

Chapter Eight

The Internal Colony Hybrid: Reformulating Structure, Culture, and Agency

Roderick Bush

After the Egyptian and Indian, the Greek and Roman, the Teuton and Mongolian, the Negro is a sort of seventh son, born with a veil, and gifted with second-sight in this American world...It is a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his twoness – an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder. (DuBois 1961:16–17)

Colonialism is generally considered to be the extension of a nation's sovereignty over territory beyond its borders. In the modern world, the model of colonialism is the extension of European dominion over much of the world's territory in the Americas, Africa, Asia, and the Pacific Islands. In some cases enslaved people were moved to another territory, or states actually expanded their territory to encompass territory formerly controlled by other populations, thereby forming what some have referred to as

internal colonies. Many indigenous populations fit this category, as do formerly enslaved Africans in territories dominated by descendents of settler colonists from Europe. Colonialism has tended to be conceived in geographical and geopolitical terms. What I intend to do here is to view the concept of internal colony more in structural terms and assess the impact of such structural relations on the development of hybrid cultures among the internally colonized populations and, consequently, on how these populations come to view themselves as change agents within the landscape of these societies. Such people almost always develop what DuBois refers to as a double consciousness, which gives them a special insight about the dominant culture not easily accessed by those who view their own societies only from the perspective of the dominant culture. The hybrid culture then becomes a source of agency that is important in the ability to impact change within these societies.

During the 1960s, the concept of internal colonialism obtained substantial utility in explaining significant populations within some nation-states who were born within the territorial boundaries of those states, and thus legally integrated into the state and economy, but who remained structurally, culturally, socioeconomically, legally, and socially marginal. These so-called "second-class citizens" were not only disproportionately concentrated at the bottom of the economic ladder, with scant political power, they were also scorned in the public imagination.

African-Americans are only one example of a group that has been identified by some as an internal colony. Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Native Americans are also commonly considered internally colonized populations within the United States. In Canada there are, of course, the Quebecois and the First Nations, in France the Occitans, in Spain the Basque, and indigenous populations throughout Latin America.

All of these populations, which seemed outside of the socio-economic mainstream of the so-called advanced industrial nation-states, were often said to constitute a subculture of the mainstream culture or to be afflicted with a culture of poverty. While the marginality of these populations were almost always the focus of observers in the social sciences, there were always some in the humanities who recognized that the efforts of such populations to seek justice and equality constituted a fundamental challenge to the democratic and egalitarian pretensions or aspirations of these societies. It was often recognized that the hybrid culture of these outsider groups gave

them an insight into these societies (what DuBois referred to as the gift of second sight) that was much more critical and perceptive than that of the more accepted groups, but that their very hybridity gave them a connection to the larger society and enabled them to communicate their insights across the cultural barriers they faced. From the perspective of the *longue duree* of historical capitalism, the most notable movements that arose to challenge the social inequalities of local, national, and global power structures during the 19th and 20th centuries were the workers' movements of the industrialized countries and the national liberation movements of the colonized, semi-colonized, and dependent zones of the world-system. While the First World War occasioned much talk about the crisis of European civilization or of white world supremacy, radicals argued that monopoly capitalism was the imperialist stage of capitalism, that capitalism was now a world system, and that it was moribund capitalism. The social movements of this period subsequently began to increasingly argue that revolution was the only solution, but they were in practice offered assimilation and inclusion by the dominant strata of the world-system. Although there had long been fierce debates between the national movements and the social movements, some came increasingly to equate the social question with the colonial (or national) question, arguing in effect that there was not a fundamental difference between the metropole-colony relationship and the capital-labor relationship. During the 1960s this position was reaffirmed, but with heightened emphasis on what Patricia Hill Collins refers to as the "outsider-within," represented in part by internally colonized populations, or what opponents of pan-European racism often refer to as the "third world within" (Blauner 1972, Collins 1991, Wallerstein 1979). The democratic aspirations of these groups were often more far-reaching and potentially transformative than those of the lower strata of the dominant ethno-racial population because they were unlikely candidates for assimilation and required a more fundamental transformation of the existing social system. The low social status of these populations, however, meant that they were disproportionately concentrated among the sub-proletarian strata, or what has come to be called the "underclass" in the core zones of the world-system. The social isolation of these populations have therefore made them particularly susceptible to public scorn among other social strata and thereby blamed as being responsible for much of the nation's ills and their own low social position.

But as the proportion of the “third world within” continues to increase in the population of the core states (most pronounced within the United States), political efficacy for the lower and lower-middle class strata will require that they face the challenge of creating an effective rainbow coalition to contend with the ideological weight of pan-European racism, which will confine them to a subordinate role in the polity, economy, and society. The defenders of the status quo have recognized this issue since at least the early part of the 20th century, when the New Negro radicals animated a variety of organizations and movements, from the Messenger Group to the African Blood Brotherhood, to the Garvey movement, to the Communist Party. To the distress of the defenders of the status quo, such movements always tended leftwards. American elites have been attentive to the threat to their hegemony coming from this quarter since the proletarian insurgencies of the World War I – era during the reign of the New Negro. Woodrow Wilson’s program for the self-determination of nations was a response to the threat of Bolshevik anticolonialism, which he thought was most likely to be introduced in the United States by blacks. Long before COINTELPRO, American security forces were employed to eliminate, discredit, and harass black leaders of whom they did not approve. The list includes many, and perhaps most, of the most respected leaders and intellectuals within the African-American community: Marcus Garvey, A. Philip Randolph, Chandler Owen, William Monroe Trotter, Hubert Harrison, Cyril Briggs, Claude McKay, Wilfred Domingo, Harry Haywood, William Patterson, George Padmore, W. E. B. DuBois, Paul Robeson, Elijah Muhammad, Langston Hughes, and C. L. R. James (Kornweibel 1998, 2002). During the 1960s, of course, we add to this list some of the main targets of COINTELPRO: Martin Luther King, Jr., Malcolm X, Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., James Baldwin, Medgar Evers, Bayard Rustin, Stokely Carmichael, Huey Newton, Bobby Seale, Fred Hampton, and Bunchy Carter (O’Reilly 1989, 1994; Churchill and Vander Wall 1988). Even the centrist leader Jesse Jackson was too much of a threat for the liberal establishment (Bush 1984, 1999). Perhaps in Barack Obama some among the centrist liberal establishment and among the white public feel they have found an acceptable candidate whose low racial profile symbolizes reconciliation between the races in the direction of a color-blind society called for by neo-conservative intellectuals in the camp of President Ronald Reagan, and since diffused to other sections of the populations. This is a crucial issue of legitimization and hegemony in the United States.

I follow the lead of Peruvian sociologist Anibal Quijano, who argues that the coloniality of power (which is heir to the colonial situation) accounts for the formulation of a worldwide system of social classification based on the idea of race. This idea, he argues, accounts not only for the patterns of social classification, but also for its dominant cultural logics, forms of knowledge, and modes of (inter)subjectivity and identification. The Eurocentric racial discourse thus established is the cornerstone of Western hegemony under the leadership of the United States and a central organizing feature of the modern constellations of power. But although coloniality is the substance of the domination of the pan-European world over the non-European world, its strategies of legitimization require that it appear as a universalistic, neutral, objective enterprise unlike the essentialist (often equated with fundamentalist) perspectives of the less-developed zones of the world-system. I also follow Kelvin Santiago-Valles, whose definition of the colonized is not dependent on the territorial formulation, but on being subjected to “degraded forms of social embodiment” and other substandard conditions of life associated mostly with those groups who are identified with racially depreciated labor (Santiago-Valles 2003:103).

The internal minorities or the internally colonized who will grow as a proportion of the population throughout the core states of the world-system are key to any system of political alliances needed to determine the whether we maintain the power relations embedded in the hegemony of the pan-European world under the leadership of the United States. As we approach the twilight of the American Century, realists within the ruling establishment might favor a strategy that takes advantage of the “multicultural” hue of our population and the positioning of a pro-imperialist leader of African descent who might allow the US to somewhat maintain its position of influence within the world-system.

Origins of the Internal Colonialism Concept

George Balandier’s “The Colonial Situation: A Theoretical Approach,” written originally in 1951, cites Jean Guilton, who equated the “colonial question” with the “social question.” Guilton is said to have argued that “they are not fundamentally different because the *metropole-colony* relationship is in no sense different from the *capital-labor* relationship, or the relationship Hegel has termed *master-servant*” (Balandier 1951:40). Balandier adds support from Paul

Reuter, who points out that “in both cases we are dealing with a population who produces all the wealth, but does not share in its political or economic advantages and constitutes an oppressed class” (Balandier 1951:40).

This has, of course, been the basis of the political coalition between the workers’ movement in the core states and the national liberation movements in the periphery of the world-system. But Balandier highlights Stalin’s studies on the colonial question, which held that “Leninism...destroyed the wall separating [w]hites from [b]lacks, Europeans from Asiatics, the ‘civilized’ from the ‘non-civilized’ slaves of imperialism.” Furthermore, he argued that “the October Revolution *inaugurated* a new era, the era of *colonial revolutions in the oppressed countries* of the world, in *alliance* with the proletariat and *under the direction* of the proletariat” (Balandier 1951:40, emphasis in original). Alvin Gouldner has a slightly different take on this position as a critique of Stalin’s practice within the Soviet Union, which involved a strategy of primitive socialist accumulation on behalf of an urban elite that imposed unfavorable rates of exchange upon a rural society they did not consider to be a part of the same moral community. Gouldner held that the peasants in the countryside were the Soviet Union’s versions of Indians, and the Soviet countryside itself was viewed as a continental reservation (Hind 1984:545–546).

While some may view Gouldner’s claims with some skepticism, the relationship between the workers’ movement and colonized strata have long been problematic. During the period of the Great Migration in the United States, African-Americans’ political agency emerged in the form of the New Negro movement. The New Negro radicals closely identified themselves with world anticapitalist and anti-imperialist forces and debated whether race was a component of capitalist stratification (race first) or whether race was clothing for class stratification (class first). During the 1930s and ’40s, these social strata made the issue of racial justice central to the overall fight for social justice, though the “race first” radicalism of the New Negro (now represented by DuBois) was sidelined in the interest of a united front against fascism.

The Communist International, which was founded in the wake of the Bolshevik Revolution, rejected the “class first” ideology of traditional socialism and was constituted by an alliance between the workers’ movements and the anticolonial movements. This was an unstable alliance, however, since there was general agreement on the issue of “proletarian leadership,” which meant the leadership of the civilized over the non-civilized and the Europeans over the non-Europeans.

Some have argued that indeed beneath the political and economic causes still dividing the white race and the colored people, there is almost always a racial motive. Though Balandier seems to accept the presumed naturalness of racial differences, he does show that the inferior status of the Negro and a justification for racial prejudice cannot be made to appear as natural because “cultural differences are virtually imperceptible and a common identity of rights have been affirmed” (Balandier 1951:54). For Balandier, this only shows that it is not possible to separate the study of cultural contacts from that of racial contacts.

In the 1960s in the United States there arose, primarily in response to the militancy of the urban black masses and secondarily because of the black power movement, a burgeoning, if unevenly sophisticated, literature that defined the nature of the African population within US borders as a colonial situation. By the 1980s, one rarely found authors who supported such a view. Both Robert Allen¹ and Robert Blauner, who had been among the most influential scholars espousing that thesis, had recanted and adopted more pragmatic positions. By the time the tumultuous sixties subsided, white America’s willingness to entertain the grievances of the black population had dramatically declined. How did we get to that point?

The Heyday of the Internal Colonialism Concept

Using internal colonialism to conceptualize the situation of black people within the United States stems from the notion – which goes back to the late 18th-century formation of the Free African Society and the African Methodist Episcopal Church – that African-Americans constituted a nation within a nation. These ideas were crystallized in the National Negro Convention Movement from 1830–1861. Henry Highland Garnett (1815–1882), Martin Delaney (1812–1885), Alexander Crummell (1819–1898), and W. E. B. DuBois (1868–1963) were some of the more prominent exponents of that formulation.

Though black nationalism had been a constant feature of the landscape of the Black Freedom struggle throughout the 19th century, it would be dramatically ratcheted up at the opening of the 20th century at the Pan-African Conference, where DuBois announced that the problem of the 20th century

¹ Robert Allen (2005) has been moved recently to reassert the issue of internal (neo)colonialism, to some extent along the lines that I do here.

would be the problem of the color line. Though this was, indeed, an ominous announcement, the relations at this time only allowed for a liberal anticolonial position. A few years later, DuBois joined with a group of black radicals who formed the Niagara Movement, some of whom would later form an alliance with white socialists and reform liberals in the NAACP. But the urbanization and concentration of blacks during the first Great Migration created the social conditions that, along with the First World War, gave rise to a new social force: the New Negro.

The New Negro radicals who came to the fore during and after the first Great Migration soon came to view themselves politically as part of world anticolonial and anticapitalist forces. They identified themselves with and arguably belonged to a Pan-African social strata in world society. Though they came to prominence in a pre-existing political community dominated by the towering figure of DuBois, he was nevertheless viewed by the young radicals as part of the "Old Crowd Negroes" (due, in part, to his "Close Ranks" editorial in *The Crisis*).

It was New Negro radicals such as Hubert Harrison, Marcus Garvey, Cyril Briggs, A. Philip Randolph, and Claude McKay who established the radical tradition that would dominate the African-American intelligentsia throughout most of the 20th century. During the early 20th century, they debated whether racial stratification was the foundation of American and capitalist stratification (race first) or whether racial stratification was simply an expression of class stratification (class first). Some of the "race first" radicals took their position to the newly formed Communist International (consisting of revolutionary organizations disproportionately located in the semi-colonial [Russia, China, Mexico], colonial, and dependent zones of the world economy), who then endorsed the idea that the Negro within the United States constituted a nation within a nation (but limited this definition to the Black Belt South). Some of these New Negro radicals then joined the Communist Party of the United States (CPUSA), who were obliged to accept the position of the international body (also known as the Third International). During the 1930s and '40s these social strata made the issue of racial justice central to the overall fight for social justice, though the "race first" radicalism of the New Negro (now represented by DuBois) was sidelined in the interest of a united front against fascism, which, among African-Americans, took the form of an informal grouping that has since come to be called the Black Popular Front. But the quest for US

economic, military, and political preeminence in the postwar world system ran counter to the egalitarian and cooperative sentiment of the 1930s and '40s, establishing in its stead an imperial project dubbed "the American century," which demanded an unprecedented ideological conformity that narrowed the scope of theorizing about race and racial discrimination to the attitudes and practices of individuals, except within the Jim Crow South.

However, the postwar rise of opposition to imperialism in Africa, Asia, and Latin America created an echo among the internal minorities in the US and brought the radicals of the Black Popular Front to an engagement with the social forces involved in the all-out rebellion against the Jim Crow system. And though the militants of this movement spoke largely in terms of the Southern Movement, they were themselves quite cosmopolitan in origin and understood the deep strains of structural and ideological racism as well as plain old prejudice and discrimination outside of the South. Many had worked on the issue of civil rights in New York City during the 1940s.

While the Southern Movement was equated with the struggle against Jim Crow and followed the formal line of the CPUSA about the Negro nation within a nation, in fact it was closer to the internal colonialism concept than most admit, as is indicated in some of the commentary that follows.

The debates of the 1960s and early 1970s arose as means to articulate the political motion of the black population in a period of intense mobilization. Such theories were also propounded in the first quarter of the 20th century, the period of the initial mass migration of black people to the urban areas of the Northeastern, Midwestern, and Western United States. The Garvey Movement, the largest social movement of the black population in the United States, undoubtedly influenced the formulations of a nation within a nation by the African Blood Brotherhood, and eventually by the CPUSA. While the CPUSA ceded to the Communist International's insistence that they give priority to what was called the Negro National Question (because the US-based African Blood Brotherhood took its own position directly to the Communist International), the implementation of the line tended to be uneven and confused, as the CP cadre tended to use the theory as a means to both recruit cadres of the Garvey movement and to theoretically justify their elevation of the importance of the struggles of the black population within the US. Eventually they abandoned the theory, arguing that conditions had changed, blacks had migrated away from the historical black nation in the

Black Belt South, and furthermore that the main thrust of the black population was for equality and justice within the United States.

Although the CPUSA was an important organization in the general working class struggles of the 1930s and '40s and in the struggle for racial justice, at the highest levels of the organization, their notions about the black struggle within the United States tended to be very mechanical. Though the infusion of militants from the African Blood Brotherhood pushed them to the forefront of the struggle for racial justice, their understanding of the inter-subjectivity of African-Americans was not really superficial, as I have argued elsewhere, but more tone deaf, for the obvious reason that they held the "race first" radicals of the New Negro movement at arm's length. Harold Cruse places his finger on this phenomenon:

American Marxism has neither understood the nature of Negro nationalism, nor dealt with its roots in American society. When the communists first promulgated the Negro question as a 'national question' in 1928, they wanted a national question without nationalism. They posed the question mechanically because they did not understand it. They relegated the national aspect of the Negro question to the 'black belt' of the South, despite the fact that Garvey's 'national movement' had been organized in 1916 in a northern urban center where the Negro was, according to the communists, a 'national minority,' but not a 'nation,' as he was in the Southern states. Of course the national character of the Negro has little to do with what part of the country he lives in. Wherever he lives, he is restricted. His national boundaries are the color of his skin, his racial characteristics, and the social conditions of his substructural world. (Cruse 1968:78)

Cruse's corrective to the orthodox Marxist mechanistic notions was part of the sweeping reevaluation of a global new left, of which the black power movement was a part. Frantz Fanon's *Wretched of the Earth* was the key political document. From the ideas elaborated in his work came the main impetus for the revival and correction of an "internal colonialism" perspective within the black power movement.

But these theories about internal colonialism within this new Left did not spring fully formed in the minds of the young militants. Harold Cruse, Stokely Carmichael, Jack O'Dell, and Malcolm X all had ties to the old Left, or had been members of the old Left. The positions that came to be articulated in the

1960s and '70s (below) derive mostly from the influence of DuBois, Robeson, and Briggs, who continued to hold the "race first" position throughout the 1930s and '40s.

In *Black Power: the Politics of Liberation in America*, Carmichael and Hamilton (1967) had argued that the black condition in the United States is essentially a colonial condition, not perfectly analogous to classic colonialism in the sense that there is not a separation of territory and no exploitation of raw materials. Such a distinction, however, was viewed as merely a technicality, since politically, economically, and socially the black community is controlled by predominantly white institutions, although they also make use of indirect rule. For Carmichael and Hamilton, the key role for black people in the United States is as a source for cheap and unskilled labor. The captive black communities also provide a market for cheap and shoddy goods for merchants, creditors, real estate interests, etc.

It should be noted that the emphasis of the Carmichael and Hamilton book was on what they called the "colonial analogy." Robert Allen would later try to take the discussion of internal colonialism beyond the level of an analogy by arguing that "Black America is an oppressed nation, a semi-colony of the United States" (1970:1), and that the implication for social change is that the black freedom struggle should take the form of a national liberation movement. He argued further, however, that there is a tension between a revolutionary thrust and a reformist thrust within the movement, despite the fact that most spokespersons used the "language" of revolution. Unlike Carmichael and Hamilton, Allen sought to avoid the "lack of perfect fit" by looking to Jack O'Dell's clarification on the issue of territoriality. O'Dell had argued:

In defining the colonial problem it is the role of the institutional mechanisms of colonial domination which are decisive. Territory is merely the stage upon which these historically developed mechanisms of super-exploitation are organized into a system of oppression. (O'Dell 1967:8)

And, thus, for Allen, colonialism was the "direct and overall subordination of one people, nation, or country to another with state power in the hands of the dominating power" (Allen 1970:8).

Allen and others have argued that in the United States the urban rebellions of the 1960s gave rise to a more neo-colonial form of control, which

utilizes indirect rule. In this scheme, black power became black capitalism, and a black middle class, militant rhetoric and all, would be allowed to get a larger piece of the pie for itself.

But there was still unease about the concept, so those involved in using the concept as a guide to social struggle turned increasingly to Robert Blauner's theory of internal colonialism; his systematization of the concept made the concept more elegant than it had been in the writings of those who were closer to the movement. He contended that the conditions of black people do not really fit the traditional criteria of colonialism, which refers to the establishment of domination over a "geographically external political unit, most often inhabited by people of a different race and culture" (Blauner 1972:83).

What is common to classical colonialism, and what Blauner calls "internal colonialism," is that since they developed out of similar technological, cultural, and power relations, a common *process* of social oppression characterized the racial patterns in the two contexts (Blauner 1972:84). The components of Blauner's internal colonization process were said to be: (1) the mode of entry into the dominant society – forced versus voluntary; (2) a process of destruction of the indigenous values, orientations, and ways of life; (3) a special relationship to the governing or legal order in which the colonized view themselves as being managed and manipulated by outsiders; (4) the racist characterization of a group as inferior because of biological characteristics, in a process of social domination by which the group is exploited, controlled, and oppressed socially and psychically by a super-ordinate group; and (5) a separation in labor status between the colonized workers and the immigrant minorities.

Much of our public attention to the concept of internal colonialism as it was elaborated during the 1960s focuses on the intellectuals mentioned above, but an influential articulation of internal colonialism was published in *Studies on the Left* in 1962 by Harold Cruse (reprinted in his *Rebellion or Revolution*). The article, "Revolutionary Nationalism and the Afro-American," framed his analysis in a longer intellectual history than most of the more popular exponents of the theory. He situated the black domestic colony in the colonial empire established by pan-European capitalism. But the United States did not establish a colonial empire in Africa, it brought the colonial subjects home and installed them within the southern states. From that time, the Negro has existed in a condition of domestic colonialism everywhere within the United

States. Cruse is critical of the Black Belt nation theory promulgated by the communists in 1928. Cruse views the colonial revolution against capitalism as the leading edge of the revolutionary struggle, rather than the western workers' movement. Members of the early 1960s black radicals, such as the Revolutionary Action movement, studied the article and circulated it among a wide circle of black radicals during that period. While most of the exponents of the theory thus far have been concerned with movements for social change, including Kwame Nkrumah (1970:87), there were also economists whose views we should examine. Some of these views use the "colonial analogy," and some use a more rigorous formulation.

William Tabb argued that there are two key relationships that must exist before the colonial analogy can be accepted: (1) economic control and exploitation, and (2) political dependence and subjugation. The maintenance of such relationships requires separation and inferior status (Tabb 1970:23). Tabb agreed with black radicals who argued that the issue of spatial separation of the colony from the colonial power was secondary to the actuality of the control of the ghetto from the outside.

Following Tabb, Bennett Harrison (1974) viewed the internal colony as a social entity similar to a "'less developed country' with a severe 'balance of payments' deficit and with 'foreign' control of the most important local, political, and economic institutions" (Harrison 1974:4). Interestingly, some analysts reject the internal colonialism model while accepting the striking similarities between the structural dualism pervading so many less developed countries and the segmentation of the American economy into a growing "core" and ghetto "periphery" (Harrison 1974:6).

Barry Bluestone had earlier expressed a more nuanced view of the ghetto economy. He thought that striving toward an inner-city economy would be the organizing base for strengthening the black community as a force to gain concessions from the government and from the corporate establishment, similar to DuBois's arguments in the 1930s.

Ron Bailey's analysis is distinguished by his combined emphasis on social movements and political economy. Bailey stresses the racial dimension in internal colonialism, defining it as "the forceful conquest of people of color by Europeans for purposes of economic exploitation" (1973). Bailey holds that "race has always been a significant and relatively independent force in shaping material reality in capitalist society" (1973:162). He is critical of

conventional Marxist analysis, which has not accorded to race its proper significance, because he sees “internal colonialism as the domestic face of world imperialism and the racist conquest and exploitation of people of color by Europeans” (Bailey 1973:162).

Bailey traces the black colony to the enslavement of Africans in the Americas as part of a global capitalist world-system. Bailey establishes that the black internal colony is a reservoir of superexploited labor, relegated to the lowest paid and least desirable jobs, alongside a large pool of unemployed workers that facilitates the exploitation of non-colonized workers. It is a zone of dependent development locked in the logic of spiraling impoverishment, and an expendable buffer zone to cushion the antagonism-producing operations of the American capitalist economy.

Bailey argued that relations of monopoly and dependency were at the heart of the economic domination of the black internal colony. The black internal colony is a zone of white control both internally and externally. Whites control and monopolize the mechanisms of production, exchange, and distribution, in addition to mechanisms of economic diversification (such as banks, credit, and technology). This dependent position of the black colony is a by-product of capitalist growth *outside* of the black internal colony. The enclave structure of the black community generates employment *outside* the black community while black labor goes unemployed (Bailey 1973:175).

For Bailey, dependency theory offered a set of organizing ideas that clarified how the black internal colony is a consequence of a set of historical forces and structures that consign it to underdevelopment and dependence (Bailey 1973:176).

Bailey concludes that the essential role of the black internal colony is to ensure the smooth functioning of the relations of production and exploitation and the system of domination and dependence, but that there must also be a system that guarantees the continuing existence of this entire edifice, which is the pacification of the black bourgeoisie, the strategy of tokenism.

In the same volume, Bailey and Flores caution against a rote invocation of the phrase colonialism based on assumptions about classical colonialism. They argue that discussion about internal colonialism too often included an undue emphasis on certain features of classical colonialism, especially the issues of an overseas army, and the domination of an overseas territory far from the conquering country. To illustrate their point, they cite Jack O’Dell’s classic article on the issue in *Freedomways* in 1966–67.

This allows them to notice that despite the affluence and power of the United States, “racial minorities remain unconquered by policies of forced assimilation, acculturation, and cultural extermination” (Bailey and Flores 1973:158). Bailey and Flores point out that the colonized minorities within US borders are distinct from their people of origin, but are also distinct from the white society within the United States, where they are rejected by the society that they built. But Bailey and Flores are not intimidated by such unwantedness; they view this strata’s counter-hegemonic critique of US racist oppression as a badge of honor rather than shame.

Indeed, the “national liberation struggles of racial minorities within the US are important negations of US capitalist domination inside its borders and converge with and strengthen the national liberation struggles of other third world peoples” (Bailey and Flores 1973:158). Bailey and Flores writing in the early 1970s are most assuredly an indication of the confidence of a rising class of radical intellectuals from the internally colonized minorities within US borders and their allies among a radicalized young intelligentsia among whites themselves.

The 1960s had brought the US back to a time when many equated the “colonial question” with the “social question.” This had been the basis of past coalitions, but there had also been controversy over which of the two were primary. The old Left consistently argued for the leading role of the working class (class first), a position that was defeated during the heyday of the internal colonialism concept.

Decline of Internal Colonialism Concept

The fierce repression of revolutionary nationalists associated with the Black Panther Party, the Revolutionary Action movement, and the Republic of New Africa led to a reassessment of the revolutionary strategy that had come to be accepted by these groups. The demise of those organizations resulted in an increasing acceptance of the “universal” ideas of Marxism. The Black Left, the Chicano Left, and the Puerto Rican Left moved to more multinational forms of organization and to an embrace of Third Internationalist forms of Marxism. As I argue above, Third Internationalist Marxism, drawing disproportionately from social movements outside of the core zones of the world economy, constituted a compromise, though unstable, between “class first” and “race first.”

Within the academy there arose increasing critiques of the internal colonialism perspective. But these critiques were never merely theoretical – they reflected changing estimates of the relations of force on the ground. One influential rebuttal of the internal colonialism model is that of Michael Burawoy (1974). Burawoy criticizes Cruse's stress on the exclusion of the Negro from US society, as a group set aside and systematically exploited for the benefit of the mother country. Burawoy argues that the Negro is an essential part of advanced capitalist societies such as the United States. Burawoy, on the other hand, defines a colony as of marginal value to the metropolis. And he relies firmly on the classical definition of a colony as a separate territory.

In the meantime, a decisive shift in rapports de force cut the ground out from under the positive notion of internal colonialism as the basis of mobilization by agents of social change. First there was a sense that the radicalization of the working class struggle called most of all for the unity of the great multinational US working class in the language of that time, and the Black Left called for black leadership of this working class movement, which all led to a movement away from nationalist forms of theoretical formulations. The Watergate crisis resulted in the resignation of President Nixon, and Crozier, Huntington, and Watnuki published a book entitled *The Crisis of Democracy* for the Trilateral Commission.

The authors argued that the 1960s had been a period of democratic upsurge:

The 1960s witnessed a dramatic renewal of the democratic spirit in America. The predominant trends of that decade involved the challenging of the authority of established political, social, and economic institutions, increased popular participation in and control over those institutions, a reaction against the concentration of power in the executive branch of the federal government and in favor of the reassertion of the power of Congress and of state and local government, renewed commitment to the idea of equality on the part of intellectuals and other elites, the emergence of the 'public interest' lobbying groups, increased concern for the rights of and provisions of opportunities for minorities and women to participate in the polity and economy, and a pervasive criticism of those who possessed or were even thought to possess excessive power or wealth... It was a decade of democratic surge and of the reassertion of democratic egalitarianism. (Crozier, Huntington, Watnuki 1975:59–60)

In addition to increased political participation, the authors argued that there was “a marked upswing in other forms of citizen participation, in the form of marches, demonstrations, protest movements, and ‘cause’ organizations” (Crozier, Huntington, Watnuki 1975:61). There were “markedly higher levels of self-consciousness on the part of blacks, Indians, Chicanos, white ethnic groups, students, and women,” all seeking “their appropriate share of the action and of the rewards” (Crozier, Huntington, Watnuki 1975:61).

Previously passive or unorganized groups in the population now embarked on concerted efforts to establish their claims to opportunities, positions, rewards, and privileges, which they had not considered themselves entitled to before. (Crozier, Huntington, Watnuki 1975:61–62)

Thus, some of the problems of governance in the United States were said to stem “from an excess of democracy.” But, the authors argued, “needed instead is a greater degree of moderation in democracy” (Crozier, Huntington, Watnuki 1975:113). The authors argued that such “moderation” comes in two forms: reassertion of undemocratic authority and cultivation of political apathy. Too much democracy was said to be an inefficient method of governance. All democracy “usually requires some measure of apathy and noninvolvement on the part of some individuals and groups. In the past, every democratic society has had a marginal population, of greater or lesser size, which has not actively participated in politics” (Crozier, Huntington, Watnuki 1975:114). The authors conclude that greater inclusion of such marginal groups in the democratic societies requires more self-restraint on the part of all groups.

In 1965, the civil rights activist and strategist Bayard Rustin had called for a movement from protest to politics. The deepening of the civil rights goals of social equality for people of color would require a form of coalition politics similar to the 1930s New Deal. By the 1970s, writes Norm Kelley, some of these leaders became, in effect, a national black political directorate, with power centered in the Congressional Black Caucus. Meanwhile, black America retired itself from the kind of political action that disrupted business as usual. Political energy was channeled into voting, the only legitimate form of redress of grievance as seen by dominant political elites. This process enabled black mobilizations to place more black elected officials at the table, but the requisites of maintaining political power limited their options, and it led to the effective demobilization of one of the more democratic publics within the United States.

The internal colonialism concept had always operated within a radical milieu. With the institutionalization of black politics within a liberal polity, and the necessity to operate within that polity during the mid-1970s, the forces on the Left began to question themselves. The Black Liberation Movement, the Puerto Rican Liberation Movement, the Chicano Liberation Movement, and the Native American Movement were all said to have gone too far. There was now a sense among some that the militants of the 1960s and early 1970s had brought much of the drama of state repression on themselves. Their adventurism and their elevation of identity politics to a principle had brought us to the twilight of our common dreams (Gitlin 1995).

Toward the end of the 1970s, William Julius Wilson sought to intervene to stem the hemorrhaging of liberal social policy that had occurred in that decade. He argued that race had actually declined in significance since the victory of the civil rights movement over Jim Crow and called for universal programs rather than race-specific programs. Wilson held that the main problem of the urban underclass in the inner cities of the United States (the black underclass or the truly disadvantaged) was not racism but impersonal economic forces that dramatically undercut their life chances and created a situation of social isolation and highly concentrated poverty. This came to be a new consensus not only on the Left, but in the Center and on the Right as well.

From the Left, Jesse Jackson encouraged the activists who called upon him to address the racism of the Howard Beach thugs who chased Howard Griffith to his death, and he warned that they should beware of the racial battleground and seek the economic common ground because there are more black people in Howard Beach than in the boardrooms of CBS, the New York Times, etc. On the Right, Ronald Reagan enjoined us to remember Martin Luther King Jr.'s call for a color-blind society. From the Center, Bill Clinton said that if King was alive today, he would not be involved in the fight for social equality and justice but in the fight against black on black crime. The internal colonialism framework had been a recognition of the significance of African-Americans as a constitutive part of American society, despite their marginalization. The history of African-Americans not only lent a semi-autonomous logic to their struggle, but it had profound implications for American society as a whole, and for its position in the wider world. During the 1970s, there was movement toward an elite consensus reflected in the deliberations

of the trilateral commission that the democratic renewal sparked by the civil rights movement was too much of a threat to social order. In the meantime, the institutionalization of black politics, which is discussed above, placed those who articulated the internal colonialism perspective in a position where such discourse was simply not acceptable. One by one, those who had argued for the concept of internal colonialism recanted.

Why the Need for a Reassessment of Internal Colonialism?

Despite the tactical sophistication of William Julius Wilson's response to the era of conservative hegemony within social policy during the Reagan-Bush administrations, there were some who were not willing to concede that the efforts of conservatives were well intended, or that the liberal/social democratic strategy of Wilson was appropriate for the difficulties faced by the truly disadvantaged.

During the 1990s, the seasoned scholar and former Congress of African People militant Komozi Woodard wrote *A Nation Within a Nation: Amiri Baraka and Black Power Politics*, in which he called attention to Arnold Hirsch's *Making of the Second Ghetto*. Hirsch details how Chicago neighborhood associations, urban institutions such as the University of Chicago and Illinois Institute of Technology, and government agencies such as the Chicago Housing Authority all agreed on the need to restrict black access to housing stock outside of the ghetto areas allotted to them. At the same time Chicago's Serbs, Croats, Poles, Italians, and Irish overcame intergroup suspicion and came together around their common interests as whites to stem black influx into highly desirable city neighborhoods (Hirsch 2000).

The Los Angeles Sentinel penned an editorial entitled "Ghettos, American Style" at the end of 1938 that warned that "those who have been protesting Hitler's despicable plan to herd German Jews into ghettos will be surprised to learn that their own government has been busily planning ghettos for American Negroes through the Federal Housing Authority [sic]" (Hirsch 2000:158). Twenty years later, the US Commission on Civil Rights would reach a similar conclusion about how the efforts of the Federal Housing Administration, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Public Housing Administration, and the Urban Renewal Administration all contributed to the residential isolation of African-Americans.

In some recent work, Michael B. Katz sought to explore the relative quiescence in US cities, since many of the conditions thought to have caused unrest during the 1960s and 1970s persist, and in some cases have worsened (Katz 2007, 2008).

Katz argues that black political control of central cities has not sufficiently altered the lives of most inner-city residents. "African-Americans inherited city governments at the very moment when de-industrialization, cuts in federal aid, and white flight were decimating tax bases and job opportunities while fueling homelessness, street crime, and poverty" (Katz 2008:191). While rural to urban migration in the United States brought political power to black politicians, in the ensuing reorganization of urban space, class-based contestations operating to the disadvantage of the lower strata have consistently maintained distance between the urban racialized lower strata and the higher social strata. For Katz, the upshot of this transformation of urban space means that the new ecology of urban power dampens the potential for civil violence by organizing race and class segregation alongside the devolution of control over urban space to previously marginalized groups. On the whole then, white abandonment, selective incorporation, and mimetic reform resulted in indirect rule, which Katz concedes in a footnote was developed as a part of the theory of internal colonialism advanced by black writers such as Stokely Carmichael (Kwame Ture) and Charles Hamilton in the late 1960s (Katz 2008:206). But the strategies suggested by these radicals were viewed as a minimum program for increasing the political power of the internal colony, from which more comprehensive struggles would ensue. Katz recognizes this briefly in one of the essays when he talks about a global crisis of legitimacy spawned by revulsion against Cold War politics, the Vietnam War, and the growth of impersonal and bureaucratic domestic institutions.

The increased political power in the cities did not fundamentally change the place of the black ghetto or the internal neocolony in the ecology of power because of the limitations of local government, which is constrained by the authority of the state and federal government. The newly elected black city leadership were also often caught between the constituencies that elected them and corporations that limited their authority by threatening to move and take much-needed jobs with them if the city did not grant them certain concessions.

The Continuing Relevance of Internal Colonialism Theory

Members of the Association of Black Sociologists have periodically sought to promote a dialogue on internal colonialism. Representative of efforts to revive the issue of internal colonialism is Charles Pinderhughes's paper on the continuing relevance of internal colonialism theory. Pinderhughes ranges far and wide over the landscape of the internal colonialism debate, effectively debunking some of what I have noted as faulty propositions in this chapter, but he also includes some remnants of a too-singular focus on juridico-political territories that I feel has been a hindrance to effective theorizing.

Throughout the paper, Pinderhughes uses the designation African-America rather than African-Americans. Yet he argues that African-Americans, or the internal colony(ies), do not constitute a nation. Then what does the designation African-America refer to? If we are to avoid the dead weight of the past in taking a new look at the concept, why the fealty to the definition of a nation established by Stalin in 1912, and used by some in the Communist International to maintain the leadership of the working class within the international revolutionary movement? It seems to me that this can only mean maintaining the leadership of the white working class.

Overall, Pinderhughes's critique is easily the broadest and most penetrating analysis of internal colonialism since Bailey's article of the early 1970s, but I would like to raise a few questions that the document raised for me.

Rather than rely on dry formulaic analysis, Pinderhughes views internal colonialism as a manifestation of popular discursive formulations such as the ghetto and the inner city to reference internal colonies on American soil. He points out how we speak easily of a colony of Italians, of Dutch, of artists, etc., but when one speaks of a colony of African-Americans, it evokes considerable disagreement. Though he says "to some," the extent of opposition seems much more considerable.

Pinderhughes describes the internal colonies as identifiable areas of concentrated exploitation and focused oppression (Pinderhughes 2007:4), which always seemed to be the subtext of William Julius Wilson's work in *The Truly Disadvantaged*. But he is quick to point out that internal colonialism is not a systematic commentary on all forms of race relations in the United States or elsewhere.

While Pinderhughes gives some respect to Stalin's definition of a nation, he relies primarily on Harry Haywood to outline (very briefly) the efforts of

the CPUSA to organize blacks (Pinderhughes 2007:6). To the extent that the CPUSA engaged in effective practice, Pinderhughes hints that this was related to its correct analysis of African-America as an internal colonial situation in the form of an oppressed nation. This seems to compress too much in a very brief commentary. Pinderhughes allows pride of position to the white cadre who came to political consciousness in the “class first” outlook that dominated the radical section of the pan-European Left from day one. But what of the black internationalists like Cyril Briggs and Richard Moore of the African Blood Brotherhood, who came to the CPUSA via the Communist International? It is not clear from this treatment what Pinderhughes makes of the intergenerational Left associated with *Freedomways* magazine in the 1960s, which clearly was associated with the CPUSA. Claude Lightfoot and other members of the CPUSA worked with the Nation of Islam during the 1960s. While DuBois joined the CPUSA in 1961 just before moving to Ghana, he had clearly worked with them since the late 1940s. Pinderhughes seems to adopt a Crusean attitude toward the CPUSA that underestimates the tension within the organization over the “class first” approach.

While Pinderhughes pays some attention to Cruse’s elaboration of the domestic colonialism position in *Rebellion or Revolution*, which was published in 1968, he does not associate this position with Cruse’s trip to Cuba and the publication of “Revolutionary Nationalism and the Afro-American” in *New Left Notes* shortly after his return in 1962. What is the source of Cruse’s position on revolutionary nationalism? Does it have anything to do with his involvement with the CPUSA in the 1940s, the heyday of the Black Popular Front?

Overall, Pinderhughes confronts the critics of the internal colonialism thesis on what most feel is their strongest point, that the implications of the theory for praxis are bleak. Here he takes on both Blauner and Burawoy most effectively. He focuses on Blauner’s remarks:

During the mid-1970s I stopped using the colonial analogy. At the time, I was still enough of a Marxist to believe that a good theory must point the way to a political practice that resolves the contradiction the theory helps us understand. There was a practical solution to overseas colonialism; the colonizers could be sent back to Europe. And for the most part they were. But I could find no parallel solution for America’s domestic colonialism.

Such a disconnect between theory and practice suggested to me an inherent flaw in the conceptual scheme itself. (Blauner 2001:189)

Here Pinderhughes pins Blauner to the wall. If short-term or middle-run praxis proves the validity of a theoretical formulation, why have some theoretical formulations persisted long after the futures that they heralded have not been validated? Since we are concerned mostly with Marxist-inflected intellectuals, how about Marxism itself? How much more time is needed? After all, *The Manifesto of the Communist Party* was written in 1848. Blauner thinks that the movements for decolonization in the overseas colonies constituted obviously “practical solutions.” They sent the colonizers back to Europe. But one might reply to this facile statement that it is all too obvious today that decolonization did not solve the more deeply entrenched coloniality of power that was the deeper concern of colonized people in the overseas colonies. Movements and intellectuals today are focusing on what a more thoroughgoing decolonization might consist of (modernity/coloniality, decoloniality group and movement).

Pinderhughes, like many of us, having been immersed in the debates of the Black Liberation movement, introduces the national question into his analysis of the concept of internal colonialism as it affects African-America. He argues that an internal colony that is an oppressed nation can opt for separation since that is achievable for a nation. An oppressed nationality, on the other hand, does not have the option of self-determination; the redress that they seek must be within the political sphere of the oppressor nation, resulting ultimately in socially transformative change within the oppressor nation. This is an extremely important point, but it is a struggle that is quite a bit more difficult than sending colonizers back to their homes. Blauner might do well to consider the implications of this. But Pinderhughes might also think of the example of the impact of the liberation of the Portugal’s African colonies on Portugal itself.

In my view, much of the opposition to the concept of internal colonialism exists in countries with social groups who have a high potential of defining themselves as an internal colony. The intellectual objection to the concept of an internal colony, or more precisely of seeing certain social groups as an internal colony, is a political objection. This is not an objection to attempting to see the real-world consequences of theoretical formulations but to allowing

short-term or middle-run calculations to dominate our understanding of the world, and thereby of our conception of the larger possibilities for social change.

To my mind, Pinderhughes seems on the whole correct when he insists that the definition of the entire domestic diaspora inside of the US as a single colony is not functional. If one does not have a single geographic location, then how does one carry out democratic reforms and administrative transformation? Pinderhughes's response to this conundrum is to view each individual location as its own internal colony (Pinderhughes 2007:23). But if one hews to the geographic rather than the socio-structural logic of coloniality, it lends to the domination of strategy over analysis, which seems to be a reversal of the order of successful praxis. First, we are all a part of the social world, we are not gods standing outside of the social situation. We seek to understand our situation in order to change it. If our analysis does not provide immediate or middle-run results, do we simply assume that our analysis is wrong or do we need a more sophisticated analysis of the larger social system and of the plurality of social times? Otherwise, we should simply accept Blauner's position.

If colonialism can only be an issue for overseas territories being subjected to the domination of an external political entity, do we miss the historically constituted structural relationship that has been defined as a colonial situation, involving the conquest of one people by the political institutions of a foreign power? This seems to clearly apply to African slaves who were stolen from Africa and enslaved in the Americas, and who were never assimilated into most of the societies that came to exist in the Americas. In the United States, this seems also to apply to Mexicans colonized on stolen land, Amerindians whose lands were confiscated and the people removed or eliminated, and to Puerto Ricans.

Are any of these internal colonies still nations? Clearly one might say that the American Southwest is a territory on which the residents might constitute a nation. This is not true of the other internally colonized groups, but this is not a dilemma, as has so often been posed. Pinderhughes almost allows these definitional difficulties to overwhelm his analysis when it is a tension that makes a strategy more difficult, but once figured out and understood within appropriate social times it can be more transformative, which is much more the object of struggle than self-determination conceived in nation-building or state-building strategies. Pinderhughes himself argues similarly in his

proposition that internal colonialism points to “the necessity of a systemic and systematic solution to the oppression and exploitation of its population, not just a reliance on democratic incrementalism” (Pinderhughes 2007:25).

Pinderhughes distrusts what he refers to as “democratic incrementalism” because it cedes disproportionate authority to the prejudices and misconceptions of the non-colonized white population. But one should resist the danger of seeing this as a closed box, when the binding of the internally colonized within the belly of the beast has implications for *rappports de forces* both within the US and within the larger world-system. This is an issue of great significance that Pinderhughes seems to dismiss with a preponderant emphasis on a state-centric approach, which he opposes to the world-systems approach of the modernity/coloniality, decoloniality group as presented in the work of Ramon Grosfoguel (2003).

While Pinderhughes’s contention that the coloniality of power is a redefinition of neo-colonialism in the sense that it is used to describe (frequently nonadministrative) structural survivals of past colonialism is accurate, he does not completely explore the full implications of the difference between the concepts except to disparage efforts that do not focus sufficiently on the state (shades of the conflict between revolutionary nationalism and cultural nationalism). But the implications of Pinderhughes’s position here may be precisely the fetishization of state power that Grosfoguel criticizes. To the extent that Grosfoguel uses the term internal colonialism, Pinderhughes is critical of what he sees as the “world-systems” flavor of his analysis, which he thinks is dismissive of initiatives for radical political and social transformations at the nation-state level (Pinderhughes 2007:32). Pinderhughes is clearly more grounded in the struggle of internally colonized populations within the United States and in his involvement in US-based black radical movements.

Pinderhughes, of course, is not unaware of the symbolic and real changes in the conditions of African-America over the last 40–50 years, but he is clear-eyed about the overall balance of an expanded professional managerial strata who are intertwined in various ways with the black internal colony, the base of a transition to what Robert Allen has recently referred to as internal neo-colonialism. But the base of the internally colonized African-America is made up largely of residents of what Loic Wacquant refers to as the hyperghetto. Pinderhughes counterposes the hyperghetto with the rising role of the special blacks (Condoleezza Rice, Barack Obama, Bill Cosby, and Halle Berry) and

token blacks. This evolution of African-America feeds the illusion that the only remaining barrier to racial equality is personal prejudice and personal failings (Pinderhughes 2007:40).

On the whole, I view Pinderhughes's "The Continuing Relevance of Internal Colonialism Theory to Africa-America" the best analysis of this issue since Ronald Bailey's articles of the early 1970s. But I am puzzled by his criticism of the internationalism of world-systems analysis, even if Ramon Grosfoguel cannot properly be viewed as a representative of the world-systems perspective. It seemed to me that Huey Newton had made the best application of world-systems analysis in his concept of revolutionary intercommunalism and the movement of Newton and the BPP from revolutionary nationalism to revolutionary intercommunalism.

According to Kelvin Santiago-Valles, races are built around unevenly structured populations or nationalities rather than necessarily being organized on the basis of juridico-political territories. For Santiago-Valles, this form of social order means that "race, modernity, and capitalism, as well as chattel slavery and its legacy, are historically and conceptually bound together as coloniality. This includes both formal colonialism and neo-colonialism as well as the Occidentalist culture of both" (Santiago-Valles 2003:218). This is the ensemble of structures that has undergirded the modern/colonial/capitalist world-system.

Lerone Bennett Jr., who many consider to be the dean of African-American history, tells us that "the history of black America is an act in the larger drama of the worldwide colonization of peoples of color by Europeans and the progeny of Europeans" (Bennett 1993:208). According to Bennett, this colonial system perpetuates the political, economic, and cultural exploitation of non-Europeans. Despite the specificity of the black experience in the United States, it is clearly a variation on a universal European theme: the exploitation of the labor power and resources of the colonized. As elsewhere, the system changed its skin at various junctures in order to protect its essential content.

Bennett dutifully notes the customary conceptualization of colonialism as an external-internal relationship between a metropolitan government and transplanted or indigenous people beyond its borders. But this is not the only situation that might be deemed a colonial one. When an alien group subjugates and exploits an indigenous or transplanted people within the borders

of a single country, it might be deemed an instance of internal colonialism. Bennett holds that “the decisive factor in colonialism is not geography but the sociopolitical relationship between a colonial center and the indigenous or transplanted people forcibly brought within the orbit of the colonizer’s influence” (Bennett 1993:209). Interestingly, Bennett uses the imagery of a developing center and an underdeveloped circumference within the borders of the same country to describe the internal colonial situation. Although the myopic focus on geography and changing forms of dominance might obscure the nature of a colonial situation, Bennett tells us, and as I argue throughout this chapter, that colonialism is “an organic structural relationship between a dynamic, developing, dominating center and a stagnant, underdeveloped, dominated circumference” (Bennett 1993:216). For Bennett, the center-circumference relationship is pivotal, as has been articulated in dependency theory and world-systems analysis. He then states in classic dependency language: “The underdevelopment of the circumference is a function of the development of the center.”² The dynamic center expands at the expense of the stagnation and underdevelopment of the colonized periphery.

Although Bennett holds that colonial situations are always characterized by political control, economic exploitation, cultural repression, racism, and force, he underlines the primary role of force in forging and maintaining the colonial relationship. He illustrates with a conversation between a prominent white citizen and Booker T. Washington’s successor at Tuskegee Institute in 1923: “You understand, the prominent white citizen said in 1923, that we have the legislature, we make the laws, we have the judges, the sheriffs, and the jails. We have the hardware store and the arms” (Bennett 1993:211).

But despite the role of force in the establishment, institutionalization, and maintenance of the colonial situation, force alone is not sufficient. Force must be used to penetrate into the “secret zones of the minds and bodies of the victims” (Bennett 1993:211). Here enters the role of denial of education or miseducation, white supremacy or racism, and the divine right of white folk to steal, as DuBois had earlier noted.

² This recalls a cartoon of a well-to-do white couple who look to be in their late 50s or early 60s riding an elevated commuter train through some American ghetto. The husband is saying to the wife, “The solution to the problem of the ghetto? My dear, the ghetto is a solution.”

Bennett shows that, initially, the colonial situation in the US was established by laws and conscious acts of institutional subordination during the slave regime. But over time, the colonial regime evolved into an autonomous entity propelled by its own social dynamics. Clearly the slave regime established the colonial situation, but the practice of both elite whites following their class and political interests and subaltern whites following their status and material advantage interests subsequently engaged in social, political, and economic practices by which this system became the established regime, which periodically changed its skin but maintained the fundamentals of the social relationship described above.

After Reconstruction, the colonial elite sought to establish indirect rule via the promotion of an accommodationist or comprador leadership strata within black America. Booker T. Washington and his successor at Tuskegee Institute, Robert Moton, were exemplars of this strata. They were strenuously opposed by more radical leaders such as W. E. B. DuBois, Ida B. Wells, and William Monroe Trotter, but the rapiers de force tended to push all leaders in the direction of accommodation. An example, of course, is DuBois' infamous "Close Ranks" editorial in *The Crisis*, advocating black participation in the US Armed Forces during World War I.

While the social structure of black America itself underwent some changes over the first part of the 20th century, neither the Supreme Court decision of 1954 nor the reforms of the 1950s and '60s went to the heart of the colonial relationship. Bennett argues that, by that time, the colonial idea was so deeply embedded in institutional practices not directly related to race (and, I would add, embedded also within the superegos of the American public of all races) that the "abolition of legal segregation and discrimination had little immediate impact on the functioning of the system" (Bennett 1993:220).

Structural Oppression and Violence

While some opposition to the concept of internal colonialism is based on the desirability of peaceful integration of African-Americans into the US economy, internal colonialism or domestic colonialism is precisely based on such integration. However, this integration has not been peaceful, but has been based on structural oppression and violence. Kamara and Van Der Meer (2007) cite Painter's contention that enslaved Africans provided the foundation of the

American economy as a basic commodity in the New England–West Indian trade, as workers producing agricultural goods for the world market, and as property (Pinter 2007). They were not considered persons, but personal property, and were thus the objects of structural violence. While the carefully delineated color categorization clarified the divide between the enslaved Africans and those descendants of Western Europe, it also underlined a sense of social purity among the descendants of Europe who coalesced into “whites,” which was posed against the “negative, evil connotation of blackness” (Kamara and Van Der Meer 2007:384).

Thus, people of African descent came to occupy a variety of legal statuses within the United States, but their social identity has not been disentangled from the “in but not of” social psychology of the dominated blacks and dominant whites. From the beginning, the enslaved Africans were unacknowledged witnesses to a discussion about freedom and liberty for all among whites. How else were they to understand the master’s conversation about freedom and liberty in their presence except to conclude that they did not exist as human beings in the eyes and hearts of the master and in those members of the master race who took part in this conversation without recognizing the presence of enslaved Africans on US soil? Perhaps there is no need to point out that the very privilege of the master and the master race are “inextricably tied to the existence” of enslaved Africans (Kamara and Van Der Meer 2007:384). The social relationship of the master and the enslaved, and the free people and the enslaved African, established a status hierarchy with material and psychic benefits that was lodged deeply into the interstices of the American commonsense and was of the very fabric of the American social structure. It was maintained by a system of structural oppression and violence that seemed to contradict the vision of the United States as a land of opportunity, with liberty and justice for all. This social violence, from lynching to intimidation to cross and church burning, to genocidal imprisonment rates, to denial of the franchise, to inadequate housing, education, and jobs, to poorer healthcare, has reinforced the internalized sense of superiority of whites and the internalized feelings of failure among large segments of the African-American population (Kamara and Van Der Meer 2007:385).

It is important to appreciate the social dynamics here. Black folk are not merely inferior and lacking in values, they are immoral or amoral. For Kamara and Van Der Meer, Frantz Fanon’s description of the colonizers and

the colonized in *The Wretched of the Earth* captures this social dynamic in a depressingly elegant manner:

It is not enough for the settler to delimit physically, that is to say with the help of the army and the police force, the place of the native. As if to show the totalitarian character of colonial exploitation the settler paints the native as a sort of quintessence of evil. Native society is not simply described as a society lacking in values. It is not enough for the colonist to affirm that those values have disappeared from, or still better never existed in, the colonial world. The native is declared insensible to ethnics; he represents not only the absence of values, but also the negation of values. He is, let us dare to admit, the enemy of values, and in the sense he is the absolute evil. He is the corrosive element. Destroying all that comes near him, he is the deforming element, disfiguring all that has to do with beauty or morality; he is the depository of maleficent powers, the unconscious and irretrievable instrument of blind forces. (Fanon 1963:35)

Despite the clear hostility of much of the white public to African-Americans who also seek to instill these ideas in other sectors of the American public, the admission of a large sector of the African-American professional-managerial strata into the mainstream of American society has been used as a justification for the demonization of the lower strata of the African-American population. Many of the black professional-managerial strata serve as a comprador elite within the black community that participates in the subjugation or helps to justify the subjugation of the lower strata of the community.

Kamara and Van Der Meer cite Martin Luther King Jr., who is moving closer to DuBois and Malcolm X and the younger Black Power militants in his last book, *Where Do We Go From Here: Chaos or Community*. In calling for a new program of action in the aftermath of the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights of 1965, King argues, "We have left the realm of constitutional rights and we are entering the area of human rights" (King 1967:130). Then he directly addresses the black middle class:

It is especially important for the Negro middle class to join this action program. To say that all too many members of the Negro middle class have been detached spectators rather than involved participants in th[is] great drama of social change...is not to overlook the unswerving dedication and unselfishness of some. But many middle-class Negroes have forgotten their

roots and are more concerned about 'conspicuous consumption' than about the cause of justice. Instead, they seek to sit in some serene and passionless realm of isolation, untouched and unmoved by the agonies and struggles of their underprivileged brothers. This kind of selfish detachment has caused the masses of Negroes to feel alienated not only from white society but also from the Negro middle class. They feel that the average middle-class Negro has no concern for their plight. (King 1967:131-132)

Like his revolutionary call that we unite with the barefoot people of the world at Riverside Church on April 4, 1967, his speech honoring DuBois at Carnegie Hall on February 23, 1968 on the 100th anniversary of DuBois' birth, and his movement toward an alliance with Malcolm X during the last month of Malcolm's life demonstrates his stance with the revolutionary people of the world and affirms the centrality of anticolonial struggle for the African-American liberation movement, which must be joined by all people of good will.

Less than six weeks later, King had been shot dead by an assassin (or assassins) in Memphis, Tennessee, where he had traveled to support a strike by black sanitation workers. This unleashed a fury of indignation within black communities all over the country. While the collective violence of this period was unprecedented, the real story here was an ongoing counter-insurgency that was removing anticolonial black leaders from the scene. While I detail some of this activity above, it is important that we understand how this kind of violence is part of the institutional structure of the United States.

Martinot argues that behind the constitutional state lies a contra-state, a self-defined para-political state, cohered around the principle of white entitlement. He calls it a byelocolonial state (*byelo* is Greek for "white"). This state is both white and colonialist toward those it insists upon excluding. This state acts consensually within a white supremacist cultural framework. Its violence and judgments are said to trump the legalisms of the Constitutional state, though it calls upon the constitutional state when its actions require more than self-legitimization.

Police action against black people that violates legality, such as profiling, arbitrary arrests, and torture, represent the para-political violence of the byelocolonial state, even though the police are officials of the constitutional state. Martinot illustrates the interface between the two structures by explaining that the role of the police is to fine a suspect when a crime is committed. But

profiling involves finding a suspect and then finding a crime for that suspect to be charged with (Martinot 2007:374).

According to Martinot, racialization defines “an allo-social form of dehumanized life devoid of birthright” (Martinot 2007:375). White supremacy is said to be an inherent derivative of this project, of which enslavement was one vehicle for enforcement. When whites define other people as non-white in order to define themselves against that otherness, the other is deemed devoid of humanity and thus divested of human recognition (Martinot 2007:376).

For Martinot, the dual state that he has analyzed reflects the existence of a dual class structure: a white class structure organized in what he refers to as the typical capitalist manner, and a racialized class system organized along a byelocolonial division between white society as a whole and the many classes and groups of racialized people dominated both within American society and within its global reach (Martinot 2007:378). What this means for efforts at social change or social transformation is that the transformation of class relations will not be sufficient to alleviate the exploitation of the byelocolonial state, which will simply reconstitute the constitutional state that it needs.

Social movements may be steps toward the allo-cultural, but they will not survive as such if they are not able to become marked as simply another “special interest” within the constitutional state, which was the fate of the New Deal coalition, the labor movement, and the civil rights movement in the post-civil rights era. The transformation of cultural structures such as the byelocolonial state cannot be achieved through rebellion against or class struggle against the constitutional state. A theory of the transformation of cultural structures has to be developed. Such a theory would require an understanding of the relationship between the Intermediary Control Strata (ICS), who play the role of policing the racialized strata; the byelocolonial state; and white racialized identity on the one hand, and the constitutional state, its class structure, and its structures of racialization on the other.

The World Context of Internal Colonialism

Mignolo argues that Creole consciousness formed in relation to Europe was a geo-political consciousness, but that Creole consciousness forged internally was racial, against Amerindian and Afro-American populations. This transformation of reproduction of the colonial difference has been termed “internal colonialism” (Mignolo 1998:34).

Mignolo argues that Latin America is not a subcontinent naturally named by God, it is an invention of the Creole elite of European descent in the 19th century with French imperial designs. Ethnicity in Latin America is thus a “site of struggle, the site of the coloniality of power, of knowledge, of being” (Mignolo 2007:43). But *rappports de force* are rapidly shifting following the increased assertiveness of Indians and people of African descent who are “shifting the geography of knowledge and taking epistemology in their own hands” (Mignolo 2007:44). Mignolo distinguishes this process from what we now refer to (often dismissively) as identity politics with what he calls identity in politics, which he feels is necessary “because the control of identity politics lies precisely in the construction of an identity that doesn’t look as such but as the natural appearance of the world,” which one finds in white, heterosexual men. These hegemonic identity politics denounce opposing identities as fundamentalist and essentialist. One must speak from the identities that have been allocated in order to de-naturalize the imperial and racial construction of identity in the modern world-system. Such constructions have not expelled certain people from the system but have marked them as exteriorities, as stigmatized beings by their superiors for purposes of maintaining the interior space that they inhabit.

Mignolo sees the emergence of a de-colonial way of thinking in various parts of the world, which he describes as confronting the hegemonic designs of Western thought from the borderlands, which is a position from which one can avoid Western and non-Western fundamentalisms.

But this struggle requires an internal organization of these internally colonized populations as a matter of survival, and an external organization to fight against imperial/colonial infiltration/destruction of their residential areas, economic and social organizations, culture, etc.

For Mignolo, the consequence of 300 years of direct colonial rule and 200 years of internal colonialism has been the growing force of nations within nations, where in Latin America *metizaje* became the ideology of national homogeneity, while an Anglo-Protestant culture core into which others would assimilate characterized the United States. But de-colonial thinking is the road to pluri-versality as a universal project. This is posed in opposition to an abstract universalism, whether of the liberal or the radical (Marxist) variety. For Mignolo, the defense of human sameness above human differences is always a claim made from what he refers to as the “privileged position of identity politics in power” (Mignolo 2007:55).

Mignolo argues that epistemic fractures are taking place around the world, not just among indigenous communities in the Americas, New Zealand, and Australia, but also among Afro-Andean, Afro-Caribbean, and Islamic intellectuals and activists. Contrary to what might be assumed, this process has led to a retreat of nationalism, conceived as the identification of the state with one ethnicity and, therefore, to the fetishization of power. If the state is identified with one ethnicity, then there is no difference between the power of the people and the power in the hands of people of that ethnicity who represent the state. And the model of this form of organization is the Western bourgeois state based upon the political theory from Plato and Aristotle to Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Locke. The de-colonial option came to the fore when indigenous people around the world began to claim their own cosmology in the organization of the economic and the social, of education and subjectivity, and when Afro-descendant groups in South America and the Caribbean followed the same path. It will gain significant momentum when Islamic and Arabic intellectuals and activists also follow that path.

The de-colonial option is being exercised more and more today because the logic of coloniality (capitalism, state formation, university education, media, and information as commodity, etc.) is indeed flattening the world, as has been enthusiastically charted by Thomas Friedman (2005). The de-colonial option moves away from Western civilization's expendability of human lives and civilization of death (massive slave trade, famines, wars, genocides, and the elimination of difference at all cost, such as in Iraq and Lebanon).

The American model of multiculturalism conceded "culture" while maintaining "epistemology." Andean intellectuals introduced the term "interculturality" as a means of claiming epistemic rights (Mignolo 2007:62). For Mignolo, the struggle for epistemic rights is fundamental to any strategy for transformative social change because this struggle is what will determine the "principles upon which the economy, politics, and education will be organized, ruled, and enacted" (Mignolo 2007:65). These principles will allow many worlds to co-exist and not be ruled out in the name of simplicity and the reproduction of binary opposition. This approach allows for the rise of a communal system (different from the capitalist and socialist systems) in which power is not located in the state or in the individual (or corporate) proprietor but in the community.

It is within this context that the internally colonized will be able to come into the light and be fully acknowledged. This will be unavoidable for the same reason that the internally colonized have been shunted into the shadows since the 1970s: they had been the principle challenge to white supremacy in the US, had mobilized large sections of the American population against the imperial role of their government in the world arena, and had argued for an increase in the democratic and egalitarian character of American society. All of the efforts at silencing these forces via a neo-liberal closing down of the welfare state, ending the discussion about racial justice via the argument for a color-blind society, and blaming the poor for their own poverty via a discourse about the underclass and a culture of poverty. The withdrawal of the state from inner-city sites of concentrated poverty, or what I would call internally colonized populations, led to replacement by a carceral state. The professional-managerial strata from these populations are incorporated into the class structure of the larger system through affirmative action and programs of diversity, a program of limited integration or assimilation of these strata into the larger society. But there remains a significant section of the intelligentsia that is scornful of this option, and who will likely in time come together with the oppositional culture of the youth and the older organic intellectuals of these communities to espouse and develop a de-colonial option. Since these communities are located in what used to be called "the belly of the beast" in the 1960s, these movements will ally with and draw sustenance from similar movements in the Caribbean, Africa, Latin America, Asia, the Pacific Islands, and Central Europe, and constitute a fundamental challenge to the system of white world supremacy, which was a constitutive feature of the founding of the Americas and the establishment of the capitalist world economy. While the capitalist world economy itself is entering into a structural crisis, the inability of the workers' movements and the national liberation movements to transform capitalism in the past will be augmented this time by populations who will not accept the gift of assimilation but who will seek to overcome not only capitalism but its coloniality of power, of knowledge, and of being.

The old order is now in a period of transition, and the delinking of these internal colonies from the centers of power will constitute a significant and strategic rebuilding of old structures of power, knowledge, and being. It will

foster a situation in which we are not likely to have a new system with global designs, but a system with a true plurality of centers, not of a universal society, but a pluri-versal one, where there is a genuine right of difference.

Samuel Huntington's Hispanic challenge is really a multifaceted challenge to the coloniality of power of the pan-European world, and especially to its declining hegemony, the United States of America. But this will be a liberation from the defensive, oppressive police of the world-system and a release of the concentrated power that will allow the rest of the world to dream their own freedom dreams, and to realistically take steps toward their realization.