Spring January, 2001

The Development of Black Nationalism - Chapter 2.pdf

Asafa Jalata

b
p
bepress™

FIGHTING AGAINST THE INJUSTICE OF THE STATE AND GLOBALIZATION

FIGHTING AGAINST THE INJUSTICE OF THE STATE AND GLOBALIZATION

Asafa Jalata

FIGHTING AGAINST THE INJUSTICE OF THE STATE AND GLOBALIZATION

Comparing the
African American
and Oromo Movements

OROMIA

Asafa Jalata

The book compares and contrasts the African American and Oromo movements in the global context. It shows how life chances changed for the two peoples as the modern world system developed and became more complex. This global system racialized exploitative structures in African American and Oromo societies and facilitated the national struggles of these two peoples. This work demonstrates the dynamic interplay between social structures and human agencies. African Americans in the United States of America and Oromos in the Ethiopian Empire developed their respective liberation movements in opposition to racial/ethnonational oppression, cultural and colonial domination, exploitation, and underdevelopment. This book also explores these two movements within the context of national and global social changes.

CHAPTER II

The Development of
African American Nationalism

We know through painful experience that freedom is never voluntarily given by the oppressor; it must be demanded by the oppressed.

—Martin Luther King, Jr.[1]

Power in defense of freedom is greater than power in behalf of tyranny and oppression, because power, real power, comes from conviction, which produces action, uncompromising action. It also produces insurrection against oppression. This is the only way you end oppression—with power.

—Malcolm X[2]

Black nationalism,[3] as an ideological, intellectual, political, and cultural manifestation of the African American movement, aimed to challenge American racist capitalist structures and to redefine the relationship between Black and White Americans so that American apartheid could be dismantled and Black America could be liberated and developed. It developed in opposition to White racial and colonial domination, cultural hegemony, exploitation, and poverty. This nationalism manifested itself in three overlapping forms: cultural, reformist and revolutionary. Too much emphasis has been given to its reformist aspect, which is the Civil Rights movement, and the cultural and revolutionary aspects of this movement have been suppressed by the media, politicians, and scholars ideologically, politically, and intellectually. The primary focus on the Civil Rights movement, without integrating it with cultural and revolutionary aspects of this nationalism, has limited our understanding of the Black national movement and its main objectives. The Black struggle for freedom had different forms, ideologies, tactics, and strategies in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.[4] Over the past 35 years, scholars have dichotomized Black nationalism and the Civil Rights movement by focusing on their strategic and ideological differences and by ignoring the shared objectives of the Black freedom and development movements. Scholars such as Howard Brotz[5] and Harold Cruse[6] originated this dichotomizing tendency by emphasizing civil rights activism and separately focusing on Black nationalism, assuming that these were not related and not aspects of a single African American

movement. According to Anthony Smith, "Nationalism . . . involves four elements: a vision, a culture, a solidarity and a policy. It answers to ideological, cultural, social and political aspirations and needs."[7] Since all forms of the Black struggle involved all these issues that Smith mentions, the Civil Rights movement was an integral part of Black nationalism.

The theoretical ideas and historical evidence presented in this chapter suggest a need for reassessment of the African American movement. We cannot understand comprehensively and critically the character of this movement without studying its cultural and revolutionary forms, and how these forms were connected to the Civil Rights movement, the movement that attempted to integrate African Americans into a larger society politically, culturally, and economically. The legal success of the Civil Rights movement had overshadowed the major issues that were raised by Black cultural and revolutionary nationalists. This chapter explores the three forms of the Black national struggle and demonstrates that the Civil Rights movement was an integral part of Black nationalism, a part that cannot be understood adequately by itself. It also reevaluates the features and impact of the Black movement in order to explain the complex problems of the Black community in America.

Redefining African American Nationalism

As the enslavement of Africans occurred in global capitalism, their struggle for liberation also developed as a part of the struggle of the enslaved and colonized ethnonational groups in the racialized capitalist world system. Through colonial expansion and racial slavery, global capitalism brought together various European, African, and indigenous population groups in a political unit that later became the United States. The European colonialists racialized this political unit to commit genocide and perpetuate the exploitation and oppression of the remaining indigenous Americans and enslaved Africans by establishing racist structures and policies and by denying to these population groups structural assimilation (access to political, economic, and cultural resources) and civil equality. However, the American racist capitalist structures and institutions could not totally crush the African American human spirit and cultural resistance. The creation of a racial caste system (slavery and later segregation) and the denial of structural assimilation and equal citizenship rights to the African American people based on the ideology of racism facilitated the emergence of Black nationalism.

Further, there were subjective and objective factors that dialectically interplayed and contributed to the development of this nationalism. Although the enslaved Africans were de-Africanized to a certain degree, isolated from their cultural roots, deprived of political and economic resources, and eventually dependent on White society, they maintained their cultural resistance and developed their nationalism because of social structural and conjunctural factors that dynamically interplayed with African American human agency. As we will see, the transformation in American social structures due to domestic and global economic and political changes, urbanization, and community formation, the development of indigenous institutions, and the emergence of Black intellectuals who helped politicize collective grievances through producing and disseminating social scientific and political knowledge facilitated the development of Black nationalism.

The literature on the Black struggle does not explain adequately the features and structures of the American racialized capitalist system and the different forms of re-

sponse to the system by African Americans.[8] Studies of this struggle also fail to address comprehensively and critically the historical and sociological factors that necessitated the development of Black nationalism, the interconnection between the political economy of racism and poverty, and the persistent crises of the African American community. Most scholars in the area of African American studies also fail to explain the different forms of Black nationalism and the relationships among them. Furthermore, these scholars and others do not consider the Civil Rights movement as a form of African American nationalism.[9] This chapter demonstrates that since Civil Rights activists and revolutionary and cultural nationalists struggled for African American freedom, they were an integral part of the Black national movement, a movement that promoted an emancipatory ideological, intellectual, cultural, and political project[10] to challenge the racist capitalist establishment.

The African American movement took a political and cultural action and demanded to deracialize the American state so that African Americans would get equal access to state power and cultural and economic resources or to create an African American state. There is no question that White America delayed the development of Black national leadership for almost three and a half centuries by denying African Americans the opportunities necessary to develop an educated and organized leadership. When slavery was abolished after about two and a half centuries, White society and its institutions developed Jim Crow laws (segregation laws) and practiced apartheid by denying African Americans the structural assimilation that was necessary for upward social mobility. It prevented African Americans from sharing American economic, political, and educational institutions so that they would remain subordinated to and serve the interests of White society as servants and cheap laborers. Although Black nationalism developed as a mass movement in the first half of the twentieth century, it had first emerged in the 1700s.[11] It took almost one and a half centuries for this nationalism to develop and mature.

Within its cultural, ideological, and political components, Black nationalism manifested reformist and revolutionary tendencies. The Civil Rights movement can be seen as a reformist movement since its main objective was to achieve equal citizenship rights for African Americans within the existing social structure so that they would fully and equally participate in American institutions.[12] As the pillar of the Black struggle for freedom and civil equality, this movement focused on dismantling the legal infrastructure of American apartheid. Taking it one step further, the Black revolutionary movement struggled to gain autonomy or independence for Black America so that this people would determine their cultural, economic, and political rights. Practically speaking, both branches of the Black movement for civil equality and human dignity aimed at liberating African Americans from White supremacy, colonial domination, underdevelopment, and poverty. As we shall see, Black cultural nationalism was the foundation of the reformist and revolutionary forms of the African American struggle.

Black intellectual and professional groups established cultural, social, and civil rights organizations in order to engage their people in a political movement to seek civil rights or political power through legal and protest actions. The question of survival requires the colonized or oppressed ethnonation to "take on some of the attributes of nationhood, and adopt a civic model . . . rational political centralization, mass literacy and social mobilization."[13] Different brands of Black nationalists, whether they envied integration, separation, or cultural autonomy, struggled for desegregation, human dignity, and true equality.[14] Therefore, it is wrong to consider only those who

struggled for separation or cultural autonomy as nationalists since all those who struggled against American apartheid were nationalists. Some revolutionary nationalists also demanded true equal citizenship rights and multicultural democracy that would empower African Americans. "Behind the revolutionary phrases of the black power militants," August Meier and Elliot Rudwick comment, "is usually a profound desire for an equal share and an equal status in American society."[15] Almost all scholars who have studied the Black struggle have not recognized the existence of different ways to be a Black nationalist. Whether they openly declared themselves as nationalists or not, all Blacks who fought for freedom, democracy, human dignity, and true equality are considered nationalists for the purpose of this analysis. Let us locate our discussion in a broad cultural, historical, and theoretical context.

The Foundation of Black Peoplehood and Nationalism

Without locating the enslavement, exploitation, and oppression of enslaved Africans and their struggle for emancipation in the context of the racialized capitalist world system, we cannot understand adequately the chains of historical and sociological factors that facilitated the emergence and development of their African American peoplehood and nationalism. The European–dominated capitalist world economy developed in Western Europe and then expanded to America and Africa and incorporated them throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In this process of incorporation, some enslaved Africans were brought to America as slaves "to mine precious metals and to develop systems of mass crop production, which provided raw materials for European manufacturers."[16] According to Clovis E. Semmes, "The resulting triangular relationship between Europe, Africa, and the Americas gave a tremendous stimulus to Western capitalism and Europe's industrial revolution, while dooming African peoples to underdevelopment and dependency."[17] Racial slavery turned these Africans into commodities, robbed their humanity, and denied all forms of freedom for almost two and a half centuries.[18]

The collective identity of African American peoplehood developed as a response to the processes of racial slavery and cultural repression. The social construction of African American peoplehood did not take place in a vacuum, but occurred through revitalizing African cultural resources that had been carried over from Africa to America and through borrowing cultural elements from Native Americans and Europeans. The Africans who were captured by African and European slave hunters from different African ethnonational groups and shipped to America did not have a common culture, language, religion, and history when they arrived in North America as slaves. Sterling Stuckey notes that "slave ships were the first real incubators of slave unity across cultural lines, cruelly revealing irreducible links from one ethnic group to the other, fostering resistance thousands of miles before the shores of the new land appeared on the horizon."[19] The African American peoplehood was formed from the melting pot of various African and other ethnonational groups in America. Despite the fact that White slavers made various efforts to break existing social and cultural bonds and to prevent the formation of solidarity among enslaved Africans, they could not stop the development of the African American peoplehood and nationalism. Enslaved Africans developed their peoplehood and cultural resistance despite the fact that slavers and their institutions separated families and relatives and suppressed cultural communications among them.

African Americans are not a racial group, but rather an ethnonational group that developed through the imposition of the process of White cultural domination and racial oppression.[20] Martin Delaney called them "*a nation in themselves.*"[21] [original author's emphasis] The formation of the African American ethnonational group indicates how the boundaries of peoplehood can change depending on the sociopolitical milieu and basic structural features. Explaining similar conditions, Immanuel Wallerstein asserts that the group was "in no sense a primordial stable social reality, but a complex, clay-like historical product of the capitalist world-economy through which the antagonistic forces struggle with each other. We can never do away with peoplehood in this system nor relegate it to a minor role."[22] (However, as we will see in this book, the Oromo case indicates that peoplehood can develop in a precapitalist social formation.) The African American peoplehood developed in the racialized capitalist world system in general and that of America in particular.

Most enslaved Africans resisted slavery in many ways and kept their lingering memory of resistance in their minds and expressed it in folktales and other cultural activities: "That memory enabled them to go back to the sense of community in the traditional African setting and to include all Africans in their common experience of oppression in North America," and "tales of the traumatizing experience of the middle passage—as the voyage of a slave ship was called—have been retained in the folk memory" of African Americans.[23] Wallerstein notes that "pastness is central to and inherent in the concept of peoplehood. . . . Pastness is a central element in the socialization of individuals, in the maintenance of group solidarity, in the establishment of or challenge to social legitimation. Pastness therefore is preeminently a moral phenomenon, therefore a political phenomenon, always a contemporary phenomenon."[24] Without learning about the accumulated knowledge of the African American past, our understanding of African American peoplehood and nationalism is incomplete.

It is paradoxical that although the slaveowning class had firm control over the bodies of the enslaved Africans, they could not control their minds. As a result, this class and its institutions could not totally destroy African cultural elements that were engraved in the minds of these slaves. Stuckey notes that "for the slave, the retention of important features of the African cultural heritage provided a means by which the new reality could be interpreted and spiritual needs at least partially met, needs often regarded as secular by whites but often considered as sacred to blacks."[25] There is a large and rich literature that addresses the preservation of African cultural elements and the impact of these cultural elements on the formation of African American peoplehood.[26] African folktales and beliefs, linguistic forms and structures, religious philosophy, carving and sculpturing techniques in folk arts, and other cultural elements had been carried over from Africa to the United States by enslaved Africans and to a certain degree were preserved by the people of African descent. Scholars such as Carter G. Woodson have documented the survival of African cultural elements in forms of religion, music, dance, drama, poetry, oratory, technical skills, folklore, spirituality, attitudes toward authority, and a tradition of generosity.[27] The African American peoplehood was mainly formed through the merging of these several African cultural elements and identities.

The study of oral history and folklore reveal the extent of African cultural retention in some African American communities.[28] Other scholars have explored the impact of African languages on African American English and showed African linguistic retention.[29] For instance, Lorenzo Turner demonstrates how African linguistic elements are

maintained in African Americans' speech, and Molefi Kete Asante explains how Blacks have retained certain African communication styles and linguistic structures.[30] Further, the exploration of African American kinship, ethnicity, family, linguistic forms, and other areas show African cultural retention.[31] These cultural elements helped Africans to maintain their cultural and historical memory and struggle to survive in the oppressive and degrading conditions in which they found themselves. By examining African American cultural elements in colonial America, Peter W. Wood demonstrates African contributions to medical practices, basketry weaving, agriculture and animal husbandry (such as cattle breeding, open grazing, rice cultivation), boat building, hunting, trapping, and fishing.[32] These cultural skills enabled Africans to carve a cultural space for themselves. In fact, Africans not only saved some elements of their African heritage, but they also influenced White Americans whenever they could. By going beyond the question of African cultural retention, John Edward Philips demonstrates how Africanisms influenced White American culture and provides some evidence from areas of agriculture, folklore, linguistics, religion, music, and cooking; he calls these cultural influences of Africans on White Americans "white Africanisms."[33] Enslaved Africans outnumbered their White owners in the South and influenced American culture through their music and dance, and their folk tales and religions.[34]

Enslaved Africans retained their African heritage and did not become totally acculturated: "But the possibility that whites might discover the guiding principles of African culture kept blacks on guard and led them, to an astonishing degree, to keep the essentials of their culture from view, thereby making it possible for them to continue to practice values proper to them. Such secretiveness was dictated by the realities of oppression and worked against whites acquiring knowledge of slave culture that might have been used to attempt to eradicate that culture."[35] While they knew that they came from different ethnonational backgrounds, enslaved Africans intentionally struggled to form a single people while resisting slavery and White cultural domination. Proto-African "nationalism provided the thrust toward autonomy, for diverse African peoples were represented and bent their efforts in pursuit of independence from their oppressors."[36] They were conscious of their Africanness, and when they created their separate church in 1821 in Charleston, they called it the African Church. One of their songs in 1816 in Charleston reflects their nationalist consciousness and recognition of Africa:

> Hail! all hail! Ye Afric clan
> Hail! Ye oppressed, ye Afric band,
> Who toil and sweat in slavery bound
> And when your health and strength are gone
> Are left to hunger and to mourn
> *Let independence be your aim,*
> Every mindful what 'tis worth.
> Pledge your bodies for the prize,
> Pile them even to the skies![37]

In an attempt to de-Africanize and depersonalize enslaved Africans, the slaveowning class called them "Negro" or "Nigger" in an attempt to erase Africanness and African culture. Despite the fact that since the thirteenth century the name *African* had been used to identify African people, White Americans called enslaved Africans *Negro*

by borrowing the Spanish word meaning "black."[38] In this way, the color of their skin became their collective name, although African American "religious and educational organizations used the prefix *African* in their names, providing a sense of cultural integrity and a link to their African heritage."[39] At the turn of the nineteenth century, African Americans who worked as house servants as well as those who had European and African heritages called themselves "colored" to distinguish themselves from those Africans who worked in the field.[40] When the American Colonization Society intensified its racist activities to get rid of free Africans by returning them to Africa, the term *colored* was almost accepted by African American leaders to fight the plan of this society.[41] In this case, *colored* was used for a practical reason. These Africans used this name to disassociate themselves from Africa so that they would not be considered Africans and forced to immigrate to Africa.

Many names were designated to refer to this people in the nineteenth century including Negro, Nigger, colored, brown, African, Ethiopian, Free African, Children of Africa, Sons of Africa, people of color, Colored American, free people of color, Blacks, Anglo African, Afric, African-American, Afro-American, Afmerican, Aframerican, Africo-American, and Afro-Saxon.[42] According to Joseph E. Holloway, the debate over the name "has come to full circle, from *African* through *brown, colored, Afro-American, Negro,* and *black* back to *African,* the term originally used by blacks in America to define themselves. The changes in terminology reflect many changes in attitude, from strong African identification to nationalism, integration, and attempts at assimilation back to cultural identification. This struggle to reshape and define blackness in both the concrete and the abstract also reflects the renewed pride of black people in shaping a future based on the concept of one African people living in the African diaspora."[43] Stuckey suggests that "the crisis over names—like the larger identity crisis—was symbolized by the mark branded into thousands of Africans at the start of slavery. The branding iron proved two-edged, searing into the slave's consciousness and an awareness that his identity was under attack and triggering a recoil from the attempt to depersonalize that lasted, for large numbers of slaves, throughout history. . . . We must understand the African background to appreciate the emotional force behind the names controversy, the cultural loss and confusion it reflects, and the spiritual pain of those engaged in the controversy."[44]

Despite the fact that "the experience of domination has shaped and continues to shape the development of African Americans,"[45] the study of their issues should not be limited to racial oppression and economic exploitation and must explore the cultural process that dialectically connects social organizations with culture and affects institutional development. There is no doubt that slavery and cultural destruction debilitated African social organizations and dwarfed their institutional development for almost two and a half centuries. Plantation owners and their institutions imposed an alien cultural form on enslaved Africans and negated their cultures and histories. The efficient exploitation and social control of African labor required the destruction of African cultures and languages through imposing European cultural hegemony.[46] Clovis E. Semmes notes that cultural and historical "negation and distortion became central to the process of domination in order to weaken the ability of the victimized people to sustain a self-conscious and self-directed sense of origin, evolution, and purpose. The need was to force the victim to relinquish internal control (independence) in order to accept external control (dependence)."[47] Although Africans and Europeans both had influenced the formation of American culture since they arrived in America at the same

time,[48] African Americans lacked "institutional power that would give them the ability to define and express their cultural needs and goals."[49]

The dominant group always attempts to impose its cultural hegemony on the dominated group so that the oppressed sustains its own oppression and exploitation by accepting the worldview of the former.[50] In addition to using physical violence in an attempt to shift the perspective of enslaved Africans, plantation owners and their institutions systematically attacked various African cultures, languages, and religions to replace them with European culture, Christianity, and languages. European Christianity "was central to the symbol of imperialism that became a foundation for the establishment of cultural hegemony."[51] When African languages and religions were systematically suppressed, enslaved Africans recognized that they were not allowed to practice their African heritages or to express memories of an African past. They were intentionally cut from their own historical roots so that their perspective would change to that of their oppressors. Cultural domination shifts the perspective of the dominated to that of the dominating structure and legitimizes the worldview of the oppressor and naturalizes subordination as a normative order. In this process the subordinated group accepts the worldview, historiography, sacred beliefs, knowledge, and social relationships that are defined by the dominating structure. White cultural domination negated Black self-development through limiting the intellectual and material production of African Americans; it introduced self-hatred and an inferiority complex, and it subordinated the Black world to that of White, promoting "efficient social control through differentiating a system of slave overseers and leaders selected and legitimated by the slave owners."[52] The slaveowning class used slaves to control those Africans who resisted slavery; those slaves who were totally de-centered became the tools of the slaveowning class and promoted the worldview of the dominant group.[53]

There is no question that, although not totally, African Americans were shaken from their cultural foundations through the imposition of White cultural domination. "The cataclysmic experience of chattel slavery, the basis of cultural hegemony," Semmes writes, "produced historical discontinuity and preempted normative cultural building through a decentering process."[54] However, without the total liquidation of the dominated people, it is impossible for the dominant group to completely de-center the perspective of the dominated group and stop its cultural resistance and revitalization.[55] Hence, short of the total destruction of enslaved Africans, plantation owners and their institutions could not eliminate African cultures. The same processes of oppression, exploitation, and cultural suppression that forced them to move from their African center also produced the conditions for the emergence of an African-centered consciousness. I agree with Semmes that "even though catastrophic oppression brought about a process of objectification and dehumanization, the absolute negation of humanity was not possible because a damaged human spirit seeks to resurrect and reconstruct itself; it also seeks self-consciousness. Culture building may be impeded, but it does not stop. Consequently, reconstruction involves renewed historiography and reflectivity."[56]

Culture provides a collective consciousness and a common center for every people through which and from which they observe their universe and understand others in terms of how they understand themselves and other phenomena external to their shared experience. The submerged African cultural elements and the common experience of oppression laid the foundation of African American culture that became the tool of resistance. "Social and revitalization movements," Semmes writes, "as well as the

outpourings of creative intellectuals and artists, reflect varying degrees of a conscious and unconscious response to this [dehumanizing] problem [in order] to rehumanize one's existence and to transcend the dehabilitating and destructive capabilities of cultural hegemony."[57] Racial slavery, an ultimate denial of human freedom, and cultural hegemony could not destroy the cultural resistance and humanity of African Americans despite their destructive and enduring capabilities.

Although it took almost three centuries to blossom, African American protonationalism emerged with slavery: "The nationalism of the slave community was essentially African nationalism, consisting of values that bound slaves together and sustained them under brutal conditions of oppression. Their very effort to bridge ethnic differences and to form themselves into a single people to meet the challenge of a common foe proceeded from an impulse that was Pan-African—that grew out of a concern for all Africans—as what was useful was appropriated from a multiplicity of African groups even as an effort was made to eliminate distinctions among them."[58] Explaining how the ideology of Black nationalism was initially fashioned, Stuckey comments, "A conscious of a shared experience of oppression at the hands of white people, an awareness and approval of the persistence of group traits and preferences in spite of a violent anti-African larger society, a recognition of bonds and obligations between Africans everywhere, an irreducible conviction that Africans in America must take responsibility for liberating themselves—these were among the pivotal components of the world view of the black men [and women] who finally framed the ideology."[59] Despite the fact that White plantation owners and institutions and White society were determined to destroy African cultural elements and bonds to maintain tight control on enslaved and freed Africans, these Africans knew that it was essential to maintain their cultural solidarity and resistance to liberate themselves.

African American protonationalism attempted to challenge slavery and the cultural hegemony that had shaken the cultural foundation of enslaved Africans so that they would resist a world defined by their oppressor. Christianity that was imposed "to sustain a social order and a system of production based on the mutual cooperation of master and slave" became the arena of the struggle since it denied African Americans humanity by perpetuating slavery.[60] It became the religion of domination for White society and the religion of liberation for Blacks: "African Americans, slave and free, began to rediscover symbolic foundations for a redemptive African-centered consciousness. The irony of this discovery is that it occurred as a consequence of interpreting the biblical messages that were intended to bring conformity and docility. African American exegesis of biblical scriptures became the foundation for the rebirth of African-centered thought. Instead of learning to be good slaves by forgetting about Africa, some African Americans realized that many of the places discussed in the sacred text held in so high esteem by white oppressors were in Africa and that many of the people were quite properly African."[61]

When European and American racist scholarship distorted the social sciences and historiography to produce and preserve the myth of White superiority and African inferiority, "a countervailing struggle emerged to transcend the cognitive slavery of white supremacy."[62] In this process, an African-centered intellectual discourse emerged as the knowledge of liberation. African American scholarship that challenged White racism by straightening historical records was "based initially on African American historical research that established an African frame of reference, began in the early nineteenth century, reached maturity in the 1890s, and has continued with

episodic prominence to the present."[63] African American intellectuals, such as Alexander Crummell, Robert A. Young, David Walker, Henry H. Garnet, Martin Delaney, and Frederick Douglass, mainly struggled in the North before 1860 for the end of racial slavery and freedom on cultural, intellectual, and political levels and laid the foundation of African American nationalism. The main issues that were raised and addressed by such scholars included the centrality of Africans to human groups, the antiquity of African civilizations, and the presence of Africans in Asia, Europe, and America before the modern era.[64] Slavery was seen as a temporary defeat and African civilizations were rediscovered through challenging the myth of White superiority and racist intellectual discourse. According to Stuckey, originally "Robert Alexander Young and David Walker speculated on the status of African peoples in a way which broke beyond the shackles which America sought to impose on the African mind. They created black nationalist ideology."[65] African-centered scholarship expanded during the Harlem Renaissance of the 1920s. During this decade, many African Americans overcame feelings of inferiority to a certain degree, became self-conscious, and intensified humanistic self-definition.

The Racialized Capitalist World System and Human Agency

The racialized capitalist world system incorporated the world populations primarily through two types of labor recruitment systems: wage labor and coerced labor (slavery).[66] The ancestors of African Americans were incorporated into this system through racial slavery. These enslaved Africans were forced to provide their labor freely to build American capitalism without getting any benefit for their generation and next generations. However, European workers who were incorporated into the capitalist system as wage laborers had better opportunities both in Europe and America because they had limited autonomy over their lives even if they were exploited by capitalists. Although they did not have equal access to major economic, political, and cultural institutions with elites and capitalists because of their class position, they had limited access to institutions that allowed them to have intergenerational upward mobility. For instance, diverse European immigrants who were indentured servants during colonial America became wage laborers after the American Revolution and obtained upward mobility, while African Americans were chained in the racial caste system for almost three and a half centuries (slavery and segregation).

Even with their emancipation during and after the American Civil War, African Americans were denied access to the cultural, economic, and political gains made during their abuse in the period of American apartheid. The denial was enforced through the criminal justice system and mob lynching. Those African Americans who obtained their freedom from slavery during the American Revolution and before the American Civil War were kept in the status of semislaves. They remained at the bottom of White society, were subjected to all kinds of abuses, and were seen as "slaves without masters."[67] According to Ira Berlin, "Segregation, black codes, the convict-lease system, and the various forms of peonage usually associated with the postbellum South all victimized the antebellum free Negro caste."[68]

The conditions of racial slavery, White cultural hegemony, segregation, and colonial domination were not enough to facilitate the development of Black nationalism. They were only the historical foundations of collective grievances from which this nationalism developed when other necessary conditions emerged. Scattered resistance

and rebellions of slaves must not be confused with nationalism, but they were necessary foundations for the emergence of Black nationalism. They were chains of historical and sociological factors that led to the development of African American nationalism in the first half of the twentieth century. Racial slavery kept African Americans under the domination of White plantation owners. W. H. McClendon notes that racial slavery "was unwavering in its aggressiveness and determination to have blacks accept servitude without resistance. Black passivity was the theme of the slaves' socialization process."[69] Racial slavery imposed upon them a cultural hegemony by negating their cultural personality, and "the cultures of African peoples became . . . objects to be dismantled for the purpose of more efficient exploitation and control."[70] In order to change the African mindset and perspective through the imposition of cultural hegemony, enslaved Africans were forced to learn English and to accept Christianity, in the process discarding their African languages and religions.

Although this forced cultural assimilation had serious negative consequences for these Africans, they gradually learned how to reorganize these new cultural values and practices according to their new conditions. Further, this forced cultural assimilation could not totally eliminate the heritage of enslaved Africans. One important heritage of African Americans was the resistance struggle that they began against African and European slave hunters in the African hinterlands, on slave ships, and later on the plantations in the colonies as slave mutinies.[71] Some slaves spontaneously and culturally opposed slavery through day-to-day defiance, flight, and armed resistance.[72]

Discussing how slaves resisted in North America, John H. Clarke expounds that African culture "sustained the Africans during the holocaust of the slave trade and the colonial system that followed it . . . African culture, reborn on alien soil, became the cohesive force and the communication system that helped to set in motion some of the most successful slave revolts in history."[73] There were about 250 slave rebellions in the United States.[74] There were about 50 maroon communities formed by thousands of runaway slaves and their descendants between 1672 and 1864 in the forests and mountains of southern states.[75] Since most African Americans never accepted slavery, there were group arson attempts, runaways, violence against masters, and group attempts to organize rebellions.[76] According to St. Clair Drake, "The first 250 years of African impact on North America were years of struggle to restore freedom and to retain an African identity."[77]

Leon Litwack estimated that five thousand African Americans from the North fought for American independence.[78] Some former slaves who were freed between the American Revolution (1776) and the Civil War (1861–1865) with the support of a few antislavery Whites[79] struggled relentlessly also to liberate their fellow Africans from slavery.[80] A few former slaves and their descendants built independent organizations and religious institutions: The establishments of the Free African Society in Newport, Rhode Island and Philadelphia; the formation of the first Negro Baptist Church at Silver Bluff, South Carolina; and the African Methodist Episcopal Church; and the emergence of the National Negro Convention and separate antislavery societies, such as the Colored Female Anti-Slavery Society of Rochester, were the forerunners of Black nationalist institutions.[81] Rhoda Golden Freeman comments that "a group of active . . . highly intelligent Negro men [and women] worked unceasingly for full citizenship as vindication of their belief in potential realization of the American ideal of equal opportunity for all."[82] Some free Blacks established independent churches, schools, and fraternal organizations in cities to worship, educate their children, protect themselves, and

revitalize African culture. The freed men and women and their descendants continued to struggle after the abolition of slavery through building independent churches, mutual benefit societies, the press, and different movements.[83]

As the country that is called the United States today moved from colonial America to an independent country after the American Revolution, as it developed from an agrarian society to an industrial one and from a semiperiphery status to a world power, new political opportunities were created by emerging structural factors for an embryonic African American movement. As we will see in chapter V, the American Civil War, which resulted from the contradiction between core capitalism in the American North and slave-based peripheral capitalism in the American South and the disagreement on the strategy of national development between the northern and southern politicians, led to the end of racial slavery. The end of racial slavery and the intervention of the federal government in state policies on the side of former slaves between 1865 and 1877 created new hopes and opportunities. But after 1877 the federal government allowed the emergence of a new racial caste system called American apartheid to continue to deny African Americans structural assimilation and civil equality.

There were historical and immediate factors for the development of African American nationalism. The Anglo-American ruling class initiated two stratification systems with the emergence of colonial America: the class system and the racial caste system.[84] The systems flourished after the American Revolution, which legalized racism and racial slavery and eliminated or reduced indentured servitude. The class system was designed for White America while the racial caste system was mainly created for Black America. The class system allowed generational and intergenerational upward mobility for most children of poor whites. Because of this, most Whites gradually improved their economic and political positions in American society. While most White children got access to education to improve their social status, Black children were denied education and forced to remain illiterate and poor for many centuries. Discussing the impacts of such economic injustices, Richard F. America says, "Those injustices produced wrongful benefits that have been passed on to the present day, creating an imbalance that has damaged economic performance and caused social instability."[85]

While racial slavery and segregation denied African Americans the fruit of their labor, the class system allowed the White working class to obtain wages for its labor. By denying generational and intergenerational mobility, the racial caste system robbed Blacks of cultural and economic capital that was prerequisite for social development. After racial slavery was abolished, the White plantation owners "tried to consolidate their control by a modified version of the wage labor system in which they would organize gangs of wage laborers to work under overseers, as under slavery. Planters attempted to act in concert to keep wages down, but blacks refused to cooperate with this system which so resembled slavery."[86] They were denied access to public facilities. In American cities, European immigrants worked in the manufacturing and government sectors that provided high social mobility and better working conditions. These new immigrants kept the Blacks segregated by joining all-White labor unions.

Despite the fact that the Blacks contributed without gains to transforming America from an agrarian society to an industrial one, and from a British colony to a world power, they were kept at the bottom of White society by brutal violence, segregation, and racism until the 1950s and the 1960s, when they intensified their freedom movement. To impose cultural dominance, White southerners made the education of Blacks

illegal. They considered "schools dangerous and revolutionary."[87] In 1860, less than 3 percent of African Americans were literate in the South.[88] Before the Civil War, only 28 African Americans were graduated from colleges and universities with bachelor degrees; in 1895 there were 1,100 Blacks who were college graduates.[89] Political and economic "modernization" during the last decades of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century transformed America from agrarian to industrial capitalism. These politico-economic changes created new conditions for racial relations.[90] The federal government engaged in what historians call the First Reconstruction (1865–1877) by sponsoring, with northern missionary societies, the establishment of Black higher educational institutions. Both the Freedmen's Bureau and northern missionary groups laid the foundation for the major colleges and universities, such as Atlanta, Howard, Morehouse, Dillard, Leland, Shaw, Fisk, and Hampton Institute.[91]

There were a few colleges founded before and after the American Civil War; for instance, Lincoln University was established in 1854 in Pennsylvania by the Presbyterian Church, and Wilberforce University was established in 1856 in Ohio by the Methodist Episcopal Church. Furthermore, African American religious institutions created schools, and between 1865 and 1869 in North Carolina, for instance, Black churches established 257 schools.[92] Although the Freedmen's Bureau coordinated and financed schools in cooperation with the educational activities of northern missionary groups, it was the northern missionaries that developed a formal system of schools and colleges for Blacks in the South. J. B. Roebuck and K. S. Murty demonstrate that "several benevolent societies sent missionaries into the South to uplift the freed slaves and their children through religion, education, and material assistance. The AMA [American Missionary Association] alone was responsible for founding seven black colleges and thirteen normal schools between 1861 and 1870."[93]

Furthermore, African Americans had a very strong commitment to educate themselves despite White hostility. They formed societies, raised money, and founded private schools. According to Roebuck and Murty, "After 1865, they formed a network of so-called Sabbath schools (also called African schools . . .) which were in session throughout the week. Classes in these and other private self-supported elementary African schools met in church basements, private homes, warehouses, pool rooms, and shacks. . . . Blacks desired to take full advantage of their freedom; to them, education, religion, and property were the means to gain personal respect, economic security, and social progress."[94] With the help of northern churches and missionary societies and the Freedmen's Bureau, more than two hundred Black private institutions were founded in the South between 1865 and 1890.[95] After the Freedmen's Bureau was dissolved in 1877, a number of philanthropic foundations joined missionary agencies in funding schools in the South. However, these philanthropic organizations never attempted to challenge White supremacy and financed programs that mainly benefited White society.[96] With the establishment of Black schools and colleges, professional and intellectual groups emerged and began to transform scattered resistance into the Black national movement.

Former slaves were not given the "forty acres [of land] and a mule" each that they were promised during the American Civil War; the system of segregation was legalized and institutionalized by the 1896 *Plessy v. Ferguson* Supreme Court decision that accepted the racist philosophy of "separate but equal." The federal government legally sanctioned the separation and exclusion of African Americans from cultural, political, and economic opportunities. This segregation denied Blacks citizenship rights that

illegal. They considered "schools dangerous and revolutionary."[87] In 1860, less than 3 percent of African Americans were literate in the South.[88] Before the Civil War, only 28 African Americans were graduated from colleges and universities with bachelor degrees; in 1895 there were 1,100 Blacks who were college graduates.[89] Political and economic "modernization" during the last decades of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century transformed America from agrarian to industrial capitalism. These politico-economic changes created new conditions for racial relations.[90] The federal government engaged in what historians call the First Reconstruction (1865–1877) by sponsoring, with northern missionary societies, the establishment of Black higher educational institutions. Both the Freedmen's Bureau and northern missionary groups laid the foundation for the major colleges and universities, such as Atlanta, Howard, Morehouse, Dillard, Leland, Shaw, Fisk, and Hampton Institute.[91]

There were a few colleges founded before and after the American Civil War; for instance, Lincoln University was established in 1854 in Pennsylvania by the Presbyterian Church, and Wilberforce University was established in 1856 in Ohio by the Methodist Episcopal Church. Furthermore, African American religious institutions created schools, and between 1865 and 1869 in North Carolina, for instance, Black churches established 257 schools.[92] Although the Freedmen's Bureau coordinated and financed schools in cooperation with the educational activities of northern missionary groups, it was the northern missionaries that developed a formal system of schools and colleges for Blacks in the South. J. B. Roebuck and K. S. Murty demonstrate that "several benevolent societies sent missionaries into the South to uplift the freed slaves and their children through religion, education, and material assistance. The AMA [American Missionary Association] alone was responsible for founding seven black colleges and thirteen normal schools between 1861 and 1870."[93]

Furthermore, African Americans had a very strong commitment to educate themselves despite White hostility. They formed societies, raised money, and founded private schools. According to Roebuck and Murty, "After 1865, they formed a network of so-called Sabbath schools (also called African schools . . .) which were in session throughout the week. Classes in these and other private self-supported elementary African schools met in church basements, private homes, warehouses, pool rooms, and shacks. . . . Blacks desired to take full advantage of their freedom; to them, education, religion, and property were the means to gain personal respect, economic security, and social progress."[94] With the help of northern churches and missionary societies and the Freedmen's Bureau, more than two hundred Black private institutions were founded in the South between 1865 and 1890.[95] After the Freedmen's Bureau was dissolved in 1877, a number of philanthropic foundations joined missionary agencies in funding schools in the South. However, these philanthropic organizations never attempted to challenge White supremacy and financed programs that mainly benefited White society.[96] With the establishment of Black schools and colleges, professional and intellectual groups emerged and began to transform scattered resistance into the Black national movement.

Former slaves were not given the "forty acres [of land] and a mule" each that they were promised during the American Civil War; the system of segregation was legalized and institutionalized by the 1896 *Plessy v. Ferguson* Supreme Court decision that accepted the racist philosophy of "separate but equal." The federal government legally sanctioned the separation and exclusion of African Americans from cultural, political, and economic opportunities. This segregation denied Blacks citizenship rights that

were provided with the Emancipation Proclamation by the thirteenth, fourteenth (assured due process), and fifteenth (extended franchise to Black males) amendments. Commenting on these conditions, Martin Luther King, Jr. wrote: "The pen of the Great Emancipator had moved the Negro [sic] into the sunlight of physical freedom, but actual conditions had left him behind in the shadow of political, psychological, social, economic and intellectual bondage."[97]

The federal government later abandoned its reformist policies of the First Reconstruction and allowed the emergence of White terrorist organizations, such as Ku Klux Klan, the Knights of Camellia, and the White League of Louisiana, which were determined to reestablish White supremacy. Southern Whites developed Black codes to disenfranchise and control African Americans. All Blacks were seen as servants by Whites. Whites for whom they worked were seen as masters. Black workers were not allowed to leave the premises without permission. They were only allowed to work as farm and domestic workers. They were not allowed to join the militia or possess firearms. African Americans needed special license to preach. They were not permitted to negatively react to Whites even if they were abused, insulted, hurt, or beaten. They were not allowed to testify against Whites. Black men were not allowed to look at White women.

White America enforced these Jim Crow laws through primitive kinds of social control, such as lynching, torture, terror, mutilation, rape, castration, and imprisonment. There were Black men, women, and children who were burned alive. Other Black men were castrated with axes or knives, or blinded with hot pokers or decapitated. Furthermore, African Americans were denied equal citizenship and suffrage rights. They were excluded from public facilities and the American political process by different measures, such as the poll tax, residential requirements, insufficient literacy to interpret a section of the Constitution, the "good character" test, registration procedures implemented through trickery, criminal records, having to produce a responsible White witness for worthiness, the "grandfather Clause,"[98] an all-White primary, and intimidation and violence. All these conditions and economic factors forced them to migrate to urban areas.

Migration, Urban Community Formation, and Nationalism

The great migration of African Americans from rural America to urban America and from the South to the North occurred between 1915 and 1960, when about five million of them moved due to economic problems, political and social repression.[99] Nicholas Lemann notes that this "migration was one of the largest and most rapid mass internal movements of people in history."[100] This great migration was seen by some scholars as the search for political and economic freedom. For example, Alferdteen Harrison argues that "the cause for the 'Great Migration' was the African-American's continuing pilgrimage in search of an acceptable status in America . . . because the status of the African-American as a slave and then as a 'Jim Crow' citizen were unacceptable, the migration was a continuation of the search."[101] Neil R. McMillen also considers this migration a "black protest against the outrages of lynching and injustice in the courts, protest against white notions of black character . . . protest against the disfranchisement, the discrimination, the exclusion, and the segregation that defined the black place in what was then often called 'a Whiteman's country.'"[102] The "push" factors for the migration were the reduction of the demand for Black labor due to the

mechanization of agriculture and the competition with White labor, and lack of adequate income for Black tenant farmers, sharecroppers and farm laborers, and unequal financial support for White and Black schools, political abuses, and lynching.

Further, the invention of the mechanical cotton picker made obsolete the sharecropper system and reduced the demand for Black labor in agriculture. "The invention of the cotton picker," Lemann writes, "was crucial to the great migration by blacks from the Southern countryside to the cities of the South, the West, and the North."[103] Employment opportunities due to industrial expansion, the decline of emigration from Europe during World War I, and the shortage of workers in the war industries were the "pull" factors from the North.[104] This migration brought scattered people together in American ghettos to form social, geographical, and political communities. The development of Black nationalism was mainly facilitated by the massive migration of the Black people from rural to urban America, the emergence of the independent Black church, mosque and affiliated schools, the emergence of the educated class, and the formation of associations, and organizations. Further, the migration of other Blacks from the Caribbean and other places contributed to the development of African American nationalism.[105] For instance, as we will see below, Marcus Garvey and other Caribbean scholar activists and the workers who immigrated to the United States contributed a lot to the development of this nationalism.

Until the 1950s the base of a Black struggle was mainly in northern cities where African Americans enjoyed relative freedom of action because of their established communities and independent institutions and organizations. Out of 75 percent of rural African Americans, nine-tenths lived in the American South at the opening of the twentieth century under the total control of American apartheid and could not take organized political action.[106] In urban areas, African Americans were also confronted by racial segregation that disappointed and frustrated them. According to Kenneth B. Clark, "The dark ghetto's invisible walls have been erected by the white society, by those who have power, both to confine those who have no power and to perpetuate their powerlessness. The dark ghettos are social, political, educational, and—above all—economic colonies. Their inhabitants are subject peoples, victims of the greed, cruelty, insensitivity, guilt, and fear of their masters."[107] Before the great migration, race was mainly a Southern issue, but this migration "made race a national issue in the second half of the century—an integral part of the politics, the social thought, and the organization of ordinary life in the United States."[108]

The African Americans' main survival strategy in cities was the building of independent religious, economic, and social institutions. Black churches served as economic, social, educational, and recreational institutions. African American religious leaders emerged as educators and cultural and political leaders in the newly-emerging African American community. Various voluntary organizations helped in promoting and defending African American interests in economic, cultural, political, and educational arenas. Lennox Yearwood argues that these organizations "provided a major source of information and communication germane to the survival of urban Black communities. Organizations contributed to the social development of these communities in that they created some equilibrium, keeping ostracism from becoming total isolation. They provided avenues for challenge and competitiveness, and furnished opportunities for the development of individual and group public image."[109]

These mass-based associations and organizations became the main building blocks for African American nationalism. "For what we call nationalism operates on many

levels," Anthony Smith writes, "and may be regarded as a form of culture as much as a species of political ideology and social movement."[110] Based on their own economic and cultural resources, African American nationalists recognized and emphasized the beauty of their blackness, the richness of their African and American traditions, and their stamina under the most deplorable and cruel racist system. Despite the fact that the ghetto has been the center of poverty and underdevelopment in affluent America, it brought Blacks together as an ethnonational community to build African American institutions, organizations, and cultural centers.[111] With the great migration the character of Black culture was transformed.[112] As we will see shortly, through Pan-Africanism, the Garvey Movement, and the Harlem Renaissance, African American culture started to reflect national and international characteristics.

The African American people widely formed their own geographical and social communities by creating institutions that became the fountains from which African American nationalism developed. African American nationalism had unleashed the potential, power, and humanity of the Black people who were suppressed by the American racial caste system. This nationalism "as a refutation of the racial ideology of slavery and segregation," James Turner writes, "is a direct challenge to white supremacy."[113] Collective grievances, political and economic modernization, urbanization, the expansion of independent institutions and organizations, and the consolidation of an educated class facilitated the development of Black nationalism. This nationalism manifested itself in three overlapping and interconnected forms.

Three Forms of African American Nationalism

Black nationalism cumulatively raised three important interrelated objectives: the redefinition of Black cultural identity, the liberation of Blacks from the racial caste system, and the economic, the political, and cultural transformation of the Black community. The objectives of Black nationalism manifested themselves in three overlapping historical forms that can be analytically separated. The first form of African American nationalism was manifested in cultural revitalization. The second form of this nationalism dealt with the issues of racial equality, citizenship rights, and social justice. This aspect of the Black national movement is popularly known as the Civil Rights movement. The third form of African American nationalism went beyond civil rights issues and attempted to address economic, political, and cultural rights that would allow the Black people to determine their historical destiny as people. This was the aspect of revolutionary nationalism.

Because of the suppression of the cultural and revolutionary aspects of African American nationalism and the lack of long-term cultural and political strategies for the Black community, the questions of cultural self-determination and economic development have not been adequately addressed in the literature on Black nationalism. The cultural and revolutionary forms of Black nationalism must not be ignored, since they in fact facilitated the legal success of the Civil Rights movement. The cultural and revolutionary aspects of Black nationalism were the powerhouses of the African American struggle. Without a cultural base there cannot be nationalism, and without militant revolutionaries there cannot be a fundamental social change since the dominant society always wants to maintain the status quo. Therefore, it is superficial to talk only about the Civil Rights movement without addressing both the cultural and revolutionary forms of the African American movement. Let us specifically look at the three forms of African American movement.

1. Cultural Nationalism: The Foundation of the Black Struggle

Black cultural nationalism has manifested itself in two forms. The first form is progressive, a part of the cultural awakening of resistance, and links cultural claims to structural social change. Another form of this nationalism is regressive, focusing on trivial cultural issues, while turning attention away from challenging the American racist capitalist order. This form of narrow cultural nationalism has at a time played a negative role in the history of the African American liberation struggle. For instance, the attempt to express cultural uniqueness without challenging various oppressive relationships within the African American community and a larger society is an aspect of the negative role of Black cultural nationalism. The glorification of African kings who participated in slavery in order to claim that Blacks had kings like Europeans is another example of trivial cultural nationalism. Our discussion here focuses on the first form of Black cultural nationalism.

African Americans not only lost the fruit of their labor in building America, they were also not allowed to practice some elements of their culture. The Anglo-American ruling class forced upon Blacks some of their cultural elements while denying them primary and secondary structural assimilation to maintain racial boundary mechanisms and impose cultural hegemony.[114] But, at the same time, to eliminate ethnic boundary mechanisms among different European ethnonational groups, the Anglo-American ruling class not only culturally assimilated other Whites, but it also vigorously promoted structural assimilation by allowing the sharing of educational, workplace, residential, political, and public and private facilities. The sharing of public and private facilities gradually led to primary structural assimilation (through close personal interactions) and marital assimilation among all Whites. The Anglo-American ruling class consolidated itself by gradually reducing or eliminating the cultural barriers that existed among all European immigrant groups.

But the Anglo-American ruling class strengthened the contradictions between Whites and Blacks by legalizing slavery, racism, and segregation. The American Constitution provided freedom for poor Whites and accepted Black slavery. That was why Bishop H. Turner said that the Constitution was "a dirty rag, a cheat, a libel and ought to be spit upon by every Negro in the land."[115] Gradually, White Americans, except a few of them, joined hand in hand to impose their racial hegemony on African Americans and others. While Blacks lost some elements of their culture for nothing except humiliation and degradation, White immigrant groups lost their respective native cultures for success and material gains. Most White social scientists and biologists tried their best to use "science" to prove the inferiority of Blacks in order to rationalize and justify their enslavement, segregation, and colonial domination. Bernard M. Magubane asserts that "between 1880 and 1920 at least, American thought lacks any perception of the black as a human being with potentialities for self-determination. Most of the people who wrote about the blacks accepted without question the idea that intelligence and temperament were racially determined and unalterable. They concluded, therefore, that the failure of Reconstruction, the low educational status of the black, his high statistics of crime, disease, and poverty were simply the inevitable consequence of his heredity."[116]

African American cultural nationalism developed in opposition to racist discourse and cultural hegemony. It included African heritage, black beauty, black literary activism, and psychological recovery. According to John H. Bracey, August Meier, and

Elliot Rudwick, "The half-century from about 1880 to 1930 witnessed the flowering of a clear-cut cultural nationalism. It was evident particularly in a rising self-conscious interest in the race's past and in efforts to stimulate a distinctively black literature."[117] Some Black intellectuals challenged racist discourses. The "New Negro" movement promoted the principles of ethnonational self-help, cooperation, ethnic heritage and pride, militancy and determination to struggle for constitutional rights.[118] Gradually, African Americans began to develop a positive attitude about themselves.[119]

Western world racism inflated the values of "Europeanness" and "Whiteness" in areas of civilization, human worth, and culture, and deflated the values of "African-ness" and "Blackness." This was intended to destroy Black cultural identity and Black psyche. Although the negative impact of deculturation and forced Anglo ideology were very serious, through developing their peoplehood and cultural identity, African Americans struggled to rebuild their historical continuity and humanity. Black cultural nationalists gradually challenged the negative images of Africanness and Blackness that were created by the Western world.[120] H. R. Isaacs comments that "transforming a negative into a positive identity, replacing self-rejection of the most literal kind with self-acceptance, has become the task of a whole new generation of black Americans coming up in politically and psychologically changed circumstances."[121] All peoples who have lived under colonialism and subjugation have experienced feelings of inferiority and have accepted the definition of themselves given to them by their oppressors until they have politically and culturally become conscious and have begun to redefine their cultures and histories in their own terms.

All human groups use shared historical origins to define their identities, to defend their interests, and to assure their survival.[122] Gayle Tate notes, "One of the most prodigious efforts of Black nationalism was the restoration of the dignity of Afro-Americans through the retrieval of African history. This recovery was important to both the psychological and political consciousness of Afro-Americans."[123] Colonial domination distorts historical development by denying cultural development to the colonized population.[124] To overcome such historical distortion, the African American people embraced various ideologies in searching for their cultural roots, historical continuity, and development. Explaining the centrality of African civilization and culture to African Americans, Gene Marine says, "many excited blacks have begun to regain a sense of the value of their own past, an understanding of the fact that their roots run as deep and in soil as rich as those of Greeks or the Jews."[125] The three important movements that connected them to Africa were Garveyism, Pan-Africanism, and the Harlem Renaissance. According to Magubane, "Garvey's epigrammatic call, Back to Africa, was more a spiritual and psychological emancipation from the pervasive racism which afflicted the black proletariat at every turn, than an actual effort to get blacks to emigrate. In contrast, the Pan-African Movement represented certain black intellectuals, most of whom could be described as farsighted fighters for black emancipation."[126]

Marcus Garvey brought to African Americans the idea of being themselves without imitating White Americans. He taught African Americans that they are Black and African. He convinced the urban Black masses that Africanness and Blackness are not inferior to Whiteness and Europeanness. As a result, the Black physical and cultural beauty and the term African American entered the psyche of Black Americans and became the foundation of modern Black nationalism. As King comments, Garvey's "movement attained mass dimensions, and released a powerful emotional response because it touched a truth which had long been dormant in the mind of the Negro.

There was reason to be proud of their heritage as well as of their bitterly won achievement in America."[127] Similarly, the Harlem Renaissance reconnected African Americans to Africa and cultivated Africanization in art and made the Black artist turn to his or her African heritage.[128] The regeneration of Black culture and the ideological connection to Africa through Garveyism, Pan-Africanism, and the Harlem Renaissance manifested cultural, national, and international features of the emerging African American movement.

Exploring the impact of Garveyism, Magubane asserts, "The central theoretical assumption of black nationalism is that before the Negro can be truly free, he must effect a psychic separation from the idea of whiteness; that is, he must stop believing in it so much that he cannot believe in himself. The idea of separation, a part of the ideological armory of the nationalist movement, is a reiteration of this slightly more complex notion, which, by making it concrete puts it in terms the uneducated layman can understand."[129] The development of Black nationalism in the form of cultural awakening matured in the first two decades of the twentieth century. The Harlem Renaissance was "a precursor to the 'black consciousness' strivings of the 1960s."[130] Recognizing its importance, Nathan I. Huggins notes that Harlem became "a capital of the race, a platform from which the new black voice would be heard around the world, an intellectual center of the New Negro."[131] Prominent Black activist scholars, such as W. E. B. Du Bois, James W. Johnson, Marcus Garvey, A. Philip Randolph, Chandler Owen, and Charles S. Johnson, and literary activists, such as Langston Hughes, Claude McKay, Countee Cullen, and Zora Neale Hurston, moved to Harlem and made it a center of Black cultural and intellectual liberation.[132] As Smith asserts, an ethnonational "identity comprises both a cultural and political identity and is located in a political community as well as a cultural one."[133]

As we will see, various organizations emerged and started to build Black political and cultural life in Harlem. If migration provided a geographical and cultural space for Blacks, the Harlem Renaissance enabled them to have an intellectual, political, and a literary platform for the development of Black nationalism.[134] Black cultural revival expanded from its birth place, Harlem, to African American literary and historical circles of other American cities, such as Washington, D.C., Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Los Angeles, and Topeka.[135] The Civil Rights movement evolved from African American cultural, intellectual and political experiences that developed in urban America.

2. The Civil Rights Movement: The Pillar of the Black Movement

The second form of African American nationalism focused on desegregation and civil rights issues. The opening of the last century witnessed African American protest actions in American cities. Although African Americans were less organized, they boycotted trolley car segregation in almost 30 cities, and these boycotts were led by businessmen and clerics.[136] Organized voices of the African American freedom movement, supported by progressive Whites, began to articulate the Black problem during the second half of the twentieth century. The migration movement of Blacks to urban areas, new allies, and the creation of Black institutions facilitated the development of the civil rights struggle.[137] In this process, various organizations and movements emerged. The Niagra Movement was founded in 1905 as the first of these organiza-
. However, between 1895 and 1915, as we will see, the accomodationist philoso-
phy of Booker T. Washington overshadowed the Black struggle for freedom. The

Niagara Movement was founded by prominent Black leaders to oppose Washington's philosophy and to promote a Black struggle; it was led by W. E. B. Du Bois.

The Niagara Movement was the first modern Black organization that gave an organized forum for the struggle of freedom, equality, and multicultural democracy. It was organized mainly by well-to-do northern and educated urban African Americans. Its members numbered about four hundred.[138] This movement "placed full responsibility for the race problem squarely on the whites"[139] and demanded political freedom and equality and protested for political rights, suffrage, the right to equal treatment in public accommodations and access to equal opportunity. It denounced racial segregation, separate-but-equal racist doctrine, and disenfranchisement laws. The unofficial organ for this movement was a magazine known as *Horizon*.

W. E. B. Du Bois was the most influential opponent of Washington's policy; he severely criticized Washington's emphasis on industrial education at the cost of higher education. Du Bois attacked Washington for asking African Americans to give up the struggle for political power, civil rights, and higher education, and exposed the consequences of his policy that led to further disenfranchisement, civil inferiority, and withdrawal of aid from many Black educational institutions, specifically those offering liberal arts curricula.[140] It was William Monroe Trotter, the editor of the *Boston Guardian*, who convinced and helped Du Bois to attack Washington's policy. He was an uncompromising critic of racial segregation and accommodation and considered Washington "as the agent of oppression."[141] The Niagara Movement was the forerunner of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP).

The NAACP grew out of an interracial conference in 1909 on the Black status. The NAACP was formed by Black intellectual activists such as William Monroe Trotter, W. E. B. Du Bois, the noted antilynching crusader Ida Wells-Barnett, White progressives, and Christian socialists. Meier and Rudwick say, "The interracial character of the NAACP was essential to the success of its early work. The prestige of the names of well-known white progressives . . . gave the agitation for Negro rights better financial support and, more important, a wider audience. Except for Du Bois, who became director of publicity and editor of the Association's organ, the *Crisis*, all of the chief officials were at first white. Several of these white leaders seemed paternalistic and condescending in their dealings with Negro associates in the NAACP."[142] The principal tactics of this protest organization were persuasion, education, and legal action to achieve equal rights for Black Americans.

Another important civil rights organization was the National Urban League, which was founded by conservative Black leaders and White philanthropists in 1911 to improve the conditions of the Black masses in urban America. While the NAACP used legal approaches to fight against American apartheid, the National Urban League used moral persuasion to convince racist businessmen and labor unions not to discriminate against Black workers. Black and White conservatives did not like the legal approach that the NAACP was using to challenge American apartheid. Emphasizing the importance of industrial education, recognizing the potential of receiving financial support for their projects from White philanthropists, accommodationists like Booker T. Washington opposed the view of politically, morally, and legally challenging American apartheid. Born in slavery and educated at Hampton Institute in Virginia, Washington was taught "the doctrine of economic advancement with acceptance of disenfranchisement and with conciliation of the white South," and his ideology and strategy could not go beyond that of the racist White establishment.[143] He founded and be-

came the principal of Tuskegee Institute, an industrial school in Alabama, and developed a "program of agriculture and industrial training that would make the education of Negroes palatable to the dominant elements of the New South."[144]

Washington internalized the notion of accommodation and emerged as an opportunist and pragmatist leader. Hence, he was favored by the White establishment. As a result, he became a rich man from the money he obtained from his White mentors and established Tuskegee Institute. Ignoring the importance of higher and liberal education for African Americans, Washington said, "Cast it down in agriculture, mechanics, in commerce, in domestic service, and the profession . . . it is in the South that the Negro is given a man's chance in the commercial world."[145] He publicly attacked the struggle for equality and citizenship rights: "The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremist folly, and the progress in the enjoyment of all the privileges that will come to us must be the result of a severe constant struggle rather than of artificial forcing."[146] For Washington, Blacks could not achieve social equality with Whites since they did not work as hard as Whites did. Meier and Rudwick argue that the compromising of the Black interest with that of racist Whites "satisfied those philanthropists and leading Southerners who opposed race equality yet liked to think that they were in favor of Negro uplift. Finally it enabled many Negroes to convince themselves that it was a way not only of obtaining money for Negro schools but also indirectly and ultimately elevating the race to the point where it would be accorded its citizenship rights."[147]

Washington convinced conservative Blacks and some protest organizations such as the Afro-American Council to adopt his philosophy.[148] "Though he covertly spent thousands of dollars fighting disenfranchisement and segregation laws," Meier and Rudwick assert, "he publicly advocated a policy of conciliation and gradualism."[149] Publicly, he blamed African Americans for their problems and saw the White man as their "best friend"; Washington "recommended economic accumulation and cultivation of Christian character as the best methods for advancing the status of blacks in America," "favored vocational training and working with hands at the expense of higher education and the professions" discouraged political activism, minimized the impact of racism and discrimination, and endorsed segregation.[150] Until his death in 1915, Washington limited the effectiveness of the NAACP and Black intellectuals because of his challenge to legal political action, his emphasis on economic development, and his access to American power and capital.[151]

After Washington's death, the NAACP gathered momentum and continued its legal attack on disenfranchisement and American apartheid. It challenged the "grandfather clauses" that limited the right to vote and municipal residential segregation ordinances in 1915 and 1917 respectively. The NAACP created its branch offices in the south in 1918 and linked its activities to the Black church and began to fight against lynching, segregated education and transportation, and political disenfranchisement.[152] It vigorously attacked the poll tax and school segregation between the 1920s and the 1950s. The NAACP provided organizational and management skills for the Black national struggle by recruiting and training ministers, lawyers, doctors, union organizers, and activists and teaching them how to organize themselves and establish working relationships among themselves.[153] Although its bureaucracy discouraged the participation of the Black masses in their struggle for freedom, the NAACP did serious preparatory work for the struggle of the 1950s and the 1960s.[154] The NAACP and its lawyers successfully challenged the legality of school segregation and, as a result, the Supreme

Court by its decision of *Brown v. Board of Education Topeka, Kansas,* ruled against the segregated public school systems in 1954. Commenting on this decision, Manning Marable says, "No one could realize completely the new phase of American history that would dawn on 17 May 1954, in a legal decision which would mark the real beginning of the Second Reconstruction."[155]

Historically, since the NAACP legal actions and the National Urban League moral persuasion against American apartheid had limited effects in solving the problems of the Black people during the 1920s, the masses paid more attention to the Garvey Movement. Marcus Garvey founded the Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA) in 1914 in Jamaica and established eight nationalist goals that he extended to the United States. The main goals of the UNIA were to establish a Black nation, to create "racial" consciousness, to fight for self-determination, to promote racial self-help, to make Blacks world conscious through the media, and to build "racial" respect and solidarity.[156] Because the Garvey Movement advocated the liberation of the Black peoples all over the world from White oppressors, more than three million individuals became members of this organization from more than 19 countries.[157] Hence, the UNIA was a manifestation of an implicit Black transnational collectivity. Magubane notes that this movement "arose and flourished in the conditions created by imperialism. It spread and became an anti-imperialist movement with incredible vigor and elan. At its peak [in the U.S.] in the early 1920s the Garvey movement was the greatest outbreak of black political activity since the Civil War."[158] Garvey also understood clearly the linkage between the economy and politics; hence, he encouraged the development of Black business. The UNIA organized a chain of restaurants, groceries, laundries, hotels, and printing plants and encouraged African Americans to support Black business. Although unsuccessful, the UNIA attempted "to establish a commercial link between the United States, the West Indies, and Africa" by influencing some Blacks to buy stock in the UNIA's Black Star Steamship Line.[159]

Although Garvey was criticized for his call, Back to Africa, he brought nationalist hope to the frustrated and disillusioned Black masses. Explaining why the Black masses were more attracted to the Garvey Movement than to the NAACP or the National Urban League, E. Franklin Frazier argues that the NAACP "has never attracted the crowd because it does not give the crowd an opportunity to show off in colors, parades, and self-glorification. ... The same could be said of the Urban League. ... Those who supported this movement pay for it because it gives them what they want—the identifications with something that makes them feel like somebody among white people who have said they were nobody."[160] For the first time, the Garvey Movement attempted to lead the Black struggle without depending on progressive Whites. This movement provided hope for the Black proletariat, but it could not provide freedom. However, Garveyism became the first ideological weapon for Black cultural and revolutionary nationalism.

In the 1940s and the 1950s, the Black people were further disillusioned and frustrated. African Americans were convinced that court actions could not destroy American apartheid without protest and revolutionary action. The founding of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) in 1942 by Black elites, White liberals, socialists, and pacifists contributed to the development of the nonviolent direct action strategy to fight against segregation in public facilities.[161] The direct actions of this organization included sit-ins and freedom rides to desegregate the interstate public transportation system. In the 1950s and the 1960s, CORE eventually combined its nonviolent struggle

with the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) and the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC).[162] Because of some legal successes of the NAACP against school segregation, White terrorist and racist groups, such as the White Citizens' Council, the American States Rights Association, the National Association for the Advancement of White People, and the Ku Klux Klan, intensified their organized attacks on the NAACP in the 1950s and weakened it by creating an organizational vacuum for the Black struggle in many Southern states.[163]

Then African Americans in Southern states turned to the Black church and made it the institutional center of their struggle. The Black church became the center of the struggle because it had an independent leadership of clergymen, financial sources, an organized mass base, and cultural and ideological foundations that were prerequisite for the Black liberation struggle. Using the Black church as their center, African Americans began to create what Aldon D. Morris calls movement centers in the South. The United Defense League was organized in 1953 in Baton Rouge, the Montgomery Improvement Association was formed in 1955 (see chapter V for details), the Inter Civic Council of Tallahassee was organized in 1956, and the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights was formed in Birmingham in 1956. The Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) was formed in 1957 as "the decentralized political arm of the black church" from these movement centers.[164] Taking the church as the center of protest movement and adopting nonviolent action as a main tactic, the SCLC began a mass boycott against the segregated buses; it also started to fight against political disfranchisement under the charismatic leadership of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

One of these movement centers, the Montgomery Improvement Association, was deliberately organized by the efforts of community leaders from mass-based organizations, preexisting social networks, and social groups that participated in the Montgomery bus boycott of 1955. Activists such as Rosa Parks, E. D. Nixon, Ralph Abernathy, E. French, Jo Ann Robinson, and Mary Fair Bruks, as well as institutions and organizations such as the Black church, the local NAACP, and the Women's Political Council (WPC) had played key roles in mobilizing human resources in the form of money, skills, and knowledge of the community for this movement. The bus boycott that was initiated by Rosa Parks on December 1, 1955, when she refused to give her seat for a White man, defying Alabama segregation laws, triggered the formation of the Montgomery Improvement Association in the same month. Martin Luther King, Jr. was elected president of the movement on December 5, 1955. In this association "the visions of an uncharismatic and largely uneducated pullman porter [E. D. Nixon] and members of the WPC and other community organizations were thrust into the hands of a charismatic minister [King] who could play a key mobilizing role because he occupied a central position in the church."[165] Rosa Parks triggered this movement because she was well connected to community organizations that had the organizational capacity for mass mobilization. Similarly, E. D. Nixon was a militant activist who had rich organizational skills that he had accumulated from leading the local NAACP chapter and from heading the local Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters for more than 15 years. Like Parks, he was closely connected to community groups and organizations. These activists and others gave a lifeblood to the emergence of this movement, which became a model for the struggle of African Americans in the mid-twentieth century under the leadership of Martin Luther King. The bus boycott occurred for almost a year and became the watershed of the Black struggle by organizing and consolidating this movement center, facilitating the emergence of the charismatic

leadership of King, achieving its objective of bus desegregation, and by laying the foundation of the Black movement.

King was a nonviolent, religious, and revolutionary leader who challenged the racist establishment, including the church. Explaining the conformist nature of the White church, King comments as follows: "The erstwhile sanction by the church of slavery, racial segregation, war, and economic exploitation is testimony to the fact that the church has hearkened more to the authority of the world than to the authority of God. Called to be the moral guardian of the community, the church at times has preserved that which is immoral and unethical. Called to combat social evils, it has remained silent behind stained-glass windows. Called to lead men on the highway of brotherhood and to summon them to rise above the narrow confines of race and class, it has enunciated and practiced racial exclusiveness."[166] He combined the social and otherworldly gospel in leading the African American struggle. King expressed that the church has an obligation to deal with moral issues in society as "the voice of moral and spiritual authority on earth" and as "the guardian of the moral and spiritual life in the community."[167] King criticized the White church for ignoring its social mission and sanctioning the racial caste system, colonialism, and apartheid.[168] King clearly understood the political and economic problems that confronted African Americans in particular and all the poor in general.

Despite the fact that most Black organizations were male-run, Black women actively participated in organizations and struggled against racial oppression.[169] Hence, it is no wonder that Rosa Parks ignited the bus boycott of Montgomery that led to the formation of the Montgomery Improvement Association and to the emergence of King as the national leader of the Black struggle in 1955. "What was once a liberal white and Negro [sic] upper-class movement," Meier and Rudwick note, "has become a completely black-led and largely working-class movement."[170] The mobilization of African Americans to participate in their freedom struggle facilitated the shift in strategy of the struggle. The struggle shifted from verbal agitation, legislation, and court litigation to direct action techniques to secure constitutional rights; by involving the masses the struggle went "beyond constitutional rights to demand specific efforts to overcome poverty of the black masses."[171]

King understood the vital role of the masses in bringing a progressive social change and developed the strategy of involving the masses and elites in massive direct action through boycotts, demonstrations, and marches. Recognizing the importance of an organized voice, Martin Luther King and his colleagues created the SCLC. King believed that when the oppressed "bury the psychology of servitude" within themselves no force can stop their freedom struggle.[172] He considered the Black struggle for freedom to be a "new expression of the American dream that need not be realized at the expense of other men around the world, but a dream of opportunity and life that can be shared with the rest of the world."[173] He dreamed and struggled to develop a just society where peoples from all sectors of American society can live together as brothers and sisters, where every person "will respect the dignity and worth of human personality."[174] Although the racist establishment did not positively respond to his religious, political, and social messages, he attempted to influence the White ruling class by using their religious philosophy: "You can use your powerful economic resources to wipe poverty from the face of the earth. God never intended for one group of people to live in superfluous inordinate wealth, while others lived in abject deadening poverty."[175] King's visions reflect democracy and distribution of wealth: "A dream of equality of op-

portunity, of privilege and property widely distributed; a dream of a land where men will not take necessities from the many to give luxuries to the few; a dream of a land where men do not argue that the color of a man's skin determines the content of his character; a dream of a place where all our gifts and resources are held not for ourselves alone but as instruments of service for the rest of humanity; the dream of a country where every man will respect the dignity and worth of all human personality, and men will dare to live together as brothers—that is the dream."[176]

Black students, supported by progressive White students, formed the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) in 1960 and used sit-in tactics to desegregate hotels, coffee shops, restaurants, movie theaters, libraries, supermarkets, parks, and public transportation systems. The SCLC and other civil rights organizations, under the guidance of King, led effective desegregation campaigns in major American cities. According to Jack M. Bloom, "Nonviolence and mass participation in the freedom struggle became a central part of King's contribution to the cause of black freedom. Mass action transformed the character of the struggle itself—making it immeasurably stronger, with a much more rapid pace."[177] King used religion, the media, and a strategy of nonviolence, and mass participation to challenge the racist establishment. "White America," King remarked, "was forced to face the ugly facts of life as the Negro thrust himself into the consciousness of the country, and dramatized his grievances on a thousand brightly lighted stages."[178]

During this phase of the African American movement, two important laws were passed: the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. These laws were passed to eliminate segregation and integrate Blacks into American society. Then Black revolutionary nationalists and the leading figures of the Civil Rights movement began to assess the impact of these civil rights laws on those Blacks who did not have jobs, education, and decent housing. Recognizing that these civil rights laws could not fundamentally change the conditions of the Black majority, King tried to expand the scope of the Black struggle. He raised human rights issues and aimed at creating an alliance with the poor and the working class in American society.[179] King was a very complex religious and national leader, and a pragmatist who challenged the racist capitalist system on its territory by developing different strategies and tactics for the struggle. In his attempt to build an alliance of the oppressed groups, King started the Poor People's Campaign: "I am speaking of all the poor, I am not only concerned about the black poor; I am concerned about poverty among my Mexican-American brothers; I am concerned about poverty among my Puerto Rican brothers; I am concerned about poverty among my Appalachian white brothers, and I wish they would realize that we are struggling against poverty for everybody and would join in a movement to get rid of poverty."[180]

King called upon the church to challenge the status quo and to struggle to change an oppressive social order. He condemned racism, economic exploitation, and war as the three primary evils in American society.[181] He had a clear vision on the issue of integration. His main objective was to secure for African Americans access to state power. King said, "'Integration' is meaningless without the sharing of power. When I speak of integration I don't mean a romantic mixing of colors. I mean a real sharing of power and responsibility."[182] He also saw integration as access to social justice, man dignity, equality, and freedom.[183]

Since King recognized the connection between political power, wealth, and poverty, he not only struggled to gain access to state power but also to reduce or

eliminate poverty. He was both nationalist and internationalist. The following quotation reflects King's complex ideological and political commitment: "Let us be dissatisfied until rat-infested, vermin-filled slums will be a thing of a dark past and every family will have a decent sanitary house in which to live. Let us be dissatisfied until the empty stomachs of Mississippi are filled and idle industries of Appalachia are revitalized. . . . Let us be dissatisfied until our brothers of the Third World—Asia, Africa and Latin America—will no longer be the victim of imperialist exploitation, but will be lifted from the long night of poverty, illiteracy, and disease."[184] Manning Marable comments that "King's unfinished search for more radical reforms in America may have been the central reason he was killed."[185]

King was assassinated before he completed his historical mission. The assassinations of Malcolm X in 1965 and King in 1968 and the limit of the civil rights laws to the conditions of Black masses clearly contributed to the consolidation of Black militancy and its crisis. Marable asserts, "After the assassinations of Malcolm and Martin, the modern black movement for biracial democracy had been crippled, to be sure, but it was by no means destroyed. Yet the absence of a widely-shared theory and strategy for black liberation was still missing; the political goal of black equality was still murky and ill-defined; opportunism and accommodation of many black militants and political leaders still raised unresolved questions for future struggles."[186]

The Nation of Islam, a religious national movement, appealed to the Black masses in the 1950s and the 1960s as the Garvey Movement had. This movement "evolved over a generation and only gradually became a well-known symbol of protest—at least in the black ghettos of America's principal industrial cities."[187] While other Black protest organizations attracted well-to-do African Americans and progressive Whites, like the Garvey Movement, the Nation of Islam mainly attracted lower-class Blacks.[188] This movement produced Malcolm X, who, after his death, "quickly became the fountainhead of the modern renaissance of black nationalism in the late 1960s."[189] As Malcolm X gradually evolved to become the revolutionary nationalist leader, his understanding of the Black question went beyond the comprehension of the other leaders of the Nation of Islam. Because of his militancy and vision, Malcolm was expelled from the Nation of Islam and created first the Muslim Mosque and then the Organization of African American Unity (OAAU) in 1964. His ideological and intellectual maturity and his increased commitment to the emancipation of his people shortened his life. Robert Allen argues that "Martin Luther King and Malcolm X were both assassinated at precisely the point at which they began working actively and consciously against the racism and exploitation generated by the American capitalist system, both at home and abroad."[190] The assassinations of these two prominent leaders further frustrated the Black masses and increased their militancy. Both King and Malcolm, although each emerged through a different route to lead the Black struggle, recognized the inability of the existing organizations to accomplish the objectives of the African American movement. Exploring this problem, William W. Sales notes, "While the existing institutional structure supported the early period of the Black insurgency, as the movement matured the existing institutional and organizational structures were inadequate to the new tasks at hand. Both men recognized that the further development of the movement required new organizational forms and for their supporters to relate to each other in new and different ways. King's 'Poor People's Campaign' represented this search while Malcolm X created the OAAU."[191]

3. Revolutionary Nationalism: The Wall of Black Struggle

A third pillar of African American nationalism that emphasized political, economic, and social transformation in Black America was revolutionary nationalism. Marable expresses that "militant nationalists of the post-war era were both anti-racist and anti-integrationist, in the sense that they opposed Jim Crow laws and simultaneously advocated all-black economic, political and social institutions."[192] African American nationalists, particularly revolutionary ones, did not want to be integrated into White society as subordinates. They struggled for Black human dignity and true equality. Reflecting on the tactical differences among Black leaders on the positions of integration and separation, Malcolm X argued "that our people want a complete freedom, justice and equality, or recognition and respect as human beings. . . . So, integration is not the objective nor separation the objective. The objective is complete respect as human beings."[193]

Among many, Malcolm X and Stokely Carmichael forcefully argued that Black America must have control of its political economy, life, and culture in order to survive and to fundamentally transform itself.[194] It was their position that this cannot be done without the mobilization of all social classes and groups in the Black community on a national level under a national leadership. As Sales notes, Black nationalism as an ideology "became a major force at a transition stage in the development of the Civil Rights movement: the stage requiring the accelerated institutionalization of formal movement organizations, the transformation of a regional movement into a truly national one, and the integration of previously inactive classes and social groups into the ongoing mobilization."[195] Discussing the importance of Blacks having control over their lives and attaining development, Malcolm X said, "Just because you're in this country doesn't make you an American. No, you've got to go farther than that before you can become an American. You've got to enjoy the fruits of Americanism."[196] During this phase, various militant and revolutionary organizations and the Black masses began to go beyond the civil rights demands.[197] Jack M. Bloom says, "The civil rights movement had won its victories because blacks had been able to assemble a coalition that altered the balance of power within the nation. That coalition had brought about structural change within the south; but that same coalition put limits on the extent of change it was willing to support."[198] Malcolm X recognized this reality and started to search for an organizational solution.

Malcolm X was a revolutionary democratic leader who combined the best elements of "the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Constitution of the U.S.A. and the Bill of Rights" in the objectives of his new organization, the Organization of African American Unity (OAAU).[199] He attempted to revolutionize and internationalize the African American movement by creating the OAAU. According to Sales, "Due to U.S. fear of world opinion, internationalizing the struggle of African Americans would give Black people breathing room against the power of racism in the United States. Such breathing room could be used to organize for self-defense, aggressive electoral politics, and Black economic advancement."[200] Using the OAAU, Malcolm planned to form an African American united front based on the ideologies of Black nationalism and Pan-Africanism. He spread revolutionary Black nationalism to the masses.

Malcolm X mobilized material, intellectual, and ideological resources to challenge the racist establishment and to provide a new direction for the African American movement. He made the most important contribution in the ideological arena

because he insisted that African Americans rethink their past experience in Africa and America by recognizing the significance of history and criticism.[201] In an attempt to increase the political consciousness of African Americans and lead their movement in a new direction, he struggled to expose "the confusion and inaction which resulted from the internalization of the racist ruling class's view of the world."[202] Malcolm X criticized civil rights leaders for not being critical enough in exposing the racist establishment and for their lack of vision in advocating an African American cultural identity: "Civil Rights thinkers never exposed the ideology of the ruling class itself to critical scrutiny. Behind the facade of racial equality, African Americans were frozen at the bottom of the political, economic, and social pyramid even though the structure of legal segregation and discrimination was being dismantled."[203]

Malcolm X criticized civil rights leaders for limiting the objective of the Black struggle to integration and civil rights, not challenging the ideological foundation of U.S. society, limiting the strategy of the struggle to nonviolence, refusing to recognize the African American peoplehood, and accepting "Americanness" uncritically.[204] Because of his militancy, dedication, oratory, fiery media appearance, and revolutionary character, Malcolm X was considered "an apostle of armed resistance," "the electronic man," "shining Prince," and "an uncompromising champion of his people."[205] With the increased militancy of Malcolm X and Martin Luther King and their assassinations, Black organizations like the SNCC also increased their social commitment to the Black struggle. According to Lester, Black revolutionary nationalists began to send a new message to White America: "This is their message: The days of singing freedom songs and the days of combating bullets and billy clubs with love are over. 'We Shall Overcome' sounds old, outdated. 'Man, the people are too busy getting ready to fight.'"[206]

Initially, SNCC emerged as one of the reformist civil rights organizations to fight against segregation. But after a few years it changed its position to militancy.[207] SNCC leaders coined the phrase "Black Power" to express the demand for self-determination. Clayborne Carson indicates that the late 1960s "had awakened dormant traditions of black radicalism and racial separatism by fostering among black people a greater sense of pride, confidence, and racial identity. Through their increasing positive response to the concept of black power, Afro-Americans . . . indicated their determination to use hard-won human rights to improve their lives in ways befitting their own cultural values."[208] Black militancy became the order of the day in the late 1960s. According to Emily Stoper, "By 1966, SNCC was a radical organization; it believed that it could not achieve success without a fundamental change in American institutions."[209] Although it was led by young educated Black elites, it attracted progressives and the other oppressed groups and classes. Stoper notes that "it mobilized the young and the dispossessed into a group that challenged directly first conservatives and then liberals and finally all those who were not dissatisfied with the status quo. By its activism and self-sacrifice, it rebuked those who saw some evils but contented themselves with passive and untaxing remedies."[210]

Some SNCC groups began to advocate forming African American independent institutions and racial separation. Carson explains, "Believing that they should not only stimulate Black militancy but also create black-controlled institutions to secure lasting social gains, SNCC workers gradually abandoned strategies based on assistance from the federal government or the emerging New Left. A group of

SNCC activists began to see racial separation as an ideal that would awaken the consciousness of black people and began a new phase of the black struggle."[211] With SNCC in decline because of its internal organizational contradiction and because of the opposition from and suppression by the White establishment, the Black Panther Party emerged as the leading Black nationalist organization among youth. It was formed in 1966 in Oakland, California, and in 1969 it created an alliance with new left radical communist Whites.[212] It advocated revolutionary nationalism and a strategy of self-defense. Explaining the essence of Black Power, Huey Newton, one of the prominent leaders of this organization, says, "When black people start defining things and making it act in a desired manner, then we call this Black Power."[213]

The OAAU, the SNCC, and the Black Panther Party struggled to bring about a fundamental social change in American society. The new Black revolutionaries believed "that black dignity and liberation are not possible in the United States without profound changes in the system—changes which run so deep that only so strong a word as 'revolutionary' will do to describe them."[214] One of the Black revolutionary organizations, the Black Panther Party, developed a ten-point program in 1966. This program included the demands for political power, national self-determination, full employment, decent education, housing, food, justice to end police brutality and unfair trials, and economic development.[215] The Black Panther Party picked up the gun for self-defense.[216] Another movement that advocated armed struggle was the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM): "RAM represented the wing of the Civil Rights movement most committed to revolutionary guerrilla warfare in the United States. It had direct ties to Robert Williams, then exiled in Cuba, and the nationalist wing of the southern student movement and its northern groups. RAM also had a grounding in Marxist-Leninist ideology which gave to its variant of Black nationalism a particular leftist character."[217] Furthermore, the formation of the Republic of New Africa in 1967 to create an independent African American state in the Deep South of the United States was another expression of Black revolutionary nationalism.

The Black masses began spectacular rebellions and set fire to millions of dollars of property in big cities. Marable estimates that "the ghetto rebellion from 1964 to 1972 led to 250 deaths, 10,000 serious injuries, and 60,000 arrests, at a cost of police, troops, other coercive measures taken by the state and losses to business amounting to billions of dollars." [218] The White establishment could not tolerate the revolutionary aspect of Black nationalism. The government developed a double-edged policy to deal with Black militancy. On one hand, by using civil rights laws, the government integrated Black reformist elites into the American system. On the other hand, it suppressed the Black masses and Black revolutionaries. Several hundreds of Blacks who participated in a series of rebellions were either killed or imprisoned. Robert Allen reports, "the FBI had organized a secret nationwide conspiracy . . . to 'expose, disrupt, misdirect, discredit, or otherwise neutralize' black freedom organizations and their leaders. The tactics employed in this illegal FBI program included everything from sending 'anonymous' poison-pen letters to red-baiting, planting agents and provocateurs in organizations, using illegal telephone taps and burglarizing files, provoking violent confrontations between different groups, and assassinating militant leaders."[219] As reformist approaches limited the capacity of the Black struggle to broaden mobilization to facilitate fundamental social change, revolutionary strategies invited repression from the White establishment.

Conclusion

The Black struggle for self-determination, democracy, social justice, and development partially succeeded in achieving its objectives: the institutions of the racial caste system were legally defeated. Several laws were passed to legally protect the political and economic rights of the Black people. But mainly the African American elites have benefited from these changes, although there is structural limitation to what they can achieve. The interest of the Black masses was suppressed with the suppression of Black revolutionary and cultural nationalists. In practical terms, individual, institutional, and structural racism has remained intact in American society despite the fact that it is illegal to discriminate based on race or national origin. Because of the opposition from the White establishment and the lack of a long-term cultural and political strategy among the African American community, the struggle for cultural identity and multicultural democracy has not yet achieved expected goals. The objective of transforming Black America fundamentally has failed since the majority of Blacks are still at the bottom of society; African Americans still do not have equal access to political, economic, and cultural resources of the country.

By focusing on the Civil Rights movement, most scholars and politicians have denied a historical stage for the revolutionary and cultural aspects of the Black national movement. However, cultural nationalism and the revolutionary wing of the Black nationalist movement and the Black masses were the backbone of the Civil Rights movement. Revolutionary and militant Black organizations supported in practice the movement and at the same time went beyond it in demanding a fundamental social change. With the success of the Civil Rights movement in dismantling the legal infrastructure of American apartheid and the suppression of revolutionary nationalism, African American cultural nationalism lost its centrality and more attention was given to integration. Of course, as the result of the Black struggle, the size of the Black middle class grew from about 15 percent to 37 percent of the Black population from 1960 to 1980.[220]

But cultural assimilation since the seventeenth century and integration since the mid-1960s did not fundamentally transform Black America. In 1966 Meier and Rudwick asked the following question: "Will the civil rights organizations be able to harness this political potential [the growing middle-class blacks] and thus help the black masses in the ghetto to secure for themselves the power with which to compel society to provide them with adequate employment, education, and housing?"[221] Presently, because of the absence of organizations that can effectively articulate the demands of the Black majority, existing civil rights organizations and Black elites could not obtain adequate goods and services for the Black community. As a result, the majority of the African Americans have been left in ghettos and exposed to all social ills, such as poverty, illiteracy, disease, unemployment, crimes, police brutality, and drugs. Alphonso Pinkney argues, "Public support for black progress virtually disappeared, and blacks were once again being blamed for their plight in a society where racism has historically been an integral part of all of its institutions and has served to maintain and protect white privilege."[222] The suppression of revolutionary nationalism and the incorporation of Black elites into the White racist capitalist establishment since the mid-1960s have perpetuated the dependency that does not allow Blacks to have political and cultural power, which is required to facilitate a fundamental social transformation.

Both structural and institutional racism and the intensification of globalization have increased the problem of the African American masses. With the intensification of globalization, the racist capitalist economic restructuring has shifted the Black population from being incorporated into the capitalist economy as the lowest of the most super-exploited sector to being *discarded* and *marginalized* from participation in the capitalist production process. White flight to suburbia mainly to undermine desegregation laws after the mid-1960s and the intensification of globalization have created a functional transformation in large American cities where the Black people live. These cities have become the centers of knowledge-intensive service industries, such as administration, information, finance, law and health, insurance, colleges and universities, transportation and communication technologies, and management consulting. At the same time, labor-intensive jobs that require fewer skills and less education in manufacturing and retail have been declining because of industrial relocation and capital flight to suburbia and peripheral countries. According to J. D. Kasarda, "The simultaneous transformation and selective decline of the employment and residential bases of these cities have contributed to a number of serious problems, including a widening gap between urban job-structures and the skill levels of disadvantaged residents (with corresponding high rates of structural unemployment), spatial isolation of low-income minorities, and an intractable high level of urban poverty. Accompanying these problems have been a plethora of social and institutional ills further aggravating the predicament of people and places in distress: rising crime, poor public schools. . . ."[223]

These social ills, particularly unemployment and poverty, have forced some Blacks to depend on the welfare economy and the underground economy. Rather than promote development and transformation, these economies perpetuate dependency, hopelessness, despair, drug abuse, family dissolution, and crime. Referring to the underdevelopment of Black America, Roger Wilkins argues, "The state of helplessness, debility, and cultural deprivation imposed for centuries on millions of blacks in the United States did not prepare them, their children, or their grandchildren for the transition into a modern high-tech society."[224] Currently, Black ghettos are controlled by two main forces: the police and gangs. These are not forces of development. When police are the force of social control, gangs are forces of social destruction. Because of these problems and the availability of opportunities in suburbia, the Black elites left these cities, leaving behind the Black masses. This makes the future of the Black struggle complex.

The Black masses in inner cities have lost control of their educational, social, political, and economic institutions. The subordination of Black America to White America for centuries has arrested African American cultural and economic development. Since the Black movement legally challenged American apartheid laws, the future struggle can use these successes and engage in developing cultural, political, and intellectual strategies that are required in developing Black America and promoting multicultural democracy. Further, the complex features of the previous struggle, such as Black mass militancy, resilient cultural and institutional resources, the sophisticated political and ideological pragmatism of Martin Luther King, the cultural and revolutionary heroism of Malcolm X, the organizational knowledge of various grassroots leaders, and the accumulated liberation knowledge of Black intellectuals, n be the foundation of the future African American struggle for total emancipation ₋nd development.

119. See, for example, John Markakis, "Material and Social Aspects of National Conflict," p. 279.
120. See, for example, Walker Connor, *Ethnonationalism: The Quest for Understanding.*
121. Ibid., p. 4.
122. Anthony Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations,* p. 3.
123. John Markakis, op. cit., p. 279.
124. See Amilcar Cabral, *Unity and Struggle;* Ronald H. Chilcote, *Amilcar Cabral's Revolutionary Theory and Practice* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1991).
125. Anthony Smith, *Theories of Nationalism* (New York: Harper and Row, 1971) p. 22.
126. Ibid.; Anthony Smith, *The Ethnic Revival* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981); *The Ethnic Origins of Nations; National Identity.*
127. John Breuilly, op. cit.
128. Ibid., pp. 1–2.
129. Ibid., p. 35.
130. Anthony Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations,* p. 154.
131. Amilcar Cabral, op. cit., pp. 65–66. See also Amilcar Cabral, *Revolution in Guinea,* trans. by R. Handyside (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1969), p. 103.
132. Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism,* pp. 1–2.
133. Elie Kedourie, *Nationalism* (London: Hutchinson, 1960).
134. For instance, Nagel suggests, "Two international factors contribute to ethnic conflict and ethnic movements: ideology and competition. Ethnic movements find their legitimacy in the ideology of the global order; an ideology that embraces such conflicting principles as, self-determination, sovereignty, territorial integrity, representative government, and home rule. Ethnic movements find their material support in the marketplace of inter-national competition, and major regional powers support dissident ethnic groups as they compete for economic and geopolitical advantage in the global arena." Joane Nagel, op. cit. p. 103.
135. Amilcar Cabral, *Return to the Source,* p. 41.
136. Amilcar Cabral, *Unity and Struggle,* p. 143.
137. Amilcar Cabral, *Return to the Source,* p. 60.
138. Ibid., pp. 43–44, 68.
139. Gurutz J. Bereciartu, op. cit., p. 141.
140. See Arthur N. Waldron, "Theories of Nationalism"; Aviel Roshwald, "Untangling the Knotted Cord: Studies of Nationalism," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History,* vol. 24, no. 2 (Autumn 1993), pp.293–303.
141. Theda Skocpol, *Social Revolutions in the Modern World,* p. 336.

Chapter II

1. Martin Luther King, Jr., *Why We Can't Wait* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), p. 80.
2. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Speaks: Selected Speeches and Statements,* ed. George Breitman (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1976), p. 158.
3. I have made similar arguments on Black nationalism in my previous work. See Asafa Jalata, "Two Freedom Movements Compared: The Cases of the Oromo and African Americans," *The Oromo Commentary,* vol. 2, no. 1 (1992), pp.13–16; A. Jalata, "African American Nationalism, Development, and Afrocentricity: Implications for the Twenty-First Century," in *Molefi Kete Asante and Afrocentricity: In Praise and in Criticism,* ed. Dhyana Ziegler (Nashville: James C. Winston, 1995), pp. 153–174.
4. See Leon Litwack and August Meier, *Black Leaders of the Nineteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988); W. J. Moses, ed., *The Gold Age of Black Nationalism, 1850–1925* (Hamden, Conn.: 1978); W. J. Moses, ed., *Classical Black Nationalism* (New

York: New York University Press, 1996); H. Brotz, ed., *African-American Social and Political Thought 1850–1920* (London: Transaction Publishers, 1992).

5. Howard Brotz, ibid.
6. See Harold Cruse, *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual* (New York: William Morrow, 1967).
7. Anthony D. Smith, *Nationalism in the Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Martin Robertson, 1979), p. 4.
8. See for example, James Turner, "Black Nationalism: The Inevitable Response," *Black World* (January 1971), pp. 5–13; Earl Ofari, "The Emergence of Black National Consciousness in America," *Black World* (January 1971), pp. 75–86; Rodney Carlisle, "Black Nationalism: An Integral Tradition," *Black World* (January 1973), pp. 4–11; Ronald Walters, "A Unifying Ideology: African-American Nationalism," *Black World* (October 1973), pp. 9–26; Freddie C. Colston, "The Ideology of Black Power: An Assessment," *The Western Journal of Black Studies*, vol. 3, no. 4 (Winter 1979), pp. 233–243; Aldon Douglas Morris, *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities Organizing for Change* (New York: Free Press, 1984); Gayle T. Tate, "Black Nationalism: An Angle of Vision," *The Western Journal of Black Studies*, vol. 12, no. 1 (1983), pp. 40–48.
9. See for example, Aldon D. Morris, ibid.; Manning Marable, *How Capitalism Underdeveloped Black America* (Boston: South End Press, 1983); James Geschwender, "An Introduction to the Black Revolt," in *The Black Revolt*, ed. J. Geschwender (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971); Rhoda Lois Blumberg, *Civil Rights: The 1960 Freedom Struggle* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1991).
10. John Breuilly, Peter Alter, and E. J. Hobsbawm define nationalism as a form of politics or a political program. Anthony D. Smith defines it as a cultural or a social movement. See John Breuilly, *Nationalism and the State* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987); E. J. Hobsbawm, "Ethnicity and Nationalism in Europe Today," *Anthropology*, vol. 8, no. 4 (1992); Anthony D. Smith, *National Identity* (Reno: The University of Nevada Press, 1991); Peter Alter, *Nationalism*, trans. Stuart Amckinnon-Evans (London: Edward Arnold, 1989).
11. See W. J. Moses, op. cit.
12. Blumberg states, "The aim of desegregation or integration . . . was not to foster intermarriage or social 'mixing' but to insure equal access to such basic rights as seats on buses, education, the vote, and fair trials when accused." Rhoda Lois Blumberg, op. cit., p. 2.
13. Anthony D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986), p. 157.
14. Walker Connor notes that "many diverse attitudes and goals are cloaked under the single rubric of black nationalism." Walker Connor, *Ethnonationalism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), p. 49.
15. August Meier and Elliot Rudwick, "Introduction," in *Black Protest Thought in the Twentieth Century* ed. A. Meier, E. Rudwick, and Francis L. Broderick (New York: Macmillan, 1985).
16. Clovis E. Semmes, *Cultural Hegemony and African American Development* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1992), p. 11.
17. Ibid.
18. Fishman states that African Americans "were denied [freedom and equality] by a rapacious colonial system of mercantile capitalism, which relied on the brutalities of the primitive accumulation of wealth backed up by ruthless armed action. This wealth played a strategic role in the amassing of capital for the rise of industrial capitalism." George Fishman, *The African American Struggle for Freedom and Equality* (New York: Garland, 1997), p. 3.
19. Sterling Stuckey, *Slave Culture: Nationalist Theory and the Foundations of Black America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), p. 3.

20. See Sterling Stuckey, *Slave Culture;* Barbara Jeanne Fields, *Slavery and Freedom on the Middle Ground: Maryland during the Nineteenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).

21. Quoted in Sterling Stuckey, ed. *The Ideological Origins of Black Nationalism* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1972), p. 8.

22. Immanuel Wallerstein, "The Construction of Peoplehood: Racism, Nationalism, Ethnicity," in *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities,* ed. Etienne Balibar and I. Wallerstein (London: Verso, 1988), p. 85.

23. Ibid., pp. 3, 4.

24. Ibid., p. 78.

25. Sterling Stucker, op. cit., p. 24.

26. See, for example, Newbell Niles Puckett, *Folk Beliefs of the Southern Negro* (New York: Dover, 1969); W. E. B. Du Bois, *Black Folk, Then and Now* (New York: Holt, 1939); Carter G. Woodson, *The African Background Outlined* (New York: Negro Universities Press, 1968; reprint of 1936 edition); Peter H. Wood, *Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina from 1670 through the Stono Rebellion* (New York: Knopf, 1974); Lorenzo Turner, *Africanisms in the Gullah Dialect* (New York: Arno Press, 1968; reprint of 1949 edition); Melville J. Herkovits, *The Myth of the Negro Past* (Boston: Beacon, 1958; originally published in 1941); Norman Whitten and John Szwed, eds. *Afro-American Anthropology: Contemporary Perspectives* (New York: Free Press, 1970); Sidney W. Mintz and Richard Price, *An Anthropological Approach to the Afro- American Past: A Caribbean Perspective* (Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues, 1976); Lawrence W. Levine, *Black Culture and Black Consciousness: Afro- American Folk Thought from Slavery to Freedom* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977); Winifred Vass, *The Bantu Speaking Heritage of the United States* (Los Angeles: UCLA, Center for Afro-American Studies, 1979); Robert Farris Thompson and Joseph Cornet, *The Four Moments of the Sun: Kongo Art in Two Worlds,* (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1981); R.F. Thompson, *Flash of the Spirit: African and Afro- American Art and Philosophy* (New York: Vintage Books, 1983); Roger D. Abrahams and John F. Szwed, eds. *After Africa* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1983); Charles Joyner, *Down by the Riverside: A South Carolina Slave Community* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984); Margaret Washington Creel, "*A Peculiar People": Slave Religion and Community-culture among the Gullas* (New York: New York University Press, 1988); Joseph E. Holloway, ed. *Africanisms in American Culture* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990).

27. See for example, Carter G. Woodson, op.cit.

28. See Beverly J. Robinson, "Africanisms and the Study of Folklore," in *Africanisms in American Culture,* ed. Joseph E. Holloway (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), pp. 211–224.

29. See for example, Lorenzo Turner, op. cit.; Winifred Vass, op. cit.; Molefi Kete Asante, "African Elements in African-American English," in *Africanisms in American Culture,* ed. Joseph Holloway, pp. 19–33.

30. Ibid.

31. See Norman Whitten and John Szwed, eds., op.cit.

32. Peter H. Wood, op. cit.

33. John Edward Philips, "The African Heritage of White America," in *Africanisms in American Culture,* pp. 225–239.

34. See Sterling Stuckey, ed. *The Ideological Origins of Black Nationalism,* p. 5.

35. Ibid.

36. Ibid., p. 48.

37. Quoted in Sterling Stuckey, "Through the Prism of Folklore: The Black ethos in Slavery," in *Massachusetts Review* 9 (Spring 1968), p. 427.

38. Joseph E. Holloway, op. cit., pp. xviii–xix.
39. Ibid., p. xix.
40. Ibid.
41. Ibid.
42. See Sterling Stuckey, ed., *The Ideological Origins of Black Nationalism*, pp. 198–200.
43. Joseph E. Holloway, op. cit., p. xx.
44. Sterling Stuckey, ed., op. cit., p. 198.
45. Clovis E. Semmes, op. cit., p. x.
46. Ibid., p. 2.
47. Ibid.
48. John W. Blassingame, *The Slave Community* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979).
49. Cited in Clovis E. Semmes, op. cit., p. 28, from Harold Cruse, *Crisis of the Negro Intellectual* (New York: William Morrow, 1967).
50. See Franz Fanon, *Black Skin and White Mask* (New York: Grove Press, 1967).
51. Clovis E. Semmes, op. cit., p. 8.
52. Ibid., pp. 3–6.
53. Ibid., p. 6.
54. Ibid., p. 12.
55. For details, see Amilcar Cabral, *Return to the Source* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1973).
56. Clovis E. Semmes, op. cit., p. 2.
57. Ibid., pp. xi, xiii.
58. Ibid., p. ix.
59. Sterling Stuckey, ed., *The Ideological Origins of Black Nationalism*, p. 6.
60. Ibid., pp. 13–14.
61. Ibid., p. 15.
62. Ibid., p. 12.
63. Clovis E. Semmes, op. cit., p. 15.
64. See George Washington William, *History of the Negro Race in America: From 1619 to 1880*, 2 vols. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1883); reprint, (New York: Bergman Publishers, 1968); Robert Alexander Young, "The Ethiopian Manifesto (1829)," in *The Ideological Origins of Black Nationalism*, ed. Sterling Stuckey, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1972), pp. 30–38; David Walker, "Walker's Appeal (1830)," in *The Ideological Origins of Black Nationalism*, pp. 39–117.
65. Sterling Stuckey, ed. *The Ideological Origins of Black Nationalism*, p. 7.
66. See Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Capitalist World-Economy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980); Walter Rodney, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa* (Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1972); Nathan Irvin Huggins, *Black Odyssey* (New York: Vintage Books, 1977); Stanley M. Elkins, *Slavery*, 2nd edition (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968).
67. See Ira Berlin, *Slaves Without Masters: The Free Negro in Antebellum South* (New York: The New Press, 1974).
68. Ibid., p. xiv.
69. W. H. McClendon, "The Foundations of Black Culture," in *The Black Scholar*, vol. 14, nos. 3 and 4 (Summer 1983), pp. 18–20.
70. Clovis E. Semmes, op. cit., p. P. 2.
71. See George Fishman, "The Ideology of Black Power."
72. See Maulana Karenga, *Introduction to Black Studies* (Inglewood: Kawaida Publications, 1982); John H. Clarke, "African Cultural Continuity and Slave Revolts in the New World, Part One and Two" in *The Black Scholar*, vol. 8, no. 1 (September 1976), pp. 41–49, vol. 8, no. 2 (October–November, 1976), pp. 2–9.
73. John H. Clarke, op. cit., p. 41.

74. Freddie C. Colston, op. cit., p. 234.
75. See Herbert Aptheker, "Additional Data on American Maroons," *Journal of Negro History*, vol. 32 (October 1947), pp. 452–460; Herbert Aptheker, "Maroons within the Present Limits of the United States," *Maroon Societies: Rebel Slave Communities in the Americas*, 2nd ed., ed. Richard Price (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1979); Bernard M. McCormack, *Slavery on the Tennessee Frontier*, ed. C. Kelly and Dan E. Pomeroy (Nashville: Tennessee American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, 1977); Gerald W. Mullin, *Flight and Rebellion: Slave Resistance in the Eighteenth-Century Virginia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972).
76. See George Fishman, op. cit., p. 70.
77. St. Clair Drake, "The American Negro: Relation to Africa," American Negro Leadership Conference on Africa (Proceedings of the Conference), Washington, D.C., January 15–30, 1967.
78. See Leon Litwack, *North of Slavery* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961).
79. See David R. Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class* (London: Verso, 1991).
80. See L. Litwack, op. cit.; W. J. Moses, op. cit.; Howard Brotz, op. cit.; L. Litwack and A. Meier, op. cit.
81. For further information, see Letitia Woods Brown, *Free Negroes in the District of Columbia, 1790–1846* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972); Luther Porter Jackson, *Free Negro Labor and Property Holding in Virginia, 1830–1860* (New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1942); John H. Franklin, *The Free Negro in North Carolina, 1790- 1860* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1943); Rhoda Golden Freeman, *The Free Negro in New York City in the Era before the Civil War* (New York: Garland, 1994); Graham Hodges, ed., *Studies in African American History and Culture* (New York: Garland, 1994); John Russell, *The Free Negro in Virginia* (New York: Negro University Press, 1969).
82. Rhoda Golden Freeman, ibid., p. 323.
83. John H. Bracey, August Meier, and Elliot Rudwick, *Black Nationalism* (New York: Bobbs-Merril, 1970).
84. Asafa Jalata, "Two Liberation Movements Compared." In colonial America, the difference between indentured White servants and African slaves was blurred since they worked side by side, and the work of the former and that of the latter was similar. The American Revolution brought White freedom and perpetuated Black slavery (except for a few Blacks who were emancipated). Poor Whites became freemen, full citizens and wage-earners. White workers were allowed to share public facilities, like schools and workplaces, with powerful Whites. They were allowed to be culturally and structurally assimilated into English culture despite their non-English national origin, and permitted to own property and to have political freedom. Then poor Whites gradually developed the ideology of Whiteness or racial superiority and gained psychological and material benefits by pushing down the weakest segment of American society, both freed and enslaved Blacks. White workers embraced the white supremacist ideology specifically after the American Revolution with the change in their position when they become wage workers. Roediger argues that "White labor does not just receive and resist racist ideas but embraces, adopts and, at times, murderously acts upon those ideas. The problem is not just that the white working class is at critical junctures manipulated into racism, but that it comes to think of itself and its interests as white." During slavery, African Americans were mainly controlled and dominated by the White plantation owners and after the abolition of slavery by White society and their institutions.
85. Richard F. America, *Paying the Social Debt: What White America Owes Black America* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1993), p. xi.
86. Jack M. Bloom, *Class, Race, and the Civil Rights Movement* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987), p. 22.

87. Julian B. Roebuck and Komanduri S. Murty, *Historically Black Colleges and Universities: Their Place in American Higher Education* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1993), p. 22.
88. E. Foner, *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863–1877* (New York: Harper & Row, 1988), p. 198.
89. Julian B. Roebuck and K. S. Murty, op. cit., pp. 22, 28.
90. See Frances Fox Piven and Richard Cloward, *Poor People's Moments* (New York: Pantheon, 1977); Jack M. Bloom, op. cit.
91. See Manning Marable, op. cit.; Julian B. Roebuck and K. S. Murty, op. cit.
92. See Manning Marable, *Race, Reform, and Rebellion: The Second Reconstruction in Black America, 1945–1990* 2nd ed.(Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1991.)
93. J. B. Roebuck and K. S. Murty, ibid., p. 23.
94. Ibid., pp. 24–25.
95. Ibid., p. 25.
96. Ibid., pp. 32–33.
97. Martin Luther King, Jr., op. cit., p. 23.
98. Those whose grandfathers voted would be allowed to vote. This was intended to allow all adult White males to vote and exclude Black men from voting since their grandfathers were slaves and never voted.
99. For details, see Alferdteen Harrison, ed., *Black Exodus: The Great Migration from the American South* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1991).
100. Nicholas Lemann, *The Promised Land: The Great Black Migration and How It Changed America* (New York: Vintage Books, 1992), p. 6.
101. Alferdteen Harrison, op. cit., p. viii.
102. Neil R. McMillen, "The Migration and Black Protest in Jim Crow Mississippi," in A. Harrison, *Black Exodus*, p. 86.
103. Nicholas Lemann, *The Promised Land*, p. 5.
104. Lennox Yearwood, "National Afro-American Organizations in Urban Communities," *Journal of Black Studies*, vol. 8, no. 4 (June 1978), pp. 432–34.
105. See for example, Winston James, *Holding Aloft Banner of Ethiopia* (New York: Verso, 1998).
106. See August Meier and Elliot Rudwick, "Introduction," *Black Protest Thought*, p.xix.
107. Kenneth B. Clark, *Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power* (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 11.
108. Nicholas Lemann, op.cit., p. 6.
109. Lennox Yearwood, op. cit., p. 424.
110. Anthony D. Smith, *National Identity*, p. 7.
111. Maulana Karenga, op. cit.
112. Nicholas Lemann, op. cit., p. 99.
113. James Turner, op. cit., p. 11.
114. See Clovis E. Semmes, op. cit.; S. Dale McLemore, *Racial and Ethnic Relations in America* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1991), pp. 52–54.
115. Quoted in Earl Ofari, op. cit., p. 83.
116. Bernard M. Magubane, *The Ties That Bind: African-American Consciousness of Africa* (Trenton, N.J.: Africa World Press, 1989), p. 55.
117. John H. Bracey, August Meier, and Elliot Rudwick, *Black Nationalism*, p.299.
118. See August Meier and Elliot Rudwick, "Introduction," *Black Protest Thought*, p. xix.
119. According to Alain Locke, "Up to the present one may adequately describe the Negro's 'inner objectives' as an attempt to repair a damaged group psychology and reshape a warped social perspective. Their realization has required a new mentality for the American Negro. And as it matures we begin to see its effects; at first, negative, iconoclastic, and then positive and constructive. In this new group psychology we note the lapse of sentimental appeal, then the development of a more positive self-respect and self-

reliance; the repudiation of social dependence, and then the gradual recovery from hyper-sensitiveness and 'touchy' nerves, the repudiation of the double standard of judgement with its special philanthropic allowances and then the sturdier desire for objective and scientific appraisal; and finally the rise from social disillusionment to race pride, from the sense of social debt to the responsibilities of social contribution . . . the belief in ultimate esteem and recognition." Alain Locke, "The New Negro: A 'Forced Attempt to Build . . . Americanism on Race Values," in *Black Nationalism in America*, ed. J. H. Bracey, A. Meier, and E. Rudwick, (New York: Bobbs-Merril, 1970), pp. 341–342.

120. Clovis E. Semmes, op. cit., p. 14.
121. H. R. Isaacs, *Idols of the Tribe: Group Identity and Political Change* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989), p. 69.
122. Manning Nash, *The Cauldron of Ethnicity* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1989).
123. Gayle T. Tate, "Black Nationalism," p. 45.
124. Amilcar Cabral, *Return to the Source*, pp. 42–43.
125. Gene Marine, *The Black Panthers* (New York: New American Library, 1986), p. 25.
126. Bernard M. Magubane, op. cit., p. 127.
127. Martin Luther King, Jr., op. cit., p. 33.
128. Nathan I. Huggins, *Harlem Renaissance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.)
129. Bernard M. Magubane, op. cit., p. 109.
130. Amritjit Singh, W. S. Shiver and S. Browdin, eds., *The Harlem Renaissance: Revaluations*, (New York: Garland, 1989), p. xi.
131. Nathan I. Huggins, op. cit., p. 14.
132. Ibid.; Arna W. Bontemps, *The Harlem Renaissance Remembered* (New York: Dodd and Mead, 1972).
133. Anthony D. Smith, *National Identity*, p. 99.
134. Nathan I. Huggins, op. cit., p. 305–306.
135. See Vincent Jubilee, "Philadelphia's Literary Circle and the Harlem Renaissance," in *The Harlem Renaissance: Revaluations*, p. 35.
136. See August Meier and Elliot Rudwick, "Introduction," *Black Protest Thought*, p. xxvi.
137. Anthony Oberschall, *Social Conflict and Social Movements* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973).
138. See A. Meier, Elliot Rudwick, and Francis L. Broderick, eds., *Black Protest Thought*, p. 59.
139. Ibid., p. xxvi.
140. Ibid., p. 42.
141. Ibid., p. 32.
142. August Meier and Elliot M. Rudwick, *From Plantation to Ghetto* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1966), p. 186.
143. August Meier, Elliot Rudwick, and Francis L. Broderick, eds., op. cit., p. 3.
144. Ibid.
145. Ibid., p. 5.
146. Ibid., p. 7.
147. Ibid., p. 178.
148. Ibid., p. 182.
149. August Meier and Elliot Rudwick, "Introduction," op. cit., p. xxv.
150. Ibid.
151. August Meier and Elliot M. Rudwick, *From Plantation to Ghetto*.
152. Aldon D. Morris, op. cit.
153. Ibid.
154. Ibid.
155. Manning Marable, *Race, Reform, and Rebellion*, p. 39.

156. See Shirley N. Weber, "Black Nationalism and Garveyist Influences," *The Western Journal of Black Studies,* Winter 1979, pp. 263–266.

157. Ibid., p. 264.

158. B. M. Magubane, op. cit., p. 96.

159. See August Meier and E. Rudwick, "Introduction," op. cit., p. xxxii.

160. E. Franklin Frazier, "The Garvey Movement," *Making of Black America,* ed. August Meier and Elliot Rudwick (New York: Atheneum, 1969), p. 207.

161. James Farmer, *Lay Bare the Heart: An Autobiography of the Civil Rights Movement* (New York: Arbor House, 1985).

162. Ibid.

163. Aldon D. Morris, *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement,* pp. 28–30.

164. Ibid.

165. Ibid., pp. 54–55.

166. Martin Luther King, Jr., *Strength to Love* (New York: Pocket Books, 1964), p. 14.

167. Ibid.; Martin Luther King, Jr., *Where Do We Go From Here: Chaos or Community?*(New York: Harper & Row, 1967), p. 96; *Stride Toward Freedom* (New York: Perennial Library, 1964), p. 185.

168. See Ira G. Zepp, Jr., *The Social Vision of Martin Luther King, Jr.* (New York: Carlson, 1989).

169. See Patricia Hill Collins, *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and Politics of Empowerment* (New York: Unwin Hyman, 1990).

170. August Meier and E. Rudwick, "Introduction," p. xx.

171. Ibid.

172. Martin Luther King, Jr., *Why We Can't Wait* (New York: A Mentor Book), p. 111.

173. Martin Luther King, Jr., "A Testament of Hope," *Playboy,* January 1969, p. 234.

174. Martin Luther King, Jr., *Negro History Bulletin,* May 1968, p. 15.

175. Quoted in Ira G. Zepp, Jr., op. cit., p. 213.

176. Martin Luther King, Jr., "The Rising Tide of Racial Consciousness," *The YWCA Magazine,* December 1960.

177. Jack M. Bloom, op. cit., p. 143.

178. Martin Luther King, Jr., *Why We Can't Wait,* p. 112.

179. Robert Allen, *Reluctant Reformers: Racism and Social Reform Movements in the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1983), p. 323.

180. Martin Luther King, Jr., "The Last Major Political Speeches of Martin Luther King and Eldridge Cleaver," *The Black Politician,* July 1969, p. 4.

181. See Ira G. Zepp, Jr., *The Social Vision of Martin Luther King, Jr.,* p. 54.

182. Martin Luther King, Jr., "A Testament of Hope," p. 231.

183. See Arnold Schuchter, *White Power and Black Freedom: Planning the Future of Urban America* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968), p. 569.

184. Martin Luther King, Jr., "Honoring Dr. Du Bois," *Freedom Ways,* Spring 1968, pp. 110–111.

185. Manning Marable, *Race, Reform, and Rebellion,* p. 105.

186. Ibid., p. 113.

187. Eric C. Lincoln, *The Black Muslims in America* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1961), p. 98.

188. Ibid.; E. U. Essien-Udom, *Black Nationalism: A Search for an Identity in America* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962).

189. Manning Marable, *Race, Reform, and Rebellion,* p. 92.

190. Robert Allen, op. cit., p. 322.

191. William W. Sales, Jr., *From Civil Rights to Black Liberation: Malcolm X and the Organization of Afro-American Unity* (Boston: South End Press, 1994), p. 42.

192. Manning Marable, *Race, Reform, and Rebellion,* p. 55.

193. Quoted in William W. Sales, *From Civil Rights to Black Liberation,* p. 80.

194. Malcolm X, "Ballot or Bullet," in *Malcolm X Speaks* (New York: Grove Press, 1966); Stokely Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton, *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America* (New York: Vintage Books, 1967).

195. William W. Sales, *From Civil Rights to Black Liberation*, p. 21.

196. Quoted in George Breitman, ed. *Malcolm X Speaks* (New York: Grove Press, 1965), p. 172.

197. Jack M. Bloom, op. cit.

198. Ibid., p. 187.

199. "Preamble, Statement of the Basic Aims and Objectives of the OAAU," in George Breitman, *The Last Year of Malcolm X: The Evolution of a Revolutionary* (New York: Merit, 1967), pp. 105–106.

200. Ibid., p. 90.

201. Ibid., p. 43.

202. Ibid.

203. Ibid., p. 45.

204. Ibid., p. 73.

205. See Ishmael Reed, "Preface," in Eldridge Cleaver, *Soul on Ice* (New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell, 1968), p. xiii; M. S. Handler, "Introduction," *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*, with the assistance of Alex Haley (New York: Ballantine Books, 1965), p. xii.

206. Quoted in August Meier, Elliot Rudwick, and Francis L. Broderick, op. cit., p. 469.

207. See Emily Stoper, *The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee: The Growth of Radicalism in a Civil Rights Organization* (New York: Carlson, 1989); Clayborne Carson, *In Struggle: SNCC and the Black Awakening of the 1960s* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981).

208. Clayborne Carson, ibid., p. 215.

209. Emily Stoper, op. cit., p. 121.

210. Ibid.

211. Clayborne Carson, op. cit., p. 198.

212. See A. Meier, E. Rudwick, and F. L. Broderick, op. cit., p. 491.

213. Clayborne Carson, ibid., p. 509.

214. Gene Marine, *The Black Panthers*, p. 23.

215. Ibid., pp. 35–36.

216. G. Louis Heath, ed. *The Black Panthers Leaders Speak* (Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, 1976).

217. William W. Sales, Jr., op. cit., p. 99.

218. Manning Marable, *Race, Reform, and Rebellion*, p. 93.

219. Robert Allen, op. cit., p. 321.

220. See Roger Wilkins, "The Underside of Black Progress," in *Race and Ethnic Relations 91/92*, ed. John A. Kromkowski (Guilford: The Dushkin Publishing Group, 1991).

221. August Meier and E. M. Rudwick, op. cit., p. 252.

222. Alphonso Pinkney, *The Myth of Black Progress* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), p. 1.

223. J. D. Kasarda, "Caught in the Web of Change," in *Readings on Social problems*, W. Feigelman, ed. (Orlando.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1990), p. 223.

224. Roger Wilkins, "The Underside of Black Progress," p.127.

Chapter III

1. Quoted in Mohammed, "The Macha-Tulama Association 1963–1967 and the Development of Oromo Nationalism," in *Oromo Nationalism and the Ethiopian Discourse: The Search for Freedom and Democracy*, edited by A. Jalata (Lawrenceville, N.J.: The Red Sea Press, 1998), p. 278.