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PREFACE

FRIENDS OF PEOPLES COLLEGE!

This document is the first in a series of Drafts for Review that we will be sending you as part of our attempt to collectively undertake concrete theoretical work. We consider the task of theoretical work to be extremely important at this stage of the movement, due especially to the heightening of contradictions in USA society and the world. A major responsibility of mental workers is to "make a concrete analysis of concrete things," and to help develop sound political theory. Indeed, this is the only way to avoid the dogmatic errors many are making in our movement today. On the other hand, we see the use of established revolutionary scientific principles and methods as central to our work in order to avoid the mechanical positivistic empiricism of bourgeois social science.

In the above ways we aim to combat both right and anti-imperialist "left" errors being made in the US/movement in this current period. Moreover, the importance of the African Liberation Support Committee (ALSC) in the development of many of the forces in the Black liberation movement (1972-1977) adds even greater significance to this work.

We are committed to working collectively in order to be comprehensive and thorough, to struggle for unity around a correct line, and to test the general level of our analysis with many diverse particular cases in order not to over
simplify the complex reality of the many material contradictions of this society. More importantly, we hold to Marxism-Leninism, and realize that correct views can only be tested in practice, the changing of the world!

However, in this context, to fulfill this task of analysis, we have constructed a questionnaire for each of you to fill out (attached as appendix). We adopted this method in order to more effectively codify your responses and to evaluate this method of collective work. Please feel free to add to this form any other criticism you have; and, as requested, please send us any reference material that ought to be considered as part of this project.

Again we want to emphasize that this analysis is a collective struggle to apply revolutionary scientific theory to the historical development of the Black liberation movement, especially focusing on the African Liberation Support Committee, in a concrete and systematic way. It requires a collective process of data collection, analysis, and criticism. In fact, this analysis is the result of substantial contributions by comrades in several cities who participated in ALSC and who unite with us in opposing the "left" dogmatism that has led to the relative demise of ALSC during 1975 and 1976. Without your help we will not be able to complete this project with as comprehensive a document as we need, nor with the level of unity that we must struggle for.
Remember Lenin's dictum that theory becomes a material force when it is grasped by the masses and used to make changes in the material world. For this we must have theory, and toward this end we are undertaking this analysis. Join us!
Footnotes to Preface

1. We agree with the correct Marxist-Leninist view that "the world is in great disorder." This requires us to pay attention to the changing character of the world situation and the deepening crisis within the USA. Things are changing and a sound revolutionary approach must take these changing conditions under consideration.

2. In "On Practice" Mao Tse-Tung wrote the following:

We are also opposed to "Left" phrase-mongering. The thinking of "Leftists" outstrips a given stage of development of the objective process; some regard their fantasies as truth, while others strain to realize in the present an ideal which can only be realized in the future. They alienate themselves from the current practice of the majority of the people and from the realities of the day, and show themselves adventurist in their actions. (Four Essays on Philosophy, page 18.)

We struggle to avoid this type of error.

2. To think that knowledge can stop at the lower, perceptual stage and that perceptual knowledge alone is reliable while rational knowledge is not, would be to repeat the historical error of "empiricism." This theory errs in failing to understand that, although the data of perception reflect certain realities in the objective world (I am not speaking here of idealist empiricism which confines experience to so-called introspection), they are merely one-sided and superficial, reflecting things incompletely and not reflecting their essence. Fully to reflect a thing in its totality, to reflect its essence, to reflect its inherent laws, it is necessary through the exercise of thought to reconstruct the rich data of sense perception, discarding the dross and selecting the essential, eliminating the false and retaining the true, proceeding from the one to the other and from the outside to the inside, in order to form a system of concepts and theories--it is necessary to make a leap from perceptual to rational knowledge.
Such reconstructed knowledge is not more empty or more unreliable; on the contrary, whatever has been scientifically reconstructed in the process of cognition, on the basis of practice reflects objective reality, as Lenin said, more deeply, more truly, more fully. As against this, vulgar "practical men" respect experience but despise theory, and therefore cannot have a comprehensive view of an entire objective process, lack clear direction and long-range perspective, and are complacent over occasional successes and glimpses of the truth. If such persons direct a revolution, they will lead it up a blind alley.

(Mao Tse-Tung, Four Essays on Philosophy, pages 12-13.)

4. Peoples College intends to publish material that puts forth a methodology for data collection on a national and local analysis. During 1974 the Research and Development Committee of ALSC distributed a research questionnaire to aid the ALSC work on the local level. We feel this type of work should increase and intensify.

5. The importance of theory for revolutionary struggle is argued by Lenin in What is to be Done (1902).
This is a case study of the historical experiences of the ALSC in the city of Philadelphia.\(^1\) It is intended as one of several working drafts toward a national analysis of the ALSC (as a background paper, not a chapter). We have undertaken to do city by city case studies first, in order not to bias the local analysis level with the ideological character of the national meetings of the organization, particularly since the leadership of Peoples College has historically been involved in the national leadership of the ALSC.

Our general approach is the science of historical materialism.\(^2\) This approach involves at least three key points:

A. The basis of all knowledge is concrete material reality, and therefore the bases of human history economic are the objective/relations that constitute (production relations) people in confrontation with themselves/and with the natural environment (production forces).

B. The development of society is in historical stages, quantitative definite periods in which there is a qualitative and / change in both the production forces and the production relations.

C. The motive force of history is the class struggle; the fundamental contradiction that gives rise
to this dynamic class struggle in the contradiction between the production forces and the production relations, i.e., the level of development of the material forces harnessed and used in producing goods to fulfill man's needs in contradiction to the organization of people in the society into owners and workers in relation to means of production (i.e., land, natural resources, capital, machines, factories, etc.) creating the dialectically opposite classes of exploiters and the exploited.

In this approach we are using the general theory of Marxism-Leninism to guide our empirical investigation, in order to sort out the many class contradictions, and to isolate the principal contradiction. This is the scientific way to draw lessons from the concrete case of ALSC as a major organizational force in the Black liberation movement (in particular) and the anti-imperialist movement in the USA (in general). Essentially we are asking the question of how to build the anti-imperialist movement, and are answering this question by using the scientific tools of Marxism to diagnose the ALSC.

We will be making extensive use of footnotes in order to share more empirical detail and theoretical references to engage in tangential polemics, and to raise questions.
This use of footnotes will make the text read faster and will allow for different readers to make an input to this collective process based on different levels of familiarity with Philadelphia.

The Philadelphia case study is in three sections. Section one is a discussion of the historical stages of development of Philadelphia, in which the dialectical social development of the Black population will be described. Section two is a more detailed discussion of the mass movements role of the 1960s in Philadelphia, especially the/Petty Bourgeois middle strata in the Black liberation movement. The third section is a detailed analysis of the historical background of ALSC in general, and ALSC in Philadelphia in particular.
SECTION I: CLASS STRUGGLE AND BLACK LIBERATION IN THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF PHILADELPHIA

1. Periodization of United States History:

The historical development of a city must be understood in the context of its entire country, and in the case of a major city, it must be understood in the context of the world. So, before we deal with the specifics of Philadelphia, it is necessary to discuss our understanding of the history of the modern world and of the USA in order to have a framework for our more detailed analysis of the history of Philadelphia.

As an introduction to the modern world, there is no more important primer than The Communist Manifesto by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. In it they concisely sum up the major features of the transition of European societies from the feudal mode of production to the capitalist mode of production. This development is of world wide significance, because the historical motion of capitalism has dominated the world for over 300 years. Also, it is important for us to note the role played by America (USA) in their analysis:

The modern bourgeois society that has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society, has not done away with class antagonisms. It has but established new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle in place of the old ones.

Our epoch, the epoch of the bourgeoisie, possesses, however, this distinctive feature; it has simplified the class antagonisms. Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat.
From the serfs of the middle ages sprang the chartered burghers of the earliest towns. From these burgesses the first elements of the bourgeoisie were developed.

The discovery of America, the rounding of the Cape, opened up fresh ground for the rising bourgeoisie. The East Indian and Chinese markets, the colonization of America, trade with the colonies, the increase in the means of exchange and in commodities generally, gave to commerce, to navigation, to industry, an impulse never before known, and thereby, to the revolutionary element in the tottering feudal society, a rapid development.

The feudal system of industry, under which industrial production was monopolized by closed guilds, now no longer sufficed for the growing wants of the new market. The manufacturing system took its place. The guild-masters were pushed on one side by the manufacturing middle-class: division of labor between the different corporate guilds vanished in the face of division of labor in each single workshop.

Meantime the markets kept ever growing, the demand ever rising. Even manufacture no longer sufficed. Thereupon, steam and machinery revolutionized industrial production. The place of manufacture was taken by the giant, Modern Industry, the place of the industrial middle-class, by industrial millionaires, the leaders of whole industrial armies, the modern bourgeois.

Modern industry has established the world market, for which the discovery of America paved the way. This market has given an immense development to commerce, to navigation, to communication by land. This development has, in its turn, reacted on the extension of industry; and in proportion as industry, commerce, navigation, railways extended, in the same proportion the bourgeoisie developed, increased its capital, and pushed into the background every class handed down from the Middle Ages.

We see, therefore, how the modern bourgeoisie is itself the product of a long course of development, of a series of revolutions in the modes of production and of exchange.6

The early history of the USA is tied in many ways to the European transition from feudalism to capitalism:

1. its early settlement by Europeans and their military superiority over the indigenous inhabitants was
facilitated by technological advances in the production forces of Europe;\(^7\)

2. its early commercial life was tied to Europe's manufacturing of goods (imports) and great need of raw materials (exports);\(^8\)

3. its early industrialization was stimulated by the European and Carribbean triangular Atlantic slave trade;\(^9\)

4. its democratic revolution in 1776 was part of the great bourgeois democratic revolutions (Netherlands 1566-1609, England 1641-53, and France 1789-94).\(^{10}\)

The subsequent history of the USA til the present can be summed up in the following way:\(^{11}\)

The general history of the United States is the history of a social formation with four interlocked modes of production that comes under the dominance of the capitalist mode of production:

a. While the colonial relations dominated, a commercial class dominated the south and enjoyed a high concentration of wealth. Also, there existed a petty commodity mode of production, and a slave mode of production, both dominated by capitalist trade relations.

b. With the American Revolution and the rise of industry, the capitalist mode of production emerges dominant in the 19th century, but must share power with the
interests of the main class in the petty commodity mode and the slave mode. The main contradiction develops against the slave owners who represent a drag on all other sectors of the society.

c. After the Civil War, the reconstruction represents the temporary rise of the petty bourgeoisie in the South. From this point on the capitalist class develops rapidly but still shares power with the petty producers.

d. After World War I and World War II industrial capitalism wipes out the petty producers and becomes totally dominant. The old petty producer sector of the petty bourgeoisie is replaced by a new petty bourgeoisie created by imperialism, the professional.

This is our very tentative summation of the major periods historical in the development of the economic base of the USA. There are several features of this summation that must be pointed out as qualifications:

1. each mode has an abstract form that is modified in its concrete existence in US history;

2. the time periods are very ambiguous because we have yet to make precise distinctions (they overlap due to the fact that one grows out of its predecessor, and the USA has been characterized by uneven general development: on the one hand, innovation, on the other, regions like the South, in stagnation and decay.
In order to reveal the substantive character of the periodication of USA history, we must take up a discussion of the major technological innovations that help set the basis for each historical stage, and the class struggles that propelled the society forward. Baran and Sweezy, in Monopoly Capital: An Essay on the American Economic and Social Order, point to the importance of "epoch making innovations" and "wars and their aftermath" because they led to "depressive effects and enabled the economy to grow fairly rapidly."\textsuperscript{12} Adding to their analysis, it is possible to see the relative importance of the technological innovation pointed out by Eric Williams in Capitalism and Slavery as setting the stage for the colonial period of this country.\textsuperscript{13} Shipping technology was very important, as was the development of firearms. The period of rising capitalism brought about a temporary (and tenuous) unity of opposite interests of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, and they both had an interest in the "new world."\textsuperscript{14} So with the shipping lanes of the Atlantic Ocean open, and with shipping technology developing rapidly, the early commercial interests were well served. The masses of people were well served by the abundance of land, and the possibility of going into business for oneself free from the bondage of feudal control and the limits of the new "wage slavery." This was not true of Blacks and Indians, of course.
The Indians were being killed, robbed, and totally alienated from their own homeland, while the Black man was turned into a piece of property, a chattel slave. There were freed Black people, who, subject to historical changes, enjoyed some of the advantages that the masses of whites enjoyed—wage slavery or the tenuous subsistence existence as a petty independent producer.

The Revolutionary War in 1776 and the War of 1812 set the stage for the full growth of capitalism and the isolation necessary for industrialization in the USA. The steam engine became the major force in production around 1870, and, because the cotton gin (1790) had been the basis of increased cotton production, the textile industry was in full swing as the key factor in the early period of industrialization. During the 19th century the railroads were the main basis for rapid economic growth, capital accumulation, and the concentration of wealth. This was followed by the automobile, which created the basis for the rise of the petroleum industry. The Civil War, the Spanish American War, World War I and World War II all contributed to the conditions that allowed for the rapid economic expansion of the US from an industrial country, to one ruled by giant monopolies that were forced to roam the earth in cannibalistic fashion seeking cheap labor to exploit, raw materials to consume and markets to dominate.
2. Periodization of Philadelphia History:

Within the context of this framework that spells out the general contours of world and USA history, it is possible to get a handle on the historical development of Philadelphia. Sam Bass Warner Jr., in *The Private City: Philadelphia in Three Periods of Its Growth*, provides an interesting analysis for our use. He claims to be providing "intellectual scaffolding for urban history." He does represent a breath of fresh air in bourgeois scholarship in that he provides a treasure house of data, and makes some attempt to organize his material in stages of development. He sums up his study of Philadelphia in four points:

1. "First, at each period of Philadelphia's history (1774, 1860, 1930) the city had grown to a radically different size, from 24,000 to 566,000 to 1,951,000."

2. "Second, the occupational history of the city changed according to the sequences suggested by current generalizations of economic history. The very conformity of Philadelphia to these generalizations suggests that the city responded to advances in transportation, business organization, and technology as a member of a large Atlantic economy and society."

3. Third, the social geography of industrialization appears to have been one of complex changes."

4. Fourth, industrialization populated the city with a new set of social units: work groups. The nature of these groups, their numbers, and their impact upon other events in the history of large cities changed significantly over time."

So, he does provide a descriptive account of some material forces in Philadelphia's history, but he fails to be systematic
and find the interrelationship between these forces. He doesn't answer the questions of a Marxist-Leninist: "What is the fundamental contradiction?" and "What is the principal contradiction at any particular time?"\textsuperscript{19}

So Warner's work is helpful in our attempt to sum up the historical development of Philadelphia, though at this point we don't have the data to fully correct his theoretical weaknesses. Our task is to demonstrate the dialectical character of historical motion for various aspects of the base (production forces and production relations) and superstructure (institutions, movements, and ideologies).

Philadelphia has had three major periods in its development, a history that closely resembles the general pattern of USA history and major capitalist cities of the world. We might simply name each stage in the following way: 1. an eighteenth century commercial town, 2. a nineteenth century industrializing city, and 3. a 20th century metropolis of monopoly capital. Throughout this history Philadelphia has had a distinct character that can be summed up in three points:

a. Philadelphia has played a leading role as a major urban center in the USA
b. Philadelphia has been a center of class struggle
c. Philadelphia has had a Black population with a rich history of social development, and struggle for defense and democracy.
3. The Development of Production Forces in Philadelphia:

Philadelphia fits almost all of the major theories of urban location, i.e., the break in transportation theory, the theory of proximity to agricultural and mineral wealth, and the regional nuclei theory.\(^{20}\)

Founded in 1682 under William Penn's liberal instructions, and settled first with Quaker artisans and a few Quaker merchants, the town had since prospered as the capital of a thriving colony. By 1720 Philadelphia was said to have 10,000 inhabitants; by 1775 it had more than doubled to 23,700. The townsite bordered the Delaware and Schuylkill rivers, both of which tapped rich forests and excellent farm lands. The line of north-south trade ran nearby, and Philadelphia also lay within reach of the Susquehanna and Potomac rivers opening to the west. Philadelphia, thus, soon excelled in most of the staples of colonial trade, exporting furs, lumber, staves, iron, wheat, and flour, and importing rum, sugar, wine, and English manufactures. (Sam Bass Warner, p. 5)\(^{21}\)

Its early location, then, can be attributed in large part to its access to raw materials, and economic potential (both production for its self sufficiency in food, and commercial activity to trade its raw materials for British consumer goods).

Land is an important aspect of the production potential of a society. A society must have these raw materials, or get them from somewhere else before it is possible to build a strong economy. But the more vital aspects of a society's production forces are labor and capital.\(^{22}\) One of the major
reasons for this is that the technological development and
the skill level/work habits of labor are a major factor in
defining the accessibility of the available natural resources.
In other words, dirt in one society can be iron ore in
another with the available technology and skilled labor to
make use of it in a metals industry. Or, more specific to
the environs of Philadelphia, it wasn't until 1840 that
techniques were developed to use the anthracite coal from
the eastern slope of the Alleghenies. 23

Marx clarifies the objective historical character of the
production forces:

Men are not free to choose their productive forces
--which are the basis of all their history--for
every productive force is an acquired force, the
product of former activity. The productive forces
are therefore the result of practical human energy;
but this energy is itself conditioned by the
circumstances in which men find themselves by the
productive forces already acquired by the social
form which exists before they do, which they do not
create, which is the product of the preceding
 generation. (Selected Correspondence, p. 35.) 24

This clearly forces us to examine both the availability of
labor and the development of capital throughout the history
of Philadelphia in order to understand the character of the
Philadelphia economy today.

Philadelphia was always one of the leading cities in
the developing new nation, and this in part reflected its
early growth in size, making it one of the largest cities
throughout the history of this country.
TABLE I

POPULATION OF PHILADELPHIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>US Rank in All Cities</th>
<th>Black Population</th>
<th>% Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>28,522</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,489</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>565,249</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,185</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1,951,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>219,559</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>4,818,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>653,751</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to its location on the East Coast it never was without its full capitalist share of immigrant labor from Europe,\textsuperscript{25} and, due to its proximity to the South, it always got a full number of Black migrants.\textsuperscript{26}

The initial Black population of Philadelphia was a sharp contrast to that in the rest of the USA. "At the time of the first national census in 1790, freedmen outnumbered Negro slaves in Philadelphia by almost eight to one."\textsuperscript{27} Moreover, from 1790 to 1800 Blacks increased by 176\% while whites only increased by 43\%. All of this existed while 60\% of all Blacks in the North were slaves, and freedmen in the South were usually limited to specific urban centers like New Orleans, Charleston, and Baltimore.

Set in the conditions of an atypical moral struggle with slavery, based on the democratic urges of a displaced Quaker petty bourgeois dominance, Black people in Philadelphia lived under the harsh condition of the early capitalist exploitation
of the working class. The transition into the industrial period brought an important intensification in all of this. DuBois introduces this period succinctly:

Five social developments made the decades from 1820 to 1840 critical for the nation and for the Philadelphia Negroes; first, the impulse of the industrial revolution of the nineteenth century; second, the reaction and recovery succeeding the War of 1812; third, the rapid increase of foreign immigration; fourth, the increase of free Negroes and fugitive slaves, especially in Philadelphia; fifth, the rise of the Abolitionist and the slavery controversy (DuBois, 25).

All of this adds up to the years from 1840 to 1870 being the lowest % growth in all of Philadelphia's history for Black people. In fact, in two decades there was a decrease in the Black population.

The twentieth century has been one of continuous growth for the Black population except for the decade of the 1930's the Great Depression. From the 1880s til now, the Black population has been increasing at a more rapid rate than the white population, and most estimates put the 1980's as the time when Philadelphia will have over 1,000,000 Black people.

The full picture of the economic base of Philadelphia also includes the formation, investment, and concentration of capital. We might look especially at the innovative and dominant character of Philadelphia in the overall economic life of the developing USA. The initial accumulation was
through commerce, merchants serving as middlemen between artisans in the city, agricultural producers in the countryside, and foreign markets (mainly England). Indeed, it is no accident that the First US Bank was charted there in 1791, and after it failed in 20 years, the 2nd Bank of the US was charted there in 1816.²⁹

Its major features, however, place Philadelphia as an early USA city to industrialize. The cotton textile industry was the first great industry, and Philadelphia led the nation from 1770 to the 1850's.³⁰ Moreover, the largest concentration of railroad construction built in the 1830's was around Philadelphia.³¹ But it had long led in transportation since the first turnpike was a 62-mile link-up of Philadelphia and Lancaster.³² And it has long been one of the major seaports on any side of the Atlantic. Today it ranks only second to New York in tonnage.³³
4. The Development of Production Relations in Philadelphia:

There is a definite relationship between the production forces and production relations in every society:

In the social production of their subsistence men enter into determined and necessary relations with each other which are independent of their wills--production relations which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum of these production-relations forms the economic structure of society..."  
(from the Introduction to the Critique of Political Economy)

In order to overcome the discontinuity between our theoretical tools and the data available from the US Census, we will make generalizations that must eventually be tested with much more accuracy and precision. At this point we are forced to use the major occupational categories in order to have a reasonable proxy for production relations, although this is not to be construed as being the same thing. This is one of the hazards of using Marxist tools of social analysis with data from bourgeois mystifiers.  

It is important, however, to note that classics of Marxist analysis, e.g., Capital and Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism, were mostly written with this kind of data and were able to organize the analysis in such a way as to bring out the essence of the capitalist mode of production. Therefore, while we proclaim our disgust at this bourgeois mystification, we nevertheless
plunge the dagger of our logic into this quagmire fully expecting to draw blood and not miss the mark.

The early commercial character of Philadelphia is based on the dominance of a petty bourgeois class. Warner sums it up this way:

More than at later times, this Philadelphia was a town of entrepreneurs. Artisans sewed shoes, made wagons, boiled soap, or laid bricks for customers who had already placed an order. Workers did not labor under the close price and time disciplines of manufacture for large scale inventories or big speculative wholesale markets. Most Philadelphians were either independent contractors hiring out on a job-by-job basis, or they were artisan shopkeepers retailing products of their work...Thus, a large proportion of the town's men--artisans, shopkeepers, and merchants--shared the common experience of the individual entrepreneur.36

Black people were victimized by the early competition for jobs, because they represented unpaid slave labor (artisan) in unfair competition with free labor. This led to the protests. DuBois indicates that "The Legislature endorsed this protest and declared that the custom of employing Black laborers and mechanics was 'dangerous and injurious to the republic.'" Hiring out of slaves was declared illegal by 1726. In 1780, the Act for the Gradual Abolition of Slavery was passed, and this coupled with the relative increase of freedmen led to Black people gaining some relatively good economic security. "...the freedman had in Philadelphia at that time a secure economic foothold; he performed all kinds of domestic service, all common
labor and much of the skilled labor. Here, DuBois leans heavily on the term "relative." In general the first shift is the transformation of the petty bourgeois character of the population into an industrial work force. This is just as Marx and Engels pointed out in 1848 as the general pattern of the capitalist system:

The lower strata of the middle class—the small tradespeople, shopkeepers and retired tradesmen generally, the handicraftsmen and peasants—all these sink gradually into the proletariat, partially because their diminutive capital does not suffice for the scale on which Modern Industry is carried on, and is swamped in the competition with the large capitalists, partly because their specialized skill is rendered worthless by new methods of production.

Specific to the 1774-1970 history of Philadelphia, there are two additional aspects to the changing social form of labor:

1. there has been a gradual shift in the numerical concentration of workers from commerce and manufacturing to service, education and government;
2. there has been a concentration of workers in large work groups transforming work into a collective social activity.

Changing Character of Labor in Philadelphia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial Sector</th>
<th>1774</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Manufacturing</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table is very important in understanding the composition of the working class, and the extent to which the large corporations have been able to increase their rate of exploitation of those workers who continue to remain in production. The value added in manufacturing for Philadelphia in 1972 was 9,239 million. This figure conceals the actual profits squeezed from the workers, but it does give us a ball park figure when we note that of this only $2,730 million (29.5%) was paid out in wages.

Another significant factor is the rapid socialization of labor into large work groups:

**Socialization of Labor in Philadelphia Manufacturing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Total Employees</th>
<th>Average # Employees per Firm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>98,397</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>292,616</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>498,000</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a very interesting aspect of the Bourgeois mode of productions tendency toward greater and greater concentration. Here is one of the most important dual features of the industrial work place which Marx sums up in Capital Vol. I:

As soon as the capitalist mode of production stands on its feet, then the further socialisation of labour and further transformation of the land and other means of production into socially exploited and, therefore, common means of production, as well as the further expropriation
of private proprietors, takes a new form. That which is now to be expropriated is no longer the labourer working for himself, but the capitalist exploiting many labourers. This expropriation is accomplished by the action of the immanent laws of capitalistic production itself, by the centralisation of capital. One capitalist always kills many. Hand in hand with this centralisation, or this expropriation of many capitalists by few, develop, on an ever-extending scale, the cooperative form of the labour-process, the conscious technical application of science, the methodical cultivation of the soil, the transformation of the instruments of labour into instruments of labour only usable in common, the economising of all means of production by their use as the means of production of combined, socialised labour, the entanglement of all peoples in the net of the world-market, and with this, the international character of the capitalistic regime. Along with the constantly diminishing number of the magnates of capital, who usurp and monopolise all advantages of this process of transformation, grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation; but with this too grows the revolt of the working-class, a class always increasing in numbers, and disciplined, united, organised by the very mechanism of the process of capitalistic production itself. The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with, and under it. Centralisation of the means of production and socialisation of labour at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. Thus integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated.\(^{42}\)

We can also mention that it is in these larger and larger units of production that the capitalist system destroys all previous distinctions of age, sex, race, etc., and with brutal rationality treats all labor the
same. Also, with increased routinization of the work process, the level of skill associated with the early artisan-craft worker is no longer needed. This large factory system reduces all workers more and more to the same skill level. ⁴³

As indicated above in the relative decrease in population, and the factors pointed out by DuBois, the period of the initial industrialization was a difficult time for Black people in Philadelphia as well as the newly constituted working class. In 1838 the occupational positions of Black males were:

Five occupations accounted for 70% of the entire male work force: laborers (38%), porters (11.5%), waiters (11.5%), seamen (5%), carters (4%); another 16% worked as skilled artisans, but fully ½ of this fortunate group were barbers and shoemakers... ⁴⁴

The occupational structure for females was even less differentiated than for males. More than eight out of every 10 women were employed in day work capacities (as opposed to those who lived and worked in white households) as domestic servants: 'washers (52%), 'day-workers (22%), and miscellaneous domestics (6%). Fourteen percent worked as seamstresses, and they accounted for all the skilled workers among the female labor force. Finally, about 5% were engaged in white-collar work, which, like the males, meant vending clothing and food. ⁴⁵

At this point, "Less than ½ of 1% of Negroes...found employment in the developing factory system." Foner sums up this period in the following way:
By the 1850's Blacks had been pushed out of the skilled trades they had once dominated by German immigrants and out of unskilled work by the Irish. During the Civil War, with increased demands for labor, job opportunities for Blacks picked up, but they declined again in the post-war years. 46

The continuation of this basic pattern was revealed by DuBois in his study of the Black population in the seventh ward in Philadelphia in 1896 (which contained 25% of the total Black population). He presents this summary table of occupational comparisons: 47

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Whole Population of Philadelphia 1890</th>
<th>Negroes of Seventh Ward 1896</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In gainful occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>6,497</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>19,438</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic &amp; Personal Service</td>
<td>106,129</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and Transportation</td>
<td>115,462</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing and Mechanical Industries</td>
<td>219,265</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Omitting 24 students 21 years of age and over

This turn of the century data reveals that the Black workers had not yet entered the industrial workplace, though
this had long been the dominant character of how the entire working class was being exploited. It is also interesting that with the figures for all Blacks in the Seventh Ward there continue to be sharp comparisons between Black males and females:

61.5% of males were in domestic and personal service work while 88.5% of females were, and 28% of Black males were in trade and transportation while only 1.3% of females were.

However, the demands made by World War I on the productive capacity of industry in Philadelphia, coupled by the necessary loss in labor due to a halt in European immigration and loss of white males to the armed forces in much higher numbers than Black males, brought a change in the relation of Black people to the production process. Not only does this sum up the objective conditions, but it was actively promoted by the giant capitalist firms, who were also interested in paying low wages and keeping the working class divided by using Blacks.

One analysis clearly describes this activity:

The Pennsylvania and Erie Railroad found it impossible to keep their systems in repair because of a shortage of labor. They, therefore, sent labor agents into the south to persuade Negroes to supply this demand. Early in the summer of 1916 the agents of these railroads picked up trainloads of Negroes promiscuously from Jacksonville, St. Augustine and Pensacola, Florida. They brought twelve thousand of them into Pennsylvania, one thousand of whom were sent to Philadelphia.

The industrial plants situated in and adjacent to Philadelphia were also influential in attracting
Negroes to the city. As early as August, 1916, the National Hosiery and Underwear Manufacturers of Philadelphia proposed bringing colored girls from the south to work in knitting mills. In preparation for this work, girls were at that time being trained at Enfield, North Carolina, to take permanent positions in the northern mills.49

This pattern continued, and Black males had gotten a firm position in the heart of the Philadelphia industrial proletariat by 1930:50

SELECTED OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYED BLACK PEOPLE OVER 10 YEARS, FOR 1930

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Category</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing and Mechanical Industries</td>
<td>31,721</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>4,348</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Communication</td>
<td>16,353</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic and Personal Service</td>
<td>15,227</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>36,349</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals for all Occupations</td>
<td>76,161</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>42,729</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table is in marked contrast to the data presented by DuBois in that he indicates for 7th Ward Blacks in 1896 only 8.2% were in manufacturing and mechanical industries, while by 1930 there were 41.7%. Black men in Philadelphia have not changed from this industrial work force during the last 40 years. Moreover, the next table will show that in relative terms, for men and women, Black people now provide more relatively/industrialized labor than whites. Due to changes
in the categories that the Census reports for occupations, the best way to show aggregate statistics for the pattern from 1940 to 1970 is to use the category Operatives.\(^5\)

\* OPERATIVES: THE HEART OF THE PHILADELPHIA INDUSTRIAL WORKING CLASS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\text{Percentages are the relative number of operatives in each race-sex category}\)

When we place this pattern of the historical development of the working class in Philadelphia in the context of capitalism as a world wide system, and take special note of the 20th century transformation of Black labor into the industrial sector, we have a concrete case for more fully appreciating this insightful analysis presented in the Communist Manifesto written in 1848:

> The bourgeoisie, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal idyllic relations. It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his "natural superiors," and has left no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than callous "cash payment."
It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasies of religious fervor, of chivalrous enthusiasm, of Philistine sentimentalism, in the icy water of egotistical calculation. It has resolved personal worth into exchange value, and in place of the numberless indefeasible chartered freedoms, has set up that single unconscionable freedom, Free Trade. In one word, for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation.52

So, what about the other production relation in Philadelphia and how has it developed to constitute the material basis for the stages of development that we have been analyzing?

The capitalist class, the bourgeoisie, is the class that owns the means of production. This means that they own, directly or indirectly, land (natural resources, real estate, etc.) and capital (the ownership of the production and distribution of goods and services). This class has always dominated American life, including Philadelphia, stealing the lions share of the wealth of this country and promoting misery and suffering for the masses of people. At no time in the history of this country has there been a time when the myth of US equalitarianism and fair play has been real, especially in the economic sphere.

While the early colonial period of US history was dominated by the wealth of a rising capitalist England, the merchants and landowners in the colony grew in wealth and power until they joined with the masses to overthrow
the yoke of colonialism. This led to high points in the accumulation of capital and the concentration of wealth and power. Charles Beard has demonstrated that the "founding fathers" of this country were a bunch of white male well heeled capitalists who were primarily concerned with protecting their own interests, and who only allowed one of their own to participate in the formal political process of founding the country.  

Beard also points out that while there were only 3 millionaires in the USA prior to the outbreak of the Civil War, by 1898 there were at least 3,800 in the USA.  

More detailed statistics for the twentieth century reveal that there has been a long continuity of concentration of wealth. This can be demonstrated for the control of production, by looking at the extent to which the largest firms control the amount of wealth produced in manufacturing, and the consumption of income, by looking at the extent to which the richest families get the lions share of the aggregate family income in the USA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Share of Total Value Added of Manufacturing</th>
<th>Share of Aggregate Family Money Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Companies</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>largest 50</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>largest 200</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>largest 50</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>largest 200</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>largest 50</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>largest 200</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>largest 50</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>largest 200</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>largest 50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>largest 200</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When we turn to the specific case of Philadelphia, it is interesting that once again a bourgeois scholar who romanticizes the ruling capitalist class in the Philadelphia scene provides us with an arsenal of empirical information. E. Digby Baltzell, in *Philadelphia Gentlemen: The Making of a National Upper Class*, not only gives considerable data on the capitalist class in Philadelphia, but also comes up with a periodization scheme which is generally correct, though often for the wrong reasons. Here is his most correct formulation:
First there were the eighteenth-century merchants and statesmen who produced Proper Philadelphia's Golden Age; these first family founders were followed by the pre Civil War founders of family manufacturing firms and investment banking houses; and, finally, there were the late nineteenth and early twentieth-century entrepreneurs who founded newer, and often fabulously wealthy, family lines.57

The ruling capitalist class during the first period of Philadelphia's history was a merchant trading class.58 This is a process that involves making profit from the circulation of goods as a middle man between producer and consumer. And, much like the agrarian land barons, land in the form of urban real estate is often a main and necessary feature of this urban class. Mainly the prime land is in the heart of a city that normally makes up its main commercial district, and the land around its centers of transportation, which in early commercial Philadelphia meant water front property.59 Warner reports that in 1774, the upper 1/10 of the population of Philadelphia owned 89% of the taxable property.60 Baltzell says that this Philadelphia was ruled by "a small Quaker oligarchy during most of the 18th century" and describes scores of their descendents who have participated in controlling the exploitation of the Philadelphia working class for the past two centuries!!61
This early group of capitalists also innovated in the area of finance, banks and insurance companies. The banks in Philadelphia dominated the country from 1781 to 1832. "In 1792 America's oldest and most aristocratic joint-stock insurance company, the Insurance Company of North America, was founded. It has written the cream of the fire and marine insurance business down to 1940..."62

However, things had changed by 1832:

Philadelphia's gradual decline from its Golden Age was now complete: it had lost the political leadership of the nation when the capital moved to Washington, in 1800; its commercial dominance passed to New York after the opening of the Erie Canal, in 1825; and Jackson's defeat of the Second Bank ended its financial monopoly.63

After the War of 1812, and especially as a result of increased manufacturing activity for the Civil War, a new class of manufacturer rose to power. The major corporate venture was the founding of the Pennsylvania Railroad in 1847.64 This company, by the end of the nineteenth century became the largest corporation in the United States. Also, Philadelphia recovered its leading role in commerce when "John Wanamaker, the son of a bricklayer, became America's leading merchant prince when he bought A. T. Stewart's New York store in 1896, but it was in 1961 that he founded what is now Proper Philadelphia's favorite department store."65
Two additional points will illustrate something very important about the national role of the capitalist class in the history of Philadelphia. The industry that dominates capitalist corporations in the world today is the petroleum industry.\textsuperscript{66} Six (6) out of the top 10 firms in the USA are based on this industry. "The rise of the petroleum industry began in 1859 when the Seneca Oil Company drilled the first commercial oil well in the United States at Titusville, Pennsylvania." The owner of this firm, Joseph Pew of Philadelphia, went on to found the Sun Oil Company.\textsuperscript{67}

And lastly, the rising capitalist class in Philadelphia was aided in its exploitation of the working class by enlisting the aid of Frederick Taylor, after the Civil War, who became an infamous enemy of the working class as the inventor of the "time-motion study" method of more systematically rationalizing the physical motion of the worker in the work process. He served the capitalist by developing ways to make every motion of the worker produce more and thereby provide the capitalist with one of the major sources of increased wealth (the others being making the work day longer, speeding up the work and/or laying off workers while keeping production at the same level). Taylor was a major contributor to what Stalin called "American efficiency!" His first employer was Joseph Wharton, an iron and steel magnate, who also founded the Wharton School of Finance in 1881.\textsuperscript{68}
What is the current character of the Philadelphia ruling class? Philadelphia "is one of the most active financial centers in the country, but it is not an independent center of financial power. To an unusual extent, its institutions are auxiliaries of a single Wall Street group, the Morgans." Although this is not always a direct relationship (through actual stock ownership, and/or influential direct representation on the Board of Directors) the indirect links are obvious. In finance, one analyst links the Morgan group to control over 2/3 of the Insurance Company of North America, all of First Pennsylvania Banking and Trust (and hence all of Pennsylvania Mutual as well) and 50% of the Girard Bank.

Using the Fortune Listing of the top 500 industrial corporations the largest ones are dominated by Morgan Group. They are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fortune 1974 Rank</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Scott Paper</td>
<td>1.1 Billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Rohm-Hass (Chemicals)</td>
<td>1.0 Billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Crown Cork &amp; Seal (Machinery)</td>
<td>726 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Penn Walit (Chemicals)</td>
<td>641 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>Smith Kline (Chemicals, Pharmaceuticals)</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>E.S.B.</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>Westmoreland (Coal)</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>Bluebird Foods</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continuing in this same vein, four other large corporations that appear to be dominated by the Morgan Group are Food Fair, Campbell Soup, Philadelphia Electric, and Atlantic Richfield. Before the government bailed the Pennsylvania Railroad out, Morgan interests dominated the board with three Insurance Company of North America Directors, the Chairman of the First Pennsylvania Bank, and three directors from other Philadelphia banks controlled by Morgan. The current Penn Central chief officer is a former partner in Drexel and Company, a Morgan influenced corporation.

And, while it is clear that this is a group dominated by a class of near homogeneous identity, they do have some Black representation. The prominent board members of the major corporations in Philadelphia are:

1. Leon Sullivan, Girard and Company
2. Thomas J. Ritter, Philadelphia National Bank
3. Henry Parks, First Pennsylvania Corporation
4. Patricia Harris, Scott Paper Company.

Morgan influenced all. This is interesting, because at least two of these people have other board positions that link them with other corporations. Sullivan is on the General Motors board ( ) and Patricia Harris is on the board of Chase Manhattan Bank (controlled by the Rockefeller Group). Indeed, it
appears that these Black people, though so tiny as to be at least numerically insignificant, do not serve only specific corporate interests, but, rather, serve the interests of an entire class!
5. Dialectical Development of the Philadelphia Black Community

As we stated early in this document, the approach being used is that of historical materialism. Basic to this scientific approach is the distinction between base and superstructure. The base of a society consists of its production forces and production relations, the basic economic factors that we have just been analysing. The superstructure of a society consists of its social institutions and social movements, its culture and art, its philosophy and ideology. In sum it is the society that people live in to carry out their social lives, it is the social structure built on the level of development of the mode of production (production forces and production relations) and its realization in the production process itself.

We have stated that history develops in stages, and we have demonstrated the dialectics of how the base in Philadelphia, in the context of world and USA history, has developed from a commercial town, to an urban industrial city, to a metropolis of monopoly capital. We have been particularly interested in the material basis of this development, because only on the basis of this can we now turn to the social and political development of the Black community and understand the objective context for the particular contradictions that reflect its development.
We are going to look at social development first, and then examine political development. In this context there are several basic questions that we think have to be answered in order to grasp the essence of the Black community in Philadelphia:

1. Within the Black population, as it was formed into a community, what is the relative weight of class structure versus status differentiation? 74

2. What is the relative importance of benevolence from philanthropic white people and institutions, versus the institutional and individual force that comes from Black self assertion?

3. What is the major dialectical struggle that propels the Black community forward, the struggle between Blacks and whites or the struggle between people being the working class (with the vast majority of Black/a necessary component part of it) and the ruling class (with some few Blacks being either in it or closely loyal to it so as to make them indistinguishable from it in the political and ideological arena)? 75

We have no pretense about being able to give definitive answers to these questions, although we are presenting this analysis as our tentative formulations of the questions as well as the answers. Please note that we must get to a concrete grasp of the material reality involved, and
use the science of Marxism-Leninism to sum up the logical structure and process of these materials, integrate it into world revolutionary theory and thereby develop a revolutionary theoretical understanding of our history and what we must do to change this history!

The first stage of the historical experience of Black people in Philadelphia represents many things: the dual character of white people, from the benevolence of the Quaker moralists to the racial oppression of the economic system: the dual Black response, from imitation of the genteel culture of upper class whites by the service elite of the Black community to the necessary defense against racial attack by the masses of newly freed Black people. The Black community of Philadelphia, like all Black people, came into being with two aspects: a group that had more privileges and the masses that were more oppressed. In popular parlance this is the distinction that has been made between the field slave and the house slave (although this is also the same distinction between the personal servants of the wealthy and unskilled workers in production jobs). (You can also think of this in terms of a division within the working class of Blacks, those that were so close to the master that they developed an identification with the system of oppression, and those in the working class that stood so far removed
from any privilege that not only was it impossible to also identify with the system but it was necessary to resist and protest in order to affirm one's humanity even if the odds of success were very slim.)

Black people in the early commercial Philadelphia benefited from the influence of the Quakers, a group who came to the USA in search of freedom themselves. With regard to slavery, the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Quakers in the 1754 epistle said:

To live in ease and plenty by the toil of those whom violence and cruelty have put in our power is neither consistent with Christianity nor common justice, and we have good reason to believe draws the displeasure of Heaven. 76

And while this followed antagonism by the newly formed, free white labor in the 1720s, this bourgeois democratic spirit led to the Pennsylvania pattern of emancipation in 1780. These were hopeful times for Black people in those parts. 77

Prior to this legal form of emancipation some of the whites had started on a voluntary basis. DuBois mentions a few, and how they helped institutionalize services for these new freedmen:

Meanwhile voluntary emancipation increased. Sandiford emancipated his slaves in 1733, and there were by 1790 in Philadelphia about one thousand Black freedmen. A school for these and others was started in 1770 at the insistence of Benezet, and had at first twenty-two children in attendance. 78
Soon after this, the increase in the number of Blacks migrating to Philadelphia resulted in racist restriction. In defense, some Blacks organized Black activity, and in doing so brought into being the first formally organized Black social institutions. The case of the church is the first and best case. Blacks were admitted to St. George Methodist church, and allowed to worship freely with the other communicants. However, when there was an increase in Black participation, the Church attempted to restrict the Blacks to the balcony of the church and thereby introduce racial segregation. Two men, who had distinguished themselves as craftsmen in the service of wealthy whites, led the resistance: Richard Allen and Absalom Jones. On April 12, 1787 they met with their followers and formed the Free African Society. This was the first organization for freed Blacks, and was soon to be the springboard for the institutional Black church, the mutual aid self-help societies, and the precedent for the organization of the Black elite. Allen left the Society and formed what came to be the African Methodist Episcopal Church, with Allen as its first bishop, while Jones transformed the Society into what became the First African Church of St. Thomas.

After the outbreak of the War of 1812, the newly formed Black community was still intact and moving ahead:
The school established in 1770 continued, and was endowed by bequests from whites and Negroes. It had 414 pupils by 1813. In this same year there were six Negro churches and eleven benevolent societies. 80

Indeed, DuBois points out that Blacks in Philadelphia were so patriotic that when asked to raise troops to fight against the British Allen, Jones, and a Black capitalist named James Forten mobilized 3/4 of the Black adult male population (2500), but when they got to the had battle front the war/closed before they saw any action. 81

It is really during the second stage of the historical development of Philadelphia that the Black community takes a form more recognizable to us in the 1970s. This is the industrial city, a city with strict national and class segregation, a city of immigrants and Blacks who fight it out on the margin of the working class, a city with increasing secularization of both the Quaker influence of William Penn and the church centered Black community of the early days of Allen and Jones.

In this second stage, the distinctions within the Black community become more pronounced, though it is obvious that Blacks have never been well off in Philadelphia or anywhere else for that matter. In the early days there had been Black capitalists like James Forten who had gotten his freedom and built a sail making firm into a very
successful business. But during this industrial period marked distinctions arose, distinctions more akin to status than class, though it is important to stress that these status distinctions reflected cleavages within the Black sector of the working class. In referring to the earlier distinction between house slaves and field slaves Frazier makes this generalization about "house slaves" of 20th Century USA that also fits Philadelphia:

Many of these families migrated before the Civil War to the north, where they formed a small upper class that boasted of its genteel traditions. Even when they could no longer make a living as independent tradesmen and artisans as they had done in the south, they continued to be "ladies" and "gentlemen" while gaining a livelihood as stewards in a club or in other fields of personal and domestic service.

One observer of the scene noted the following in his subjective characterization of the status distinctions within the Black community, as quoted by Litwack:

...an upper class, residing "in ease, comfort and the enjoysments of all the social blessings of this life;" a middle class, "sober, honest, industrious, and respectable;" and a lower class, "found in the lowest depths of human degradation, misery and want."

However, these status distinctions had a material base, though it was not relative to ownership to the means of production, but to the accumulation of personal property:
In both 1938 and 1847 the poorest half of the (Black) population owned only one-twentieth of the total wealth, while the wealthiest ten per cent of the population held 70% of the total wealth; at the very apex of the community, the wealthiest 1% accounted for fully 30% of the total wealth.\(^85\)

But this distribution should not appear to represent any kind of economic security, since as is true today, the event of a downturn in the economy brings a halt to any degree of privilege experienced by this status group of elites:

Between 1838 and 1847, there was a 10% decrease in per capita value of personal property and a slight decrease in per capita total wealth among Philadelphia Blacks... There was, in other words, despite a considerable increase in the number of households, both an absolute and percentage decrease in the number of real property holders.\(^86\)

During this period, the sway of the early Black elites was still in command. Even though the Baptist church had gained a stronger foothold among Blacks, the early venture into Methodism led by Allen and Jones was evident in that the 1838 Abolitionist Census of Blacks in Philadelphia showed that out of 2,776 households in which somebody went to church, 73% of them were Methodist.\(^87\)

Also, as Frazier points out, the mutual aid societies were still going strong:

By 1838 the number of such societies, mostly small groups, had increased to 100, with 7,448 members. The members of these societies paid in $18,851, received $14,172 in benefits, and
the societies had $10,023 on hand. In 1848, there were 8,000 members in 106 societies. Seventy-six of these societies had 5,087 members, whose contributions of 25 cents to 37½ cents a month totaled $16,814.23. The 681 families that were assisted by these 76 societies received $1.50 to $3.00 a week as sick benefits and $10 to $20 as death benefits.88

And while Prince Hall, a Black man in Boston, had received a charter from the Masonic Lodge in England and set up a Masonic Lodge of Black men in Philadelphia in 1787, it was in the second stage of Philadelphia development that there was a significant number of Black secret fraternal societies formed.89

But again, while the early institutional development of the Black community was initiated by this high status elite group, the masses of Blacks were suffering. Here is one account that concerns the high mortality rate of the masses of Blacks:

Philadelphia's coroner attributed the high mortality rate in Negro districts to intemperance, exposure, and malnutrition. After conducting an inspection in 1848, he reported that many Negroes had been "found dead in cold and exposed rooms and garrets, board shanties five and six feet high, and as many feet square, erected and rented for lodging purposes, mostly without any comforts, save the bare floor, with the cold penetrating on all sides." Some bodies had been recovered "in cold, wet, and damp cellars," while still others had been found lying in back yards and alleys. Most of these Negroes had sold rags and bones for a living. Not too far away, however, middle and upper class Negroes maintained some respectable living quarters.90
This is the period in which the early tolerance of the free Black community was halted and the barbarism of segregation was firmly instituted in many aspects of Philadelphia's public life.

When Philadelphia streetcars went into operation in 1858 Negroes could ride only on the front platform...Protesting this practice, one local newspaper charged that Philadelphia was the only northern city which barred Negroes from the public conveyances and that this prevented them from moving to outlying areas where they could secure cleaner and more comfortable homes at cheaper rates. The Philadelphia District Court, however, upheld the restriction as a consequence of the different treatment accorded Negroes and whites, particularly since 1838. Finally, in 1867, a legislative act forbade segregation in public conveyances.91

During this same period there was racial segregation of the schools and it was maintained even against the Black elites who protested.

In Philadelphia Negro leader Robert Purvis protested "the proscription and exclusion of my children from public school" by refusing to pay his school tax, but integration efforts failed.92

And as we would expect from our contemporary experiences, the phenomenon of segregation in public agencies is closely connected with residential segregation. Warner points out in his arrogant style:

Philadelphia Negroes "knew their place."... Although several thousand Negroes were scattered throughout the city as domestic servants in white families, the bulk of Philadelphia's Negroes in 1830 lived in a shanty town on the south side of the city in the Cedar, Locust, New Market, and Pine wards of Philadelphia and adjacent Moyamensign and Southwark.93
He later makes the following statement:

During the seventy years from 1860 to 1930 the residential areas of Philadelphia shifted from mild to pronounced segregation by income and ethnicity.\textsuperscript{94}

Using Karl Taeuber's Index of Dissimilarity that measures the extent to which a group in evenly distributed (a score of 0) or totally clustered with no exceptions (a score of 100),\textsuperscript{95} Warner presents an analysis of residential distributions of types of groups, businesses, and classes. Out of 16 different identifiable groups in 1860 for which these calculations were made, Blacks were the most segregated with a score of 47.3, while in 1930, out of 24 scores, Blacks were tied with Italians for the second most segregated with a score of 50.7, out-segregated only by housing units renting for under $15 per month.\textsuperscript{96}

As Philadelphia moved into the era when it became a metropolitan center of monopoly capital, the Black community took on its contemporary character with continued growth in what it had developed, but also took on three new features: a group of small Black capitalists who fed on the profits / this segregated community, a further specialization of institutional development in the areas of social service, fraternal and social organization, communications, and education, and last, a growing spontaneity
from the masses to start new efforts to meet various psychological and material needs going unmet by the institutions created and sustained by the coalition of the Black elites and their white benefactors.

This new period of monopoly capitalism, the most pervasive and all-influential stage of capitalism, and one that yanked Black people from near feudal like circumstance in peonage and sharecropping to the modern industrial proletariat, was the basis for a transformation in the organization of the Black elite. Frazier sums it up this way (including the factor of color):

During the decade or so following the first World War in both northern and southern cities educational and occupation increasingly supplanted family background and a light complexion as a basis for admission to the social elite among Negroes. For example, in New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia, Negroes who had constituted Negro "society" because they were engaged mulattoes and acted like "gentlemen" were pushed aside because they were engaged in personal services. The Negro doctors, dentists, lawyers, and businessmen, who could not boast of white ancestors or did not know their white ancestors, were becoming the leaders of Negro "society."97

But the fact remains that there is a residue of this old elite still hanging on in Philadelphia. One of the romantic chronologers of the ruling class of Philadelphia puts it this way:

The Negro community in Philadelphia is old, and in its continuity since the eighteenth century has managed to get itself Old Philadelphianized at the top...(However)...The Old Philadelphia
Negroes themselves are a precariously tiny minority inside, if at the top of, Philadelphia's enormously increased Negro population, which since the war (World War II) has grown by the hundreds of thousands of penniless and near-illiterate sharecroppers from the south, who crowd into areas formerly occupied by other national groups, creating slums and delinquents as they go.\(^98\)

To continue with the cultural manifestation of this group, joined to some extent by the new elites of the professionals, they formed many organizations that have allowed them to conduct their social affairs in a very ostentatious manner with conspicuous consumption as a necessary tag of identity. In 1904 they formed the Boule (Sigma Ph Phi), known for its "status" affairs.\(^99\)

In general they are an outstanding example of what Frazier characterizes as the "world of make believe:"

In Philadelphia the Debutante Ball known as the "Pink Cotillion" is reputed to excel all others in the country. At this Debutante Ball, noted for the money spent on decorations and the expensive gowns and jewels worn by the women, an award is made each year to some distinguished Negro. This award consists of a diamond cross of Malta...The Debutante Balls are written up in the Negro Press with pictures in order to show the splendor and wealth of those who participate in this world of make believe.\(^100\)

But this small elite is not indicative of the Black community of Philadelphia, even though it is disproportionately in the public view. The masses of people are engaged in a daily struggle for survival and the simplest of pleasures. As they migrated from the South, they were
met with the dual face of these Black elites and their white benefactors: giving aid with one hand and taking it back with the other.

The Black community takes shape when the Black migrants come to town, having escaped the brutal national oppression of the South and come to what they had been told was the "promised land of the North," and arriving without the general cultural orientation to living in a city of knowledge of the specific cultural milieu worked out by the old Philadelphia set. Here is how Scott sums this situation up:

Philadelphia had for years been pointed to as having a respectable, thrifty, and prosperous colored population, enjoying the good will and the cooperation of the best white people in the community. These northern Negroes felt then that the coming of the brethren in the rough did them a decided injury in giving rise to a race problem in a northern community where it had not before figured. This unusual influx of other members of the race greatly stimulated that tendency to segregate Negro children in the schools, to the deep regret of the older citizens of Philadelphia. Other social privileges as in theatres, churches and the like, formerly allowed the Negro citizens of that city, tended gradually to be withdrawn.101

Based on our previous analysis, it is obvious that while this may have been the subjective feelings that this old guard had it does not fit the facts. What it tells us about Philadelphia is that in each stage of its development, there was a pattern of social cohesion that developed
through the efforts of whatever basic forces were dominating the economy aided by the religious, philanthropic elites (and, as we shall see, the politicians). But, in the transition from one stage to another there has been a period of social disruption. With regard to Black people, the disruption leading to the early period of industrialization was reflected in conflict that emerged within the working class between immigrant Irish and German workers, on the one hand, and Black workers on the other, and the social conflict that reflects the rise of the monopoly metropolis is the conflict within the Black community of old Philadelphians versus the new migrants. In both cases, however, these have been major but not fundamental contradictions. In each case the fundamental contradiction is the ruling capitalist class changing and intensifying its control over the working class and Black people. This is easily demonstrated by noting that the objective condition of misery and suffering experienced by the entire working class, and virtually the vast majority of the Black community, has not been changed by the resolution of these transitional contradictions in the history of capitalism in Philadelphia. We are dealing with stages of development within a socio-economic formation dominated by the capitalist mode of production, and should never lose sight of the fundamental essence of the system,
nor misunderstand the significance of a contradiction, which, though real and at any particular time may be the principal contradiction, is not the fundamental contradiction.\textsuperscript{102}

The rapid increase in the population of the Black community was a profound force in the transformation of the institutional makeup of the community:

Negro preachers invited the new arrivals into the church but many of the congregations made him know that he was not wanted. In some cases the church split over the matter, the migrants and their sympathizers withdrawing and forming a church for themselves.\textsuperscript{103}

This observation was made after the World War I migrations, though Fauset, in observing the World War II pattern reaches the same conclusion about what happened.\textsuperscript{104}

He presents an analysis that points to the institutional church and the new racial-economic experiences as being the basis for the rise of a new independent Black holiness church.

It seems reasonable to believe that the striking increase of cult groups in the large northern centers is to be related in part to the psychological factors which are implied, first in a change from rural to urban life, and second in the adjustment of mental attitudes to new mores, especially with regard to the rights of men of different races, as these vary between the north and the south.

The rural life in the south and, relatively speaking, southern urban life as well, is much less complicated and nerve-racking than life in the north. The Negro, accustomed to the
southern mores, and used to living chiefly to himself in a segregated scheme of life, had relatively few adjustments to make so far as his relations with white folk are concerned. In the north, much of the old accustomed way of life had been shattered. Not only is the erstwhile southern Negro embarrassed by the presence of thousands of "sophisticated" Negroes who want no reminders of "back-home" ways, but the infinitely more baffling problem of making a new adjustment to life as a relatively free man, and consequently having to meet free competition (instead of the paternalistic regard so commonly manifested towards Negroes by white people in the south) are more than this type of Negro is able to cope with easily, after the experience of many years in the south.105

Fauset did a study of Black religious sects in Philadelphia, Mt. Sinai Holy Church of America, Inc., United House of Prayer for All People, Church of God (Black Jews), Moorish Temple of America, and the Father Divine Peace Mission Movement. Most of these organizations were founded by ambitious enterprising people who migrated to Chicago, New York or Philadelphia and seized the opportunity for organizing provided by the mass migration following World War I. Philadelphia, next to New York, was the main center for these kinds of groups. In fact, Father Divine at one point moved his headquarters to Philadelphia.

The broad national pattern can be inferred from the following table on the extent to which different types of denominations were in the city:106
The Black Urban Church in the USA: 1936

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th># Churches</th>
<th>Total Membership</th>
<th>% Members in Urban Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>8,968</td>
<td>1,183,035</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>24,328</td>
<td>3,845,977</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent New Black Church</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>14,954</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data strongly suggests that the types of churches that Fauset analyses, plus others that might appear to be more conventional in a "protestant" sense, are indeed an urban phenomenon that resulted from the mass migrations to the northern cities.

This is particularly clear when we compare these data with the over all urban character of Black people, 20% in 1890, and over 40% by 1930. Black people were 48.2% in urban areas in 1940. So, while even the Methodists and Baptists recorded a higher rate of urban membership than the entire population, the independent Black church was a child of the city.

During this same period of transition, and the social disruption that accompanied it, Philadelphia had its own version of the settlement house movement (best known for white people like Jane Adams in Chicago, though at this same time Black people like Ida B. Wells were equally active). 107
In Philadelphia, wealthy young Quaker John T. Emlen organized a social service agency in April 1908 to develop "life and opportunity" for Blacks. Emlen called the organization the Armstrong Association of Philadelphia and it conducted one fund raising event per year for the benefit of Hampton and Tuskegee. However, its primary program was an ongoing effort to find work for Black mechanics and even to act as a contracting agency when necessary. Richard R. Wright Jr. (who later became Bishop of the African Methodist Episcopal Church and president of Wilberforce University), was the first field secretary. Wright had studied at the University of Chicago, and at Berlin and Leipzig. He was the first Black Ph.D. in Sociology in 1911, doing a thesis entitled "History of the Pennsylvania Negro" at the University of Pennsylvania. This Armstrong Association became an affiliate of the National Urban League in 1914, as did a number of such places in several other cities. It was a mainstay in the programs to aid the migrants in their adjustment to the city. In 1918 there was a crisis for more housing for the immigrants:

A committee was appointed by Bishop Rhinelander, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, to take action in the promotion of better housing conditions for the Negro migrant. The committee consisted of social workers, church officials, and representatives of such industries as the Franklin Sugar Refining Company and the Pennsylvania Railroad. Representatives of the Armstrong Association, the Travelers' Aid, the Society for Organizing Charity, the Philadelphia Housing Association, and various Negro churches formed a joint committee to provide suitable housing for Negro families arriving in the city and to aid them in securing work.
This is the major pattern of social services in the Philadelphia area: on the one hand there is the joint effort of the philanthropy of the Black elites (and the institutions they control, especially the church) and the white elites (again this centers around the church, but also in the secular welfare approach), and on the other hand there is the spontaneous motion based on the masses of people, which represents insurgent institutions (sects, movements, etc.), most of which have short lives, hardly ever achieve public recognition and legitimacy, and generally emerge in periods of crisis and conflict.

This is only one side of the way Black elites have related to their fellow Blacks. The other major way is to regard them as "their" market in which to make a profit. Housing played a role in this as well. With the increase in demand for housing by the Blacks migrating into the monopoly metropolis Black banks arose to meet this need. Banks are usually set up to facilitate a business community, and serve depositors in order to use their money for business investments. But as Harris points out in his research, banking in Philadelphia was part of an attempt to create Black businesses:

It further shows that, because of the absence of commercial and industrial business, these banks could expand their operations only by becoming real estate promoters and speculators,
or by financing theatrical and other amusement enterprises; and that the very character of these ventures gave these banks an unsound financial structure.\textsuperscript{113}

However, we should not interpret this as enlightened benevolence:

It is the savings of the Negro working class that enable the Negro bank to exist at all. Thus the losses that result from the banking failures among Negroes fall heaviest upon this class. Although the funds which the Negro workers place at the disposal of the Negro banker are invested mainly in real estate, as we have noted in previous chapters, such investment is rarely if ever made with a view to mitigating their appalling housing needs. These real estate investments are made to facilitate home-ownership among the Negro upper class.\textsuperscript{114}.

There have been six major Black banks started in Philadelphia:\textsuperscript{115}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLACK BANKS IN PHILADELPHIA</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Northern Colored Cooperative Banking Co.</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoples Savings Bank</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown and Stevens Banking Company</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keystone Company Operative Banking Association</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmopolitan Bank</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens and Southern Bank and Trust Company</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These have reflected two types. The Brown and Stevens and the Cosmopolitan Bank are both examples of highly risky speculation by two very ambitious, profit hungry
men. The Citizens and Southern, on the other hand, was founded by Richard R. Wright Sr., the father of the sociologist who worked for the Armstrong Association, and was a very frugal, tightly run operation by a former college president (Georgia State Industrial College, now Savannah State College). Harris sums this up:

Although the institution does not engage in general banking, since its main business is that of receiving deposits and investing them conservatively, it is perhaps one of the strongest and best managed Negro financial enterprises in existence. Its ability to weather the business depression is perhaps traceable to the extremely conservative and cautious management of its president, Mr. Wright. Perhaps it is the type of bank best suited to the needs of the Negro community which is composed of wage-earners and small salaried people.

As might easily be guessed, the business ventures of the Black freedman during the first period of the commercial town were very small, and hardly could be said to have comprised a group. The most successful of efforts, as far as numbers is concerned, is the catering business.

In Philadelphia, Prosser and Minton and a number of other caterers were patronized by the leading citizens in the early part of the nineteenth century. They organized personal service into a business and enjoyed a monopoly of the banquets and special parties of the wealthy whites.

But this is not all. In the area surrounding Philadelphia, one Black man owned some land, and had money invested
in industrial undertakings. And there was at least one significant Black manufacturer after the turn of the century:

For many years before and after the War of 1812 James Forten was one of the principal sail makers of Philadelphia who employed a number of white and Black workmen. During the panic of 1837 Forten suffered heavily, losing at one time $9,000 through the failure of a financial house in the city. Forten's enterprise, however, faced the more formidable difficulty of adjusting itself to steam transportation which was already providing itself adaptable to river and ocean commerce.120

The transition to the industrial city was a rough one for all small manufacturers, and the Black businessman especially. So, the businesses that had staying power were primarily in service, particularly low capital businesses that dealt with the particular needs of the working class Black community. One analyst has written that there were "probably fewer than 25 affluent Negro businessmen in Philadelphia in the entire generation preceding the Civil War."121

Rather than detailing other examples of this trend, DuBois provides a useful summary of what happened in this transition to the catering business, although he is summing up the rise of the monopoly period. He indicates that Black caterers, by the time of his study in the 1890s, no longer dominated the field. "The chief reason for this is the change that has come over American fashionable
society in the last twenty-five years, and the application of large capital to the catering business." He goes on to make a generalization:

It is the old development from the small to the large industry, from the house-industry to the concentrated industry, from the private dining room to the palatial hotel. If the Negro caterers of Philadelphia had been white, some of them would have been put in charge of a large hotel, or would have become co-partners in some large restaurant business, for which capitalists furnish funds. For such business cooperation, however, the time was not ripe, and perhaps only a few of the best Negro caterers would have been capable of entering into it with success. As it was the change in fashion and mode of business changed the methods of the Negro caterers and their clientele. They began to serve the middle class instead of the rich and exclusive, their prices had to become more reasonable and their efforts to excel had consequently fewer incentives. Moreover, they now came into sharp competition with a class of small white caterers, who, if they were worse cooks, were better trained in the tricks of the trade. Then, too, with this new and large clientele that personal relationship between the caterer and those served was broken up, and a larger place for color prejudice was made.122

In general the current picture is reflected in these data:123

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Businesses</th>
<th>Retail Stores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>4,242</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 1913 figure represents an increase of over 700 businesses in the 17 years preceding it. More revealing is that of the 4,242 businesses in 1964, 35% were in hairdressing and hair cutting, and 11.5% were restaurants (total of these two is 46.5%). Of the more substantial types of business, there were 13 manufacturing firms and 14 wholesale distributing firms.¹²⁴

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black Manufacturers</th>
<th>Black Wholesale Distributors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 beauty products</td>
<td>8 beauty products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 clothes</td>
<td>3 food products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 caskets</td>
<td>1 candy, notions, novelties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 iron works</td>
<td>1 caskets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 meat products</td>
<td>1 clothing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DuBois wrote the following in 1899:

> Today...the application of large capital to the retail business, the gathering of workmen into factories, the wonderful success of trained talent in catering to the whims and taste of customers almost precludes the effective competition of the small store. Thus the economic condition of the day militates largely against the Negro; it requires more skill and experience to run a small store than formerly and the large store and factory are virtually closed to him on any term.¹²⁵

This we will come to see is not the entire story. In the June 1976 issue of the Black Enterprise they list the following Philadelphia firms among the nation's top 100 Black businesses:¹²⁶
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>$$$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Great Philadelphia Trading Company</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Century Chevrolet</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Vassall Motors, Inc.</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Gordon Buick, Inc.</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Progress Aerospace Enterprises</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The historical development of the educational experiences of Black people in Philadelphia are somewhat different from this, mainly in the fact that capitalism has been forced to absorb the task of educating the laboring masses in public institutions to insure a sufficient number of adequately trained workers. In the first period the education of Black people was mainly through occupations and relationships with white people. The major exception to this is the school set up by Quakers under the leadership of the abolitionist Anthony Benezet in 1770. After 5 years there were 40 Blacks and 5 whites in attendance. Benezet even held the school in his home for two years.

With the rise of the industrial city, public education was started for Blacks in 1822.
There were four kinds of schools, private, public, charity, and reformatory. In 1838 a total of 1732 Black children went to 25 schools, 57.3% of the total Black children of school age.\(^{129}\) Although during this period of economic crisis the level of school enrollment did not increase by 1856 58.9% of Black school age children in Philadelphia were in the following schools:\(^{130}\)

- **Public Schools**: 1,031
- **Charity Schools**: 748
- **Benevolent and Reformatory Schools**: 211
- **Private Schools**: 331
- **TOTAL**: 2,321
- **Not in School (ages 8-10)**: 1,620

The early Philadelphia had an illiterate Black population, compared to the figures given by DuBois for the Seventh Ward in his study: 1850, 44%, 1870 22%, and 1896 12.2%.\(^{131}\) Also in the midst of this industrial period there was established a school to become Lincoln University (1856).\(^{132}\) This institution has proved to be a significant institution of national and international standing. By the rise of monopoly, and the spread of African students around the world, Lincoln was one of the schools that took up the training of African
students as a major task. This was accomplished and men like Kwame Nkrumah were trained there under the leadership of men such as the educator Horace Mann Bond.

But in the city of Philadelphia, public education has not been the mainstay of education that it has been in some other cities. Owing to the strong maintenance of the Quaker elitist tradition, coupled with the strong emphasis on parochial education, it has been estimated that today "...in Philadelphia, roughly three out of every five white children go to private schools."\textsuperscript{133}

Things have changed for the Black student in higher education in the Philadelphia area. With no real opportunities in the early history, and only all Black schools in the industrial period, the monopoly period has opened up the greatest opportunities yet. This of course is in keeping with the greater skill levels necessary in the society, but also is a tribute to the struggle waged by Black people and justice loving people for a more equitable system of education. There are 67 college level institutions in the 150-mile radius around Philadelphia, with a total Black enrollment of 8,065 (1970 figures).\textsuperscript{134}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Founded</th>
<th>Total Black Enrollment</th>
<th>% Black of Campus Enrollment</th>
<th>% of all Black Students in Philadelphia Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheyney State</td>
<td>1725</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple University</td>
<td>1682</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln University</td>
<td>1278</td>
<td>96+</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden City College</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 62 Schools</td>
<td>2344</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8065</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. State Power, Violence, and Black Liberation in Philadelphia

The most important aspect of the superstructure for the class forces that dominate a society, as well as for the forces that seek to change a society, is the state. The governmental structures and personnel are empowered to make laws, and are the only forces ordained to legitimately use violence in maintaining "order." In this case, "order" is defined as that pattern of social life that reinforces the will of the dominant class--get the workers to work, and not too much trouble in the neighborhoods seems to be the capitalist mandate.

In this section we are concerned with four aspects of this overall process: formal political behavior (voting and office holding), the police and "criminal behavior," spontaneous collective violence, and insurgent movements for social change. Each of these involves the state and the use of violence in maintaining control over the development of the Black community.

A. Voting: Black people in Philadelphia were accorded the right to vote at the very political organization of the Pennsylvania laws, more due to lack of mention than specific treatment. This was in 1682. Further, DuBois goes so far as to say that it is probable that
some Blacks helped choose delegates to the USA Constitutional Convention in 1776.\textsuperscript{136}

He sums up the actual experience by noting that "it is certain that for nearly a half century free Negroes voted in parts of Pennsylvania."\textsuperscript{137} This came to an end in the industrial period, when Blacks lost the vote from 1838 to 1870, about 32 years.\textsuperscript{138}

After regaining the vote, we can sum up the historical use of the Black vote in three phases:\textsuperscript{139}

1. 1870 - 1930 Republican dominance
2. 1935 - 1947 Republican decline
3. 1951 - now Democrat dominance

This fits the national pattern of Black voting behavior. After the passage of the 15th amendment to the US Constitution, Black people flocked to the party of Lincoln, the man who was sold to them as their "emancipator."\textsuperscript{140} This lasted until the first major internal crisis demonstrated a basic flaw in the monopoly capitalist system, the Great Depression beginning in 1929.\textsuperscript{141} Following the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt and the implementation of the social service programs of the New Deal, and the support of these programs by the organized left, Blacks were won over to the side of the Democrats. A frequently heard expression was "Jesus leads us, and Roosevelt feeds us." The great man theory of history
was used to mystify gains that the working class had won through hard struggle in the 1930s, and once again a representative of the monopoly capitalist class was viewed as the hero of the period, just as Lincoln was viewed as the heroic figure in the era of industrial growth.  

by Blacks
The switch/to the Democrats proved to be decisive for the margin of victory in many elections. In Philadelphia these included the following campaigns:

5. City Controller: 1957, 1961

However, this is a pattern that does not have much to do with the self assertion of the Black community, with as it does/the response by Blacks to what is offered to them from the established political forces in the white community. This has changed a little recently, but independent political organization has never been big in electoral politics in Philadelphia.

B. Office Holding: Blacks were first elected to the Philadelphia city council in 1884, but have continuously held offices only since 1936 on the city council, and since 1920 in the General Assembly (state
Major breakthroughs occurred in the 1950s, including electing attorney Robert Nix (a democrat) to Congress in 1958. The current picture of Black elected officials in Philadelphia is still much like this pattern in 1974:

1974 BLACK OFFICE HOLDERS IN PHILADELPHIA

Congress 1
State Supreme Court Justice 1
State Legislature 9
City Council 4
Local Judges 17

This compares with the total in the USA of 2,991 Black elected officials in 1974, out of which 36.1% were on the city councils, and 25.6% were on the school boards.

C. The Police and Crime: The police have been an agency that has been quite characteristic of the historical development of Philadelphia. Warner gives us a good view of the colonial commercial town:

The wealthy presided over a municipal regime of little government. Both in form and function the town's government advertised the lack of concern for public management of the community. The municipal corporation of Philadelphia, copied from the forms of an old English borough, counted for little. Its only important functions in the late eighteenth-century were the management of the markets and the holding of the Recorder's Court. A closed corporation, choosing its members by co-option, it had become a club of wealthy merchants, without much purse, power, or popularity.
By modern standards the town was hardly governed at all. The constable in each ward and a few watchmen provided an ineffective police, the safety of the house and shop being secured by citizens helping each other to drive away intruders or pursue thieves. *149*

But, as ought to be evident now, the rise of the industrial city, with its complex of social forces including a very diverse and divided population, required change. Philadelphia was consolidated into a larger unit of government and the politics shifted to maintaining control over a growing industrial proletariat:

Both changes were essential ingredients in the system of social control of the nineteenth-century big city and the early twentieth-century industrial metropolis. The creation of a large professional police force which could control riots had been the major demand and was the first product of consolidated government in Philadelphia. *150*

This is an excellent example of what Marx summed up in his analysis of the Paris Commune of 1871. The essence of this is summed up by Lenin in *State and Revolution*. *151*

The Philadelphia Police Department was the first of its kind for a city in the entire USA. *152* At first the Irish workers were recruited, some Blacks were hired to deal with Blacks, and it wasn't until 1914 that the first Italian was hired. This proved to be of unusual historical importance since this Italian immigrant was Rafael Rizzo, father of the legendary
Rizzo
Frank/destined to become police commissioner, then mayor. He is
first and best known as the "Cisco Kid" for his daring
exploits to "clean" up the town for monopoly capital. 153

By 1969 Philadelphia was spending 75.1 million
dollars for police protection, 13.5% of all city expenditures. 154
This has come to mean that Black people are now, more
than ever before, wards of state power through the
police agency, firmly supported by the judicial proceedings
of the courts. One study found that from 1948 to 1952,
among all defendants receiving a court trial 82% of all
Blacks and 62% of whites were found guilty. 155 This
occurred while Blacks were 18% of the Philadelphia
population. Also note that in the area of Black office
holding, contrary to the national pattern of national
elected Black officials, the main area of success is
in the courts which allows Black judges to pass sentence
upon Blacks giving monopoly capital a Black face to
hide behind from its heinous crimes against the people.

D. Spontaneous Racial Violence: While Philadelphia
is known as the City of Brotherly Love, it has been
the turf of terror and violence in every stage of its
development. Before turning to the data, perhaps a
brief theoretical discussion might be helpful. The
so-called normative order in USA society is for violence
not to take place, but for grievances and conflicts
to be worked out in a just manner through legal and volunteer agencies. However, in all capitalist societies, the normative order, due to the antagonistic relationship between the working class and the bourgeoisie, is based on the systematic violence of the bourgeoisie as administered by the state (government). When collective outbreaks of violence develop spontaneously this represents a breakdown in the institutionalized violence of bourgeois state power. This can happen because some forces feel it is not doing a good enough job, or it can reflect the real interests of the masses, the working class and all other exploited and oppressed people, to resist and fight back.

With the outbreak of racial violence in the 1960s many social scientists were compelled to study this phenomenon in order to sum up its importance in American life. Janowitz makes a very important analysis contrasting the communal riot violence perpetrated against people, Blacks against whites, and the commodity riot, in which Blacks focused their violence against property. He goes on to speculate about the possibility of the next stage being one of political racial violence aimed against the state with the view of establishing a new social order.
This analysis implicitly liquidates the role of the state in maintaining the violence of the bourgeoisie. And this is our starting point. This formulation focuses on the development of the working class in this country, and how the different historical periods of riots can be viewed as an index of class development. The first riots reflected the conflicting positions workers of different nationalities played in the production process as the wheels of industry began rolling. This was the transitional social disruption connected with the process of industrialization. By the second riots, there was sufficient proletarianization that the riots were no longer mainly between people, but the violence was against the things that represented the profits of the bourgeoisie. This is a significant step of the working class toward becoming a class of itself, but not yet a class for itself. At least it was not striking the main blow against itself. The political violence that Janowitz is worried about is the violence that will come when the working class is a class for itself and fully understands that in order to seize power it must wage struggle against the armed agents of the ruling class.

In a similar vein, Lenin sums up the historical development of the working class in What is to be Done:
The violence of the early history of the Philadelphia experience has more to do with struggle against slavery than other issues which are added to this during the rise of the industrial city, so we will discuss that in the next section. The major thrust of collective racial violence begins in the 1830s.

Between 1832 and 1849, Philadelphia mobs set off five major anti-Negro riots. In July, 1834, a white mob stormed through the Negro section, clubbed and stoned its victims, destroyed homes, churches, and meeting halls, forced hundreds to flee the city, and left many others homeless. In assessing the causes of the riot, a citizens' committee cited the frequent hiring of Negroes during periods of depression and white unemployment and the tendency of Negroes to protect, and even forcibly rescue, their brethren when the latter were arrested as fugitive slaves.161

Warner gives a graphic description of another riot:

On Monday morning, August 1, 1842, a group of young men of a Negro temperance society began a parade through the streets of south Philadelphia intending to wind up on the banks of the Schuylkill for a celebration of Jamaican Emancipation Day. A banner, showing a colored man breaking his chains and depicting the rising sun of freedom, attracted the attention of some bystanders who misread it as a representation of a Negro triumphing over the massacre of whites at St. Domingo. Perhaps the bystanders were only spoiling for a fight. In any case, as the parade reached the public market stalls at Shippen street, near Fourth, boys began throwing fruit and vegetables and a general melee ensued. The neighborhood of the market was a district of poor Irish and native workers. 162

After the crowds had chased away a posse of sixty officers, seven companies of militia were required to restore
Bourgeois order. The banner had read "How Grand in Age, How Fair in Truth are Holy Friendship, Love, and Truth."\(^{163}\)

The intensity of this violence, and the oft times complicity of the city government and the police, caused many Blacks in Philadelphia and throughout the country to decry the flagrant injustice in that city. Frederick Douglas, the great Black abolitionist, said the following after a riot in 1849:

The papers give an account of another ferocious mob in this mobocratic city. Its violence was directed against the colored people in the neighborhood of Sixth and Thomas street — a large number of whom are represented as having been killed. As usual, the excuse for this bloody outbreak is represented to be the fact that white and colored persons were living in the same families together, and associating on equal terms. One of the papers states that this is a mere pretext. But whether it be true or false it conveys an instructive lesson on the bitterness and baseness of the hatred with which colored people are regarded in Philadelphia.\(^{164}\)

Douglas exclaims: "Shame upon the guilty city! Shame upon its law-makers and law administrators!"

After the Civil War, there was a period of industrial expansion, some rise and fall in the economy, but there was nothing as severe as the earlier crisis and racial violence that nearly tore Philadelphia apart. When the World War I migrants from the south arrived, however, the housing shortage resulted in the ghetto expanding and creating racial border controversy. One such case sparked a race riot in which
A colored probation officer of the Municipal Court, a woman of refinement and training and an old citizen of Philadelphia, purchased and took up her residence at the house numbered 2936 Ellsworth Street. The white people in the neighborhoods resented her living there and besieged the house. A race riot ensued in which two men were killed and sixty injured. 165

The riots of the 1960s, mainly 1964, had turned into a different kind of riot in Philadelphia. 166 Now the basic and underlying fundamental contradiction had ground down the old type racial antipathy between white and Black workers. To be sure, racial prejudice still existed and Blacks had a more assertive stance and defensive posture, but the class contradiction and working class unity (particularly in the trade union history that we will discuss next) were strong and growing as well. In the 1964 riot the incident that precipitated the riot was incidental, certainly when compared with a case of housing integration or a political demonstration of solidarity. In the middle of the summer, on a hot July night, what appeared to be a domestic quarrel turned into a major riot in which 2 were killed, 339 wounded and 308 arrested. 167 In this confrontation, the Black elite were not involved, as in the 1918 case, or the nineteenth century riots. In this case there was near unanimity from them to condemn the rioters as lawbreakers. In fact, Dr. Sadie
Alexander, author of an analysis that we have been quoting on 1918 Philadelphia, the granddaughter of the famous painter Henry O. Tanner, one of the first three Black women with a Ph.D. (received in 1921 from the Wharton School of Economics), and married to the Judge Raymond Pace Alexander (himself a graduate of Harvard Law School in ), was chairperson of the Municipal Commission on Human Relations, and she said that she was going to call upon the mayor...to enforce law and order and to inform him that 5,000 responsible Negro leaders were prepared to be deputized in an effort to support the police.\textsuperscript{169}

In 1964 the confrontation was directly with the police, so that of the 339 wounded, 239 were Blacks in the riot area and 100 were police officers.\textsuperscript{170} It is also interesting to note that 60% of those indicted for riot crimes were under 21 years of age.\textsuperscript{171} This was a working class revolt, a revolt of working class youth against the violence of unemployment and a society that chooses to waste them instead of providing productive self-fulfilling work for their betterment and not for the greed of others.

In the same general period the profound class essence of the 1960 decade riots comes out in this portrait of the rioter in the industrial city of Detroit:
In a social profile of the 496 Negro males arrested in Detroit, the typical participant has been characterized as "a blue collar worker in a manufacturing plant where he earned about $120 a week. Although currently employed, he had experienced more than 5 weeks of unemployment in the past year. He had not participated in a government training or poverty program." 172

E. Black Liberation Movement: The Black liberation movement in Philadelphia has a long history, one that fills every stage. The initial period of the colonial town represents the combined efforts of Black and white abolitionists in the dual efforts of petitions to Congress and the organization of the underground railroad. Franklin notes that

In January, 1800, the free Negroes of Philadelphia led the way by requesting Congress to revise the laws on the slave trade and on fugitives. 173

The situation of the free Black was a precarious one in that slavery by 1800 had only been outlawed in Pennsylvania 20 years prior. The main attack against the system had to be covert.

The underground railroad was a network of people who would give aid and send communications so that fugitive slaves could escape from the slave South and assume the life of a freedman in a northern state or go as far as Canada. 174 Frazier wrote that "Because of the anti-slavery activities of the Quakers, Philadelphia became in the late 18th century an important center of the underground railroad movement." 175 Franklin adds evidence to this:
The origin of the Underground Railroad goes back into the eighteenth century. Perhaps there were people to help fugitives as early as there were runaway slaves. By the end of the War for Independence, however, organized resistance seemed to be taking shape. At least George Washington thought so when he complained in 1786 of a slave escaping from Alexandria to Philadelphia, "whom a society of Quakers, formed for such purposes, have attempted to liberate."\textsuperscript{176}

Franklin notes also that others tend to date the large scale organization of the liberation network to about 1804.\textsuperscript{176}

During this early period Black people were very much involved in the liberation of their people, although much of the work could best be done by whites. This is particularly true when it came to the initial organization of the abolitionist movement, though this too was a limited thing. After a while there were four significant contradictions that arose. The material basis of these contradictions must first of all be viewed in the context of the early industrial motion in the 19th century.

Also, the impact of free Blacks in the North having some personal wealth, making them independent but not with much surplus as a group, and the exposure and education of men like Frederick Douglass.

1. One contradiction was the demand by some Blacks to play more of a leading role in the public articulation of the Abolitionist cause from
the point of view of a Black man. This caused a split between Douglass and Garrison in

2. A second contradiction occurred when a white organization formed to organize the forced emigration of free Blacks back to Africa. This was nearly unanimously opposed by Black people, although there were a few, located mainly in the deep southern slave states, that took this offer up. This group included those that went to colonize Liberia, and now form a caste in control as tools of USA monopoly capital, the Americo-Liberians.

3. The third contradiction was whether Blacks should undertake their own colonization effort, and look for a place to set up a large colony free from the threat of slavery. The major example of this was Wilberforce, a community in Canada set up by free Blacks in . The opposing position was that we ought to stay and fight inside this country since we have a duty and obligation to our people still in bondage.

4. The last major contradiction of the movement in this second stage in the history of Philadelphia, and at the time of the Civil War, was whether
to undertake active aggressive armed struggle or undertake the unity of slow buildup of forces for a guerrilla war. In this, John Brown took the former position as did Harriet Tubman, and Douglass took the position that the gradual buildup of a fighting force was the more correct road. 180

Many of these contradictions came to a head in one of many conventions called on a local and national level. The first such convention took place in Philadelphia when Richard Allen and Absalom Jones joined others, one month after the American Colonization Society announced their plans, to protest against the removal of free Blacks from the USA. 181 But the major National Negro Convention Movement actually started in Philadelphia in 1830. 182 It was in these conventions that the third contradiction mentioned above was raised as well as programs designed to help the free Black community, e.g., the formation of an industrial college for Blacks in Philadelphia. A group of New Haven Blacks had moved for this and they caused a riot among the whites who feared it. 183 As you might expect, the fourth contradiction mentioned above was not done in a public meeting, but John Brown was well known by all Black men engaged in these efforts. 184 The few examples of Black men who
did urge the taking up of arms were summarily assassinated, like David Walker. 185

In the early transition of the monopoly period Black people in Philadelphia began to institutionalize in a modern way. The major Black newspaper that publishes today, The Philadelphia Tribune, was founded in 1887. 186 The Black folks in electoral politics formed the Citizens Republican Club in 1895. 187 But it was after the turn of the century that the major rights organizations were born. In the area of material services the Urban League was formed in 1914, 188 and two years earlier the Philadelphia chapter of the NAACP was formed in the area of political and civil rights. 189

The Urban League and the NAACP represent the modern manifestation in the period of the monopoly metropolis of the same coalition of the last two hundred years between white elites and Black elites, both continuing to fight for bourgeois democratic rights. The interesting thing, however, is that during the period of the early commercial town and the rise of industry the efforts to fight for these democratic rights had revolutionary importance. They represented a legitimate fight to win democratic reform and push the society forward. Now, their efforts "appear" to be progressive, but have grown stale. They objectively serve the interest
of the monopolies. This may appear to be in contradiction, because they appear to be fighting against wrongs. The brutal fact is, however, that we have attained the limits of bourgeois democracy, we have all we can get within this present system. Now, all that can be accomplished by these organizations is the continual fight for reform in one area, only to have something taken back in another. They serve to give people a false hope that this system is capable of doing more and remaining the same system. They refuse to say that it is capitalism as a system that is not capable of doing more, and that only real progress can be won by waging a war to destroy the capitalist system.
7. Class Struggle and the Historical Development of the Philadelphia Working Class

One of the major tasks facing all proletarian intellectuals is to fight for a correct summation of the history of the working class, and how the development of the class war between the working class and the bourgeoisie has shaped the history of this country. This is a long and slow process due to the fact that it is a protracted war. The working class has been fighting heroically, but the intellectual agents of the bourgeoisie create many obstacles that hide this history. In this sense, the intellectual fight for a correct history of the USA working class is a manifestation, and a very important one, of class war.¹⁹¹

In the colonial period and after, the commerce dominated town of Philadelphia did not have a modern working class, but had artisans and craftsmen who were skilled, self-employed workers.¹⁹² They owned whatever means of production they used in their work, e.g., carpenters and tailors owned their own tools. However, they were exploited by the merchants who controlled the prices of their goods on the market.¹⁹³ This is the first manifestation of the antagonistic contradiction with free workers. At this same time there were indentured servants who, while holding out for the promise of freedom
and having the chance of running away, were held in virtual slavery. And the slaves, who were bought and sold like any other commodity, although it had the same capacity as all labor to produce commodities as well. This contradiction of free artisans and craftsmen, indentured servants, and slaves against the merchant capitalist class was rising within colonial USA, but the principal contradiction was the rule of the British. Therefore, a national liberation united front (unity of action) was created and the revolutionary war was fought and won.

The main force of the revolution were the workers (called mechanics).

By the latter part of 1765 the conduct of the struggle against Great Britain was no longer entirely in the hands of conservative merchants and planters who had hitherto dominated the political life of colonial America. The mechanics and working men of the larger towns had formed their own militant organizations which thrust aside hesitant conservatives, prodded those who wished to move more slowly and in countless ways pushed the Revolution forward until British rule was overthrown in a revolutionary way. Sometimes they called themselves "regulators;" in Pennsylvania they were known as the "Associators," and in Connecticut they were referred to as "The United Company." Usually they were known as the "Sons of Liberty." 194

Further organization took place in every major city, including efforts to build unity between the farmers and the workers in the towns. 195 Finally shots were
fired in Boston on March 2, 1770 and five workers were killed:

These victims of the Boston massacre were Crispus Attucks, a Negro seaman who had escaped from slavery; Samuel Gray, a ropewalk worker; James Caldwell, a young seaman; Patrick Carr, an artisan, and Sam Maverick, a joiner's apprentice. All five were buried in a common grave.¹⁹⁶

The multi-national unity of these workers who died for freedom has haunted all forms of tyranny and exploitation from the external domination of England to the indigenous USA capitalist class in all its forms, from the merchants to the monopolists. We have yet to see the working class exact payment from the capitalists for these and countless other heroic deaths of the sons and daughters of the working class.

In the midst of this conflict for national liberation, the wealthy merchants and their collaborators moved to seize the political initiative, but the motion of the workers was too great a force.¹⁹⁷ During an extra-legal provincial conference in Pennsylvania, as had been the case in other places, the political thrust of the workers forced the merchants to install what was their word but not their want.

Out of this convention, in which workers and farmers were well represented, emerged the most democratic constitution of that time. It guaranteed freedom of speech and religion, increased representation for the back country, and allowed all residents who had paid taxes
to vote and hold office. Reactionaries called this document a "mobocracy of the most illiterate," and James Allen, Esq. of Philadelphia wailed: "All power is in the hands of the Associators...." 198

And later at the Continental Congress the will of the masses was

...read aloud on February 10, 1776, from a pamphlet entitled Common Sense, written by a man who had been a cobbler, a staymaker, a civil servant, a laborer in a weaver's shop: "The period of debate is closed. Arms, as the last resort, must decide the contest." 199

This was written by Tom Paine.

After the success of the Revolutionary War, and the consolidation of some bourgeois democratic rights, the working class of artisans continued its forward motion. Now the principal contradiction had changed again and the main blows had to be delivered to the indigenous capitalist class in the USA. This was nowhere more championed than in Philadelphia. Foner cites the following examples of the workers movement as having originally developed in Philadelphia:

1. The first authentic strike took place in America in 1786,...Determined to secure a wage of a dollar a day, the journeymen printers of Philadelphia met and adopted a resolution... When the employers refused to grant the request, the printers struck, or conducted a "turn-out" as it was called, and succeeded in winning their demands. 200

2. The first organization of workers in the United States to maintain permanent union was formed by the Philadelphia shoemakers in 1792, after previous attempts had failed. 201
3. In the spring of 1827 workers in Philadelphia were stimulated by an anonymous pamphlet... One result of this pamphlet was the formation of the Mechanics Library Company, which published in Philadelphia that year the weekly Mechanics' Free Press, the first labor paper in America...

4. The awakening began in Philadelphia where, in the summer of 1828, the first labor party in America was formed.

5. ...in 1835... in Philadelphia for the first time an American city experienced a general strike.

These motions, and motions they were, linked to the ebb and flow of daily battles and the rise and fall of many organized forms, resulted from the impact of the rise of industry, the forces of production that helped to intensify the class contradictions:

The process of industrialization by breaking down old crafts into new specialties raised some artisans into downtown retailers, factory owners, and mill supervisors out of them. Others it lowered to the level of traditional artisan-shopkeeper group would have been a troublesome process in its own right since it frustrated so many men's expectations for a shopkeeping, master artisan role for themselves and their families. In addition to this frustration the rising productivity of industrialization exacerbated artisan grievances by raising the level of the new middle class's consumption while skilled workers gained little.

Further:

At the very least, the net result of early nineteenth century industrialization was to leave the unskilled workers close to eighteenth-century poverty, and to widen the difference in consumption ability between the artisans on the one hand and the new middle class on the other.
In the context of this period from 1827 to the 1850s, the working class made significant gains. Unfortunately, history is not an unbroken march forward, but a dialectical process of victories and defeats, of zig-zags, a constant struggle until there is a revolutionary break with the past, and a new set of struggles begins. So during this period of industrial consolidation, we can identify three major advances made by the working class. And even though each was defeated and failed to become a dominant trend, they taught the workers lessons, and destroyed bosses lies that the workers could not unite and wage successful struggle.

The first major lesson was the value of unity. The material basis for this, as mentioned above was the socialization in larger work groups, and the relative availability of jobs. The unity was not inclusive of the entire working class, however, since the Black workers were not an integral part of the workers movement, though some few were involved. The subsequent development of the concentration of capital and the more total secularization of the production relations and the reduction in the relative value of skilled specialization led to the more inclusive basis in the monopoly period.

One instance of unity was the new activity of the relatively unskilled worker.
Unique to the enthusiasm of 1835-36 was the first appearance of the unskilled. Such groups had never organized themselves before, nor would most of them be heard from again until the twentieth century. Sailors, coal heavers, seamstresses, and firewood sawyers, all members of traditionally exploited occupations, broke through the shell of the city's indifference and hostility for a moment to demand recognition by the general society. Their strikes and parades were the last echoes of the radical demands of the Revolution.

In the nineteenth century, as in the eighteenth, sailors were recruited from the rural and urban lower class. The men were kept in order by the military discipline of the ship. It is testimony to the spirit of the 1835-36 labor movement in Philadelphia that such a traditionally down-trodden, transient, and ill-trained group was able to come together to sustain a strike for wages.\textsuperscript{209}

Another glimpse of unity was the momentary rise of women in the needles trades.\textsuperscript{210} The woman worker was exploited not only as a worker, but also because of the male supremacy that reigned in this period. However, in this period there was a successful effort at organizing a seamstress and tailors union which did win a few reforms for a short period of time.

The main thing, according to Warner, was the educational derived from value / the publicity that women were fighting for the same demands of the entire working class.\textsuperscript{211} This is a major example of the fighting spirit that women displayed in the abolitionist movement in the previous historical period.
And there was some Black-white unity, although this was the object of prejudicial rejection. There is one case of this being a factor in failing to win the economic reform of a wage increase:

When the lowest class of laborers, the street wood sawyers spurred by the success of the others, demanded ten to twenty-five cents more for sawing a cord of wood, their strike was met by sneers at their interracial organization and with disbelief that such lowly persons could be expected to be taken seriously.212

But the greatest show of unity in the working class in this period was the development in 1833 of a central labor organization of labor unions on a city wide basis.

Once organized they grew rapidly. The Philadelphia Trades Union had only three societies with less than 400 members when it started in November 1833; by April 1836 it had 50 societies with a membership of 10,000. Among these members were common laborers, factory workers, and skilled mechanics.

"The Union makes no distinction between natives and foreigners,"it proclaimed, "All are alike welcome to its benefits.If he is a workingman in favor of the emancipation of all who labor from the thraldom of monied capital, he is welcome to our ranks. We ask no qualification of birth or parentage, no sign or token to gain admission amongst us."

To promote the general welfare of the workers, the trades unions engaged in numerous activities. Traveling agents helped organized workers to set up locals which became members of the central union. The organizer for the Philadelphia union in a general appeal to labor spoke of the union as "a school in which every mechanic has an opportunity of learning how to defend and protect his rights.213
As Lenin pointed out, trade unions and the unity of the working class are necessary though not sufficient development for proletarian revolution. The class must be organized and schooled in the art of struggle. This can happen only when there are broad based workers organizations in which revolutionary fighters can introduce socialist ideas. However, Lenin also points out that if the revolutionary fighters do not assume the political leadership of the working class, then the political action of the trade union will degenerate into making compromises with the capitalist system, reformism will be the key political character of the action. This is the ultimate strategic view of a proletarian revolutionary. Put in a historical context, however, Lenin would agree that the fight for democracy, in fact the fight to further develop the capitalist system and remove all of the vestigial remnants of the patriarchal hold of the bourgeoisie, is a good thing because it sets up the conditions for the revolutionary surge to put the proletariat in power. The major condition though is that this serves the proletariat best when it is carried out in a revolutionary way and not through bourgeois reform. The key factor is the role of the revolutionary party.
In Philadelphia, a second major lesson concerned moving from economic to political struggle. The workers developed a political party, a historical development that had a good progressive side, and a weak reformist side. This does not prove the weakness of the working class in Philadelphia as much as it shows their first step in moving in an organized fashion from the economic struggle to the political struggle in a period of the formation of the modern industrial working class. This is a strength because it shows a fighting spirit, and it is the material basis for us to understand the futility of trade union politics without the leadership of the proletariat revolutionary party. In its historical context democratic gains were won for the working class and this is a good thing.

The goal of the "Working Men's Party" was solidly proletarian:

The Mechanics and Working Men of the City and County of Philadelphia are determined to take the management of their own interests, as a class, into their own immediate keeping...

Warner sums of the life of the Working Men's Party:

During the active years of the party, from 1828 to 1831, these artisan groups demanded a number of reforms: a free universal public school system, abolition of the summer militia training and its related system of fines, abolition of imprisonment for debt, institution of a mechanic's lien law to give workmen first position for debt collection against bankrupts,
abolition of lotteries, and tighter regulation of the sale of alcoholic beverages. During the next twenty years the Pennsylvania legislature enacted into law all these useful proposals for easing the working man's lot; it even passed an irregularly enforced ten-hour day in 1847, but such reforms could not counter the basic anxiety of the Working Men's Party --artisans were working harder but steadily losing ground to the new middle class.219

What we have demonstrated is that the working class of Philadelphia has a rich history in class struggle in this early period of industrialization. It is also true that in this period there were groups affiliated with the First International, led by the ideological and political leadership of Karl Marx and Fredrich Engels. "Communist organizations" began to develop shortly after the Civil War in several northern cities.220

However, we do not have adequate data on these events at this time, nor is the communist movement a strong, viable force until the 20th century. The roots of monopoly, the giant corporations and the trusts, the big banks and the concentration of wealth, all begin to take shape after the Civil War as well. In this period, we have the national beginning of the modern workers movement. This is a more recent phenomenon, a more well known history (and available in many sources), in this "draft for review", so we will give just a brief overview of it, and save a more systematic presentation for another draft.221
The modern working class developed national organization in stride with the development of giant monopoly corporations. The concentration of capital, the socialization of labor, and the specialization of labor (transforming the skilled worker into a mass worker) were the objective conditions for this, but the subjective spirit for this represented the learned lessons of class struggle. The working class had been in battle all over the world, especially in the revolutionary struggle of the Paris commune in 1871. But not only in Europe, because the heroic struggles of the USA working class rang in every factory and meeting hall in the world when their efforts were taken to symbolize the fighting power of the proletariat everywhere: A highpoint of the movement for an eight hour working day was / great massacre of workers united in a protest rally in Chicago's Haymarket Square, May 1st, 1886, and the International Workingmans Association (led by Marx and Engels) chose that date as the annual date to demonstrate and commemorate as International Workingmans Day. Also, on March 8th, 1909 Chicago women workers staged a strike and mass protests that led to the International Congress of Socialist Women to designate March 8th as International Women's Day. Beginning in 1866, the working class of the USA has had a national organization of one sort or another.
The basic character of these national organizations has been for the craft type federation of unions to be protective of their skilled membership, while the majority of the other forms has at least nominally opened its ranks to all of the working class. The fact is that even with these unions, there has been a long struggle for immigrants, women, and Blacks to be accepted as full fledged union members. It seems that with the development of national organizations, the class contradiction heightened to the extent that the workers began to learn the necessity of total unity, and not privileged unity.

In Capital, Marx wrote in 1867:

In the United States of America, any sort of independent labor movement was paralyzed as long as slavery disfigured a part of the republic. Labor with a white skin cannot emancipate itself where labor with a Black skin is branded.225

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organization</th>
<th>Dates of Existence</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;One Big Union&quot;</td>
<td>1866-1872</td>
<td>National Labor Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1869-1895 (1949)</td>
<td>Noble Order of the Knights of Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1905-1920s (present)</td>
<td>Industrial Workers of the World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft Unions</td>
<td>1881-1957</td>
<td>American Federation of Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Unions</td>
<td>1937-1957</td>
<td>Congress of Industrial Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft and Industrial Unions</td>
<td>1957-present</td>
<td>AFL &amp; CIO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What follows is an abbreviated summation of these major national union organizations in terms of their relationship with Black workers.

The first major national organization was the National Labor Union. This proved to be a major organization for the continuation on a more coordinated class wide basis than had been achieved before. Moreover, the NLU was the first national organization to directly confront the question of the Black worker:

At the first of its seven conventions this body declared that "the interests of the labor cause demand that all workingmen be included within its ranks, without regard to race or nationality; and the interests of the workingmen of America especially required that formation of trades' unions, eight hour leagues, and other organizations should be encouraged among the colored race; and that they be invited to cooperate with us in the general labor undertaking."

The main shortcoming of this is that it only allowed for racially based dual-unionism, and, moreover, only was implemented in a minimal way.

The other major fault of the NLU in regards to Black people, and a major political shortcoming that limited its overall contribution to proletarian struggle, was the fact that although it was started in the post Civil War period, it failed to recognize the fundamental need to carry the agrarian revolution in the South to its rather end; it turned its full attention to the captains of industry:
Even now a slavery exists in our land worse than ever existed under the old slave system. The center of the slave power no longer exists south of Mason's and Dixon's line. It has been transferred to Wall Street; its vitality is to be found in our huge bank swindle, and a false monetary system. The war abolished the right of property in man, but it did not abolish slavery. This movement we are now engaged in is the great anti-slavery movement, and we must push on the work of emancipation until slavery is abolished in every corner of our country.227

This proved to be a "left" error, one that objectively sided with the bourgeois defeat of the effort at Reconstruction of the South.228 The NLU aimed its guns at the ruling class, but did not have a correct summation of the stages of the struggle. Therefore, fighting for the continuation of the democratic struggle until it had been anchored in ownership of the land was not a major part of the NLU program. Moreover, while the moral voice of the national leadership was progressive, and the national conventions did eventually include Black delegates, the NLU proved chauvinist on another point of racially specific dual unionism. In ideological terms, this was not an exception but the rule, for the NLU was dominated by a petty bourgeois reformist line that focused on monetary policy and not the basic question of the proletariat fighting bourgeois dictatorship, to wrest control of the means of production, to smash the state apparatus of the bourgeoisie and institute the dictatorship of the proletariat.229
These types of problems led to Black workers in 1869 to form the National Labor Union. At the first convention these Black workers and friends held that the exclusion of Blacks from jobs and full union membership was "an insult to God, injury to us and disgrace to humanity." As the struggle continued the Black workers moved to a defensive posture: "As long as you persist therein we cannot fellowship with you in your struggle."

So with a similar class base, and a similar petty bourgeois understanding of the political economy of the USA, the CNLU nevertheless was more consistently democratic in its attempts to organize the working class. Isaac Myers, first President, summed up the position:

Labor organization is the safeguard of the colored man. But for real success separate organization is not the real answer. The white and colored mechanics must come together and work together...The day has passed for the establishment of organizations based upon color.

These are the words of a Black trade unionist spoken at an integrated rally of workers in Virginia, 1870. But while the CNLU was open to all workers, Blacks, whites, and Chinese were the main groups of workers recruited, they fell into the reformist trap of believing that labor and capital could learn to live and grow together. They failed to see the irreconcilable conflict, the life and death struggle hidden behind the wedding veil
of bourgeois propaganda. Such were the times. Even leading Marxists in the USA failed to develop a correct political line. At an NLU convention, Foner recounts a telling incident:

It is also incredible that F. A. Sorge, the leading Marxist in the United States, said nothing at the convention to enlighten the delegates on the special needs of Black workers. To be sure, Sorge joined the Blacks in opposing the proposition that monetary reform was the cure-all of the workers problems--although for reasons different from the Blacks'--but at no time during the convention did he join the Negroes in their call for the removal of restrictions imposed upon Black workers by nearly every affiliate of the NLU.

The radical organization of workers into a national organization begins with the Knights of Labor.

In 1869, the year the Colored National Labor Union issued its first appeal for the unity of American workers "without regard to race or color," nine Philadelphia garment cutters, whose union had been shattered and its members blacklisted, formed a secret society that ultimately was to transform this sentiment into reality. They named it the Noble Order of the Knights of Labor.

From the ranks of the militant Knights of Labor rang the slogan, "An injury to one is a concern for all!!!

And thousands sang:

Toiling millions now are waking
See them marching on;
All the tyrants now are shaking,
Ere their power is gone.

Storm the fort, Ye Knights of Labor,
Battle for your cause;
Equal rights for every neighbor
Down with tyrant laws!
The membership size of the Knights is a good indication of its rise and decline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>20,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>51,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>71,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>111,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>729,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>511,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>221,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These membership figures clearly show the rapid rise and decline of this organization, but they also suggest the vast importance that it came to represent for the working class. In fact, at its height it had about 100,000 Black workers in its ranks. And in many cities throughout the country, including the South, not only were Blacks a major part of the membership, but also the Knights managed to conduct several mass campaigns and marches fully showing a militant solidarity between Black and white workers.

Although this is not central to our concern, it is important to note that
The preamble to the constitution adopted by the first national convention of the Knights in 1878 included a historic provision which asserted that one of the principle objectives of the Order was "To secure for both sexes equal pay for equal work." But the constitution made no provision for the admission of women.

Foster sums up the Knights of Labor in this way:

Despite the white chauvinist attitude of many of its officials, the Knights of Labor represented the highest stage of Negro-white unity yet achieved by the workers, as well as the most effective stand of the working class against the offensive of the employers. The organization began to decline after 1886 from a variety of causes. Among these were the destructive influence of the large influx of non-working class elements--farmers, professionals, etc. --who came into the order; tendencies of the leadership to play down and even betray strikes and other militant working class actions; trends toward purely opportunist political activities; disruptive activities by Most and other anarchists, and involvement quackeries. Especially destructive was the hostility of the rival national craft unions which were strongly opposed to the organization form of the order. By 1895, after 10 years of its greatest activity, the K. of L. was no longer the key labor organization of the working class.239

The ideological heirs of the Knights of Labor, the next major radical union to be inclusive of all sectors of the working class, was the Industrial Workers of the World, founded in Chicago in 1905.240 The ideological character of the class struggle was clearly put: "The working class and the employing class have nothing in common."
The constitution with its motto, "An injury to One is the Concern of All," established the Industrial Workers of the World. Only wage earners were eligible for membership in the new organization. Race, creed, color, and sex were made no bar to membership, and any immigrant with a valid union card was eligible for immediate membership. "Big Bill" Haywood, at the meeting ratifying the work of the convention, declared that although unions affiliated with the A. F. of L. discriminated against a worker who was a Negro or foreign born, to the I.W.W. it "did not make a bit of difference whether he is a Negro or a white man. It does not make any difference whether he is an American or foreigner."241

The I. W. W. (or Wobblies as they were generally called) was to be "one big union" of the USA working class.

Spero and Harris indicate that the size of the IWW and Black participation was at the same level:

During the active part of his life the IWW issued about one million membership cards. About 100,000 of these cards were issued to Negroes. The important work of the IWW among Negro workers was in the southern lumber industry in Louisiana and Texas and among Negro longshoremen and dockworkers of Philadelphia, Baltimore and Norfolk, Virginia.242

This is even more dramatically put by Foner on the qualitative character of the Black worker in the IWW:

...at no time in its history did the IWW ever establish segregated locals for Black workers, even in the deepest south. Wherever it organized, members were brought together in locals regardless of race or color. In fact, the Industrial Workers of the World is the only federation in the history of the American labor movement that never chartered a single segregated local.243

It was just this kind of policy that led WEB DuBois to write:
We respect the Industrial Workers of the World as one of the social and political movements in modern times that draws no color line.\textsuperscript{244}

The Wobblies were perceived by the capitalist class as a major threat to their rule. The Wobblies were syndicalists, a political position that workers can directly seize control of the state mainly through the use of the strike.\textsuperscript{235} This is often connected to anarchism which holds that while there is a need for the overthrow of the oppressive state, this is for the purpose of destroying the state for good and not to replace it with a proletarian state. Foster gives a very clear summation of this tendency:

The actual development of American syndicalism into a system was directly caused by...a subjective factor, the theoretical weakness of the left wing. This was the historical "left" sectarian tendency of not struggling against these anti-political forces, but of adapting itself to them and restricting its revolutionary struggle to the economic field.

Briefly, the main theoretical errors of the left wing which tended to the development of syndicalism were: 1. a great under-estimation of the role of the party, especially by DeLeon, which led straight to a repudiation of the party altogether by Haywood and other true syndicalists; 2. exaggeration of the role of labor unions and syndicalistic speculations of bringing about the revolution by utopian dual industrial unions; 3. misconceptions of the role of the state, especially the dictatorship of the proletariat, and also the elaboration of syndicalistic notions of conducting the future society through a trade union.\textsuperscript{236}

One of the important things about the above summation is that for a long time W. Z. Foster was himself a syndicalist. He
eventually rose to be one of the leaders of the Communist party in the USA.237

Going back before the founding of the IWW we now turn to the formation of a national federation of craft unions, the American Federation of Labor, founded in Columbus, Ohio in 1886 (although they date their history from 1881 based on their predecessors' birth, the Federation of Organized Trades and Labor Unions). This proved to be an exclusive protectionist organization which consolidated the most reactionary sectors of the working class, the old skilled craft worker.238

The AF of L was fully consistent with the bankruptcy of bourgeois democracy. It spoke good sounding words but failed miserably in practice. Reid presents a correct view of its relationship with Blacks:

What then is the official position of the American Federation of Labor toward the organizing of Negro workers? It comprises a number of resolutions urging organization against efforts of radicals at organization; segregated organization of Negro workers in certain occupations through local and federal labor unions; a few pleas for organization; the employment at various times of a few Negro organizers; and a total inability, if not unwillingness to compel international unions to remove from their constitutions Negro exclusion clauses, or suffer expulsion from the Federation.239

An objective factor that made some impact on the AF of L was the mass migration of Blacks to the urban north and the transformation of them from rural workers
to industrial workers. The other factor that changed the AF of L approach was the crisis of the Great Depression and the rise of industrial unionism.

Although the craft type union was the dominant form inside the AF of L, there were some industrial unions, e.g., mine workers, auto workers, and clothing workers. A struggle emerged between these two trends, representing not only the two objectively based sectors of the working class (craft versus mass industrial workers), but also two basic political trends (reactionary narrow interests versus broad interests for progressive social and political changes). The rift broke out at the 1935 convention, after which the dissident group formed the Committee on Industrial Organizing as a minority bloc within the AF of L. After some struggle, they were purged and subsequently they set up the Congress of Industrial Organ in 1937 (although they did not change the name until 1938). 240

In a real sense the radical wing of the labor movement was again given vitality in the early days of the CIO. The then revolutionary Communist Party gave leadership to the organizing effort, and led the working class in pitched battle against both the sell-out trade unionism pushed by the leadership of the AF of L, and the barbaric practices of the bourgeois class and its state during
the severe crisis of the Great Depression. So the old southern slander of the trade union movement was again dripping from the lips of every reactionary lackey of monopoly capital: "labor unions + strikes = communist + atheism + social equality with the Negro!". 341

A more accurate assessment, though, points to the historical importance of this new organization of industrial unions:

All workers gained substantially from the organizing drives of the CIO, but Black workers perhaps gained the most. Before the establishment of the CIO barely 100,000 Blacks were members of American trade unions; by 1940, there were roughly 500,000. Before the rise of the CIO, the presence of a Black union official at union events was a rare occurrence; in 1939-40, it was commonplace. A body of militant Black union officials had come into being. As spokesmen for hundreds of thousands of Black union members, they occupied a strategic position in influencing union policies. 342

The development of the CIO in relationship to the AF of L can be summed up in three stages leading to the merger in the 1950s.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR</th>
<th>CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg.# Affiliates</td>
<td>Average# Members (000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938-41</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942-47</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>6,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-54</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>8,902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
l. The first stage reflects a major need being fulfilled by the CIO, especially in the organizing of Auto and Steel. This was so much the case, in fact, that the membership rolls of the CIO outdistanced the AF of L. The initial reaction of the Black community was favorable:

With most Negro workers employed in mass-production industries, national Black leadership immediately endorsed the principle of industrial unionism. This principle was, for example, supported in 1936 by the National Negro Congress, which sought "to secure definite cooperation of Negro workers in mass production into industrial unions." The Pittsburg Courier, a leading Negro newspaper, expressed similar sentiments. The CIO, in sum, was for Black institutional leaders the long sought after viable alternative to industrial paternalism and union exclusion, and they responded by supporting it in the jurisdictional dispute that developed with AF of L organizers. 244

However, the Black community did not speak with one voice, but split over the issue: one side was tied to capital and focused on racism in the unions to argue against unionization, while the other side argued that since the strategic concern of Blacks was only possible in the trade union movement that whatever problems existed had to be fought rather than to jump in bed with capital. 245

There are many examples of this kind of a split. The major industrial giants, like Ford in Detroit, contributed funds to local churches in order to gain the support of ministers to fight the efforts to organize Black workers into an industrial auto union. Also, local Urban Leagues
often took a pro-capital position because of the composition of their board and the relationships they had developed in fund raising for the League. Often this local practice was in contradiction to the national policy which often was support, critical though it was hardly ever strongly anti-union.

2. The second period begins with the consolidation of support for the CIO and industrial unions by Black leadership.

The dominant view was expressed by Ralph Bunche:

The overwhelming majority of Negroes are working class, and most of these are unskilled. Thus practically the entire Negro race would be included in the scope of this ideology. The Black and white masses, once united, could employ the terrifying power of their numbers to wring concessions from the employers and from the government itself.\textsuperscript{246}

This view was substantially adopted by the NAACP, as for example is revealed in this 1943 statement:

Every attack on labor is an attack on the Negro, for the Negro is largely a worker...Organized labor is now our national ally. The CIO has proved that it stands for our people within the unions and outside the unions...If labor loses a battle, the Negro loses also.\textsuperscript{247}

This period of support of the CIO by Black leadership was rooted in the first period when the National Negro Congress gave its full support to the CIO. This organization was a united front of Black organizational leadership which ranged from the Communist party to the YMCA, Black college presidents, and Black ministers. In addition
to their general political and moral support, the National Negro Congress helped do some of the work, although the Congress was generally ineffective. Chicago is a case in point:

With the rise of the CIO the Chicago chapter (of the National Negro Congress), at least, took on more life. A close relationship was established between this unit of the Congress and the CIO and several of the paid Negro organizers were recommended to the CIO by the Congress. Among these were L. McDonald, Henry Johnson and Eleanor Rye of the SWOC (Steel Workers Organizing Committee). A portion of these organizers' salaries was at first paid by the National Negro Congress. The Congress in Chicago and some of the other industrial centers was also active in urging unionization of Negro workers and held mass meetings and distributed leaflets and press releases to this end.248

The other major aspect of this stage was the consolidation of the reactionary forces operating in the interest of capital, and their increased attacks on the CIO. The most backward anti-Communist propaganda was directed at the CIO. This was made more complex by the relationship of organized labor with Franklin D. Roosevelt, and their support of the USA in World War II.

3. By the third stage we have a hardening of the right position in the trade union leadership, and a consolidation of the right wing leadership in the CIO itself. After the war, the AF of L continued with blind patriotism to support the "cold war policies" of the USA and the CIO was not far behind.
At the eleventh CIO convention in 1949, the process of tying the organization to the cold war was completed. The Constitution Committee proposed a catchall resolution that would bar from the Executive Board anyone who advocated "policies and activities" directed toward advancing the purpose of the Communist Party. Then came a resolution to expel the 50,000 member United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America because it did not support the Marshall Plan or the North Atlantic Pact and had endorsed Henry A. Wallace for President in 1948. Without a trial or hearing, the resolution to expel was passed. The charter of the electrical workers was handed to James B. Carey, the leading CIO cold war advocate and an acknowledged agent of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists. The next day, the Union of Farm Equipment and Metal Workers was expelled and the union's jurisdiction turned over to the United Auto Workers. Expulsion of the Fur and Leather Workers Union; the International Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers; the ILWU; the Food, Tobacco, Agricultural, and Allied Workers Union; the United Office and Professional Workers; the United Public Workers; the American Communications Association; the National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards; and the International Fishermen and Allied Workers followed. In all, eleven progressive unions, with almost 1 million members, were expelled from the CIO as "Communist dominated" (fourteen years earlier the CIO itself had been expelled from the AF of L).249

This was the structural implementation of an agreement in political line such that it led to the merger of the AF of L and the CIO. This had serious meaning for Black workers, due to the fact that now there was no radical national trade union organization that took a clear and antagonistic stand against capital. So the extent of the relationship was now good sounding liberal policy, based on cooperating with capital, but no implementation
of the policy, only local control under local conditions which means "things as usual."

The result of this merger is that now the organized trade union movement is led by "labor lieutenants of capital" and represents the loyal opposition. The AF of L-CIO has supported many reformist causes, including much that has happened in the civil rights movement. However, when you compare it to the Knights of Labor, the IWW, and the CIO of the 1930's you find that it is a degenerate political force in this country. However, even though this is the character of the national organizations, especially the leadership, the militancy of the rank and file workers is marching on. The fact is that on the local level the trade unions represent the major organizational form of all of the workers. This must be seen in light of the many struggles that go on, often in opposition to the trade union leadership. The chart shows the degree to which the working class has been unionized and the level of their militancy as expressed in strikes. It is a testament to the bankruptcy of the national leadership that only around 30% of the non-agricultural workforce is organized, and it is a testament to the strength of the working class that the number of work stoppages is going up even though the organizing efforts of the trade union bureaucrats is often minimal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>UNION MEMBERSHIP AS % OF NONAGRICULTURAL WORKFORCE</th>
<th>WORK STOPPAGES (STRIKES AND LOCKOUTS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RANGE (LOW-HIGH)</td>
<td>YEARLY AVG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1936</td>
<td>11.3-13.7%</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937-1942</td>
<td>22.6-27.9</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943-1961</td>
<td>30.2-35.5</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-1972</td>
<td>29.8-26.7</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now that we have surveyed the general national character of the trade union movement as it has developed over the last 100 years in the USA, the impact of this on the city of Philadelphia can be demonstrated by reviewing three strikes in 1913, 1921, and 1944. The working class struggles in the city of Philadelphia have been exemplary of the working class as a whole. However, it should not be assumed that this is the only side of the story, because it has also been the scene of some of the most reactionary sellouts of the working class. These three strikes are examples of how the unity of the working class, under progressive leadership has fought for and won gains, has made concrete the call for the unity of Black and white workers, and has created a better basis for building a revolutionary movement.

Foner sums up the 1913 strike on the docks of Philadelphia in which the IWW played a leading role:

The IWW did recruit many Negro members among the waterfront workers along the Atlantic Coast and the lumber workers in the South. In 1913 it created the Marine Transport Workers' Industrial Union to organize waterfront workers regardless of craft or race. A manifesto issued late that year to all workers in the industry announced the IWW's plans to organize, criticized Jim Crow unionism in the International Longshoremen's Association, and pledged that "no color line" would exist wherever the Wobblies recruited members. It also declared:
We shall compel the masters to pay us wages that will enable us to develop ourselves mentally and socially, support those depending upon us and eventually support a family of our own.

We shall reduce our hours enough to make room for the unemployed, thereby solving the unemployed problem.

We shall build a union that will be a real hope for all workers on the waterfront, black and white, a real support in the hour of our need, and compel the respect and recognition of all society. Generally speaking, we shall ourselves assume control of our industry and dictate the conditions of work.

The IWW kicked off its campaign in Philadelphia. It was long overdue. The ILA had established a foothold on the waterfront in the 1890s but had lost it when it failed to support striking longshoremen in 1898. For fifteen years the Philadelphia longshoremen were unorganized. During that time, the employers had frustrated all attempts at organization by pitting blacks and whites against each other, meeting each complaint about conditions from members of either group with the threat that their jobs would be given to the other. The IWW entered the picture by telling the dock workers that, whether whites and blacks liked each other or not, their only hope was to organize in one union. The man who led the organizing campaign was Philadelphia-born Benjamin Harrison Fletcher, the leading black in the IWW.*

*The first important black organizer for the IWW was R. T. Sims, who came over to the Wobblies from the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance. He attended the 1906 convention, was appointed to the "Good and Welfare Committee," and introduced a resolution protesting lynchings of Negroes and antiblack riots as "a blot on the garment of civilization" and calling for the elimination of "such wanton and atrocious acts." The resolution was adopted.
Within a few months Marine Transport Workers' Local 3 was organized in Philadelphia over the opposition of the ILA, the AF of L, and even the Philadelphia branch of the Socialist Party. On May 13, 1913, Local 3 struck for recognition, supported by the African Methodist Episcopal Church in Philadelphia. One minister declared: "The IWW at least protects the colored man, which is more than I can say for the laws of this country."

For weeks, to quote the Public Ledger, "upward of 3,000 Italians, Poles, Slavs and colored men, who are employed as stevedores, gangmen, and haulers, have tied up the shipping industry in this city." Under the leadership of the IWW, the strikers battled police and invaded the mayor's home to protest the police department's protection of scabs and brutality toward the workers. The shipping interests assured Philadelphia that under no circumstances would they yield to the "lawless IWW." The solidarity of white and black longshoremen, unprecedented in the history of the Philadelphia labor movement, forced the shipping owners to eat their words. The dock workers won all their demands except the thirty-five cent hourly wage. The final settlement included recognition of the union, the right to bargain collectively, and thirty cents an hour.

In October, 1913, the boatmen's branch of the IWW, Local 8 of Philadelphia, was organized and struck for higher wages and shorter hours. After two days most of the employers gave in.

Those IWW victories proved that labor solidarity could win out over bitter opposition from the shipowners. "Only after many unsuccessful attempts to use scabs, police, gunmen, bribery, race prejudice, etc., to break their ranks," Fletcher wrote in Solidarity, "The shipping trust was forced to surrender to the solidarity of labor."

On May 14, 1914, the longshoremen again went on strike, this time for a wage increase. The struggle ended two weeks later in victory. During the strike, the first anniversary of the longshoremen's branch of the National Industrial Union of Marine Transport Workers
was celebrated in Philadelphia. The main speakers were "Big Bill" Haywood and Alanzo Richards, a black member of the Philadelphia local. Both whites and Negroes participated in a parade through the waterfront district and at a local park.

Strikes in 1915 and 1916 completed the union's control of the docks. In the spring of 1916, Local 3 gained job control on the waterfront for the longshoremen. By then the union's membership exceeded 3,000, and it had raised wages for black and white longshoremen from $1.25 to $4 a day, with time-and-a-half for overtime and double time for Sundays. In keeping with its belief in equality of black and white, the local had a rotating chairmanship; one month a Negro was chairman; the next month a white member.251

Spero and Harris describe the 1921 strike in the needled trades in which Black women were initially used as scabs, and then ended up in joining the union. The main lesson here is that racism in trade unions is collaboration with capital, and the only way to win is to unite all workers, Black and white, employed and unemployed. Here is their account:

In Philadelphia Negro strike breakers were introduced during the women's dress strike of 1921. Shop after shop was filled with colored workers. The whites, fearing that they would be entirely displaced, became alarmed and tried to resist the introduction of Negroes by force. Bitter fighting took place between pickets and scabs. Scissors and pins were used freely by both sides, and the employers, in the hope of strengthening the determination of the strike breakers, tried to give the clashes an interracial rather than industrial color. This failed, however. The city handled the situation wisely and assigned Negro police to shops where Negroes worked.

When the strike ended the white workers, for the most part, found their way back into the shops.
The Negro, however, had gained a real foothold in the industry. More than 1,000 workers, or 20 to 25 per cent of the employees now in the Philadelphia dress shops are colored, whereas before the strike there were only about 300 Negroes employed. The industry is about 35 per cent organized and the union has about 200 Negro members.

This 1921 strike, like the Chicago strike of 1917, was lost to the union through the Negro strike breaker. The leaders of the Negro community overwhelmingly supported the strike breakers despite the International's scrupulously fair attitude towards the colored workers. During the entire struggle not a single influential Negro voice was raised in behalf of the union. The Armstrong Association, reputed to be one of the most progressive local Urban Leagues, remained neutral.

This attitude of the colored leaders was due largely to the fact that they were eager above all else to get the Negro into industry. The union realized that with 20 to 25 per cent of the industry colored it had a serious problem on its hands and that its future in the city depended to no small degree on winning the influential forces in the Negro community to its side. This it set about to do with great thoroughness. Union representatives visited the Negro editors, ministers, and professional men whose word carried weight. A meeting of some of the most prominent colored citizens in the city was arranged at which the union made a plea for support. It explained that it was not only willing to accept the Negro and give him an equal chance, but that it was eager, now that he had won a permanent place in the industry, to guarantee him his position and protect him against exploitation. These pleas gradually won important Negro leaders, including ministers and editors, to the union cause. The union, both to demonstrate its good faith and further to strengthen its position, appointed the employment director of the Armstrong Association as one of its organizers.252

The third strike example concerns the transportation workers in Philadelphia.253 While this has been characterized as a "race hate" strike, to simply have this analysis
would be an error, the ideological error of empiricism. On the one hand the strike was conducted with racism as the major organizing tool by the reactionaries. However, there are three major aspects of this struggle that clearly demonstrate that the class contradiction is at the heart, is the essence of the oppression of Black workers.

a. The origins of the strike lie in events which took place as long ago as 1911 when management of the local traction system set up a cooperative wage fund for employees at the same time that it established an Employees' Co-operative Association. 254

The key issue here is that the reserve of money saved by the membership of the union was being used by the company for additional investment capital. So the workers were not helping themselves as much as they were allowing capital to have another means of exploitation. Also, rather than have a union that is based on the independent interests of the workers, the phenomenon of a company union means that the workers are in an organization that without any doubt or trickery is serving the interests of capital.

b. Another issue is the direct result of struggles by the working class in the USA, the Wagner Act. This 1935 legislation outlawed certain anti-union practices, e.g., the company union on the grounds that this was unfair interference by the company. This act called
for free elections for union representation, and collective bargaining to achieve contractual relations between the employer and the employees. The first result of this was a 4 way election in 1937 for union representation. The contest was between the CIO Transportation Workers Union, the ALF Amalgamated Workers, the Independent Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and the Philadelphia Rapid Transit Employees' Union. The last one mentioned here won, it being an outgrowth of the earlier Association and there represented merely a company union in disguise. So the second issue was the issue of union representation.

c. The third issue was the issue of the employment of Black workers in the higher paid positions such as trainman and conductor. The issue was first raised as labor shortages began to hit the city. The war years forced many companies to change their hiring practices, and Philadelphia was no exception. However, all efforts were made to hire white workers rather than Black ones, even those that could have been upgraded within the company. This even meant going so far as to try and recruit white women.

The Fair Employment Practices Committee (FEPC) got into the issues in 1943 by issuing a directive for the company to change its practice of excluding Blacks from certain jobs. The company union (PRTEU)
pointed to a clause in its contract that gave it the right to agree with the company:

Except as herein specifically covenanted, all existing rules, regulations and customs bearing on the employer-employee relationship shall continue in full force and effect until changed by agreement between the parties.255

The key word is "customs."

There was a long period of negotiation during which a mass public campaign was developed to follow the directive of FEPC.

The CIO Central Labor Council went on record favoring immediate acceptance of the directive. Church groups joined in, and their efforts were climaxcd on December 14th when a petition favoring fair employment practices on the local transit lines and bearing the signatures of over 12,500 substantial Philadelphia citizens was sent to the company.256

Now all three of these issues came to a head during an organizing drive that involved the same four unions that had clashed in the 1937 campaign. Only this time the just stand of the CIO was more compelling for the workers, because not only did they consistently maintain their position regarding the FEPC directive, but they also promised to fight for a contract that would more consistently represent the interest of the workers and not the old sweetheart arrangement that the old company union had stuffed down the workers throats. The CIO-TWU won almost 2/3 of the vote.
It was shortly after this election that the company conspired with their lackeys, the PRTEU, and the reactionary AFL Amalgamated to plot the overthrow of the CIO-TWU by calling a strike. Eight Black workers had been chosen to train for trainman and conductor and this sparked the strike.

Less than two-hundred bitter men succeeded in organizing the strike which tied up all public transportation in Philadelphia for nearly a week.257

This jumped off at 4:00 a.m. when there were only a few cars on the street. All of the other cars were lined up in the barns one behind the other on only a few tracks. This made it easy to hold onto the first cars and prevent all of the others from coming out.

The strike was hot and heavy, and eventually the President of the USA stepped in, and the army was called out to enforce the FEPC back-to-work order. After a week, the strike came to an end. And two days later, the company was forced to sign the CIO-TWU contract. And although there were still efforts to undermine the CIO-TWU efforts, at their first election of officers more than the original voters for them participated, which seems to indicate that they had gained strength rather than losing any. Moreover, one of the four vice-presidents elected was a Black worker.
The major lesson of these three strikes is the necessity of the view that the racist oppression of the Black worker is in essence the further class exploitation of the working class. In other words, each of the three strikes demonstrates that without unity of the entire working class, the trade union fights can only lead to failure. This is a trade union lesson, but it is also a lesson necessary to have for the development of a revolutionary movement in which labor and its allies engage in decisive combat with capital. Lenin called strikes "schools of working class war" and he was absolutely right!!

So these are the types of trade union experiences that the working class in Philadelphia has to build on, this is the tradition of the Knights, the Wobblies, the CIO and the continuance of this incipient revolutionary tradition in rank and file militancy, even in some of these same unions today.
SECTION II

THE CRISIS OF BLACK LEADERSHIP IN THE 1960s:
The Case of the Middle Class and the
Struggles of Black People in Philadelphia
During the 1960s

The first section of this study took up the task
of summarizing the essence of the entire sweep of Philadelphia's
history. This analysis revealed the basic logic of
class struggle in general, and the struggles of Black people
in particular. Section Two is focused on the 1960's
as an intense period of struggle, particularly in terms
of the immediate historical precedents for the analysis
of ALSC in the 1970's. The main objective of this section
is to discuss the role of Black middle class leadership
during this period of mass upheaval throughout the USA
as well as in Philadelphia.

Our approach to this will begin with a theoretical
discussion of classes and an empirical review of the
historical development of the various aspects of the
Black middle class. This is a very important and necessary
task since the heart of our approach, as spelled out
in the beginning, is the concept of classes and class
struggle. Moreover, this has been a very controversial
subject, a controversy in which we will take a stand
and differentiate our position from others.
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In addition to this abstract approach, we will examine the concrete role of the Black middle class in the movement in general, and then examine in greater detail the specific character of this class in three cases in Philadelphia. These case studies are all important for the contrasts provided on the issues of ideology, organization, leadership, relationship of the masses of people to the ruling class, and the historical motion that leads into the 1970's.

The militant upsurge of the 1960's represents an excellent historical period in which to make a class analysis of Black people in the USA because not only were the objective characteristics and interests brought into sharp focus, and seen by virtually everyone since they were played up in the media, but the political expressions of these various interests were clearly articulated and in conflict with each other so as to provide a good occasion to sum up the class essence of the Black struggle, a key aspect of determining friends and enemies of the proletariat. We view this part of the analysis as mere preliminary notes to a more systematic and thorough analysis of the turbulent 1960's.

1. Notes on the Marxist Concept of Class with special reference to Middle Strata Classes
The most complete definition of class was presented by Lenin:

Classes are large groups of people differing from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relation (in most cases fixed and formulated in law) to the means of production, by their role in the social organization of labor, and, consequently, by the dimensions of the share of social wealth of which they dispose and the mode of acquiring it. Classes are groups of people one of which can appropriate the labour of another owing to the different places they occupy in a definite system of social economy.⁴

A major reason that this stands out as the most complete definition of class in the development of Marxism is in part due to the fact that Marx never finished Chapter 52 of Volume 3 of *Capital* which was focused exactly on this point.⁵ It is possible, however, to use various examples of concrete analysis to grasp this concept and how to use it as a fundamentally important tool of analysis.

In general there are two basic approaches to a Marxian notion of class:⁶

1. the abstract category drawn from **theoretically specific** modes of production, based on delineating the basic antagonistic production relations in each, and that is summed up as diametrically opposed classes in constant irreconcilable class struggle;
2. The concrete analysis of the many classes that exist at any given time within a historically specific socio-economic formation is made complex by vestigial remnants of previously dominant modes of production, the turmoil of new developments intrinsic to the dominant mode of production (especially capitalism), and the emergence of new classes that constitute a transitional tendency toward the future.

The definition given by Lenin above is an attempt to give a general abstract definition of class, and it is precisely this that Marx did not get around to finishing. But that is not the achilles heel of Marxist analysis as many bourgeois polemicists would argue. The fact is that Marx, and those who best followed his line of analysis carried out brilliant concrete analysis that enables us to recognize that this summation by Lenin is accurate. Only in this light is the following statement from the Communist Manifesto to be considered correct, because it sums up the essence of class struggle in different class modes of production and is therefore necessarily abstract:

The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle.
Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeyman,
in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on uninterrupted, now hidden now open fight, a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary re-constitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes.

In the earlier epochs of history we find almost everywhere a complicated arrangement of society into various orders, a manifold gradation of social rank. In ancient Rome we have patricians, knights, plebians, slaves; in the middle ages, feudal lords, vassals, guildmasters, journeymen, apprentices, serfs; in almost all of these classes, again, subordinate gradations.9

All of the above mentioned classes reflect the criteria laid out by Lenin to cover the most abstract consideration of classes in different modes of production. However, it is to the empirical studies by Marx10 and later Engels,11 Lenin,12 Stalin,13 Mao Tse Tung14 and others that we can turn for specific concrete cases where classes have been summed up as they actually exist (economically and politically) at any given time within a given society.

A concrete analysis of classes that exist in a society is one of the first tasks of a revolutionary in order to answer the proletariat's question:

Who are our enemies? Who are our friends?15

Mao Tse Tung says that:

To distinguish real friends from real enemies, we must make a general analysis of the economic status of the various classes in Chinese society and of their respective attitudes towards the revolution.16
This points us to another important distinction regarding the concept class, the relative importance of base and superstructure. Here is the big issue that has frightened liberals, the issue of economic determinism. The fact is that Marx totally dissassociated himself from this in every instance. The Marxist analysis is rooted in the base of a society because of its long range causal impact on all other aspects of society, but it never liquidates the importance of non-economic factors and recognizes that the concept class is relevant to all aspects of the society. Consider the following:

1. on the state:

Each step in the development of the bourgeoisie was accompanied by a corresponding political advance of that class. ...The executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie.

2. on ideology:

The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas, i.e., the class which is the ruling material force of society, is at the same time its ruling intellectual forces. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of mental production, so that thereby, generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subject to it. The ruling ideas are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relationships, the dominant material relationships grasped as ideas...
These two quotes can be extended to virtually every aspect of social life because of the scope of analysis taken up by Marx and Engels, not to mention the continuation of this work over the last 100 years or so. The best summation is a direct statement by Engels refuting a simple economic determinism that is erroneously charged against Marxism:

...According to the materialist conception of history, the ultimately determining element in history is the production and reproduction of real life. More than this neither Marx nor I have ever asserted. Hence if somebody twists this into saying that the economic element is the only determining one, he transforms that proposition into a meaningless, abstract, senseless phrase. The economic situation is the basis, but the various elements of the superstructure --political forms of the class struggle and its results, to wit: constitutions established by the victorious class after a successful battle, etc., juridical forms, and even the reflexes of all these actual struggles in the brains of the participants, political, juristic, philosophical theories, religious views and their further development into systems of dogmas--also exercise their influence upon the course of the historical struggles and in many cases preponderate in determining their form. There is an interaction of all these elements in which, amid all the endless host of accidents (that is, of things and events whose inner interconnection is so remote or so impossible of proof that we can regard it as nonexistent, as negligible), the economic movement finally asserts itself as necessary. Otherwise the application of the theory to any period of history would be easier than the solution of a simple equation of the first degree.21

Based on this it is essential to draw out clearly some lessons of Marxist class analysis:
1. The basic material reality (the mode of production) for a class analysis is in the base of the society, the production forces and the social relations of production. In a class society, the production relations that are antagonistic result in the development of classes that are in conflict.

2. As in all things, there are many class contradictions in class society. However, there is only one principle contradiction that sums up the relationship between the main classes of that society. This is the key to a Marxian analysis of classes and class struggle.\textsuperscript{22}

3. In a thorough going class analysis, it is necessary to make an analysis of all classes that constitute secondary contradictions, but always in relationship to the principal class contradiction.

4. A thorough going class analysis takes into consideration material economic forces, as well as all aspects of the superstructure, particularly ideological and political issues as expressed in social situations, especially where there is a struggle over power based on the different "class" interests involved.
Our focus here is on the middle class, the petty bourgeoisie. At first, it is important to sweep aside the bourgeois myths of social mobility and social stratification in general. The development of bourgeois sociology has raised up Max Weber as a "god" to defeat Marxist theory, and operationalized his ideas on class and status to fit an empiricist approach in the spirit of the American philosopher (pragmatist) John Dewey. The three empirical indicators of this bourgeois notion of class are quantitative rankings of income, educational attainment, and prestige of one's occupation. This assumes that the society is stratified on a quantitative basis like a ladder with so many rungs, rather than class being qualitatively distinct social relations of production. In essence here is a diagnosis of this insanity:

a. income: this is crude "fetishism" because it assumes that one's ability to consume in the market place is the key factor, rather than one's ability to appropriate value produced, surplus value. What class is the millionaire dope dealer in?

b. occupation: this is a real reversal because it raises up an objective indicator
of one's relation to the production process, but rather than being objective about class, the reverse is done by considering one's occupational status. This means that a Supreme Court justice is ranked over the head of a ruling class family, although this is ranking the employee over the employer! In sum this puts forward that man's consciousness (status) determines his being (class), while for a Marxist the material real world is just the opposite.

c. education: this empirical measure incorrectly assumes that one's life chances are rooted in one's motivational and skill level. This confuses freedom with necessity, or on the other hand, again places the subjective in a dominant position over the objective.

Therefore, in our study of the middle class (petty bourgeoisie) we will focus on the material basis of this class and not these mystifications.
The petty bourgeois class in the USA has been very important, both as a transitional factor in the historical stages of development as well as an apparent mainstay in the current imperialist arrangement (though certainly a vacillating insecure material force). The first major manifestation of this class was in the form of small farmers and artisans-handicraft workers. The distinguishing factor here is that this class owns its own means of production, employs little more than the labor power of its own family, and therefore appropriates all the value produced for consumption. The second manifestation of this class emerges with the further development of capitalism to its imperialist stage. The "new" petty bourgeoisie is composed of highly skilled technicians, who, by virtue of services that they provide or the special role that they play in the production process, maintain a degree of independence and security (reflected in legal protection, professional associations that protect legitimacy, and petty material pleasures--high levels of consumption of luxuries).

The general historical motion of the petty bourgeoisie is the overall general decline of the old (small farmers, artisans, handicraft workers, and small shop keepers) and the rise of the new (non-productive wage workers, especially in government and private bureaucracies,
scientific and technical workers, mental workers in general). The exception to this is the periodic explosion of the old, a sort of renaissance of American dream type competitive capitalism in communities especially of the nationally oppressed and youth (street vendors, etc).

In general, the political life of the petty bourgeoisie reflects this relatively insecure economic position. It shares some unity with the bourgeoisie, and some unity with the proletariat. Further, it is these two main classes that represent the future for the petty bourgeoisie. R. Palme Dutt sums this up quite well:

Either finance-capital, owning the means of production, can seek to make the middle class its auxiliary, giving a measure of employment, if diminishingly in production, then at any rate increasingly in the tasks of violent coercion of the working class (fascist militia, police-officer class, fascist bureaucracy), or the proletariat, socializing the means of production, can at last give full scope to all the useful trained and technical abilities within the middle class in the gigantic tasks of social reconstruction. These are the only two alternatives before the middle class. The first is the line of fascism. The second is the line of communism.

2. Black People in the Petty Bourgeoisie

The historical development of the Black petty bourgeoisie is an important but frequently obscured class reality. We are confronted with the best and worst in a work by E. Franklin Frazier, Black Bourgeoisie (1957). He presented a wealth of empirical evidence, but was blinded by the
pseudo-scientific theories of bourgeois social science. His theoretical blunder is best revealed in this definition: "...the black bourgeoisie is comprised essentially of white-collar workers." 27 It is important to go deeply into these errors and separate what is correct from the incorrect but that would be a deviation from our task here.

The petty bourgeois class among Blacks has had four main sectors:

(a) **Artisans**: 28 An artisan is a free worker who by virtue of owning means of production, being self-employed, and employing few if any workers, consumes his own labor power by virtue of appropriating all surplus value for the well being of himself and his family. This was the experience of the handicraft worker who existed in the USA up til the 20th century, and continued til WWII and after.

Blacks in this category are described for the early Philadelphia (above), and this generally represents the pattern in pre-Civil War times. The existence of some free Black artisans in southern cities is described by Blassingame, Wade, Starobin, and Frazier. 29 In the end, however, Black artisans were never allowed to develop and therefore are not of great significance during the 20th century.
(b) **Farmers:** A farmer (small petty bourgeois type as distinct from the large capitalist farmer on the one hand and the tenant farmer on the other) owns (wholly or in part) land and tools by which products are produced by family labor for direct consumption or exchange wholly appropriated for sustaining the well being of the family.

This class sector of the petty bourgeoisie also has its roots before the Civil War. Frazier reported:

In 1830 the free Negroes owned about 32,000 acres of land valued at $184,184, and by 1860 both the acreage and the value of the farms owned by free Negroes had doubled. Since nearly half (43%) of the farms owned by the 1,200 free Negro farm owners contained 25 acres or less, it may be assumed that these farms were used for subsistence rather than for commercial enterprises.30

More recent statistics give a good picture of the 20th century changes in the size of Black farmers (owners and part owners).

**BLACK FARMERS IN THE SOUTHERN USA**31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total in South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>186,676</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>218,467</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>217,589</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>182,019</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>173,263</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>189,232</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>193,346</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>180,590</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>127,283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The high point of Black farmers was 1910.

By 1900, the first census year for which general data are available on color and farm tenure combined, 179,418 Negroes were operating their own farms in the southern states. The number was somewhat larger in 1910 and then held fairly steady from 1910 to 1920, when 217,589 Negro farm owners had 4% of the southern farm acreage. In 1920, owner-operators were 60.4% of Negro farmers. Thereafter the number of owner-farmers (whether white or colored) declined, but the rate of decline was much sharper in the colored group. After 1930 there was a slight upward spurt, the number of Negro farm owners rising from 182,000 in 1932 to 186,000 in 1935, but their total acreage continued to decline.32

Since World War II there has been an overall decline in the number of people engaged in agricultural production, among especially Blacks. "From 1945 to 1959, a 70% loss of Negro tenants took place. Owners declined by 33% --a heavy loss in itself, but much less than that of tenants."33 However, "Negro owners (full and part) numbered (in the south) 127,000 and operated 8.7 million acres of land in 1959."34

The current picture shows a continued decline:

Today, there are fewer than 100,000 Black farmers in the south, a tenth of the region's total. Twenty-five years ago, Blacks operated 20 percent of the south's farms.35

The Emergency Land Fund, an agency established to aid Black farmers, states:

According to the fund's calculations, in the decades immediately after the Civil War, the south's newly freed Blacks amassed some 15 million acres of farm land. Today, the fund
estimates Blacks own fewer than 5 million farm acres, perhaps half of them lying fallow.36

(c) **Shopkeepers:** The petty bourgeois shopkeeper is self-employed in commercial trade by providing the essential service of enabling buyers to gain more efficient access to commodities. This has been the main objective basis for what has euphemistically been mis-labeled "Black Capitalism."37

E. Franklin Frazier stated:

In 1939 there were nearly 30,000 retail stores owned and operated by Negroes, with total sales amounting to about 71.5 million dollars. According to the 1944 study of Negro business, 80% of all Negro businesses were operated by their owners...about 70% of these stores were located in the southern states.38

The current picture is as follows:39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Sales ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>163,073</td>
<td>4,474,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>194,986</td>
<td>7,168,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) **Professionals:** The professional sector of the petty bourgeois class is highly skilled, enjoys work conditions that allow for relative individual independence, and receives material rewards reflected in relative comfort and consumption of luxuries. Black petty bourgeois professions developed in two waves, paralleling the general development of this class, though very few existed before the Civil War.
First to develop were the traditional professions: teachers, doctors, lawyers, etc. Then, greater differentiation occurred in government (e.g., social workers) and technical fields. On the elite level, from 1920 to 1962 Blacks received only 143 doctorates in the physical sciences (0.27% of total) and 250 doctorates in natural sciences (0.29% of total).  

In general, the Handbook of Labor Statistics 1974 enables us to present a very general approximation of the relative size of the three significant sectors of Blacks in the petty bourgeois class (excluding artisans) --see footnote for more detailed explanation.

### SECTORS OF BLACK PETTY BOURGEOISIE AS % OF TOTAL BLACK EMPLOYED MALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total (000s)</th>
<th>Farmers</th>
<th>Shopkeepers</th>
<th>Professionals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>3,821</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>4,229</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>4,702</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>5,133</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The importance of this table is how the relatively constant size of the petty bourgeoisie conceals the change in its character from the traditional (farmers) to the new (professionals) with shopkeepers only declining slightly.

An important aspect of this picture of the petty bourgeois class in the US is the role of
the government (the state apparatus). In general, the state has been the major single agent in the objective development of petty bourgeois Blacks and its ideological orientation. Not only does this reflect the general trend of US state monopoly capitalism, but it is central to understanding the particular history of Blacks since the Civil War (e.g., Freedmans Bureau, New Deal Programs, FEPC, Poverty Program and Affirmative Action are some of the high points in this respect).

1. The government as a source of jobs: This is key for the petty bourgeois professional as well as the entire Black employed, in that over 20% of Black workers are classified by the 1970 census as government workers. In addition, the passage of the Fair Employment Practice Commission bill opened new opportunities during and after World War II. Hence government action has been both a direct (as employer) and indirect (through legislation regarding employment in general) source of jobs.

More recent statistics reveal the importance of government employment in a study for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education by a Harvard University economist:

Over all, about 51% of all male Black college graduates are employed by governments—either federal, state, or local—compared to about 25% of college-educated white males.
Although the largest number are teachers, there are high proportions of Blacks employed by governments in other fields as well—about 28% of Black lawyers, compared by 14% of lawyers overall. 47.5% of personnel and labor relations professions, compared to 25% overall, and 24% of all Black men who are managers, which is about double the overall proportion.

During the 1960s, Freeman reported, the share of Black managerial workers employed by governments nearly tripled.44

2. The government as a source of capital: Again the history of Black business activity can be seen in relation to government action, beginning with the great fiasco of the Freedmans Bank during the reconstruction period, but best since the Nixon administration with special legislation and executive guidelines to channel both public and private funds into the hands of Black entrepreneurs. And while the majority of businesses started by Blacks may be independent of direct government intervention, it appears that a majority of those that are successful are helped with funds (grants, loans, etc.) and/or technical assistance.45

A further aspect of this class is its ideological reproduction.46 This is key because of the dynamically changing and insecure economic basis of and political prop for petty bourgeois Blacks. By ideological reproduction we mean the process by which the material interests of a class are reinforced through education, cultural activities, religion, mass media, and political organization.
Frazier is at his best on this subject. The second half of Black Bourgeoisie is entitled "The World of Make-Believe." He states:

This world of make-believe, to be sure, is a reflection of the values of American society, but it lacks the economic basis that would give it roots in the world of reality. In escaping into a world of make-believe, middle-class Negroes have rejected both identification with the Negro and his traditional culture. Through delusions of wealth and power they have sought identification with the white America which continues to reject them. But these delusions leave them frustrated because they are unable to escape from the emptiness and futility of their existence. 47

There is no doubt that the Black petty bourgeoisie tries to mimic the ruling class in this society. This is the meaning of various Black colleges claiming to be the "Black Harvard," or the way social and fraternal organizations consume luxuries in order to achieve status where they don't have the material equality rooted in class terms. This pattern of delusion seems to be increasing rather than decreasing due to the changing demand for Black labor. When Black colleges were founded there was the need for skilled labor and managers of the affairs of the ruling class over the Black community. Now that the supply of such has started to exceed demand, particularly in this period of a downturn and increased economic and political crisis, the decrease in material payoff is mystified by the increased ideological thrust to commit this highly ambitious class force to a world of make believe.
A concrete example is that during the 1960's Black fraternities and sororities were on the decline. But with the economic crisis of the 1970's they are on the rise again.\(^4\)

3. Mass Struggles of the 1960's and the Crisis of Middle Class Leadership

One of the major features of the mass struggles that emerged in the 1960's was its overwhelming petty bourgeois leadership, in distinction to its mass base which was rooted in the working class.\(^4\) This is a rather expected pattern within a movement of the nationally oppressed,\(^5\) though here it provides an important prism through which to examine the class nature of Black politics. Black politics reflects class contradictions in which there is increased proletarianization of the Black masses on the one hand, and on the other hand the Black petty bourgeoisie (and though small, the Black sector of the Bourgeoisie) and its vacillating relationship to both the masses and to monopoly capital.

This section will be a short summation of the major trends of the 1960's when middle class leadership experienced a severe crisis which has carried through to the 1970's.\(^5\)

Based on the demographic revolution of the post World War II period, the rising expectations of first generation provided with the college students and graduates burst forth after they had been/initial impetus to struggle resulting from the 1954
Supreme Court decision on Brown versus Board of Education,/ in Topeka, Kansas. The sit-ins of 1960 were the war cry of the petty bourgeoisie. 52

This gave a tremendous uplift to the civil rights movement in which there was a combination of concrete material goals and status goals connected to the masses and the leadership. 53 All of the civil rights groups had petty bourgeois leadership, and the trade unions were captured by bureaucrats who had lost the radical militancy of the CIO and the 1930s. In general the struggles for civil rights resulted in status gains for the masses and material gains for the petty bourgeoisie including swelling their ranks.

However, this turned into its opposite when the working class entrants into petty bourgeois positions reacted by refusing the golden apple of integration and putting forward nationalist demands. 54 This was not a clear proletarian program, but due to the continuation of national oppression, this radical nationalist movement was revolutionary in its initial thrust. It had a tremendous impact of a large sector of youth in the USA and was a stepping stone to the general rise of radicalism. 55 The riots of the big cities, followed by the militant organization of Panthers, Deacons for Defense and Justice, etc., pushed aside the road block of passive nonviolence and raised the possibility of revolutionary struggle. 56
Since this time the petty bourgeois elites have had to rapidly transform themselves. Not only has this been a cosmetic switch in which they have had to adopt the changes in dress and hair styles, but their language has been radically changed as well. Black had to become a legitimate replacement for Negro because the masses in struggle demanded it. One slogan after another was coopted by this elite because of growing influence of the masses. However, since it was this institutional-based petty bourgeois elite that was in the leadership, in the short run they have had more staying power since the masses were mainly characterized by spontaneity and not organization that summed up their concerns and represented their interest.  

The net result of this has been an insecure leadership, unsure of when the next mass upsurge will occur and over what issue, more and more vacillating wildly from the masses to the ruling class. Of course, this is the normal activity of this group who must strive to serve both masters if their class privileges are to be maintained. The main trend seems to be based on their organizational context, with the security and amount of resources at one's disposal being key determinants in one's ability to deliver "the goods" and legitimate one's leadership in the eyes of the masses.
This general framework is the basis for the following analysis of three different petty bourgeois-led efforts, each with a different institutional or non-institutional base.
SECTION IV: ECONOMIC REFORMISM OF REV. SULLIVAN OF ZION BAPTIST AND OIC: THE MASSES, PETTY BOURGEOIS LEADERSHIP AND MONOPOLY CAPITAL

One of the main areas of concentration for petty bourgeois forces, and in this respect Black people are no exception, is on economic reforms. A particularly important connection links the church in the Black community to various schemes under the rubric of Black economic development. This is a major institutional basis for how petty bourgeois ideology and practices are allowed to influence Black people with the direct and indirect support of the government and major capitalist corporations. The "holy" guise of the church is the vehicle for the "profanity" of economic reformism. Indeed, religion is used as an opiate for the masses of people.

A survey of the history of Black people in the US quickly reveals this "cash nexus with God." Black banks, insurance companies, and mortuaries owe their origins to the burial societies and mutual aid societies that were frequently rooted in the church. After all it was here in the church that large groups of Black people gathered, and it was this context that provided leadership and security in what otherwise was a hostile environment. In other words, it was easy to believe a con if it was disguised with "the good book," and was a form of traditional theatre in which one's great familiarity would enable sensitive
and discriminating choices to be made by the masses without any formal training. How else can we interpret the success of Daddy Grace, Rev. Ike, Jesse Jackson, or the long list of others?

The main aspect of our concern, however, is not with this cultural aspect, but with the connection of the church with monopoly capitalism, and how this promotes the bogus political line that the problems of Black people can be solved within this capitalist system by reforming it. This is the basis on which we use Rev. Leon H. Sullivan, of the Philadelphia Zion Baptist Church, as a case study.  

The importance of Rev. Sullivan is that he has had the greatest record of any petty bourgeois leader with a solid institutional base in promoting programs of economic reform. Moreover, he has combined his social base in the Black community with an extreme amount (for Black people) of financial backing from corporations, foundations, and government. And while he began all of this in 1964, his story really begins in 1922.

Rev. Sullivan was born in Charleston, West Virginia on October 16, 1922. His grandfather was a coal miner and his mother, an elevator operator. Sullivan graduated from West Virginia State College in 1942, and (although
he had been ordained a year before) went to New York City to study at Union Theological Seminary (of Columbia University) with the aid of a fellowship. He had met Rev. Adam Clayton Powell when he had visited in West Virginia and preached at one of his two churches there. So in coming to New York Powell set him up and eventually he became an assistant pastor at the famous Abyssinian Baptist Church.

While in Harlem he joined and became president of the March on Washington Movement started by A. Philip Randolph. He was active in demonstrations and street corner speaking:

We shared our platform with all who spoke for Black men, including the Black nationalists, who were small in number and unaccepted at that time, and we all joined hands and voices in a common effort against racial bigotry. 'Unity of Action' was our watchword.61

However, he rejected this non-institutionalized form of struggle and returned to the church. Here are his words:

The glamour of being recognized by crowds had begun to affect me. And I was losing touch with God. We decided that it was imperative that I leave New York--the Golden Gate Recreation Center, and the Coordinating Councils on Juvenile Aid, and the mass meetings, and the weekend corner meetings, and the glare and the glow and the excitement of Harlem and Manhattan. I needed to find myself; I had to rediscover God.62
His story is a real zig zag drama with the ruling class/militant struggle to warm embrace. So it appears that his own version of leaving Harlem in search of God, whether he believes it or not, is a mystification, particularly when we see the results of that move.

After five years in New Jersey, and settling in to a church in Philadelphia, Sullivan took to the streets again, but this time creating a civilian volunteer communications network to supply the police with information on all forms of anti-social activity.

...we established a vast communication network with citizens at work in each block. All problems in block areas were reported to division leaders, and then to police headquarters or other departmental agencies for action. Vice and crime reports were recorded in the name of the Citizens Committee so that individual citizens would not be concerned about reprisals. Citizens met with police regularly, and police began to understand the citizens and their problems.63

All of this patriotic work was done in the same period that Police Captain Rizzo was earning the reputation for being the "Cisco Kid" for the joy he got out of police brutality.64 In reward for his effort, the U.S. Jr. Chambers of Commerce hailed Sullivan as being one of the 10 most outstanding young men of 1955, and assigned Vice-President Richard Nixon to give him the award.65

His next venture was to return to the militant protests that he had left in Harlem. In 1958 he organized
in Philadelphia a "selective patronage" campaign, a version of the 1929 Chicago "Spend Your Money Where You Can Work" campaign. Sullivan states, "In all, there were 29 Selective Patronage campaigns between the years 1959 and 1963." Once again Sullivan hit the jackpot and Rev. Martin Luther King called him in to find out how this man had organized 400 ministers to carry out such joint action. This is the 1962 origin of Operation Breadbasket that Jesse Jackson went on to lead (now called Operation PUSH).

His rationale for the success of these campaigns appears to point to charisma, but it really confirms the thesis that the institutional base of the Black church proved potent in this case:

Selective Patronage came into being, therefore, because the colored preachers in Philadelphia rallied around the idea and set it into motion. There was never a formal organization. No minutes were kept and there was no treasurer, no elected leader--not even a specific meeting place. Yet those four hundred colored preachers became perhaps the best organized disorganization in history. Strangely, its disorganization was its greatest strength. No one had to fight about who would be boss. There were four hundred bosses, four hundred chairmen.

But Sullivan has more Booker T. Washington in him than WEB DuBois, he is more apt to like pulling on bootstraps than snapping the leather of boxing gloves. This comes through in this 1971 portrait of him in Ebony:
He was always deeply influenced by Father Divine who sometimes called him 'son' and whom Sullivan credits with being 'an inspiration to me. He did things 20 years ago that we're just beginning to do now. He built businesses, schools, and taught people pride, thrift, and honesty.' He equally respects and admires the current work of Elijah Muhammad and the Muslims who have consistently stressed economic programs.

Sullivan is the personification of the petty bourgeois leader. He has one foot with the masses but his head is filled with the dreams of capitalism of a bygone era, or at least that is the "dream book" he raps to the masses. He can sound militant:

The basic problem of Black men in America since the turn of the 20th century has been our submission to our own fears of white oppression and to white threats. We have accepted too much too long without fighting back.  

But then he turns around and negates the centuries of Black labor and the current proletarian class character of Black people:

We Black folk must become partners at the helm of the national economy, and not continue just in menial roles, for in the final analysis Black men will be respected only in proportion to what they produce to strengthen the nation. No one wants a beggar in his living room.

This line is based on petty bourgeois ideology. He puts it clearly:

I will never be satisfied until every Black adult in America owns a piece of this country individually or mutually, even if it is no more than two square feet of earth or a share of stock.
Moreover, he isn't just rappin' this mess but is actually out building what appear to be programs of great success that validate his ideas.

Sullivan has developed a two-pronged approach over the last 13 years.

The first was a great local, national, and international hit, the Opportunities Industrialization Center (OIC). He compromised the historical debt that capitalism owes to Black people and all working people, and really assumed the burden of guilt (or at least proof)!

After we cracked the door of industry through selective patronage and through the efforts of other militant groups and the change had come, we began to hear the old excuse 'We would hire him, but he is not prepared.' Personnel officers did not mention the white men, also unprepared, who had been taken into jobs and taught how to do the job while they were on the payroll. No explanation was given as to why Black men who held menial jobs and did the dirty work in the factories were never given the opportunity to develop skills and be upgraded to better positions. All we heard was 'He is not prepared.'

All right, I said to myself, if we are not prepared, then we will make ourselves prepared! We will help ourselves. That would be a good slogan. To those who say that Black men cannot learn as white men do we will prove that intelligence is colorblind. Some people argue that Black people do not really want anything more than relief and the labor of others to live on. We will prove that they are wrong, and all that Black people really want is a chance—not relief rolls but payrolls.74

The OIC began in Philadelphia in 1964, and by 1975 had spread to 117 cities, in 47 states, and four African
countries (Nigeria, Kenya, Ghana, and Ethiopia). The basic thrust of the program is to organize a local support group, raise a little money to make it appear to be based on local initiative and then pour in support from the government, private foundations, and corporations. By 1975 they claim to have trained over 200,000 people for jobs.

The other approach is the business end of things. Sullivan used his church, 5000 strong, to fund some ventures that were quickly joined by outside funding. To the Black petty capitalist, one can only drool at his accomplishments: the million dollar Zion Gardens apartment complex, Progress Aerospace Enterprises, which not long ago won some $7 million worth of contracts to fabricate and hook up the electronic gear for army field communications vans, Progress Products Corp., which makes electrical harnesses for GM, IBM, and Chrysler, and a multi-million dollar Progress Plaza Shopping Center. This is of course only a partial listing of his credits.

What does all of this mean to him? Well, it comes straight out of his own mouth:

I tell my people, 'Look at the Rockefellers, somebody had to begin that fortune. We'll never have a Rockefeller but 10,000 of us can make one.'
And, he never even flinches when he (from the other side of his mouth) says in defense of his efforts:

They are real! Conceived by African Americans and run by Africans with the support and aid of others who truly care. \(^{83}\)

Now we must ask, who are these people who really care? Well, in 1975:

...Sullivan presented the OIC's Excellence in Government award to Donald Rumsfeld, Ford's Chief of Staff. 'We know you as a friend of OIC,' said the smiling Sullivan.

Later in the day Sullivan gave the OIC's state government award to Governor George C. Wallace of Alabama...Wallace in his acceptance speech characterized Sullivan as a modern Booker T. Washington.\(^{84}\)

But these people, along with nearly every major politician from Johnson to Kennedy to Nixon, all came to pay homage at the altar of OIC. After all, it was an altar to capitalism in a location that profoundly proves its moribund character, the urban Black community. The full story of the relationship between OIC and these people who really care is most clearly revealed by the list of people on the OIC blue ribbon advisory committee. These captains of industry are supposed to be the friends of Black people: \(^{85}\)
BUSINESS ADVISORY BOARD OF OIC

Thomas McCabe
Chairman of the Board
Scott Paper Company
Chester, Pa.

Gerald Phillippe
Chairman of the Board
General Electric
Company

George Champion
Chairman of the Board
Chase Manhattan Bank

William M. Allen
President
Boeing Company
Seattle

J. Paul Austin
President
Coca Cola Company
Atlanta

George R. Brown
Chairman of the Board
Brown and Root,
Incorporated
Houston

Walker Cisler
Chairman of the Board
Detroit Edison
Company
Detroit

Joseph A. Dallas
Vice President
E. I. DuPont
de Nemours
Wilmington

John T. Dorrance
Chairman of the Board
Campbell Soup
Company
Camden, New Jersey

Ben S. Gilmer
President
American Telephone
and Telegraph
New York

John Haas
Executive Vice President
Rohm and Haas
Philadelphia

Gilbert W. Humphrey
Chairman of the Board
Hanna Mining
Company
Cleveland

John H. Johnson
President and Editor
Ebony Magazine
Chicago
Edgar F. Kaiser  Chairman of the Board  Kaiser Industries Corporation  Oakland, California
Ralph Lazarus  Chairman of the Board  Federated Stores of America  Cincinnati
T. Vincent Learson  President  International Business Machines  Armonk, New York
Charles P. McCormick  Chairman of the Board  McCormick and Company  Baltimore
John A. Mayer  Chairman of the Board  Mellon National Bank and Trust Company  Pittsburgh
Robert S. Oelman  Chairman of the Board  National Cash Register Company  Dayton, Ohio
Henry G. Parks, Jr.  Chairman of the Board  Parks Sausage Company  Baltimore
Frederic A. Potts  Chairman of the Board  Philadelphia National Bank  Philadelphia
General E. W. Rawlings  Chairman of the Board  General Mills, Incorporated  Minneapolis
Charles A. Seigfried  President  Metropolitan Life Insurance Company  New York
Jay L. Taylor  Chairman of the Board  Baker-Taylor Drilling Company  Amarillo, Texas
The ultimate reward for Sullivan this time was being elected to the board of General Motors, the world's largest industrial corporation. The then chairman James Roche was clear on who they elected:

I think Dr. Sullivan's philosophy basically is a very sound one. He recognizes that whatever can be done for the minorities should be done within the framework and concepts of our American system.86

And Sullivan is quick to add:

I'm not interested in wrecking GM...I want to help GM make a profit.87

After a year in this new position, Sullivan lists four major accomplishments. The reality of this list points to the petty bourgeois interest that he represents on the board.88

1. more GM money has been invested in Black banks;
2. more Blacks have been allowed to buy GM dealerships;
3. more Blacks have been upgraded from wage jobs to salary jobs;
4. there has been more training for Blacks in auto mechanics.

Can there be any doubt which class he serves?

This case is radically different from Sullivan in one respect, but quite similar in another. This is a case where petty bourgeois leadership is quite militant without an institutional base, with a great deal of sound and fury, ending with a whimper and not a bang. However, what is also important is that the main character in this act of the play is able to recoup and enter back into a prominent leadership position by being elected to the Philadelphia City Council.

The NAACP has long been one of the major arms of the Black petty bourgeois elite, as jobs for lawyers, and as positions of status for others to speak for the entire national population of Black people. The roster of its national staff and leadership reads like a who's who for Black public figures. Indeed, in its early days it led many heroic and courageous struggles against many forms of brutal oppression heaped on Black people, and the legal defense arm has saved many Black people from being "legally" lynched. But things turn into their opposite, and while in particular cases the NAACP can play a key and positive role, the overall picture is one of holding up the false hope of reform in the face of imperialism rather than arming the masses with the truth and building the ideological, political, and
organizational tools to fight a mass struggle, our only real hope of victory.

The major national accomplishments of the NAACP have been in filing court briefs and lobbying for legislation. During the 1960s this was their aspect of the struggle, while mostly everyone else was out in the streets mobilizing the masses. But in the 1950s the mass movement was just emerging, though the NAACP was at work on the Brown Decision of 1954 by the Supreme Court. Indeed, the Brown decision struck a responsive chord and stirred the hopes and aspirations of masses of Black people.

The national NAACP by 1962 had 1,494 branches in 48 states with approximately 471,000 members. Within the civil rights movement this makes it by far the largest, and with its bourgeois class connections, the one with the most resources. Moreover, the nature of its leadership (especially the self-perpetuating character of its board of directors) anchors its leadership in a sort of oligopoly paralleling the seniority of the southern Dixiecrats.

The increased activity of the early sixties had an impact on its membership size. Here are membership estimates for four cities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>1959</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>12,051</td>
<td>22,325</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>16,746</td>
<td>21,870</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>12,318</td>
<td>13,895</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>6,797</td>
<td>11,059</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aside from the fact that New York membership in the NAACP is not counted on the metropolitan level, these are the four cities with the largest NAACP memberships by 1963. It is important to note that the % increase is both a reflection of the activity level and political line of local leadership, as well as the general political context of mass struggle. In this regard Philadelphia is a major case of NAACP success.

However, this success is quite short lived. Here are the details of its growth and decline:94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1959</th>
<th>6,797</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>11,059</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>19,000</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>23,000</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>30,000</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>12,000</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>3,855</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

These membership statistics set the context for the turbulent story of a colorful militant leader whose personal feats were spectacular, but whose lack of an institutional base, who as a petty bourgeois militant ultimately holding out for reforms, was his downfall.

Cecil Moore was born in West Virginia, with college educated parents.95 He spent nine years in the Marines
(1942-1951) before taking a law degree from Temple University in 1953. While maintaining a practice in criminal law, he became a Republican ward leader and was a delegate to the national GOP convention in 1956. He ran for Congress twice and lost twice. He was elected President of the NAACP in Philadelphia in 1962, and took office January 1963.

The historical evidence on the class character of the Philadelphia NAACP clearly points to petty bourgeois dominance on the leadership level as well as the rank and file membership. Nelson sums up the situation in the 1930s:

Class similarity between executives and the general membership explained why twenty branch members who held office during the 1930s were grouped occupationally among the Black middle class--3 post office employees, 3 physicians, 3 housewives (married to Black professionals), 2 realtors, 2 attorneys, 2 businessmen, a dentist, minister, clerk, school teacher, and a YMCA director... In 1930, 668 dues paying members were listed on membership rolls, 355 (51.6 per cent) of whom listed their occupation in the City Directory--319 being categorized as business and professional people, and 36 listed in non-professional or low status occupations. A significant number of the non-professionals were home owners (26, or 72.2 per cent) and these people could be included among the Black middle class; only 7,800 of the city's 50,000 Black families in 1930 enjoyed home ownership.

But this picture is quite different than the one given later by Moore, one that he connects to the basis for the phenomenal increase in NAACP membership during 1963 and 1964:
"I run a grass roots group," he says, not a cocktail party, tea-sipping, fashion show attending group of exhibitionists. That's the difference. Those things divide the Negro, separate him into classes. I want nothing to divide the Negro; I want a one-class Negro community. Your so-called middle class Negro is a 'professional Negro' who doesn't come into contact with the masses. I'd be lost if I had to move up to Mount Airy or one of those places where I'd have to be so damned respectable that I couldn't go out and stand on a street corner on Saturday night. The Negro is always on the corner on Friday and Saturday night. That's where you go to talk.

This is an important indication of petty bourgeois ideology responding to the mass unrest and struggle of this period. Moore does not make clear class distinctions (the reality of classes being rooted in production relations and in struggle), but rather wants to merge the different classes that exist into one ("a one class Negro community"); and, in a characteristically petty bourgeois fashion, talks about the masses of Black people like everybody hangs out on a street corner.

Moore seems to have rejected the traditional petty bourgeois base of the NAACP, which to a great extent overlaps with the church (even a cursory glance through the NAACP's organ, Crisis, will reveal the involvement of Black churches throughout the USA in membership drives). This does not mean that he has defected from being petty bourgeois, but the mass struggles of the 1960s rather has forced him to express his class interests in another way. He has had to count on his
personal qualities (and skills as a lawyer which brings him people in need, a natural constituency, "a friend in need is a friend indeed"). Basically his approach during his NAACP period was to reign supreme, fight off any militants who challenged his popular leadership, ride the waves of mass sentiment, claim everything as a victory, and always show confidence. As Moore put it, "I am the goddam boss!"

Moore gained prominence for fighting highly visible status issues that bring forth an emotional protest against national oppression. For example, he organized resistance against the custom in Philadelphia for an organization, the Mummers, to march in Black face in the annual New Year's Day parade. He had been able to build the emotional pitch of youth to the point of possibly taking direct action against them if they had done it. He also led the fight against the segregationist policies of Girard College in Philadelphia which was a monument to national oppression. Further, Moore was active in bread and butter demonstrations like discrimination among the building trades working for the city government, picketing at school construction sites for hiring more Blacks, and protesting the failure to hire Black drivers by Trailways bus company.

But in nearly every case he did all this in direct opposition to the efforts of some other civil rights group. The Girard College demonstrations were held to coincide with
a visit to Philadelphia by Martin Luther King, while the construction demonstrations had been carried on by CORE for some time before Moore and the NAACP ever got involved. All of the evidence points to a great deal of organizational opportunism, a practice that makes struggle not so much an attempt to solve problems and change the real world, but a process for the growth, success, and popularity of one organization over another. Moreover, it is important to mention that one part of this is the careerism and personal advancement often sought by individuals in the leadership.

Moore bucked the traditional petty bourgeois institution and its leadership, and was successful in sporadic political combat with more grass roots types of civil rights groups. But for the petty bourgeoisie, as the petty bourgeoisie, the chickens always come home to roost. Moore had picked up a rock, only to have it fall on his own feet. The traditional petty bourgeoisie elite got its revenge.

Here is how the Crisis summed up what happened:103

In the Philadelphia situation, a group of six officers and members filed a complaint charging that Cecil B. Moore, the branch's colorful and controversial president, was "guilty of conduct inimical to the best interest of the Philadelphia Branch," and that he had "incurred numerous obligations of more than $50,000 in the name of or in behalf of the Philadelphia Branch without the vote of the executive committee...as required by the Constitution and By-laws for Branches." As one of the disciplinary actions requested, the group called for the removal of Mr. Moore as president and that he be expelled from membership in the branch and the Association.
In his reply, Mr. Moore denied all the allegations and filed a counter-complaint charging that the group had demonstrated "a malicious and malevolent intent to destroy the local branch and to vilify its leadership." He likewise asked that the six complainants be expelled from membership in the branch and the Association because of "their conduct in trying this matter in the press, radio and television."

The hearing, conducted in New York City, consumed three all-day sessions—December 3, December 9, and January 5. Each side was represented by counsel and produced both witnesses and written documents to support its case. Before the Committee issued its ruling, both sides were permitted to submit for review additional evidence and briefs.

The Committee, of which Judge Hubert T. Delany is chairman, handed down its decision on February 8, 1965, following approval of the Committee's findings by the Executive Committee of the NAACP Board of Directors.

In the long-awaited ruling, the Committee opinion stated that "while we find no malfeasance or misfeasance, the hearing made evident that the record-keeping of the Philadelphia Branch, particularly in regard to financial matters, is exceedingly loose and not in accordance with constitutionally prescribed procedures for making authorized disbursements."

Noting that there has been no audit of the Philadelphia Branch records for the years 1962-64, the Committee ordered the branch "to have a public audit made of its funds for the years 1963 and 1964...within 90 days by a firm of accountants to be selected by the National Office."

It was further ordered that the Philadelphia Branch "assign one or more of its full-time paid employees to the task of keeping accurate and full records of the income and disbursements of the Philadelphia Branch, and all necessary explanatory data incident thereto, and to prepare a monthly statement to be approved by the president and the treasurer for submission to the executive committee and members of the branch."

Meanwhile, Mr. Moore was overwhelmingly re-elected at a postponed branch election held on February 6.
However, some members broke away from the NAACP and formed the "Philadelphia Association for Negro Advancement." And while this was not a major social force in the community, it was a symbolic forerunner of the mass defection of 1965.

Moore lost the battle, but he was not out of the war. Different institutional positions of leadership require different kinds of relationships with the masses of people. Moore turned again to electoral politics and won a fight to be on the city council. Being elected to office for an opportunist mass leader is like surfing in the ocean, because one's what is needed is the skill to time one's moves and ride the waves of support if one is to be successful. Of course there are several other considerations (being part of a political machine, being an incumbent and winning because waves of challenge do not arise, etc.). But for a popular mass leader, electoral politics provides a big payoff for one campaign--a term in office, with definite material resources at one's disposal, even if this only means better access to the mass media.
SECTION VI: MILITANT SPONTANEOUS STRUGGLE: THE CASE OF CORE, SNCC, AND THE BLACK PANTHER PARTY IN PHILADELPHIA

In sharp contrast to the previous discussion of Sullivan and Moore, both of whom represent the traditional professions and organizational activities of the Black petty bourgeoisie (minister and lawyer, the church and the NAACP), the more spontaneous militant organizations do not fit such neat categories. In general, the organizations which came to life or were created as part of the mass struggles of the 1960s were much more dynamic and fluid in their organizational form and in the specific composition of their leadership. However, one thing is the same—in essence, they were led by petty bourgeois ideology.

Another important aspect of these more militant organizations is that their lasting impact carries over more in the cumulative experiences of the participants rather than in a formal organization or for that matter in specific victories. It would be incorrect to join with the cynics who grumble that all this was much ado about nothing. The wave of struggles that beat against the stone wall of imperialism in the 1960s is returning to stalk the beast, but this time the fewer soldiers who are left are armed with proletarian weapons (ideological, political, and organizational line). We can take Lenin's phrase here, better fewer but better. At least this is true in these early stages of this period of developing revolutionary struggle in comparison to the petty
bourgeois "madness" that dominated the leading forces in the popular upsurge of the 1960s.

The 1960s were generally characterized by spontaneity because the masses of people rushed forward into action without disciplined organized leadership as petty bourgeois leaders tailed behind. The most common experience was for ad hoc local groups to emerge, often around a specific battle and then continue on to take on many different issues. Also, in contrast to the older, more bureaucratic organizations like the NAACP and the Urban League, some of the organizations like CORE and SNCC were really a federation of groups with a national office and a few national staff organizers. This meant that frequently a local loosely formed group would become affiliated with the national, work off and on with national staff around particular campaigns, but normally not have any systematic protracted relationship based on a definite ideological, political, and organizational line.

Given the rather limited access to the existing archival materials that this study is based on, this discussion of CORE, SNCC, and the Black Panther Party will rely primarily on published sources. This means that in each case a very brief sketch of the historical background of the organization will be followed by a discussion of several key features of the Philadelphia experience of each. While this will certainly lack the systematic character that we would like to have, it
will nevertheless suffice to make the general points that are necessary to lay the ground work for a more detailed discussion of ALSC.

A. CORE: The early history of CORE is rooted in petty bourgeois idealism, the reformism of "applying Ghandian techniques of Satyagraha, or nonviolence direct action, to the resolution of racial and industrial conflict in America." The parent group was the "Christian Pacifist Fellowship of Reconciliation," and the immediate context was student life at the University of Chicago. After an initial experience with direct action in 1941 a group of 50 people met and formed "a permanent interracial group committed to the use of nonviolent direct action opposing discrimination."

Meier and Rudwick sum up the general context for this organizational development this way:

Rooted in the American pacifist movement, CORE began in Chicago during the spring of 1942. Its foundations were laid at a time when growing segments of the white public, stimulated by the ideological concerns of the New Deal for America's dispossessed citizens and by the irony of fighting the racist Nazis while tolerating domestic racism, were gradually becoming more sensitive to the black man's plight. Simultaneously, in the black community, as a result of the legal victories achieved by the NAACP during the 1930s, the encouragement of leading New Dealers like Eleanor Roosevelt, and the obvious contradictions between America's democratic war propaganda and its violation of democracy at home, a more militant mood was becoming widely evident.

CORE spread around the country, mainly appealing to interracial groups in college settings, and developed a
growing history of nonviolent direct action protest. However, it remained in the hands of petty bourgeois leadership, though its self-image placed it above the more traditional NAACP as more militant and relevant to making changes for the masses of people. However, CORE did not penetrate every city. CORE came to Philadelphia late in its history:

...in Philadelphia the group formed in March (1960) as a result of the Woolworth picketing suspended its projects after a few months, but revived late in the year.111

The existence of a CORE chapter in Philadelphia in the early 1960s virtually assured that it would take on a different social character than CORE had assumed in the previous two decades. And this seems to be part of a more general trend.

A few others, like Philadelphia, were shifting from a white to a black majority. In less than three years the Philadelphia chapter underwent an evolution in membership characteristics that took as long as a decade in other chapters. Revived at the end of 1960 under the leadership of a black pacifist school teacher, Ruth McIntosh, this predominantly white chapter quickly underwent a cleavage between its "pacifist" wing and an "actionist" wing critical of "too much philosophizing" at the expense of moving at once into concrete projects. The pacifists were pushed to the sidelines and the actionists, who were largely ADA- and trade-union-oriented whites, vigorously sought Negro working-class members. With the election of Louis Smith as chairman in 1962, the affiliate became working class both in membership and in orientation.112

Philadelphia CORE took up the bread and butter issue of jobs:
This chapter which had been revived when the national office dispatched two field secretaries to the city at the end of 1960, undertook as its first project an attack upon the Horn and Hardart restaurant chain. Vigorous CORE picketing produced a fair hiring agreement in April 1961. By November, however, the chain had obtained only 3 Black waitresses and one cashier, and CORE resumed picketing. The following January a sit-in at the company's executive office finally brought its officials to the negotiating table. When the management, who agreed to train 6 Negroes as waitresses and hire 3 more Black cashiers, claimed that it could not find qualified individuals, CORE conducted a search and by November 1962 the company had hired 32 Black waitresses and 5 cashiers.\textsuperscript{113}

However, as mentioned in the discussion of the NAACP, CORE did have difficulty with Cecil Moore. Meier and Rudwick sum up two cases this way:

\begin{enumerate}
\item When CORE criticized him for accepting a token number of jobs, Moore warned the Black community that CORE was a "completely negligible" group of agitators trying to increase their own prestige.\textsuperscript{114}
\item In Philadelphia the Trailways campaign triggered another public feud with the local NAACP branch president Cecil Moore, who, insisting that the bus company had fulfilled previous job assignments with his organization, joined with the bus company in January to secure an injunction against CORE picketing.\textsuperscript{115}
\end{enumerate}

Here we see two petty bourgeois-led groups, both with a working class constituency, struggling for the limelight because both needed popular mass support since that is all they could get without a firm base. But Moore and the NAACP were more cut-throat it seems, and ready to join sides even with Trailways against these young up-starts.

In the end, though, CORE declined much like Moore, as this one comment suggests:
In January 1965, Philadelphia CORE Chairman James O. Williams, announcing that there was only one person left on the education committee, said, "It is a sad day in the life of this organization when its committees cannot function because of a lack of people."\[116\]

B. SNCC: The militant upsurge of Black youth throughout the country, particularly Black college students in the South, is probably best represented by the developments of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. This is the organization that fired the imagination of thousands of students, put forth political lines that gave real leadership to the student movement (including the white students and the development of SDS---Students for a Democratic Society),\[118\] and developed internal contradictions that really serve as a precedent for the developments that unfold in the 1970 struggles in ALSC.

After the rise of the Montgomery (Alabama) Bus Boycott movement in 1955, the student movement developed. The forecast of the motion to come was reflected by 2 marches, "Youth marches for integrated schools," that brought 8,000 in 1958. Secondly, and 25,000 in 1959 to Washington, D.C. /on February 1st, 1960, 4 young Black students from North Carolina A&T sat in a 5 & 10¢ store in Greensboro, N. C., to protest a segregationist policy and sparked the sit-in movement that led to SNCC, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

SNCC was the most dynamic organization in the Black liberation movement in the 1960s and from its experience there
are many lessons to be learned. SNCC moved through three stages: (1) 1960-63, SNCC was based in the South, and focused its attention on fighting the denial of democratic rights to Black people particularly in the rural areas. This was a period of petty bourgeois religious-inspired idealism. SNCC wrote in its founding statement:

We affirm the philosophical or religious ideal of nonviolence as the foundation of our purpose, the presupposition of our belief, and the manner of our action...through nonviolence, courage displaces fear. Love transcends hate. Acceptance dissipates prejudice, hope ends despair. Faith reconciles doubt. Peace dominates war. Mutual regards cancel enmity. Justice for all overwhelms injustice. The redemptive community supersedes immoral social systems.119

Moreover, it was not the system of American society (USA) that was rejected but the rejection of Blacks by the/system that SNCC fought against. SNCC folks believed in the American Dream. One militant wrote:

What was the source of my belief? It was based on my assurance that in this country there was room for everybody, that for every man there was, or soon would be, some place where he could be free to explore and employ the creative potential within him...In short, I believed in guaranteeing everyone freedom, equality and democracy as the means of living full lives, and I thought that the rest of the country believed in these things too.120

But unlike the now bureaucratic reformists that dominated the old civil rights organizations (Urban League and NAACP) or the new church-based motion (SCLC), SNCC was militant and bold in its desire to resolve injustice with direct action, changing reality by confronting whatever danger was there.
The sit-ins hit this country like a bomb shell and spread like a prairie fire. In a year's time over 50,000 students were involved in over 140 places in this revitalized tactic of struggle—the sit-in. Actually it spread through the mass media, the articles reading like handbooks of struggle. While Martin Luther King had ideological hegemony over students, it was Ghandian tactics that guided the struggle. The students also had the Black college's commitment to bourgeois political idealism for their ideological foundation. Stephen Wright, former president of Fisk University said at the time, "Students have been exposed all of their lives to the teachings of the great American scriptures of democracy, freedom, and equality, and no literate person should be surprised that they reflect these teachings in their conduct." This ideological basis fit the rising petty bourgeois aspirations of Black students so the initial level of participation was broad and far reaching.

Tactically the sit-ins were a model of dedication, commitment and discipline. People were instructed to absorb whatever violence came, but not to retaliate.

You may choose to face physical assault without protecting yourself, hands at the sides, unclenched; or you may choose to protect yourself, making plain you do not intend to hit back. The sit-inners faced tear gas, police dogs, burning cigarettes on their flesh, beatings, jailings and suspension or expulsion from college. Throughout it all, their discipline dedication and commitment was a source of moral strength that pierced
deep into the Black community and eventually led to winning the sympathy if not support of the masses of Black people.

The sit-ins led to the freedom rides initiated by CORE, and SNCC moved in when mob violence had temporarily halted them by burning a bus in Anniston, Alabama. Students from Nashville and Atlanta went to Birmingham and rode buses into Jackson, Mississippi.

After the sit-ins and freedom rides, students began to voluntarily leave school to work full time for SNCC. They plunged deep into the south. One group focused on the struggle to desegregate public accommodations, and the other stressed the need to register voters and struggle for change at the ballot box.

(2) The second period of SNCC's development is really a period of transition (1963-1964). In these two years SNCC used the momentum of the previous 3 years of oft times isolated struggle in the deep rural South to seize a national platform, and also pull the nation's attention into the deep South. In 1963 SNCC was a key participant in the March on Washington in which 250,000 people went to demonstrate in the Capital, the seat of state power. SNCC was regarded as a brash young militant organization and was forced to delete part of John Lewis' speech. He was supposed to say:

We march today for jobs and freedom, but we have nothing to be proud of. ...We must have legislation that will protect the Mississippi sharecropper who is put off his farm because he dares to register to vote.
We need a bill that will provide for the homeless and starving people of this nation. We need a bill that will ensure the equality of a maid who earns $5 a week in the home of a family whose income is $100,000 a year. We must have a good PEPC bill.

Let us not forget that we are involved in a serious social revolution. By and large, American politics is dominated by politicians who build their careers on immoral compromises and ally themselves with open forms of political, economic, and social exploitation. There are exceptions, of course. We salute those. But what political leader can stand up and say, 'My party is the party of principles?' The party of Kennedy is also the party of Eastland. The party of Javits is also the party of Goldwater. Where is our party...We cannot depend on any political party, for the Democrats and Republicans have betrayed the basic principles of the Declaration of Independence.

The time will come when we will not confine our marching to Washington. We will march through the south, through the heart of Dixie, the way Sherman did. We shall pursue our 'scorched earth' policy and burn Jim Crow to the ground—non-violently. We shall fragment the south into a thousand pieces and put them back together in the image of democracy.

After much struggle, in February, 1964, SNCC sent out a call for Black and white students throughout the nation to come to work in Mississippi for the summer. Nearly 1000 volunteers worked in Mississippi that summer. During those months 6 people were killed, 80 beaten, 35 churches burned, and 30 other buildings bombed. But the slogan that fits SNCC's posture was "Ain't Gonna Let Nobody Turn Us Around." The nation was forced to look at the swamp that is Mississippi, a state dripping with the venom of racism, falling near the bottom of every index of social development with a population 43% Black. SNCC had long since dropped its college appearance and had adopted the denim overalls of the rural Mississippi sharecropper as the uniform for struggle.
During this same period SNCC groups had been developing in northern cities and had moved beyond simply support work for the southern struggle. The Chicago group sparked a united front effort to fight defacto segregation of schools. This resulted in two school boycotts, 225,000 students in 1963, 180,000 in 1964.

This period sparked a reconsideration of nonviolence. Bob Moses, a leading SNCC militant in Mississippi, said of Martin Luther King's philosophy:

We don't agree with it, in a sense. The majority of the students are not sympathetic to the idea that they have to love the white people that they are struggling against. But there are a few who have a very religious orientation. And there's a constant dialogue at meetings about non-violence and the meaning of non-violence...For most of the members it is a question of being able to have a method of attack rather than to be always on the defensive.125

The great political lesson during this period was learned when SNCC tried to upset the domination of the regular Mississippi Democratic Party with the organization of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. After holding legal precinct, district and state elections with full legal documentation the MFDP went to the Democratic convention in Atlantic City. In addition to the MFDP delegates, and scores of SNCC militants, SNCC brought the burned remains of the car driven by Chaney, Goodman, and Schwerner, the first 3 civil rights workers killed earlier in the summer. Although they had a sound case, the political maneuvering of vice-presidential
hopeful Hubert Humphrey, at Johnson's instructions, set up a compromise for the MFDP to accept representative seating with no voice or vote. All established civil rights leaders urged acceptance of this, King, Wilkins, Rustin, etc. But SNCC said that we had to put some principles in politics, and rejected it. The grass roots MFDP delegates swung with SNCC, the youthful militants who had walked with them down the dusty roads to register to vote. They had marched with too many sacrifices to compromise their principles. This was a political lesson of the highest order. And it was this political lesson that propelled SNCC into its 3rd period.

One militant put it this way:

In retrospect, I think that in our hearts we knew our flawless arguments would fall on deaf ears. We were aware, at least subconsciously that no group of white people was going to send some of its own packing in order to make room for us. No matter that that group had said to the world that it regarded all people as equals and no matter that we had a right to representation in that group. It took a few more turns at knocking our heads against stone walls (walls that, according to our society, did not exist) before we became fully conscious that this was the case.

She continued:

In this experience can be seen one of the origins of the call for black power, which I consider the other side of the coin of black consciousness. One cannot exist without the other. Imagine the MFDP's 1964 experience repeated hundreds of times in hundreds of conventions and back room meetings. Imagine that in every corner of the United States black people are coming face to face with the fact, never before so widely or so publicly acknowledged
that it is through the exercise of power that decisions are made, and that those decisions have little or nothing to do with morality. The next logical step is the call for black power.\textsuperscript{127}

(3) The third period lasted from 1965 to 1967. A trip to Africa by a SNCC leadership delegation, discussions with and about Malcolm X, and growing alienation between Blacks and whites inside SNCC, was capped by the Watts riot of August, 1965. By May, 1966, at a SNCC staff meeting in Nashville, Stokely Carmichael was elected chairperson of SNCC. During the June march in Mississippi started by James Meredith, SNCC militants set off another spark that resulted in a prairie fire—\textit{BLACK POWER}.\textsuperscript{128} What this did was ignite motion in every aspect of U. S. society. In light of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Voting Rights Act of 1964, another tactic to attack the system was necessary. And while the initial response of white liberals and bureaucratic Civil Rights leaders was to charge "racism in reverse," SNCC gained great popularity among the masses of people. The latent national consciousness of Black people who had childhood roots in the rural south, still have relatives living there, and continue to experience national oppression in the North surged forward. However, SNCC still had not developed a scientific analysis of this society, and did not have a systematic program. Therefore, this new prairie fire was guided away from revolution to reform by a reformist petty bourgeois elite who used the movement to
promote its own class interests. SNCC moved to form local political parties like the Lowndes County Freedom Party, and in fact included the revolutionary weapon of armed self-defense. But the petty bourgeoisie pushed a nationalist program of reform with themselves at the helm.\textsuperscript{129}

By 1967 the Black liberation movement was at an all time high.\textsuperscript{130} And it is at this time that SNCC began to move away from its independent organizational impact on the movement and began to count more on its leading personalities, the media, and its influence on other organizational forms.

During this year, 1967, H. Rap Brown, formerly a Southern University student, was elected Chairperson of SNCC.\textsuperscript{131} He and Stokely Carmichael became household names in the USA. The riots and repression in Newark and Detroit reached an all time high for national coverage of racial violence. In all there were 164 incidents of violence in the U.S. in 1967, 89 deaths, and nearly 600 million dollars in property loss.\textsuperscript{132} The ideologies of the new nationalist posture congregated in Newark at the 1st National Black Power Conference.\textsuperscript{133} But for SNCC, 1967 signalled a new focus:

In May 1967, SNCC formally declared that it was no longer a Civil Rights organization but a Human Rights organization interested not only in human rights in the U.S. but throughout the world. It declared its support of those liberation groups struggling to free people from racism and exploitation.\textsuperscript{134}
SNCC sent delegations to a peace conference in Japan, to Vietnam representing the Bertrand Russell International War Crimes Tribunal, to the Latin American Solidarity Organization in Havana, then to Vietnam, Algeria, Syria, Egypt, Guinea, Tanzania, and Europe. Moreover, SNCC spoke at a UN conference on Apartheid in Zambia, and again in New York on foreign investments in Southern Africa. This new posture led to a position on the Palestinian problem after the June War in the Middle East. SNCC held that "The basic issue of the conflict was aggressive, expansionist Zionism backed by U.S. imperialism." SNCC alienated itself once and for all from the liberal philanthropists who had financed the civil rights movement. The leadership then turned to the Black Panther Party as a new organizational form, but their relationship was short-lived. SNCC continued, but the staff was tired, disillusioned and demoralized with the lack of organization, strategy and most of all a systematic, coherent, ideological and political line.

Now although this has been only a sketch of SNCC, it is possible to sum up some of its most important shortcomings and strengths. The major weakness was its consistent lack of a unified line and political education, making it more difficult to move forward. This resulted in great gaps developing between the rank and file militants in local projects and its central leadership. Moreover, it made it
difficult for SNCC to consolidate and make shifts of position when necessary. This is the basis for the other problems:

1. SNCC lacked a revolutionary strategy so on each campaign raised ultimate hopes only to lead to great disappointments, disillusion, and anger;

2. SNCC's organization revolved more around key personalities rather than on organizational structure and process. Therefore many SNCC leaders appeared larger than life. This led to many problems that resulted from the fact that the actual weaknesses of these brothers and sisters became magnified liabilities for the entire organization;

3. SNCC's program was characterized by bowing to spontaneity, a process of seizing on the objective motion of the people and calling that revolutionary. Moreover, sometimes a major campaign would start accidently and be allowed to disrupt ongoing work;

4. and last, all of what's just been said was complicated by SNCC militants not having the discipline of relating to each other in the most principled way. This was true in general, but particularly in interpersonal relations.

These shortcomings were glaring not because SNCC was a total failure, for it had some measure of success; but it did not survive, and we need to learn the reasons/well. Its strengths were based on an honest and quite serious attempt to change this society. The Black students and youth of SNCC were committed to the masses of Black people, and had no
hesitancy in sinking deep roots among them. If integrating with the masses is a revolutionary trait for students, then surely it is clear that SNCC had a revolutionary style of work.136 SNCC reflected this in its ability to develop slogans that were adopted by the masses, its use of songs to mobilize and raise the spirit of the masses, its projection of symbols that fired the imagination of the Black masses, and generally its use of records, still photography, films, and newspapers in carrying propaganda work deep among the masses. And SNCC was a bold, fearless army of militant Black youth. In every state SNCC sought out the most dangerous area to show Black people that it was possible to fight oppression and win. The theme song of the Mississippi project was, "We'll never turn back," and in many ways while SNCC was active, it didn't.

In the context of Philadelphia, SNCC did not have a long history but what it did experience reveals the essence of how the bourgeois state apparatus began to test fascist techniques for the repression of militant Black liberation forces.137 This test case of "dynamite in Philadelphia" became the general approach to the Black Panther Party, especially the brutal murder of the two Chicago Panthers Fred Hampton and Marc Clark. As James Foreman summed it up:

When Black Power was brought to Philadelphia by SNCC in 1966, the reaction of the city's power structure was exactly what you might expect: Move to destroy. But we didn't expect them to use dynamite.138
In general, this is the case of a frame-up:

The frame-up took place because Philadelphia had become the first major metropolitan area in which SNCC was developing the concept of a national freedom organization with the panther as its symbol.139

A spark that set the stage for this was a one shot visit to Philadelphia by the SNCC leader, Stokely Carmichael:

Carmichael carried his message of black power there in July, seeking to mobilize the generally moribund Negro ghetto consciousness into meaningful activity not controlled by Black politicians. Democratic Mayor James Tate was aghast. He seriously suggested that Carmichael should be banned from speaking in northern cities.140

This set a climate in which the public might well be sold a bill of goods that would isolate SNCC, and allow the state to kick them out if they came. SNCC came, developed relationships with the local Black militants, and set up headquarters in the heart of the Black community.

On August 13, 1966 the newspapers screamed out the information:141

80 ARMED POLICE RAID FOUR SNCC OFFICES HERE
SEIZE DYNAMITE, ARREST 4
1,000 MORE DEPLOYED TO KEEP ORDER

After considerable confusion, with moves by the police and counter-moves by SNCC, which quickly involved many in national leadership positions who came from Atlanta, New York, and Washington, D.C., the following account has been reported as an accurate scenario:
The police had raided four places with so-called search and seizure warrants. One was the SNCC office at 521 South Sixteenth Street. The next was a house on North Seventeenth Street where Fred Meely, Morris Ruffin, and some others slept. They had intended to use it eventually for a freedom school. The third place was the Freedom Library run by the Northern Student Movement (NSM). The fourth was the home of George Brower, at 909 North Sixteenth Street, where the Young Militants sometimes met. The Young Militants was a local group which had grown out of the Girard College demonstrations and which was at that time very closely aligned with Cecil Moore.

Only in one place did the police claim that they found dynamite, and that was in the apartment of George Brower. It is not a place where SNCC had held any meetings, although the press initially reported that this was a meeting place used by SNCC, CORE, and the Young Militants.

The search and seizure warrant used for the raids was signed by an FBI agent named Dean. It stated that Dean had been told by an informant, who had given him information two hundred times in the past which had led to two hundred arrests, that there was dynamite in the SNCC office and that he had heard people talk about how they could use it to destroy life, liberty, and property. (According to the Pennsylvania statute, for the possession of dynamite to be a crime, one must have intent to use it so as to inflict bodily harm, destroy property, etc.)

The confession of Barry Dawson was introduced at the trial. It stated that he had received some sticks of dynamite from a man named Ealy, who said that he had got it from a construction worker named Jenkins. (Ealy and Jenkins had subsequently been arrested and were before the judge at this preliminary hearing along with the four persons originally arrested.) Dawson had brought the dynamite to the SNCC office while Fred Meely was out of town, the statement said. When Fred came back he was very upset and told Barry that the dynamite had to be
removed from the office. Fred, Barry, and Morris Ruffin wrapped it up in three packages. Each of them was going to take a package and throw it in the river.

When Barry left the office he felt that he was being followed by a police car. He stopped at 909 North Sixteenth Street and the car was still pursuing him. He saw some white men getting out of the car who looked like the same people who had beaten him the night before. He threw his package over the fence.

At the end of the hearing Barry Dawson was bound over for the grand jury with bail set at seventy-five hundred dollars. Ealy and Jenkins were also bound over, with bonds of one thousand dollars apiece. The case against the three other defendants was dismissed. The case of Barry Dawson never came to trial, nor those of Ealy and Jenkins. However, Dawson—who had other cases pending—eventually spent some time in a mental institution and also served a two-year parole term.

In November of that year Fred Meely, Morris Ruffin, and George Anderson turned themselves in after successfully evading the police network. In April, 1967, the case against them was dismissed for lack of evidence.

It is interesting that the summation presented by Forman of this entire affair leads us directly to our third case, the Black Panther Party (as it also leads us to the wild fantasy of Stokely Carmichael's efforts to organize the All African Peoples Revolutionary Party around idealist Pan Africanist schemes). Forman summed up the lessons of this dynamite affair this way:

But the police had won a larger battle. The momentum generated by our activities in the black community declined and SNCC lost its
base in Philadelphia. The police effectively stopped SNCC from organizing around the symbol of the black panther in a major metropolitan area by putting our organizers in jail or driving them underground for months...These defeats were also SNCC's fault to a large degree. We failed to sustain the momentum which had been injected into Philadelphia's black community because we lacked sufficient trained workers to deal with the complexities of organizing in an urban, Northern situation...SNCC faced the absolute necessity of transforming itself into a centralized political party embracing the many aspects of black people's struggles and with a tight ideological framework. It could no longer exist as a cadre of organizers going into situations and helping people to "do their thing."

C. BLACK PANTHER PARTY: In marked contrast to CORE and SNCC, the Black Panther Party (BPP) was not middle class in composition, did not develop out of the church, didn't have religious idealism as its initial ideological thrust, and was not primarily in conflict with post-Civil War "Jim Crow" practices. The BPP was a new, northern, urban phenomenon, one that could only have emerged after the great transformation following World War II.

We have earlier presented a brief outline of the periodization of the U.S. history in general, and Black history in particular. Here we are concerned with the results of transformation, Black people entering into the urban industrial working class. More specifically we are concerned with the following aspects of Black people:
BLACK PEOPLE ARE MOVING NORTH, TO THE CITIES, AND ARE YOUNG (TOTAL USA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% in North (Non-South)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in Cities (SMSA)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Under 25 Years of Age</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Factory Workers (Operatives)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data represent the material basis on which the BPP developed. In addition, the BPP was not a revolt of middle class youth turned on by a revolution of rising expectations, but rather were a force built on marginal working class youth who normally experienced unemployment, were pushed out of school, lived in slums, and had a history of arrest and imprisonment. So if anything, they were youth whose revolt was inspired by relative deprivation. They were rejected and made to suffer in a land of apparent plenty.

The political realization of this basic contradiction slapped America in the face with the WATTS REBELLION.145 This more than any of the other insurrections of the 1960s was the experience that brought this new sector of Black youth to the agenda of political action, both the plotting and scheming of the ruling class as well as the politics of revolt such as the BPP.

A total of 34 people were killed in the Los Angeles riots, 31 of them Negroes, and between 900 and 1,000 injured, including over 100 police and firemen; nearly 4,000 people were arrested and hundreds of guns seized. Over 500 buildings, mostly white-owned,
were looted and burnt, the damage caused being estimated at some $100,000,000, but within a week more than $300,000 worth of looted goods were recovered by the police.\footnote{146}

This, however, was a two-sided question. It fired the spirit of rebellion, and was based on blind anger and spontaneity. In this sense, it was the militant gesture called for by Claude McKay when he wrote this call to arms:\footnote{147}

\begin{quote}
If we must die, let it not be like hogs
Hunted and penned in an inglorious spot,
While round us bark the mad and hungry dogs,
Making their mock at our accursed lot.
If we must die, O let us nobly die,
So that our precious blood may not be shed
In vain; then even the monsters we defy
Shall be constrained to honor us though dead!
O kinsmen! We must meet the common foe!
Though far outnumbered let us show us brave,
And for their thousand blows deal one deathblow!
What though before us lies the open grave?
Like men we'll face the murderous, cowardly pack,
Pressed to the wall, dying, but fighting back!
\end{quote}

Allen sums up the social origin of the BPP in this way:

The Panthers represented an effort to mobilize and organize the most alienated and frustrated of the ghetto youth. In this, the organization enjoyed a considerable measure of success. It succeeded in awakening and drawing into its ranks thousands of youths and young adults in cities throughout the country. These were young workers or youths who had dropped out of the system because they saw no hope in established institutions, or they had been forced out because they could find no useful employment. But, because they were young, they were impatient with this fate and refused to accept its finality.\footnote{148}

The development of the BPP was a step forward in the struggle of Black people, as well as the overall revolutionary movement in the United States. Though we will not give it the
full treatment that it deserves, we will take up the main outlines of its development and its strengths and weaknesses. We have concluded that it went through three major stages of development.

1. **The Spark of Revolution: Huey, Bobby and the Red Book**

The beginning of the BPP was in October (1966), based on the association of Huey Newton and Bobby Seale in Oakland, California. They were working class youths who chose to struggle. They pulled together the initial political documents, and proceeded to organize a following. In this initial stage of their development they made at least three major contributions to the movement:

   a. They boldly picked up guns and forced recognition of the constitutional rights of self-defense. This was a radical break with the nonviolent passive resistance line of the civil rights movement, and summed up the revolutionary aspiration of young Black people in this post-Watts Riot period;

   b. They placed our struggle in the USA in the context of world revolution, and more specifically popularized the theoretical work of Mao Tse Tung by widely distributing the Red Book, and introducing into popular use concepts such as colonization, third world, and liberation;

   c. They initiated the broad discussion of the problems of Black people as an oppressed nation, and
challenged the "liberal" analysis that had been the basis for the civil rights movement.

But the bold clarity of Black youth carrying guns into the California State Legislature and getting away with it, flavored with the dashing glamour of Black leather jackets, Black berets, and military coordination, was not the revolutionary thrust it was hoped to be. This became clearer in stage two.

2. Building a Movement: Free Huey!

In October, 1966 Huey was arrested in a fracas that resulted in a policeman being killed. This was one year after the BPP was formed. The decision to make the Free Huey campaign the main way to build the party brought into sharp contrast a contradiction that was to be the main issue on which the BPP was to rise and fall. The contradiction was between the mass movement generated by the style and content of the militant revolutionary aspect of the BPP, and the other aspect was the move to enter into coalitions with liberals and the revisionist CPUSA in order to gain resources and support. The first aspect, which was initially the main aspect, resulted in severe facist police repression, while the latter pushed the remaining forces into social welfare kind of reformist activities.

The mass motion sparked by the Black Panther Party gave form to the content that Malcolm poured into the hearts of
young militant Blacks, particularly in the depressed Black communities of the northern ghettos. It is clear that this was not a universal appeal, because obviously many other organizations representing other class elements of Black youth did exist. But what is clear is that the BPP was a "warrior" group, and many were afraid that to be a Panther was too bold, too dangerous. On the other hand, the BPP was a general umbrella adopted by many of the spontaneous forms of militant struggle that began to emerge. It is important that there was a considerable impact on some Black student unions, particularly in California, and a few Black union caucus groups (e.g., there was a Black Panther caucus of the UAW\textsuperscript{152} at the Fremont General Motors Plant in Northern California).

However, the main action of the BPP was with what Boggs calls the "street force."\textsuperscript{153} This, however, was a short-lived romance that objectively disproved the theory the BPP put forward concerning the revolutionary capacity of the lumpen proletariat. This very theory put forward allowed the police to infiltrate nearly every BPP chapter, even participate in forming several. Their theoretical error killed the revolutionary potential of the BPP. It even killed some of the Panthers themselves. The facts surrounding the brutal murderous raid killing Fred Hampton and Mark Clark (Chicago, 1969), while in the main implicating the conspiracy of the US
government, point to a lumpen element being fatal. Of course, the career of Eldridge Cleaver is the best example of this.\footnote{154}

On the other hand, the BPP moved to tie itself to other forces in order to have greater influence and access to more resources. This was the opposite type of error, placing revolutionary confidence in the petty bourgeoisie. The fact is, however, that the petty bourgeoisie shares many attributes of vacillation and larceny with the lumpen proletariat, so their allegiance is a weak factor in any strategy for change. Certainly to count primarily on either of these classes is to run the risk of repression or reformism.

The BPP was convinced to move into legal battles, essentially electoral campaigns and court battles. The major coalitions that it entered into brought it into the arms of the liberals (Peace and Freedom Party), and the CPUSA (National Committee to Combat Facism, the Anti-Genocide Campaign, and their lawyer, Charles Garry). It must be made clear that the flamboyant style of the BPP continued to fire up these tired old alliances with liberals and revisionists. However, all of this eventually led to a negation of Marxism-Leninism, turning away from the lessons of world revolution, and developing new theories that sounded like Walt Disney and looked like Florence Nightingale.

3. Reformism: Intercommunalism and Serve-the-People Programs
The BPP began to negate all of the revolutionary aspects of their program. Many people had been killed. Cleaver had left the country and was setting up his own center of action (from Cuba, to Algeria, to Europe), ignoring central BPP leadership. A split developed and was popularly referred to as the East Coast-West Coast split. All this of course served as the cover for several more Panthers' being killed in what appeared to be fratricidal warfare.

Huey summed up this new stage of degeneration in a speech before the National Association of Black Manufacturers in Los Angeles in 1972: "I am not a Marxist, I'm a Panther. We don't have to copy the Marx, Engles, Hegal, and certainly the Soviet Union, because I don't like them." Not only does he mistakenly associate revolution (Marx and Engles) with reaction (Soviet Union after the late 1950s), but he negates it all.

This period is dominated by their new view of the world called "intercommunalism." This theory held that countries and nations were no longer relevant historical categories for struggle, nor for revolutionary theory. It is based on the theory that capital in the form of multinational corporations had transcended nationality to some world wide status. This means that the world is one single entity, and that each country should be thought of as a community, and therefore the new internationalism is intercommunalism. Huey even went
to the Peoples' Republic of China and told them they were not a country but a community; moreover, he offered BPP members as troops to go fight in Vietnam. Not only is this the height of theoretical confusion, but takes American arrogance to the ridiculous.

In practical terms, the BPP moved away from its exhortations of "pick-up-the-gunism" and "off-the-pig" woofing to a series of serve-the-people programs. This had two aspects to it. The positive aspect is that free medical care, free shoes, free food, free breakfast, etc., did meet immediate needs of the people who were able to take advantage of the service. But the negative aspect is that it was reformism to the negation of their promise of revolution. Moreover, the BPP which attempted to raise these programs, devoid of struggle to make the system meet the needs of the people. In essence, serve the people with revolutionary education to the level of revolution—in principle!

Now in the context of Philadelphia the BPP was not a significant force over any length of time. However, there is one campaign waged by a relatively new Panther chapter that is instructive for our overall concern. In 1970 the Black Panther Party announced plans for a new Constitutional Convention, a meeting to reconsider the basic political document of the American state. This was the first major event by radicals in the USA in anticipation of the
Bi-Centennial. And Philadelphia was the appropriate choice for its first plenary session.

Two significant aspects of this campaign occurred just before the session was to convene. First, Huey was released from jail and this was to be his first major public speech. During the campaign most of the supporters of the BPP had never seen Huey since he had been incarcerated before the BPP had spread across the country. But, nevertheless, Huey was bigger than life. He was the personification of a revolutionary who was incarcerated by the "pigs," he was doing time for the people.

This of course had the opposite effect on the police forces of this country. On the top levels it was a perfect cover for preparing to heighten repression. On the rank and file level it was like facing an image that had grown so big (and after all he was busted for allegedly killing a cop) that it was necessary to prepare for all out warfare. 157 Where else could one find a perfect matchup than Huey the revolutionary and Rizzo the fascist pig? Philadelphia was a perfect scene, chosen with the Cecil B. DeMille staging so characteristic of the BPP.

The second aspect of this situation was the contradiction of national and local leadership within the BPP over the nature of the Constitutional Convention. The national leadership was carrying forth their coalition efforts and
had pulled together a loose band of "movement" activists, most of whom were white, a lot of whom were rooted in counter-culture aspects of the movement. It should not be taken lightly that in the first public statement Huey made after he was released from prison he included a statement that the gay liberation movement was a vital part of the overall struggle.

The local BPP leadership was more rooted in the Black community, and had some ideological adherence to nationalism. Moreover, they had built that kind of constituency and were very concerned with the possible conflict that this "California-style coalition" (a sort of combination of Fillmore, Haight Ashbury, and Berkeley) would represent for progressive but nationalist Black people in Philadelphia. This general conflict was accentuated by the bureaucratic commandism of the national leadership when they came into town. The local non-party members were angry and turned off.

Rizzo jumped the gun and arrested the local leadership of the BPP. This was done at night on the street by lining the Panthers up and having them strip naked for a skin search for weapons. The pictures of this extremely humiliating arrest spread around the world as a vivid demonstration of national oppression of Black people. More than most images, it is an American classic. The arrest was timed to throw a wrench into the preparation for the Convention.
The national BPP leadership came into town and took over. However, with the conflict mentioned above, they had little success in getting local cooperation. The local leadership had to be gotten out of jail to save the day. All of this was happening while the Black community of Philadelphia looked on, but remained aloof. The local leadership got out of jail, pulled the loose strings together, and the meeting was held in the gym of Temple University filled to its capacity. But when the traveling road show left town, the local BPP chapter soon pulled away from the national organization and for a short time continued local work.

The main lesson of the Philadelphia incident is the dead end result of a national organization moving into a local area without sufficient theoretical and practical grasp of the overall situation and the particular locality of the action. The BPP was theoretically confused, had built a loose and unwieldy coalition on the basis of this theoretical confusion, and negated its local experience. The police were almost invited in. The local party leadership was almost forced out. And Black people were given a negative example and they remained passive. For the BPP, Philadelphia was a bad scene.

D. MILITANT BLACK NATIONALISM

The shortcoming, by omission, of this discussion is the lack of treatment given to the Black nationalist groups. This is a major concern for further research and data collection.
It is anticipated that in the final draft of this analysis of Philadelphia this will be corrected.

We are including in this category the following groups:
1. Nation of Islam (Muslims)
2. Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM)
3. African Peoples Party (APP)
4. Black Power Conference II
5. Congress of African People (CAP)
6. Black Student Groups on Campus
7. Independent Black educational institutions
8. Black Economic Development Conference (BEDC)
9. Trotskyists and Black nationalism

E. NOTES ON LESSONS TO BE LEARNED FROM PETTY BOURGEOIS BLACK LEADERSHIP

This analysis of the 1960s has focused on the Black petty bourgeois leadership of the organizations that "led" the mass upsurge of the 1960s. While there have been great omissions, it is possible to draw from this analysis a few key lessons of this decade of struggle. There are two empirical tests for lessons from struggle: first, these lessons must be accurate reflections of what has happened in the historical process of struggle, and second, these lessons must be guides to future action. In this analysis it is possible to get a grasp of both since we have the 1960s to sum up, and we have the historical practice of the ALSC in the 1970s to examine.
1. **Social Organization of Struggle:** Here is the important contrast between the older, more traditional petty bourgeois leadership rooted in stable, bureaucratic institutions with deep roots among the masses of people, and the new militant petty bourgeois leadership that emerged from within and/or appealed to the spontaneous mass upsurge of militant Black people. The 1960s seem to demonstrate that the viability of protracted struggle is based on stable organizational leadership with a solid basis of support. However, what is also indicated is that no such organization was so strong that it could maintain its leadership when the masses of previously unorganized (or if organized, then dissatisfied) Black people were in motion. In sum, the potential of the masses, as demonstrated by the power of their spontaneity, is greater than the traditional bureaucratic organizations. On the other hand, the more stable organizations outlasted the spontaneous struggles, and have continued after the tide of the 1960s declined.

A secondary aspect is that the masses have no network of interpersonal loyalties and material ties to the ruling class, no compromises that must be made for material reward and privilege. Of course this is a statement of the entire class, as a class, and does not include the many devices used by the ruling class (or those used by more opportunist elements of the working class) to create lackeys, informers, etc. The
petty bourgeoisie always has a class stand that points to an easier way to do things, a way that simply means selling out the ultimate aim of basic change and reducing the struggle to reformism, meaning change that is acceptable to the ruling class.

2. **Ideological Basis of Struggle:** On the ideological plane there is consensus and contradiction. A key feature is agreement that the key Black leadership must come from the petty bourgeoisie, on the other side of which is an elitist view of the masses. This is the theoretical rationalization for the maintenance of petty bourgeois leadership. In addition, while there is disagreement over whether the ruling class is benevolent or cruel, there is implicit agreement that the main basis for this is human nature. This appears to be linked to a metaphysical notion of human nature, which roots racism of individuals in personality and not in historical experience defined by material conditions. And last, there is a tendency to lump all of the masses of people together (2 into 1) in one category. This accomplishes two things for the petty bourgeoisie. First, it guarantees that they will always be considered part of the masses of people and liquidates the material reality of class differences. Also, secondly, it provides the opposite image of the ruling class, sort of the reverse stereotype, that the very (human) nature of the masses requires leadership of the sort that the petty bourgeoisie can provide.
The key ideological question for the petty bourgeoisie is which class in the class struggle is to be counted on and for what. One line says that it is the benevolent liberal ruling class that must be counted on to avoid genocide, and therefore the only hope is for small step by step reforms. One might hear the following: "And, after all, aren't things getting better?" The other position holds that it is the masses of exploited and oppressed Black people that must be counted on because no reforms of great significance are possible without fundamental social change. Both of these represent positions taken within the Black leadership of the petty bourgeoisie. The facts seem to indicate, however, that the former becomes an obstacle to struggle while the latter can develop with and be transformed by struggle.
4. The Philadelphia Chapter of ALSC

The focus of this entire work has been on Philadelphia, though the analysis has had to include many national aspects of class struggle and the Black liberation movement. This particular discussion of ALSC in Philadelphia is to be considered a brief draft to be revised based on discussion and criticism from ALSC activists in Philadelphia. The main aspect of this section, therefore, is to describe the general character of ALSC in Philadelphia.

The first stage of ALSC involved forces in Philadelphia:

(a) Participation in 1972 and 1973 was limited to ALD activity (this was in keeping with national mandates, though it is important in reflecting a lack of local ALSC initiative in Philadelphia);

(b) leadership of ALSC in Philadelphia was based on joint leadership efforts of PanAfricanists (CAP), Trotskyites (SWP), and a few independents.

The Frogmore National Steering Committee meeting sparked the interest of some new people in Philadelphia, people who were progressive activists in the Black liberation movement. However, formal efforts to firmly establish ALSC as an official chapter in Philadelphia did not occur until nearly one year later. This reflects the first line struggle of Philadelphia ALSC. Two of these new and independent forces wrote the following to the ALSC Chairperson, Gene Locke:
Brother:

The members in the Philadelphia chapter of ALSC number four (4). According to the ALSC Internal Document, Organizational Structure and Operational Guidelines, August 1973, numerical membership for local chapters is designated at not less than ten (10). Technically, then, there is no functioning Philadelphia chapter of ALSC.

However, several ALSC members and several individuals designated by Imamu Baraka, Eastern Region Chairperson, called together a meeting of several local organizations to form a "temporary" ad hoc committee to carry out the mandates of ALSC activities surrounding the African Liberation Month (ALM) demonstrations.

The agreed upon structure of this ad hoc committee is:

a) a fund-raising committee with chairman,
b) a communications committee with chairman,
c) a mass media committee with chairman,
d) a transportation committee with chairman,
and finally,
e) a chairman of the total "ad hoc" committee who is responsible for co-ordinating committee chairmen.

Consequently, some conflict and misunderstanding has arisen regarding the above-mentioned arrangement. The 'Chairman of the Chairmen,' one of the individuals designated the mandated activities of African Liberation Month (ALM), is attempting to call the structure outlined above the ongoing Philadelphia chapter of ALSC. He is attempting to do this in opposition to members of the "ad hoc" committee who only see themselves as participants in a united front effort centered around African Liberation Month (ALM) as per ALSC guidelines...they did not and do not see themselves as permanent members of ALSC. Obviously, the 'Chairman of the Chairmen' either misunderstands his mandate to organize a "temporary" ad hoc committee, or received incorrect information from Brother Baraka as to what constitutes the necessary structure for a legitimate ALSC local.

Thus, we must impose upon you as National Chairperson for ALSC and ask for clarification on the following points:

1) Are the procedures outlined in the August, 1973 ALSC Internal Document, Organizational Structure and Operational Guidelines, still valid procedures to be followed by local chapters,
2) What is the relationship and responsibility of ad hoc committees to the National Office of ALSC; that is,

a) Is membership based on an individual's participation on an ad hoc committee, or is it based on an individual's consent to join ALSC as a functioning member committed to the Statement of Principles and the overall objectives of ALSC,

and,

b) Do ad hoc committees have financial obligations to the National Office of ALSC.

Our next committee meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, 15 May 1974; therefore, your immediate attention and response is very much in order.

Given the high intensity of theoretical and practical struggle in the month of May (1974) this letter got an immediate response:

I received your letter on today. In an effort to respond to it as quickly as possible, I will briefly answer the questions raised. However, this letter should not be seen as an end to discussions on the situation in Philadelphia; hopefully, a more extended discussion can take place in the very near future.

The history of the Philadelphia ALSC deserves some review. The Philadelphia group has historically been a "quasi chapter"--meaning that for some time, a number of people there worked with ALSC programs but were never a full chapter meeting the dictates of all other chapters.

Until last month, I had been sending all ALSC communications to Tony Austin and had assumed that a chapter was being developed. Given the closeness in distance to D.C., it had been my hope that a nucleus of people could be pulled together to work on ALM and help bring people to the conference and demonstration in D.C.

The procedures outlined in the ALSC Internal Document on Organizational Structure are still in effect. At least ten persons are necessary for formation of a local ALSC. Membership is open to any Black person who agrees with ALSC's programs, principles, and is willing to work under the ALSC structure.
Before a chapter can be certified in Philadelphia, all of the guidelines spelled out in the Organizational Structure-Internal Document of August, 1973, must be adhered to.

However, failure to have an official ALSC chapter does not prohibit groups of brothers and sisters from working on ALSC programs, e.g. ALM. These kinds of groups have not financial obligations to ALSC, except with the African Liberation Fund (all monies collected must be turned over to ALSC). Moreover, we always encourage groups who work with ALSC to move to establish ALSC chapters if they so desire.

I am enclosing the procedures for forming an ALSC Chapter. I hope the letter offers some clarity.

Note that the Philadelphia letter says the main contradiction is the hegemonic organizational efforts of CAP vs the efforts of honest independent forces to establish an official chapter of ALSC in keeping with official guidelines.

The response, while not mentioning CAP or Baraka by name, does take a clear position on organizing ALSC in Philadelphia:

(a) Tony Austin (Socialist Workers Party) is implicitly criticized for not doing an adequate job of organizing, even though he had been receiving official communications for ALSC national leadership;

(b) The de facto leadership initiated by CAP is ignored, while the de jure possibility by "any Black person who agrees with ALSC" (in a group of 10) is emphasized.
The motion of the ALSC Chairman was clear on this. The Trotskyite SWP had virtually dropped out of any local leadership (except perhaps in Minnesota) after Progmore, while CAP was very much a force. By May 1974 CAP had adopted socialism as part of their ideology of Pan Africanism and nationalism, and Baraka began changing his catechism to include Lenin.

The forces were able to pull together, have a local demonstration of several hundred people, and send a local delegation to Washington, D.C. At the National Conference, the newly emerging independent leadership in Philadelphia had an opportunity to meet and engage in fraternal political struggle with the progressive forces in national ALSC leadership. This sealed their commitment to return to Philadelphia and make ALSC a real force there.

A formal meeting to organize a local Philadelphia chapter was held August 11, 1974. The political composition is described in the following table:

POLITICAL REPRESENTATION AT MAY 1974 ORGANIZATION OF A PHILADELPHIA ALSC CHAPTER

| 1. Political Independents                  | 9 |
| 2. Nationalist                            | 1 |
| Committee for Black Political Action      |   |
| 3. "Left" SWP-YSA Ethiopian Womens Study Group Black Panther Party Revolutionary Union A multi-national anti-imperialist project | 5 |
| TOTAL                                      | 15 |
The meeting was opened by a regional ALSC speaker affiliated with the national headquarters of CAP in Newark, New Jersey:

Cheo Hakima, the keynote speaker, gave historical background to ALSC and entertained questions. Some of the questions asked were: 1) "Why was Unita provided with resources?, and 2) What will be the new direction for ALSC, if any?" A third matter of importance that was discussed was the procedure for establishing an ALSC chapter. The procedure is simply that there be interested persons—not less than ten (10)—, an open meeting, and two dollars ($2) annual fee paid by each applicant. One dollar ($1) of each fee will be allocated to the National and the other dollar to the Local. There is no twenty-five $ ($25) chapter fee as had previously been assumed.

The meeting elected 4 officers, 2 women and all political independents. Plans were set for a local educational activity:

There will be a conference with workshops to define and consolidate the designated work areas within our local. Everyone is asked to come and participate in order that we may give some substance, clarity, and quality to the work that we are about to embark upon. Remember: the different work areas are 1) Political Education, 2) Fundraising, 3) Communications, and 4) Research. If you have an interest in one of these areas or a skill that you may want to contribute, please feel free to come and share your ideas. They are welcome.

Also, an announcement was made about the August 17th Houston National Steering Committee meeting.

It was announced that there will be an International Steering Committee meeting of ALSC in Houston, Texas, on the 17th and 18th of August, 1974. Philadelphia was asked to participate. It will not be known until then, however, what the status of Philadelphia will be. Hopefully, it will have full voting rights. Inquiries were made to determine the number of persons that will attend the meeting but it was difficult to ascertain who was going because people had not, as of that time, made up their minds. Those interested in a carpool were asked to get in touch with Jeannette Walton.
It was not known, exactly, what the topics of discussion were to be, however, it was expressed that we could at least advance three concerns:

1) Why each delegation is allotted two votes only if two representatives are present,  
2) The question of the role of women within ALSC,  
and,  
3) The question of multi-national involvement with ALSC.

We should have a report on the International Steering Committee meeting at our next general session.

Two delegates went to Houston (Chairperson and Secretary), but their first stop was in North Carolina. In general there were 3 aspects to their visit: (a) they sought a better understanding of the progressive leadership (particularly those they "perceived" to be in opposition to Baraka), (b) they sought arbitration for a developing conflict between themselves, and (c) they had issues to raise in Houston and wanted to discuss them before then. The North Carolina stop turned out to be a preview of Houston.

Three main issues developed during the Houston meeting that directly involved Philadelphia.

1. Philadelphia put forward a correct line on how to consolidate ALSC after the intense internal political struggle. They said,

We have a structural proposal for ALSC that will allow it to move forward with its struggle against imperialism, and at the same time, will allow ALSC to constructively work toward the resolution of what we hope is its own non-antagonistic contradiction through the development of a COLLECTIVE LEADERSHIP APPARATUS.
This meant that they supported uniting the main political tendencies in a joint leadership. Moreover, they advocated a focus on practical struggles, with the continuing ideological and political struggle being grounded on a summation of the practical struggles. Their position paper put it this way:

Which struggle is more important; the internal ideological struggle within ALSC or the struggle of the people versus world imperialism?? I say neither.

On the one hand, I say, that the ideological struggle that is being waged within ALSC must be subordinated to the struggle of the people versus world imperialism. It must be subordinated, not in the traditional sense of the word "subordination," but in the sense of our understanding the dialectics of contradiction. We must give a new perspective to our internal struggle; a perspective that gives the much needed latitude necessary for the carrying out of a just struggle for the overall development of ALSC; BUT, we need to raise our struggle to the next level.

They also put forward a view on local chapters.

LOCAL CHAPTERS - The local chapters of ALSC will become semi-autonomous structures with the authority to organize within their local communities around the concrete issues of their community. As opposed to defining all programs on the national level. Some programs will now be defined by the locals. That is, the locals will now be partly responsible for the transition of theory to practice (it must however be within the context of the "Statement of Principles"). Locals will also be responsible for their own fund raising. Locals and regions must submit monthly/weekly reports and news items to the official organ of ALSC, in order that we may all be informed about the activities of each branch. This is MANDATORY.

Because they were not clear on the politics of RWL, their perception of ALSC was incorrect. While they correctly understood the dialectics of theory and practice in ALSC, they failed to understand RWL's line of liquidation.
Therefore, their support of RWL dominance of a collective national leadership and their view on "semi-autonomous" local chapters, fed into RWL's liquidationist line even though they were against such a line.

2. They criticized the role of women in ALSC.

First let us begin with the question of the lack of participation of women in the present, leadership composition of ALSC. Except of course, the stereotyped, antiquated, mechanical and functionary role of secretary--our role--I beg your pardon I mean International Secretary. Now let me point out that we fully understand how great the task of being International Secretary to a formation such as ALSC...is. We sympathize with and give fraternal thanks to Brenda for her service.

However, it is our contention that women can and must do a great deal more within ALSC...Brothers and Sisters, after what will within one month be the second anniversary of the birth of ALSC, two years in which we believe it is safe to say that the participation of women in every phase of ALSC's work has always been overwhelmingly great, such activities, as organizing, mobilizing, fund-raising, partaking in local and national demonstrations. All these acts stand to our credit. With this kind of record, why then are we not allowed indeed pushed into leadership positions, Brothers?

Early this year, I raised this same question in Atlanta, at a North American Steering Committee meeting of Six PAC. At the time the North American Chairman, Jim Turner, was considering asking ten national leaders to prepare a North American position paper to be taken to Dar. The ten names were all names of men. I asked Jim why there were no women being asked to partake in the writing of this position paper, lo and behold the Brother layed on me that there were no women that he knew of who carry-out such a task. Now there is no need for me to speak here of the role played by our women throughout our long and trying fight against the capitalist dogs for over 4 centuries, we are all aware of these facts Brother Turner, too.
Now Sisters and Brothers if we are truly serious about building the anti-racist, anti-imperialist BLACK UNITED FRONT in the America, we must struggle to eradicate this narrow unconscious petty bourgeois male chauvinistic mentality which still exists within our ranks, relying on the weapons of criticism and self-criticism, and the comradely concerns of the collective that cures the disease to save the patient. I say unconscious bourgeois behavior because certainly, such a progressive Brother as Jim Turner, and all those of you here would not consciously let decadent and morbid bourgeois concepts, of what women are capable of doing and not doing i.e. "The Womanrole" obstruct our developing into a complete and viable force in the struggle against world imperialism and state monopoly capital.

The CRITICISM stated, let's move on to the CHANGE.

We charge you, the organizations that make up the formation of the African Liberation Support Committee, as well as this steering committee or rather the in-coming steering committee, with the task of making every effort to develop the leadership of women to the highest possible degree. Why do we make this charge to you? Because this formation is by far the most politically progressive formation in all of North America. ALSC in its historic meeting at Frogmore and the equally historic D.C. conference, pushed the Black Liberation Movement to its highest level ever. Pushing the movement towards the realization of the importance of class struggle to the masses of our people.

Let me be clear about what I mean by leadership participation on the part of women, having the same opportunity as men in developing our individual political and social consciousness to its fullest. The right to partake in all theoretical discussions, so as to make our contributions, to the theoretical development of our movement. Playing equals role, in decisions on all matters of policy.

3. The nomination of the chairperson of ALSC in Philadelphia to the new ALSC National Secretariat as an at large member. This was accepted by Philadelphia since it was received as a solution to
the need for women in leadership, and it was accepted by RWL because she was regarded as a close political (and personal) ally.

After the Houston meeting, during the third stage of ALSC, several important things happened. A very dramatic twist of events occurred in Philadelphia as purges were carried out. However, rather than a move to the "left" in keeping with the national motion there was a move to the "right." On September 13, 1974 they rejected the membership of representatives from the Trotskyite SWP, the Marxist-Leninist Revolutionary Union, and a multi-national anti-imperialist project with this notification:

You are hereby notified that your membership application to join the Philadelphia African Liberation Support Committee has been rejected. The nature of your organization as a multi-nation body and the make-up of leadership of said organization is not in keeping with the national policy of ALSC. We hope that this will not prohibit any future working relationship that was in the making between our organization and the Socialist Workers' Party. We further hope that in the case of any questions you will feel free to pose the questions and move for proper action. We will do our part to ensure that a proper review of any questions is had.

However, confusion remained even after this as reflected in the September 25th chapter minutes:

A question was raised regarding the review procedure of the termination of memberships of Rose Marie Mealy, Erik Chaka Young, and Tony Auston. It was then discovered that there was some unclarity in terms of whether or not a final decision on this matter had actually been reached. Nevertheless, since the persons listed above had already received notices, the committee proceeded to attempt to deal with the question.
It was felt that those whose memberships were terminated should be instructed to take any questions that they may have to the national. However, that was in contradiction to the instructions per the committee's termination notice. For, indeed, the committee did instruct said persons to direct any questions and any request for review to the local. As a result of this two things were concluded:

a) that we would not deal with this subject until officially contacted by any of the three, and

b) that we would specifically get in touch with Rose Marie Mealy to get further information on the organization, V. B.

By December 1974, the purge of the left reached the Chapter leadership. The Secretary fell victim to the "ax" completing the struggle developing prior to August 1974. The decision concealed the political essence of the purge by holding up alleged organizational errors:

THIS LETTER IS TO INFORM YOU THAT, THE STEERING COMMITTEE VIEWS YOUR PERFORMANCE AS SECRETARY AS GETTING WORSE RATHER THAN IMPROVING OVER THE LAST PAST MONTH. IN AN ATTEMPT TO SOLVE THE MATTER, AT OUR LAST STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING OF WHICH YOU FAILED TO ATTEND A UNANIMOUS DECISION WAS REACHED TO DISMISS YOU AS SECRETARY OF THE PHILA. LOCAL CHAPTER OF ALSC.

The unity of these two purges reflects the essential unity of a right and ultra "left" line. The first purge was consistent with the hegemonic design of RWL and CAP, while the second purge eliminated a progressive chapter leader from challenging the opportunist liason between the dogmatists and independents who carried political and ideological baggage of Black nationalism.
On the other hand, these purges did not entirely eliminate all progressive aspects of the chapter. What remained as a dominant tendency was the position that ALSC should be a Black force fighting imperialism. However, the nationalism was often hidden behind left rhetoric. For example, when the Marxist-oriented Secretary was purged by the rest of the leadership the notice ended with the following:

Sincerely True to Proletarian Struggle
The Steering Committee of A.L.S.C.
Philadelphia Chapter

This is a second line struggle. It represents opportunism and is full of petty bourgeois intrigue. Mao Tse-Tung put forward correct proletarian principles:

...practice Marxism, and not revisionism; unite, and don't split; be open and aboveboard, and don't intrigue and conspire...

This experience in Philadelphia provides a good lesson by negative example.

Another aspect of the work of the local Chapter was involvement in struggle. This is a positive aspect of their work. Mostly this took the form of support for actions and campaigns proposed by others, since national ALSC in this third stage had negated the fighting anti-imperialist thrust of the second stage of ALSC. The following are the main groups they worked with:

(a) Coalition of prison groups

(b) Puerto Rican Solidarity Day
(c) South African Coal Petition Drive
(d) Committee Against Rhodesian Imports
(e) Coalition in Support of the Palestinians
(f) Strike Support Coalition with United Mine Workers of America
(g) Conference on Racism and Political Repression

However, this is not the entire story because some resistance to working with multi-national groups continued. For example, the chapter refused to join a coalition for an "Independence Day Salute for Guinea Bissau." The main reason concerned who initiated the action, specifically Ethiopian students and the Revolutionary Union. They refused:

"It was decided that we would not do anything at all."

A third major trend was the conflict of theoretical and organizational line. The first 6 months of stage 3 was characterized by a bureaucratic approach to organization (extensive committee structure, reports, etc.), and a purge of left forces. However, in comparison to the liquidationism of RWL in the national ALSC leadership, Philadelphia had some progressive aspects. By March 1975 they took the following position:

TO: NATIONAL SECRETARIAT, ALSC
RE: PRESENT STATUS OF ALSC, NATIONALLY AND LOCALLY

The Philadelphia Chapter, ALSC presents the following as a constructive analysis of the present situation of ALSC, as we
observe it to be. We come to this meeting seeking clarification and consensus on the nature and structure of ALSC.

The Philadelphia Chapter goes on record as theoretically accepting the Statement of Principles. Though we have points that need clarification, on the whole we find the Statement of Principles to be broad enough to be accepted by members of our chapter. HOWEVER, it is to the question of practical application that we wish to address.

After a great deal of discussion in our chapter, we arrived at three essential points of agreement.

1. The fundamental objective of ALSC is to give political and material support to the liberation struggles in Africa.
2. ALSC should and must be a broad-based Black united front with a conscious left-marxist-leninist-presence.
3. We must constantly show the connection between U.S. imperialism and the oppression of Blacks in southern Africa.

In essence these points of agreement are essential elements in the Statement of Principles which we have found to applicable in practice.

Our understanding of an united front infers that individuals or organizations coalesce around a particular issue and work together until that issue is resolved. This does not preclude consciousness--raising on the part of the left element present. Theoretically this structure was adopted by ALSC. HOWEVER in practice we have not seen united front formations in operation nationally or locally for the most part. This may be due to several things:

1. Complete failure, nationally or locally, to submerge ideological differences, petty jealousies, and cultural vagaries to work around a specific goal. This emerged nationally and filtered down to the local chapters. This has permitted the infiltration of local chapters by blacks representing white left formations who gain control of a chapter through dogmatic brow-beating. They then go on to take the chapters into coalitions which are predominately white and which further isolates ALSC from the black community.

2. The apparent confusion among the national leadership as to priorities. This confusion has led to the adoption of an amorphous concept of loosely federated autonomous chapters left to go their own way with minimum leadership and guidelines. Those who accept the theoretical position that black workers are potentially the most revolutionary class AND seek to put such theory into practice should do so not under the banner of ALSC but in a structured organization. Working in such a
manner is a full-time job and requires that kind of organizing and study. BUT one cannot and indeed should not be permitted to do that work and retain leadership of ALSC.

There are some members of the Philadelphia Chapter who are struggling to put into practice the theoretical position regarding the black worker. It is clear however that they must do that as part of another formation other than ALSC. We are dismayed to learn that many chapters are involved in a debate as to whether the May demonstrations should focus on the worker and the economic conditions in the U.S. or focus on southern Africa. ALSC as implied in its name and its history should not be involved in such a debate.

This led the Philadelphia Chapter to propose regional demonstrations for ALD 1975. This was in conflict with the liquidationists. They also had 3 specific slogans (demands) concerning Namibia, Zimbabwe, and Azania, while the national decision lacked focus by their adoption of a laundry list of 16 slogans. Philadelphia was defeated and local demonstrations were held.

After the local demonstration (which has yet to be summed up), the main contradiction of the national trend united with an emerging trend in the Philadelphia chapter. RWL intrigue excluded Philadelphia except in a periodic visit to gather votes. Moreover the "dogmatic insanity" of commandism, left phrase mongering, and sectarianism pushed the remaining progressive leadership out. On the local level some of the nationalists were flipping over to the left, and at least one major person ended up in the WVO dung heap.

So the Philadelphia chapter of ALSC was destroyed by liquidationism from above, and a "left"-right split from below. No Marxist-Leninist forces were in the Philadelphia chapter at this time.
The final stage of ALSC continued this last development mentioned above. Three tendencies developed, while many other forces began to emerge as well.

(a) nationalist forces joined other Blacks (mainly people who had been with the Center for Black Education and in the leadership of the 6th Pan-African Congress) to form a Black Coalition in Support of Southern Africa;

(b) "ultra-left" dogmatists laid their WVO-RCL (formerly CAP) claim on ALSC but were repudiated and defeated;

(c) progressive forces led by Marxist-Leninists built a powerful ALD 1977 coalition and mobilized a significant contingent for the Washington D.C. march. Trotskyites, petty bourgeois "left" (e.g., the Philadelphia Workers Organization), and nationalists either supported the bankrupt line of Stokely Carmichael or turned away from ALD 1977 to work on a June 16th one year commemoration of the Soweto uprising in South Africa.

This is important because the ALD 1977 coalition in Philadelphia was spearheaded by an independent Marxist-Leninist who had a history in ALSC and a member of the Revolutionary Communist Party (and formerly of R.V.). Both were Black and both had been (organizationally in one case and personally in another) victims of "right" purges earlier in ALSC.
In sum, Philadelphia provides valuable lessons:

(a) In Philadelphia the purge policy resulted in a line of unite the few to oppose the many, while the correct approach would be to unite the many to oppose the few.

(b) In Philadelphia the error of organizational hegemonism (CAP) was replaced by the error of organizational intrigue (with RWL), while the correct approach would be to combat liberalism and swim against the tide of all forms of opportunism.

(c) In Philadelphia the personal conflicts of leading individuals were covered with liberalism rather than struggled over in a principled fashion.

(d) In Philadelphia, the approach of MASS struggle to build ALSC that was taken up by the AID 1977 coalition proved to be the correct approach to building the United Front against imperialism. The previous approach of joining other coalitions, often not more than in name, proved to fall short.

Philadelphia is one of many case studies that reflect the general lessons of ALSC. This document has been prepared to deepen our collective understanding of the history of ALSC in order to better know how to build the United Front Against Imperialism. We acknowledge that there are many errors and omissions in this analysis. We welcome criticism and
struggle over the material of this analysis and the line put forward. We hope this approach to the application of the revolutionary science of Marxism-Leninism, the concrete analysis of concrete things, provides a fresh and useful alternative to the rampant dogmatism of some and the even more pervasive revisionist liquidation of the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

This draft analysis was completed under severe time limitations, but we anticipate that with your contribution it will take a qualitative leap toward being the correct analysis. Toward this end please fill out the questionnaire and return it to Peoples College in Chicago.
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ADDENDUM

1. In general, how useful anything? As you read be useful in building

2. Summarize the strength

3. What works should be
4. Please comment on the following:
   a. theoretical analysis (questions of ideological and political line)

   b. empirical data and analysis

   c. use of language

   d. documentation

   e. length

   f. style
5. Work is underway for three other case studies. List references, people to be interviewed.

A. Atlanta

B. Bay Area, California

C. Chicago