

the  
COMMUNIST  
BLACK.  
POWER: 2

6d

Number 19.

(Part 1 of this article in THE COMMUNIST, June 1968 dealt with statements by the CPUSA on the Negro question in the USA before and after revisionism became dominant in it, and with statements by the London Workers Committee or Working Peoples Party of England on Black Power in Britain, equating Black Power with Socialism.)

STOKELY CARMICHAEL

In a speech delivered on February 17th of this year (and published in THE RUNNING MAN No 1) Stokely Carmichael clarified his political position:

"We have in our community black people -- the masses and the bourgeoisie, that's about the level of the breakdown. The bourgeoisie is very minute inside our community. We have to bring them home... We have to bring them home because they have technical skills which must be put to the benefit of their people, not to the benefit of the country which is against their people... We need each other, we have to have each other for our survival. We got to have each other, from the revolutionaries to the conservatives - a black united front is what we're about."

"Now there's some people may not understand Brother Rap when he talks about whom we ally with. He says we have to ally with Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, and the dispossessed of the earth. He did not mention the poor whites. We must understand that. I will not deny that poor whites in this country are oppressed. But there are two types of oppression. One is exploitation, the other is colonisation... Exploitation is when you exploit somebody of your own race. Colonisation is when you exploit somebody of a different race. We are colonised, they are exploited."

"If I am black and am exploiting you who are also black, we

18.

have the same values, the same culture, the same language, the same society, the same institutions, so I do not have to destroy those institutions for you. But if you are of another race, if you have a different culture, different language, different values, I have to destroy all of those who make you bow to me. And that is the difference between poor black and white. Poor whites have their culture, have their values, have their institutions, ours have been completely destroyed..."

"Now then, that brings us to the point of this thing about communism and socialism. Lets get to that once and for all. Communism is not an ideology suited for black people, period. Period. Socialism is not an ideology fitted for black people, period. Period. And I will tell you why."

The ideologies of communism and socialism speak to the class structure. They speak to people who oppress people from top to bottom. We are not just facing exploitation. We are facing something much more important, because we are victims of racism. Communism nor socialism does not speak to the problem of racism. And racism, for black people in this country is far more important than exploitation. ... On the question of exploitation, it comes second."

"If you were exploited by other black people, then it would be a question of how to divide the profits. It is not that for us... It is a question of how to regain our humanity and begin to live as people - and we do not do that because of the effects of racism."

"We must consciously strive for an ideology which deals with racism first..."

"A revolutionary prospectus says that we're fighting a war of liberation. In order to fight a war of liberation you need an ideology of nationalism... The nationalism can be nothing but black nationalism. Black nationalism has to begin to be our ideology."

It is clear that Stokely Carmichael's political position expresses the class interest of the black bourgeoisie of the U.S. It follows the usual national bourgeois practice of counter-posing nation and nation irrespective of class. And it opposes the class interest, not only of the white working class, but also of the black working class. It aims to use the racialism which the U.S. ruling class developed as an aid to exploitation, to hold back the development of the class consciousness of the black workers. It aims to restrict the revolutionary militancy of the black workers. It aims to restrict the revolutionary militancy of the black masses within bourgeois limits.

When Stokely Carmichael opposes Communism, and says that the ending of racialism would bring about the liberation of the black people, he is clearly talking about bourgeois liberty. The bourgeois elements in the black population would be liberated by the ending of racialism; the black workers obviously would not be.

Though they are expressed in very militant language, Stokely Carmichael's political aims do not go beyond <sup>the</sup> eradicating of racialism from the bourgeois superstructure in the U.S.A., and the liberating of black bourgeois elements whose development has been thwarted by the white ruling class. He aims to use the revolutionary enthusiasm of the black masses to "bring home" the black bourgeoisie; to squander the revolutionary energy of the black masses in achieving bourgeois liberty for the black bourgeoisie (as has been done in numerous other societies.)

There are three possible aims for Negro revolutionaries in the U.S. 1) to struggle with the workers of all races and nationalities in the U.S. against the monopoly capitalist ruling class, for the establishment of socialism; 2) to struggle for the establishment of a separate Negro national state; 3) to struggle for "freedom" for Negroes within the present state structure. Stokely Carmichael has categorically rejected the first, and has not formulated the second. His aim appears to be greater political rights for Negroes within the present state structure, or with a slight modification of the present structure.

Needless to say, it is only the black bourgeoisie who could achieve freedom in this way. Racism is the only obstacle to the freedom of the black bourgeoisie, but it is not the only, or even the main, obstacle to the freedom of the black working class. The statement "racism...is far more important than exploitation", is true for the black bourgeoisie (who have no interest in exposing bourgeois exploitation). It is racism that inhibits their development as an exploiting class. Up to the present they have been content to appeal to the white bourgeoisie to end racialism, or to engage in pacifist opposition. But, now that the conditions of life of the black masses have impelled them into revolutionary action, the bolder bourgeois spirits are prepared to use the revolutionary masses to achieve bourgeois liberty; to sweep aside racialist restrictions on their development as a class. To do this it is essential for the black bourgeoisie to hold back the development of class consciousness in the Negro masses.

For the black bourgeoisie, the main question is racialism. And it makes sense that they should attempt to build up their own pressure group within the present social structure on a racial basis. Other sections of the bourgeoisie in the U.S. have done likewise, notably the Irish.

20.

Carmichael and other bourgeois leaders may speak of and dream about a united movement of all black people on the basis of race or colour. But this is an impossibility. There is no objective basis for the unity of all black people - or, for that matter, of all white, yellow or red people. A black, or a white, bourgeoisie may be able in the short term succeed in gaining the support for bourgeois aims of the majority of the workers, semi-proletariat and petty bourgeoisie under their power and influence. In the long run this unity must be disrupted by the conflict of class interest. And, even in the short run, the black bourgeoisie, or the white, cannot give rise to a united movement of the whole bourgeoisie of that colour for the simple reason that it is not colour but class that dominates human society. The unity of the African bourgeoisie, which Nkrumah hoped to achieve, never went beyond words. The Biafran war should show how substantial a base for unity colour is. Class interest makes the black bourgeoisie (along with the bourgeoisie of all other classes) behave in the same manner as the original white bourgeoisie.

While there is no objective basis for the unity of all black people there is an objective basis for uniting the majority of the black people and that is working class interest. And the unity which can be achieved on that basis makes no distinction between black and white and yellow.

\*

#### MALCOLM X

In his development Malcolm X went through various stages from the Black Muslim position to the brink of socialism. In 1963 he held a position akin to that of Stokely Carmichael's today. But in every speech of his there can be heard a genuine radicalism, contributing to the development of the mass movement, while Stokely Carmichael's statements are clearly those of a phrasemonger trying to hold back the development of an aroused mass movement.

In his "Message To The Grass Roots", November 10, 1963, Malcolm X said:

"...once we realise that we have a common enemy, then we unite, on the basis of what we have in common. And what we have foremost in common is that enemy - the white man... In Bandung back in, I think, 1954 was the first unity meeting in centuries of black people... Some were communists, some were socialists - despite their economic and political differences, they came together... The number one thing that was not allowed to attend the Bandung conference was the white man. He couldn't come. Once they excluded the white man, they found that they could get together. Once they kept him out, everybody else fell right in and fell in line." (See Malcolm X Speaks p5)

The fate of the Bandung movement should be a sufficient comment on this. Concerning the basis of the black revolution he said (in the same speech): "Revolution is based on land. Land is the basis of all independence. Land is the basis of freedom, justice, and equality... A revolutionary wants land so that he can set up his own nation." (p9)

In A Declaration Of Independence (March 1964) issued after his break with Elijah Mohammed, he wrote: "I believe the best solution is complete separation, with our people going back home to our African homeland..." "Whites can help us, but they can't join us. There can be no black-white unity until there is first some black unity. There can be no workers solidarity until there is first some racial solidarity." (p20/22)

In April 1964: "The economic philosophy of black nationalism... means that we should control the economy of our community... Our people have to be made to see that any time you take your dollar out of your community and spend it in a community where you don't live, the community where you don't live, the community where you live will get poorer, and the community where you spend your money will get richer and richer... If we own the stores, if we operate the businesses, if we try to establish some industry in our community, then we're developing to the position where we are creating employment for our own kind." (p38/9)

"Revolution is always based on land. Revolution is never based on begging somebody for an integrated cup of coffee". (p50).

"Revolutions are fought to get control of land...and...the institutions that flow from that land. The black man has been in a very low condition because he has had no control whatsoever over any land." (p57)

At this time he made a tour of Africa, as a consequence of which he said: "In the past, I have permitted myself to be used to make sweeping indictments of all white people... I no longer subscribe to sweeping indictments of one race... I am not a racist and do not subscribe to any of the tenets of racism." (p58)

"Negroes can't judge each other according to colour, because we are all colours, all complexions... Just as on the African continent, we have this wide range of complexions -- so much so that we can't call it a brown struggle, a red struggle, or a black struggle." (p 83/4)

With regard to his former racist position, he said: "...as a black man, and especially a black American, any stand that I formerly took, I don't think that I would have to defend it, because it's still a reaction to the society, and it's a reaction that was produced by the society; and I think that it is the society that produced this that should be attacked, not the reaction that

22.

developes among the people who are the victims of that negative society" (p197)

In Jan. 1965 he said that he no longer believed in the establishment of a black state. In the period when he was a seperatist he stressed the fundamental importance of land in the black revolution. Later after he abandoned the aim of a black national state, he was asked: "What political and economic system does Malcom X want?" He answered: "I don't know but I'm flexible." (p69)

The fake "Maoists" of the W.P.P.E. claim that Mao agrees with their Racial view of the question. Malcom X tells of a meeting with the Chinese Ambassador in Ghana in 1964:

"He didn't sound a racist, he didn't sound a fanatic, he didn't sound unreal, he seemed to have a very objective picture in front of him... If he wanted to impress me, since he had heard I was a racist ... he would have been talking some of that racist talk to me. Instead he was telling me that its not wise and intelligent for a person to take the position of a racist because you can't defend it. And its true. You can't take a racist position and defend it. No, you can't have anything to base it on." (p215)

In one of his final statements on the question before he was murdered he said;

"I believe that there will ultimeatly be a clash between the oppressed and those that do the oppressing ... but I don't think that it will be based on the colour of the skin, as Elijah Muhammed had thaught it. "(p216)It is incorrect to classify the revolt of the Negroas simply a racial conflict of black against white, or as a purely American problem. Rather we are today seeing a global revolution of the oppressed against the oppressor, the exploited against the exploiter. The Negro revolution is not a racial revolt."(p217)

(In part 1 of this article we said that it was theoretically possible for the Negro question in America to be resolved within the Imperialist framework, that sections of the ruling class were attempting to achieve this, but that it was prevented by a number of questions, including the ineptness and the backwardness of the ruling class as a whole. Malcom X said essentially the same thing: "America today is at a time when ... she can be the first country on this earth that can actually have a bloodless revolution. In the past revolutions have been bloody ... America is the only country in history in a position to bring about a revolution without violence and bloodshed. But America is not morally equipped to do so." (p56/7)

At the time of his death Malcom X had no coherent political position. He had abandoned his earlier racialist/black nationalist position and he had not worked out a comprehensive alternative to it (he had in fact little time to do so.) He could only have found a comprehensive alternative in Communism. Of course it cannot be said

that if he had lived he would have become a Communist. It can only be said that he was being driven in that direction by the honesty of his approach, and his ability to see realities - and that Stokely Carmichael is not his successor.

\*

### MARCUS GARVEY

The ideologists of the bourgeois Black Power movement are increasingly focussing attention on the writings of Marcus Garvey, founder of the petty-bourgeois "Universal Negro Improvement Association" (1914) and of the Black Star Line, formed for the purpose of carrying American Negroes back to Africa. In the first part of this article we quoted an assessment of the political nature of Garvey's movement made by a (black) Communist. Since the validity of this assessment is denied in the Black Power movement, a closer look at Garvey's position is required in order to remove the suspicion that the black man who characterised it as petty bourgeois was really a white man in disguise. Firstly we will look at a speech delivered by Garvey in the Albert Hall, London, republished earlier this year.

The Chairman of the meeting, Garvey's Assistant President, addressed his speech to "the stalwart people of the great British Empire" (p6), and tried to explain to them that the imperialist interest would gain if imperialism treated the black people a bit better:

"We feel that if the negroes...can work day in day out, year in year out, producing wealth, giving their labour for the sustenance of the Great British Empire, and of the U.S.A., and of many nations in Europe, that there ought to be a better spirit existing between these nations and these peoples. We feel that if these negroes are to work under the conditions that they are labouring under now for the sustenance of these great nations that they would be willing to work twice as much if the spirit was a little better." (p7)

And Garvey said to the imperialists: "We represent the new negro. His back is not yet to the wall; we do not want his back to the wall because that would be a peculiar position and a desperate position. We do not want him there. It is because of that we are asking you for a fair compromise" (p23). Here we have an open plea to the imperialists to take reformist action in order to avert a revolutionary upsurge by the Negro masses against imperialism - which, of course, would also endanger the position of bourgeois elements among the Negroes.

A new edition of "The Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey" was published in Britain in 1965. In the Introduction, E. U. Essien Udom says: "There is a similarity between Garvey's concern for a united and powerful Africa and a recent call for

24.

black solidarity by Chief Remi Fani-Kayode, former Deputy-Premier in W. Nigeria. In his book "Blakism" (1965, Lagos), Chief Fani-Kayode writes: "Blackism is a call to the states of Africa to unite. A positive, aggressive, and direct force. Naked and unashamed Blackism, a force to weld together the states of Africa into one unified entity... I may as well copy the communist slogan: 'Black men of the world unite, you have nothing to lose but your shame, humiliation, suffering and the contempt of the white man'". We give below a sample of Garvey's "Philosophy and Opinions":

"I believe in a pure black race just as all self-respecting whites believe in a pure white race, as far as that can be. I am conscious of the fact that slavery brought upon us the curse of many colours within the Negro race, but there is no reason why we of ourselves should perpetuate this evil." (Part 1, p 29-30)

The U.N.I.A. "believes in the purity of the Negro race and the purity of the white race." (Part 2, p 81)

"If I must advise the Negro workingman and labourer, I should warn him against the present (written in 1923, CWO) brand of Communism or Workers Partizanship as taught in America."

It seems strange and a paradox, but the only convenient friend the Negro worker or labourer has, in America, at the present time, is the white capitalist", who lets him sell his labour cheap.

"Fundamentally what racial difference is there between a white Communist, Republican or Democrat?"

"... the group of whites from whom Communists are made in America, as well as trade unionists and members of the Workers Party, is more dangerous to the Negroes welfare than any other group at present. Lynching mobs...are generally made up of 99½% of such white people... The Negro should keep shy of Communism or of the Workers Party in America."

"If the Negro takes my advice he will organise by himself and always keep his scale of wages a little lower than the whites' until he is able to become, through proper leadership, his own employer; by doing so he will keep the good will of the white employer..."

"Capitalism is necessary to the progress of the world, and those who unreasonably and wantonly oppose or fight against it are enemies to human advancement..." (Part 2, p69-72)

## THOMAS FORTUNE

The bourgeois and opportunist leaders of the Black Power movement recognise and publicise their bourgeois forerunners. And it is notable that the Negro leaders who associated themselves with working class movement tend not to be mentioned in their publications - for example, W.E.B. Du Bois who openly associated himself with the world Communist movement. Here we will look at the writings of another leader of the Negro movement in the U.S.A., a former slave, T. Thomas Fortune, whose book, "Black and White: Land, Labour and Capital in the South", was published in 1884. Fortune stated that:

"The primal purpose in publishing this work is to show that the social problems in the South are, in the main, the same as those which afflict every civilised country on the globe; and that the future conflict in that section will not be racial or political in character, but between capital on the one hand and labour on the other", and that, therefore, "the labor elements of the whole U.S. should sympathise with the same elements in the south, and in some favourable contingency effect some unity of organization and action, which shall subserve the common interest of the common class." (iv)

Fortune analysed the Civil War, showing its real causes, and showing that neither the Republican nor the Democratic parties represented the interests of the masses, black or white. He made no colour distinctions among the bourgeoisie. He showed how the democratic forces which the bourgeoisie had to call into motion for the purpose of waging the war (e.g. the emancipation of the slaves, and the rousing of them to struggle) were effectively suffocated in the decades of the Reconstruction after the war:

"Look at the misgovernment of the Reconstruction period... misgovernment by white men and black men who were lifted into a 'little brief authority' by a mighty but unwieldy voting force. That black man who connived at and shared in the corruption in the South which resulted in the subversion of majority rule, is a traitor to his race and his country... and I have nothing to heap upon his head but curses, the execrations of an injured people. Like Benedict Arnold he should seek a garret in a desert of population, living unnoticed and without respect, where he might die without arousing the contempt of his people". p120/21. (The "Marxist-Leninist", J. James would no doubt claim that those black bourgeois elements were really white.)

Throughout his book Fortune reverts to one theme: that class lines cut across racial lines. And though the American bourgeoisie was overwhelmingly white, Fortune continuously drew attention to the black bourgeois elements that existed. He said he

26.

he had seen white businessmen who "spoke with the utmost deference to ... coloured gentlemen who had money to lend." (p183)

"Already I have seen in the South the black and the white farm labourer, working side by side for a black landlord; already I have seen a white brick-mason (and carpenters as well) working upon a building side by side, under a coloured contractor. And - we are not yet two decades from the surrender of Robert E. Lee manumission of the black slave." (p195)

He maintained that the Southern poor-whites held a social position beneath the blacks: "They instinctively hate the black man; because the condition of the black ... place(s) him a few pegs higher than themselves in the social scale ... It was long a common saying among the black population of the South that "I'd rudder be a niggah den a po' white man!", and they were wise in their preference" (p201)

Fortune showed that for the mass of the black people chattel slavery had merely been replaced by another slavery. The Civil War, while freeing the slave left the institution of private property in the means of production: "the thing which gave birth to chattel slavery and which is now fast giving birth to industrial slavery; a slavery more excruciating in its exactions, more irresponsible in its machinations than that other slavery, which I once endured" (p235) "Even when slavery was first introduced into this country, Fate had written upon the walls of the nation that it "must go", and go it must, as a result of wise statesmanship or amid the smoke of battle ... No man can tell whether wisdom will dictate argument of peaceful, or there must be found a, violent solution: but all men of passable intelligence know and feel that justice will prevail."(p94)

Fortune was of the opinion that the further development of capitalism in America would in its natural course obliterate racial distinctions; that the black bourgeois elements would merge with the white bourgeoisie to make a single national ruling class.(The intelligent, ambitious and wealthy men of both races will eventually rule over their less-fortunate fellow citizens ..."). In this case the race question would recede and the class nature of the struggle would become obvious. But he also took into account the possibility that the white ruling class would obstruct this development. And in fact, with the rise of monopoly capitalism, racial discrimination was intensified and the free political development of the black bourgeoisie was obstructed by the white bourgeoisie. And the growth of class solidarity between the black and whiteworkers was obstructed. However the temporary obstruction of the growth of the political and economic expression of objective working class interest does not eliminate that objective class interest. Fortune's conclusion is unassailable:

"The hour is approaching when the labouring classes of our country, North, East, West and South, will recognise that they have a common cause, a common humanity and a common enemy... When the issue is properly joined, the rich, be they black or be they white, will be found upon the same side; and the poor, be they black or be they white, will be found on the same side. Necessity knows no law and discriminates in favour of no man or race." (241/2)

It is men such as Fortune, and men such as Marcus Garvey, who are the forerunners of the Negro working class movement.

\*

### "MARXIST-LENINIST" RACIALISM IN BRITAIN

The "Working Peoples Party of England" held its first public meeting on June 18, 1968 on the subject of racialism and imperialism. The meeting was addressed by J. James, one of the leaders of the W.P.P.E., and was attended by leaders and supporters of the Black Power movement. It was an enlightening meeting in many respects.

On the part of the Black Power supporters (mainly students) there was an undisguised hostility to the working class which J. James and the W.P.P.E. leadership did nothing to combat (though an new member of the W.P.P.E. attempted to state the Marxist position, without openly disagreeing with his "leadership"). In fact the W.P.P.E. gave every encouragement to the racial position of the Black Power movement, while attempting to cover themselves with the odd, vague reference to class.

One Black Power supporter put it to J. James that imperialism was a product of white racialism. This thoroughly idealist notion is a logical conclusion from the Black Power position. It was a view that was honestly held by the person who put it. J. James who has been representing himself as a Marxist-Leninist leader since 1963 or earlier, knows very well that it is not the Marxist position. Yet he evaded answering the question.

If race, not class, is at the root of social development; if imperialism is an expression of white racialism, and has its basis in white racialism; then it is possible that the great revolutionary struggle of our era may be, as the Black Power movement sees it, the struggle of the non-white races against the white race. If race is the basis of social development, then social revolution as well as social reaction must be racial in nature. But if the Marxist position is correct, if social development is based on the class struggle, and if racialism is a product of a reactionary class, then the revolutionary movement must have a class basis.

28.

Both of these positions cannot be correct, and they cannot be reconciled with one another. Marxists have never been in any doubt as to which position is correct. And the "Marxist", as for instance J. James, who does not unequivocally uphold the class position whenever it is challenged, and who tries to gloss over the difference between the class and the racial positions, is an opportunist of the most contemptible kind. And when he deliberately avoided answering the question of the Black Power supporter as to whether he agreed that imperialism was a product of racialism, he showed just how unprincipled an opportunist he is.

Furthermore, this "Marxist-Leninist leader" declared, the development of Marxism-Leninism itself now had a racial basis: it was no accident, he said, that Mao was a black man!

Some people, he said, might point to the fact that a high percentage of the combat troops in the U.S. Army of oppression in Vietnam were black. But this was an illusion. The black men in the U.S. army, declared Mr. James, were really white men.

It is to be stressed that these statements were made by a leading member of a group which claims that it is the Marxist vanguard of the English working class, at a public meeting at which the main point of controversy was the class versus the racial view of social struggle. They put the W.P.P.E. clearly among the reacialists. James tried to cling on to a semblance of a Marxist position by pleading that the coloured immigrants in Britain were not yet ready to be presented with the class view: that at some unspecified future date a transition would be made from the racial to the class view. Now it is an actual fact that there is a substantial number of black workers in the British working class who have, without consulting J. James, adopted a class view of life, and that every day more and more are learning the class view from their actual conditions of life in Britain. And even if this were not so, Marxists would not be justified in substituting racial propaganda for class propaganda. James' view expresses the most extreme form of tail-endism. His counterparts will be found in Ireland where certain "Marxists", on the grounds that the Irish workers aren't ready for undiluted Marxism, preach Christian Socialism.

\*

It has been alleged that the C.W.O. is repeating imperialist propaganda when it characterises the position of Universal Coloured Peoples Association as racialist. But since the U.C.P.A. rejects the class view and clearly states the racial view, we cannot see why they object to being described as racialist. More strictly, they do not base themselves on race, but on colour. The non-whites against the whites irrespective of class, is their policy.

To give an example of the nature of the propoganda of the U.C.P.A. we quote from the June issue of "Black Power Speaks" (from an editorial statement on page 8.)

"All over the place, the Whites are now howling for more and more of our blood ... The real reason is that we are blacks and they are Anglo-Saxon fascists ...

White lynch mobs, klansmen, and" (here it comes) "workers are now marching the streets, howling, jeering, and screaming for the scalps of black men. They are like animals on the loose and the White worker is there carrying the banner - a lesson for some of us blacks."

And from the black power manifesto:

"We do not enjoy seeing our beautiful black girls on their hands and knees scrubbing subway platforms for ungrateful Whites. We do not enjoy the look of agony in the eyes of those Black girls when they look up and see their intellectual inferiors scamping by in jollity and affluence simply because they happen to be White girls... We do not enjoy the tantrums and rebukes of White patients as our long suffering Black nurses scrub the arses of those ungrateful White men". (P11)

"We are willing to accept that good White people exist. But we must say no when we are asked to let the existence of exceptions distract us from our task". (p12)

"It takes a single match-stick to burn London down. It takes one angry Black man to light that match. BLACK POWER is a revolutionary conspiracy of Black people. The less the number of people involved, the more secure the conspiracy". (p9)

If an Irish bourgeois intellectual stated that he was humiliated by the thought of long-suffering Irish nurses scrubbing the arses of Black men in London hospitals, his position would at once be identified as racist. And if he expressed the elitist, terrorist concept of revolution which is expressed above, and the open hostility to the working class movement, this would be identified and exposed. How does the essential nature of the position change when it is expressed by a black bourgeois nationalist intellectual instead of a white one?

\*

In the first issue of "Black Power Speaks", journal of the U.C.P.A., we read the following statements by its editor, Obi Egbuna:

"We talk about blowing up the White man. But how many of us know that before we can blow up the White man out in the street, we must first of all blow up the White man within ourselves? It is an unfortunate consequence of colonialism that every Black man

30.

today has two ambivalent personalities co-existing within himself, one White, one Black". (p2)

"Black Power signals a rejection of all destructive white values which the Whiteys have been forcing down our tonsils ever since we came out of our mother's wombs. And because we reject what is so patently evil and incompatible with the Black personality and the revolutionary programme of the third world, they call us "extreme". Because we say "Black is beautiful" when they have been saying "White is Beautiful" for centuries, they call us "racist". (p6)

In viewing this let us start from the black intellectual or small bourgeois who wants to be white. In essence this has nothing to do with colour. It is a class question. It merely expresses the desire of the petty bourgeois to be a big bourgeois. The black petty bourgeois does not want to exchange places with white worker but with the bourgeois. Since there was no substantial bourgeoisie of his own nationality his ambition was to join the British bourgeoisie (or French etc., as the case may be).

In Ireland, where there was no colour involved, the same phenomenon appeared. The ambitious small bourgeois engaged in a cultural mimicking of the dominant British bourgeoisie. To this day the Irish bourgeoisie mimic the British monopolists, and have earned the title of "West-Britons". The Irish West-Briton is of a kind with the black man who wants to be white.

But we are now living in the era when only the masses can make history. And the masses are not tortured with the self-doubt of these bourgeois elements. Irish bourgeois elements may have felt that they were not part of the English bourgeoisie; Negro bourgeois elements may feel that they are not human because they are not part of the white bourgeoisie; and both may try to compensate for their feelings of sub-humanity by mimicking those who express their standards of humanity - but the masses by and large were untouched by all of this.

In English bourgeois literature down to the present century the Irish masses were openly described as sub-human. Elements in the Irish middle class felt disgraced because of this. But the masses were not greatly influenced in their view of their own humanity by the opinions which were held about them in the best bourgeois circles.

Hundreds of thousands of African and Irish slaves were transported to the Caribbean plantations and treated as sub-humans. Yet whether in Africa, in Ireland or in the Caribbean they were not afflicted with doubts about their humanity. The black masses have never needed to be told that "black is beautiful" and the Irish masses have never needed to be told that "black is beautiful" and the Irish masses were never inhibited from reproducing themselves

by the fact that they didn't look like English bourgeoisie. Furthermore the black, white and yellow masses in the Caribbean demonstrated that biological attractiveness in the human species does not exist within the limits of skin colour; that it is no more a fact that there are certain standards of beauty for people with black skin and broad noses which are different from those which apply to people with white skin and long noses, than it is a fact that a person's standards of beauty, standard of attractiveness differ with the colour of his hair. And they did this by freely intermarrying between races.

\*

The black masses did not need to be told that "black is beautiful". The rapid expansion of the black population in the U.S. during the past century, which is a source of anxiety for the white ruling class, is final proof that the black masses did not cease to find one another attractive because they were not white. It was the black bourgeois and intellectual elements who, having through the class struggle adopted white bourgeois racialist standards of beauty, needed to discover that "black is beautiful". It is now more than a half century since the progressive black intelligentsia began to make this discovery, which in political literature was given its most vigorous expression by Dr. Du Bois. The increasing fascination of black intellectuals with ever deeper shades of blackness, which is found in the writings of this period, was accompanied by increasing involvement in the general democratic movement, and in the socialist movement. But the racial purity ideas of Garvey were of a vastly different kind. They were a device of bourgeois nationalism to influence its home market, and went with a conciliatory attitude to imperialism and open hostility to socialism.

\*\*\*

COLOUR        "The most exploited section of the working  
AND            class in Britain is formed by the million  
RELIGION      coloured, immigrant workers." (W.P.P.E. Pro-  
gramme.)

The coloured workers are among the most exploited section of the working class in Britain, (oppressed is the correct word: Marx pointed out a long time ago that the relatively better off workers tended to be the most exploited due to the greater productivity of their labour. He showed that despite the greater poverty of the colonial workers in Ireland the industrial workers in England were more exploited. This, however, may seem irrelevant to the cult of ignorance fostered by the WPPE).

To anybody who makes even a superficial survey of the working class in Britain it will be clear that Catholic workers in such cities as Belfast and Derry are in the most oppressed section.

(and they are undeniably oppressed by the same British state that oppresses coloured workers in London or Wolverhampton, even though the WPPE may choose not to "recognise" the fact. The objective situation remains unaltered by the fact that the WPPE will not recognise it.)

In this part of the state there is an armed police force which is free to murder with impunity and makes use of that freedom. There is no pretence of democratic rights. In the past half century there has been a succession of fascist, anti-Catholic pogroms. Imprisonment without trial is a normal occurrence. And sentences of up to 15 years have been imposed for possession of illegal literature. ("Illegal literature" includes a bourgeois nationalist newspaper called THE UNITED IRISHMAN and Histories of Ireland.) And by far the highest rate of unemployment prevails there.

The ruling class has attempted to divide the working class according to religion. Catholic workers have been deprived of civil rights (to put it mildly), and those who rebel received the same treatment as the US negroes who rebelled.

Catholic bourgeois forces, for obvious reasons, have encouraged the workers to see their struggle in terms of Catholic-Protestant struggle. When accused of religious sectarianism they reply in the manner of the "Marxist" J. James, that this is absurd: that it is the protestant imperialists who are guilty of religious sectarianism; and that to accuse them of religious sectarianism is to be the mouthpiece of protestant imperialism. Yet we find the real marxist, James Connolly (to whose principles the WPPE pays a certain amount of lipservice) continually exposing the Catholic bourgeois nationalist leaders who urged the workers to fight their struggle over the religious issue as religious sectarians. Marxists who encourage the workers to develop their struggle on any basis but the class basis are guilty of criminal deception. The struggle of the working class can only be fought successfully on the basis of the real issue: the class issue.

In drawing attention to the intolerable oppression suffered by this particular section of the working class we are not denying that the main part of the coloured workers are also among the most oppressed workers in Britain, or that other groups beyond the two mentioned are in the most oppressed section. But we have said enough to demonstrate the utter superficiality of the WPPE programme in this respect.

\*\*\*

#### IMMIGRANTS AND CLASSES

Is it correct to speak of immigrants or coloured immigrants as a class? Obviously it is not. Immigrants to Britain must fit into the class structure of British society. Immigrants come to Brit-

ain from societies with widely varying historical backgrounds and social structures, and they come from different classes in those societies - mainly the working, peasant and petty bourgeois classes. But whatever their background they are moulded by the class structure of society in Britain and fit into one or other of its classes.

To represent the immigrants as joining only the working class in Britain would also be incorrect. Class differentiation takes place among them. They split up mainly into the working, petty bourgeois and professional classes. The extent to which they enter classes other than the proletariat is not determined chiefly by skin colour. The main body of immigrants into Britain have been white - the Irish. But is it a fact that a higher percentage of the Irish than of other immigrant groups avoided becoming part of the proletariat?

It can be said that the majority of immigrants of every national group enter the proletariat. But is it a fact that the percentage of immigrants who join the working class is higher than the percentage of the population of Britain that was already working class?

One of the ways in which class differentiation takes place in immigrant groups is through the rudimentary development of various "national markets". Small - and sometimes not so small -

bourgeois elements among the immigrants of a particular nationality can use the other members of their national group as a "home market" on which to develop. But these various "national markets" exist within the overall British market, and mainly in distribution and housing, and they can never develop beyond the rudimentary stage (otherwise there would be the development of various small nations). These immigrant bourgeois elements can only approach the big bourgeoisie by going beyond their little "home market" and operating on the British market as a whole.

These "home markets" do not compare in terms of power with the overall British market; and this is nothing to be sad about from the working class viewpoint. Whatever their colour or nationality, the "national bourgeoisie" among the immigrants are agencies for bourgeois ideology of a particularly reactionary nature. In order to safeguard their "home market" they must try to hold back the development of the most elementary class consciousness among the workers of their national group. Anti-British, national bourgeois patriotism disseminated by small bourgeois elements in Britain (or England) among workers of their own national group has no positive aspects. There is no possibility of these elements giving rise to national liberation struggles against British imperialism. Essentially they are no more than small operators defending their local spheres of influence in a big market. The damage they do is done entirely to the workers of their own national group, not to the monopolies.

The example of the Irish immigrants shows how effective the influence of these bourgeois elements can be over a relatively long period. Exploiting bourgeois patriotism to the full, Irish contractors in Britain have for many years employed large numbers of Irish labourers, worked them hard over long hours in the crudest of conditions, and prevented the growth among them of even the most elementary forms of trade union organisation. The workers are carted out to the job at 6.30 am, and return at night, fall to give their wages to the Irish petty-bourgeoisie. And this system is carefully safeguarded by the Irish bourgeois and petty-bourgeois elements. Over a period there is a pressure from the surrounding environment to break down this system: to spoil the Irish workers by integrating them into the British working class movement. A continuous influx of fresh labour from the Irish countryside is needed to maintain it. This system also has its "marxist" expression: The Connolly Association.

Instead of taking it as its task to help the Irish immigrant workers to free themselves from the influence of Irish bourgeois elements, and to expose the activities of these bourgeois elements - thereby enabling the immigrant workers to contribute to the development of the revolutionary working class movement both in Britain and Ireland - the Connolly Association, by peddling the notion that Irish immigrants in Britain (among whom there are proletarian, petty bourgeois and bourgeois classes) have a common interest, makes itself a vehicle for carrying bourgeois nationalist propaganda among the more advanced elements of the Irish immigrant workers.

Over the past decade there has been a flowering of similar opportunist "socialist" bodies to carry out the same work among other immigrant groups. It has been said that power without responsibility is the prerogative of the harlot. But no generation of harlots ever did a fraction of the damage done by these opportunist elements, or had such a glib way of evading responsibility.

In the first place they plead that their primary interest is not in the British working class movement but lies with their own people (as one of them actually put it), the Irish, the West Indians etc. And on the other hand, since they are functioning in Britain and not in Ireland, West Indies etc., they are not accountable to the working class in those countries. They can give free rein to their opportunist inclinations in the "immigrants' movements" in Britain, and be responsible to nobody. (And the present fragmentation of the international communist movement opens the doors to international congresses to many of them. One prime specimen has "represented" Indian writers at a congress in Peking and Caribbean workers at a congress in Tokyo, to mention but a couple of his multitudinous activities.)

The immigrant workers of each nationality have their own particular history in addition to forming part of the international working class. This varied experience could be of service in

developing political consciousness in the British working class movement. But it can also be exploited by the opportunists in order to retard the development of the working class movement both in Britain and in the various countries from which workers have emigrated to Britain.

The form of opportunism which, under the pretence that its "first loyalty" is to its own national group, justifies its disruptive activity in the working class movement in Britain, and which carries on the bourgeois nation that it has special rights with regard to "its own" workers must be mercilessly exposed. The British working class is at present carrying an immense burden of opportunists of all sorts and descriptions. Certain of these parasites are among the first to declare their amazement that the political development of the British working class should be proceeding so slowly. It is certain that when despite the weight of these opportunists, the political development of the working class in Britain begins to gather pace, the "marx ists" and "maoists" who have made themselves agencies for nationalism and racialism will be among the first to be pitched into the rubbish bin.

(To Be Concluded)

+ + + + + + + + + +

CONTENTS

Stokeley Carmichael .....	17	"Marxist Leninist Racialism	
Malcolm X .....	20	In Britain .....	27
Marcus Garvey .....	23	Colour and Religion .....	31
Thomas Fortune .....	25	Immigrants and Classes .....	32

+ + + + +

Pamphlets

STALIN: Economic Problems Of Socialism In The USSR ..	2/6
STALIN: On An Article By Engels .....	9d
STALIN: Concerning Marxism In Linguistics .....	2/6
*	
THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION .....	9d
"ON STALIN'S 'ECONOMIC PROBLEMS', Part 1 .....	2/6
'CAPITAL' AND REVISIONISM .....	*1/-
REVISIONISM AND IMPERIALISM .....	6d
IN DEFENCE OF LENINISM .....	1/6
THE PALESTINE QUESTION .....	9d

By post from D.GOLDEN, 4 Despard Road, London, N.19.  
(Postage 6d per order)

