



75% whitened) that black women love white men and black men white women, that a disillusioned black bourgeoisie could persist, that kinky hair straightened is a criterion for beauty. Any black person in America who honestly hates whiteness: hates a major part of himself, unavoidably. Listen to Eldridge Cleaver's words:

I love you
Because you're white,
Not because you're charming,
Or bright.
Your whiteness
Is a silky thread
Snaking through my thoughts
In read not patterns
Of lust and desire.

I hate you because you're white
Your white meat
Is nightmare food.
White as
The skin of evil.
You're my Moby Dick,
White witch,
Symbol of the rope and hanging tree,
Of the burning cross.
Loving you thus
And hating you so,
My heart is torn in two,
Crucified.

The truth is salient. Blacks HAVE, already, done more of their share of integrating before they even espoused the philosophy. Now mustn't the white man fulfill the desire ratio? Yes. But he won't, and he can't.

Why he won't and can't is already answered: the black's culture in America is a caricatured, reative culture of the WASP's. White America won't integrate this culture for the obvious reason that it doesn't need a mimicry of itself. And, certainly, since this culture is hardly unique, save in a few aspects, it can't be integrated into White America.

In a word, integration by its true definition is virtually impossible in this society. Only when integration means gradualism, tokenism, assimilation is it conceivable. This IS how American history conceives of integration and, to this writer, the assimilationist concept is not at all worthy of black people. Integration is disintegration.

For what then should black people strive? History and reason offer but an option—either assimilation or nationalism. What might be considered, on a less ignominious tangent of assimilation, as an inbetween would be cultural pluralism. As this philosophy mostly concurs with the nationalist philosophy on the practical level, I will discuss this option later. Suffice it here to say that the choice is virtually between assimilation, or the eventual complete loss of the black ethnic identity to the WASPIAN society, and nationalism, or the creation, development, and maintenance of a pure black culture, ideally in a separate nation. Since I am of the nationalist school I ask rhetorically, why not assimilate?

The answer: WE AM BLACK, PROUD, ANGRY. WE AM BEAUTIFUL, AWARE, SOULFUL. AND KNOW

WHAT'S HAPPENIN!) (Dig it.) For what reasons should black people forsake their awesome potentialities in favor of the culture of simply another minority? Wouldn't a true Black Peoplehood be just as significant, if not more, to humanity as the WASP's?

My own pride in being black and my love for black people compel me to seek assiduously the full autonomy of blacks. If every white in this country died (say from an overdose of LSD, as his image of America DOES seem hallucinatory) I desire that black people still survive. Certainly DuBois was foreboding in warning that the problem of the twentieth century would be the problem of the color-line; maybe he should have added that the goal of black people must be the goal of survival, ethnic survival and self-survival.

“And the camps and the unheard-of weapons are ready, baby. It's shattering, but Hitler and Orwell were for real, man, were dug!”

(Therefore, at least from a sense of pride and preservation we should adopt nationalism—indeed the most honorable, rational choice.)

But it is also critical that we adopt such: I contend that one of the four following will become manifested in the near future: 1) The power structure will provoke a well planned revolution and undertake a totalitarian regime. 2) The present radical young generation will provoke a revolution and if successful will institute some sort of nonracist, non-exploitative establishment. 3) The lesser radicals will arrest the other trends by espousing and effecting the cultural pluralist philosophy. 4) Nothing will occur, save the further infusion of the decadent Western system. As seen, each possibility is of crucial significance and black people must be nationalized to adjust effectively.

Examining the first trend, evidence is manifold that the power structure has its timetable geared toward a totalitarian overtake. American society is being conditioned to accept this. It is being readied to MAKE BLACK PEOPLE AMERICA'S SCAPEGOAT BY THE POWER ELITE'S PROGRAMMING ITS AGITATION A CERTAIN CALCULABLE WAY. And the camps and the unheard-of weapons are ready, baby. It's shattering, but Hitler and Orwell were for real, man, were dug. Indeed we must ready OURSELVES to either defend nobly ourselves, if the time came, or expatriate as a nation.

On the second plain, should whites get hip to what's really happening in Nixon's crib, and rectify the system before it enslaves them, we blacks must be in a position powerful enough to fill some of the resultant power vacuums.

It seems that the most immediate probability is cultural pluralism, the third possible trend of American society. Once America understands her very nature on the social level, this may well be the best step, regardless whether blacks are here or elsewhere. Cultural Pluralism, a philosophy developed by Horace Kallen between 1915 and 1925, suggests that America recognize her ethnic makeup and reevaluate her society around that makeup. Milton Gordon, who also promulgates the philosophy, terms it instead structural pluralism, since much of the native ethnic cultures is replaced by the WASPIAN culture, thereby leaving a structurally ethnic milieu (refer back to the four assimilational processes.) Here is where that in-between option for black people, mentioned earlier, may prove

“Whites shouldn't play jazz simply because they are interfering primarily with the development of black nationalism on the cultural level.”

viable, despite its assimilationist bending, which is for societal order only.

My contention in these regards, concerning black people, is the cultural or structural pluralism as a program cannot be efficient unless preceded by nationalism. Otherwise the result would be the perpetuation of our reative culture, regardless of how acknowledged it is by other pluralists.) Nevertheless, it is conceivable that in black nation-building a residue of values already acculturated from America will exist which will not be incompatible with the values of other ethnics in the pluralist society.

Finally, should America do nothing or change little, black people must still unite nationally. The reasons are abundant throughout this paper and need not be repeated here. A word of clarification is, however, in order. In whatever trend that America seems to follow, I am not here encouraging blacks to become obsessed activists in other-America. The black man is needed to realize black nationalism, primarily. The SYSTEM will die without much black activist help; those ardent, young, angry, radical whites will see to that. Blacks must remain cool, of necessity, and allow the whites to crumble their own decadent, salacious creation (W.H.) Blacks must be black; being black is being real; being real is being nationalist.

Nationalism is no new phenomenon in concept. Its gamut extends from the nationalist hints of Nat Turner and David Walker through DuBois through its ungerminating seeds in the Harlem Renaissance on to the emotional “Kill Whitey” programless programs of late. That this trend is not a progressive development but rather a skewed wandering begs examination. The history of nationalism is indeed of too much depth to relate here. Suffice it to say that our earliest “nationalists” were murdered; that DuBois and the Harlem Renaissance failed due to absorption by integrationists and white paternalists; and that the only observable program of the “Kill Whitey” sect is to do just that.

I've left out a lot: Delany, Garvey, Vessey, Malcolm, W. Hughs, Jones—a whole lot. It was, however, exposed in those I did mention that integrationism and white paternalism effected nationalism's heretofore failure. To examine the records to learn of all our leaders and how they fared is the immediate role of we brothers and sisters--being, supposedly, the intellectuals of the movement.

With this frame of reference, then, we can examine some requisites of nation-building. For the present, physical separation is unfeasible. However some sort of physical separation would be the nationalist's ideal. Opposition to the principle itself merely squeals where one's true horde of values lie.

It being presently impracticable for massive migration, nationalism must be directed toward the black communities themselves. Within them, irrelevant Western values must be supplanted by new black values. Cultural developments must be evolved by and for blacks. Arts in the areas of music, dance, theatre, literature, painting, etc. must find definable black forms. The unique cultural and social needs of the people will eventually determine our best political and economical systems.

Looking out from within, we must see ourselves as separatist egalitarians. Separatist because nation-building inheres some sort of alienation, if none other than ethnic separation. Egalitarian because human rights must be universally acknowledged, and because our culture must be envisaged as the equal to any other, the WASP's notwithstanding.

Most important, we must thwart our biggest outside threat—white paternalism. History tells us why we must. To preclude this, we mustn't allow for the involvement of whites even behind the

scenes (maybe except for financial contributions—if they are unconditional.) Heretofore, most of our leaders have been parroting white voices and sponsoring white-programmed policies: This must cease for evident reasons. Whites too must not involve themselves on the activist level. A white radical, for instance, who can teach a young black child black history does little psychologically, since the white would still, as always be in the teaching, superior role.

Culturally speaking, this is why I must discourage white musicians from playing black music—jazz. Before I say more let it be known that I KNOW EXPERIENCIALY THAT SOME WHITES CAN PLAY JAZZ; I know too that on the whole they distort it—but this is not my point. Whites shouldn't play jazz simply because they are interfering primarily with the development of black nationalism on the cultural level; second, because they take employment away from more deserving blacks. (e.g. why did King Oliver die a pauper while PAUL WHITEMAN died wealthy, honored as the FATHER OF JAZZ?)

Moreover, how can young black nationalists cope with their musical art form when it is performed by whites? And that whites are notoriously the distorters of jazz stymies black nationalism all the more: black people who are ignorant of the art form will find it progressively harder to weed out authentic jazz from distorted “jazz.” In sum, if whites continue to whiten black music in the name of humanity, then all that needs to be coupled is the distorted “jazz” heard by still-unsofisticated blacks with the performers being white, and the regressive effect of those whites on black nationalism would be ostentaciously. (And Phil, boy, one doesn't GIVE jazz to the world—it's TAKEN!)

These same points hold true for any black endeavor. Whites should see for themselves that black freedom and identity must come from a black thing. What I encourage whites to do is get hip to their SYSTEM and do something about that. Whites can't truly relate to what black people are doing until they desire to rectify their own demon system. While whites do their thing there, Moses Shickletroy and the rest of us brothers will be evolving a black peoplehood.

The entire above is but a superficial yet, hopefully comprehensive rationale of my maturing philosophy of black nationalism. My argument has been straightforward, frank. Although Phil insists that mine is a “VERY VERY SICK, RASCIST” philosophy, I uphold it as the utmost humanitarian. So to all brothers and sisters I appeal, let us take out Black Experience and develop national drama forms, literary forms, dance forms; let us take out black music and make it our classical; let us take our large noses, big asses, thick lips, and nappy heads and define our own set of beauty values!

Integration is disintegration, NATIONALISM RATIONALISM.

NOTES

- 1) Milton M. Gordon, ASSIMILATION IN AMERICAN LIFE (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964)
- 2) Thomas Jefferson, NOTES ON VIRGINIA Query 8 quoted in Gordon, op. cit., p. 91
- 3) Quoted in Benjamin P. Thoman, ABRAHAM LINCOLN, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952) ppl63-64
- 4) Oscar Handlin, RACE AND NATIONALITY IN AMERICAN LIFE (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1957) pp 93-138
- 5) Gordon, op. cit., p. 221.
- 6) Eldridge Cleaver, SOUL ON ICE (New York: McGraw-Hill Publications 1968) p 13