Black History and the Class Struggle

Malcolm X: The Man, the Myth, the Struggle

What's Missing from Spike Lee's Movie
Activists Remember the Civil Rights Movement and the Black Power Era

New World Order - Neocolonialism in Africa
Introduction

As we mark Black History Month 1993, one of the most compelling figures of American black history, Malcolm X, seems to have emerged from the pages of history to claim a place in the consciousness of the youth of today. His 1964 autobiography heads the bestseller lists, in part as a result of Spike Lee’s acclaimed film, which itself has both fed off and further fueled a renewal of interest in Malcolm. Already last year, public school authorities in the South were clamping down on the proliferation of Malcolm X hats and T-shirts, apparently nervously anticipating a renewal of student activism which might again raise radical demands for freedom “by any means necessary.” But even with Malcolm’s name on everyone’s lips, it is more a matter of style than of substance, for the young people of today have been systematically deprived of any real understanding of his scathing critique of the racist status quo. We offer this pamphlet, the tenth in our series on Black History and the Class Struggle, as part of an effort to restore the context in which Malcolm X emerged as the “great truth-teller for black America.”

In this pamphlet we explore the history and lessons of the civil rights movement, whose activists were the audience to whom Malcolm directed his message. Abstracted from the turbulent social climate of the late 1950s and 1960s, when the demand for civil rights took form in a mass movement embracing millions of people, Spike Lee’s Malcolm X has become merely a courageous individual figure whose message might be summed up as “be all that you can be.” But for the real Malcolm X, his personal redemption, rising above his origins in the street life of petty crime and drug addiction, came through his commitment to seek the freedom of his people.

Today, in the schools and colleges, on television and through the news media, young people are fed a steady diet of self-congratulatory rhetoric about the “victory of the civil rights movement.” Against this backdrop, it is not surprising that neither the talented film director nor those who flocked to see his film have much idea what Malcolm X’s life was really all about. Because Malcolm—a contradictory figure, and one whose ideas were still evolving at the time of his murder—was one of the first black spokesmen to grasp that the broader aspirations of the millions for a life of dignity, justice and peace would not and could not be fulfilled by a movement which looked for salvation to a section of the establishment, and in particular to the Democratic Party and the federal government. All of his passion and eloquence were directed towards indicting the system as he understood it for the pervasive brutality and degradation directed at this country’s black citizens, and toward exposing the black “leaders” who sought to tie the masses of idealistic youth to the Kennedy/Johnson White House.

The failure of the civil rights movement—or rather, the betrayal of its revolutionary potential at the hands of those who wanted only a vehicle for advancement of the “talented tenth” through overturning the formalities of Jim Crow discrimination, in alliance with a section of the government and capitalist class—was signaled by the ghetto upheavals which swept the country, beginning with the 1964 Harlem riot, triggered by cop violence but expressing the anger and frustration of the masses at the hideous conditions of Northern ghetto existence.

The betrayal of the civil rights movement was underlined again last year, when the acquittal of the racist L.A. cops who beat Rodney King to within an inch of his life sparked another explosion of indignation against the American “injustice system” (see Black History and the Class Struggle No. 9, “There Is No Justice in Capitalist America”). The multi-racial Los Angeles riot bore witness to the economic devastation confronting blacks, Latinos and poor white youth today and the hollowness of the promises about jobs, housing, education and the rest that were wrested from the lying rulers by the mass struggles of the 1960s. But last year’s explosions, ironically, also illuminate the much-vaunted “victory of the civil rights movement”: as L.A. erupted and cities all over the country were shaken by demonstrations in sympathy with the protest, there was no lack of black mayors and black police chiefs to restore “law and order.”

It is the victors who write history, and if they today try to tell us how Malcolm X was moving toward accommodation with Martin Luther King, we know why that is. Today the demand for “black power” has been recast as “black empowerment,” meaning black faces in high places, and black petty entrepreneurs who dream of a monopoly to exploit “their own” people. Demagogues who posture as more “anti-establishment” than the BEOs are simply playing the same continued on page 38
A biographical film on Malcolm X has been more than 20 years in the making, a project almost as controversial as the man himself. Now Spike Lee has finally brought it to the big screen. Starved for black leadership, and finding in Malcolm X a legend who refused to submit to the racist white ruling class, inner-city youth are hitting the books and fueling a self-motivated literacy drive that school librarians never dreamed of. This year alone, more than a million copies of The Autobiography of Malcolm X have been sold—ten times the number sold when it was first published in the mid-‘60s. It’s a damn good thing youth are reading Malcolm X in his own words, because despite great sound and vibrant color, Lee’s Malcolm X is a celluloid blank space in history—the mass struggles for black rights are missing from the movie.

It is something, in this racist society, to make a film that gives humanity back to a black militant who the entire power structure feared, hated and demonized. But Lee’s reverence for Malcolm X becomes 70 millimeter mythology. Stripped out of any social context, Lee’s Malcolm X plays like a “Booker T.” remodeled for the ‘90s—magnetic Denzel Washington is a Malcolm whose message is to uplift the race by pulling yourself up by your own bootstraps, living clean and emancipating yourself from the “prison in your mind.” Hardly a program for revolutionary social change! Despite his intentions and pretensions to be one “bad” black filmmaker, Spike Lee has managed to turn Malcolm X into a... liberal! Through Lee’s lens, Malcolm X emerges from Mecca as a combination of Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr. A generation after the defining battles of the civil rights movement, black revisionist history casts Malcolm and Martin as partners in a joint struggle for black rights. But Malcolm X’s political role was defined against King and all the preachers of liberal accommodation to the racist power structure.

The present generation of black intellectuals is overwhelmingly remote from mass political struggle, so that they cannot think programmatically and strategically. Nonviolent resistance vs. armed self-defense, support for the liberal wing of the Democratic Party vs. independent political action, the relation of national liberation struggles in Africa and Asia to the American black movement—these are the issues which defined Malcolm X and determined his appeal. Since Lee does not present the political climate of the ‘60s, the evolution of Malcolm X and the specific positions he takes in the film remain inexplicable.

Lee views Malcolm X through the perspective of the self-conscious black intelligentsia of the renovated brownstones of Bed-Stuy and Fort Greene. From his previous films produced through his 40 Acres and a Mule Productions, to Spike’s Boutique at Macy’s, to Malcolm X, Lee focuses on personal development and promotes “black capitalism.” If he draws the line at marketing “X Air-Freshener” (“eradicate odors by any means necessary”), it is only because this product is too downscale for Lee’s target audience. Ultimately this world view is not hostile to American capitalist rule. Thus it’s no
accident that Lee’s Malcolm emerges as no threat to the bourgeoisie: *Malcolm X* received rave reviews in the *Wall Street Journal*, among other places.

**From Street Hustler to Muslim Minister**

The film is best, and most faithful to the *Autobiography*, in capturing Malcolm’s early years. Malcolm Little’s family home is burned to the ground byrobed, hooded Klansmen who later murder his father, a follower of Marcus Garvey and a proud man who refused to submit to white supremacy. His mother is then judged unfit to fend for her children, and the state takes Malcolm and all his siblings and splits them up in foster homes. Malcolm grows up with whites who call him “nigger” so routinely he doesn’t even know it’s a fighting word. He excels in school and hopes to become a lawyer, but is dissuaded by a patronizing white schoolteacher who reproaches Malcolm for aspiring to a station in life beyond what white society has ordained as proper for the black man.

After a series of dead-end jobs, shining shoes and slinging sandwiches while working on the railroad, Malcolm (aka “Detroit Red”) finds a more lucrative hustle as a sidekick to “West Indian Archie” running a small-time numbers racket and shacks up with a blonde in Harlem. A falling-out among thieves sends Malcolm running to Boston, where he sets up his own burglary ring. A young man who has suffered the mental lashes of the white man’s whip, Malcolm has internalized racist oppression. He burns his scalp with lye to remove “conk” his hair, then smiles and says, “looks white, don’t it?” Busted for burglary, a crime which normally carried a two-year sentence, Malcolm realizes that in the eyes of the racist judge (played, in one of the movie’s many in-jokes, by radical lawyer William Kunstler) his real pathology of America’s ghettos by preaching self-respect, and forgoing drugs, crime and a host of other things from pork to sex. The Black Muslims seek are black-owned businesses so that a layer of “upstanding” blacks can exploit the ghetto masses themselves. Black nationalism seeks a reactionary utopian “never-never land” at a time when the whole of American capitalism has been contracting and shriveling.

**A Spokesman for Militant Self-Defense**

After seven years in prison, Malcolm was released and quickly became the most devoted and able minister for Elijah Muhammad. To see Spike Lee tell it, you would think that Malcolm X attracted supporters to Harlem’s Temple Seven and nationally by preaching the faith. Not! It was because he departed from Muslim mysticism and talked with razor-sharp clarity about present-day race relations and the black struggle that he attracted a personal following in Harlem and beyond. Malcolm X attacked the submissive Christian leadership of the civil rights movement and its sacred cows in a way no one else did before or since. Describing King’s sellout of the 1963 March on Washington to the Kennedy administration for a tame “farce on
Washington," Malcolm X thundered:

"If you think I'm telling you wrong, you bring me Martin Luther King and A. Philip Randolph and James Farmer and those other three, and see if they'd deny it over a microphone. No, it was a sellout.

It was a takeover.... They controlled it so tight, they told those Negroes what time to hit town, how to come, where to stop, what signs to carry, what song to sing, what speech they could make, and what speech they couldn't make; and then told them to get out of town by sundown. And every one of those Toms was out of town by sundown.... It was a circus, a performance that beat anything Hollywood could ever do, the performance of the year. Reuther and those other three devils should get an Academy Award for the best acting because they acted like they really loved Negroes and fooled a whole lot of Negroes. And the six Negro leaders should get an award too, for the best supporting cast."

"Message to the Grass Roots," Malcolm X Speaks

Lee's movie shows the respect and support Malcolm earned from non-Muslims in Harlem for organizing the dramatic protest outside the 28th Precinct, where a Muslim brother lay bleeding after being beaten by the police. As Malcolm tells it in his Autobiography, "Hundreds of Harlem Negroes had seen, and hundreds of thousands of them had later heard how we had shown that almost anything could be accomplished by black men who would face the white man without fear."
The government feared Malcolm (the 28th Precinct's Deputy Chief Inspector said, "No one should have that much power") and saw to it that he remained vulnerable to attack. New York City's stringent gun control laws date directly from legislation rushed through the City Council against carrying rifles or shotguns in public—the bill was aimed at preventing Malcolm X from carrying his carbine in his car.

Still, as Malcolm himself acknowledged, the Muslims were perceived as people who "talk tough, but they never do anything, unless somebody bothers Muslims." It was true. While Malcolm preached against any kind of integration, the masses of blacks were fighting to smash Jim Crow and achieve social, political and economic integration into American society. Malcolm X was an outside critic of the movement for black equality. The young activists in the Students Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) were growing weary of silently enduring racist crackers who smeared mustard into their hair at lunch counter sit-ins, or worse, fired shotgun blasts into their homes. They were fed up with King's pacifism and derisively referred to him as "De Lawd."

This army of civil rights militants was Malcolm X's real audience. Lee simply has no comprehension of how convulsive and polarized was the period in which Malcolm came to prominence. The entire black community was politically mobilized, as well as a whole generation of white liberal/radical youth. In the film, these people do not exist for Malcolm X— but they were his real mass base, not the handful of blacks who joined the Nation of Islam. In fact, Malcolm's membership in the Nation, which abstained from social struggle, was a major impediment to increasing his influence—a fact which underlay his split.

As we wrote in our 1984 tribute, "Malcolm X: Courageous Fighter for Black Liberation":

"Malcolm personified to an extreme degree the fundamental contradiction of black nationalism. As a doctrine, nationalism can sometimes attract militant blacks deeply alienated from this racist society and who have no illusions that it can be reformed. But American blacks are not a nation. They are an oppressed color-caste integrated into American capitalist society while forcibly segregated at the bottom of it, Elijah Muhammad's call upon the United States government to grant several states for a separate black nation was more pie-in-the-sky than any of King's dreams. Separatism is not a program for social struggle in racist America."

"Black History and the Class Struggle No. 2."

While the Black Muslims remained aloof from struggle, young black radicals were attracted to the demand for "black power" precisely because of the inability of the liberal civil rights movement to address the systematic racial oppression inherent in this capitalist system. This came to a head in the North, where it was clear despite formal legal equality blacks were still forcibly segregated at the bottom of American society, through economic factors such as jobs, education, housing. Their frustration exploded in the 60s ghetto riots, and in their wake despair over the failure of liberal integration led to the spread of hardened black nationalism. That black militants were not introduced to the Marxist program of revolutionary internationalism at the critical juncture is in large part due to the capitulation of the Socialist Workers Party to black nationalism and its criminal abstention from the struggle in the South (for a fuller analysis of this period, see Spartacist pamphlet, "On the Civil Rights Movement," Black History and the Class Struggle No. 2).

"Chickens Come Home to Roost"

While Spike Lee plays up Malcolm's moral revulsion at the discovery of Elijah Muhammad's sexual exploits with young Muslim women and ostentatious high living, an immediate cause of Malcolm X's split with the Nation of Islam was his bold and unapologetic assessment of the Kennedy assassination, that it was a case of "chickens coming home to roost." The film shows the tremendous courage it took for Malcolm X to make such a statement in the midst of a national orgy of patriotic mourning (even ostensibly "socialist" groups like the Communist Party and the Socialist Workers Party fell over themselves offering condolences to the First Lady). And Elijah Muhammad, despite all the "white devil" rhetoric, was outraged that his disciple let loose with such an affront to the white ruling class, because it would be very, very bad for business.

But since Lee does not show the bloody terror perpetrated by the U.S. government on black marchers throughout the South, on Africans in the Congo, against the Cuban Revolution and against the people of Vietnam, how are youth today to understand what is coming home to roost?

September 1960: Cuban revolutionary leader Fidel Castro stayed at Harlem's Hotel Theresa in solidarity with oppressed American blacks. Here he dines with hotel staff.

Andrew St. George
Malcolm's attacks on the Kennedy/Johnson White House were central to his political stance and his appeal to the radicalizing youth in the black struggle. Searing speeches, like "The Ballot or the Bullet"—where Malcolm exposes the hand-in-glove workings of the Southern Dixiecrats with the Northern liberals, and declares, "A vote for a Democrat is a vote for a Dixiecrat"—have no place in Lee's film. Indeed, when interviewed about the cause of the L.A. riots, Spike Lee said, "The Democratic administration tried to help the poor, but Reagan and Bush are not concerned" (Liberation [Paris], 5 May).

Refusing to be silenced by Elijah Muhammad for speaking out on the Kennedy assassination, and increasingly aware that the Nation was responsible for the death threats he and his family received, Malcolm split from the Nation of Islam. He formed his own organizations, Muslim Mosque, Inc. and the OAAU (Organization of Afro-American Unity), and made clear that he would engage in secular political struggles. At an OAAU meeting the next year, Malcolm read aloud a telegram he had sent to the American Nazi leader George Lincoln Rockwell:

"This is to warn you that I am no longer held in check from fighting white supremacists by Elijah Muhammad's separatist Black Muslim movement, and that if your present racist agitation against our people there in Alabama causes physical harm to Reverend King or any other black Americans who are only attempting to enjoy their rights as free human beings, that you and your Ku Klux Klan friends will be met with maximum physical retaliation from those of us who are not handcuffed by the disarming philosophy of nonviolence, and who believe in asserting our right of self-defense—by any means necessary."

—Malcolm X Speaks

Back from Mecca

Shortly after his split from the Nation of Islam, Malcolm made the Muslims' pilgrimage to Mecca. This trip and a subsequent lengthy tour through Africa convinced Malcolm that it was wrong to narrowly define the struggle against oppression in racial terms. In Spike Lee's movie, this fundamental break from black separatism is portrayed simply as a realization that Muslims come in all complexions, therefore not all white people can be "devils," and true "spiritualism" can form a brotherhood of humanity. You'd think Malcolm was ready to link arms with the Kennedys and sing "We Shall Overcome." Hardly.

A more realistic picture of the times is provided by SNCC activists John Lewis and Donald Harris, who met up with Malcolm in Ghana in 1964, and wrote home that people would tell them, "If you are to the right of Malcolm, you might as well start packing right now 'cause no one'll listen to you".... After a day of this we found that we must, immediately on meeting people, state our own position in regard to where we stood on certain issues—Cuba, Vietnam, the Congo, Red China and the UN, and what SNCC's role, guidelines and involvement in the rights struggle was" (Malcolm X Speaks).

Malcolm wrote that "travel broadens." Meeting fighters from successful revolutionary wars against British, French and U.S. imperialism got him thinking about how to redefine the struggle against racist and colonial oppression. After a conversation with a man who
helped drive the French out of Algeria, Malcolm said:

"He was an African, but he was Algerian, and to all appearances, he was a white man. And he said if I define my objective as the victory of black nationalism, where does that leave him? Where does that leave revolutionaries in Morocco, Egypt, Iraq, Mauritania? So he showed me where I was alienating people who were true revolutionaries, dedicated to overthrowing the system of exploitation... I had to do a lot of thinking and reappraising of my definition of black nationalism.... I haven't been using the expression for several months."

—"Young Socialist Interview,"
By Any Means Necessary

But Malcolm's x-ray vision, which had never failed to see through the hypocrisy of American bourgeois politics, went myopic on him in Africa. It's almost embarrassing to read his accolades to the Saudi monarchy—the last state on the planet to practice legal chattel slavery of black Africans and women! And he had big-time illusions in the United Nations (a den of thieves and their victims) as an ostensibly independent and moral entity.

Thus Malcolm had a plan to press charges in the UN against the United States for its heinous crimes against the 20 million descendants of Africans brought to America's shores in bondage. Although the UN's composition was changing with the admittance of a host of former black African colonies, even at the time the UN was complicit in the assassination of Patrice Lumumba, the radical nationalist Congolese leader. And while Malcolm was basically blind to the nature of the African regimes which talked of so-called "nonalignment" and even "socialism" as they exploited and repressed the workers and peasants. Now, after the U.S. slaughter of 100,000 Iraqis and the destruction of the country (carried out under the "neutral" UN flag with the active support of African and Arab states), such a perspective is grotesque.

The Legacy of Malcolm X

Malcolm X opens with a powerful sequence of images—the horrific and familiar clips of the police beating of Rodney King give way to a giant American flag that ignites and smolders into a giant "X." It's a promise that this film will have relevance to the urgent problems plaguing black America today. It's a promise unfulfilled. By omission, this film is a conscious cover-up of some very sinister enemies of black rights and a perversion of Malcolm's greatest strength—the ability to see the two-party political system in America for the con game it is.

This film shows that both the FBI and the Nation of Islam wanted Malcolm dead. Yet a cameo role is given to avowed FBI fink Al Sharpton, who wore a wire for the feds to spy on other black activists! That Spike Lee can get away with such a maneuver speaks volumes to the dearth of struggle and the low level of political consciousness today. Twenty years ago, audiences would have walked out or thrown something at the fat fink the moment he appeared on the big screen!

As to the Nation of Islam's involvement, Malcolm X clearly shows that Elijah Muhammad and his very disciplined followers wanted Malcolm dead and gone. But the sinister figure who replaced Malcolm as minister in Harlem's Temple Seven, and became the Nation of Islam's hatchet man for the savage hate campaign against Malcolm X, is still around. He now heads the Nation of Islam. His name is Louis Farrakhan. Spike Lee interviewed Farrakhan before making the movie and confronted him with the damning evidence—the death threats against Malcolm X—issued by Farrakhan himself in Muhammad Speaks and reprinted here. But when the cameras rolled, Lee pulled his punches and Farrakhan is not mentioned in this film.

As black historian Clayborne Carson wrote, "Some viewers may even see Farrakhan as a modern-day Malcolm" (San Francisco Examiner, 22 November). Carson also noted:

"By ignoring the political Malcolm in favor of the personal story, Lee makes it difficult for viewers to understand why FBI and CIA surveillance of Malcolm increased rather than decreased after he abandoned the anti-white teachings of Elijah Muhammad. During his last year, Malcolm was considered a major threat by these agencies because his talents were no longer confined within a small, apolitical religious cult."

Malcolm X was a compelling figure, and everybody wants a piece of him—indeed, the most diverse political tendencies claim this remarkable man as "theirs" and assert that at the time of his death he was inexorably moving toward their own political positions. Clayborne Carson's own angle is to say that Malcolm was coming around to reconciliation with M.L. King and "nonviolence." But this remarkable man's life was tragically cut short; he was robbed of the chance to evolve politically, in what direction we do not know. As we wrote in our 1965 obituary (Spartacist No. 4, May-June 1965):

"He was the stuff of which mass leaders are made. Commencing his public life in the context of the apolitical, irrational religiosity and racial mysticism of the Muslim movement, his break toward politicalness and rationality was slow, painful, and terribly incomplete. It is useless to speculate on how far it would have gone had he lived.... In any event, at the time of his death he had not yet developed a clear, explicit, and rational social program. Nor had he led his followers in the kind of transitional struggle necessary to the creation of a successful mass movement."

Still, Malcolm's intransigent commitment to the truth and his uncompromis-
As the voice of the angry black ghetto, Malcolm X knew that the Southern-based civil rights struggle for formal equality could not achieve freedom for black people in capitalist America. No new civil rights bill could begin to address the systematic racist discrimination and dehumanizing conditions that the black population was forced to suffer in big Northern ghettos like Detroit, Roxbury and Harlem—where blacks were, of course, “equal” under the law.

The avalanche of blows by police billyclubs on a black man named Rodney King, and the outrageous acquittal of his cop tormenters, taught a lot of people that there is something fundamentally wrong with this society that no piece-meal reform can change. It was a clear racist atrocity. And the mass upheaval of anger against it was plebeian and multiracial. As young people took to the streets around the country, they were busted by black mayors who waved their “nonviolent” civil rights credentials in one hand and waved in vicious police assaults with the other. One last speech by Malcolm X seems particularly prescient:

“In 1963, one of their devices to let off the steam of frustration was the march on Washington.... In ’64, what was it? The civil-rights bill.... What will they give us in 1965? I just read where they planned to make a black cabinet member. Yes, they have a new gimmick every year. They’re going to take one of their boys, black boys, and put him in the cabinet, so he can walk around Washington with a cigar—fire on one end and fool on the other.”

—“Prospects for Freedom in 1965,” Malcolm X Speaks

Black Liberation Through Socialist Revolution!

Conditions for black youth in America today are much worse than in Malcolm’s time. Ghettoized youth are considered by the ruling class to be a “surplus” population. There are no jobs for them and thus no need to educate them. Some two million manufacturing jobs have disappeared in this country over the past decade, and the real incomes of black working parents under the age of 30 were driven down by a staggering 45 percent between 1973 and 1990. But while the black poor were being ravaged, a layer of black yuppies emerged, moving out of the ghettos. Currently the top 20 percent of black families account for almost half of all black income—a degree of inequality greater than among whites.

These facts alone explode the black nationalist myth of a common interest of all black people. While the overall conditions for black people have gotten much, much worse, there is a growing perception—from white Caterpillar workers in the Midwest, to Latinos in L.A., to black youth in Harlem—that the fundamental division in this country is not between black and white, but between haves and have-nots. And despite the looting and deindustrialization of America by the capitalist class, black workers still play a strategic role in the American economy and organized labor movement. All those basic jobs which keep American society functioning—bus drivers, hospital workers, subway motor­men, sanitation workers, longshoremen, postal carriers—are disproportionately held by blacks. And therein lies their tremen­dous potential power, as black workers, as part of an integrated working class leading all the oppressed. As we wrote at the time of the Los Angeles riots (“L.A. Upheaval Shakes America,” WV No. 551, 15 May):

These black proletarians can serve as a bridge between the ghetto poor and the organized labor movement. Conditions are overripe for a massive social explo­sion in this country extending from the ghettos and Hispanic barrios to white skilled workers, many of them one paycheck away from bankruptcy and evic­tion.... Decisive in the outcome will be the construction of a multiracial commu­nist vanguard party such as Lenin and the Bolsheviks built in tsarist Russia’s ‘prison house of nations,’ which led the multinational working class in a successful insurrection against the capitalist order.
1965 Spartacist Statement on the Assassination

MALCOLM X

Of all the national Negro leaders in this country, the one who was known uniquely for his militancy, intransigence, and refusal to be the liberals' front-man has been shot down. This new political assassination is another indicator of the rising current of irrationality and individual terrorism which the decay of our society begets. Liberal reaction is predictable, and predictably disgusting. They are, of course, opposed to assassination, and some may even contribute to the fund for the education of Malcolm's children, but their mourning at the death of the head of world imperialism had a considerably greater ring of sincerity than their regret at the murder of a black militant who wouldn't play their game.

Black Muslims?
The official story is that Black Muslims killed Malcolm. But we should not hasten to accept this to date unproved hypothesis. The New York Police, for example, had good cause to be afraid of Malcolm, and with the vast resources of blackmail and coercion which are at their disposal, they also had ample opportunity, and of course would have little reason to fear exposure were they involved. At the same time, the Muslim theory cannot be discounted out of hand because the Muslims are not a political group, and in substituting religion for science, and color mysticism for rational analysis, they have a world view which could encompass the efficacy and morality of assassination. A man who has a direct pipeline to God can justify anything.

No Program
The main point, however, is not who killed Malcolm, but why could he be killed? In the literal sense, of course, any man can be killed, but why was Malcolm particularly vulnerable? The answer to this question makes of Malcolm's death tragedy of the sharpest kind, and in the literal Greek sense. Liberals and Elijah have tried to make Malcolm a victim of his own (non-existent) doctrines of violence. This is totally wrong and totally hypocritical. Malcolm was the most dynamic national leader to have appeared in America in the last decade. Compared with him the famous Kennedy personality was a flimsy cardboard creation of money, publicity, makeup, and the media. Malcolm had none of these, but a righteous cause and iron character forged by white America in the fire of discrimination, addiction, prison, and incredible calumny. He had a difficult to define but almost tangible attribute called charisma. When you heard Malcolm speak, even when you heard him say things that were wrong and confusing, you wanted to believe. Malcolm could move men deeply. He was the stuff of which mass leaders are made. Commencing his public life in the context of the apolitical, irrational religiosity and racial mysticism of the Muslim movement, his break toward politicalness and rationality was slow, painful, and terribly incomplete. It is useless to speculate on how far it would have gone had he lived. He had entered prison a burglar, an addict, and a victim. He emerged a Muslim and a free man forever. Elijah Muhammad and the Lost-Found Nation of Islam were thus inextricably bound up with his personal emancipation. In any event, at the time of his death he had not yet developed a clear, explicit, and rational social program. Nor had he led his followers in the kind of transitional struggle necessary to the creation of a successful mass movement. Lacking such a program, he could not develop cadres based on program. What cadre he had was based on Malcolm X instead. Hated and feared by the power structure, and the focus of the paranoid feelings of his former colleagues, his charisma made him dangerous, and his lack of developed program and cadre made him vulnerable. His death by violence had a high order of probability, as he himself clearly felt.

Heroic and Tragic Figure
The murder of Malcolm, and the disastrous consequences flowing from that murder for Malcolm's organization and black militancy in general, does not mean that the militant black movement can always be decapitated with a shotgun. True, there is an agonizing gap in black leadership today. On the one hand there are the respectable servants of the liberal establishment; men like James Farmer whose contemptible effort to blame Malcolm's murder on "Chinese Communists" will only hasten his eclipse as a leader, and on the other hand the ranks of the militants have yet to produce a man with the leadership potential of Malcolm. But such leadership will eventually be forthcoming. This is a statistical as well as a social certainty. This leadership, building on the experience of others such as Malcolm, and emancipated from his religiosity, will build a movement in which the black masses and their allies can lead the third great American revolution. Then Malcolm X will be remembered by black and white alike as a heroic and tragic figure in a dark period of our common history.

Bay Area Spartacist Committee, 2 March, 1965
Activists Remember the Civil Rights Movement and the Black Power Era

On 11 December 1992, a Spartacist public forum was held in Oakland, California. The speakers were three comrades who participated in the turbulent civil rights struggles which were polarizing this country at the time that Malcolm X rose to prominence. Unlike so many of the brothers and sisters who became involved in the mass movements of the 1960s only to see their dedication and sacrifices betrayed by the liberal leaders in the service of a prettified racist status quo, or squandered by the black nationalists and New Leftists who played with the rhetoric of revolutionary change while lacking any real program for bringing it about, these comrades have remained committed fighters for black liberation and are today leaders of the Spartacist League.

Joseph Seymour
Spartacist League Central Committee, participant in the radical movement of the early 1960s

When I was nineteen years old, I was involved with a left-wing socialist group at City College, which is located on the fringes of Harlem. We organized for Malcolm X to come and address the student body. Now, he didn’t come with a big entourage, and since I was chairing the meeting, just before he spoke I found myself standing next to him in the auditorium. I felt terribly intimidated and sheepish—I mean, here I am with Malcolm X. Just to make conversation, I noted that the previous summer I had gone to Cuba where I had met some people from the Nation of Islam. Malcolm expressed real interest and sympathy for the Cuban Revolution. He said he didn’t know very much about it and asked what my impressions were. He wasn’t just being polite. He really wanted to know what a 19-year-old college kid thought of the Cuban Revolution.

A few minutes later he spoke to several hundred students, most of them white and generally liberal, and the main point he made was to attack support for and illusions in the Democratic Party. At that particular time, Lyndon Johnson was pushing the Civil Rights Bill and a lot of people thought that the President of the United States had finally taken a hard line against white supremacy. Malcolm said, “Don’t be fooled! Johnson’s best friend in Washington is Georgia Senator Richard Russell who is an arch segregationist.” He said, “When somebody says they are against racism but their best friend is Richard Russell, it’s like somebody saying they are against train robbing and their best friend is Jesse James.”

This incident reveals what’s missing from Spike Lee’s film Malcolm X—the momentous political struggle in this country and abroad which formed the background of Malcolm’s rise to prominence. The debate that was raging among the activists. Did you support the Cuban Revolution and the Vietnamese Revolution against U.S. imperialism? Or did you support the U.S. government in trying to overthrow Castro and in trying to destroy the Viet Cong in blood in the name of anti-communism? Did you attack John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson as war criminals who oppressed and savaged the dark-skinned peoples of the world? Or did you look to them to bring democracy and civil rights and racial equality to black people in this country? Did you believe that civil rights militants had the right to defend themselves against the cracker sheriffs and the Klan and the White Citizens Councils? Or did you maintain that in fighting for their democratic rights black people could do no more than engage in non-violent protest?
These were the issues which polarized American society. These were the issues that defined Malcolm's politics and determined his appeal. Because what he was in the minds of everybody—black, white, left, right, center—he was the best known, the most powerful, the most incisive enemy of what we at the time called the "white power structure." Spike Lee doesn't understand that because he doesn't understand how convulsive and explosive American society was in the early 1960s. The civil rights movement, in the sweep of its mass support, in the aspirations for freedom and equality which it generated among black people, and in bringing into existence a whole generation of young radical activists, had a revolutionary potential.

In the South, the entire black community was mobilized—hundreds of thousands of people were confronting a totalitarian racist police state which they had lived under for three-quarters of a century, since Radical Reconstruction was abandoned and defeated in the aftermath of the Civil War. In the North it was different, because blacks had, legally, the formal democratic rights which the Southern civil rights movement was fighting for. They could vote, they could go into restaurants and ride buses with white people. But blacks in the North as well as in the South did not consider the civil rights movement in this narrow a way. They saw it as a movement for general social equality, even though there was no coherent or agreed-upon program for how to achieve that.

In Spike Lee's movie, you don't realize that at one point there were probably more civil rights militants in the town of Albany, Georgia than there were in the entire Nation of Islam nationally. A whole generation had been standing up to the cops in the South and in the North. Like Malcolm X, they came to understand the link between racism in the United States and the oppression by the American government and the big corporations of dark-skinned people throughout the world.

Preachers' Pacifism vs. Militant Self-Defense for the Movement

That's why the question of nonviolence at that moment was so decisive and so important. It wasn't about the right of individuals to defend themselves or their families. In the movie they show Malcolm X's father (who was a black nationalist minister) warding off an attack by local Klansmen by threatening them with his pistol. But that wasn't what the debate was. We were talking about armed self-defense for a movement—which embraced millions and which was confronting the capitalist state.

The question of nonviolence was basically a question of your attitude toward the system. To say that the civil rights movement had the right to defend itself against racist terror was really to say that you had the right of revolution; that you didn't accept the rules of the game. And when King pledged nonviolence, what he was really saying is he was pledging allegiance to the white power structure. He was saying that the black movement cannot go beyond the bounds set for it by the liberal wing of the ruling class represented by the Democratic Party. That's what it meant. And that's why Malcolm X called King a "20th century Uncle Tom" whose primary concern is to defend the white man.

When Malcolm said that, a lot of people in the civil rights movement, even people who were critical of King, thought that this was exaggerated and unfair. Yet a few months after Malcolm was assassinated, the black ghetto in Watts in Los Angeles rose up. Black youth ran through the streets demonstrating defiance of the ruling class. The police and the National Guard were sent...
in and killed more than 30 black kids—most of them unarmed, most of them in cold blood. What did King do? Did he call upon the LAPD and the FBI and the National Guard to "turn the other cheek," to throw away their guns and resort to "nonviolent resistance"? No! He said it was necessary that "as powerful a police force as possible be brought in to check them." Malcolm X was known above all at the time as a person who said that the oppressed black masses had the right and the duty to overthrow the system which oppressed and degraded them, although he did not have a coherent program to do that.

The Myth of "Black Capitalism"

While Malcolm X was alive, he was slandered as some kind of crazed fanatic and advocate of black violence against white America. But today there is a different kind of falsification, which in its way is no less pernicious. He is now presented as a pioneer advocate of black-owned business, as a man who believed in the economic development of the segregated ghetto within the framework and under the rules set by white-dominated American capitalism. This line and lie is perpetrated not only by nationalist hustlers like Farrakhan, who when Malcolm split from the Nation of Islam said that he deserved death for defying Elijah Muhammad, but it's also perpetrated by the house organ of international financiers. A recent issue of the London Economist says that Malcolm's message was "black capitalism."

It is true that Malcolm sought, both as a Muslim and somewhat later, to break poor blacks from the degrading pathology of ghetto life: alcoholism, drug addiction, wife-beating, prostitution. He told black people that they should stand on their own two feet and not depend on the white man. But by that he did not mean that they should take over grocery stores and dry-cleaning stores and open sweatshops in the ghetto to rip off and exploit their own people! This I will tell you, that while he was alive, no one, absolutely no one believed that Malcolm X was an advocate of "black capitalism" or any other kind of capitalism. Quite the contrary.

If Malcolm X did not advocate liberal integrationism like King, and he did not advocate separatist capitalism like Farrakhan, what did he stand for in a positive sense? The movie shows that it was his pilgrimage to Mecca which broke Malcolm from a narrow, racially defined black nationalism. That is true. But the movie does not show that Malcolm undertook a second trip to North Africa and sub-Saharan Africa which had a profound effect on his political outlook. After that trip Malcolm talked not only about opposing racial or national oppression, but "overthrowing the system of exploitation."

Does that mean that Malcolm had become a Marxist or was moving toward Marxism? This is the position that was argued by the late George Breitman, for example, a professed Trotskyist who edited a number of Malcolm's speeches and writings. But that too is a falsification. In the last period of his life, Malcolm X came under the influence of the new bourgeois-nationalist regimes in the Arab East and black Africa; people like Egypt's Nasser and Jomo Kenyatta. These people denounced Western imperialism, Western racism. They talked about "African socialism" or some other kind of "socialism." Malcolm bought this.

Malcolm X understood American society in his own way. He saw through the lies and hypocrisy of American capitalist politicians, including black Democrats like the slick Harlem Congressman Adam Clayton Powell. But he actually knew very little about the Egyptian or Algerian or Kenyan societies at the base. He took at face value the pretense of these new ruling elites that they were opposed to racism the world over; that they were believers in and champions of social equality. Much of Malcolm's energy in the last period of his life was directed at getting what he called the Afro-Asian bloc to pass a resolution in the United Nations condemning racism in America.

To begin with, there was no way that was going to happen, because all of these regimes depended on money from Washington and London and Paris, even though they denounced Western imperialism at every opportunity. They denounced Western imperialism, they flirted with Moscow, they said they were nonaligned in the Cold War—as a ploy to get more money from Washington and London and Paris. But even if they had passed a resolution in the UN condemning racism in the United States, the American ruling class would have ignored it.

While Malcolm's campaign to enlist the United Nations in the service of anti-racism was misdirected, he nonetheless understood that simply by its own resources and its own efforts, the American black community could not achieve equality, could not overcome and break the power of the American government and its ruling class. That's why he was so desirous of finding powerful allies outside the U.S. But Malcolm X did not see that there existed a powerful force within the United States, potentially hostile to the white power structure, namely the racially integrated working class.

He saw American society as racially divided, but not as class divided. His view was shaped by his own personal experience. He had been a ghetto hustler, then a prisoner for several years, and then the minister of a black nationalist religious sect. Unlike millions of other American black men and women, he had never worked with whites or Hispanics.
He knew nothing of the trade-union movement. He had never been involved in a strike or defending a picket line against the cops and the scabs. He did not understand that it is the strategic role of blacks in the working class which gives them the potential leverage to overturn the racist capitalist system.

Black workers, armed with a revolutionary socialist program, and organized by a multiracial communist party, can lead backward white workers even though they have racist attitudes and prejudices, in struggle against the ruling class. Malcolm X believed and stated Southern civil prejudices, in struggle against the cops and the scabs. He did not understand that it is the strategic role of blacks in the working class which gives them the potential leverage to overturn the racist capitalist system. When you pull away the liberal façade, the bourgeois state is armed bodies of men—cops, prisons, National Guard—used by the ruling class to suppress the working class. As SNCC organizing among the black masses repeatedly brought the situation to the flash point, the government rushed in their black sellouts to cool it down, their CIA agents to co-opt it, their courts to indict it, and their troops to crush it. There is another myth too about the role of the troops—look at some of these things like Eyes on the Prize—actually the troops were only sent in when blacks began to defend themselves.

In 1961-62, SNCC organized black people in Albany, Georgia for a highly popular all-sided attack on segregation. It was really heating up over a period of time. Martin Luther King would come in periodically for the weekend, and take these highly publicized trips to Albany and declare a truce. This did not go over too well. It came to the boiling point when SNCC was organizing a rally outside a black church and three thousand partners in the struggle for civil rights. There’s a famous picture that a number of left groups peddle that shows Martin Luther King and Malcolm X shaking hands—as though this is what they did all the time. In fact, I think Malcolm X cornered Martin Luther King in a public place, where he couldn’t get out of it, and made him shake his hand. In fact, it was Malcolm X’s scathing criticism of the civil rights leadership for groveling before the white power structure, his attack on the Kennedy/Johnson Democratic Party administration, that was his real appeal.

This found a response among the civil rights activists. I was in the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), which was the left wing of the civil rights movement. It was started by students from the black colleges and emerged out of the lunch counter sit-ins of 1960. It was originally started under the auspices of Martin Luther King’s group, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Initially, it was an extension of black liberalism. The students hoped to bring formal, legal equality to the South, to “Northernize” the South and end all the gross aspects of Jim Crow segregation—the separate bathrooms, the “sit at the back of the bus” stuff.

At the outset, they shared Martin Luther King’s whole liberal pacifism thing and sought to pressure the government and Northern Democrats. The strategy behind this was that you were supposed to have nonviolent demonstrations. Then these racist sheriffs would come out and beat your head in. This would go on television and would scandalize the nation and would then force the federal government and the Northern Democrats to send in the federal troops to help black people. That was the idea. So the SNCC activists started off with big illusions that the U.S. government was on their side. But they soon learned the truth, the hard way.

As Marxists, we know that the bourgeois state is not neutral but an organ for the oppression of the working class and the black masses by the capitalist class. There’s a famous picture that a number of left groups peddle that shows Martin Luther King and Malcolm X shaking hands—as though this is what they did all the time. In fact, I think Malcolm X cornered Martin Luther King in a public place, where he couldn’t get out of it, and made him shake his hand. In fact, it was Malcolm X’s scathing criticism of the civil rights leadership for groveling before the white power structure, his attack on the Kennedy/Johnson Democratic Party administration, that was his real appeal.

This found a response among the civil rights activists. I was in the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), which was the left wing of the civil rights movement. It was started by students from the black colleges and emerged out of the lunch counter sit-ins of 1960. It was originally started under the auspices of Martin Luther King’s group, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Initially, it was an extension of black liberalism. The students hoped to bring formal, legal equality to the South, to “Northernize” the South and end all the gross aspects of Jim Crow segregation—the separate bathrooms, the “sit at the back of the bus” stuff.

At the outset, they shared Martin Luther King’s whole liberal pacifism thing and sought to pressure the government and Northern Democrats. The strategy behind this was that you were supposed to have nonviolent demonstrations. Then these racist sheriffs would come out and beat your head in. This would go on television and would scandalize the nation and would then force the federal government and the Northern Democrats to send in the federal troops to help black people. That was the idea. So the SNCC activists started off with big illusions that the U.S. government was on their side. But they soon learned the truth, the hard way.

As Marxists, we know that the bourgeois state is not neutral but an organ for the oppression of the working class and the black masses by the capitalist class. When you pull away the liberal façade, the bourgeois state is armed bodies of men—cops, prisons, National Guard—used by the ruling class to suppress the working class. As SNCC organizing among the black masses repeatedly brought the situation to the flash point, the government rushed in their black sellouts to cool it down, their CIA agents to co-opt it, their courts to indict it, and their troops to crush it. There is another myth too about the role of the troops—look at some of these things like Eyes on the Prize—actually the troops were only sent in when blacks began to defend themselves.

In 1961-62, SNCC organized black people in Albany, Georgia for a highly popular all-sided attack on segregation. It was really heating up over a period of time. Martin Luther King would come in periodically for the weekend, and take these highly publicized trips to Albany and declare a truce. This did not go over too well. It came to the boiling point when SNCC was organizing a rally outside a black church and three thousand
Malcolm X spoke to young people in Selma, Alabama in February 1965 in the midst of a campaign of violent attacks on civil rights demonstrators by local police. "King's man did not want me to talk to them," he remarked later.

KKK massed outside the town, and then the cops attacked the black rally. At this point black youth began to fight back with anything they could find, which was mostly bricks, bottles and so on, against the police violence. Martin Luther King came in and denounced the blacks for violence and declared a day of penance for the black peoples' sin of defending themselves. SNCC refused to condemn the blacks and started to refer to Martin Luther King contemptuously as "De Lawd." It was not meant as a compliment.

SNCC Gets Shafted by the Democrats

The 1963 March on Washington was originally planned to put pressure on the Kennedy administration to stop footdragging on the Civil Rights Act. It was supposed to be in front of the White House. Kennedy got wind of it and called in the "Big Six" respectable black leaders—King, Roy Wilkins, A. Philip Randolph, Bayard Rustin, Whitney Young, James Farmer—and read the riot act. And they backed down. They agreed to move it to the Lincoln Memorial. They agreed to censor all speeches and not allow any "subversives" to speak and only approved signs would be allowed. The bottom line was: no criticism of the Democratic Party.

Orchestrated from the White House, it became a giant liberal prayer fest to channnel the masses back into the Democratic Party. John Lewis, who was one of the leaders of SNCC, agreed under pressure to delete certain passages from his speech. Unfortunately for all concerned, he had already published some of it in the newspaper! I want to read a few lines of what they absolutely couldn't stand to have spoken.

"...the party of Kennedy is the party of Eastland... We cannot depend on any political party for both the Democrats and Republicans have betrayed the basic principles of the Declaration of Independence... Where is our party? Where is the political party that will make it unnecessary to have Marches on Washington?"

That question, "where is our party" is a good question, isn't it—if anything even more urgent today. The respectable black leaders could censor John Lewis, but they couldn't censor Malcolm X. So he referred to the whole thing as the "farce on Washington." This march on Washington was where Martin Luther King made his very famous "I have a dream" speech. In response to this, Malcolm X commented acidly that the black masses were, and still are, having a nightmare.

Malcolm X became the great truth-teller for black America. He said all the things that a number of people in SNCC and around the country were thinking but weren't quite up to saying yet. By the time Kennedy was assassinated, many civil rights activists did not mourn for this head of U.S. imperialism who had ordered the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba and who sent the Green Berets into Vietnam. They agreed with Malcolm X, who was the one who had the guts to say that "the chickens have come home to roost."

In 1964, SNCC did a voter registration drive in Mississippi and organized 80,000 blacks who were refused the right to vote to sign protest ballots. This was
dangerous work for SNCC activists and for those people who signed the protest ballots. This was the summer that Good­man, Cheney and Schwerner were killed in Mississippi. SNCC took these protest ballots and formed the Mississippi Free­dom Democratic Party. With Fannie Lou Hamer at the head of it, they tried to get seated at the 1964 Democratic Party conven­tion in Atlantic City in place of the usual all-white, Jim Crow delegation from Mississippi. 

They got shafted—and not just from the Dixiecrat Southerners either, but most particularly from the Northern liberals. It was Hubert Humphrey’s job in particular to see that SNCC not get seated. That’s what he had to do to be the vice presidential candidate. Martin Luther King also showed up there and told SNCC that they should take a com­promise whereby they not get seated, or get seated at-large, which they refused to do. It was a real eye-opener for SNCC activists. 

Malcolm X spoke to a number of SNCC activists who had been in the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, and he spoke very eloquently against illusions in the Democrats. He said:

“Likewise, the Democratic Party, which black people supported recently, I think, something like 97 percent. All of these crackers—and that’s what they are, crackers—they belong to the Democratic Party. That’s the party they belong to—

the same one you belong to, the same one you support, the same one you say is going to get you this and get you that. Why, the base of the Democratic Party is in the South. The foundation of its authority is in the South. The head of the Democratic Party is sitting in the White House. He could have gotten Mrs. Hamer into Atlantic City. He could have opened up his mouth and had her seated. Hubert Humphrey could have opened his mouth and had her seated. Wagner, the mayor right here, could have opened up his mouth and used his weight and had her seated. Don’t be talking about some crackers down in Mississippi and Al­abama and Georgia—all of them are playing the same game. Lyndon B. Johnson is the head of the Cracker Party.”

His explicit message to black America was that “either party you align yourself with is suicide because both parties are criminal. Both parties are responsible for the criminal conditions that exist.”

We agree with that. We say that they are both capitalist parties and that the Democratic Party is not an instrument for change but an instrument of our oppressors.

**Labor Flexed Its Muscle and the Segregationists Backed Down**

Let me say a little bit about my own experiences in Gulfport, Mississippi in the summer of ’65. By 1965, pacifism was wearing thin. And I don’t just mean the idea of “turning the other cheek,” but the whole liberal strategy of paci­fism and relying on the government. Too many people had been killed. Too many people had had their heads beaten in. I was in Mississippi that whole summer of the Watts riots and I remember reading in the newspaper when Martin Luther King called for “as powerful a police force as possible.” And I will tell you that at that time up and down the South SNCC activists cursed Martin Luther King’s name. Because it was so clear that it was pacifism for us and guns for the National Guard to shoot down
blacks. And today there is upheaval in L.A. again. Which one of the black leaders has called for the troops to get out of L.A.? Not one of them!

So in 1965 in Gulfport we didn’t do much voter registration. I believed then and I believe now that everyone should have the right to vote…but I didn’t want to vote Democrat! The 1964 convention had proved that you couldn’t work in the Democratic Party! Like many of my generation, I was radicalized in part by the fact that the Democratic Party was in power. You could see exactly what they were doing. You didn’t have the same illusions. It became a lot clearer that the problem was the capitalist system and that imperialism was an integral part of the capitalist system.

What we did more of in Gulfport, Mississippi was integrating lunch counters, trying to force them to serve blacks—which I liked much better than voter registration. It was much more activist and lively—to put it mildly. An integrated group of us would go down to the local Woolworth’s and try to be served. When we were refused service, we came back the next day with a large demonstration of maybe 300, mostly black high school students. We were running this thing—at age 19 we were the adults. We were surrounded by this huge white mob screaming obscenities, waving little Confederate flags and spitting on us. Then the cops would arrive and laugh and watch. This went on for a few days, escalating all the time. Our forces became bigger but the racist forces became bigger too.

It was quite a dangerous situation for us. Luckily, there was a longshore union local in Gulfport. It was a segregated black local of the International Longshoremen’s Association. The union president there met with the mayor and the chief of police and said that if the civil rights activists were arrested or beaten up, the longshoremen would go on strike and shut down the port. And I will tell you, that really worked. We weren’t arrested or killed and the restaurants began to serve blacks. I was very impressed with this. We didn’t know what to do with this at the time, but it taught me a lesson I never forgot, that the fight for black freedom must be linked to the power of the proletariat.

**The Fight for Revolutionary Leadership**

It was when the civil rights movement came north to Chicago with Martin Luther King and attempted to deal with black oppression there—segregated housing, unemployment, rotten schools—that it was stopped dead in its tracks. Because the bourgeoisie might allow some of the blatant aspects of Jim Crow segregation in the South to be overturned, but the basic economic and social aspects of black oppression are an integral part of the American capitalist system. Blacks are an oppressed color caste, integrated into the capitalist system but forcibly segregated at the bottom. So the civil rights movement was just stopped dead.

For the black militants, disillusionment with Martin Luther King and what he stood for meant they broke with liberalism as they understood it, but many soon came to embrace the illusion of "despairing nationalist separatism. And nationalism was really to be a dead-end road for a generation of black militants. For blacks are not a nation but an integral part of the American working class, and separatism is not a program for struggle in racist America.

There was another road besides liberalism and black nationalism, and that was proletarian socialism. That black militants were not introduced to the proletarian Marxist program of revolutionary integrationism at this critical juncture is in large part due to the refusal of the ostensible revolutionary movement—particularly the Socialist Workers Party—which had been the Trotskyist organization in this country—to fight for revolutionary leadership. The SWP capitulated to black nationalism and criminally abstained from the struggle in the South. It was the predecessor of the Spartacist League that fought inside the SWP for an active policy of intervention in SNCC. And believe me, I would have welcomed some Marxist clarity in SNCC at that time. I knew we were confused. I didn’t know what the answer was, but I could tell confusion when I saw it.

**Don Alexander**

* Spartacist League Central Committee, 1960s Black Power militant and former Black Panther

The great Bolshevik revolutionary, Lenin, once pointed out how the bourgeoisie hunts down and persecutes revolutionaries when they are alive, and when they are dead turns them into harmless icons. Certainly you can see that with Malcolm X. Various and sundry bourgeois elements and reformists and liberals are peddling the lie that Malcolm X was a liberal; that he was a latter-day X was a liberal; that he was a latter-day "self-help"; that he preached "black capitalism"; that he preached acquiescence to the racist status quo.

It is important to have in mind that the American ruling class was especially frightened by the recent explosion in L.A. The strategic class purpose behind their falsification of history is to prevent the emergence of any serious, militant, revolutionary-minded black leadership that could link up with the labor movement and fight for black liberation through socialist revolution. The interest of the bourgeoisie is to prevent the crystallization of a revolutionary workers party.
The Spartacist League is the American section of the International Communist League and the nucleus of the vanguard party of the working class. We are the memory of the working people—from the victorious October 1917 workers revolution led by Lenin and Trotsky’s Bolsheviks to the counterrevolutionary reversal of the historic gains of that revolution at the hands of Yeltsin-Bush counterrevolution. Decades of Stalinist and social-democratic betrayals wiped out the memory of the Russian Revolution in the minds of the Soviet working people. We were the only revolutionary organization in the world that fought against Yeltsin-Bush counterrevolution. We fought tooth and nail in defense of the historic gains of that revolution against world imperialism and internal counterrevolution. Today the task is to fight for socialist revolution in the ex-Soviet Union. We Trotskyists proclaim that Stalinism is dead, but communism lives. It lives in the struggles of the working people, in their struggles against the vicious brutal system of capitalist exploitation, from South Korea to South Africa.

We are class-conscious revolutionary internationalists, We are Trotskyists. We remember how the bourgeoisie greeted Malcolm X’s death—with undisguised malicious glee. We remember how they gloated over the murder of Huey Newton, the Black Panther Party leader. For us Trotskyist fighters for world revolution, the American workers revolution needs black leadership. In racist capitalist America, we fight to build a racially integrated workers party fighting for black liberation through socialist revolution. For us that is a strategic task confronting the American working class. Every institution of this racist bourgeois order exudes racist poison. As the great Bolshevik Leon Trotsky once remarked, black workers are “convoked by history” to play a leading role in burying this racist capitalist system.

As revolutionary integrationists, we base ourselves firmly upon the militant program of integrated class struggle. In this country, segregation is poison. All the talk about “separate but equal” is a diversion from the class struggle and plays into the hands of the ruling class. We hear a lot of that today in the name of “Afrocentricity” and segregated schools. We have these petty-bourgeois misleaders pushing it in order to hold back the working people and the oppressed.

Drawing upon the lessons of history, we fight to finish the Civil War. Black people were freed from chattel slavery but the Northern bourgeoisie betrayed the struggle for black equality. We fight to finish the Civil War by fighting for a workers government in this country, through the instrumentality of a multiracial vanguard party. There cannot be a successful working-class seizure of power in this country unless the most class-conscious working people unite under the leadership of a communist vanguard party as the most militant and consistent champions of all the oppressed and exploited. A party that is a “tribune of the people.”

Malcolm X and the Black Power Era

Malcolm X was cut off from the possibility of developing such a revolutionary working-class perspective. But he was not a liberal. He was a militant, courageous, intelligent and honest fighter for black liberation who the liberals—black and white—feared and hated. They especially hated his advocacy of armed self-defense against the racist police and Klan. And of course they hated his denunciation of the Democratic “fox” and the Republican “wolf.”

Malcolm X knew you couldn’t work within the system to wipe out centuries of racial oppression, fostered and maintained by a violent, racist ruling class. After Malcolm X broke with the Nation of Islam, the sinister, anti-Semitic, nationalist demagogue Farra-khan wanted him dead. This is hushed up by the liberals and the reformists, from Spike Lee to the Communist Party. It’s no accident that this wasn’t in the movie.

The previous speakers addressed the civil rights movement. The question is, why did such a tremendous expenditure of energy yield such meager results? It’s very important to understand the betrayals of the reformist Stalinist Communist Party during that time, of the social democrats and the fake-Trotskyists, who tailed behind the black preachers, the black Muslims and the labor bureaucrats. They paved the way for the collapse of that movement. There was an opportunity to win over thousands of black militants during that period to a revolutionary working-class program and perspective.

In particular, the criminal abstention from participation in the civil rights movement by the ostensibly Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party meant that these historic struggles that were to shape a whole generation took place without the intervention of a revolutionary party. Many of these courageous black militants could have been recruited to the Marxist program of revolutionary integrationism, which is the fight for integration into an egalitarian socialist society. The origins of our organization were as the revolutionary opposition that emerged in the Socialist Workers Party at that time, fighting against this abstentionism which reflected the Socialist Workers Party’s loss of a proletarian revolutionary perspective. We were subsequently expelled in 1963 because we were fighting for a communist-led civil
rights movement and for mobilizing the integrated labor movement nationwide to put its muscle behind the struggle for black equality.

**Democratic Party—We Know Which Side You’re On**

Today the conditions for the black masses are as terrible as those of the Depression era in the 1930s. The same criminal racist rulers that killed 38 Black Panthers with their FBI COINTELPRO program, that framed and jailed Geronimo Pratt for 22 years for a crime that he did not and could not have committed, that put Mumia Abu-Jamal on death row—is the same enemy that attacked white middle-aged workers at the Caterpillar plant in Peoria, Illinois on the picket line, and that jailed Bob Buck, a white steel worker, for defending his picket line in the Ravenswood Steelworkers strike.

Now that Wall Street has replaced Bush with Clinton, the pro-capitalist labor traitors and the black misleaders are selling working people and the oppressed the lie that things are finally going to get better. They say we’re going to have a “New Deal,” a “new day” and some “new opportunities.” Well, they’re talking about opportunity for themselves. A few little cabinet posts and a few little bones are being thrown their way.

Clinton got elected by distancing himself from and spitting on black people. Loyal Democratic flunky Jesse Jackson was kept at the back of the bus. Clinton presided over the execution of a brain-damaged black man during his campaign, and he singled out especially poor women, black women, for attack with the promise to “end welfare as we know it.”

Clinton’s election was not so much a Democratic Party triumph as it was a Republican collapse. In comparison to the ’88 elections, the black voter turnout was 12 percent less. This new Democrat is itching to impose arrogant U.S. imperialism’s bloody role as global cop in a so-called “one superpower world.” U.S. imperialism created the famine in Somalia. Now in the name of “super-sovereignty” they’re flexing their muscles. They have their eye on the Near East and of course they think they have a right to police the world. This is very dangerous stuff—ultimately to reverse the decay of American imperialism, it means World War III, particularly against their Japanese and German imperialist rivals. So this is a racist, colonial adventure and we say: U.S. Global Cops Out of Somalia!

The fight to build a class-struggle workers party in America will come through breaking workers, blacks and other oppressed minorities from their illusions in this two-party shell game, this electoral prison which politically disarms the working people in the face of the most violent ruling class in history. After Clinton’s election, the Detroit police beat a black man to death—that is the real face of racist American capitalism. Life in the so-called “New World Order” is one of desperation, misery and hopelessness for millions of the hungry and the homeless, the old and the young in this country.

**L.A. Upheaval Shook America**

When Los Angeles exploded, it tore a gaping hole in the New World Order. This gave the bourgeoisie a fright. This was a multiracial revolt that demonstrated that U.S. society can be polarized along class lines. So what happened in the aftermath? They had a so-called “weed and seed” program. The idea was to weed out the Hispanics and blacks and throw them in jail. The “seed” was all this talk about “minority enterprise”—and of course it’s a bunch of bull. You hear talk about “retraining.” What jobs to retrain for? There are no jobs! This country is a gigantic prison, and particularly the youth have no future under the capitalist private property system. The impoverishment of the masses has created a generation of minority youth who do not have anything to lose. White working-class youth in this country face increasingly bleak prospects.

During the Los Angeles revolt, we fought for labor/black defense, for the mobilization of the multiracial working class to defend black and Latino youth against the racist cops and troops. And to lead a fight not simply to seize articles of consumption (people of course need things) but to seize the means of production, because the wealth is created by the working people. This was not an abstract proposition. The Longshoremen have struck in Los Angeles against the bosses, and a couple of years ago they struck against the cops when they invaded their union hall. Had ten thousand longshoremen been out on the streets, this would have sent a powerful message that labor’s power is a force to be reckoned with. Only the Spartacist League fought for that perspective while the rest of the left was pressuring the so-called liberal wing of imperialism’s Democratic Party, i.e.,
Mayor Bradley to pressure Bush.

There is a general point: we have no friends in high places. You really saw it then. All the capitalist politicians, black and white, rallied behind the banner of racist law and order. Not one black leader publicly denounced the sending in of those troops or called for their removal, because those "leaders" are the defenders and beneficiaries of the racist capitalist system. A system that crushes workers, that crushes black people, Latinos, women, gays, and the desperately poor.

Pseudo-nationalist black capitalist hustlers, who want to have the sole right to exploit blacks, organize to divert the anger and outrage of the masses by pitting desperate black youth against Latinos and Asians. And this is very deadly stuff. In New York City, the Zionists are pushing for race war and anti-Semitic black nationalists like FBI fink Al Sharpton are organizing for the same thing. We had better fight those who serve the interests of the racist bosses by setting us up for bloody defeat while the Klan and the skinheads and the cops laugh themselves silly. Our enemy is not Jews or Koreans but the capitalist class and system. Our brothers and sisters are not those who are on the side of the racist capitalist oppressors. Their interests and ours are directly counterposed.

We can see that clearly again in terms of what happened in Los Angeles. You have a black Democrat, ex-cop Tom Bradley, who's been mayor for 19 years. He unleashed his cops and the National Guard to smash that revolt. And around the country you had black Democratic mayors, from Maynard Jackson in Atlanta to Dinkins in New York, and also their white counterparts like Jordan in San Francisco—they unleashed their bloody racist cops to brutally attack those demonstrating against the racist acquittal of the L.A. cops. This is no accident.

Black Liberation Through Socialist Revolution!

Today there is a widespread illusion that all black people have the same interest. Look at the objective facts: the top 20 percent of the black population controls almost half of the total income of all blacks—an inequality greater than among whites. I always like to tell people a story about the earliest seeds of class consciousness that I developed. I remember many years ago when we were in battle for black rights and this black administrator—one of the guys who got co-opted by these poverty programs of the sixties—he was lecturing us and said, "I might be your color, but I’m not your kind." And that drove home a really basic point, that we live in a class-divided capitalist society. That’s the beginning of understanding. This society is based upon the exploitation of labor.

The upheaval in Los Angeles came in the context of over a decade and a half of massive deindustrialization of the U.S., of rampant capitalist greed, thievery and unparalleled financial parasitism. I mean, they’ve been stealing everything that’s not nailed down! We paid for the S&L rip-off—hundreds of billions of dollars! This poses the urgent task of organizing to get rid of this racist capitalist system. For workers power and revolution, we must build that mass, fighting, integrated, revolutionary party. American workers revolution does need black leadership, a leadership that partakes of the qualities of a Malcolm X.

Malcolm X had nothing in common with the reactionary petty-bourgeois hustlers who are cashing in on the misery of the black masses. For instance, some of the leaders of L.A. gangs like the Crips and the Bloods—they’re getting theirs. Farrakhan’s organization got a contract from the government to police the housing projects. And there are various aspiring capitalists around who are pushing “black capitalism” as the answer to racism, unemployment, police murder and brutality—all of which is inherent to the capitalist system. This program is a hoax. It’s a fraud. It’s utopian. The possibility of a significant class of black capitalists developing in the United States is as likely as racist ex-L.A. police chief Daryl Gates establishing a Rodney King scholarship fund for the families of black and Hispanic youth murdered over the years by the bloody, racist L.A. police department.

We Trotskyists of the International Communist League have a right to say that we have the only program that is in the objective interest of the working people and the poor. From Detroit in 1979, to Washington, D.C. in 1982, to Philadelphia in 1988, we have initiated and led the only successful labor/black mobilizations that have stopped provocations of the Klan and the skinhead fascists who organize for racist murder. Our exemplary actions point to the tasks of a class-struggle workers party. A party fighting for jobs for all through a shorter workweek with no cut in pay; for an end to discrimination against women and gays; for full citizenship rights for foreign-born workers and their families; for organization of the unemployed and unorganized; for free medical care and education; for the defense of the right to bear arms; for labor/black defense against racist police and fascist terror.

Those who labor must rule. We fight for the expropriation of the capitalists,
without compensation. That means a working-class-­led fight to seize the means of production in the struggle for socialist revolution and a workers government. That’s the way we will get everything we need and deserve. You always hear, “Who’s going to pay for it?” That’s how it’s paid for—by ripping the productive wealth away from the ruling class. The only instrument for carrying that out is the Trotskyist vanguard party leading the fight for power.

In conclusion, I’d like to say this: Malcolm X was a very serious student of history and he once pointed out that history is our best teacher. Indeed that is the case. Every gain of the working class and the oppressed has been won in struggle against the bosses and their state. These gains are always reversible under capitalism. The one thing that is sacred for the capitalist ruling class is the accumulation of surplus value—maximum profit squeezed out of capitalist wage slaves and the poor.

We can’t reform the racist capitalist system. It threatens us with total annihilation. It must be overthrown. It is socialism or barbarism. The U.S. imperialist slaughter of over 100,000 Iraqis underlines that capitalism must be destroyed on a world scale by an internationalist revolutionary party, a tribune of the people like the Bolsheviks under Lenin and Trotsky who led the only successful workers revolution in history.

I want to end with a couple of short quotes from Malcolm X. The first one is about how you can’t work within the system.

“It’s impossible for a chicken to produce a duck egg—even though they both belong to the same family of fowl. A chicken just doesn’t have it within its system to produce a duck egg. It can’t do it. It can only produce according to what that particular system was constructed to produce. The system in this country cannot produce freedom for an Afro-American. It is impossible for this system, this economic system, this political system, this social system, this system, period. It’s impossible for this system, as it stands, to produce freedom right now for the black man in this country. And if ever a chicken did produce a duck egg, I’m quite sure you would say it was certainly a revolutionary chicken!”

And on capitalism:

“You can’t operate a capitalistic system unless you are vulturistic; you have to have someone else’s blood to suck to be a capitalist. You show me a capitalist, I’ll show you a bloodsucker. He cannot be anything but a bloodsucker if he’s going to be a capitalist. He’s got to get it from somewhere, and that’s where he gets it—from somewhere or someone other than himself.”

You can appreciate the spirit, his militant opposition to the racist status quo. And that’s what we honor about Malcolm X.

---
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Southern Schools Ban Malcolm X

Down With the Confederate Flag of Slavery!

Black students in the Old South have been besieged by "in your face" racists insisting on their "right" to wave the Confederate flag of slavery in public schools. In Georgia, South Carolina and Tennessee, white racist students have joined forces with hooded Klansmen and swastika-tattooed skinheads in school boycotts, walkouts and racist rallies demanding the right to carry or wear this flag in public schools. Underscoring the precarious position of blacks in the so-called "New South," public school boards and principals have responded to this resurgent racism by politely labeling it "racial tension" and slapping black youth back down in their place to appease the race-haters.

In public schools across the South, black students have been banned from wearing the popular "X" hats or any T-shirt bearing an image or quotation from Malcolm X, the militant spokesman for black self-defense against racist attacks. At suburban Atlanta's Peachtree Jr. High (which banned Malcolm X clothing on the eve of February, Black History Month) a student who thought it was OK to wear a shirt bearing the likeness of the accommodationist Martin Luther King Jr. was harassed and humiliated by school authorities and forced to wear his clothing inside out all day. And it doesn't stop there—the principal is even on the prowl for "Black Bart!"

Dimwitted school principals argue that banning fascist regalia and Malcolm X T-shirts is just an evenhanded dress code against "message clothing." But to equate the youthful expression of black pride, by an oppressed minority in a white racist society, with the bloody banner of white supremacy is an outrage. The Confederate flag is a call to arms for murderous thugs North and South. It represents a program of racist terror for those who want to live in the kind of society we'd have if the South had won the Civil War. The Confederate flag is a call to arms for murderous thugs North and South. It represents a program of racist terror for those who want to live in the kind of society we'd have if the South had won the Civil War. The Confederate flag is a call to arms for murderous thugs North and South.

What began initially as an effort by black students and organizations like the NAACP to pressure the school boards to remove the Confederate flag from public facilities has come back with a vengeance against the black students themselves, who are now stripped of their rights and facing vile racist reaction. This example drives home the point that pleasing with bourgeois politicians and state authorities to " outlaw" fascist activity and symbols simply gives the state more ammunition to restrict and regulate the rights of unionists, socialists, opponents of racist terror. If more people who wear Malcolm X regalia are banned Malcolm X, they might not fall into the trap of asking their enemy to defend black rights. Although Malcolm did not have a program of integrated class struggle, at the time of his murder in 1965 his views were evolving from black nationalism. He was deeply hostile to U.S. imperialism's oppression of dark-skinned peoples throughout the world, and saw with x-ray vision the sham of racist American "democracy." Malcolm said, "when you vote Democrat, you vote Dixiecrat," and spoke the bitter truth about Uncle Tom black leaders who fostered illusions that the system could be made to work for black people.

Especially in the South, there should be no illusions in the supposed "neutrality" of the government or any of its institutions from the courts to the cops to the school boards. It was in open defiance of the Brown v. Topeka Board of Education decision outlawing segregation in public schools that the Georgia state legislature dug up the old Confederate battle flag and slapped the state seal on it in 1956. (Alabama and South Carolina immediately followed suit and Mississippi has just about always flown the Confederate flag.) It is to this barely modified battle flag of slavery that school principals ask students to rise and pledge allegiance each morning. It's a daily reminder that there is a lot of unfinished business to attend to in this country.

To wipe out the scourge of racism and Klan terror, and bury forever the Confederate flag of slavery, requires a thoroughgoing socialist revolution in this country to finish the Civil War and make good on the unfulfilled promise of black freedom. The Spartacus Youth Clubs are dedicated to winning students to build a multiracial revolutionary party to fight for this future.
Imperialism Starves Africa

Thousands of people are dying of hunger every day in Somalia. The strife-torn northeast African country, initially a Soviet client, switched sides to become a client of Washington in the late ’70s and then back to Moscow in the late ’80s. With the end of the Cold War it is no one’s client. Tens of thousands have been killed by marauding bands, hundreds of thousands driven from their lands to become homeless refugees. Drought, famine, civil war and banditry lay waste to the land, where human existence was precarious in the best of times. This is the hidden face of the imperialist “New World Order.” And it reflects the agony of an entire continent, where colonialism has been replaced by neocolonialism, and for the masses life continues to spiral downward to pure hell.

A famine of unprecedented proportions is ravaging Africa. The worst drought in a century has hit southern Africa and the eastern part of the continent up to Kenya, causing massive crop failure and destruction of livestock. Hardest hit by the famine is the northeastern Horn of Africa where communal warfare has devastated crops, curtailed trade and interrupted shipments of food relief. In Somalia, engulfed by all-sided clan conflict, 1.5 million people—more than a quarter of the population—are in danger of starving to death. In the Sudan, where the fundamentalist regime is waging a jihad (holy war) to impose Islamic rule on the black peoples of the south, the situation is possibly even more critical as the government continues to block relief aid to the region.

The capitalist media treat the famine as an inevitable consequence of drought and war. But the mass starvation is not due to an “act of god.” The countries of sub-Saharan Africa are deprived of the most elementary provisions for times of shortage and crop failure: food and currency reserves, reservoirs and irrigation. Ordered by the IMF (International Monetary Fund) to grow export crops instead of food in order to pay off the usurious debt, cut off by the banks and multinationals from new investment, their populations have been driven down into desperate misery. The underlying cause of African famine is the brutal exploitation of the continent by imperialism, which in its ruthless drive for profit is thrusting the African peoples into poverty which is below the minimum level for human existence.

The food relief sent to Africa by the capitalist leaders has been pitiful compared to the need. By UN estimates, it will take well over half a million tons of food to provide for Somalia alone over the next year. Yet only 30,000 tons of food monthly are being received from donor nations—and other sub-Saharan countries are being largely neglected. Bush flamboyantly announced in mid-August that the U.S. was airlifting 140,000 tons of food to Somalia, but it later turned out that only one-tenth of that amount would be airlifted; the rest will supposedly be available the “next fiscal year” and will be sold to “merchants in Kenya.” The racist arrogance of the Washington fat cats is summed up by one official who suggested that Somalia “should be paved over and turned into a parking lot” (Washington Post, 12 August).

Instead of feeding the population, food relief has become a weapon in the savage fighting between Somali clan chiefs. Journalists report that starving villagers who received food aid were assassinated and their food seized by
the warlords. The UN, while stationing 500 Pakistani soldiers to protect the unloading of shipments at the port of Mogadishu, is negotiating to sell most of the food at cut-rate prices to local strongmen who will resell the supplies at exorbitant prices to finance their murderous feuding. Washington saw in this human tragedy an opportunity to do some saber rattling, stationing a 2,400-man Marine amphibious group from the Persian Gulf just off the coast of Mogadishu to provide "seaborne command and control."

The violent disintegration of the Somali state is a by-product of the collapse of Stalinist rule in the Soviet Union. For more than two decades, the Somali regime of Mohammed Siad Barre played off the Soviet Union against U.S. imperialism, obtaining the guns and a dribble of aid that enabled him to keep "order." With the end of the Cold War, Barre lost his international backers and last year fell from power. The country was engulfed in furious warfare among rival clans who turned on camps into what one relief worker called "a death trap." Now that the Horn of Africa no longer suffers from the Soviet-allied regime, (They virtually ignored the other sub-Saharan countries which were also hit by the drought.) This time, famine in Africa coincides with a massive cut in grain production engineered by the U.S. to drive up prices. After a record harvest in 1990, the U.S. slashed wheat production by 30 percent (27 million tons), largely by reducing the area planted, triggering the largest one-year fall in worldwide grain production in history.

So as Africa is starving, the imperialists order huge cutbacks of grain production! The answer to mass hunger is not philanthropy but class struggle. And the main enemy is not a bunch of feuding clans in Somalia, but the worldwide capitalist system which produces solely for profit and not to satisfy human need. Lenin noted, regarding one of the many famines in tsarist Russia (when the government continued to export grain in the midst of starvation):

"There neither is nor can be any other means of combating unemployment and crises, as well as the Asiatic-barbarian and cruel forms the expropriation of the small producers has assumed in Russia, than the class struggle of the revolutionary proletariat against the entire capitalist system. The rulers of the capitalist state are no more concerned about the vast numbers of famine and crisis victims than a locomotive is concerned about those whom it crushes in its path. Dead bodies stop the wheels, the locomotive halls, it may (with a too energetic driver) jump the rails, but, in any case, after a delay, long or short, it will continue on its way."

—V.I. Lenin, "Review of Home Affairs" (October 1901)

Africa: Imperialism and Hunger

Africa's natural resources are more than adequate, if correctly utilized, to provide sufficient food for its population. Estimates of the continent's uncultivated arable land range from three to four times the area presently cultivated. As one study concluded, "there is little doubt that Africa contains enough land to feed its present population and more, if rural areas were properly developed" (Ronald Cohen, ed., Satisfying Africa's Food Needs [1988]). However, the irrigation projects, drainage of swamps and cleaning of disease-infested areas which would be required to develop Africa's agricultural potential are unthinkable as long as Africa is squeezed in the vise of Wall Street and the international bankers.

Nowhere is the necessity of worldwide socialist revolution clearer than in the inhuman condition that capitalism imposes on its colonial and semi-colonial slaves. Famine has become a chronic condition in Africa and the situation is getting steadily worse. The UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) estimates that about a third of the 450 million people on the continent suffer from malnutrition and between one-quarter and one-fifth of the population in the region does not have enough food to be able to work or pursue any form of physical activity (Jean Drèze and Amartya Sen, eds., The Political Economy of Hunger [1991]).

Africa is caught in the blind alley, inherited from colonialism, of concentrating its agriculture on tropical cash crops for sale on the world market. Prices for these crops are steadily falling because of the imperialist stranglehold on the world market for tropical exports. This market is characterized by compe-
tion among many suppliers while a few giant trading companies, often having a near-monopoly, drive prices down by playing suppliers off against each other. For example, Kenya, Tanzania, Ethiopia, Uganda and the Ivory Coast all compete with each other (and with Brazil, Colombia and others) to sell coffee to a handful of companies like General Foods and Nestlé.

At the same time, 90 percent of world grain exports come from North America, giving the U.S. near-monopoly control of the market for exportable grain. The hammer lock that a few U.S. trading companies have on the world market for food grains makes the “oil cartel” pale in comparison. The result is that world food prices have steadily skyrocketed. In the decade following the mid-’70s, African countries’ food bill increased five-fold—and their foreign debts increased ten times.

The high price of oil is often cited as the reason underdeveloped countries are driven into debt to the world bankers. In reality, food imports place a much heavier burden on the poorest countries than oil. Imports of food and fertilizer in the mid-1970s cost the least-developed countries nearly twice as much as their payments for oil imports. Many African countries, after selling their cash crops on the world market, are able to import less food than they could have grown themselves!

But they are not permitted to grow it themselves. The imperialist powers, and their agents in the IMF and the World Bank, see to it that the semi-colonial countries increasingly concentrate on cash crops to “export” themselves out of the debt crisis. This only pushes them further into the red. When the Sudan, in the 1970s, decided to switch over from cotton to food production in the vast, irrigated Gazeira region, the IMF and World Bank imposed a veto. As a World Bank official explained: “Cotton definitely has an advantage in terms of efficiency of production and profit margin in the short run over wheat in that area” (PBS documentary “The Politics of Food,” 6 January 1988).

This is simply a continuing of the policy followed by the colonialists since they first conquered Africa, of seeking to eliminate subsistence farming in favor of cash crops for the market. Only in this way could the Africans’ labor be transformed into profit to fill the colonialists’ coffers. Vast tracts of land were seized outright and turned into plantations. Peasants who retained their land were “persuaded” to stop producing food by such measures as taxation (which required cash crop production in order to have money to pay the tax), stark coercion and even subsidizing food imports. By imposing cash crops, often to the exclusion of staple foods, colonialism sowed the seeds of famine.

Numerous academic studies have been made to uncover the causes of the crisis of African agriculture and to propose ways to increase the productivity of those peasant holdings producing food. However, the root of the problem was explained by Lenin in Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism (1916):

“It goes without saying that if capitalism could develop agriculture...if it could raise the living standards of the masses, who in spite of the amazing technical progress are everywhere still half-starved and poverty-stricken, there could be no question of a surplus of capital... But if capitalism did these things it would not be capitalism; for both uneven development and a semi-starvation level of existence of the masses are fundamental and inevitable conditions and constitute premises of this mode of production.”

The “Food Weapon”

The excruciating fact is that the terrible famines which strike capitalism’s semi-colonies take place in the midst of plenty. Currently, worldwide production of cereal grains alone is sufficient to supply a diet of 3,600 calories a day to every man, woman and child on the planet. As a recent study declared: “If food were distributed equitably, current supplies would be more than adequate to provide an ample diet to all” (Basil Blackwell, Hunger in History [1990]). The reason food does not get distributed to all is that under capitalism, food is a commodity which is sold on the market in order to make a profit. Like any other business, agribusiness seeks to monopolize and control the market to keep prices as high as possible and maximize profits.

To achieve hegemonic control of the world food market, the U.S. carried out a fundamental transformation of that market—and turned agriculture into the country’s number one export industry. Before World War II, Europe was the only continent which was a net importer of food, all others produced more food than they consumed. By the 1960s, this had been fundamentally altered. All continents except North America (and Australia) now produce less than they
consume and have become net importers of food. By the late 1970s, the underdeveloped countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America had gone from being non-importers of food to buying almost 80 percent of U.S. wheat exports.

The unchallenged dominance of the U.S. as global food supplier was achieved through a policy of massive government assistance to U.S. agriculture and forcing world grain prices down in order to “drive out” the competition. Grain prices on the world market were kept low by “dumping” U.S. grain at artificially low prices, by maintaining enormous unsold government grain reserves and by massive food aid (through the PL 480 program) and credits (in the 1950s, U.S. aid alone accounted for one-third of world trade in wheat).

When the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people knocked U.S. imperialism from its position as hegemonic imperialist power, marked by the devaluation of the dollar in August 1971, agriculture was slated by U.S. leaders to play a central role in shoring up the declining U.S. economy. In 1972, U.S. leaders engineered a world “food crisis” which drove food prices up to unprecedented levels by taking 50 million acres out of production and wiping out U.S. grain reserves. Despite famines in Africa and Bangladesh and crop failure in the Soviet Union, the U.S. slashed food aid to one-third its previous level (much of the rest was sent to South Vietnam and Cambodia to help finance the war). By 1974, a ton of wheat was selling for three times as much as a ton of oil!

The U.S. imperialists were quick to seize on their power to throw underdeveloped countries into starvation as a way of furthering their political interests. A secret CIA report of August 1974 projected that “the United States’ near-monopoly position as a food exporter... could give the U.S. a measure of power it never had before” (quoted in Robert Paarlberg, Food Trade and Foreign Policy [1985]). President Reagan’s secretary of agriculture enthused that food was the U.S.’ “greatest weapon” because “countries become more dependent on American farm exports and become reluctant to upset us” (New York Times, 24 December 1980).

The U.S. pioneered the use of food as a weapon during the Vietnam War when President Lyndon Johnson repeatedly interrupted food aid to India, suffering from the terrible famine of 1965-66, in retaliation for criticisms of U.S. policy. In late 1974, as a million people in Bangladesh perished in a famine, the U.S. cut off food aid because Bangladesh sold jute to Cuba. In late 1982, when famine struck Ethiopia, the U.S. held up relief assistance because Ethiopia was a Soviet ally. And last year, as famine swept across southern Sudan, the UN cut off food relief because of Sudan’s support for Iraq in the Gulf War. The cut-throats in Washington have turned death by starvation into a routine instrument of foreign policy.

**Hunger and the “Green Revolution”**

Technological advances in agriculture have been spectacular in the last 30 years, but under capitalism even these have translated into increased hunger and misery. The “Green Revolution” was launched in 1943 in Sonora, Mexico where Norman Borlaug (who received the 1970 Nobel peace prize) with the backing of the Rockefeller Foundation used genetic selection to develop “miracle” strains. Since they were introduced in the mid-1960s, hybrid strains of wheat, rice and corn have provided spectacularly increased yields. India went in five years from severe famine to being self-sufficient in grain. Indonesia, which had been the world’s largest rice importer, became self-sufficient in two years. The new hybrid strains were touted as solving the problem of world hunger.

In fact, the hunger of the world’s poor has *increased* as a result of the “Green Revolution.” Hybrid strains will grow only if they have irrigation, fertilizer and insecticides which require enormous capital outlays. Only the largest landowners can profit from the new technology, and small peasants, unable to compete, are driven from their land. A study by the Asian Development Bank of the consequences of the “Green Revolution” in the 1970s concluded that the number of malnourished people had increased, that rural incomes had declined and that unemployment had been exacerbated. It declared that “the region is no closer to solving the food problem than ten years ago” (quoted in Susan George, *Feeding the Few: Corporate Control of Food* [1979]).

The liberals’ proposals for “solving” the hunger crisis—such as easy credit for small agricultural producers, organization of producer cooperatives and breakup of the agribusiness monopolies—are centered on preserving and reinforcing small farmers. This is a futile attempt to hold back the tendency under capitalism to increased concentration of capital. Despite the American myth of the family farm, which capitalist ideologues are now trying to transplant to the ex-USSR, in fact corporate “factories in the field” (relying on heavy mechanization and low-paid Mexican agricultural workers) are far more efficient producers. In fact, the majority of American agricultural output now comes from units that are the size of Soviet collective farms.

Hunger is not exclusively a “Third World” problem. It results from the poverty and misery which are inevitably produced by capitalist exploitation. In South Africa, the sixth leading grain producer in the world, three million black children suffer from clinically diagnosable malnutrition, and some 50,000 die each year from illnesses related to hunger. In the U.S., a scientific survey determined that 12 million children—more than a quarter of all children—are chronically undernourished (*Scientific American*, February 1987). And the immunization of the ghetto population fosters epidemics of deadly diseases of poverty, from cholera and tuberculosis to AIDS. In Africa alone, an estimated six million people have been infected with HIV viruses.

With present-day technology, U.S. agriculture alone could make up for the entire world shortfall of food production, eliminating hunger from the face of the earth. With aid from the advanced industrial countries, Africa could feed itself and have plenty of surplus left over to invest in improving the life of the masses. The question is what class holds the power. So long as capitalism remains, it will continue to reproduce the scourge of mass hunger. However, capitalism sows the seeds of its own destruction. By socializing and internationalizing production, it lays the basis for the working class, through world socialist revolution, to institute economic planning on a global scale.
President Bush has ordered a massive military intervention into Somalia, code-named “Operation Restore Hope.” With public opinion horrified by the images of Somali children slowly starving to death as local warlords seize most of the food aid, Bush promises to use the U.S. military to ensure that the desperate population is fed. President-elect Bill Clinton quickly gave his enthusiastic support to a military intervention whose purpose is supposedly not strategic gain but humanitarian relief. But behind this feigned concern by the racist American rulers for starving black Africans is the sinister reality of U.S. imperialism, which is using the famine in Somalia to justify direct military intervention in Africa.

While TV is filled with heart-rending scenes of Somali children with distended bellies and sunken eyes, followed by shots of Mad Max road warriors roaming around in their “technicals” (pickup trucks with mounted machine guns), this is the excuse for sending in a colonial expeditionary force of 28,000 to 35,000 U.S. troops. To distribute food? To put down gangs armed with AKs? Hardly. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Colin Powell explained that it had to be “a large enough force that we could dominate the entire country,” and “these numbers may go up considerably” (New York Times, 5 December).

The media are trying to sell the lie, particularly to black people in this country, that the imperialists are “coming to the aid” of the impoverished people of war-torn Somalia out of “humanitarian” concern. Nonsense. The famine in Africa is caused by imperialist exploitation, which drives the population into conditions of poverty that are below the minimum level for survival (see “Imperialism Starves Africa,” reprinted on page 22). Deprived of food and currency reserves, the African nations are decimated by natural disasters like drought, or political and economic crises. In Somalia, mass starvation has resulted from the breakup of the country, a by-product of the capitalist counterrevolution in the Soviet Union. After coming to power at the end of the 1960s, murderous Somali strongman Siad Barre was able to play off the USSR and the U.S. to obtain financial aid and sophisticated arms until he was overthrown in early 1991.

Now Washington claims it is going to fix the situation in Somalia. General Powell says that the U.S. army is going to Somalia “like the cavalry coming to the rescue” (CNN, 5 December). The idea of the U.S. military, which dropped the atomic bomb on Hiroshima, raped Vietnam and trained generations of torturers in Latin America and elsewhere, as a force for humanitarian relief is grotesque! For over a year after Somalia broke down into clan warfare and famine, the imperialist leaders turned their back on the mass starvation there. And virtually nothing is being proposed to assist the more than a dozen other African countries which, faced with the worst drought in a century, are being wracked by starvation.

What interests the imperialists in Somalia is that they see it as an ideal military base, strategically situated astride the sea lanes of the Indian Ocean and the Gulf of Aden, providing a forward base for intervention in the Near East.
Indeed, according to the Washington Post (4 December), the Pentagon is planning to set up modern port and airfield facilities in the Somali capital of Mogadishu.

The imperialist rulers are trying to pretend that this is going to be a quick operation, but in reality they are preparing for a prolonged military occupation of Somalia. President Bush piously vowed that U.S. troops would not seek to influence Somalia's political crisis, and General Powell is talking about withdrawing U.S. forces "in a few months." But Powell quickly hedged, saying that U.S. Marines would remain stationed off the Somali coast as a "presence," ready to intervene again, and that "a few units" of ground forces would remain in Somalia indefinitely to support UN "peacekeepers."

Moreover, UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali insisted that, in addition to distributing food relief, an aim of the intervention is to "maintain security in the region" and "reconciliate" warring clan chiefs. A CIA report, summarized by the New York Times (2 December), estimates that the prospects for setting up a stable Somali government are bleak, and proposes a UN protectorate or trusteeship by which a country (unnamed) would rule Somalia on behalf of the UN "until the territory is ready for self-government." Thus, Somalia would be recolonized in the name of "the white man's burden" of bringing "peace" and "civilization" to Africa.

Washington Declares "Supersovereignty"

As the imperialists arrogantly assert their right to intervene as they wish anywhere and at any time, columnist William Safire waxed eloquent on the need for the "only standing superpower" to have a "new sovereignty":

"When do the world's responsible powers have a right to intrude on what used to be an impenetrable sovereignty? Anarchy offers the obvious invitation to intervene, as is the case in Somalia—but what of cases of genocidal tyranny, as practiced by Iraq in its portion of Kurdistan, or by the Khmer Rouge as it plots new savagery in Cambodia, or by Serbia as it readsies for its final solution in Kosovo?"

—New York Times,
30 November

As Safire put it: "By virtue of being the superpower, we have a superinterest." And so U.S. imperialism arrogantly asserts "supersovereignty," to intervene when and where they want. This is the same doctrine that the White House and Supreme Court use to assert the "right" of the U.S. to kidnap anyone, from Panamanian heads of government to Mexican doctors, in the name of "justice."

"Operation Restore Hope" in Somalia is of a piece with Bush's supposedly humanitarian "Operation Provide Comfort" last year, when the U.S. set up a "security zone" for Kurds in northern Iraq. In the aftermath of the Persian Gulf War—in which the Pentagon wantonly slaughtered over 100,000 Iraqis—Kurds and Shi'ites rose up. After Hussein put down the revolt, the U.S. flew in food and medicine to Kurdish refugees in the north while U.S. warplanes prevented Iraqi military attacks. In return, Washington demanded that the Iraqi Kurdish organizations cooperate with the reactionary Turkish regime in repressing fighters of the Turkish PKK (Kurdish Workers Party). So in the interests of imperialist "divide and rule" policy, Iraqi Kurds massacre Turkish Kurds!

Washington is throwing massive firepower into Somalia: artillery, tanks, armored cars and helicopter gunships, with an aircraft carrier battle group off-shore for reinforcements and possible bombing missions. In addition, there will be several thousand troops from half a dozen countries, including France, Canada, Egypt, and Somalia's former colonial ruler, Italy. Facing untrained and undisciplined bands armed with light weapons, most U.S. officials agree with the military analyst who estimated that "this ought to be a piece of cake" (Los Angeles Times, 30 November). Meanwhile, the racist U.S. ambassador to Kenya warned: "If you liked Beirut, you'll love Mogadishu."

No doubt many in Somalia and elsewhere believe that the U.S. presence can only be beneficial since things could scarcely get any worse. Of the African regimes, only the Sudan has opposed the U.S. intervention in Somalia. Yet ultimately, direct American military intervention in Africa can only result in increased oppression and exploitation of the African people. The U.S. was the main supporter and arms supplier to Somali butcher Siad Barre from the late 1970s, when President Jimmy Carter wooed him away from being a Soviet client, until the late 1980s, when the end of the Cold War made the Horn of Africa lose much of its strategic interest to Washington. But since the Gulf War, the U.S. is intent on reinforcing its strategic presence in the region vis-à-vis its imperialist rivals.

With Bush giving a "democratic," "humanitarian" façade to the pursuit of imperialist interests, liberal Democrats are positively ecstatic. Liberal columnist Murray Kempton effusively declares of Bush:

"Now we can say goodbye, grateful for his having lifted himself and his countrymen up to this one great moment that transcends all of his and our lesser hours.... We have assembled our battalions not to fight but to save a people we do not even know and who can offer us no spoil except the sense that we have done a good action for no material boon."

—Los Angeles Times,
12 December

Liberals would like to cloak U.S. imperial interests in the rhetoric of "do-goodism." But when the Carter administration installed a "human rights junta" in El Salvador in a U.S.-sponsored coup in the fall of 1979, it opened the
road to a decade of bloody repression. And Carter’s “human rights” campaign over Afghanistan and Poland was the opening salvo in Cold War II, which ultimately saw the collapse of the Soviet degenerated workers state into capitalist misery and nationalist bloodletting.

Western Imperialism and the Yugoslav Bloodbath

There is also pressure to intervene further in Yugoslavia in the name of supposedly “humanitarian” concerns. The communal civil war, with “ethnic cleansing” carried out on all sides, has created more than two million refugees, and continues to do so at a rate of more than a thousand a day. The UN estimates that more than 400,000 people could die this winter of cold, disease and starvation. While publicizing Serbian war crimes the Lebanon of Europe, with myriad conflicting national/communist forces and shifting alliances. And if the U.S. or other Western “peacekeepers” try to work out a deal with the Serbs, they risk being attacked by the Croats, Bosnian Muslims, Macedonians, Albanians, etc.

The bloody breakup of Yugoslavia is intertwined with inter-imperialist rivalry. The secessionist regimes in Croatia and Slovenia—before World War I provinces in the Austro-Hungarian Empire—were set up in the summer of 1991 as clients of the newly reunified German Fourth Reich. Serbia, on the other hand, is historically a Balkan ally of British and French imperialism.

Although Washington politicians now ritually denounce Serbian “aggression,” and the American media even compares Belgrade nationalist strongman Slobodan Milosevic to Hitler, U.S. imperialism is not fundamentally hostile to a strong Serbian state. Thus the Bush administration gave special dispensation for an American millionaire of Serbian ancestry, Milan Panic, to become prime minister of the rump Yugoslavia state. The U.S. rulers would like to have a more pro-Serbian posture, provided that Milosevic is replaced by pro-Western “democrats,” that is, direct agents of Wall Street and Washington.

If, despite these factors, U.S. and/or West European troops do intervene in Yugoslavia, revolutionaries must give military support to Serbia against the imperialist invaders. While we support no side in the present communalist bloodletting, we resolutely oppose the imperialist blockade and any attempt to bring the “new world order” to Yugoslavia. This would only further inflame national hatred among the Balkan peoples, as well as intensify their exploitation by Western capitalism.

The myth of a “humanitarian” imperialist has captivated various radicals, as well as the social democrats of In These Times, who call for military intervention in Yugoslavia. In Europe, Alain Krivine, leader of the French section of the United Secretariat, likewise signed an appeal calling for European imperialist intervention in Yugoslavia. In sharp contrast, the International Communist League makes no concession to the so-called “democratic” bourgeoisie. We fight to mobilize the working class to bring down the imperialist system through international socialist revolution.

Military “Superpower” With a Bankrupt Economy

U.S. imperialism is seeking to play the role of “cops of the world” with a debt-ridden financial structure, an obsolete industrial plant and a population whose living standards have been driven downward for the past two decades. Washington is trying to assert its global leadership through a massive military apparatus which rests on a decaying economic base. No longer able to compete effectively with Japan and Germany in the world market as it is presently organized, American capitalism will be driven to use the Pentagon war machine to carve out its own exclusive trade zones and spheres of exploitation.

Over the past decade the U.S. has reasserted its “superpower” status through military adventures on the cheap against poor Third World countries—the rape of the tiny black West Indian island of Grenada, terror bombing of Qaddafi’s Libya, the invasion of Panama, Operation Desert Slaughter against Iraq, and now the occupation of famine-stricken Somalia. However, American imperialism cannot reverse its decline by taking over small and impoverished Central American or East African countries. The Pentagon’s military power can change the real balance of economic forces in the world only if it is successfully directed against Japan in Asia and against Germany in Europe: a replay of World War II, only this time starting with nuclear weapons.

Today, the U.S. military must act as cops of the world, because the Wall Street banks and Fortune 500 corporations exploit the working people of the world, from South Korea to South Africa, from Central America to Central Europe. Only if the capitalist bloodsuckers who run this country are overthrown by the working class, allied with the black and Hispanic poor, can the drive toward a new world war be halted and America’s productive capacity be made to serve the genuine interests of humanity.
UN Cover for Imperialist Intervention in Somalia

U.S. Out of Africa!

It was the ultimate photo-op: Commander in Chief Bush, posing for cameras with smiling children on New Year’s Day, at an orphanage in Baidoa, the epicenter of the Somali famine. He told American troops (and the TV cameras), “we are very, very proud of this humanitarian effort.” It’s packaged as a Christmastime gesture of altruism and philanthropy. But U.S. rulers, Republican and Democrat alike, are using starving black babies in Somalia as a backdrop to assert American hegemony in a “New World Order.” As George Herbert Walker Bush and William Jefferson Clinton promote a “civilizing mission” for Yankee imperialism under the flag of the United Nations, they want to show imperialist rivals that the U.S. can “project power” globally and sling lead—so long as they’re not going up against someone who might give them a serious fight.

American troops are not going into Somalia to put up telephone wires or dig wells. Even the excuse of “famine relief” is a fraud. For the past three weeks, food convoys under U.S. military guard have been arriving in Baidoa. But, tragically, the main reason the death rate has fallen off there (nationally an estimated 200 people per day continue to die of starvation) is that so many of the weaker victims, especially the young and the aged, have already perished. The New York Times (10 January) noted: “The deployment was already too late. The haunting, skeletal children whose televised pictures had shocked the world during the summer had already died by the tens of thousands.”

Who could expect “humanitarianism” from the bloodyminded would-be masters of the world who reveled in the wanton slaughter of more than 100,000 Iraqi soldiers and civilians in the one-sided Persian Gulf “war”? When, at the UN-brokered talks between Somali clan chiefs being held in Ethiopia, strongman Mohamed Farah Aidid stalled on accepting a truce, U.S. Marines simply blew away his Mogadishu compound in a “firestorm” launched from helicopters, tanks, mortars and hundreds of Marines on the ground. “It’s a whole new ballgame now,” chortled the U.S. military spokesman. But opposition is growing among Somalis who see the occupying forces as a new colonial power. Relief workers and journalists have been pelted with rocks and met with cries of “Go home! Go home!”

Somalia is now occupied by an imperialist legion of more than 21,000 U.S. troops, plus 10,000 troops from 17 other countries, and detachments continue to pour in. U.S. officials are now saying that they may be “forced” to stay “for the long haul” in order to get the country back in order (New York Times, 10 January). In an article titled “U.S. Intervention Also Serves Geopolitical Interests,” the Navy Times (14 December 1992) reports the opinion of Defense Department officials that “although the Bush administration describes it as purely humanitarian, intervention in Somalia serves U.S. strategic and political inter-

Washington Revives Racist “White Man’s Burden”
est in Africa and the Middle East.... Whoever controls Somalia could control the southern entrance to the Red Sea and thus the Suez Canal..... a prime location from which to influence the political stability of the Middle East.

But beyond the Pentagon planners calculations, Bush’s utterances reek of racist imperialist arrogance. It recalls Rudyard Kipling’s poem, “The White Man’s Burden,” written in 1899 after the U.S. victory in the Spanish-American War. Bewailing the plight of the colonials having to make reluctant sacrifices for the benefit of their subjects, the poem counsels the imperialist thinktanker Angelo Codevilla of the Hoover Institution writes unabashedly in the Wall Street Journal (7 January):

“Our only realistic choice in Somalia and in all too many similar places is either to leave them to their misery or to renew air strikes against Iraq if Sadam Hussein did not withdraw aircraft missiles from the “no-fly” zone decreed by Washington in southern Iraq. Like a cowboy riding off into the sunset, Bush intends to go out with his guns blazing.

Meanwhile, Clinton has supported all these bellicose moves. The “policy wonks” of the incoming Democratic administration want to use Somalia as a launching pad for a “multilateral force” to play world cop under the aegis of a plant UN. With the breakup of the Soviet Union, the erstwhile Cold Warriors have been rethinking U.S. foreign policy in the pages of authoritative journals like Foreign Affairs. A major theme has been an emphasis on the need for the U.S. to rely on “collective military action,” under the cover of international agencies like the UN. Clinton’s choice for CIA director, James Woolsey, a Vietnam “dove” turned anti-Soviet warmonger, has presented a plan for a permanent UN “standing ready force” along with a rapid deployment force of up to 30,000 troops from among Security Council members, including the U.S.

For “mainstream” Democrats, the code words for the new colonialism are “Saving Failed States,” the title of a recent article in Foreign Policy (Winter 1992-93), which asserts that the colonial independence movements following World War II resulted in a series of “failed states”—citing Somalia, Sudan, Liberia and Cambodia—that should be simply taken over as UN trusteeships. Taking its cue, the New York Times (28 December 1992) pontificated that “a glance around the world reveals a dozen or more ‘failed states,’ countries verging on collapse and ethnic strife, each a possible candidate for U.N. intervention.” For these haughty haute bourgeois, a UN “standby force” would be “like the cop on the beat,” whose very presence could “deter genocide.”

Somalia is being recolonized in what amounts to a resurrection of the UN trusteeship system. (Southern Somalia was a UN trusteeship from World War II until independence and unification
The imperialist intervention in the Congo (today Zaire) in the early 1960s, in the guise of a UN “peacekeeping” force, underlines the bloody consequences of illusions in the “democratic” nature of the UN. When the Congo gained independence from Belgium in 1960 and nationalist Patrice Lumumba became prime minister, Belgium sponsored a secessionist rebellion under Moise Tshombe in the mineral-rich Katanga province. The papers were full of atrocity stories about raped nuns in Stanleyville. United Nations troops, intervening in response to an appeal by Lumumba, sided with Tshombe and his Belgian supporters and disarmed Lumumba’s forces. Lumumba was ousted in a U.S.-sponsored coup and turned over to Tshombe, who had him assassinated.

UN troops only withdrew after installing the butcher Mobutu in power in 1964. Mobutu recruited an army of mercenaries, armed and supported by the U.S., to put down the nationalist uprising which had been sparked by Lumumba’s fall. Backed up by U.S. air support and Belgian troops, the mercenaries then marched on Stanleyville (today Kisangani), indiscriminately massacring the population by the tens of thousands. They crushed the Congolese nationalists in an orgy of bloodletting and confirmed in power Mobutu, who has since then carried out an uninterrupted campaign of reactionary terror against his people while stealing the country blind.

Fake-Lefts Join UN Fig Leaf Brigade

The U.S. left, after years of calling for the U.S. or the UN to intervene in South Africa to impose “democracy,” is not surprisingly hard-put to oppose the imperialists’ “humanitarian” occupation of Somalia. The Communist Party hails the UN-sponsored invasion as “long overdue” and admits that “to get the aid through, military force may be necessary” (People’s Weekly World, 5 December 1992). Progressive Labor and the International Socialist Organization criticize the intervention, but refrain from calling for the imperialist troops to get out. Workers World and the Socialist Workers Party call for “food, not troops in Somalia”—i.e., for truly “humanitarian” action by the imperialists. Workers World (31 December 1992) spells it out most clearly: “The U.S. Air Force is by far the largest in the world. It could have easily and inexpensively provided famine relief.”

Meanwhile, the Bulletin (18 December 1992) of the dubious Workers League testifies to the difficulties provoked among its members:

“In the past week the Bulletin has been asked by sympathetic readers and even...
With its “humanitarian” invasion of Somalia, the United States is masquerading as the friend of the starving black masses of Africa. In fact, the American occupation is aimed at pursuing its superpower appetites in the Horn of Africa. The “benevolent” mask of U.S. imperialism was ripped off by American Communist John Reed, speaking to the 1920 Congress of the Peoples of the East sponsored by the young Soviet republic in Baku. As American capitalists offered millions in “aid” to famine-wracked Armenia, Reed warned that their aim was to enslave the Armenian nation and prevent the spread of socialist revolution.

I represent here the revolutionary workers of one of the great imperialist powers, the United States of America, which exploits and oppresses the peoples of the colonies.

You, the peoples of the East, the peoples of Asia, have not yet experienced for yourselves the rule of America. You know and hate the British, French and Italian imperialists, and probably you think that “free America” will govern better, will liberate the peoples of the colonies, will feed and defend them.

No. The workers and peasants of the Philippines, the peoples of Central America and the islands of the Caribbean, they know what it means to live under the rule of “free America”....

In North America itself there are ten million Negroes who possess neither political or civil rights, despite the fact that by law they are equal citizens. With the purpose of distracting the attention of the American workers from the capitalists, their exploiters, the latter stir up hatred against the Negroes, provoking war between the white and black races. The Negroes, whom they lawlessly burn alive, are beginning to see that their only hope lies in armed resistance to the white bandits.

At the present time the American capitalists are addressing friendly words to the peoples of the East, with a promise of aid and food. This applies especially to Armenia. Millions of dollars have been collected by the American millionaires in order to send bread to the starving Armenians. And many Armenians are now looking for help to Uncle Sam....

Promising food to starving peoples and at the same time organizing a blockade of the Soviet Republics—that is the policy of the United States....

Uncle Sam is not one ever to give anybody something for nothing. He comes along with a sack stuffed with straw in one hand and a whip in the other. Whoever takes Uncle Sam’s promises at their face value will find himself obliged to pay for them with blood and sweat. The American workers are demanding an ever larger share of the product of their labour; with a view to preventing revolution at home, the American capitalists are forced to seek out colonial peoples to exploit, peoples who will furnish sufficient profit to keep the American workers in obedience and so make them participants in the exploitation of the Armenians. I represent thousands of revolutionary American workers who know this, and who understand that, acting together with the Armenian workers and peasants, with the toiling masses of the whole world, they will overthrow capitalism. World capitalism will be destroyed, and all the peoples will be free.

—John Reed, Speech to the Baku Congress (September 1920)
Vancouver Labor/Minority Mobilization

3,000 Drive Off Fascist Skinheads

VANCOUVER—The Nazis of “Canadian Liberty Net” and their gang of skinheads were put on the run here Friday night, January 22. The Hitler-lovers had boasted they were going to rally in front of the Vancouver Art Gallery at 7 p.m., and organize a “secret meeting” to “welcome” infamous American Nazi Tom Metzger. What happened instead was no secret. The Nazis’ intended site was occupied by 3,000 anti-racist protesters—organized contingents of trade unionists, youth, minorities, gays and other opponents of fascist terror.

When word ran through the crowd, as the rally was winding down, that skinheads had been sighted at the Century Plaza Hotel, hundreds took to the streets, joining with the Trotskyist League of Canada and Partisan Defense Committee in chanting, “Stop the Nazis, this is the hour! Labor, minorities have the power!” As the 500 marchers neared the hotel, the handful of fascists cowered in a side alley. Pursued by the demonstrators, the Nazis jumped walls, scrambled over fences and fled into the darkness.

“This was a victory,” PDC spokesman Miriam Scribner declared. “What happened tonight was a vindication of our call for a mass union-centered mobilization to sweep the fascists from the streets.” After the two-bit Hitlers fled, the TL led part of the crowd downtown to a victory party, chanting “Off with the hoods! Off with the sheets! We drove the fascists from the streets!”

The Vancouver Sun headlined “White Supremacist Skinheads Flee Hotel,” reporting: “As thousands of anti-racists demonstrated outside the Century Plaza Hotel, a small group of white supremacist skinheads escaped like terrified prey out a side entrance.” The cops took their revenge by arresting two anti-fascist protesters, threatening them with

Unionists, minorities, students massed at Vancouver Art Gallery. Spartacists had called for massive labor-based mobilization to stop the fascists.

Mobilize Labor/Minorities to SMASH the KLAN! 

Spartacist Canada photos
charges including “weapons” possession and wearing a mask! Drop all charges against the anti-fascist demonstrators!

“All Out to Stop the Fascists”

The attempted “Liberty Net” rally was a deadly threat aimed at all labor and minorities in Vancouver. The race-terrorists have firebombed the homes of East Indian and Chinese Canadian families and burned a cross outside the house of Iranian immigrants. A Jewish synagogue and a cemetery were defaced with Nazi slogans and swastikas, and a gay bookstore was bombed. Metzger’s “White Aryan Resistance” skinheads brutally murdered an Ethiopian man in Oregon in 1988. Now the fascists announced a provocation at the Art Gallery, the traditional site for leftist and labor demonstrations in this city.

In response, the PDC, the legal and social defense organization associated with the Trotskyist League, issued an urgent appeal on January 11 to labor and minority organizations, calling for a “massive, disciplined display of labor power mobilizing minorities and all the fascists’ intended victims—when and where the fascists say they intend to be.... Stopping this Nazi provocation is a matter of basic survival.” This struck a real chord in Vancouver—a solid union town, with tens of thousands of East Indian and other Asian workers.

Two days later, the British Columbia Organization to Fight Racism (BCOFR) put out a press release calling for an “Anti-Racism Rally” at the Art Gallery to “say no to W.A.R.” The BCOFR rally, endorsed by the Vancouver and District Labour Council tops, was not called to stop the Nazi terrorists, but billed only as an “alternative to the advertised visit” by Metzger.

Intent on assuring that outrage against fascist terror was not diverted into an impotent talkfest, TL and PDC supporters distributed 30,000 copies of a mobilizing leaflet, addressing trade-union meetings and immigrant communities across the city. “All Out to Stop the Fascists!” said the TL leaflet, insisting:

“Official union contingents, under their union banners, together with East Indians, Chinese, Japanese, blacks, Native Indians, Jews, gays and socialists, can see to it that this Nazi ‘rally’ never happens, and that these scum are swept off the streets.”

East Indian shopkeepers posted the leaflet in their windows. Students at the University of British Columbia, Simon Fraser University and Langara Community College took stacks to distribute.

The Vancouver local of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers voted unanimously to endorse the TL/PDC call, issuing a leaflet calling for labor/minority mobilization, and sent a capable squad of union members to the demonstration. The International Longshoremen’s and Warehousemen’s Union Local 500 put out their own leaflet as well, which was posted all over the waterfront, calling on longshoremen to go “All Out to Stop the Fascists” and “Join the Trotskyist League/Partisan Defense Committee Contingent!” (while repeating the Labour Council tops’ plea that the government stop Metzger). A solid crew of longshoremen turned out, as did truckers and tugboat workers from two locals of the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway, Transport and General Workers Union. Saying they came “to make a point here,” one union official expressed the widespread determination to make short shrift of the Nazis: “We’ll stop them if they show.”

Other labor contingents came from International Woodworkers of America-Canada Local 1-357, Canadian Union of Public Employees Local 391, Telecommunications Workers Union Local 1 and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. Some of these workers joined the TL/PDC contingent, supplying the main body of our marshals squad.

Official trade-union banners were everywhere to be seen outside the Art Gallery on Friday night. People from the city’s Japanese, Chinese, black, Iranian and other communities were there, as well as women’s groups and gays, and a Jewish peace group carried a sign in Hebrew, Arabic and English. The prospect of having to face a united front of organized labor, minorities and other anti-fascists sent the Nazis scurrying to find a new meeting site at a planetarium a couple of miles away. Tony McAleer, the would-beführer of Canadian Liberty Net, and a few skinheads strutted around for the bourgeois media and bragged about how they were going ahead with their “secret meeting.”

At the Art Gallery, the BCOFR and others wanted to contain opposition to the fascists by trying to lull the crowd with music and insipid “love thy neighbor” speechifying—including in their roster a Tory MP who spoke as the representative of the racist, labor-hating federal Conservative government! The New Democratic Party loyalists of the BCOFR never intended to mobilize the battalions of labor to crush the fascists. They refused to call for union contingents, and at a January 19 Labour Council meeting BCOFR spokesman Paul Gill explicitly opposed going after the Nazis if they dared show their faces in the vicinity of the Art Gallery.

Although the BCOFR rally was designed to head off any genuine mobilization to stop the fascists, militant and serious unionists representative of the powerful B.C. labor movement meant business, and they kept the fascist out. Trotskyist League spokesman Oliver Stephens was widely applauded when he said from the rally podium:

“The fascists want to destroy us and ours! They want to split us apart, to open us up for attack, to poison any kind of integrated struggle, like winning strikes. They are the shock troops of the racist ruling class. They can and must be stopped, and the organized working class has the power.”

There were two counterposed political programs on how to respond to the fascist threat in Vancouver. The policy of the reformists and labor bureaucrats, which comes straight from the ministerial offices of the social-democratic NDP, was to preach reliance on the capitalist state and its police. In practice, this meant allowing the fascist provocation to go ahead. Against this the TL leaflet argued:

“Reformists believe that the capitalist state is ‘neutral’ and can be pressured to ‘ban’ the fascists. As Marxists we understand that this state enforces the rule of
capital and that the fight against fascism is the road of class struggle leading to the forging of a revolutionary workers party and socialist revolution.”

At a BCOFR marshals meeting on January 20, spokesman Alan Dutton made perfectly clear their intention that any Nazis outside the perimeter of the rally would be left alone to spew their racist filth. A representative of the Coalition United to Fight Oppression (CUFO), a rad-lib sandbox which includes the Freedom Socialist Party and the International Socialists, argued that if the skinheads showed up and tried to march through the rally they should just be “ignored”! A speaker for the I.S. advised the marshals not to remove known fascist provocateurs from the demonstration but just “keep an eye” on them!

These reformists tried to put their wimpy program into action at the demo. As marchers headed off for the Century Plaza Hotel to get the skinhead thugs, CUFO marshals first tried to slow the protesters down and then they (including the I.S.) linked arms in front of the hotel to bolster the line of cops who were shoving the crowd back.

Last March, a gang of half a dozen skinheads waving swastika flags marched right through a “Rally Against Racism” that was held at the Art Gallery. TL supporters sought to mobilize demonstrators to defend themselves against these fascist thugs. But the rally organizers—the I.S. and CUFO—let the Nazis parade with impunity! The social-democratic I.S. is not guided by such Gandhian pacifism when it comes to anti-communist exclusions, launching a savage physical assault to keep Trotskyist League members out of a “public debate” in Toronto last August.

The Cold War “socialists” of the I.S. urged solidarity with every imperialist-backed counterrevolutionary force aimed at destroying the former workers states in East Europe and the Soviet Union. The result has been a tidal wave of reactionary nationalism and fascist terror which is the cutting edge of capitalist restoration. Those who cheered these forces in East Europe and the ex-USSR are hypocrites when they claim to want to “fight fascism” at home. The class-collaborationist appetites that underpinned the reformists’ virulent anti-Sovietism can be seen in their supine response to the fascist terrorists here.

Forge a Revolutionary Workers Party!

After 16 years of union-busting rule under the ultraright racist yahoos of the Social Credit Party, the powerful B.C. labor movement thought it would get a break under an NDP government. But since their election in 1991, the NDP social democrats have imposed even further austerity, jacking up taxes and slashing social services, while alibiing racist cop terror against minorities. This is hardly new—the last NDP government in 1975 launched the most massive strikebreaking assault in the province’s history. The social democrats serve as the labor lieutenants of capitalist class rule—“left” guardians of the decaying system that breeds fascist terrorists. In the course of class struggle, the NDP must be split, its working-class base won to a revolutionary party.

While small in numbers now, the fascists are the mortal enemies of all working people and must be crushed in the egg before they grow. When the capitalists feel their rule is being threatened by the working class—as in Germany and Italy in the 1920s and ’30s—the bourgeoisie will finance the fascist killers and grease their rise to power in order to smash the workers organizations. Without revolutionary leadership the working class of Europe paid a terrible price, as the Nazi Holocaust devoured tens of millions of Jews, Gypsies, Slavs, leftists and others. As the TL leaflet concluded: “Unionists, minorities and a lot of others who oppose everything the fascists stand for are looking for a way to fight back against a system that has condemned them to poverty, degradation, homelessness, broken unions and broken lives. A genuine class-struggle mobilization to stop the fascists of ‘Canadian Liberty Net’ would give a taste of the power that must be brought to bear in the fight for a socialist revolution to overthrow the decrepit rule of the capitalist bosses which finds its degenerate expression in Metzger’s Nazi-lovers, and bring to power the working people who built all the wealth of this country.”
Furor Over Georgia State Flag
Down With the Flag of Slavery!

Atlanta, Georgia is the showcase city of the supposed “New South,” a town that dubs itself “the city too busy to hate.” But in recent weeks black Atlanta has been made to suffer the indignities and threatening reminders of a past of chattel slavery and a present of racist violence and inequality. A proposal by Georgia governor Miller to finally remove the Confederate battle emblem from the state flag has roused a storm of protest by Klansmen and their “civilized” auxiliary, the Sons of Confederate Veterans (they wear ties instead of hoods), to preserve this banner of racist terror North and South.

In a provocation deliberately timed to spurn the observance of Martin Luther King Day, five enormous billboards displaying the Confederate flag were placed within a mile of the state capitol, like monster Nazi flags at Hitler rallies. One billboard was appropriately defaced and removed. And on January 19, 300 Sons of Confederate Veterans rallied at the capitol to “save” the banner of slavery. Blaring Dixie at top volume, racist losers dressed in Confederate uniforms fired frighteningly real-sounding gun volleys in the direction of city hall’s black administration.

As a columnist in the Atlanta Journal and Constitution wrote, “Just when you think the New South is all set—a gloss of skyscrapers and canny businesses—the Old rises again, like something undead in a Stephen King novel.” Undead indeed. Some of the most sinister racist creeps in America are fighting to preserve the battle flag of slavery, including Vietnam war criminal General Westmoreland, ultra-right powerbroker and fascistic presidential hopeful Patrick Buchanan, segregationist Lester Maddox, and two dozen members of the Georgia state legislature!

While black Democratic Party hacks applaud Miller’s “change of heart” in proposing to replace the flag (he wants the Confederate “Stars and Bars” instead!), we remind people that this racist pig launched his political career campaigning against the 1964 Civil Rights Act. His “change of heart” is a cynical move to protect the big bucks that are expected to flow into Georgia when Atlanta hosts the 1996 Olympics. It finally dawned on profit-conscious racists that flying the Confederate flag over an international sports competition dominated by the world’s best black athletes might be bad for business—after all, the city’s new “official” VISA credit card might balk at carrying the flag as its logo. Meanwhile, under the cover of the flag flap, Miller is trying to ram through a welfare "reform" that would deny aid to children born to women on public assistance—the vast majority of whom are black.

Every time and everywhere the Confederate flag is raised is a burning reminder of the unfinished business of the Civil War. The Georgia state legislature dug up the battle flag and slapped the state seal on it in 1956 as a gesture of open defiance of the Supreme Court’s order to desegregate public schools. From capitol domes across the old Confederacy, to KKK cross-burning rallies, to marauding white ethnic mobs in Howard Beach, New York, the Confederate flag is a symbol and rallying point for murderous racist terror. The fight for black freedom requires a socialist revolution to finish the Civil War. Then the red flag of liberation will fly from the state capitol and we can set to work sandblasting Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee, and Stonewall Jackson from the granite face of Stone Mountain and put an end to the night of the living Confederate dead once and for all. ■
Lynch Mob Atrocity in Florida

On New Year's Day, Christopher Wilson, a black stockbroker clerk from Brooklyn, was on working vacation in Florida and visiting his girlfriend in Tampa. On his way to pick up a newspaper that day, Wilson was seized at gunpoint to drive 16 miles on a winding road to a remote farm area near Fort Lonesome. Stopping in a field, the racists robbed Wilson, doused him with gasoline and set him on fire. "You're going to die, n-----," they taunted as they laughed and drove off. The would-be killers, Jeff Ray Pellet, Mark Kohut and Charles Rourke, left a note behind signed "KKK," reading: "One less n----- and one more to go."

Christopher Wilson did not die, but he now suffers excruciating second and third degree burns on 40 percent of his body. He narrowly escaped being burned to death, managing to reach neighbors who used a hose to put out the fire. In an outrageous display of official racism, authorities first labeled the atrocity a routine "robbery." This attempted cover-up of a savage, murderous racist attack is not surprising, despite efforts to paint Tampa/St. Petersburg as a fun-in-the-sun tourist spot in the "Sunshine State." Despite the cosmetic overlay of the "New South" touted by capitalist politicians, the lynching mob terror of the Old South remains. Plenty of black and working people know the Florida coast as the "Redneck Riviera," and lots of white racists across the "cracker belt" are proud of it. A couple of years ago, some of these types pushed for a referendum for the northern part of the state to secede from the heavily Jewish and Hispanic southern region and join Alabama.

Florida has always been a Klan stronghold, ranking right up there with Georgia and Alabama in numbers of cases of KKK violence, surpassed only by Texas and Oklahoma. Tampa Bay was one of the main KKK centers for decades and currently has the highest rate of hate crimes in Florida. In the years before World War I, the state had the highest per capita rate of lynching in the country. Now, like the attempt to cover up the torching of Christopher Wilson, a cover-up was recently revealed of the lynching of an entire black community in Florida, on New Year's Day 1923. The only two remaining survivors of the Rosewood massacre, Lee Ruth Davis, 77, and Minnie Lee Langley, 88, are demanding that the state legislature reimburse them for property loss and memorialize the massacre.

Rosewood was a thriving town 75 miles north of Tampa, where black home­steaders worked for the area's pencil factories and turpentine mills. The Klan marauders on that January day showed up under pretext of searching for a black man alleged to have raped a white woman—long the rallying cry for lynching mobs. Droves of Klansmen from all over Florida and as far away as Georgia rode against Rosewood, killing dozens of black men, women and children, and torching the town. "All that remains of Rosewood," a recent UPI (29 December 1992) account notes, "is a green and white sign with the name of the town on it and a two-story white clapboard house. It was owned by the only white resident, which is why it was spared."

Lee Ruth Davis and Minnie Lee Langley were only children when they witnessed the bloody massacre. Their stories are searing—a partially paralyzed black man was forced to dig his own grave, then was shot and shoved into it. Another man was hanged from a tree, a pregnant woman was shot as she crawled under a porch to hide. Bloodhounds bayed as the lynching mobs hunted down fleeing men, women and children, and gunmen were waiting at the railroad to kill anyone escaping. "We had all our property there, and they took everything they didn't burn," recalls Langley. "They even took it off the map." (Atlanta Journal and Constitution, 17 January). The Rosewood massacre was so obliterated from history that no one even knows how many people were killed in the rampage. Newspaper accounts vary from 7 to 21. A lawyer representing the two survivors puts the number closer to 100.

The '20s were years of rampant racist terror throughout the U.S., as white soldiers demobilized after the war were set against the black population. In 1921, an aerial police bombing obliterated the black district of Tulsa, Oklahoma, killing 75 people, mostly black, while 4,000 more blacks were thrown into concentration camps. Florida was notable for the fact that its various KKK chapters...
Bureaucrats Give Scabs Half the Jobs
Drywallers Strike Settled, Fight for Solid Union Goes On

LOS ANGELES—After almost six months of hard class struggle, the strike of drywall construction workers in Southern California has been settled. The 43 contractors in five counties who make up the Pacific Rim Drywall Association were finally forced to recognize the union. The contract includes health benefits, significant wage increases, a union shop and a union hiring hall that will rid them of the hated labor contractors. But it also includes a no-strike clause, and in a scandalous stab in the back, Carpenters union bureaucrats agreed that contractors will initially be required to hire only 50 percent of their workers from the ranks of the strikers! Current jobs, and half of all new work, will be filled by scabs!

Up against the powerful home builders of Southern California, the workers defended their picket lines against the LAPD, Orange County sheriffs and the strike-breaking INS (Immigration and Naturalization Service), the hated migra. At the beginning of the strike, an incredible Orange County Register (19 July) marveled at these workers, “Mexican, immigrant, Spanish-speaking, taking on the most potent political powers in the county.” These strikers captured the imagination of the multiracial working class from the San Pedro docks to the Century City hotels to the ghettos and barrios of L.A.

Yet this long, courageous struggle, at the cost of hundreds of arrests and deportations, is being sabotaged by the AFL-CIO craft union tops. One Carpenters business agent admitted the strikers “weren’t thrilled” with the contract. More bluntly, strikers told Workers Vanguard, “It sucks.” In San Diego, where the scabbing was heaviest, the contractors are refusing to sign, as 250 drywallers continue the strike.

Strikers told WV that even before the settlement, picket lines were ordered down at sites of some contractors who had simply agreed to talk. The no-strike pledge has pissed off a lot of workers, who know that the contractors will do everything to gut any gains. Already, contractors are calling the people they want, bypassing the union hiring hall. One worker said that only 200 strikers have been called back to work. And the entire agreement has an escape clause that the bosses can drive a tractor-trailer through: if contractors show the contract puts them at an unfair advantage with non-union competitors, wages and benefits can be slashed in the name of “market relief”!

This is an outrage! Strikers have not weathered hundreds of arrests, cop beatings and deportations only to be working side by side with scabs who crawled on their belly for the bosses. Returning strikers should greet the scabs with an “education committee” (something like a cross between the L.A. Raiders and Pancho Villa’s diplomatic corps) to “teach” them how a union hiring hall works—and make sure they owe their allegiance to a union forged in six months of hard struggle.

As we go to press, negotiations are continuing to have outstanding legal charges against the drywallers dropped, but there has not been a single mention from the bureaucrats of defending the strikers who still face deportation proceedings at the hands of the INS. The drywallers have fought hard—but they have been betrayed by the pro-capitalist labor traitors, and their reformist hangers-on, who did nothing to mobilize L.A. unions to win a decisive victory in this key class battle. One tail on the bureaucratic donkey, the International Socialist Organization, waxes enthusiastic about the “important step forward” of the settlement, while concealing the contract clause that gives half the jobs to scabs and not even mentioning the deportations!

Sure, the union tops donated rice and beans and a few bucks—after all,
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Sure, the union tops donated rice and beans and a few bucks—after all,
they want the drywallers’ dues money. But immigrant workers were leading a battle for all labor in an industry and an area where the union movement has been weak. In contrast to the pseudo-socialists, the Spartacist League and Partisan Defense Committee took up the drywallers’ struggle early on and fought for real solidarity action by L.A. labor. In a statement to a July 14 defense rally in Santa Ana, PDC spokesman Benito Montgomery said, “The unity and determination you have shown must serve as a call to the integrated labor movement—longshore, aerospace, Teamsters, hotel/restaurant and janitors—to come out and fight shoulder to shoulder to defeat migra union-busting.”

**Drywalleros Play Hardball**

The drywallers understood from the beginning what they faced. “We are all getting ripped off and exploited by rich bosses. And we have police and immigration and politicians all against us,” said one striker. The employers, the Building Industry Association of Southern California, are billion-dollar developers in a highly lucrative industry—new homes in Orange County average almost $300,000. The capitalist state threw everything at the strikers—special “labor relations” squads of Orange County sheriffs, outrageous bail of $50,000 on kidnapping charges for militant picket lines, lynching charges for allegedly rescuing their comrades from LAPD dragnets.

It was a “labor movement that has stunned experts with its organized and willful defiance” (Orange County Register). One sheriff bitterly complained, “I have not seen anything this organized...where they are being this bold, this brazen.” Ten years ago, unions in the Southern Californian residential building trades industry were wiped out during the Reagan years in Reagan country. Mexican workers, many from the village of Maguey in the central Mexican state of Guanajuato, were brought in to break the union. Wage scales plummeted, creating the conditions that sparked this strike: workers are paid as little as $300 for backbreaking 60-hour weeks installing 100-pound sheets of drywall.

Overwhelmingly Latino, cut off from unionized, commercial construction by the prejudice and backwardness of the craft union tops, the drywallers fought to win a union. From Washington, D.C., International Brotherhood of Carpenters president Sig Lucassen pronounced that “the trade union movement—the Brotherhood included—will be dead in the water unless it brings them in” (Carpenter, September-October 1992). But when strikers ran up against the cops and judges and the magra, the cowardly, pro-Democratic Party AFL-CIO chiefs hid behind anti-labor laws. Orange County Central Labor Council secretary-treasurer Bill Fogarty admitted the gutless impotence of the bureaucracy when he claimed there was an advantage to the drywallers “organizing alone”: “labor’s hands are tied. An employer can get an injunction against a union.” The drywallers’ “advantage” lay in the fact that, unlike the pro-capitalist tops, they refused to play by the bosses’ rules.

The strike began in June, but it gained prominence when an orchestrated sheriffs/INS attack on the picket lines over the July 4 weekend resulted in the largest mass arrest in Orange County history. Strikers were arrested on outrageous charges of “kidnapping” (!) for running a handful of scabs off a construction site. INS agents were waiting at the jail when strikers were brought there. Strikers’ wives quickly organized a demonstration that surrounded the jail. More than 70 workers were forced into “voluntary deportation,” another 26 are still in the courts. Workers Vanguard demanded “Labor Must Defend the Drywallers!” and “No Deportations!” The PDC contacted L.A. unions to come out to the court hearing. We joined over a hundred strikers protesting outside the L.A. federal building, but the union tops (and fake-lefts) didn’t bother to show.

The contract negotiated by the union tops stipulates that the union must screen drywallers at the hiring hall for undocumented workers, under the sanctions provisions of the racist, anti-labor Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986. On behalf of their masters in the Democratic Party, the labor fakers have been the worst promoters of jingoist attacks on “illegal immigration.” For years, the only time you heard the bureaucrats talk of Mexican and Central American workers was to blame them for the loss of jobs in decaying American capitalism. That is the AFL-CIO tops’ motivation in opposing the imperialist North American Free Trade Agreement to be signed later this month, a scheme for the super-exploitation of the Mexican proletariat.

The Spartacist League opposes this plan for a “Fortress North America” because we fight for international workers solidarity. The drywallers strike was a precious opportunity for the labor movement to wage a sharp fight to say: anybody who has made it to this country has a right to stay here and work at good union jobs. We fought to stop INS union-busting and for full citizenship rights for foreign-born workers. The historic discrimination against blacks, Latinos and women in the construction industry must be dramatically broken. Now is the time to make the developers pay for aggressive, union-run recruitment and apprenticeship programs to bring black, Latino and Asian men and women into residential and commercial construction.

**Class Struggle Against the New World Order**

The drywallers strike came on the heels of the explosion of rage in Los Angeles and across the country after the acquittal of the racist cops who brutally beat Rodney King. Migra vans patrolled the streets of L.A. during the riot. The National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights reports that 900 workers were “processed for removal”—that is, deported. They also reported that the “LAPD is known to have turned over hundreds of Latinos directly to the INS just on the basis of ‘looking like undocumented workers’.” The L.A. rebellion sent the U.S. rulers’ “New World Order” up in flames, as workers and the oppressed across the world saw the color of racist American “justice” and the fragility of U.S. imperialism’s claim to rule the world.

The drywallers inspired workers by reviving class-struggle tactics like roaming pickets, real picket lines that scabs learned it was dangerous to cross. They brought a taste of the power of labor to the open shop backwaters of Orange County and the “Inland Empire.” There have been key labor battles in L.A.—hotel workers, janitors, longshoremen, teachers (who are now facing a 12 percent pay cut)—which have breathed new life into the labor movement here. But the labor trainers funneled the anger of South-Central L.A. and the militancy of workers on the docks and construction sites into the Democratic Party of imperialism and war. That is why the unions were criminally silent in the face of the bloody state repression in L.A. last May.

After the mass arrest of drywallers in July, we demanded the labor movement act to defend the drywallers, and pointed the way forward:

“The labor movement, especially powerful industrial unions like longshore and aerospace, must defeat INS union-busting and defend foreign-born workers. As the fastest-growing component of the union movement, these workers are linked in struggle to their black and white class allies, and are a bridge to combative Mexican workers on the other side of the border. From among them will be recruited class-conscious cadres who will play a crucial role in forging the revolutionary internationalist workers party that will bring down the capitalist system once and for all!”
In Response to Crown Heights Verdict
Zionists Seek Race War in NYC

The Brooklyn neighborhood of Crown Heights has erupted again, after a jury of blacks, Hispanics and whites returned a verdict of "not guilty" on October 29 in the case of a black youth charged with the murder of Yankel Rosenbaum. Rosenbaum, a member of the ultra-orthodox Lubavitcher Hasidic sect, was stabbed by a gang of black youths in August 1991 during the explosion of rage after a seven-year-old black child, Gavin Cato, was struck down and killed by a reckless driver in the entourage of Lubavitcher head Rabbi Menachem Schneerson.

For three days that August, anger raged in this neighborhood of largely Caribbean blacks. Over 2,000 cops flooded into Crown Heights. After the stabbing of Rosenbaum, the cops picked up 17-year-old Lemrick Nelson Jr. and charged him with murder. The killing of Yankel Rosenbaum was a vicious racist crime. But the case that the prosecution took to a Brooklyn jury over a year later was based purely on the testimony of the NYPD racist killers. Nelson's defense attorney was able to point to glaring inconsistencies in the cops' testimony, and the jury voted for acquittal. One juror summed up what every New Yorker knows—"The police were not honest." But the right-wing Zionists don't care—they wanted a guilty verdict, guilty or not.

After the verdict, a dean of the NYU Medical School pointed to the "outrageous medical neglect" that contributed to Rosenbaum's death that night at Kings County Hospital—neglect that the black and Hispanic poor of Brooklyn are also routinely subjected to. The 29-year-old scholar died two hours after he was admitted, because of what one doctor called peripheral lung injuries "that should not kill anyone in 1991."

Now Zionist leaders and right-wing politicians like Ed Koch and Brooklyn councilman Noach Dear have seized on the verdict to launch a provocative escalating campaign for race war in New York City. The day after the verdict, a mob of 500 Satmar Hasidim set upon five black and Hispanic teenagers in the Williamsburg area of Brooklyn. The same day, 400 members of the Lubavitcher sect gathered on Ocean Parkway, the dividing line between the Hasidic and black communities in Crown Heights. When a black veteran of World War II appealed to them that "We rescued you from the concentration camps!", Hasidic racists shouted taunts of "You go back to Africa."

There are more sinister, and more powerful, forces pushing for race war than the isolated Lubavitchers. Right-wing Zionists in NYC are still seething over the acquittal last year of an Egyptian in the death of Zionist Meir Kahane, founder of the fascist Jewish Defense League. In Israel, on the second anniversary of Kahane's death, his followers in "Kahane Chai" threw a grenade into a crowded marketplace in Arab East Jerusalem, killing one Palestinian and wounding a number of others. In Crown Heights they paraded with JDL slogans like "Every Jew a .22." Schoolchildren were given placards reading "Execute Nelson Now."

Certified racist pig and former mayor Ed Koch went to Crown Heights to whip up racist hatred, appearing at a November 1 rally of 4,500 with vigilante Guardian Angel punk Curtis Sliwa, Senator Al D'Amato, and former federal prosecutor and mayoral candidate Rudy Giuliani. "Wanted for Murder" posters of black mayor David Dinkins were handed out. Koch rails about the "physical fear because of black violence" and declares, "We are on the cusp of a white, which includes Jewish, exodus" (New York Times, 19 November).

The Zionists think they can treat blacks in New York like Palestinians on the West Bank. But this is a dangerous illusion. Moreover, with their racist provocations the Zionists are fueling powerful reactionary forces which are not exactly "friends of the Jewish people." When anti-Semites like Mississippi governor Kirk Fordice and the likes of David Duke proclaim the U.S. a "Christian nation," they have Jews as well as blacks in their sights.

But the Zionists poison the possibility of common Jewish/black struggle against the fascists, as they seek to whip up race war. On November 9, Rabbi Avi Weiss led a march on Gracie Mansion, his followers shouting racist slurs and carrying a coffin "fitted to the contours of Mayor David N. Dinkins" (New York Times, 9 November). They took out a full-page ad in the Times ten days later to escalate their campaign of race-hate. On November 12, Noach Dear stormed into a City Council meeting demanding that it condemn the verdict, and then denounced black councilwoman Mary Pinkett as an "anti-Semite" when she refused to knuckle under. Pinkett said of Dear that he was trying to "out-JDL the JDL."

Who stands to benefit from the repeated bouts of race and ethnic hatred are the WASP Wall Street bankers who really do rule NYC, and their killers in blue. Just two months ago, 10,000 armed police besieged City Hall in an ominous display of racist cop bonapartism aimed at black mayor Dinkins. Now the media is full of accounts of a recent case of a black plainclothes transit cop who was shot at 21 times by his white colleagues who "thought he was a mugger." But they are silent about the long list of black and Hispanic victims of the NYPD.

After the killing of Gavin Cato, the anger of black Crown Heights, especially against the police, was criminally misdirected by nationalist demagogues like Sonny Carson and Al Sharpton into hideous anti-Semitic attacks on the Lubavitch community and individual Jews. Black youths marched on synagogues chanting "Heil Hitler!" It is only the racist oppressors who benefit from blacks and Jews going at each other's throats.

Even more grotesquely, in the wake of the murder of Yankel Rosenbaum, supposed leftists like the defunct "Fourth Internationalist Tendency" actually applauded such attacks (see "Crown Heights: FIT Panders to Pogromists," WVT No. 538, 8 November 1991). In this they only aid the bourgeoisie in diverting the anger of black youth away from the cops and the racist rulers of this country.

As we wrote in "Death in Crown Heights" in August 1991: "It's going to take hard class struggle and a revolutionary workers party to defend the myriad communities which make up this country, and to win a future for an entire generation of youth."
Moscow—Patrice Lumumba University

African Student Murdered by Yeltsin’s Cops

Capitalist Counterrevolution Unleashing Racist Terror

With the collapse of Stalinism and Boris Yeltsin’s “countercoup” last August, the Soviet Union has been wracked by “all the old crap” of capitalist society surging to the surface. A storm of nationalist bloodletting has raged since Yeltsin seized the reins of power in the name of “free market” capitalism and Russian chauvinism.

At Moscow’s Patrice Lumumba People’s Friendship University, a 25-year-old Zimbabwean student, Gideon Chimuso, was shot to death by a Russian policeman on the night of August 11. Militia were immediately dispatched to the campus after the murder to back up the killer. The next day, the OMON paramilitary units—a killer elite which first drew blood for the “democratic” counterrevolution at an anti-Yeltsin protest on Soviet Army Day in February—savagely attacked a student demonstration protesting the slaying of Chimusoro. Students carrying hand-lettered signs reading “We need police protection, not police murderers!” were chased, kicked in the groin and beaten with rubber truncheons. One cop yelled, “I will kill you, swine!”

The Russian press “justified” the cop murder and rampage by inventing stories of a student “riot”—lies calculated to inflame racist fear and hatred of the African, Asian and Latin American students at this university. A Nezavisimaya Gazeta (13 August) headline screamed “Only Machine Gun Fire Could Calm Down the Wild Running.” Moskovskii Komsomolets invented stories of blacks burning cars and kiosks, of students hurling furniture, televisions and burning mattresses out of dorm windows. A TV anchorman closed the August 12 nightly news story by stating that the African students “promise to shoot down all of us tomorrow.” This outrageous lie was nothing but sinister incitement to a pogrom!

Upon hearing of the cop murder, comrades from the International Communist League in Moscow immediately went to Patrice Lumumba University to express their solidarity with the students. Our comrades saw with their own eyes what a pack of lies the Russian press reports were. The kiosks were all there and none were burned; the dorms were in normal condition, the rooms fully furnished. A student from Yemen, who was an eyewitness to the murder of Chimusoro and OMON’s attack on the students, volunteered to tell everything to the press. He was interviewed. Shortly thereafter he was violently attacked in a predawn raid on his dorm room and remains hospitalized. A statement issued by the newly formed student Coordination Committee warned:

“We will hold [the press] responsible for anything that would happen to any African student in the future.... We will fight to the end until our rights are respected and recognized in this country where the African students in particular are constantly offended for having committed the only crime of being Black, being different, or simply being poor.”

On August 19 the Coordination Committee organized a press conference and invited comrades from the International Communist League to participate. But the university president directly inter-
vened to cut us off as soon as our comrade drove home the point that this murderous attack on the foreign students was an example of the racism and nationalism unleashed by the counterrevolutionary Yeltsin government’s drive to destroy the multinational Soviet workers state. Later the university president tried to get the militia to shut down our literature table, claiming that “political activity is forbidden at the school.” The militia refused to follow his orders when we stood our ground and said, “We don’t follow laws that allow racist murders and ban political activity.”

**Capitalist Counterrevolution Means Racism and Impoverishment**

Students interviewed by our comrades at Patrice Lumumba University described the devastating plunge in their living conditions in the last year. As stipends were slashed and prices soared, many students found themselves in abject poverty. But more than anything, it is the explosion of raw racism that has turned their world upside down. Selected for study at a prestigious university founded to train cadres for the Soviet Union’s Third World allies, these students were once the honored guests of Moscow. Today they are reviled for the color of their skin and fear to go out in public at all.

A Moroccan student told our comrades, “I would say the changes started in 1985 when perestroika began. Now if you are a foreigner you aren’t worth anything. They think you are the reason for the crisis. And they say this in the name of ‘democracy’!” A Jamaican student told us he had been dragged off public buses, attacked on the street and in hotel lobbies. Even high-ranking diplomats have been targets of attack. Godfrey Chanteta, a Zimbabwean diplomat, told of racial taunts and threats directed at himself and his family. He concluded, “I don’t want to learn Russian, because the more you learn the more you understand what they are saying” (Moscow Guardian, October 1991).

Only a few years ago, racist outbursts would have been regarded with almost universal contempt. The Soviet Union was a deeply integrated society of over 100 nations. The very term “nationalism” was regarded as derogatory. The Bolshevik Revolution transformed what Lenin called the tsarist “prison house of peoples” into a multinational federation. It was only the Bolsheviks’ internationalist program, asserting full and equal national rights for all peoples in order to secure the fullest unity of the workers of all nationalities, which made this possible.

However, the administrative apparatus of the Soviet state and the Bolshevik Party were subverted into a narrow nationalist, bureaucratic caste headed by Stalin, who usurped political power in 1923-24. Stalin did not overturn the economic basis of the new workers state but consolidated his regime by reversing many of the liberating political gains of the Bolshevik Revolution. Anti-Semitism was revived to go after Trotsky and the former USSR, weak counterrevolutionary governments, lacking capital, have substituted racism and nationalism as a tool to destroy the deformed workers states. “Ethnic cleansing” is the battle cry of the capitalist-restorationists, from the Serbian chauvinists and Croatian fascists to the new nationalists of the USSR, weak counterrevolutionary governments, lacking capital, have substituted racism and nationalism as a tool to destroy the deformed workers states. “Ethnic cleansing” is the battle cry of the capital­ist­restorationists, from the Serbian chauvinists and Croatian fascists to the new nationalists of the USSR, weak counterrevolutionary governments, lacking capital, have substituted racism and nationalism as a tool to destroy the deformed workers states. “Ethnic cleansing” is the battle cry of the capitalist­restorationists, from the Serbian chauvinists and Croatian fascists to the new nationalists of the USSR, weak counterrevolutionary governments, lacking capital, have substituted racism and nationalism as a tool to destroy the deformed workers states.

The ultimate “appeasement” of imperialism came with the bureaucracy’s self-destruction and the rush by yesterday’s bureaucrats, headed by Yeltsin and his cronies, to become part of a new capitalist ruling class. Across East Europe and the former USSR, weak counterrevolutionary governments, having capital, have substituted racism and nationalism as a tool to destroy the deformed workers states. “Ethnic cleansing” is the battle cry of the capitalist­restorationists, from the Serbian chauvinists and Croatian fascists to the new nationalists of the USSR, weak counterrevolutionary governments, lacking capital, have substituted racism and nationalism as a tool to destroy the deformed workers states. “Ethnic cleansing” is the battle cry of the capitalist­restorationists, from the Serbian chauvinists and Croatian fascists to the new nationalists of the USSR, weak counterrevolutionary governments, lacking capital, have substituted racism and nationalism as a tool to destroy the deformed workers states.

In Moscow, the Pamyat fascists, who Yeltsin legitimized, openly describe themselves as the “last hope of white civilization.” Yeltsin’s “democratic intelligentsia” is shot through with a Great Russian chauvinist racism. A common reaction among these “yuppies” is that the abandonment of Afghanistan was justified because “those Afghans are not worth the blood of our Russian boys.” This is the racist face behind the mask of Yeltsin’s “democratic” counterrevolution.

**For Workers Political Revolution!**

Led by the Bolsheviks, the young Soviet republic was a beacon of liberation, especially for the most oppressed peoples on earth. In a land that invented the word “pogrom,” a Jew, Yakov Sverdlov, became the first president of the Russian Republic. Feliks Dzerzhinsky, a Pole, became chief of the secret police. Imagine comparable steps for the liberation of mankind today: a victorious American workers revolution installs a black communist as president and a Hispanic woman as chief of police to clean out the remaining nests of KKK and Nazi scum.

Claude McKay, a Jamaican-born poet who addressed the Comintern’s Fourth Congress (1922) in Moscow, wrote of the incredible reception he received as a black man in Soviet Russia:

“Never in my life did I feel prouder of being an African, a black, and no mistake about it... From Moscow to Petrograd and from Petrograd to Moscow I went triumphantly from surprise to surprise, extravagantly feted on every side... I was the first Negro to arrive in Russia since the Revolution, and perhaps I was generally regarded as an omen of good luck! Yes, that was exactly what it was. I was like a black ikon.”

—A Long Way From Home (1970)

Despite the degeneration led by Stalin, the planned, collectivized Soviet economy was the basis for a society where peoples of diverse races and nationalities lived in relative equality. In 1935, Paul Robeson sent his own son off to the Soviet Union to get an education where “he would not have to undergo the discrimination his father faced in the United States.”

The Bolsheviks saw the Russian Revolution as the first step of a world revolution. They looked to extend proletarian power to Germany and the rest of Europe, and also to the East. In 1921 the Communist University for the Toilers of the East was founded in Moscow as a cadre school for internationalist revolutionaries. In Memoirs of a Chinese Revolutionary, Wang Fan-hsi recalls that after the defeat of the 1927 Chinese Revolution—a defeat sealed on Stalin’s orders that the Chinese Communists lay down their arms before the bourgeois-nationalist Kuomintang—many young exile revolutionaries in Moscow immersed themselves in the documents of the Left Opposition and went on to struggle as Trotskyist fighters for authentic communism.

Today the International Communist League is struggling to reforge a genuine Leninist-Trotskyist party to lead the working class in a fight for political power to oust the counterrevolutionary Yeltsin government. The horrifying murder of a Zimbabwean comrade at Patrice Lumumba University is one more compelling example of what the triumph of counterrevolution would have in store.
Scenes from the movie: Residents outraged by police murder trash pizzeria; right, Mookie (Spike Lee) and Sal (Danny Aiello).

"Do The Right Thing"—
A Review

New York City. From the Bronx to Brooklyn, people are lining up in the summertime heat to see Do The Right Thing, Spike Lee's new film about racism in New York. It is a riveting picture of abrasive race relations as seen in the life of one block of the Bedford-Stuyvesant neighborhood in Brooklyn.

Young Spartacus Film Review
by A. Stevens

Here people are locked in, compressed, brimming with pent-up frustration. Nothing comes from outside this block except the heat—the killer cops and a merciless sun. As the temperature rises, we see not the fabled American "melting pot" but a pressure cooker that serves up an American meltdown. A racial confrontation and then police terror spark an explosion. People who don't even see themselves as racists get caught up in it: there is no way out.

There is a genuine New York flavor to this movie—both in the stinging rawness of race-hatred and the cultural mix in this city with its ethnically diverse population of minorities and foreign-born. This vibrant and often very funny film is something of a cultural breakthrough: a restoration of humanity and compassion to black people that Hollywood has all too often typecast in racist stereotypes. Lee's idea for Do The Right Thing arose out of the racist murder of a black man by a gang of white racists in Howard Beach, Queens. Lee says: "It was 1986 and a black man was still being hunted down like a dog. Never mind Mississippi Burning: Nothing has changed in America, and you don't have to go down south to have a run-in with racist rednecks. They're here in Nueva York." Although Lee has brought a charged political issue to the big screen, Do The Right Thing is deliberately ambiguous in its message.

Do The Right Thing is dedicated to six black men and women, a roll call of victims of Lynch-mob and racist cop terror: Michael Griffith, Eleanor Bumpurs, Michael Stewart, Edmund Perry, Yvonne Smallwood, Arthur Miller. As their names rise on the screen we remember each chilling murder and also think of the new names that must now be added and also not forgotten—Richard Luke, seized in his housing project and murdered in police custody; Trevor Francis, hurled to his death from a Harlem roof. How many more have been martyred for the "crime" of being black in a racist society? Deliberately timed for release in the midst of New York City's mayoral race, this is pretty hot stuff—too hot for some blowhards of the bourgeois press.

One reviewer hysterically accused Spike Lee of having lost the election for black Democratic hopeful David Dinkins. Others sound the alarm that this film could spark race riots at a theater near you. But did the press worry when they screamed "WILDING" all over their front pages? Did any of them fear unrest when George Bush rode to office over the image of Willie Horton? Whipping up white fear and hatred is news fit to print for those who mold "public
opinion" in order to keep things as they are. But black rage? Misdirected vengeance? It's a racist double standard. As Lee said, "Any riot this summer will be because another cop killed a black kid who's innocent."

The Euro-chic judges at the Cannes Film Festival snubbed this film, declaring a movie about American racism "irrelevant." (We suspect that North African workers in France and Asian immigrant workers in Thatcher's Britain won't think so.) The critics found "Mookie," the movie's central black character, "unheroic." It is precisely the absence of heroes and angels and feel-good-Movieland endings that give this film its complexity and its viewers something to think about. Shouting "Howard Beach!" Mookie turns his wrath at the police murder of Radio Raheem (the block's baddest, most alienated and menacing youth) on Sal, the white pizzeria owner. It's not heroic. It is a very tame screenplay of the repression and rebellion that's swept America's inner cities when black youth have been driven beyond reason by trigger-happy cops.

Cultural Nationalism: Liberal Lies

A self-proclaimed "black nationalist with a camera," Lee paints a very idealized portrait of ghetto life. This block of Bed-Stuy looks good; poor but rich in spirit, laughter and innocence. Even the cops are too good to be true. The choke-hold murder of Radio Raheem is horrifying and intentionally evocative of the real-life police murder of Michael Stewart, yet here it's portrayed as an accident by two overzealous pigs, one of whom pleads, "Hey, that's enough, stop it." By contrast, the murder of Michael Stewart, like so many others, was no accident. It was 14 against one and nobody yelled "stop!" except the anguished family and angry New Yorkers in protest of this heinous crime.

It is not this "artistic license," however, that has many critics howling. All they want to know is "where's the dope?" One can appreciate Lee's bristling at racists who believe all black people are shiftless, lazy junkies who must be held personally responsible for the degradation, disease, crime and poverty that are endemic in the ghetto. Spike Lee has created a stylized neighborhood for his movie, which is of course his right. Still, Lee purports to tell "the truth, Ruth"—and this portrait is unreal. Before he could even build the sets for this movie, Lee hired 20 bow-tied heavies from Louis Farrakhan's Fruit of Islam as his private security force! They boarded up two crack houses, swept up M-16 cartridges, ran the junkies around the corner, cracked down on crime and patrolled the set round-the-clock through the entire shoot.

In this film, nobody but Mookie has a job (except for his sister, who Lee described as "in a grey area, not black or white, when it comes to politics"). Working for the white man makes Mookie the middleman between Sal's business and the black community. Mookie's unemployed friends keep reminding him to "stay black" and demand that Sal add pictures of black people to his pizzeria's "Wall of Fame." The main omission from Lee's slice of life is the black working class, a force that could lead the ghetto masses in struggle.

There is a purpose to this deceptive portrait: to construct a framework for the simultaneously liberal and reactionary politics of cultural nationalism. Certainly blacks and Hispanics caught in America's ghettos know what they've got stinks and they want out. They don't want Ed Koch's decals of flower boxes pasted over burned-out tenements, they want real housing, real jobs, real schools. So why prettify the conditions and omit the power that black people have in the working class? It's convenient if your perspective is petty-bourgeois black nationalism.

The name of Spike Lee's production company, "Forty Acres and a Mule," identifies with the aspirations of black people after the Civil War and is a reference to their freedom betrayed. It is past defeats of integrationist struggles that fuel the defiant posture and rhetoric
of nationalists who have in fact given up the fight. Pork barrel politicians and black capitalist hustlers worship the accomplished fact of segregation in order to push their own ambitions: to politically control and economically exploit “their” people, “their” market. Although this nationalist mindset permeates Spike Lee’s diary, production notes and interviews, his talent as a filmmaker transcends his politics. His camera records all players in the New York scene with compassion and complexity and gives us a richer picture.

New York City Raw

Do The Right Thing captures the ambivalence of the black community toward a Korean greengrocer and turns it into an argument against the anti-immigrant bigotry that nationalist hustlers (like Sonny Carson, or FBI fink Al Sharpton who led a march against Arab grocers) are pushing in New York City. In one scene, the three sidewalk sages argue over why they are black and unemployed while a Korean has a successful new business in the neighborhood. One hastens to remind “Coconut Sid,” a Caribbean black, that he’s not so long off the boat himself and ought to drop this Korean-hating nonsense; another rejects talk of a boycott with the announcement that “it’s Miller time” and heads over to buy a beer. When the police murder Radio Raheem, the Korean grocer is among those chasing the cop car out of the ghetto. The crowd turns on him as another “outsider” charging “much money” in the black neighborhood. He frantically swings a broom to defend his store and pleads that he is not white either, that he too is black. Fury turns to amusement and finally compassion; the crowd disperses.

Lee exposes the contradictions of race-hatred with humor, and at times with a startling blast of raw loathing. Sal’s son Pino, a racist Italian punk who can’t stand serving Pop’s pizzas to black people, ties himself in knots trying to justify his bigotry while conceding that all his entertainment idols are black: “...but not really black. They’re more than black. It’s—it’s different.” A rapid-fire montage of racial slurs slung between blacks and Italians, cops and Puerto Ricans, and the Korean to the Jewish mayor, stings the audience while they laugh. These words mean blood in NYC and everybody knows it. Lee hammers home the point of how absurd it is for everybody to hate everybody...while the cops get away with murder.

Sal (Danny Aiello) is a compelling figure in the film because he seems like such a decent guy, but when menaced, the same racist filth surges out. Moreover, that scene was a genuine, unscripted eruption. Giancarlo Esposito, who plays “Buggin’ Out,” the mover of the boycott of Sal’s in the film, says “I got the ball rolling when I called Sal a guinea bastard”:

“When Danny said ‘Nigger,’ I freaked. It finally came up for him. I knew that at some point in his life, he’d called somebody a nigger, and I went crazy because he was someone I liked. Danny was upset with himself, I was really upset with myself, and Spike was gleaming, because he’d gotten the scene.”
—Rolling Stone, 15 June

Esposito’s real-life mother is black and his father is Italian. Off camera, he and Danny Aiello chatted in Italian. On camera, they were hurling epithets at each other. Lee’s art didn’t imitate life, it became life.

The Fake Unity of Malcolm and Martin

To the incessant beat of Public Enemy’s rap tune “Fight the Power” blasted from Radio Raheem’s boom box, the recurring image in this film is a photo of Malcolm X and Martin Luther King standing together. The incoherent, stuttering “Smiley” peddles this photo up and down the block. When Sal’s pizzeria is burned to the ground, “Fight the Power” still pounds away from the ashes and Smiley pins his photo on Sal’s previously all-white, all-Italian “Wall of Fame.”

What’s the point? The photo evokes a period of militant struggle against Jim Crow segregation and racist inequality in this country. That struggle was defeated—by black misleaders who sold their souls to the Democratic Party, by brutal state repression that mowed down the most militant black fighters, and by a passive labor movement that failed to flex its muscle in a class-struggle fight for black freedom. But that photo (snapped in the one brief moment that these two opposing political leaders ever stood together) has been preserved and peddled to promote a liberal lie.

Malcolm X, who stood for militant self-defense against racist attacks and opposition to the bosses’ Democratic Party, is made more “acceptable” by association with King. King, who preached “love thy oppressor,” is packaged to make him acceptable for today’s alienated and oppressed black youth. That photo hangs in virtually every Black Studies department in every university. Malcolm X is now marketed for the illusion that you can “fight the power” while just buying into it. And that message is the conclusion of the film. There is no social struggle to combat cop terror against black America, just one word from “Mister Señor Love Daddy,” the neighborhood’s DJ and social conscience: “VOTE!”

Fight For Power

In his epilogue to Do The Right Thing, Spike Lee (who thinks his character, Mookie, is “from the Malcolm X school of thought”) writes: “In the end, justice will prevail one way or another. There are two paths to that. The way of King, or the way of Malcolm.... I know who I’m down with.” The film ends with two quotes. Martin Luther King espouses nonviolence. Malcolm X objects to self-
defense being mislabeled as “violence”; he rightly calls it “intelligence.”

It’s a terrible abuse of a terrific quote from Malcolm X. Malcolm told the truth about the need for black self-defense and warned against any illusions in the bosses’ police or the bosses’ political parties to defend black rights. But burning down a pizzeria has nothing to do with self-defense, and the real powers that keep blacks locked at the bottom of a capitalist social system lie far from “Sal’s Famous” pizzeria in Bed-Stuy. Herein lies the danger of the purposely ambiguous message of *Do The Right Thing*.

In a recent *Penthouse* (August 1989) interview Spike Lee said the way out is that “blacks have to build our own economic base, own our businesses, be self-sufficient.” And, he added in a talk show on Black Educational Television, when blacks are not just consumers but owners, then they can put up the pictures they want in their shops. So in the end, what triumphs is accommodation with the racist Pino’s views: blacks should stay in their own neighborhoods and Italianists in theirs. What crap! In a racist society, *separate means unequal*. The myth of black capitalism is a hoax, and furthermore a naked one, which anyone can see by just looking at the racial composition of the ruling class in this country: not one black CEO in the top 1,000 corporations.

Yet “black capitalism” schemes such as pushed by Jesse Jackson tell black people the lie that they should look to Coca-Cola for liberation, rather than to united class struggle together with white, Hispanic and Asian working people against their common enemy.

Lee provides the wrong answer to the question of why there are no black-owned businesses in a discussion about the Korean grocer in the film. His sidewalk sage concludes: “Either dem Koreans are geniuses or we Blacks are dumb.”

Black people are not simply another ethnic group in this society or just the most oppressed among many. Since the victory of Northern capitalism in the Civil War and the defeat of Reconstruction, the black population has been compacted as a *race-color caste*: last-hired, first-fired and segregated at the bottom of society. A caste system means social mobility only for some—Koreans, even light-skinned Hispanics can move up, but keeping black people down is a pillar of this capitalist system.

But society is not fundamentally divided between owners and consumers. There are *producers* of the wealth who have been systematically denied the fruits of their labor. It is the integrated working class that has the social weight and power to break the bosses’ rule. To see that, Spike Lee would have to cast his camera off the microcosm of one ghetto block. But not too far. Even a glimpse of the local subway at rush hour would do. Tens of thousands of black men and women, many of them unionized hospital workers and public employees, teachers, utility employees and service workers, are a key component in what makes New York run. And getting them to work every morning are the transportation workers, who showed their power in 1980 in a big strike that left the Brooklyn Heights yuppies limping over the bridge to Wall Street.

Genuine emancipation of black people from their oppression in this racist capitalist society, making racial equality a reality rather than a dream, will begin with socialist revolution. There is no other road to black freedom. To lead that fight, we need a party—an integrated, class-struggle workers party that will mobilize labor and minorities in defense of the beleaguered ghettos. The bosses’ Democratic Party is the main political means used to tie the oppressed to their exploiters. We need a workers party to lead all the oppressed in a fight for a workers government. To this we in the Spartacist League are dedicated.
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