

THE **BLACK** SCHOLAR

THE
CULTURE
OF
REVOLUTION:

ADOTEVI
CARMICHAEL
CHRISMAN
CLEAVER
HARE
JONES
KILLENS
TOURÉ

THE BLACK SCHOLAR has been born out of the struggle of black scholars, black intellectuals, black leaders — all black people — for an education that will provide meaningful definitions of black existence.

So born, **THE BLACK SCHOLAR** is the first journal of black studies and research in this country.

We recognize that we must re-define our lives. We must shape a culture, a politics, an economics, a sense of our past and future history. We must recognize what we have been and what we shall be, retaining that which has been good and discarding that which has been worthless.

THE BLACK SCHOLAR shall be the journal for that definition. In its pages, black ideologies will be examined, debated, disputed and evaluated by the black intellectual community. Articles which research, document and analyze the black experience will be published, so that theory is balanced with fact, and ideology with substantial information.

We cannot afford division any longer if our struggle is to bear fruit, whether those divisions be between class, caste or function. Nothing black is alien to us.

A black scholar recognizes this fact. He is a man of both thought and action, a whole man who thinks for his people and acts with them, a man who honors the whole community of black experience, a man who sees the Ph.D., the janitor, the businessman, the maid, the clerk, the militant, as all sharing the same experience of blackness, with all its complexities and its rewards.

THE BLACK SCHOLAR is the journal for such a man. It is your journal. Support it.

THEBLACKSCHOLAR

Staff

Publisher Nathan Hare
Editor Robert Chrisman
Coordinator Allan Ross
Production B. W. Friendly
Promotion Julia Reed
Circulation T. B. Smith
Advertising Victoria Barnes

Journal of Black Studies and Research

Volume I Number 1 November 1969

Contributing and Advisory Editors

Andrew Billingsley, Ph.D.
*Assistant Chancellor for Academic Affairs,
University of California, Berkeley*

J. Herman Blake, Ph.D.
*Department of Sociology,
University of California, Santa Cruz*

Dolores Cayou
*Secretary, Black Faculty Union,
San Francisco State College*

Price Cobbs, M.D.
*Department of Psychiatry,
University of California Medical Center*

Emory Douglass
Minister of Culture, Black Panther Party

Herman Ferguson
Minister of Education, Republic of New Africa

Carlton Goodlett, M.D., Ph.D.
Publisher, The Sun-Reporter

Charles V. Hamilton, Ph.D.
Professor of Political Science, Columbia University

Vincent Harding, Ph.D.
Institute of the Black World

Milton Henry, LL.B.
Detroit, Michigan

Maulana Ron Karenga
Founder-Chairman, US

John O. Killens
Creative Writing, Columbia University

Joyce A. Ladner, Ph.D.
Institute of the Black World, Atlanta, Georgia

Don L. Lee
*Black Writer in Residence,
Northeastern Illinois State College*

Acklyn Lynch
*Department of Social Science
Federal City College, Washington, D.C.*

Floyd McKissick, LL.B.
President, McKissick Enterprises, New York

Gerald McWorter, Ph.D.
Social Theoretician, Chicago

Alvin F. Poussaint, M.D.
Department of Psychiatry, Harvard University

Sonia Sanchez
Black Studies Program, University of Pittsburgh

Chuck Stone
John T. Dorrance Professor, Trinity College

Jesse Taylor
*Department of Black Studies,
San Francisco State College*

James Turner, Ph.D.
Director, Afroamerican Studies, Cornell University

Sid Walton
*Principal, Martin Luther King School,
Sausalito, California*

Preston Wilcox
*Chairman, National Association of
Afroamerican Educators*

A. Cecil Williams
*Minister of Involvement and Celebration,
Glide Urban Center*

Contents

- 2 NATHAN HARE
A Report on the Pan African Cultural Festival
- 11 SÉKOU TOURÉ
A Dialectical Approach to Culture
- 27 STANISLAS ADOTEVI
The Strategy of Culture
- 36 STOKELY CARMICHAEL
Pan-Africanism — Land and Power
- 44 ELDRIDGE CLEAVER
Education and Revolution
- 54 IMAMU AMEER BARAKA (LEROI JONES)
A Black Value System
- 61 JOHN O. KILLENS
The Artist in the Black University
- 66 ROOSEVELT JOHNSON
Black Administrators and Higher Education
- 77 ROBERT CHRISMAN
The Crisis of Harold Cruse

The Black Scholar is published monthly, except July and August, by The Black World Foundation, a non-profit educational organization. All editorial correspondence should be addressed to Box 31245, San Francisco, Calif. 94131. All subscription correspondence should be addressed to Box 908, Sausalito, Ca. 94965. Phone (415) 332-3152. Subscription rates: \$10 per year, \$25 for 3 years; single copies \$1.25. Foreign rates on request. Second class privileges applied for in Sausalito, Calif. 94965. Copyright 1969. All rights, including translation into other languages, reserved by *The Black Scholar*.

ALGIERS 1969

A REPORT ON THE PAN-AFRICAN CULTURAL FESTIVAL

by NATHAN HARE

NATHAN HARE was the first coordinator of a black studies program in the country. He is on the Advisory Council of the National Conference on Black Power, where most recently he was Chairman of the Education Committee. Hare has written some sixty articles and *The Black Anglo Saxons* (to enter its second printing in December). He received the Ph.D. in sociology from the University of Chicago and is an active member of the New York Academy of Sciences. He is publisher of THE BLACK SCHOLAR.

THERE WAS A BATTLE IN ALGIERS in late July, with lighter skirmishes both old and new, and emerging signs of struggle which now lurk ready to boomerang around the world in the years (and months) to come. The troops came together, African generals and footsoldiers in the war of words and politics that splashed against the calm waters of the Mediterranean Sea — in the First Pan African Cultural Festival — from everywhere in greater numbers than ever before; from San Francisco to Senegal, from Dakar to the District of Columbia.

The conflict was over which course a potentially unified Africa could take toward national and continental liberation, particularly the role of culture in the struggle for liberation and in social and economic development. Which, in the context of things, revolves in some presently intransigent way around the relationship of black and white revolutionaries. Though antagonists centered their fire on the question of culture, the battle was recognized all around as “98 per cent political,” and clearly hinged at last in long and passionate debate, private and public, over the future direction of the struggle for liberation on the continent and, indeed, the entire world.

HUNDREDS OF DELEGATES came from thirty-one independent African countries and representatives from six movements for African liberation, from Palestine to Angola-Mozambique and the Congo-Brazzaville. And there were Black Panthers and “black cubs” and old lions from the American contingent. Secretly exiled Eldridge Cleaver chose this occasion to reveal his whereabouts, and expatriated Stokely Carmichael came with his South African-exiled wife, Miriam Makeba. Kathleen had her baby during the Festival, and there was Panther Minister of Culture, Emory Douglass, international jazz artists, such as Nina Simone and Archie Shepp, and Julia Hervre (the late Richard Wright’s daughter now living in Paris).

Leroi Jones (whose passport had been held up) could not get over, but there

were: the serious and quietly charismatic young poet, Don L. Lee; Carmichael lieutenants, Courtland Cox and Charlie Cobb; Panther Chief of Staff, David Hilliard, who had to return to the United States before the festival was over to take care of a crisis with Chicago police; and the compassionate black Parisian poet, Ted Joans. There were many young black Americans who had not been invited, but who had cared enough to piece together their own fare; including Oakland’s Harriet Smith, who, as of this writing, is still in Africa traveling and lecturing.

Hoyt Fuller of *Negro Digest* was there. He had been also in attendance at the Dakar Festival of 1966 and seemed particularly struck by the contrast in the type of black Americans at the two festivals. Dakar had collected the most well-known artists and entertainers, the Duke Ellingtons and the like; Algiers had attracted the new breed young militant whether those of fame, those on the rise, or those yet to begin the making of their names. Students, of course, also came, notably from San Francisco State College, and others around the world (including Stokely’s chief aide now studying sociology in Europe whose name oddly slips me at the moment though I got to know and like him well enough before I left to give him my favorite dashiki) and ex-patriated young Americans from Paris, some of whose names I never knew. Like their African counterparts, they had journeyed in search of new hopes for freedom to a most appropriate place, Algiers, Algeria—most famous in recent times for the revolutionary overthrow of a major oppressive power.

ALGIERS, the adopted home of the late black Martinique psychiatrist, Frantz Fanon, stands mysteriously like a quaint and complex ant hill — almost inhuman in its architectural and natural beauty — overlooking the Mediterranean at the apex of the continent of Africa, the “cradle of civilization.” On the first night of the Festival, its streets were filled with multi-colored balloons floating against the background of

a gaily illuminated sky, as twenty African countries came through in a parade. Guinea was the most applauded, but there was fellowship and entertainment for all, from Guinean ballet to restrained dancing in the streets.

The next day saw a somewhat different Algiers, and what has been achieved since the revolution, not all of it yet so good. The air of celebration continued, but daylight revealed, in at least one major section, project housing tenements as dilapidated as any in the United States. Esso service stations appeared, and Shell, and Hertz, and Pepsi Cola (and company); and the French colonialists slipping back in predatory droves.

Some say that the weakening of cultural resistance has increased Algerian susceptibility to the re-entry of the French and American imperialists. And so, there are signs of Algerian resistance again on the ready: revolutionary graffiti in large people's scrawl on buildings, walls and fences, and, particularly, the old pre-revolutionary symbol of resistance, the *haik* (or veil) worn by so many of the women. Most of the men, by contrast, dress in European attire, but they also are infused with revolutionary fervor. Besides,

In the colonialist program it was the woman who was given the historic mission of shaking up the Algerian man. Converting the woman, winning her over to the foreign values, wrenching her free from her status, was at the same time achieving a real power over the man and attaining a practical, effective means of deconstructing Algerian culture.¹

With the onslaught of resistance, the woman returns to her traditional values, retreating into the irrevocable sanctuary of her old society's values, reversing her role in the colonialist program.

AND YET, Algerian leaders today seem rather more concerned with the pitfalls of cultural attachment on the part of oppressed peoples. They lambasted the ultra-devotion of many black intellectuals to jazz music and black art and other forms of "folkloric prestige," and denounced African

intellectuals who are likewise so fascinated, who fail to visualize a certain solution for the present, and hold on to the "reactionary theory of negritude and the excessive cult of a revolutionary past. If Africans must lean on their past, this is not to regret a lost paradise but to recover it in order to assert it fully today."²

This was conspicuously a view shared by Libyans and other Arabic and "white African" nations.³ Even the most universal-minded black leaders and intellectuals seemed much less afraid of any dire effects of black African nationalism, though a debate raged throughout the symposium and the Festival between the more revolutionary black Africans and the proponents of "Negritude"—more about that later.

The revolutionary leader from Angola-Mozambique, for example, was unequivocal. He spoke in a calm but emotional voice, without benefit of any notes, saying that the liberal colonizer always comes over, at just the moment when oppressed black nations are achieving a takeoff in revolutionary consciousness, to introduce the duality of white-black collaboration,⁴ thus prolonging the debate and dividing the forces of the oppressed.⁵

The representative from Mozambique went on to concede that these endeavors on the part of the liberal colonizer are all all right on the surface, in theory, but that a revolutionary needs a singularity of purpose and has not enough time to wrestle with the problems of assimilating his struggle. However, he also emphasized that culture must be built around struggle. He was

1. Frantz Fanon, *A Dying Colonialism*, tr. by Haakon Chevalier, New York: Grove Press, 1967, p. 39.

2. "Quand tous les africains se donnent la main," *Algerie Actualite*, semaine du 20 au 26 juillet 1969, p. 22.

3. Fanon has written of the latent revival of racial feelings between black and white Africa. "Africa is divided into Black and White, and the names that are substituted — Africa South of the Sahara, Africa North of the Sahara — do not manage to hide this latent racism." See *The Wretched of the Earth*, New York: Grove Press, Evergreen Edition (tr. by Constance Farrington), p. 161.

4. In this regard, he corroborates the observation of a Marxist Tunisian, Albert Memmi, "The Colonizer who Refused," *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, New York: Orion Press, 1965.

5. Stokely Carmichael also has written recently on the way liberal oppressors tend to "represent the liaison between . . . the oppressed and the oppressor." See the pamphlet on *The Pitfalls of Liberalism*, undated but current.

one of the most applauded speakers in the conference, though he was not alone. From the Vice President of the Revolutionary Council of Congo-Brazzaville also came the view that

African culture is a culture of combat, a culture which is forged in affronting the same problems, in having the same cares. It is necessary for us to surpass that which is congealed. We believe in and want to march forward toward modernism.

But the most persistent assertion that revolution is technical and economic, and must encompass and connect itself very closely with scientific rationality and economic and scientific discoveries, came from the Algerian delegation, echoed once or twice by a Russian delegation which was, of course, not an official participant in the symposium. The Algerian leaders went so far as to say that technique opposes culture and that whole civilizations have been sterilized by their failure to appreciate that one simple fact. While struggling for liberation, a people must "not give up self but it must listen to the world."

Yet black delegates such as the one from Dahomey spiritedly offered a similar appreciation of the ideal of progress, fearing that there otherwise might result a "freezing of action and ideology."⁶ The most applauded speaker of the entire symposium, he held on the one hand that "there can be no people without a culture," but in the selfsame breath also insisted that "there is no society which does not change."

ON THE PROPELLOR OF PROGRESS, Africa is priming itself for change, some cultural, some scientific and otherwise. One hundred and twenty delegates representing more than twenty-five countries met one day and held a symposium to study peaceful uses of atomic energy for the economic development of their countries, particularly in the area of agriculture. They further planned a ceremony for laying the first stone of a "regional nuclear center."⁷

Swinging the pendulum, white (or Arab) Africans, while expressing apprehensions that revolutionary black Africans might get

entrapped by cultural nationalism, also recognized progressive uses of culture as an instrument for liberation instead of a crutch — and more about that later. For the moment, Libya, which spends 27% of its budget on education (the highest in the world) has, since independence, set up many cultural centers, about sixty centers now (libraries, theaters, several theatrical troupes and institutes for music, including folk troupes and folk studies toward developing national folk art). The purpose of such cultural centers, in the words of the Libyan delegate, is "to raise national consciousness."

CONFLICTS OVER CULTURE similarly gripped black Americans and was ostensibly at the heart of the Stokely-Eldridge split, which troubled them so much more. Some had come to the Festival in part to help resolve or at least to understand that cleavage first hand. Only two or three of them, out of the dozens there, regularly attended the symposium at the Palace of Nations — for one thing the taxi fare was eight dollars round trip — unless you had unlikely access to a car. However, the Panthers, who had a car, did not attend the symposia, concentrating instead on a back-to-the-people campaign with the Algerian populace through "Afro-American Cultural Center" programs and the press while Stokely courted the African revolutionaries and Festival delegates.

I got the impression that both succeeded rather well in what they were trying to do, that they were trying to attain fundamentally the same objectives — the liberation for our people — but along routes that were worlds apart. They appeared, therefore, to have divided up and made a pact at least on their turf. I never saw Stokely at the Afro-American Center and I never saw Eldridge at the Palace of Nations. Even at the registration center, I

6. See *A Dictionary of the Social Sciences*, Free Press of Glencoe, 1964, p. 544-45, for a discussion of the relationship between the growth of belief in the idea of progress and revolutionary advances in scientific inquiry. See also Frantz Fanon, *The Algerian War and Man's Liberation*, in *Toward the African Revolution*, tr. by Haakon Chevalier, New York: Grove Press, 1967, pp. 144-49.

7. *El moudjahid*, 29 juillet, 1969, p. 1.

noted that the Panthers and most of their aides were housed in the Hotel Alletti while what Panthers call the "cultural nationalists" (a term now too loaded to have clear meaning) were in the Hotel St. George.

Within hours after my arrival, I was seated at an outdoor dining table when Eldridge appeared and greeted me. Though I knew Kathleen, I had never actually met Eldridge before. He told of the Afro-American Cultural Center and invited me to drop by. I would of course be pleased to do so. Eldridge then left my table; and, when I finally got up to go, I saw him and Stokely sitting in a very private and serious huddle. They appeared as old friends — or better yet, as estranged spouses — in a deliberately subdued quarrel. I said hello to Stokely as I passed by, having known him as a student at Howard University in the days of the passive resistance movement, and soon fell into conversation with some other black Americans. Some while later Stokely came up and invited me to the table where Makeba and a portion of their entourage were seated. I asked him what he was up to these days and he responded in a way that most black Americans over there found convincing, especially as they grew alienated from the Panthers, largely because of the prominence and arrogance of the whites in the Panther operations. This included the Afro-American Cultural Center, which some black Americans eventually came to call "the Panther Lair." The other black Americans complained of Panther hostility and distance, and the Panthers complained that the black Americans did not frequent the Center, usually overflowing with Algerian enthusiasts from the street. The relationship of black Americans and the Panthers was changing for the better in the last days of the Festival, but it had started too late to do much good.

Like most black Americans, I, too, had come with some hope of unifying those two forces within our struggle, though being more familiar than most with the deep and far-reaching sources of the split, some of which will be explored later, I was con-

siderably less optimistic. But I, too, had some missing links to connect and was pleased to have, in any case, an essential firsthand communication. Though revolutionaries not accustomed to the search for a middle ground, most black Americans seemed totally caught off guard and, when their repeated efforts merely to get the two together for a subsequent talk continued to fall through, became quite naturally dismayed. They expressed strong fears of a coming "blood bath" within the movement. Some soon discovered and complained that there is "no middle ground anymore."

THE SEARCH FOR GROUND (or "land") is just what separates Eldridge, a "Marxist-Leninist" who stresses class above color, from Stokely, who believes the matter one of "both class and color" and hopes to obtain a land base for black Americans by helping to get Nkrumah back to Ghana. This land-base would then have the same relationship to black Americans as Israel now has to American Jews. In contrast to Eldridge, Stokely chooses the Palestine liberation movement over Israel, Africa over the Third World, and Peking over Moscow. It is not easy to subsume such far-reaching matters under the umbrella of culture alone.

And so, it was inevitable that all factions of the black American contingent, like the African delegation, would relate to culture in an ambivalent way. One instance took place at a panel discussion put on by the Panthers at the Afro-American Cultural Center. I was to have been a participant but was away from the hotel all day attending the Festival symposium and missed the message left there for me. Later I did obtain a complete tape of the panel discussion, which was kicked off by Emory Douglass, Minister of Culture for the Black Panther Party. Emory early asserted that the only culture worth keeping is a revolutionary culture and denounced "cultural nationalism" as a bourgeois concept. The Panthers were popular with the young Algerians who seemed considerably to ad-

mire black Americans in general. We soon learned to say "pouvoir noir" (black power) to taxi-drivers, who could tell, from our skin color and French, that we were black Americans. Thus we could avoid otherwise frequent overcharging, or even obtain a long free ride.

Anyway, Eldridge Cleaver spoke, and the dialogue began. He began by telling of a call that morning from Black Panther Chairman Bobby Seale about harassment and persecution of fellow Panthers back home, invited dialogue and sat down.

Then a young Algerian stood and engaged Eldridge in a long debate. He was careful to point out that he had not come to denigrate the Black Panthers but wanted to raise, for clarification, "some questions of principles." It was his view that the Panthers should shun participation in "the world of publicity" and the "cult of personality." He further was disturbed by Panther program item #6 — which reads: "We want all black men to be exempt from military service" — on grounds that it excluded other persons in the United States who may oppose the war. Cleaver defended on grounds that, though they knew that persons and categories other than blacks are oppressed in the United States, the Panther program was being addressed specifically to blacks, that "we not only have to attack and fight against capitalism but also against the specific policy of racism they used against us." The young Algerian then cautioned against falling into "the trap that's been set for us" by the oppressors. Then the interpreter, Julia Hervre, daughter of the late Richard Wright, spoke "just for once" on her own.

I want to talk to you about Malcolm X, about a trip he made to Ghana and about an interview he gave to the Algerian ambassador to Ghana, who asked him to explain the situation in the United States, which he did. The Ambassador then asked him this question: 'You see, Malcolm, I suffered; you see, Malcolm, I struggled; and I was hurt. But after having struggled and waged the battle, you still looked at me as a white man. Where, Malcolm, do I stand in your theory of black revolution?' [applause] 'You see, Ambassador,' Malcolm replied — and this has never been

published but should in actual fact be published — he replied, 'I've been on this continent now for three or four months and it is the first time that I have no longer used a very narrow terminology of black nationalism.' And that is why we today of the Black Panther Party who wish to be spiritual heirs to Malcolm X, no longer use the narrow term 'black nationalism.'

The Algerian spokesman then ended the exchange by saying that his group supports the struggle of the black people in the United States, of all people there "struggling against the capitalist system," commended the courage of the Black Panthers against police oppression, and explained again that the questions had only been raised to "clarify what the real situation in that country is and the programs of the black organizations represented" on the round-table panel.

The questions he raised and the panelists' commentary reflected the current groping among revolutionaries and other oppressed persons in America and around the world for a solution to their plight. And it was also apparent that there exists no ideological clarity on anybody's part.

HAD IT NOT BEEN for the strictly formalized structure and policies of the symposia held by the Organization of African Unity, which was sponsoring the Festival, the exchanges in the Palace of Nations most surely would have been more spirited and, frequently I am afraid, considerably less friendly. There the roots of conflict stretch farther back through the years and, to some extent, had generational overtones, or at least reflected the anachronisms of at least two eras, fired by further division between conformist and revolutionist.

The crucial debate in the Palace of Nations was that of the future, if any, of Negritude.⁸ In Algeria the debate was kicked off by leading Negritude theoretician, Leopold Senghor, who, rising above the confines of Negritude itself, as well as its fellow traveler, Arabity, contended that

8. For a discussion of the conflict over Negritude in the early years of the Organization of African Unity, see B. Bourtros-Ghali, "La personnalite africaine," *L'Organisation de l'Unité Africaine*, Paris: Librairie Armand Colin, 1969, pp. 28-64.

"Africinity" is the thing which "cuts across the Festival . . . the perennial dialogue between Arabo-Berber and Negro-Africans, it is the symbiosis of two complementary ethnicities." He supported his view with laudatory accounts of how ancient Africa gave birth to the first human beings, its high civilizations, and harked back to the classical monuments of ancient Egypt.

He was not long in coming under attack. Sékou Touré, who believes that the class war has been weakened by some efforts to set forth the idea of cultural pluralism, warned fellow African leaders of whatever rank, who would lead their people to a just combat, never to permit the "false concepts of Negritude" to guide them.⁹ The pitfalls of Negritude were once analyzed at length by the late Frantz Fanon, and he was much alive in the debate in Algiers, where he is highly revered indeed, with a college, a street and other entities now bearing his name. Cab drivers and waiters can quote and cling to his words. There was a long feature story on him and a photo in the daily paper during the festival.

Fanon, recognizing stages in the development of the revolutionary intellectual, placed Negritude in the second stage, as a reaction against the first stage of revolution, and which typically hampered the revolutionary's leap into the third, the stage of actual combat. Negritude, on the contrary, permitted an escape into excessive glorification of the past and the traditional, both in terms of values and in costumes worn and general way of life; so that one found difficulty in incorporating the techniques of the present and the future or in turning them effectively against the oppressor. At that point in the confrontation, Negritude contrarily becomes a literature of mysticism. Fanon's point of view was echoed by many black African delegates to the Algerian Festival.¹⁰

Stanislas Adotevi, the delegate from Dahomey, established a "theory of melanism" on grounds that there is no culture separated from life, that the battle for culture is the battle for political life.¹¹ Fanon too, for his part, had pointed out in his

early work that a "true culture" of oppressed peoples "could not come to life" under oppressed conditions, that the fetters would have to be withdrawn before the true attainments of a culture could be known.¹²

Those critical of Negritude looked to culture as an ideological weapon, pointing to the failure of Negritude up to now in the seizure of African consciousness. The concept, in their view, amounted to a collaboration with colonialism, leaving the matter of oppression and liberation in the realm of mystification, hostile therefore to even the cultural development of Africa. From Tanzania came the view that it is "impossible to develop an African culture without freedom."¹³

A Haitian poet now living in Cuba also took up the cry against Negritude, praising the delegates from the Congo-Brazzaville, Guinea, Algeria and the various revolutionary movements for taking similar stands. He summarized the search for identity in the formula: "We make the revolution, therefore we exist." And he pointed to his fatherland, Haiti, as well as a number of African countries, for examples of Negritude-oriented dictators who themselves were enemies of liberation. "Negritude also will be revolutionary," he concluded, "or it will not be."¹⁴

There was conflict, however, in the minds of some revolutionary African leaders who wished not to discard the glories of their people's troubled past yet longed to move ahead into a new generation of black men on the rise. The solution for them, as in the case of the vice-president of the Revolutionary Council of the Congo-Brazzaville, was "to take the best" from both their own

9. *El moudjahid*, 23 juillet 1969, p. 2.

10. See "On National Culture," *The Wretched of the Earth*, tr. by Constance Farrington, New York: Grove Press, Evergreen Edition, 1968, pp. 206-248.

11. *El moudjahid*, 27-28 Juillet 1969, p. 7.

12. *Black Skin, White Mask*, tr. by Charles Lam Markmann, New York: Grove Press, 1967, p. 187.

13. Cf Fanon, *Ibid*.

14. *El moudjahid*, 29 juillet 1969, p. 3. See Mohamed Aziz Lahbabi, *Liberté ou libération?*, Paris: Aubier, 1956, for an analysis of the frequent conflicts between liberty and liberation.

past and the modern world and "leave the rest behind."

After all was said and done by the younger critics of Negritude, the Minister of Education and Culture of Senegal angrily rebutted the attacks. He freely admitted his fears that the "cultural" symposium might run the risk of becoming a "political forum." He admitted as well that "we Africans must move beyond the stage where we go on stating that our culture does exist" and observed that "some aspects of the culture under question will change as objective conditions change." But he was adamant no less in his tenacious allegation that there is indeed a "geography of Negritude" in that ". . . Negroes are distinguished by certain particularities and values by which they live wherever they are found." He was applauded when he offered support for Palestine and said that Negritude does not prevent Libyans, Algerians, and others from participating in African Unity.

AN EXCEPTION was made for a representative of the Palestinian Movement (Al Fat'h) who, though not a member of the Organization of African Unity, was allowed to speak. He was greeted by heavy applause when he came to the stand. He held that there are only two worlds – colonialism and tyranny as against the forces of freedom. To him Africa is more than a continent; in fact, it is on the same political map with Palestine. He charged that Britain and Zionist forces have united against his people exactly as the imperialists have done in Rhodesia and South Africa. On another occasion he had suggested that Russia too, because of the white alliance, is in concert with and happy over the state of Israel. Britain, in his analysis, is protecting Ian Smith just as the United States is protecting Israel, because economic relationships with South Africa and Israel led to close relationships in all aspects.¹⁵

African brothers, our story, Palestine, is your story in Africa. They came to our country as the white racists came to yours; and we tried, as you have tried, to live with them

in the same state, under the emblem of law and peace. But they want, as the white minority in Africa, to establish a purely racist regime to our detriment.

This kindled the revolutionary sentiments among the African delegates as they returned to cultural considerations. A number of them had already endorsed the necessity for armed struggle; and the delegate from Tanzania was only one of those to win applause when he remarked that "freedom will only be won by the gun and the bullet."

THE FLAMES OF REVOLUTION were hotter still in the hearts of the Pan African Movement for Youth. Early in the Festival, the youth had been rather suspicious of their revolutionary elders and took pains at once to see "that solutions [coming out of the Festival] conform to the aspirations of the youth." They watched impatiently the too-ready acceptance of neo-colonialist domination and imperialist aggression on Africa's immense land and riches. And they spoke of a new resistance on the rise to "parry and thrust" against colonial conspiracies "on the military, political and economic plane rather more than on the cultural."

In the end their Executive Committee held a press conference and "condemned the attempt at secession in Africa and congratulated those governments working for national unity and socio-economic promotion of their people."¹⁶ They also saluted armed struggle for national liberation wherever it is occurring, denounced aid given by NATO and other imperialist powers to preserve the status quo, and urged moral pressure from African states and progressive peoples around the world against imperialist powers to force them to halt imperialistic aid to oppressive governments.

Support was reiterated for the peoples of Angola, Guinee-Bissao and Isles of Cape

15. The issue of Zionist aggression was raised in O.A.U. affairs (by Gamal Abdel Nasser, the Conference of Casablanca) as early as 1961. Bourtros-Ghali, op. cit., pp. 83, 84.

16. *El Moudjahid*, 31 juillet 1969, p. 1.

Verde, Mozambique, Naibie, South Africa, Zimbabwe and the United Arab Republic. They saluted the revolutionary and liberal movements in the Sudan and bestowed condemnation on attempts to overthrow progressive regimes in Africa, notably in the Sudan and in Guinea. The youth also supported the Latin American struggles and showed solidarity with the popular resistance to interference in the internal affairs of their states by imperialist powers.

In the Middle East: they reiterated solidarity and support to the Palestine Revolution, Al-Fat'h, and urged the withdrawal of "Zionist occupying troops." And they applauded, of course, the revolutionary provisional government of South Vietnam, which they recognized as a new phase in the struggle against "neo-colonialist U.S. aggression." Finally, the Executive Committee affirmed the necessity for intensifying its action, in the immediate formation of young African cadres and formed a commission to develop and build a concrete program toward that vital end.

It was left only to Algerian President Boumedienne to say that:

The world has discovered that despite the tragedies of slavery, exile, transportation or depersonalization, Africa succeeded in preserving its dignity, its spirit, its sensitivity . . .

AS OF THIS WRITING, however, the unfortunate fact remains that all of that has not been quite enough.

The first Pan-African Cultural Festival showed Africa on the verge of finding at last whatever else is needed. The people there began, in the ten days of the Festival, to tackle the problems they face, but they failed to find a common solution as the symposium committees broke down in heated discussions far into the night.

For one thing, the African people, on the continent and in America, are still suffering from the influence and intervention of western liberals and thus have only feebly begun the clarification of the uses and misuses of culture in the struggle for liberation. Before there is clarity, before there is a true and effective ideology, there has to be extensive and serious debate. But there also cannot be any fundamental discussion of culture — it was clear from the Festival — unless economic, social, political and other topics also have become clear. When once this is done, Africa may no longer stand darkly honored as simply the "cradle of civilization," but the cradle of freedom, perhaps — and brotherhood and peace — as well.

The African in every territory of this vast continent has been awakened and the struggle for freedom will go on. It is our duty as the vanguard force to offer what assistance we can to those now engaged in the battle that we ourselves have fought and won. Our task is not done and our own safety is not assured until the last vestiges of colonialism have been swept from Africa.

KWAME NKRUMAH,
from "Ghana: The Autobiography of Kwame Nkrumah"

A DIALECTICAL APPROACH TO CULTURE

by S ÉKOU TOURÉ

THE PATH OF TRIBULATIONS undergone by the concept of culture is, today, long indeed! The opinions of "committees of intellectuals" cancel each other out in a sterile dialectic; various "symposia" bring incomprehension and a hollow humanism into a timid encounter with historical truth and the progressive determination of man up against the greatest calamity known to history: imperialism.

In countries where a capitalist regime isolates the general populace from scientific and technical attainments, the intellectual fights to retain his false "freedom" and questions himself in vain about the future of a decadent economic and social structure. He is helpless. He somehow constructs a cultural policy in an attempt to strengthen a society whose upheavals are the undeniable symptoms of degeneration, and instead of using the faded light of his poor autocratic reason to seek a new cultural conscience, he sinks into scepticism or, rather, into the terror of a future overshadowed by capitalism.

European trends have dominated the study of cultural problems in Africa. For a long time latter-day Anglo-Saxon anthropology, concerned with justifying the re-

actionary ideas of colonialism, cited Africa as the home of backward peoples who should be forced to accept colonialist humanitarian civilization.

History has shown that revolutionary maturity cannot be the object of an edict which imperialism would, in any case, never sign! The Anglo-Saxon school of thought allowed for a pseudo-realism worthy of Hume's successors — a pseudo-realism the reactionary ideological content of which was soon to be exposed. Vierkandt's disciples, "culturalists" such as Grabner and Ankermann, and functionalists like Malinowski, believed they had discovered the basis of our culture. Their empiricism and its hatred of historical materialism produced a flood of disjointed monographs in which the class war and the imperialist's exploitation of our peoples were denied and reduced to an anti-scientific cultural pluralism.

ARCHAEOLOGISTS' pickaxes had evidently not reached the African culture which lay too deeply buried under the irremovable heap of dirt, left behind by the colonialists, which our peoples have now succeeded in uncovering. The anxiety to extricate an authenticity which is, for obvious reasons, indiscoverable, gave rise to a fairly accurate representation of prelogism of Levy-Bruhl, who was already blind! In any case there is no difference of concept between

SEKOU TOURE is the President of the Republic of Guinea and one of Africa's most eminent revolutionary thinkers. When Kwame Nkrumah was deposed in Ghana, Toure gave him political asylum.

the black man unaware of the logical categories of the classical world on the one hand, and the idea of the essentially sensitive black man as a sort of passive, wax creature, only fit to remain at a primary intuitive level in his perception of the outside world, on the other.

Thus it is no accident that African states still have to dedicate a symposium to a topic such as that which unites us today: "African culture and its realities." We recall that twenty years ago many pages were devoted to another topic which at that time seemed provocative and that was, "A black man is a human being." It has become today our historical duty to re-establish ourselves in a field such as culture, because we are emerging from a long period of eclipse during which the most elementary attributes of man, notably that of his creativity, were contested and denied to us.

According to a well-nurtured prejudice, Africans took no part in the general task of shaping civilization. Africa is accused of being without history and without culture because it was necessary that this be so. Europeans slaughtered American Indians while at the same time admiring their temples and palaces. They admitted that they massacred the men to take over their land. With their conquests and domination, Europeans destroyed millennial civilizations in Asia, but they never denied the existence of these civilizations as such, and never contested the quality of their craftsmanship and their human attributes.

Concerning Africa, Europe's first notion was not to exterminate the men with the sole idea of seizing their treasures, but to treat them as beasts to be sold into slavery and as they pleased, sold on the spot or exported to America, or even killed when their capabilities and selling price no longer assured an adequate profit.

To guarantee the success of such a venture a preliminary step was necessary — that of easing one's conscience and re-assuring oneself by thinking that it was a question of dealing with beasts and not human beings. Hence the alleged barbarity

of Africans and the denial of their culture and civilization gave birth to their estrangement from the human race.

But time did not stop, and progress continued to strengthen in the face of opposition and exploitation. More attention was paid to the legends, the epic poems and the tales passed by word of mouth from generation to generation of the Griots. Archaeology finally penetrated the various continents, thrusting deep into the depths of history and the soil so as to revive and bring to the surface the remains of entombed cultures.

In fact even without archaeological research and the tales of the Griots, ordinary common sense was adequate to realize the absurdity or rather the class-consciousness of those who managed to imagine a cultureless people.

By culture, we understand all the material and immaterial works of art and science, plus knowledge, manners, education, a mode of thought, behavior and attitudes accumulated by the people both through and by virtue of their struggle for freedom from the hold and dominion of nature; we also include the result of their efforts to destroy the deviationist politics — social systems of domination and exploitation through the productive process of social life.

Thus culture stands revealed as both an exclusive creation of the people and a source of creation, as an instrument of socio-economic liberation and as one of domination.

Culture implies our struggle — it is our struggle.

Culture — as both the expression and the result of the relationships between man and society, and between man and society on the one hand and nature on the other—is found among all peoples and is inherent in the very process of life. A culture is to be found wherever conscious life exists.

Culture is the sum total of the material and spiritual values created by humanity

throughout its history. This creation is both continuous and necessary. It is the corollary, the yardstick and the result of man's action to adapt to his environment so that he can both survive and flourish. It is inspired by the instinct for survival at the first stage and by an awareness of the laws of existence at a higher stage. Therefore it first obeys a simple biological law regulating the survival of the individual and the species before obeying a more complex psychological and socio-economic law. Now the instinct for self-preservation and the need for self-fulfillment are common to all societies and peoples. Every people must struggle to exist by creating the material means of its existence.

AFRICAN peoples, like all peoples, have come along the long road of history through recurrent conflicts whose overall result has been increasing success. The creation of material values, the creation of spiritual values, the creation and development of this global culture progresses continuously in spite of momentary slowing-down, stagnation and setbacks. Material cultural production and spiritual cultural production are dialectically linked and exercise a reciprocal influence on each other. But the absolute priority must rest with material production, which itself participates directly in man's concrete action.

For human history has more than once recorded a slackening of spiritual tension, a stagnation of intellectual and political life or even a total annihilation of all intellectual and political activity, but it has never recorded a long-term total interruption of the development of material civilization. This evolution can, of course, slow down but it can never stop, as its stopping would signify the end of man's creative activity, the disappearance of his powers of adaptation, and mean his extinction.

This material production is a matter of vital necessity — a condition and sign of life. Man's material action is the "prime mover," the source of all else. It aims at the satisfaction of needs, first vital, physical

needs and then less immediate ones relating to the assertion and enrichment of the personality, the intellectual and moral needs. This action of both men and society is directed against the environment, against man himself and against nature. It is designed to meet the needs of all and this raises the problem of its efficiency and profitability. To meet the needs of all, material action must have a tactics, a strategy, an intellectual effort to action, a certain degree of planning, both criticism and self-criticism in the light of the results, and a methodology bringing into play a whole series of intellectual operations. Culture is a material and spiritual acquisition, both the product and the price of action.

Creative action springing from a universal imperative and culture, which is its reflection, subject and effect, both constitute universal realities. Wherever there is the necessity of creation, we find culture. As the expression of the relationships between man and society, between man, society and nature, culture poses in the most pressing terms the problem of the dialectic of the general and the particular. Culture is an expression, in particular, specific forms, of a general problem — that of the relationships linking man to his environment.

But these relations in turn take on a specific character determined by geographical conditions, the level of development of productive forces and the nature of the means of production as determined by the historical and social context. The cultural level of a people (including the peoples of Africa), its means of conquering knowledge, its manner of explaining phenomena, will depend on the power that it has gained over natural forces, and the degree of objectivity and abstraction attained in the heat of action to gain mastery over ever more perfected techniques.

The specific, particular nature of a culture is a reality; it is one of the attributes of national reality in general and of class reality in particular. It expresses conditions of life shared in common, a similarity of attitudes and of reactions to natural and social phenomena.

But there is a general aspect even to this specific particularity. Even if these attitudes and reactions are marked by the irrational at certain stages of historical development, even if they derive from simple emotion at certain points in the action or even if they occur at the level of reflexes, they are fundamentally set in motion and guided by reason with a view to reaching well-defined objectives and finding solutions to well-defined problems. Specific particularity is not specific to African culture, but to every culture.

This specificity is a general reality. But, apart from this general aspect of specificity, culture, by virtue of its content — the expression of man's eternal aspiration to happiness and to the final unfolding of his nature, with ever-increasing power over the environment — culture is in perpetual movement towards the universal. The speed at which culture tends towards the universal is in function of the dialectic of cultural forms and content at a given stage of history.

The universalization of the content of culture in interpreting the aspiration of all peoples will go hand in hand with a greater perfection of its forms of expression, due to the general development of forms and the revolutionization of industrial relations. African culture, like any culture, originated with the African himself and embodies his first preoccupations, his first struggles, his first successes and setbacks.

THE course of history and the succession of African culture's development have closely reflected the course of the development of productive forces. Its initial simplicity, low intellectual level and slow rate of progression all reflected the weakness of man's position and the precariousness of his existence. Then over the centuries and down the ages, following the development of productive techniques, culture developed, became diversified, took on shades of meaning and incorporated science, technology, literature, music, dancing and sculpture.

This whole evolution, this progressive qualification is subordinated to reason, to the law of gnoseology, to the transition from ignorance to an increasingly deeper and more exact degree of knowledge. Any anthology of African culture tending to situate it outside the realm of reason, of rational thought, of the law and of gnoseology tends to down-grade it and deviate it from its true end, which is to qualify mankind, and sacrifices it to the myth of singularity and specificity.

African culture neither has nor needs any foundation other than the concrete life of the African. With its roots deep in the innermost life of the people it expresses the life, work, ideals and aspirations of the African people. It has contributed along with other peoples to the development of science and technology. Prior to the contact with other continents, Africa had begun to smelt metal and to forge tools and weapons. She had learned to weave fabrics. The notion of chemistry had developed through various recipes needed to make soap, indigo, ink, to tan hides, etc.

But, to a far greater extent than science, which was handicapped by the persistence throughout the ages of a low level of technology, African art, African literature, African sculpture, music and dancing, will occupy or already occupy an important place in humanity's cultural heritage. The reality of African culture needs no further demonstration, but its infinite realities are still to be discovered, recorded and described.

On the other hand, in Africa as elsewhere, culture reacts upon those producing it (man and society) at the same time as it is produced and developed.

Culture is an accumulated experience which modifies man in a linear, progressive and quantitative manner but with additional qualitative phases of mutation. The result is a new man, a new society, more skillful and more apt, integrating to an ever-increasing extent the means and the end of action, and perfecting to an ever greater extent technology and means of action.

Experience, acquired by and for action, becomes an inexhaustible source of energy; both the instrument and the guide of present and future action. Culture appears then, at one and the same time, as a creation and a means of creation of man and society, as an expression of the dialectical relationships between the creator and his creation. It is clearly apparent in its real light, that of a factor determining and conditioning all else. The conquest of culture has obliged man to mobilize all his physical and intellectual resources. Once it was conquered, culture became a flame animating and intoxicating the conqueror, man. So it is scarcely an exaggeration to say that man equals the culture that formed him and which inspires his behavior and action.

The fact of a culture conditions both the existence of the people and their exercise of sovereignty and power. For us, to speak of culture is to fight, and, although history has very edifying examples to offer, such as those which dominate the formation of feudalism, we have chosen to carry the data of this combat forward into the present era.

Everyone knows what a foul use was made of culture by the predatory powers in the course of modern history, in their appropriation, among other things, of the African peoples.

After having laid their hands on the essential elements of the culture of their own people, the upper classes of the colonialist powers used this weapon in their endeavor to dominate and exploit our continent.

It was first of all necessary to legitimize the various kinds of pillage and colonial domination in the eyes of established morality. To this end the natural difference between our culture and that of the peoples of these powers was used to justify and accredit the ignominious assertion that we did not have any culture and that a culture should be bestowed and imposed upon us.

Here started the crusade for humanization through the culturalization of the

"marginal" peoples, of the peoples which have remained at the stage of "raw material-peoples," of peoples waiting to be manufactured in the Big Factory of civilized men. And presently, so as to ensure that colonization was everlasting, the colonizers introduced the systematic indoctrination of native workers, which contributed to the smooth functioning of the Big Factory.

The corps of "colonial elites," "men of culture," natives of any level, of any experience and political hue, was created.

ON the eve of the disintegration of the colonial empires an "intellectual elite" emerged. It was opposed to the old "colonial elite," but subjectivist in the nature of its opposition.

This new elite tried to make use of all available means. It had suffered from the racist blows that imperialism has dealt to Africa, but it had not understood that although ideology and racist practices may be an effective weapon when wielded by imperialism which is an active racism and a non-culture in history, that racist ideology used by those who are in revolt cannot be but a double-edged weapon which, in the last resort, is profitable only to the imperialist enemy. Therefore, Holy Negritude, be it Arab-Berber or Ethiopian-Bantu, this Negritude is objectively an ideology auxiliary to the general imperialist ideology.

The Master transforms his slave into a Negro whom he defines as a being without reason, subhuman and the embittered slave then protests: as you are Reason, I am Emotion and I take this upon myself. This is how we loop the loops. The Master assumes his pre-eminence, and the Slave his servitude, but the latter claims his right to weep, a right which the Master grants him.

A reconciliation has come about and one understands easily why the imperialist propaganda system, press, radio, cinema, etc., goes to such trouble to spread the comforting concept of Negritude. Negri-

tude is actually a good mystifying anaesthetic for Negroes who have been whipped too long and too severely, whipped to a point where they have lost all reason and become purely emotional.

As serious analysis shows the colonial situation is by no means contested by this elite, and that, objectively speaking, far from mobilizing and arming the subjugated peoples, it gives the colonizers an easy conscience by accrediting the existence of certain liberty of thought and action within the colonial system.

FROM this point of view, the intellectual elite, while being subjectively in opposition, objectively completes the arsenal of colonial domination. While the latter appropriates popular culture for its own profit, it deprives the colonized people of its best defensive and offensive weapons, an autonomously created culture nurtured by themselves.

The combination of two circumstances: a people deprived of its own culture on the one hand, and the tremendous development of science and technology (elements of culture) by the imperialist, made a certain kind of culture into a deadly weapon in the hands of the neo-colonialist, at the time the former colonies were attaining national independence.

It must be admitted that the frightened attitude of many African governments towards cynical imperialist arrogance, the helplessness of the peoples who were victims of neo-colonialist coup d'états, were a result of the fact that these peoples had been deprived of their culture. The most powerful weapon for the rape and renewed subjugation of our peoples now available to imperialism and neo-colonialism is a certain kind of culture.

The invincible weapon, defensive against imperialism and colonialism and offensive for the complete emancipation of our peoples, is culture which has once again become the creation of an entire society and the source of all progressive creation.

This analysis leads to the conclusion

that culture, a superstructure born from an infrastructure, which it modifies and qualitatively transforms in its turn, is the reality of a class of ideological classes.

ONE should not mistake this expression for a form of neo-idealism: by ideological classes, we are referring to classes which are by no means born from a simple economic and social stratification; we are faced here with a fundamental choice between two and no more possibilities which are mutually exclusive, viz. between:

1 – The ideology of domination, and prostration under domination.

2 – The ideology of struggle against any kind of domination and of the complete sovereignty of the people, power being exercised by and for the people.

All the activities of the Guinean Democratic Party are based on this second ideology which is manifest in all the aspects of life without a single exception.

Thus it is understood that culture is a field of action where man, society, nature, men and peoples confront one another. In this merciless combat, the reconnoitering and conquering of ground are essential for victory. The superiority of arms is a superiority of culture, at least in its material and technical aspects. And it is this superiority in the production of culture which enables a people to dominate other peoples and impose its spiritual culture on them.

CULTURE is a more effective weapon than guns for the purpose of domination. For it was scientific, technical and technological culture which produced the guns. The prerequisite for any domination, exploitation and oppression is the denial to the oppressed man or people of his or their human attributes and therefore, in the first instance, cultural activities.

Before conquering, dominating and subjugating a people, the ruler asserts the superiority of his culture and civilization and proclaims its civilizing mission to those he has declared arbitrarily and unilaterally to be barbarian, savage, uncivilized.

tured, and without civilization. The rulers take it for granted that the understanding of nature with a view to exploiting it in order to promote technical advancement is their exclusive privilege, their property. But opinions more authoritative and more justified than those of imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism stated that nature was understandable to any individual and that man, provided he was aware of the historical significance of his existence, was capable of penetrating further every day into the secrets of nature, and increasing his power over it in order to increase his control of it.

What is important, at a given historical moment in the process of the knowledge and control of natural forces, is not so much the quality of knowledge and its conformity to the absolute truth as the way men and people are aware of their abilities and possibilities for understanding, and of their unfailing will to progress. In this process, the characteristic factor is an attitude, a turn of mind leading to self-reliance and confidence in the people. Acquired knowledge and the degree of truth which characterized it, belong to a quantitative factor linked with facilities used in research, experiment, and application.

This is a historical stage in development which each people will achieve more or less quickly according to their means, the pre-requisite being once again the belief that what is unknown can be known. No people are more gifted, more intelligent than others, but there are differences in historical contexts. Imperialists and exploiters blinded by the will to exploit are incapable of understanding this primary truth. Their culture is made up of guns, whips, hard labor and training which deny, humiliate and depersonalize those under the colonial yoke.

For the bourgeoisie and its colonialist allies, masses must be kept in ignorance, for ignorant individuals can distort culture if they attain it. Peasants and workers are incapable of preserving cultural values, let alone creating new ones. This propaganda has been proved to be absurd in those

countries where socialism is being introduced. Revolution is the only way to insure that science and culture will thrive and not decline.

Culture, through art, literature, techniques, etc., is the image of men's activity. Thus, hunt dances imitate the movement and pace of the game hunted. The stylized choreography of the African savannah hunter imitating the lion or the elephant even so far as to include its appearance, is aesthetically poor only in the minds of the exploiters who hate all that is connected with the people. War is a hunt where man is the game, and culture is an imitation of war episodes. The dances of the Sofas of Samori or the "tudos" of the Damel Tagne lat Dior, the Boko (challenge dances) of a N'Beur-Kat (Senegalese wrestler) like the famous wrestler Modum Khule (who actually existed) are real masterpieces, especially when accompanied by songs and gestures of attack like those of the phalanges mentioned by Stanley. Culture is the image, the record of both experience and the techniques of production.

Sayings, proverbs, tales and folk songs express the wish for a bountiful production and the experience of mastery over nature; hence the naive materialism of peasant cultures co-existing with the idealism arising from their ignorance.

AUTHORS as perspicacious as Frazer, in their rejection of historical materialism, were not able to account scientifically for magic. The experience of the fight against nature enables man to acquire knowledge. But given his limited means and sometimes even the implacable hostility of physico-chemical determinism, the major secrets of nature are all the more difficult to penetrate in that their world is unknown. Magic then becomes a conjuration, and rites reproduce gestures acquired from experience, which are regarded as valuable if occult creatures are favorable. Hence man invokes the experiences aiming at limiting damages, natural disasters, and at killing beasts which destroy the crops, etc.

Should development stop at that stage, it would lead to ignorance. Imperialism soon found out that its power lay in this. It had to transform us into sacred, helpless beings facing natural and historical necessities. Kept in such an ignorant state, oppressed peoples are prey to prejudice and terror before invisible powers which are all the more alienating in that they are closely linked with their culture. Misery and physical decline are given an explanation except when this latter unveils the monstrous responsibilities of the imperialist exploiters.

Culture is the synthesis of people's activities. To fight together against diseases and hunger, to control nature and to widen the scope of knowledge are the tasks of the whole of mankind. Scientific and technical culture is the highest manifestation of collective creativeness. It has led to the eradication of several natural scourges.

From the historical point of view, no culture can be free of a class content. Unless it is a fake to camouflage some stupidity of the ideologists of exploiting regimes, every culture follows a well-defined political line. African feudalism for example did not experience private land control while, on the contrary, it was the case in Europe, where the lords came to consider themselves as the owners of the land they were entrusted with simply defending against possible invaders. That is the origin of the collective nature of peasant dances, where the gestures cover the whole range of free agricultural activity.

Culture, like all social phenomena, is characterized by class struggle. Cultural power, the container and contents of economic and political power, is thus a powerful oppressive weapon in the hands of the exploiters. Culture for the people has rightly been considered as the *bete noire* of the ideologists of capitalism.

IT is logical for capitalistic exploitation to deny workers access to the culture they have created. Thus it is that sociologists, reactionary historians, with a view to justifying such a monopolization and to praising it, put forward the theory of the de-

velopment of culture by an elite. The idea is that mankind is indebted to a handful of such genial individuals as Darwin, Einstein, Shakespeare, and Beethoven for its achievements in art, science, technology, and literature. Of course, tribute should be paid to these men. But if it is true that their active existence is a proof that culture is created by an elite, how can one explain that individuals endowed with equal genius did not exist in the days of the Leakey man or *Sinanthropus*?

Science has never been a one-man concern. It is usually retorted that, in the past, a scholar used to work by himself. In fact a scientist can make discoveries or inventions and enrich the heritage of mankind only in a favorable social and cultural context. Nowadays, the method of scientific research has altered. The scientist forms part of a team. The "demonstration" of this method has not yet led to the realization that collective work was a necessity due to the complexity of problems and the scope of modern science. It is also due to the fact that capitalism aims at monopolizing and exploiting brigades of brains. But as far as we are concerned we are fully aware that this method, of which capitalism considers only the effects, is the very basis of scientific inventiveness. Besides, scientific workers are the perpetuators of the efforts of past generations.

It is here that I and the poet Victor Hugo are in agreement. I wrote: "... one discovery may fundamentally or partially question a scientific principle previously considered sacrosanct and which had therefore prevailed till then ... undoubtedly it is the law of continuous advance which prevails." Hugo wrote: "Science is continuous scratching with fruitful results; science is a ladder. . . ." The foundations of culture have been created and the conditions for its progress are created by the working masses which are the makers of history.

LITERATURE and art have thrived for a long time in the form of folklore: epic poems, legends, tales, proverbs, songs served as a

basis for writers. Painters and artists drew inspiration from the applied arts created by the people; popular art is an inexhaustible treasury of patterns and methods, a source of exaltation for writers and artists. It generates and feeds the national form of the art and literature of every country; science stems from the people's genius.

Consequently, culture is not the privilege of those exploiters who have, by depriving the masses of the benefits of science and culture and by keeping them in ignorance, found a justification for their class supremacy. For intelligence and talent are not the privilege of a class; the force of the spirit, talent and will of thousands of workers is reflected in all cultural creations.

Culture, a weapon of domination, will be one of liberation. In this instance, one must fight on ground of the enemy's choosing but one where the issue of the fight will be governed by an adequate weapon: popular culture. The imperialists use cultural, scientific, technical, economic, literary and moral values in order to justify and perpetuate their regime of exploitation and oppression. The oppressed peoples also use cultural values, but of a nature contrary to the former, in order to fight more successfully against imperialism and in order to free themselves from the colonial regime.

Resistance and then the offensive, will be organized, first of all, in the cultural field. Colonized man must first recollect himself, critically analyze the results of the influences to which he was subjected by the invader, which are reflected in his behavior, way of thinking and acting, his conception of the world and society and in his way of assessing the values created by his own people.

IN THE FIRST PLACE, he must undertake to re-conquer his own personality by denying the cultural values which have depersonalized him, by de-colonizing his own mind, his customs, and his attitudes, by dismantling the philosophical systems justifying dominations, particularly Levy-Bruhl's

notorious myth of primitive and prelogic mind as opposed to the intellectual and moral superiority complex of the colonizer. The colonized man must free himself from his inferiority complexes and embody man in what he represents of absolute values, aspirations to the universal.

This first stage of liberation, of struggle for the liquidation of the various complexes of the colonized man is not to be dissociated from the following stage — that of the reconquest of lost values, of possessions denied and lost, attributes of a sensible man who thinks and acts in a dignified way and is aware of his potentialities. Nature abhors a vacuum, even on the cultural level. One cannot extirpate from the mind of colonized man the culture which has been imposed upon him and which has poisoned him, except by offering him a substitute culture, namely his own culture, which implies an action to restore to life, re-valorize and popularize that culture.

However, this action is possible only in the larger framework of the struggle for national liberation and social promotion. Culture cannot flower properly without putting an end to the causes which have been stifling it; but conversely the cult of cultural authenticity, the struggle for the reconquest of this authenticity by activating the awareness of popular masses and their mobilization, activate the process of political and social liberation, as well as forging the nation through the creation of a melting pot in which the simple citizen is formed without any consideration of tribe or race.

This free man within a free people who has rediscovered his physical and mental balance can thence forward assume the entire responsibility for his own destiny. He can and must widen boundlessly the bases of his cultural heritage, diversify them, direct them in order to clarify any action likely to be undertaken with a view to improving the conditions of existence and prosperity. The imperialists have dominated and oppressed peoples because of a technical superiority they had previously acquired. The peoples in turn, animated

by the conviction that the faculty of research, discovery and invention is the thing most fairly shared among men, will throw themselves into the battle for sciences and technics. Scientific culture, the ideal means of domination and production of goods, is a factor for progress in the creation of material culture and spiritual culture.

Yes, culture is an instrument of freedom, an anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist, antineo-colonialist weapon, a means of dominating nature, always providing it is a progressive, revolutionary culture created and consumed by the people on the basis of popularization. Only such a culture frees man of himself, of his egoistical tendency, of the vanity and pride and the fear which inhibit him — only such a culture frees and promotes a people by reconciling them with their authentic nature and opening for them the way to the future and the universal.

TODAY, national liberation and the edification of socialism are scheduled in the program of revolutionary Africa. All kinds of imperialists, colonialists, neo-colonialists, armies of ideological puppets, traders of peoples have taken fright when confronted with the determination of our masses, and vilify socialism and present it as an ideology of terror. The only reason for such a display of anti-revolutionary force is our determination to free Africa from the lust of imperialism, our determination to build an Africa having nothing to do with the exploitation of man by man.

However, we would be supporting a determinism similar to a wait-and-see policy and to fatalism, if we limited our victory to the eradication of imperialism and its self-destruction. For, while such a system bears in itself the germs of its own destruction, history teaches us that the duration of the regimes of exploitation of man by man depends on the intensity of intervention and the cultural level of the oppressed peoples. It is therefore important to create revolutionary conditions in order to enable citizens to give the best of themselves. Culture, being a synthesis of peo-

ple's activities, is a power whose democratic mastery provides the masses with unexpected capacities of ideological and material creation and improvement.

It was through cultural power that the Master managed to justify and maintain his political power and economic domination over the Slave. It is through usurpation of cultural power — in the form of science, technology, methodology, art and a certain conception of the world — that neo-colonialist imperialism is still controlling many governments and exploiting the peoples it is supposed to help.

The other aspect of the elite's monopoly is that it cripples culture; capitalism, which is only concerned with the creation of a wealthy upper class, cannot stimulate culture. There is neither a unilateral economic determinism nor idealism to assert that the weakness or the death of several civilizations is due not to irascibility or to a so-called original moral insufficiency of man, according to ill-omened bourgeois philosophers, but to the fact that culture was the monopoly of a small minority; the scientific and technical power of this minority was the perfect expression of the frailty of such economic and cultural systems. Only a creative people can make culture advance, provided that the social system enables the democratic assimilation of the techniques and that the enrichment of a universal cultural patrimony becomes the peoples' monopoly. Democratization of science and culture is thus the fertilization of progressive civilizations.

Only the revolutionary movement can restore to culture its humanistic essence.

Culture is then understood in its two basic aspects:

- It means domination of physico-chemical determinism for progressive purposes.
- It means revolutionary orientation of society.

The Cultural Revolution implies the total emancipation of the people; consequently the Cultural Revolution is the radicalized revolution.

One cannot talk of revolutionary socialization of the means of production when the

people, who are the rightful owners, are uneducated and incapable of improving upon that of which they have been deprived. The revolutionarization of culture supposes two basic aspects:

- Culture is available to masses, and is a democratic process which is the means of qualifying the masses.

- By widening the intellectual qualification, revolution creates new conditions for the fecundation of culture and science. Once the people are aware of what they create, and know they are responsible for the improvement of social relationship, they are ideologically capable of undertaking the construction of a society free of the exploitation of man by man.

REVOLUTION democratizes culture to its very core, making it serve all of society and not just the elite. The democratization of culture enables many people to reveal their talents in all fields of scientific and artistic endeavor, and it creates the conditions that enable these talents to flourish.

Artistic creation cannot remain outside the struggle, aloof from politics, because each writer, each artist, whether he likes it or not, expresses the interests of his class in his work. The socialist revolution throws off the monetary yoke from culture and permits the creation of works for the vast popular masses and not just for the flattering of the personal tastes of a handful of stupid gluttons.

The cultural and technical aspects of a society are a part of the whole of the revolutionary cause. Lenin wrote that they are "a little review and a little screw" in the general mechanism of the revolution. Revolutionary culture is a powerful fighting weapon and a material force for the people. Before the revolution, it constitutes an indispensable part of the battle-front of total revolution. Science and culture fit perfectly into the general mechanism of the struggle, as weapons of unity and education for the destruction of the enemy, with one heart and one will.

"An army without a culture is an ignorant army and an ignorant army can never

defeat its enemy," wrote a contemporary philosopher. Africa must join the Cultural Revolution. But what are the principal tasks of the Cultural Revolution? Cultural Revolution does not mean the denial of all culture of the past; rather it is the continuation of everything that was beautiful because it was of the people in spite of the will of the exploiters. It is therefore a question of:

- Choosing permanent and sound values from the cultural heritage and rejecting everything that is useless and reactionary, the outmoded mores, the bad traditions, the superstitions, and alienating and inhibiting attitudes such as Negritude.

- Transforming culture from the privilege of an elite into a culture that belongs to the people.

- Elevating the cultural and scientific level of the working class to insure the continued progress of the production forces.

- Re-educating and completing the training of the older intellectuals who can still be salvaged, because once man has freed himself from the narrowness of the petit bourgeois, he can always be perfected.

- Creating a new type of intellectual.

- Committing the whole people irrevocably to the building of socialism.

The revolution restores to the people what they created during the secular class struggle, returns to the masses the scientific and technological acquisitions achieved by their labor, and defines constantly the means of struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism.

Given adequate material and dimensions, our people become invincible, raise higher the flag of freedom and better exercise their historical role of eradicating imperialism permanently.

HERE, presented as briefly as possible, is an African sample of Cultural Revolution.

During the 22 years of the heroic struggle of the Democratic Party of Guinea against colonialism, feudalism and imper-

ialism, pride of place is due to the fight for the restoration and assertion of the cultural assets of the works of civilization created by the millenary genius of our peoples, shamelessly scouted by the most criminal aggression of imperialism, cultural aggression.

Indeed, more than the military invasion and armed occupation of the mother country, more than the looting of our riches and the destruction of our country's social institutions, the lowering and denaturing of our civilizations seemed to our people to be the most unbearable expression of the colonialist imperial regime.

During the most intense period of separate citizenship and hard labor, in the prisons and the death camps, the proud people of Guinea, chained and gagged, have been continuously rejecting the cultural assets of the colonizers. In their moral and physical poverty, they remained haughty and aloof to assimilation, proclaiming forcefully and with determination the undying authenticity of their culture and rejecting at the same time the caricature of civilization in the name of which the authorities in occupation enjoined them to renounce their personality.

Our people have never accepted the inevitability of colonization. They were aware of the fact that our continent had been in ignorance of Europe, Asia and America for millions of years and that, during the long centuries of furious struggle against nature, our ancestors, facing the multitudinous difficulties connected with survival and improvement, produced cultures and civilizations which stand today, in many fields, as the finest achievements of human creation.

They were aware that, during these remote ages, our ancestors discovered the secret of the techniques and laws of agriculture and pastoral life; that they discovered and mastered numerous secrets of nature; that they devised methods of education and information in relation with the requirements of their development; that they codified the rules of social organization and ethics; that they organized trade,

erected cities, created armies, founded empires and states.

Thus our people know that they were the worthy repositories of human culture, assets in the defense and perpetuity of which so large a number of our ancestors — forever immortal — gave their lives; our people did not kneel to the cultural mystification of the authorities in occupation.

FOR A PEOPLE animated by such an awareness of history, there could not be any compromise: it was a question of totally rejecting the colonial system of imperialism and its criminal ideology as well as all the values it defends.

We must, in and by a struggle, recreate a new society based on the values which glorify the memory of its heroes.

We must restore to the concept of culture all its meaning and all the importance that it should have never lost: that of being at the same time the specific creation and collective property of each people concerned, the factor of identification, cohesion and improvement of societies, the means for the mastery of nature, the source and the surest defender of people's power, and the pre-eminent weapon against any foreign intrusion.

This is how, throughout the centuries, were maintained the concept and reality of African Culture, for the perpetuation of which millions of Africans gave their lives, among whom history mentions the prestigious names of Samory, Alpa Yaya Lat-Dior, Soundiata, Biton Koulibaly, Behanzin Abdelicader.

On August 2nd, 1968, I started, in the name of our people, the socialist Cultural Revolution, an event with far-reaching consequences.

Although, in the course of the construction of an essentially democratic society, the exercise of political power by the people must be accompanied by a mastery of the economic power, this alone is not enough. Experience taught us that when the people do not control what they create, if they are not aware of the finality of their daily activities, the acquisitions of the revo-

lution and all the prospects for the improvement of society are still watched by the internal and external counter-revolution. Science, technology and culture in the widest sense are now the property of the people and enable the masses to assume irreversibility of the permanent and ever-improving revolution.

So it is that some intellectuals without any revolutionary political philosophy and some theorists, who are prisoners of a unilateral dogmatic materialism, think that the idea of the revolution conscience-in-movement, used by our Secretary-General in his analysis, is a form of neo-Hegelianism, because for Hegel the conscience was just an absolute idea wandering in quest of undiscoverable contents. For us this conscience is not an evanescent form; for our party, idealism is rather in the conception of a socialist society which gave birth mechanically to popular science and culture without which, however, the edification of socialism is a compromise.

We reject this theory for two fundamental reasons. First, at a time when imperialism brandishes science and technology like a scarecrow, at a time when imperialism in Vietnam, in Africa, in the Middle East shamelessly scorns universal reprobation by its aggression and maintenance of neo-colonialism, the people must be more than ever the masters of nature and society. Second, culture and technology, together forming cultural power in the hands of a "comprador bourgeoisie," are the most deadly weapons of the counter-revolution.

Therefore, although adequate political and economic conditions produce the possibilities of changing society, the economic and political power remains fragile as long as the methodical, scientific development of the future by the people has not been achieved. The growth of revolutionary movement depends on the scientific and ideological level of the people.

One might be tempted to put this conception of the cultural reality prior to the material edification of socialism to the account of objective neo-idealism. This is

wrong — we have clearly adopted the analysis of Marx and Engels: the superstructures result from the material basis and influence it dialectically. This analysis, chiefly put forward by Engels, was an immediate answer to the class spies of historical materialism.

IT IS THROUGH a serious study by the light of the new data on the African revolutionary movement that we discovered a characteristic of the superstructures which seemed to have passed unnoticed so far: culture is at a given time a social process, an infra-structure. Therefore it can be easily understood that once cleared out of its idealistic contents and impalpable synthetic data, culture, now including science and technology, is the stake for a ruthless class struggle.

This is why, forged by twenty years of fight, the people of Guinea, as early as the 8th Congress of its national party, the DPG, after several sessions of the National Revolutionary Council, and the decisive one of the Central Committee on August 2nd, 1968, started the socialist revolution with its cultural phase.

Our Cultural Revolution operates in all fields of national activities.

At the level of the masses, all the inhabitants of our country must become literate before October 2nd, 1971, the end of the literary campaign. In a second stage, literate persons will receive supplementary courses of two kinds: the knowledge and the know-how acquired at the end of this vocational and intellectual qualification corresponds to the 9th school year in our system (lower certificate in the Colonial system).

At the level of public services, institutes, specially organized schools, and production unit committees are the promoters of the courses; a ministry created for this purpose is entrusted with the standardization and distribution of courses.

Each rural political and economic unit has its own PRL (Pouvoir Revolutionnaire Local — Local Revolutionary Administration).

We have established that state centralization is the worst manifestation of bureaucracy; in the long run it impedes localization of the functions of the state; the revolution becomes a collection of principles in a vacuum. Directives, mobilizations and manifestations are characterized by a discontinuous periodicity in contrast with the need for continuity in the development of the Revolution.

The PRL (Local Revolutionary Administration) represents the revolutionary state in the hands of the people who thus have a real control of bodies which are notably concerned with practical achievement. Not only does the state no longer maintain a plethora of civil servants who might well take over the revolution at their level, but the activities of those who are in service necessarily come partly within the sphere of the PRL.

The PRL's are responsible for:

- the economy
- Public Works
- education and culture
- health
- civil status and justice
- communications
- defense of the revolution

The objectives laid down in each sector are attained by the masses by means of specialized brigades.

WE MAY WELL expand a little on education and culture. Each political and economic cell, and we have over eight thousand such basic cells, has its various cultural unit; each has an artistic group and sporting groups. Artistic competitions between local committees or between sections of the Party provide opportunities for cultural activities rich in stimuli for mass mobilization and particularly for the rehabilitation of African Art. After making a selection at basic committee level, the Sections of the Party become shock troops meeting each other in friendly strife each year during the National Artistic fortnight. Prizewinning plays and other forms of artistic creation, after being checked for ideological soundness, become part of the

teaching material available for training and education. As far as we are concerned, the play *Et la nuit s'illumine*, the theatrical expression of the recent epic of our people, which is our country's entry at the present competitions in Algiers, together with another tragedy *The Siege of Sikasso*, are quite the equal of *Le Cid*, *Iphigenia* or *Othello*.

As regards its functioning, the PRL has been adapted to the structure of the Party and the State, as regards both its organization and its various offices.

As we have said, the PRL represents the Revolutionary State in country districts. This has proved beneficial in abolishing urban bureaucracy and planting the roots of the revolution in the countryside.

On the economic front, no hierarchy in government service is exempt from participating in the annual agricultural campaign, the final aim of which is to abolish economic blackmail by turning the slogan, "Produce to be self-sufficient," into a reality. It is also the best method of re-educating the old-style intellectuals towards a real instead of a lip-service identification with the ideals of the Popular Revolution.

As regards education, the schools are closely coordinated in the process of transforming individuals and society and are known as CER (Centre d'Enseignement Revolutionnaire — Centre for Revolutionary Education), covering all four stages of schooling, from the primary school to university level.

Education, now in revolutionary mould, follows a dialectical line:

It starts with social, geographic and political realities; on the basis of these initial data, it draws up plans for transformation; these plans are carried out on the land made available to the CER.

IN THE REPUBLIC of Guinea today each scholastic establishment, right up to university level, is a production unit working one or more forms and at the same time an administrative unit, self-governing through its Council, all the members of which, save one, are pupils. Today we already have a

number of self-sufficient units and State financial support for the others is ever more strictly reduced. Thus the CER is a fertile cell in the forefront of socialism.

It is not a simple school, but a centre of economic and ideological radiation, the crucible in which the New Man is formed. Not only does it represent in the countryside, for example, the most successful creation of the revolution, but every one of the 8,000 Basic Committees of the Party has a CER attached to it, which thus becomes a centre of research and of scientific and technical extension.

Pedagogically speaking, the curricula have been shorn of all that was useless and ideologically false. This makes it possible to devote far more time to productive activities which, in some cases, account for 75% of the programme.

In each district and in the Federation there exists a Council for Revolutionary Socialist Culture, directly concerned with the close integration of the schools with the life of the people.

As part of the revolutionizing of our educational system, we considered that the moment had come to end our linguistic inferiority complex — a tenacious heritage of colonialism. The re-establishment of our native tongues is held to be a potent factor in shaking off alien influence, and in bringing ideological freedom and therewith the self-confidence of which colonialism had robbed us.

Accordingly, from the earliest classes onwards, these national languages are not “lessons” or “subjects” but tools — the vehicles for transmitting scientific and technical knowledge. In the higher classes, including the 4th stage — High Education — the national languages are compulsory subjects not merely for the Faculty of Social Sciences, but for the Technical Faculties also. The national languages are, at this level, provisionally compulsory subjects because they are intended, in our plans for a Cultural Revolution, to be the tools of education in uprooting mental structures foreign to the genius of our people.

All this is not easy; we have our difficulties, but they are far from insurmountable. The class struggle following the path of anti-imperialism cannot be a simple affair. But our difficulties are the less formidable because in education, as in all other fields, no decision is taken until it has been discussed in a thoroughly democratic manner in the Party framework. From the 1st to the 4th scholastic cycle, the people have a voice in all matters; the people cannot be wrong and may oppose a perfectly justified decision if they have not been consulted or if they are not convinced that the decision is right. This principle is dear to us.

AT ALL LEVELS, the CER is directly administered by the pupils and students themselves, through a Governing Council which is not only an administrative body but also a technical component of the Party, functioning with well-defined attributes. In all cycles of education the headmaster is not the potentate of yesterday but an adviser, a member of the Council who takes part, on the same footing as the pupils, in the collective management of the funds voted by the State or earned directly by the production of the CER. The Council maintains discipline and has the whole responsibility for the correctness of financial dealings. The teacher is no longer a figure declaiming dogmatically from behind his desk, but a militant spirit carrying out his tasks in revolutionary education.

It is no internal contradiction but the logic of our socialist leanings which has prompted us to democratize the administration of our educational establishments and the relations between masters and pupils, professors and students. In an hour when youth is causing age-old and “proven” systems to totter, our young people, satisfied and with no further claims, no longer ask the dramatic question, “What shall I be tomorrow?”

Our youth are not merely implicated in the exercise of power, which is denied, incidentally, to their comrades in bourgeois

countries, but they exercise power effectively and exclusively. Today the struggle — often bloody — of youth in support of its claims, which is, by the way, a heightened aspect of the class struggle in many economic systems, does not exist in Guinea. Our youth, entirely devoted to the struggle against imperialism and against the clique of counter-revolutionaries, demands, instead, supremacy over nature. Armed with the Party ideology, these young people strive rather to rid historical necessity of its fatal character by becoming the effective masters of the future.

We have been well aware that a revolu-

tionary movement without a coherent and scientific ideology is a dangerous compromise doomed to fail. Therefore the Party ideology is at the heart of all our activities, whether productive, scientific, technical, literary or other. For us ideological training is absolutely imperative. It is above all for us the essential implement enabling us to create, in Guinea, the African Society, the New African Man, an artisan conscious of possessing a culture, the crucible of United Africa and an original contribution to universal culture.

That, Comrades, is what we are doing in Guinea, in the name of Africa.

Our history and our culture were completely destroyed when we were forcibly brought to America in chains. And now it is important for us to know that our history did not begin with slavery's scars. We come from Africa, a great continent and a proud and varied people, a land which is the new world and was the cradle of civilization. Our culture and our history are as old as man himself and yet we know almost nothing of it. We must recapture our heritage and our identity if we are ever to liberate ourselves from the bonds of white supremacy. We must launch a cultural revolution to unbrainwash an entire people . . .

Armed with the knowledge of the past, we can with confidence charter a course for our future. Culture is an indispensable weapon in the freedom struggle. We must take hold of it and forge the future with the past.

MALCOLM X

THE STRATEGY OF CULTURE

by STANISLAS ADOTEVI

AS THE IMMEDIATE EMBODIMENT of a way of life, culture is the transfiguration of human preoccupations, the elaboration of certain specific and dated demands. Culture, at once part of reality and transcending it, engenders its own realities, polarizes society and transforms it. As President Houari Boumedienne so rightly pointed out in his speech, it is what, in the fullest and widest sense, "enables men to regulate their lives."

Moreover, culture always expresses something. Taken at the source, it indicates difficulties; in social matters it clamors for solutions; among the people, it opens up new paths. There is no people without culture nor society without change.

All true culture, then, has its roots in the heart of society. It is in society that it becomes aware of its own law and the law of variations or modifications. In other words, despite refinement of style, and numerous different trends, despite the apparent autonomy of forms and the marvelous diversity of cultural output, there can be no cultural life which is divorced from political policy. Carrying our demonstration further, I would say that politics is primarily a manner of looking at culture and culture reflects man's first gaze upon so-

ciety; the concept of culture owes its being to politics. Accordingly, a country has the culture it deserves.

For this reason, I find it right and normal that Algiers should strike the keynote in opening this Festival. Algiers, tragically beautiful, or rather beautified by the long and deep anguish which gave birth to us all, Algiers knew better than anyone that culture cannot be a mere luxury. Culture is a serious matter. It is for her sake that these thousands and thousands of Algerians laid down their lives, for her that men are dying today in Angola, in Guinea-Bissao, in Mozambique, in Namibia, in South Africa, as well as in the suffocation of Asia or the ferment of Latin America.

By instinct and by reasoning Algiers understood this. That is why this Festival includes a symposium. It was not enough to provide things to see (our masks, our dances, etc.); there was need to analyze, to develop, to bring forward and to find a way. Because, the re-establishment of our cultural heritage is bound up with the long and bitter struggle which all of us have waged in varying degrees for our right to existence. We undertook this symposium as a necessity, leaving the ethnologists to say of us what they are accustomed to say, and ourselves embracing the duty to see clearly, the desire to leave here with an idea and a programme.

In concrete terms, we should be content to have.

1 — a plan of action;

STANISLAS ADOTEVI, Commissioner General for Culture and Youth of Dahomey, Adotevi is a professor of philosophy by trade. His article, "The Strategy of Culture," was the most popular presentation at the First Pan-African Cultural Festival's symposium in Algiers.

2 — a permanent secretariat with regional sections;

3 — the resolve to intensify exchanges between our various countries; but above all, because to achieve these three aims which are, after all, only suggestions, we must review all our problems and work out as best we can a philosophy which will underlie all our activities, whether cultural or simply political.

WE NEED A PHILOSOPHY, because in order to liberate the boundless activity which is culture and to live fully what Marx called the generic essence of man, every African must free himself from spells and ghosts, or in other words from under-development, which is the immediate expression or consequence of neo-colonization.

Under-development, as we now know, is the presence of absence in the present, the mythical character in a debased drama named neo-colonization. It is neo-colonization which fills the stage of today's events with both actors and scenery, which robs the wakeful state of its certainty. It is a mysterious force whence issue the emanations of eternal exploitation, the matrix from which fetishes are endlessly turned out. It is this which makes and unmakes governments. Every African brought into its service, like Caliban by Prospero's wand, is working only to accomplish its desires.

Therefore, since in Africa there is no reality except through this savage fiction, the extraordinary resilience of which Césaire spoke and which all of us wish for can only come about through the projection over the whole of Africa of new realities which, spreading to infinity, will liberate new energy. These new categories, this system of unaccustomed entities, must assume the task of retranslating in detail all the excrescences with which Africa is afflicted.

In concrete terms, it will no longer do to talk of African unity; we must pursue the means. We can no longer content ourselves with abstract affirmations about African culture in general; we must elucidate sci-

entifically what it is that makes such and such a manifestation distinctly African Negro, another Magrabin and a third, by its origins and inspiration, strictly Arab. This is the truth, eroded sometimes by the passage of time but confirmed by circumstance. All of us share the desire to bridge centuries and differences and to create a united present.

It is to a review of conscience that I invite you — to a casting up of accounts, and finally to a resolution.

Since accounting there must be, I will myself speak of Negritude, but I trust that all the other strains which go to make up our continent will be studied. For that is Africa.

Since we must arrive at a resolution, each one of us has a duty to regard differences in the perspective of unity.

Magrabinism and Pan-Arabism are no doubt political concepts, but it would be hard to deny that their infra-structure is cultural.

Negritude thinks of itself no doubt as a purely literary concept; in truth it is today a political mysticism.

These are the problems we have earnestly to tackle.

For my part, I should like in turn, but in other terms, to take up the theme of Negritude. Negritude has failed. It has failed, not in the main because a few pseudo-philosophical scribblings have attributed to it the wish to denounce a certain form of African development, but because it has become hostile to the development of Africa, denying its origins to deliver us, bound hand and foot, to ethnologists and anthropologists. The Negritude we are offered is the relegation of the Negro to the slow rhythm of the fields, at the treacherous hour of neo-colonization. As Madame Kestloot has realized a little belatedly, it is not surprising that the young no longer flock to hear her.

The approach to eternity of the negritic Negro is not a metaphysical one, but political. Negritude today fixes and coagulates for unavoidable ends the most well-worn theories about African traditions, of

which it claims to be the literary expression.

By rehashing the past and tickling a morbid sensitivity, it hopes to make us forget the present. The Negritude of speeches, the Negritude of today provides, when the great distributions are made, the "good Negroes." Alas for the great poetic vision!

"Do you suppose," we read, "that we can beat the Europeans at mathematics, except for a few outstanding men who would confirm that we are not a race of abstractions?" This sentence was contributed by a theoretician of Negritude to the UNESCO *Courier* of April 1965. Reread it; you will look in vain for poetry. What you will find is the confirmation that the zealots of Negritude are not content merely to point out a difference which is, after all, understandable, but as part of this mania for upholding the concept of theoretical imperfection they endeavor consciously to oppose the black continent to a Europe which is rational and, above all, industrial.

IT IS EASY to discern the intention behind all this intellectual confusion. From the unfinished concept of Negritude one passes to another, very vague and very subtle, of the Negro soul; and thereafter to the uncertainty of a philosophy without imperatives and without foundation whose sole title is the French which, it appears, is to regenerate the world — the African world and, of course, the rest. At the end of the road we are offered African socialism which, excuse the incongruity, is merely the conclusion of a syllogism of which the premise is the lubricious Negro. This comes from no theorist of Negritude, but we know our Sartre. However great our liking for him, we find passages which are mere enormities. "Negritude," he wrote, "is not a state but an attitude . . . an act; but an act which ignores the world, which does not tend towards transforming the wealth of the world . . . it is a matter of existing in the midst of this world . . . of an appropriation which is not technical." From this it follows that for our Negro poets (and I quote):

"Existence is the repetition year by year of the sanctified coitus . . . the human rises out of nothing like a penis in erection; creation is an immense and perpetual parturition; the world is flesh and the offspring of flesh . . . Thus the deepest roots of Negritude are androgynous." This is sheer phantasmagoria. It is not surprising if after this the Negroes are incapable of making a revolution. Revolution is primarily technical and that is why Marx was the one to write the finest songs about the bourgeoisie.

But Sartre, in self-defense, came practically to another conclusion. It will suffice to read the final pages of that very fine text *Orphee Noir* to become aware of this. By keeping the sexual pedal pressed right down, Sartre drifted into delirium, which is normal. Negritude, by seeking fecundity elsewhere than in Africa, lapsed into socialism, which serves it right.

For we thought that African socialism derived from Negritude would bring about the downfall of the oppressor's warehouses.

This idea is the winding street of revolutions and the end of all our hopes. Negritude, by pretending that socialism already existed in traditional communities and that it would be sufficient to follow African traditions to arrive at an authentic socialism, deliberately camouflaged the truth and thus became ripe for destruction.

The first outcome of all this nonsense is the ghosts which disturb our dreams at night:

- the purring of states which are running in neutral gear
- ante-diluvian demagoguery
- government waltzes
- a cacophony of administrative interference in stagnant economic operations
- daily increasing cleavage between town and country
- unemployment and impotence of the educated
- lack of structural changes
- incompetent civil servants, etc.

ONLY FRENZY and bitterness are in sight. This must change and to do this it is not sufficient to talk of Negritude, for African Negroes know they are Negroes and that they are in the midst of the present African catastrophe. In other words we must deal with today's tasks.

This duty may be understood in accordance with the seriousness with which the following questions are tackled:

- How shall we modernize Africa?
- How shall we get rid of old structures?
- How shall we encourage technical culture?
- What importance should we attach to each stratum of our society?
- What place will be occupied by women and young people?
- How shall we resolve our ethnic problems?
- How shall we approach traditional religions etc.?

For the intellectual, the worker, the shopkeeper, the peasant and for those who do not want to travel outside the country, these are the daily problems which must be solved immediately.

Negritude, hollow, vague and inefficient, is an ideology. There is no further place in Africa for literature other than that of the revolutionary combat. Negritude is dead.

A worrying thought arises at this point. I should like to combine this worry with my own worries. It lies in the same direction.

Doubtless, if we examine the events over the past ten years in Africa, and if we disgustedly consider this cavalcade of servility and begging and if we measure the extent of this hypocrisy, we cannot prevent ourselves from calling for a revolt.

Africa has not gone and she does not seem to be ready for departure.

The false alarms, the courtelinesque ballets and the tragi-comic setting of the gigantic Luna-Park make people quick to conclude that these Negroes are worth nothing and are still under the influence of their fantasies and keeping the worst sur-

prises for the best intentions. The conclusion can be quickly drawn and it is drawn. It grieves and humiliates us and we are tempted to throw in the sponge. It could be the same for Negritude.

IT IS NECESSARY to restore the natural aridity to things, to understand how I deviate from my friends, not because of the objectives or the projected end, but because of the means. To understand Negritude, we must put it back in its former neurotic context and by comparing it with the current situation, ask ourselves what the chances are of exorcising it.

At this abstract level, it is easy to see that nothing has changed. Exploitation has become more disgusting, and this continent which, except for man's looting, was not destined for misfortune, lives without an objective and with a stagnant future. We know what they say: mess, waste and disorder. This is what the great friends of these States are saying among themselves. To know this is to know the necessity of recovering in the same movement at least the Negritude programme, if not its final goal.

Without a doubt the irrationality of under-development and especially that of Negroes is enormous. But without going as far as taking examples from their history, it might be useful for Europeans to make the dialectical reversal advocated by Marx, which has now become a working argument. This reversal will allow us to refute certain allegations. And we have known since Montesquieu that, in political life, "All political vices are not moral vices and all moral vices are not political ones." In the same way, we will be led to think that, however vicious Negroes may be, they are not completely commanded by their imagination: and that beyond the Negro's unreason, there lies a reason that is not reasonable, but extraordinarily rational. All

The artificial quest for traditions is, as this unreason has its structure: colonial necessity, whose dominion is so sure that

it can not only digest the strangest eccentricities but even the stroke of fortune bringing success or failure to a coup d'état, and which depends on an ambassador's smile or his silence. This understanding of the structure of the exploitation of Negritude should have assured him.

Its failure came about because it neither would nor could do this work for itself or for us. In any case, there can be no doubt that Negritude will never do it now, but Negritude, at the outset and merely because it did not yet have the possibility, already raised its voice in certain contexts in a way that could be heard and which some of us did hear.

In consequence, whatever may be our quite justifiable references with regard to it and although certain aspects may seem old-fashioned and with frankly reactionary objectives, we should consider Negritude as a primitive period necessary to the African renaissance. I would say, and I choose my words carefully, that at a time when the whole world was given over to racialism and people like Andrass and Morand were taken for vagabonds, at a time when the whole of humanity raised voice in competitive cacophony, there was a single pistol-shot in the middle of this concert — Negritude. It shook a few consciences and brought a few Negroes together, and this was a good thing. I do not intend to defend Negritude against its internal weaknesses and the disintegration with which it is threatened.

We should nonetheless recognize that Negritude's exaltation of our heroes can be none other than abstract and underlines contemporary demands. It produced poetry of the unusual and of solitude, doubtless, but at the same time that poetry was political in its refusal to betray its origins. It was political before being lyrical.

I AM NOT speaking of deviated or perverted Negritude. I am speaking of our debt, and above all, our pride, in belonging to the tradition of African civilization, and in possessing values which distinguish the

black world from that of the white men. In the realm of artistic creation, this attitude calls for a casting off of European models and a profession of faith in the destiny of Africa. Formulated thus, Negritude should be considered as the first moment of present day requirements; I think that it was, yesterday, one of the possible forms for the struggle for emancipation.

It is a curious struggle, I will be told, that contents itself with words when depersonalization is rampant in Senegal and men are dying like flies in the banana-fields of the West Indies. Doubtless this is so, but one should forget for an instant the Negritude of the dictionary and neo-colonial imposture and should try to understand what courage was needed to dare to protest against humiliation in the "thirties." And as regards words I should recommend a little more thorough reading of Marx. One can read, in his "Contribution to the Criticism of Engel's 'Philosophy of Law'," this phrase which may appear astonishing to some of you. I quote:

"It is evident," says Marx, "that the aim of criticism can in no wise replace criticism by armed force. Material force can only be countermanded by material force, but theory is also changed to a material force as soon as it penetrates the masses." I do not think, therefore, that the error arises at this level. The capital error of this older Negritude, the great sin of Negritude in general was to have been, at the outset, inverted love. It was to have believed, even before its birth, in universality — when the universe was forbidden to it. The carnal ardor of black hatred should have been opposed to the cosmic insults to which none other than the black race have been subjected. But our poets, overtaken by unreason, preferred the crazy advances of love. Damas says this when he looks in vain for "a shoulder in which to hide his face and share of reality." On behalf of us all, pigment confirms the truth that this entire Negritude is morbid sterility because it never knew what harvest it would reap. And indeed, that which brings about the restructuring of the world concerns revo-

lution, not cosmic ferment. Negritude was born dead; it was going to die and it died.

A message, however, remains. Apart from the ineffectiveness of its negation, apart from the labyrinth of mystification, Negritude was a rejection of humiliation.

TODAY THIS HUMILIATION is still apparent and the problem posed by Negritude remains. There are the unwanted gifts intermittently showered upon us so as to insure our continued subjection. There is the deterioration of rates of exchange, there are the prices fixed in Paris, London and elsewhere. And for one unemployed — let no more be said — there is the appetizing food to be had in foreign embassies. There is the isolation of China. There are the millions that foreign aid brings in to the countries that are supposed to be aiding us, and the moving text by Che Guevara:

"How can we speak of the 'mutual benefits' if we have the sale, at world market prices, of raw products costing unlimited efforts and sufferings to the under-developed countries and the purchase, at world market prices, of machines produced in today's great automated factories?"

"If we establish this sort of relationship between the two groups of nations, we will have to agree that the Socialist countries are to a certain extent implicated in imperialist exploitation.

"It will be argued that the volume of exchanges with the under-developed countries constitutes an insignificant percentage of Socialist countries' foreign trade. This is absolutely true, but makes no difference as to the immoral character of this exchange."

In short, there is the spirit of Camp David. And finally, there we are — divided, crushed and pulverized. A reduced and shaken Africa, with no grasp of its future.

This is the reality set before us.

Africa, still anti-Aristotelian, is still in the expectation of form. But the great upheavals of the next decades will proceed from this unreasoning, formless Africa. All that is needed is unceasingly renewed action, an imposed discipline and, above all, a way of thinking which can embrace situa-

tions, discern difficulties, repulse determinism and make real the new situation enabling us to reach our goal.

I would put forward the doctrine of Melanism.

One could find another name for it, but the essential thing is the cementing force and thought which, operating in the perspective of unity, reacts on particular sensibilities as do Magrabism and Arabism.

The Melanism which I would propose to you is open to all Nubia, i.e. Africa. It is not a new racialism but an identification. It is an affirmation of the plain fact that to be a Negro today is still to live through the violent depredations of the slave trade.

Melanism is the acceptance of a state of war, but with arms other than prayers and Negro spirituals. Said Machiavelli, "It is an act of humanity to take up arms in the defense of a people for whom arms are the only resource."

Melanism will be the unique resource of a people who can no longer decorate their torture with trophies conquered from shame. It will be, as Césaire says, the expression denying the whip. We must give the lie to negation by assigning positive tasks to each Negro.

We are not trying to racialize problems but to understand that white people have the habit of putting all Negroes into the same category and of inspiring themselves with this same common historical attack and subsequent traumatism, so as to define a strategy for the present. To put it clearly, Negroes should relegate their tears to antiquity. The battle has taken on a physical form, and should henceforth only have a physical expression.

FOR CERTAIN American Negroes, it would be illusory to think that the battle will end with the illusory conquest of civil rights. Even if they one day take over economic and social power, or if, in the meanwhile, they have crumbs thrown to them in the middle hierarchies, they should know that they are nothing, so long as the Negroes of Africa have not yet completed the ascend-

ancy, the tragedy of which was related by King Christopher.

This all goes to say that the essential task must fall on the Negroes of Africa. And they can only carry it out by coming to agreement on the following questions:

1 — It is true that no race has been more insulted than ours?

2 — Is not the present-day situation the perennialization of this humiliation?

3—Is it not true that the Africans themselves (our ancestors who acquiesced in the selling of slaves and who are the present-day apologists of modern sodomy) bear the overwhelming responsibility for this fearsome cavalcade?

4 — And, as things are thus, is it worthwhile making the effort to get out of this slough of spittle, tears and blood?

5 — Finally, is there a certain and effective means of doing this? And if so, what is it?

These are five questions that Melanism would place before the conscience of each African.

For my part, I do not think much of African socialism. It is the ideological expression of a social category which installs, in a backward country, capitalism with its backward economy. It has nothing to offer us.

I therefore think that the only practical socialism is that propounded by Marx, completed by Lenin and applied, with a greater or lesser degree of success, by the socialist countries. This socialism is the only practical possibility — with, of course, the variations imposed by geography. But we know Lenin's dictum, "Communism is the power of the Soviets plus electrification." This is not yet the case in Africa. There is also the advice given by Lenin to the 2nd Internationale. To make the great social leap forward one must, he said, have an active, organized proletariat and help from socialist governments. Now what we know of our proletariats and the present international situation condemns us to defer this hope.

THERE REMAINS CAPITALISM. I will not speak of the extent of this phenomenon, but will content myself with listing its failures by means of a quotation from Meister:

"Finally one fails to wonder about the inability of liberalism to apply to new countries the principles which made possible the spectacular development of our Western countries. By its very development, capitalism impedes the development of new countries: the principle of the free circulation of capital empties these countries of their surpluses, while that of free enterprise kills the embryo of industrial development. To stick to these principles and leave their frontiers open means condemning these countries to the same stagnation as that reigning in Latin America, that typical product of neo-colonialism in that last century. It is obvious that the liberal way is a total failure in Africa."

Although during several decades Europe has been the theater of the greatest capitalist upheavals, and although capitalism today still appears as an extraordinarily fertile model which constantly generates free energy, here, for the African, it is, to use a metaphor, an extinguished and slag-covered volcano.

We therefore are forced to look for something else. Melanism which, I admit, is somewhat irrational, aims at keeping the sore open and, by shelving the solutions so far proposed, gets rid of the inextricable estrangement and founds the state in which the future history of Africa will take on a meaning.

I have already defined Melanism. It is not just a phobia. As it cannot be compared to the "anti-racist racism" Sartre speaks of in "Orphee Noire," it is our purpose here to de-mystify the concept of race and to wrench it out of the hands of reactionary politicians who are using it to obscure the issue.

Although Sartre's objective was the same as ours — to denounce the evil that has led to the racism of the black poets — ours differs from his in that it does not limit itself to exorcising race by making it active, but aims at strengthening a people by a

racial awareness, a people which perhaps is still abstract although not paradoxical, and which is probably mistaken as a result of inhibition.

THERE REMAINS however, in spite of the precautions taken, something which should not be left obscure. We should repeat here what we have already said:

1 — We are products of white unreason: we are Negroes only for the whites. In Africa, to be a Negro, is to be as natural as the infinite stars in the night.

2 — Whatever our opinions, whether we are Christians, Muslims, Communists or reactionaries, and often at the height of battle, white necessity has been burnt to a cinder in our flesh.

3 — As it is our purpose to save ourselves from racism by constructing a modern state in Africa, this our purpose can only be made real by an exacerbated nationalism, the force of which, although partly deriving from objective facts, also derives, according to Renouvin, from irrational elements. Consequently, we cannot reject the irrational part of such an enterprise. On the contrary, if we take the end into account, the objective pursued will give the enterprise a positive value, as has always been the case throughout history. Undoubtedly, to be able to speak of national feeling, we should, according to the well-known pattern, first have a nation. But who could deny that Islam has favored nationalism? And is it possible, as Renouvin asks, to understand anything about Japanese nationalism without referring to Shintoism?

Our project therefore, far from floundering through imaginative excesses, may break silence in pointing to the beyond and in rejecting limits. It states the necessity for a modern state while indicating the means to attain it.

Therefore it takes its inspiration from the great nationalist upsurges of the past centuries, but with the difference that, although it may serve to create a myth, this myth should draw its truth only from its own strength: we need a myth which is not mythical but a reality shattered in the

bric-a-brac of time. A myth such as the one Gramsci, who pronounced the only right and profound judgment on Machiavelli, discovered in *The Prince*, which he considered as an "illustration of political ideology which does not present itself as a frigid Utopia or a doctrinaire argument, but as the creation of a concrete reasoning process which operates on a dispersed and scattered people to provoke and organize their collective renaissance."

IN THE SAME WAY, Africa must be convinced by meditation on race. It should come to terms with its present so as to regenerate the future. In this connection, there are two objectives:

- The establishment of a collective mel-anian will.
- New mental structures.

There are five prerequisites for attaining these objectives:

1 — On the political level: the establishment of a modern state

2 — On the economical level: a democratic national economy

3 — In the field of the philosophy of history, rejection of all systems which persist in discovering cyclic returns and deny indefinite progress.

4 — On the intellectual and moral level:

(a) in the moral field, an educational system drawing its force from a constant reference to past and present humiliations of the race and which also considers reprehensible any insane cult of the past, even when national, as well as all stupid borrowings from abroad.

(b) in the intellectual field, opposition to stifled traditions, an appeal for rational innovations of the various world revolutions.

5 — Lastly, on the level of personal training, we should only strive for a perpetual creation of ourselves by ourselves and for a constant creative activity based upon a sense of initiative and responsibility and only retaining elements useful for the nation.

To sum up, pending the union of the whole of Africa, this transitional ideology aims at the establishment of a strong and prosperous national state which:

- inside the country brings about the recovery of the race by vivisection!
- outside the country asserts African irredentism using subversion if necessary;
- finally, on the economic level, takes advantage of the contradictions between and inside the power coalitions in order to found a modern industry and economy.

A hallucination? Perhaps. In any case, the present methods will have to be transformed. Practical and theoretical necessities often entail the introduction of new concepts into the problem.

Before socialist recovery, must come recovery of ourselves. This is not a matter of repudiation. Tactics had to be changed. We are changing them.

In any case, these ideas are directed to the young Africans of my generation, to the generation which, like me, will perhaps not

see the promised land, but which should know that the shore exists. Melanism is, after all, the preliminary to socialism. Instead of disdain and condescension, each African, as is more or less the case with the Chinese today, will read in the eyes of the European the first signs of terror.

Therefore, everybody should, in the sinister hour of discouragement, repeat after Fichte these sentences of restored hope: "Already one sees the new daybreak shine, it casts a glow upon the mountain tops, announcing the coming day. I want, as much as is in my power, to seize the rays of this daybreak and condense them to make a mirror which reflects its image on our desperate era, so that it may find there its true core, and perceives, through its successive transformations and developments, the anticipated form of its definitive face." No doubt this contemplation will dissolve the image of our former life and that which is dead will not definitely enter the tomb before emitting excessive moans.

The whole world surprised, wakes up in panic
To the violent rhythm of blood, to the violent rhythm of jazz,
The white man turning pallid over this new song
That carries torch of purple through the dark of night.

The dawn is here, my brother! Dawn! Look in our faces,
A new morning breaks in our old Africa.

PATRICE LUMUMBA,
from "Dawn in The Heart of Africa"

PAN-AFRICANISM

-LAND AND POWER

WHETHER WE WANT IT OR NOT, there are divisions among black Africans living in the United States, the Carribean and on the African continent, divisions which have been imposed on us by Europeans. There are geographical divisions, countries such as Senegal and Moritania, Mozambique and Guinea, created by Europeans as they struggled for the wealth of Africa. Then there are political divisions and economic divisions, again imposed on us by Europeans.

Now they are planning to impose on us grave cultural divisions and, most of all, to divide us by naming us different things. If you are in San Francisco, for example, and you see a Japanese or a Chinese walking down the street, you do not say that there goes an American Japanese or a Japanese-American. You say simply that there goes a Japanese — period. Yet, probably, that Japanese cannot speak Japanese at all; he may be third or fourth generation in America. But no one calls him a Japanese American. The first thing you call him is a Japanese; because a person is defined, really, at first by his physical presence, or in terms of his ancestral stock. Whether they are Chinese, Japanese or African. The same is true of the Indians. Even in America, when you see a red Indian, you do not say he is an American; you say he is an Indian. The same is true for East Indians; the same for Phillipines. Wherever you see them, in any part of the world, you call them Chinese or what not.

The same is not true for Africans.

Let's ask ourselves why.

If you see an African in Europe, you do not say that he is an African. If you see him in America you do not call him an African. He may be Negro; he may be West Indian; he may be everything else but African. That is because Europe took its time to divide us carefully, quite carefully. And they gave us different names so that we would never, always never, refer to ourselves by the same name; which helped to insure that there would always be differences. If you say you are West Indian, it is fairly obvious that you are something different to be set apart from an African. An American Negro and an African also obviously are not the same thing.

One of the most important things we must now begin to do, is to call ourselves "African." No matter where we may be from, we are first of all and finally Africans. Africans. Africans. Africans. The same also happens to be true of North Africa. When they say "Algerians" or "Egyptians," they are talking about Africans because Africa happens to be one solid continent. Among Africans there will and must be no divisions. They are just Africans — period.

You must also understand that there are two types of oppression, basically. One is exploitation. Another is colonization. With exploitation one is economically raped;

STOKELY CARMICHAEL sparked the "black power" movement during the Meredith March through Mississippi in the summer of 1966. As a student at Howard University, where he took a double major in philosophy and sociology, Carmichael showed rare promise. After receiving the bachelor's degree, he left academia for Lowndes County, Alabama and soon emerged as National Chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. He and Charles Hamilton are co-authors of the book, *Black Power*.

by STOKELY CARMICHAEL

for example, in the 1930's the labor movement was a response to economic exploitation. Rich white people, in that instance, were exploiting poor white people. But there is another type of oppression — colonization. Colonization is not just the economic raping of someone, not merely taking a lot of money away. Colonization deals with destroying the person's culture, his language, his history, his identification, his total humanity. When one is colonized one is totally dehumanized. So that when the victims of colonization fight they are fighting for a process of humanization.

This is entirely different from the fight of people who are only exploited. The people who are exploited fight just for economic security. The colonized fights beyond economic security, far beyond. And so, it seems to me that as we begin the search for allies and coalitions we can only form allies and coalitions based on whether those people are fighting for the same thing, fighting the same fight that we who have been colonized are fighting. In other words, people who are fighting for their humanity. This means, for example, that all non-white peoples who have been colonized can join hands, understanding of course that our fights remain entirely different.

The people who have been colonized by white folk, let us say, in Asia, are fighting the same fight but a different fight because of culture, humanity. Their way of life is and will be entirely different from ours.

But they are fighting nonetheless and fighting for a humanity of their own, albeit the same thing in a sense that we are fighting for, to affirm our humanity. We are fighting to affirm our humanity. With those nonwhite people we can begin to move so long as they understand precisely what the fight is all about and that we may differ in some respects.

IN AMERICA, folk seem to think that the revolution there—if there is such a thing, or even if there will be such a thing—will all be over in five years, when actually we are talking about a generation of struggle. That is why they always have deep questions in their minds to trouble them. They fail to understand that the struggle we are talking about inside America is only symptomatic of a world-wide struggle against Europe and its satellites. America, in fact, is nothing but Europe. The white people in America are not Americans but in fact Europeans. When we call them Americans we allow them to escape; we define them incorrectly. We should call them Europeans and understand that they never belonged in America, that they took that continent from somebody else. When you call them Americans you forget that they were Europeans because you give them in fact the theory of native origin, that they came out of America. Where did Americans come from? They come from America — that is, somebody you call American. But if you say that they are Europeans (which

is what they are), then the question arises as to where they came from—Europe. What are Europeans doing in what is now called America?

We must understand that because it shows how deep our struggle really, really, really is. These are things we do not even think about, because, if you see what I have been saying up to now, you also will see that, in the final analysis, the struggle is going to be waged with Europeans against non-Europeans. And that means that America is European. That means that our struggle is not five or ten years but is, in fact, a generation. Once we understand that our struggle is at least a generation, then we do not even have to worry about so many little things. We will know, then, that we are not going to see any really concrete or substantive victories in our fight for at least five or ten years. I mean to say anything really concrete enough for us to look at and say that that is what we have been able to do.

At this point, it becomes important that you have people of African descent — scattered over the Western hemisphere by Europeans, scattered across the West Indies and used so long as slaves — bound together in a unified struggle for their liberation. This is not impossible inasmuch as we have people today all over the world moving forward in the quest for liberation against their oppressors.

BECAUSE I understand so clearly the foregoing factors, the ancestral roots of the problem, I have concluded that the solution has to be Pan-Africanism. Everybody — DuBois, Padmore or whoever — always comes back at last to Pan-Africanism. Pan-Africanism is not just some nonsensical black nationalism. Even white philosophers understand this fact. For example, Plato in *The Republic* talks about the theory of Antaeus.* The parable of Antaeus, says Plato, shows that the philosopher

king has come up out of the earth, that the people grew out of the earth. They were asking “Where are we from?” Plato says that you must always answer that question: “Where are we from?” In his book he says that the people come out of the earth, have grown up there, so that they always fight for that earth; and for the ideas that come out of that earth. And they always will. So black people (us) come out of that earth, and we always will; and so black people (us) must stop running around in circles. We have to have our theory of Antaeus — where we are from. If black people in the States say “where are we from?” they must wind up at Africa. One must know one’s beginning, who one is, before one knows where one is going.

People who regard Pan-Africanism negatively, who think that it is a racist theory, ought to read George Padmore’s book, *Communism or Pan Africanism*. Padmore is clear on this. Writing around the 1930’s, and one of the advisers to Dr. Nkrumah, Padmore was crystal clear on the point that we must talk about Pan-Africanism. I believe that people who talk about “Marxist-Leninism” so hard, in such a hard line, are people who are groping for an answer. They seize on “Marxist-Leninism” as if it were some sort of a religion. Marx becomes, in essence, Jesus Christ. Now anything you cannot answer you take over and bow to Marx. That, in my view, is absolutely absurd. At least for me.

I cannot claim to understand all of Marxist-Leninism. I have read very little of them and understand little of what I have read. So, for me to jump up and say that I am a Marxist-Leninist is for me to be intellectually dishonest and, in fact as well, a damn liar. And yet, though I do not fully understand all that you folk are talking about, I do have certain universal concepts which happen to agree with the things that Marx was talking about. But, just because I have these concepts does not mean that Marx was the man who taught them to me. I knew them before I read Marx. So, even if I agree with them, why now should I call myself a Marxist? Tunisian Ibn-Khaldun

*Antaeus was a giant wrestler who was invincible as long as he was touching his mother, the earth.

spoke of Marx's concept of surplus value, for example, as early as the fifteenth century. Why should I give Marx the credit for plagiarizing Khaldun? Marx only wrote down universal truths about oppression. He did not invent all of them.

Everybody can arrive at these truths themselves. I don't need necessarily to read Marx, though Marx wrote it down more fully. I give Marx the credit for writing it down, of course, for being a good writer. But Marx wrote down the universal truths of those who came way back before Marx. Right here in Algeria there was Ibn Khaldun. For me, to always look to Marx is once again to give the credit for everything good to Europe. Once again I continue to stress my own inferiority as an African. Ready to unify my country, I continue to look to a European, Marx, to unify me. I say "Marx, Marx, Marx," and once again I am looking to Europe. People with this approach do not believe that they themselves can originate something worthy, which becomes very damaging.

People in that frame of mind are going in circles and they of course are going to be aided by our oppressors. They are going to be aided whenever they travel in circles. When a man is lost and you know that he is going in circles trying to get to you, you do not tell him "Look, Man, you are going in circles." Even if you did you would be unable to show him the proper path. If you said "Look, man, you are going in circles," he would get mad at you and keep on moving. He would lay back and then he would say, "O.K. man, let's go." Don't get in a man's way when he's going in circles.

And yet, I view the struggle in the States as part and parcel of the entire world struggle, particularly the black world struggle. That is to say, I cannot see the struggle in the States as any different from the struggle anywhere else where men are fighting against a common oppressor. Our fight is clearly a fight against both capitalism and racism. One does not get rid of capitalism without fighting against racism.

I cannot agree with the ideology that

says that capitalism and racism are two different entities unto themselves. I would have you struggle against both. To get rid of capitalism — I repeat — is not necessarily to get rid of racism. As a matter of fact, I think that black people ought to know this better than anyone else. I think that, in terms of reality and history and my own ideology, all of the movement that we have been building up in terms of black nationalism, from the sit-ins for coffee to "black power," runs straight to Pan-Africanism. We always come back to that.

IT is clear now that the only position for black men is Pan-Africanism. We need a land base. We need a base. A land base. In the final analysis, all revolutions are based on land. The best place, it seems to me, and the quickest place that we can obtain land is Africa. I am not denying that we might seek land in the United States. That is a possibility, but I do not see it clearly in my mind at this time. We need land and we need land immediately, and we must go to the quickest place for it.

We need a base that can be used for black liberation, a land that we can say belongs to us. We do not need to talk too much about it. That will harm the struggle. When one needs a base one needs also to prepare for armed struggle. To seize any of the countries in Africa today that are dominated by white people who have physically oppressed us is to confront an armed struggle, a prolonged struggle.

But once we have seized a base we will be on our way. We will then have to demonstrate our willingness to fight for our people wherever they are oppressed. I believe that people basically defend their own kind, as America did during the Spanish Civil War. In the Middle East they did it even in 1967 with Israel. People who didn't have any rights in that country were flying in from all over the world to fight. There's nothing wrong with our doing the selfsame thing. It can be done and, most important, we are trying to secure a political ideology as we seek a state. We are beginning to understand our movements and

to see how we can move politically, so that we begin to talk clearly and critically now about Pan-Africanism. It is a discussion that must begin.

There are many people who live in Europe and America who support lands which do not belong to them. Concretely. They wage so large a propaganda campaign that one cannot say anything about their country without being automatically labeled "anti..." to the point where one is even afraid to move for fear of falling into that label. If we obtain a bigger base than they have we can do a better job than they do because we have more rights to be in Africa than they have to be where they are.

MALCOLM X said that one fights for revolution but that in the final analysis revolution is based on land. He was absolutely correct. You have to have land in order to produce, in order to feed, shelter and clothe your people. People fight the revolution not solely for ideas; they fight also for a better way of life, and they incorporate new ideas introduced to them that promise a better way of life. People do not just fight for ideas, unless they are sure that they can see a better way of life coming out of those ideas.

Thus, unless one can feed and clothe and shelter people who want to fight for these better ideas, there is nothing for them to fight for. In order to have a revolution one must have a clear and viable alternative for the masses, one they can understand and follow, one that can move them to struggle. I do not think that in the States there can be a clear and viable alternative for black people. I am almost convinced that there cannot be. That is not to say that the struggle cannot and will not continue.

But we cannot begin to understand clear and viable alternatives until we first obtain a land base. We have to have a land base. I think that the best place for that is Africa and in Africa the best place is Ghana. Black people in the United States meanwhile must begin to understand that there

needs now to be a clear sharpening of our ideologies. Our ideology must be Pan-Africanism, nothing else. I am almost convinced of that. Once we get a land base we can begin to experiment with it and develop it and go about the concrete tasks of nation building.

One of the problems of black people is that we are afraid, always, to put up leaders. I don't know why. We have some fear of putting up leaders and following a leader. What we always look for instead is merely someone who has an idea. We all will agree with the idea but fail nonetheless to give concrete support to that man. We keep saying that the man is not important, that the idea alone is important, but that is not necessarily true. You have to have someone who is capable of implementing the idea. Our enemies have recognized that and, whenever they find someone able to implement a viable idea, they move to destroy him. All the time. They kill him physically; or isolate him politically or ruin his name among us.

We allow that to happen and only after he has been destroyed does he become a hero for us. By that time it is too late. Now everybody is wearing Malcolm X T-shirts and Malcolm X, blah, blah, blah. But Malcolm today would be more important to us alive than dead, although in death he has become more famous. We need him now and we need to know what he would do in the present case, because at least he had some ideas about where he was going, before the rest of us did. He was ahead of us. We have caught up with him today in a sense but he would still be ahead of us, hopefully growing at the same rate that we are growing. But we never protect our leadership while our leaders are alive. We are afraid to do that.

WE never understand history because history is always moved forward by a single person. China would not be China were it not for Mao Tse-tung. That is not to say that somebody else would not have led China, but it would not be what China is today without Mao. Vietnam would not

be Vietnam without Ho Chi-minh. France would not be France without De Gaulle. England would not be England without Winston Churchill. We have to understand that. Now I have traveled all around the world. I have looked and I have seen. I have been waiting for and seeking for a black man outside of our generation who knows what is going on. I have found one — Dr. Nkrumah. He knows precisely what the struggle is. We should bring Dr. Kwame Nkrumah back to Ghana. I would not deny that he made some mistakes. But he was the first person to talk about Pan-Africanism as a concrete term. And he demonstrated his willingness to fight. He sent his troops to the Congo and mobilized his troops to move to Zambia when problems developed there. He trained many guerillas. He was the first to give Lumumba assistance. He gave his country as an open base for every African freedom fighter or liberation movement. He trained his youth in the concept of Pan-Africanism. It was he who started the whole drive for African nationalism. Dr. Nkrumah was one of the first people to wake me up. It was he who began to wake up everyone. He is the person who can bring our fight together and give us some direction to fight. We need such a person and Dr. Nkrumah happens to be that person as far as I am concerned.

But the fact that we start in Ghana does not mean that we stop in Ghana. We must fight for the unification of Africa. That's what Pan-Africanism is all about. The unification of the mother continent at this time must take priority. The unification of the African continent is entirely different from African unity. They are two different things. They are two different terms and they are two different things. African unity means you have different states who come together and talk, talk, talk, talk. Unification of Africa means you have one state — Africa. Everybody speaks the same language, one government, one army.

So that you start in Ghana for the unification of Africa and you recognize, if you are intelligent, that South Africa is not go-

ing to be removed by talk. It is not going to be removed by talk. It is not going to be removed by Britain, by the UN, or by anybody. Nor is it going to be removed by a handful of guerillas. It is only going to be removed by the entire black world standing up against it, because when in fact the final confrontation over South Africa for example, takes place, the black man will see that he is not just fighting whites in South Africa. He is fighting all of Europe, because all of Europe is going to actively defend South Africa.

WE must begin to move. The whole black world must begin to move, though we will not even be able to see anything concrete for at least five to ten years. Then you begin to understand precisely our direction. We are coming closer; we are more sharply defined now. We have always been moving. Let's go back to the 1960's: we start a move for integration — a cup of coffee. Even before we got the cup of coffee, we recognized where else we were going. We were moving for the vote. By the time they were getting ready to give us the vote, we recognized that that was not it either. So now we recognize that it is Pan-Africanism.

It becomes more and more sharply defined now. It has taken since the 1960's, almost ten years, to understand precisely where we are going. Ten years to take us to Pan-Africanism, and it will probably take us another ten to sharply define what that is all about. We mistakenly believe that we can solve the problems of the United States in five years. Then, when the five years have come and gone and the problem remains unsolved, our people grow tired and say: "Well, you've been jiving me. You said five years." We should prepare ourselves for twenty-five years. We should always say twenty-five, at least twenty-five. One generation will have to fight, because there are people who are always attuned to fighting if you have indoctrinated one generation thoroughly, prepared them to fight. Then all subse-

quent generations are prepared to fight. Vietnam is clearly a case of that readiness.

I believe that as you study you struggle and struggle. It's like a math problem. If you are given a math problem, you may sit up all night working with it before, finally, things click and the problem is solved within five minutes. But that does not mean that you could come here and solve it in five minutes whenever you please. Before you solve it in five minutes, you have to sit down and go through that whole process of trying everything you know. If you have tried and you have eliminated all the possibilities, you now come to the one correct one. The same is true for us; that's what we have been doing in our struggle.

PAN-AFRICANISM wants to save as many black people as possible. We will lose some. Some will even die in the struggle. We know that, but there's no need for us to emphasize those deaths. We want to emphasize what is alive. Revolution is not about dying; it is about living. People do not understand that. You kill to live; you die to live. It is not just about dying. We no longer have to prove that we are bad by dying. We want to live. Fratricide, for instance, is something that we must not in any way encourage. It is okay to back down from a fight with one's people. The impression of Pan-Africanism especially is that one must be aggressive and intolerant against the enemy; but, with one's people one must always be humble. If one says one is really serving the people, one must be humble. You are always humble to him whom you serve.

We must always be political. I think that culture, for example, is always very political. It always has been and always will be. We must understand that this conference is really a political conference, especially for our people. It means that at this point Africa is ready to launch its real liberation. In order to launch its liberation, it must have a culture because a culture represents the values, the values for which one fights. If one is fighting for a revolu-

tion, one is talking about more than just changing governments and power, and that is changing the value system. What carries that value system is one's culture. What we have here is the beginning of people who are trying to grope for a real fight with the culture.

CULTURE is a cohesive force. It is what keeps people together. Culture is very important in the fight because a lot of people have fought against their oppressors yet maintained the culture of their oppressors and culturally they are the same as their oppressors. They haven't fought for anything actually. All they have done is change powers, but that is not a revolution. You have to understand that changing powers is not a revolution.

Black people in America, Africans who live in America, especially must understand that and begin to alienate our people completely from the culture and values of Western society. That is going to be particularly difficult because all of us live within those values and it is going to be hard for us to root them out. I mean that it is like people who say that they want to be black. But being black is an awfully hard job in the United States.

It is very, very difficult, and we have to constantly try to understand the rejection of Western values and the picking up of new values. It is very, very difficult. But our first task is all the more to alienate our people at every chance we get from the Western culture and values, because once they are alienated there will be no influence over them. That is what we are seeking. We are seeking to stop all influence of Western culture on our people — completely. We must stop it; so we move to alienate. That is number one. Then number two: we move to give a concrete ideology that the people in the United States will adopt. They have a lot of technical skills and a lot of information which they could begin to put to the aid of the unification of Africa — spiritually, morally and politically.

At the same time, there will be struggles

inside the United States, always moving on different levels as black people keep trying to get a better way of life. These struggles will continue. I cannot say that I know exactly which way to go, but I think that some trends are very important. For example, the trends in black studies are very, very important and they must continue because what is at stake is not the subjects but the attitude, the attitude of black people having the right to have the education that will benefit black people.

Those are the skirmishes. They are the beginnings because the rulers are not going to let us have a truly black studies or a truly black university. In the final analysis one can not have a black university in any other society than a black society because the job of the university is to propagate the values and institutions of that society. In the United States, a black university, a truly black university, is going to be totally

anti-American, not just possibly anti-American, but anti-American to the point where it urges people to destroy, dismantle, disrupt, tear down, level completely in America. So you cannot have that, but that is precisely the job of the black educator, to train his people how to dismantle America, how to destroy it.

WHAT those black study groups should now do is not just talk about Africans living in Africa, but Africans living all over the world, so that the subjects will become concrete subjects related to Africans, in Africa, Africans in the Caribbean, Africans in the United States, Africans in Canada. We have to understand also that Egypt is in Africa; Algeria is in Africa. They are African and even the Arabs are going to find that the African world must come first because that is where they are continentally. They are African. That's the roots, and that's where we all have to come from.

REPRINTS AVAILABLE

THE BLACK SCHOLAR offers reprints of any of the articles published in it. Reprints come individually bound in pamphlet format, 7" x 10", an ideal size for classroom and community use.

For details, write:

REPRINTS
THE BLACK SCHOLAR
Box 31245
San Francisco, Calif. 94131

EDUCATION AND REVOLUTION

ONE WAY OF UNDERSTANDING what's going on, on the college and the high school campuses in the United States today, is to examine the essence of education. Basically an education passes the heritage, learning, the wisdom and the technology of human history to the coming generations. We want this information to be passed on to enable and to help mankind continue to survive and cope with the environment. In terms of surviving and coping with our environment, basically, we have two worlds to deal with. We have the natural world — the task of surviving against the given world, the task of eking a living from the earth itself, for which technology has been designed. On the other hand we have the social world, the social situation. We have an antagonistic orientation to both of these worlds. We speak about the natural enemies of man, including everything from animals to the weather, and these elements have been given the label of enemy because they can kill people. We have to be able to harness these forces, we have to be able to adapt to the natural situation so that our survival will be enhanced, and for this purpose, science and technology, agriculture and industry, all of these tools have been developed by mankind through practice in coping with this physical environment.

We are in the habit of speaking about certain things that happen in the social situation that are hostile and inimical to the prospect of survival for mankind, and

we also label these with the same designation of enemy. The distinction between the struggle for survival against the physical environment, and the struggle against the antagonistic forces and situations in the social realm is a very important distinction to make, because often the struggle in the social realm is really the only struggle that many people are caught up in. They are not directly involved in struggling against the physical environment, but their survival does depend upon struggling within the social realm, in terms of how the economy is organized, how the political system is organized, and how the social system itself is organized, so that many lives are played out against this background of struggling against the way civilization is presently organized.

The struggle against the physical environment, of course, is primary. We have organized our social situation in order to cope with the physical environment. The way that we organize agriculture, the way that we organize industry, the way that we organize the economy as a whole, the way that we organize the political situation, all historically have been towards facilitating and better enabling us to cope with the physical environment.

AT THIS POINT I think it would be useful to establish some terminology. The best terminology I know of, for discussing this distinction between the struggle within the physical environment and the struggle

ELDRIDGE CLEAVER is Minister of Information for the Black Panther Party and author of the best-selling book, *Soul On Ice*. He is a product of the San Quentin Prison, where he served nine years. While still on parole, Cleaver was implicated in a shootout between fellow Panthers and Oakland policemen. When his parole was revoked, he fled the country for Africa and is now exiled in Algiers. He is currently International Editor for *Ramparts* magazine.

by ELDRIDGE CLEAVER

within the social environment, is the terminology developed by Karl Marx. He designates the struggle against or within the physical environment as taking place within the economic base of society. And, upon the economic base of society is erected the superstructure of society. Thus the struggle within the social realm takes place within the superstructure and the struggle in the physical realm takes place within the economic base. In the economic base we find the natural resources, the technology, the industry, all the machines and the tools and the means that mankind has developed for coping with the physical environment. They are designated as the means of production, the means of producing material wealth, goods and commodities from the natural resources themselves. But all of the institutions of society, everything from the educational facilities to the hospitals and the postal service, everything belonging to the organized aspect of society, exist within the social superstructure, which has been built and sustained by our means of producing material wealth.

Let's get to the essence of an education. In a very simple-structured social organization, where technology and learning have not become complex, it would be possible for one's father or one's uncle to pass on the technology. Your father could teach you how to fish or your father could teach you how to farm at a rudimentary agricultural level. He could teach you how to hunt with a spear or a rock, or bow and arrow.

But as the economic condition becomes more complex, and as the level of information and knowledge and understanding of the environment increases, to the extent that society requires people to specialize in passing on this information, then the problem of education really sets in. When it was necessary for people to be designated as teachers and to specialize in, or devote all their time to, passing on this information, the learning situation itself had to be centralized as an institution. Schools, universities, etc., were developed so that the maximum productive use of a man's time and energy could be made. Now you can readily understand how in a very complex social situation it would be understood by the community, by everybody involved in the social unit, that these places or institutions of learning were there to serve and to benefit the community as a whole. It would be absurd for a teacher or one who is charged with administering the learning process as a whole, it would be absurd for him to alienate himself from the community as a whole or to claim that he owns the body of information that is a heritage to mankind; this would be absurd, it would not be tolerated by the community.

Of course I have been writing as though society was an organism in which people were in harmony with each other, in which they cooperated with each other and in which they were not waging wars of aggression against each other and were not

in conflict with each other. But in actual fact and in terms of human history such harmony has not been the case.

In human history, we see that society has been broken up into classes, into antagonistic ethnic and economic groups that struggle against each other for survival as each sees it. They enslave each other and make their living at the expense of other groups, special interest groups are formed, etc. So that in reality we have to look at our own situation, have to look at the situation that exists in the economic base in terms of the class struggle, also in terms of the ethnic struggles that have gone on. When we look at our own situation today in the United States, we find that those who are very powerful in our society are powerful because of their relationship to the means of production, because they are rich, because they own the factories and because they own the natural resources. With this economic power they are able to gain control of all the institutions in society, they are able to appoint people who themselves may not be rich, or may not own stock, or have any control over the means of production of the natural resources, but because of their extensive education are able to be appointed to positions of managing society.

But at the top of the social organization in the United States, we have the ruling class mentioned; and because of the wealth of this ruling class, it is able to dominate American society and control American society, able to determine what judges are appointed to the judicial system, able to determine who is appointed to the Board of Regents to administer the colleges, and able even to determine who is elected to office, because it controls the wealth, and has vast amounts of money at its disposal to wage a political campaign.

Those who control the economy of the United States are able to control the rest of society. Those of us who are not in this advantaged position, black people, Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, Indians, Eskimos, virtually every ethnic group including poor white people and also middle

class college students, all find ourselves in the position wherein our lives are manipulated and controlled by those who have this advantaged social position.

We have to struggle in order to survive. But we're not struggling against the natural environment, our struggle is not in reality taking place against nature itself, but we are struggling against the way society has been organized. We are struggling against those who have organized society to their advantage, in order to continue their control and rule of the entire social unit. It is very important for us to understand that we are called upon to wage this struggle with the same desperation and the same "do or die" necessity that a caveman in some forgotten time in human history had to struggle against the natural elements. In reality, our adversaries are other men, other women and other social classes. In terms of the racial strife within the United States our class struggle is often hidden by our ethnic struggle. We are manipulated along the color line as well as along the class line. We are exploited economically, and we are discriminated against racially, also.

TODAY, AS ALWAYS, the struggle of the exploited people within the United States is taking place on all fronts, but the most sensational and explosive clashes are being centered and focussed more and more on the college campuses and on the high school campuses. We understand that those who control the mind can control the body, so that those who are interested in keeping people in oppressed positions and then dominating their perspective and their outlook on life, know that it is necessary for them to control the learning process in order to brainwash people, in order to camouflage the true nature of the society. In order to sanctify their system, they teach the exploited people and the oppressed people to virtually love the system that is exploiting and oppressing them. This oligarchy has an interest in seeing to it that the content of the curriculum is to its liking, and that it does not expose the

true nature of the decadent and racist society that we live in.

On the other hand, the exploited and oppressed people have the opposite interest in exposing the true nature of the society and in educating ourselves and our children on the nature of the struggle and in transferring to them the means for waging the struggle so they can be aware of the level of the struggle, of the progress and the history of the struggle and the nature of the enemy and the true vulnerability of the enemy. In other words, we want to be able to teach ourselves and our children the necessity for struggling against this ruling class.

What we have to realize above all else is that our enemy and that which we in fact are struggling against is not an individual college president or high school principal or a board of regents or a board of education, but the entire social structure. We are struggling against the capitalist system which organized itself in a way that purchases our lives, that exploits us and forces us into a position wherein we have to wage a struggle against the social organization in order to survive.

One of the techniques or one of the weapons that the enemy uses against us in our struggle is to turn words against us, to define our struggle in terms that place our struggle in a bad light, so that the word "revolution" is given a bad name, is looked upon as a negative term.

But what revolution means and what it means to us is that we are trying to change a system that has historically enslaved our people, has continually exploited us, has discriminated against us and made our lives miserable and kept us underdeveloped and kept us blind and kept us in a form of slavery, one form of slavery or another. Of course, our struggle has continually forced the slavemaster to modify the terms of the slavery, but every modification that has been made has only been made because the slavemaster found it necessary to make a few minor adjustments in order to continue his exploitation of us on a new level.

THE PROCESS of breaking out of slavery, the process of breaking out of a set of social arrangements, out of a social organization that is killing us, this process is named revolution; we are revolting and rebelling and moving against a system that is our enemy. For us the word "revolution" should be a beautiful word because it's a word that promises us hope, that promises us a better life and we should not be ashamed to call ourselves revolutionaries. We are a revolutionary people, our very social situation forces us to be a revolutionary people. If we are not going to be revolutionary people, we have to accept the designation of satisfied slaves; if we aren't satisfied, then that means we have a revolutionary consciousness. It is important for us to be consciously revolutionary, to understand that we are revolutionaries, and to understand that it is right for us to be revolutionaries and that in fact the enemies are the ones who are wrong.

The enemy uses words against us, talks about "crime in the streets," talks about "disorders," talks about "law and order," all of these words are smoke screens, are smoke screens to confuse us, to create conflicts between the various exploited groups and to turn them against each other. It is the old technique of divide and conquer. What we need and what — if we had any sense at all — what we would be working for is to create an alliance between all the exploited people within the society so that we could join together to create machinery, coordinate our struggle, and coordinate our attack against the capitalist system and destroy it. Because as long as the capitalist system exists, by its very nature some people will have to be exploited in order for others to be rich and powerful, so that the exploited are powerless and in an oppressed position. Therefore revolution is a glorious term, it is a term to be proud of and we should know that we are morally right, we are right in every sense of the term and that the oppressor is the one who is wrong and that the oppressor has no rights which the oppressed are bound to respect.

History is on our side and justice is on our side and it is only a question of removing from positions of power those who are able to judge our struggle and to pass out judgements that denounce us and that deny us the right to survive. If we had revolutionary members from the exploited classes sitting on the Supreme Court, in the halls of Congress and in the Executive Branch of the Government, then these revolutionaries in office would give out revolutionary decisions, the revolutionaries on the benches of the court would give out revolutionary decisions on the court cases and the capitalists and the racist police would be judged wrong.

They would be the ones who would be sent to prison. They would be the ones who would be penalized. They would be the ones who would be forced to raise a hundred thousand dollars in order to get out on bail. In other words, the oppressed people have to take control of the government, they have to take control of the state, so that in their hands these instruments of power would be turned against the exploiters. The exploitative system would be dismantled and we could build another system that would be based on cooperation, not on a "dog-eat-dog" epic of competition, of corrupt methods of exploiting people. It would be based on how best to organize the industries, the means of production, in order to give everybody a good life.

OUR STRUGGLE to gain black studies departments on college campuses, our struggle to have black studies added to the curriculum across the nation is a struggle that the enemy sees as a grave danger. The enemy also recognizes the struggle of young white people on the college campuses and high schools as a grave danger and he is right. It is a grave danger because what we realize is that the education that is given is designed to perpetuate a system of exploitation. On the one hand it is designed to keep black people and so-called minorities ignorant, and on the other hand it is designed to keep the masses of

white students in harmony with this system, to keep them supporting the system, to indoctrinate them to fight the wars that protect the system, and that extend the influence and the power of the system. We are all becoming conscious of the evil of the system, conscious of the fact that this system can no longer survive, that we have a historic opportunity for attacking the system and destroying it at its root. Thus all of the manipulations that the capitalists and the watchdogs of the capitalists go through are designed to destroy the thrust of the movement, to designate as criminals those who are in the forefront of the struggle and those who are guiding the struggle.

Historically the struggle in the educational arena, in terms of black people, has been waged from, on the one hand the slavemaster not even wanting black people to learn how to read and write, to black people wanting to learn how to read and write on the other. The struggle then transposed itself over into what black people were allowed to read and write, until today black people have reached a point where they want to control totally what they read and write.

This has been a steady struggle against the opposition of the slavemaster, it has been defeat after defeat for the slavemaster, until now we have burst into consciousness, until now we have realized the necessity of taking control of our education. When we see this long line of progression from the struggle to become literate to the struggle today to control totally the education, we can see the true nature of the opposition that we face now and faced then. All of these racists and liberals who are opposing our moves today to gain control of our education, are nothing but the descendants of the outright racist slavemasters who opposed us in our attempts to learn how to read and write on the plantations during the days of slavery. Hence all of their rhetoric, all of their arguments, all of the changes that they go through, in the last analysis, are a continuation of the desire and the necessity of the slavemaster to keep us ignorant

and unable to manipulate ideas; because in order to organize a revolutionary struggle, we must be able to manipulate ideas. We must have knowledge of ourselves and of our enemy, and of the situations that we find ourselves in, in order to organize a true revolution to move against the oppressor.

ONE OF THE GREAT DANGERS that our revolutionary struggle faces, perhaps the greatest danger, is that we historically have tended to compartmentalize our struggle; that is, we get hung up on one aspect of the struggle, without having an overall revolutionary perspective and without realizing that the struggle that we wage is against the total social organism. We focus all of our attention and all of our energy on the educational system, and we don't realize — or our tactics and our strategy would seem to indicate that we don't realize — that this is only one aspect of our struggle and that the same people who control the educational facilities, control the rest of the social structure. Everything, the economy, the judiciary, the political parties, the political instruments, every aspect of society is in the same hands. We need a broader strategy, a revolutionary strategy that aims at overthrowing the rule of this class as a whole, so we will not just be going through changes on the college campuses.

The repression against the movement that the United States is now mobilizing is not a sign of strength on the part of the ruling class, but rather the sign of weakness of the ruling class, and a sign of the strength and effectiveness of the movement. All of the lies, the subterfuges, the hypocrisy of the ruling class has been exposed, for it can no longer hope to control or manipulate the movement by words alone. It has to resort to the brutal, repressive forces of the police department. The movement itself has drawn several lessons from this reaction of repression by the ruling class. The clear cut nature of power in the United States and the racist policies of the ruling class are revealed.

ON THE ONE HAND the rebellion of black students and black people thoroughly exposes the racist policies of the administrations of the various colleges and high schools, and on the other hand there is the repression that the blacks and the allies of blacks are receiving. It's really incorrect to speak of the white section of the movement as being the allies of blacks, because in reality there is no such thing as a black movement and a white movement in the United States. These are merely categories of thought, that only have reality in terms of the lines that the ruling class itself has drawn and is enforcing among the people.

Because the United States is controlled by one ruling class, one single structure, and the whole drama of the black liberation struggle, and the revolutionary struggle in the white community is being played on one stage. Because of the division that the ruling class has historically implanted amongst the people, because of the different experiences of black people from white people, the reality of the division is more apparent than real, because at the top opposed to both black people and white revolutionaries is a single ruling class, there's not a ruling class for blacks and a ruling class for whites, but there's one single ruling class that rules all, that controls all, and that manipulates all, that has a different set of tactics for each group, depending upon the tactics used by the groups, in the struggle for liberation.

One of the great weaknesses in the movement at this particular time is in the campus aspect of the attack upon the ruling class and the power of the ruling class. In the compartmentalized thinking of the traditional American society, the college community and the college campus is viewed as something separate and distinct from the rest of the community. The college is not really looked upon as a part of the community. People who are not concerned with themselves going to college or who have no children in college feel that what's going on, on the campus is none of their business. But nothing could be farther

from the truth, because in reality they are the people's colleges, institutions that have been set aside to perpetuate the human heritage, and to pass on human wisdom, the knowledge and technical skills for the further development of society and civilization. And every single individual living in a given society has a stake in what goes on in them; he has a stake in seeing to it that what happens on the campus is proper, and that the best interest of all the community is being served.

On the other hand, the attacks focussed on the college campuses serve to expose the nature of power in the United States. When we look at the composition of the board of regents and administrations, and councils that control the colleges, we find them replete with military men, retired generals, foundation personnel, and big businessmen. We could say that the boards that administer the universities are a good barometer, or a clear diagram of the stratification of power in the society as a whole. We don't see poor people represented on the boards of administration of the institutions of learning, for in the society beyond the college campus, poor people do not exercise or possess any power. If they did have the power, they would be in a position to see to it that some of their members were appointed to these boards.

But those who control the economy, those who control the various sources and levels of power in the community and around it, are able to have their lackeys and their flunkies appointed to administer these institutions of learning. The composition of the boards of administration of the institutions of learning indicate clearly, the powerlessness of the various sectors of society and this fact needs to be brought out much more clearly and brought home to the community. A connection needs to be made between the college campus and the community so that the repression and the tactics of the ruling class can be defeated by the total community being involved. As long as the pigs are able to vamp on the college campuses and to commit mass arrests and brutality against the

students and there is not solid and massive community support, then they will be able to get away with it, and slowly but surely they will be able to grind the movement to a halt by cutting off wave after wave of leadership, by expelling the leadership, and hounding the leadership out of existence.

It's a mistake to think that the ruling class cannot be successful if a proper response is not made from the movement, a mistake that has been made time and time again in the various revolutionary struggles around the world. There have been cases of the revolutionary movement being very highly advanced, very well organized, much more organized than we are in the United States, with a higher theoretical understanding, and with very good party machinery, etc. and they have been crushed because the power structure would resort to unlimited brutality — it would kill, it would imprison. It had the mass media in its control, and it could use the mass media to justify this, and to brainwash other people who were not organized enough to do anything about their repressors.

So that it's a question of time. The movement is always behind, the movement has the initiative. The power structure, by over-reacting seeks to buy time for itself, and the pressure that the movement puts on the power structure determines the amount of time that is left. Because if the struggle progresses slowly enough to allow the ruling class to devise means of coping with the movement, then all is lost and the movement itself is doomed to failure. So that a broadening of those involved, or those concerned, and those whose support is now latent is what is required.

Poor black people and poor white people and middle class people who are not themselves directly involved in the college situation, need to be made to understand that something of their own precious liberty, which either they never had or they thought they had, is being decisively determined in the struggles that are going

down on the campuses today. Every black mother, every black father, every Mexican mother, every Mexican father, every father and every mother in every group, white, Puerto Rican, Indian, Eskimo, Arab, Jew, Chinese, Japanese, whatever ethnic group they happen to be in, in the United States, need to be made to understand, that if they have no child or teenager involved in the educational process today because they were not able to afford to send them to college or something of that nature, that this in itself is a criticism of the structure of education in the United States.

IT IS THE DUTY of any society to see to it that every individual in that society is invested with the human heritage and provided with the technology, the skills, and the knowledge that will enable him to cope with his environment, to survive and to live a good life. It is the duty of the society to provide this education, just as it is the duty of the society to provide the highest level of medical assistance, housing and employment, of every benefit that exists in society, it's the duty of the government to provide that. As long as the state is not providing these benefits, it is not worthy of existing, and under our kind of state which is called a representative democracy, it is not possible for a capitalistic economy to provide a universal education for the people. What it has been providing is universal brainwashing that masquerades as universal education. The quality of the education is contemptible, it is inhumane, and it is only geared to provide a level of intelligence or a level of competence that will enable the product of the educational system to become war material, to be exploited by the capitalistic economic entities within the United States.

So what we're into today is not only sitting back and criticizing, but actively reaching out and challenging the authority of those who control the various institutions in society, not simply challenging this authority, but by actively moving to disrupt the functioning of these facilities in the best interests of the community as a

whole. These facilities can no longer serve the interests of the crosswork monopolies that are being administered by racists and by pigs who only want to exploit people and sentence people to be cogs in a wheel. In the final analysis, the struggle that is now going on on the college campuses cannot be settled on the college campuses. It has to be settled in the community, because those that sit on the boards of administration of the colleges do not derive their power from the fact that they are sitting on the board, but rather, they sit on the board because they have power in the community.

Their power is based on the economic institutions of society and other institutions that form the power structure, and because of their relation to these sources of power, they're able to be appointed to these positions of administration.

We have to destroy their power in the community, and we're not reformists, we're not in the movement to reform the curriculum of a given university or a given college or to have a Black Students Union recognized at a given high school. We are revolutionaries, and as revolutionaries, our goal is the transformation of the American social order.

IN ORDER TO TRANSFORM the American social order, we have to destroy the present structure of power in the United States, we have to overthrow the government. For too long we've been intimidated into not speaking out clearly what our task is, our task is the overthrow of the government, which has to be understood as being nothing but the instrument of the ruling class. The court, the congress, the legislature and the executive branches of the state and federal government are nothing but instruments in the hands of the ruling class, to see after the affairs of the ruling class, and to conduct the life of society in the interest of the ruling class. So we're out to destroy this, to smash this machinery and to erect new machinery. But new machinery cannot be erected until the present machinery is destroyed. It is not the

task of revolutionaries to keep their heads up in the sky, wondering about what they will do when they have power. What they have to do at the present time is to have their minds centered on destruction. We are out to destroy the present machinery of the ruling class, that is our task.

We must do this by the only means possible, because the only means possible is the means that's necessary, and the only means possible is the violent overthrow of the machinery of the oppressive ruling class. That means that we will not allow the ruling class to use brutality and force upon us, without using the same force and brutality upon them. We must destroy their institutions from which they derive their power. A given college president may have his power as a result of being involved in a corporation. We must attack him on the campus but we must also pursue him off the campus and attack him in

his lair, the lair of his power, in his corporations! Such attack could be through boycotts of the products of that corporation, or through the physical destruction of the property of the corporation, or the physical elimination of him as an individual.

We must not get into a bag of thinking that we're involved in a game: a revolution is not a game, it is a war. We are involved in a war — a people's war against those who oppress the people, and this is the war in the clearest sense of the word. It is only our resistance that is under developed and it is our resistance that is underdeveloped because the ruling class has formidable arsenals of the materials of war to unleash upon us, and they are only using timid materials at this particular time, because our resistance to their aggression has heretofore been timid.

I had been brought up with the democratic idea that this general welfare was the object of democratic action in the state, of allowing the governed a voice in government. But through the crimson illumination of war, I realized and, afterward by travel around the world, saw even more clearly that so-called democracy today was allowing the mass of people to have only limited voice in government; that democratic control of what are at present the most important functions of men: work and earning a living and distributing goods and services; that here we did not have democracy; we had oligarchy, and oligarchy based on monopoly and income . . .

W. E. B. DuBOIS, "Dusk of Dawn"

In the forthcoming issues of

THE **BLACK** SCHOLAR

Robert Williams

The Black Struggle — 1969

Floyd McKissick

Toward a Black Ideology

Chuck Stone

The Black Political Party

James F. Turner

The Sociology of Black Nationalism

Nathan Hare

Politics and the Black Intellectual

Don L. Lee

Directions for Black Writers

Robert Chrisman

Marxism and the National Question

Wm. J. Middleton

Pan Africanism: A Historical Assessment

Phaon Sundiata

The White Reaction to the Black Assertion

Nathan Wright Jr.

Black Power vs. Black Genocide

You can't afford to miss a single issue!

**If you are concerned about the black struggle,
Read THE BLACK SCHOLAR**

A BLACK VALUE SYSTEM

Umoja (Unity) — To strive for and maintain unity in the family, community, nation and race.

Kujichagulia (Self-Determination) — To define ourselves, name ourselves, and speak for ourselves, instead of being defined, and spoken for by others.

Ujima (Collective Work and Responsibility) — To build and maintain our community together and to make our brothers' and sisters' problems our problems and to solve them together.

Ujamaa (Co-operative Economics) — To build and maintain our own stores, shops and other businesses and to profit together from them.

Nia (Purpose) — To make as our collective vocation the building and developing of our community in order to restore our people to their traditional greatness.

Kuumba (Creativity) — To do always as much as we can, in the way we can in order to leave our community more beautiful and beneficial than when we inherited it.

Imani (Faith) — To believe with all our heart in our parents, our teachers, our leaders, our people and the righteousness and victory of our struggle.

THE 7 PRINCIPLES are 7 because the number is a meaning-symbol for this world. As a throw of dice it speaks of spiritual concepts and scientific principles. It is because of this that the seventh day

was the culmination, as a period of devotion and meditation, for the 6 days of divine work. Sun-Day. So Maulana speaks of spiritual concepts and scientific principles embodied as a morality system — complete in itself, as a contemporary black philosophy old as the sun.

The 7 principles are the spine and total philosophy of the US organization. They are simple in what they say, but total in that they evoke all the levels of meaning associated with philosophical systems.

The 7 principles are "10 commandments" yet more profound to us — US because they are pre and post 10 commandments at the same time. If there is *Umoja*, for instance, thou cannot kill, steal, bear false witness, commit adultery, or any of the things the western world thrives on. The commandments are fulfilled by the initial need of blackness for unity—oneness.

But unity is political too. The meaning vibrates as a totality. Spiritual unity is the needed completion of physical and mental unity. (The doctrine is made up of the 3 sides of the ancient pyramid—physical, mental and spiritual—in each of its statements. The three pyramids of the US symbol meaning "our traditional greatness," and by this, our traditional understanding.) The 7 principles are solutions to the political dilemma of Black people. I would say solutions to the political dilemma of all men, but I recognize we are different by virtue of our concerns and the context of our lives.

LEROI JONES, poet-playwright and jazz critic, is author of *Blues People* and *Black Music*. His plays include: *The Dutchman*, *The Toilet*, and *The Dead Lecturer*. His poetry has appeared in many leading magazines, among them *Harper's*, *Negro Digest*, and *Liberator*. Jones co-edited, with Larry Neal, the anthology, *Black Fire*. During the rebellion in Newark in the summer of 1967, Jones received head lacerations while being arrested for possession of a pistol.

by IMAMU AMEER BARAKA (LeRoi Jones)

We, the different peoples, are as different rays of light, each bent to particular articulation of the initial life force, and at different stages of evolution (self-consciousness). All men would benefit by the 7 principles. But the black man has created them out of his *specific* need. The balancer of East and West, completer of this cycle.

Umoja (definition: To strive for and maintain unity in the family, community, nation and race). We are a *body* of people, the large Being of Blackness. The many of us are parts of the body. The whole cannot function *as it will* (Kujichagulia — Self-Determination) if it is scattered, the head one place, the heart another. Physical unity. Mental unity. We must think one way of total movement to liberate ourselves. Each has a function but as complementary parts of a whole. All organizations, *organs* really, they must function as of the whole body.

Ujima — Collective Work and Responsibility. All of the organs must function by the same will. We must have a head with control over all the organs. The I's must be our many eyes and be a basis for seeing in all the places.

One being in harmony with itself, this is the first need to be satisfied before we can deal with an outside world. But it is internal unity that makes a single will, which is self determination. What we will be what we will do, are questions only we ourselves have the proper answers to.

The concept of *oneness* is old and black

and spiritual. The One God. And the 7 principles are a religious creed, in its most practical application, a code of common morality.

WE NEED a value system to be predictable in our behavior, Maulana has said. Predictable, meaning stable, pointed toward a single goal. The liberation of our soul, mind and body. A value system is the spine of all cultures. What is good or bad aside from specific interpretation in specific context? Through unity, we arrive at self-determination and can then proceed to collective work and responsibility (in the organs, or as each one teach one, or painting a wall), *Ujima*. The value system selects the goal we apply ourselves to it, live by it, the rest follows. Why Moses gave the commandments for the same result, as a best way to live. And they will *raise* us.

So that Maulana Karenga's doctrine is first a value system. It sets forth a value system, to be followed, called Kawaida, literally ("that which is customary, or traditionally adhered to, by black people"). A nation is only as great as that set of values it *actually* practices . . . no matter what it says, e.g., witness America (white and negro). The value system is how you live, to what end. And Kawaida is, as the doctrine teaches, "a weapon, a shield, and a pillow of peace."

One cannot have a slave's mentality and hope to be free, or one *can hope*, but that will not make anything really happen. The

freeing of the mind, before anything else can happen. The people *must actually want* to be free. Want it bad enough to be it.

A value system that is itself the way of life of a free man of high morality, is what the Kawaida teaches. A morality (more) is *the meaning* of what people do. Culture is how they live, morality is what it means. What it means as cause and effect, past what you or anyone else might *think*. What happens as a result of . . . is what morality directs. And there is a finality to this path-making that is part of the heaviest truth. To live better, you must live better. It is simple and complex.

KAWAIDA, or the doctrine of Maulana Karenga, is the measure of that "better" life. It is African, because we are African, no matter that we have been trapped in the West these few hundred years. But by the quality of what our lives *meant* we have transformed the West, even transformed the white man. The value system, especially as the Nguzo Saba begins to focus it, can give us the identity, purpose and direction to move to that better life. At each level it is a contrast to Euro-American *morality*, because first it is based on teachings that are superior to the practiced morality of Euro-American civilization. It is also a value system beneficial to black people. And there is no reason for the practiced value system of Euro-America to be beneficial to black people, quite the contrary, it has always been absolutely detrimental to black people. For instance the fourth principle of the Nguzo Saba is Ujamaa, collective or cooperative economics.

But Ujamaa is not, as it has been called, "African Socialism," it is Ujamaa. If anything you could say European Ujamaa, but never the reverse. The reason? Ujamaa is the traditional way of distributing wealth for the black man. It is an economic attitude older than Europe, and certainly older than the term Socialism. Which finally is another thing, coming from the European definition, since the European definition is a state that will exist "after

the decay of capitalism." Ujamaa has always been the African *attitude* towards the distribution of wealth (until they decay that made our kingdoms fall). It has never been a European attitude, but rather a *theory*. Can you dig it? (See Julius Nyerere's paper *Ujamaa in Uhuru na Umoja*.)

The "decay of capitalism" theory is also another aspect of the European attitude of "world revolution," and do not mistake my meaning, I am talking about the life style of violence. Vita (violence or war) in Swahili equals *life* in Latin. When we say "revolution" we mean the restoration of our national sovereignty as a people, a people, at this point, equipped to set new paths for the development of man. We mean the freeing of ourselves from the bondage of another, alien, people. We are not warring upon our own society among ourselves. These pigs are no kin to us. We are trying to destroy a *foreign oppressor*. It is not "revolution" but *National Liberation*.

When you speak of capitalism you speak of the European mind. We do not want to be Europeans. No, not of any persuasion. Just as the, as he calls them, "economic radicals" of the twenties tried to stop J. A. Rogers, whom they called "a black capitalist", from doing his research and rewriting our destroyed archives saying Rogers was "chauvinistic" and suffered an "inferiority complex," they said he should be studying people like "Marx, Engels, and Lafargue and be preparing for the worker's utopia which was just around the corner . . ." (See Introduction to Rogers' "World's Great Men of Color, Vol. 1"). *But are not Marx, Engels and Lafargue just another list of "great" men . . . but great white men*, or at least white men thought great by one particular group of white men? Another group of white men might give you another list . . . like say Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Kennedy, etc. But it is, either way, still a commitment to Euro-American values, to whiteness.

In order to free ourselves, and this may come as a shock to many "hip negroes," we are going to have to do it ourselves!

For ourselves. Yes, the world will benefit, but they are not going to do it, any more than you helped free the Chinese! If you cannot have faith in blackness, in the black mind and the black man to find a way out of this slavery, you are full of despair, or else emotionally committed to white people. Which is the terrible truth for many of us, even our so-called "revolutionaries." They are so committed to whiteness that they must find a way to make white relevant some way. The Right will not save us so the Left will. This group of white people will not do it, but this other group of white people will. (Do not misunderstand, we will take aid from a scorpion, but we must not confuse our identity. Or try to crawl under rocks, with scorpions.)

Another fallacy of many "revolutionaries" is the "right around the cornerism" that Rogers cites and Maulana Karenga always emphasizes as dangerous. There is no such thing. The work of National Liberation is hard and its resolution is to be sought but not fantasized as the result of unprepared spontaneous outbursts of emotionalism. It is work. It will only be achieved by disciplined, dedicated people, with a value system that allows them to persevere and remain healthy and rational and committed for as long as it takes no matter what happens to anybody or everybody else.

Too often so called revolutionaries without a black value system, like Kawaida, do exactly the same things as the oppressor-people, and as I said, they are always emotionally committed to the oppressor people. They speak the same language, think the same things valuable, have the same "taste". In fact they are so much the same they can make alliances that are unnatural as far as the natural life styles of the new peoples are concerned. The bush-smoking, wine drinking, homo-superhetero sexual bellbottomed life of the hippy (a truly interracial though white committed phenomenon) is just a phase of death rattle for a culture and a people. The magnetism of the final death will compel to death all those with the jingling matching magnets around their brains.

An epoch passes because it is played out. To imitate the played out is to simulate, and then not to be able to stop, death.

So *Nia*, purpose. What is your purpose, for anything? For being alive? If you are black your purpose should be the building of Black. The Nguzo Saba says our purpose must be the rebuilding of our people to their traditional greatness. One reason for the stress on history, if you do not even know of your traditional greatness, then you will not aspire to anything but dry rock white "radicalism" (like some 1930's vampire risen again from the grave to suck black peoples' blood) as some kind of alternative to the maggoty pork that exists. But neither is our shot, brother. Initially our purpose is *Nation building*. To raise black people to "our traditional greatness". National Liberation as Malcolm called it.

KARENGA stresses cultural nation for the same reasons that Mao continues his cultural revolution on a continuous basis in China even after his political revolution has been realized. It is a constant process. The minds of the people are the most important factor of any movement, without them you can have nothing else. And we do not have to settle for maggoty pork or renewed draculaism (a white "radical"). We can have and be ourselves.

But you must have the cultural revolution, ie., you must get the mind before you move another fuhtha. There is no violent revolution except as a result of the black mind expanding, trying to take control of its own space. Our armies are not yet formed, as armies. We cannot fight a war, an actual physical war with the forces of evil just because we are angry. We can begin to build. We must build black institutions. In all the different aspects of culture. Political, Religious, Social, Economic, Ethical, Creative, Historical, institutions, all based on a value system that is beneficial to black people.

All these institutions will be alternatives to the Euro-American or Negro institutions that exist, but will exist in their own right as expressions of the black sensibility, and

not merely as reactions to an alien sensibility. If Mao does not control the minds of the Chinese, his political victories are lost, his military is hostile, Maoism is another name for what was. Ghana should have had a continuous cultural revolution. To maintain the consciousness of the people. So that they could not be taken off by the criminal sickness of the white led Negro mentality that re-invaded Ghana. If the chief of state of Biafra names as his country's national anthem "Finlandia," then we know where his politics are right off. The internalization of a white value system, will always militate for white decisions about the way things should be. Whether it is a national anthem or an economic system.

Black creativity, *Kuumba*, is the sixth principle. Which tells us how we must devise a way out of our predicament. How we must build, with what methodology. In what emotionalism, the fire of blackness. So that even Ujamaa is Kuumba in regards to the distribution of wealth among men. For the European, Ujamaa, like jazz, is a saying, a pretending illusion, rather than a being. And we are not racists, when we say this, we are merely recognizing the traits of different peoples.

When we call white people evil it is based on empiricism, not theory. Do you remember how you Africans got here to the Western Hemisphere in the first place? (I mean as slaves, not as Egyptians and Moorish explorers and settlers.) The recital of the horrors black people have suffered at the hands of the white makes us racists? Only to the white, or the *white committed*. Herodotus came up with the Teutonic Origins theory of why white was best and how the rest were not, on a descending xenophobic scale all the way down to us. A theory, not a fact. The lynching and oppression and enslavement of black people by European, and the capacity for such cruelty by the European mind is fact, not theory. It is empirical, we have witnessed, and lived through it, are still living through it. And just because some dude wants to sleep with a white woman,

let him not call those of us who do not racists. There are facts, to which any honest man had better bear witness.

WHEN WE SAID, Black Art, we meant Kuumba. The spiritual characteristic of revelation through the creative. The artist is respected in Bantu philosophy because he could capture some of the divinity. Because it flowed through his fingers or out of his mouth, and because he would lend this divinity to the whole people to raise them in its image, building great nations reared in the image of righteousness. What is soul (like the one sun the sole solar force, in this system) our connection, our relation with the infinite. And it is feeling, like inner revelation, that is the connection, the force of the uncreated, which we constantly make reference to, bringing into creation. Yehh! we scream, bearing witness to the power of Kuumba.

But black creativity is what will save us — not just "artists" but all of us — after all is said and done — nothing else. An antidote to birth or mind control! The Ngnzo Saba itself is one of the strongest examples of Kuumba. And each idea or act that animates our lives must be measured against the Nguzo Saba in each of its components. You must ask of each new idea or dissociation that comes to mind, what does this have to do with bringing about unity for black people, what does it contribute to black people's self-determination — does it have anything to do with Ujima, collective work and responsibility, and so on. So, for instance, a "black TV program" with a straight haired sister dancing a Martha Graham — Merce Cunningham — esque tribute to the ghetto (?) is not Kuumba — neither the dance nor the program.

A nation coming into being is a new creation. It must be willed into existence by itself. It is new—it is literally something other than what exists.

Imani is faith — Faith in your leaders, teachers, parents, — but first faith in *blackness* — that it will win. Faith in Nationalism, that *we* can build *ourselves* into a

conscious nation once again — that we can free ourselves, from the chain of white commitment — this is all that binds us to slavery — *the fact that we are emotionally committed to it* — to being slaves.

Imani is the supra rational aspect of Nationalism, but the aspect that we cannot survive without. We must believe past 2 + 2 or 180 vs 40 that the number we want is the one we can achieve.

SIMPLE FAITH, like church people say and that's what we want — hardrock emotional faith in what we're doing. The same way your grandma used to weep and wring her hands believing in Jeez-us, that deep deep connection with the purest energy, this is what the Nationalist must have. Can you understand this? That we must believe past any bullshit "rationale" that we may or may not achieve based on 7 million subjective-objective variables. We must believe in Nationalism. We must believe in the justness of our struggle and the certainty of our victory. *No matter how long this might take.* There is no time. Only change.

Nationalism must be the basis for our entire lives. It must be the content and initiator of anything we do. Always, as the formulator of any act must be the need to see that act contribute to the building of a Nation. That is our purpose, Nationalism our direction. Black is our identity. The totality of these as a life focus is simple faith, even before it exists as spirituality. *But that is what faith is, if it is directed toward grace — spirituality.*

We say spirituality because the spiritual is the blessing of life. It is what all life points toward. Complete consciousness and Nationalism, at this point, is the definer and director of our people toward that goal of absolute, yes, absolute consciousness.

So the 7th principle, Faith, is actually at one with the 1st — to create the whole, the one (it's what Umoja means).

There is nothing anyone can do about the fact of the Nguzo Saba. It does — they do — exist. Now it is only for the studying or aspiring Nationalist to accept these prin-

ciples as the clearest statement of the badly needed new value system.

It is spiritual without being religious. That is, it moves to the higher levels of human aspiration but describes no ritual dogma. The Nguzo Saba would organize the morality of the would-be Nationalist, give him a new and more relevant morality, to begin to build Blackness anew.

As long as we are committed to old ways and ideas, to paraphrase Touré, we will never move from where we are. A value system is a describer of your life on the planet, how you lived, in what manner and for what reasons, i.e., to what purpose. If you do not consciously create a new value system, one that is quite different from the rest of crazy America's—you will be exactly what crazy America is and die the way she dies.

BUT WE WANT TO SURVIVE. We want life. We want to build and create. We do not want a modified version of what exists, we want the totally new — newly claimed but as the eastern, the tradition, the African, the black—i.e., we want a whole different version of men's life on earth. We do not want what Marx wanted or what Abbie Hoffman wants. We want our new black selves as absolute masters of our own space. Can you dig it *space*, and I repeat it for all these simple "black" cryptohippies who believe in Malcolm solely *because he is dead* — *Space* is what we are fighting for. And it manifests itself as anything or everything. Institutional space, living, i.e. human space, thinking space or the actual planet-room una fahamu? Like they say, land. It is all space. CAN YOU UNDERSTAND??

But the point man is Malcolm never had a *doctrine* — we learned from him because he was straight and true but he made no doctrines, no real *organization*, and we must face this. This is *our* work now, today, to organize better than Malcolm did. Can you understand? Malcolm's teachings must now be analyzed, formalized, and a structure and program issued out of them.

Elijah had a formal teaching, something close to a doctrine and Malcolm sprung

from it, but made some other decisions. But he, Malcolm, made no doctrine. But now a doctrine has been made, formalized around a black value system, and this is what we need. How you live is how you project and how you will project. Your progeny, your creations are products of life, manifestations of your way, scenes from your path. The Nguzo Saba is the key to the new Nationalism. It is the key to the new learning. And that learning is the complete doctrine of Maulana Karenga.

The Nguzo Saba is the first, the basic, primary teaching. The rest of the doctrine, covering the completeness of modern ex-

perience is a black ideology in toto. A path itself to blackness and Nationhood.

The doctrine now is in the head and hands mostly of organization people, and a few key organizers and student leaders around the country. (*The Quotable Karenga* is a light sampling of some of the doctrine's content.) But soon it will be published and available to most of us. It is the central ingredient of the new nationalist organization. It will transform black people and by doing this, transform yes, America.

You better get ready for it.

THE ARTIST AND THE BLACK UNIVERSITY

by JOHN O. KILLENS

A LITTLE MORE THAN A DECADE AGO, some of us said that one of the things lacking in the civil rights movement was a cultural arm, a place in the movement where the artists could play a special role. Some of the leaders of the movement took a dim view of the idea. They got all uptight and over-protective of their leadership. Unduly so, since none of us saw ourselves in the role of civil rights leaders. Individual artists were used from time to time for prestige value and for fund-raising, but the movement did not see the artists as a force which could help the movement arrive at an ideology and a program based on that ideology. I suspect they saw us as a bunch of trouble-making radicals. They did not see the role that writers and other artists could make in defining goals and principles and strategies for the movement.

What did the movement mean by "Integration"? What was meant by the "Negro Revolution"? Was it a revolution or a non-violent improvement association? What was non-violence? Did it deprive the black man of the right of self defense? Could a revolution be waged non-violently?

JOHN O. KILLENS teaches creative writing at Columbia University. He is renowned as a novelist and essayist. His works include: *Odds Against Tomorrow*, *Black Man's Burden*, *Youngblood*, *'Sippi*, and *And Then We Heard the Thunder*. Killens studied at Columbia University and Howard University Law School before turning to writing as a career. He was for two years Writer-in-Residence at Fisk University.

Did black folk merely want to integrate into a society that had denied them their humanity for four hundred years? Were we so uncritical of a society that had used us and abused us for centuries? Or were we working to change this society, fundamentally?

We heard, with alarm and disbelief, many of the civil rights leaders answer the question, "What does the Negro want?" with the answer, "We want everything you got. We just want in." Some of the artists said, "Hell no! We don't just want in. If Charlie has syphilis, we do not want everything he has. We don't want a piece of the action if America is one great whorehouse. Our mission is to change America and the world and make it a more fit place for human habitation. To create a world that makes sense, in the words of Margaret Walker, for all the adams and eves and their countless generations." Beginning, of course, with black folk.

IN 1963 some of us black artists declared a cultural revolution the purpose of which would be to undo the millions of little white lies America had told the world about herself and the African-American; to de-brainwash black people in the first instance and all Americans in the second. We said that writers and artists and educators would be the most logical people to attempt this gargantuan task. Out of an outraged reaction to the murder of the five children of Birmingham, a group of us in

New York formed the Association of Artists for Freedom. The group included such committed artists as Ossie Davis, Ruby Dee, Max Roach, James Baldwin, Louis Lomax, Odetta, and John Killens, who was elected Chairman.

We issued a call to Black America to boycott Christmas, especially that part of it that commercialized on the jolly fat cat named Santa Claus. Although no civil rights organization gave us their open support, the campaign against Christmas buying had a fair amount of success. We sponsored a symposium at Town Hall in New York City, the theme of which was *THE BLACK REVOLUTION AND THE WHITE BACKLASH*. Participants included Paule Marshall, LeRoi Jones, Ruby Dee, Ossie Davis, the late Lorraine Hansberry, John Killens, Charles Silberman, James Wechsler and David Susskind. It was highly successful on several levels. Despite the few successes, the Association enjoyed an illustrious, but a very brief life. Artists are not easily organized and kept together.

But things were happening almost imperceptibly. Black artists were beginning to make themselves heard. And they were being listened to. The movement could no longer pretend their non-existence. From this development and from the new demands of the movement, from civil rights to Black Power and its cultural counterpoint, Black Consciousness, the artists were beginning to assume important roles. All during these developments, the student movement, itself, was inventing, creating, always reacting to the changes going on in the so-called "Negro Revolution." Recall the sit-ins and the freedom rides and voter registration, beginning with the bus boycott. Ultimately, the cultural revolution reflected itself on the campuses with the demand by students and a few teachers (very few) for a black university on the one hand and black studies program on the other.

In both of these demands, the key word, the key demand, was relevance. How to make the college experience relevant to the black experience. In the first instance,

there was the hope (I was one of the naive ones who shared that hope) that, at universities like Fisk and Atlanta and Howard, euphemistically known as "predominantly Negro colleges," black educators and artists and students could establish institutions which would have a total relevance to the black experience and the black community. By the black community, I mean the community in which a particular institution is located, but much more than that. It should have a relevance to the national black community and even the international one. Most of today's "black" institutions sit uneasily (they used to sit complacently) in the midst of the black "ghettos" like oases on a barren desert. Oftentimes the oasis inhabitants are more barren than the desert people.

IN DEFINING OUR DEEP CONCERN, some of us began to talk about a Black "Communiversity." The Black Communiversity, when we painfully establish it, will have "Homecoming Week" every week in the year, calling on the brothers and sisters to come home to their black commitments from wherever they find themselves, lost as most of us are in this vast quagmire of a white supremacist society. A Communiversity, where the campus itself would be the very sidewalks of the black community. A Communiversity which would bridge the so-called generation gap. Let the white liberal children flaunt their generation gap. Most likely it's about the only thing humane they have to flaunt. More power to them. Black people can't afford such bourgeois indulgences as generation gaps. Our goal must be Black Unity. Black understanding between black of every age and generation is what the Black Communiversity must be about.

At Fisk University in Nashville (where I spent three and a half years as writer-in-residence), there were some beautiful men and women who were dedicated quietly to making that university relevant. But there were many obstacles. The first was, of course, the omnipotent Board of Trustees, many of them white and conservative and

representing powerful moneyed interests in this nation. I imagine most private black schools are faced with this problem on one level or another. Black state schools have problems with the state.

Another roadblock, was, of course, the white teachers, who made up approximately fifty per cent of the instruction staff. They could be placed into about three categories; first were those hard-core conservatives who saw Fisk as the "Negro Harvard." Then there were those whites who were a wee bit pinker and saw Fisk as becoming a "colored" Oberlin or Antioch, and then there were the funky, bushy-haired "radicals," who saw Fisk as becoming the "Afro-American" Berkeley.

But none of these saw Fisk as becoming her own black beautiful self, and being renamed W. E. B. DuBois University and being rebuilt in his magnificent image. He is its most illustrious graduate. The other group we had to fight was more insidious than all the others put together, because it consisted of some of our own black brothers and sisters of the faculty. They were, generally speaking, those who had the most longevity and tenure at the University, twenty-five and thirty years, and who went around talking about the good old days and the "old Fisk," smiling in your face and whispering behind your back about how John Killens and that whole bunch was bringing the University down, "with that Black Power stuff." These were the same people who thought John Lewis was out of his mind when he and Diane Bevels led the non-violent integrationist movement in Nashville. Anything that whites disapprove of is crazy and out-of-the-question to them. They see Fisk as a finishing school to train black boys and girls how to be nice little young white ladies and gentlemen in black skins.

For example, we instituted an annual Black Writers Conference at Fisk, which was held successfully for three years. Students attended from all over the country. I don't believe that the heads of the departments in English, Speech and Drama attended a single session. And this, despite

the fact that most of the most important black writers in the country were in attendance at these conferences. Indeed, a couple of the students informed me that one of the black department heads advised (threatened?) her students against attending the conferences.

These are old-timers at Fisk, Negroes who still dream of going back to the "old Fisk." "What has happened to the old Fisk?" they mumble wistfully. The fact is: we black folk are never going back. And further, the "Old Fisk" was never really the "old Fisk." It was a figment of their imaginations. I am certain that Brother Nathan Hare faced similar (even graver) problems at Howard and had far fewer colleagues on his campus who were sympatico and committed to black expression. Nevertheless, it seems to me, that the logical place to start to build the Black Communiversity is at the "predominantly Negro colleges."

ON THE OTHER HAND, if you are a student at Yale or San Francisco State or Harvard or Columbia, the only sensible demand is for a black studies program. You know that these institutions will never be fundamentally relevant to your own black situation. It was never meant to even be of service to you, black boy, black girl. Dig. Not even to be of service to you. So the best that you can do is to creat a "make-do" situation. And this is not to derogate or to put down the black studies programs, but only to place them in perspective. They are proper demands, they are demands that further the Black Liberation Movement. They are of prime importance to black students on white campuses.

And now it must be said, that as far as the demands for a Black Communiversity or a black studies program are concerned, neither should be used as cop-outs or excuses for students not taking care of business vis-a-vis the books. I'm saying that the "militant" student should be the best student on the campus, if he has the capability. Of course much of what you learn will not be relevant to your black thing. Learn it anyhow. Learn everything. Re-

gurgitate that which is not relevant or useful to you later on. It should be clear to all of us, that in order to beat Charlie's game you've got to know his system.

So that, while we work for and emphasize black studies, we, simultaneously, learn everything we can about this game the man has been running on us for centuries. Otherwise, we would be working in an unreal situation, and most black people and black students would have better sense than to follow us and would be justified. What I am saying, brothers and sisters, is that some of us are shucking and jiving and hiding behind the cover of "militance and relevance." The Liberation Movement needs doctors, teachers, lawyers, engineers committed to the movement, and some of you are copping out because "it ain't relevant." There is a great danger of a whole crop of "militant" students, wonderful people, becoming *irrelevant* to the movement. Dig it.

The Black University and the cultural revolution is not separate and apart from the Liberation Movement. It is at the core of the movement; the brain of the movement, that builds the engine, that puts the movement into motion. There should be no contradiction between the Cultural Revolution and Black Liberation. Picture a brother down-South in Mississippi or up-South in New York City. He is a committed revolutionary, right? And Chuck's police is chasing him and he runs onto the airstrip to make his getaway on a waiting plane. You are the pilot. Right? There you stand in a beautiful dahsiki underneath an Afro so way out the sun can't get to you. You are turning white for lack of sunlight. But there you stand pumping your arm up and down and shouting "Black Power!" The only problem is: you forgot to learn how to fly the plane because it wasn't relevant. Can you dig it?

LET US BUILD A BLACK COMMUNIVERSITY which will educate our people from the cradle to the grave. (Repeat: devoid of generation gaps.) One of the grave problems facing the black communities is that

black parents will sacrifice and send their sons and daughters to college, and when they return home, their parents can no longer understand them, and vice versa. They no longer speak the same language. The college man speaks so "proper" he can hardly understand himself. He no longer speaks Afro-Americanese. Instead of serving the community, he is lost to it. And it to him. In the end, he becomes the greatest loser, the Lost Man.

There are a few black folk who say that the demands for the Black University and black studies programs are impractical. Somebody has even said that these programs would only prepare black students to be educated cotton pickers. On the contrary, the Black Communiversiity would prepare its students to be black men and women in a white society. What's impractical about that? It would also prepare its students to revolutionize this society, change it, so that it makes sense for black people, Mexican people, Puerto Rican people, poor people, the disenfranchised and the disinherited. This is the role of the Black Communiversiity: to make sense to us, to be practical for us, to prepare us for the black reality in this white society. And to build a black society.

Let us build a Communiversiity where black artists and scholars and community people and educators and students and activists will come together regularly because they are a part of the Communiversiity and the Communiversiity is a part of them. Our Board of Trustees will be made up in the main of the people of the community. At this Communiversiity we will redefine ourselves in our own black image. For centuries black people have looked at themselves through the eyes of white America. Words have been used to enslave and colonize colored peoples throughout the earth. We must use words, as well as other weapons, in this war of liberation. We must decolonize the language. For example, in terms of redefining ourselves, why should we call our community the "ghetto?" It is a Western word of contempt used by the oppressors to designate their

victims, the inhabitants of the so-called "ghetto."

They also refer to our community as the "jungle," thereby creating the image of a place inhabited by savages and beasts, where missionaries venture, and wise men tread at their own peril, to bring the "natives" goodies and glad tidings of Christianity and civilization; Afro-Americanese translation: oppression and exploitation. It will be up to us to determine how we will regard ourselves. What shall we call our community? The Turf? The Neighborhood? What is the word in Afro-Americanese?

THE ARTIST has a crucial role to play at the Communiversity, and the Communiversity can play a crucial role in the lives of black artists. We have been discussing the function of the Communiversity, one of which is redefinition — of itself, the community (which it must become and which must become itself). The artist is a man who redefines himself every time he puts oil to canvas and his fingers to the typewriter; each time he performs another role in the theatre. The artist is a self-criticizer. Therefore he has an important function. At a real Black Communiversity there will be workshops in black art, black creative writing, black music, black film, black dance, black poetry and black drama. We will establish rotating chairs for artists like Sister Aretha Franklin and Brother Ray Charles and Stevie Wonder and Belafonte and Odetta and Poitier and Sammy Davis. Most of these Brothers and Sisters would be proud to have chairs in their names, or in the names of men like Brothers Martin, Malcolm and DuBois.

It is time for black artists and educators to come to grips with the white-manufactured-myths of the "Black Matriarchy" and "Black Male Irresponsibility," And "Black Male obsession vis-a-vis The White Woman." Many black artists are peddling these themes today and receiving wide acclaim as well as great financial rewards. It is time for us to deal with these questions that separate us, cause dissension in our

group. A young man is writing a novel in a New York workshop, the theme of which is: "The black man has two enemies, the white man and the black woman." How did this misconception come about? We must deal with all these questions at the Communiversity. As Malcolm taught us, we must close the door to outsiders and deal with questions like this in a family way.

And how shall our people learn to appreciate black literature? At the Communiversity, black literature will be read aloud, acted out, even excerpts from black novels. The writer will be invited to the Communiversity to discuss his work with the students and the people of the community. Let the artist meet his critics here. Construct black schools of literary criticism at the Black Communiversity. Far too long the black writer has been fair game for the white critics, none of whom could really dig him. Far too long he has thought he had to please white critics, and has written, not to us but to be understood by them. It is self-defeating enough for him to have the white publisher staring over his shoulders.

WE WILL MAKE black literature and art as relevant and essential to black existence as bread and milk. It is true, Man cannot live by bread alone. Everywhere Western man went he made men into niggers, the easier to enslave and colonize them. One of the key tasks of the Communiversity and the artist is the same as that of the Black Liberation Movement; to deniggerize the earth. Human reconstruction is the goal of the Black Communiversity. To rid the world of niggers.

There are some brothers in North Carolina struggling to bring into being a Black University in the name of one of the great black teachers of the Twentieth Century: Malcolm X. Liberation University. Brothers, sisters, artists, activists, teachers, let us all give our support. It could be a great homecoming.

BLACK ADMINISTRATORS AND HIGHER EDUCATION

IN THE WAKE OF BLACK CONSCIOUSNESS, black power, black studies, the free speech movement, and the "relevancy explosion" on college campuses, a need for more black administrators has become undeniably apparent. The question which must be answered without too much delay is, how are the desperately needed administrators going to become prepared to cope with the charges which the black college students have placed before the predominant white college campuses across the continent?

The non-black has traditionally risen from the ranks of the faculty to dean, vice-president, and culminated his ascension with the presidency of a given institution. However, with the immediate demand before higher education for more black administrators to serve the recently recruited black students, the black scholar contingency cannot climb the administrative ladder in such a precise order. The customary order of entering the administrative framework within higher education will have to be re-evaluated, re-defined, re-oriented, and the need reconciled if a legitimate effort is going to be made to assist the black students once they reach the predominantly non-black campus.

The major thrust of this writing will be an analysis of the current problem facing higher education vis-a-vis black administrators, the current state of higher education (a caricature which is difficult to elucidate), and some suggestions for possible

improvement of its deplorable condition. It is my intention not to cover the broad spectrum of higher education, including both black and white institutions, but rather to deal with the phenomena of the white institutions which are, as we all know, hard put to come up with some vehicle to fulfill the national purpose confronting them today — getting black folk into the main stream of higher learning. A lot, perhaps not enough, has been said about the problems of the "Negro institutions." I would like to beg off discussing Negro colleges this time, but some would say that Negro institutions, traditionally speaking, would be one and the same as white colleges, as regards black administration.

AS IT STANDS NOW the black administration at non-black institutions is manifested in several individuals who occupy "window dressing positions." They are the recently acquired black manikins who are brought out on special occasions, say like on "Mother's Day," to do a special job of seduction for very esoteric audiences. These audiences and special occasions, can run the gamut, from seeing a press release about the institution's involvement in the plight of the black community (in most cases, a sham) to displaying the new fire extinguisher to dash out blazes which frequently result as a corollary of black and white basic encounter sessions — and I have no reference to the ones which are

ROOSEVELT JOHNSON is the Director of Collegiate Assistance Programs at St. Louis University, where he is a candidate for the Ph.D. in Higher Education. He has been a consultant for such projects as the Concentrated Employment Program (East St. Louis) and the Human Relations Commission. Johnson is a member of the Special Committee of the North Central Accrediting Association and head of a "black power family" which includes a wife and one young daughter.

by ROOSEVELT JOHNSON

conducted by the Human Relations Committee.

They are usually consigned to one of the following pseudo-administrative type "jobs": an admissions officer — to concentrate upon the ghetto schools with platitudes sent by the institutional power structure; a black counselor in the advisement office, if the institution has one, to handle the "militant advisee"; an assistant to the Director of the Student Center to keep the Director up on the latest dances and inform him of what soul records should be on the music box and an assistant to the Chancellor to act as the integrating agent in his public retinue.

Usually the extent of the black administrator's power and decision-making ability is relegated to a private conference with his superior to advise him on how to handle some trivial confrontation between two ethnic group social fraternities and possibly to act as a "go-between" when the black students get up to their necks in absurdities and rebel by taking over a dean's office or perhaps, depending upon the extent of the oppression, a building.

If per chance one has been sensitive enough to note that I have left out the Director of the Black Studies program, then it is fitting to draw the conclusion that the reader's aptitude on the question of blacks and higher education is exceptionally elevated. This exclusion of the Black Studies Director is intentional. Why? The reason is quite simple — not enough has

been done in this area, at this point, to elaborate upon the fate of these aborning administrators to speak of their efficacy; they represent a possible break-through on this whole business of blacks and higher education.

However, the Black Studies Director must be ever conscious of the tremendous task which lies before him at every writing of the memoranda requesting budget revisions, at every conference with the black student pressure groups calling upon him, conscious of the vicarious needs of the white faculty calling upon him for possible teaching positions, and especially tuned in to the brother approaching him in the dashiki who espouses blackness but whose goals may be the antithesis of the whole movement. Although the outcome of the Black Studies Director's role in higher education is too new to be evaluated, his daily operation will be tremendously formidable and challenging.

BACK TO THE BUSINESS AT HAND, that of trying to illuminate what I had reference to when I alluded to the terminology of "window dressing." Well, it certainly does not take an intelligence quotient of 150 to know the quaint psychology of having-one-of-the-enemy-on-our-side: we have seen this type of operation since silent movies. Let us take a look at the movies that we currently see on the late, late show, for example, to get a better picture of the predicament. When one sees re-runs of *Ra-*

mar of The Jungle, and other such antiquated movies, the psychology becomes all too clear to the sensitive black. As far as I am able to remember, Ramar, the great white physician, always had along "Willie Willie, the ignorant looking black," to talk to the natives in the many dialects of which he displayed competent knowledge, so that Ramar, in the event of danger, could call upon Willie Willie to offset aggression so that he could go about his business of performing experimental medicine on the tribes he came into contact with. Think about this for a second and let the full effect grab you.

Willie Willie, for all intents and purposes, had to have been a very gifted individual to go about the Mother Country and talk all of those languages to keep Ramar alive. Well, the same situation is apparent today on the modern American multiversity—the good native black brother has been hired, in most cases, to keep the great experimenter alive via his interactions with the hostile young "natives" from the alien tribe across the railroad, which the colonial power structure has admitted to the "king's courtyard" — college campus U.S.A. In the final analysis, seeing that Willie Willie was so intelligent and had so much insight into the customs of all the tribes, he should have, in fact been hired, not as a guide, but, to put him on parity with Ramar, as a professor of cultural anthropology. Show me an employed black man and I'll show you an under-employed man!

I insist that when blacks are brought into the polluted mainstream of higher education to perform these "window dressing roles" that these roles can serve as a positive correlative of just how far blacks have gone in the United States since Reconstruction — we have gone, intervally speaking, not one hash mark up on the scale of social progress. The Reconstruction was a farce and I would submit that, at this point the business of black administrators in the higher educational arena today is just as much a farce. We are constantly dangled out in front of the benevolent foundations,

those very well-deserving edifices, as though we were some sort of "black carrot" to attract some foundation's investigator. The investigator, not too recently removed from an impoverished situation himself, is apt to become enraptured with our plush offices and the administration's "mouthing" of a black enrollment to equal that of the national proportion of the black population, so much that he is prone to grant funds to the institutions at hand, thinking that a concerted effort is really being made in an attempt to achieve that goal.

THE "WINDOW DRESSER" is usually placed in some conspicuous "cubby hole," where he must be seen by the public, and is given some perfunctory "job." I know of an assistant to a Director of Financial Aid at a leading Mid-Western university whose sole purpose for being there, he feels, is to act as a countervailing agent in the event of some confrontation by the black students on that campus. He is virtually without any power and the decisions he has to make are unbelievably frivolous. He has the authority to assign part-time jobs which have been designated by some tacit systematic method as being for the black students on this particular campus — janitorial, cafeteria, and odd job work at faculty members' homes. In terms of having the authority to make the decisions considered to be important to the students, he is administratively emasculated. He, for example, has nothing to do with the granting of the National Defense Loans, the state grants, the achievements awards, the voting upon scholarship recipients, nor can he approve an emergency loan of, say, five dollars.

I ask, is this administration? To further make the situation appalling is the self-realization on his part of the role he is having to play. This is truly a dilemma! What is he to do? If he speaks up, he is very likely, says he, to be "professionally" castrated and the pursuit of his advanced degree forfeited. If he continues to be docile, he will not last another year with

the pressure being exerted upon him by the factions of the black students on the campus who are unquestionably aware of his behavior, which is in some instances, interpreted as cowardice.

What is the responsibility of a quasi-administrator, who is black and/or Negro, whatever the case calls for, who is directing a large program in the Mid-West which is handsomely funded by one of the leading foundations in the country and who does not have control of his budget? How can he wear the title of Director of anything when, in fact, he cannot direct his secretary to purchase a postage stamp without the approval of some uninvolved, uninterested, glory-seeking white superior? I would assert that implicit in any administrative role is the presence of a budget commensurate with the responsibility of role. In saying this, one could conclude that the absence of control of money indicates the circumvention of black administration.

Any newly recruited black administrator must go into the interview situation pointing out the principles he has within him that are not negotiable. This administrator must know from the word "go" that doing a good job and having job security are not positively related when it comes to the black administrator. That doing a good job is important and must be striven for cannot be overemphasized. However, if a good job means taking demeaning roles and engaging one's self in sophisticated "shuffling," then the job is not good enough to be done.

Not only are white administrators across the country playing a teasing game with the black administrators at the "knowledge factories," but the black students are giving them a fair share of hell in their own right. However, I am not at all sure that some of the black students are acting rationally when they accuse the black administrators of "selling out to the system" when, on certain occasions, it appears as though he is acting a little white." Let's face it: we all have a little white orientation in us. That militant student who is

usually pointing his finger at that black compromiser would be hard put to explain his presence on the "lily white" campus which he is trying to reform. So much for that. The point is this: the black administrator is caught in a game of double jeopardy between the hustle of the white power structure and the young, vicious, energetic, and answer-seeking black warriors. He is caught in a web of hostility which is relentless in either quarter and it is compelling upon him to cope with every traumatic second and emerge immaculately free of any psychological ramification or anxieties of having betrayed his dual responsibilities — a case of academic administrative ambivalence.

A MORE COMMON ROLE played by black administrators is that of Director or Coordinator of the remedial or compensatory programs on the campus such as the Upward Bound Program, the Education Opportunity Programs, Educational Talent Search, etc. True, these positions should be held by blacks if the largest percentage of the students enrolled in such programs is black. No matter, however, what the case may be vis-a-vis a particular minority, it is important that these positions be held by non-whites. Accordingly, this black individual, if there is not an identity crisis, is apt to have (aboriginal or soulful) insight into the problems of the "high potential" recruits.

To further emphasize this sensitiveness, will one please concern himself with this thought? All of us black administrators now holding Ph.D's and other high caliber white credentials, know full well the disciplines and subject-matter area where we encountered the most difficulty. Namely, in most cases, English composition and mathematics, and I have no quarrel with any brother who might want to disagree with my assessment of the areas of difficulty — to each his own. However, I would hold tenaciously to these two areas. If we know that these are the areas in which we have encountered difficulties, should not our counseling and development of the spe-

cial curriculums take the same into account? It certainly should. That is, if that certain indigenous soulful concern has not been crucified out of the particular administrator by the white ethnocentric curriculums across the nation.

If a brother administrator is willing to come to grips with himself and reconcile his close natural association and physical attributes of remarkable similarity with the students so enrolled in his program — in short, if he identifies—he does not have to have that many meetings with the black students to ascertain what they want; he knows what they want! What's more, he is capable of articulating needs to the institutional power structures in such an eloquent manner that they are apt, if they have legitimate intentions, to respond with rapidity.

All too often, regrettably, too many of our black administrators fortunate enough to move into one of the alluded-to positions, forget from whence they have come. Although there is probably some self-hate syndrome immediately beneath the surface, there is no reason for such a total "de-blackification" so prevalent in and around certain "cities of intellect." For in the words of Saint Malcolm X, when addressing an audience at a leading Eastern university after having received sharp and cutting remarks from a Negro Ph.D. who was in the crowd, said he, in essence, "Do you know what they call you, Ph.D.? A nigger." This is to say that all of those brothers who are "neo-toms," and Oreo's turning into vanilla wafers will not be saved when all of the acting is over, and the circumstances lead to the final confrontation. The oppressive, de-humanizing, institutional racism that they are helping to nourish will make no effort to distinguish in the degrees of blackness — at the moment of truth, it is black survival against psychological genocide.

Get those "soulful insights and aboriginal traits" out front and put them to use for the sake of liberating the black minds of our well-meaning, often too naive, black brothers and sisters who are calling upon us the best way they know — a native way.

The black rebels on college campuses are resorting to primitive ways to deal with a primitive mode of oppression, via the conditioning of minds by educating one away from his identity.

The failure of the white educational system, relative to the black constituency, has been pre-supposed. It has failed! The directors of these black programs must take heed and come to the naked conclusion that they must try something new and that they must be the agent which will shock the institutional power structure into a new mentality predicated on the axiom that blacks will not be educated as usual. That there is more than one way of performing the same task is an adage which our forefathers believed. To the extent that we realize the uncompromising flexibility and validity implicit in such a cliché we will achieve in renovating and innovating the current curriculum patterns in higher education.

BLACK ADMINISTRATORS of the compensatory programs on the various campus must grapple with this whole problem of remediation and lead in innovation. It is not true that all study is a remedial experience? A remedy for something that one does not know or has a deficit in? Posing this question, I would then ask, can we afford to wait to remediate in the traditional sense of the term in an effort to ameliorate the conditions of the black "high potential" student? I, personally, do not think that we can tackle this problem of remediation and compensatory education in the traditional sense. If we continue upon the thesis that the path to liberation of the mind is through the currently established curriculums, which have been with us since the University of Paris and Medieval Period and which have been geared to an elitist society, we will continue to search into a darkness so pervasive that the radiant red blood from 350 years of lynching cannot illuminate it.

It is pressing upon all black administrators in remedial programs to equip themselves with a diversified body of curricu-

lum development and go to war with the central, oh yes, conservative administration and push for compensatory programs that will offer the participants some type of prorated credit toward graduation. I will contend that we cannot, at this point, ask our undergraduate brothers and sisters to engage themselves in programs of compensatory and remedial education which will not afford them any credits toward the baccalaureate degree. I am not so obstinate that I would insist that the participants receive full load credits each semester or quarter (it would be nice though) but I am saying that they must receive some credit for the work on which they are expending a tremendous amount of time. I will offer no specifics in this case; let every institution assess its own milieu and adapt its program to that particular environment.

That black administrators should direct compensatory programs cannot be overstressed, but the ultra significant, important positions into which blacks must be placed, without too much gradualism, have to do with the decisions and policy-making for the entire university. Power must be available which will afford black America an opportunity to effect significant educational change. There must be actions instead of motions, realism instead of rhetoric, and power in place of ambassadorial platitudes and euphemisms. That is, positions which make themselves felt in such areas, as curriculum planning with intra-component colleges and divisions, personnel of the professional and para-professional nature, academic policy, rank and tenure, management of all aspects of the University.

I will contend that it is contradictory to pass legislation, appropriate funds, recruit and enroll black students who, for some asinine reason, have been tagged "high risk," if no instrument is available whereby their needs can be communicated to the higher echelon of the college administration and, for heaven's sake, the faculty. Where this instrument is lacking, turbulences are in the making and some type of "undesirable" confrontation will ensue in a

subtle or blatant fashion, depending upon the severity of the incident which triggers the charge. The conspicuous exclusion of blacks from the viable and legitimate administrative roles is one of the central, underlying forces which have detonated most of the campus explosions where black students were involved.

With the exception of a very few cases of campus activity during the last academic year, the principle cry heard after a confrontation was that the students did not utilize the proper protocol to make their needs known to the administration. How, pray tell, will these students be able to discern the different roles and functions of university offices when the multiversities are growing to such magnitude that the mail clerk and the plumber are the only ones who know where the offices are? Of course, this is not true in all cases, but for the large campuses where activity erupted this will hold true in more cases than one.

If, we come to grips with the university's socio-historical developments and study its origin in the U.S. we will discover that this particular institution has grown only one way — horizontally. Therefore, it would behoove us, the black administrators, not to work for change which will call for a redevelopment of a college or a department within a university. Rather, we will have to work for additional departments and/or institutes which will be grafted onto the existing structure. White faculties are by nature conservative; white administrations have, at one time, been white faculty; the board of trustees, in a number of cases, represent the alumni, who are conservative; and the alumni are the personifications of arch-conservative views. Calculating such a homogenous group yields a monolithic index. Taking this tremendous impasse into serious account, no alternative is left but to add some instrumentality onto this monolith, an instrument which will receive its impetus from a viable external pressure group — black America.

The black student pressure organizations on campuses are attempting to do their part to "negotiate" for constructive change,

but they are "only" students in the eyes of the faculty and administration, and to further emphasize the point — only black students. There needs to be some modifications made in the triangle of students, faculty, and administration which comprise the university.

There is no use in recommending the "playpen" student governments as the answer. That simply will not work. It appears to me that in addition to permitting students to sit on the board of trustees, a new movement, we must now place tactful statesmanship right out front and ask at institutions where the black enrollment is increasing, that black students be placed on the policy working bodies within the institutional framework. This ought not be a "show" position; it should rather, be a position whereby the needs of the black constituency can be articulated to the individuals who are professing meager knowledge of the black man's plight. These students should be in a position to exercise full voting rights on these key policy bodies.

There is no use in our "rappin" about who the institution is for, for we will not come to any consensus on this topic. The faculty will say it's for research, the students will say it's for teaching, the administration is apt to espouse any number of reasons for its being, but one can rest assured that none of these bodies will express a position that it is for society as a whole. If, perhaps, they could bring themselves to a point of serious deliberation about the concept of society, they would learn that the black spectrum is definitely a part of the society and by virtue of our being a part we deserve a role in the process of making decisions about our destiny.

The white power structure has always honored administration via sub-group pressure. It is now incumbent upon them to come to the realization that the temporal trend within this country makes it essential for them to come around to a new way of thinking and effectuate a receptiveness to the emerging sub-group pressures: the black

community generally, and in higher education, the young black students who are not cognizant of any changes which have been made to enhance the black condition.

In some cases, it would not be possible for the black students to constitute this vehicle of communication. In these situations, it would be wise to include, by any means necessary, a black faculty member or administrator on one of these bodies in an attempt to keep the university community, at large, attuned to the needs and stresses of the black students on the campus. This individual ought to have rank within one of the departments and should not be linked officially to the black student pressure group on the campus. (By virtue of his blackness, however, he will inevitably be thought of, by certain quarters of the faculty, as being a part of the "conspiracy" to overthrow the system of higher education within the United States.) For all intents and purposes, this black faculty member will serve as a professional sensitizing agent to keep the administration and the faculty honest in their endeavors to educate the black students.

Again, tradition must be laid aside if a serious effort is going to be made to institute some instrument for communication. Tradition would have us wait two decades for the newly acquired black students to establish themselves for positions on these faculty councils and other machinery found on college campuses, which would put us in an inoperable position. An arbitrary edict must come forth and direct the college to select individuals who are black and carry rank, to immediately become parts of that machinery. I would suggest, wherever a reluctance is discovered on campuses to make policies which will effect immediate change, that that institution is a bigoted caricature of a university or college.

AT INSTITUTIONS where the Board of Trustees are espousing a doctrine of "concern for black student enrollment," a position of Vice-President, Vice-Chancellor for Minority Group Affairs should be estab-

lished. To many, the ones living in retrograde, this idea could sound unrealistic. To them, I would say that perhaps it is better for them to research the development of student personnel administration in higher education and learn of the factors influencing the development of specific areas into established components of higher education; student personnel administration was an effort to ensure a harmonious college life for the student. At one time the president performed all of the administrative functions of the college. As administrative needs grew, more personnel had to be sought. Thus, the dean of students, the counselor, health services, registrar, etc., became meaningful parts of the college community as the temporal needs became apparent. There is now a temporal need — a need for black representation at the decision and policy-making level in colleges and universities. Having such will benefit the faculty and administration as well as the student, to whom the most worthy consideration must be given.

I envision such a position as that of Vice-President or Vice-Chancellor for several reasons. Ordinarily, these individuals would report directly to the president of the institution who in turn would go directly to the Board of Trustees. Unless the president is some omnipotent god, he is apt to give this position academic "*carte blanche*" in its realm of operation. Concomitant to this position would be *power*. This individual should have a budget commensurate with his title and responsibility. This individual should have enough power to effect the administrative changes which would derive from his title and responsibility. This individual should be answerable only to the President.

In the organizational structure this administrator should be on the line directly beneath the President of the institution with authority lines feeding into all segments of the university community, as these would have to do with meeting the needs of the American Minority Group Student. His services should be called upon by the other vice-presidents or chancellors

whenever any situation arises concerning the minority students on campus. I am informed of the fact that there are now several institutions who are employing vice-presidents and chancellors for Foreign Students' Affairs. I insist that it is wrong to employ individuals in this capacity to deal with aliens when so many descendants of the men who built this country are standing around with an unquenchable thirst for a higher education.

The writer envisages this black administrator working on an executive and administrative parity with the chief academic officer, the one under the President, of the University. If this happens to be the Dean of the Faculty, then he should work congruently with him; if this is the Academic Vice-President, then he should work congruently with him; if he should be the Academic Chancellor, then he should work congruently with him; the desirability of having this black officer working at the top of the vertical hierarchy is obvious.

If one would note, in the above, the emphasis on the word "academic" or "faculty," it should become apparent the significance I bestow upon the academic framework of the university. The university is positively related to academe. If we were to remove the concept of academe, we would not have a college or university. Therefore, taking that assertion into account, one must conclude that academe defines all segments of the university. If this is the case, and I believe it to be, all other offices, departments, schools, institutes, etc., are merely ancillary machinery necessitated by the student's central purpose for having attended college—to master academic material.

No office, it appears to me, could justify its reason for being if it were not for the academic framework of the university. Advancing this concept a bit further, I would assert that all offices, departments, and schools are, or should be, answerable to the top academic officers of the university or the college. In the final analysis, it is uncontrovertibly necessary for the

black administrator recruited and hired for this position to have the authority and decision-making ability commensurate with that of the chief academic officer under the President of the university.

THERE is not enough time to wait for a generation of Ph.D.'s to be exuded into the main stream of higher education in an equal manner to satisfy the caprices of the white institutional power structure. No, we cannot wait! There is also reason to believe, by looking at most of black scholars today, that the acquisition of the Ph.D. is leading the black away from teaching and personal involvement rather than into this involvement. The actualization of this critical situation is leading any number of us to believe that we must now impress upon the white institutional power that good teaching and research are not necessarily positive correlatives with Ph.D. With all of the countries represented in the whole of American Higher Education, it must behoove us to push to get some African-Americanism represented in the diversified relics which we find alienating us today.

The one simple way of instituting this change into higher education is by refusing to cater to the whims of the white institutional power structure. When they go into the academic euphemism about wanting only blacks with Ph.D.'s, we must keep the truth right out front, that because of the social injustices and racism, we are unable to come forth with this cadre of Ph.D.'s which most of them are well aware of our not having. Whenever white administrators ask for blacks with that terminal degree to fill a position, that is a true sign of a "cop out" and we must realize that we have been hit again with the "qualification syndrome"—remember Willie Willie. We must refuse to go along with the "qualificatits" which the white administrators are constantly trying to ram down our parched throats. That is, the symptoms which show the signs of equating academic qualifications with the Ph.D. degree in order to enter the bureaucratic "city of intellect,"

must be rediagnosed and reacted to in a pervasively different manner.

Back to the point of black Ph.D.'s being educated away from the personal involvement. This brings to mind a conference I attended recently in Atlanta, Georgia, where black educators were assembled from across the country to deal with and develop new perspectives in black education and to come up with creative solutions. While I am not at liberty to quote the number of Ph.D.'s present (it would be a guess), I can say that very few of the supposedly nationally known black scholars were present. Black people at that conference came with deep convictions and hopes of acquiring new and meaningful knowledge, but to their dismay, they were left without the knowledge of some of our foremost black writers and scholars to help them with their attempts at legitimate and viable change. To you all, where were you?

That particular episode could easily serve as food for thought on the subject of the mentality which a number of black scholars must have on the college campus—the Ph.D. black scholars. Therefore, we must take a different bearing as to how we are going to provide the needed black administrators on the predominantly white college campus. And after having found some type of solution to this problematical situation, we must interpret it to the existing institutional powers and be obstinate in our belief that the road down which we have chosen to travel must be one navigated by our cognition. I say it can be done!

This is being stressed for those unrealistic and antipathetic majority group administrators who feel to date that the only blacks who are qualified to become members of their institutions must have all the makings of the archaic conceptualization of the "super Negro." The time has now come in higher education when the criteria for selection of black administrators will have to be re-defined in black terms and with black standards of excellence. Engendering the principle of "preferential treatment" as the primary criterion for selection,

will be a step in the right direction for breaking the cycle which has enmeshed the black psyche in a deep woven web of inferiority caused by abandonment neurosis, oppression, and social injustices.

The Institute for Black College Administrators

Robert J. Wert, one time Executive Associate, Carnegie Corporation of New York, said in *Current Issues in Higher Education*, 1959, "Most presidents have had no particular preparation and a few, at least, will never miss it. Either they are instinctively good administrators or they have worked on their own to learn administrative theories and practices." In view of this statement concerning college presidents, I would think that a similar statement could be made about individuals of lesser line authority in a college organizational structure. In the future as in the past, I would venture to say that administrators will continue to become so without any formal training.

However, to tranquilize the whims of many "majority group" administrators, I submit the following as a means for aspiring black administrators to supply evidence of their qualifications as a black administrator in higher education. Please learn that the writer feels that this plan is offered to meet the immediate needs. It has been said that we are witnessing a social revolution. Thus, a revolution is supposed to encompass a magnitude of abrupt changes. Anything taking a conventional or traditionalistic path in an attempt to make changes is, then, a reformation. To keep in pitch with the crescendo of the militant symphony of unrest on college campuses, the academic conductors must move the baton of change with extreme rapidity.

The Institute for Black College Administrators should be held at universities and colleges centrally located by geographic regions throughout the nation. Perhaps to have them housed at the several centers for the study of higher education would be as good a place to initiate them as any. The

Institute for Black College Administrators should be administrated by black academicians who have shown their ability to be creative and effective. These institutes would have to be instructive and have some academic format of transmitting knowledge. Therefore, all platitudes about having equal time for "rappin" will have to be dispensed with. We must assume that certain individuals have more knowledge and experiential background and implicit in such an assumption would be the proposition that one can learn something from another.

If predominantly white universities are legitimately interested in recruiting black administrators, they should be capable of recruiting aspiring black college administrators and financing their periodic formal training in order to keep abreast of the trends in higher education as seen from a black perspective. Not only would the institute, which could be held each summer, be beneficial to the black administrators, and scholars, but it should strengthen the white colleague as well.

If the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is serious about the Higher Education Act, then I feel that this governmental agency should be of some financial assistance in an endeavor of this nature. The benefits of such a program would stimulate black individuals who are not in higher education to enter the "closed corporation" without having to resort to redundant types of learning activities which their professional fields covered in their undergraduate and graduate curriculums.

THE FORMAT would be that of a common course where the learning activities and workshops would run the gamut of all phases of Administration in Higher Education from the black perspective. The participants would assemble at the said universities for a period of twelve weeks. The individuals attending would register in advance and would have the option of participating in the institute for credit or no credit. Each visiting professor would have a two to three day stay at the respect-

ive campus for presenting and leading the learning relative to his expertise and topic.

In the main, these learning activities would be in the art and the science of Administration in Higher Education. Inherent in this type of format would be the socio-historical development of the American Higher Educational System to gain insights as to how the system developed, thus affording the participants an opportunity to formulate their own theories about possible solutions to the problems which are universal in higher education. The influences of Holland, Scotland, and Germany would be systematically studied to indicate the many piece-meal components of the system of higher education in the United States of America.

A VITAL KNOWLEDGE to any college administrator is the financial administration in higher education. As I am sure that no black administrator will have a long while before he will be involved in the system to such a degree that he will learn all of the sources of income for the "closed corporation," I, then, cannot over-emphasize the importance of knowing all of the ramifications of budget preparation and control.

The whole area of student personnel administration will have to be studied and solutions to problems dealt with from a black perspective. It is staggering to witness the vastness of this particular phase of higher education and look at how enormously it has grown during the twentieth century. However, we must realize that it must grow even more to incorporate within it the black man's plight. This administra-

tive area must be systematically studied and researched in our institute. These alluded-to areas must be built into the proposed institute with a plan carefully prepared and earnestly addressing itself to the stated hypothesis—if given a chance, the black can be an effective administrator in higher education.

There would be research possibilities. Each participant would be presented with a topic on which he could do research for the academic year to be completed and ready for submission at the onset of the following summer institute. For this work credit would be given by the sponsoring institution.

The administration of the institute would also have the responsibility of coordinating an internship for black administrators.

The major thrust of such a program would be the immediate availability of black college administrators at the beginning of each academic year. The program would entail enough flexibility to attract blacks who are currently employed outside of higher education. It would afford an ongoing opportunity for research on the various areas of higher education from the black perspective. It would be of tremendous assistance in providing the personnel which the growing community college demands.

In conclusion, the problem is irrevocably upon us and nothing less than a program which will show tangible, legitimate yields in the shortest period of time, will do in trying to meet the needs of the ideological, politically energetic black students presently enrolling on American college campuses.

THE CRISIS OF HAROLD CRUSE

by ROBERT CHRISMAN

HAROLD CRUSE'S book *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual*, is a remarkable achievement. Historical in approach, it traces the shape of black American cultural development for the last six years and the role of the black intellectual in that development. Documentation is thorough and extensive; many texts and sources on black experience emerge for the first time or are pleasantly renewed and the index is excellent. *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual* is by far the most impressive history of black intellectual development to emerge in this decade.

Indeed, it has the same quality of impact on black letters and the total American sensibility that James Baldwin's *Notes of a Native Son* and Ralph Ellison's *The Invisible Man* had before it. Like those works, Cruse's isolates, defines and crystallizes the major black concerns and climate of its time. Like them, it is not only a definition of contemporary black crisis but an act of self-definition as well. The same kind of personal urgency that pervades *Notes of a Native Son* and *The Invisible Man* also burn in *The Crisis of the Negro*

Intellectual. In substance, in rhythms, in tone, Cruse's work registers the crisis of the contemporary black intellectual like a fever chart.

It is not by accident that Baldwin and Ellison come to mind with respect to Cruse, for each of these authors was primarily concerned with the problems of sensibility that press upon the black intellectual.

But where Baldwin's concern has been for individual black sensibility, Cruse is concerned with collective black sensibility, what he terms, "the residual stratum of Negro ethnic group consciousness," and how that group consciousness has been expressed and represented by black intellectuals from approximately 1900 to the present.

Cruse maintains that enough "ethnic group consciousness" has always existed in black Americans sufficient to create a people that are definable not only by their physical characteristics, but as possessing a potential for developing a distinct culture. The distinction between *possessing* a culture and possessing a *potential* for culture is important here. Cruse contends that a distinct black culture has yet to be realized from that potential, despite its occasional flowerings.

The creation of this black culture and the sustaining of it, he maintains, is the task of the Negro intellectual and artist. The Negro intellectual has a crucial task, one on which pends the collective destiny

ROBERT CHRISMAN is a young poet and a professor of English and Black Literature at San Francisco State College. He was graduated from the University of California, Berkeley, and holds a master's degree from San Francisco State College, with further study at Southern Illinois University. He has been published in a number of little magazines and has given readings and presentations on college campuses. Chrisman also is editor of *THE BLACK SCHOLAR*.

of black America. For Cruse, only the black intellectual can create a black culture and without a black culture there can be no political and economic advancement:

"As long as the Negro's cultural identity is in question or open to self-doubts, then there can be no positive identification with the real demands of his political and economic existence. . . . Thus it is only through a cultural analysis of the Negro approach to group 'politics' that the error, weaknesses and goal-failures can cogently be analyzed and positively worked out."

The Negro intellectual has not yet created that culture, states Cruse. But, instead, through folly, poor judgement, lack of insight and foresight and his subversion by black rivals and by other interest groups, he has consistently aborted its development and failed his intrinsic responsibility to his people.

It is a furious book. At times vitriolic, and often captious, *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual* is nihilistic at its worst and a source of terse, seminal insight at its best. Cruse may not be the gadfly of Athens, but he is certainly the horsefly of Harlem.

THERE ARE nonetheless some very deep confusions and contradictions within it, confusions and contradictions that revolve around some of its most basic terminology and concepts. Cruse never defines his vision of culture, or culture itself, for that matter. Nor is there an operational or prescriptive definition of an intellectual. His concepts of nationalism and integrationism have a similar haziness.

There is a vicious anti-Semitism throughout the work. When faced with complexity, Cruse finds the nearest scapegoat and furiously lashes his way out of the jam. *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual* is the crisis of Harold Cruse more than it is anything else. Where his vision of black experience should crystallize and develop a new intellectual framework, it lapses into a fog of personal confusion and spite, and imprecision on basic issues and concepts.

In general usage, the word "culture" has two meanings, with almost opposite con-

notations deriving from each meaning. Culture can mean the acquisition of esthetic judgement, taste, fluency with the fine arts. So used, culture connotes breeding and refinement and the cultivation of non-functional skills and appreciations. Or, culture can mean the physical and institutional equipment a people have developed in order to survive, in which case culture is functional, rather like a set of survival tools.

MOST OFTEN, Cruse appears to use culture in the esthetic sense of the word to indicate the literary, dramatic, musical and philosophical values and achievements of black people, or to bewail the "fact" that black people do not have culture, in his opinion. He does not discuss "functional" culture in any depth, so one must assume that he is confining himself to "esthetic" culture.

It is unfortunate that he limits his consideration of culture to the esthetic realm, for the total culture of a people is composed not only of its arts and philosophy, but also of its tools, work habits and survival patterns. Any serious discussion of black American culture must consider both the functional and the esthetic and realize that they are fused, are reciprocating agents. Such a consideration would lead one to realize that a black American culture *does* exist and that it has remarkable power, complexity and grace—enough to sustain black Americans for over 350 years with a strength that has intensified, not waned.

But this is not the culture Cruse is talking about, though it is of and from this functional culture that the more glamorized (nowadays) aspects of blackness derive: soul food, field hollers, blues, holy roller churches, gospels, dances, hunting, fishing and working skills, not to mention strategies for social behavior, from loud talking to bad mouthing to tommying to signifying to running amok. John Henry, Stackolee and others represent this functional culture in black folk literature. But this is not the kind of culture that Cruse addresses himself to. Nor does he advocate a return

to the culture of a romanticized African past.

Cruse instead maintains that culture *precedes* political and social change; that culture is created by intellectuals and artists and then shoveled to the masses who eventually grow politically and socially active from the culture they have acquired. In this theory, esthetic culture is a catalyst for social change, with an apolitical, non-activist intellectual in the vanguard.

If Cruse were to maintain that esthetic culture is active propaganda, is a form of agitation, then his theory might be more credible. But he does not. He instead establishes culture as expressing ethnic consciousness through esthetic contemplation and he believes that such cultural activity has revolutionary potential.

IT IS AN ELITIST THEORY — and a foolish one. If art alone could make revolution, there would be daily upheavals. Esthetic culture comes *after* a social upheaval has been started or realized. But if, in addition, the creative intellectual is apolitical, then his work can have no dynamic bearing on social change. Certainly middle class intellectuals and artists have started and led revolutions, but *as political activists*, and their politics take precedence over their art or culture. Patrice Lumumba, Fidel Castro, Lenin and Mao Tse Tung are some examples. Yet Cruse can say at his book's conclusion that:

"The only real politics for the creative intellectual should be the politics of culture. The activists of race, nationalism, and civil rights will never understand this, hence this dilemma becomes another ramification of the manifold crisis of the Negro intellectual."

Such is the thesis of *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual*, that it has been the task of the black intellectual to create a framework for radical black change and that he has failed. Putting the faultiness of the thesis aside, let us examine the book further.

WHY HAS THE NEGRO intellectual failed to create that culture? The answers are various —and naive. The "integrationist" black has been responsible. The Jew has been responsible. The Communist has been responsible. A communist, Jewish, Zionist liberal, integrationist conspiracy has smothered black culture for sixty years, says Cruse.

The book then becomes a catalogue of colored ineptitude. Claude McKay blew it; Langston Hughes blew it; Marcus Garvey blew it; Richard Wright blew it; Paul Robeson blew it. Baldwin, Ellison, Hansberry, Killens, Ossie Davis, LeRoi, A. Philip Randolph, Malcolm X, DuBois — name a brother and you'll find out he blew it. The only blood left intact is Phyllis Wheatley.

The rich — almost magnificent — dimensions of *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual* are choked, precisely when the work must deal with crucial questions, questions that Cruse himself poses and then thwarts. The book does not resolve its own conflicts nor fulfill its thesis. It rides through its 500 pages on a razor's edge of ambivalent fury. The fury is most precise and lethal when it is turned to blacks and other minority groups of ethnic or political nature. When turned toward the individual and institutionalized oppression of white America, the fury of Cruse sputters, fizzles, and fails. Fails, falls back upon itself and any black within its range.

And so, blacks come off far worse than whites in the book, even though Cruse's own orientation is black nationalist more than it is integrationist.

THE TASK OF the black intellectual is vision, in both senses of the word — vision in the sense of seeing what exists and vision in seeing what should exist and has existed. To see the problem of blackness in the United States as a matter of integration versus nationalism is like looking through a pair of binoculars with each eye piece in opposite focus to the other. Each eyepiece contradicts the other and nothing can be seen, not to mention envisioned.

In a peculiar sense, the book is blind. Sixty years of black culture are seen and not seen. Black achievement is not recognized, nor is the full nature of white oppression. For, both integration and separation are responses to white oppression; if one fails to see them in perspective to white oppression, then error occurs.

One encounters this problem of vision often in *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual*. In discussing black music, Cruse gives an excellent analysis of the colonization of jazz by white musicians, and the whole bizarre double minstrel show that has taken place in American culture, wherein white "artists" will take a black experience and paint it white or take a white experience and paint it black. Discussing music, Cruse says,

"But symphonic music is not really an American product. The native American music is Negro jazz. Why, with all the Negro folk-music tradition forming the basis of almost all American popular music, has America never produced a *black* Gershwin?" (emphasis Cruse)

The blame falls on the black intellectuals:

"... their washed-out brains reacted with not a modicum of critical assessment. This is especially true of that clique of writers and critics hatched out of the cultural henhouse of the old leftwing in Harlem. For their collective mentalities are obsessed with little else but the folklore of integrationism, transposed from the civil rights front to the cultural front."

It's an extraordinary passage. Cruse's demand for a "*black Gershwin*" is absurd. Evidently, for jazz to become culture it must have "white" form. Does black esthetic culture have to be "whitened" and European in form to qualify as culture? The greatness in jazz that Cruse demands has already been achieved, and not in European forms. Who needs a black Gershwin when there is a black John Coltrane, a black Charlie Parker, a black Miles Davis? In crying for a black culture, he ignores the black culture that exists — and his ignorance comes in the name of blackness.

In the section on the Harlem Renaissance, he portrays very clearly its nature —

that Harlem was a playpen for white nouveau riche during the Twenties. They and their involvement ended with the Depression. So did the Harlem Renaissance. Serious black artists and intellectuals continued their work — Langston Hughes, W. E. B. DuBois, Duke Ellington, and new artists emerged. The fact that this renaissance died when whites withdrew their financial support and interest should have told Cruse something about it, that it was as much a white bubble as a black song. Yet he can take Langston Hughes to task for saying,

"I was there. I had a swell time while it lasted. But I thought it wouldn't last long . . . For how could a large and enthusiastic number of people be crazy about Negroes forever? They thought the race problem had at last been solved through Art plus Gladys Bentley."

The Harlem Renaissance ended in 1929, when white fortunes collapsed and its patrons could no longer afford to support it. It would have been a convenient point for Cruse to discuss the relationship between art and economics and, more important, the relationship between black art and white money.

CULTURE IS EXPENSIVE. The black culture Cruse demands — theatre, dance, music — would have to be supported with black bourgeois money if it were to parallel, say, the European symphony or ballet traditions, which were both bought and paid for by the European bourgeoisie. But there is no involved black establishment to support that black culture.

White America buys and supports only that black art and thought that it likes or that it needs to sustain an image of itself. Jazz musicians die like flies as a result. Black actors and entertainers perform in productions owned by white Americans. Black writers and intellectuals are published by white firms. With a brutal directness, white economics affects the expression of black culture, censors it, praises it, condemns it, nurtures it or kills it. The black bourgeoisie ignore it. In fact the black bourgeoisie mainly consist of actors

and entertainers sustained by white America.

Cruse ignores that, too. Instead, he says:

"American capitalism must prove that political democracy, economic democracy and cultural democracy are possible under free enterprise. It means that free enterprise must lay the economic basis for all three objectives by direct financing of new parallel institutions within the ghetto of an economic, cultural and class-ownership nature."

Shades of Booker T. Washington! American capitalism will take only those actions necessary to preserve itself. Ghettoes such as Harlem exist because race exploitation is one of the economic corner stones of American capitalism. It will eliminate racist exploitation only when it is no longer profitable. Racism has been profitable in the United States since 1619 and it is still profitable. How can Cruse expect free enterprise to *now* provide a parallel economy for blacks, when economic exploitation of races has been its policy since 1619?

Having evaded an analysis of American capitalism and economic racism and the relationship between capitalism and culture, Cruse returns to his favorite whipping boy, the black intellectual. Black gullibility and communism were responsible for the absence of an elite cultural establishment, not the economic racism of American "free" enterprise and the literal poverty of black Americans.

In the case of Richard Wright, "... vulgar Marxism had rendered him incapable of seeing unique developments of American capitalism. Uncharted paths existed for the Negro creative intellectuals to explore, if only they could avoid being blinded by Communist Party propaganda [for] the path to the ethnic democratization of American society is through its culture."

American capitalism *did* make some radical democratic shifts in the Thirties, not because of culture, but from economic and social pressure applied by groups such as the Communist Party, organized labor, NAACP and other groups. Capitalism had failed during the Depression and it has a

history of racial exploitation. These two facts would make any black intellectual of the Thirties skeptical of American capitalism.

But laying aside economic facts, Cruse continues:

"... the great brainwashing of Negro radical intellectuals was not achieved by capitalism, or the capitalistic bourgeoisie, but by Jewish intellectuals in the American Communist Party."

His conclusion is clear. It is not the vast institutional machinery of American racism which has inhibited the development of a black culture, but Communist Jews.

Were the black intellectual inventive, faithful and ingenious enough, he would find a way to culture in a country whose first act was to demolish the African culture of the first black imports 400 years ago and forbid their wages, education, literacy, marriage, legal stature, property and custody of children, a scheme of action which continues today in subtler forms. Education, money, law, family and property are the raw materials of culture. When they are denied and inhibited, how can blacks develop a bourgeoisie culture or cultural establishment?

Cruse assumes that such a black culture would inculcate blackness, which would in turn lead to economic progress through a cooperating white capitalism. Hence, his antipathy for what he calls "integrationist" intellectuals and trends. Generally liberal, left wing or Marxist, these "integrationists" drift away from black nationalism and collaborate with whites, in their efforts at social change. The specific black interests of these intellectuals is coopted by the whites, and so is black culture. This has been true, when the price of white support has been abandonment of blackness. On the other hand, a separatist approach has the disadvantage of isolation and also accommodates the white power structure by tending to make fewer real demands of it.

In *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual*, there is an impression in the terms, "integrationist" and "nationalist-separatist", their context in the whole of American

culture. Fredrick Douglass is viewed as an "integrationist" and Booker T. Washington as a "nationalist," which is a rather strange equation. Civil rights, racial equality, freedom are seen as integrationist by Cruse. Separatism, "accommodationist self-segregation," are viewed as nationalist.

Presumably, civil rights and freedom are integrationist because their black advocate intends to exercise them among white Americans. That is true. In fact, it is a truism. They would not be exercised among white Americans in some capacity only if the black man did not live in the United States. The struggle for equality and freedom from oppression is not necessarily assimilationist, but a drive for control over the conditions of black existence.

In this light let us review Douglass at a midnight hour, when he ponders the decision to attempt to escape or stay on the plantation:

"On the one hand, there stood slavery, a stern reality, glaring frightfully upon us — its robes already crimsoned with the blood of millions, and even now feasting itself greedily upon our own flesh. On the other hand, away back in the dim distance under the flickering light of the north star behind some craggy hill or snow-covered mountain, stood a doubtful freedom — half frozen — beckoning us to come and share its hospitality."

Douglass had no illusions here in terms of an "integrationist" North or slaving South; there was only "a doubtful freedom."

Starvation, "causing us to eat our own flesh," "the fangs of the terrible bloodhound," scorpions, snakes, capture and execution are pondered, and the decision emerges:

"In coming to a fixed determination to run away, we did more than Patrick Henry, when he resolved upon liberty or death. With us it was a doubtful liberty at most, and almost certain death if we failed. For my part, I should prefer death to hopeless bondage."*

Escape he did. And in advocating regiments of armed black soldiers to return and destroy Southern slaveholders (which

they did), Douglass was not an "integrationist."

His opposition to the black migration from the South of the late 1870's was strategically sound and what might be called "nationalist" from another perspective. He recognized that migration would diminish the rather formidable black population concentration in the South and result in a mutual dilution of black force, both in the Southern base, and at the place of disembarkation, the Midwest. Douglass' theoretics consistently recognized that the relationship between white and black America was an antagonistic one, that white dominance had been initiated and sustained by force and that black struggle was the key to black liberation, that, as he put it, "Power never yields without a struggle."

Cruse is much more favorable toward the "economic nationalism" of Booker T. Washington, a nationalism that was more integrationist than separatist at the sources of real economic and political power. An examination of Washington's *Up From Slavery* reveals the intricate web of his involvement with the white power structure, politically, economically and psychologically.

The keys to the psychological identification with white power sound early in his book. There is the touching and pathetic little boy's dream of eating ginger-cakes in the "big house," and the reflection that "... the black man got nearly as much out of slavery as the white man did," and the general repression of the horrifying experience of being enslaved, by accepting the values of the slave-master. The compulsion for cleanliness and frequent washing that are expressed throughout his autobiography and to which he literally attributes much of his success, might reflect a desire to wash the blackness out of his skin.

Washington was brilliant, diligent and shrewd. And, also a brother. The enjoyment of black folks pervades the book, but

*Fredrick Douglass, *Narrative of the Life of Fredrick Douglass, an American Slave, Written by Himself*, Dolphin Books, Doubleday, Garden City, New York, p. 85.

that *Gemutlichkeit* is dominated by a Calvinistic conviction of the superiority of whiteness and an oblique, distant contempt for black capability. Washington's peculiar combination of scorn and affection for blacks (in the place of respect) is a mirroring of the white man's model, a weird psychological concoction which draws us blacks into both intense collaboration with, and betrayal of, each other. In Washington's own parable, "Negroes are like crabs in a basket. When one has just about crawled out, another one reaches up and pulls him down."

The deepest refutation of Washington's "nationalism" comes when we examine how deeply integrated his economic base was with the capitalism of the white establishment. That integration was not a by-product of American economy but occurred because Washington and all his projects were subsidized by that establishment — Carnegie, Rockefeller, Roosevelt, Taft, etc. Significantly, the massive outpouring of white support came after the Atlanta Exposition Address, an incredible abdication of social struggle.

WASHINGTON's economic nationalism was rewarded by the power structure of the United States, not because it carried within it the seeds of black liberation, but because it instead provided a means of maintaining control over the black population. If we are concerned with economic nationalism, we must examine what is necessary for such a thrust in the United States — or elsewhere. Ownership of heavy industry, investment capital and land constitute enduring economic power in this country. Those are the tools which consolidate nationhood.

A nation, after all, is a parcel of land which sustains an organized body of people of common origin; in these times, heavy industry and capital are those sustaining agents. Washington's views sufficed to create a rather narrow black middle class of professionals and technicians who were

dependent upon a white capitalism for their survival and upon a white culture for their identification.

The anti-intellectualism of Booker T. is notorious and it provided no cultural apparatus for the black identification of his students and proteges. Indeed, he blocked the appointment of W. E. B. DuBois to Tuskegee and impeded the continuance of DuBois' Atlanta Conference project, which was in essence a black cultural center. Washington did not avail himself of the cultural power of DuBois and instead, harassed and impeded it. The result was that white leadership, white culture and white identification filled the vacuum for Washington's graduates — and several generations of black America.

A black originated system such as Washington's, which carries within it all the machinery for white domination, would quite logically receive white support. So much so that 70 years later, Richard M. Nixon can use the same economic scheme — black capitalism — with enough success to get elected President of the United States, passing among black people as a white Booker T. Washington.

LAND, HEAVY INDUSTRY, and the state must be the real concerns for the serious nationalist. Had Lyndon Johnson or Richard Nixon been serious about a black nationalist kind of economic development, the Federal government would have purchased Ford and Chevrolet factories for blacks, to be owned and operated by a cooperative of the entire black community in which the factory was located.

But such an act by them would abdicate the exclusive control of economic power and privileges which constitutes capitalism, and it would abdicate white establishment control of black people. The United States cannot afford a non-capitalist liberation of ten per cent of its population, when that system has controlled them for the previous 400 years.

It is for these reasons that the conceptual framework of *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual* is limited and the promise of the book is strangled by that limitation. Integration versus separation is a false proposition. Freedom is the real issue. Both integration and separation are proposals for dealing with a racist society: the degree of involvement (integration) or separation (segregation) from this society is almost academic. Neither truly challenges the racist structure of American society but, instead, each accommodates it in different ways. White America pushed segregation during Washington's time and integration

during the Martin Luther King period, both for the same purpose — control of a black population.

INTegration and segregation are concepts defined by this establishment as means of dealing with a malcontent black population. One cannot accept the conceptual framework of the oppressor and find in it a ladder to freedom. To accept the oppressor's definition of the black condition is to continue the colonization of the mind which cripples so totally. That is the crisis of the black intellectual, and it is the particular crisis of Harold Cruse.

ATTENTION: COLLEGE STUDENTS

THE BLACK SCHOLAR needs your help for subscriptions, distribution and circulation.

Be a sales representative for **THE BLACK SCHOLAR**.

For information regarding promotion and sales materials, write:

STUDENT SUBSCRIPTION PROGRAM
THE BLACK SCHOLAR
Box 908
Sausalito, Calif. 94965

Book Review:

The Black Curriculum: Developing a Program in Afro-American Studies by Sidney F. Walton, Jr. published by the Black Liberation Publishing Co., P.O. Box 10242, East Palo Alto (Nairobi) California 94303. 522 pp. \$10.00.

Most black writers — and even black leaders — whether knowingly or not — have written about black people or the black condition for an essentially white readership. The name of the game was “convince *white America* of the essential humanity, educability, employability, worthiness or what have you, of black people.” If blacks read the books or received the message, it occurred mainly because they were curious or were good listeners. The white man’s reaction was usually the key.

The Black Curriculum does not meet the traditional westernized standards for a “book”; neither is it a mere non-book. In reality it is a *black experience* on paper. It is the work of a revolutionary black intellectual on how-to-survive as an authentic black educator within a white-dominated institution. Brother Walton’s efforts spell out how he chose to fight *white racism* as a means to his own survival. Survival at a lesser cost was not worthwhile to Walton.

Walton asked himself a different question:

“What the hell was I doing for my people? Nothing really in the schools, other than offering my presence, accepting the absence of blackness, and perpetrating racism by not offering alternatives to the racist system.”

It was while in search of these alternatives that *The Black Curriculum* became a reality. Walton’s forthright honesty, ability to examine his own behavior, the authenticity and reasoning that undergirds his anger, the consummate skill with which he clarifies the issues — and forces his readers into self-confrontation — and his ability to transform the *extraneous white* into the *germane black* makes a studied journey through this text a memorable encounter.

A major contribution of this endeavor is the clarification of terms such as black racism, mother-fucker, the credentialing system, and in fact to develop a *survival* language for black people. In a discussion of semantics, Walton notes:

“The tuning in on words rather than messages is a perpetration of the great American hang-up of tuning in on the color of man rather than on the dignity and worth of the man.”

His message to black men is that “humanism” must be reborn within them. Their sense of dignity and worth must become indelible, indestructable characteristics, collectively self-reaffirming. Tune in on black humanism — the medium of black survival. The new language, then, is not words but *meaning*.

Readers will become immediately aware of why black students have campaigned for independently-controlled black studies programs. They refuse to integrate themselves into racist educational programs which predestine them to fail or to be conditioned against the best interests of their own people. Black students cannot "succeed" within a racist program. Such a course now leaves them but one destiny: to emulate white Uncle Toms. As Brother Walton put it:

"Racism is psychologically unhealthy for black youngsters whether it is labelled 'quality', 'integrated' or 'segregated.' We want our youngsters to *learn*, and it seems we have the answer — *All black educational environments which do not dehumanize black children.*"

The Black Curriculum is a collection of semi-official documents — memoranda, letters, reports, reprints of articles and studies — whose combined impact, when elaborated upon by Brother Walton, leaves no doubt that most black men employed within white institutions are playing the game of self-survival. This is not a put-down; it is a mere statement of fact. Walton is compelled by a desire to foster the collective survival of black people. It is this commitment that enriches his effort.

Conceptually, the book redefines education for black people into a day-to-day *struggle*; and into a broad spectrum of social and political concerns with the classroom and the transfer of knowledge to students being a very small part of the whole. The black educator becomes an advocate for the black agenda; the white educator is also educated as to how to join the struggle to redefine himself.

This book is sure to gain historic stature within the black world. It confronts the Emily Post, WASP, Victorian, "law and order" and scholarship standards of white America; not intentionally however. Readers must understand that it was not addressed to the black reader from that vantage point. It is a black "I.Q." test, ethnically-oriented, humanistically political, educationally relevant — for black people — and white humanists.

In the last analysis, readers who *experience* the book will be richer because they are able to do so. Those who remain as mere readers are still trying to make it with white people. Those who reject it completely are already doing the bidding of white people. The fact of the matter is that no one — readers or non-readers — will escape the impact that the book is bound to have on education for black liberation.

PRESTON WILCOX, *Chairman*
National Association For Afro-American Education

merit publishers

873 broadway
new york, n.y. 10003

telephone (212) 673-4900

Books and Pamphlets on the Afro-American Struggle

Malcolm X		George Breitman	
Malcolm X On Afro-American History75	Black Nationalism and Socialism50
Malcolm X Speaks (cloth)	6.95	How A Minority Can Change Society35
Malcolm X Talks to Young People35	Malcolm X, The Man and His Ideas35
Two Speeches by Malcolm X40	The Assassination of Malcolm X50
Paul Boutelle et al.		The Last Year of Malcolm X;	
Murder in Memphis25	The Evolution of a Revolutionary . Cloth	4.95
The Black Uprisings35		
The Case for a Black Party35		
		Robert S. Browne and Robert Vernon; Should the U.S. Be Partitioned?50
		Albert Cleage et al. Myths About Malcolm X50
		Harold Cruse et al. Marxism and the Negro Struggle65
		Della Rossa; Why Watts Exploded35
		Leon Trotsky; Black Nationalism and Self-Determination95
		Robert Vernon; The Black Ghetto.50

Announcing Forthcoming Merit Books

Malcolm X

BY ANY MEANS NECESSARY. Edited by George Breitman. Speeches, interviews, articles: A companion volume to Malcolm X Speaks. (Publication date: Feb. 21, 1970—the fifth anniversary of the assassination of Malcolm X.)

W. E. B. DU BOIS SPEAKS. Edited by Philip S. Foner. With a Tribute to Dr. Du Bois by Martin Luther King. The speeches span Du Bois' career from 1890 to 1962.

THE CASE OF THE FORT JACKSON EIGHT and GIs United Against the War in Vietnam. Interviews of the participants by Fred Halstead. With an introduction by Attorney Michael Smith.

BLACK VOICES FROM PRISON. By Etheridge Knight. Half of the articles and stories in this book are by Knight; the remainder are by his fellow prisoners in Indiana State Prison. Knight, already known as a poet, reveals himself here as a prose writer of great talent.

BLACK NATIONALISM AND THE REVOLUTION IN MUSIC. By Frank Kofsky. The radical changes in the thinking and mood of the black ghettos have produced a radical new music. Special attention is paid to the art of such seminal innovators as John Coltrane.

CUBA FOR BEGINNERS. A cartoon history of Cuba from its discovery by Columbus to the tenth anniversary of the Fidelista revolution. This hilarious anti-imperialist volume has had six editions in Mexico. By the brilliant Mexican artist RIUS, who has updated the book for its first U.S. edition.

EUGENE V. DEBS SPEAKS. Edited by Jean Tussey. Selected speeches and writings of the great socialist orator and agitator.

LEON TROTSKY ON LITERATURE AND ART. Edited, with an introduction by Paul N. Siegel. Trotsky's ideas on literary and artistic criticism set forth in selections from his writings, followed by a section of book reviews, essays, and articles showing his application in practice of these ideas.

MALCOLM X ON AFRO-AMERICAN HISTORY. An expanded and illustrated edition of this popular work. 80 pp.

Write for free catalog and further information.

BLACK HISTORY BY BLACKS

FUGITIVE SLAVE SERIES

AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF THE REVEREND JOSIAH HENSON

With an Introduction by Robin W. Winks,
Yale University
Paperbound, 190 pp, \$2.45

THE NARRATIVE OF WILLIAM W. BROWN, A FUGITIVE SLAVE

With an Introduction by Larry Gara,
Wilmington College
Paperbound, 98 pp, \$1.95

AUSTIN STEWARD: TWENTY-TWO YEARS A SLAVE AND FORTY YEARS A FREEMAN

With an Introduction by Jane H. and William
H. Pease,
University of Maine
Paperbound, 221 pp, \$2.45

THE REFUGEE: A NORTH-SIDE VIEW OF SLAVERY BY BENJAMIN DREW

With an Introduction by Tilden G. Edelstein,
*Rutgers,
The State University*
Paperbound, 272 pp, \$2.45

FOUR FUGITIVE SLAVE NARRATIVES

This volume combines the four paperbacks.
Hardbound, 272 pp, \$12.95

THE BLACK RESPONSE TO AMERICA From Frederick Douglass to the NAACP

By Robert L. Factor, *Queens College of the City
University of New York*

With an Introduction by Merle Curti, *University
of Wisconsin*

This text explores the various motives, techniques, problems, and sources of strength and weakness of Black leaders beginning with an interpretation of Frederick Douglass and including an analysis of black responses to Post-Reconstruction America and the central role of Booker Washington. The political, legal, economic, and intellectual responses are discussed and analyzed. In press (1970).



Addison-Wesley

PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC.

Reading, Massachusetts 01867

The Black World Foundation is a non-profit organization for the purpose of creating, publishing and distributing black educational materials.

This is a time of struggle, but there can be no meaningful, sustained black liberation unless there is a research and production center for study, analysis and creation of the necessary materials.

The Black World Foundation has been designed to meet that need.

The overall objective of **The Black World Foundation** is:

- To provide a forum for extensive research and dialogue for a revolutionary black ideology, the basic premise being that no fundamental change in our society is possible without an ideology that will inspire and lead to revolutionary change.

This objective will be implemented through publication and through special projects.

In publication, **The Black World Foundation** will:

- Publish **THE BLACK SCHOLAR** on a monthly basis, 10 issues per year.
- Publish basic black books by old and new writers, including booklets, pamphlets, textbooks, poetry, art reproductions, photographic essays, etc.
- Establish extensive apparatus for printing, distribution and promotion of black literature.

The Black World Foundation will establish the following projects:

- A Center for Research, Planning and Statistics, to gather data relevant to this generation of black Americans, its goals, strategy and tactics.
- Symposia and seminars on every phase of black America.
- Dialogue among various liberation groups and progressive factions within the United States, for an effective and creative exchange of information.
- Liaisons with African cultural groups for the purpose of developing a new type of cultural renaissance — from kindergarten to university.

For further information, write:

Black World Foundation
Box 31245
San Francisco, Calif. 94131

THE **BLACK** SCHOLAR

CALENDAR

DECEMBER

Black Politics: Ideology
Nationalism
The Black Party

JANUARY

The Black Woman in the Black Struggle

FEBRUARY

Black History: In Memoriam W. E. B. DuBois

MARCH

The Psychology of Blackness

APRIL

American Cities:
Black City States or Black Colonies

MAY (double issue)

Agenda for Revolution
Malcolm X: In Memoriam
Black Labor: History and Prospects

JUNE (double issue)

The Black Artist: A Celebration of Black Culture