it is important that I begin to speak in specific terms about
restructuring our political behavior in all of its manifestations. In the next chapter I will speak directly to the issue of economic development and African American autonomy. It is important that Afrocentric scholars remain critical about every aspect of our liberation struggle especially those aspects that will directly and immediately impact on the daily lives of African American people. Economics is one of those areas that impacts on our lives and has been subjected to the influence of Eurocentricism.

Consequently, due to the influence of Eurocentric hegemony, and due to political and intellectual impotency, the issues concerning our economic underdevelopment have been distorted and limited in their potential. I will argue that this debate is limited and needs to be broadened to include reparations and development as opposed to restricted to issues of employment.
Chapter 4

Colonialism, Underdevelopment and Reparations

Reparations and Nationalist Politics

I have argued throughout this analysis that nationalist politics is the only alternative available for a colonized people who hope to change the structural relationship between themselves and their oppressors without engaging in violent social revolution. This is no different for colonized African Americans. I have maintained also that African Americans suffer from the political effects of a fostered uncritical and false-consciousness that has inhibited them from engaging in a selfish but necessary form of nationalistic politics that would liberate them politically, socially, culturally and economically. Consequently, they have allowed themselves to be spoon-fed several social programs which supposedly will result in political and economic equality.

If social equality is to occur, it is my opinion, that something other than individualistic legal policies must be implemented to bring this about. Neither welfarism, Black capitalism, CDC's [Community Development Corporations], integration, affirmative action or other forms of social legislation will accomplish this goal. Something else is needed, something that will change the monetary gap between Euro and African Americans. As
William Darity (1990) has said, "antipoverty programs and social welfare programs that left untouched...the fundamental disparity in American society, the racial gap in ownership of the nation's wealth, were palliative at best" (3).

It is my opinion, and that of other Black cultural scientists, that this something must be in the form of a massive income transfer, (either in the form of cash, capital, land, etc.), between African and Euroamericans. What they advocate, and I endorse, is that America must pay a substantial amount of reparations to African Americans for current and past violations against us as a distinct nation of people. "Although the word "reparations," when used in connection with blacks, still makes many whites (and a few blacks) uncomfortable, the need for a massive capital transfer to blacks as a precondition for significant stride towards black economic development is increasingly agreed to by persons all along the political spectrum" (Puryear, 1972, v). I would add that, without massive recapitalization, our economic underdevelopment cannot be reversed nor will our national economic autonomy be realized.

This massive transfer must be between us as a nation, and not given to us as individuals. What we are after, aside from compensation, is the political unity that will result from such a transfer. What is crucial for the sustained legitimization of our national integrity, is the recognition of African nationhood, allowing us to sever our economic interests from that of Euroamerica.
I have also argued that before this and other nationalist political problems are successfully addressed, a mental decolonization process must take place within the African American nation. We must first be educated to see ourselves as a separate nation, and the wrongs that were committed against us during slavery and its formalistic ending and subsequent redevelopment as crimes committed against us as a decentralized and diverse nation.

If this takes place, then the various forms of social welfare programs, or programs aimed at bringing about social equality, without some form of social compensation for those insidious crimes, will be dismissed as a disgrace to our ancestors and to those of us who are their living descendants. We will then dismiss the arguments for those inconsequential programs as nothing other than smokescreens aimed at fooling us, as was the case with the integration charade. Anything other than massive cash and/or capital-stock transfers from the Euroamerican colonizers to our people must be viewed as subsistence allowances aimed at keeping us politically docile and distracted from economic independence.

While we use the term nation to refer to ourselves, we still fail to comprehend the fullness of the term. African Americans lack the political behavior and consciousness that must accompany it.
If we are a nation, then all forms of economic and political behavior must be
couched in terms relevant to the relationship between us as a nation and the
Euroamericans as a nation. That is, we must act nationalistically.

Thus, we must view the various forms of economic welfare as nothing
other than foreign aid and the economic relationship between African and
Euroamericans as one of dependence* and monopoly. As a nation, African
Americans must realize that what we export is our labor while
Euroamericans export their capital. As a consequence of imperialist-
colonialism, and capitalism, colonized African Americans have been
prevented from developing a meaningful diverse economy that could
manufacture and export finished goods; or, employ large numbers of African
Americans. They have no meaningful manufacturing industry that employs
large numbers of their own people or other people in this country (Manning,
1983). In fact, the African American corporate core (Manning's term) is
comprised of less than 200 individuals and " 1,060 Black Businesses with a

* I use the term dependence in the economic sense as defined by
Theotonio Dos Santos in his article, "The Structure of Dependence,"
dependence as "a situation in which the economy of certain countries is
conditioned by the development and expansion of another economy to
which the former is subjected. The relation of interdependence between
two or more economies, and between these and world trade, assumes the
form of dependence when some countries (dominate ones) can expand and
can be self-sustaining, while other countries (the dependent ones) can
do this only as a reflection of that expansion, which can have either a
positive or negative effect on their immediate development,"
(Santos,231).
workforce of 20 or more employees, led by Black Enterprise magazine's top 100 firms" (Manning, 1983, 157). Most of the African American enterprises employ between 1 to 19 employees dominated by single family enterprises. More importantly, for our current discussion, we must take steps that will politicize the economic inequities between our capital impoverishment and their capital surpluses, and recognize that the basis for this capital imbalance is historically rooted in our enslavement and continued exploitation (Browne, 1993; America, 1977; Malveaux, 1992; Schuchter, 1970; Walters, 1992; Darity, 1990; Swinton, 1990; Mazuri, 1990; Main, 1972).

Nationally, the only way to equalize this economic imbalance, and to foster social equality, is through political behavior designed to break the economic underdevelopment from which we are currently suffering. Reparations must become a central component of our nationalist agenda and be viewed as the way to recapitalize our economy without having to receive massive foreign investments. We must resist the movement of the colonizers to marginalize our call for reparations, since it creates an atmosphere that facilitates their foreign investment overtures while ignoring their liability. Euroamericans have been successful, thus far, at associating our legitimate claims with the denigrated ideologies of our most strident African nationalists. They have been able to marginalize successfully this legitimate argument to the periphery of our intra and international economic and
political debate. Not only do we have to rescue it from this narrow marginalized discourse, but from the proponents as well.

Those who would become our nationalist leaders, our political leaders, must be accessed from this national economic criterion and other dimensions of ethnonationalism. The call for reparations must become a call spoken by every woman, child and man of the African American nation. It is necessary for national resurgence and is not a side issue of *militants and madmen*. Universal reparation payments is a legitimate way of breaking the stifling underdevelopment that continues to imperil our people. For African American reparation economists, and myself, reparations is the economic source that can finance our economic redevelopment because we are a colonized nation of people who are confronted with the economic problems *endemic to colonial underdevelopment* (Mazuri, 1980; Yansané, 1980; Cheru, 1989; Drake, 1980; Stone, 1979; Reese, 1979; Casanova, 1965; Stavenhagen, 1965).

**Internal Colonialism and African American Economic Underdevelopment**

The best way to view the relationship between the African American and the Euroamerican community is one of economic development and underdevelopment. The African American community has been, and is, being maintained as an underdeveloped segment of the Euroamerican economic society for the same exploitative reasons as traditional colonies
were maintained; that is, for the economic benefit of the 'mother country.' In essence, African Americans constitute an internal colony of exploitation.

The economic choices for the colonized African American people are the same as those of any other colonized people facing massive developmental problems. In essence, their problem is how to recapitalize, minimize the amount of foreign investment and still achieve development goals. All formerly colonized nations are faced with the dilemma of either [a] inviting foreign investments into the society, thereby, exposing themselves to continuous foreign exploitation or [b] attempt to develop with internally generated capital which would maintain economic autonomy.

If a country attempts the latter, then they must make a complete break with the former colonizing country, and substitute for resources that were formerly available. Economic autonomy is dependent on how willing the African American people are to struggle for their independence, and the extent to which they identify with the concept of separate nation status, i.e., do they see themselves as a separate and distinct people.

If African Americans are to be successful in their struggle for complete separation, then they will have to overcome the divisive counter-nationalist movements mounted by both African and Euroamericans, and by the state-capitalist system. "If the wealth of America is to be shared on a more "equitable" basis, new rationales for the distribution will have to be developed. Unlike overseas colonies which can win their freedom and go
their own way, blacks must remake the total economic and social system in America if they wish to change their own situation" (Tabb, 33).

There are essentially two methods that African Americans can use to develop their economy. First, through various capitalist schemes and second, through socialist schemes. If the African American community chooses the former, we would be in the same neo-colonialist position as other Third World countries after formal political independence: economically enslaved. According to Tabb, (1970),

the "white power structure,"...prefers individual ownership by blacks, which necessarily will have to be in cooperation with outside white interests. The reason for this choice is apparent. Such an arrangement is amenable to neo-colonial rule, since it guarantees the indirect control of the ghetto economy through a local native class essentially dependent on larger white businesses (35).

Euroamerica continues to promote neo-colonialist policies aimed at increasing the size of the African American middle-class. They have continuously maintained, along with the bourgeois nationalists, that this is the best way to develop the African American nation. They argue that by increasing the middle-class, African Americans can have a group that could provide stability during times of unrest; bring economic opportunity to the African American masses, have a vested interest in the growth of the larger economy and lessen the visibility of Euroamericans in their economy and communities. Thus, the major proposal has been, in some form or another,
since the revolts of the 1960s, 'Black capitalism.' But, the creation of a bourgeois class has never been beneficial to developing former colonized nations per se and neither has it been beneficial to our community (Frazier, 1957; Wilson, 1987; Pinkney, 1984; Allen, 1990; Cruse, 1987; Hacker, 1992).

Black capitalism has been advocated because it proposes.offers minimal government intervention, while multinationals gain tax breaks through subsidies from various levels of government. It also is an opportunity to monopolize the growing choices of the African American 'purchasing' economy. Black capitalism gives large multinationals the opportunity to control and increase their share of the lucrative African American consumer market. Multinationals are able to accomplish this through the use of African American 'petty bourgeois' business subsidiaries and distributorships. These economic schemes also provide the banking industries with opportunities their profits.

---

*Also see, Talmadge Anderson, Black Economic Liberation Under Capitalism, The Black Scholar, October, 1970. Anderson argued that black capitalism, "special Small Business Administration projects, and joint industry-government programs designed to give blacks a semblance of capitalistic participation, have met with limited success. These programs are mere compromising, gratuitous, piece-meal and political appeasers to the white power structure, (Anderson, 1970, pg., 12)."

Anderson maintains, and this point supports my argument, and that of many other reparations economists, "to prove sincerity of intend in the economic reconstruction of black people, white-industry and government would be required to spend hundreds of billions more than the few millions presently allocated," (Anderson, 13).
This policy promotes the development of cheap labor and the removal of government cash payments to poorly educated people. Thus, forcing them into wage labor and working poverty.

In fact, currently there is a national debate being carried on between various factions within the colonizers community over the question of welfare reform legislation. One of the major aspects of this debate is how to best convert welfare into 'workfare.' Colonial administrator Bill Clinton has proposed that welfare benefits be limited to a "two year period after which recipients would be required to take a job or do community service" (Chicago Tribune, Sect. 1, Col. 1). Under this plan, multinationals will be given "some form of direct subsidy... as an incentive" (Chicago Tribune, sect. 1, col. 1) as 'encouragement' to hire the working poor.

This renewed reform movement is all a part of "a broader conservative (colonizers who accept their usurped positions) strategy, initiated more gingerly in the mid 1970s, to redistribute income upwards and reduce the size of the Federal government" (Abramovitz, 238). According to Abramovitz (1988), "their real desire is to shrink the A.F. D. C. rolls and reduce the program's cost rather than meet the needs of poor women. Putting them to work would also help enlarge the cheap labor pool" (Abramovitz, 240). By removing the 'safety net' of welfare, which serves as a form of subsistence living, Welfare recipients and other members of the 'working
poor' will be converted into low wage earners with no place to go except into the cheap labor pool. And as designed, this 'reform' movement is basically designed to redistribute wealth among the imperialist class and not designed to provide a better living for the poor.

African American bourgeois nationalists have lobbied for the growth of multinational penetration into the African American economy and the private corporate sector, and various colonial administrations have willingly developed several schemes to accommodate their limited desires. One such scheme has been the Community Development Corporation. The CDC, as it was called, was supposed "to aid the people of urban...communities in among other goals, achieving the ownership and control of resources of their community, expanding opportunity, stability, and self-determination" (Tabb, 51).

Most of the CDC schemes attempted to develop capital and human resources; i.e., better economic and educational opportunities, better the infrastructure of the communities, offer different schemes to increase self-determination and have corporations return some portion of profits to the community. While these schemes on the surface sounded good, they failed to address a major growth problem which with all developing nations are confronted.
That is, and especially for the African American domestically colonized community, the limited potential for businesses to grow without a well developed export economy, or the development of an African American diversified economy to keep monies from leaving their economy after minimal circulation.

Tabb offers a limited solution to our export development. He maintains that our economic development can only be achieved with massive outside capital investments, offered through various economic schemes to the African American nation. He maintains that the multinationals and colonial administration should give the African American developing nation better terms of trade and technical assistance, help to build up overhead capital, invest in human capital development, and provide low-interest loans to small African American businesses. All of which, in my opinion, only further enslaves African Americans. These schemes offer Euroamericans and other foreign imperialist-capitalist multinationals monopoly influence in the African American national economy.

African Americans do need assistance, but not the type for which Tabb argues. They do not need assistance that would continue their underdevelopment and exploitation. African Americans must find economic
means that will help them create a diversified economy that will lead to their independence. The African American colony has but one single crop: our labor to export. Like similarly colonized people, they have been restricted in developing a fully integrated stratified economy. As such, in recognition of this fact, Tabb advocates policies that further exploit this single crop by promoting various full employment schemes. Full employment, while desirous, is not the solution to all of our economic problems.

We will not discuss in full all of the nuances of Tabb's economic proposals. What he does say that must be briefly looked into is that underdevelopment should be viewed, for prescriptive purposes, from the twin perspectives of a lack of power/freedom and dependence. This means that we ought to "stress social and economic relationships, in contrast to definitions of poverty which stress income" (Tabb, 82) on the one hand, and propose economic programs that promote long-range economic strategies leading to independent economic development on the other.

Poverty, as defined by income, tends to focus on the nature of the relationship that individuals and groups have to the labor market, stressing human resource factors and not societies' responsibility for their condition, and avoiding the nature of a person's or group's attachment to the market. The question is whether individuals and groups have a strong attachment to the market, or are they dependent on unilateral government transfers for their livelihood? Undoubtedly African Americans are denied substantial
opportunities to be attached to this economy, and they have suffered enormous income disparity due to exploitation, appropriation, and discrimination. But, they have been given governmental cash transfers instead of economic development opportunities. Overlooking the extent to which African Americans have been exploited and discriminated against, it has become a common and accepted practice to 'blame' them for their economic plight, and to politicize negatively their claim for government transfers. This can be seen in the highly politicized debate over public assistance, i.e., welfare.

If one took the position that African Americans are contributors, Social Insurance would be a just remedy for them during times of unemployment. If one's position is that African Americans have not contributed to the wealth of this society, then Welfare would be appropriate. The difference is vast and goes to the nature of the relationship that a person or group has to the marketplace. Social Insurance requires no means test and carries the connotation of contributing to the growth of the economy, while public aid, on the other hand, "refers to programs that provide payments in cash, kind, and services to needy individuals and families. Unlike social insurance programs, which pay benefits as an earned right, public aid programs rely on a means or income test to determine eligibility" (Tabb, 89). This connotes that recipients of welfare are not deserving of public assistance because they have taken away from national economic growth.
Euroamerican nationalist view public assistance as a gift as opposed to a right. Thus, public assistance can best be characterized as paternalistic, voluntary and localistic. The American colonial welfare system can best be seen in two conflicting ways. First, that it is the responsibility of government to provide the good-life to its citizens and, therefore, welfare is a mechanism of providing the good-life when the private sector is unable to do so. Secondly, one can see "the welfare system as actually carrying out only too well its function—a function of colonial administration" (Tabb, 95).

Tabb comes to a position with which I agree with and intend to advance; that is, "this second approach perceives the function of welfare agencies to be the policing of the poor. Strongly put, the main impact of many social-welfare programs has been to provide enough services to keep the 'natives' from becoming too distressed. The aim has been to 'cool out' their anger rather than to help them out of poverty" (Tabb, 96). Put differently, the American welfare system has been designed to forestall movements towards autonomy and national independence, while maintaining the people in an underdeveloped dependent position. All of the various schemes that have been advocated by the colonial-imperialist capitalist structure to develop the African American colonized nation have not been to assist in the development of their economic independence, but rather to continue the domination and exploitation of our people. The struggle over what method
to use to develop our nation economically has continued for several decades by each generation since the first reconstruction period.

There has historically been a heated debate in the African American nation between our nationalist and bourgeois-nationalist leaders over economic development strategies. The nationalists have at different times throughout our struggle advocated *going it alone*, i.e., economic nationalism/autonomy, while the bourgeois-nationalists have advocated accommodation/cooperation with the colonial administration and the corporate structure. While this debate is unique due to our particular circumstances, it is not unique in the sense that all colonized people have been confronted with the complexities surrounding economic development during their decolonization struggles.

**What We Mean by Reparations and What We Want to Accomplish**

If we are to make a distinction between what has been paid to African Americans in the form of cash payments from the colonial administration and what we want, we must first define reparations. The term reparations as used by reparation economists means, "the act of making amends or giving satisfaction or compensation for a wrong, injury, etc.; also, the thing done or given; amends, satisfaction; compensation" (Brown, 1972, 69).

There is general confusion concerning the meaning and purpose of reparations. According to Brown (1972), "it is a cry of anguish from the mouths of some, a plea for justice from the mouths of others, and an
ominous threat on the lips of yet others" (67). It has been spoken of by presidents and laymen alike. It has been called a marshall plan, or referred to as an overdue promissory note, or just plain reparations. Its message, whether given in a speech, a presidential address, a 'manifesto,' or a sermon, has always been the same: a demand for a massive capital transfer from the oppressors and violators of our national integrity and human rights to us as a nation.

I use the term reparations in this chapter to mean various forms of substantial compensations, i.e., cash, capital-stock, land, economic and business institutions, to be turned over to African Americans, as a nation, for historical and contemporary injustices committed against them as a nation by the European nations, acting as a single European/Eurocentric coalition, regardless of their particular nation-state constructions.

What is it that African Americans want or hope to accomplish by such demands? According to reparation economists there are basically four non-exhaustive points to be considered:

a] To punish (or expiate) the white community for the sins of slavery committed by its ancestors and oblige it to render retribution to the descendants of the slaves;

b] To provide the black population with restitution for unpaid labor of its slave ancestors;
c) To redirect to blacks that portion of the national income which has been diverted from blacks to whites as a result of slavery and post emancipation racial discrimination: and,

d) To provide the black community with the share of the national wealth and income which would by now have had if it had been treated as other immigrant communities were, rather than enslaved.*

The monies being discussed are needed to transform the underdeveloped African American nation into an independent/autonomous economic entity such that they can contribute to the American society and the world by developing multinationals for Pan-African world development. Given the substantial amount of monies, (some estimates fall within the range of $448 to $995 billion) that we are discussing, it is too often feared that the American economy will suffer. This need not be the case, as Brown (1972) states,

To the extent that America feels able to face the redistributional need openly, via taxation, land reform, or some type of expropriation, the multi-billion dollar internal capital transfer need not seriously affect the state of the economy. Indeed, to the extent that there are macro-economic effects, they may well be salubrious one's (79).

The purpose of such payments are to place the African nation in the proper economic position that it would have acquired if there had not been

* The above list cited from Robert S. Brown's Article: The Economic Basis for Reparations to Black America, pg., 69.
inhuman developmental restraints placed on them. African Americans were denied the opportunity to invest in themselves, denied means to remedy their deficiencies after the Civil War, and faced with socioeconomic discriminatory practices after the Civil War which continue unabated today. The result has been the continued exploitative appropriation of their only economic commodity and, therefore, their acute underdevelopment.

Reparation payments must compensate the African American nation for historical and contemporary illegitimate appropriation of their labor and other economical discriminatory practices that have led to their underdeveloped condition, while recapitalizing their nation so that African Americans can develop economic intracommunal and multinational institutions that will facilitate a world wide economic ascendancy.

**Underdevelopment, Employment Discrimination and Reparations**

One of the ways to understand the effects of colonial economic policy on the African American nation is to view employment discrimination as a source, or form, of economic underdevelopment. If one takes the position that African American labor is the only resource that they own outright, then any behavior, economic or political, that impedes them from capitalizing fully on its revenue production is, in fact, a means of underdeveloping them as a nation, and is a way of preventing them from diversifying their economy through economic reinvestment.
Euroamerica has developed several economic polices designed to retard the economic development of the African American economy; most notably, employment discrimination. The African American claim for reparations must be aimed at recovering such monies that have been illegally appropriated through employment discrimination. As such, the total price of this portion of our reparations claim will be totally shared by the Euroamerican community for its gains, resulting from the continued practice of discrimination. This cost will affect their community in various ways, but will be most visible in the monetary loss felt by Euroamerican individuals in the form of taxation.

"Discrimination also involves real cost: the cost of extra police to control racial unrest which builds up as a result of discrimination, damage to property in race riots, and so on" (Main, 1972, 38). But, if there is a minimal cost to the colonizers of this society for their continuous discriminatory practices, in a secondary way, there is a primary cost that has to be bore by the oppressed African American nation in lost revenues, resulting in their continued underdevelopment.

Main argues that the individual cost (in the form of lost income) to African Americans, per person, per annum, in 1983 dollars, is approximately $3790. This loss in income by African America is a net gain for Euroamerica. This money, in the form of income transfers that they gained from
discrimination, like monies earned from slavery, is spread throughout their economy. Consequently, they, as a nation, benefit.

To understand the full impact of discrimination on African Americans, one must accept that African American and Euroamerican people are two "separate countries involved in international trade" (Main, 29). If one rejects this analogy, then one will miss the fullness of the argument. Accepting the dual interdependent economies theory requires that one takes the position that Euroamericans have capital, and Africans [Americanized] have labor as their primary trading commodities.

"Since they are discriminating, whites tend to use their capital only with white labor unless they can be induced to export capital by a higher rate of return than they can get in the white sector" (Main, 29), i.e., the lure behind Black Capitalism, or Free Enterprise Zones. Black labor becomes, like any other exported good to the metropolitan society, devalued, resulting in our economic underdevelopment.

Taking the position of two trading nations, it is easy to see that the African American nation is like any other poor colonial society that is dependent on the metropolitan society for its livlihood, in that the value of our exported commodity [labor] is subjected to the desirability of the Euroamerican society as any other exported single crops shipped from the colony to the metropolitan society (Swinton, 1993, pg. 27-33).
All exported goods from underdeveloped countries are devalued, in that, their rates of exchange are determined by those who are importing the commodity. According to Mazuri (1980),

*It is a buyer's market when the commodity is produced in the Third World, and a seller's market when the commodity is produced in the industrialized world. It becomes a buyer's market when a country ... produces it, but the buyer in the North decrees its price and conditions for its transaction. It is a seller's market when the equipment, the cars, the television sets, the implements of cultural transaction come from the northern industrialized states and the sellers define the terms of sale and the conditions under which it is transacted (85).*

It is my position, and that of reparation economists, that Euroamerica, by practicing discrimination, has engaged in devaluing our labor (our single-crop) and that this continuous practice has lead directly to our dependency and underdevelopment. The capital transfer that has taken place between the African American nation and the Euroamerican metropolitan society has been in different forms. The reasons why there is continued employment discrimination is because "the white sector of the population realizes economic gains (albeit short-run gains) by discriminating against blacks," (Swinton, 28). Therefore, "some form of legislation or government action may be necessary to lift the blacks out of their vulnerable position and perhaps compensate them for those quantifiable income transfers" (Swinton, 28).
The continuous policy of employment discrimination has led to the unequal transfer of wealth in the forms of capital, employment opportunities, investments in human capital, and wages to the Euroamerican community. Discrimination influences wages via occupations and education. As much as 16 percent of the income gap between the colonized Africans and the Euroamerican colonizers is due to racial discrimination (Main, 1972). "The net economic affect of wage discrimination is the possibility of appropriating part of each black's marginal product by paying him less than his product" (Main, 32). The gains to the Euroamerican colonizers, from paying their African colonized citizens less, is obvious.

Another major tenet of Main's thesis is the contributing role that education makes to economic gains. He maintains that this has been clearly demonstrated with the advent of automation and the rise in sophistication of production techniques. The importance of education as an economic contributor was clearly seen in the rise of the G.N.P. during the decades between 1929 to 1957, when improvements in education led to a 42% share of the 160% "growth rate in product per person employed" (Main, 34). The Euroamerican colonizers "seem to prefer to maximize their short term income by absorbing as much of the human capital investment as their majority position allows them to do" (Main, 34). This policy prohibits the colonized from developing the human resources necessary for their industrialization, and from learning the skills necessary for economic
development. "Thus left behind in the rising national educational norms, poor black families are even less qualified to compete for jobs or to help their children obtain the education they require to escape from poverty" (Main, 34).

The structure of the American colonial economy has not only prevented the African colonized people from accumulating adequate capital, but from making efficient use of the limited capital that they do have. The limited Black businesses that the African nation do have are faced with competition from well capitalized Euroamerican companies. The individual African person is also inhibited from maximizing on the capital investment that they make in themselves in the open market places of this colonial society (Swinton, 1993). If African Americans had the same educational attainment as Euroamericans, "and earned the same pay and experienced the same unemployment as whites, then the national income would increase by $20.6 billion or approximately 3.5 percent" (Main, 38).

The effects of discrimination, even in disproportionate terms, are not always realized in the era that it occurs. "This distortion of income flow was the cumulative affect of wage, occupational, employment and educational discrimination" (Main, 38). This is clearly visible in the fields of education and accumulation of wealth. There is a lag time associated in these areas. When the disproportionately effected areas do reveal themselves, there is a multiplier affect that is manifested. "The point that must be made here is that
the income arising from racial discrimination today becomes the legitimate income of next year" (Main, 39).

While it is clear that the current income and capital disparities between the African and Euroamerican nations have a direct connection to the era of formative colonialism [slavery], it has been shown here that we African Americans must not allow this nation to reduce their repayments to this era alone. We Afrocentric scholars must broaden our scope of reparations claims to include current and contemporary discriminatory practices. Our economic underdevelopment has been, in part, created by the historical illegal appropriation of revenues from our labor and by current employment discrimination and illegal/unequal redirection of wealth used in capital human resource development.

Nor, can we allow the correct analogy of our condition as a separate undeveloped economic nation to be improperly placed within the American national economic discourse. We must demand that this debate be placed in the comparative paradigm of separate and unequal nations, with all of the connotations that this paradigm implies. We must clarify the popular Eurocentric characterization of this reality..*

---

* Earlier I said that one had to accept the dual interdependent economies theory to fully appreciate this argument. This is still my position, but, there has been another way of characterizing the same system. This alternate characterization is called the "dual labor market theory. According to this thesis, as advanced by Michael Piore, there are two labor markets in this society that he calls the primary and secondary markets.

In his essay entitled, The Dual Labor Market: Theory and
Imperialist countries were always faced with the inevitability of losing their overseas possessions. As M. E. Chamberlain (1985) said, "colonies were like children who would eventually grow to manhood and would then inevitably seek their independence from the mother country" (2). As such, imperialist-colonialist countries were always faced with the dilemma of maximizing the profits from their economic possessions while trying to avoid violent decolonization. In other words, imperialist-colonialist countries were always faced with the problem of how they could provide sufficient 'welfare' to the native people of the colonies without giving them economic autonomy.

They were always faced with the dilemma of how to reconcile the inadequacies that accompanied economic exploitation with economic progress for the colonized nation. In essence, they were faced with how to give the impression of the 'good life' to the colonized without it actually leading to economic independence. Imperialist-colonizing countries were faced with just how many and what types of economic concessions it would take to forestall violent revolutions.

**Implications**, Piore argues that historically and currently in America, there has been two complimentary labor markets characterized and distinguished by such traits as, [for the primary market], high wages, good working conditions, employment stability and job security, equity and due process in the administration of work rules, and chance for advancement. The secondary market is distinguished by poor working conditions, considerable variability in employment, harsh and often arbitrary discipline, and little opportunity for advancement.
This balancing act is never more delicate than in the domestic colonial situation. Under domestic colonialism, both societies co-exist in close proximity to one another, such that the distance between impoverished and opulent communities is drastically compressed. This forces colonial officials into the position of trying to explain the existence of blight in the midst of opulence, of trying to place blame, while not providing solutions.

The most favored device/strategy utilized by the colonizers is \textit{welfarism}. Welfare was seen as a necessary form of concession. It was meant to keep the colonized content with their oppressed status and to forestall economic independence. Welfarism was necessary, therefore, to provide the maximum socio-economic benefits of colonialism while making the colonized become reconciled with their new oppressive environment. Welfare was to be the administrative device used to placate the natives.

"Welfare has been defined as the possibility to satisfy those needs of which one is aware" (Furnivall, 1956, 436), or it has been identified with concepts such as liberty, salvation and comfort. If we assume that the purpose of welfarism is more in concert with independence, and the former, (consumerism) with confusion, and therefore, in harmony with colonial exploitation, then (welfarism and consumerism) is what has been promoted and the latter, (welfarism as comfort and liberty), avoided in colonial societies.

Taking the position of the former (welfarism as consumerism) as conducive to colonial longevity, it has been associated with economic.
progress; and economic progress is confused with welfarism. In colonial societies, this confusion is promoted and given precedence in administrative policy. Welfarism, thus, has become confused with possessing consumer goods, with owing a house, clothes, automobiles, or other trappings of the colonial 'good-life.' This confusion between production, as a means of providing the goods of consumerism, and welfarism has lead to the destabilization of the colonial lifestyle and to economic dependency.

The confusion between consumerism and welfare has lead to the promotion and adoption of a uncritical consciousness in the minds and behaviors of the colonized people, such that they become satisfied with goods and not freedom, or remain tied to the trinkets of Western consumerism. Furnivall maintains that "if welfare signifies harmony between man and his environment he may be better fed, better clothed and better housed under foreign rule, and still enjoy less welfare..." (Furnivall, 438). We can best express this with an equation: economic autonomy + political independence = social welfare; social welfare - economic independence + political dependency = colonialism + economic underdevelopment.

Welfarism is essentially designed to forestall autonomy, not to promote independence. As the gulf between the standard of living widens between the colonized and colonizers, the colonial administration is forced to make welfarism more efficient; efficiency is thus seen as the way of securing colonial existence. The administration is continuously urged to make the
machinery of welfarism more efficient. But inevitably, it fails. It fails because, as Furnivall (1956) reminds us, welfarism

still remains a machinery, and acts mechanically on the people taken in the mass as an aggregate of individuals. Each specialist takes snapshots of the people from its own angle, but the composite photograph obtained by fitting the results together bears little relation to the native world as a hollywood film to life (402).

It is based on an alien understanding of the 'good-life' and what it means to the colonized. Yet, the colonial power is forced into trying to make this system workable. The more the colonizers attempt to make welfarism serve as a substitute for economic autonomy, the more resentful of the colonial existence the masses become (Furnivall, 440).

The natives become discontent because the covert purpose of colonialism is not to provide economic or social welfare among the colonized community, but rather to exploit ruthlessly the country and its people. The covert purpose is to decimate the country and not to promote civic responsibility. Therefore, "the elaboration of welfare machinery can have no appreciable effect on welfare, and still less can it promote autonomy" (Furnivall, 1956, 442).

Many have argued that welfarism's primary function is pacification. It is difficult to avoid coming to this conclusion when colonial welfare policy states that its primary purpose is to teach the people that "they can get what they want only if they want what in the conditions of the modern world they
must want [italics mine]" (442). What is important for us Afrocentric scholars to remember is that the colonial welfare system, "will not give them what they want unless they want what it can give, and the promotion of welfare must be approached from a new angle by a revolution in method" (Furnivall, 442). What African Americans need is not reform, but economic autonomy, recapitalized through the payment of reparations. If we wish to promote the 'good-life' among our people, it is necessary that we seek economic and political autonomy, not reform the current colonial welfare system.

True enhancement of welfare is dependent upon sovereignty, not dependence.

Colonial welfarism was, and is, "designed to protect labor against capital" (Furnivall, 439), and it still serves the same purpose under domestic colonialism. Under colonial welfarism "there is a shift of concern from what is to be done to how it is to be done, [italics mine]" (Warren, 1969, 136). Consequently, there have been many abuses tolerated in the system. The system has been a convenient tool to be used by the colonizers to carry on various community destructive practices. This shift to how has allowed the issue of African American survival to be transformed from a national matter to a state issue under the guise of Federalism.

A major component under the many 'reform' plans being advanced throughout the colonizers community, is turning a federally run program into a state function. Under colonial administrator Bill Clinton's plan, "the
administration is turning to the laboratory of the states for some answers. It recently gave Virginia approval to subsidize employers who hire Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) recipients. . ."(Chicago Tribune, sect, 1, col.1). Since the beginning of this new legislative initiative (1987) several states have advanced and developed their own version of welfare reform. California, New Jersey, Illinois and Ohio just to mention a few. While there are many different versions circulating they all have one common feature: the conversion of welfare into workfare.

By doing so, in a climate of racial terrorism and racial abuse suffered by African Americans, as Warren (1969) notes, the shift to how has allowed colonial welfare administrators the right to

- set budgets below minimum survival needs,
- the right to impose residence requirements,
- the right to assign 150 cases to a worker,
- the right to search for a man in the house,
- the right to suggest sterilization,
- and all of those other rights so jealously guarded by states and counties in administering welfare(136).

We need to decolonize our thinking about welfarism so that we can counteract the destructiveness of the current system. We need to return our thinking to the what; which should be towards reparations and not towards reforming welfarism. Warren (1969) argues that what the African American needs to do, if reform is their goal, is "to enhance the what of cash transfers, involved in public welfare so as to secure adequate support levels for all poor
people, whether it be through negative income tax, guaranteed annual wage, forms of family allowance, or whatever, [italics mine]" (137).

Along with these limited suggestions, we also must insist that the current colonial welfare system stop engaging in the destruction of the African American nation by the removal of males from the households and removing recipients from the communities through various relocation programs. These, and other suggestions, will only come into fruition by elevating the national-consciousness of the African American people.

**Domestic Colonialism and the Welfare Capitalist State**

Our concern here is not to map the development of the welfare capitalist society, or to critique its rightfulness or wrongness *per se*, as much as it is to illustrate that the principles of traditional colonial welfarism presently exist, disguised as welfare capitalism, in colonial American. Our concern here is with the depolitization of the public sphere under domestic colonialism in regards to the disparity between the colonized and the colonizers of this *welfare capitalist society*, and how welfarism has prevented the politicization of the discomfort that is associated with this colonial disparity.

The intent of welfare capitalism is exactly the same as traditional welfarism, that is, to prevent colonized people from seeking to reestablish control over their own economic lives via autonomous and rebellious
behavior. Modern welfarism is designed to separate the suffering oppressed colonized people from those who caused their suffering.

It is accepted knowledge among the interest groups who assist in managing this colonial society that those who benefit the most from the welfare capitalist society are those in the private corporate sector, and not the great number of oppressed citizens. The private corporate sector benefits from big government in various ways. The state, under welfare capitalism, has created "institutions and develops policies explicitly aimed at promoting the long-term interest of capital accumulation. Monetary policies, tariffs, and import-export trade policies, debt spending, farm and corporate subsidies, and regulation of its own spending level" (Young, 68).

While the welfare capitalist state has enriched and accommodated the private sector, it has willingly allowed these same institutions and agencies of government, along with the private sector, to squeeze the public out of the decision making process concerning the inequalities of our current economic arrangements. It has turned the decision making process over to the experts. "Expertism," according to Young, has depoliticized the space between those who profit from government intervention in the economy from those whose lives these beneficiaries and experts rule over.

Furnivall makes the argument that, in traditional colonial societies, growth was seen as the answer to the discontent that was increasingly felt among the people. Young's argument on the role of contemporary colonizers...
[my term], those 'experts' [her term], who make the decisions in our welfare capitalist society, have restricted the process to themselves and 'democratically' decided that the way to reduce the discomfort among the colonized people of this society is to have unlimited growth. The public, those who have been pushed out, or colonized, have been socialized into being silent concerning their own welfare by the system.

In domestic colonies, the problem is the same as it was in traditional colonies, that is, how to provide the maximum amount of social comfort to the exploited masses, while attempting to prevent them from realizing that they could provide themselves with greater, if not equal, levels of comfort if they were independent. How does the colonial government give the illusion of autonomy while actually maintaining a state of economic dependency?

We must remember that welfarism grew out of the inadequacies of competitive capitalism. Competitive capitalism was unable to solve the differences in wealth between the capitalist class and the working class. It was out of the discovery by economists, and oppressed people arguing for fairness via union struggles, that the 'invisible hand' was not so invisible, and was unable to guide the capitalist economy. Not only was it not invisible but it was blind to the needs of the oppressed, and seemingly had been trained by 'Oliver Twist.' It was robbing the masses and enriching the wealthy.

Welfare, as a means of promoting and maintaining social stability, is a central component of Young's thesis. According to her thesis, if stability was
to be maintained, some form of economic equalization had to be found. Government intervention into the economy of this nation was unavoidable. Through the economic history of this society since the anti-trust era, government intervention and regulation of competitive capitalism has become an economic way of life, thus, making the emergence of the welfare-capitalist state inevitable. Government intervention into 'planning' the economy has become seen as a necessary evil that has to be tolerated if economic longevity is to be assured.

The *invisible hand* of competitive capitalism is stealing more from the oppressed people of America than it is conducive to social stability. According to Young (1990), the government initiated various entitlement programs, "social security, unemployment insurance, medicaid, housing support and direct income support..." (68) to bring economic relief to the oppressed people of America. As a consequence, colonial pundits began to equate autonomy, formal equality, and distributive justice with these programs in one form or another. Equality began to be equated with consumerism, job-creation, and individualized distributive justice and less with African American national liberation and economic autonomy.

Welfarism, under traditional colonialism, during what JanMohamed calls the "overt phase" (JanMohamed, 1986, 81), as it is under domestic colonialism under its overt phase, assumed that the decision making authority, concerning the definition of the 'good-life' for themselves and the
masses should rest in the hands of the colonizers and that somehow this alien colonial society is accordingly 'natural.'

More importantly, for those who lack material comfort, the benefits that they receive under the welfare state is to compensate for their oppressed conditions. For the colonized African American community, welfarism has even been seen as a partial repayment for historical and contemporary discrimination and enslavement. And this is my concern here.

I am concerned with the false-assumption that welfarism is anything other than a means of crippling the colonized mentally, economically and politically. Thus, it inhibits them from developing the nationalist consciousness necessary for independent political thought and, thereby, preventing them from seeking national autonomy. Welfarism is nothing other than a colonial policy aimed at furthering the colonial situation. I maintain that welfarism is a cheap way of providing reparations to the colonized African American oppressed nation, and that welfarism has only provided subsistence in the place of progress. American colonial welfare payments "are not only too small but, more important, are administered through a machinery which perpetuates colonial domination" (Hayden, 1969, 185). The current American welfare system is an important component of America's 'containment policy' used to maintain Euroamerican domination and national stability.
Although welfarism is a necessary concessionaire mechanism, it is still confronted by "enormous obstacles: the indifference of the Congress to ghetto needs, the lack of incentive for business to invest in the slums, the lack of other black or white power groups. . ." (Hayden, 183). While I am in agreement with many of the points in Hayden’s thesis and his overall descriptive analysis, I strongly disagree with his conclusions and general line of argumentation. I disagree with his line of argument that the simple creation of more jobs, and investment opportunities for Euroamerican multinationals will correct our underdevelopment.

Welfarism and The Debt Owed To African Americans

I have argued that welfarism is a colonial policy aimed at forestalling economic autonomy. It is different from progress and has been confused with consumerism. Welfarism, as a confused form of progress, or consumerism fosters a false consciousness in the minds of the oppressed and prohibits them from engaging in political activity that would eventually lead to independence. Central to the policy of welfarism is the idea of economic depravity, that is, monies taken for welfare payments must be taken from somewhere or someone.

Under domestic colonialism, welfarism has been confused with the net debt owed to our people. Some see welfarism as a form of reparations compensation for the years of systematic discrimination and overt
appropriation of African slave labor. Some confused, guilty Euroamericans feel that an economic income flow from

whites to blacks, or at least from government to blacks in the form of housing, welfare, and employment programs. Some readers who accept the basic debt argument might suppose that the two flows more or less cancel each other out and that no debt remains (America, 1972, 10).

Basically, these confused Euroamericans are the one's who erroneously believe that

their affluence and material well-being are almost entirely derived from the virtue, intelligence, and industry of themselves and their forefathers. Very few seem able to accept the possibility that slavery and racial discrimination have contributed to their economic position or to the level of total income and wealth of the nation (America, 4).

The colonizers who accept their position [conservatives], are not willing to accept the fact that whites have advanced partially as a result of the oppressive conditions that exist in carceral America. Some will argue that poor Euroamericans suffer equally as do African Americans; that the economic suffering that may serve as a basis for reparations due African Americans is invalid because whites also suffer the same fate, and that its really a class issue and not a racial matter.

This is an invalid argument in part because, while poor white may have suffered as a class from income transfers to capitalist colonizers during the nineteenth century, in the form of labor exploitation in regionally
depressed agricultural, industrial and mining areas, e.g., Appalachia, they did not suffer from their whiteness as African Americans suffered from their blackness. Furthermore,

Whites were not, however, exploited because they were white, but because they were a vulnerable and relatively immobile labor force. Poor Whites who left depressed areas could prosper (America, 8).

African Americans however,

every economic and educational level suffered exploitation and income transfer because they were black, and were generally held to be inherently inferior no matter what region they lived in or moved to (America, 8).

Some people may argue that some form of reparations has been paid to oppressed African Americans. But as cautions,

most of the government's welfare or relief programs were tolerated by white taxpayers as a kind of price that had to be paid to keep the blacks alive, but in their place.... Those payments, however, permitted most other forms of white supremacy-economic, political, and cultural-to perpetuate themselves (America, 8).

The fact is that these meager forms of income transfers is hardly a just compensation for 350 years of officially sanctioned racial oppression and discrimination. At best, they could only suffice to maintain subsistence in the African American nation and, at worse, serve as a form of dependency fostering mechanism. Welfarism hardly addresses the issue of reparations, or
the primary problem of economic recapitalization. To argue as if it does, is a
great disservice to our forefathers and their descendants.

**Development not Welfarism is What We Need**

As mentioned, all colonies are faced with trying to stem of the ills of
economic underdevelopment, while attempting to maintain economic
autonomy. Colonial people here in the United States still must solve the
problems "of perpetual hunger, of death from preventable diseases and
starvation, of illiteracy fostered by the ruling powers to assure a constant
supply of cheap and docile labor" (Goshal, 1979, 274). African Americans, like
other similarly colonized people, must solve these and other problems
swiftly, and welfarism is not going to be sufficient in financing our
development. Welfarism, as we have argued, is not designed as a mechanism
for colonial development. What the African American nation needs is not a
revitalized welfare program, or innovative welfarism per se, as much as we
need to create a comprehensive industrialization program, to eradicate
illiteracy, especially technological illiteracy, and to stabilize our nation. We
must swiftly change the woefully inadequate lack of trained mangers who can
solve our business development problems. In this respect, we must resurrect
and revitalize Washingtonian and DuBois-type technocratic economic
nationalism.

For the African American nation there is "a short supply of adequately
trained and experienced mangers and entrepreneurs ready to establish or take
over and run successful and fully competitive businesses" (America, 1977, 6), necessary for African American economic industrial development and ascendancy. We too have been prevented from acquiring necessary skills, as Nkrumah so aptly noted. But the lack of a true middle-class, from which an entrepreneurial class can emerge, is not totally the fault of the African American community. This is because, "under the colonial system, a middle-class which accumulates capital is an impossible phenomenon" (Fanon, 1963, 150). We must either develop this group or seek funds from outside of our nation for its development.*

"Any effective solution of the colonial problem must be based upon a thorough going change in the economy of the colonies and must have as its goal a rapidly rising standard of living for the people" (Goshal, 274). Such an ambitious program cannot be tied to failed policies that only secure the imperial arrangements that have been proposed to date, i.e., Black capitalism, Free Enterprise Zones, etc.. A viable economic program must be one which will advocate full integrated economic development such as those developed and implemented by our elder economic nationalists, i.e., Booker T. Washington, Marcus Garvey, and to a limited extent, the Black Muslims.

* The only way that we can prevent this new class from becoming the new exploiters, (and this is crucial to the success of our economic development), is to assure that this group emerges and owes its development to a community based socialization process that is active, compelling and has a community sanctioned process to assure compliance. Their compliance and willingness to serve our communal interest, outside of coercion, will be contingent upon the thoroughness and effectiveness of the process and it's authenticity.
Too many of the proposals concerned with the issue of economic development of African Americans are based on the misguided idea of solving our conditions through job-creation and not enough are able to see that this is only a means-strategy and not an end-strategy. The economic development of the African American nation must be more comprehensive than solving mere employment issues. African Americans were employed during slavery. Labor is the single-crop economy that the African Americans have always had. We need to move beyond plans that merely call for remedial job-creation or inner-city small businesses, as proposed by various groups and officials who support Black capitalism, or other limited economic programs. Too many programs have been limited to the near sighted policies of the colonial national government. Too many have not looked beyond the 'urban-decay' syndrome of our national Black organizations; such as the proposals of the National Conference of Mayors. Too many of our African American national, economic and policy leaders are not looking beyond the present colonial administration's job-creation programs.

In fiscal year 1992-3, under the present colonial administration, there was a policy initiative to spend 30 billion on various job-stimulus packages. These monies would be spent on creating 500,000 jobs in its "Rebuild America" program. Another 150,000 jobs would be created during a four year period under its Federal Highway program and

with rapid transit program creating another 83,000 jobs in the same period.
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Then, spending through Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) is estimated to create 60,000 jobs in five years, and additional programs such as housing rehab will make other jobs available as well (Walters, 1992, 6).

The imperialist colonial administrative policies simply seek to extend the single-crop economy of the African American community (labor). They continue to propose programs that will continually retard our economic development. Little is done to advance our economic autonomy through economic, industrialization, manufacturing, or human resource development. This same type of colonial economic philosophy has become endemic of the economic programs of our current administration, which has advocated a revision of

the Davis-Bacon Act which governs construction aided with federal funds has changed the 1992 regulation to provide for the use of "helpers" on jobs in ratio of two such "helpers" to three journeymen. And, since the contract threshold has also been raised from $2,000 to $250,000, a wider number of construction jobs will theoretically be available (Walters, 1992, 6).

These and other economic programs are all geared towards solving the short-range needs of the African American colony. They neglect to question the long-range soundness of continually connecting the economic viability of the African American nation to that of the general economic system. As we saw in chapter two of this document, these economic policies are endogenous to
the colonial situation, e.g., the Bretons of Brittany; The French of Quebec; and
the Indians of Mexico.

Programs like Congresswoman Maxine Walters' "Neighborhood
Infrastructure Improvement and Inner City Job Creation Act" (Walters, 6),
which is just another elaborate job-creation program tied to the useless
imperialistic enterprise zone policy, or the Kemp-Garcia federal proposal that
is designed to give tax credits to corporations who invest in the African
colonies here in America, provide very little for the economic independence
of the African nation. The massive job-loss that was experienced by the
colonized African American oppressed nation will not be recovered through
short-term economic programs. Every major industrialized city in the north
experienced massive job-losses due to industrial relocation and
suburbanization. For example, "Chicago lost 47% of its manufacturing jobs
between 1972 and 1982. Jobs were generally moving to the suburbs and the
sunbelt, physically away from the black poor. . ." (Walters, 3). Cities like, Gary,
IN., Newark, NJ., Detroit, MI., Pittsburgh, PA., St. Louis, MO., Cleveland, Oh.,
Flint, MI., etc., all lost significant portions of their tax paying populations to
the suburbs, leaving the oppressed poor African American nation without
income to pay taxes, which would in turn provide for a high quality of living.
These are the same cities that experienced rebellions during the late 1960s and
early 1970s. These are the same cities that now experience a high tax erosion
and are engaged in a fight between themselves and the suburbs over tax
revenues. These lost jobs and tax paying people are not going to be replaced by the current short-term job-creation policies of the current colonial administration. Nor are they designed to. These jobs, and other forms of economic welfarism, are designed to provide pacification, not liberation.

What we need, as I have said earlier, is a comprehensive economic policy/program that will include, "small, medium, and large businesses and cooperatives located wherever it makes economic and political sense" (Walters, 7). Economic programs that are tied to economic policies designed to alter the current economic dependency philosophy of colonial single-crop job-creation. Any progressive economic policy must be aimed at fostering economic integration with the general economic system and lead to economic liberation. Afrocentric scholars must rethink the economic philosophies of Washingtonism, Garveyism and other African American nationalists, and promote the idea of recapitalization through reparation payments.

Some will resist this type of program because it sounds like economic nationalism, and they would be correct in making that connection. But they would be incorrect in saying that it, therefore, is anti-American. It is not only based in sound economic efficiency theory, but it is also morally, and ethically just. It is a proactive idea that promises to transform an economically underdeveloped community into a major contributor to the economic stability of this country. While it does call for a major redistribution of the nation's wealth, it is not based primarily on historical or current guilt.
It demands that we alter the way that we view the African American community. It asks that we remember that the economics of this community does not exist in economic isolation from the general economy. It demands that we understand that the current economic relationship between the African American nation and the metropolitan society is one based on dependency and monopoly. What this type of economic policy demands of both African Americans and Euroamericans is that we view the ghettoes of this nation as "a developing social, political, and economic system" (Walters, 1), such that we resist policies that promote Euroamerican intranational imperialism, which promotes, among other things, the social work profession.

Although this program a nationalist call for economic redevelopment and advocates a major income-transfer from Euroamerica to African Americans, it also advocates that the developmental burden be most heavily carried by the Africans (Americanized). It demands that they become involved in this very practical form of economic nationalism, and "unless such a practical form of nationalism exists or can be generated, it is probably not worthwhile thinking seriously of comprehensive economic and community development" (Walters, 11). African American people must began to engage in economic nationalist policies which will benefit them and other African people primarily. They have to take responsibility for their own economic well being and future.
Economic Development and National Sovereignty

It is important that we African Americans remember the lessons of the past as we prepare for the future. If we are to foster comprehensive economic development, then African Americans must also follow the six sound economic principles of colonial economic redevelopment (see Ali Mazuri cited earlier). To insure the success of our nationalist economic development program, African Americans must develop a broad based savings program among all of our people. We need a comprehensive economic development policy designed to convert our single-crop economy into a diversified one. This then would necessitate the development of a management cadre to manage our redevelopment. To assure our success, it is imperative that, as a community, we foster the development of a culturally grounded entrepreneurial class which will encourage economic creativity among our people.

Planning is greatly needed and cannot be avoided by the African American political leadership simply because it has acquired a bad name in the general colonial society. Just because "planning" has been associated with "socialism and centralized governmental investment and operating decisions," (Walters, 12), and therefore stigmatized here in America, African Americans cannot allow this fact to deter our people from seriously thinking about the benefits derived from a planned economy. More importantly, African American economic and political intellectuals/leaders need to
consider if capitalism can lead to their economic liberation? In short, if capitalism has been instrumental in oppressing African Americans then what other solutions are available to us?

One thing has become clear to our economic strategists, and that is,

urban centers such as Harlem, the south side, and Watts cannot really develop into stable and broadly attractive communities unless rural South develops simultaneously or in some carefully determined sequence according to a rational integrated plan and program (Walters, 12).

Planning is seen as a necessity for growth and development. We must rely on our managerial personnel for such a program.

While we, as a nation, have resisted the philosophy of 'Black capitalism' for all of the obvious reasons (helping the few get rich at the expense of the many), we must be reluctant to pay our needed managers a proper sum for their skills, knowledge and dedication to our national struggle. They must be paid well for what they can do for our people. And, if they are culturally grounded and virtuous, having the interest of our nation first, then their frugality can be a source of inspiration. By choosing to be thrift instead of mimicking the decadence of their Euroamerican counterpart, they can set the tone of our austerity programs.

It is true that, like similarly situated colonial bourgeoisie, our national African American middle-class is also influenced by the domestic colonizers. But, "there is a clear and striking need for a management and technical
leadership class, but not for a financial and industrial elite or an oligarchy in the traditional sense" (America, 13). If we are to develop as a nation, then we must reeducate and rely on this skilled class. They are going to be the personnel that lead our institutions to benefit others inside and outside of the African nation. They will be, along with our Afrocentric political leadership, the group that will come up with creative economic programs to reverse the import-export imbalance that our nation currently is experiencing. Together, these two groups will seek alternative business opportunities that will finance our political and economic growth and independence. Before we commit ourselves to any particular group of programs, or endorse any policy, we must first decide "whether the eventual thrust of a program or proposal will be primarily to encourage "import" substitution or "export" creation" (America, 17).

African American nationalists have all argued for the former, i.e., buy black. But rarely have we talked about the latter, except in terms of our culture. Now it is time that we consider both if we are to achieve national sovereignty. African Americans have to become engaged in the current federalist struggle over our land, (the urban centers of this country) if we are to avoid relocation: like all other powerless colonized people here in colonial America (the Hawaiians, and the Amerinatives).

The African American nation also needs various institutional leaders to come to grips with our educational institutions; some of which need to be
rethought of as financial institutions, that will create products and personnel that can begin to reverse this economic imbalance. Some of our institutions of higher learning, among the many national higher education institutions that we have, must become research institutions; and others as trainers of skilled people to populate our growth industries. They will have to create economic institutions that will offset the current crime employment industries that dominate our inner-cities.

The Hunger for Land and Reparation Payments: The Struggle for the Ghettoes

As we noted earlier, colonized people have suffered from having their lands expropriated by the colonizers. African Americans also suffer from this condition, in that they have historically been denied the status of legal claimants to any large land holdings. The lack of a historical homeland argument has, in many ways, contributed to the position that African Americans do not have a legitimate basis for their claim to ethnonationalism. As we have said, the land question has been at the center of our struggle here in this society.

Currently, [since the mass migrations following the reconstruction era and the two World Wars], African Americans are involved in a struggle for land involving the 'inner-cities' of this society. Although these ghettoes have been characterized as being "dangerous areas budding over with crime, the physical blighted by neglect, the infrastructure crumbling, the budgets
overburdened" (Malveaux, 1992, 11), there is currently a struggle over who is going to rule these areas.

Since the mid 1980s, there has been an increased interest in the ghettos of this society. Through various colonial schemes, the federal government in association with other levels of colonial administration, have subtly orchestrated a program of relocating the colonized people. According to Malveaux (1992),

Furthermore, in some urban areas, especially Washington, D.C., San Francisco, and other cites, urban renewal has meant "ghetto removal" and the gentrification of some areas has led to the flight or reduction of black population. The "urban pioneers" drawn to central cities by architecturally sound buildings in blighted neighborhoods often are offered public resources that are unavailable to those who once lived in those neighborhoods, partly because of well-documented discrimination in mortgage lending (12).

The colonizers of this society have long been able to co-exist along side blighted areas and have been able to tolerate the bifurcated nature of our society. In fact, colonialism is predicated on the manicheanistic manifestations embodied in colonial housing. The extremes manifested in housing, and other social conditions, only serve to reinforce their philosophical tropes of goodness and evil.

Due to many economic and social forces, the 'inner cites' now have become attractive to the colonizers. They have always appreciated the lifestyle that goes along with urban living. They like the 24 hr. accommodations, the
civil activities, the opulence that had been associated with cosmopolitan life. It was only due to their pathological hallucinations over race, along with the dynamics of colonialism, that they began the exodus to the suburbs. And it is the cost of such living, regardless of the exodus of businesses to those areas, that are causing many to rethink those earlier moves.

Without diminishing the tremendous problems that politicians and residents of the ghettos are currently facing, it is still prudent to say and to warn our people of the possibility that relocation is forthcoming; ghettos, for a variety of reasons, are financially and socially attractive places to live. And as such, we as a nation, must begin to address the various relocation schemes that are being proposed and implemented under various Euroamerican nationalistic ideologies, i.e., new federalism, urban renewal, various welfare housing removal programs, etc. In short, we need monies to promote African American land ownership and redevelopment schemes, like those implemented by Booker T. Washington.

African Americans must remember that, without a strong counter-nationalist policy, which will resist the tendency and necessary policy of forceful land displacement, today's suburbs are tomorrow's ghettos, or, 'slave quarters.' Let us not forget that ghettoization is not tied to location; it is a process, not a place. And as such, African Americans must not get caught up in the illusionary argument of associating underdeveloped territory with underdeveloped people. Instead, African Americans will understand that our
struggle for land, currently tied to the urban ghettos of this society, is no different from other colonized people. That the behavior of the Euroamericans is no different from other settler colonizers. And that, if we are to resist relocation en mass and reverse some of the more cruel forms of this process that are currently wrecking our nation then it is essential that we make land ownership a major portion of our reparations claim initiative.

Land Ownership and Ghettoization

African Americans must decolonize our thinking about the process of suburbanization, relocation, and ghetto residency because, "while there are major urban problems, cities have enough strengths to be desirable areas and that some of the issues of crisis are really issues of control" (Turner, 10).

Those who choose to continue to own ghetto land and remain outside of the ghettos must be forced to pay for the conditions of our internment. We, as a people, have a legitimate claim to those dwellings and others inside of the refugee camps of our society. The absence of land has contributed directly to our underdevelopment and continuous exploitation. As Turner aptly noted, "without control over any significant portion of the area they occupy, and not having ownership of any capital instruments or means of production, black people are not simply oppressed but are the victims of super-exploitation" (Turner, 10).

"There are many thousands of black tenants living in slum ghetto housing who would invest in their decaying homes if, through a
redistribution of housing (and land) ownership, they were converted from tenants to owner-entrepreneurs" (Schuchter, 1970, 164). There are many forms of civil and renter disobedience in which we African Americans must engage to correct the current profiteering that supports the process of ghettoization.

We must increase our pressure on the various mortgage companies to make loans to African American families via African national mortgage holding companies, Black banks, or other self-help organizations to be created. There are many things that we must and will do. The mechanics will be worked out by our economic managers and land experts. We intellectuals must do is to politicize the issue of land ownership and connect it to a larger decolonization struggle. Ghettoization, land ownership and reparations must be viewed as a single multifaceted issue that will economically invigorate our society; and is vital to our economic autonomy.

We can, and must, raise our national consciousness to the point that we not only force various concessions from the local and federal colonial administrators concerning the conditions of the housing in the 'inner-cites,' but we must also force them into a position of conceding land ownership to our people. Part of the nation building process must be concerned with the land ownership question in regards to the ghettos of this society, and also, who controls them administratively. The question is whether we are going to let the colonizers rule through various direct or in-direct neo-colonial
policies, or are African Americans going to engage in nationalist politics that will "place black nationalist-oriented party members in office who will claim the African area as autonomous city states and develop and create planned economics based on African Socialist models directed towards self-reliance" (Turner, 13).

There is going to be more infighting among the colonizers over the control of the land in the ghettos, and we can be assured that it will not be, no matter which way the fight goes, to our advantage without our input. Land redistribution is essential to our reparations claim, and we can be assured that, just like all other settler-colonizers, Euroamerica will resist us over this and other reparations issues. The critical question for us to answer by this struggle is whether we wish to bring our nation into the next century dependent on others or independent and free.

If we say that we want to be free and independent then we must call for a massive transfer of land to our people. We have legitimate claims to land as a form of reparations payment to our nation. "The Republic of New Africa, a black separatist group, have demanded $400 billion and the states of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia and South Carolina" (Marketti, 44). While the economic capital derived is close to some current estimates concerning the debt owed to our nation, it does however address another important overlooked form of income denial to our people individually and collectively. And that is, the prohibition placed against us to share in the
massive land transfers opened to white immigrants during the Westward Expansion.

The frontier was virtually closed by the time of Emancipation, and in the ensuing decades, myriad real and intangible values have been capitalized into real estate prices so that the black man's opportunity to share equitably in the ownership of the natural resources of the continent he helped to develop has been lost to him unless extremely high cash payments or radical land reform programs are instituted to undo this inequality which reflects itself not only in the well-known income differential between the races but also in the extremely small percentage of America's assets which are owned by blacks (Brown, 76).

We must be compensated for this. This is a crucial issue for all colonized people and this question of land ownership [save the legal claims by the Amerinatives, to whom we must defer our claims] must be confronted. Those lands that the federal government has clear ownership to, by way of treaty or claim settlements, must be contested. We are entitled to a portion, and we must politically base our participation in this system to a settlement of those claims, and agitate for them. Massive civil disobedience must once again become a part of our political behavior, and mere electoralism must cease. Land reparations must become central to our political agenda.

Reparations, Development and Social Parity

If the African American nation is to achieve parity with the general society, then it is apparent that measures used thus far are not sufficient in themselves to accomplish this goal. Welfarism, formal equality, right
advocacy, or other limited schemes, i.e., affirmative action, equal employment opportunity, etc., have only contributed to the atomization and frustrations of our nation and its people. "One conclusion that should be stressed is that equality is not likely to be obtained without some form of reparations" (America, 1977, 161).

Reparations should be seen as a means of compensating the living Africans (Americanized) in our society for lost payments due them as a consequence of slavery, Jim Crowism and continued employment discrimination. These payments are seen as a way to provide economic stability and recapitalization so desperately needed for future development. By viewing reparations as a means of compensating for lost capital stock, we are able to assess the success of other efforts over the last several decades to bring about economic equality between Euroamericans and African Americans. While there are no significant studies to assess the impact of racism and discrimination on the wealth accumulation of African Americans, it is however known that wealth ownership of African Americans is well below and not equal to Euroamericans. It has been estimated that in 1983 dollars,

blacks would have to own roughly $820 billion in private assets. Using the above estimate of the gap in wealth ownership would imply a $656 billion gap in private wealth ownership....Using an overall wealth gap number of $700 billion would probably adequately represent the approximate level of reparations required to repair the cost that discrimination
has imposed on the living black population (America, 159).

Although these are just rough estimates, they do serve to illustrate the extent to which the combined forces of racism and discrimination have impacted on the African nation, while providing the living African people with economic lines upon which to base our reparation struggle.

It is clear to see then that current and past economic transfer efforts have not been sufficient if we are serious about closing the economic gap between African and Euroamericans. While it is true that there has been an increase in cash and in-kind transfer payments since the mid-1960s, they in total are insufficient. "However, even if all excess welfare payments to blacks since the mid-1960s were counted as reparations, the present value of these payments would amount to n more than $60 billion" (America, 159). They could not, therefore, be seen as a form of reparations for historic damages, but, should be seen as payments for compensating African Americans for current racial discrimination, and even then, they are insufficient. "It is estimated that annual welfare and public assistance to blacks is ten times smaller than the annual loss due to racial inequality in labor earnings alone" (America, 159).

By focusing on recent income loss to the colonized African American, without considering,

losses to black people from slavery and discrimination. Billions of dollars (15 to 20 billion by some estimates for recent years) are lost annually by black
people who are the victims of wage and salary discrimination. But, that is not the end of the process. A portion of those dollars are transferred to whites, either other workers, employers, or investors, and that transfer mechanism benefits the majority of whites collectively at the expense of all blacks collectively (America, 1972,12).

Reparations Owed: Some Numbers

Any detailed discussion of the money owed must recognize that economically, the 'slave era' represents more than the time when the African was exploited for his free labor; it also represents the time when the EuroAmericans were able to amass large amounts of capital to be used in various ways to further distance themselves from African Americans. It was during the formative era that African Americans never received their 'First Payment,' for initial work in building this economic system, and a time when the American society, as a whole, took their first payment to invest in itself. Thus began the economic process that has resulted in our underdevelopment.

Many contemporary historians, and social scientists, have begun to focus on various aspects of slaveocracy in order to come to some standardization in computing the economic advantages gained by the Euroamericans/Europeans, and the lost income to the living descendants of the African slaves. Some have studied the cost of maintaining slaves, the cost of purchasing them, the economic benefit gained from their labor, the profits received from breeding them, the economic transfer in capital and human
resources, etc., all in an effort to ascertain the economic impact of slaveocracy on western economic development, so that they can determine the validity of any such claim, and to the extent to which Western nations are culpable for the economic retardation of African Americans and other Third World people of African descent.

The whole western world owes its economic development to monies gained from the African Slave Trade. "The slave trade was the source of wealth for European settlers for over four centuries and economically, was expanding rapidly in the nineteenth century" (Engerman, 1990, 20). And as such, "compensation to the descendants of slaves must be linked to the evolution of the entire wealth of the Western nations" (Darity, 6).

In 1718, According to William Wood the "slave trade was the spring and the parent whence the others flow." [italics mine] (Williams, 1944, 51). Western economic growth is a direct result of the exploitation of the entire Third World, and therefore, all Third World people of African descent should be paid for this injustice. "The value of the exploitation attributable to the use of black slave labor during the period 1790-1860 alone, compounded to the present, range from $448 to $995 billion" (Williams, 6). Slavery is such an example of unacceptable behavior. Although we may argue the relativeness of any one form of behavior; "slavery as it was practiced in the Atlantic slave system was not identical with the practice of slavery in other times and places," (Engerman, 7).
Another estimate is given by Swinton who argues that, in 1983 dollars, the amount of monies gained from the expropriated labor of African Americans during the 'slave era' ranges "from $ 963 billion to $97,074 billion, depending on whether a 3 percent or a 6 percent rate of interest is used" (Swinton, 1990, 156). He further argues that to repay the African American people for slavery and continued discrimination, "could take more than the entire wealth of the United States to compensate blacks fully" (Swinton, 156).

Another type of monetary perspective is given by Larry Neal who focuses on the magnitude of unpaid wages to African Americans. According to his computations, the present value of unpaid net wages to blacks before emancipation, after adjusting for inflation, would come to $1.4 trillion (Darity, 9).

Aside from wages lost, African Americans paid greatly into the fiendish slave system, taking the position that "the slave system as an industry whose principle capital input were humans," (Marketti, 45), and that, it was primarily a triple layered system; composed of those who owned or rented the capital goods; those who used them in combination with other production goods to produce exporting commodities; or, who owed those capital goods to produce still other capital goods, [females to have children]. Based on this model/explanation, it is easy to understand the capital flow from the African slave to the slaveowing colonizers.
"Now the point of all of this is that the net income or profit stream returned on slave capital was returned to slaveholders rather than to its rightful owners—the slaves themselves" (Marketti, 46). We can measure this net income flow from the African slave to the Euroamerican colonized society by taking the

\[
\text{net income exploited from slaves at several points in time in the 1790-1860 period (a stock concept), that from those stock values, an implicit net income flow can be considered (the value exploited from blacks during slavery), and that from those figures we can derive the social indebtedness for the 1969 value of black equity in the slave industry (Marketti, 46).}
\]

The best way to understand this method is to present the discounted value of a single slave or 'cohort of slaves', as opposed to the total slave population, through the calculations of these primary concerns of the investors was the annul net return on investments, the expected time period of which the investments could be realized, and the rate of expected return. By utilizing this formula, reparations economists can determine the amount of African American equity they built into the system. Thus, African American [black] equity is defined as "the accumulated annual net incomes..., generated by a slave or slave cohort with interest compounded on the accumulating incomes for any period during which the equity is not reparated" (Marketti, 46).
It is argued that African [Americanized] equity into the system "through 1860 ranges from $7,060, 500,000 to $40,951, 400,000 depending on the rate of return used" (Marketti, 54). African American equity just "through 1968 ranges from $101 billion to $22.1 trillion, depending upon the combinations of rates of return" (Marketti, 55). By using a three percent interest rate, an interest rate that reflects the growth rate of the American Gross National Product between the years of 1869 to 1967, the value of African American equity into the system ranges from $448 billion to $995 billion. Regardless of the interest rate used, African American equity into the system is enormous and must be used as a source of computing the debt owed to our nation.

It is important to reiterate that the claim for reparations must include a debt owed to the African American nation that occurred during the formative years. It is not enough to speak of reparations in terms of contemporary, post-civil war discrimination. Although there are some real concerns associated with how one would actually measure the debt owed to the living descendants of African slaves, it certainly should be unquestioned that such a debt is owed.

Interestingly, history provides us with a legal justification for the legitimacy in the cause of reparations being paid to the living descents of African slaves. Reparations were historically paid to slaveowners who either lost their slaves due to acts of nature or men, but not after the Civil War. It is
believed that the total value of slaves owned during the two decades prior to the start of the Civil War was roughly 15 percent "of the total assets in the U.S. economy" (Darity, 5). Southern settler colonizers were not compensated because "slavery in the United States came to an end via civil war, and this, precluded serious congressional discussion of compensation for Southern planters for the loss of their slaves in the 1860s" (Darity, 5) and neither were the African American slaves compensated. The African American slaves were forced into economic serfdom by the abdication of the federal government when it relinquished its responsibility after the infamous Hayes-Tilden Compromise.

There is no doubt that this country has a historical obligation to pay compensations to the living descendents of slaves. The only question is, whether it will live up to this obligation. In fact, it might be folly to expect that this society will ever live up to its debt, in that, a colonial society is not trustworthy by nature. Nevertheless, any serious discussion on this topic, and future discussion concerning the issue of social justice and inequality, must be tied to the historical reasons for our current condition. Reparations must become a cornerstone in our politics of difference. Legally, there are many examples of reparations being paid to groups/nations, who have been illegally treated outside of the human range of acceptable conduct, due them by others. The precedence has been well established. But America has refused to acknowledge its debt to our nation. This has to change.
Considerations for the Future

During this time of tension, apprehension, ambiguity and doubt, it is important for us Afrocentric scholars, and our nation of people, to remember that despite all of the difficulties and hardships that we have had to overcome, we, as a people, have done wonders. Taking the position that we have started from a zero base in every major national category, from education to land and other capital ownership, we are closing the gap between ourselves as a nation and our oppressors.

Coming out of the formative years, and given absolutely nothing to start from except the strength of our national will to go on, we have marched from the bottom of this society to soon sit in the major seat of power of our enemy. The Emancipation made no efforts to provide a basis for any retroactive claims by the Freemen, and has been

what many regard as one of the most callous and ill-planned acts of American History, some four million illiterate, highly visible, totally unorganized, ex-slaves were precipitously severed from their mooring and set adrift in a war-ravaged and economically battered region (Brown, 1990, 71)

and given the fact that our ancestors faced terrorism, torture and death, along with continued discrimination, we have done wonders.

We started the twentieth century way behind the Euroamerican colonizers who failed to make any effort to restitute the ex-slaves

for the crimes which American society had perpetuated upon them or for the
labor which they had provided nor was an
effort extended to make minimal capital
investment in this tremendous human
resource which could have enabled it to
win an equatable place in the overall
society (Brown, 71).

It is important that we Afrocentric scholars impress upon our people that they can accomplish anything given their past efforts; and ask them to envision what the world would have looked like if we had been given the opportunity to compete with the other immigrant groups, those who freely came to this society and were welcomed.

The massive capital transfers that we have discussed can make this competitive development possible. According to Richard America (1990),

until this issue, so far not recognized
as profoundly serious, is researched
thoroughly, faced squarely, and
understood widely, real and lasting
solutions to the urban and racial
problems that threaten the stability and
progress of this country may not be found
(11).

But, let us be very clear on one point, as William Darity says, "after all, apart from the increased demand for genealogists which black reparations would engender, it really is the stuff of fantasy to imagine white America turning over more than $1 trillion of wealth over to black America" (Darity, 11). America would not be the same society if this occurred. The opulence that Euroamerican colonizers now enjoy would be questionable. The massive deficiencies between our nation and their's in terms of capital, wages, investments in human capital, and other important areas would be closed
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and spread around more evenly. The dependency of our nation, and of our African brothers and sisters throughout the diaspora and on the continent, would change.

Reparations must be included in the nationalist political agenda of African Americans: it must become a cornerstone in our political struggle, not only for its sociopolitical transformative potential, *but more importantly, for our national respect and economic independence*. The African American community must decolonize the concept. Reparations must become politicized and presented viewed as a means of recapitalizing our underdeveloped nation without the accompanying loss of economic independence which has characterized and hampered the economic growth of many nascent Third World nations. The least that this will do is unearth the depth of damage done to African Americans and to make naked the colonial nature of the American society.
I have argued that all decolonization struggles travel similar but yet unique roads to liberation. Along the way, bourgeois-nationalists struggle to find alternative ways to achieve national independence without a violent revolution. As a way of avoiding this phase in the liberation struggle, colonizing countries grant many different concessions to the bourgeois-nationalists, i.e., legal or civil rights concessions. These rights are designed to bring the native population into the mainstream of the colonizer's society in the hope that by granting some limited rights, the native population will dismiss their claims for full liberation and the colonial situation can continue.

The African American liberation movement has currently become stalled in this phase. Unfortunately, our nationalist struggle for liberation has been hampered by the bourgeois-nationalist contingent, headed by the NAACP's push for counter-nationalist goals. Instead of struggling for race-specific goals, a coalition of SCLC-CORE-NAACP, joined by the Euroamerican liberal contingent, have been pushing for integration.

Consequently, the traditional-nationalist movement has been forced to engage in an ideological and tactical war with the bourgeois-nationalist
interracialist oriented civil rights coalition, that has resulted in both groups becoming ineffective and unable to develop meaningful programs aimed at our liberation. Caught between the struggle of these two groups are the African American people who have been forced into a position of ambivalence. Not surprisingly, our nationalist ideology reflects this contradictory struggle (Cruse, 1971). According to Cruse (1987, 71), "in the face of the realities of Negro development in the United States, it is surely an almost impossible task to reconcile nationalism and integrationism". Yet, that is exactly what the African American community has and is attempting to do. While members of the African American community disdain the legalism of the NAACP led "civil rights" coalition, for its lack of militancy and slowness, they fail to accept the reality of integration. That is, African Americans fail to realize that "if it (legal gradualism) is ever to achieve its aims, it has to be gradual" (Cruse, 71). And, this approach, is an unconscious endorsement of the evolutionary political model of America advocated by Euroamerican colonizers; a model that I reject for this and other equally impossible reasons. To endorse this model and this approach, is in fact an endorsement of continued subjugation, dehumanization and prolonged domination, and I contend, eventual decimation.

In this chapter I will argue that legal gradualism and integration are synonymous and both are antithetical to the objectives of decolonization. Both are predicated on the belief that social equality, which is rooted in the
'evolutionary/equilibrium' model, is possible in a colonial situation. This is problematic because it views social equality as the correct political objective for colonized people. Furthermore, those who consider legal-gradualism, as a proper means of expropriating the colonizers, and returning to their nations political sovereignty, economic autonomy and self-determination "fail to see the intimate connection between political domination and economic exploitation. They apparently ignore the fact that such steps, as they propose in asking for gradual withdrawal of the political administration, are in affect asking the 'mother country' to expropriate herself" (Nkrumah, 1962, 31).

Unfortunately, our civil-rights organizations have continuously remained tied to this approach and the dogma of interracialism. Consequently, many African Americans have become impatient with their legal-gradualistic-integration approach. For many African Americans, integration cannot bring about sufficient tangible rewards and meaningful equality. According to Cruse (1968),

many Negroes, who are neither nationalists nor supporters of the NAACP, are becoming impatient with the NAACP-Martin Luther King-student legalistic and "passive-resistance" tactics. They suspect that the long-drawn-out battle of attrition with which the NAACP integration movement is faced may very well end in no more than Pyrrhic victories. They feel that racial integration as a goal, lacks the tangible objectives needed to bring about genuine equality (79).
One reason why the NAACP has not been viewed by African Americans with favor, is its lack of an economic program.* As early as 1911, DuBois noted that if the NAACP was to remain relevant to the African American community, it would have to develop an economic development program; not a program centered around securing employment for African Americans, but a program that would remedy their underdevelopment. Lacking an economic platform, the NAACP was forced into the important but limited struggle against segregation and discrimination, where its emphasis still remains today. Forced into a struggle that, if successful, is essentially antithetical to the political-economy of this nation, the bourgeois-nationalist coalition has been engaged in a struggle that has been ultimately both useless and unwinnable. Many of the pyrrhic gains that they seemingly had won have been reversed. For instance, in the struggles for integrated schools, for the right to vote, in employment opportunity, and for equal protection under

* When the N.A.A.C.P. was established in 1900, it was considered a 'radical' group. With social programs based on integration, as opposed to Booker T. Washington's 'then' perceived 'accommodationist' tactics, DuBois and the integrated NAACP was often ignored, denigrated, denounced, and rejected by the Euroamerican capitalist-political establishment. With the arrival of Marcus Garvey and his race-specific nationalist organization; the Universal Negro Improvement Association, an all African American organization, the NAACP was then forced into the accommodationist role previously occupied by Washingtonism.

The N.A.A.C.P. was forced into using a strategy that they were ill equipped to use, and into taking positions that would not render the successes that they sought. According to Cruse's analysis, the bourgeois-nationalist coalition was doomed to fail. The struggle that they had undertaken, coupled with the tools and tactics that they employed, the N.A.A.C.P. could not bring about the desired goals that the African American people desired.
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the law, African Americans have won some victories only to see the courts take them away. As Bell (1985) argues, "all but the most optimistic among you must concede that the once swiftly moving march toward racial equality through law reform has slowed to a walk, leaving millions of black Americans no better off than they were before the civil rights movement"(45).

Citing a variety of statistics to support this conclusion, Bell concedes that all is not well in the African American colony, and that the cost to the African American community has been a division along economic lines. While admitting that the courts have been unable to disconnect themselves from their social milieu, Bell maintains that until something else is offered, he and other lawyers, will continue to rely on the courts. He continues on to say, in an indirect way, that although law is often contingent, ambiguous, uncertain and biased, it is however, better than nothing.

Politically, the gains that the African American community have won, as a consequence of this tactic, i.e., overcoming the structural barriers with the passage of the 1964 voting rights bill, have had very little meaningful impact on their lives and many of the elected officials have found that they are powerless to change the every day life of the ordinary African American person. Unfortunately, African Americans still remain tied to the political-judicial system seemingly unwilling to admit to its limited and useless ability to remedy our condition.
Using school integration as an example, Bell argues that we took the wrong course of action. Instead of having our concerns forced into the discourse where integration became synonymous with equality, where the remedy became the placement of our children with Euroamerican children which neither side was willing to do and its implementation which took military force and government coercion, the African American community should have argued for integrating the financial boards and securing positions like the Euroamerican community did. According to Bell (1985),

but while we spoke and thought in an atmosphere of 'right and justice,' our opponents had their eyes on the economic benefits and power relationships all the time. And that difference in priorities meant that the price of black progress was benefits to the other side, benefits that tokenized our gains and sometimes strengthened the relative advantages whites held over us (108).

Bell's charge against this class, concerning their misguided school desegregation strategy, could be made against their overall approach to our liberation struggle. A misunderstanding of our current condition, misplaced objectives and wrong tactics have stagnated our struggle to date. In what follows, I will attempt to explain how and why legal-gradualism has become the center of this problematic approach. At the same time, I will grapple with the role that the struggle for rights has and must come to play in our liberation.
Legal Formalism and the Individualist Tradition

Prior to the 'era of integration' [1930s to the 1970s], the African-American struggle in this country was organized and institutionally directed by segregationists-nationalists, through the convention movement. Partly as a consequence of legalized apartheid, i.e., Jim Crowism, as decreed in the *Plessey v. Ferguson* case of 1896, and partly as a result of nationalist sentiments during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, African Americans seemingly were more interested in guaranteeing for themselves more tangible results than they were in the indeterminate one's as defined by rights. This rejection of 'civil-rights' as the object of our struggle was to cause a major rift between two champions of the black community for a good deal of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Cruse, 1968). And these twin approaches still hamper our liberation struggle today.

Initially this tactical struggle became associated with the different philosophies and personalities of W.E.B. DuBois and Booker T. Washington. DuBois advocated that African Americans should push for social equality via a struggle for full citizen rights, i.e., voting rights, public accommodation, integration, etc., and Washington wanted more distinct and separate social goals for our people, i.e., jobs, housing, land, Black owed businesses, and segregation which he believed would also bring about full citizen rights and social equality. This division over strategy and goals became institutionalized
both in structure and ideology and these two African ambassadors carried out
their tactical struggles until Washington's death (Cruse, 1968).

Following Washington's death, this debate continued on between
DuBois and Garvey. As our society became more and more separated along
the lines of race, the popularity of Garvey and his distinctively separatist-
nationalist program was to overshadow DuBois and the N.A.A.C.P.. What
became clear, as evidenced by the massive following and support that Garvey
had, was that a majority of the people in the African American community
wanted and advocated separatism and independence as the way to achieve
social equality as opposed to integration. They wanted freedom as a nation
and not individual rights which are not necessarily exclusive of one another.
But, because of their status in this society, the two have not been connected.
Individual African Americans may receive their 'rights' as individuals, but,
African Americans as a collective have not.

For various reasons, i.e., riots, World War I, the mass exodus of
Africans from their American national homelands (the southern states),
seeking jobs and refuge from terrorism inside the reservation camps in the
urban enclaves of America's big cities, and with the assistance of the
"Assimilated";* the shift from distinctive separatist nationalism was made to

*This term was used in an Article by Robert A. Williams to
describe the integrationist behavior of young Indians, as apposed to the
nationalist elders of their tribe. Their behavior is akin to the
behavior of many of our current political leader of the African American
colony.
the quest for individualized formal equality. This shift in tactics and strategy changed the character of the African American struggle for liberation and turned over to the colonizers and those seeking integration, the right to determine the direction of the movement, and to set remedies for the injustices that we, as a nation, had historically suffered.

More importantly, this shift also entailed a philosophical change from one of African self-extension orientation, [groupness] to Eurocentric individualism with an almost exclusive focus on the struggle for individual rights. Accordingly, "rights were seen as the key to social change. The dispossessed, silenced and oppressed could get justice by going to court" (Milner, 1991, 255). It was believed and advocated by these bourgeois nationalists, that the "rule of law gave them equality" (Milner, 255). The result has been to not only place our struggle in the hands of Euroamerica, but atomize our community, forcing our common communal problems into the language of individual rights and away from liberation. As Milner points out,

an emphasis on rights encourages a politics based on selfish individualism and discourages the very communitarian and egalitarian values that rights advocates often really want to pursue. Rights keep people from seeing other and better ways that individuals can use to relate to one another, through a sense of caring, [italics mine] (Milner, 260).
Social Equality, Social Justice and Colonialism

The shape and contours of our legal-gradualistic struggle here in carceral America can be traced to the decision handed down in the Scott case. The decision of Scott goes to the heart of the citizenship question. It was mandated in the Scott case, that we African colonial subjects were not intended to be citizens, and consequently, we were prevented from enjoying the rights of citizenship. We have stubbornly hung on to the belief that by our will alone we could change that decision. We still believe that we can make this society grant us those rights which the Scott decision denied us. We still mistakenly confuse citizenship rights with human rights and struggle for the former and neglect to act politically for the latter.

African Americans still are demanding all of the citizenship rights that Euroamericans and other non-Africans enjoy without considering alternative methods to accomplish our emancipatory objectives. We demand the right to fair housing, equal treatment under the law, education, protection, health care, employment and, most importantly, the right to political enfranchise, never asking if these objectives can be met in the arena in which such struggles take place, or whether we can accomplish our objectives through the exclusive medium of individual rights struggle. Unfortunately, African Americans have turned over their historical struggle to this method and have abandoned others. Rights advocacy, has come to dominate our
discourse on liberation. African Americans are talking and acting as if rights advocacy is the assured way to achieve their liberation.

**Everybody is Talkin' Bout Rights**

The prevalence of rights-based political action does not mean that there is no controversy and division. There are those who see rights as useful, and those who think that fighting for social change within the arena of rights, or 'rights-talk,' is useless. Everybody is talkin' bout rights, and everybody has an opinion.

Some who argue against the utility of rights from within the community of the colonizers see, rights-talk as useless because rights "are so prominent in the vocabulary of individualism and private property..., and are fictions" (Haskell, 1001). Others in this community argue that because they are so subjective, 'rights' have no continuing or timeless value. They contend that in order for rights to be useful they must be timeless, and therefore, objective and applicable to every society. They forget that rights are socially based, and a discourse on rights, helps us to interpret the nature of a particular society. When one looks at the scope of rights denied to African Americans, one can construe the exact extent and totality of the oppressive conditions that confront the life-reality of our people. Consequently, one is forced to confront the contradictions between America's social and political theories and her practice.
On the other side of this narrow debate, in the community of the colonizers, are those (usually composed of liberals) who argue against rights-talk, or waging our battle in this terrain, contending that the reliance on rights often leads to other wrongs. They argue that "there is too much emphasis placed on defining the relationship between the citizen and the state in terms of rights" (Milner, 1989, 649). It is this manipulative dimension of rights that they find wrong in the reliance on rights-talk and the law.

In this community, rights-talk, and its companion the law, are seen as insidious, inaccessible, and divisive. It is argued that,

Legal discourse relies on making distinctions, and these distinctions --- between self/other, person/nonperson. male/female, majority/minority, mentally healthy/mentally ill, abled/disabled --- become reified, making them appear "natural" rather than culturally constructed (Milner, 1989, 635).

Haskell and others maintain that rights-talk is nothing but the Nietzschean will to power in disguise and, consequently, rights-talk is of no value or use to the oppressed in struggling for their liberation or social equality. They maintain that because rights are open to human subjectivity, i.e., interpretation and reinterpretation, rights advocacy is useless in creating social stability. Both groups inside the colonizers community maintain that too often rights-conflicts become a contest between the powerful and the powerless as to whose rights matter the most.
In this community, rights-talk is seen as being too contingent, contradictory, manipulative, divisive, individualistic, subjective, and a tool to be used by the powerful to maintain their control over society. "And of course anyone who has ever been oppressed by those with the law on their side knows that it can always be manipulated to oppress all the more," (Freeman, 1988, 316).

**Listen to Us: Those Who Have Done Without the Security of the Law and Rights**

While it is necessary to understand the limits of a rights-based strategy and the role it has played in the formation of legal-gradualism, it is also important to point out that the quest for rights have realistically done many positive things for the struggling African American community. Although limited, the rights struggle has provided the African American community with a language to communicate with their oppressors while demystifying the law. It has allowed us, "at its most ethereal level... to identify and overturn all contingent, hierarchizing forms of legal consciousness in order to free up: the definite possibilities of human connection" (Williams, 1987, 120). In the community of the oppressed, rights-talk has given African Americans the power of "discovering contradictions in the majority society's discourse on rights" (Williams, 128). In a limited and tenuous way, it has helped to built a sense of community among the colonized oppressed people. This phase in our struggle has helped to convince African Americans that
our communities should not and cannot be allowed to be destroyed by those who attempt to atomize us by the usage of law. As Harlon Dalton (1987) argues,

no matter how smart or bookish we were, we could not retreat from which we came. We learned from life as well as from books. We learned about injustice, social cruelty, political hypocrisy and sanctioned terrorism from the mouths of our mothers and fathers and from our very own experiences.... And from the beginning we learned, not as an article of political faith but rather as a simple fact of life, that our fate and that of all persons of similar hue were inseparably intertwined. The fundamental connectedness, together with our distinctive subculture, nourished and sustained us, created in us an unshakable sense of community. The lucky one's among us revelled in that community, fed on it. Others of us resented it, or tried to hide from it. But escape was not possible, for the community was within us and we were branded forever (439).

The colonized are forced into these communities and have learned to find refuge in them. We have learned that we do not belong in the community of the 'others.' This is a reality of our existence. We have learned that rights and the law are something to strive for even though rights and the law are only ideologies that have been determined by the colonizers of this society for their own convenience. We have learned this about the law just as we have learned "that politics is war carried on by other means. . ." (Williams, 125).

African Americans have suffered from those truths. We have aligned ourselves with those who know how to speak in the language of the
colonizers. We resist the argument that maintains that rights advocacy is based on nothing but mystified consciousness because "rights discourse, precisely because of its mystifying power in white America's legal and political mythology, secures significant ideological high ground for the legal and political movements of minority groups in the post-World-War II era" (Williams, 121). Rights advocacy is another weapon in our arsenal. Used in the correct manner, along with other useful tactics, rights advocacy has the revolutionary potential to bring about the desired structural conditions that can lead to our liberation. The struggle for rights, even though it has been waged in the wrong arena is still one that we cannot allow the colonizers to convince us through "a discursive practice of abandonment " to forsake (Williams, 121). Why should we continue to debate the utility of rights advocacy with our oppressors. We should not. What we must do is to heighten our rights struggle to the point where we create a greater tension between the philosophy of equal rights and the reality of rights denied here in America.

The Mythology of Rights and the Creation of False Consciousness

While rights advocacy can still serve a very useful revolutionary function, African Americans have to be cognizant of the potential multilayered and polycentric dangers associated with this form of struggle. They have to guard against the threat that it poses to our collective identity,
to our decentralized community structure and, most importantly, to legitimizing the system through the usage of rights language.

Historically, as a consequence of living in an oppressive society, African Americans and other oppressed 'minorities,' have looked upon rights as a means "of protection in an overwhelming racist and sexist society" (Trent, 1989, 40), and as "something to get so that one is treated similarly to those in the overclass" (Williams, 125). Rights are seen as valuable and worthy of a struggle. African Americans believe in rights "so much so hard that we gave life where there was none before. We held onto them, put hope of them into our wombs, and mothered them-not just the notion of them. We nurtured rights and gave rights life" (Williams, 1987, 430).

We have chosen rights as a means of gaining our humanity, our respect in this colonial environment. But the more that we have struggled for formal equality, for our rights, the more we have learned that "rights are granted to, or bestowed upon, the powerless by the powerful. They are ultimately within the control of those with authority to interpret or rewrite the sacred texts from which they derive" (Freeman, 1988, 331).

We have learned the hard way that rights may be manipulated and used to do more harm than good. That they are not fixed entities in the world, and more often than not, "rights are disempowering" (Milner, 1991, 259) and have been known to turn people away from the system because they
have found out that rights are not generalized, but are given out by those who define them in piecemeal fashion.

We have learned after years of struggle that,

rights legitimize society's unfair power arrangements, acting like pressure valves to allow only so much injustice. With much fanfare, the powerful periodically distribute rights as proof that the system is fair and just, and then quietly deny rights through narrow construction, nonenforcement, or delay (Delgado, 1987, 304).

Those of us who have marched, buried and mourned our dead, and seen rights given and easily taken away, regretfully know that they are contingent, manipulative, alienating, and that "rights are indeterminate" (Milner, 1991, 259). And yet, Africans insist on securing them, and have historically "committed themselves to these struggles, not to attain some hegemonical functioning reification leading to false consciousness, but a seat in the front of the bus" (Williams, 1987, 120). The oppressed people who have been involved in the struggles to obtain these mythological rules, called rights, were led to believe in them by experience. They saw what the absence of rights meant in this society. They were led to believe, by the propagandists of the colonizers community, that obtaining them would lead to a 'better day.' And yet, African Americans have found out just the opposite. And,

the embarrassing absurdity of posing such a naive belief "that fairness was not far away" in the minds of those involved in the struggle for minority, "rights" serves to highlight the instrumental function of rights rhetoric in the social
movements of peoples of color (Williams, 122).

African Americans do not need any group to tell us that rights are not what they seem, our existence has taught us that. And,

for people of color, rights rhetoric is a primitive weapon, but one we cannot afford to denigrate though in our hearts we may question its ultimate relevance once we secure our position (Williams, 129).

Rethinking Justice

What the African American community has been struggling for has been justice for ourselves as individuals and as a group. In very limited circumstances, we have been successful at receiving justice as individuals but have failed at the latter. We have tried mass protests, electoral politics, formal equality via the courts, and pushing for national legislation, i.e., civil rights laws, and violence.

The commodification of justice, (Young, 1990) has been a convenient way for the oppressors of this society to place the burden of proof on the victims, and thereby, exonerating the system while avoiding such issues as reparations. By shifting the level of the debate, they have forced the African colonized nation to concentrate their efforts on seeking the perpetrators as opposed to challenging the system. Hence, as Freeman (1982) points out, modern American law has come to understand "racial discrimination as something that is caused by individuals, of individual institutions, producing discrete results that can be identified as discrimination and
thereafter neutralized" (99). In other words, the life situation of the victim is ever forsaken in the continual process of identifying and cataloguing perpetrators. It is almost as though justice is merely "making sure that correct evil [is ascribed] to correct perpetrators" (99).

It seems clear that if the African American decolonization struggle is to succeed, then we should refocus our attention on changing the system and redefine what we mean by justice. We should not continue to permit it to be defined as simply eliminating discrimination, but return it to our historical meaning: liberation from oppression in its many forms. Because, as Young (1990) aptly notes,

if one focuses on discrimination as the primary wrong groups,[insert African Americans], then the more profound wrongs of exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, cultural imperialism, and violence that we suffer go undiscussed and unaddressed (197).

Allowing those who oppress us to define what justice is and, thereby, establish the forum, gives them control over the parameters of the debate and the remedies that can be applied. In one instance, we must define social justice in terms of "institutional conditions, and not to the preferences and ways of life of individuals or groups" (Young, 36). Like any other colonized people, African Americans suffer from various forms of institutionally caused oppression. Consequently, our decolonization struggle must change these institutional arrangements that currently exist. We must once again engage in a form of direct confrontation with the various agencies of this
colonial administration and challenge its authority and the decisions that affect our lives.

African Americans must return to the notions of their ancestors who saw justice as virtue, happiness and harmony among the total citizenry; and rid ourselves of this individualized concept of justice. Colonialism, as a system, exists for the single minded purpose of economic exploitation. Colonial residents tend to think of justice in those same terms. We think of justice as the distribution of goods, services, income, rewards and positions; and not as the relationship between people and institutions. Yet, in a paradoxical way, African Americans can not afford to think of anything but the structural relationship between our community and the metropolitan society and, still must rely on and utilize the law to engage these structures. Because, domestic colonialism is primarily a structural arrangement and our analysis concerning justice must be cognizant of this arrangement. We must be fully aware that the law is designed to maintain this relationship as we attempt to use it to dismantle the system.

To do otherwise would "obscure the institutional context within which those distributions take place, and which is often at least partly the cause of patterns of distribution of jobs or wealth" (Young, 22). To allow a continuous shifting in our struggle leads to, and perpetuates, a false consciousness to which we have fallen victim. We seemingly have forgotten this system
maintenance aspect of the law. Our overreliance on legal-gradualism is suggestive of this omission.

We must eliminate the confusion between rights as defined by outcomes, that is distribution, and outcomes as being defined by opportunities. We must focus our attention on the way the system is structured. Because "what is important is not the particular pattern of distribution at a particular moment, but rather the reproduction of a regular pattern over time" (Young, 29).

Not an Abandonment but an Escalation: Admitting to Some Ugly Truths

History has proven that the quest for social equality for African Americans via a formal legal struggle, has been fruitless. However, this is no time for us to abandon that struggle. We must not carry on this struggle for our liberation shackled to national and individual false-consciousness. We now correctly understand that the law is a fluid dynamic and is not static. It is influenced by various groups and mythologies that exist in this society. Our task is to impose our own nationalistic understanding on the relationship of the law to us.

Our task is to seek the development of a true pluralistic legal system in this society and understand how law relates to the African American nation. It is no longer prudent for us to continue an individualist approach to solve a collective problem. It is no longer prudent for us to approach what is rightfully violations of our human rights as if they were civil wrongs, civil
violations by our common respected government. The current legal system has failed our people and has been used to oppress us instead of administering justice. African Americans can surely do a better job of administering justice than those who do not have our best interest at heart. The development of an alternative legal system will have many benefits. Among them, an increase in national self-esteem, increased feelings of security and confidence; and most importantly, it will add to the reinforcement of a collective identity and the eradication of and individualized approach to our collective problems.

The wrongs that have been committed against African Americans are wrongs that have been committed against a nation. It is no longer prudent for us to seek remedies that are designed to benefit the individual and not the group. It is time for us to admit that the law and the rights won under cases such as Brown v. Board of Education or Goldberg v. Kelly are only partial makeshift concessions whose principal function is to preserve the intellectual as well as social stability of the dominant order" (Williams, 1987, 117).

African Americans must admit that the integration era, that was a direct consequence of the infamous Brown decision, was a mistake caused by a shifting of the goals. It was a policy carried on by our bourgeois civil rights lawyers' personal commitment to racial integration. This personal commitment trapped both communities into a strategy that was universally
resisted and was contrary to the lessons taught to us African Americans by our elder nationalist leaders.

It is time that we escalate our struggle for social equality via rights to another level. Our struggle has always been over rights, but we have been waging it at the wrong level and in the wrong forums. We have been struggling at the local and national level in the courts of this land as an aggregated community, when we should have been struggling as a unified nation at a national and internation level in federal and world courts. The former level of struggle can only lead to individualized remedies, while the latter leads to group based remedies such as reparations and eventual liberation and autonomy. One calls into question the totality of the whole political socio-economic structure, and the other leads to what Patricia Williams so correctly calls, the shell game, that is, looking for individual perpetrators as if the total society was somehow void of racial discrimination.

Let us admit that there have always been some hidden ceilings to the Affirmative action philosophy and programs. It is time that we admit to ourselves that there has never been a willingness on the part of this country to allow equality between African and Euroamericans. African Americans should realize that social engineering has been a program developed by Eurocentric social scientists to keep the two races separate and no amount of legal maneuvering has changed this reality; that determining the quotas in
housing, employment, education and many other areas of American life are historical facts.

The bottom line is that the civil rights movement failed because it was never really meant to succeed. The whole thrust of the civil rights movement was by design a threat to the continuation of the colonial society and, as such, it could not have been allowed to succeed. Does this mean that the nationalist movement has no choice but to turn to a violent revolutionary strategy? I will attempt to answer this question in the next chapter.
Chapter 6

Is Violent Revolution A Viable Strategy

Contradictions and Complexities: A Question of View

I argued in the last chapter that legal-gradualism, as a decolonization strategy has failed to produce meaningful and lasting changes in the lives of African American people. I also argued that this strategy was primarily the approach taken by the bourgeois-nationalists who have remained tied to an interracial tactic which has prevented them from seeking other viable alternatives. While unfortunate, this approach to decolonization is not unique. Initially, all decolonization struggles are elite affairs of "genteel petitioning to colonial authorities to reform their rule, soften their depositism and admit the traditional and petit-bourgeois factions of the . . . elite to their councils" (Chinweizu, 1975, 115). But eventually, there emerges another younger generation that is not "disposed to be genteel, gentlemanly and pleading" (Chinweizu, 115). This group is disposed to be more combative and more willing to use violent struggle to achieve what the previous generation could not: the liberation of their nation. They abandon the former strategy and, for them, revolution becomes the means of struggle.

Throughout the history of this nation, most recently during the 1960s, violent revolution was openly advocated and sanctioned by a large segment of the African American community. Those who advocated the usage of
revolutionary struggle saw revolution as the only viable means of achieving the liberation for African Americans. As a tactic, violent revolution still retains its allurement among certain segments of the African American community. If one takes the position that African Americans are a colonized people, and that colonized people have only achieved their liberation via violent revolutionary struggle, then, seemingly, revolutionary behavior is not only possible, but certain to occur here in America (Allen, 1990).

I will argue that while violent revolution is seemingly unavoidable here in America, there are some alternative options which we should consider before we embark on this course of action. I will argue that violent revolution, as we know it, is not yet applicable to our circumstances and that major changes must occur before we engage in this form of social change. African Americans must begin an ideological struggle that will change the way that they think of themselves and the world. Like all other revolutionary situations and people, African Americans must overcome a series of internal contradictions if they are to succeed. Revolutions are essentially about the resolution of contradictions. All revolutionaries are faced with the task of overcoming the contradictions and the complexities of their struggle. Revolutionary change, at one level, is continuous but in another, it can be made permanent. As one set of contradictions are overcome, another set arises. This process has been called the negation of the negation or revolutionary dialectics.
African Americans are confronted with many internal contradictions. For example, while African Americans are desirous of revolution, many of our revolutionary leaders have been too willing to support this capitalist system, and are too willing to cash in on the various movements for personal gains; many are seemingly afraid to discuss alternative systems of political economy; many of them espouse traditional values while suffering from historical discontinuity. Some say that they recognize that we have been deculturated but, avoid reculturation. Far too many recognize that we, as a people, suffer from political and economic ambiguity, but are unwilling to engage in nationalist behavior.

Revolutions are "not easy because more than a willingness to engage in revolutionary action is asked; another prime prerequisite is a willingness to study and to sort out the implications and repercussions of the revolutionary act. This means that the revolutionary must not only be armed with the weapons of his trade, but armed also with sufficient knowledge and political understanding to put those weapons to best use" (Allen, 5).

For the African American revolutionary theorists, this means that they have to grasp the reality of these and many other internal and external contradictions that will make our revolution possible. Historically, what has hampered our revolutionary thrust has been an inadequate understanding of America's peculiar society and interlocking institutions. Most importantly, and what may well be the most important contradiction facing African
American decolonization theorists is the contradiction between American's overdeveloped material society and its people's political underdevelopment.

Most Americans, and especially African Americans, are politically underdeveloped. African Americans, like other Americans, are too often willing to allow others to make political decisions for them instead of actively becoming engaged in the political decision making process on a collective or individual basis. They are too willing to succumb to the popular mythology of expertism or other depoliticizing ideologies.

A major contradiction, one that will directly impact on our decolonization strategy, is the possibility of decolonizing America through democratic institutions. This is unique and seemingly impossible, but it is not. The African American decolonization struggle has been, and will continue to be, unlike any other movement in the evolution of humanity. Thus we begin our search for an answer to our inquiry here.

Evolution, Afrocentricism and African American Revolution

Before revolutions occur, there has to be a period of reflection and debate among revolutionary leaders. This is important because "new ideas come out of reflection upon past experiences. . . . The process of reflection is as important as the experiences themselves because in reflection lies the possibility of something new and original " (Boggs, 1976, 15). Revolutions are not events that just occur, they just do not happen. They are events that come about because some leaders, or party, have taken it upon themselves/itself to
reflect, learn and plan. They happen because some group has learned upon reflection what are the major contradictions facing the movement, and is willing to engage in the necessary process of preparing the people for protracted struggle. Once a party, or leaders, has educated a people, and they are willing to confront the counter-revolutionary forces that are in opposition to their movement, then that society has entered into a revolutionary period. "A revolutionary period is one in which the only exit is a revolution. Revolution is a specific way in which the evolution of man/woman is advanced. The only justification for a revolution is that it advances the evolution of man/woman. A revolution is a phase in the long evolutionary process of man/woman" (Boggs, 19).

The new ideas that will create the conditions for a new woman/man are not dependent on the masses for their development. They come about because of deliberation and reflection by a person or group of people through consultation and debate. Once these ideas are agreed upon, it is up to the dedicated cadre and the party leadership to implement them (give them back to the people). The ideology that has the best possibility of advancing the evolution of African Americans is Afrocentricity. As such, it is has both revolutionary and evolutionary potential.

As more and more African Americans assume an Afrocentric posture, and adopt it as a guiding ideology in their lives, they will begin to see that the current substructures of this society are inadequate in meeting their
individual or collective needs. When that occurs, they will begin to organize and begin the necessary process of reflection and learning. Once they assume the Afrocentric ideology, incremental change no longer will be sufficient to satisfy their individual and collective desires for freedom, or liberation.

If there is a dedicated political cadre working to educate the masses along Afrocentric political lines, and in various interrelated decolonization programs, this inadequacy will create the desired and necessary tensions between Afrocentric African American people and the substructures of Euroamerica. These are opposing forces that can only be resolved if one side allows the other to impose their will. Thus far, African Americans, functioning under the delusion of colonial citizenship, have allowed, in part, Euroamerica to impose their will on them. As African Americans become more Afrocentric, Eurocentric colonial hegemony will become more oppositional and confrontational, requiring either further acquiescence by African Americans, or revolutionary struggle. I predict the latter.

Agitation and propaganda are essential tactics used and needed in the revolutionary process. By altering the various institutions within our own communities, and infusing the larger image making institutions with a new vision of our humanism, African Americans can bring about the necessary conditions which will increase the desire by all Americans for a more humane society.
Thus making human evolution, as first thought of here in America by the Puritans during their voyage to this society, and early revolutionary thinkers, possible.

By attacking the various substructures of this society is it possible to create the conditions necessary for decolonization and human evolution. This will occur if some nationalist group assumes the responsibility for the American people. In particular, this becomes possible if some group takes it upon itself to infuse the African American community with the ideas of Afrocentricism, and begins the protracted struggle of making it the guiding principle for all of our intracommunal organizations and philosophies. The meaning of revolution has changed and in changing, it has brung about new challenges that require new ideas.

What is needed now, in order to continue the evolution of humanity, is for African Americans to rethink and reflect on their past and what has happened to change the meaning of revolution. The history of revolutionary behavior has changed colors. And as members of the hue-man race, this requires that African Americans make a contribution to human evolution unlike any other people. African Americans can contribute to human evolution only if they redefine revolution and revolutionary behavior.
Decolonization Struggles and the Changing Meaning of Revolution

If one takes a critical look at the political events of the modern era, especially at the events that have been called decolonization movements, one will discover that violent social revolutions, "have thus far determined the physiognomy of the twentieth century" (Ardent, 1973, 11). Above all other political activities, i.e., internationalism, nationalism, imperialism, revolution remains along with war, the two central issues of this era. This century has witnessed the usage of revolutionary tactics by colonized countries as the means of dissolving their relationships with their former colonial oppressors.

Revolutionary decolonization struggles have, and are, shaping the political map of the world. The dramatic change in the location of revolutions, and in the composition of its participants, that is, in the hemispheric locus of revolutions from European to Third World countries, and from citizens of industrialized states to former colonized and oppressed people (from white Europeans to people of color), has changed the meaning of revolution. As a consequence, this shift in geography and participants, has made the Western version, and definition of revolution passé (Cruse, 1968, 107).

Consequently, "if the Negro movement, then, is revolutionary, it must be revolutionary in a sense which is uniquely different from the characteristics and aims of all other revolutions of this century" (Cruse, 98).
Because of the increasing structural dysfunctionalism associated with American internal colonialism, and the resulting tensions and contradictions between its democratic mythologies and its imperialistic imperatives, America is both Eastern and Western in its revolutionary potential. Thus, containing elements of both and never fully incorporating either. And, as a result, making it more difficult to come up with answers based on the revolutionary movements under either model.

If given a sustained and aggressive politicization of certain issues by a nationalist group, or, if Euroamericans continue to resist the survival-thrust of African Americans, an atmosphere could be created that could either bring about a paralysis among the ruling elites, or bring about their abdication. At the very least, it will continue the evolutionary development of African American people that will eventually demand revolutionary change.

As such, these factors, and certain others, caused by the colonial environment, make the potential for revolution greater and its allurement more attractive to the oppressed African American people. America is creating the conditions for the inevitability of revolutionary change. America is economically, politically, and intellectually creating the conditions for an elite-led revolutionary liberation struggle, in that it is remaining stagnated, and tied to a model of social organization that resists human evolution. In its

essence, America is not only conservative, opting to remain tied to institutions and philosophies that advocate stability instead of fostering needed change, America is counter-revolutionary. Choosing to maintain the status quo of bondage, instead of seeking political changes that will avert unnecessary human and social catastrophe, only make revolution possible.

If we look at the history of revolution, we will find that colonial societies, because of their exploitative nature, force all colonized people into revolutionary behavior. Revolution and decolonization movements become synonymous. Colonial societies, are structurally dysfunctional and counter-revolutionary by design. *Any behavior that seeks to continue the status quo of bondage in an oppressive society is counter-revolutionary and contrary to human evolution.* Euroamerica's appeal to law-and-order, the constitution, or political stability, when confronted with change, means the continuation of material domination and, therefore, is counter-revolutionary, and antithetical to our decolonization goals.

**Revolutions and The African American Movement**

Revolutions are unique forms of social change that are dependent upon the use of violence and are caused by structural dysfunctions within a given society. They are contingent movements that are dependent on the inability of social structures and/or elites to meet the demands of revolutionary elements in the society and are dependent on the behavior of
military elites and the presence of an accelerator, such as an unwinnable war (Johnson, 1964) before they occur.

By utilizing the structurally integrated model of society to explain the cause of revolution, we gain a different perspective of society and social change. Societies need not be the static, slow moving and gradual entities that proponents of the *evolutionary model* would have us believe. They are structurally integrated entities that are continuously changing. Thus, change can either be violent or non-violent, slow and gradual or rapid.

The *evolutionary model* encourages incremental, slow and gradual change that leaves the pace and goals within the hands of the ruling elite, while the conflictual model argues for rapid change whose goals and pace are determined by those who are in opposition to the elite. The *evolutionary model* supports social stability which necessitates slow non-violent change and, therefore, will resist any behavior that proposes abrupt and sudden changes that drastically alter the relationship between groups within a given polity. Thus, the *evolutionary model* is antithetical to the revolutionary process or its necessity.

The *conflictual model*, the one that I have endorsed throughout this dissertation, argues for, and makes the implicit case for, revolutionary change. According to the *conflictual model*, the imbalance that is caused by structural dysfunctions requires rapid change to bring about a state of equilibrium. Sometimes the changes can be made without violence and
sometimes, when certain conditions are 'right', violence is the only way to accomplish the necessary changes.

Unfortunately, "a dysfunctional society can similarly experience a long-term gradual secular decline until some occurrence, such as defeat in war, suddenly accelerates or intensifies the burdens under which it labors." And "when such an accelerating event occurs the level of dysfunctions will rise dramatically, previous elite effort (if any) to relieve dysfunction will be irrelevant, and revolution will take place" (Johnson, 1964, 13).

Revolutions are violent, seemingly sudden occurrences that can only succeed if the revolutionary movement is able to neutralize a fully professional military force. If confronted with such a professional force that has not been neutralized, revolutions are unlikely to succeed. The role of the state's military institutions are critical to determining its success or failure.

There are several ways that one can neutralize the effects and minimize the role of the military. One can bring about the defeat of the military by an outside force, especially during a war; split the military elites from the rank-in-file, or bring about a split in consensus between the military and government elites over viable actions to be taken towards the revolutionary conspirators. If the non-military elite can bring the military elite into the conflict without the existence of a division, then insurrectionist revolutions are almost impossible.
Most revolutions are aimed at changing the regime, or the entire community. I will not discuss the various types of revolutions but will turn my attention to the form that has been advocated most often by African American colonized 'revolutionaries: militarized mass insurrection. This type of revolutionary disposition, as advocated here in America, calls for direct confrontation with an organized professional military that has not been neutralized.

Many *mislabeled* African American revolutionaries have periodically called for a mass militarized revolution, attempting to use foreign doctrines to explain our conditions, or to develop revolutionary strategies. Appealing to past historical examples, i.e., rebellions by revolutionary leaders during the formative years (slavery), they indirectly suggest that it is possible again. They correctly maintain, functionally speaking, that many of America's integrated subinstitutions have not worked beneficially for the African American community; but then proceed to analyze the nature of our condition in terms using foreign circumstances, to advocate for violent change of this society. Those who argue for a violent revolution, using foreign examples or examples of African American rebellions, fail to realize that the African American community is an internal colony without many willing supporters outside of its community. They fail to realize that because America is a colonial society, first and foremost, those Euroamericans whom they think will join in a class generated struggle are not willing to do so.
Why should sufficient numbers of Euroamericans, who receive their material and psychological support from a system that is essentially anti-African American, be willing to struggle for human liberation and evolution? Upon critical reflection, it is clear that the Euroamerican community historically has not been willing to struggle for our liberation or the evolution of humanity, except on terms of their own making. They are willing to see change, but not rapid change that will drastically change the relationship between them and other non-Euroamericans. They enmass support the evolutionary model and are in violent opposition to the basic imperatives of the conflictual model.

The major tensions between African and Euroamericans is not exclusively economic, but rather, primarily social. The substructure that has historically prevented oppressed people here in America, regardless of race or ethnicity, from developing a united front against imperialism has been racism not classism. The social tensions between African and Euroamericans have prevented class and gender unification, e.g., the union movement, the feminist movement and, the anti-war movements. As such, African American revolutionary thinkers need to develop political, cultural and economic strategies, and programs that will attack America's cultural matrix, such that we can change America's image of itself and break down the social antagonisms that prevent human cooperation.
While I have demanded that we seek reparations, the reader might confuse this demand with seeking material solutions, which is seemingly a contradiction in my argument: it is not. My primary concern with reparations, aside from the definite economic advantages that will accrue from them, is political. By restructuring the economic system in this country, African Americans can once again place politics in charge of economics. But since America is a colonial society, by attacking her materialist substructure and challenging her material idolatry, African Americans can create immeasurable revolutionary potential, and correct our political immaturity.

America’s economic institutions currently lead her politics. If African Americans want to reverse this imbalance, and once again restore politics to its leadership position, we must challenge dominant American subinstitutions. Only then, will humanity continue to evolve.

Revolution: An Arendtian Critique

As African Americans search for an understanding of revolution, I think that we would be remiss if we did not mention the contribution of Hannah Arendt. Her analysis of traditional western revolutionary history shows both the promises and the pitfalls of defining revolution for African Americans. Most importantly, Arendt’s study clearly demonstrates that in oppressive situations, certain social factors have played a crucial role in driving a people to revolutionary behavior. It is my position that these same
factors exist in colonial America to some degree, and as such, can once again become crucial factors in driving human growth forward.

The factors that she documents offer African American revolutionary nationalists some valuable prescriptive lessons.

One of the major themes in her thesis is the use of violence. According to her, violence must be directly connected to an organized revolutionary struggle if it is to be useful in creating a revolutionary atmosphere. More importantly, the use of violence must be connected to a movement that is current, and whose goals are not distant. I am not in total agreement with this view of revolutionary violence, in that successful revolutions are often drawn out struggles. But, I do agree that if violence is not directly connected to an organized revolutionary movement, it easily becomes counter-revolutionary and useless. Sporadic, or misdirected violence, then becomes a tool to be used by the colonial government in its perpetual ideological warfare against a people struggling for liberation.

**Revolutionary violence must be used in connection with an organized movement that is seeking freedom.** Better yet, violence must be used to create and establish an atmosphere where freedom can exist. Where the bottom becomes the top, or as described by her, "the low and the poor, all those who had always lived in darkness and subjection to whatever powers there were, should rise and become the supreme sovereigns of the land
Violence, as an option, is only useful if it is designed to restructure society and not simply used to get revenge.

This bring us to another critical element of her analysis; the notion of necessity. Modern revolutions that are currently being fought in many Third World countries, e.g., Mexico, El Salvador, are struggles to improve the impoverished environments of the people and to eliminate their necessitous conditions. Novelty (a new beginning), is interconnected and is central to the revolutionary concept of necessity.

Necessity was historically, and currently is, the attraction that draws various groups (intellectuals, workers, students), to the revolutionary cause. Necessity is the alluring factor that sweeps everyone into the perpetual motion of revolutionary behavior, and seemingly takes people and nations where it wants them to go. Since the French revolution, necessity has been the driving force that has changed forever the definition of revolution. The notion of poverty would now displace freedom as the object of revolution, and the happiness of the people was/is now defined in biological terms. The concept of freedom had given way to the physical needs of the people. The concepts of poverty, necessity and compassion united to defeat the original notion of freedom during the French revolution; and it still is at the heart of most revolutions fought by Third World people today. Thus, the French revolution was important because it demonstrated that humanity could
direct their own lives and not be victimized by nature, or oppressive political 
regimes.

The social question still calls many contemporary revolutionaries into 
action. The social question was the force that drove the decolonization 
struggles on the continent of Africa, throughout South America; the 
Caribbean, on the island of Cuba, and mobilized the African American 
revolutionaries of the 1960s. It still continues to stir revolutionary 
sentiments among the African American colonized masses. African 
Americans are still demanding to be in charge of their own lives. They are 
still demanding self-determination in the fullest sense of the word.

African American revolutionaries, like their counterparts throughout 
the Third World, argue correctly that the social conditions that our people are 
suffering from, are not the result of our own inabilities, i.e., internal control 
factors, or the result of nature, but rather, the result of Euroamerican 
structural and personal exploitation, i.e., external control factors. It was Marx 
who would first associate the notion of poverty, i.e., the social question, with 
politics. Marx was one of a few to associate poverty and politics with the 
concept of exploitation, thereby, creating in the minds of the poor, "that 
poverty itself is a political, not a natural phenomenon, the result of violence 
rather than of scarcity" (Arendt, 63). With this shift in understanding, 
revolutions would now become less associated with the liberation of men 
from tyranny and the oppression of other men, and become associated with
the notion of abundance. And unfortunately, now economic consideration would determine the political course of nations in Europe. This shift would now replace politics as the driving force of social arrangements with economics.

While it is admitted that poverty and compassion have been prime motivators for revolution, just eliminating poverty will not assure the permanence of the goals of the revolution, nor bring about the desired ends for which humanity often finds itself longing. While compassion was, and is, essential in creating a union of people, and then into motivating them into revolutionary behavior, i.e., nationalists politics, it is not enough to carry a revolution through the difficult times of nation building. Politics must again be at the forefront of human evolutionary change. Political ideology, human evolution, and revolutionary change can only mesh when a country installs a constitution.

The success of the liberation struggle may well depend on the ability of the revolutionary nationalists to attract the intellectual class to the struggle such that they engage in the difficult task of creating a constitution, as determined by the particular conditions here in colonial America. This is their most crucial task; and as such, we see that the development of an intellectual cadre is essential to our cause.

While this is the desired goal of revolution, constitution building is the most difficult stage. It is not glamorous in the revolutionary sense; that is,
violence is not associated with this phase. Historically it has proven to be the most dangerous stage. It is dangerous because those who are attempting to make a constitution are doing so without the power or authority of the people.

This can and must be eliminated in our particular struggle. African Americans can make this a safer and more decentralized process if we renew our historical convention movement (see chapter 9 this document). Given the complexities of our condition, and based on our unique history, constitution making still offers African American revolutionary nationalists some problems as noted by Arendt.

The greatest problem facing revolutionary African Americans is "how to find a form of government which will put the law above man" (Arendt, 83). How do African Americans construct a new society that does not give preference to race, class or gender? How do they reconstruct America such that every citizen can enjoy the greatness of America and put into practice what Euroamerica holds in mythology, i.e., substantive or social democracy? What type of society will African Americans create that will assist in the evolution of humanity?

Revolution, although a seemingly universal occurrence, still remains tied to the social circumstances that give rise to it and, therefore, any attempt on the part of revolutionaries, to incorporate foreign ideas and methodologies into their own particular revolutionary condition, without
alterations, would ultimately lead to failure. This does not mean that we
African Americans cannot learn from others; but, we must make sure that
our analysis is based on an accurate reading of the historical and current
conditions that are unique to us, as a colonized people in the American
context.

World Revolution and the Search for An African American Paradigm

During the 1950s and 1960s, the world witnessed colony after colony
choosing violent social revolution as the method to dissolve the chains that
held them imprisoned inside the world of colonialism. Throughout the
Third World, revolutions and counter-revolutions became a common
occurrence, so much so that the threat of revolution, in the industrial
imperialist world, became just as effective as the event itself in forcing
concessions from the ruling elites.

In the United States, colonized African Americans have used the threat
of revolution as a means of gaining marginal concessions from Euroamerica.
As a result of what I consider to be an over usage, the threat of revolution has
become a cheap political tactic. It no longer carries the same threat, nor does
revolution mean what it formerly meant during classical times. African
Americans must assist, or force America to rediscover its revolutionary past.
Cruse's analysis encompasses the peculiar circumstances that surround the
African American condition and thus lays out the unique structure of a
revolutionary movement to achieve the desired ends that the African
American community is seeking. What separates Cruse's thesis from many others is his critique of American culture and how it alone will influence our revolutionary movement by incorporating the various dominant ideologies that impact on our human evolution, i.e., Afrocentricism, capitalism, cultural nationalism. According to Cruse, the U. S. is not divided along strictly class lines as traditional Marxists believed, but rather is a society ruled by competing ethnic groups. For him, revolutionary change is only possible in the commercial institutions that manufacture and promote America's culture. The object of Cruse's revolutionary theory is the creation of a democratic culturally pluralistic society (Cruse, 1968; Young, 1987).

Central to his unique form of revolutionary cultural nationalism is the distinction made between evolutionary versus revolutionary social change. According to his thesis, evolutionary change is noted by the absence of a protracted revolutionary program aimed at changing the economic structure of this society, whereas, revolutionary change entails having a long term program that will end in totally restructuring America. More importantly, revolutionary change is dependent upon African Americans developing various institutions that will change the way that America views itself, and will assist in sustaining developmental and historical continuity within the African American community.

Thus, as African Americans seek inclusion into the American mainstream without seeking fundamental structural changes within and
outside their own communities, their liberation movements will continue to stagnated. Their mislabeled rebellions can only be converted into revolutionary movements if they seek to change completely the political economy of America, and to change the way that they interact among themselves.

They have to change the cultural basis of all of their institutions, the way that they see themselves, and develop a political and intellectual cadre that will struggle to win the second revolution. That is, they have to seek changes intracommunally that will result in their personal evolution into Afrocentric Africans. This transformation is essential to the success of the decolonization struggle.

The mislabeled revolutionary movements of the African American community, that is, those reformist movements that were called revolutionary by the white-liberals, and reactionary militant elements in the African American nation, up until very recent times, were designed to achieve inclusion into the American mainstream without seriously challenging the basic capitalist and Eurocentric cultural structures of this nation. According to Cruse's analysis (1968), this purposeful mislabeling is,

unwittingly adding fuel to the flames of racial crisis which can lead to more racial chaos instead of racial solutions because such people are not helping to explain exactly what the Negro is up against in his struggle to win equality in America (99).
The mislabeled 'revolutionary' movements of the 1950s and 1960s were reformist in their orientation, because they sought racial equality through integration, did not seek to end the capitalist system and had an interracial leadership. * In their essence, they simply sought to redistribute America's wealth without altering the imbalance between America's material wealth and their political impoverishment.

The reformism of the 1960s and 1970s movements, is confirmed by research done after the era of rioting, 1968-72. They discovered that the rioters were not revolutionary oriented, but were simply seeking reformist goals, such as better jobs, education, equal opportunity, fair housing. While the necessity question (social question) was at the forefront of their demands, they did not advocate changing the basic structure of the system, that is, from

---

* For an additional argument on this point See Julius Lester *Revolutionary Notes*, Richard W, Baron, N.Y.,1969. Lester maintained that it was the reformist orientation by some of our mislabeled revolutionary groups that caused divisions between them and fragmented their combined revolutionary thrust. Lester goes on to say that this reformists orientation as evident by the revolutionary doctrine of the militant Black Panthers Party of the 1960s; and eventually would led some groups to openly challenge and reject them. One such group was SNCC. SNCC voted not to join the Panthers because "it was thought that the Panthers program was more reformist than revolutionary," (144).

If one looks at the ten point program of the Panther Party, it is not hard to come to that conclusion. They, [the Black Panthers and many other African American 1960s revolutionaries], were not interested in revolutionary change per se but primarily interested in extending constitutional liberties to African Americans, while contradicting themselves by espousing traditional communist doctrines. And according to Arendt, this reformist restoration had a long historical tradition in Western social behavior.
capitalism to democratic socialism, or, to an African socialist system. Although these researchers did not use reformist language to describe the goals of the rioters, this position clearly emanates from their conclusions.

What they found was that these young militants only wanted an opportunity to succeed in the existing social order. What they wanted was reformism. According to Williams (1970), "this suggests that young militants would be very responsive to any changes that would expand the opportunity structure for them and reduce the amount of discrimination and exploitation they faced"(88). In other words, they want[ed] reform, not revolution. Even the Panthers, and other 'revolutionaries' of the 1960s, were not anti-capitalist, they simply wanted to redistribute the wealth of America. While they did on occasions advocate the ideologies of Mao and Marx, they neither understood nor had the capacity to implement their doctrines.

I have argued throughout this discussion that African Americans suffer from an uncritical-consciousness which has hampered their political thrust. African American uncritical-consciousness manifests itself in all segments of our society, and has seriously crippled the African American political leadership (the Negro-bourgeois nationalist and our intellectual class). It is my contention that the African American social movements aimed at bringing about cultural revolution have been limited by the desire on the part of this leadership to become integrated into the American society.
and, therefore, our movements have become reformist and not revolutionary.

Consequently, bourgeois leadership has been unable to develop revolutionary ideas to meet the political demands of the masses or to change the consequences of their narrowly defined interracial social objectives (Cruse, 1968; Williams, 1987; Madhubuti, 1976; Bell, 1987, 1992; King, 1990). They have ignored the fact that Euroamerica is not willing to admit African Americans into the white labor-capital alliance or to establish democratic cultural pluralism to the extent that it threatens or changes the commercialization of our current and soon to be developed culture.

While the present and past programs of the Negro leadership have been oriented towards integration, where does this leave our movement? Lost, without an answer to the American dilemma. Not only is the present Negro leadership lost without answers, but Euroamerica is also lost. Euroamericans are also seeking answers to the many questions surrounding their national identity; and African Americans currently do not have any solutions to the cultural crisis facing this nation. We are the only community that has a reasonable chance to formulate an answer to this crisis in general, or the African American nationalists' coalition in particular.

African Americans are the only group that has been consistently denied a sustained opportunity to be incorporated into the mainstream of this society. More importantly, they, as a community, have not been allowed,
even on a limited basis, to become a contributing part of this society without
the loss of their personal and group identity. In order for African Americans,
on an individual level, to become included into America, those who have
done so, for the most part, have had to sacrifice important portions of their
identity. African Americans can only accomplish this if we create an
alternative national culture. African Americans must develop a pronounced
form of cultural nationalism if they wish to combat the cultural deficiency
that confronts America.

This means that we have to come up with novel ideas concerning the
nature of this society. "The key to the question of "unique ideas" is lost in the
confusion of ideas, or better, the lack of positive ideas, of what America is as a
nation and the true nature of the Negroes' intrinsic relationship to the
American reality" (Cruse, 109). America is not the white Anglo-Saxon society
that the Euroamerican community continues to profess; America is a mulatto
country. Until we African Americans engage in a revolutionary form of
cultural nationalist behavior that will establish democratic cultural
pluralism, and redirect the monies misappropriated from America's cultural
production, then America will remain confused and we will remain
impoverished and politically impotent.

The African American Cultural Revolution

Euroamerica is more than a society that refuses to accept its
multiculturalism. America "is also the most extensively industrialized
capitalist nation in the world, and also wants desperately to remain capitalistic in order to defend its "free" institutions by keeping Negroes excluded (white labor is not going to overthrow it" (Cruse, 110). Hence, if we are to speak of revolution in the African American context, it must mean "a reinterpretation of the meaning of social revolution for our times" (Cruse, 107).

As we look across the American contemporary landscape, we will discover that this is the area that is currently being Africanized the most. The youth of this society, especially the males, are undergoing an African-Americanization process initiated by African American Males. According to Cornel West (1994), "this process results in white youth—imitating and emulating black male styles of walking, talking, dressing, and gesticulating in relation to others" (West, 127). In essence, the American culture, in its major commercial thrust, is African American and urban.

What has to take place now, is for the African American to develop a national culture based in neo-traditional African culturalism, i.e., a national culture, to be used as a revolutionary cultural nationalism to counter-Euroamerican mummified (classical European) cultural hegemony.

I have repeatedly maintained that African Americans are a colonized people and, in this section, addressed the need for America to come to realize its multiculturalism and its colonial nature. Cruse understood this and saw that the overthrowing of this "semi-colonial yoke" (111), offered the African
American people a viable opportunity to redefine revolution and to reconstruct this society.

As African Americans strive to reconstruct America and to create humanistic institutions that negate the Euroamerican image of America and to force an acceptance of her multiculturalism, African Americans will be compelled to reveal the cultural banality, decadence and debasement of Euroamerican culture, while stopping the appropriation of our contribution to this society (Cruse, 1968; Fanon, 1963; AkBar, 1980).

Cruse and Walter Rodney, and other African American social critics, understood the importance of changing the misappropriation of our cultural contributions to America. Cruse and others have argued that this misappropriation has directly contributed to the economic imbalance between African and EuroAmericans. EuroAmerica has used our cultural contributions for its economic enrichment and national development. Rodney (1982) makes the point that,

at a glance, nothing could be less harmful and more entertaining than music, and yet this too is used as a weapon of cultural domination. The American imperialist go so far as to take the folk music, jazz, and soul music of oppressed black people and transform this into American propaganda over the Voice of America beamed at Africa (26).

Cruse (1968) also argues that
the historical truth is that it was the Afro-American cultural ingredient in music, dance and theatrical forms (the three arts in which America has innovated) that has been the basis for
whatever culturally new and unique that has come out of America. Take away the Afro-American tradition of folk-songs, plantation minstrel, spirituals, blues, ragtime, jazz styles, dance forms, and the first Negro theatrical pioneers in musical comedy of the 1890s down or Sissle and Blake of the 1920s, and there would be no jazz industry involving publishing, entertainment, recording; there would have been no Greshwins, Rodgers and Hamerstiens, Cole Porters or Carmichaels or popular song tradition—which is based on the Negro blues idiom (114).

The insight that is expressed by these two scholars is not unique. It a position that is as old as our struggle in this society. DuBois (1990) understood this a century ago and spoke most eloquently on it:

there is no true American music but the wild sweet melodies of the Negro slave; the American fairy tales and folklore are Indian and African, and, all in all, we black men seem the sole oasis of simple faith and reverence in a dusty desert of dollars and smartness (52).

America’s culture has been predicated on racial exclusion designed to glorify Eurocentricism and to either denigrate, marginalize, villainize, or manicheanize the culture of any other non-white section of this society. If African Americans are to achieve their own unique version of revolution, then it will be essential that they nationalize their culture and begin to monopolize on their uniqueness. If revolution has been redefined by societies characterized by economic underdevelopment, then revolution in an industrialized society cannot be defined the same way.
Domestic Colonialism: A Source of Revolutionary contradiction

Cruse was convinced that the African American revolution had to be cultural in its thrust. His belief was based on what he considered to be, [a] contradictions in the revolutionary ideology and desired outcome/goals of the African American 'revolutionary' movements; [b] the geographical and ethnic/racial change in revolution, and [c] the unique circumstances that confronted the African American people.

He attributed these contradictions and confused goals to our semi-colonial status in this society, the anti-nationalist/racial orientation of our intellectuals and political leaders, the pro-capitalist socialization of our contemporary 'revolutionary' cadre/generation, a willingness on the part of our intellectuals to accept monetary rewards/payoffs instead of meaningful changes; and a profound lack of Africanized institutions that would leave a historical legacy of knowledge upon which to base any contemporary revolutionary struggle. According to his thesis, African Americans comprised a unique colonized people because they lived in a highly industrialized, militarized, democratized, racialized and capitalist nation, which would force them to redefine revolution.

Like Cruse, Karenga understood the connection between self-knowledge and self-actualization, or, as Afrocentric psychologists call it, "Self-Extension Thrust." Karenga (1983) said, "thus, to realize themselves, a people must know themselves and produce themselves, and both self-

"There can be no real black revolution in the United States without cultural revolution as a corollary to the scheme of "agencies for social change" (Cruse, 475). What has become clear to many historical and contemporary progressive thinkers is that without the revitalization of the mummified culture of the native [African Americans], successful revolutionary struggle is impossible. Revolutionary struggles are always preceded by a cultural revolution. In fact, there is no such phenomenon as a political, social, economical, or religious revolution separated from a cultural movement.

If one takes the position that African American political impotency stems from their lack of positive Black self-consciousness, then one would have to agree that in order for them to solve this condition, they will have to confront it on a practical and theoretical level at the same time. In other words, it is a problem of theory and practice. It is not enough for African Americans to become engaged in self-actualization without having a theoretical basis for this process. They need a self actualizing theory that will manifest itself in revolutionary behavior. Afrocentricism must be seen as our
comprehensive revolutionary theory. In essence, Afrocentric revolutionary ideology is indispensable to our political struggle (Fanon, 1968, Karenga, 1983; Cruse, 1968; Williams, 1987; Sartre, 1969; Césaire, 1972; Asante, 1990; Ngugi, 1986).

If African Americans are to be successful in their decolonization efforts, then they have to base this revolutionary program on three essential factors. They are, in some configuration, economic, political and cultural reorganization/reculturation/Africanization. As Dr. Karenga (1983) noted, "cultural struggle or revolution is important not only in the preparation of political struggle, but also in the very process of it" (222).

If the African American nation is to engage in revolutionary change, then they must politicize the contemporary revolutionary cultural changes that are occurring within their community, and then force, through mass politicization, the pluralistic promise of equality among culturally different people.

While pluralism has been a reoccurring thematic in American social philosophy, it has never been fully appreciated or tolerated. The only people that enjoy full cultural freedom are "the White Anglo-Saxon group, which has the freedom to deny cultural equality to other ethnic groupings in America" (247). Therefore, cultural revolution for African Americans must be fought on two fronts.
They must fight for the recognition/legitimacy of their culture within the context of the larger society and, then, they must reestablish an authentic neo-traditional culture within their own community.

"It is in the midst of this cultural and historical construction that they will transform themselves "from a vaguely distinct and unconscious (ethnic nationality) into a clearly defined self-conscious historical personality, proud of its past, challenged by its present and inspired by the possibilities of its future" (Karenga, 226). This is the challenge, the possibility that awaits the African American community. They can change themselves and the American nation. To have a comprehensive cultural phase to our revolutionary struggle African Americans must seek to objectify and subjectify it simultaneously.

The Second Revolution: Changing African American Civil Society

Carl Boggs reminds us that Antonio Gramsci understood that along with a revolution there needed to be a second and more important pre-revolution. This revolution preceded "the conquest of political power" (Boggs, 1984, vii). What Gramsci argued for and understood, is that there needs to be a reconstruction of civil society. This pre-revolution (and it is a misnomer to say pre-revolution, in that it must and most often does coincide
with the struggle for political power) needed to permeate the very heart of society, affecting everyone in all segments.

This second revolution makes possible the first. It attempts to challenge the way the state influences the life world of the people, and directly challenges the ideological hegemony of the ruling elites. The essence of this critical struggle is ideology. That is, it utilizes ideology and philosophy, coupled with the contradictions between the present dominant ideology and praxis, to change the way that people think and interact among themselves and towards the state.

The object of this revolution is to bring a new person into being and thus have them conceive of a new meaningful relationship between themselves and the state. By changing the way people see and interact among themselves, one hopes that the result will be an uncompromising evolution in their humanity, such that certain palliative changes are rejected for more meaningful changes.

What I have been arguing for throughout this discussion is the necessity of this second revolution. African American intellectuals, or a dedicated cadre, must struggle to change the way that our people conceive of themselves, and critically address the way that the various substructures of this nation relate to them. By changing the way that they think of themselves, it is my belief that African Americans will not only evolve into a different
people, but refuse anything other than a revolutionary change in their relationship to the state.

The Afrocentric ideology assumes to change the relationship among African Americans, and professes that once it has become the guiding ideology in their lives, African Americans will demand revolutionary change where once reformism was acceptable. I have argued that this second revolution began during the 1960s and is still proceeding uninterrupted today. The ongoing evolutionary stage in this revolutionary period was begun by the development of the Afrocentric paradigm and today is altering the way that African Americans see the world and their place in it.

While it is important that we think of revolution in terms of the political struggle for power, I think that it is more important for African Americans, at this stage in their evolution, to think of making the second revolution successful. This struggle must be waged and it is vitally important, as a precursor to the final revolutionary stage, that we focus our attention here. Thus, it is important that we push for altering the way that Americans, in general, see themselves, by infusing our images into the cultural matrix of this society. If African Americans succeed at this, then they can become a major force in reconstructing not only their own segment of civil society, but American civil society in general.

The revolutionary challenge confronting the Afrocentric scholar, at this critical stage in the revolutionary process, is to wage an ideological war
against Euroamerica for the minds and hearts of African Americans. It is not enough for us to think in narrow terms of changing the relationship between the various substructures of this society and ourselves. It is more important, for African Americans to rethink what it means to be an African American in the context of this society, and what type of society we want to replace this one with.

The second revolution for which we are struggling must challenge every African American to become involved in the democratization and politicization of civil society. We must begin to repoliticize our own society through discussion groups, at the work places, in the churches, schools, and dancehalls. We must revitalize the liberation appetite of our people as it was during the formative years. The ideological struggle of this vital second revolution is essential if the first one is to have any chance of succeeding. The primary goal of the second revolution is to initiate an evolutionary process that culminates in revolution.

**What Revolution Means for African Americans: Conclusion**

Revolution means the development of innovative ideologies that accurately reflect the nature of this society and our role in it. Revolution, in this sense, means the eradication and elimination of ideas that stem from foreign conditions, and the creation of ideologies that will be indigenous to the African American condition. It means that African Americans formulate ideologies that will contribute to the evolutionary progress of humanity.
They can only do this if they begin to adopt a posture that is uniquely innovative and evolutionary.

If racism and classism in combination have led to the alienation and creation of a false consciousness in the minds of our people, and have oppressed us in a unique combined way here in America, then any solution that our revolutionary intellectuals develop must address this combination in unison and not in separation. If we are to have a revolution, then our leadership must address the many contradictions that still persist in our nation/community. We must develop an intellectual class that will take a polycentric multifaceted approach towards a solution. DuBois (1990) said almost a century ago that,

the bright ideals of the past-physical freedom, political power, the training of brains and the training of hands,-all these in turn have waxed and waned, until even the last grows dim and over cast.... To be really true, all these ideals must be melted and welded into one (51).

What revolution means for African Americans is discounting the exclusivity of violence, while shunning the objections of intellectuals and revolutionary theorists that advocate that we do not have a just claim to its usage.

* For a good example of this see Micheal Waltzer "The Obligation of Oppressed Minorities," *Commentary*, May 1970. Walzer argues that as long as "oppression persists, oppressed men and women retain the right, not to destroy the democratic state or to make war against it, but to deny it what they have to give: their loyalty, service, and obedience. Activists on their behalf are free to repeat this refusal and to organize it in the struggle" (79).

Walter rejects the notion of Arendt and others that claim that
Revolution would mean that the African American nation ends its endorsement of integrationalist politics and returns to our traditional nationalist political ideologies and movements. It would call for the politicization of reparations, a redefinition of our rights struggle and our perceptions of ourselves. Thus, it would mean a neo-traditional redefinition of our culture, such that it may serve as our 'classical' or national culture (Karenga, 1980). Revolution ultimately would result in a revolutionary social change whereby our African-Self-Survival Thrust would be symmetrically reflected in this society.

An African American revolutionary movement is not inseparably tied to or anchored in the traditional revolutionary doctrine that demands violence. Our revolutionary movement is still, and must continue to be, institutionally oriented; in part, this means the Africanization of those institutions in our particular community and the continuation of pressure for radical changes in the institutions of this society as they relate to us. Our revolution movement can be non-violent. It can be one which results in a forceful social and institutional abrupt change that will alter the relationship between the American people, if not the whole world.

violence in the face of continued oppression was justifiable when there are institutions open for change and discussion of grievances, then violence is ruled out. I reject his notion on its face and advocate that we have a historical and legitimate right to open resistance. I cannot overlook or ignore the therapeutic benefits of violence in the Fanonian sense; in that, we are also suffering the effects of colonialism.
This does not negate the need for conspiratorial-elite-lead-mass revolutionary behavior. What it argues for is the need to behave in a revolutionary manner that will capitalize on those conditions that avail themselves through spontaneous actions while being engaged in 'protracted' revolutionary behavior. The drastic changes that our continued politicizing will bring about, and the social and political nature of America, will result in the constitutional changes that Arendt demanded.

The primary thrust of our revolutionary movement will be intracommunal and interpersonal but, it will, by the process of national self-actualization, directly challenge the intercommunal structures of this society. The success of our revolutionary behavior and decolonization struggles are by necessity predicated on the premise of African American individuals and nation transforming themselves/itself through a psychological process.

This self-conscious, self-actualization process will result in African American evolution, and eventually, due to the colonial institutional dysfunctionalism of this society, demand that revolutionary institutional changes take place. As African Americans begin to evolve along Afrocentric ideological lines, they will begin to comprehend the inability of various Eurocentric ideologies and institutions to meet their needs and, thus, will become more conscious of what it will take to have a society that is symmetrical.
Thus, the answer to the question posed in the title of this chapter is maybe but not necessarily. Violent revolutions are not necessarily planned, they seem to occur. As a strategy, African American progressive thinkers, and leaders must begin to organize themselves such that, this is planned for but not depended on. Violent revolution will always be an option in a colonial situation (Allen, 1987). But, as African American institutional development takes on a more Afrocentric posture, violent revolution may or may not occupy a center position in our struggle. The violent option will depend on Euroamerica's reaction to our survival-thrust. Therefore, it would only be prudent that its possibility be recognized and accounted for by African Americans as it has been by them.
Cultural-Specific Politics and Self-Consciousness: A Case of Identity

I have argued that African Americans are a colonized people and as such, it is important for them to recognize this fact and, like any other colonized people, it will be necessary for them to undergo a total psychological transformation if they are to engage in a successful decolonization struggle. As with any colonized people who are engaged in a decolonized struggle, African Americans must change the ways that they see themselves and their oppressor. Thus far, African American perceptions of themselves have been determined by those who are in opposition to their survival. Consequently, the identity and personality of African Americans have been distorted and the political consequences of this distortion have been devastating to the survival thrust of African Americans. Lacking an African perspective, one that is reinforced by indigenous institutions, African Americans have engaged in a form of politics that has been detrimental to their own survival: coalition politics based on the philosophy of integration. To correct this, it is imperative that they now reconstruct who they are and begin the vital task of building institutions that will sustain them in their struggle.
I will argue that it is no longer prudent for African Americans to see themselves as individuals, or for them to use Eurocentric psychological constructs such as ego, self, I, as terms to describe their being. It is now necessary for them to see themselves as a collective such that they can begin to engage in a collective form of politics based on race-specificity. I will also argue that African Americans have engaged in race-specific politics in the past but, that this racialized politics was not anchored in an appropriate consciousness which has led to our powerless condition. I believe that all that African Americans need to do is to change their perspectives of themselves and for them to develop a political philosophy based on this new identity construction. Once they have begun to change their psychological orientation, and begin to realize that they are uniquely different from Euroamericans, it is my belief that African Americans will then engage in a politics of decolonization based on conscious African principles.

Thus, we begin our inquiry here into the role that culture must play in the formation of a people's individual or national identity and how it impacts on revolutionary politics. Identity has become a central focus of the debate on social reconstruction and ethnonationalism, i.e., group-specific politics. According to the current debate, group-specific politics goes beyond the limited and often confused boundaries established by contemporary political pluralists; and consequently, identity has become culturally specific. In very simplistic terms, while the pluralist proponents recognize that ethnic
salience will likely remain important in determining political behavior, they maintain that each ethnic group will abandon their particularistic interests and pursue policies for the general good. They intend to disprove the argument that a national democratic polity cannot be created in a society that is not ethnically homogeneous (Mill, 1975). They argue that such a polity can be achieved if all ethnic groups are allowed to engage in the ruling of society without denying their own cultural identity and uniqueness. They wish to eliminate the politics of Eurocentric cultural hegemony and replace it with a multicultural democracy.

Thus, cultural distinctiveness, which challenges the continuation of "Americanized" pluralism that characterized the interracialism of the 1930s through the 1960s civil rights era, is an attempt the replace the cultural distinctiveness of the ruling hierarchy and impose a multicultural coalition on the decision making process. What is being called for now, by group-specific proponents, is a cultural politics based on intragroup cultural values that are intragroup defined, absent outside influence or interpretation (Cruse, 1967, 1968; Karenga, 1983; Young, 1990; DuBois, 1903; Williams, 1987; Mahubuti, 1978).

While not calling cultural-specific politics what it truly is, these proponents are seeking cultural nationalist politics. The reality is the same, only the language has changed (Young, 1990). The result will be a multicultural society ruled by a truly multicultural coalition. Group-specific
politics is the political expression of America's current and rapidly growing multicultural society. If America is to become a more egalitarian and progressive society, then a multicultural democracy is a correct step in that direction.

If one takes the position that cultural specific politics is necessary for African American liberation, then one would also have to accept that what has been absent from African America's ethnic politics thus far has been a clear understanding of who they are. While it is admitted that African Americans have had their traditional cultural identity virtually destroyed, no one as yet has been willing, on a sustained basis, to outline the causes for this continued deculturation process. Having identified the colonial status of the African American people as the cause in this chapter, I will lay out the specifics of the process of decolonizing the mind.

Self-consciousness is more than a philosophical issue. It is a cultural matter. Therefore, culture and consciousness are interwoven since humans are primarily cultural beings. Therefore, consciousness is a derivative product of people actualizing themselves. That is, it is a product of a people's ethos. Ethos is defined "as a sum of characteristics and achievements of a people which define and distinguish it from others and give it collective self-consciousness and identities" (Karenga, 1983, 212). Because of their colonial condition, African Americans suffer from a double-consciousness or self-fragmentation.
Self-fragmentation was first discussed and confronted by DuBois who called this condition double-consciousness. According to DuBois, the African American condition of double-consciousness was the result of them living in a society that failed to recognize them as being culturally different and human. Consequently, the identity of African Americans became bifurcated. One side African, and the other not quite American; i.e., as being an inferior American. This "twoness" [DuBois' term] entails two warring identities, unreconcilable and struggling, inside the bodies of African Americans, whose dogged strength alone kept them from being torn apart. Fragmented consciousness is, therefore, derivative. It is the product of twin forces impacting on the African American psyche. One force attempting to impose foreign values on their African identity, and the other attempting to remain culturally and humanly different.

Self alienation as used here means "estrangement and separation of humans from all or anything through which they can realize themselves, i.e., to know and produce themselves" (Karenga, 216). The African American identity has been concealed by four competing and overlapping social forces here in America: race, class, sex and colonialism. Colonialism, for me, is the base upon which the other three are built.

For our analysis, we take his third cause of false self-consciousness under discussion: ideological deficiency. What the African American people must do, and this is a primary task for its intellectual class, is to create a
proactive ideology that will challenge the hegemonic ideologies of the dominant society. As Karenga (1983) states, "one does not have to be a Marxist to concede that "the ideas of the dominant ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas, i.e., the class that is ruling material forces of society, is at time its ruling intellectual force" (220). As we have argued, Afrocentricism is the only philosophy that assumes to correct the cultural, psychological and political deficiencies of the African American people by placing them inside the correct historical continuum.

Through the attainment of a culturally specific philosophy (Kawaida, Afrocentricism, Weusi) the African American nation will come to know, actualize and develop national consciousness. African Americans can then engage in a politics of liberation, based on the particularities of its own historical struggles. By doing so, African Americans can "transform themselves "from a vaguely distinct and unconscious (ethnic nationality) into a clearly defined self-conscious historical personality proud of its past, challenged by its present and inspired by the possibilities of its future" (Karenga, 226).

Colonialism, the Destruction of Indigenous Culture and Liberation

American internal colonialism has destroyed all of the African American traditional cultural institutions that could facilitate national regeneration and self actualization. No traditional institution has been allowed to manifest a healthy pre-colonial culture uncontested. When
African Americans have developed such institutions, unfortunately and expectably, they were mummified, i.e., traditional customs, arts, dress, or, dance. When these institutions were resurrected from the dead, they have been denigrated, or marginalized by the Euroamerican oppressive class-race. African American cultural institutions have never been allowed to be associated in parity with those of the colonizers. They have always been seen as subcultural institutions.

During the colonial situation, the culture of the colonized is allowed and encouraged to die and become frozen in time. It is forced to become a relic of the past, and only used to forestall national liberation. Thus culture and personality have been severed. African Americans no longer live in harmony with their culture; they no longer reflect a harmonious cultural, personality symmetry. As such, they too often reflect anti-self behavior that is necessitated by the social matrix that is caused by their colonial domination.

Being colonized, they too suffer from subjugated identities and personalities. They have been denied individual identities, i.e., being thrown together into the dominated category of the 'other,' or asked to break out of this construction at the expense of being like them. In any circumstance, the African American personality/identity has become lost in the social construction of oppression.

It is necessary for African Americans to reconstruct and recreate their pre-colonization identities in order that they contribute to the evolution of
themselves and humanity. So lost has their former self become, that many now ask "is there such a thing as a collective or individual African American personality/identity?"

Weusi: The Collective Black Mind: The Basis for a National African Culture

The recovery of colonized peoples identities has been at the forefront of all decolonization struggles. For African Americans, this recovery project has been aggressively pursued since the 1960s. While great strides have been made towards freeing the African American identity from the manichean world of domestic colonialism, Afrocentric social scientists have not gone far enough towards an explanation, or towards identifying the type of culture that has imprisoned our identity in particularistic terms.

I have suggested that it is necessary to rediscover/recover our identity, in order to enter the 'revolutionary' politics that Cruse and Young advocated (Cruse, 1968; Young, 1990). If this is to come to fruition, then the recovery project that Afrocentric scholars in the cultural sciences are conducting is vital. Having said this, it is now time to discuss briefly the concept of the Black personality within the contexts of the collective i.e., the collective Black mind or Weusi.

Robert L. Williams, asked a very pertinent question; "is there such a phenomenon as a Black personality?" Williams answer is affirmative and argues that one could not separate the black personality from the cultural
struggle of the Africans in this society. He continues by defining the African American personality.

The black personality is defined as a collective mentality, mind, or consciousness arising from the struggles—not suffering—of black people in the diaspora. As such, the black personality is an all-encompassing construct that is significantly and inseparably linked to black culture. Indeed it is born and rooted in the struggles of black people, and develops according to the extent to which the individual participates in and earns his/her Black identity through the Black struggle. For these reasons, our personality construct is called WEUSI, a Swahili word meaning "the collective Black Mind," (Williams, 55).

Black personality, is not dependent on the color of the skin. "The terms black and black perspective pertains here not to color of the skin but to [a] the state of mind of the researcher" (Williams, 55). Based on the definition just given, we can conclude then that the African personality is transformational and progressional. Black personality, therefore, is dependent on the extent to which a person engages in the struggle for African American survival. The African American personality is a collective construct and not an individual of isolated entity. According to Williams, "when I speak of the African or Black personality there is an insistence upon interdependence, ... and on regarding ... as an integral part of a collective identity" (Williams, 97). This is why the concept of weusi is so importance to our political struggle.

Weusi, which will now be used instead of the individualistic concept of "personality," "ego," "self," "me," and "Negritude;" literally means
"collective Blackness" in English. It is the infrastructure for the development of the CB [collective blackness] Network, which is the base upon which the Collective Black Nation [CBN] will be built. Thus, "WEUSI theory is a nation-building philosophy and one that would penetrate the daily lives of all Black people--and at all levels of the socio-economic stratum" (Williams, 102). Weusi is a proactive goal oriented theory that has the harmonious unification of all Africans as its final goal. Given that, as a philosophy, weusi seeks to establish a national culture based on an Afrocentric philosophy.

An African American collective identity will serve as the basis for a collective nation-building network, predicated on the concepts of 'oneness,' collective responsibility, cooperation, harmony with nature and fellow man, unified through the 'naturalness' of all Africans/Americans for the survival of the group/tribe. What will be the political benefit of this identity construct is the willingness of African Americans to engage in and support an all African American political party. A Black political party that advocates a form of politics and a political agenda based in Afrocentric collective consciousness rooted in genetic, spiritual, cultural, and psychological Blackness. Because Blackness "is the first and most distinctive Afrotypic feature of the WEUSI" (Williams, 103).

What is needed is a national Africanizing movement as in other former colonized African nations. Our people must be taught to accept their Africanness just as they have been historically taught to disrespect all things
about their African selves. One must remember that African Americans have undergone a deculturalization, dehumanization process longer than any other colonized people in the world and, therefore, a recovery project, without a recognition of this fact, and without allowances made for correcting this mishap, will fall short of the necessary expectations.

Such a development can only result in the rise of our collective self-esteem. A healthy concept of our identity based on collectiveness can only result in solidifying our people and enhancing the possibility of collective action. The questions that have to be answered are have African Americans unconsciously acted in a collective way based on feelings of identity in traditional and non-traditional ways? And is race-specific politics important in colonial decolonization struggles? Before we embark on this crucial aspect of our discussion, we should first discuss the role that African American psychologists can, and must, play in reconstructing this neo-traditional African (Americanized) identity.

The Role of Black Psychologists and African American Liberation

The role of the Black/Afrocentric psychologists in the current liberation struggle is one that needs to be addressed. There is a direct connection between psychology and politics. In fact, many in both disciplines agree that there is a connection between group political behavior and individual psychology. According to Kallen (1923),

Whether they will borrow their psychological armament from behaviorism
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or a more sentimental type of psychological apparatus is not important. What is important is that they can not formulate a variant conception of political society without at the same time grounding it upon a variant definition of human nature whose variant trait is established in the special group interest to be advanced, defended and vindicated. So, then, if political science is not psychology, what is it (203).

Political theorists since Plato and Aristotle have understood and connected psychology and politics. It was Aristotle who said that man was a political animal and, since then, political scientists have sought to explain exactly what that connection is. Early political theorists like Machiavelli and Rousseau, in some way or another, have connected the psychology of mankind to political science. Merriam argued that social psychology held great promise in understanding the political behavior of groups in society. According to Merriams (1924),

it is evident that the relation between political problems and those of social psychology is very intimate, and that the maturity of social psychology contains great promise for the students of what may be termed political psychology (481).

The relationships between people are not restricted to individual relationships. A greater part of one's life involves the interaction between the individual and society as a group. If Afrocentric political scientists want to understand the political behavior of African Americans, they will have to study/understand the individual and society.
To study one without studying the other will only lead to erroneous conclusions and false assumptions (Merriam, 1924).

Afrocentric psychologists have unraveled the relationship between colonially oppressive societies and the psychology of colonized people. Thanks to the work of scholars such as Fanon, we now understand the relationship between psychology and political behavior, especially under oppressive colonials conditions. It is imperative that we Afrocentric political scientists utilize their findings to construct a more nurturing political environment and to prescribe tactics that will facilitate the emancipation of African Americans.

* See Alexander Thomas, M.D. and Samuel Sillen, M.D., Racism and Psychiatry, Brunner Mazel Publishers, N.Y., 1972. Sillen said "in order to judge what is healthy or morbid in an individual's psychological functioning, one must be aware of what is appropriate and effective behavior within his specific cultural milieu [italics mine]" (Sillen, 63. Sillen continues on to note that too often many Eurocentric psychiatric clinics tend to "shy away from inquiries into the cultural background of the patients" (63).

** My point is taken from Robert Lanes discussion in his book Political Man, in particular from his chapter entitled, "The Study of Political personality." What influenced me most in this chapter was his ideas on the role that organizations and culture play in the formation of political personality. Lane argues that, "the definition of political personality includes the attribute "organized," implying some interrelation among the constituent elements, such that a change in one, say, a growing need for social approval, would modify other elements, perhaps leading to a decrease willingness to defy authority, (Lane, 1972, pg., 6).

Lane maintains that political personality is interconnected with culture, such that at times it becomes indistinguishable from it. He argues that " personality is sometimes said to be the subjective side of
African American psychologists are currently being called upon to contribute to our cultural and group specificity claims. We now call on them to create an accurate profile of the African American personality that has been distorted by this oppressive colonial environment. What we are now demanding from our Afrocentric psychologists is assistance in our identity recovery and reconstruction project.

Where once we asked that our Black psychologists defend our humanness, we now ask them to arm us with psychological data to substantiate our claims for political inclusion, based on our uniqueness as humans. We now ask them to provide us political scientists with an accurate profile of the African American, so that, we can conceptualize and theorize on an appropriate body politics for survival as unique people. We now ask them to become aware that they have a substantial role in our liberation.

The African American nation must, even if flirting with certain dangers, recover its identity and deconstruct the negative identities that

culture (lane, pg., 7).

This is also my point. As an organized racial group that has been subjected to oppressive and alienating cultural forces, the African American political personality has been structured, at an early age, in such a way that they have become accustomed to practicing a form of politics that is antithetical to their individual and group survival. African Americans, as a group, have been socialized to believe that they are inferior, and that their survival is dependent on them engaging in the political process as a minority group through coalition politics without questioning the bases of the electoral system.

The Eurocentric disciplines of the social sciences, especially psychology, have assisted in formulating an identity of the African American 'normal' person that correspond to the survival thrust of Euroamericans and to the national detriment of Africans (Americanized).
colonialism has imposed on us. We can only do this if we move beyond the misinterpretation and distortions of many Eurocentric psychologists. As dangerous as this sounds, and for all of the potential dangers inherent in what I am calling for, some group must be willing to say, fully aware that this identity is only temporal, that this is who we are. I say this, fully cognizant that all identities are fluid and not fixed. To attempt to construct a national identity is dangerous, but for an identity less people, it is necessary.

For Afrocentric political scientists, this is critically important and has considerable political implications. If one is to understand African American political behavior, it is crucial that Afrocentric political scientists have adequate psychological measurements and theoretical frameworks to gather such information that is based in the cultural context of the African American people, not the Euroamericans.*

*As I have said, this is a dangerous undertaking, in that the creation of normalcy might open itself up to abuse and 'conservative'-reactionary narrowness. Then again, in some respects, this might lead to a modern day version of historical nationalist mysticism, which seeks to glorify our existence in the name of unity. While we need to correct the distortions concerning our psychological being, we must remain critical of our new assertions. We can not lapse into the same forms of biogenetic/biopsychology that does not accurately reflect who we are.

The idea of 'normalcy' itself becomes an abusive process that marginalizes many in the name of political harmony and expediency; but, I feel, that during the nascent stages of our redevelopment, it is, essential that some groups, say 'this is who we are,' it is also equally important that this normalization does not become essentialist. I would add, that among those of us who fear the necessity of being narrowly exclusive, make it known that this exclusionary policy is temporal.
Euroamerican Cosmology and The White Supremacy Survival Thrust

Eurocentric psychology is rooted in a normative base that has been very harmful to African Americans. Eurocentric psychology is based on norms that correspond to the Eurocentric cosmology, i.e., worldview. Consequently, what is expressed as normal psychological behavior is based on this narrow construction.

At the core of European/Euroamerican worldview, and therefore, its psychology, is "the guiding principles of "control over nature" and [b] "survival of the fittest" (Baldwin, 145). "The extreme concern, if not obsession, with uniqueness, difference and individuality are directly related to the way in which European peoples perceive and understand the universe, i.e., their conscious awareness of their own consciousness" (Nobles, 1976, 24). To understand the sense of psychological misorientation that the African American nation is now displaying, a behavior that according to Baldwin is survival threatening, one has to understand the culture in which they are living.

There is a distinct difference between the Euroamerican and the African American cultures. Baldwin (1985) maintains that there are fundamental differences that are in opposition to each other, and because of the technological [weapon] superiority, wealth and social construction, the Euroamerican cosmology is now the dominant worldview.

Cosmology is defined as the distinctive way in which a people perceive
reality and conceptualize their ontology and cultural definitions. A people's "cosmology then defines the particular 'survival thrust' of a racial-cultural group to which it is indigenous" (Baldwin, 216).

EuroAmerican Social Psychology as a Source of African American Alienation

African Americans live in a world that has attempted to render them invisible, compels them to compromise themselves in order to survive, forces them to adapt themselves to an alien culture that does not reflect their natural self and display various forms of anti-self behaviorism in the name of conformity. Fanon described this feeling of being forced to exist in a culture that does not reflect oneself; the feeling that comes with living in a society that denies one's existence:

A Malagasy is a Malagasy; or, rather, no, not he is a Malagasy but, rather, in an absolute sense he "lives" his Malagasyhood. If he is a Malagasy, it is because the white man has come, and if at a certain stage he has been led to ask himself whether he is indeed a man, it is because his reality as a man has been challenged. In other words, I begin to suffer from not being a white man to the degree that the white man imposes discrimination on me, makes me a colonized native, robs me of all worth, all individuality, tells me that I am a parasite on the world, that I must bring myself as quickly as possible into step with the white world "that I am a brute beast, that my people and I are like a walking dung-heap that disgustingly fertilizes sweet sugar cane and silky cotton, that I have no use in the world (98).
Ralph Ellison describes this feeling of invisibility caused by existing in an asymmetrical society that does not reflect you or your cultural values. His words supports those of Fanon, other Afrocentric psychologists, and colonial theorists. They speak of lost humanity and isolation:

I am an invisible man. No, I am not a spook like those who haunted Edgar Allan Poe; nor am I one of your Hollywood-movie ectoplasms. I am a man of substance, of flesh and bone, fiber and liquids—and I might even be said to possess a mind. I am invisible, understand, simply because people refuse to see me. Like the bodiless heads you see sometimes in circus sideshows, it is as though I have been surrounded by mirrors of hard, distorting glass. When they approach me they see only my surroundings, themselves, or figments of their imagination—indeed, everything and anything except me (3).

To live in a world that is dominated by a people who hold beliefs that are alien to one's correct understanding of self, especially when one does not hold them, or when they are in opposition to one's understanding, is to live in an alien culture and to be subjected to inhuman conditions. Consequently, alien colonial cultural existence is the "source of inhuman conditions that we can trace the roots of mental disorder" (AkBar, 19). Colonialism produces the inhuman behaviors. Therefore, the logical result would be for dominated people either to develop inhuman behavior, i.e. anti-survival behavior, or to attempt to escape from it. As Fanon (1963) said, "the truth is that colonialism in its essence was already taking on the aspect of a fertile purveyor for psychiatric hospitals" (249).
African Psychology: A Key to the Liberation of African American People

After reading the works of colonial and Afrocentric psychologists it becomes clear that an important part of the decolonization struggle is the recovery of the identity of the colonized people. It is clear that the struggle for identity must also be linked to the reconstruction of the culture of the colonized. As colonized people, suffering from many of the same mental disorders that other colonized people suffer, African Americans must rediscover who they are and, then, reconstruct a culture and social structures that are reflective of that recovered identity.

Afrocentric psychologists maintain that African Americans are no different at their core than the Continental, Caribbean, or other Africans; and, it is their belief, that all African people, regardless of their particular environment, share the same basic core beliefs and display the same types of behaviors.

Nobles, Clark, et al, and other Afrocentric psychologists, believe that by utilizing the African cosmology, as the basis for understanding the behavior of African Americans, that social scientists can understand the extent and nature of the mental disorders affecting the African American people. For Afrocentric political scientists, this is important because it could help to explain why some African American people are reluctant while living in an oppressive colonial environment, to engage in nationalist political behavior.
African traditions are a logical place to delve into for the recreation of "healthy" African people. As Baldwin points out,

The sense of oneness of being is reflected in the traditional African belief that man is inextricably tied to his surroundings as a part of the harmonious rhythm of nature. This belief contributes to another basic principle in the African ethos—"survival of the group." Not only is the human being an integral part of his/her ecological setting, but he/she is also harmoniously bound to his/her bio-social community or group. These guiding principles of the African cosmology influences all aspects of African life. The African ethos endorses the value for unity, cooperative effort, collective responsibility and concern for the community among black people (Baldwin, 157).

African Cosmology: The Root of African Psychology

African psychology is rooted in African Cosmology, i.e., world view. It is, therefore, the philosophical basis that connects all African people through the diaspora with other Africans on the continent of Africa. Afrocentric psychologists believe that by anchoring their psychological approach inside an extended cultural orientation, then they, and other cultural scientists, [Semja's term], can better understand and describe the 'normal' (the term used by Afrocentric psychologists) behavior of our people, and to demonstrate how it has become distorted in an oppressive environment. As Nobles (1980) argues,

the Afrocentric theories thus allow us to conceptualize not only the natural condition of Black personality but also the extent to which Black personality has
become estranged from its natural condition under the "unnatural" influence of Western reality structure that dominates American society (Nobles, 24).

Black psychologists also believe that African American behavior is still primarily rooted in, and controlled by biogenetically conscious and unconscious West African behavior patterns. Baldwin (1984) defines culture as follows,

> culture, as we define it herein, refers to operationalization of a people's cosmology or world view in the everyday approach of life of the people. That is culture represents the institutionalized expressions, practices and products of a people's cosmology (179).

In short, a particular worldview forms the basis for the culture of all African people. By revealing this cosmology, we get an insight into what 'natural/normal' [their terms] African American behavior should be. We can discern the necessary deconstructive/reconstructive action that we must take to facilitate their survival thrust.

African cosmology

is governed by the overriding theme or ontological principle of "Human-Nature Unity," or "Oneness with Nature," or "Harmony with Nature". This means that humanity (consciousness) forms an integral-inseparable part of nature..., a "Oneness of Being." There are several supporting themes that emphasize this belief in groupness. There is "sameness and commonalty; cooperativeness, cooperation, collective responsibility and interdependence (Baldwin, 244).
Therefore, the African/African American self is defined within the notion of the collective (Mbiti, 1969; Nobles, 1980; White, 1980; Semja, 1978; etc). Baldwin (1985b) argues that, "the self is inextricably tied to the collective (racial group), because the self derives its significance by virtue of one's immersion into the collective or group reality" (Baldwin, 1985, 154).

An African self (as theoretically constructed by these and other Afrocentric psychologists and cultural scientists), is one that is tied to his/her racial group. It is concerned with the survival of the African self-extension and African survival thrust. An African culture would be one that emphasizes the group (the African concept of the extended self), but does not negate the individual, it is harmonious with nature and is spiritually oriented. Finally, it believes that morality is essential for institutional and individual behavior.

**Political Implications of Collective Identity**

African American powerlessness is the plight of a people who have neither a government or country to protect them. The essential question facing them is whether they will engage in a politics that is nationalistic and selfish, or continue to practice counter survival politics.

For colonized African Americans, the only reasonable way to gain respect, rights and freedom, and therefore, to assume our correct group and individual identity, is to engage in nationalist politics aimed at conferring upon all of our people respect, rights and an opportunity to survive, which
the present system is unable, or willing to do. There is a real danger for any African American who calls for nationalism, because nationalism, as an empowering course of action for African Americans, has been, and still is, denigrated, denounced and denied by Euroamericans and some African Americans. Regardless of the dangers and denouncements, political nationalism is the only responsible form of political behavior for the African American nation.

"When we identify the central problem of black people today as the lack of self-government—that is, a free and independent national black life—we run headlong into the contention that nationhood (for black people) is either impossible or not worthwhile," and "it is difficult, indeed, to identify a group of people anywhere on the face of the earth who are more in need of independent nationhood" (Davis, 1978,178).

It is no longer viable for African Americans to see their struggle as having to be wages as individuals; it is now necessary for them to consciously see it as a collective fight. Like all colonized people, African Americans are in need of self-government. Self-government " is not done for a people, it is,

---


The importance of his article is not so much this point, as much as it is his implicit argument that America, like all other colonial governments has historically and will continuously attempt to destroy African American nationalist movements and its leaders. He explicitly indicts African American intellectuals who have, "shied away from revolutionary, nationalist ideology and movements" (Ahmed, 11).
instead, done by them or not at all. America and Americans are incapable of insuring black survival. It would be against everything that they are, to govern in such a manner. Government that insures the survival of the people—particularly the despised ones—is good government, and there is no good government in America" (Davis, 183).

After four hundred years of oppression in this society, it is time for African Americans to finally decide on nationalist politics, and time for them to develop a twofold strategy to meet the challenges that confront them as an underdeveloped nation. We must develop short and long range strategic plans to confront the continuous threat to our survival thrust and this can only be accomplished if we unite in a ‘natural grouping’ based on biogenetic-commonality, i.e. racially or ethnically.

But before we can engage in this form of politics, I think it is vital that we ascertain whether our people are conscious of their collective identity (personality). Are African Americans aware of the role that racial consciousness, self-esteem, knowledge of the system, distrust, and their global position determines and impacts on individual and collective political behavior.

Self-Esteem, Group Identity and Political Participation: A Case for Collective Identity

Immediately after the rebellions of the 1960s and 1970s, many research projects were undertaken to determine, and much has been written on the
topic of, African American self-esteem and personal efficacy, especially as it relates to the political process. Many wanted to know to what extent did racial identity play a role in determining traditional and non-traditional political behavior.

The answer to this, and other related questions, was, and is, important to traditional and progressive political leaders. It is a well accepted fact that group dynamics plays a decisive role in determining the behavior of individual members who identify with a particular group. Thus, if it could be determined that racial identity was an important factor in the political behavior of African Americans, it would serve both a descriptive and prescriptive function.

I have argued earlier in this discussion that the African American identity and personality have been distorted by the Eurocentric psychological community, and that it would be critically important to our decolonization struggle that we develop an alternative assessment of the African American 'person. I have also argued, that this assessment must be more experientially relevant so that African American political scientists might develop a more accurate portrait of potential African American political behavior, which would facilitate our developing a political agenda and theory conducive to African American self-actualization and survival thrust.
As such, I take a Rawlsian position on self-esteem and government's role in its promotion and development. It is my position that the American

In his article entitled, *Government and Self-Esteem*, Robert E. Lane, argued that "all governments are in the business of promoting and discouraging and distributing and redistributing the conditions that facilitate self-esteem... All governmental policies give significance, power, honor and opportunities to some and not to others." Lane continues on to say, and this is critical to our argument, that "there is no point in saying that esteem is not the business of government; the government is inevitably engaged in that business of who gets self-esteem, when how, why" (Lane, 165).

Lane argues correctly that government has the ability and means to either promote self-esteem, enhance national pride or "more divisively, ethnocentrism." As we have continuously argued, the Euroamerican colonial government has promoted Lane's last point while engaging in promoting euroamerican self-esteem and attempting to lower African Americans.

Lane argues that self-esteem is based on four distinct values. They are, [1] power; [2] significance; [3] virtue, and [4] competence. We will not discuss each of them, but will note that of the four items one and four have been promoted here in colonial America. According to Lane, power "is the least promising, for insofar as it implies power over others, it means that someone's gain in self-esteem is someone else's loss," (Lane, 166).

While competence and virtue are the preferred bases for self-esteem, in colonial America, African Americans have been given very little to feel competent about as promoted by governmental actions. On the other hand, the colonial government has continuously promoted Euroamerican competence to marginal satisfaction.

In his book, *A theory of Justice*, John Rawls argues that the promotion of self-esteem is one of the primary tasks of government. Rawls argues that self-esteem has two basic aspects. First, it includes a person's "sense of his own value, his secure conviction that his conception of his good, his plan of life, is worth carrying out. And second, self-respect implies a confidence in one's ability, so far as it is within one's power, to fulfill one's intentions," (Rawls, 321).

Following an Aristotelian formulation and principle, Rawls argues that man is basically a political animal. As such, Rawls argues that self-esteem is both individually based and socially reinforced and will usually manifest itself in the political behavior of a person/people. That is, people need to know if those whom they are using as a comparative, agree with their idea of self worth. In every complex society, there are different groups of varying capacities and abilities and what seems interesting and important to some are not to others. Therefore, each person needs to have, and will establish a community where they share the same capacities and interest.

I maintain that in an ethnically stratified and oppressive
colonial administration, through various anti-African policies and programs, due to the colonial structure of this government and society, has promoted low-esteem measures concerning African American existence, i.e., constant and continuous redistricting of their single-district communities, restricting their political participation to the autocratic two party system. Consequently, the Euroamerican colonial government, has engaged in anti-democratic behavior for the exclusive purpose of maintaining economic exploitation through structural internal colonialism.

Patricia Gurin, et al. make the argument that group identity [consciousness] is a more important factor in determining political behavior than are socio-economic factors. When added to distrust of government, group, [collective] identity became a primary factor in determining the self-esteem of the individual African American.

Group consciousness [hereafter called collective identity] may translate into political participation if group members perceive that their group's position in society lacks societal influence, and associate their position to social barriers. And the interaction of these twin beliefs often serve as

community, all members of a dominated group are forced into sharing their commonality in gross macro terms; i.e., along ethnic lines. I will show, in support of both Lane's and Rawls formulation, that despite the efforts of the colonial government, African Americans have maintained a sense of high self-esteem, have not let SES factors determine their political behavior, and have not used the Euroamerican community as their bases for comparison. thus, they have maintained a high degree of self-esteem, and are not adversely affected by what Euroamerican think of them. More, importantly, African Americans see themselves as a separate and distinct people, who are in opposition with Euroamericans.
motivations for political behavior. Collective identity also accounts for other forms of non-electoral behavior as well. Group conscious people are often involved in political education and discussion, actively remain in contact with government agents, and will directly or in-directly become involved in political campaigns.

These traditional forms of traditional political behaviors are due more to an interactive model of group behavior as opposed to a linear, additive function (Gurin, 1981). Gurin, et al, found that since the 1960s, African Americans have been inclined to participate in traditional forms of political behavior and so were other 'subgroups,' the young, the aged, women and other minorities. "Research presented here reveals that subordinate group members who were discontented with the relative power of their groups and who saw an unjust system as the explanation for their power disadvantage were motivated to bring about change by participating in traditional types of political activities" (Gurin, 506).

Collective identity seems to be a process through which dissatisfactions with the status of the group and with the behavior of the government are aggregated across individuals and then they are politicized. Group consciousness [a] incorporates the notion of shared interest and, [b] the recognition that one's own welfare is inseparable from the group's welfare. Political group consciousness is further delineated by the realization that
one's group's inability to gain valued resources in society is due to [a] political decision making and [b] the society's reward distribution process.

Individuals that are mobilized to political, nonelectoral or nonpolitical behavior, "believe that the system must be corrected as opposed to personal shifts in their own or group expectations. In this way group attitudes act to stimulate political participation among an important segment of the population—the disadvantaged. Without the mobilizing influence of group consciousness, these strata would clearly participate at a significantly lower rate" (Gurin, 509). Collective identity, coupled with mistrust of government and an exceptionally strong sense of personal-efficacy, served as strong motivating factors that propelled large numbers of African Americans into the political process during the 1970s and 1980s.

As long as people have some faith in the political structure, or any portion of it, they will continue to engage in traditional political activity and will resort to nontraditional activities, i.e., protests, revolts, demonstrations, only when they feel that the 'system,' as a whole, is unresponsive. Clearly, African American nationalism must be considered as belonging to the latter

*Also see Richard Shingles "Black Consciousness and Political Participation: The Missing Link," The American Political Science Review, 1981. Shingles makes the parallel argument that Black consciousness was the missing explanatory component that connected the rise in Black political participation to 'system blaming.' For Shingles, like Gurin et al, and other researchers, the 'feeling' of belonging to a group that was being denied social benefits, primarily because of their difference, was a strong motivational factor in the upsurge of black traditional political behavior that occurred during the 'era of electoral mobilization/participation.'
category. But, for us, what is important about these research projects is the argument African Americans exhibited a higher sense of personal efficacy than whites of similar socioeconomic status, and, that when coupled with personal efficacy and mistrust, collective identity was/is a strong political motivator. While African American political behavior has been on the decline, their sense of internal-control has remained high, as well as their belief that external-factors/controls are responsible for their social condition. African American personal-efficacy is very high, and they engage in various forms of political behavior beyond what is expected of them, due to traditional Eurocentric SES theories. African Americans are highly involved in organized traditional political activities and have demonstrated a willingness to confront the system and its officials.

Generally, African Americans distrust the system and its officials, and racial identity and solidarity have been responsible for their rise in political activity. And they, as a racial group will resort more readily to the use of violence when confronted with threatening resistance to their claims for redress. What these research projects illustrate is that African Americans are politically inclined to, and will form and participate in, organized politics because they are conscious of their sociopolitical position, are highly self-efficacious, and share a collective identity/personality.
John R. Forward and Jay R. Williams sought to discern the reason for the increase in riots and nontraditional political participation among ghetto residents during and after the era of nation rebellions, i.e., riots. What they discovered was that the African Americans were not willing to blame themselves for their socioeconomic status, but were now able, after extensive reeducation conducted by various nationalist organizers, to place the blame more realistically on factors outside of their immediate control.

African Americans who were more politically and racially conscious (had gone through the identity transformational process), were also more willing to abandon their own individual political behavior for a collective form of political action, and engage in the use of violence to achieve those ends. As Williams (1976) notes, "the present racial situation may be forcing a choice between individual and collective expressions of effectiveness on the part of better educated and more highly motivated black militants (Williams, 90).

Although they were mislabeled as 'militants,' the evidence clearly shows that these young activists were nationalists who were highly motivated, extremely confident of their own ability to shape their future, i.e., had internal control; were not drifters and delinquents, but were good standing community residents who had the support of the community; because of their personality transformation they were more aware of the
social, economical and political environment than non-participants; had shifted the blame to the system and away from themselves, i.e., had external control, for their individual and the groups low resource attainment; and were aware that there were forces working against them achieving their goals. More importantly, they were willing to engage in selfless behavior for the benefit of the group.

The relationship between individual mobility and collective action has been portrayed as being mutually exclusive. Consequently, one would expect to find a negative correlation between high personal control and system blame. But, this is a false conclusion as proven by many of these studies. What was observed was the reverse. There was a direct connection between these two components in determining the behavior of riot participants. Self-esteem, coupled with system blame and collective identity were strong motivational factors in determining both traditional and non-traditional political behavior.

There are strong reasons to assume, based on these findings, that given a political alternative, coupled with a progressive political education program expressed in nationalistic and racial terminology, a political program that is

*Also see Patricia Gurin, et. al. "Internal-External Control in Motivational Dynamics of Negro Youth," Journal of Social Issues, Vol.XXV, No. 3, 1975. Gurin adds what is a very important ingredient into the external-control formulation which has a direct effect on the shift in blame from African Americans to the system. Unlike other researchers, Gurin, et al, factored in discrimination and racism as crucial explanatory components of the model.
decentralized and orientated towards demonstrating the institutional dysfunctionalism which is rampant in America, and the inability of the colonial government to effectuate meaningful change for the African American survival thrust, members of the African American community would be willing to endorse and engage in nationalist politics. The only question left to answer is, whether this same willingness cuts across economic strata as suggested by these and other studies?

The Middle-Class, Black Consciousness and Nationalist Political Behavior

We now turn our attention towards middle-class African Americans, i.e., the traditional neocolonial bourgeoisie, in an attempt to discern the extent to which they experience feelings of race consciousness [collective identity]. We want to know if their feelings of collective identity are strong enough to solidify them with the African American masses and to discern or predict their willingness to engage in, or support, nationalist political behavior.

These are potentially important issues, in that in other traditional colonial societies, which have, or are experiencing the effects of neo-colonialism, the bourgeoisie has often been a producer of, and has historically exhibited, anti-nationalist political sentiments, and has displayed counter-revolutionary behavior.

If there is any validity to the findings growing out of the research conducted among the African American masses, which argues that collective
identity, stemming out the "Black Power" movement, was experienced by the black community, then we should expect to find that it is/was also present in the middle-class. It is now clear that they now recognized their critical revolutionary role, as a result of having been frustrated by Eurocentric nationalism and racial-separatism.

Nathan Hare argues that the traditional view of the African American mislabeled middle-class has become passé because of the entrenchment of Euroamerican separatist-nationalism, and the inability of the African American bourgeoisie to achieve its misorientated aspirations for integration. According to Hare, the middle-class African Americans will be forced to play their critical role in the revolutionary struggle for liberation because they will not be allowed to compete with the Euroamericans in the American economic arena, will never be allowed to have the same economic goals and successes as the Euroamericans because of racism, and will be forced into being no more than mere wage-earners as other colonized African Americans.

Never allowed to rise to their full potential, the African American bourgeoisie will hence be forced into playing its role in the struggle; and come to realize that ethnic solidarity is its only way to survival (Hare, 35).

Politically, it is important that we recognize and understand the actual social, economic and political conditions of the African American middle-class. It is crucial that we understand that they too are a product of the
colonial environment of America and, consequently, the stratification and
intranational normal arrangements between them and the masses are
abnormal. That is, the classical stratifications of economic society has been
artificially altered, and the classes, as we know them, are artificial." In that,
they have not developed out of normal capitalist economic conditions, but
out of an abnormal colonial society (Fanon, 1968; Zahar, 1974; Nkrumah,
1963).

Consequently, what would be a normal antagonistic arrangement
between the classes, according to Eurocentric political economy, is not normal
and the conditions necessary for the amelioration of those antagonisms are in
many ways facilitated by the colonial environment on the one hand, and
complicated on the other."

---

' See C. J. Munford "Social Structure and Black Revolution," The
Black Scholar, Nov.-Dec., 1972. Munford reminds us that the African
American middle family (his term), i.e., the middle class, is an
artificially produced and labeled class that is basically comprised of
people who are employed in the service sector of the American Economy
and not the traditional economic class of Marx. Munford contends that
they have received their position in the middle stratum of the African
American community because the Euroamericans felt that there was not
enough profit to be made in the domestic colonies, (his term); and that
they are allowed to exist as long as it serves the interest of the
metropolitan society.

"For a good example and discussion of this distorted behavior
see Robert Allen Reluctant Reformer: Racism and Social Reform
Movements in the United States, Howard University Press, Washington C.,
1983. Allen demonstrates how throughout the history of this nation
reform movements have been hampered and become useless because of
racism and colonial capitalism. A good example has been the union
Given that, it is important that Afrocentric political scientists, when developing a political agenda which calls for the unification of the nation, should not only know that there is a revolutionary role for the bourgeoisie to play, but understand why it will be easier to incorporate them into the new political strategy.

Part of our difficulty stems from the fact that the middle-families/class are over employed by the colonial government in various low level and low paying jobs. But, because of the nature of colonial-capitalism, African Americans can still expect that the middle class/neo-colonialists/bourgeoisie will experience a rise in ethnic solidarity as the African American nation pushes for its liberation. We can expect their allegiance regardless of their traditional historical role.

Traditionally, the middle class/bourgeoisie/neo-colonialists group has acted cautiously, and their alliance with the masses has "lasted only as long as it is able to monopolize the leadership of the "negro movement," elect "moderate" mayors, sheriffs, congressmen and judges, act as a spokesmen for the whole domestic colony, control and dampen the revolutionary ardor of the popular masses, and keep the Black liberation movement within the framework of an integrationist or "community control" programme, that is,
as long as it does no harm to capitalist ideals and leaves the political sovereignty and territorial unity of the United States unassailed and intact" (Munford, 19).

Unfortunately, that may have been their historical function, but I maintain that as the decolonization struggle moves into an unavoidable revolutionary stage, the middle-class/bourgeoisie/neo-colonial class will be forced into the position of choosing to become aligned with the masses. As the struggle intensifies, they will necessarily become, not only economically aligned with them, but culturally and politically aligned as well: if for no other reason than personal survival.

In Fact, Sampson and Milam discovered that the attitudes of the middle class has changed from those anti-racial attitudes found by earlier researchers during the 1940s and 1950s; and consequently, their findings expressly contradict the contention of Eurocentric scholar William J. Wilson who erroneously contents that the middle-class abandoned their African American brethren. According to (Sampson and Milam, 1964),

What we found? Generally, middle-class blacks express positive attitudes toward the black middle-class. They indicate a fairly strong sense of group consciousness and group solidarity. When they express negative attitudes toward the middle-class, it is most often because they agree with Frazier, Hare, and Neal that middle-class blacks are not doing enough for the race, generally, and for less fortunate blacks, specifically (164).
Sampson and Milam further argue that, "taken together, these findings indicate that middle class blacks are conscious of their blackness, seem to feel an obligation to the race due to their more "privileged" position, and express a strong sense of group solidarity (164).

As a consequence of colonialism, there is a strong sense of solidarity among African Americans regardless of macro socioeconomic factors, and as a direct result of the 1960s, middle-class African Americans understand that the reasons why the progress of African Americans was/is impeded, were not due to their own failures, but rather, were the consequence of external factors outside of their immediate control. It has been discovered through various research projects that the African American middle-class, as a whole, also, and this is crucial, began to identify with the demands and political agenda of ghetto residents. What emerges is a clear picture of a collective personality, a collective identity [Weusi] being reformed through collective struggle.

An alternate reading of this material would argue that the African American middle class/families/bourgeoisie/neo-colonialist segment, regardless of socioeconomic factors, and as a consequence of the 1960s, is expressing intranational race/group solidarity, has a clear understanding of the plight of the oppressed masses, is willing to support alternative solutions to their present conditions, has a very high degree of self-esteem, is
becoming filled with rage.* And, if given an opportunity to engage in a

* See Ellis Cose, _Rage of the Privileged_, Newsweek Inc., N.Y. 1993.

What becomes clear from reading this unscientific survey is that the African American middle class, as a consequence of the colonial structure of our society, like their counterparts of the 1970s and 1980s, is being forced into aligning themselves ethnically with the African American masses. What he discovered was that the current successful middle class person also expresses strong racial solidarity and unity; felt that they had been deprived because of their ethnicity and suffered some forms of identity lost as a consequence of trying to fit in; looked to their own group for acceptance; felt that their own success was tied to the success of the group; had been placed into 'black jobs' with little chance of escape (ethnic stratification of jobs as suggested in chapter 2 this document); expressed a strong sense of positive personal efficacy; knew that their inability to succeed had nothing to do with their ability but with the system, i.e., system blame; had low expectation for the future; and, had not suffered any loss of self-esteem as a result of their negative experiences in the Eurocentric corporate structure.

Most importantly, these contemporary middle class African Americans were displaying a very strong concept and feelings of an African collective personality. While this may, at this time, be unconscious, in that it has not been successfully articulated, seemingly, every group is experiencing and expressing the concept of Weusi.

Cose quoted Dorothy Gilliam, who is a columnist for the _Washington Post_ and current president of the National Association of Black Journalists, on the effects of race on one's life chances in the Euroamerican corporate structure. Gilliam's words clearly express group solidarity and allegiance when she says, "you feel the rage of people, [of] your group... just being the dogs of society" (Cose, 57).

In interviewing another successful African American, who was a Harvard Law School graduate and partner of a top Eurocentric law firm. Cose discovered that he was enraged over the treatment that he was receiving concerning his retirement. Cose was told by the lawyer that he [a] felt insecure about his children's future in Eurocentric America, [b] did not need acceptance from the Euroamerican world, [c] that he could get support from his own people, and [d] felt that he had been denied a 'fair shot' because of his ethnicity, (Cose, 56).

On the issues of self-esteem and personal efficacy, Cose was often told that they were 'good' at what they did but, they felt that they had been placed into 'black jobs' from which they could not escape. They felt that they either had to accept their position or be forced to move on. In expressing her feelings concerning personal efficacy/self esteem, Dr. Ella Louise Bell who is a professor at MIT, said: "I think it's very difficult once we have achieved, and we have good educations, and we know we're good... to run up against this brick wall... Nobody wants to be perceived as being a victim of racism or prejudice. It hurts. It hurts deeply" (Cose, 58).
different form of politics, by all indications, the African American middle class is willing.

Colonial America is forcing many privileged African Americans into the nationalist community by refusing to allow them to fulfill their best. They are filled with rage, apathy and disillusionment. They reject the American values and no longer feel secure outside of their own communities. It is this group that America has rendered 'invisible' and turned into potential nationalist supporters.

Politically, it is foolish to tell millions of African Americans to seek a better life outside of the colonies and then punish those that do. What must be done, and what many 'privileged' African Americans are discovering, after centuries of being told by nationalists, is that we must become more united and concerned about ourselves. We can ignore this conclusion if we wish to, but, American colonial imperatives will force us into this conclusion and sociopolitical position. Racial self-esteem, personal efficacy, and personal self-esteem are interrelated and are firmly anchored in the quality of relationships one has with their family, friends, church and community. The three are highly influenced by micro and macro social processes and, as we have seen, colonial America is making these factors increasingly salient. African Americans no longer are identifying with Euroamericans on a number of issues, and are not using them as their comparison group. Because of these factors, a contemporary African American personality is being
formed and the political ramifications can only be a united political party and a new nationalist political movement.

Racial self-esteem is contingent upon the culture of the African American community and is promoted by institutional inequalities through education, interracial contact and the overwhelming perception that discrimination impedes the progress of the individual and the group. Personal efficacy is dependent upon one's position in the macro-order of institutional inequality, and on personal experience of efficacious activity, (Demo, 154). It is time that we stop looking at African American self-esteem, in that inequality has little affect on the formation of one's self-esteem and instead look at the system and how it psychologically affects one's personal efficacy.

What is encouraging about this material is that it demonstrates that more African Americans have ceased internalizing the negative images produced by Eurocentric colonial America, and have placed the blame for their condition, in part, where it rightfully belongs: on the system.

---

On June 12th African Americans leaders representing the full spectrum of the African American community met in Baltimore Maryland to discuss the issues threatening the survival and prosperity of the African American community.

Those who were in attendance felt the historical relevance and experienced a continuity between what they were attempting to do and other national African American leaders during the convention movement. In fact, "the summit follows a tradition of such meeting in the black community, dating to the 1830s during the height of slavery, when there were annual National Negro Conventions to strengthen the resolve of blacks to free themselves from bondage, (Merida, A1).

Although representing a diverse ideological spectrum in the struggle, many who attended express the same concerns. And chief among them was the "need to create independent political structures (Merida, A10)."
Consequently, African Americans are able, and have been willing, to engage in traditional and non-traditional political behavior on a collective basis. The African American ethos is thus forming a neo-traditional collective personality: Weusi.

I now want to turn my attention to that portion of the colonized African American community that has engaged in extra-legal activity (riots and revolts), to discern whether they experience any sense of racial solidarity with other non-rioters, and whether they engaged in these non-traditional forms of politics because they were less political. It is my belief that we should find the same correlation between self-esteem, personal efficacy and system blame, which has produced feelings of collective identity.

**Ethnic Salience, Riot Participation and African American Solidarity**

Jeffery M. Paige demonstrates that there was a correlation between high personal efficacy, distrust of government, political and general knowledge, and collective identity among rioters. Paige, like Verba & Almond (1965), and Gamson (1968) demonstrates that earlier conclusions drawn by other Eurocentric researchers which connected riot participation to ignorance, alienation and apathy, were incorrect. "Rioters were most often found among the dissenters—those high on political information and low on trust in the government (Paige, 819).

African Americans who are intermediate on trust and high on efficacy are inclined to engage in civil rights activity. While those who are both low
on trust and information, are less likely to engage in either 'traditional' and 'nontraditional' forms of political activity. There is a continuum on a linear basis from 'mild' forms of political dissent to more 'radical/revolutionary' forms of political behavior based on the interconnection of trust, efficacy and racial identity. That is, as one's trust factor decreases from high to low, one is more inclined to participate in 'nontraditional' political activity. And those who can be placed in the middle of this axis, can be expected to place mild constraints on the government. While the two factors are important, another equally important factor is the relationship between the group and nontraditional political behavior, and this is critically important for those of us interested in decolonization and the political system. The further removed colonized African Americans are from decision makers and those who implement the policies of this government, the more likely they are to express beliefs that the government is unresponsive to their concerns and overtures for liberation.

"Extremist political tactics, like other forms of politics, require interest in government but, unlike conventional forms, imply that the government is fundamentally untrustworthy (Paige, 811). This construction of the potential rioter/revolutionary is a 'radically' different image of the "alienated person model" advanced by Eurocentric scholars. This view suggests that if a nationalist political organization engaged in progressive political education, it could produce a cadre of political activists that would engage in nationalist
political education that it desired and necessary for revolutionary progressive politics.

Currently, this is the pivotal group [rioters and militants/gangsters] in the decolonization struggle (as were the lumpenproletariate for Fanon and Cleaver), and if reeducated along progressive political lines, coupled with a strong nationalist program, they too could become a potent political cadre to carry a protracted political struggle forward. These studies demonstrate that rioters are not only knowledgeable, but do not feel powerless.∗

Twenty five years after the era of rebellion, the ethereal peace that had settled over America was shattered by a spontaneous outburst of

∗Also see, The Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (hereafter referred to as the Commission), which concluded and was supported by other subsequent surveys, that the typical rioter was [1] highly educated (more so than those who did not participate in riots); [2] displayed a high degree of self-efficacy; [3] felt distrust in government and governmental officials; [4] was a young African American male between the ages of 18-25; [5] had a high degree of political sophistication; [6] had taken part in other forms of nontraditional political activity, i.e., protest, boycotts etc.; and [7] distrusted the average African American middle-class person.

The commission found that the average rioter [1] displayed strong nationalistic sentiments; [2] felt that they were superior to Euroamericans; [3] preferred to be called Black as opposed to Negro; [4] felt that it was essential for all African Americans to study their history and an African language; and, [5] that they did not feel that this country was worth fighting for if they were called to defend it. Commission, "he rejects the white bigots stereotype of the Negro as ignorant and shiftless. He takes great pride in his race and believes that in some respects Negroes are superior to whites (Commission, 129).

More importantly, what this and other surveys prove is that many participants said that they felt good about themselves and their people after, or when they were participating in riots. These confirm the Fanonian theory of revolutionary therapeutic violence, see chapter 3 this document).
revolutionary violence in several cities across this nation: all in response to the infamous decision handed down by a jury of colonizers in Simi Valley in the trial of the Los Angeles police. The four police officers were on trial for handing out colonial justice, but had been caught on video tape by another colonizer. All of this, and the rest, is contemporary history and well known to us all. But what is important for us here is the underlying sentiments among the ghetto residents. Like the rioters/rebels in 1967, the African American colonial residents who took part in the rebellions of 1992 expressed the same basic characteristics.

In a series of interviews that were conducted by Michael Slate, immediately after the rebellion in L.A., it became clear that the rebels still showed distrust in the government, expressed strong racial solidarity, displayed political sophistication and a remarkable international awareness of their circumstances. Those who were interviewed, distrusted government officials, and demonstrated a strong sense of personal efficacy. These feelings were expressed by young and old, male and female, and seemingly were wide spread.

For example, when conducting an interview with a group of male elders, age 35 to 65, Slate was told, "and if you think what happened now was something, well you just wait and see what happens if they sentence them young guys they got in jail now for beating on that white truck driver. I'll tell you what, this time it won't be just youngsters out there. This time we'll be
in it. We gonna get in it this time and we gonna make sure it's real organized this time" (Slate, 8).

The rebellions of 1992 were similar, and yet, very different. They were different in that this time many of the people expressed a willingness to die in the struggle. Many expressed a sense of being at war, and said that eventually African Americans would have to fight Euroamerica for their freedom. Many felt that armed struggle was certain because they believed that there could be no justice found in the American judicial system. All of the interviewees had a profound knowledge of the historical aspects of the King decision. Many felt that traditional institutions were useless, and, that they all experienced a Fanonian sense of humanity in taking part in the struggle.

Another good example is when Slate was told by an elderly woman that "I'm glad they raised up all of this and I hope they raise some more hell. They gonna do it. I'll tell you one thing, they got the message over, yes sir! I was happy to see them rise up. And it ain't over. Now the police, they say they don't know what happened with all them guns. Well they gonna know what happened, just wait." and with that she let out with a broad, broad smile and a roaring laugh that came from deep down inside" (Slate, 10).

When Slate was interviewing a group of young women, who all had taken part in the rebellion, it became clear that they felt justified in their actions and the actions of other rebels. They also expressed a Fanonian sense of humanity for having resisted in a violent manner. All of them said that
"it was the first time in my life it felt great to be Black. I was standing out there with my people and saying loud that we're all together and we ain't gonna let them run us into the ground. Hey now, Fuck tha police" (Slate, 12).

It seems that the battle lines have been drawn, and the only thing that keeps the war from escalating is the absence of a strong nationalist party to direct the apparent anger and rage that is widespread among the African American masses.

Revolutionary consciousness is evident and, seemingly, the masses are willing to engage in armed organized struggle for their freedom. Like all colonized people, they too are demanding implicitly and explicitly, that there be no compromise on points of principle, and that their leaders demand unconditional liberation and not legal or political reforms. The increasing lumpenization of the African masses, here in America, has caused many of them to become increasingly more inclined to discuss violent revolution. And as we have seen, many of them, even in this limited stage, are throwing themselves into the rebellions. A collective personality is being created and replicated throughout the African American community, and all that needs to be done now is for a progressive nationalist program and dedicated nationalist cadre to emerge.

Lessons Learned and Nationalist Politics

There are a number of critical lessons to be learned from the evidence presented here for the development of a nationalist political party. What
emerges from the research and interviews conducted after both massive rebellions is that African Americans are racially solidified, conscious of their racial group, and are willing to engage in rebellious actions to redress wrongs done against them as a group.

Seemingly, all strata of the community are politically sophisticated and willing to struggle for their freedom. Some have expressed a strong distrust in traditional institutions, i.e., the church, distrust the government and its officials, and understand the international implications of their actions. African Americans now display an extraordinary sense of historical continuity, and there is unity across socioeconomic strata. Consequently, ethnic allegiance is on the rise and integration, as a social policy, is seen to have failed. If the belief in and the endorsement of integration, as a goal, began after the 1967 rebellion, then it surely ended after the 1992 revolt.

One can conclude, therefore, that nationalist politics is surely desirous among the African American masses and, if given an alternative to traditional African American interracialist supportive politics which many of them reject, the masses [the word masses as used here means the total community and not just the lower-classes] will support such a party. It is clear that the politics of the past 'electoral era' has failed many of our people and that it is now time, after the collapse of the delusionary 'era of integration', that we embark on a nationalist political agenda. After several decades of
useless interracialist politics, the masses are demanding that political leaders now address themselves to their desires.

Because of its colonial pluralistic structure, America has fostered the necessity for the development of a politically revolutionary African American party and, seemingly, the African American nation is willing to support a nationalist political agenda.

**Cultural Nationalism and African American Liberation**

What we have been calling for throughout this section has been cultural nationalism, and linking the development of this national culture to the physical and psychological liberation of the African American people. National liberation among the colonized people and cultural revitalization are inseparably connected. In fact, cultural revitalization and liberation struggles to affirm and reaffirm one another and give validity to, and create, a new colonized person in the process.

It is the belief of many colonial critics, African American scholars and myself, that it is a mistake to search for cultural revitalization within the framework of the stagnant colonial situation. It can only be found within the context of liberation struggles. Just as the colonial situation created the colonial culture, decolonization will create a new culture, a new person. As Fanon (1963) observed, "after the conflict, there is not only the disappearance of colonialism but also the disappearance of the colonized man" (Fanon, 246).
The liberation of African Americans is interconnected to the recovery of themselves, and the resurrection/development of a neo-traditional cultural base. They must struggle for both simultaneously. Nationalist behavior, on all fronts, is the only progressive behavior left for the African American nation, if it is to survive in the 1990s and beyond.
Chapter 8

Black Nationalism and Domestic Colonialism

In chapters two and three I discussed how ethnonationalism was endemic to, and a consequence of, the colonial experience. I argued that all colonized people eventually develop a common sense of nationhood as a consequence of sharing common oppressive experiences. Ethnonationalism, therefore, initially is a defensive phenomenon. Ethnonationalism is used as an empowering phenomenon by the colonized to combat the unilateral and ubiquitous oppression of the colonial situation on the one hand, and to transform a colonial state structure to an independent national structure on the other hand. In other words, ethnonationalist sentiments lie just beneath the consciousness of all colonized people.

As a people begin actively to resist colonialism and its policy of social atomization and destruction, colonized people eventually overcome their decentralization, ethnicity and other forms of national division, and develop a national consciousness which they use to crystallize their anti-colonial sentiments into a nation. Consequently, the colonizers, during the various phases of the decolonization struggle, will attempt, by using various strategies, to destroy nationalist movements. Colonized ethnonationalism is antithetical to the axioms of colonialism.
Nationalism, or national consciousness, develops in part as a consequence of the colonized not being allowed to participate in the ruling of the country. Therefore, the colonized will develop their own political organizations along ethnonationalistic lines where they engage in the activities previously denied to them.

Ethnonationalism becomes a unifying phenomenon during the decolonization struggle, directing the different generations toward a common goal. Prior to decolonization, especially during the overt colonial stage, nationalism is an intracommunal divisive force, splitting communities and families along generational lines. The older generation, already having resigned itself to emptiness and incompletion, fight against the youth, who are demanding that nationalist changes in the system take place. The colonial society, which is inert and diseased, is unable to create any new changes to meet this youthful upsurge. Therefore, it tends to crush these movements leaving generational conflicts unresolved.

The colonial society remains the same, resistant to the continuous demands for inclusion that it has denied to each previous generation of the colonized. And nationalism, spurned on by youthful impetuousness, awaits revolutionary zealousness for emancipation. Nationalism and decolonization become synonymous with one another during the struggle (Fanon, 1963, 68; Nkrumah, 1968; Chamberline, 1985; Allen, 1990).
Having argued that African Americans have been colonized longer than any other people, and that they have suffered from several stages of colonial development, African American ethnonationalism has been developing for over 350 years. As a consequence, African American nationalism has been subjected to propaganda, denigration, public and private denunciations and denial by both African and Euroamericans. Its proponents have been subjected to assaults, intimidation, arrest, murder and deportations (Marcus Garvey, W.E.B. DuBois; Stockely Carimichael; Eldridge Clever).

Too many African American scholars unfortunately believe that African American nationalism developed primarily as a consequence of the recent attacks on the Nation of Islam's controversial leader Louis Farrakhan is another example of the continuous assault on nationalist leaders that this country has historically waged.

As late as February 28, 1994, Louis Farrakhan, and his nationalist organization had come under attack. In the Time magazine, Time Inc, N.Y., 1994, issued on the above date, several bourgeois interracialists, and anti-African liberals, as well as the author, in subtle and overt ways, denounced him and his leaders on an array of loosely connected issues.

More than anything else, what came out of this covert attack on him and his organization, was the fact that there is a clear difference in perspective concerning the value of his doctrine. While it is safe to say that as a nationalist[?] many Euroamericans and the normal Jewish contingent, disapprove of him and his organization. With the exception of a number of bourgeois, and neo-colonialists, a vast majority of African American people desire to hear his message, and hold dissimilar views about him.

*While I am not in agreement with much that the Black Muslims say and stand for, in that I think that their nationalism is limiting, and in many ways counter-revolutionary, the recent attacks on the Nation of Islam's controversial leader Louis Farrakhan is another example of the continuous assault on nationalist leaders that this country has historically waged.
African Americans living in an oppressive society, i.e slaveocracy, and were in need of a potential liberating doctrine/movement.

In a limited sense, African American nationalism did develop in response to the same oppressive conditions that all other domestically colonized people have shared. And, consequently, African American nationalism is defensive; and has been used to combat the divisive forces of economic exploitation, colonial structural racism, social destruction and deculturation and has been an empowering doctrine used by African American people in their struggle for liberation. But, it is also true that African American nationalism owes its origin to other factors that are not necessarily in response to or connected to, American colonial conditions.

The different dimensions of African American nationalism have been promoted and developed by several different nationalist proponents throughout its long glorious history in this country. There was the social and economical technical nationalism of DuBois and Washington, the racial nationalism of Garvey, the separatist nationalism of Malcolm and Blyden, the revolutionary nationalism of Nat Turner and David Walker, and the integrational nationalism of Douglass and King. The fullness of African American nationalism owes much to many. This fact led Cruse to remark that never has a nation of people been blessed with so many great leaders (Cruse, 1968).
One of the most compelling aspects of Cruse's analysis is his observation that African American nationalism was a tool used by African Americans in their historical search for meaning and identity. According to Cruse (1968), "most of the young generation of Negroes who articulate these values are beset with a compelling problem of self-identification. They are plagued by an obsessive search for identity in a predominantly white society which has its own problems of self-identification, both at home and abroad" (Cruse, 68).

It is my contention that this aspect of African nationalism owes its ontology to the era of integrational nationalism during the 1930s to 1960s. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, African American nationalists were secure in their identities. Early African nationalism, in its formation here in America, has lent itself to erroneous charges of being, primarily, a reactionary nationalism as are all other ethnonationalistic movements and philosophies and, therefore, it has been called a deviant form of behavior by social malcontents. Such charges are incorrect and only illustrate the extent of historical discontinuity that we as a distinct people suffer and, the depth of Euroamerican intellectual ignorance.

**Phenomenology, Domestic Colonialism and African Nationalism**

Those who have tried to explain the importance of African nationalism by ascribing it to black "frustration" and to imply that this is a pathological response" (Allen, 115) miss the point. They miss the fact that, as
Allen argues, "black nationalism is a serious component of black thinking, both in the past and present" (Allen, 114). They refuse to recognize that it is not going to disappear regardless of white nationalist denigration. Black nationalism is a natural consequence of our history and our historical relationship to white nationalism in this country.

Domestic colonialism has been a valuable analytical device from which to analyze the American society, and is just as useful in understanding the fragmented continuum of African nationalism. The rise of ethnonationalism is a natural consequence of the purposeful disintegration of indigenous colonized societies. Consequently, all decolonization movements become nationalistic (Memmi, 1968; Fanon, 1964, 1968; Nkrumah, 1962; Césaire, 1968). Viewed from this context, African nationalism can be understood as a natural phenomenon of domestic colonialism and not as some deviant movement among those who are pathologically ill.

The persistence of African nationalism is the inevitable result of the African-American, being forced to work out his nationalism inside a white host-country. This uniqueness is heightened when it is recognized that the dynamics of "white nationalism" forms an overlay to Black Nationalism and that Black Nationalism must respond to it (Walters, 1973, 15).

To extend this point, it is necessary for us to place the proper social dynamics in which both of these two forms of antagonistic nationalisms are forced to interact. In a colonial situation, the nationalistic doctrines and thrust of the
colonized and the colonizers will be in opposition to one another, such that the nationalism of the colonizers will seek hegemony and the nationalism of the colonized will become oppositional.

A common excuse, used to dismiss African American nationalism, is that African Americans lack a historical homeland. Those who oppose African nationalism erroneously point out that the African nation does not occupy any land to which they can historically lay claim. This argument is based on the traditional definition of Eurocentric nationhood which is narrowly defined. This narrow requirement of land, as the only legitimizer of ethnonationalism, overlooks other equally important factors upon which legitimate ethnonationalism may be based. According to Mill (1975),

A portion of mankind may be said to constitute a Nationality, if they are united among themselves by common sympathies, which do not exist between them and any others— which make them cooperate with each other more willingly than with other people, desire to be under the same government by themselves or a portion of themselves, exclusively. This feeling of nationality may have been generated by various causes. Sometimes it is the affect of identity of race and descent. Community of language, and community of religion, greatly contribute to it. Geographical limits are one of its causes. But the strongest of all is identity of political antecedents; the possession of a national history, and consequent community of recollections; collective pride and humiliation, pleasure and regret, connected with the same incidents in the past [italics mine] (380).
Because of their history, African Americans have many common experiences inside and outside of this country that extend back seven millennia, upon which they can base their nationalism. The question of land has always been a luxury that our unique form of nationalism has been forced to do without. African Americans, therefore, have based their nationalism on history, shared experiences and race consciousness. All of our great nationalist leaders have based their nationalist arguments on our racial identity and our common African ancestry. To refuse the African nation its nationalism simply because of a supposed absence of a historical homeland here in America is a form of colonial arrogance and national ignorance.

Having said that, it is important that we also recognize that the question of land is critical to understanding the struggle that African American nationalists have been waging in this country. The land question has been central to our struggle throughout our history and promises to be central to our nationalist debate in the future.

Historically, it has manifested itself in various forms of separatist arguments and movements. Early in our history it manifested itself in the colonization movements of Delaney and Blyden. Then again in the back to Africa movement associated with Garveyism. Recently, it has been a continuous argument of the New African Republic, The Black Muslims, and a main argument of Malcolm X and other separatists. Undoubtedly,

There is a deep land hunger in the heart of Afro-America. It has always been
there, just as much so as in any other people. Even to waste time asserting this factor is to yield to racism, to argue with the racist assertion that blacks just aren't like other people. Suffice it to say that Afro-Americans are just as land hungry as were the Mau Maus, the Chinese people, the Cuban people; just as much so as all the people of the world today who are grappling with the tyrants of colonialism, trying to get possession of some land of their own (Clever, 52).

The need to satisfy the African American nation's hunger for land has dominated the policies and programs of many nationalist leaders. During the 1960s, it once again was the dominant component among our revolutionary nationalists, for whom community control was a very important part of their revolutionary agenda. Many revolutionaries of that time argued that African Americans should use either violent or non-violent means to acquire land and pursue the redistribution of wealth. For these revolutionaries, the methods used were unimportant, its acquisition was the only consideration.

As important as land is to the solidification of national sentiments, it nonetheless has not prevented the African American nation from realizing their nationhood. In attempting to realize its nationhood, early nationalist leaders established national governments to address all of the major concerns that it had in confronting white oppressive nationalism.

The era of the African National Convention was an attempt to establish the existence of an African nationalist government (Walters, 1973). Only recently have African Americans failed to form a government in exile.
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It has only been within the last three decades that the African nation has not formed a national government. And many have come to realize that this is a major failing (Cruse, 1968; Williams, 1987; Madhubuti, 1978; Alkalimat, 1973; Jones, 1972).

The African American community currently does not have a national forum to work out its national strategy. They have attempted to resurrect their historical conventions to formulate a nationalist government but, thus far, they have failed (see chapter 9 this document). The revitalization of this crucial ingredient of African American nationalism must be central to our decolonization movement.

**African American Nationalism and the Golden Era**

Wilson J. Moses argued that the nineteenth century, especially the decade prior to the Civil War, was the high mark of *classical* African American nationalism. It was during the middle decades of this century that many of the dominant themes that had been formed during the early formative years were solidified, directing nineteenth century African American nationalism. Against the backdrop of continued and intensified racial separation, social terror, biological themes of racial superiority and inferiority, legal, political and economic disenfranchisement, social
One of the more important elements of classical nationalism was the idea of universal African collectivism. This ideal was the motivating force behind the creation of African American self-help groups, African institutions, reading societies and communal financial institutions. The ideal of collective improvement motivated early African American women to form the National Association of Colored Women, which saw their primary role to be the uplifting of the African American community, while promoting the ideology of African American communal and individual racial purity. The ideology of African American racial 'purity' and collective action are still today central to Pan-Africanist and African American nationalist theories.

This period was characterized by a national call to racial duty and obligation, influenced along the lines of social Darwinism and Victorian conceptions; a confused national policy of assimilation through separatism; an odd mixture of mysticism and racial chauvinism; the overpowering concept of collective unity; various themes of colonization, either in the continental United States or overseas, laden with the ideas and philosophies of African American supremacy and Christian missionaryism; the ideal and primary thrust of African American progress, as characterized by the technocratic ideologies of DuBois's "Talented Tenth" and Washington's army of skilled technicians; the belief in collective leadership; the endorsement and development of political, economic and social authoritarianism; originated and developed the Pan-Africanist philosophy; and, racial and community purity.
The primary thrust of these dual ideologies was the belief that all Africans throughout the diaspora are essentially African in their biogenetic and cultural behaviors and, therefore, they have a responsibility to assist in the general uplifting of the race, regardless of geography. This still is a central component to the Afrocentric ideology and movement (see chapter 7 this text). According to Moses, "an authoritarian collectivist ideal was evoked, a belief that all black people could and should act unanimously under the leadership of one powerful man or group of men, who would guide the race by virtue of superior knowledge or divine authority towards the goal of civilization" (Moses, 1978, 20).

The reoccurring themes of group collective behavior, subordination to the group ethics, collective leadership, authoritarianism and universal unity were to become the hallmarks of early African American nationalism. They were the primary thematics in the writings and speeches of Alexander Crummell, Edward Wilmot Blyden, Henry H. Garnett, and J.T. Holly.

Another dominant and confused theme of early African American nationalism was African American separatism. In its mildest form, it simply meant institutional separation, such that African Americans would develop separate institutions that would assist in the development of African Americans and diasporic African peoples. In its extreme form, it meant "the perpetual physical separation of the races" (Moses, 23). This movement has usually been historically challenged by the assimilationists.
Internationally speaking, early separatists were both separatists and assimilationists, in that they advocated the returning of African Americans to Africa to bring civilization, Christianity and enlightenment to the less civilized African people. They were heavily influenced by the dominant European themes of racial superiority and social Darwinism. This disposition has led many to argue that early African American nationalism was, in fact, a Black version of European nationalistic themes.

Moses makes the erroneous argument that early African American nationalism developed during the same historical epoch when the European nation state ideology became dominant and accepted around the world. He continues on to repeat a common theme which connects African American nationalism exclusively to the United States. In part, he is both correct and incorrect. If we take his argument as exclusively correct, one would have to agree that African American nationalism is primarily reactive; owing its orientation, maturation and thrust primarily to being a reaction to continental Eurocentric nationalism. That is, African American nationalism is an exclusive philosophical movement based on overcoming the negatives of Eurocentric nationalism.

While this may be true, it is not the only basis for the development of African American nationalism. African American nationalism has a historical component that extends beyond its national and communal boundaries. I will not discuss this issue in detail here, but I will later.
According to Moses, it is impossible to discuss African American nationalism outside of its continental boundaries. For him, African American nationalism should be seen primarily as a reactive movement. According to Moses (1978), "black nationalism by general consensus originated in the late eighteenth century. Since it was developed in the climate of the slave trade and was largely a reaction to attitudes of white supremacy, it is impossible to conceive of its existence outside the context of Western civilization" (25).

For Moses and many other African American scholars, African American nationalism proper was an adaptation to particular conditions in the western environment. Unfortunately, they too often overlook the circular aspects of African cultural and west African geographical commonality of African American people. They have failed to connect the recycling of new Africans into the American environment and the effect that these new arrivals would have on continuing many traditional west African cultural and political nationalistic behaviors.

They too have succumbed to seeing African American nationalism, like Ebonics and our continuous history, through the western filter. They have filtered our nationalism, and our experience here in America, through Eurocentric movements, thereby negating the cultural, political, mythological, spiritual and social ideologies formed by African influences.
African American nationalism is unique because of two primary dimensions. First, it has a long heritage which extends back throughout the millenniums and, second, because of its solidification during the horrors of the African American holocaust experience.

In particular, the forces that created embryonic African American nationalism can be found in the common disaster of slavery. It was during this infamous experience, that African nationalism was to take a unique turn in its history. It was out of these common horrors that the African American nation was formed, and our own unique form of ethnonationalism developed in a mutated form.

It was during the common experience of forced slave marches from the interior to the coast, where different nationalities were collected to await the arrival of slave ships to make the terrifying *middle-passage*, that the first common meshing of different groupings was to take place, laying the seeds for our unique nationalism.

It was after departing for the new world during the middle passage, where once again there was an intermixing of the different nationalities, forcing a common reality. This new common reality contributed to reinforcing the sense of 'sameness' among the captives. It was during this time, more than any other, that the Africans became aware that regardless of their former nationalistic differences, they were all now a part of the same
horrible experience (Bennett, 1966; Franklin, 1974; Genovese, 1976; Davidson, 1980; Wright, 1990; Elkins, 1976).

It is out of this cruelty that the African American and western hemispheric African was forged. It was out of these social and experiential forces that African Americans formed their sense of communalism. It is here and the subsequent isolation in the various breeding and 'seasoning' stations throughout the middle Atlantic states that the African nation was formed.

Historically, cultural nationalists have argued that the basis for African American nationalism was recycled, continuous, African culture. According to Stuckey (1987), "that consideration led to the inescapable conclusion that the nationalism of the slave community was essentially African nationalism consisting of values that bound slaves together and sustained them under brutal conditions of oppression" (ix).

Hence, African American nationalism owes its existence, on one hand, to the continuous brutality of this oppressive society, and on the other, to the continuation of an unbroken African nationalism. African American nationalism, in its many manifestations, is continued African nationalism. Stuckey maintains that at the deep social level, West African culture was consistent and unified. Stuckey extends this thesis to say that it was this cultural commonality that cemented the various West African ethnic groups together during the various stages of slaveocracy, and served as the cultural basis for the formation of traditional African nationalism here in America.
African culture manifested itself in the religious rituals, social customs, values, beliefs, mythologies, survival skills and family structures of the slave communities. African American cultural nationalism was continuously infused with West African religious and cultural practices as a consequence of slaveocracies brutality. Slaveocracy was in constant need of new slaves and, therefore, had to import them on a continuous basis. As such, the survivors of slaveocracy, were continuously infused with West African cultural practices. Aided by linguistic commonality, these new arrivals were able to transmit their beliefs and practices to those who were beginning to lose their's.

Central to traditional African nationalism are the beliefs in collective action, survival of the group over the well being of the individual, the primacy of spiritualism and ritual practices, elitism and authoritarianism, collective leadership, and racial based solidarity. African American nationalist theory has always been national in scope, in both theory and practice. And due to the severity and divisive nature of the system, has always been bifurcated, displaying both bourgeois and elitist tendencies as well as a mass generated strand. According to Stuckey (1987), "what we know of slave culture in the South, and of that of blacks in the North during and following slavery, indicates that black culture was national in scope, the principal forms of cultural expression being essentially the same" (82).
Throughout the history of the African American struggle, self-sacrifice characterized the behavior many of our leaders and people. This is never more evident than in the behaviors of our revolutionary warriors, early social and political leaders, and insurrectionists, e.g., Nat Turner, Denmark Vesey, Harriet Tubman, David Walker (the father of African American nationalism), F. Douglass. Self-sacrifice as a guiding principle directed and determined the behavior of the Freemen, who were subjected to continued social and legal brutality, and faced with the constant threat of re-enslavement. As disciples of this principle, they continued to press for African American emancipation in spite of the constant danger.

David Walker exhorted African American intellectuals and bourgeois nationalists to be activists, to use their abilities for the general betterment of the African American people. He argued that they had a responsibility to assist in the mental development and physical emancipation of all African American people. According to Walker (1993),

> men of colour, who are also of sense, for you particularly is my APPEAL designed. Our more ignorant brethren are not able to penetrate its values. I call upon you therefore to cast your eyes upon the wretchedness of your brethren, and to do your utmost to enlighten them—\( \text{to go to work and enlighten your brethren!} \) let the Lord see you doing what you can to rescue them and yourself from degradation, [italics mine] (48).

Through religious practices, active cultural practices and references, communal isolation, and political beliefs, African American nationalism was
really recycled African nationalism. It was the continuation of cultural practices that served as the substructure upon which African American nationalism is based.

**A Turning Point**

Attention is now turned to what I consider to be a very crucial point in the history of African nationalist development in this country. The twentieth century was to become a pivotal point in nationalist ideology and acceptance. During the early portion of this century, nationalist sentiment continued to be foremost among the ideologies widely professed and implemented. It would continue to out-distance many of its rivals, such as communism, which only enjoyed marginal success inside the African community and among the intelligentsia.

Communism in the U. S., among the African Americans, enjoyed the same fate as it did on the continent of Africa and elsewhere that western hemispheric people were fighting for their freedom. That is, it was essentially a means ideology and not an end philosophy. "More frequently, however, and particularly in the revolt against imperialist domination, Communism is seen as an alternative means of reaching national goals" (Emerson, 4). The reason for its relative success in the African community was because the "Communist Party succeeded in establishing itself for a time as the leading advocate of equal rights for Black People" (Allen, 102). Nationalism was the philosophical basis, communism was only the tactical means.
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During the twentieth century there would be a great shift in the approach of African nationalism. It would witness the collapse of the *Convention era*, which was basically a continuation of the bourgeois nationalism that characterized our earlier nationalist movements, to the mobilization of the masses around nationalist economic, political and cultural 'separatism.' This 'separatist' philosophy would culminate in the 1920s with the massive Garvey movement that attracted millions of African Americans. The Garvey movement was based on African American racial solidarity and escapism, with the eventual goal of recolonizing Africa.

With the deportation of Garvey, a disciple of Booker T. Washington (a great African diplomat who espoused cultural and economic nationalism), the nationalist movement of this era would again be reversed. The philosophy and practice of bourgeois nationalism would dominate our nationalist movement after the collapse of Garvey's racial nationalism. The philosophy of the nationalist movement would change from separatism to accommodation and integration. From the 1930s to the 1960s, the era of the *Civil-Rights Movement*, would be dominated by such organizations as the N.A.A.C.P., S.C.L.C. and the Urban League.

The bourgeois nationalist leaders of that time were Floyd McKissick, Whitney Young, Martin L. King, and Adam Clayton Powell. All advocated reformist accommodationist goals, believing in the correctness of the *incremental development theory*. The emergence of these organizations,
under these leaders, as the new standard bearers of bourgeois neo-nationalism, came after several hard fought battles against the Euroamerican nationalists over African American inclusion into the mainstream of this society. Those initial battles between these two groups proved to be beneficial to Euroamericans and to the reformist goals of these neo-colonialists.

This tactical switch would prove to be both a blessing and a curse. It was a curse, in that its cost to the African American community in terms of solidarity, economic, nationalist political will, and intracommunal continuity were too expensive for the returns. It proved to be beneficial, in that integration has always been a crucial philosophy in colonial policy as a mechanism to achieve social equality. Philosophical integration however is antithetical to the separatist racist axioms of ethnonationalism. Thus, this tactic had to fail and eventually force the return of traditional African American separatist nationalist ideology. One conclusion clearly emerges from the failed mass mobilization and demonstration era. That is, regardless of tactical priority, African Americans were willing to engage in a nationalist struggle for their freedom.

It is also important to note that regardless of how successful, initially, the bourgeois nationalist movement may have been in redirecting our traditional institutional nationalist behavior, these bourgeois nationalist organizations were never able to shift the attention totally away from the
nationalist separatist ideology to the integrationist ideology among the masses.

Due to superficial concessions made by white American nationalists to the bourgeois nationalists of our community during the era of civil-rights, the successful decolonization movement in Vietnam, a stiffening of the positions among Cold War leaders, and various liberating movements in America, there emerged a counter to these bourgeois nationalist organizations. The leaders and followers of this counter-hegemonic nationalist movement would be called militants, communists, race haters and other villainized names; when in reality, they were neo-traditional African American nationalists. These neo-traditional nationalists would recast and espouse the nationalist philosophy of the nineteenth century and simply call it Black Power.

Black Power: The Continuation of African American Nationalism

It was out of the confused era of the 1960s that the loud voice of the masses came screaming above the sirens, crackling of burning buildings, shouts of rioters, gun shots of looters and police, in over one hundred cities from Newark to Detroit, from Chicago to L.A.. It was at this historical moment that the voice of Black Power was forced into the consciousness of America. Many Americans, both black and white, tried to explain what it was and what it meant to America (as we argued in chapter 1 of this document).
Some feared it as an ideology of race hatred and others saw it as a movement of liberation; but no one could ignore it.

In every major urban city where the colonized Africans of this country resided, it was a constant voice declaring that the failures of the last three decades would no longer be tolerated, and that all was not quiet on the new 'Western Front.' It served notice to the Negro (bourgeois) leadership that they had failed and a new day had arrived. It was a confrontational ideology that had elements of Washingtonianism, Garveyism, DuBoisism, Delayenism, Maoism and other national and universal philosophies. It was an ideology that rejected the axioms of white nationalist capitalism and embraced the ideology of Pan-African socialism. It was Fanonian in its understanding of human alienation. "The ideology of Black Power gives supreme importance to the problem of the Negro's image of himself" (Franklin, 1969, 291).

Created and maturing during an era of violence, the advocates of Black Power understood the importance of violence as a political weapon. Black Power had a violent dimension to it as demonstrated by the Black Panthers. Leaders of the Black Panther organization realized early that violence had several advantages. They understood that it was a means of getting concessions from the federal government and could be utilized in creating a new African people.
In essence, they understood that violence served both an objective and a subjective purpose. They understood that the government could either respond with "a total repression of the Negro community specifically and a general repression of dissent and agitation groups concerned with fundamental changes in our society, or (2) a more larger response in the form of larger programs to rehabilitate the ghetto" (Franklin, 290).

Black Power was a loud authoritarian voice of human inventors, creators and image-makers. They advocated the creation of a new political system and rejected coalition politics and politicians. They demanded that those who would serve the African American community be innovative teachers who would not coddle the masses but criticize without offending them. It was the unified voice of a united African community, who, for the first time in this nation's history, witnessed the unification of the African masses with their African intelligentsia. In short, it was a unifying call to interracialist and separatist nationalists and sought to re-direct their bifurcated struggle.

This neo-traditional nationalism was the nationalism of those who had come North in ever increasing numbers after the World Wars and were met with hatred, crowded conditions, unemployment and discrimination in the schools, jobs, society and in the law. It was a revolutionary philosophy that no longer saw the masses as a hindrance but as a source of strength. It was cultural in its orientation and shouted that 'Black is Beautiful.' It was the
voice of the outsiders who threatened to take the majority of the urban young, and poor warrior class with them. It was a voice of those who were economically, politically and culturally on the outside of the mainstream of this country.

And for all of the good that this neo-nationalism was to produce, it was still immature. It still lacked an understanding of the world liberation movement and had no serious revolutionary program to offer these newly created masses. "To be sure, even the Negro struggle has barely begun to approach a revolutionary intensity. The methodology of this struggle has not even acquired a "theoretic frame" (Cruse, 175). It took the position of reformers and Marxist revolutionists. As far as the latter was concerned, it was a totally bankrupt system which had failed to produce results on the continent of its creation and certainly was inapplicable to our unique circumstances here in America. From the former, they [the Black Panthers] borrowed the philosophy and ideals of the American revolution and constitution and used them as the basis for their struggle.

For our purpose, the importance of the Black Power movement lies less in its failures of astute leadership, reactionary politics, mislabeled revolutionary behavior of its proponents, with their inappropriate Marxist revolutionary ideology, as it is with the fact that this ideology met the conditions of the new urban masses with a new form of African nationalism. And consequently, the attractiveness of the movement among the urban
lower class masses illustrated that nationalist behavior was still foremost in
the minds of a majority of African Americans in this society.

We must make note of the fact that the ideological importance of the
Black Power movement came at a strategic point in the struggle of the
African nation in this society. It came as a counter hegemonic movement to
the coalition between the African American neo-colonialists and the liberal
wing of the white nationalists, who together had usurped the tactic of
integration to lead our movement for African enfranchisement and equality

The Black Power movement did then, and still does today, serve notice
to these twin amalgamist groupings that African nationalist sentiments still
run along the same traditional, cultural, economical and separatist lines, and
that their coalescence is short lived and invalid. When it emerged, Black
Power was seen as an anomaly, just as African nationalism has always been
viewed by the white nationalists of this society (Barbour, 1968; Carmichael,
African nationalism, has been viewed by the Negro
neo-colonialist-nationalists as a persistent annoyance, and as a movement
that would retard or forestall their desired integrational developments. Many
have attempted to dismiss its significance as a movement for liberation. And
those astute enough to recognize its fragmented importance, then fail to
understand the phenomenological implication of its continuous
reemergence. And if they are aware of its historical continuum, they dismiss it as merely a crisis movement only significant as an indicator of African displeasure. Unfortunately, anyone who has failed to view it in the only light which reveals its importance, has missed the many indicators that point to its eventual final dynamic ascendancy to the preeminent political position of the African American nation. Black Power, for all of its inconsistencies and lack of historical continuity, still remains continuous. It has retained all of the essential elements of traditional revolutionary African American nationalism (Cruse, 1968; Blake, 1978; Walters, 1973; Reed, 1971; Cross, 1987).

Beyond Sentiment: African American Nationalism and Liberation

It is time that we move beyond the sentimentalism and mysticism of early African American nationalism. It is time that we move beyond the romanticism of Garvey, Blyden, DuBois, Malcolm X and Martin L. King. It is time that we base our nationalism on the pragmatism of 21st century reality. The early nationalists were tired of oppressive conditions and attempted to confront them with idealism, romancism, mysticism and stubborn persistence, but it is time that we use the information that we now have acquired and fashion a nationalism that will be based on this information and collective will.*

*Asante argues correctly that what the African American nation needs now, in order to confront the problems of the future, is a pragmatic nationalism. This revisionist form of nationalism would be data based, be based on the conscious recognition that racism will be a continuous part of the American landscape, and is the fundamental contradiction of this society; recognizes that racism and classism have
African Americans must go beyond the sentimentality of Garvey and Muhammad, and I am in most agreement with Asante when he says that "the philosophical base of systematic nationalism must always be emancipating politics" (Asante, 124). The only correct behavior of any oppressed people is a form of selfish politics that is focused primarily on their own emancipation. It is the selfish behavior of nationalism which is correct in a pluralistic society. I would agree, arguing that systematic nationalism is the only proper behavior for any people living in a colonially oppressive society. We must move our nationalism to the forefront of our consciousness and then engage in proper comprehensive behavior, including, science, economics, culture and politics.

I have maintained throughout this discourse that due to the failures of our 'nationalists,' the African American condition has stayed the same, if not worsened. The failure of our nationalists to develop and politicize a
comprehensive program is largely responsible for our stagnation and continued oppressive condition.

Currently, there is a movement that advocates the resurgence of nationalist conventional politics (see chapter 9 this document). This is the only time in our recent history [since the 1930s], that we, as a nation, have not created a government in exile with leaders who would confront our common problems on a national scale, in a national forum. Consequently, we have allowed too many others to decide what our political position should be. But, I must also say that this request for, and belief in simple electoralism, is counter to the call for intelligent nationalism. Mere electoralism will not change fundamentally our colonized condition. Unless we challenge, on an organized basis, the basic criteria upon which this electoral system is based, the numerical position that we occupy in this political system will negate our best intended political behavior.

Because we did not have a strong nationalist theory, and failed to practice nationalist political or economic behavior on a unified unequivocal basis in the sixties, when African nationalism was at its zenith but unfortunately loosely connected, when asked what we wanted as a nation, African Americans answered, "WE WANT TO BE AND LIVE LIKE YOU," or to put it more accurately: "WE WANT TO BE WHITE." Thus, we got the Great Society, the War on Poverty, integration, Model Cities, poverty programs, Black Negro studies, food stamps, and Lyndon Johnson
proclaiming to the world, in all his southern majesty: "We shall overcome." We became whiter, and black slavery became more and more subtle" (Madhubuti, 26).

Now, as it has always been, the major issue confronting African Americans is how to defeat Euroamerican white supremacy and survive to benefit the future generations of Africans world wide. It is my position that the only way to accomplish this dual goal is to avoid the various white supremacy management systems, i.e., capitalism and communism, (Scott, 1980; Williams, 1987; Chomsky, 1992; Parenti, 1989), and to develop and act according to African worldwide nationalist principles. It is time that African Americans develop and go beyond the limited nationalist programs and philosophies of the past. It is time that we extend and combine African and Pan-African philosophies to meet the challenges of the future. As Madhubuti said, "if we are to realistically advance and develop as a people, we must organize and nationalize around Black National Interests. We must organize as a people in order to advance the people [italics mine]" (Madhubuti, 40).

Amnesia, Communalism and Nationalist Political Paralysis

African Americans are showing signs of various degrees of amnesia. Seemingly, they have forgotten what it is to be a nation of people who are self defined and defended. This condition is manifested in various visible ways, from displaying overt signs of forgiving those who have and continue to oppress them, i.e., by verbalizing and politicizing the dogma of integration, or
refusing to defend themselves against the obvious physical attacks conducted by various institutions of Euroamericans.

African Americans seem to have lost their communal sense of purpose and direction. African Americans no longer seem able to carry the struggle to the next necessary level of intensity, or do not seem to recognize what the next level of struggle is. They seem stagnated in the dogma of individualism, apparently, unaware that individuality and individualism are oppositional and antithetical to revolutionary struggles. What is so terrifying about this, is that the community seems to know this, and is either unwilling to do anything collectively about it, or do not have the collective will to alter this defeatist agenda.

Being estranged from themselves as individuals and as an organic collective, they have lost their will to power and are seemingly unable to objectify themselves as a nation. "Individuals and nations have no personality until they have achieved this pure thought and knowledge of themselves" (Knox, 1967, 37). Consequently, the African American communal person has been forgotten. They are lost to linger in a non-communal condition which only continues to alienate them as individuals and as a community, as a nation.

The African American community maintains their individual self at an atomized level. They seem lost in the pathology of EuroAmerican individualism. Consequently, they are waging a fight for national liberation on the individual level absent a centralize approach to their common problem. They are fragmented into so many loosely defined groups all searching for a common end. Unable to achieve it, because they have seemingly lost their sense of communal tradition of collective behavior. The African American community suffers from a state of not objectifying its constituent subjective parts, i.e., its black citizens. This is a result of colonially imposed disorganization and destruction of the normal development processes of the objectified state.

To correct this, the African (Americanized), will have to struggle to reimpose/reinstitute their communalism inside America which is currently struggling against the negative forces of individualism (Bellah, 1985). Traditionally African Americans have been a communal people. Their current communal retardation is a consequence of Americanized colonialism and the dogma of individualism. At times, African Americans forget this side of themselves and the forces that created this anti-communal behavior displayed by some of our people. Instead of associating themselves with corrective causes, they as a community, have accepted the excuses offered by Eurocentric ideologues. Believing in this hoax, members of the African nation have too often acted in their own self interest and not in the
interest of the community. Unfortunately, too many members of the community have forgotten that African Americans have continuously waged a struggle to retain a community (Rawick, 1972,107-9).

African Americans have made some very costly errors while attempting to create and maintain their community. They have fallen victim to the pathology of individualism so characteristic of colonialism and capitalist societies. They have allowed themselves to be defended as a national minority at the expense of nationhood and have attempted to free themselves of these conditions via the traditional political route, or simply gone along with the dominant discourse and assumed that classism and individualism were somehow natural. As a result of this accommodational behavior, they have fallen victim to a critical condition of national false-consciousness [Constantino's term].

**False-Consciousness and National Retardation**

The task that lies ahead of the Afrocentric political scientist and revolutionary nationalist today is twofold. First we must not only create a nationalist identity, but create a national consciousness. Secondly we must take the historical struggle of our elder nationalists further today than what they attempted yesterday; we must correct the level of ignorance that they displayed and then eradicate the pervasive level of nationalist apathy that consumes our people.
Traditionally, elder African nationalists, while suffering various levels of assault from Euroamericans, did create a nationalist identity among the early African American community during the formative years. This is evident in the many African titled institutions that they formed in response to being denied inclusion into the larger society. From self help societies to the formation of churches, fraternities and national conventions, traditional African nationalists recognized that they were Africans and with the structure of colonial America, and constructed a separate nation inside this country.

Unfortunately, they did internalize their supposed inferiorization that the formative colonizers [slavers] manufactured and adopted some of the dominant themes that were circulating during their lives; they even constructed parallel institutions. This is evident, in the ideologies of missionary zealfulness and the spreading-civilization mission' that dominated the thinking of the bourgeois nationalism during the colonization era of the nineteenth century. However, they did manage to engage themselves in revolutionary counter-consciousness work, and to do the necessary work of political education, which is an essential step in creating a revolutionary consciousness among oppressed people. National consciousness "is distinguished from identity which may not always connote degrees of politicization which should always accompany national consciousness" (Constantino, 32). They did remain active in confronting the
antiAfrican survival-thrust that was dominant during their times. They continued to organize and agitate for the freedom of our people and sought to solidify them into an active nation of people struggling for a common cause.

One of the difficulties facing our embryonic African nationalist was being separated from the Black masses. This separation created various problems which threatened their individual lives, but also the life of their nation. Many nationalists were returned to the life of slavery, forced into hiding and faced death on a regular basis. Thus our movement became fragmented. Our leaders acted in separation from the body of African people. The head and the body were separated. Another major problem was the development of an intracommunal racial caste system that was supported by our colonial society. That is, most of our early bourgeois-nationalist either were freeman, or they came from the class of slaves who were of mixed breeding.

This fostered, and recreated, the old destructive elitist behavior that destroyed our ancient nations. But, it is also fair to say, that some of these early leaders came from a unique class of runaway slaves who did not develop the elitist attitudes of those who were bred for bourgeois status and, consequently, they prevented the totalization of the caste-bourgeois ideology. The historical struggles between Washington and DuBois, Adam Clayton Powell and the early Martin L. King, or the lives of Frederick Douglass, or Rev. Nat Turner serve as good examples.
Another problem facing our traditional nationalist was the pervasive amount of ignorance among the slaves. Consequently, these two forces produced a bourgeois class that dominated the rise of nationalism in the African community, and produced, or contributed to the ambiguous behavior that still infects our people today.

The bourgeois nationalists did attempt to create a national consciousness among our people for over two hundred years. They did attempt to create a consciousness among African Americans and forced them to address their position in America and the world. Thanks to the efforts of these early nationalists, our people remained conscious of their nationalistic goals and aspirations. Early African Americans were conscious of their nationhood. Constant politicization is what distinguishes national consciousness from national identity. National consciousness "means that sense of oneness which comes from a community of aspirations, response and actions (Constantino, 25). The masses understood that their primary goal was to become free and to be separated from their captors. They also had a strong desire to return to Africa; and the nationalists continuously politicized these goals. The current crisis in African American consciousness is the result of an abdication from our historical aspirations, the acceptance of narrowly defined goals, i.e., equality; and, the success of the white colonialist propaganda and socialization apparatus which has altered our individual and collective identity.
Our loss of nationalist-consciousness has been assisted by pseudo-nationalists who help to maintain the synomonic discourse of domestic colonialism and, therefore, have forced the understanding of our people into the euphemistic national American dialogue instead of seeking a revolutionary dialogue between our community and the white nationalists of this society. As a result, too many of our people are confused about formulating correct programs and policies that will lead to their liberation. Too many of them question whether there is a need for such discussions, assuming incorrectly that we are free, and that those who advocate nationalist politics, and nationalist behavior, are extremists. But there is a reason for this confusion as Fanon (1963) reminds us,

This traditional weakness, which is almost congenital to the national consciousness of underdeveloped countries, is not solely the result of mutilation of the colonized people by the colonial regime. It is also the result of the intellectual laziness of the national middle class, of its spiritual penury, and of the profoundly cosmopolitan mold that its mind is set in (148).

Too many members of our contemporary leadership are not revolutionary nationalists and therefore are not engaged in educating the masses politically. The consequences of a national false-consciousness can be seen in the political behavior of our people. It can be seen in the way that we continue to participate in a politics that is not conducive to our survival and prosperity. As long as we continue to conduct ourselves as ordinary
American citizens, and not as a special group of American citizens, we will continue to be at the mercy of the larger metropolitan society.

If African Americas are to once again take their place among the community of free men, then it is necessary that they not only formalize a political identity, but a national consciousness. It is necessary that they resist the colonial identities associated with a dehumanizing culture and territorial confinement mentality. They must resist and transform the territorial identity that ghettoization has imposed upon them and assume a world consciousness. African Americans must become aware of the fact that their condition is the result of worldwide imperialist forces and not isolated and separate from this worldwide system of oppression.

To accomplish this, we must develop an Afrocentric nationalism, which means decolonizing the limited nationalism that is now being continued. The current nationalism is narrowly concerned with creating a national identity by connecting us to the African continent culturally. If we are to do this, we must resist the destructive forces of individualism that are affecting our society today. We must eradicate those who are engaged in cannibalistic behaviors for themselves to which we as a nation have fallen victim. The pimps, whores, drug dealers and users, the "black Capitalists" the treasonist politicians, the illiterate teachers and professors, and all who seek refuge inside the pathology of individualism must either be reeducated along
traditional communal lines or removed from us. They must seek refuge inside the communities whose values they ignorantly reflect and espouse.

It is a common belief that African Americans at their core, are communal people. If this is so, the revival of our traditional communal selves must not be based on romanticism or the consequence of us refusing to criticize inappropriate aspects of traditional West African communalism. We must not glorify primitive communalism and hope to, in the name of racial solidarity, transform it into some ecumenical enigma such as primitive African Socialism. We must transform our political, cultural, and economical theories into concrete programs that are aimed at transforming our universal condition into a positive reality. The question is, do we have the will to do so?

African Americans are currently displaying a colonial consciousness that is causing them political paralysis. They are currently lacking the interconnection between national identity and consciousness that was evident during periods of our struggle, especially during the revolutionary 1960s which in many ways was a watershed in our evolutionary growth as a nation.

Currently, the African community is reverting backwards to the pre 1960s. We are entrusting our national destiny to those who have become the neo-colonialist of our society. We are now once again suspended in the counter-revolutionary era of *elite ascendancy*; the same elitism that stagnated
and characterized our traditional nationalism during the Golden Age. The correction of this elitist tendency presents a formidable challenge to our decolonization struggle. We must take the lead from the masses and not exclude them. Even those who will become our leaders, because of natural or acquired abilities (the talented tenth for example), can be relied on only to the extent that the socialization process is effective. If they have not been culturally socialized, institutionally developed, in a reAfricanized environment, then it is reasonable to assume that this leadership group or it's cadre will also become counterrevolutionary. African Americans cannot allow our nationalism to be channeled into the narrow and limiting parameters of cultural nationalism.

Culture is vital in the struggle for national liberation. But our cultural redevelopment is counter-revolutionary. We are currently demonstrating behavior that is counter to the dialectical nature of culture. Presently, we are attempting to resurrect our traditional West African culture with little regard for its needed redevelopment. This reversion must be to create a new cultural form; it can not stay locked at this stage. We must decolonize our present cultural redevelopment and connect it to a transforming liberation struggle.

The Will To Power and the Internationalization of our African Nationalism

The question that must be answered by the African American community, if we are to become the free people that our nationalism demands, is do we have the will to power? That is, do we desire to become a
nation? Are African Americans willing to do whatever it takes, in the name of naked power, to assume nationhood. Do we, as a collective, possess more will for national power than those individuals who wish to remain lost in counter-revolutionary behavior? Among too many individuals who have been traumatized and suffer from national amnesia, the answer seemingly is no; but in the collective, the answer must be a resounding YES.

As a result of our atomization, and the resulting destruction of our national identity and consciousness, we as a nation no longer seem willing to assume power. We no longer seem to have the national desire to take power. Our nationalism, as a living organic collectivism, which desires to manifest itself in the acquisition of power, to constitute itself, to manifest itself, like all other living entities, refuses to die, it has chosen life. And the colonizers and their collaborators, within the neo-colonialist class of our community, understand this natural desire to live. They continue to resist aggressively and attempt to destroy nationalism and our nationalists. Thankfully, even if African Americans do not display or promote a sense of nationalism, simply because of our situation, it will remain a potent force in our political lives.

We must, move beyond our earlier form of nationalism, which was based on this simple and narrowly focused form of will, into a national cause for inclusion into the world community of Free and independent nations. This must be the only objective of our nationalism. This is the dialectical struggle that the colonial paradigm places before the community of the
colonized. The struggle to manifest itself in the face of continuous threats to its being.

We must rely on the people. We must entrust our national being into their hands. We must teach them "that everything depends on them; that if we stagnate, it is their responsibility, and if we go forward it is due to them too, that there is no such thing as a demiurge, that there is no famous man who will take the responsibility for everything, but that the demiurge is the people themselves and the magic hands are finally only the hands of the people" (Fanon, 197).

We must strengthen the revolutionary connection of our middle-class and intellectuals with the masses that occurred as a result of the Black Power movement of the 1960s. Because at the base of that movement was a strong will to and for power. It was the astute analysis of the African "Black Power" advocates who said that African Americans were at the bottom of the power pecking-order here in America, and that Africans wanted a share of the power. Power has always been at the center of national and human relations and it should come as no surprise that Africans wish to share in that power arrangement.

At the beginning of this discourse, I stated that the African American nationalism presently was a powerless nation inside America. It is this desire to change that condition that is at the core of our nationalistic drive. This is the naked power of nationalism; this is the ability that we must seek.
What we must do is turn our national _will to power_ loose. We must allow it to grow and seek its natural course. We must allow it to manifest itself, instead of engaging in complicitous behavior with those who our nationalism opposes. To continue to retard the development of our nationalism, is to remain oppressed Therefore, we must engage in a politic which will create a nurturing environment for it. Our _will to power_ must become uncompromising.

We can no longer engage in interracial politics, ignore the power imperatives behind political pluralism or multiculturalism. Our nationalism can only develop when it is met with confrontation. When our will is confronted with the counter will to dominant us.

This is the primeval behavior that drove our nationalistic behavior during the formative years. This must be the renewed drive of our expanded nationalism today. We must push the level of resistance forward and upward. _We must engage in a politics of difference, a revolutionary politics, that will create a political climate whereby our nationalistic will to power will be confronted by the will of white nationalism to dominate us._ We must struggle for our nationalism to be.
Chapter 9
Decolonization, Democracy and Nationalist Politics

The driving force today, as it was during the height of the colonial era, is economics. As it was then, so is it still today the primary reason for the acquisition and control of colonies. The difference today is that many former colonies are now being ruled by finance colonialism, but colonialism all the same. As such, economics are at the root of other types of imperialist policies, such as its compliment, political colonialism.

Politically, colonialist will utilize any regime to facilitate their exploitative ends and they will not discriminate between political ideologies. "Imperialist governments stand for political and economic domination, no matter under what mask, 'democracy' or what not, and therefore will never give colonial subjects equal status with other dominions... (Nkrumah, 30).

Reformist political policies are usually advanced by various bourgeois-nationalists groups supported by liberal colonizers, or, by conservative colonizers seeking independence from the 'mother country.'

All colonies have been subjected to social engineering, i.e., pluralism and, therefore, they lack national political and social continuity thereby making 'progressive' politics difficult if not impossible. Thus, imperialist-colonizers are able to continue their exploitative practices unabated even under various forms of reformist political arrangements, i.e., dual-mandate,
dominion status, etc.. During this intermediate stage of the colonial situation, "colonial politics tend to lack finality because high policy is decided elsewhere,. . ." (Walker, 91).

Lacking any real political authority, colonized bourgeois reformists and nationalists, are compelled to physically, or verbally, fight and debate among themselves over the value of current and/or future political arrangements and the direction of the country. Forced into political impotency, characterized by regionalism, tribalism, and individualism, colonial politics becomes useless. As Walker (1945) said, "debate cannot issue policy;.... Each man counts for so much in a restricted community, each man (and woman) knows so much of his neighbors' affairs, that politics tend to turn on personalities" (91).

In colonial societies, that are artificially pluralistic, political debate either centers around personality or economics (taxation). Taxes are the only unifying political issue that all of the various ethnics groups of the colony have in common. In all other matters, they are fragmented along ethnic lines. Consequently, each ethnic community is antagonistic the other; all of them competing for limited shared resources never thinking about combining their power for survival.

Nationally, the push towards political independence eventually evolves around, and centers on, questions regarding what would be the most appropriate arrangement to make with the former rulers that will combine
their desire for self-rule and the imperialists' desire for continued economic advantages. One popular answer has been 'trusteeships.'

Many internal colonial theorists have argued correctly that internal colonizers have engaged in, and duplicated, various aspects of classical colonial political policy (Stavenhagen, 1965; Casanova, 1965; Cruse, 1968; Blauner, 1972; Turner, 1970; Carmichael & Hamilton, 1967; Allen, 1990). It is my position, that Euroamerica has developed an internal colonial political system that is designed to maintain a 'trustee' relationship with the internal colonized communities (ghettos); and has developed, or is producing, an internally indigenous class to carry on its indirect neo-colonial policies. American colonizers have constructed a pluralist society, thereby making cohesive multiracial national politics difficult.

Euroamerican colonizers, have through socialization, produced a cadre of westernized political and academic intellectuals that promote political stability to the detriment of African American autonomy and equality. They have developed a political system, and installed an imperialist-colonial regime, that is based on a perverted form of democracy.

In colonial America, political structures predominate over democratic substance, and as such democracy is viewed as an end and not as a means. By fostering the democratic ideologies of electoralism, participation and obligation, Euroamerican colonizers, and colonized African Americans, exist under a democratic illusion of having control while endorsing the principle
of one-man-one vote which works for colonial domination but not for the liberation of African Americans.

Due to the success of this political socialization, African Americans believe that they can achieve their liberation through non-violent political means. And, while Euroamerican colonizers have peddled this mythology, they, as a community, have endorsed and promoted various forms of atomistic political policies, such as tribalism, regionalism (euphemistically called community-control), localism, state control, or individual agency, to further confuse the colonized African American community. They have engaged in these various forms of colonial politics while denouncing, denigrating and attacking African American nationalist politics as a form of deviant behavior carried on by madmen and social malcontents.

Euroamericans have used a perverted form of democracy to blind the colonial reality of this society and, by promoting the democratic mythology, where structure is given dominance over substance, Euroamerica has constructed a democratic system that is in fact autocratic. Contrary to popular belief, colonial Euroamericans were not interested in, nor did they develop a politically democratic society. Democracy and classism were not a historical part of early America's social and political choices, either in theory or practice, but estatism and republicanism were (Scott, 1980).

When we look at the political history of America, and the African American political experience, we will find that even under the best of
conditions, African American political participation has been confused, contradictory, incomplete and misguided. If African Americans are to utilize structural politics as a means of ending their colonial subjugation, then they must engage in a form of extra-legal behavior that will force structural changes in the system, such that, it will facilitate their liberation.

The Role of Nationalist Politics in the Decolonization Struggle

The African American community has attempted various strategies to achieve its liberation from the oppression of this society, and to date they still find themselves in the same, if not a worse condition after several decades of seemingly hopeful signs that all would be well. They have tried legal gradualism, rebellions, riots, electoral politics, colonization and advocated violent revolution.

African Americans must consider how they can transform this autocratic colonial political system into a multiracial pluralistic democracy, based on cultural specificity, i.e., ethnonationalism. Transforming the American political system into a viable strategic tool in our struggle will in itself be revolutionary. It will mean transforming what has been a purely republican colonial-autocratic system, with all of its implications, into a truly decentralized pluralistic social and political democracy.
That in itself will entail the massive transformation of the anti-democratic apparatus of this society into a mechanism that will accommodate the wishes and aspirations of the underprivileged, and directly challenge many colonial American political traditions.

Nationalist politics occupies a crucial role throughout the decolonization process. A political movement that coincides with, and extends beyond, the violent revolutionary option. Until recently (1960s) African Americans were nationally and locally being ruled directly by the Euroamerican colonial administrators (mayors, governors, aldermen, city councilmen, state legislators).

Since the 1960s, African Americans have been trying to change this type of political colonialism on the regional and local levels with some measure of success. Consequently, they are now entangled in the web of, and suffering from, all the ill-effects of indirect, or neo-colonial rule. Because of our unique circumstances, which has us existing inside a democratically structured country, and yet excluded from the American democratic political process, we have the possibility of utilizing democratic means to solve our political problem[s] (Davis, 1972; Holden, 1972; Jones, 1972; Walton, 1990; Walters, 1992).

If we take the position that political leaders and the intelligentsia are essential to the success of the decolonization process, then nationalist politics
must aggressively be placed as an option before the African American people. Nationalist politics is critical to the success of any decolonization struggle. If the nationalist political party is to be effective, it must at once create an atmosphere of unity in the nation and seek out the marginalized elements that could either facilitate or serve as a counter-consciousness force.

It must begin to educate people towards national consciousness, and instill in them the belief that they are the one's who will determine the success or failure of the struggle; and encourage them to become politically active. The nationalist party must become the voice of the people, such that it takes from them, and then returns what they have learned to them in the form of programs and policies. The unification of the party and the leaders with the masses, is the essential link that determines the success of the political struggle.

If the nationalist party is incapable of establishing a truly national polity, whereby it and the total community are combined into a single

---

* Fanon maintains that the nationalists party must; [1] be all encompassing, "i.e." have a broad political power base; [2] be dedicated to the total community; [3] be a unifying force; [4] be actively involved in political education; [5] have a political and economic agenda upon which to maintain the liberty of the country; [6] be the voice of the people. In essence, Fanon wanted a decentralized socialists democracy; [7] that its leaders must be culturally 'rooted' to insure that they are 'truly' representative of the people, and; [8] must reject both white nationalists political economic ideologies, "i.e.," communism or capitalism.
minded entity, various groups will begin to work against national
unity. *Absent enlightened culturally grounded nationalist leaders, those

*One very important and growing group for Fanon and Eldridge Cleaver was the lumpenproletariat. Both of these revolutionary thinkers opposed Marx’s formulation of this class. According to Marx’s revolutionary model, the lumpenproletariat was as useless and non-productive group who comprised the lowest echelon of the economic strata. This group, according to his formulation, is comprised of the pimps, gamblers, whores, prostitutes, and unemployed. Marx’s implied that this class willfully joined this class and was therefore, non-political.

Both Cleaver and Fanon understood the function and composition of this class differently than Marx. Fanon understood this class to be the most important pivotal group during the revolutionary struggle, and during the nascent stage of national independence.

Fanon maintained that this class, in the colonial situation, was composed of those who had been forced out of their traditional occupations in the rural areas and into joblessness in the urban centers. In the urban centers they would be forced into a life of crime, and used by the colonizers and his military, to work against the revolutionary movement.

Once in the urban centers and out of employment, this group would remain a threat to the stability of the colonial regime and would therefore be constantly arrested and harassed by the military. Therefore for Fanon, the lumpenproletariat, “this mass of humanity, this people of the shanty towns, at the core of the lumpenproletariat, that the rebellion will find its urban spearhead. for the lumpenproletariat, that horde of starving men, uprooted from their tribe and from their clan, constitute one of the most spontaneous and the most radically revolutionary forces of the colonized people,” (Fanon, 129).

Fanon argues that this is the class that is responsible for the urban crime as a result of unemployment, isolation, official neglect and colonial oppression. This is the group that will commit various violent and non-violent crimes, such as, stealing, debauchery, and alcoholism. Juvenile delinquency in the colonized countries is the direct result of the existence of the lumpenproletariat.

Fanon says that this class, of pimps, hooligans, the unemployed will become the most violent revolutionaries and “throw themselves into the struggle for liberation like stout working men, (Fanon, 130).” According to him, they discover revolutionary action, shunning reform, and rejecting morality. The various strata of this class become the relentless horde that carries the revolution forward not having anything to lose, but everything to gain through revolutionary struggle.

The nationalists party fails, initially, to understand or attract this class. They neglect them as the colonizer once did and, if they continue to do so, this class will struggle against them as well. To
who are able to develop an independent economic and political movement, and adopt, or transform nationalist sentiments into policies and programs, individual groups, and the nationalist leaders themselves, will succumb to outside influence, which will place the majority of the masses in opposition to their policies and programs, thus putting the nation on a collision course that will only end in a national civil war.

The nationalist party has the responsibility of organizing and controlling the various national elite groups and masses who will comprise

avoid this needless struggle, the nationalists party must work to incorporate them at every level of the struggle and during the nation building phase of the decolonization struggle.

Cleaver, in his article, "On Lumpen Ideology," The Black Scholar, Nov-Dec. 1972, demonstrated that he also understood the importance of this class, and he too rejected the Marxian formulation. Cleaver argued that Marx's formulation was too primitive and useless for today's capitalism system. Cleaver argued that advancements in technology was creating what he called "the lumpenization of the people of the world, (Cleaver, 1972)." As the capitalist system becomes more technologically advanced, more and more people would be forced to turn to "the system of relief, of charity, of welfare, developed and elaborated into Social Security, (Cleaver, 7)."

Cleaver maintains that the growing lumpen class is the most revolutionary class in the capitalist world. He too rejects Marx's proletariat revolutionary doctrine. Cleaver argues that the proletariat have become brainwashed supporters of the system as a result of the growing unemployment roles and the erosion of their employment and political power.

The African American nationalist cannot afford to overlook this growing class inside the African colonies here in America. This growing class is currently displaying all of the pre-revolutionary behaviors that Fanon and cleaver described.

the ruling polyarchy. This party, in order to be effective, must be decentralized such that it can attract and incorporate the largest and broadest cross section of the society into a conscious nation. In order to do this, it has to embark on a political education program that will unite all of the people into a cohesive political unit.

Very few underdeveloped countries became nationally independent without attempting to create political and economic indigenous institutions; or, without developing a strong culturally nationalist political party that is responsible to the people. If they are unable to develop a political cadre that will march into the various regions and begin a political education program among the masses, the best intended leader will fail and the nation will revert back into counter-consciousness characterized by neo-colonialism and regionalism.

**Bourgeois-Nationalist Politics and Domestic Colonialism**

Fanon uncovered political ambivalence and economic ineptness among the bourgeois-nationalists in Algeria and other African countries. He revealed that because they lacked political sophistication, and did not develop an indigenous political organizational philosophy, and were dependent on technical and financial support from the West, the national bourgeoisie became political tools to be used by the colonial rulers in their programs of continued economic exploitation. To cover up their economic ineptness, and to insure their continued positions as imperialist lackeys, these bourgeoisie-
nationalist often become dependent on useless voting schemes advocating useless one-man-one vote policies. Fanon (1963) said,

the entire action of these nationalist political parties during the colonial period is action of the electoral type: a string of philosophic-political dissertations on the themes of the rights of people to self-determination, the rights of man to freedom from hunger and human dignity, and the unceasing affirmation of the principle "One man, one vote." The nationalists political parties never lay stress upon the necessary of trial of armed strength, for the good reason that their objective is not the radical overthrowing of the system. Pacifists and legalist, they are in fact partisans of order, the new order—but to the colonialist bourgeoisie they put bluntly enough the demand which to them is the main one: "Give us more power" (59).

Fanon's argument is the same as Walters and other African American political scientists who argued that our bourgeois-nationalist political leaders lack economic programs, and have relied on simple electoral politics. These bourgeoisie-nationalists, without capital, without ideals and without courage, help to create an atmosphere were the decolonization movement flounders and stagnates. The new trend in "black politics" (mislabeled as being "Black politics" when it is not), is based on the selective few mayoral victories that African Americans have experienced, i.e., in New York, Seattle, etc.; and is highly favored by whites as the way for African Americans to succeed in the political process.
What Walters calls 'crossover' politics, I will correctly call neo-colonialist/interracialist politics is clearly not in the interest of our people, nor is it new. According to Walters, 'crossover' (hereafter called correctly, neo-colonialist politics), emerged after the few selected victories experienced by the neo-colonialists in 1989. What these neo-colonialists have done is minimize African American interest, run on a non-confrontational and non-racial themes and, thereby, normalize African American political demands into the political structure.

In other words, they had now become neo-colonialists instead of African American nationalists, who abdicate their ethnic responsibilities to serve the interest of the Euroamerican colonial structure. What these neo-colonialists attempted to do was change the character of traditional African American political theory into 'classical' neo-colonialist political behavior.

Too many Eurocentric political scientists and analysts falsely ascribe the title of "black politician" to both sets of political leaders, i.e., those who

*Traditionally, (since 1960), African American political theory has been concerned with, [1] transcending the 'normal' political structure to advocate/address the urgent needs of our people; [2] changing the way that political institutions work and bring pressure on those institutions; [3] not being ashamed of, nor afraid to promote the African American political agenda; [4] has addressed the persistence virulence of racism as the basic cause of our condition; and, [5] has always been an uncompromising theory, in that, it pushed the African American agenda.
advocate this form of politics as opposed to the 'truly' nationalist African American politician simply because they both happen to be African American. But, what they conveniently overlook is the substance of their political agenda. One has an agenda that is clearly anti-African American survival, and the other is keeping with the limited traditions established after the civil rights era.

It is fair to say that those who are now advocating 'crossover' politics, have been socialized into this position as a consequence of three overlapping processes; the exodus of many Euroamerican separatists-nationalists from the inner-city, the resulting dwindling resources caused by the intra-national movement of employment from traditional economic centers to newly formed Eurocentric residential centers, and the forcing of African American national political leaders into positions of compromise and ineffectiveness as a result of not having a strong viable economic basis to continue giving the limited goods and services that the African American were receiving, or to meet their growing expectations.

Coupled with the political and ruling lessons received as a consequence of tenure in office, many African American new 'crossover' politicians began to feel that they did not have an obligation to do something about the condition of the black masses. Consequently, what emerged from the 'era of electoral politics' was two political traditions. One would assist in the
liberation of the African American people, and the other would assist in their domination.

The Euroamerican political elites and imperialist-capitalists have begun to train a neo-colonialist political cadre made up of westernized and traditional community elites, along with the new post' electoral' era political leaders to rule over the African American urban colonies. What the Euroamerican colonizers have accomplished is to turn our traditional leaders into ineffective political cripples. As Immanuel Wallerstein (1966), notes, imperialist-colonizers will "enlist the ruling class in our cause...[and to] reduce the native chiefs to the role of "mere creatures" (37). Too many current neo-colonialist African Americans have become creatures of American internal colonialism.

In Search of a Paradigm: Electoral Politics, a Train Going?

There is a great deal of confusion within the political science community in general, and among African American political scientists in particular, concerning the behavior of African American political leaders. Much of this confusion has been caused by African American political scientists as they attempt to avoid having to either face or reveal the truth about Black leadership and the political condition of African Americans.

Unfortunately, like their counterparts in other areas of the social sciences, African American political scientists are using paradigms and a language that mirrors the Eurocentric conception of African American
political leaders which reinforces the minority-subjectivity that this language either explicitly or implicitly endorses. Even as they try to avoid using accurate and descriptively useful language, they nonetheless, describe a condition, or arrangement, that endorses the very condition that they want to avoid. Many African American political scientist avoid calling the political arrangement between African and Euroamericans conflictual, but in their attempt to avoid describing it in those terms, they in fact, end up describing a conflictual arrangement.

Consequently, "the most common and persistent method of describing and reviewing the nature of black leadership has been in terms of their militancy, non-militancy" (Forsythe, 1972, 18). African American political leaders have been considered (by the colonial administration and the larger Euroamerican society), outsiders; as being in opposition to the welfare and stability of the system. In very general and confusing terms, any Black political leader who has attempted to mobilize the African American community, or attempted to formulate policies to achieve economic or political goals has been described as a Black political leader.

Many African American political scientists are now questioning whether it is correct to call some political leaders Black politicians in the 'traditional sense. These political scientists view many African American politicians " as institutional heads rather than as race leaders." These political scientists have noted that some of these leaders have been able to reconcile
such roles and still others feel that by being "good" (true to their institutional roles) officials, they will serve their ethnic interest" (Walters, 1985, 26). In either case they argue, these new leaders are not Black politicians in the traditional sense. While this may be a fair charge, I think that it is important to note that many African American political leaders were forced into this neocolonialist role because they did not have an economic base to satisfy the minimal interest of the community. Limited by the economic reality of colonial America, many of these leaders were forced into the role of being ineffective brokers over existing economic arrangements.

Twenty years after the 'electoral era' began, "the material condition of the black masses have deteriorated drastically. Yet, at the same time the number of black elected officials have skyrocketed to an all time high"(Morris, 1992, 68). An obvious conclusion drawn by some progressive African American political scientists, concerning the effectiveness of our 'elected' political leaders, is that "the election of black politicians does not automatically empower the African American community, and it is even possible for that community to become less empowered as the number of black elected officials increases" (Morris, 168).

No matter how well intended an elected official may be, he alone cannot empower the African American nation, nor does politics without economics lead to the 'good-life or liberation. It is now time for African Americans to rethink its myopic strategy towards politics as a way of seeking
empowerment'/liberation. Our political leaders and our people must become united on the nature and objects of programs and policies designed to assist in our liberation struggle if we are to succeed. Our leaders cannot continue to have one political agenda and the people another one. And, this program[s] must come from the people and not generated by the leaders. No more bourgeois-nationalist political leadership.

Unfortunately, too many political scientist avoid being critical of the African American political leaders and the nature of our political impotency and instead focus on discussing chimeras of power. They choose to focus on appearances of empowerment relying on 1960s techniques to address today's problems. Too many seem to think that protest politics is an effective way of empowering African American elected officials in their struggle with the 'dominant' community.

While there are some who believe that this tactic will again be successful, some believe that the African American community without any effective means to bring pressure to bear on the Euroamerican establishment will be ineffective in its survival thrust. They, like myself, have come to the conclusion reached almost a 100 years earlier by one of the African American communities greatest statesmen, Booker T. Washington. That is, "real black empowerment flows from economic resources rather than from the mere acquisition of political office (Morris, 171)."
Yet, in the face of these and other major shortcomings, simplistic electoral politics seems to be the way of the future in the African American community. African American politicians, acting in all too familiar ways, continue to advocate voter registration, political participation and bourgeois-reformism. Their call for mere structural participation is all too typical of their counterparts in other neo-colonial societies as they advance a decadent form of, I will lead you to the promise land, "pimping politics."

The masses are convinced on a subtle level that once elected, black politicians will provide them with good jobs, economic parity, and social justice. Regrettably, this has been proven false. Too many of our negro leaders have sought offices for their own bourgeois glorification, i.e., mayoral seats, federal and state legislative/congressional seats, and many local offices. In essence, they have acted like neo-colonialist who have become the local mouth pieces for Euroamerican colonial interest. Too many of our political leaders have become sell-outs who no longer represent the interest of our people.

When faced with questions concerning economic policy, too many African American bourgeoisie-reformist, elected officials, avoid this discussion; since it would reveal their ineptness and overall powerlessness. According to Morris (1992), "there is good reason why black political leaders avoid generating or sharpening a debate focusing on black economic empowerment. Such a debate would reveal their lack of capacity to actually
implement fundamental economic change within the black community" (172).

African American participation in the political process, and the continued advocacy for their participation by the African American bourgeoisie-reformist, has become a carnival of ritualized-formalization. It has become more process and little substance. As Morris (1992) says "the current obsession with black electoral process, at the expense of actually empowering the African American community, is a disturbing development. The current brand of black electoral politics stresses political procedures and office holding rather than actual activities and ideas capable of producing black empowerment" (173).

But, like too many other Eurocentric African American political scientists, Morris fails to state in unequivocal terms that African Americans should engage in race-specific politics, i.e., nationalist politics. He too relies on mere appearance of power politics, i.e., protest politics, to empower the African American political leaders, which seems contradictory when compared to his call for race-specific economics. It seems clear that if one is going to advocate race-specific economic policies, as a means of providing leverage for the African American politician, then race-specific politics is the only natural extension. Anything other than that would seemingly dilute the strength of the African American politician. Why call for one, without endorsing outright the other, especially when they have connected the two?
In calling for race-specific politics, I, like the other authors, have not addressed a glaring failure of the antidemocratic nature of the American colonial government. While these authors are correct, in a limited way, in demonstrating the limited effects of what Prof. Lani Guiner calls the "black electoral success theory" they fail to note that the colonial government is

In her article entitled, "The Triumph of Tokenism," *Michigan Law Review*, Vol. 89, No. 5, pg. 1079, Guiner argues correctly that the "black electoral success theory" was successful in a limited way, but inherently it was flawed. While not being articulated in any coherent model or strategy, it has been, and still is, erroneously endorsed as the appropriate political strategy for African American liberation. It is flawed theoretically and functionally. Theoretically, it is based on antithetical democratic principles. According to her, it is flawed because it [1] romanticizes the problems of tokenism and false-consciousness; [2] makes the illusionary, if not, delusionary connection between voter participation and results, and; [3] assumes that the Euroamerican colonial government electoral structure is correct. That is, it implicitly endorses the one-man-one vote ideology as the proper electoral scheme to be used by a visible minority as a means of political empowerment; and thus it's functional flaw.

Prof Guiner argues that the, "black electoral theory" contains four basic assumptions: [1] the authenticity assumption, which basically stated that "authentic black leaders would be elected by black voters. Futhermore, these leaders it was incorrectly assumed would be authentic simply because they were physically, culturally and psychologically black. Again showing what Fanon called the simplistic meanichean understanding of the world; [2] the mobilization/electoral control assumption, which simply believed in the novelty of electing a black into office was sufficient to get African Americans to turn out. the mobilization assumption was a naive approach to dealing with our short comings; and was structurally limited; [3] the polarization assumption simply assumed that in a pluralistic community different ethnic groups would automatically vote for their own kind. Again ignoring other important factors, and; [4] the responsiveness assumption which believed that black elected officials would be the first line of defense against Euroamerican racism. this has proven to be incorrect as have the other assumption. Unlike the assumed relationship between black elected officials and their communities, we will show that these leaders have abdicated from their commitments to the community and have become typical neo-colonialists.

Guiner argument illustrates that the colonial government offers African Americans limited opportunities for success. As structured, even the most responsible electoral behavior by African Americans cannot have but limited affects on their condition.
structurally inadequate in effectively assisting African Americans in their quest for liberation. They fail to point out that as a visible numerical minority, without the development of special provisions being made in the electoral process, African Americans can never effectively use the system as a tool in their struggle.

John S. Mill argued that a truly democratic society, when there was a visible minority, would make fit possible for them to be ‘proportionately’ represented. Proportional representation according to Mill is the only way to assure equal representation and to defeat the rule of a numerical tyranny. According to Mill (1975), "in a really equal democracy, every or any section would be represented, not disproportionately, but proportionately" (248).

Absent any structural means of instituting proportional representation, mere electoralism is ineffective and antithetical to participatory democratic theory. Since, African Americans comprise a visible and numerical minority in colonial America, if the American democratic system wanted to assure true substantive democracy, then they should be given the proportional numerical equivalent to their actual numbers in society. Of course this will not be done since substantive democracy is not what colonial American wants. African American nationalists must begin to address these shortcomings and develop a political cadre that will politicize these and other issues if we are to make our decolonization struggle successful.
This new cadre should be well anchored in the culture of our African American experience, and not be the figureheads of the Eurocentric establishment. It is time that we invoke the African Principle in deciding who will be our political leaders. All other colonized people before us, choose leaders who were committed to the decolonization struggle of their people. Nationalism appears to be the only choice that we have; and nationalist are the only one's who can fill leadership positions in such a political program.

These new leaders must not make the same mistakes that were made earlier over the issue of alliances vs. coalitions. This new leadership must understand the fundamental distinctions between these two organization strategies/methods and forge the correct partnerships and coalitions with other interracial groups; and alliances with all intraracial Pan-Africanist groups.

Coalitions, Failure and An African American Nationalist Program

Historically, African American nationalists have been confused over the difference between coalitions and alliances and have attempted to convert the former into the latter. They are/have been willing to engage in coalition politics and endorse policies that are not in the direct or long term interest of the African American oppressed nation and its national minority.

As a consequence of this confusion, among both wings of our primary nationalist movements, concerning our survival-extension orientation, both
have consistently entered into 'coalitions' that have proven detrimental to our survival. The leadership of neither group has expressed a thorough understanding of the implications endemic to coalition theory.*

Karenga makes a very critical distinction between alliances and coalitions. This distinction is crucial to correcting our unique political circumstances.** According to Karenga (1993), "alliances are internal first and then among others whose long term goals and principles coincide or mesh with those of African Americans. These are usually other Third World people" (342).

The two are not mutually interchangeable as they are used in the lexicon of contemporary political science. Coalitions are/should be based on/aimed at achieving short term specific goals, whereby the coalition

* For a good but limited discussion see Carmichael & Hamilton Black Power, 1967 Vintage Book, N.Y.. In their book Carmichael et al provide three basic flaws, (myths), in our coalition philosophy that have contributed to our political retardation. They are, [1] a belief that our survival thrust is concomitant to that of Euroamericans; [2] that unequal coalitions partners can built viable coalitions, and; [3] that political coalitions can be based on moral principles.

** There are five areas of confusion (misconceptions), that dominate our usage of coalition politics. While several of his five components overlap Carmichael & Hamilton's, Karenga used a language and form of analysis that contributes to theirs. Karenga's five misconceptions are: that the bases for coalitions are long-term common interest and principles as opposed to short-term specific goals; that common goals in one area are/can be the basis for unity in other areas; the common misconception of moral affinity; that coalitions can exist between the powerful and the powerless and, *a final misconception about coalitions is that coalition action is a substitute for a people's or group's own initiative, (Karenga, 339).
partners can enter into/exit from them depending on their own particular agenda. This allows the less powerful to coalesce with other less powerful groups to increase their combined strength while denying the more powerful group the option of increasing its own. Thus preventing and/or reducing the chances of forming misconceptions about the nature and extent of the coalition.

Too often African American political groups have not understood this and have relied on certain groups to our own political retardation, i.e., the Democratic Party and the Jewish community. Neither of these groups can be alliances, but are/should be, only temporary coalition partners. Because of the relative difference in strength between the two groups, i.e., the African American-Jewish, or the African American/Democratic party, African Americans have been left in a dependency position and the coalition has often become a distorted form of politics based on patronage. The Democratic and the Jewish groups have at different times shown that they have their own political objectives that they wish to pursue and have sought their own program to accomplish their own goals, while the African American community has felt abandoned and lost.

While neither of these two groups can/should be alliance partners, there are certain natural alliance partners that we should/must develop; i.e., Third World ethnic groups or other progressive groups in this country. To
make these alliances work, however, the nationalist wing of our political movement must reverse some of its political shortcomings.

If one couples these shortcomings with a lack of political education and extensive grassroots organizing throughout the colonized community, then it is clear what has to be done to correct our political posture in this society. The political factions of our community must develop a strong political base upon which to make coalitions and alliances with others, if we are to become politically effective. The best place to begin this needed building process is in the historical convention forums of our past.

We should not let superficial, meaningless and artificial divisions separate us, nor the delusionary argument that African Americans cannot unite to accomplish anything. As Walker noted, colonized politics is notorious for its useless debates and fighting over ideological and personality issues. It has now become accepted knowledge among the African American community that the lessons of our great statesman, Booker T. Washington, who advocated economic and political self-reliance is what is essential to our survival. According to Martin (1992),

the need for Black self-reliance as a way out is now widely acknowledged. Black conservatives have belatedly rediscovered the concept. The Black nationalist community has striven for self-reliance since time immemorial. Even the integrationalist community, traditionally reliant on white philanthropic assistance, seeks "independence" from such support. Booker T. Washington moved the race several steps forward on the
principle of self-reliance one hundred years ago" (36).

Not only is it time to return to self-reliance, but it is also time that we develop race-specific forums to discuss these and other issues in racial isolation and privacy. It is the time for conventions on the national and international levels that include all segments and interests of our people, without European influence. This is essential to the successful reemergence of our political nationalist movement.

Another important issue to be discussed in our conventions is the need to develop an alternate political party. Contrary to popular belief, the development of a third party will not be antithetical to democracy. In fact, it will serve as an insurance policy, in that the more competition among parties, for the vote of the citizens, the more assured the citizens will be that their individual and collective needs will be met.

**Multiculturalism and Nationalist Politics**

I have argued that our new political leaders must be careful when forming coalition and alliances. This is true, but, in a society that is increasingly becoming more multicultural, it is essential that our nationalist party engages in coalition politics with those political groups whose interest do not conflict with ours. That means building newer and more meaningful coalitions; unlike those coalitions of the past. Coalitions must be based on our best interest and not those of our oppressors.
Any new nationalist party must correct the coalition failures of the past and make political overtures to those ethnic and progressive groups that are seeking similar changes in the system. We must not repeat the same mistakes as have been made in the past where we had, coupled with other ethnic groups, a ruling majority but, because we were narrow minded and failed to develop a cadre of progressive people, allowed Euroamerican colonial nationalists to coopt us and undermine our liberation efforts. Chicago serves as a good example.

In Chicago during the early 1980s, African Americans behind a massive voter registration drive and the formation of several coalitions, successfully overthrew the Irish nationalist regime that had traditionally run the city. Harold Washington, who became a two time mayor, successfully courted various progressive and ethnic groups in Chicago to form the basis of a viable political machine to replace the anti-African Daley democratic machine.

Unfortunately, with the sudden unexpected death of Washington, coupled with his inability to engage in correct power politics, the Irish nationalist were able to regain control of the city. What occurred was typical colonial politics.

African Americans, and other ethnic groups, failed to develop long term alliances, and failed to overcome short term differences between themselves. They allowed greed, self-interest politics and competition for limited resources to split their combined strength. The result was in fighting
and coalition defections, and a return to the eventual subordination to the Irish nationalist coalition and loss of rulership. Within the African American community, several marginal and outright neo-colonialist collaborators, defected to the Irish nationalist camp and fought over the political spoils of the city only to lose the election.

More importantly, African American negro leaders failed to reestablish and solidify the various coalitions that they had under their successful takeover of the city under Washington. Again, African Americans failed to correctly distinguish between coalition and alliances only to lose political opportunities and power (Marable, 1992).

African American nationalist cannot allow these types of errors to prevent them from being powerful in this country. They must aggressively court other ethnic groups in this society, and form broad based grassroots coalitions and alliances. African American nationalist must seek out and establish partnerships with various progressive groups for our combined interest.

America is increasingly becoming populated by nonEuroamericans; by people of color. By people with whom we have similar experiences. Groups of people who will make 'natural' coalition and alliance partners. America is fast becoming a society ruled by people who are more like us than different. If we are to assure ourselves a better place in this new society, we had better
build a political party that will seek out and form these new progressive broad base coalitions and alliances.

An African American nationalist party will assure that there are other options to the two party system, and will make the American political arena a more viable market place.

Nationalist Politics and Democracy: A Political Market Place

"A democracy can last only if the maximization of the democratic ideal does not lead to rejecting as inadequate the principle of the control of power. Sartori (1962) continues by saying that if that happens, "all we get in exchange are governors who are out of our control—whose power is no longer limited. And a situation in which the governors have all the power and the governed have no power, is purely and simply absolutist" (Sartori, 67).

This is important because African Americans, as an oppressed political class, currently have little or no control over the governors of this colonial society. For them, and other oppressed colonized subjects, the colonial government of America is 'absolutists', 'elites', 'estatists,' and autocratic; and African Americans have argued throughout their exile in this society, that this system was undemocratic."

\* In 1860, Robert Purvis, in a speech before the Anti-Slavery Society meeting to celebrate its 27th anniversary delivered an indictment against the American government and challenged the democratic creed of this society. While making his indictment, Purvis showed astute partyism, dedication to democratic principles and to Christian philosophy. Purvis had this to say about American democracy after seeing many African Americans denied the right to universal suffrage and he being denied admittance into the courts and polling
A properly functioning democracy would serve as a 'market place' for political consumers. And political consumerism is best protected by having several competing parties. "Democracy is to politics what a market system is to economics. The rule of the game is competition and, to pursue the analogy, a multi-party system works in very much the same way as a system of oligopolies. Just as we know of better method of protecting the consumer than forbidding monopolistic concentration of economic power, we do not know a better means of defending freedom than letting parties compete among themselves" (Sartori, 151).

To propose the development of an African American nationalist political party is not in opposition to the democratic creed; but would serve to bring about the development of political and social democracy and offer opportunities where there exist none today for colonized African Americans. It would provide more competition, which would assure greater citizen satisfaction, bring more people into the political system, and legitimize the system to those who currently see it as illegitimate. More importantly, it

places of America. "But, sir, narrow and proscriptive as, in my opinion, is the spirit of what is called Native Americanism, there is another thing I regard as tenfold more base and contemptible, and that is your American Democracy—your piebald and rotten Democracy, that talks loudly about equal rights, and at the same time tramples one-sixth of the population of the country in the dust, and declares that they have "no rights which white man is bound to respect." And, sir, while I repudiate your Native Americanism and your bogus Democracy, allow me to add, at the same time, that I am not a Republican. Robert Purvis, On American Democracy, 1860, Floyd M. Barbour, Ed., The Black Power Revolt, Extending Horizons Books, Porter Sargent Publisher, Boston, Mass., 1968, pg., 49.
would assure that government did more than meet the minimal needs of people and give them a sense of dignity.

Currently, the needs of the African American people are going unmet by the present two party system, which is in many ways, anti-democratic. In colonial America, African Americans are not having their minimal needs met, nor any of their other high priority needs provided for.

There is a school of thought that argues that people have a need priority that extends beyond physical or organic needs. They have a need for social-affection, self-esteem or dignity needs, and a need for self actualization. Because African Americans are oppressed, have no nationalist political party to assure that their higher priority needs are considered, and are confronted by an autocratic colonial government, African American are not being made a part of the larger society. Their sense of belonging and acceptance are being denied, and, thus, many of them feel rejected by the present colonial administration.

The American colonial administration has sanctioned the denigration, and degradation of our people. And "when a regime tries to isolate individuals by degrading them and establishing routines for informing on them..., individuals are also deprived of their self-respect, their dignity" (Davies, 1991, 400). As oppressed colonized people, the dignity of African Americans is being abused and seen as unimportant. So much so, that the
various leaders of the colonial two party system have substituted demagogy for democracy.

The difference between democracy and demagogy is most assured by the absence of competition between political parties, or by 'lying' and making unfulfillable promises. For African Americans, this is a crucial distinction; in that it speaks directly to the political condition in which they find themselves here in colonial America absent their own nationalists political party. Historically, political parties have made promises to African Americans that they could not fulfill, or never intended to fulfill under the assumption that African Americans had no other alternative.

In a democracy where there are limited parties to represent the interest of many people, the tendency is for the parties and their leaders to engage in the practice of substituting promises for deeds. Outbidding becomes the common political practice. "The difference, then, is that unfair competition in politics has no effective correctives. And when competition becomes a matter of bewitching rather than accomplishments, of promises rather than deeds, the rule of political competition takes on the ill-famed name of demagogy" (Sartori, 67).

The only time that the people actually can engage in governing is during elections when they are able to set the political agenda or select the political representatives. But, if there are a limited number of party options, many people become apathetic and refuse to engage in the electoral system.
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The result has been leadership, or mandate, by a numerical minority. Politics has become a useless and meaningless exercise where many Americans decide not to participate.

America can best be described as a democracy ruled by an active demos or a colonized race-class-aristocracy. Those are the ones who actively engage in party politics or comprise our imperial-capitalist-expert-class. In a society where the party identifies with the state, democracy is in danger of being non-existent. When the interest of the party are the same as those of the state (as in colonial America where stability and maintenance of Euroamerican control are shared interest of both government and parties), then neither political, or social democracy exist. The equilibrium model argues that this arrangement is desirable and will assure political stability.

The decision to develop a two-party system was designed to submerge differences of opinions, moderate political conflict, and is more easily controlled (Froman, 131). In essence, it was designed to maintain the political domination of misled Euroamericans, and exclusively to deny colonized African Americans entrance into the political decision making process.

The present two political parties have very little to offer the majority of the American electorate and "political parties in the United States are, in reality, simply organizations developed for the purposes of winning office and have very little to do, except perhaps symbolically, with issues" (Froman, 133).
Like African Americans, many other groups have found little recourse for their grievances within the two party system and they too have had to go outside of the political system to force concessions from the ruling elites. Consequently, elections have become nothing more than meaningless rituals and rites. They have little impact on the political system and only serve to continue the ideology of democracy.

Americans believe in and actively participate in these rituals and rites because they have been socialized to do so. "During every election, for example, citizens are exhorted from every corner to get out the vote, whether they want to or not, and whether or not they are able to tell the candidates and parties apart. They are told it is their duty and their obligation as citizens" (Froman, 136).

This ritualization, has even been promoted by African American political scientists and politicians. While African American voting participation is higher than it should be, according to the political behavioralists, they have not received adequate rewards for their efforts and allegiance to the system. Neither political party continuously addresses or is concerned with the political wishes or demands of African Americans.

Politically speaking, presently, African Americans have no alternative political party structure to go to. Since the 1930s, and especially since the 1960s, African Americans have been without an active nationalist party or leader. They have found themselves forced into either of the present colonial
two political parties where they have experienced defeats and frustrations, or into developing their own party.

**African American Party Behavior as an Indicator**

Unfortunately, African Americans have believed in the democratic myth to their detriment. They have engaged in various forms of political behavior that has not given them benefits equal to their participation. African Americans have engaged in political structures and institutions that are not structured to contribute to their liberation struggle. One such structure has been two party system. When African Americans have engaged in traditional party politics, they have been denigrated, denounced, and denied an equal opportunity to participate.

Hanes Walton, Jr., (1985) notes that, "despite the use of closed party structures and various other systemic factors to keep blacks out, the behavioral literature persists in its attempts to explain black party behavior solely from individual factors" (133). In typical fashion, Eurocentric scholars have been engaging in blaming the victim.

According to the twin schools of thought advanced by Eurocentric political scientists, African American party behavior is a threat to the two party system, and hypothetically, economically and socially tied to the democratic party. They maintain that African American party behavior is unsophisticated and politically immature, volatile and unstable, controlled by outside economic and social factors, and is unable or unwilling to challenge
or change these factors. According to Walton (1985), therefore, African American party behavior is static (Walton, 1985).

In sum, then, the present portrait of black party behavior as drawn in the literature is a static one. It paints black party supporters as robots, unthinking and under numerous sociopsychological controls. Moreover, it leads to some peculiar political strategies and approaches to capture or change the black vote (137).

A more accurate conclusion is that African Americans are politically sophisticated. African Americans would display deviate political behavior if they stayed with a political party that was unresponsive to their political needs. As wise political consumers, African Americans have historically aligned themselves with candidates and parties that have presented the best opportunity for meeting their particular needs. They have been most pragmatic in their political behavior and have not allowed party affiliations stop them from getting the best political buy for their votes.

African Americans have displayed a truly educated understanding of the political process, and have over their participatory history been more inclined to vote issues and not strictly party. According to Walton (1985), "blacks surveyed indicated that they are attracted to a particular party primarily because of the candidates' stand on issues rather than because of an "image" or the party's historical position of Civil Rights" (145).

Therefore, an accurate assessment of the political environment that African American politically participate in would reveal that African
American party behavior historically has been flexible, it fluctuates, is responsive to closed party structures, and has been highly sensitive to issues that affect their lives.

African American party behavior is highly influenced by several very important factors that should be considered because they will indicate just how sophisticated African American voters have been. By doing so, any nationalist politician interested in the formation of an alternate party could uncover useful and valuable lessons concerning the political ability of our people.

The present American political environment is conducive to the development of a major third party that is race-specific. As such, the formation of an African American nationalist party will offer a clear alternative to the current two party system. Presently, there are many independent voters in our society who are rejecting both political parties. By declaring themselves independent, they are saying that the current two party system is unable to meet their political needs. They are declaring that they are open to the development of and can be persuaded to support a comprehensive third party. Why not an African American political party?

The present two-party system cannot fulfill the needs of America's diverse citizenry, nor is it conducive to the development of social democracy. There is room and a need for an major third party in this country. Currently, the two party system as we know it, is being converted into a single
Euroamerican nationalist party thus locking out more and more nonEuroamericans. As such, more out of necessity than ethnic desire, African Americans must again develop their own political party.

Historically, African Americans have been forced into creating their own satellite or alternative party because they were either limited from full party participation by structural barriers, by a failure to, on the part of the 'established' parties, to recognize their presence in the existing structure, or because they could not endorse their racist organizational policies and/or platform.

For example, in Alabama, the Lowndes County Freedom Organization was formed because African Americans were prohibited from participating in both the national or local democratic party. They were confronted with a 900 percent increase in the qualifying fees and, African Americans were asked to take the infamous literacy test. Many African Americans said that since "the state party constitution required all members to uphold white supremacy" (Walton, 132) they could not participate in it.

As a consequence of these types of policies, African Americans have either endorsed one of the two parties, joined another third party, or formed their own. Rarely, did African Americans engage in party politics out of blind allegiance. African Americans have given their support to a particular party based on its platform and the party candidate. What stands out when looking at African American party behavior, is that environmental and closed party
structures have influenced their party participation and determined their allegiance.

If we utilize only the Eurocentric view to understand African American party behavior, without considering the political environment as a causal factor, we will fail to recognize that African American party participation has been influenced by party structures and geographic locality. Or, we will fail to understand why African Americans became switchers, independents, third party supporters, or floaters.

We also may overlook the influence that particular parties have on the populace, i.e., machine politics as in Daley's Chicago, or that many African Americans have been excluded from state or local parties, and were consequently forced into national party affiliations. Most importantly, we will fail to notice the influence that group identification has had on their political behavior. Racial identity has been very influential in determining African American party identification and behavior.

Most Eurocentric scholars have attributed the influence, or the rise of African American political parties, to one of two factors, socioeconomic factors, or education. Either position tends to place the rise of an African American political party into some form of deviate environment. The conclusion to be drawn from either position is that educated persons or those who are well-off will not support a nationalists political party. Most
Eurocentric political scientists have devalued, by omission, the importance of racial identity, i.e., collective behavior.

Admittedly, African American third parties have traditionally emerged in districts that have a high concentration of African American residents but that does not indicate that African Americans are deviate or that the existence and popularity of these third parties is strictly an indication of socioeconomic factors. A more accurate reading would reveal that in these highly populated areas, where African Americans still retain sentiments of racial unity, they have traditionally chosen to act collectively. Racial identity, and thus collective behavior, has been more important than any other factor.

Considering these facts, and the high voting percentages among African Americans, as a class, it seems clear that African Americans will support a third party. To the various nationalists organizations the message is clear: if they develop a sophisticated political party, with a clearly progressive platform, African Americans will support it. Because, as history has shown, African Americans will support alternative parties just as readily as they have supported the two traditional parties.

African Americans have tended to vote for, and support third parties, and all Black parties, when they have perceived them/it to be in their best interest. Modern-day African American voters are just as, if not more, sophisticated than their ancestors, and have a clear perception of the political environment in which they exist, and will give allegiance to any person or
party (although it is admitted that they have/do display a tendency to support the democratic party, and will give their allegiance to African American candidates) that addresses issues in a manner that have meaning to them.

Historically independent African American third party efforts have suffered from the same group of core problems that currently hampers African Americans in their contemporary attempt to construct an independent party. The major problems that have undermined these parties are, their inadequacies in meeting the needs of African American nationalism, and their mimicking of Eurocentric structural methods for handling divergent views.

African American political parties have shown an inability to assure their organizational permanence by constructing what Walton calls a "bureaucratic monster" and, consequently, have been unable to tie the finances of the organization to the masses. They have continued the legacy of reformism that began during the 19th century and, therefore, have not been willing to develop an alternative philosophy that would produce a program fundamentally changing the socioeconomic structure of this society.

In essence, true to the descriptive axioms of political colonialism, African Americans currently suffer from the same political flaws as other colonized people. They currently still insist on forming political institutions that parallel Eurocentric political structures, fail to indigenize their institutions with neo-traditional political values; have not offered counter-
hegemonic political doctrines, and like all colonized people, African Americans have also engaged in divisive political debates on the relevancy of foreign ideologies.

It is time that our attempts at party development stop mirroring Eurocentric structures; and, it is time that we develop our own type of institutional structures infused with an Afrocentric political posture. Unlike our other attempts, which calls into question "whom do you serve," any new convention, or party, must make it absolutely certain that the answer is obvious. It must serve the interest of the masses. Most importantly, the African American party must be guided by the African Principle. That is, doing that which will benefit the most living Africans and not succumb to individual differences as we have done in the past. A major obstacle to the survival of our parties has been an inability by many participants to place the interest of the party before their own ideologies.

**Nationalist Politics, Black Empowerment and Grassroots Organization**

James Boggs argues that Americans are materially overdeveloped and politically underdeveloped (Boggs, 1974). Manning Marable makes the same charge stating that Americans were politically illiterate because they are unable to define political problems correctly, and are content with allowing others to make political decisions for them. This is another manifestation of the welfare state mentality: having others take care of you by making your decisions, i.e., experts.
As an oppressed people, African Americans can least afford to be politically illiterate or underdeveloped. African Americans have, at this point in their historical struggle, in a comprehensive way, no one to consistently look out for their survival. No one to assure them that their welfare will be provided for. Therefore, they must be educated to look out for themselves. They have to be taught to see their self-interest as being more important than any other group in this society. Self-interest politics is essential for our survival.

Marable makes a very good point arguing that what African Americans need to do is to stop concentrating on national political positions and concentrate on the thousands of elected positions at the local, and state levels (Marable, 1992). What African Americans need to do, in the face of the collapse of the two party system, is to organize themselves into grassroots political organizations and run candidates for these and many other offices that directly impact on their lives. For the near future, we should cease concentrating on winning national political offices and concentrate on the smaller offices that have a greater impact on our well being.

Grassroots political organizing is the most effective way for a nationalist party to become a major influence in the political life of the average African American; and to position itself to become a dominant national political force. It is at the local levels of this nation that an African American nationalist party has the greatest possibility of succeeding. By
running a slate of candidates on a progressive nationalist program, nationalists can begin the task of developing a political cadre who can carry on an aggressive political education program that will convert our people into a viable political force capable of developing policies and programs to alter the direction of this nation. More importantly, they will become accustomed to political battles, and thus, become seasoned political fighters accustomed to battles and planning. By engaging in political planning and struggle, African Americans will take on a collective political ethos that can carry a political struggle forward successfully.

By controlling the various elected and nonelected offices at the local level, African Americans can push for, and implement, changes that can redirect and change the current impasses that prevent us from correcting the numerical imbalance between us and the colonizers in the electoral process. Pushing for these types of changes at the local level, will at the very least, create the necessary climate for revolutionary change.

As our people develop a habit of winning offices, and experience the satisfaction of achieving nationalist objectives, they will develop a national consciousness and quicken the pace in their evolution as a nation of people. When that takes place, eventually, reformist solutions will cease to satisfy their demands for social change and they will demand revolutionary changes that will compliment their evolutionary growth.
As the two party system collapses into the republicrates (Marable's term), the possibility for the success of an African American political party is greatly enhanced. African Americans must place themselves in the position to take advantage of this occurrence. The present system cannot continue to exist as America becomes increasingly multicultural.

African Americans have been overlooked long enough. It is time that we stop being merely tie-breakers. We must be the party to beat in all elections, and this must begin now.

As white nationalists increase their hold on the political process, and thus restrict its attractiveness to other progressive elements in this society, African American nationalist and other progressive elements in this society, must begin to organize into effective alternative political organizations to counter their repressive politics.

In the 1992 presidential election neither party gave any serious attention to the wishes of the African American community. As a matter of fact, the traditional alliance [?] between the African American community and the democratic party was all but severed by Clinton and the democrats. Given the tenuous nature of this alliance, (inappropriately termed and relied upon), it is clear that the only solution is for the African American community to form its own party, and run candidates that will be responsive to the political agenda formulated by the African American community. More importantly, African Americans must make it known that candidates
that run on the nationalist platform will be held accountable to the community, unlike they are now.

As the conditions inside of colonial America worsen, and the African American survival-thrust becomes more intense, due to increasing the tensions between Euroamerica's need to maintain political stability, and our intense desire to be liberated, I expect that eventually all ideological groupings inside the African American community will be forced into a single minded political party. Political, economic and cultural tensions caused by our decolonization movement will continue to fracture the tenuous Eurocentric/American coalition and began to reveal the fragility of Anglo-Saxon conformity. Colonial America can only become more reactionary and dangerous, causing further erosion of their own political and philosophical mythologies, and reveal the imperialist nature of this society to many misguided Euroamericans who will be forced into the untimely realization that they too are oppressed by imperialist-colonialism.

The thing that African Americans must do in these dangerous times is to prepare themselves to lead and offer alternatives to the autocratic imperialist led political system of America. If African Americans can unite into a strong nationwide political party, and begin to force the colonial regime to make political concessions on matters that will assure our political numerical parity, then, it is possible for African Americans to develop political programs and strategies that will alter the direction and course of this
society. This becomes more possible as the present limited two party system collapses into a repressive ineffective single party system displaying all of the characteristics of any repressive illegitimate regime.

**America’s Single Party System and African American Empowerment**

Beginning with the election of Truman in the ‘impossible victory’ over Dewey in 1948, and continuing on with the election of John Kennedy in 1960 and the election of Johnson in 1964, African American influence in the democratic party, and their power in determining national elections, was beginning to become decisive. In both the Kennedy and the Carter elections, it was African Americans who played the determining role in assuring the success of the democratic party. Let us not forget that "the majority of white Americans voted against John Kennedy in 1960 and Jimmy Carter in 1976" (Marable, 1992, 138). While African Americans remain stuck to the American political system in general, and the democratic party in particular, the system has consistently, when it has been in the interest of Euroamerican stability, turned its back on us.

After having lost a majority of the last twelve national elections, and all but agreeing that the republicans were more apt at being America’s "national managers" (Marable, 1992), beginning with the 1980 presidential campaign, the democrats consciously shifted their politics to the center-right. It was "Dukakis and his advisers [who] closed the political door on the left, and accepted the conventional wisdom that national elections are won by
seizing the center" (Marable, 166). In doing so, Dukakis and the democratic party sent out an undeniable message to the Euroamerican colonizers who accept their positions (the reactionary conservative, e.g., conservative businessmen and women, the Dixiecrats, the Reagan democrats, Klan members loyal to Dukes, middle class white males whose influence had been on the decline since the 1970s, etc.) that the democrats were now willing to do business.

The result has been the split of the two party system along racial and economic lines. The democratic party clearly being seen as the party of the nonEuroamerican-labor-liberal coalition, and the republicans being portrayed as the party of the 'silent majority.' For example, during the 1984 election approximately 60 percent of all Euroamericans nationally and 70 percent of all southern Euroamericans voted for Bush. Generally, Euroamericans who earn $40,000 or more and live in suburbia have voted for the GOP. In 1988, those Euroamericans who earned $50,000, had college degrees and were from either traditional democrats or republicans families voted for Bush; just as 66 percent of all Euroamericans had voted for Reagan before him.

What we have seen since the 1968 campaign of Richard Nixon, and especially in the past four national presidential elections, is a returning to the politics of color and money. What we have seen is that both the democrats and republicans have demonstrated a willingness to preserve the single party system; a shift to reactionary right-wing white supremacist groups, and away
from the ideas of democracy. What has been emerging is the steady influence of the southern democrats and the reactionary colonizers within both parties; and a vain attempt by African Americans and other lower-class citizens, to pull the democrats back to their post-New Deal position.

The last major attempt was the "Rainbow Coalition" orchestrated by Jesse Jackson, which failed because of white republican racism, the flight of the liberals; the death of liberalism here in America, a rise in the politics of intolerance; and most importantly, it failed because its leadership "failed to develop a coherent national apparatus, with a national newspaper, regional political organizers, and a trained cadre on campuses and in communities" (Marable, 177).

Consequently, many progressives have come to the conclusion that "we really don't have two political parties, just one, the "republicrats," both of which are controlled by corporate and upper class interest" (Marable, 179). As such, many progressive minded people, intellectuals, academicians and laypeople have come to the conclusion that "the American political system today is a fraudulent relic, bluffing its way through everyday life" (Strickland, 1975, 20).

American politics has come to a standstill using various fraudulent myths and schemes to give the appearance of life. Those who rule this system in the shadows (although they have become more out in the open since Nixon) have used political language, and the politics of language; promoted
the usage and belief in idols, i.e., the mythology of quietism, expertism; the
myth of 'you can't beat city-hall; 'hyper-individualism; superpatriotism;
militarism; selfishness; some of its leaders have promoted and courted the
politics of religiosity; and they have attempted to use the divisive politics of
gender, race and class, to assure their continued domination (Parenti, 1994).

Thus, "in many areas of public life, government is a negative force, an
instrument of coercive power that helps to intensify rather than mitigate the
inequalities suffered by millions of people at home and abroad. Government
in the hands of the privileged and powerful will advance the interest of the
privileged and powerful—unless democratic forces can mobilize a
countervailing power" (Parenti, 1994, 3). And for African American people,
who can no longer look to the democratic party for a continuation of the
traditional reciprocal arrangement as it once could, as evidenced by the
politics of the last two presidential campaigns, especially the Clinton
campaign (Clinton has become the mortician for the dying democratic party),
where he sought to distance himself, as Dukakis did, from African Americans
and the traditional democratic coalition, where do African Americans or
Black Politics go from here?

As I said, we/it can no longer go to the American presidency, nor can
we/it turn to liberals, or look to liberalism for answers. African Americans
cannot look to the democratic party, or to any European country or any of the
other countries of the industrialized world. In essence, the African American
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people, or Black Politics, "is all dressed up with no place to go" (Strickland, 22), that is, except to ourselves/itself.

African Americans must now turn towards themselves by forming their own political party for empowerment. Only by forming their own political party can African Americans assure themselves of meaningful political gains and sustained forms of empowerment. The "reality is not that black people have broken with the American political system but that the American political system has broken with black people" (Strickland, 22).

Any continued opposition to the formation of an African American independent political party is a clear sign that the individual, or group, has failed to understand the current trends in American politics that are, and have been, unfolding in this country for the last four decades.

If the formation and development of this party is to be successful, then its leadership will have to move beyond the possibilities of the Gary convention, and into the realm of strict revolutionary political partyism as understood and professed by Lenin, Mao, Ho Chi Minh, and Cabral. They have to learn from these great revolutionary thinkers and benefit from the failures of Gary.
A Call for a National Political Forum: A Return to Historical African American Conventionalism

Cruse calls into question the political philosophy of African American nationalists of his time for their lack of political astuteness. Cruse's critique of the nationalist parties centers around four major areas of political activism. Cruse bases the inability of the intellectuals/'nationalists' to create a comprehensive political agenda that would meet the basic desires of the masses, on their colonial indoctrination of 'interracialism' in general, and political interracialism in particular. Consequently, they (the Negro intellectual nationalists) have never been able to deal effectively with Euroamericans as a counter hegemonic political force in America, or on the world scene. African Americans, and/or, African American nationalists, will never realize their political power until they develop a comprehensive group specific nationalist political program. According to Cruse (1984),

the American Negro has never yet been able to break entirely free of the ministrations of his white masters to the extent that he is willing to exile himself, in search of wisdom, into the wastelands of the American desert. That is what must be done, if he is to deal with the Anglo-Saxon as the independent political power that he, the Negro, potentially is" (364).

* Cruses' four points were: [1] their limited ability to formulate a political agenda; [2] their inability to activate group specific policies; [3] their under assessment of their political potential, and; [4] their failure to educate the masses. Consequently, they never accurately recognized that the masses were willing to follow them if they developed a comprehensive political agenda.
African Americans do not need a reactionary form of institutional separation that is based on reactionary racial hatred. What we need is a political philosophy, and party, that is rooted on the solid strategic imperatives of an African American survival thrust.

African Americans need a nationwide all African American organization as a means of assuring African American survival. African Americans need to develop a national organization that is organized along strict exclusive racial lines. An all African American/African diasporic organization is the only way that African Americans, and other African people, will survive into the next century. But this organization will have to be organized on a scale never before seen in the history of the African/African American world. If this worldwide organization is to succeed, it must be anchored in, and organized along the philosophical lines of African cosmology (Williams, 1987, 320-2).

It is clear that as colonized people, African Americans need a single all encompassing organization as opposed to having several different groups all vying for the leadership position. This organization should be organized at every level of the African American oppressed nation, and be comprehensive enough to cover all aspects of African American survival. According to Williams (1987),

no one would propose that 35 million Blacks be brought under a single umbrella of leadership. Nor is that necessary. But
an organizing national conference should develop a program designed to form hundreds of organizations into one vast national body of millions, with each society carrying on its own functions as before except in matters concerning the whole race, or organize by families and individuals, community by community and state by state. Where the matter concerns the whole race, affiliated groups would speak in one voice through the overall organization of the race (322).

One of the major failings of early African American nationalists, was their dependence on Euroamericans for organizational and political ideals and financial support. The only poverty that African Americans really have, is poverty of the spirit. Every other argument is merely an excuse. For instance the "lack-of-financial alibi stand, for in spite of our lower incomes, we waste millions in luxuries" (Williams, 323) is useless and is motivated by fear. The time for big talking is over, and the time for big action has now arrived.

The African/African American world is being confronted by the same forces that our ancient ancestors were confronted within ancient Kemet almost 6,000 years ago; i.e. pillage, dismantling of our communities, invasion and war.
As Thompson (1992) notes,

black people are the world oldest revolutionaries, the world's oldest freedom fighters. We are part of the longest resistance movement on earth. We have been fighting foreign invaders for 4,000 years and have been under siege for 3,000. Our struggle against Asia and Europe are not new, Since the 21st century BC and earlier, the Euro-Asian nomads have been attacking, disrupting, dismantling and pillaging the African world, her great kingdoms and civilizations" (50).

We are faced with the same devastating conditions today as we were during ancient defeats. Just as we were then, because of the Euroamerican separatist programs (white flight to the suburbs and elsewhere), we are left with blighted underdeveloped communities that offer us no opportunity for self development.

African Americans must come to the realization that Euroamericans do not want now, nor have they ever wanted integration. Euroamericans have consistently rejected any attempt by African Americans to integrate with them. With such a realization, African Americans must unite all of their people into this racial organization. By all people, I mean prisoners, those who call themselves 'separatists,' the bourgeoisie, the young, the old, feminist, Gays and Lesbians. All of our people will be needed if we are to succeed. Only by organizing along race specific lines, while accepting the perpetual existence of racism, can America's two 'warring' nations exist in a symbiotic relationship, and thus, avoid the seemingly eventual 'race' war.
All of this is dependent upon African Americans successfully freeing their minds of the 'interracial indoctrination' that they have been subjected to.

The call for an all race national organization by Williams, Morris, Walters, etc., and the demand by Cruse, for the African American nationalists to develop a comprehensive organization, is a request for the return of African American nationalist conventions. It is a demand that they begin to develop programs and policies that address themselves to the same issues that are threatening our national survival today, as were facing our elders during the early nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The nationalist consciousness that is now sweeping the African American oppressed nation and its national minority, has a historical precedence.

The fact that it is now looked upon as innovative and 'militant' lends itself to the argument that the African American people have failed to build institutions that would serve as a bridge between the failures and successes of the past and problems of the present. As Williams says, unity among the African American people is feared and the Euroamericans will/has employ[ed] various tactics to undermine its development. We must begin to see the development of a convention movement as crucial and nonthreatening to Euroamericans who might resent or oppose its development.
Conventions, Nationalist Politics and African American Liberation

John H. Bracey, et al, state that the convention movement which began in the 1830s was an attempt by African American people to come to terms with some of the pressing problems that confronted them as a unified people. The various conventions, that spanned the decades between 1830 to 1893 (the first wave of conventions), were characterized by social ambivalence, economic matters, tactical differences and class antagonisms.

They were usually dominated by the bourgeoisie nationalists and clearly showed signs of political confusion. But despite all of these problems, these conventions displayed a strong sense of racial pride and concern for the 'welfare' of the total race; i.e., especially the African Americans who were being held in overt slavery. These conventions were in essence, organized governments in exile.

Many of the early conventions were issue specific, with a few attempting to deal with the full complexities that faced the African American nation. From these earlier conventions, we learn that African Americans dealt with racism, disenfranchisement, economic and social oppression, and the sought to uplift our race. Many of the early conventions were organized around the specific issue of emancipation for African Americans still held in overt slavery. Later these conventions would address the liberation of African American people from the forces of national oppression in all of its forms (Foner, 1980).
For example, in 1853 a convention was held that dealt with the issue of 'rights' for the African American people. The primary concern of the convention was organizational. That is, they wanted to organize the African American community into an effective national decentralized, i.e., grassroots, political organization that would be comprehensive and capable of dealing with the complex issues that faced them as a distinct oppressed people.

African Americans decided to organize themselves into local, state and national councils. Each council had four committees composed of five members each. There was the committee of publications, manual labor school, protective unions and a committee on business relations. The implementation of ideas that arose never came about, but this did not deter the conventioneers. Conventions would continue to be the medium by which the early African American people would unite themselves in their continued struggle for liberation.

Later conventions dealt with issues of national development. They were convened to concentrated on matters concerning economic and political development of the African American people. Bourgeois economic nationalism came to dominant the conventions from 1853 to the turn of the century, ending with the Atlanta Exposition in 1900.

From The Proceedings of the Colored Laborer's and Business Men's Industrial Convention, held in Kansas City, Mo. in 1879, we get a glimpse of the economic concerns that would dominate many of the economic conventions that proceeded and would succeed it. This convention adopted five specific policies and advocated the development of several programs to implement them. To facilitate the success of the programs that the conventioneers designed, Negro business leagues were proposed and used on a limited bases.

For example, Fred R. Moore called for the development of African American economic leagues. These were broad based business enterprises/organizations that will be engaged in economic development and growth of the African American nation. His proposal like many others advocates economic racial solidarity, business education; that the organization serve as community consumer watchdogs, utilize consumer

*The five programs were: [1] that many, if not all young African American men should become small business men; [2] the development of co-operative stores in the building supply industry; [3] economic chauvinism; [4] the small business owner become should adequately prepared educationally in the details of business retailing and marketing; and [5] that joint stock companies and co-operatives should develop advertising strategies to facilitate the growth and expansion of these companies and businesses.

"We suggest that plans for joint stock companies and co-operative stores be published from time to time in our colored newspapers, and in such other papers as are accessible to them and that our people desiring to engage in such enterprises may have the benefit of the wisdom and experience or our most successful business men. All of which is respectfully submitted," (238).
advocates that stressed fair prices and cleanliness, and proper business techniques. These leagues advocated strict racial economic compliance and racial group economic chauvinism, declaring to expel any member of the race who failed to purchase from the community owned stores, and stressed unity and pride in the abilities of the race above everything else. According to Moore (1970),

I lose respect for the individual who doubts the capacity of his people to do; that we cannot do as well as the whites. How can we ever prove that we have the ability to compete unless supported by our people. I believe that we can do anything that the white man does, if only given a chance... We must begin to recognize the true principle and we should educate the race up to it; and that principle is—believe in your race and practice it by giving them proper support in all proper undertakings. What a mighty power we shall be when we begin to do this, and we shall never be a mighty people until we do begin (239).

Following the Exposition, the convention movement would become more comprehensive in its approach to the African American condition, but still the over-all policy/philosophy of these conventions would express familiar nationalist themes. Based in the central belief that the African American people comprised a distinct 'nation within a nation,' conventions had the same organizational flavor and character of any government in exile.

As Walters (1973) stated, "that there was a distinct awareness of a national group can be seen easily in the growth of the "negro Convention" movement which essentially functioned as a Black national government"
It is important that we remember, when looking back on these movements, that the political arrangement that African Americans found themselves in was not of their choosing but was imposed upon them, and that they were unable to change those arrangements as individuals. So, they attempted to find collective solutions, even if they developed parallel institutions to do it.

The African American nation has been striving to develop an all-race organization for as long as they have been exiled in this country. They have organized themselves into many different organizations all attempting to, in

---

* Kelly Miller, cited in early text by Bracey et al, called for a Negro Sanedrin to be held in Chicago in the week of February 11, 1924. This was an all-race conference that was designed to bring together all of the issue specific groups into one effective national organization. Kelly argued that "there are already innumerable organizations in the racial field operating separately and severally. Each is efficient in its sphere, but no one of them, nor yet all of them combined, can claim to be sufficient as concerns the general welfare of the race." Kelly outlined the reasons that an all-race conference was needed by the African American people. He argued that the African American people suffered from the psychological effects of being held in oppression and that the only way to deal with racism and its consequences was to deal with it as an organized group.

Kelly argued, that African Americans had to organize now to deal with the changes that he felt were on the political and social horizon. Kelly (1973) said, "within the next half generation there will be a tremendous change in the scheme of race adjustment in the United States. The quickened conscience of the nation will not consent to go on living forever on the basis of a lie. The relation of the Negro will become more firmly established on a basis of equality, will settle into a status of frankly declared inferiority. Which it shall be, will depend upon the Negro himself,"(353).
their own small way, assist in the liberation of the African American/African people. Unfortunately, they have not been united in tactics or strategy, nor have they had an umbrella organization that was able to effectuate policy or programs to facilitate the multidirectional goals that these splinter organizations have been seeking and struggling independently for.

After the 1930s, these organizations came to a halt and it was not until the Gary convention of 1976 that African Americans again attempted to organize and meet the challenges that were confronting our survival on a national level.

Strickland points out the essential features of the Gray convention that were overlooked by the Euroamerican media. According to Strickland's analysis, the most salient points of the convention were the mass participation of the African American community, the singularity of purpose and dedication to a common cause, the extremely high level of political awareness among the participants, the endorsement of nationalist politics and the general belief that there was a need for an alternative political party. There was also general agreement that 1972 represented a time of political transition for the American nation in general, and the African American people in particular.

The 'Gary Convention' represented "a living, breathing, united Black force" (Strickland, 1972, 22). A Black force of 10,000 African Americans who were united to create an alternative to the 'traditional' Eurocentric political
system here in America. A united force that understood that what was essential for the liberation of our people was a mass unified political front, to combat the destruction of the African American nation. According to Strickland (1972), "only a national movement of Black people has the capacity to grapple effectively with and eventually to overcome the causes of our national depression" (20).

The conventioneers who met in Gary were committed to breaking away from the Eurocentric dominated political system that had failed to solve any of the problems that it had created. They wanted to break with a political system that was continuing the status-quo of African American bondage. These various nationalists saw little hope in depending on the 'bankrupt' political system that had created the terrible conditions in which the African American people found themselves existing in.

What came out of the Gary Convention was a profound sense of political unity and direction. They created a political agenda that angered some participants and pleased others. The Black Political Agenda was a theoretical approach to solving the political problems that confronted the American society in general and the particular problems of African Americans.

It was the belief of many of the participants that what African Americans needed was an alternative political party: a Black political party. "
"Blacks in this country need a political party, but not the kind of party that white folks have or talk about. Not simply an electoral party. Not simply a party that is dedicated to patronage and jobs, or the election of individuals as a first concern. We need a party that can do those things when they advance the interest of black people, but, more importantly, we need a party that is concerned about the controlling of institutions, the building of new institutions, the shaping of our destiny, a party that sees itself concerned fundamentally with assuming power (Strickland, 25-6).

Strickland continues by saying that this new party must reunite morality, ethics and politics. "Any new Black politics, then, must have an ethical value system, and a moral authority that clearly sets itself apart from the American political tradition. It must say plainly to people that it has come to transform the society and not to seek a niche within it" (Strickland, 23).

The participants of the Gary Convention had continued a long historical movement in the African American community in its struggle for liberation. I think the most salient feature to come out of the Gary convention was the realization that the only people who could effectuate an end to the terrible conditions that have confronted and continue to confront, the African American people are the African Americans.

African American/African diasporic and continental people are at a 'crossroad' and it is time for us to develop an all-race organization. But before
we can develop such an organization, we must accept the central fact, as put forth by Williams (1987),

that the whites are the implacable foe, the traditional and everlasting enemy of the Blacks." The compelling reason for publicly putting this declaration in its historical context is clear: the necessary re-education of Blacks and a possible solution of racial crises can begin, strangely enough, only when Blacks fully realize this central fact in their lives: The white man is their bitter Enemy (310).

As much as we may attempt to avoid this conclusion, history and current conditions suggest that it is true. If the African American oppressed nation and its national minority wishes to change this condition, and to be successful in their attempt at decolonization, then they must decide once and for all, that they are going to organize themselves into race-specific organizations as our ancestors did. African Americans must finally eradicate the interracial indoctrination that has hampered our political behavior thus far. "Nothing will ever be achieved by such a minority group in white America, nothing that leads to real adjustment for progress, until a powerful unity movement among blacks develops throughout the United States. Thus must be done to achieve full recognition even as men and women, not to mention full citizenship" (Williams, 321).

Beyond The Gary Convention

For all of the positive results that came out of the Gary convention, there were many things that were not. It is safe to say today that the best
intentions of the Gary movement failed. The Gary movement failed to bring forth any of its policies. It failed because it failed to reach the masses of the people, failed to produce a dedicated cadre that would go into the communities; on the campuses, in the streets, and official and unofficial organizations, and other gathering places to prepare the people for self rule.

The Gary movement failed because it did not follow the lessons of revolutionary partyism as advanced by Mao (Boggs, 1974, 53). That is, it let debate and difference cause the participants to withdraw from the organization. They failed to realize that debate, disagreement and discussion are essential for resolution and solution, and most importantly for consensus formation.

I think that were major two major failures on the part of the leadership and those who attended the Gary convention. One was the failure to engage in the development of a cadre class and to commit themselves to the development of a long term political education and development program; a program that would have begun to devise plans for eventual political empowerment and governance. Secondly, they failed to recognize their crucial role in our liberation struggle "was to be the custodians of the national black political interest until such time as the masses of people could be reached, and recruited, and convinced, to represent themselves" (Strickland, 25).
After having said that, and recognizing that African Americans have no other place to go but inward for assistance, what are the lessons to be learned from Gary? Are there any lessons that can be used in the development of a new political agenda, and to guide a future political party? Whatever the answer to these pressing questions, it is very clear that African Americans need to continue to hold these nationwide broad based conventions and once again form a national government designed to address our special needs. In doing so, by finding solutions to our common problems, we can also provide assistance to other oppressed people in this society. It is also time that we as a people take steps towards formally establishing ourselves as a nation of people with special features and interest.

A Plebiscite: Answering the Call of Nationalism

One of the most critical functions of any new convention movement has to be to answer the question of whether the African American people consider themselves as a distinct nation of people. While it is true that African American nationalism has been, and still is, lying just beneath the surface of our political behavior and rhetoric, it is just as true that it has not been collectively endorsed or given national sanction/authority. It is now time that African Americans address the need for nationalistic political behavior, and endorse, or legally establish our nationhood. By doing this, we can arm our political representatives with a political mandate to push for an African American specific comprehensive agenda. More importantly, an
affirmative answer would solidify the continuous sentiments that many African Americans now carry silently inside themselves. A plebiscite would accomplish all of these goals.

Cleaver discussed the political and psychological impact that holding a plebiscite would have on both EuroAmericans and African Americans. Cleaver noted that it would challenge Euroamerica's authority to rule the African American colony, put our call for national autonomy on the international stage and thereby raise the debate to a higher level. By doing so, African Americans will seriously tarnish America's international image and policies. This issue can place, comprehensively, once and for all, the African American condition squarely on the national political agenda, and, if handled correctly, it can legitimize our struggle for self-determination.

Because of America's colonial structure, and the fact that African Americans do not trust the American colonial government, African Americans must demand that this plebiscite be conducted by the U.N.. Cleaver (1966) argues that "the purpose of the plebiscite is to answer the question once and for all as to just what the masses of black people want. Do the masses of black people consider themselves a nation? Do they want U.N. membership? The viability of this proposal consists in the fact that it does not call for a response beyond the means of black people" (53).

*Also see James Forman Self-Determination, Open House Publishing Inc., Washington, D. C., 1984). Forman also calls for a plebiscite and connects it to the issue of autonomy and self-determination. Forman ties the plebiscite issue to political education and nationalist
As any other nationalist political organization involved in a decolonization struggle, an African American nationalists organization must become involved in the political development of our people. We must approach the issue of plebiscite, economic autonomy and political activism aggressively and comprehensively. Our educational program must be developed around mobilization, organizing on a national 'grassroots' level, and, negotiating with the federal government and international official and unofficial organizations. "Autonomy now for the oppressed African-American nation and its national minority areas is a new formulation in the literature on self-determination of nations " (Forman, 1984, 36). Political and economic autonomy must be politicized and agitated for. Both issues must be addressed together and they both must be given the highest position on our nationalist agenda. Now is the time that African Americans to engage in selfish politics for our survival. It is time for us to


Forman advocates that African Americans should bring together all of the many splinter groups that represent the multi-interests of our people to form a single umbrella organization, in the mold in which C. Williams calls for, to choose national representatives that will have the authority to negotiate with the Federal government on issues of national autonomy for the African American people.
engage in nationalist politics if our decolonization goals are to be achieved without violent revolutionary struggle.

But, before we can realize our liberation via the democratic process, African Americans will have to organize locally and nationally in broad based political groups under one umbrella organization. Through these political organizations, African Americans can push for structural changes in the electoral process: this will be the determining factor. If we do not succeed in changing the electoral structure, all of our political activity will be meaningless, leaving only revolution.

Led by an enlightened leadership, which is responsive to a conscious and politicized community, the African American political party can offer fresh and innovative programs to those currently being provided by Euroamerican colonizers. Clearly this can only be accomplished if African Americans approach the development of, and necessity for, the development of this new party as more than a need to engage in electoral politics. It must be seen as a means of liberation which will, [a] strengthen the political process in this country and, [b] as the means of confronting the oppressor. This, I feel, will stimulate a new intracommunal approach to its development. No longer will there be divisive intraparty conflict, wars over ideological appropriateness, or a need to abandon the struggle because of differences in tactics. If the political party is seen as a means of liberation, then, I feel, this will encourage the development of a philosophy that encourages debate,
democracy and consensus. In essence, the development of an African American political party will bring forth many lasting rewards for many generations.
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