

https://dspace.org/

Black politics in the United States in the 1960's and the Nationalist-Integrationist Debate

Halisi, C.R.D.

1977-04
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/8724

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND

A F R I C A N S T U D I E S I N S T I T U T E

African Studies Seminar Paper
to be presented in RW
4.00pm APRIL 1977

Title: Black Politics in the United States in the 1960's and the Nationalist-Integrationist Debate.

by: C.R.D. Halisi

No. 052

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND, AFRICAN STUDIES INSTITUTE

AFRICAN STUDIES SEMINAR

Paper for Wednesday, 20th April, in the Seminar Room, African Studies Institute, Convocation House, (note venue) at 4.00 p.m.

C R D Halisi

Black Politics in the United States in the 1960's and the Nationalist-Integrationist debate.

Introduction on the doctrine of imported rebellion

Police experts have recently testified before the Cillie Commission to the effect that the Black Consciousness movement in South Africa is no more than a gross importation of American Black power. Since this paper will attempt to deal with certain aspects of the America's Black movement it seems appropriate to comment on the claims of the "experts" who themselves are utilizing a doctrine employed by many other recalcitraint states faced with an undeniable need for change. This argument commonly known as the doctrine of imported rebellion has particular force in South Africa because of the conservative presuppositions through which many white South Africans attempt to analyze and explain their own political ambient

The ideology of South Africa's ruling party, which is accepted in whole or partially by many of its supporters, shuns the tenets of liberal Western democ racy and clings to an anti-liberal conservatism uniquely South African in character. Despite the exceptionalist nature of much of South African conservatism it shares with similar ideological orientations some common features. One such feature is the conservative mentality's hostility to theory. Conservative thought "inclines to accept the total environment in the accidental concreteness in which it occurs, as if it were the proper order of the world,to be taken for granted and presenting no problem."[1] For this reason,Karl Mannheim categorizes conservatism as a form of utopian thought. The conservative thinker accepts the given order as the "natural order and is thus unable to account for the sources of radical social change in his society. Historically, "only the counter-attack of opposing classes and their tendency to break through the limits of the existing order causes the conservative mentality to question the basis of its own dominance."[2] The South African conservative adhering to a complex amalgam of class and racially based concepts reacts similarly to Black social unrest. (Thus we find more social introspection from all quarters after June of last year).

Important for our purpose is the doctrine of imported rebellion as the attempt of the conservative mind to "theoretically grasp" and dismiss social upheavals. Given the assumptions of conservative thought soical conflict cannot possibly rise from within the "organically harmonious" environment of the Plaaterland or the southern American plantation. Therefore, a category must be created to account for such disturbances. Conveniently, notions such as "foreign doctrine" and "agitator" allow for the displacement of

social conflict and the imputing of a kind of satanic otherness to those who would dare rebel against their "rightful" position in paradise. Social conflict is automatically denied any roots in society and is simplistically attributed to manipulation by trouble-makers. This style of reasoning serves two purposes. First it provides the state with a justification for further repressive measures; next, it reinforces on an ideological level the atheoretical assumptions of conservatism. Leo Kuper's description of the reasoning of South African government officials during the Pondoland rebellions is illustrative:

> For the government, the charge of outside agitation immediately introduces the spectre of communism, of professional politicians exploiting the masses for their own ends. There is the further implication that the people are content until mislead by false propaganda. The magic formula thus exonerates the government, elimanates the issue of policy, and transforms it into a problem of exorcising the devil.[3]

Such pronouncements might ordinarily be passed off as the official paranoia of a minority government that refuses to in any way share power with its Black populace. But amongst a white populace steeped in christian theology and for whom the boundaries between divine prophecy and raw political power are virtually non-existent, such explanations of political phenomena carry unusual currency.

Nonetheless the serious social thinker must resist the temptation toward conspiracy theory. For even when conspiracies of one type or another exist, one yet must explain the social conditions in which this particular form of political action transpires. Likewise, any attempt to understand the Black consciousness movement in South Africa as a mere "offshoot" of the Black power movement in the United States can only lead to a miserable distortion and total miscomprehension of both these highly relevant social phenomena. Again, Mannheim argues, quite cogently, that certain modes of thought are incomprehensible as long as their social origins are neglected or obscurred.[4]

The attempts of Black men to account for the formation of their own consciousness and to relate that process to their political and social environments must be studied as seriously as any other dimension of social reality.

This paper attempts a brief outline of some of the issues that the Black power movement in the United States posed to American society as a whole. The implicit argument being that one must analyze Black power within the context of American society. It is furthermore hoped that by a discussion of Black politics in America a fuller and more realistic comparison with contemporary South Africa can be made than is being offered by the advocates of doctrine of imported rebellion. In addition, we feel it quite proper to include the Black experience in America as but another aspect of the total African experience. Blacks who left this Continent landed in America as Africans, and in several respects remain so until this very day.[5]

The Emergence of Black Power

The term Black Power was first publicized by the well-known Black American novelist Richard Wright. In the late Fifties, Wright, as a guest of Kwame Nkrumah, observed the last stages of Ghanian de-colonization. This was the first time that a Black African State had gained its independence. Wright entitled his written account of what he had observed Black Power. In the early sixties, Adam Clayton Powell, Harlem's flamboyant Black Congressman, incorporated the phrase into his vocabulary, garnishing it with a

3/ .....

domestic interpretation. In June of 1966, Stokely Charmichael shouted the phrase "Black Power" in the ear of an American public slightly dosing from the lullabye of moral platitudes being sung by spokesman of the civil rights movement. Carmichael, then chairman of the Student Non-Violent Co-ordinating Committee, was leading a Freedom March in Mississippi. What was important was the fact that for the first time the phrase Black Power had become the rallying cry of the youth-wing of the civil rights movement. White Americans of all political persuasions found the phrase to be particularly alarming. It seemed to release in the average white a stored up flood of anxiety, fear and soon enough, resentment. It dramatized a fact that every Black American was too well aware of: that the association of the word power with the word black was completely unacceptable. In an interview in the Fall of 1966, after debate over the precise meaning of the term had raged for a few months, Carmichael concluded that "the furore over 'Black Power' reveals how deep racism runs and the great fear which is attached to it.[6] In Black communities across the country, the Black Power cry, while in some ways novel, only provided a new twist to the long-standing debate between nationalist and integrationist orientated leaderships. This debate was exceptionally sharp throughout the sixties and each trend found a leading figure and national spokesman in either Martin Luther King or El Haj Malik Shabazz (Malcolm X).

The Nationalist-Integrationist Dichotomy: An overview

The Negro is sort of a seventh son, born with a veil, and gifted with second sight in this American world, - a world which yields him no true self-consciousness, but only lets him see himself through the revelation of the other world. It is a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his twoness - an American, a Negro; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder.....

W.E.B. Du Bois, Souls of Black Folk

August Meier, in his sensitive analysis of black American thought during the era of Booker T. Washington, identifies two re-occuring trends among Afro-American political leaders. Usually, black leadership can be distinguished by its commitment to an inward and group centred nationalist approach or an outward orientated integrationist emphasis.[7]

Substantially in agreement with Meier, Eugene Genovese contends that "the history of black America may be viewed, on one level of analysis, as a record of alternating and simultaneous integrationist and separationist responses to white oppression".[8]

So varied is the organizational and ideological attire in which these two trends disguise themselves, one must evaluate and re-evaluate each black organization and social movement with respect to these two distinct social philosophies. Harold Cruse traces these two trends in his fascinating study of race relations within the American left. According to Cruse, one must separate "Negroes proper from Marxist politics and examine their movements purely within the context of nationalist vs. integrationist trends."[9]

Viewed from this perspective American radicals have often been indistinguishable from liberals and some, in their hostility to black groups which manifest national

consciousness rather than class consciousness, approximate conservatives. Few white American radicals have explored the conditions which give rise to national consciousness and have dismissed nationalist approaches as "petty-bourgeois" or "utopian". For this reason and others, the Black Power Revolt - which, in some ways, can be seen as but another life-cycle in the on going nationalist-integrationist debate - clashed with both liberal and radical stereotypes of "the Negro". In his essay "Black Power and Historical Scholarship", Genovese discusses the impact black nationalism in the 1960's had on American history writers. "The insistence on a nationalist interpretation of black culture and black history may be one-sided" says Genovese , but it is by no means irresponsible ..." [10]

Cruse would agree, that any attempt to elevate the rivalry between nationalist and integrationist social views, to the level of a shibboleth, for the comprehension of Afro-American history, is not only one-sided but misguided. He advocates linking the success or failure of one or the other trend to the larger economic and political forces at work within American capitalism. Cruse continually assails the black intellectual for his theoretical poverty and lack of an independent radical perspective. Says Cruse, "by 1930's the Negro still had not learned that for him economics, politics and culture are inseparable."[11] Much too often, the changing dynamic of American capitalism caught radicals - black and white - sound asleep. For example, few predicted the explosions, beginning with Watts in 1965, that spread to nearly every urban ghetto. The violent erruptions of the black masses arose just as the non-violent and multi-racial protest politics of the civil rights movement began to wane. These ghetto revolts thrust militant nationalist spokesmen to the forefront, heretofore given no national platform. Shortly before 1965, which marked the turning point in mass attitudes among blacks, Malcolm X appeared on a national television program with the six big leaders of the civil rights movement. The mere presence of Malcolm with this "sacred six" including Martin Luther King, Roy Wilkins, Whitney Young and James Farmer, highlighted the nation's growing realization that these men of peace did not speak for the angriest sectors of the black populace.

The diverse political strategies and moral appeals of the civil rights and black power organizations forced each to justify its existence visa via the history of the Afro-American community. Nationalists, in particular, took a keen interest in black history. They have always argued that one of the ways blacks were oppressed was by denying them any sense of black history. A popular distinction referred to by nationalists was between "History" and "His story" (that is the Whiteman's version of history). An important dimension of this growing concern with Afro-American history and the black experience was that it emerged outside the walls of American academic institutions. Ghetto residents developed an interest in what black spokesmen of the past had written about the plight of the blackman. Ghetto youth, hardly inclined towards academics, would turn out in large numbers to hear a brother rap about the "true" history of black people. It became clear to the average blackman that the academic institutions in America belonged to the overall establishment and by extension had a vested interest in keeping blacks ignorant of themselves. A corallary of this reasoning was distrust of what whites had written about blacks. Even professors like Genevesse, who considered themselves sensitive to nationalist interpretations, were singled out by campus radicals as academic exploitors of the black experience. Of course, this grassroot approach to history had a positive and negative

side. At times, it lead to highly dubious interpretations of the history of blacks, as one could disqualify any school of thought by terming "white". More positively, it actually challenged some of the misinterpretations fostered by various historical schools; it also fostered mass based interest in black social movements of the past and generated a grassroot concern with historical and theoretical issues.

The effort to link the history of the blackman in America to that of his African counterpart was the predominant trust of most nationalist historians. One noted speaker used to emphasize the cleavage that had developed between continental and western African history by rhetorically posing the question: "Do you think that we are all like Pixies and just sprung up here in Georgia Alabama and Mississippi with the cotton crop?" Africa often became a black state of nature to be contrasted to the ugly and brutal existence of the ghetto. Cruse, growing up in an era when Africa was not in vogue and having his initial political experiences in left movements rather than nationalist ones, criticizes this utopian approach to both African and Afro-American history. As for the black American experience, he wants it located squarely within the American socio-economic reality, and is quite critical of grassroot Africanists such as Chalcellor Williams and Yosef Ben Jochannan. With specific reference to black power, Cruse insists that this crucial concept cannot be discussed outside of a reevaluation of the three most important Afro-American leaders of this century - Booker T. Washington, W. E. B. Du Bois and Marcus Mosiah Garvey.[12] If Cruse's suggestion is correct, a discussion of Washington, Du Bois and Garvey should enhance our understanding of the issues raised by black power and lend an historical dimension to the nationalist-integrationist debate which reemerged so sharply in the 1960's. The ideological, political and organizational struggles between Washington and Du Bois in the beginning decade and a half of this century may be our best point of depature as the issues loom so clear. And, we will later discuss the advent of Garveyism. However, it is worthwile noting that nationalist and integrationist views first collide in the abolition movement prior to the Civil War and Reconstruction.

Several scholars believe that Du Bois merely extended the militant protest politics of the famous black abolitionist Fredick Douglas into this century. Douglas, an unrelenting and militant abolitionist, escaped from slavery to freedom in the North. A free black and yet a champion of the cause of the Southern slave, Douglas perhaps became somewhat removed from the realities of slavery. He was militant on political questions but on race questions simply felt that the solution to the black problem was complete assimilation into white America. Furthermore, Douglas was too closely aligned with the famous liberal abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison, for the liking of some more nationalist minded abolitionists. Many of Garrison's abolitionist colleagues considered the movement the affair of whitemen, only including blacks on ceremonial occasions and in instances when a real live "Negro" gave them credibility. Eventually, the issue of white control of the movement to free slaves arose, as well as opposition to some of its liberal, integrationist, and non-violent assumptions.[13]

Henry Highland Garnet opposed the integrationist trend which dominated the movement. Garnet called for blacks to return to their mother Africa. In October of 1864, the abolitionist movement anticipating the thirteenth amendment (which abolished slavery) formed the National Equal Rights League; the first meeting of which was chaired by Douglas. Garnet at this meeting argued that Blacks constituted a separate nationality and should leave the land where they would always face discrimination. This was by far a minority position, as most Black abolitionists considered America to be their new "birthright". The optimistic

6/ .....

spirit of the times caused them to suspect any attempt at repatriation or partition in certain Black areas. [14] How deeply the freed men that comprised the Black wing of the abolition movement had considered the problems that would face slaves is uncertain. But there were those like Garnet with no faith in the open-armed acceptance of American Whites.

President Abraham Lincoln was also concerned about the social impact the end of slavery would have upon the nation and favoured colonization schemes, that would reentrench the ex-slave in Africa and parts of South America. Had Lincoln not been assissinated the history of Afro-America might read somewhat differently. In 1862, Lincoln interviewed a black delegation and argued:

> Should the people of your race be colonized and why? Why should they leave this country? You and we are different races. We have between us a broader difference than exists between almost any other two-races. Whether it is right or wrong I need not discuss, but this physical difference is a great disadvantage to us both, as I think. Your race suffers very greatly, many of them, by living among us, while ours suffer from your presence. In a word, we suffer on each side. If this is admitted it affords a reason why we should be separated. If we deal with those who are not free at the beginning and whose intellect is clouded by slavery, we have very poor material to start with. If intelligent coloured men, such as are before me, would move in this matter much might be accomplished. [15]

Of course, limited colonization did occur and Liberia today remains a vestige of this approach to solving America's race problem. Meier contends that a gradual shift towards Black nationalism among abolitionists did occur. In the 1830's, under the influence of Garrison, moral suasion was largely depended upon. The 1840's brought the Liberty Party and Free Soil movement as well as more radical tactics. By the 1850's the predominating emphasis was on the nationalist themes of self-help, racial solidarity, economic advancement, and emigration. [16]

Booker T. Washington incorporated most of the 1850's themes into this Tuskegee Institute program for Black upliftment. He, however, omitted emigration, being of the opinion that Blacks were a permanent part of the American terrain - come what may. Yet Washington was keenly aware of the antipathy the white Southerner lodged for the ex-slave, and that most desired some form of separation from Blacks. This hatred was exacerbated by the South's defeat in Civil War and the subsequent politics of Reconstruction. Between the years of 1890 and 1899, there were 1,111 reported lynchings in the United States, most occuring in the Southern and Border states. From the year 1882 to 1938 there had been a grand total of 3,397 Blacks lynched in America. [17] Rather than advocating physical separation of Blacks and Whites, Washington hoped to make the Blackman politically invisible and to convince the Whiteman that free Blacks represented no threat to his authority. This thinking was brilliantly summed up in the famous analogy from his Atlanta Exposition Speech delivered September 1895. "In all things purely social we can be as separate as the five fingers, and yet one as the hand in all things essential to mututal progress". To this Washington added that the Negro was the "most patient, faithful, law-abiding and unresentful people that the World had ever seen". If Washington understood anything, it was the racist mentality. Oliver Cox, in his much neglected Caste,Class and Race, compares the reasoning of the racist and the anti-semite and confirms what Washington apparently knew about racism:

> The condition for its (society) liking the Jew is that he ceases being a Jew and voluntarily become like the generality of society, while the

7/.....

condition of its liking the Negro is that he ceases trying to become like the generality of society and remain contentedly a Negro. [18]

Washington,pandering to the racist fears of the South, adopted his much criticized strategem of political accomodation. He stressed thrift, cleanliness, christianity and the uselessness of political agitation and protest. So cautious and circumspect was Booker T that when asked to comment on a recent rash of lynchings, he dwelled upon the morally degenerating impact lynchings had on white lynch mobs.[19]

As far as Washington was concerned, political protest without an economic base was futile. And the louder the protest the less opportunity Blacks had of developing an economic base. This attitude infuriated his more radical critics. They were particularly upset by what they considered Washington's soft-peddaling of the disenfranschisement and Jim Crow bus segregation issues. Seldom would Washington take open stands on such questions. Instead he worked through his rather extensive network of personal contacts to prevent the passage of harmful legislation. Ironically, Washington's apolitical politics made him the sole most powerful Blackman in the country. Presidents Roosevelt and Taft would seldom appoint a Black to a post or make an appointment which affected Blacks without first consulting him. [20]

Yet economic nationalism, as repugant as it was to radicals when advocated in isolation from politics, could not so easily be dismissed. Du Bois knew this quite well and never attacked the notion of a group economy. He merely challenged Bookerite means to this end. Du Bois, as an historian and sociologist of the black community, knew that stratification within the community must be considered. The idea of a group economy would haunt Du Bois throughout his intellectual career. He was aware of the problem that black cooperative economics posed, given the class dynamics within the Afro-American community on one hand and the cooptive power of capitalism on the other. Bookerite economic nationalism too easily divested of its worker orientation, was most attractive to segments of the black petty-bourgeoisie. Particularly, those whose wealth or livlihood was based in the segregated South or Northern urban ghettoes. The pull-yourself-up-by-the-bootstrap idea also appealed to certain upwardly aspiring segments of the black proletariat.

Washington basically detested the urban life in the North and encouraged graduates from his institute and blacks in general to remain in the South. For only in the South could a man acquire land, which to Washington's mind was the basis of both wealth and respect. He, therefore, supported the development of an independent black yeomanry. This romantic fascination with "the land" has surfaced as a theme in more recent black nationalist groups. The South has often become equated with "the land" and been seen as the best base to launch a nationalist program. Despite critics, who warned that it amounted to a Bantustan policy, Elijah Muhammad, the late leader of the Nation of Islam, and incidentally one of the most consistent neo-Bookerites possible, demanded that the American government hand over five Southern states to the black nation. In the 1960's, the militant, yet romantic, Republic of New Africa attempted to forcibly confiscate certain portions of the South, and called upon the black masses to launch a guerilla war to establish liberated zones. Nor has this fascination with the South and a land base been the possession of nationalist alone. In 1928, Stalin called for the Black Belt states in the South to become a Black Republic. The Black Republic doctrine was simultaneously applied to the southern United States and South Africa. George Padmore, then a member of the American Communist Party, felt that this call was purely politically motivated and theoretically opportunist.

Padmore thought this to be a "fantastic scheme designed to capture sections of the disintergrating Garvey organization."[21] Despite the disenchantment and condemnation on the part of Padmore and numerous others, the Black Belt scheme figures into the program of several American leftists until this very day.

Another aspect of Bookerite economic nationalism was a commitment to industrial and agricultural education. Booker T. was not the creator of educational emphasis; he was ..... a product of industrial education himself and later became one of its loyal disciples. When applied to the Blackman, industrial education had certain racist overtones. Samuel Chapman Armstrong, founder of Washington's alma mater, Hampton Institute, was much influenced by the Social Darwinist's notions of "backward" and "dependent" races. Colored races in particular were considered to be slothful, backward, lascivious, and inferior. Their only hope of advancement lay in the acquisition of Yankee civilization. "For Armstrong the means of Negro advancement in a competitive, capitalist civilisation lay in..working hard, buying land, saving money, creating stable christian families, and learning trades. He urged Negroes to stay in the South with their 'best friends' the Southern whites, and to remain farmers, through striving to become independent landowners. He felt that Negroes should eschew politics and the demand for civil rights." [22]

Thus the concept of industrial education was linked to a definite socialization program which had little to do with its educational content. In ideological terms it was but another version of the doctrine of progress that in various forms dominated European thought at the turn of the century. Washington cleverly applied this gospel to the racist realities of the American South. He was well aware of the fact that the average Southerner opposed the education of Blacks, and he saw industrial education as a compromise between the North, the South and the Negro.

True enough, Northern and Southern capitalists alike feared that liberal arts education would remove potential black workers from the labour market. Northern industrialist, in particular, vigorously funded industrial and agricultural education programs after 1880. Industrial education also caused some controversy amongst black leaders. It implied certain things about the correct path to "race development". The seemingly positive aspect of this sort of education was its emphasis on uplifting the working class by transforming the unskilled black labourer into skilled labour. Critics often pointed out that industrial education curriculums adhered to the colour bar and only offered blacks, at worst, obsolete skills and, at best, those that did not place them in direct competition with white skilled labour. Nonetheless, the tendency to focus on the working masses rather than the middle class raised the questions: "What is black development?" and "At which class should development be aimed?" In answer to this last question, Du Bois offered his theory of the Talented Tenth, which he later altered and finally abandoned, as a response to the assumptions of industrial education. This theory amounted to an argument for the creation of a stratum of black intellectuals as the key to racial upliftment. Even those who wanted to focus on the labouring classes often opposed industrial education. "By some industrial education was viewed as a means for helping the labouring classes to rise in the world, while others viewed it as a type of instruction suitable for adjusting them to their subordinate social role."[23]

Of course, Washington wanted to make of black labourers pristine and prudent petty-bourgeois gentlemen. The fact that he geared his programs toward the downtrodden and toiling black masses presented a peculiar paradox. An essentially nationalist program, with little appreciation for labour questions, per se, enjoyed the support of large numbers of black workers. Middle-class radicals who

9/.....

possesed a superior understanding of the issues involved in labour were virtually inactive among black workers. Washington never seriously challenged the organisation of American society, and as a result, was only able to engage in faintly reformist politics. He shared with his financial supporters a hostility to the still infant trade union movement. It should not be assumed that Washington adopted a negative view of trade union politics simply because he was ordered to by his capitalist patrons. Much of his thinking was shaped by his own experiences in the working class where he encountered the contempt of white workers for their black counterparts.

Young Booker T. Washington worked in the West Virginia coal mines for several years; here he developed great resentment for, what he once termed, professional labour agitators. In the South, labour unions functioned as racially elite associations for the protection of white workers -mostly skilled white workers. Washington faulted the unions for eliminating black workers from the skilled trades on the mines and in other industries. [24]

He strongly believed in the right of black workers to sell their labour freely and competitively on the market and surmised that white trade unions would only allow blacks to the degree black workers were feared as strikebreakers. Naturally, a vicious circle of animosity thrived between black and white worker. White workers often insisted that the black was innately a scab and could not be unionised. Consequently, the non-unionised black worker, with virtually no knowledge of unions, was frequently used as a scab. The hostility ran even deeper. The first craft unions in the South were from their very inception under pressure, by their white members, to exclude blacks. Spero and Harris show in their analysis of the competition between slave artisans and white artisans, before the end of slavery, that skilled slaves posed a serious threat to white skilled labourers, especially mechanics. 25

Undoubtedly, those supporting Washington financially took advantage of the conflict between black and white workers and encouraged anti-trade unionism. "Industrialists and philanthropists appreciated his petit-bourgeois outlook." 26

These men of wealth were quite eager to shape the political and social consciousness of the former slave. The Afro-American owed his first taste of formal education to missionary schools funded from the coffers of northern manufacturers and financiers. A subtle aspect of this education was a proper understanding of the "evils" of trade unions, imparted by omission or commission. E. Franklin Frazier observes: "No teacher in a school of industrial education could mention the existence of labour unions." 27 Even Du Bois, later to join both the socialist and communist parties, in his more youthful statements, referred to white labour as the "bitterest opponent of the Negro".

Washington's distrust of organised labour is prototypical of most nationalist thought. Nationalist thinkers, in all sincerity, could not see how the white worker could be counted as the friend - let alone liberator - of the Blackman. It must be added, and this is a point to which Spero and Harris devote considerable attention, that many leaders in the Afro-American community were used by and sometimes on the payroll of various monied interest, and with no concern for the overall plight of the black worker, pitted him against the white worker. Still generations of conflict might have been avoided had the early socialist movement dealt decisively with the question of slavery.

Large waves of German socialists emigrated to the United States after the aborted revolution in Germany near the middle of the last century. Several were close associates of Karl Marx. Herman Kriege, Wilhelm Weitling and Joseph Weydemeyer, all radical socialists, found the question of slavery a difficult one. German workers were more proned to seriously consider the relation of slavery to the labour movement for two reasons.

First, they were most often serious socialist with a vast theoretical understanding of what that concept implied. Second, most Germans were highly skilled labourers, and unlike the Irish common labourer, they came into little direct competition with black workers. [28]

Yet, both Kriege and Wietling joined the Democratic Party and by so doing became defenders of slavery. As foreigners, emigrant socialists were themselves under pressure from the anti-foreign Know-Nothing Movement. This made them less willing to demand the abolition of slavery and the inclusion of free black workers in unions. According to Du Bois, early socialists who settled in America, against the protest of their European associates, quietly abandoned the hope of including black workers amongst their ranks. In the end, a rather spurious logic triumphted: "After all abolition represented capital". [29] American born labour leaders, more inclined toward race than class, were not tormented by theoretical "trivialities". White unionists like John Campbell were explicit:

> Will the white race ever agree that blacks shall stand beside us on election day, upon the rostrum, in the ranks of the army, in our places of amusement, in places of public worship, ride in the same coaches, railway cars, or steamships. Never! Never! Nor is it natural or just, that this kind of equality should exist. [30]

Early nationalist thought was formed in an atmosphere of racial hostility from all classes of white America. Nationalists concluded that racial solidarity was the only logical position for blacks.

It took someone like Du Bois, who was not hostile to nationalism in and of itself, to see that even a reasonable nationalist position could not wisely regard white America as a solid racist bloc. It is symbolic that Du Bois lived between the political careers of two powerful race thinkers -- Washington and Garvey -- and became the bitter opponent of both. Paradoxically, Du Bois' own political career is a testimony of the power of the nationalist-integrationist dichotomy. Meier, in his essay "The Paradox of W.E.B. Du Bois", attempts to trace the zig-zag pattern of Du Bois' thought and activity between nationalist and integrationist trends. We would like to quote at length his interesting summation:

> Scholar and prophet; mystic and materialist; ardent agitator for political rights and propagandist for economic co-operation; one who espoused an economic interpretation of politics and yet emphasised the necessity of political rights for economic advancement; one who denounced segregation and called for integration into American society in accordance with the principles of human brotherhood and the ideals of democracy, and at the same time one who favoured the maintenance of racial solidarity and integrity, and a feeling of identity with Negroes elsewhere in the world; an egalitarian who apparently believed in innate racial differences; a Marxist who was fundamentally a middle-class intellectual, Du Bois becomes the epitome of the paradoxes of American Negro thought. [31]

As the quote from his Souls of Black Folk (which introduces this section) indicates, Du Bois more than any other black American leader was sensitive to the acute conflict caused by being black in white America. Perhaps, he was even more aware of this dilemma because of his obviously mixed ancestry (he once referred to himself as being a little French, a little Dutch and a little Negro) as well as the extent of his involvement in academia. Du Bois was a graduate of Fisk (a black college in the South), Harvard (its first black graduate) and Berlin, where he studied with prominents like Max Weber. However, he always considered himself a Race-man (a leader of the Race) and eventually emerged as the major alternative to the leadership and politics of Washington, and what Du Bois like to term, his "Tuskegee machine". Du Bois evolved rather slowly as an outspoken critic of Booker T. Washington. Others, most notably, William Monroe

11/.....

Trotter, another Harvard graduate and editor of the Boston Guardian, were much in the vanguard of the anti-Bookerite faction of Negro leaders. Trotter articulate and virtually obsessed with exposing the "Uncle Tomish" approach to politics advocated by Washington, set out to win Du Bois to his position. Perhaps Trotter sensed the vacilation of which Du Bois was capable. Ultimately, Du Bois became the undisputed leader of this faction. The anti-Bookerite forces manifested themselves organisationally with the founding of the Niagara Movement in 1905. The membership of this movement never exceeded 400, but it did alarm Washington tremendously. The only concrete victory ever gained against Washington was the successful ouster of his control of the Afro- American Council. Meanwhile, Washington "used his personal influence to wean people away from the radicals, attempted to deprive opponents of their government jobs, where possible arranged to have his critics sued for libel, placed spies in radical organisations, employed his influence with philanthropists as an effective weapon in dealing with educators and others, deprived critics of subsidies in political campaigns, and subsidised the Negro press to support him and ignore or to attack the opposition." 32 On various occasions, opponents of Washington who headed Black educational institutions had to step down so as not to adversely affect the acquisition of funds.

In the long run, there was not much that could be done to prevent the emergence of leaders like Du Bois. As the masses of Blacks began to put the slave experience behind them, they were more and more inclined toward political activity. For instance, between the years 1898 and 1904, citizens of Augusta, Atlanta, Columbia, New Orleans, Mobile and Houston boycotted segregated street-cars and in some cities Blacks started their own bus companies. 33 Although many Blacks disagreed with Washington, as to the role of political agitation, they were far from dismissing his every effort. Many simply adopted economic nationalism and political agitation, seeing no conflict between the two. Du Bois and the radical intelligentsia were not only struggling against Washington, they were fighting to place the politics of protest in a dominant position. A major step in that direction was taken with the founding of the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People, in 1910. There was tremendous overlap between the memberships of the NAACP and the Niagara Movement. At the NAACP's inception, Du Bois was the organisation's only black national official. Du Bois would probably never have dented the "Tuskegee machine" had it not been for the support of certain well-off white progressives that gave the NAACP financial assistance. But nationalists for over sixty years have accused the NAACP of being a totally white dominated organisation.

The militant integrationism of the NAACP has always been a double edged sword. Its contribution during the era of Washington was the recognition that political and economic advancement were inextricable. It corrected many of the misconceptions fostered by Bookerite compromise politics. Du Bois, in his critique of Bookerite tactics, "Of Mr. Washington and Others", asks the question: "Is it possible, and probable that nine million men can make progress in economic lines if they are deprived of political rights ... " 34

Kindly, Du Bois acknowledged that when Washington founded Tuskegee the prospects for the Blackman seemed well-nigh impossible. He then goes on to make what is the most damaging criticism of Washington's leadership and gets to the crux of his accommodationist stand. For all his talk of racial solidarity, Washington was attempting to serve two masters, mount two horses. In the words of Du Bois': "Booker T. Washington arose as essentially the leader not of one race but of two -- a compromiser between the South, the North and the Negro". 35

He further accused Washington of accepting the inferiority of the Blackman and allowing Southerners to feel justified in their barbaric treatment of his people. At one point Du Bois was prophetic. He seems to predict the 1960's split between nationalists and integrationists and suggest that because Washington was attempting to walk a middle path he found himself denounced by two groups of Blackmen.

12/.....

"Mr. Washington's position" says Du Bois, "is the object of criticism by two classes of Coloured Americans. One class is spiritually descended from Toussaint the Saviour through Gabriel, Vessey, and Turner and they represent the attitude of revolt and revenge; they hate the white South blindly and distrust the white race generally, and so far as they agree on definite action, they think that the Negroes only hope lies in emigration beyond the borders of the United States". 36 The second group, Du Bois referred to was a group of outspoken professionals which included Kelly Miller, a Howard University professor, and Archibald Grimke, a Boston lawyer. These gentlemen had worked with Washington on various national projects but disassociated themselves from his accommodationist politics, yet refused to attack him publicly. They made three demands of the United States:

1. The right to vote according to ability. 2. Civic equality 3. Education of youth 37

As mentioned, Du Bois' analysis of Washington presaged the Sixities; neither Civil Righters nor Black power advocates claimed Washington. As inconsistent as it may have been for nationalist to claim Garvey or Muhammad while rejecting Washington, this was generally done.

The radical wing of the Black middle class had no difficulty locating the contradictions in Bookerite economic nationalism. It would find it more difficult to grasp the inconsistencies in its own position. The vast majority of these "radical" Negroes were chiefly 'radical' on race questions and most of them remained 'conservative' in their broader economic and social outlook. 38 Ironically, radical political doctines and even socialism took hold amongst this stratum. Horizon, the Niagra Movement's publication, in 1909 stated: "This is a radical paper ... it advocates Negro equality and human equality; it stands for universal manhood sufferage, including votes for women; it believes in the abolition of war, the taxation of monopoly values, the gradual socialization of capital and the overthrow of persecution and despotism in the name of religion. 39 In 1907, Du Bois wrote that he believed in socialism lay the best hope for the American Negro. 40

Time would prove that the paradox Du Bois faced was not simply the antimonies in his thought, but rather his growing commitment to more radical doctrines and approaches and the legalistic, bureaucratic, and elitist bent of the NAACP. The actual social character of the Association became more and more visiable. After all, the NAACP is and has always been the institutional expression of the Black bourgeoisie, to use E. Franklin Frazier's term. And similar to its European counterpart, it only saw in radical politics an opportunity to secure for itself a position of dominance. Once entrenched, the Negro and white liberals of the NAACP, frowned upon any type of mass action; they were only concerned with the briefcase politics of the court room. Not unlike Booker T. Washington, the NAACP devised another variety of political invisiability -- ignore mass agitation; only struggle in the high courts of the land.

The NAACP, to speak more accurately, did not, during Du Bois' day, even represent the whole of the black middle class; it represented the "old" middle class which originated amongst freed Negroes prior to emancipation. These were often the fair-skinned aristocrats of the South who somehow created a niche for themselves behind the walls of Southern segregation. Many owed their freedom to the white plantation owner's lust for his female chattle and his guilt which forced him to manumit his own flesh and blood. The tragedy and shortsightedness of Du Bois was, he imagined, that a constituency such as this would follow him down the road to radical activity. To far to the left of his own organisation, in 1934, Du Bois "felt he was being forced into a bureaucratic mold and split with the NAACP. 41

13/.....

His departure was a victory for Walter White, a shortsighted, pragmatic, social sophisticate, who became the new power in the organisation. White, not much of a long-range thinker, was a sparkling success at the numerous integrated social affairs, of which NAACP members were so fond of sponsoring. Du Bois now found himself in a precarious position -- disliked by nationalists, distant from the masses, and too radical for his own middle class base.

Du Bois had continually demanded that the NAACP identify itself more closely with the masses and engage in direct action. Only slowly did he realise why it would not. E. Franklin Frazier, who spent his entire academic career studying the black middle class, was well aware of the conflict between the black masses and the black bourgeoisie . "The middle class leadership has always been under the scrutiny of leaders who rose from the Negro masses. [42]

Du Bois and the NAACP soon came under the critical gaze and constant attack of one of the most remarkable yet controversial men to emerge from the ranks of the black masses, Marcus Mosiah Garvey and his Universal Negro Improvement Association.

Garvey, a West Indian black, was the descendent of one of the Jamaican Maroon colonies. These were African slaves who fled to the hills to form free communities. Many Maroon colonies remained beyond the reach of British authority and repulsed numerous military assaults. The reverse of Du Bois, Garvey was of unadulterated African blood and a fierce racial pride accompanied the purity of his countenance.[43]

Before arriving in New York on March 23, 1916, Garvey spent several years as a worker in various parts of South and Central America; he spent time in London as well. Garvey, an almost total autodidac, educated himself while applying his trade as a master printer. Through his highly dedicated and disciplined efforts, he baceme a brilliant orator and extraordinarily well read. Garvey's commitment to mass organisation was formed during his working class experience.

In 1907, he was deeply involved in a strike called by the very first Jamaican union, the Printers Union. Workers demanded higher wages and better working conditions. The company involved offered their foreman -- Garvey -- a wage increase, but he refused, and went on strike with the rest of the workers. For his part in the strike action, Garvey was blacklisted amongst private printers in Kingston. After a spell of political activism, he made a move to Costa Rica where he took up employment with the United Fruit Company. Here, Garvey was staggered by the plight of the black plantation workers. Finding the situation unbearable, he decided to journey to the Costa Rican capital to protest before the British Consul. This idealistic young man believed that conditions where such only because they had managed to escape notice by British officials. He was soon to find out otherwise. Bitterly, Garvey concluded that "no whiteman would ever regard the life of a blackman equal to that of a whiteman". [44]
Panama, Venezuela, Honduras and Columbia were some of the countries in which Garvey travelled and worked. In each he found the conditions of the black proletariat shameful.

By 1912, Garvey had ventured to London; here he met the ardent Pan-Africaist, Duse Mohammad, and was introduced to Booker T. Washington's Up From Slavery. Soon Garvey corresponded with Washington and was encouraged by him to visit Tuskegee. He developed a genuine admiration for Washington and considered him to be the only Afro-American leader who was a true uplifter of the race. Garvey, owing to their privileged position in Jamaican society, exhibited a compulsive distrust of fair skinned Negroes.

14/.....

This would be a factor in his contempt for Du Bois and the NAACP. More important, however, where ideological differences. Upon arriving in the United States, Garvey was informed that Washington had died. "With the death of the Sage of Tuskegee, the leadership contest which had raged for nearly twenty years between Washington and Du Bois ... was far from resolved. In a sense, Garvey was to fill the vacuum left by Washington ..." [45]

Garvey, like Washington, was primarily concerned to generate an economic base. He initiated the establishment of trade colleges and industrial schools. In some ways, Garvey projected Washington's economic nationalism on to an international scale. Just as Washington did not understand much about the dynamics of capitalism, Garvey understood next to nothing about the implications of imperialism. Just as Washington desired to foster black capitalism, Garvey dreamed of imperial power. This is clearly indicated in the famous question he posed to himself. "Where is the Blackman's government? Where is his King and Kingdom? Where is his President, his country and his ambassador, his army, his navy, his men of big affairs? I could not find them, and I declared, I will help to make them. [46]

Although his stronghold was Harlem, his model was the British Empire. What Europe had, Garvey wanted for Africa. It was he that made Casely Hayford's phrase "Africa For the Africans" a rallying cry for his movement.

Garvey, however, did depart from Washington's accommodationism. In its place Garvey reverted to a pre-Washington colonization schemes. He would proudly state that the major difference between the UNIA and other black organisations was that his group sought "independence of government ... while others seek to make the Negro a secondary part of the existing government ." [47] The concern with building a black empire allowed Garvey the luxury of mobilising the masses in various countries without a concrete program for any country in particular. Another common trait of Bookerite and Garveyite nationalism was hostility to trade unions, and with Garvey Communism was thrown into the proposition. The struggle between capital and labour was, according to Garvey's analysis, a white affair. It did not affect Blacks and they could benefit from it. Garvey advised the Black proletariat to sell their labour beneath that of white labour. Yet he did not seem to condemn all labour politics but rather that which was prevalent in America. As he put it:

> If I must advise the Negro workingman and labourer, I should, warn him against the present brand of Communism or Workers' Partisanship as taught in America, and to be careful of the traps and pitfalls of white trade unionism, in affiliation with the American Federation of white workers or labourers. [48]

Garvey went on to say that because he was basically selfish and only cared for profit, the white capitalist was the most reliable friend of the blackman. Much of Garveyism's success with influencing black workers had to do with the racialistic policies of the AFof L. Spero and Harris discuss the case of the Philadelphia Marine Transport Workers' Union. This union was under the control of the famous American syndicalist group the International Workers of the World (IWW). Garveyite agitators could never lure any of the black members away from the union largely because the IWW fought racial discrimination in its unions and amongst its ranks. [49]

By following Washington on labour questions, Garvey made a serious error. He inherited all of Washington's enemies,and then some,but gained not one of his rich indistrialist friends.

Had Garvey realised that he was not based in the South at a time when Southern landed capitalist and Northern industrial capitalists were at bitter odds, and that his organisational ranks were swollen by the unemployed and underemployed. Had he even been of the mind of someone like Clements Kadalie and organised a general union; he would have been able to combine nationalist sentiments and labour politics. This would have made a world of difference in the outcome of his movement. It also would have forced a new set of circumstances on the white labour movement -- this the CIO eventually did anyway. Garvey would have also split the vast array of opponents to his movement. Had only Garvey understood something about the American reality.

Of course Garvey could not have neglected nationalism. Black labour radicals organised around the Messanger Newspaper had a labour program but no real mass following. When Garvey began to organise after the First World War the black masses were faced with severe national oppression. Essien Udom comments:

> Blacks hoped that the principles for which they had fought would be extended to them at home. Nearly 400,000 Negroes had served in the arms forces during the World War, and Negro civilians at home had patriotically purchased more than 250,000,000 worth of bonds and stamps in the five major Liberty Loan drives. [50]

Instead, the termination of the War lead to an intensified campaign of anti-black violence. Groups of uniformed black soldiers clashed with hostile white civilians; the Klu Klux Klan greatly increased its recruitment especially among white workers and in some states became a considerable problem to labour unions; there were a total of twenty-six race riots in 1919 alone. Easily, the firery nationalism of Garvey engulfed urban blacks. The moderate NAACP and the West Indian and Afro-American radicals, including the well known labour organiser A. Philip Randolf, were overwhelmed by the brush-fire like expansion of Garveyism. Socialists and communists who had never been able to make much headway among the black workers began to give their efforts at recruitment , some type of nationalist twists. The Messenger group organised the Friends of Negro Freedom with the hope of unionising migrants, protecting Negro tenants, advancing co-operation between blacks and creating public forums to educate the masses. [51]

Obviously, the program of the Friends of Negro Freedom was an attempt to cut in on the mass following Garvey had caputed. What the Messenger radicals clearly demonstrated was that, radical or moderate, most of the existing black organisations were integrationist in their approach, and for that reason could not tap the actual sentiments of the average black worker. Cruse argues that a latent function of integrated radical groups is to make sure that nationalism does not rear its ugly head. [52]

Washington had been in no position to openly attack integrated organisations such as NAACP; it is clear from much of his private utterances that he had mixed emotions about them. Garvey, on the other hand, made anti-integrationism a vocal part of his program. He loved to inform his audience of the racial treachery of "misguided mulatto misleaders" like Du Bois, and the rest. This was not hard for the average Black to understand. Wilson Records points out that groups like the NAACP were structured so as to keep out the very people that men like Garvey and Elijah Muhammad embraced. [53]

The Messenger radicals, on the issue of nationalism,generate two interesting interpretations. Cruse would argue that they were not nationalist enough. Even though a split did develop between the West Indian and Afro-American factions of the leadership, oer the question of nationalism.

16/.....

The West Indians supporting nationalism broke off to form the African Blood Brotherhood. Their nationalism was short lived as they eventually joined to American Communist Party. Cruse contends that neither group were truly nationalist and the split was more over how the two factions regarded their respective relations with the Afro-American masses. West Indians arriving in America, says Cruse, had "making it" on their minds, whether in business or the "business radicalism" of the socialist and communist organisations. [54] But Spero and Harris seem to think that the Messenger radicals were always basically "nationalist". They contend that their attraction to radical ideas had more to do with racism than with capitalism. The radicals grouped around this publication advocated a theory of the "New Negro" and believed that capitalism was responsible for racism, to this formula they were sincerely committed. Spero and Harris question their devotion to class struggle, in and of itself, rather than a means of solving the racial problem. The intragroup rivalry between West Indian and Afro-American intellectuals was not the only conflict that the Garvey movement would expose. It also resurrected the question of white influence and control of black movement. After Garvey, the anti-integrationist mantle would be taken up by the neo-Garveyite Black Muslims and most forcefully articulated by their brilliant National Spokesman, Malcolm X. Malcolm hammered the civil righters because of their subordination to the liberal establishment; he eventually won the youth of the sixities to his reasoning.

As for Garvey, what ever splits existed amongst various forces, liberals, socialists, communists, conservatives -- black and white -- could agree on one issue, "Garvey Must Go". This became the slogan of the Friends of Negro Freedom and the raison d' etre of the mysterious Committee of Eight. This small group of notables petitioned the Attorney General to deport Garvey as an undesirable alien. In 1925, Garvey was sentenced to five years imprisonment (by a judge who he argued should be disqualified because he was a member of the NAACP) for using the mail to defraud. This was in connection with his Black Star shipping line; a catastrophic business venture in which over one million dollars was spent to buy and make sea worthy four dilapidated ships, to return blacks to Africa (Liberia). Interestingly, Garvey's first ship was renamed the S.S. Booker T. Washington. Garvey spent two years in prison before, President Collidge commuted his sentence and had him deported to Jamaica. The numerous Garveyite and neo-Garveyite groups particularly in Harlem, for instance, the African Pioneer Movement, still accuse Randolf and Du Bois of selling Garvey out. Cruse thinks these accusations incorrect, and a continuation of the Afro-American-West Indian conflict. In fact, the most ruthless opponents of Garvey were his West Indian countrymen in the African Blood Brotherhood not Randolf and Du Bois who often gave a more balanced account of Garvey and his activities. [55]

Du Bois, in his autobiography, claims that he "begged his (Garvey's) friends not to allow him foolishly to overwhelm with bankruptcy and disaster one of the most interesting spiritual movements of the modern world. [56]

Of course, Du Bois is not the whole of the black middle class. This class "showed contempt for the masses who followed the Garvey movement". [57] It is true that the core of the Garvey movement consisted of West Indian blacks, and this was perhaps a source of conflict. Frazier, however, traces this resentment to the mania of the American middle class black for white acceptance. Anything connected with the black masses repulses this class. This has been the basis of their hate of their African past until the Black Power Movement imposed an African identification on the community. Thus, the two movements which turned to Africa and the black Folk for inspiration, namely the Garvey movement and the Harlem Renaissance, were bitterly fought by the Negroes of the middle class. The older black bourgeoisie cherish the aristocratic values of the slave South; while, the members of newer Northern based wign of the bourgeoisie are basically nilist who only live for conspicuous displays of wealth. [58]

Garvey's very first error was that he saw his opponents in terms of colour (light skinned) rather than those of class. But this was the least of his failings. His most grievous error was the one offered by Cruse.:"What was wrong with Garvey's nationalism was that it was more bourgeois than it was revolutionary; thus he fell into the error of trying to fight capitalistic imperialism with solely capitalistic methods of economic organisation. [59] Cruse compares Garvey to another nationalist leader who was his contemporary, Sun Yat Sen of China. The difference between Sen, spiritual father of both nationalist and communist China, and Garvey was that the former understood, studied and applied economic theories to the Chinese situation. This implies that social movements must be understood within their overall socio-econimic milieu. The distinction between politics, economics and sociology is a dubious one if it amounts to anything more than a slight emphasis. All three disciplines are about society as organised and all social organisation emerges historically. By Cruse, competent social activists must be serious social theorists and the black intellectual is sterile because since Du Bois not one serious economic analysis, radical or conservative, of the black situation has appeared. Of necessity, any serious analysis of the Garvey movement turns into an assessment of black middle class leadership, since it was so threatened. One finds it remarkable that Negro capitalists, conservatives, leftwingers and ex-radicals all argue with the ghost of Garvey.

CIVIL RIGHTS, BLACK POWER AND THE NEGRO MIDDLE CLASS

Wilson Record, a scholar devoted to scrutinising communist infiltration into Negro movement, details the long history of struggle between the NAACP and the American Communist Party (CPUSA). But he finds himself involved in the NAACP's battles with the Garvey movement and the Black Muslims, at great length. Records condludes that the NAACP has been fighting a war on two fronts since its founding.[60] The NAACP-CPUSA relationship has been a strange and complicated love-hate affair. In ethnic terms, both groups were dominated by a Jewish-Black coalition (a fact the American Nazi Party never tires of reproducing as evidence that communism and civil rights is the outcome of "nigger"-jew race mixing), which was formerly very powerful but has come under serious strains due to black ghetto revolts attacking Jewish shops and the Third World slant of the Sixties leadership. Often one had the moderate and more radically inclined members of the same ethnic groups at loggerheads. Cruse devotes considerable time to a discussion of Jewish-Black race relations on the left and feels that it is a sacred cow which everyone runs from fro fear of being branded anti-semetic. [61] In ideological terms, the dispute between the two groups was the violent, anti-American and anti-capitalist rhetoric of the one and the non-violent, pro-American, pro-capitalist pronouncements of the other. In social terms, both the NAACP and the CPUSA were avowed integrationists. The only disagreement was if an integrated society could be achieved under the present economic order. Their unity on social questions is easily identified by the manner in which persons formerly geared toward NAACP style politics, a la Du Bois and the famous black baritone Paul Robeson, found themselves closely associated with the CPUSA. This does not suggest that social criteria predominate but it is common knowledge that they figure into the proximity of the two groups. Robeson, the classic example, is today hardly known to the average black in America but is considered by many American Jews with the same reverence as a Ben Gurion or a Chaim Weizman (not that every Jew regards these men in the same way). This also has to do with the fact that he and Du Bois, as communists were economically compelled to leave the country.

In 1959, the CPUSA endorsed the NAACP program of full integration; resultingly, when the Sixities ushered in black power politics, both groups were violently opposed.

As early as 1963, other socialists were commenting on the uncritical stand of the CPUSA. For example, editors of the Monthly Review wrote: "The Communist Party understands very little except how two repeat cliches, glorify bourgeois leadership in the Negro movement, and heap slander on the heads of other Negro leaders, including the Black Muslims and Robert Williams". [62]

Out of touch with simple "Who's Who" in ghetto politics, the CPUSA accused Malcolm X of being a CIA agent. An interesting case, was when Mao Tse Tung on the occasion of Robert Williams' visit to China, issued a statement in support of the Afro-American struggle. (Robert Williams was a NAACP branch head in Monroe, North Carolina who in response to Klu Klux Klan violence and intimidation of civil righters called for blacks to organise self-defence groups. For this he was expelled from the NAACP and finally left the country). The civil rights leadership, in response to the Mao statement, hurriedly called a press conference and roundly denounced Mao and everything he stood for. In complementary fashion, the CPUSA leadership labeled Maoist support of Black Power "opportunist support of reactionary bourgeois nationalism". It seemed that the Party position was that bourgeois integrationalism was fine but not bourgeois nationalism, at least that is the way many nationalist interpreted it.

On one level, the conflict between the CPUSA, NAACP and black and white radicals of the Sixties was strictly generational. Rudolf Heberle argues that a generation cannot be measured by age groups but by common and joint experiences, sentiments and ideas; a generation is a way of understanding life. [63] Most of the "old" left (including the CP) had been shaped by the 1930's and the New Deal era during which American capitalism nearly collapsed. The theories of Keynes and the leadership of F.D. Roosevelt created welfare capitalism in the United States and by so doing avoided a major political challenge to the system. A large number of radicals of all ethnic backgrounds were drawn into this new motion. These were the days of the Negro National Congress; days which found the moderate leadership of the Sixities advocating radical doctrines, these were men like Ralph Bunche, A. Philip Randolf and Bayard Rustin. Thus in order to understand the clash between the so called "old" and "new" Left in the Sixities, one must trace out the decline of the 1930's Left simultaneously with the deradicalisation of Negro leadership. This we think is the strength of Cruse's analysis. Genovese accredits Cruse with elevating the often wildly rhetorical debate of the Sixities to new heights. [64] Cruse's strength is that he links black movements to social forces at work in the country as a whole. Furthermore, he clearly understands that one of the real subtle factors of repression is the ability of American capitalism to co-opt the radical challenge of each generation and distort the intellectual continuity between one generation and the next. This is managed by the right mixture of repression and co-optation.

The rise of the civil rights movement momentarily forced the black middle class into a necessary coalition with the black masses. Actually, the early civil rights movement was to the left of both the established Negro leadership, and the established left. In class terms, the challenge came from students at segregated southern colleges and what Frazier refers to as the "new" black middle class, and its liberal supporters from the North. The "old" middle class, as has been stated, had its origins amongst those Negroes freed before the emancipation of the slaves. Slightly before the Civil War, the numbers approximated 500,000; it is estimated that this sector of the population owned 50,000,000 dollars in real and personal wealth. [65]

The famous Freedmens Bank began to foster savings and entrepreneurialism amongst this group as early as 1865. The Bank was a result of an act of congress and is perhaps the first poverty program aimed at the black community. Durham, North Caroline, a city which bustled with small black businesses, insurance companies and banks, was the capital of the "old" bourgeoisie.

19/.....

(in this respect Atlanta has probably replaced Durham).

The "new" middle class has its economic basis among the salaries created by increased skill differentation in larger industrial cities of the North and South, but primarily the North. The real boost to this class came with the industrial boom created by the Second World War. To prevent the kind of retrogression which accompanied the end of the previous war, the government passed anti-discriminatory legislation in order to protect black employment gains. The Federal Government, with its contractual control over the weapons industry, was on its way to becoming the biggest employer in the country. It was able to provide employment and advancement for blacks even when private industry proved stubborn. Between the years of 1956- 1960, survey showed that in Chicago black employees were 28.5 percent of all federal employees, in Washington D.C. 24.4 in Los Angeles 17.9, in St. Louis 18.2, in Mobile 15.5 and New York 15.6. In further assistance of this class the Federal Government passed the Banking Acts of 1933 and 1935 and created the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation in 1934. The Carver Federal Savings and Loan Bank was symtomatic of this new class development. George S. Schuyler well known black newspaper columnist and propagandist for "Black Capitalism", boasted in 1947, that the total assets of Negro Loan Associations amounted to $8,864,342; the total mortgage loans were $7,392,963; cash on hand $832,589 and government obligations only $366,191. [66]

This new middle class,under the leadership of Martin Luther King and his Southern Christian Leadership Conference, assumed hegemony within the ranks of the Negro leadership. It id not take much of an adjustment for the old guard to accept King. In fact, his chance emergence as the leader of the Montgomery bus boycotts was in part due to his freshness and that he stood outside of the old factional squabbles. The NAACP's hassle with King was over his tactics, which included involving the masses. "Southwide ... the conservative image of the NAACP became self-perpetuating and it tended to attract more conservative Negroes -- those who want change but with as little fanfare as possible and who were not much concerned with involving lower class Negroes in the process". [67] The tactical differences become clear when we consider the conditions under which the NAACP joined the March on Washington in late August, 1963, "Although the Association is willing to join King and his followers who are carrying their protest to Washington, the Association insist that it be a respectable pilgrimage not a March on Washington". [68]

Malcolm X in his famous speech "Message to the Grassroots" exposed the compromise that obviously transpired. The March on Washington, as SCLC wanted, would go on but it would be highly co-ordinated and staged from the top down, a development which pleased the NAACP. According to Malcolm, from its initial planning session, at a hotel owned by the Kennedy family, to the careful screening of speakers (James Baldwin was scratched because his highly emotional and extremely unpredictable tongue was considered a risk) the march was a political Porgy & Bess. This middle class has always been close to the National Government to which it largely owes its existence and especially the Democratic Party. Some critics of this alliance during the Kennedy era called John Kennedy, Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King -- the Father the Son and the Holy Spirit respectively. Another part of this liberal alliance was the new image of labour.

In 1930's, the new first industrial union the CIO, organised black labour into its ranks. Confronted with industries containing large numbers of blacks, the CIO had to disavow the racist practices of the AFof L. The NAACP, at first very close to Ford Motor Company, debated at its 1936 annual conference its relation to the new image of orgnaised labour. [69] The NAACP decided to support labour and began to campaign for CIO unions. It also helped to avoid racial violence and blacks acting as strikebreakers during the United Automobile Workers drive to organise Ford Motor Company. To show its appreciation, the CIO became a major contributor to the NAACP, and a Civil Rights Committee was developed within the union bureaucracy. However, by the time of the AFL-CIO merger in 1955, strains had developed and organised labour had come under attack from its civil rights friends.

20/.....

The NAACP though close to the trade union bureaucracy found that joint AFL-CIO, now acting as the AFL once did, refused to organise the large stratum of black unorganised workers. By the Sixties,labour seemed so neatly tucked into the liberal political and economic structure that many young black militants would come to the same conclusions as did Washington and Garvey. They were slow to develop a labour program and self-righteously demanded that workers support them; many workers would have,had they been able to phantom in what.

We have seen that merging the old and new wings of the middle class leadership was a problem far from insurmountable. However, the growing militancy of the student wing of the civil rights movement proved to be a development which the old guard could not thwart. The students had spontaneously began the sit-ins at segregated lunch counters and were from the start inclined toward direct action. Student activists embraced either one of two organisations, the Student Non-Violent Co-ordinating Committee or the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE). SNCC, in particular had emerged out of the efforts of black students and had the most democratic work-style of any black American organisation. Working amongst rural and semi-rural southern blacks they honestly faced the inherent conflict between themselves and the largely uneducated masses. One writer, involved with SNCC, recalls: "SNCC organisers for example make almost a fetish of their determination not to impose their ideas on a community because they feel 'intellectuals' will control those without formal education; there was even recently a proposal that no one with more than an eight grade education be allowed on a SNCC governing body". [70] A genuine mass zeal such as this would sooner or later have to clash with the elitist attitudes of the old guard leadership. SNCC and CORE gradually, at first, began to drift away from the older men and to question their goals as well as their blind dedication to integrationist and non-violent tactics.

Due to their more intimate contact with the average Blackman, and the self-sacrificing idealism which often accompanies youth, students soon reconised glaring disparities in the limited aspirations of the civil rights movement. Few would have used the exact terminology at the time but they saw that the goals of the movement had a definite class bias. The movement had successfully removed petty-apartheid throughout most of the South but perhaps had not touched the real problem. Blacks could buy wherever, go wherever, even sit next to whitemen on toilets, whenever, but as one Montgomery black leader put it, "if a Negro father was earning $40 a week he was doing good ... most working women were in domestic service making $16 to $18 a week". [71] This was a reality that even Martin Luther King began to see. It is quite significant that he was murdered when he began to involve himself in the organising of workers in the larger southern cities, and to develop links with urban militants, making attempts as in Newark, New Jersey, to elect black mayors and control black ghettos economically and politically. Today, two sides of King's politics have split into two trends represented by two leaders, formerly his young lieutenants. Andrew Young embodies King's international pacifism, his belief in the peaceful solution, race problems. Jesse Jackson, the Chicago based leader of Operation PUSH (People United to Save Humanity) has attempted to implement King's later thinking on the need for a group economy. Jesse starts most of his speeches by questioning the overall impact of civil rights legislation. His yearly "Black Expositions" attempts to generate "Blacks Buying Black" programs. Jesse is one of the few ex-civil righters who will admit that the movement did next to nothing for black workers. His programs are a return to Bookerite economic nationalism, as Washington was the first to found a National Negro Business League. The Black Muslim's also extremely powerful in the Chicago compete with PUSH for support of the black community. Both Bookerites, there main differences are christian black nationalism as opposed to Islamic black nationalism and the exclusivist black nationalism, of the Muslims as against PUSH's welcoming of white support.

21/.....

(this last distinction no longer exist as the Nation of Islam now calls itself the Bilalian World Islamic Movement and allows whites to join). —

A critique of the overall strategy of the civil rights movement soon surfaced in just about all quarters. SNCC began to relate to the question of power, its meaning and how to acquire it within the American context. Soon its members would feel as strongly as, Cruse who maintains that in the U.S.A. the "black bourgeois is the most politically backward of coloured bourgeois classes in the non-Western world ... It is a class that ... seeks civil rights without seeking group political power and then demands economic equality in the integrated world without having striven to create any kind of ethnic economic base in the black world" [72] SNCC switched from protesting to organising unregistered voters in those many countries in the South where black voters were in the majority but through trickery and legal and physical intimidation never cast a vote. Their vehicle became the Lowdens County (in Mississippi) Black Panther Party (to be distinguished from the California based group of the same name, which developed later). The shift to political organisation caused many to question the civil rights' tactic of non-violent protest -- the incident in Monroe N.C. with Robert Williams had already challenged it -- and this tactic was hotly debated. Youth began to advocate self-defence and groups like the Decons for Defence began to appear. As Rap Brown, Chairman of SNCC after Carmichael, was to remind everyone "violence is as American as applepie". Students refused to submit to the increasing acts of violence against civil rights organisers by Klu Klux Klan and White Citizen Council groups. Such ideological and tactical changes would hardly remain within the liberal coalition framework for long. Thus the coalition of black and white liberals predominating within the civil rights movement was doomed. This the older civil rights leaders knew.

Bayard Rustin, one of the most thoughtful civil rights ideologues,in an article"'Black Power' and Coalition Politics" first appearing in Commentary in 1966, referred to the debate over Black Power as the most bitter that the community had experienced since the days of the Washington and Du Bois feuds.[73] Black Power, says Rustin, "diverts the movement from a meaningful debate over strategy and tactics, it isolates the Negro community, (emphasis added) and it encourages the growth of anti-Negro forces. [74] Rustin calls for co-operation with established institutions, as Martin Luther King was doing in Chicago where he was aiding the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO in coalition with religious groups, to weaken the Daley-Dawson machine. [75] For Rustin and the old guard leadership, any move outside the old coalition was purposeless. There is no alternative, Rustin insists, to the "liberal-labour-civil rights coalition which would work to make the Democratic party responsive to the aspirations of the poor. [76] The typical New Deal thinker that he is, Rustin's solution was a call for a $100 billion dollar Freedom Budget to be provided by the Federal Government.

Ultimately, Black Power has to be understood as a response to the class based direction in which the Civil Rights Movement travelled. The debate between integrationists and nationalists only represented the class dynamics of the American and Afro- American communities. As the progressive aspects of the civil rights thrust gave way to middle class and government co-optation, the nationalist movement began to represent more closely the sentiments and aspirations of the masses, especially the urban masses. The term power can only be understood as a result of social relations within a given society, and so Black Power must be understood in this manner.

22/.....

BLACK NATIONALISM, THE NEW LEFT AND THE URBAN PROLETARIAT

In 1963, Attorney General, Robert Kennedy, made some rather insightful observation about racial situation in the country. He felt "racial problems in the South were easier to solve than those in the North because the demands were simplier -- open public accommodations etc -- and that these things could be granted and a 'valve released'" [77] Just as Kennedy had recognised the difficulty of solving the northern race problem, nationalists would learn how difficult it would be to develop a concrete program for the northern ghettoes. The task was further complicated by the social psychology of the ghetto. Both Cruse and Genovese identify nihilism as a main opponent of ghetto organisation. Genovese traces this tendency to the slave tradition; the political constraints on slaves prevented organised group action and encouraged nihilistic violence, as the only way to retaliate against the slave system. [78]

Cruse seese this very same nihilism in the everyday life of the ghetto. Ghetto revolts not only brought the plight of the average working class ghetto resident into the picture; they also exposed the more seamy side of the ghetto life with its large lumpenproletarian stratum. In a ghetto like Harlem, it was not at all unusual to know men who hailed from three generations of unemployment. One of the strengths of black nationalism was that it understood the social psychology of the ghetto. Genovese's investigations into the history of black proletarianisation has lead him to conclude that "black nationalism constitutes a necessary response on the part of the black masses." [79] Programs such as that of the Black Muslims rehabilitated hardened criminals, dope pushers and pimps. Often it merely forced them out of informal business and into formal business; Black nationalism itself is a product of the northern ghetto and has never really survived in the conservative South. Nationalism first thrived in embryonic form in the numerous black faternal lodges and secret societies existing in urban communities. The sociology of the southern movement proved very different from that of the northern struggle. Nonetheless, by 1966, Carmichael was still considered the leading Black Power spokesman. His first visit to Watts that same year, as the guest of a coalition of black community organisations known as Black Congress, was quite successful. Two years later SNCC had dropped"non-violent" from its name and merged with the Oakland, California based Black Panther Party for Self-Defence, lead by Huey Newton, Bobby Seal and later Eldridge Cleaver. The merger indicated unquestionable Black Panther hegemony, and symbolised the total emphasis on the North.

Critical of the nationalists for their failure to evolve a concrete program, Cruse thinks that most of them only "transcended self-defence to a version of anarchism combined with some 'direct action' ... " [80]

Much of Nationalism's theoretical confusion stemmed from a purely rhetorical interpretation of the meaning of the civil rights movement and a miscomprehension of the true nature of Malcolm X's split with the Nation of Islam. At least, Southern activists had gone through a process; they had come to the decision to change tactics and thinking through an understanding of the weaknesses the civil rights approach. Whatever were the problems of the civil rights movement it clearly knew what it wanted -- integration into American society. Nationalists claimed to want separation but how was that to come about and how was it to look? Few understood the articulation of class within the civil rights movement. Some had learned the word "bourgeois" but linked it only with some vague notion of "life styles" and proximity to the "system" or "establishment". [81]

It was bad enough not to know what constituted class action within the civil rights movement; it was worse to know this within their own. Similarly nationalists totally misread the nature of Malcolm X's split with the Nation. In order to understand the terms in which many nationalists grasped ideological questions during that time, the growth of Malcolm 's thinking is absolutely necessary to comprehend. The Nation of Islam's doctrine contained three diverse elements.

23/.....

One was black nationalism of the Washington-Garvey variety. Muhammad combined the politics of the two; he called for a group economy within the ghetto, while asking for five states to separate from America, some times in the future. The second aspect was Islam. Here Muhammad departed from Washington and Garvey and took the writings of the famous Pan-Africanist thinker Edward Wilmont Blyden to heart. In his Christianity, Islam and the Negro Race, Blyden had argued that Islam closer accommodated the Negro essence than did christianity. Third, was the aspect of capitalism without politics, just as advocated by Washington. Muhammad did not believe that his followers should bother with the decadent politics of the "devil race" -- the whiteman. As the Nation developed a successful mass base and a successful financial base, tension developed between the two. Malcolm as primary organiser of the mass base had pushed the Nation as a militant group willing to defend the masses. For Malcolm, Islam, the middle term in this triod, was a religion of war not of business. However, the business establishment within the Nation controlled by Muhammad's family thought otherwise. For them, Islam was no different from protestantism; it was solely about business, with an exotic new packaging. Today the paths the Nation has travelled and the one Malcolm X traversed before he was killed make what was happening then obvious.

Businesswise, the Nation had astounding success and the better business became the less talk about separation. Today, Muslims are no longer an organisation whose recruits come only from the worker and subworker stratum. In the last days, the black middle class has flocked to the Nation. This same organisation, which most middle class blacks despised in the Sixities, has become a refuge for several small businessmen, and many black professions, now hard hit by the economic affects of their own politics of a decade ago. Under the auspices of moving toward "true" Islam the Nation has accommodated the middle class and abandoned all references to race. Neatly, this also has put them in a position to qualify for small business loans since they are no longer an exclusively black organisation. Malcolm X on the other hand, left the Nation and formed a group called Muslim Mosque Inc. He had not conceptialised a new direction at this point and his differences with the Nation were not clear. Shortly before he died, he formed the Organisation of Afro-American Unity. After his visit to Africa and the Middle East, he began to define his ideas in broader terms and to connect the struggle of the Afro-American with international revolutionary trends.

Surely as class had become a factor in the civil rights movement, so it did in the nationalist movement. And as surely as certain black radicals had only understood the issues posed by the civil rights movement as integration vs. nationalism and non-violence vs. self-defence, the "new" nationalist radicals most ingenious at concocting rigid categories offered one more. The division between revolutionary and cultural nationalist groups sought to explain the two trends in nationalism. The element of truth in this categorisation is that the nationalist did split into two equally romantic tendencies. One romanticised revolution, and while professing a class analysis, came to the conclusion that the "lumpenproletariat" was the most "revolutionary" class in America. The other group romanticised Africa, and sought to build an African culture within the United States. Not once did they successfully connect the question of culture to the ideology and process used in the creation of the black working class; thus culture always remained an abstraction.

The new left which also had its origins in the civil rights movement but had been expelled with the era of Black Power; it now turned to the War in Vietnam. But long before Black Power, many of its adherents had begun to sense that a change was going to come. A debate broke out in the pages on the Monthly Review when a young socialist, Marc Schleifer, wrote the editors an article entitled "A Socialist Plea for Black Nationalism". [82] Schleifer questioned socialists who could call black nationalism, even in its separatist form, utopian and at the same time ask the black masses to wait until white workers accepted them, so that the business of socialism could proceed.

He asked American radicals if black nationalism was any more utopian than the hope for socialism under American conditions. Schleifer made two important admissions. First, "we have accepted the goal defined by white and black liberals, and that goal is for 'integration' under the capitalist system." [83] Next, this writer goes on to say that the Afro-American masses "are not simply the most potentially revolutionary sector of American life today -- they are the only potentially revolutionary sector". [84]

The editors,in partial agreement with Schleifer, could not really offer an effective counter. They agreed with most of his argument, but did not want to admit that separatism was acceptable.

In order to solve the intellectual quandry of supporting nationalism but at the same time being committed to a harmonious and multi-racial society, the new left found the solution to their own theoretical poverty and lack of connection with the white masses in passing the mantle of struggle on to the "revolutionary nationalists", who became their allies. Sweezy applauded the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) for recognising the Black Panther Party as a revolutionary vanguard and urging their chapters to support Panther program. [85]

Malcolm X before he died had called for youth to be organised and termed them the most important sector ofthe community. In places like Los Angeles, black organisations had at this been most successful. In fact, part of the conflict between the Panther Party and its arch-rival US cultural organisation was due to the fact that the two largest youth gangs had gone over to either Panthers or US. These two gangs, the Slausons and the Gladiators, carried their animosity for one another into the rival groups.

The open alliance of the new left and the revolutionary nationalists reintroduced the nationalist-integrationist debate. The new left while claiming to be taking the lead from the "black vanguard", as always, controlled the purse of the movement. The numerous celebrity legal cases of political activists,cost millions. Nationalists who opposed the politics of this alliance called it "revolutionary integrationism". The ludicrous dimension was that young radicals,black and white, pointed a condemning finger at older radicals without recognising the depth of their own dilemma. In 1950, Paul Baran had more honestly faced the truth than any of the younger generation. In a conference dedicated to co-operation on the Left, Baran stated "there is hardly any room for co-operation on the Left because at the present time there are no politics of the Left". [86] Perhaps Genovese summarised the situation best:

> The white Left like American society as a whole has along history paternalism toward the black man. White radicals, both in the Old Left and the New, have professed to defer to blacks as the vanguard of revolutionary change while hoping to use the black movement for their own purposes. The black movements moreover, has historically been a refuge for the white radical with escapist tendencies. [87]

Yet for the black movement the question still remained "why five decades of Marxism, Black Nationalism, and NAACP-ism have solved neither the problem of civil liberties and human rights, nor the inability of nationalists groups to unite among themselves ..." [88]

However, the nationalist trend,for a brief moment,represented the interest of the urban worker but allowed student and middle class leadership to push the worker out of the picture once again. Essien-Udom in his 1962 study of the Black Muslims [89] noted that"the interests of the middle class are different and, in some measure, lower class Negroes are estranged from them." [90]

He concluded that groups such as the Muslims were searching for an identity, and that their hostility was less against the American society, than against the betrayal by their own middle class. Both Essien-Udom and C. Eric Lincoln have written sympathetically on the Black Muslims; both have focused on the psychological dimension of nationalism. [91] In what is probably the most empirical piece written on nationalism, A. James Gregor criticises the psychological approach.

By applying the concept of "integration" to the problems of urban housing, he demonstrates the obvious middle class bias of the concept. Gregor argues that none of the civil rights legislation touched the black worker. At the same time job increases for middle class blacks were extremely high, the black worker was hardest hit by unemployment. "The Negro insulated in the federal or state employ is not beset by the same tensions, the same insecurities as is the unskilled Negro who must find employment opportunity in industry. [92] With respect to housing, Gregor notes that application of the NAACP doctrine of "target integration" to the realities of urban housing has allowed the middle class Negro access to white residential areas, but has actually intensified the residential segregation of lower income blacks. After all the sound and fury of the Sixities, a middle American magazine such as Readers Digest would note that while the lot of the black middle class had improved during fiftees and sixties, the black worker, considering cost of living increases, was doing no better than he had done in 1954. The government poured millions of dollars in the form of poverty programs into the black ghettoes across the country, yet few workers had benefited from these programs. It soon became obvious that ghetto militancy had become big business and "community organising" was a secure career.

FOOTNOTES.

1. Karl Mannheim, Ideology and Utopia (London 1936), p 206.
2. Ibid. p.207
3. Leo Kuper, An African Bourgeoisie (New Haven, 1965) p.24
4. Mannheim, Ideology and Utopia, p.2
5. The First real attempt to view the Afro-American community, and its uniqueness within the American context, as a product of African residual elements, was mady by Melville Herskovitz. See his Myth of the Negro Past (Boston,1958). More recently, Roger Bastide, African Civilization in the New World (New York, 1971). On the question of labour Eugene Genovese has realised the importance of comparing work under both African and southern American conditions, so as to understand the adaptations slaves had to make. This is done in his chapter "The Negro Labourer in Africa and the Slave South" in The Political Economy of Slavery (London, 1966).
6. Interview in the New York Review of Books, September 22, 1966
7. August Meier, Negro Thought in America:1880-1915 (Ann Arbor,1963)
8. Eugene Genovese, In Red And Black (New York, 1968) p.249
9. Harold Cruse, Crisis of the Negro Intellectual (New York, 1967; London, 1969) pp 118-119.
10. Genovese, In Red and Black, p.250
11. Cruse, Negro Intellectual, p.151
12. Ibid, p.558
13. Gary T. Marx and Michael Useem, "Majority Involvement in Minority Movements", In Gary T. Marx,Racial Conflict:Tension and Change in American Society (Boston, 1971) pp 424-440. This article contains a discussion of this aspect of the Abolition Movement and compares the Untouchable movement in India and the Civil Rights Movement.
14. Meier, Negro Thought, pp4-5
15. W.E.B. Du Bois, Black Reconstruction in America (1935, New York, 1975) p.149
16. Meier, Negro Thought, p.4
17. W.J. Cash, The Mind of the South (New York, 1941) p.309. Cash provides an interesting discussion of the social and class dynamics of lynchings.
18. Oliver Crimwell Cox, Caste,Class and Race (New York, 1959) p.401
19. Meier, Negro Thought, pp. 108-109
20. Ibid, pp.108-109
21. James Hooker, Black Revolutionary: George Padmore's Path from Communism to Pan-Africanism (London, 1967) p.12
22. Meier, Negro Thought, p.88
23. Ibid, p.86
24. Ibid, p.104
25. See their chapter "The Slave Regime:Competition Between Negro and White Labour". Sterlin D. Spero and Abram L. Harris in The Black Worker (New York, 1931)

26. Meier, Negro Thought, p.117
27. E. Franklin Frazier, The Black Bourgeoisie (Glencoe, Illinois, 1957) p.69
28. Spero and Harris, The Black Worker, p.14
29. See Du Bois "The White Worker" in Black Reconstruction, pp 17-31 Also Williston H. Lofton, "Abolition and Labour" in the Journal of Negro History, vol. 33, no.2 (April,1948) pp. 249-283
30. Quoted in Du Bois, Black Reconstruction, p.22
31. Meier, Negro Thought, p.206
32. Ibid
33. Ibid p.175
34. W.E.B. Du Bois, The Souls of Black Folk (Chicago, 1904) p.51
35. Ibid, p.41
36. Ibid, p.53
37. Ibid
38. Meier, Negro Thought, p.184
39. Ibid, p.185
40. Ibid
41. Wilson Record, Race and Radicalism (Ithaca, New York, 1964)p.106
42. E. Franklin Frazier,"The Negro Middle Class and Desegregation", Social Problems, vol. 4 (April, 1957), pp.291-301.
43. E.U. Essien Udom, Introduction to the second edition of The Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey, compiled by Amy Jacques Garvey (London, 1967) p.x
44. Ibid, p. xii
45. Ibid, p. xiv
46. Ibid, p. xiii
47. Ibid, p.97
48. Ibid, p.69
49. Spero and Harris, Black Worker, p.335
50. Essien Udom, Introduction, p. xv
51. Spero and Harris, Black Worker, p.395
52. Cruse, Crisis, p. passim.
53. Record, Race and Radicalism, p. 10
54. For the details of the Afro-American-West Indian conflict see "1920's and the 1930's -- The West Indian Influence" in Cruse, Crisis, and Spero and Harris, Black Worker, p.397
55. Cruse, Crisis, p.125
56. Quoted in Ibid, p.330
57. Frazier,"Negro Middle Class", p.298
58. This reader on black consumer behaviour brings together sociology and case studies. George Joyce and Norman Govoni, eds., The Black Consumer (New York,1971)

59. Cruse, Crisis, p.330

60. Record, Race and Radicalism, p.109

61. See his chapters, "Jews and Negroes in the Communist Party" and Negroes and Jews -- The Two Nationalism and the Bloc(ked) Plurarity" in Crisis of the Negro Intellectual.

62. Editors, "Socialism and the Negro Movement" in Monthly Review, vol. 15, no. 5 (September, 1963) p.231.

63. Rudolf Heberle, Social Movement (New York, 1951) p. 119

64. See his essay "Black Nationalism and American Socialism: a Comment on Harold Cruse's Crisis of the Negro Intellectual" In Red And Black.

65. Frazier, Black Bourgeoisie, pp. 15 & 34

66. George S. Schuyler, "Views and Reviews" The Pittsburg Courier, January 8, 1949, p.17

67. Anne Braden, "The Southern Freedom Movement in Perspective" in Monthly Review, vol. 17, no.3 (Special issue, July-August,1965) pp. 1-96.

68. Frazier, "The Negro Middle Class", p.298

69. Ray Marshall, Labour and the Black Community in David Brody, ed., The American Labour Movement (New York, 1971) p.142

70. Braden, "The Southern Movement", p.90

71. Ibid, p.86

72. Cruse, Crisis, p.328

73. This article has been reprinted in G. Marx, Racial Conflict, pp. 193-200.

74. Ibid, p.194

75. Ibid, p.195

76. Ibid.

77. Quoted in Braden, "Southern Movement", p.91

78. Genovese argues this in two essays "Class and Nationality in Black America" and the revised version of this piece "The Legacy of Slavery and the Roots and Black Nationalism", In Red And Black.

79. Ibid, p.150

80. Cruse, Crisis, p.382

81. Words such as "system"and "establishment" have been a mixed blessing to radicals. They often became catch-all phrases that beg the questions that should be asked. On one occasion when the term "system" was theoretically confronted a well known "theoretician" of the movement actually operationalised the term along structural-functionalist lines. This Black power leader took his theoretical lead from a very traditionally orientated political science professor from Columbia University. This more than anything else spoke to the level of theory in the movement.

82. Editors, "Socialism and the Negro Movement" cited above. The article referred to is reproduced entirely within this article.

83. Ibid, p.226

84 Ibid, p.227

85. Editors, "The Old Left and the New", Monthly Review, Vol.21, no.1 (May 1969)

86. Ibid, p.7

87. Genovese, In Red And Black, p.67

88. Cruse, Crisis, p.257

89. Black Nationalism:A Search for Identity in America (New York, 1962).

90. E.U. Essien Udom, "In Search of a Saving Identity" in Jacob Drachler, ed. Black Homeland/Black Diaspora (Port Washington, New York, 1971) p.204. This is an excerpt from his 1962 publication.

91. Essien Udom's work cited above and C.E. Lincoln, The Black Mulsims in America (Boston, 1971) both dwell on identity. Essien Udom dedicates a great deal of attention to class but concludes with a psychological analysis.

92. A James Gregor, "Black Nationalism:A preliminary Analysis of Negro Radicalism". Science and Society, vol.27,no.4 (Fall 1963) pp. 415-432

Note on the uses of the words Negro, Black and Afro.American within the American context. Negro usually appears in most writing undertaken before mid-sixties. The Black Power Movement attacked this word along with the word Coloured as racist and as an attempt to impose an ideological and psychological isolation from the African and Black world. Today Negro is infrequently used or used facetiously. Afro American and African-American reemerged in the Sixities but had their origins as fac back as the Colonization programs before and after the Civil War. Black is simply a general term used to refer to any person of African descent. It does not connote skin coloure, since Black Americans are all shades. Many Puerto Ricans also refer to themselves as Blacks.