BLACK INTERNATIONALISM AND TRANSNATIONAL AFRICA

Roderick Bush

Although I grew up in the Jim Crow South during the 1950s, for a variety of biographical reasons, I bypassed the civil rights movement—or it bypassed me. For this reason, Dr. King's great testament to the true meaning of our American creed in his 1963 "I Have A Dream" speech did not resonate with me. Although I routinely said the Pledge of Allegiance at school and other public events, I did not feel a special allegiance to the United States. Although there was very little I understood about politics at the time, having been schooled intensively and daily in the outlook of Booker T. Washington, I knew that we Black folk were second-class citizens, or even barely citizens. I was not unusual in this regard: It seemed a general sentiment, and some were quite militant about it. I did not understand the larger ramifications of that position then, but I would soon come to understand that I, too, am Transnational Africa.

As a youth, I did not begin to think seriously about social and political issues until the Black Power movement became a hegemonic force among African-American youths during the late 1960s and after I had joined so many others in the migratory trek to the urban north. The patriotic sensitivity that developed within the civil rights movement was not a part of my experience. My intellectual development had been intimately entwined with the development of Black social thought during the Black Power period, and both my politics and almost all of my scholarly work stems from this fact.

Growing up in the Jim Crow South in the 1950s, the parameters of my aspirations stemmed from the religious views of my family and community and not from any idea about the so-called American Dream—even when I self-righteously rebelled against what I then felt to be the hypocrisy that I saw among some in my church and became something of an atheist. The idea of being my brother's keeper was the foundation of my value system, despite my disaffection with the church during my teenage years and early adulthood. It is ironic that this position is what made the Marxist-inflected Black radicalism make sense to me during the late 1960s, and later enabled me to return to an intellectual reengagement with the Black Church. The framework of the Black Power movement meant that I initially rejected those Blacks aligned with the Communist Party USA (CPUSA) during the 1960s, mostly because they seemed to reject the militancy I thought was necessary and in some sense seemed a variant of the timid liberalism that opposed the Black Power movement.

The specific form in which class analysis became part of my intellectual stance was influenced by the manner in which I came to understand race and class during my life. As a resident of Florida in the 1950s, the only thing that I knew about the white world was the smiling faces that I saw on TV, which contrasted starkly with the snarling arrogance of so much of my very few encounters with whites. For Black people living in this kind of environment required an ongoing series of humiliating and self-effacing interactions with whites. You were required to say "yes, sir" or "no, sir" to all white males of any age, and "yes, maam" or "no, maam" to all white females, for example. If you offended a white person, you or your family could be targeted for retribution with a range of activities that threatened your family's livelihood and possibly someone's life. This kind of survival strategy might at times be simply a prudent adaptation and sometimes an internalization of white supremacy. So while it seemed, on a daily level, simply a way of interacting that most people adjusted to, for some, the internalization of white supremacist ideology exacted psychic costs. This meant for me that white supremacy was a natural order that I did not question, and when I moved from Florida to Rochester, New York, at age 13, the de facto segregation that existed there and the idea that whites were superior seemed natural.

When I moved to Rochester in 1959, I attended an inner-city school composed almost entirely of the children of the working class, about 50/50 Black and white (with a handful of Puerto Ricans). The few middle-class students were all white. Rochester's Black middle class was extremely tiny. I did not know any of them until some years later when, after leaving the city for college, I returned and began to get involved in

some of the networking programs, which brought the Rochester's Black college students together. When I was in high school, there was little encouragement for us to go to college. I did not think seriously about going until a recruiter from the historically Black Howard University came to our school and asked for an interview because I had good grades.

So my idea that white supremacy was part of the natural order of things was reinforced by the almost perfect correlation of race and class in Rochester, so different from the South where a Black middle class had to be developed to operate the "separate but equal" institutions. In the South, I had known nothing about the civil rights struggle going on at the time. We were taught mainly about Booker T. Washington in the public schools. The education system in Rochester offered even less to its Black students. Education, except for a few exceptional teachers, seemed totally unrelated to how I understood the world and what I would do in the world. But I spent hours and hours in the public library and established something of an intellectual life outside of school.

In 1963, when I was about to graduate from high school, a close friend who was a leader of the Junior NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People) in Rochester asked if I planned to attend the March on Washington. Why would I do such a thing, I asked. He said I should go because whites thought they were better than us and thus deserved more of the good things in life. I thought for a moment and replied, "Aren't they better than us?" At that time, I ranked third in my senior class, above all but one of the 90 or so white students in the class of 150.

I saw Howard University as a place where I would get an education that would enable me to get a good job. I was a child of the working class at a university whose traditions were mainly those of the Black middle class, the aspiring Black bourgeoisie. I did not understand class as an analytic construct at that time, so I simply refrained from involvement in the many historic actions going on at the university at that time because I had to get myself together first.

But the Black Freedom struggle was rising to the center of public awareness, and Howard University was something of a center of the movement. Despite the fierce pursuit of my individual aspirations, these events and the public debate about them began to influence my thinking and forced me to think about what all of this meant for who I was. While at Howard, I observed as the militants of Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) came to our campus and to my sociology class to inform us about the struggle in the South and recruit people to go to Mississippi to fight for civil rights and democracy. I was inspired by their

courage, but I could not see myself making such a commitment. I was at Howard when the Dean of Students refused to crown the homecoming queen because she wore her hair in an Afro style. I was there when the university fired Dr. Nathan Hare for proselytizing among students and pushing a Black Power/Black Pride line. I was there when students chased Selective Service Director General Lewis B. Hershey from the stage of a university auditorium shouting "Hell no, we won't go," and "America is the Black man's battleground." I was there when the students increasingly called for Howard to become an exclusively Black university.

During my junior year at Howard University, I took a class with the great poet and literature critic Sterling Brown. He was the one who put me on the path toward becoming an intellectual. I only knew that I liked to read and I did not quite know what it meant to be an intellectual. One of my roommates at Howard was the son of the president of the NAACP. He often joked about how "culturally deprived" I was (a term that resembled the social-science language about the culture of poverty). I was deeply offended by his teasing but internalized it, until I met Sterling Brown. Since I believed fervently in the biblical injunction that "the last shall be first," I was shocked by the condescending visions of the poor that I found in much of the social-science literature. Until my encounter with Brown, these ideas had shattered my self-esteem and, for a while, I felt totally off-balance among my middle-class classmates at Howard. The class with Brown enabled me to find my own voice and my self-confidence was restored, but I was still mostly focused on my own career goals.

After I graduated from Howard in 1967 and entered a doctoral program in clinical psychology at the University of Kansas, I entered the white world for the first time as an adult. Although I thought my status as a doctoral student would enable me to be viewed as an exception, and that I would be judged by the content of my credentials, while looking for an apartment I ran smack up against racism in housing. I was humiliated and outraged. At the same time, the student movement began to gather steam everywhere. There was a takeover of the administration building at my alma mater. The insurgents demanded that Howard University become a Black University rather than a Negro University turning out Black students who thought like whites. Black students at Columbia University took over an administration building in protest against the university's expansionist activities in the neighboring Harlem community, and white students from Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) entered the strike in support of the Black students and in opposition to the university's role in promoting the war against Vietnam.

A veteran of movement, Leonard Harrison had moved to Lawrence, Kansas while his wife pursued a Ph.D. in history. He had a job as the

director of a community center in Lawrence and since I was a doctoral student, I was asked to be on the board of the center along with Frances Horowitz (a professor of psychology at the University who later became president of the City University of New York (CUNY) Graduate Center).

Students at the University of Kansas were influenced by the stirring of the Black Power movement and demanded that the university select a Black student to be on the university's Pom-Pom Squad (cheerleaders). This action was the basis for forming the Black Student Union at the University of Kansas (KU). Off campus, some of us joined with Leonard and Alferdteen Harrison and other members of the community in the Movement for Afro-American Unity (modeled after Malcolm X's Organization of Afro-American Unity). These were heady times. I vividly remember sitting in Leonard and Alferdteen Harrison's living room during a meeting of MAAU and solemnly dedicating my life to the liberation of my people. I was 23 years old, and felt that I had finally come home. (At the time, there was a saying among the youth that you could never trust anyone over 30. I really worried about turning 30, but by the time I was 30, there was no turning back. And I have never really looked back.) My intellectual itinerary can be understood best as a consequence of this peculiar biography, and thus much of my intellectual work has focused on the issue of Black nationalism, or, more precisely, "nationalist consciousness." While this focus has drawn criticism because of imprecision in defining who is a nationalist and those who would like a more forceful criticism of the nationalists, this focus seemed appropriate to me given the pervasiveness of nationalist consciousness among African-Americans. Biographically, I come mostly out of the Left nationalist tradition (the Movement for Afro-American Unity), which was loosely affiliated with the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM); the Congress of African People; the Student Organization for Black Unity/Youth Organization for Black Unity, initiated by some SNCC cadre); and the Revolutionary Workers League, a Black Marxist organization that resulted from the merger of several prominent Left nationalist formations and no relation to a currently existing organization with that name.

My sense at the time was that there were tensions in the manner in which the Left nationalists sought to use third internationalist methods of work and ideological traditions to establish a workable guide to action. It should not have required that we discard so much of what our people had learned in their long travail in the wilderness of the American cauldron, so that our people could no longer recognize us. We needed an approach that maintained a revolutionary stance, but which used plain language and united with ordinary folk, learning from them the practicalities of

building a revolutionary movement. My response to this dilemma was to locate a tendency that had come out of the women's movement, which had built a substantial presence among the Black and Latino working class in the San Francisco-Bay Area and among intellectuals and movements in Africa, the Caribbean, and Latin America. Theoretically, this tendency was associated with the dependency theorists and the world-systems analysis that came out of intellectuals and militants working in Africa and Latin America.

In 1985, I traveled to Addis Ababa to attend a meeting of the African Association of Political Science as a representative of the journal *Contemporary Marxism*. When I got off the plane, I was so overwhelmed by my homecoming that I bent down and kissed the ground. I did this without forethought or self-consciousness, a curious gesture for a Marxist, indeed. I still did not identify at all with the United States of America. Despite my involvement in Marxist politics, I learned my nationalism from Malcolm X, and I guess I never unlearned his stance. Malcolm X was, most certainly, Transnational Africa.

The demise of the movements in the 1980s during the so-called crisis of Marxism sent me back to academia, specifically to State University of New York (SUNY) at Binghamton to deepen my study of the work of Immanuel Wallerstein and the body of work known as world-systems analysis. Although Wallerstein was certainly the most widely respected American social scientist outside of the United States, he addressed much of his work to the militants involved in the struggle for a just, democratic, and egalitarian world. In this vein, he argued that the strategy of the family of antisystemic movements (Communists, Social-Democrats, and national liberation movements) had failed, and this would lead to widespread disillusionment and the abandonment of the movements by many of their militants. The most important thing to do at this time, he argued, was to understand what had gone wrong so that we could engage in the process of rethinking strategy. While I had been skeptical of this position in the early 1980s, I came increasingly to share Wallerstein's views by 1986–1987. SUNY Binghamton faculty also included Terence K. Hopkins and Giovanni Arrighi, whose work in the historical social sciences seemed at par with that of Wallerstein. Significantly, all three scholars developed the foundation of their outlook during the time that they spent in Africa learning from the national liberation movements and intellectuals there. That is why I returned to SUNY Binghamton in January 1988.

In my first book upon returning, I sought to revive and assess the analytic foundations of the Black radical intellectual tradition and to connect with other intellectual traditions. *We are Not What We Seem: Black*

Nationalism and Class Struggle n the American Century sought to establish that the appropriate unit of analysis was a historical social system larger than the United States, but that the hegemonic position of the United States exponentially magnified the potential social power of African-American social movements. The evolution of the racial order after the abolition of slavery was inextricably intertwined with processes of class formation. That is why Black activists and scholar activists were able to speak so clearly to the logic of a struggle for human rights over civil rights, a clearly universalistic position (often in nationalist clothing) that transcended the boundaries of race, class, and nation.

But the abandonment of global liberalism of the post-World War II period by the declining U.S. hegemony attempting to halt its decline, led to the revival of a mean-spirited and racist discourse, which disparaged the humanity of the inner-city poor and those middle-class youths who identified with them. When the liberal and Left liberal intellectuals attempted to adjust their presentations to the new orthodoxy, I was outraged by what seemed to me to be a sellout of the ground we had gained during the reform period of the 1960s and 1970s. The very angry tone of my work during this period was a response to this cultural warfare waged against the most disadvantaged section of our population. In the face of attack, I united with my community's defiance and despaired that anyone would give an inch in this battle in the interest of purely intellectual fads, such as antiessentialism.

Both liberal and Marxist readers of that book viewed my defense of Black nationalism as a defense of essentialist racial categories. What I had intended to do was to show that the nationalisms of the oppressed often were much broader in vision than the false universalism of the liberal Left.

Following Immanuel Wallerstein, Anibal Quijano, and others, I argue that the overarching framework for our analysis should be the modern world system, a capitalist world economy that emerged in the sixteenth century with a Western European core and an American periphery. The peripheralization of the Americas involved the displacement, dispersion, and destruction of the indigenous people, and the formation of a coerced labor force consisting mainly of enslaved Africans. Racism is thus constitutive of our historical social system in providing a pattern of social distinctions between the conquering people and the conquered people, naturalized in the notion of race. This pattern of distinction was used to categorize people in the pan-European world as superior and those from the extra-European world as inferior, with Africans and indigenous people at the bottom of the social scale. After the colonization of America, Quijano argues, the expansion of European colonialism

to the rest of the world and the subsequent constitution of Europe as a new identity required the elaboration of a Eurocentric perspective of knowledge—what Quijano views as "a theoretical perspective on the idea of race as a naturalization of colonial relations between Europeans and non-Europeans."[1]

Blacks have long understood that Pan-European racism is the Achilles heel of the modern world system, and that the demographic situation of the United States, with its large, strategically located populations of color, is a key locus of struggle for a more democratic, egalitarian, and just world order, crosscutting the geographical division of labor between the pan-European and dark worlds. The revolutionary nationalism of the New Negro Movement's Race First activists was the ideology of a group that saw itself as outcasts in the land of their residence, both those who were descendents of native-born parents and those whose parents had emigrated from other parts of the African Diaspora. Radicals that came to the fore during and after the first Great Migration viewed themselves politically as part of world anticolonial and anticapitalist forces. They belonged to Pan-African social strata in world society, though some did not see themselves as a part of that emerging political tendency. They came to prominence in a preexisting political community dominated by the towering figure of Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, who nevertheless was viewed by the young radicals as part of the "Old Crowd Negroes" (due in part to his "Close Ranks" editorial in *The Crisis*).[2]

We might trace the development of institutionalized Black Power among African-Americans to the late eighteenth-century formation of the Free African Society and the African Methodist Episcopal Church, to be crystallized in the National Negro Convention Movement from 1830–1861. George Padmore describes Du Bois as the father of Pan-Africanism, who differed from Marcus Garvey in the sense that his Pan-Africanism was viewed as an aid in the promotion of national self-determination among Africans under African leadership, for the benefit of Africans. Garvey envisioned Africa as a place for colonization by Western Negroes who would be under his personal domination. However, Padmore readily saw, as did Du Bois, that the Garvey movement was a people's movement rather than a movement of intellectuals.

When Leopold Senghor, Gatson Monnerville, and Aime Cesaire addressed the president of France and others on the 100th anniversary of the abolition of slavery on April 27, 1948, all three used the memory of slavery, revolution, and emancipation to oppose colonial practices, despite the official posture of French tolerance and benevolence. Monnerville and Senghor wanted the government to honor the tradition of abolition by using the same principles in the present. Cesaire, on the other hand,

viewed plantation slavery, colonial violence, and anti-Black racism as part and parcel of the modern French political order, and inscribed in its social relations.[3] Racism was part of the rationality of the French social order, not an irrational aberration. Cesaire did not view 1848 as the victory of enlightened republicanism over colonial backwardness; instead the radical currents to the republican tradition had fallen victim to the revolution's dominant bourgeois-colonial elements.

During the 1920s, a heterogeneous community of Antillean and African intellectuals, professionals, and labor organizers consolidated in Paris. They debated one another, produced journals, and out of the associations emerged the Negritude movement in the late 1930s. Aime Cesaire was a member of these groups, which sought to join demands for political equality with demands for cultural recognition. Cesaire sought to reconcile humanism and nativism. After the liberation of Martinique, Cesaire became an advocate of political assimilation and was one of the architects of the 1946 law transforming Martinique, Guadeloupe, Guiana, and Reunion into formal French Departments. Frantz Fanon, who worked on Cesaire's successful campaign to become a member of the French National Assembly, later would become Cesaire's student. Cesaire, paradoxically, was an unrelenting critic of the colonial order, and a French political official. A new generation of Antillean activists, therefore, both celebrated him and criticized him. This was, of course, not unlike the position of some members of the American Black Power generation after some of their political successes.

Bandung and the Historical Grounding of Black Liberation in the Postwar Era

Between 1947, when India won independence, and 1963, when Kenya and Zanzibar won independence, virtually the entire dark world was able to free itself from the bounds of colonialism. This is a time when one might say that the specter of national liberation haunted the imperialist powers. This process was facilitated by the weakening of the imperialist nations in Europe, which made resistance to imperialist power more feasible. Though the threat of a united front against the colonial and neocolonial powers brandished by the Bandung Conference of 1955 did not materialize, the decolonizing process that did materialize represented the rise of the dark world, which had been the coin in the trade of a number of African-American leaders from Du Bois to Garvey to Elijah Muhammad to Malcolm X.[4]

In 1947, Du Bois argued before the newly formed United Nations Commission on Human Rights that prolonged policies of segregation and discrimination had involuntarily welded the mass of Black people

into a nation within a nation with its own schools, churches, hospitals, newspapers, and many business enterprises. The United States, of course, denied the reality asserted by Du Bois, but with the location of the United Nations in New York City, the problem of the African-American people had become internationalized.

In the decade before the April 1955 meeting of 29 nations at Bandung, Indonesia, millions of people emerged from the shadow of European colonialism through the pursuit of anticolonial social struggles. India, Burma, Indonesia, Egypt, and China were among those countries that achieved independence during this period. The 29 countries meeting at Bandung represented more than half of the world's population at that time—1.4 billion people.[5]

Richard Wright (living in exile in Paris), Adam Clayton Powell, and Carl Rowan were prominent African-Americans who attended the conference. Neither Paul Robeson nor Du Bois were able to attend because of travel restrictions imposed on them by the U.S. State Department. Coverage of the conference in the United States was limited and negative in tone. *Newsweek* magazine characterized the conference as "an Afro-Asian combination turned by [C]ommunists against the West." The U.S. Black media commentary on the conference was celebratory. The meeting at Bandung was deemed the most important international meeting in the history of the world with incalculable implications for Blacks in the United States and throughout the African Diaspora, and for colored people everywhere.[6] The 1956 First World Congress of Black Writers and Artists in Paris was a watershed event in closing the gap that had existed between the various circuits of Pan-Africanism: the British colonial subject in Africa and the Caribbean, the French colonial subjects in Africa and the Caribbean, and the African descended subjects in the United States. Alioune Diop, editor of *Presence Africaine*, called for unity of those convened, whether they believed in God or were atheists, whether Christians, Moslems, or Communists."[7] Aime Cesaire, a member of the French Communist Party from Martinique, added to Diop's frame that "There are two ways to lose oneself: by segregation within the walls of the particular or by dilution in the 'universal'".[8] For Cesaire the universal is one that is "rich with the particular, rich with all the particulars, a deepening and a coexistence of the particulars."[9]

This was a time when nationalist movements were taking root everywhere. Wallerstein points out that the independence of the Indian subcontinent had profound consequences for English-speaking Africa. For French-speaking Africa, the struggle in Indochina was a formative experience, which transformed the realm of the politically possible. The Bandung Conference was an assertion of strength and identity in reaction

to European colonialism. It transformed the sense of solidarity among the colonized into the Afro-Asia concept, which Wallerstein argues would play a role for ten years to come. In Africa, this new sense of solidarity brought together North African and Sub-Saharan African states, as well as French-speaking and English-speaking Africans.

Nikhil Singh points out that at the first Congress of Black Artists and Writers, Aime Cesaire generated considerable controversy among the African-American delegation when he argued that "even our American brothers, as a result of racial discrimination, find themselves within a great modern nation in an artificial situation that can only be understood in reference to colonialism." Included in Cesaire's definition of colonial were colonial, semi-colonial, and para-colonial situations, which encompassed independent nations like Haiti, racial minority populations such as U.S. Blacks, and people suffering under colonial rule.[10]

Du Bois and Robeson had been unable to attend the Congress because the State Department would not allow them to travel. Du Bois sent a letter to Congress, describing why he could not attend and cautioning, "Any Negro-American who travels abroad today must either not discuss race conditions in the United States or say the sort of thing which our State Department wishes the world to believe."

So there was furious debate about the conditions of African-Americans, and the degree of racial progress in the United States, with the U.S. delegates pretty much taking up the positions Du Bois had predicted. Richard Wright was an exception. He was silent on the colonialism issue in the United States, but unleashed a ferocious attack on African culture as backward and primitive.

But Cesaire argued against the valorization of European culture and for a different idea of the universal, a universal that is rich with all that is particular that exists, and seeks to deepen those particulars, which will coexist with one another. The concept of a postcolonial era assumes that the dismantling of the official apparatus of colonialism is the same as the abolition of colonialism, or as others would say, the "coloniality of power."[11] Colonialism required a discourse in which everything that is good, advanced, and civilized is measured in European terms.

Magubane pointed out that during the post–World War II period, we saw the rise of a collision between the historical treatment of Blacks in the United States and the attitude that the United States had toward an independent Africa and the Black world as a whole. One cannot understand the relationship of African-Americans to Africans without understanding the historical development of that relationship.

Magubane argued that Blacks could not have a sense of security in a world that degraded and rejected them. Given the negative political psychology

that pervaded much of the upper strata of African-American society (such as it was), attitudes toward Africa reflected this degradation. Blacks initially expressed their interests in Africa in terms of their duty to regenerate Africa and Africans. For Magubane, Ethiopianism, Pan-Africanism, and Garveyism all include sentiments, which can only be explained in terms of the nature of white hegemony over African-Americans.

This, I would argue, is true of what Wilson Moses refers to as the classical age of Black Nationalism, which ends with the demise of the Garvey movement. However, the Race First radicals in the New Negro Movement eventually would set African America on a new course. By the 1920s, the impact of those intellectuals profoundly affected by Du Bois, had, in turn, transformed the doctor in ways that moved him far beyond the Fabian Socialism (social imperialism) of his turn-of-the-century persona.

By the 1960s, Black radicals represented ably by Malcolm X, had come quite a long way. Magubane explores how Malcolm X views two opposing strategies for African-American advancement and the implications for a changing sense of identity. Though Malcolm was the individual most capable of grabbing the spotlight, he was not alone on this issue.

In 1959, Hansberry told CBS News correspondent Mike Wallace, "that the sweep of national independence movements globally was inextricably linked to the political initiatives of Black Americans engaged in similar, and sometimes overlapping, struggles for freedom, full citizenship, and self-determination."[12] According to Fanon Che Wilkins, this stance dates from the early period of the civil rights movement. In this way, Wilkins shows that the Cold War did not obliterate the Black Left, but it fostered a split between them and centrist liberals within the NAACP. Wilkins does not accept the assertions of Horne, Plummer, and Von Eschen that the unanimity of anticolonial opinion among African-Americans during the early 1940s was shattered by the Cold War, resulting in cutting off 1960s activists in the SNCC and the Black Panther Party from an older generation of Black radicals who had been engaged in anticapitalist and anti-imperialist critiques of American and European imperialism. Wilkins argues, as do Ian Roxborough Smith and others, that a significant presence of Black Left figures from the 1940s facilitated an intergenerational exchange of ideas and practices, which built on the legacy of Black internationalism. Lorraine Hansberry was part of that contingent during the 1950s until her death in 1965. During this period—which preceded SNCC's assumption of the Black Power stance— Hansberry "remained committed to an anticolonial/ anti-imperialist political project that challenged the supremacy of American capitalism and advocated for some variant of socialist development at the height of McCarthyism and beyond."[13]

While Hansberry, like her contemporary Frantz Fanon, anticipated the dangers of neocolonialism, which would confront the newly decolonized states of Africa and Asia, their views were reflective of the radical spirit of the 1955 Bandung Conference. Malcolm X's position was slightly different; however, since he anticipated that the decolonization of African-America would shatter the power of the U.S. hegemony, and bring about the end of white world supremacy.

Blacks in the Belly of the Beast: The Chickens Coming Home to Roost

The language of the "Belly of the Beast" has its modern origins during those halcyon days of the world revolution of the 1960s and 1970s, when oppressed people everywhere seemed to be on the march. The power of the people seemed to be on the rise everywhere and seemed invincible. The language of liberation passed from revolutionary centers in Ghana, Guinea, China, Cuba, Algeria, Indonesia, and Vietnam to young people in the imperialist countries, including the Pan-African social strata that overlapped with what some called a "Third World within" the imperialist countries, especially the United States.

Nkrumah, Mao, Lin Bao, Fanon, Rodney, Che, Cesaire, Cabral, Nyerere, and Toure all spoke eloquently about the forces within the "Belly of the Beast" who were implacable foes of imperialism, not simply as solidarity movements, but as part of the revolutionary wave sweeping the world system.

My point here is really about how we understand social time so that we can properly situate both the era of social struggle to which I refer, and the era of neoliberal globalization. We need to understand the plurality of social time, such that we do not fall prey to the misleading sense of the event, because such immediate judgments really constitute "dust in our eyes."[14] Following the same logic, it is also important that we understand the long historical trajectory of capitalism, as a system with a beginning, a long period of "normal" operation, and an ending. This logic also should be applied to the rise and fall of hegemonic imperialisms, and the trajectory of white world supremacy.

The wave of revolutionary struggle that started in the middle of the 1960s constituted a break from the geoculture of the period from 1848 to 1968. In response to the working-class struggles of the 1840s, when working-class movements that were implacable foes of capitalism came to the fore, the ruling classes evolved a strategy of compromise by making concessions designed to reintroduce these movements into the logic of the system. Such concessions were made only when movements obtained

significant strength such that simple repression would only deepen their footprint on history. The strategy of co-opting, or what some have called the social democratic compromise, has meant that movements that rose from an antisystemic logic, once in power, would continue the existing system rather than destroy this system as Jacques Depelchin argued at length in a presentation titled, "Thinking Through African History in the Spirit of 1957: Never Claiming Easy Victories (a la Cabral[15])," presented at a conference at SUNY Binghamton titled, "Black Liberation in the Spirit of 1957."

I fear that we are often so constrained by our focus on the nation-state and episodic time (the short term) that we have difficulty understanding the nature of transforming a world system of capitalism and not just taking political power in one country. As we all know, Marx and Engels argued that the transition to socialism would take place where capitalism was most developed (advanced) has not comported with our social reality. It seems to me that Lenin's strategy of "the weak link" was a recognition that this is what could be achieved at the time. But we should be wary of turning Lenin's insight about the vulnerability of the weak link into simply a tactic, while maintaining the idea that the culture of the "advanced capitalist countries" is the most fertile soil for the rise of proletarian socialism. This seems to me to miss what seems to be the clear lesson of the 1960s and 1970s. The break with the geoculture of historical capitalism was not a gift of the workers' movement of the Pan-European world to dominated people and areas, but stemmed from a dramatic acceleration of the pace of the rise of the dark world, where a pushback had been under way since the nineteenth century against the 500-year history of white world supremacy. Can we visualize Transnational Africa as an analog to Lenin's weak link, but as a key link to the transformation of historical capitalism toward a more just, democratic, and egalitarian world order?

While we have clearly been chastened by the political defeat of the national liberation movements that came to power since World War II, we need to maintain our tactical sensibility to understand what these defeats mean. It might be important to look at these defeats as part of the juncture of the collapse of European socialism and the national liberation movements, which I will argue is, in reality, the collapse of liberalism.

We also have tended to be so bamboozled by the Washington consensus or neoliberal globalization that we have lost sight of the clear decline of American power, and the drift of historical capitalism itself toward a structural crisis. Is this not what all of the macho bombast, shouting, and warmongering is about? We know that the Project for A New American Century was set up long before the September 11, 2001, attack on the

World Trade Center and the Pentagon. We know, in fact, that they were looking for a pretext to justify the use of military intervention to intimidate anyone who would dare challenge U.S. power in the international arena.[16]

The 1945–1970 surge in the rise of insurgent forces on a world scale exhausted the global liberalism that had been a product of U.S. hegemony. The increased power of the oppressed in the United States and other core states, and the increase in the power of oppressed people in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, constituted a change in the social power of the oppressed and destabilized the entire world system, a state of unruliness that the system could not tolerate.

The reformist liberalism of global capitalism could no longer make concessions on the scale that was being demanded. One by one, the window of opportunity closed for oppressed people everywhere. The epoch of socio-democratic compromise had reached its limits. The national liberation component of this social compact at a global level lacked the leverage of a powerful state to enforce the compact. The intensification of Pan-European racism within the core states turned the white working classes of the imperialist countries against their internal minorities and cemented a conservative alliance whose leading political lights were Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan.

The era of development that had marked U.S. hegemony was no more, and that meant the end of the road for both the European socialist states and the nationalist movements that had come to power in the periphery of the capitalist system and that, by the 1980s, had to succumb to the policies of structural adjustment. But it also began to close the options for the core states of the capitalist world, reflected in books such as Frances Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward's *The Breaking of the American Social Compact.* The political logic in the core states was quite simple: a ratcheting up of Pan-European racism against both internal minorities and the bulk of the world's lower strata, located in the extra-European world. This conservative wind also brought about a ratcheting up of racism's favorite partner, the patriarchy.

Neoliberal globalization, or the Washington consensus, seemed invulnerable, but its feet of clay were obvious to some. Wallerstein, who had pointed out that U.S. hegemony had started to wane after 1970, began to argue—quite against the grain of much of the left—that capitalism was entering a structural crisis. He cautioned those who argued that the demise of the European socialist states was an indication of the strength of the United States and the capitalist system. He also argued that the twentieth century had witnessed a slow but significant growth in the pushback of the extra-European world against Pan-European hegemony.

All of these were elements in the demise of capitalism as a world system. These would be difficult times, but the world as we had known it was in irrevocable decline, and the hollow triumphalism of some sections of the ruling class, and the punditocracy constituted chasing an illusion.

This illusion has been fostered by the liberal and conservative interpretations of the 1980s victory of Thatcher and Reagan in the political domain, and the 1989–1991 collapse of the European socialist states. Despite whatever criticisms we had of those regimes, we did not wish to see their collapse contribute to what seemed to be the political fate of the left and left-of-center forces by the conservative juggernaut.

Though we were confronted by a significant change in world politics and in the pace of capital accumulation, we also were in the midst of an unprecedented demographic transformation that was changing the face of the earth right before our eyes. While the world revolution of 1968 indicates, for Wallerstein, the onset of the structural crisis of capitalism, the period 1967–1973 also represented a shift in the capitalist world economy, from the most dramatic expansion in the history of the capitalist system to stagnation. It also was the period that, for many, marked the limits of the social compact that had provided internal stability to the imperialist countries and the core states since 1945. In contrast to the reigning orthodoxy of the core left, it was the political force of the oppressed on the periphery of the capitalist system, including the internal peripheries within the core states, which clarified the dimensions of the struggle that must be waged against dominant capital. That demographic transformation was a consequence of what some scholars refer to as the restructuring of the international division of labor. This restructuring was a response to the increasing power of the working class in the core states, especially those sectors of the working class that were part of the internally colonized populations. The Hart-Celler Immigration Reform Act of 1965 abolished restrictions on immigration based on national origin. This act was designed to bring new, low-wage workers into the core states, and it opened immigration to colonial subjects of the Pan-European world in an unprecedented fashion, dramatically increasing the flow of these immigrants to the United States.

Between 1880 and 1920, 24.5 million immigrants were absorbed into the U.S. population, mostly from southern and eastern Europe. From 1965 to 2000, 25 million people migrated to the United States, primarily from Latin America, Asia, and the Caribbean. Europeans, who accounted for the majority of the immigrants before 1965, now account for less than 15 percent of immigrants to the United States. The concept of assimilation, which played such an important role in understanding European immigrants, does not necessarily apply to these new immigrants, who

hail from countries that had been colonies, neo-colonies, or semi-colonies of the Pan-European world.[17] This demographic shift makes it all the more important to understand the nature of the populations who found themselves within the borders or political jurisdiction of the imperialist countries because they had no other choice if they wished to maximize their life chances and that of their community of origin. I want to move now to the argument for the continued relevance, or the central significance of a framework that emphasizes internal colonialism or a Third World within.[18]

Let me set the stage for that argument by putting into context what I argued earlier about the manner in which the 1960s revolution shattered the liberal geoculture, which had dominated the movements against historical capitalism since 1848. This is an issue of accumulation of forces.

On August 8, 1963, Mao Zedong responded to a request made by Robert F. Williams, the exiled former president of the Monroe, N.C., NAACP, for support of the African-American struggle against racial discrimination. Williams had fled to exile in Cuba after calling for his followers to arm themselves against the Ku Klux Klan when the local police refused to protect them. Mao recounted that he had been asked for this statement twice and now spoke on behalf of the Chinese people. He called for the support of the people of the world to stand in solidarity with the Afro-American people. He argued that it is a "handful of imperialists, headed by the United States, and their supporters, the reactionaries in different countries, who are oppressing, committing aggression against, and menacing the overwhelming majority of the nations and peoples of the world."[19] He expressed confidence that the African-American people would prevail in their just struggle, and concluded: "The evil system of colonialism and imperialism arose and throve with the enslavement of Negroes and the trade in Negroes, and it will surely come to its end with the complete emancipation of the black people."[20]

Just four months later, on December 1, 1963, Malcolm X would give his last speech as a member of the Nation of Islam, focusing on the March on Washington, which had also been the context of Chairman Mao's statement. This speech was titled, "God's Judgment of White America," though it is frequently referred to as "The Chickens Are Coming Home to Roost."[21] Malcolm X forcefully articulated the depths of the contradiction of that period—when the United States stood poised at the pinnacle of its might and prestige, but was facing a world in rebellion against white Western hegemony. And while the United States attempted to woo the nations of the dark world as a true friend who itself had fought a war of national liberation against Europeans, in truth it was

now in a position of being the police of the historical system dominated by western capitalism. So while the United States may have been basking in the public relations glow of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s testament to the American Dream, it was Malcolm X who had his finger on the pulse of the rebellion of the Third World against white Western hegemony, and on the pulse of many in the inner cities across the nation.

Malcolm X stripped away the veil of the liberals, who, he argued, only pretended to befriend Black people. For Malcolm, there was no doubt about where white conservatives stood. They did not pretend to be the friends of Black people. Of white conservatives, Malcolm X argued:

> They are like wolves; they show their teeth in a snarl that keeps the Negro always aware of where they stand with them. But the white liberals are foxes who show their teeth to the Negro but pretend they are smiling." And it is precisely this confusing signal from the white liberals that makes them in Malcolm's view, more dangerous than white conservatives. "They lure the Negro, and as the Negro runs from the growling wolf, he flees into the open jaws of the 'smiling' fox."[22]

Malcolm X was a master of the word. He explained that the Negro "revolution" was controlled by those foxy liberals who, he pointed out, not only had manipulated the March on Washington, but had openly cautioned the white public that they had to respond to the moderate Negro leaders to enhance their image in the eyes of the Black masses and to keep them from turning to the Black "extremists." Unlike the "Negro Revolution," the Black revolution was not under the control of any section of the white population. Malcolm X pointed out that the "Black revolution is the struggle of the non-whites of this earth against their white oppressors. The black revolution has swept white supremacy out of Africa, out of Asia, and it is getting ready to sweep it out of Latin America."[23]

Malcolm X framed the situation of the Black people in a way that was quite different from the official position of the leaders of the civil rights mainstream, who only saw themselves as a minority on an "American stage." In contrast to the Negro leadership, Black revolutionaries viewed themselves on the world stage, and when you looked around on the world stage, you saw that most people resembled you more than they did the white people of Europe and North America. For these revolutionaries and the masses of Black people who gave them their ear and their allegiance, there was no American Dream but an American nightmare. But the people of the United States, particularly white people, should heed the handwriting on the wall, for in 1963, Malcolm X articulated a

stunning but entirely convincing proposition that we had arrived at the
end of white world supremacy. He argued:

> The time is past when the white world can exercise unilateral authority
> and control over the dark world. The independence and power of the
> dark world is on the increase; the dark world is rising in wealth, power,
> prestige, and influence. It is the rise of the dark world that is causing the
> fall of the white world.
>
> As the white man loses his power to oppress and exploit the dark
> world, the white man's own wealth power or "world") decreases . . . You
> and I were born at this turning point in history; we are witnessing the
> fulfillment of prophecy. Our present generation is witnessing the end of
> colonialism, Europeanism, Westernism, or "Whiteism" . . . the end of
> white supremacy, the end of the evil white man's unjust rule.[24]

Shortly after his declaration of independence from Elijah Muhammad
and the Nation of Islam in the aftermath of the controversy about his
statement describing the assassination of President John F. Kennedy as a
case of "the chickens coming home to roost," Malcolm X gave the famous
presentation on "The Ballot or the Bullet." In this speech, he called for
Blacks to do away with all illusions. How could we call ourselves American
if we are not sharing in the benefits of citizenship?[25] The 22 million Black
people in this country, he said, "are victims of Americanism." And, as
one of the 22 million Black victims of the disguised hypocrisy, which is
presented to the world as American democracy, Malcolm X said he did
"not see an American Dream;" . . . but "an American nightmare."

Malcolm X was the pivotal figure who linked the feelings of the
earlier radicalism of the Race First New Negro radicals to the evolution
of the United States and Pan-European power during the last half of
the twentieth century, although some members of the Black Left (or
Black Popular Front) of the 1940s played an important role in the civil
rights movement. It was Malcolm X who established a revolutionary
position against the reformism of both the civil rights mainstream and
of the old left (social-democrats, socialists, and communists). He argued
with absolute certainty and humility (quite a combination) that those
who believe in civil rights spend most of their time trying to prove that
they are Americans, confining themselves to domestic issues within
the boundaries of the United States and viewed from the perspective
of a minority. When these people look on the American stage, they
see a white stage. This manner of framing African-American identity
simply reinforces the minority perspective, which is the perspective of
an underdog impelled toward a begging, hat in hand, compromising
approach.[26]

Malcolm X and the Black Nationalists on the other hand, are more interested in human rights than civil rights. They do not look upon themselves as Americans. "They look upon themselves as a part of dark humankind. They see the whole struggle not within the confines of the American stage, but they look upon the struggle on the world stage. And in the world context, they see that the dark man outnumbers the white man. On the world stage the white man is just a microscopic minority."[27]

Magubane also cites Harold Isaacs, who argued:

The downfall of white supremacy system in the rest of the world made the survival of it in the United States suddenly and painfully complicated. It became our most exposed feature and in the swift unfolding of world affairs, our most vulnerable weakness. When hundreds of millions of people all around look in our direction it seemed to be all that they could see.[28]

Finally, Magubane quotes Nehru speaking at a private meeting with Black and white civil rights leaders at the behest of Ralph Bunche and Walter White:

Whenever I warn against acceptance of Soviet promises of equality because they are so frequently broken, I am answered quite often by questions about America's attitude toward dark skinned people. The people of Asia don't like colonialism or racial prejudices. They resent condescension. When Americans talk to them about equality and freedom, they remember stories about lynchings. They are becoming increasingly aware that colonialism is largely based on color—and for the first time in the lives of many of them they realize that they are colored.[29]

What Magubane has done is reframe our gaze on the impact of the U.S. system of white supremacy on African-Americans and their relations with the entire dark world. But he also points out that African-American espousal of Black nationalism is at the heart of the revolt against white world supremacy. Magubane then argues that "Ethiopianism, Garveyism, and Pan-Africanism of the early twentieth century may have been poor efforts, small fissures in the dry crust of white hegemony, but they revealed an abyss: Beneath the apparently solid surface of world domination by whites they showed oceans of liquid matter only needing expansion to rend into fragments the hold of white supremacy."[30]

Because the modern, colonial, capitalist world system formed in the sixteenth century had global ambitions from Day One, the logic of transnational resistance and of transnational social strata predated our current

era of so-called globalization by a few centuries. Pan-European racism, which functioned to incorporate the lower strata of the white population into an alliance with dominant capital, also constructed a veil that profoundly degraded the social intelligence of large sections of the white social strata, although, of course, not of individuals.

Enslaved Africans, unlike the indigenous populations, were a part of the newly formed United States of America, and were living contradictions to the "land of the free" rhetoric of the nation's propagandists. Their incorporation into U.S. society—even if ultimately as second-class citizens—would remain not only the Achilles heel of U.S. pretensions of freedom and democracy, but was also the foundation of its internally colonized periphery (or third world within). This is a very unstable mix. Melanie Bush and I will explore this at length in our forthcoming "Tensions in the American Dream," but I would like to demonstrate how these tensions are manifest in the trajectory that we have just traveled.

While there were constant appeals to an international audience against the barbarity of enslavement, it was Du Bois's announcement at the Pan African Conference in 1900 that the problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line that served notice of a rising arc of struggle against white world supremacy now joined by people of African descent within the United States.

Black solidarity in the United States has taken a variety of political forms. This includes the liberal nationalism and anticolonialism of the Pan African Conference and Dr. Du Bois at the turn of the century, the militant and assertive Black solidarity of the Niagara Movement of 1905, and the Race First nationalism of the New Negro radicals whose leaders included Marcus Garvey, Hubert Harrison, Cyril Briggs, Richard Moore, W. A. Domingo, and Claude McKay. Even the Class First radicals of the New Negro Movement (A. Philip Randolph and Chandler Owen) were firm practitioners of Black Solidarity. In the 1920s and 1930s, Du Bois forcefully challenged the false universalism of both the Center and the Left within the American and Pan-European body politic while building alliances with radical nationalist movements and independent governments in the Dark World, and beginning a dialogue with revolutionaries in the Soviet Union who were not quite white by the standards of that time. In the 1930s and 1940s, many of these forces (Du Bois, Paul Robeson, Richard Wright, Ralph Ellison, C. L. R. James, Angelo Herndon, Oliver Cromwell Cox, E. Franklin Frazier, Ralph Bunche, Abram Harris, George Padmore, Shirley Graham, Claude Lightfoot, John Henrik Clarke) constituted a Black Popular Front that stood in the forefront of the struggle for defining the Black Freedom Struggle as one against racism and imperialism, and for U.S. involvement in the

construction of Henry Wallace's "Century of the Common Man" (as opposed to the imperialist project of an "American Century"). During the 1950s and early 1960s, the continuing influence of the race's first radicals influenced the move to the Left within the Nation of Islam under the leadership of Malcolm X, Muhammad Ahmed, and others. During this same period, remnants of the Black Popular Front connected with Dr. King and the civil rights movement (including young militants in both the SNCC and the Nation of Islam).[31]

Black particularity has often been a specter haunting the imaginations of the dominant social strata within American society because of perceived volatility and among large segments of the Pan-European population because their privilege and their relatively higher status rested upon the racial foundation provided by the people of African descent and other people of color. Needless to say, this creates substantial social tension and a formidable sense of defensiveness whenever questions are raised about the naturalized system of meanings designed precisely to be invisible.[32] Notwithstanding the racial tensions felt on all sides, Black particularity has more often than not been a search for a wider and broader definition of "we," and an attempt to widen, instead of narrow, the circle of humanity. It has not, for the most part, been about simple integration into the mainstream of U.S. society. That is why the notorious exceptionality of the Black population has been the target not only of the colorblind discourse introduced by President Reagan in 1980, but of a much more antagonistic political strategy that we forget at our own peril. Black intellectuals and activists who have challenged the false universalism of the U.S. intelligentsia and public discourse have suffered exile, repression, ostracism, and assassination.[33]

President Woodrow Wilson's internationalism was nominally anti-imperialist, but his eye was on the threat posed by the radical, left-wing anticolonialism of Lenin and the Bolsheviks. Despite Wilson's rhetoric, he failed to address colonial and minority questions in his own sphere and remained notoriously hostile to Blacks.[34] Wilson imposed rigid segregation in Washington, D.C., during his years in the White House. He regarded Black soldiers as an especially dangerous group, a fertile conduit for the spread of Bolshevism within the United States. This recalls the pronouncements about the threat of revolutionary internationalist politics and white racial degeneration by Madison Grant and Lothrop Stoddard in 1920s.

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.[35] argues that race-conscious Blacks, "nourishing prejudice, magnifying difference and stirring up antagonism" have come to represent a significant threat to what he views as the defining ethos of American nationhood. If this sounds suspiciously like the post-Reconstruction era attacks upon Blacks to achieve national reconciliation, this is by no means accidental.

It has not escaped the attention of American elites that the Black population in the United States has constituted the most consistent base and leadership of the U.S. left since the time of the Great Migration (1910–1920). It should, therefore, not be a surprise that as the nation moved to the center left, an African-American politician would win the presidency.

When Barack Obama entered onto the national stage, he struck me as similar to Jesse Jackson during his Rainbow Coalition phase, though he was more careful than Jackson to avoid being labeled as simply a Black politician. He also moved strategically to capture a significant section of the political center, unlike the Rainbow Coalition, which was much more Leftist in its stance. To do so, he played the "race-neutral card" with deliberateness and consistency in an environment where accusation of playing the race card would be used by the "colorblind racists" of the Republican Party to neutralize one's ability to appeal to the white electorate.

Interestingly, the fallback position of those who opposed Obama for racial reasons is that Obama's success is an indication that the nation is overcoming its racial divisions. Despite the disingenuous pleas of the right, there is something happening. The Southern strategy that emerged in the midst of the conservative backlash of the 1960s is dead. It has been on life support since 2000, but voter suppression has been used effectively to give us a sense that it is still in power. People of color are becoming too large of a demographic force to simply dismiss by demonizing Blacks, especially when Huntington and like minded people complain about the Hispanic threat, the Muslim threat, and the Chinese threat. The push-back against white world supremacy has been integral to the rise of the oppressed throughout the twentieth century. It is not separate from the increased power of working people, women, and increased opposition to (or at least a relaxation of) hetero-normativity. The relations between the dominant forces and the subordinate forces in the world system have been altered in favor of subordinate forces over the longue durée of the world system. The accumulation of oppositional power among people of African descent at the political and social center of a "Third World within" the United States has had, and will continue to have, enormous consequences for the structuring of power in the country and the larger world system.

This power will continue to be used to press for the decolonization of the U.S. Empire both internally and externally.[36] This thrust will continue, whatever Obama does. But his election is a consequence of the slow change in relations of force, both internally, as people of color increase their numbers and social power in U.S. society, and externally, as their strength grows in the world system.

In 1963, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover argued that the United States was in the midst of a social revolution, with the racial movement at its core. He decided that the trajectory of the civil rights movement had to be radically altered or simply stopped, to forestall the social revolution that was under way. Many riding the progressive wave that swept the country during those years felt that Hoover's fear struck a discordant note at a time that the United States was at the top of its form, reaching for the best that was within the nation. But the flowering of liberal nationalism, undergirded by the most dramatic expansion of the economy in world history, not only was the basis of the postwar welfare state and an attempt to bring Blacks into the social democratic compromise, it also was the time when the policing function of the hegemonic power was passed to the United States. And this was at a time when the social power of the oppressed strata, anchored in a "Third World within" had come to the fore. While this process was similar to the manner in which the polyglot working class of the early twentieth century led to the rise of the Communist Party of the United States, colonial origins of the post-1965 accumulation of power is significant for the logic of the argument that I present here. The particular racial demography of the United States earlier used to legitimate this "nation of nations" as fitting for world leadership now undermined the new hegemonic power, as the dark world within American borders recalled the hesitancy of previous generations to play the role of imperial enforcer of white world supremacy. In addition, a radical critique of the white, middle-class nature of second-wave feminism led to the rise of an antiracist, antisexist political faction within the '60s movement led by radical women, such as Fran Beal and Linda Burnham in the SNCC Women's Liberation Commission; Angela Davis in the CPUSA and Black Panther Party; and Marlene Dixon at the University of Chicago. These forces ignited a cascading and unifying liberation force within the U.S. Black liberation, Puerto Rican liberation, Chicano and Mexican liberation, Native American liberation, women's liberation, and lesbian and gay liberation movements. The vigorous questioning raised by those who were fighting for liberation within U.S. society broke the easy identification with the liberal nationalism of the U.S. ruling class, opening up a location to the left of the body politic for the children of the greatest generation.

The liberal Eurocentrism of the Enlightenment had been the cultural foundation of the social democratic compromise in the core states of the world system, and to some extent, of the radical semi-peripheral states of the Pan-European world as well. In hindsight, many now view this period as the golden age of capitalism. But it is also brought us to the limits of the system because this compromise could not be extended to the rest of

the world without exhausting the limits of the profit-maximizing logic of capitalism. The ruling classes of the hegemonic power in its twilight were searching for an alternative strategy, but knew that the preemptive warriors of the far right were not a plausible answer to this crisis of U.S. hegemony, which is accompanied by a crisis of white world supremacy, and finally, by a structural crisis of capitalism.

The golden age of capitalism enabled strata within the "belly of the beast" and its periphery to glimpse larger possibilities for social transformation and to attempt to realize them. In the meantime, the harsh rhetoric against those within the belly of the beast and its peripheries has been ratcheted up. Civil tension in the United States is at an unprecedented level, giving rise to a dramatic expansion of what Steve Martinot refers to as the para-state. But what is new in this period is that the strategy of neoliberal globalization has come undone. The oppressed strata no longer accept that there is no alternative. The dramatic demographic shift in the population of the core states includes large numbers of people forced to move from Africa, Asia, the Pacific Islands, Latin America, and the Caribbean to the Pan-European world. Though the 800,000 Africans who are a part of this migratory trek are not large in number, their educational levels (43.8 percent college educated) is higher than both Asian-Americans (42.5 percent), and the U.S. population as a whole (23.1 percent).[37] Similarly Okome points out that 88 percent of adults who emigrate from Africa to the United States have a high school education or higher, compared with 77 percent of native-born Americans, 76 percent of Asian immigrants, and 46 percent of immigrants from Central America.[38] Although I understand Okome's reservations about the difficulties of integration into the United States,[39] I think the more appropriate model would be that which created the New Negro movement in the United States during the period of the first great migration of people of African descent from the South and the Caribbean (e.g., Marcus Garvey, Amy Jacques Garvey, Hubert Harrison, Cyril Briggs, Richard Moore, W. A. Domingo, Claude McKay, Otto Huiswood, et cetera). In contrast to Cruse's focus on the so-called integrationist wannabes in that group, most other accounts view the New Negro movement as a galvanizing and radicalizing force in American history.[40] High levels of education of the African immigrant population, combined with their resistance to the Eurocentric-biased cultural brainwashing that American students have to combat, could be a significant component in the dramatic expansion of a leadership stratum that could assimilate into the existing African-American, Caribbean-American, and African-Latino communities to make the segment of transnational Africa residing in North America a formidable force in uniting the larger transnational circuit of Africans

and working with other transnational groups to change the power relations of the world system. The rise of the Obama phenomenon is only a part of the arrival of transnational Africa as a transformative force in the world system in the same way that other transnational social forces have been.

This brings us to a brief assessment of what Arrighi and Zhang (2009) hail as the New Bandung, based on supplanting the Washington consensus with what some call the Beijing consensus. This new trend is anchored by the four largest economic powers of the south: China, India, Brazil, and South Africa. J. C. Ramo holds that China, the largest economic power in the south, has entered into relationships with other states that stand in stark contrast to "U.S.-style power, bristling with arms and intolerant of other world views."[41] For Ramo, the Chinese offer a multilateral, rather than a unilateral, model of global alliances. Not every country can be a superpower, but each can be a power in its own right, not strong enough for domination, but strong enough for self-determination.

The rise of this New Bandung, the influence of transnational Africa at many levels of the American political and civil society and the demographic changes in the core states will alter worldwide political and economic relations of long standing. The rise of the power of the south and the demographic changes within the core states linking a segment of their populations to the countries of the south will unhinge the cultural foundation, which stabilizes the core states, freeing the working classes of the Pan-European world to focus finally on the class rule, which has long imprisoned them. But the key link in this process is breaking the chains of Pan-European racism or white world supremacy.

Notes

1. Anibal Quijano. "Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America." *Nepantla: Views from the South,* Vol. 1, No. 3 (2000): 534–535.
2. W. E. B. Du Bois. "sClose Ranks," in *The Emerging Thought of W. E. B. Du Bois: Essays and Editorials from the Crisis,* ed. Henry Lee Moon (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972). 254.
3. Gary Wilder. "Race, Reason, Impasse: Cesaire, Fanon, and the Legacy of Emancipation." *Radical History Review,* No. 90 (Fall 2004). 32.
4. Eugene Victor Wolfenstein. *The Victims of Democracy: Malcolm X and the Black Revolution* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1981). 234.
5. Azza Salama Layton. *International Politics and Civil Rights Policies in the United States, 1941–1960* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000). 70.
6. Ibid., 71.

7. Immanuel Wallerstein. *Africa: The Politics of Unity* (New York: Random House, 1967), 15.

8. Wallerstein, 1967: 15.

9. Ibid.

10. Nikhil Pal Singh. *Black Is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 174.

11. The notion of the coloniality of power is associated with the Peruvian sociologist Anibal Quijano, the Puerto Rican sociologists Kelvin Santiago-Valles, Ramon Grosfoguel, and Agustin Lao-Montes, and the Argentine scholar Walter Mignolo.

12. Fanon Che Wilkins. "Beyond Bandung: The Critical Nationalism of Lorraine Hansberry, 1950–1965." *Radical History Review,* No. 95 (Spring 2006). 192.

13. Ibid.

14. My use of a framework developed by French historian Fernand Braudel does not indicate an agreement with his own lack of historical depth regarding the history of Africa. I stand with Jacques Depelchin's (2005) critique of the academic violence encapsulated in the dominant historiography of the Pan-European world.

15. Many will recall Amilcar Cabral's frequently invoked admonition that the forces of liberation should "Tell no lies, claim no easy victories."

16. See Mojúbàolú Olúfúnké Okome (2007), "Either You Are with Us, Or You Are with the Terrorists: US Imperial Hegemony at the Beginning of the Twenty-First Century," presented at International Conference on Globalization: Migration, Citizenship and Identity, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria, November 6–9, 2007.

17. Mary C. Waters. *Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999). 22.

18. Here I merely assert the significance of the internal colonial construct taken from Kwame Nkrumah's *Class Struggle in Africa.* See my article "The Internal Colony Hybrid: Reformulating Structure, Culture, and Agency," Bush (2008).

19. Mao Tse-Tung, "Statement Calling on the People of the World to Unite to Oppose Racial Discrimination by U.S. Imperialism and Support the American Negroes in the Struggle against Racial Discrimination." *Peking Review.* Vol. 6, No. 33 (August 16, 1963). 4.

20. Ibid.

21. This was the occasion when Malcolm X, in response to a question from the audience, made the comment about the assassination of John F. Kennedy being a case of the "chickens coming home to roost." For this statement, he was suspended from the Nation of Islam, initially for 90 days, and then indefinitely. We can see in this commentary that Malcolm X had moved beyond the limits of the Nation of Islam.

22. Malcolm X, *The End of White World Supremacy: Four Speeches, 1971* (New York: Merlin House, 1987). 137.

23. Ibid.

24. Ibid., 130.
25. George Breitman. *Malcolm X Speaks: Selected Speeches and Statements* (New York: Grove Press, 1965). 26.
26. Bernard Magubane. *The Ties That Bind: African-American Consciousness of Africa* (Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 1987). 187.
27. Ibid.
28. Ibid., 188.
29. Ibid., 189; 1,059.
30. Ibid., 193.
31. See my forthcoming *The End of White World Supremacy: Black Internationalism and the Problem of the Color Line* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2009).
32. Melanie Bush. *Breaking the Code of Good Intentions: Everyday Forms of Whiteness* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2004); Peggy McIntosh. "White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack," *Race, Class, and Gender: An Anthology,* 6th edition, ed. Margaret Andersen and Patricia Hill Collins (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 2007); Eduard Bonilla-Silva. *Racism Without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2003).
33. Nikhil Pal Singh. *Black is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004). 42.
34. Ibid., 31.
35. Arthur Schlesinger. *The Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society* (New York: Norton, 1992).
36. Ramón Grosfoguel. "Latinos and the Decolonization of the U.S. Empire in the Twenty-First Century," *Social Science Information.* Vol. 47, No. 4 (December 2008): 605–622.
37. Schoenberg, 2008.
38. Okome. "The Antinomies of Globalization: Some Consequences of Contemporary African Immigration to the United States of America." *Ìrìnkèrindò: a Journal of African Migration.* Vol. 1, No. 1 (September 2002b). 13.
39. Ibid., 33–40.
40. Roderick Bush. *The End of White World Supremacy: Black Internationalism and the Problem of the Color Line* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2009) and *We Are Not What We Seem: Black Nationalism and Class Struggle in the American Century* (New York: New York University Press, 1999); Theodore Vincent. *Voices of a Black Nation* (San Francisco, CA: Ramparts Press, 1973) and *Black Power and the Garvey Movement* (San Francisco, CA: Ramparts Press, 1971); Michelle Ann Stephens. *Black Empire: The Masculine Global Imaginary of Caribbean Intellectuals in the United States, 1914–1962* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005); Mark Solomon. *The Cry Was Unity: Communism and African Americans, 1917–1936* (Jackson, MS: University of Mississippi Press, 1999); Winston James. *Holding Aloft the Banner of Ethiopia: Caribbean*

Radicalism in Early Twentieth-Century America (New York: Verso, 1998); Joyce Moore Turner. *Caribbean Crusaders and the Harlem Renaissance* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2005); William Maxwell. *New Negro, Old Left: African-American Writing and Communism between the Wars* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999).

41. J. C. Ramo. "The Beijing Consensus: Notes on the New Physics of Chinese Power." *Foreign Affairs Policy Centre* (London, 2004). http://www.chinaelections.org/uploadfile/200909/20090918021638239.pdf.

References

Arrighi, Giovanni, and Lu Zhang. "Beyond the Washington Consensus: A New Bandung," in *Globalization and Beyond: New Examinations of Global Power and its Alternatives*, ed. Jon Shefner and Patricia Fernandez-Kelley (University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2009).

Bonilla-Silva, Eduard. *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2003).

Breitman, George. *Malcolm X Speaks: Selected Speeches and Statements* (New York: Grove Press, 1965).

Bush, Melanie. *Breaking the Code of Good Intentions: Everyday Forms of Whiteness* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2004).

Bush, Roderick D. *The End of White World Supremacy: Black Internationalism and the Problem of the Color Line* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2009).

———. "The Internal Colony Hybrid: Reformulating Structure, Culture, and Agency," in *Hybrid Identities: Theoretical & Empirical Examinations,* ed. Keri E. Iyall Smith and Patricia Leavy (Boston, MA: Brill Publishers, 2008).

———. *We Are Not What We Seem: Black Nationalism and Class Struggle in the American Century* (New York: New York University Press, 1999).

Depelchin, Jacques. *Silences in African History: Between the Syndromes of Discovery and Abolition* (Dar Es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers, 2005).

Du Bois, W. E. B. "Close Ranks," in *The Emerging Thought of W. E. B. Du Bois: Essays and Editorials from the Crisis,* ed. Henry Lee Moon (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972). 254.

Grosfoguel, Ramón. "Latinos and the Decolonization of the U.S. Empire in the Twenty-First Century," *Social Science Information.* Vol. 47, No. 4 (December 2008): 605–622.

James, Winston. *Holding Aloft the Banner of Ethiopia: Caribbean Radicalism in Early Twentieth-Century America* (New York: Verso, 1998).

Layton, Azza Salama. *International Politics and Civil Rights Policies in the United States, 1941–1960* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Magubane, Bernard. *The Ties That Bind: African-American Consciousness of Africa* (Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 1987).

Malcolm X. *The End of White World Supremacy: Four Speeches, 1971* (New York: Merlin House, 1987).

Mao Tse-Tung, "Statement Calling on the People of the World to Unite to Oppose Racial Discrimination by U.S. Imperialism and Support the American Negroes in the Struggle against Racial Discrimination." *Peking Review.* Vol. 6, No. 33 (August 16, 1963).

Maxwell, William. *New Negro, Old Left: African-American Writing and Communism between the Wars* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999).

McIntosh, Peggy. "White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack," *Race, Class, and Gender: An Anthology, 6th Edition,* ed. Margaret Andersen and Patricia Hill Collins (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 2007).

Okome, Mojúbàolú Olúfúnké. "Are You with Us, Or with the Terrorist? US Imperial Hegemony at the Beginning of the Twenty-First Century." (International Conference on Globalization: Migration, Citizenship and Identity, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria, November 6–9, 2007).

———. "The Antinomies of Globalization: Causes of Contemporary African Immigration to the United States of America." *Ìrìnkèrindò: a Journal of African Migration.* Vol. 1, No. 1, September 2002a.

———. "The Antinomies of Globalization: Some Consequences of Contemporary African Immigration to the United States of America." *Ìrìnkèrindò: a Journal of African Migration.* Vol. 1, No. 1, September 2002b.

Piven, Frances Fox, and Richard A. Cloward. *The Breaking of the American Social Compact* (New York: The New Press, 1998).

Quijano, Anibal. "Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America." *Nepantla: Views from the South,* Vol. 1, No. 3 (2000): 533–580.

Ramo, J. C. "The Beijing Consensus: Notes on the New Physics of Chinese Power." Foreign Affairs Policy Centre (London, 2004). http://www.chinaelections.org/uploadfile/200909/20090918021638239.pdf.

Schlesinger, Arthur. *The Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society* (New York: Norton, 1992).

Singh, Nikhil Pal. *Black Is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004).

Solomon, Mark. *The Cry Was Unity: Communism and African Americans, 1917–1936* (Jackson, MS: University of Mississippi Press, 1999).

Stephens, Michelle Ann. *Black Empire: The Masculine Global Imaginary of Caribbean Intellectuals in the United States, 1914–1962* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005).

Turner, Joyce Moore. *Caribbean Crusaders and the Harlem Renaissance* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2005).

Vincent, Theodore. *Voices of a Black Nation* (San Francisco, CA: Ramparts Press, 1973).

———. *Black Power and the Garvey Movement* (San Francisco, CA: Ramparts Press, 1971).

Wallerstein, Immanuel. *Africa: The Politics of Unity* (New York: Random House, 1967).

Waters, Mary C. *Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999).

Wilder, Gary. "Race, Reason, Impasse: Cesaire, Fanon, and the Legacy of Emancipation." *Radical History Review,* No. 90 (Fall 2004): 31–61.

Wilkins, Fanon Che. "Beyond Bandung: The Critical Nationalism of Lorraine Hansberry, 1950–1965." *Radical History Review,* No. 95 (Spring 2006): 191–210.

Wolfenstein, Eugene Victor. *The Victims of Democracy: Malcolm X and the Black Revolution* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1981).

This page intentionally left blank