James Tyner

The Geography of MALCOLM X

Black Radicalism and the Remaking of American Space

The Geography of MALCOLM X

Page Intentionally Left Blank

The Geography of MALCOLM X

Black Radicalism and the Remaking of American Space

James Tyner

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Published in 2006 by
Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
711 Third Avenue
New York, NY10017

Published in Great Britain by
Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
2 Park Square
Milton Park, Abingdon
Oxon OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of Taylor & Francis Group

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

International Standard Book Number-10: 0-415-95122-4 (Hardcover) 0-415-95123-2 (Softcover)
International Standard Book Number-13: 978-0-415-95122-7 (Hardcover) 978-0-415-95123-4 (Softcover)
Library of Congress Card Number 2005015708

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Tyner, James A., 1966-
The geography of Malcolm X : black radicalism and the remaking of American space / James Tyner.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-415-95122-4 (alk. paper) -- ISBN 0-415-95123-2 (pbk. : alk. paper)
1. African Americans--Politics and government. 2. African Americans--Intellectual life. 3. X, Malcolm, 1925-1965--Political and social views. 4. Radicalism--United States. 5. Public spaces--Political aspects--United States. 6. Geography--Political aspects--United States. 7. African American philosophy. 8. African Americans--Social conditions. 9. Social justice--United States. 10. United States--Race relations. I. Title.

E185.61.T97 2005
305.896'073--dc22 2005015708

informa
Taylor & Francis Group
is the Academic Division of Informa plc.

Visit the Taylor & Francis Web site at
http://www.taylorandfrancis.com

and the Routledge Web site at
http://www.routledge-ny.com

To Belinda

Page Intentionally Left Blank

CONTENTS

Page Intentionally Left Blank

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To some of my colleagues, this book appears to be a departure from my earlier work. Indeed, on the surface, a book on Malcolm X and black radicalism seems a rather startling diversion from my previous work on labor migration from the Philippines. However, this work actually constitutes a continuation of my broader concern with the disciplining of society through the regulation of space. As such, this present work demonstrates my attempt to understand and challenge the oppressive structures that limit the realization of the human experience. And now, I must find the space to acknowledge my friends and colleagues who have helped me over the years.

First and foremost, I thank Dave McBride at Routledge for his support, guidance, patience, and vision in seeing this book to completion. This book would not have been possible without his efforts. I thank also the many editors and reviewers who have been associated with my work on Malcolm X, both known and anonymous, for their comments, criticisms, and support: Don Mitchell, Rod Bush, Jamie Peck, Adam Tickell, Audrey Kobayashi, John Frazier, and Elizabeth Leppman. Their professionalism is sincerely appreciated.

Thanks go out to the many colleagues who have helped me over the years: Curt Roseman, Michael Dear, Laura Pulido, Stuart Aitken, Gary Peters, Mona Domosh, Richard Wright, Victoria Lawson, Ruth Wilson Gilmore, Jennifer Wolch, and Keith Collins. And while many of these people did not directly contribute to the workings of

this book, their inspiration and insights on Geography continue to shape my own personal and professional transformations. Over the years I have been fortunate to work with a number of graduate and undergraduate students, all of whom have shaped me as a scholar (for better or for worse): Rob Kruse, Joshua Inwood, Aron Massey, Steve Oluic, Stacy Wicker, Steve Butcher, Donna Houston, Olaf Kuhlke, Gabe Popescue, Sutapa Chattopadhyay, Rob Schwartz, Scott Hutka, Quentin Scott, Patrick Davis, Monika Flaschka, Rachel Oley, Kamaria Wolf. Special thanks are also extended to my chair, Jay Lee.

I was fortunate to have the opportunity to present my ideas on Malcolm X and black radical thought at the following conferences and institutions: The 2004 Race, Place, and Ethnicity Conference at Howard University; the 10th Annual Critical Geography Mini-Conference at the University of Illinois; the 2002 Conference of the Southeast Division of the Association of American Geographers; the "Soup & Substance" Dialogue Series at Kent State University; and the Geography Department at Ball State University.

The following articles have been revised for inclusion here and appear with permission. I am sincerely grateful to the editors and journals: "Geography, Ground-Level Reality, and the Epistemology of Malcolm X," *Journal of Geography* 102 (2003): 167–78; "Territoriality, Social Justice and Gendered Revolutions in the Speeches of Malcolm X," *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* NS 29 (2004): 330–43; "'Defend the Ghetto': Space and the Urban Politics of the Black Panther Party," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* (forthcoming).

I thank also my family: Dr. Gerald Tyner, Dr. Judith Tyner, David Tyner, Floris Tyner, Karen Owens, and Bill Owens. Each, in his or her own way, has helped me mature as a person, a father, and a professor. These brief sentences can in no way cover my thanks. As always, heartfelt thanks are extended to Bond (my puppy) and Jamaica (my cat), for their constant companionship. Together, they remind me of what is really important while writing a book: snacks, naps, and scratches behind the ears.

My greatest debt, of course, remains with Belinda, and not for the usual reasons—tolerating my absent-mindedness, putting up with the mounting piles of books and papers stacked in all rooms. Rather, it is because of Belinda that I first began this project on Malcolm X. While enrolled in the Pan-African Department at Kent State University, Belinda first raised the connections between Geography and Malcolm X. She may not want to hear it, but she would make a good Geographer. Over the years, Belinda has stood beside me, providing a needed balance of encouragement and criticism. I fondly dedicate this book to her. *Maraming salamat*; *mahal kita*.

Throughout the writing of this book, however, one person more than all others occupied my thoughts: Jessica, our daughter. When Malcolm X was killed, he was just thirty-nine years old—the same age as myself. At the time, he had four daughters—Attallah, Qubilah, Gamilah, Ilyasah—with his twin girls, Malaak and Milikah, yet to be born. I think often of Malcolm X, and the daughters he never knew. As I complete this book, Jessie is almost three years old. She enjoys reading, and we often browse the bookstores looking for new discoveries. Now, her books are filled with characters named Barney, Clifford, and Dora. She doesn't know about Malcolm; she doesn't yet know of the sacrifices that were made in the name of social justice. I hope that this book, in some small way, will help her understand the contested spaces in which we live.

Page Intentionally Left Blank

1
Malcolm X and Black Radical Thought

...for us, the problem is not to make a utopian and sterile attempt to repeat the past, but to go beyond.
—**Aime Cesaire**[1]

This is not a biography of Malcolm X, but rather a geography of knowledge.[2] This is an attempt to place the political thought of Malcolm X within a broader context of fundamental concepts of Geography, including segregation, territoriality, representations of place, scalar politics, and representations of self-hood. My starting point begins with a challenge posed by Malcolm X himself. Shortly before his death in 1965, Malcolm X concluded his autobiography with a reflection on his greatest failing, namely, the lack of an academic education. More significant, though, was his understanding of the confluence of knowledge, liberation, and African Americans. Malcolm X wrote:

> You see, most whites, even when they credit a Negro with some intelligence, will still feel that all he can talk about is the race issue; most whites never feel that Negroes can contribute anything to other areas of thought, and ideas. You just notice how rarely you will ever hear whites asking any Negroes what they think about the problem of world health, or the space race to land men on the moon.[3]

I propose to ask Malcolm X about geography.

An enigmatic and controversial figure, the legacy of Malcolm X continues to evoke intense debate over the meanings of both justice and humanity. "We want freedom, justice, and equality," Malcolm X wrote. "We want recognition and respect as human beings."[4] Malcolm X was clearly a product, and producer, of his times. Malcolm X also represented both a continuation with earlier radical black intellectuals as well as a transitional figure between the counterculture and youth movements of the late 1960s and early 1970s. Indeed, as the Civil Rights Movement shifted in the mid-1960s, demanding economic equality as well as social justice, scholars and federal officials attempted to untangle the threads of poverty, race, and gender; much of this scholarship began to focus on core themes that were recurrent in the speeches and writings of Malcolm X.[5]

The late 1950s and early 1960s—the years of Malcolm X's most intense political maturation—were a chaotic period of Cold War politics, wars of national liberation, and social movements for self-determination. Following the Second World War the United States found itself as the most powerful economic and military state in the world, and American policy-makers worked to maintain this supremacy. During the Cold War the United States dedicated itself to the endless accumulation of capital and to the securement of markets for resources and investment. Politicians were prepared to exercise the political and military power to defend and promote that process across the globe against the communist threat.[6] Billions of dollars in aid were distributed to Western European states in an attempt to buttress America's preeminence in the world market. And even Japan, a country devastated by America's nuclear power, was reconstructed with American monies.

In its foreign affairs, the United States presented itself as the chief defender of liberty and equality. But American policies were at times seen as contradictory and hypocritical. The United States, for example, supported in principle the ideals of self-determination, and yet simultaneously helped France reimpose its colonial reign on Indo-China. American officials likewise suppressed anticolonial liberation movements in the Congo and the Philippines. Malcolm

X, among others, was a vocal critic of American policies, daring to challenge the hypocrisy of American foreign interventions.

Malcolm X is in many ways inseparable from the revolutionary fervor of the 1960s. All society was a battleground: a great deal was at stake and powerful social forces were in conflict.[7] According to Max Elbaum, this conflict entailed, on the one hand, the country's traditional elite, accustomed to power and absolutely determined to maintain it; on the other hand, were previously marginalized groups who were no longer prepared to accept unequal treatment or unjust wars at home or abroad.[8]

As opposition to international communism became the guiding principle of American foreign policy, so too did this principle translate into increased surveillance and repression of domestic social movements. As the Cold War was increasingly cast in apocalyptic terms, critics of American society—such as Malcolm X, but also Paul Robeson, Richard Wright, and Dick Gregory—often found themselves labeled as "subversive" and "anti-American."[9] American politicians, fearful of communism both home and abroad, retained a tight control over ideas and actions. This would have a profound impact on the development of black radical thought. As expressed by Rod Bush, throughout the twentieth century African-American social movements shifted from a concern primarily with their own survival and prosperity to a more antisystemic position, which essentially demanded a fundamental reordering of the capitalist world-system.[10]

American attitudes and treatments of "minorities," however, became international fodder for the communist states of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) and China. During the Cold War years America's self-proclaimed leadership of the free world came under intense scrutiny. Images of police dogs and national guard soldiers attacking African Americans were discordant with the principles forwarded by American politicians. As the United States competed with the Soviet Union for the "hearts and minds" of newly independent states in Asia and Africa, a burning question remained: Did America live up to its own ideals? Such was the American dilemma, the contradiction between racism and the

ideology of democracy.[11] Malcolm X recognized this dilemma, and understood fully the implications of American foreign policy on the Civil Rights Movement. His message was painfully blunt, his words were passionate but plain: "You and I were born at this turning point in history," he explained, "we are witnessing the fulfillment of prophecy. Our present generation is witnessing the end of colonialism, Europeanism, Westernism, or 'White-ism'...the end of white supremacy, the end of the evil white man's unjust rule."[12]

Political and economic changes were also manifest on the landscapes of the United States. From Los Angeles to Harlem, Chicago to Boston, Malcolm X witnessed the profound changes that were occurring at the street level. The years of Malcolm X evinced a reorganization of everyday life that was unparalleled in American history. Especially pronounced in the northern and western states, many young American families began to settle in the suburbs. The "American" way of life was that of Norman Rockwell, with private single-family homes and white picket fences. And by 1960, for the first time in U.S. history, a majority of American families owned the homes in which they lived.[13] But not all Americans were able to participate in these changes. The spaces of America were Janus-faced, with the decaying black urban ghetto contrasting starkly with the idyllic suburban oasis of white America. The color line long ago identified by W.E.B. DuBois was more than a spatial metaphor; it was the literal inscription of social injustice and inequality on the American landscape. For many African Americans, their lives were spatially restricted to high-rise project buildings in overcrowded and underserviced slums. These spaces of oppression and degradation were not the result of local prejudices. Rather, for Malcolm X, these spaces were the result of an entrenched and corrupt system that marginalized peoples in America and beyond.

Economically, many African Americans entered the decade of the 1950s in a better economic position than ever before; earnings as a whole were up, and the number of African-American households that could legitimately afford to own a home had increased substantially.[14] However, many African-American families were unable to participate fully in the American Dream. Lending institu-

tions continued to discriminate in their granting of loans and, with new housing largely unavailable to them, African Americans found themselves left only with hand-me-down houses.[15] Subsequently, as America's involvement in global capitalism deepened, many African Americans saw their lives continue to worsen. The Cold War rhetoric of self-determination, equality, and social justice rang hollow in the ears of many African Americans. The historical and geographical experiences of African Americans left them with a deep sense of alienation from the society of their birth and an intense longing for full and equal citizenship.[16] This sense of longing, however, was coupled with a profound questioning of their *belonging*.

What does it mean to *belong*? In a state such as the United States, a nation of many cultures, does it make sense to speak of an American community of meaning, an American culture? According to Kenneth Karst, the question "Who belongs?" turns out to be a question about the meanings of America. He explains that to speak of self-definition, of the sense of community, and of the community-defining functions of law is not to identify different parts of a machine, but to view a complex social process from several different angles.[17]

Questions of belonging are thus as much personal and political as they are legal. But they are also spatial. To belong is to be *some place*. But as Malcolm X argued, belonging was not a matter of choice, but rather a matter of contestation. The Civil Rights Movement was more than a demand to eat at a lunch counter; it was a demand to be present, to be counted. The message of Malcolm X was, in short, for African Americans to assume their Constitutionally guaranteed place in America. The Civil Rights Movement must be transformed into a revolutionary movement to remake American spaces.

Black Radical Intellectuals and the Pursuit of Geographic Understanding

Geography, as the study of space, is well positioned to contribute to an understanding of racism and other forms of injustice. How these geographies are approached, however, requires a critical reflexivity in the questions we ask, the methods employed, and the worldviews that guide them. In short, a revolution *in* geography is also required.

For nearly four decades David Harvey has been an outspoken proponent of just such an approach. According to Harvey, a revolution in geographic thought does *not* "entail yet another empirical investigation of the social conditions in ghettos." For Harvey, sufficient information exists as evidence of our society's inhumanity. We do not need another map of malnutrition, poverty, or crime; we do not need further sterile empirical descriptions devoid of critical analysis. Instead, Harvey argued that the immediate task for geographers was and is "nothing more nor less than the self-conscious and aware construction of a new paradigm for social geographic thought through a deep and profound critique of our existing analytical constructs." Geography was to mobilize its efforts "to formulate concepts and categories, theories and arguments" which could then be applied "in the process of bringing about a humanizing social change."[18]

William Bunge likewise cautioned against "campus geographers" who tended to separate theory from practice. Of these geographers, sitting comfortably within their ivory towers, Bunge admonished that "They read too much and look and, often, struggle not at all. They cite, not sight."[19] Bunge described his experiences of living in the African-American "ghetto" in Chicago for the Martin Luther King, Jr. demonstrations. At the time, Bunge was contemplating a project on "humankind as a three-dimensional creature." He wrote:

> I worked with a young Black woman, a union worker, and former peddler on 43rd Street....She hated my concern about the three dimensionality of the species and our need to protect the world's children. Her people's children were starving....Another young Black woman...was teaching me similar lessons, filled with hatred toward me because I did not notice the children being murdered by automobiles in front of their homes or children starving in front of abundant food.[20]

Bunge concluded that the two young black women, furiously interpreting the world all around him that he could not see, because his life had been spent buried in books, caused him to reverse his analysis.

By the late 1980s, however, a geographic engagement with racial injustice was diminishing. The revolutionary paradigm advocated by Harvey, Bunge, and others remained unfinished. Despite Harvey's

plea in the early 1970s, inquiries into the spatial distribution and development of African-American residential patterns as well as concerns over social problems have dominated the literature at the expense of cultural and historical studies of African Americans and African-American places. Moreover, in tandem with the relative decline of the Civil Rights Movement in the late 1970s, and in the face of widespread white-identity backlash, the effect may have been to reduce, if not remove, challenges to racism from the dominant liberal agenda.[21]

Certainly the infusion of critical social theory into the discipline of geography has retained some discussion on racism and social justice. This is exhibited most clearly in the forwarding of feminist and queer theories, and, in particular, the nexus of the personal and the political. Mona Domosh, for example, relates her experience of hearing bell hooks speak at Florida Atlantic University. Domosh was inspired by the talk, but she was concerned by some of the comments of other people who attended the talk. Domosh explains:

> In several of these conversations, people were critical of her [hook's] talk because it was "anecdotal". But that was exactly the point for me. bell hooks seamlessly related large-scale political issues to her personal life and personal stories....These stories did two things for me—they transformed her from a symbol of gendered/racialized academic analysis into a full-blooded, vulnerable person, and they allowed me to think through complex issues by wrapping my mind around a particular event, with real human consequences.[22]

Accordingly, the experiences of both Domosh and hooks relate to broader epistemological questions surrounding power and knowledge. Recent discussions among feminist geographers in particular have encapsulated these concerns.[23] Audrey Kobayashi, for instance, identifies that "Feminist scholars are unabashedly forward in using their work to engage the political, by challenging academic norms and by helping to bring about social transformation." Moreover, she contends that "Anti-racist scholars, many of whom work within their own visible minority communities, see the struggle to overcome racism as a transformation of themselves as much as it is a transformation of the social norms and practices through which racism occurs."[24]

Radical geography is thus about fighting for social justice as well as revolutionizing the discipline of Geography in particular, and academia more broadly. But apart from critique and transformation, radical Geography is concerned with the forwarding of "alternative" geographies, of transformed spaces.

Black radicalism likewise is about alternative geographies, of social and spatial transformations; black radicalism is about the remaking of spaces. Progressive social movements do not simply produce statistics and narratives of oppression; rather, the best ones do what great poetry always does: transport us to another place, compel us to relive horrors, and, more importantly, enable us to imagine a new society.[25] As David Delaney writes:

> If we want to understand the historical construction of geographies of race and racism in the United States, it seems we have to do more than map changing distributions of "black people"—as if the geographies of race were in principle no different than the geographies of cotton or the blues or the AME Church. We will instead examine the ways in which racism as a set of ideologies contributes to the shaping of geographies of power....[26]

Robin Kelley argues that the conditions and the very existence of social movements enable participants to imagine something different, to realize that things need not always be this way.[27] It is that imagination, that effort to see the future in the present, that Kelley calls *poetic knowledge* and what Derek Gregory terms *geographical imaginations*. These alternative knowledges, in fact, have a long history among writers and activists. The utopian/dystopian literatures of George Orwell, Ray Bradbury, and Aldous Huxley, for example, are world-writing: they are *geographies*. Moreover, the geographical imaginations of these writers have become exemplars of social justice in that they serve as warnings of oppression and exploitation.

Significantly, black radicalism consists of similar approaches. Kelley explains that in the poetics of struggle and lived experience, in the utterances of ordinary folk, in the cultural products of social movements, in the reflections of activists, we discover the many different cognitive maps of the future, of the world not yet born. Indeed, Kelley concludes that the most radical art is not protest art but works that

take us to another place, envision a different way of seeing, perhaps a different way of feeling.[28] Kelley's use of "maps" and spatial analogies extends beyond a mere metaphorical use, for Kelley effectively captures the literal "geo-graphing" of space. The epistemology of black radicalism is thus predicated on a ground-level reality. Indeed, Black radical intellectual production oftentimes began with an engagement and dialogue with Western radical political ideas, and then moved on to a critique of these ideas as their incompleteness was revealed.[29] As Kelley writes, the most radical ideas often grow out of a concrete intellectual engagement with the problems of aggrieved populations confronting systems of oppression.[30]

Bogues identifies two dominant, though not necessarily exclusive, traditions of black radical thought. The first is a heretic intellectuality wherein heresy entails the challenging of authority. For the black radical intellectual, heresy means becoming human, not white or imitative of the colonial, but overturning white/European normativity.[31] Heresy is therefore a constructive project, one predicated on establishing an alternative political economy. A second tradition is that of prophesy. Prophetic redemptive figures are numerous in black political and social history, but their presence has been marginal in the study of black intellectual production. For Bogues, this is because they exemplified, in colonial eyes, *unreason* as compared to European *reason* and disciplinary rationalities.[32]

Characteristically, the prophetic tradition in black radical thought functions as a form of social criticism. It entails a redemptive discourse that argues for the end of racial oppression and exploitation. Despite these basic components, however, prophecy within the black radical tradition is not monolithic. Robert Terrill identifies two broad forms of prophetic discourse within African-American protest rhetoric: the jeremiad and the apocalyptic.[33] The term *jeremiad*, meaning lamentation or doleful complaint, derives from the Old Testament prophet, Jeremiah, who warned of Israel's fall and the destruction of the Jerusalem temple by Babylonia as punishment for the people's failure to keep the Mosaic covenant.[34] Within the United States, the jeremiad has a long and deeply entrenched history. The Puritan John Winthrop referred to New England as a "City on a Hill," a shining

example of socioreligious perfection lighting the way for the coming of God's earthly kingdom.[35]

The American jeremiad has been frequently adapted for the purposes of black protest and propaganda.[36] Indeed, it has been suggested that jeremiad prophecies appealed to African-American preachers and abolitionist orators because African-American slaves often compared themselves to the Israelite slaves of the Old Testament, awaiting their exodus to the Promised Land of a socially equitable America.[37] The jeremiad tradition, though, entails two basic variations. One tradition is directed toward whites in which the racist society must reform its behaviors. Adherents of this tradition advocate a virtually complete acceptance of and incorporation into the national ideal of America's promise. This conforms readily with the integrationist or accommodationist ideologies of Frederick Douglass and Martin Luther King, Jr. African Americans, according to this perspective, must wait for the racists to atone for their sins. A second jeremiad tradition perceives the destiny of African Americans to be apart from the dominant white society. This is seen, for example, in the nineteenth-century separatist movements of "Pap" Singleton, the "Moses of the Negro People," who led an exodus of African Americans from the Deep South to Kansas.

In contrast to jeremiad prophecies, apocalyptic rhetoric promises the inevitable and cataclysmic end of the oppressor; as such, there is little motivation for a rhetoric of integration.[38] Proponents of the apocalyptic tradition maintain that the racist society is irredeemably corrupt. This variant of prophetic black protest resonates with the separatist claims of Marcus Garvey and Elijah Muhammad, both of whom were influential to the philosophical development of Malcolm X.

"I see America through the eyes of the victim. I don't see any American dream; I see an American nightmare."[39] So argued Malcolm X in his momentous "The Ballot or the Bullet" speech delivered at the Cory Methodist Church in Cleveland, Ohio. The speech came just months after Martin Luther King Jr's prophetic "I Have a Dream" speech in Washington, DC. Malcolm X explained that he was not an American. Rather, in his words:

> I'm one of the 22 million black people who are victims of Americanism. One of the 22 million black people who are victims of democracy, nothing but disguised hypocrisy. So, I'm not standing here speaking to you as an American, or a patriot, or a flag-saluter, or a flag-waver—no, not I. I'm speaking as a victim of this American system.[40]

Malcolm X viewed the spaces of America not as a dream but as a nightmare. He did not in 1963 see a Promised Land, one where the white racists could be redeemed. America was not a bright City on a Hill illuminating the world in all its glory. Rather, America was a hypocrisy, a place of dreams deferred and promises not kept. And it was within these spaces that Malcolm X implored his audiences to retain a sense of self within a dehumanizing, unjust landscape.

As a black radical, however, Malcolm X does not conform easily with the prophetic or heretic traditions. Prophetic speech does not model for its audiences a productive relationship between invention and action: listeners may be encouraged to act in accordance with the values and standards that are claimed to have been obscured—as through racist educational systems—but not to judge critically or to make independent decisions.[41] This form of protest and social criticism was increasingly unacceptable to Malcolm X who, in the months before his death, desired to pursue a prudent strategy of black radicalism and racial uplift based on ground-level realities. Prudence emphasizes the individualized perception of the possibilities inherent in any given situation.[42] In a speech delivered in Harlem to a group of black high school students visiting from McComb, Mississippi, Malcolm X stated that "one of the first things I think young people, especially nowadays, should learn how to do is see for yourself and listen for yourself and think for yourself."[43] Prudence is inward-looking; rhetorically it encourages audiences to question, evaluate, and monitor their own actions and relationships. Prudence requires audiences to develop a habit of critical judgment and reflexivity. As discussed in later chapters, Malcolm X encouraged his listeners and readers to think about their relationships, not only to the white society, but with other peoples of the African diaspora. David Smith writes that "if a geographically sensitive ethics has no more than one major message,

it is ... the importance of context, of understanding the particular situation: how things are, here and there."[44] Today, Malcolm X's phrase "By any means necessary" is almost a cliche. However, his statement resonates with his rhetorical style, one that indicates a geographically sensitive ethics. At the time of his death, Malcolm X did not forward a normative geography; nor did he specify a detailed mapping for his remaking of American space. Rather, the geography of Malcolm X, while strongly and unwaveringly committed to the elimination of oppression and exploitation, was contingent and flexible.

Moving Forward, Moving Beyond

In the future there will be white men who will look
into black and yellow and brown faces,
and they will say to themselves: "I wish to God
that those faces were educated,
that they had lived lives as secure and serene as mine;
then I would be able to talk to them, to reason with them...."
But then it will be too late.
—Richard Wright[45]

In his book on Malcolm X, William Sales Jr. asks "Why another book on Malcolm X?" His answer is simple yet compelling. There remains a need to discuss the experience and thinking of Malcolm X in order to move his legacy beyond the stage of hero worship.[46] Crucially, as bell hooks writes, the "contemporary resurgence of interest in the writings and teachings of Malcolm X has helped to create a critical climate where we can reassess his life and work from a variety of standpoints."[47] This includes Geography.

During the latter years of his life, Malcolm X was one of the most invited speakers on university campuses throughout the United States. Moreover, *The Autobiography of Malcolm X* was without question the single most widely read and influential book among young people of all racial backgrounds during the mid- to late-1960s.[48] Significantly, the salience of Malcolm X has not diminished over time. If anything, the ideas, expressions, and actions of Malcolm X have assumed greater importance during the decades following his

death. In an era of globalization, unilateralism, and preemptive war, the salience of Malcolm X's thought is as germane as it was during the Vietnam era.

The Geography of Malcolm X is less about Malcolm X than it is about his production and critique of geographic knowledge. In particular, I argue that the objective of Malcolm X's black radicalism was the attainment of respect and equality within American society; this was to be accomplished through a remaking of American space.

In the pages that follow I attempt to push forward our understanding of radical spaces by moving beyond the traditional account of one man's life. Geography has been too myopic, stagnated by its insularity from radical intellectuals. The counterrevolution advocated by David Harvey so many years ago remains unfinished and, in certain respects, neglected. It is not too late; the chickens have not all come home to roost.

Page Intentionally Left Blank

2
The Displacements of Malcolm X

Do not ask who I am and do not ask me to remain the same:
leave it to our bureaucrats and our police to see
that our papers are in order.
—Michel Foucault[1]

Steve Pile asks, "what difference does it make to think theory in different places or through different understandings of space?"[2] This question is particularly relevant in articulating an understanding of the geography of Malcolm X. Scholars, for example, have frequently ascribed tremendous explanatory power to the travels of Malcolm X following his separation from the Nation of Islam.[3] As a case in point, in the foreword to a collection of Malcolm X's speeches, Malcolm X is said to have progressed "through a rapid political evolution to carefully thought-out anticapitalist and, then, pro-socialist positions during this last year of his life."[4] Dean Robinson also writes that "in the last year of his life, Malcolm X broadened his thinking about black politics at home, the links to African politics abroad, the need for self-defense and even a favorable consideration of socialism."[5] William Sales concurs, noting that, "As a result of his two trips to Africa in 1964, Malcolm X came to recognize the inconsistency of Black control of Black communities in a monopoly capitalist economy rooted in Western imperialism."[6]

For the most part I agree with these assessments, both with the impact of travel and with a focus on the last year of his life. As Michael Dawson explains, "Just as it is difficult to reconcile the 'young Marx' with later versions, it is hard to believe that the political thought of Malcolm X in 1961 and his beliefs in early 1965 can be easily reconciled within a single theoretical framework."[7] However, an overemphasis on the writings and speeches of his last year tends to impart a radical split in the political consciousness of Malcolm X. One comes away from these studies with the impression that Malcolm X was exceptionally unaware of world events and black political ideologies prior to his travels. This is simply not true. These elements were present, but Malcolm X needed a personal separation from the Nation of Islam to better comprehend, contextualize, and formulate his ideas.

Researchers, theorists, or activists do not operate in vacuums; rather, their activities reflect personal experiences and values, societal concerns, and disciplinary trends.[8] David Lowenthal, for example, argues that "every image and idea about the world is compounded ...of personal experience, learning, imagination, and memory."[9] Moreover, as Heidi Nast identifies, "historical and material (including bodily) conditions of oppression carried through patriarchy, racism, heterosexism, capitalism, and so on foster different ways of knowing or epistemologies that affect how we (whomever we are and wherever and however we are positioned) negotiate the world and how we resist those in power."[10] Specific to black radicalism, Anthony Bogues writes that there exists a deep political practice that connects the lived social and political experiences of Africans and the African diaspora to the categories of political thought.[11]

Malcolm X, an exemplary of prophetic and prudent traditions of Black radical thought, predicated his geographical imaginations on a dialectics between his lived experiences and broader ideas. His radical political thought was a synthesis of Christian, Islamic, socialist, and Pan-Africanist philosophies; accordingly, his slogan *by any means necessary* resonated at a number of levels. Taken often as choice between the bullet or the ballot, the phrase is more applicable to his later contingent and flexible approach to social justice.

The geography of Malcolm X's political transformation, I suggest, is supported by a series of displacements, though two stand apart from the others: first, his philosophical separation from the Nation of Islam and, second, his physical separation from the United States in the form of two sojourns to Africa and the Middle East. However, I argue that this second separation (his travels) would not have impacted Malcolm X to the degree it did without the earlier philosophical separation. In the remainder of this chapter I consider these dialectics of lived experience and critical interpretations, but specifically as these experience occurred *in space*. Operatively, they are located in particular places and at particular times.

A substantial number of biographies and memoirs of Malcolm X have been published, some good, some bad.[12] For the most part, these works provide either a chronology of Malcolm X's entire life or his last year. Substantively, these works also reflect, in general, a particular ideological viewpoint or disciplinary perspective. My present study both follows and departs from these trends. As indicated in chapter 1, I provide not a *biography* of Malcolm X, but rather a *geography*. My interest lies in Malcolm X's own understanding of geographic concepts—place-representation, territoriality, separatism, nationalism—as they relate to a broader program of social justice. Consequently, the organization of my book is topical rather than chronological. Chapter 2, though, is a partial exception. In a moment, I will provide a cursory narrative of Malcolm X. In these few short pages I cannot hope to do justice to the depth of Malcolm X's life. And yet I do provide this portrait for three reasons. First, I cannot assume that readers will be familiar with Malcolm X. Despite his still public persona, his face adorning posters and t-shirts, there remains an ignorance of the man, his life, and his beliefs. Second, I maintain that key events and places greatly informed Malcolm X's geographies. This, of course, represents one purpose of this present work. And third, I take seriously Malcolm X's own sentiments as expressed in his posthumously published autobiography:

> ...each day I live as if I am already dead, and I tell you what I would like for you to do. When I *am* dead—I say it that way because from the things I *know*, I do not expect to live long enough to read this

> book in its finished form—I want you to just watch and see if I'm not right in what I say: that the white man, in his press, is going to identify me with "hate". He will make use of me dead, as he has made use of me alive, as a convenient symbol of "hatred" (italics in original).[13]

I would like to prove Malcolm X wrong. If I am to "make use" of Malcolm X, it is to enrich our understandings of protest movements and the quest for social justice.

The Displacements of Malcolm Little

On May 19, 1925, Malcolm Little was born in Omaha, Nebraska. Not until 1952 would he "become" Malcolm X. But the Malcolm X of the 1950s and 1960s was many years and many miles away from the Malcolm Little of the late 1920s and 1930s. Malcolm was the fourth child of his mother, Louise Norton Little and the seventh child of his father, Earl Little (who had three children from a previous marriage). Earl Little was a carpenter by trade who also guest-preached in local churches. He was also an organizer for Marcus Garvey's Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA). The Jamaican-born Garvey (1887–1940) founded the UNIA in an effort to facilitate the uplift of all peoples of African descent. Himself inspired by Booker T. Washington (discussed in chapter 3), Garvey, through his UNIA, was part of a broad Pan-African nationalist movement that flourished during the early twentieth century and represented a key grassroots movement for African Americans. Garvey viewed the masses of African diaspora as a strength and laid the foundations for the formulation of subsequent Pan-African nationalist ideas. P. Olisanwuche Esedebe, for example, asserts that Garvey introduced the ideas of an African nationality and the African personality to the uninformed masses in the villages and streets of the African world.[14] Michael Conniff and Thomas Davis likewise argue that Garvey captured the popular imagination and developed the largest black nationalist organization and movement in history.[15] Employing slogans such as "Africa for the Africans" and "Back to Africa," Garvey argued that for blacks to be free and not oppressed wherever they lived, Africa itself must be free from European colonialism. Garvey

demanded equality and "gave notice to the European imperialists and colonialists, to quit or face forcible eviction."[16]

Born in 1890 in Reynolds, Georgia, Earl Little traveled for much of his life. His first marriage resulted in three children, although he left behind this family and moved to Montreal, Canada. He later lived for various periods in Philadelphia, Omaha, Milwaukee, and Lansing. He met his second wife, Louise, at a UNIA convention in Montreal. Louise Norton Little was born in Grenada and immigrated to Canada in 1917. She, like Earl, was a strong supporter of the ideas of Garvey and often served as a reporter for the organization's publications. As a child she had been educated in Anglican schools in Grenada; as an adult, she cautioned against religious orthodoxy. Indeed, it was through his mother that Malcolm was exposed to a variety of Christian denominations, including the Baptists, Methodists, Pentecostals, and Seventh Day Adventists. At the same time, though, Louise also encouraged her children to form strong relationships with God.

Malcolm was immersed in the atmosphere of his parents' political activism and, indeed, it was the Little household that laid the foundation for the critical aspects of Malcolm's later ideas.[17] In his autobiography, Malcolm X explained that his father believed, as did Garvey, that freedom, independence, and self-respect could never be achieved by the Negro in America, and that the Negro should leave America to the white man and return to his African land of origin.[18] Of the UNIA meetings that Malcolm attended with his father, Malcolm remembered

> hearing of "Adam driven out of the garden into the caves of Europe," "Africa for the Africans," "Ethiopians, Awake!" And my father would talk about how it would not be much longer before Africa would be completely run by Negroes—"by black men" was the phrase he always used. "No one knows when the hour of Africa's redemption cometh. It is in the wind. It is coming. One day, like a storm, it will be here."[19]

These memories are significant in that they reveal how deeply the jeremiad tradition was instilled in young Malcolm. They are also important elements in the later articulations of Malcolm's geographies,

of having a homeland with an emphasis on *home*. According to Kofi Natambu, the repatriation-to-Africa idea was especially appealing to Earl and Louise Little and many other poor African Americans who were deeply alienated by the oppressive racism they encountered in the United States.[20]

Earl's support of Garveyism was a dangerous undertaking during the 1920s. And it was Earl's sermons that contributed to his family's displacements. As a young child Malcolm and his family were driven from Omaha by members of the Ku Klux Klan. After a brief stop in Milwaukee, the family finally settled in Lansing, Michigan. As Malcolm later detailed in his autobiography, "The Klansmen shouted threats and warnings at her [Malcolm's mother] that we had better get out of town because 'the good Christian white people' were not going to stand for my father's 'spreading trouble' among the 'good' Negroes of Omaha with the 'back to Africa' preachings of Marcus Garvey."[21]

As the Littles moved to Milwaukee and then to Lansing, at each place they encountered racism and violence, both at the hands of racist white groups and disgruntled black families that disapproved of Earl Little's preaching of Garveyism and "not knowing his place."

Life did not improve for the Little family in Michigan. When Malcolm was six years old, Earl Little was crushed beneath the wheels of a street car. Although evidence suggested that he had been murdered by a white supremacist group, the authorities concluded that Earl had committed suicide. As a result, Louise Little was unable to collect on a life insurance policy.

African Americans were especially hard hit by the Great Depression, and the Little family was no exception. The family, poor even when Earl was alive, became more mired in poverty. In 1937 the stress of raising seven children under the age of twelve, of a humiliating reliance on welfare, and of seeing her family torn apart by social workers, took its toll on Louise. She eventually suffered a mental breakdown and was incarcerated in the State Mental Hospital at Kalamazoo. Throughout these years Malcolm and his siblings were repeatedly transferred from foster home to foster home. Any semblance of a "normal" life was impossible. Malcolm X recalled, "I truly believe

that if ever a state social agency destroyed a family, it destroyed ours. We wanted and tried to stay together. Our home didn't have to be destroyed. But the Welfare, the courts, and their doctor, gave us the one-two-three punch."[22] Malcolm X, in retrospect, concluded that the social workers, the courts, and even society in general "looked at us as numbers and as a case in their book, not as human beings. And knowing that my mother in there was a statistic that didn't have to be, that existed because of a society's failure, hypocrisy, greed, and lack of mercy and compassion."[23] This episode foreshadows the experiential significance of Malcolm X's political thought in that Malcolm X would later frame his experiences within a context of institutional and material factors that caused his family's suffering.

The educational system was also a source of discrimination and oppression for the young Malcolm. Although he ranked third in his class, and was elected class president, Malcolm was subjected to racial jokes and slurs, by both teachers and students. He remembered:

> English and history were the subjects I liked most....The one thing I didn't like about history class was that the teacher, Mr. Williams, was a great one for "nigger" jokes....Later...we came to the textbook section on Negro history. It was exactly one paragraph long. Mr. Williams laughed through it practically in a single breath, reading aloud how the Negroes had been slaves and then were freed, and how they were usually lazy and dumb and shiftless.[24]

Education seemed to offer few opportunities. This "reality" was driven home after class one day. Malcolm X, in his autobiography, detailed the advice given to him regarding career choices. An English teacher asked Malcolm whether he had given any thought to a career. In reality, Malcolm had not, but on the spur of the moment, said that he would like to be a lawyer. Malcolm described what happened next:

> Mr. Ostrowski [the teacher] looked surprised...and leaned back in his chair and clasped his hands behind his head. He kind of half-smiled and said, "Malcolm, one of life's first needs is for us to be realistic. Don't misunderstand me, now. We all here like you, you know that. But you've got to be realistic about being a nigger.

> A lawyer—that's no realistic goal for a nigger. You need to think about something you can be. You're good with your hands—making things....Why don't you plan on carpentry?[25]

This well-known episode certainly sheds insight into the evolving political thought of the man who would become Malcolm X. However, Malcolm's early childhood is tremendously important for an understanding of his geographies. To this point in Malcolm's life, factors beyond his control, beyond the control of his parents, worked to destroy his family. More significantly, the institutions that were tasked to help—social work agencies, schools, police authorities, insurance companies—did little to help him or his family. Indeed, in many instances these institutions augmented the Littles' problems. Concurrently, however, Malcolm had been exposed, largely through the efforts of his mother but also his father, to numerous ideas and approaches for redemption, social reform, and liberation.

Malcolm first visited Roxbury, Boston's black ghetto, in 1940 when he spent a summer with his half-sister, Ella Collins. Herself a homeowner, Ella lived on Sugar Hill in the black middle-class section of Roxbury. Following the death of Earl and the institutionalization of Louise, Ella visited Malcolm in Michigan, and later, encouraged Malcolm to visit her in Massachusetts. Away from Michigan, Malcolm was overwhelmed. In his autobiography, Malcolm described his impressions:

> I couldn't have feigned indifference if I had tried to.... I didn't know the world contained as many Negroes as I saw thronging downtown Roxbury at night....Neon lights, nightclubs, pool halls, bars, the cars they drove! Restaurants made the streets smell—rich, greasy, down-home black cooking! Jukeboxes blared Erskine Hawkins, Duke Ellington, Cootie Williams....And on Sundays, when Ella, Mary, or somebody took me to church, I saw churches for black people such as I had never seen. They were many times finer than the white church I had attended back in Mason, Michigan.[26]

This physical displacement of Malcolm was transformative in its effect. The new sights, the sounds, even the smells, affected Malcolm deeply. According to Natambu, the experience in Boston induced a

radical change in Malcolm's perspective and behavior in that he saw a different side—indeed, different spaces—of Black America. And after Ella arranged to obtain custody of Malcolm, he moved to Boston in 1941. It was also in Boston, however, that the older Malcolm X would develop his attitudes toward class differentials within the African-American population. As Michael Dyson explains, in Boston Malcolm encountered "for the first time the black bourgeoisie, with its social pretensions and exaggerated rituals of cultural self-affirmation, leading him to conclude later that the black middle class was largely ineffective in achieving authentic black liberation."[27]

Ella enrolled Malcolm in an all-boys' school in Boston, but he quickly dropped out and made his way to the clubs, pool halls, bars, and dance halls of Roxbury. Malcolm worked menial jobs, including stints as a shoe shine boy and a railroad dining-car attendant on the Boston–New York route. He first went to Harlem in 1943 and later found employment there as a waiter in the nightclub Small's Paradise Club. Louis DeCaro writes that Harlem, to Malcolm, was the heartbeat of Africa-in-America. Indeed, making the trip to Harlem, for Malcolm, was a form of Garveyite pilgrimage, a way of reaffirming his belief in the black gospel that had been preached by his parents.[28]

As a youth growing up on the streets of both Boston and Harlem, Malcolm entered a world of hustlers, pimps, prostitutes, and thieves. This was a period of Malcolm's life that, he later recalled, might have found him dead were it not for prison. Malcolm, during these years, apparently turned away from religion and morality. As explained by DeCaro, though, Malcolm's "race-consciousness remained intact." Indeed, DeCaro contends that the atheism exhibited by Malcolm was "more practical than philosophical, convenient as it was to his emerging criminal life-style."[29]

In 1946, at twenty-one years of age, Malcolm, his friend Shorty, and two white sisters, were arrested for burglary. The average prison sentence for a first-time offender was two years; Malcolm and Shorty, though, each received ten-year sentences. Later, in his autobiography, Malcolm X explained that he was punished more for dating white women than he was for robbery:

> The girls got low bail. They were still white—burglars or not. Their worst crime was their involvement with Negroes. But Shorty and I had bail set at $10,000 each, which they knew we were nowhere near able to raise. The social workers worked on us. White women in league with Negroes was their main obsession....How, where, when, had I met them? Did we sleep together? Nobody wanted to know anything at all about the robberies. All they could see was that we had taken the white man's women.[30]

During the trial, Malcolm recalled that "Even the court clerks and the bailiffs: 'Nice white girls...goddam niggers—' It was the same even from our court-appointed lawyers....Before the judge entered, I said to one lawyer, 'We seem to be getting sentenced because of those girls.' He got red from the neck up and shuffled his papers: 'You had no business with white girls.'"[31]

According to his autobiography, Malcolm's prison experience appears as a poignant narrative of redemption and salvation, one of personal transformation and enlightenment. It was during this period that Malcolm reeducated himself. He began correspondence courses in English and, later, Latin. He also transcribed the dictionary, dutifully rewriting every mark on every page. However, the prison "rebirth" of Malcolm was probably not so dramatic as described in his autobiography. Malcolm was actually prepared for his self-education because of the Garveyite upbringing he received from his mother. DeCaro explains that following Garvey's admonitions to "never stop learning" and "master the language of your country," Louise, whose Anglican school training far exceeded her husband's elementary level schooling, kept issues of the UNIA's *Negro World* and a dictionary ready for use for the children's homework assignments. He maintains that if Malcolm reached for the dictionary in prison, it was because he had seen his mother and elder brother Wilfred using it many times, and had already internalized its great value for learning and the art of communication.[32]

Malcolm did, though, considerably expand his personal education while confined. He read widely and voraciously, making use of the prison library: Will Durant's *Story of Civilization*, H.G. Wells's *Outline of History*, and W.E.B. Du Bois's *Souls of Black Folk*. He read

of Nat Turner and Mahatma Gandhi, and the writings of philosophers such as Socrates, Herodotus, Kant, Spinoza, and Nietzsche. Malcolm also read and learned from the histories of revolutionary movements, including the American, French, Russian, and Chinese revolutions. Years later this knowledge infused his advocacy for political change in the United States, and was a defining element that distinguished Malcolm from the integrationist leaders of the Civil Rights Movement.

It was also in prison that Malcolm turned to the Nation of Islam and the teachings of Elijah Muhammad. However, this was not likely to be the first time that Malcolm had heard of the Nation of Islam. Louis Lomax writes that "Malcolm's prison years are now discussed in mystical terms by those who elevated him to sainthood and martyrdom. The harsh truth is that these years of confinement allowed Malcolm to crystallize the forces that were already at work within him. The Black Muslim doctrine capsulated his experience with white people, women, poverty, crime, and Christianity."[33] Indeed, Lomax contends that Malcolm was probably exposed to the Black Muslim movement prior to his incarceration. He explains, first, that Earl Little, as an evangelical black nationalist in Lansing—some thirty miles from Detroit, the birthplace of the Nation of Islam—would no doubt have heard about the movement and discussed it with his wife and older children. Second, information obtained by Lomax indicates that Ella Little Collins was closely allied with Elijah Muhammad in the early years of the Nation, and indeed was scheduled to become Muhammad's first female minister. Lomax concludes that "The general assumption has been that Malcolm came upon the Black Muslim teachings while in prison. It now appears ...that Malcolm had been familiar with the movement for several years, and the solitary life of prison gave him time to think and crystallize what had always been a strong influence in his family life."[34]

DeCaro's studies of Malcolm X's religious involvements also support Lomax's assertion. Louise taught her children to appropriate their experience in various religious communities as tools in constructing their own altars of faith.[35] It is not far-fetched to assume that Malcolm X began to incorporate his own personal experiences

with organized religions, white-dominated institutions, and societal racism with the teachings of the Nation of Islam. Malcolm X would later recall that:

> The white people I had known marched before my mind's eye. From the start of my life. The state white people always in our house after the other whites I didn't know had killed my father...the white people who kept calling my mother "crazy" to her face and before me and my brothers and sisters, until she was finally taken off by white people to the Kalamazoo asylum ...the white judge and others who had split up the children ...the teachers—the one who told me in the eighth grade to "be a carpenter" because thinking of being a lawyer was foolish for a Negro.[36]

Malcolm drew on his casual observations—his geographically situated life experiences. He began to make informed observations, to compare his personal experiences with what was taught in schools, or was spoken by politicians. Prison *did* afford Malcolm an opportunity to develop a renewed understanding of history and of geography, and of the place of African Americans in a racist society: the material aspects of life, the meanings of being black. Resonant with the teachings of Garvey, these ideas also foregrounded Malcolm's later thinking on questions of truth, power, and knowledge. These themes, which are developed more fully in chapter 3, are expressed clearly in his autobiography:

> "The true knowledge," reconstructed much more briefly than I received it, was that history had been "whitened" in the white man's history books, and that the black man had been "brain-washed for hundreds of years."...Human history's greatest crime was the traffic in black flesh when the devil white man went into Africa and murdered and kidnaped to bring to the West in chains, in slave ships, millions of black men, women, and children, who were worked and beaten and tortured as slaves. The devil white man cut these black people off from all knowledge of their own kind, and cut them off from any knowledge of their own language, religion, and past culture, until the black man in America was the earth's only race of people who had absolutely no knowledge of his true identity.[37]

To Malcolm, "History had been so 'whitened' by the white man that even the black professors have known little more than the most ignorant black man about the talents and rich civilizations and culture of the black man of millenniums ago."[38] Accordingly, the representation of peoples, places, and events would figure prominently in the political thought of Malcolm X. Within his speeches and writings Malcolm X would later challenge the dominant representations of Africans and African Americans that were taught in history classes. Malcolm X, for example, made the following accusation:

> In one generation, the black slave women in America had been raped by the slavemaster white man until there had began to emerge a homemade, handmade, brainwashed race that was no longer even of its true color, that no longer even knew its true family names. The slavemaster forced his family name upon this rape-mixed race, which the slavemaster began to call "the Negro". This "Negro" was taught of his native Africa that it was peopled by heathen, black savages, swinging like monkeys from trees. This "Negro" accepted this along with every other teaching of the slavemaster that was designed to make him accept and obey and worship the white man.[39]

Paroled from prison on August 7, 1952 at twenty-seven years of age, Malcolm found, through his brother Wilfred, employment at a furniture store in Detroit. Malcolm's concerns at this point, though, focused more on his activities at the Nation of Islam's Detroit Temple Number One.

Founded in 1930 by W. D. Fard, the Nation of Islam developed into the most important black nationalist organization. The Nation of Islam rose on the remnants of Garveyism and other movements in inner-city Detroit. Part of its early success must be attributed to the extraordinary range of its foundational prophecy, which integrates the influences of Christianity, orthodox Islam, science fiction, black nationalism, Pan-Africanism, and Freemasonry.[40]

In 1934 Fard mysteriously disappeared, and, subsequently, leadership was assumed by Elijah Muhammad. Originally named Elijah Poole, Muhammad was born in Georgia in 1897, the son of ex-slaves. During his reign over the Nation of Islam, Muhammad would assume

the title "Messenger of Islam" and claim to be the prophet of Allah. Under his guidance, moreover, the Nation of Islam was tightly regulated. Ministers of the Nation, for example, were strictly trained as to the proper messages disseminated. According to Elijah Muhammad, only the black race was the original creation of Allah; all others were not of divine origin, but rather the result of genetic experiments by a Yacub, a black scientist. The white race—devils—created by Yacub were the natural enemy of blacks.[41]

Malcolm's involvement in the Nation of Islam contextualizes many of the influences of his early life. The teachings of the Nation of Islam did not separate African Americans' resentment of servitude from the racial identity of the people responsible for it. Furthermore, the values of the Nation of Islam (e.g., respect, knowledge, self-help, communal solidarity) resonated strongly with Malcolm's Garveyite childhood as well as his prison experience. Indeed, Malcolm personified these changes and made them manifest in his adoption of the name Malcolm X. As he later explained in his autobiography, "the Muslim 'X' symbolized the true African family name that he never could know. For me, my 'X' replaced the white slavemaster name of 'Little' which some blue-eyed devil named Little had imposed upon my paternal forebears."[42]

The tone of Elijah Muhammad's teachings articulated the personal anger of Malcolm X in racialized, structural terms. Indeed, years later Malcolm X's half-sister Ella recalled that "The NOI had given [Malcolm] a platform to structure for his life's battles and a black perspective to take to the country and the world."[43]

In 1953 Malcolm X was appointed by Elijah Muhammad as Assistant Minister of Detroit Temple Number One. A skilled organizer and masterful orator, Malcolm X recruited new members in the bars, poolrooms, clubs, and street corners of Detroit. Within six months the membership of Temple Number One tripled.[44] Following this success, Malcolm X rapidly ascended the ranks, serving as Temple Minister in Philadelphia and New York. During his twelve years with the Nation of Islam Malcolm X evolved into a strong critic of white supremacy and racism. He would also emerge as a vocal critique of specific policies of the Civil Rights Movement, namely his percep-

tion that other African-American leaders tended to accommodate too readily within a white racist system.

The time spent in the Nation of Islam for Malcolm X, while important in his maturation as a community leader, was also limiting. Malcolm X grew increasingly frustrated with the insular nature of the Nation of Islam, and especially of Elijah Muhammad's instructions to keep the Nation of Islam out of the broader activities of the Civil Rights Movement. For a "radical" organization, the Nation of Islam was exceptionally conservative. The speeches and writings of ministers of the Nation of Islam, for example, during the time of its ascendancy in the early 1960s, were tightly controlled by Elijah Muhammad. For the most part, orations and publications consisted of delivering variations of the foundational mythic narrative of Yacub.[45] For Malcolm X, though, it was hypocritical for the Nation of Islam not to take a proactive stance on civil rights while many other African Americans were dying in the effort. These differences would eventually contribute to the breakup of Muhammad and Malcolm X.

The underlying causes leading to Malcolm X's split from the Nation of Islam are many, including intraorganizational jealousies and the revelations that Elijah Muhammad himself had violated the Nation's strict sexual codes by fathering children out-of-wedlock with different women of the Nation. Publicly, however, one event more than any other served as the catalyst. In December 1963, following a speech in New York at Manhattan Center, Malcolm X was asked to comment on the recent assassination of President John F. Kennedy. Elijah Muhammad had given strict orders that no member of the Nation of Islam would publicly comment on the assassination, except to express their sympathy. Malcolm X, however, set the context for his response by naming leaders in Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia who had been killed as a result of American covert intervention. And then Malcolm X said, "This [the assassination] is simply a case of chickens coming home to roost. Being an old farm boy myself, chickens coming home to roost never did make me sad; they've always made me glad."[46]

As the nation mourned the death of the president, Malcolm X articulated the interrelation of oppressive and violent world events.

Malcolm X, as Natambu identifies, had been the only national figure to speak out against America's central role, via the CIA, in the assassination of Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba in the Congo (see chapter 6); the only black leader to address the American public regarding the country's war in Vietnam; and the only black leader to openly criticize the Kennedy administration for bullying Fidel Castro and attempting to have him assassinated.[47]

Perhaps it was inevitable that Malcolm X would depart the Nation of Islam. No doubt, the increased activism of Malcolm X would not long remain tolerated within the rigid confines of Elijah Muhammad's organization. Whatever the reasons, Malcolm X's break from the Nation of Islam was crucial for his own maturation as an advocate of social justice. This is seen both in his rhetorical style, as well as his overall message.

Following his separation from the Nation of Islam, Malcolm X abdicated the "prophetic" relationship of a Black Muslim minister to his audience in favor of a more "prudent" role. As Robert Terrill concludes, a prophetic rhetoric was ill-suited to Malcolm X's understanding of his and his audience's situation and position.[48] Increasingly, Malcolm X disavowed his position as a religious leader and its implied authority; instead, Malcolm X assumed a more Socratic role, the persona of a teacher. In his "The Ballot or the Bullet" speech delivered on April 3, 1964, Malcolm X began "I would like to clarify something concerning myself. I'm still a Muslim, my religion is still Islam." He continued that "Although I'm still a Muslim, I'm not here tonight to discuss my religion. I'm not here to try and change your religion. I'm not here to argue or discuss anything that we differ about, because it's time for us to submerge our differences and realize that it is best for us to first see that we have the same problem...."[49]

In a press conference on March 8, 1964 Malcolm X declared his formal separation from the Nation of Islam. In so doing he announced the formation of his first organization: the Muslim Mosque, Inc. Soon after, he intimated his course of action for a progressive social movement. On March 12, in his "Declaration of Independence" speech, Malcolm X began: "Because 1964 threatens to be a very explosive year on the racial front, and because I myself intend

to be very active in every phase of the American Negro struggle for human rights, I have called this press conference this morning in order to clarify my own position in the struggle. ..."[50] This declaration solidified a position that would remain constant throughout the remaining eleven months of his life, namely the linkage of the Civil Rights Movement to the larger struggles of third world liberation and social justice (see chapter 7).

During his 1964 travels Malcolm X undertook the hajj, and gave numerous speeches and lectures at universities, cultural centers, and on radio and television. He also visited with various political leaders, including Tanzanian President Julius Nyerere, Kenyan President Jomo Kenyatta, Nigerian President Azikiwe, Ghanian President Kwame Nkrumah, and Ugandan Prime Minister Milton Obote. As Malcolm X explained in December 1964, "I've done a lot of traveling and, I think over all, travel does broaden one's soul."[51] More informative, Malcolm X explained that the understanding he received from his travels and his conversations with political leaders enabled him to "see the problems confronting Black people in America and the Western Hemisphere with much greater clarity."[52] These travels would greatly inform his later Pan-Africanist sentiments.

In a now-famous series of letters from abroad Malcolm X detailed his personal transformation during the hajj. Malcolm X wrote: "There were tens of thousands of pilgrims from all over the world. They were of all colors, from blue-eyed blonds to black-skinned Africans, but were all participating in the same ritual, displaying a spirit of unity and brotherhood that my experiences in America led me to believe could never exist between the white and the non-white."[53] Furthermore, Malcolm X wrote that "The experiences of this pilgrimage have taught me much, and each hour here in the Holy Land opens my eyes even more."[54]

The 1964 travels of Malcolm X, including his hajj, should be viewed through his evolving geopolitical philosophy. It was during the first trip of 1964 that Malcolm X appeared at the Summit of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) where he introduced a petition charging the United States with violating the rights of African Americans.[55] On his second trip he attempted to organize a coalition

to politically challenge the United States and the European states of Britain, France, and Portugal who had colonial governments in Africa, and also to gather support for his quest to bring the United States to trial to the United Nations on human rights abuses.

Apart from the context of Malcolm X's travels, the "place" of travel also must be modified. The transformative effects of Malcolm X's 1964 travels are not in dispute. However, these sojourns were not the first travels abroad for Malcolm X. In May 1959, for example, President Gamal Nasser invited Elijah Muhammad and his family to make the hajj and to visit Egypt as official state guests. However, both the United States Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) attempted to prevent Muhammad from receiving a passport (in 1951 similar tactics were used to prevent Paul Robeson and William L. Patterson from traveling). Owing to delays, and not wanting to waste this opportunity, Muhammad sent Malcolm X in his place. Malcolm X left on July 12, 1959 and visited Egypt, Iran, Syria, and Ghana. Malcolm X, though, is curiously silent in his autobiography regarding the 1959 trip. Likewise, other chroniclers of Malcolm X's life make little reference to this event.

Aside from travel, the exposure to an international perspective, as well as socialist ideology, also appears much earlier than many writers give credit. Indeed, Malcolm X was clearly aware of these ideologies prior to his 1964 trips. As early as 1959, for example, Malcolm X was referring to the 1955 Bandung Conference in his speeches (a subject I discuss more fully in chapter 7). Later, in his 1963 "Message to the Grass Roots" speech given while still a member of the Nation of Islam, Malcolm X explained:

> ...once you study what happened at the Bandung conference, and the results of the Bandung conference, it actually serves as a model for the same procedure you and I can use to get our problems solved. At Bandung all the nations came together, the dark nations from Africa and Asia. Some of them were Christians, some were Confucianists, some were atheists. Despite their religious differences, they came together. Some were communists, some were socialists, some where capitalists—despite their economic and political differences, they came together. All of them were black, brown, red or yellow.

> The number-one thing that was not allowed to attend the Bandung conference was the white man.[56]

During the late 1950s and early 1960s, well before his separation from the Nation and his travels of 1964, Malcolm X learned from the third world revolutionary movements of Algeria, Cuba, Kenya, and Vietnam, among others. In 1960, furthermore, Malcolm X met with Fidel Castro in New York. Malcolm X also spoke of human rights while a member of the Nation of Islam. At the University of California, Berkeley, on October 11, 1963, Malcolm X explained that there were "Twenty million so-called Negroes, second-class citizens, seeking nothing but human dignity and human rights, the right to life in dignity as a human being."[57]

What is the difference between the travel experiences of 1959, of which virtually nothing is said, and the travels of 1964, which are described as epiphanies? A partial answer must be that Malcolm X underwent a personal liberation after his separation from the Nation of Islam. For anyone who was a member of the Nation, Peter Goldman explains, doubt was not permissible; rebellion was unimaginable.[58]As Goldman further writes, the Malcolm X of 1959, despite his travels, refused to acknowledge the contradictions between the Nation of Islam and orthodox Islam. Malcolm X, prior to 1964, for example, would lecture to light-skinned Arab Muslims on the blackness of God and why it was necessary and proper that the world's least color-conscious religion maintain a black-only communion. To Goldman, Malcolm X simply rejected the evidence of his senses.[59] The experience of travel, in the development of Malcolm X's thought, is thus more a philosophical distancing from the rhetoric of Elijah Muhammad. In 1959 Malcolm X traveled as a spokesperson for the Nation; five years later Malcolm X traveled for himself. Indeed, it was following his hajj that Malcolm X assumed his orthodox Muslim name, Al-Hajj Malik Al-Shabazz, thus symbolically signifying his transformation.

Prior to 1964 Malcolm X largely reduced his analysis of the exploitation and oppression of African Americans to the racist and sexist doctrine of the Nation of Islam. In his 1963 "Grass Roots" speech, for example, Malcolm X explained his understanding of the meeting of

the colonized states at Bandung: "When they came to the Bandung conference, they looked at the Portuguese, and at the Frenchmen, and at the Englishmen, and at the Dutchmen, and learned or realized the one thing that all of them had in common—they were all from Europe, they were all Europeans, blond, blue-eyed and white skins."[60]

But following his pilgrimage and his travels, Malcolm X reinterpreted the causes of oppression among third world peoples. The enemy for Malcolm X was no longer reducible to skin color, but rather was a synthesis of structures, including racism, capitalism, colonialism, and sexism. In his speech of December 20, 1964, thus, Malcolm X described how the European countries exploited Africans; how the industrialization of Europe came at the expense of Africa—through resource exploitation, slavery, forced labor, and captive markets. He then drew a connection between these forms of colonial oppression and exploitation with the continued discrimination of African Americans. "You can't understand what is going on in Mississippi," he told his audience, "if you don't understand what is going on in the Congo."[61] Rather than parroting the Nation of Islam's racial-based doctrine, Malcolm X rearticulated an argument predicated on the globalization of capital under the guises of colonialism and neocolonialism. As detailed in subsequent chapters, Malcolm X argued that social justice for African Americans would never be achieved while racist power structures controlled the global economy.

The travels of Malcolm X also significantly influenced his thinking on women within the Black Revolution. In his early speeches and writings, while still a member of the Nation, Malcolm X "evoked what might be called a 'benevolent' patriarchy in which the patriarchal father/ruler would assume full responsibility for caring for his family."[62] In his speech of October 11, 1963, for example, Malcolm X decried the condition of black women and children in America: "Because our children grow up in this overcrowded atmosphere, the lack of much-needed privacy destroys their sense of shame. It lowers their moral standards and leaves them exposed to every form of indecency and vice imaginable. Our young girls, our daughters, our baby sisters become unwed mothers before they are hardly out of their teens....And our community has tens of thousands of little

babies who have no father to act as their provider or protector."[63] Tellingly, in an apparently autobiographical statement, Malcolm X concluded that "the only provider many of our children know is the white welfare agent or the white social worker," the implication being that the provider should be the black man.[64]

The speeches and writings of Malcolm X while he was a member of the Nation were laden with misogynist statements suggesting that the current negative condition of African-American men was predicated on the "evils" of women. As bell hooks writes, "Malcolm was obsessed with the notion of emasculation and concerned that black men assert control over their lives and the lives of others."[65] In his autobiography, for example, Malcolm X discussed his views on women while he was a member of the Nation. Reminiscent of Adam's fall from grace in the Garden of Eden, Malcolm X asserted that women were "tricky, deceitful, untrustworthy flesh" and he "had seen too many men ruined, or at least tied down, or in some other way messed up by women."[66]

Once separated from the Nation of Islam Malcolm X began to reconsider the role of women both in revolutionary movements and within the community. James Cone writes that "Following his split with the Nation of Islam and his subsequent trips to the Middle East and Africa, Malcolm made an about-face regarding his view on women's rights, as he began to consider the issue not only in the context of religion and morality, but, more importantly, from the standpoint of mobilizing the forces needed to revolutionize society."[67] hooks concurs, noting that "It was Malcolm's break with the patriarchal father embodied in Elijah Muhammad that created the social space for him to transform his thinking about gender."[68] Nevertheless, Malcolm X did not, in the last eleven months of his life, provide an explicit theoretical understanding of gender and the Civil Rights Movement. As such, Malcolm X continued to cast the movement in masculine terms.

Conclusions

Bobby Wilson writes that "to incorporate black identity politics into...frameworks of analysis, we must begin from the standpoint

of race-connected practices in the lives of people, the particularity of the person, the body, how these concrete practices produced and reproduced themselves over time and space—how they, in fact, shaped and reshaped the world of both black and white bodies in actual praxis."[69] Malcolm X was, literally and figuratively, a product of his times. But this does not negate his importance for contemporary society. In her foreword to Malcolm X's autobiography, Attallah Shabazz, Malcolm's eldest daughter, writes: "Some have said that my father was ahead of his time, but the truth is he was on time and perhaps we were late." Geographers may be late in acknowledging the contributions of Malcolm X on the theory and praxis of space and social justice. But, as Malcolm X himself explained in 1965, "anything that is done for us, has to be done by us."[70]

In the chapters that follow I present a series of geographic engagements with Malcolm X. My intention is not to substantiate his claims, but rather to open the dialogue of space and social justice to include heretofore excluded voices. My goal is to establish Malcolm X as a serious scholar on geographical issues, one deserving the recognition and critical examination afforded other social theorists by geographers.

3
Contesting Geographic Knowledges

The supposed neutrality of geographic knowledges has been at best proven to be a beguiling fiction and at worst a downright fraud.
—**David Harvey**[1]

"...Caucasoid, Mongoloid, and Negroid—there's no such thing": So argued Malcolm X in a speech delivered on January 24, 1965, just four weeks prior to his assassination. He continued: "These are so-called anthropological terms that were put together by anthropologists who were nothing but agents of the colonial powers, and they were purposefully given that status, they were purposely given such scientific positions, in order that they could come up with definitions that would justify the European domination over the Africans and the Asians."[2] In this statement, Malcolm X argued against the classification of races; he vociferously contested the (still) taken-for-granted racial hierarchies prevalent in the social sciences. This is seen, for example, in his critique of racial terms, such as *Negro*. He argued, for example, that "Negroes" do not exist outside of America's geographical imaginations, for they are a construct of American racial ideologies. Malcolm X elaborated that "The Black man's history—when you refer to him as the Black man you go way back, but when you refer to him as a Negro, you can only go as far back as the Negro goes. And

when you go beyond the shores of America you can't find a Negro. So if you go beyond the shores of America in history, looking for the history of the Black man, and you're looking for him under the term *Negro*, you won't find him. He doesn't exist."[3]

The contributions of black radical intellectuals to geographic thought remain mostly neglected. This is consonant with a broader neglect in situating the contributions of African Americans to both political thought and social theory. And yet, as Michael Dawson writes, "Over the centuries black activists, elites, and intellectuals have forged ... visions of freedom into black political ideologies which offer both a more or less consistent vision of freedom and a roadmap for the journey to freedom."[4] The thoughts of Malcolm X, in particular, have been missing from most discussions. Minimal research on Malcolm X attempts to relate his political thought to radical practice geared toward social transformation and human liberation. This lacuna exists, despite the fact that Malcolm X was the second-most sought after speaker on college campuses across the United States and around the world, including Oxford University, the London School of Economics, and the University of Ghana.

The neglect of Malcolm X is not simply an oversight. Rather, his absence in the discussions of social justice, politics, and geography is related to the messages that Malcolm X forwarded. Specifically, Malcolm X critiqued the existence of institutional racism, both within educational systems and the media. During his life, and after his death, Malcolm X was and is marginalized by a conservative element that ignores the radical challenges he posed. Indeed, even the continued deification of Malcolm X precludes serious discussion of his contributions to Civil Rights and social justice.

In this chapter I focus on the contributions of Malcolm X to the contestation of education and, especially, his critique of the production of geographic knowledge. On the one hand, geographical knowledge may be understood as that information purported to explain, describe, and interpret the distributions and characteristics of peoples and places. This is a fairly standard approach to Geography: the writing of peoples and places. On the other hand, geographical knowledge may also be understood to encompass a normative dimension in that

it prescribes *where* peoples are to be located. This is consonant, for example, with a more critical understanding of geography, one that takes seriously the claim that social struggles, manifest spatially, are crucial to the structuring and shaping of oppression and exploitation. In this way, education is inseparable from larger concerns of social justice. Historically, education for African Americans, including both access to education as well as the content of education, has been contested. In this chapter I maintain that these contestations are doubly manifest in the production of geographic knowledges *about* African Americans and also the knowledge *available* to African Americans. As designed by various "white architects" of black education, knowledge about Africans, African Americans, and Africa often served to legitimate the institution of slavery. More pointedly, though, education—and particularly that of industrial education as forwarded by the Hampton Institute (see below)—served to recast African Americans into a docile, subservient, slavelike position.

The Production of Geographic Knowledges

Educational policies were crucial to the maintenance and rationalization of slavery in the antebellum United States, as well as in the segregated landscapes following emancipation. In both periods, the geographic knowledge *about* African Americans, as well as Africa and Africans, often reflected white supremacy. Indeed, this function of education—to articulate and justify a racist order—increased in significance during the Reconstruction period. As Leon Litwack writes, what underlay the movement for black education among some whites was clearly the pressing need to inculcate a new generation of blacks with proper moral and religious values.[5]

Crucially, debates over the content of postemancipation black education, and particularly the representation of African Americans and of slavery, coincided with the apex of Western imperialism. Between 1860 and the start of World War I, much of Asia and Africa was occupied, and the profits from colonialism, the value of capital accumulated in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, along with the riches flowing from the newly settled areas of European settlement, expanded enormously.[6] Prior to 1884, for example, over

80% of the African continent was under indigenous control; within decades, though, virtually all of the continent came under European domination. In Asia, likewise, Britain was consolidating its control, especially in China, Malaya, and Burma; France was in the process of colonizing Indochina—the present-day states of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.

These were the years of exploration and observation, classification and conquest, as "scientists" sought to make sense (and order) of the world they "discovered." The nineteenth century especially was the age of scientific exploration and the production of geographic knowledge. Most of what was learned about non-Europeans came from these sources: colonial administrators, travelers, military personnel, scientists, missionaries. James Blaut argues that geographic knowledge "constructed from this information—and this includes the great bulk of nineteenth-century anthropological, geographic, and politico-economic theories about non-Europeans—is systematically distorted."[7] In particular, scientists and researchers were often most intent on substantiating pregiven racial hierarchies and supremacist beliefs of nationality. However, as David Livingstone writes, there is a danger of too narrowly typecasting both geography and imperialism, perceiving geography just as the scientific underwriter of overseas exploitation. It is necessary, therefore, to more concretely consider the practices that followed the ideas.[8]

This was also the period during which many geographical societies were founded, and it was often through the efforts of geographers that specific knowledges of distant people and places were produced. The American Geographical and Statistical Society (later shortened to the American Geographical Society [AGS]) was founded in New York between 1851 and 1852. Initiated by the concerns of philanthropists, the objectives of the AGS were to provide a source of geographical and statistical information about parts of the United States that were not well known, and also about foreign areas where American merchants were transacting business.[9] In 1888 the Washington, DC-based National Geographic Society was formed, and in 1904 a third, and more scholarly association, was founded: the Association of American Geographers.

Such was the context from which the contestation over African-American education emerged. Scholastically the histories and geographies to which *all* children were exposed in the classroom and the primers made a virtual gospel of the superiority of Anglo-Saxon institutions and ways of thinking and acting. Keith Johnston's 1896 text, for example, *A Physical, Historical, Political, and Descriptive Geography,* explained that "throughout the many classifications of the varieties of the human family in the different schools of ethnology, there is a general agreement in recognizing the peoples of the most highly-developed nations of the world...as belonging for the most part to one group. This is called the Aryan or Indo-European family of nations...." The book continues that "Increasing ever in civilisation and intellectual power from age to age, this group has become the dominant one in the world, extending its influence to every part of the earth, supplanting many inferior races, and re-peopling wide areas, as in America and Australia."[10] Education provided, essentially, a sanitized history of Anglo-Saxons and northern Europeans: Pilgrims, Puritans, and Founding Fathers.[11]

With respect to questions of Africans and people of African descent, geographers (among others) expounded and elaborated on existent racial hierarchies. As explained in another geography text, written in 1870, the "white or Caucasian race is superior to all" whereas "blacks in Africa...and the Indians...in North and South America...are savages."[12] Johnston's text likewise reaffirmed the supposed natural, and scientifically derived, hierarchy of races. "Negroes," as described by Johnston, are native to Central Africa and "are marked generally by their black wooly hair, protruding lips, and flattened nose; they are fond of ornament, and, above all, of dancing; they live for the moment, and are careless and improvident, passing quickly from one mood to another, from the most exuberant joy to melancholy or anger."[13]

Apart from the content of education—such as the geographical knowledge of persons of African descent—educational policies also address the dissemination of information. Were whites and blacks, for example, to receive *identical* educations? Or were they

to be accorded a different set of objectives vis-a-vis education? As W.E.B. Du Bois explained during a 1930 commencement address at Howard University:

> It was ever the new and age-young problem of youth — a black man who was not born in slavery. What was he to become? Whither was his face set? How should he be trained and educated? His fathers were slaves, for the most part, ignorant and poverty-stricken; emancipated in the main without land, tools, nor capital—the sport of war, the despair of economists, the grave perplexity of science. Their children had been born in the midst of controversy, of internecine hatred, and in all the economic dislocation that follows war and civil war. In a peculiar way and under circumstances seldom duplicated, the whole program of popular education become epitomized in the case of these young black folk.[14]

In short, the education of African Americans specifically was predicated on a question of *whom* the African American was and would become, and, crucially, where the African American would be placed.

The Power of Knowledge

Knowledge about any given object, and especially the production of that knowledge, is crucial to political practice. In the numerous writings of Michel Foucault, knowledge assumes a central place. Indeed, a dominant motif of Foucault's work was to provide a critique of the way modern societies control and discipline their populations by sanctioning the knowledge claims and practices of the human sciences.[15]

For Foucault, knowledge is inseparable from power. Foucault writes that power and knowledge directly imply one another; there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations.[16] Power as conceived by Foucault is exercised rather than possessed. He writes: "Power must be analysed as something which circulates, or rather as something which only functions in the form of a chain. It is never localised here

or there, never in anybody's hands, never appropriated as a commodity or piece of wealth."[17] Later, in his *History of Sexuality* (Vol., 1), Foucault explains that power is not something that is acquired, seized, or shared; relations of power are not in a position of exteriority with respect to other types of relationships (e.g., economic processes); there is no binary and all-encompassing opposition between rulers and ruled at the root of power relations; there is no power that is exercised without a series of aims and objectives; and where there is power, there is resistance, and this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power.[18]

Foucault maintains that discipline is a form of power, "a modality for its exercise, comprising a whole set of instruments, techniques, procedures, levels of applications."[19] Moreover, discipline may be appropriated by various institutions, such as prisons, schools, and the military. Foucault, however, also counters the traditional notion that power as manifest in discipline is a purely negative process, of one individual or institution exerting hegemony over another. Power, even within disciplining practices, is always diffuse. Discipline, in the words of Foucault, produces subjected and practiced bodies.[20] Disciplinary techniques are used for specific purposes by specific institutions. In short, "It might be said that the disciplines are techniques for assuring the ordering of human multiplicities."[21]

From a Foucauldian standpoint, it is the body that is the object of knowledge and the target for disciplinary practices. Captured in the term *biopower*, Foucault considered at length the governmental regulation of populations and the concomitant production of knowledge of those populations. Foucault argued that this notion of biopower is crucial in the incorporation of labor in that it constitutes "an indispensable element in the development of capital; the latter would not have been possible without the controlled insertion of bodies into the machinery of production and the adjustment of the phenomenon of population to economic processes."[22] Education, in its broadest usage, assumes a crucial role in both the discipline *of* geography and a discipline *through* geography. Foucault introduced the concept of a microphysics of power, one which presupposes that the power exercised on the body is conceived not as a property, but as a strategy,

that its effects of domination are attributed not to appropriation but to dispositions, maneuvers, tactics, and techniques.[23] Education performs a political economy of the body. As Foucault writes:

> the body is...directly in a political field; power relations have an immediate hold upon it; they invest it, mark it, train it, torture it, force it to carry out tasks, to perform ceremonies, to emit signs. This political investment of the body is bound up in accordance with complex reciprocal relations, with its economic use; it is largely as a force of production that the body is invested with relations of power and domination; but, on the other hand, its constitution as labour power is possible only if it is caught up in a system of subjection ...the body becomes a useful force only if it is both a productive body and a subjected body.[24]

This is seen clearly in Foucault's discussion of "subjected and practised" bodies. He elaborates:

> Discipline increases the forces of the body (in economic terms of utility) and diminishes these same forces (in political terms of obedience). In short, it dissociates power from the body; on the one hand, it turns it into an "aptitude," a "capacity," which it seeks to increase; on the other hand, it reverses the course of the energy, the power that might result from it, and turns it into a relation of strict subjection. If economic exploitation separates the force and the product of labour, let us say that disciplinary coercion establishes in the body the constricting link between an increased aptitude and an increase domination.[25]

Foucault asks: "What mode of investment of the body is necessary and adequate for the functioning of a capitalist society?" In other words, how was education to be utilized to facilitate a reconstructed slavery under the guise of wage labor? It was precisely this question that the architects of African-American education asked. The problem for many whites came down to perceptions of the effects of black schooling in a society that depended on blacks to perform most of its menial tasks.[26] As William Watkins affirms, the education of African Americans has always been inextricably connected to state politics and the labor market.[27]

The Discipline of Education

The post-Reconstruction period was characterized by the continued rationalization and justification of slavery—an emergent ideology predicated on re-creating "black spaces." George Fredrickson maintains that, "Once freed, the black population of the South constituted a new element that had to be incorporated somehow into the American social and political structure."[28] Simply put, as the title of Jeffrey Hummel's 1996 book suggests, it was a process of *Emancipating Slaves, Enslaving Free Men*.[29] This required the construction of new spaces for blacks, spaces that were enforced commonly by legalities and often by violence. Specific knowledges of blacks, and of the consequences of emancipated blacks, were produced. The comments of George T. Winston, President of the College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts in North Carolina at the turn of the twentieth century, are instructive.[30] In a paper published in 1901 Winston waxes nostalgic about the days of slavery and how he spent time playing with "Negro" children. He writes, "[A]lways in my childhood memories, especially in happy memories, I find associated together my mother, my home, and the Negro slaves." Winston further discusses the respect he saw between blacks and whites during slavery. In reference to blacks, Winston writes, "it was always 'Uncle Tom' or 'Aunt Susan.'"[31] To Winston, this informality and familiarity was not a cause of social death but an indication of white society's acceptance of blacks.

This attitude, characteristic of many authors during the post-Reconstruction period, accompanied the retrospective justification of slavery as a form of social welfare for blacks. Slavery was seen as a contributing to the genetic betterment of the black race, a viewpoint often reflecting a misappropriation of Darwinian thought and the progress of natural selection. Winston suggests that slavery "transformed the Negro so quickly from a savage to a civilized man."[32]

H.E.A. Belin concurs, writing in 1908 that "Slavery, so far from degrading the Negro, has actually elevated him industrially, mentally, and morally, the term of his involuntary tutelage [slavery] to the white race raising him to a vastly higher level than that ever occupied by his kinsmen in Africa."[33]

Supposedly, the abolition of slavery curtailed this evolutionary improvement. Winston notes that at the time of his writing, unlike in the days of his youth, the "familiar salutation of 'Uncle' or 'Auntie' is no longer heard."[34] The black had overstepped his bounds and no longer knew his place. Moreover, the black was retrogressing to his natural, uncivilized condition. Belin describes the transformation as "frenzied," noting that blacks who "but one brief hour before, were laughing, chattering, peaceable members of the community, are subject at any moment to be converted by some trivial occurrence into fierce, howling, blood-thirsty savages."[35] Indeed, Belin provides a veiled defense of slavery and, implicitly, lynching when he writes, "With the overwhelming disparity of numbers in favor of the Blacks, the white population was in sheer self-defense ...compelled to exercise a vigilant control over the excitable semi-barbarous."[36] Senator Ben "Pitchfork" Tillman of South Carolina was more direct: in his defense of the federal quiescence regarding violence perpetrated against blacks, Tillman argued that blacks had deteriorated since slavery and needed to be frightened into submission.[37] In short, through education (or other means), blacks must be taught their proper place in white America.

The history to which black children were exposed in the classroom and the primers made a virtual gospel of the superiority of Anglo-Saxon institutions and ways of thinking and acting. They imbibed the same lessons taught in the white schools. It was not their history, nor had it much relevance to their lives or to the lives of their parents and neighbors. What little they learned of their own history consisted often of disparaging caricatures of black people as the least civilized of the races—irresponsible, thoughtless, foolish, childlike people, satisfied with their lowly place in American life, incapable of self-control and self-direction.[38] As Litwack concludes, the history of black people was a history of submission gladly endured and of services faithfully rendered.[39] The geography of black people was of knowing one's place—literally and symbolically—and not transgressing those spaces.

With few exceptions, following emancipation, what the black child learned in school was expected to underscore a moral, productive,

and accommodative life.[40] This is seen in three major "architects" of Black education: Samuel Armstrong, Booker T. Washington, and Thomas Jesse Jones. Born on the island of Maui in the Hawaiian Islands, Armstrong was the son of missionaries. In his adult life, he would become a missionary, solider, educator, and college president. Most significant, however, Armstrong was the founder of the Hampton Institute and the mentor of Booker T. Washington. It was the Hampton Institute that, as a pedagogical model, predominantly influenced black education for much of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Although an abolitionist, Armstrong believed firmly in white superiority. He believed, for example, that African Americans were immoral, inferior, and destitute of ambition. Perhaps indicative of a missionary zeal, he also felt that it was his duty to perform God's work, and, in the process, to combine humanitarianism with patriotism. During and after the American Civil War, Armstrong associated with blacks in various capacities. While on military duty, for example, Armstrong supervised black soldiers; later, he worked in the Freedman's Bureau. It was during his time at the Freedman's Bureau, especially, that Armstrong articulated his ideas regarding the place of emancipated blacks.

Although Armstrong fervently believed in the inferiority of blacks, he also did not deny that blacks would occupy a permanent place in the socioeconomic life of the United States.[41] That place, though, was rooted in the South in the form of cheap labor. With regard to the various separatist movements, for example, and the Exodus of African Americans to the West (see chapter 4), Armstrong cautioned blacks about venturing into uncertainty.[42] These attitudes reflect less an altruism toward African Americans than a concern over the viability and prosperity of the southern states. Armstrong wrote in 1881:

> Some of the Negroes are leaving the South, not because they are oppressed or outraged, but because they are anxious to better their condition. He is told that he can do better in the North, or East, or West than at home; and, being of a trusting, confiding nature, easily led and easily influenced, he believes the representations that are made to him. But, except in some rare instances, there is

> no oppression of the black man in the South today. He is paid fair wages, and he has all the work he cares to do. His work, however, is altogether in the field.[43]

For Armstrong, African Americans were best located in the South; their needs would be met beyond (from his point of view) expectations, and the overall environment was amenable. It was only through false representations, perhaps the orations of blacks who did not "know their place" that was the source of tension.

Armstrong believed that providing accommodationist-style education to the African American was key to resolving the larger racial, social, and political problems of the time.[44] Through the assistance of the American Missionary Association, Armstrong arranged to obtain property along the Hampton River in Virginia. This was to be the site of Armstrong's vision, the Hampton Institute. Opened on April 1, 1868, the institute was a manual labor school. As described by Watkins, the institute would provide badly needed teachers for a mostly illiterate, alienated, and displaced black population; it would provide training in character building, morality, and religion to "civilize" the "childlike" and "impetuous" Negro. Moreover, a particular narrative of African Americans was produced. This entailed a retrospective on slavery that was aimed at defusing anger by presenting slavery as an unfortunate episode or an aberration.[45] Pedagogically, Armstrong believed that African Americans had the intellectual capacity to learn, but what was required was not "book learning" but instead knowledge of industry, self-restraint, and decency.[46]

The Hampton Institute, in effect, operated to produce docile African-American bodies who "knew their place" and yet, in the process, were able to contribute to the economic functioning of American society. At Hampton, for example, students took lessons, practiced military-style drills, and learned such basic trade skills as laundry work and domestic service for the girls and proper farming techniques for the boys.[47] Regarding cheap labor, Armstrong wrote in 1878 that:

> There is no source whatever of a suitable supply in lieu of Negro labor. The large, low swampy, malarial, but highly productive area of the South would become almost a desert without it. The successful

> Southern farmer knows that he has the best labor in the world. The Negro is important to the country's prosperity.[48]

Blacks were to be free, but not too free; they were to remain subservient to the economic and political interests of whites. Armstrong's vision therefore was to provide a manual labor school, to provide training in character building, morality, and religion to "civilize" African Americans.[49]

Booker T. Washington was Hampton's prize student. He later became a major educator, albeit one who remains contested in the writings of African-American history. Washington has been labeled an accommodationist, and is discussed in opposition to other educators, such as DuBois. Washington did embrace the Hampton ideal, and he did encourage the attitude of self-help fostered by the Hampton Institute. In particular, Washington believed that Armstrong's views on discipline, orderliness, and character building for African Americans were desirable.[50] However, as will be seen in later sections, the ideas of Washington were too complex to be reduced to one of accommodationism.

Born into slavery in Franklin County, Virginia, Booker Taliaferro Washington developed into an influential educator and spokesperson for African Americans. In his autobiography *Up From Slavery* Washington described his early experiences of living and working on a plantation. He learned the alphabet on his own, and later he found time in between his labors in the salt mines to attend night classes. Later, while working as a "houseboy" for a wealthy white lady—Viola Ruffner—Washington was encouraged in his schoolwork. Ruffner, for example, permitted him to take an hour from his work to attend classes; she also lent him books from her personal library.[51]

Washington eventually was able to enter Hampton Institute, where he stayed for three years until his graduation in 1875. Armstrong invited Washington to teach night school. In 1881 Armstrong was asked by the Alabama State Education Commission to recommend a qualified *white* man to be principal of a new normal school for blacks in Tuskegee. Armstrong, however, recommended Washington.

When Washington arrived in Tuskegee, he found that no resources had been provided. Accordingly, Washington arranged for

the students themselves to construct the buildings, produce and cook foods, and perform other required tasks. Throughout his efforts, Washington related education to life, reflecting the American dream of self-determination. The controversial aspect hinges, in part, on interactions with whites, and the "place" of African Americans in American society. Washington, for example, believed that Southern whites had to be convinced that the education of blacks was in the best interest of the South.[52]

Through industrial training at Tuskegee, black youths would not only acquire skills as bricklayers, blacksmiths, and printers; they would also acquire middle-class virtues: thrift, cleanliness, work, and self-help. At the same time, the educational experience at Tuskegee taught young blacks to curb their ambitions and aspirations, and to adapt themselves to the limitations placed on them.[53] Washington became the apostle of a form of industrial education that would not antagonize the white South and, concurrently, carve out a place of service for blacks in their communities.[54]

Washington did not publicly stress or promote political or civil rights for African Americans. On this score, therefore, Washington is portrayed as an accommodationist—one who capitulated to the white racist society. However, as John Franklin and others identify, Washington also privately financed some of the earliest court cases against segregation and, away from the public spotlight, fought lynching, disenfranchisement, peonage, and educational discrimination. It appears, therefore, that Washington attempted to work within a racist system, effecting change without raising questions from his white supporters.

Thomas Jesse Jones, born in Wales, immigrated to the United States with his widowed mother and siblings in 1884. As a teenager Jones enrolled in Washington and Lee University in Virginia and, later, Marietta College in Ohio; each time as a result of a ministerial scholarship. Later, Jones took classes simultaneously in graduate social science at Columbia University and religious studies at the Union Theological Seminary. As Watkins summarizes,

> Jones was serious about his studies and came under the influence of the sociology professors interested in applying Christian and

> religious teachings to current social problems....Geographical displacement, labor relations, race relations, and immigrant exclusion were foremost.[55]

As reflected in his master's thesis, entitled *Social Education in the Elementary School*, Jones was increasingly interested in how schooling could and should contribute to the social development of (especially) disadvantaged populations. Throughout his career, Jones put these ideas into practice. In 1902 Jones accepted an appointment as associate chaplain and professor at the Hampton Institute. There, he taught social science classes and contributed articles for the institute's journal, the *Southern Workman*. Jones also authored the *Hampton Social Studies*, a manuscript which became the primer for African-American education. According to Watkins, the primer, intended as a classroom curriculum, taught African Americans their place in a society in transition from agricultural slavery to mechanical industrialization; it addressed the question of how blacks should fit into the new social order without disruption.[56]

Armstrong, Jones, and Washington all stressed industrial education, character training, and social evolution. Their task was one of social engineering, as education was viewed as a civilizing mission. Armstrong and Jones, specifically, developed policies and curricula that reinforced white supremacy and of defining and maintaining acceptable spaces for African Americans as providers of cheap, docile, and largely manual labor. Education in this manner functioned as a microphysics of power. The "bodies" of African Americans were to be subjugated as a means of civilization, but more so to serve as productive laboring bodies. Education was not a tool for personal self-fulfillment, but rather as a means to produce a reserve of exploitable labor. Indeed, Baldwin stated bluntly that "Educating southern Negroes was not a matter of humanitarianism or altruism, but rather of social order and commerce."[57]

The Lessons of Malcolm X

For many educators and policy makers schooling became a tool for disciplining African Americans. However, this disciplining did not

go unchallenged. As Litwack finds, although often hedged by cautious administrators, some black teachers endeavored to redeem the black past even as they projected hope about the future.[58] African Americans did not simply acquiesce to the production of knowledge, nor to the construction of educational policies. Rather, challenges to educational systems and curricula were made: all in an attempt to remake the histories and geographies of peoples of African descent. And it is along this path, pioneered by individuals such as W.E.B. DuBois, Carter Woodson, and Mary McLeod Bethune that Malcolm X is to be understood.

Both DuBois and Woodson, for example, were each vociferous opponents of accommodationism, the Hampton Institute, and especially men like Jones. The "body" and the "mind" of African Americans became issues of contestation. Indeed, DuBois argued that "Before men thought or greatly cared, in the midst of the very blood and dust of battle, an educational system for the freedmen had been begun...."[59] In defiance of white supremacy, portraits and pamphlets of the lives and exploits of black leaders like Frederick Douglass were sold within African-American communities.[60] Also, blacks and black educators fashioned their own narratives and attempted to redeem the black past. For many African-American teachers and reformers, to redeem their history was to get beyond their slave past and to discover their cultural roots.[61] But for some, such as Malcolm X, "getting beyond" did not entail *forgetting*. Lessons were to be learned from the experiences of slavery and emancipation, morals were to be drawn from historical analogies, such as "field slaves" and "house slaves."

Cornel West writes that Malcolm had a great love for black people; his love was a concrete connection with a degraded and devalued people in need of psychic conversion.[62] This is why Malcolm X's articulation of black rage was not directed first and foremost at white America. Rather, Malcolm X believed that if black people felt the love that motivated that rage, the love would produce a psychic conversion in black people; they would affirm themselves as human beings, no longer view their bodies, minds, and souls through white lenses, and believe themselves capable of taking control of their own destinies.[63] I would also suggest that this conversion was also spatial,

founded on a belief that African Americans should take control of their own spaces, and counter the negative images associated with "slums" and "ghettos" (see chapter 4).

Malcolm X argued that education was politically controlled and socially disciplining. He spoke at length that the production of geographic knowledge served to instill in African Americans a sense of inferiority. His words echoed those of Carter Woodson who wrote: "If you can control a man's thinking you do not have to worry about his action....If you make a man feel he's inferior, you do not have to compel him to accept an inferior status, for he will seek it himself." Woodson was influential in his criticism of African-American educational policies, identifying how knowledge was used to subjugate African Americans:

> ...if by the teaching of history the white man could be further assured of his superiority and the Negro could be made to feel that he had always been a failure and that the subjection of his will to some other race is necessary the freedman, then would still be a slave.[64]

Malcolm X contested the production and dissemination of geographic knowledge. Aware of the political economy of the body, of "scientific" observations and "statistical" truths that were used to subjugate African Americans, Malcolm X addressed the physical and psychological segregation that resulted from assimilating into the oppressor's system. It is this understanding of geographic knowledge, I contend, that buttressed his arguments for separation as opposed to integration (chapter 4) and provided the keystone to Malcolm X's differentiation of black revolution and Negro revolution (chapter 5). In a speech delivered at the London School of Economics on February 11, 1965, for example, Malcolm X explained that "[We would]...hate the shape of our nose. We would hate the shape of our lips. We would hate the color of our skin and the texture of our hair. This was a reaction, but we didn't realize that it was a reaction."[65]

Malcolm X identified that these negativities of the black body were imbricated with colonial practices. Malcolm X, for example, argued that "Having complete control over Africa, the colonial powers of Europe projected the image of Africa negatively. They always

project Africans in a negative light: jungle savages, cannibals, nothing civilized."[66] He continued: "Why then naturally it was so negative that it was negative to you and me, and you and I began to hate it. We didn't want anybody telling us anything about Africa, much less calling us Africans."[67]

The production of geographical knowledge, from Malcolm X's perspective, operates at a psychological level. In effect, *geographical knowledge may engender a crisis in identity.* This crisis emerges from the way in which the Western powers constructed the image of Africa and Africans. Malcolm X argued that:

> By skillfully making us hate Africa and, in turn, making us hate ourselves, hate our color and our blood, our color became a chain. Our color became to us a chain. It became a prison. It became something that was a shame, something that we felt held us back, kept us trapped....As long as we hated our African blood, our African skin, our Africanness, we ended up feeling inferior, we felt inadequate, and we felt helpless.[68]

The spatial imagery in Malcolm X's assessment is readily apparent. Reminiscent of Frantz Fanon's rhetorical question—"Where am I to be classified? or, if you prefer, tucked away?"[69]—Malcolm X recognized that the production of geographical knowledge was more than a simple description of observable physical features or the areal differentiation of facts; geographical knowledge, rather, served a disciplinary function. This disciplinary technique was employed to keep people in "place" both physically (e.g., segregated spaces) and psychologically (e.g., knowing one's place).

Confronted with negative representations, African Americans faced a limited number of possibilities. On the one hand, African Americans could indeed attempt to assimilate or acculturate into mainstream society. Arguing from a third world colonial context, Fanon, for example, wrote that, "He becomes white as he renounces his blackness, his jungle."[70] In other words, by refusing the negative representation, and adopting the externally constructed mask of the colonizer, the colonized could perhaps find a place in the dominant society. However, both Fanon and Malcolm X maintained that this "dream" of acculturation was impossible. In his London School of

Economics speech, Malcolm X explained that "The Black man in the Western Hemisphere....they don't want to accept their origin, they have no origin, they have no identity. They are running around here in search of an identity and instead of trying to be what they are, they want to be Englishmen." He continued, "In America our people are trying to be Americans, and in the islands you got them trying to be Englishmen, and nothing sounds more obnoxious than to find somebody from Jamaica running around here trying to outdo the Englishman with his Englishness."[71]

Another possibility forwarded, but never advocated, by Malcolm X was to embrace the identity that the dominant society had forged for the marginalized group. This would necessitate the adoption—social scientists use the terms *acculturation* or *assimilation*—of the oppressor's language and geographic knowledge. Malcolm X, however, explained that "since the white man, your friend, took your language away from you during slavery, the only language you know is his language."[72] Moreover, Malcolm X stressed that the adoption of the oppressor's language would lead to a disembodied existence.

Carter Woodson wrote that, "While being a good American, he [the African American] must above all things be a 'good Negro'; and to perform this definite function he must learn to stay in a 'Negro's place'."[73] This statement highlights the interconnections of power, knowledge, and geography within the context of African-American thought. These concerns resonate with the theoretical insights of Foucault who argues that "the body is directly involved in a political field." The production of knowledge about Africa, Africans, and African Americans was constituted in such a way as to produce docile, subjugated bodies that "knew their place" in a racist society. Foucault, however, also argues that one is never entirely subjugated. Indeed, the very fact that disciplinary practices need be imposed suggests the presence of resistance movements.

Malcolm X's deconstruction of the term *Negro* is crucial for understanding his contestation of geographic knowledges. He began his critique with the observation that "One of the main reasons we are called Negro is so we won't know who we really are."[74] This education of ignorance, Malcolm X explained, was rooted in the "making" of

slaves. "The slave maker," Malcolm X said, "knew that he couldn't make these people slaves until he first made them dumb. And one of the best ways to make a man dumb is to take his tongue, take his language."[75]

Malcolm X emphasized the spatiality inherent in the term *Negro*. Malcolm X explained, "Negro doesn't tell you anything. I mean nothing, absolutely nothing. What do you identify it with?...Noth ing....It's completely in the middle of nowhere. And when you call yourself that, that's where you are—right in the middle of nowhere." Accordingly, the word *Negro* as a signifier is used to negate the physical presence of African Americans. This is made possible because, according to Malcolm X, Negroes do not exist as people. Rather, they "were scientifically produced by the white man."[76]

Malcolm X continued that the adoption of the term *Negro* "doesn't give you a language, because there is no such thing as a Negro language. It doesn't give you a country, because there is no such thing as a Negro country. It doesn't give you a culture—there is no such thing as a Negro culture, it doesn't exist. The land doesn't exist, the culture doesn't exist, the language doesn't exist, and the man doesn't exist. They take you out of existence by calling you a Negro."[77] In this manner, when used in the context of, and by, the oppressors, the term *Negro* carries negative meanings. By extension, when used by African Americans as a self-descriptor, the term is emptied of meaning. This constitutes a variation of Patterson's concept of social death whereby the naming of slaves contributes to their nonexistence as a people. Malcolm X emphasized that "When we were first brought here, we had different names. When we were first brought here, we had a different language."[78] However, resultant from enslavement, Malcolm X explained how the Africans became socially dead: "...once our names were taken and our language was taken and our identity was destroyed and our roots were cut off with no history, we became like a stump, something dead, a twig over here in the Western Hemisphere."[79] The use of the oppressor's language is self-defeating. For Malcolm X, those who identify themselves as Negroes "can walk around in front of them [whites] all day long and they act like they don't even see you. Because you made yourself nonexistent."[80]

Fanon wrote that "the black man should no longer be confronted by the dilemma, *turn white or disappear*; but he should be able to take cognizance of a possibility of existence."[81] Malcolm X would be in agreement with this statement, arguing that the adoption of the term *Negro* (or any other name foisted by the "white" power structure) would lead to a condition of nonexistence. Using an analogy of trees and root systems, Malcolm X affirmed that, "Just as a tree without roots is dead, a people without history or cultural roots also becomes a dead people. And when you look at us, those of us who are called Negro, we're called that because we are like a dead people. We have nothing to identify ourselves as part of the human family."[82] One either attempts to emulate the oppressor. which is never completely possible, or through the adoption of the oppressor's label, one becomes socially dead. In this sense, African Americans would become liminal; all that would remain is the "place," which the oppressor provides, a place that historically has been predicated on economic use-value. It is this underlying connection between geographic knowledge and existence—a point I return to in chapter 4—that explains much of Malcolm X's antipathy and resistance toward strategies of integration that permeated many Civil Rights discussions. Here, however, I draw a parallel between Malcolm X's understanding of racism and knowledge and Iris Young's conception of cultural imperialism. For Young cultural imperialism consists in a group's being invisible at the same time that it is marked out and stereotyped. She writes that "culturally imperialist groups project their own values, experience, and perspective as normative and universal" while "victims of cultural imperialism are rendered invisible as subjects." Concurrently, however, the oppressed groups are "fixed" as deviant and always marginal to the normative group. This is seen most vividly in the use of adjectives to separate out marginalized groups (e.g., *African* Americans or *black* Americans). Linguistically, these groups are never able to fully be *within* society. As Young concludes, "When the dominant culture defines some groups as different...the members of those groups are imprisoned in their bodies. Dominant discourse defines them in terms of bodily characteristics, and constructs those bodies as ugly, dirty, defiled, impure, contaminated, or sick."[83]

It was this embodiment of racism that Malcolm X understood in his critique of white supremacy. Consequently, an engagement with terminology formed a major element in the "Basic Unity Program" that Malcolm X and his colleagues forwarded within his fledgling Organization of Afro-American Unity (OAAU). As explained in the program (which Malcolm X did not write, but he did approve), the term *Negro* is "erroneously used and is degrading in the eyes of informed and self-respecting persons of African heritage."[84] The program continues that the word *Negro* "denotes stereotyped and debased traits of character and classifies a whole segment of humanity on the basis of false information....[I]t is a badge of slavery and helps to prolong and perpetuate oppression and discrimination." A critique of terminology thus transcends far beyond mere word choice, for the use of terms such as *Negro* denoted other, negative, meanings. The term *Negro*, as the OAAU program specified:

> developed from a word in the Spanish language which is actually an adjective (describing word) meaning "black," that is, the *color* black. In plain English, if someone said or was called a "black" or a "dark," even a young child would naturally question. "A black what?" or "A dark what?" because adjectives do not name, they describe. Please take note that in order to make use of this mechanism, a word was transferred from another language and deceptively changed in function from an adjective to a noun, which is a naming word. Its application in the nominative (naming) sense was intentionally used to portray persons in a position of objects or "things." It stamps the article as being "all alike and all the same." It denotes: a "darkie," a slave, a subhuman, an ex-slave, a "*negro*."[85]

As evidenced by these excerpts of the OAAU's Basic Unity Program, Malcolm X envisioned a movement that would challenge the existing normative functions of American culture. Consonant with his advocacy of revolution, Malcolm X premised that racism within the United States was deeply entrenched institutionally. Social justice and, by extension, the challenge to white supremacy, would entail a sustained critique of all forms of knowledge. All persons, white and black, would require a substantial reeducation.

Conclusions

Malcolm X explained that "as long as the African himself was held in bondage by the colonial powers, was kept from projecting any positive image of himself on our continent, something that we could look proudly and then identify with—it was only as long as the African himself was kept down that we were kept down."[86] However, he also explained that "to the same degree that it has shifted from negative to positive, you'll find that the image of the Black man in the West of himself has also shifted from negative to positive."[87]

A reappropriated education, for Malcolm X, was crucial for the Civil Rights Movement. In this manner, Malcolm X believed that the emancipatory effects of education, and a reconstituted historical and geographical understanding of Africans and African Americans, was paramount in the cultivation of a positive self-image. In an interview given to Jack Barnes and Barry Shepard for the *Young Socialist* on January 18, 1965, Malcolm X was asked who is responsible for race prejudice in the United States. Malcolm X answered: "... a skillfully designed program of miseducation that goes right along with the American system of exploitation and oppression."[88] He continued:

> If the entire American population were properly educated—by properly educated, I mean given a true picture of the history and contributions of the Black man—I think many whites would be less racist in their feelings. They would have more respect for the Black man as a human being. Knowing what the Black man's contributions to science and civilization have been in the past, the white man's feelings of superiority would be at least partially negated. Also, the feeling of inferiority that the Black man has would be replaced by a balanced knowledge of himself.... So it takes education to eliminate [racism]. And just because you have colleges and universities doesn't mean you have education. The colleges and universities in the American educational system are skillfully used to miseducate.[89]

Malcolm X emphasized to young Civil Rights workers, but also to his audiences in general, "the importance of viewing the world from their own perspective, on their own terms: terms based and built on the best continental and diasporan African views and values, criticisms of and

contributions to human culture and civilization."[90] This necessitated a restructuring of the educational system, and of the production of countergeographic knowledges. African Americans were to refuse the language of the colonizer, then replace negative or liminal terms such as *Negro* with more Afrocentric terms. As such, the Garveyite roots of Malcolm X's upbringing are brought sharply into focus.

For Malcolm X, though, there was also an immediate and practical dimension to the production and control of knowledge. As he explained in the above-mentioned 1965 *Young Socialist* interview, "the students have been deceived in what's known as the civil rights struggle....The students were maneuvered in the direction of thinking the problem was already analyzed, so they didn't try to analyze it for themselves." He elaborated this point, noting that the political dimensions of education are often overlooked. Accordingly, students must learn to think for themselves, to not accept the colonizer's language:

> ...if the students in this country forgot the analysis that has been presented to them, and they went into a huddle and began to research this problem of racism for themselves, independent of politicians and independent of all the foundations (which are a part of the power structure), and did it themselves, then some of their findings would be shocking, but they would see that they would never be able to bring about a solution to racism in their country as long as they're relying on the government to do it.[91]

It was imperative, from Malcolm X's perspective, for his audience members to become active critics of the dominant culture, to be able to make independent judgments regarding their relationship to that culture. Prophecy does not constitute such participation, but prudence does.[92] In short, Malcolm X assumed the role of an educator, one committed to producing an alternative geographic knowledge. African Americans must be in control of themselves, their identity, their analysis, and their actions, for only then would it possible to enact the particular form of oppositional prudence that Malcolm X advocated.[93] As explained in the next chapter, this prudence would become a key element in Malcolm X's linkage of subjectivities and separatism.

4
Space and the Geographies of Separation

We shall have to struggle for the right to create our own terms through which to define ourselves and our relationship to the society, and to have these terms recognized.
—Kwame Ture and Charles Hamilton[1]

On February 14, 1965 Malcolm X spoke to an audience of four hundred attendees at the Ford Auditorium in Detroit. In his speech he addressed the civil unrest that had occurred during the summer of 1964. Malcolm X noted that the press coverage "referred to the rioters as vandals, hoodlums, thieves" and that the press "skillfully took the burden off the society for its failure to correct these negative conditions of the black community."[2] His argument was epistemological: the *observation* of African Americans "rioting" was not all that it appeared. Rather, the actions of the "rioters" were symptomatic of deeper, more entrenched structural conditions. During a "riot," Malcolm X argued, the white merchant is not present; the white landlord is not present, and so the property is attacked. In short, according to Malcolm X, the control of economic resources by exploitative white merchants and landlords "is what makes them [the rioters] knock down the store windows and set fire to things."

Malcolm X concluded, "It's not that they're thieves....It's a corrupt, vicious hypocritical system that has castrated the black man, and the only way the black man can get back at it [the system] is to strike it in the only way he knows how."[3]

Malcolm X forwarded an argument that hinged on the dialectics of self and space. The "solution" to the problem of the "color line" was not to be found in the ghettos themselves. Nor was the solution found in an attitudinal change of white society. Instead, for Malcolm X, what was required was a complete remaking of society and space. This remaking was to be foundationally predicated on a reconfigured understanding of the appropriation and representation of space. Don Mitchell argues that "Conflict over rights often resolves itself into conflict over geography" and that "Space, place, and location are not just the stage upon which rights are contested, but are actively produced by—and in turn serve to structure—struggles over rights." Mitchell contends that, "Rights have to be exercised somewhere, and sometimes that 'where' has itself to be actively produced by taking, by wresting, some space and transforming both its meaning and its use—by producing a space in which rights can exist and be exercised."[4] For Malcolm X, the production of space was encapsulated in the idea of separatism, for it was through separatism that African Americans would be able to reclaim their rightful place in America.

The (Re)Making of Space

In chapter 3 I discussed the shifting productions of geographical knowledges. These discourses are crucial in the making of both space and race. At this point, however, it is necessary to engage more concretely with the concepts of identity and space because, as Wolfgang Natter and John Paul Jones attest, subjects achieve and resist their system of identification in and through social space.[5]

It is common to say that an individual, such as Malcolm X, "made history." Implicit in this statement is the understanding that "history" was made discursively; that through one's actions, events were affected. Less common, though, is the assertion that an individual "makes space." As expressed by Edward Said, "Just as none of us is

outside or beyond geography, none of us is completely free from the struggle over geography."[6] Space and spatial relations are therefore seen as key to grasping the essential changes in the possibilities for agency and the key fields where social intervention is called for.'

The centrality of space is well-illustrated by David Delaney's description of what he terms *geographies of experience*. Delaney writes, "Our lives are, in a sense, made of time. But we are also physical, corporeal, mobile beings. We inhabit a material, spatial world. We move through it. We change it. It changes us. Each of us is weaving a singular path through the world. The paths that we make, the conditions under which we make them, and the experiences that those paths open up or close off are part of what make us who we are."[8]

Delaney prefigures a discussion of a dialectics between self and space. Through our daily activities we encounter other peoples and other places; our thoughts and actions are influenced by these encounters. Concurrently, however, our presence, our interactions, likewise reflect back upon those spaces. Just as we are transformed through our daily activities, so too are the spaces which we inhabit transformed. In short, we produce and are produced by space just as we produce and are produced by discourse.

At this point it becomes clear that the meanings and uses of space are never separate from the contestations over identities: Who is granted or denied access to certain spaces? What activities are deemed acceptable or not? And who has the authority—the power—to define such spaces. Henri Lefebvre suggests that space may be viewed in two basic forms, these being *representations of space* and *representational spaces*. Representations of space are conceptualized spaces, the spaces of scientists and planners, the "dominant" space in society.[9] In this light, "Space is purposefully representational of certain societal ideals, and therefore the holders of these ideals attempt to control its use."[10] Often we are socialized—and trained–into an understanding of these representations of space. Public parks, we are taught, are *children's* or *families'* spaces. Teenagers who attempt to appropriate these spaces for their own use, such as for hanging out, are shunted away by authorities. These divisions of space, and of appropriate use, become naturalized and normalized. This does not counter the fact that these

spaces remain (often) highly regulated and policed; spaces become sanctioned. It is through the forwarding of representations of space, we will see, that certain people are viewed as being "out of place."

Representations of space may be materially demarcated, as in the erection of signs, walls, or fences. Enforcement, as indicated above, may be further ensured through collective action and the threat, if not actual use of force. We internalize these lessons, and learn appropriate behavior. The imposition of Black Codes following Emancipation, and later, Jim Crow laws, were attempts to fix the meaning of space, reflecting a hegemonic cultural norm (e.g., white supremacy). Spaces in this sense were color coded and imbued with particular meanings. As Grace Hale writes, "Segregation tried to make racial identity visible in a rational and systematic way."[11]

The dominance of representations of space is far from complete. Representational spaces "are sites of resistance, and of counter-discourses which have not been grasped by apparatuses of power."[12] According to Lefebvre, representational spaces "need obey no rules of consistency or cohesiveness. Redolent with imaginary and symbolic elements, they have their source in history—in the history of a people as well as in the history of each individual belonging to that people."[13] The work of Hale, among others, finds, for example, that racially segregated spaces were far from rigid; indeed, the absolute racial coding of spaces was often very porous.[14]

Mitchell argues that "Public space often, though not always, originates as a representation of space" but "as people use these spaces, they also become representational spaces, appropriated in use."[15] It is through this interaction that *space is produced or made.* As Lefebvre explains, "Space is never produced in the sense that a kilogram of sugar or a yard of cloth is produced."[16] Instead, space is "the product of competing ideas (discourses) about what constitutes that space—order and control or free, and perhaps dangerous interaction."[17] The struggles to maintain (public) space, however, are rarely the stuff of formal politics. Rather, these struggles are "found in the parks, plazas, streets, and sidewalks of our cities and towns, and they are waged through the acts of ordinary people in the everyday spaces in which we live."[18]

Just as space is produced through the contestation over representations, so too are identities. Neither space nor identity are fixed, monolithic or bound; both are open to interventions.[19] Edward Soja refers to this process as a sociospatial dialectic: that social and spatial relations are dialectically interactive and interdependent.[20] Racial formations, accordingly, become manifest in the representations of space and, through this process, spaces become racialized (as well as sexed, gendered, classed, and so on). Spaces, therefore, become "overcoded"; physical space is produced via classification schemes with various ideological divisions such as "good" and "bad" areas (e.g., redlining practices) and "ours" and "theirs."[21] More germane, however, is that these codings are fundamental in social and cultural reproduction. As Rob Shields elaborates, people learn the comportment associated with gender or "race" and, hence, "know their place in society"; ideologies and cosmologies are reproduced through this training of bodies in space as well as through the tutoring of outlook via images of community, nation, and world.[22] This is captured in the idea of racialized spaces. Delaney explains that "race—in all of its complexity and ambiguity, as ideology and identity—is what it is and does what it does precisely because of how it is given spatial expression."[23] African Americans, for example, are often associated with "ghettos" and the "inner city." The *place* of African Americans becomes fixed.

Attempts to normalize space are never complete; the hegemonic control of space is always open to exposure, confrontation, reversal, and refusal through counterhegemonic or disidentifying practices.[24] We saw in chapter 3 how Malcolm X began to reappropriate the "identities" of African Americans through his deconstruction of the term *Negro*. His rearticulation of African American identity, however, had a spatial counterpart, one reflected in his forwarding of separatism. In this chapter I examine more closely Malcolm X's deconstruction of representations of space. Following Natter and Jones, a social movement that works against hegemony in all its forms must not only disidentify from the categories of identity processed by hegemony (e.g., "Negro"), it must also disidentify from the spaces in which it has been situated and maintained.[25]

Making Segregated Spaces

The segregated spaces of the American landscape are neither natural nor inevitable; rather, they are born of generations of race-connected practices that simultaneously include and exclude peoples based on racist discourses. Segregated spaces must be constantly produced and reproduced through a sociospatial dialectic.

In the United States, the term *segregation* was first used in reference to the physical partitioning of African Americans from whites during the 1890s.[26] The spatial practice, however, had a much longer history. In 1717, for example, freed blacks were prohibited from residing in any town or colony in Connecticut; by 1820, blacks were concentrated in New York City in the Five Points area—popularly called "Stagg Town" or "Negro Plantation."[27] For our purposes, however, the period immediately following the Civil War was most crucial to the emergence of segregated black spaces.

Within the United States, the years following emancipation were, and in many ways remain, a time of extraordinary confusion and invention, a period defined by struggles over basic questions of racialized identities and social/spatial relations.[28] After the abolition of slavery as an institution, as Hale writes, "If whites no longer owned African American bodies, they had new, more flexible means of maintaining a different power."[29] This was to be accomplished more completely through the control and regulation of space.

Between 1865 and 1866 Southern politicians implemented laws to curtail African-American occupational, social, and spatial mobility. Known as *Black Codes*, and geographically varying by state and local jurisdiction, these laws generally denied freed slaves the right to marry whites, bear arms, or assemble after sunset. As David Blight explains, President Andrew Johnson was a thoroughgoing white supremacist and a doctrinaire states rightist. As such, Johnson himself openly encouraged the South to draft the Black Codes. Moreover, every governor whom Johnson appointed to head the new state governments opposed black suffrage.[30]

The Black Codes were followed by a decade-long "occupation" of Southern states by Federal troops. This period of Reconstruction (1867–77) brought some improvement—both politically and

socially—to the lives of African Americans. The gains, however, were short-lived as national reconstruction came at the expense of racial reconstruction. As Blight argues, the reunion of Southern and Northern whites following the Civil War was achieved through a segregated landscape—as seen in theaters, train cars, washrooms, and Civil War memorials—and a segregated memory of antebellum society—encapsulated in literature, song, and, later, film. Blight concludes that the American reunion could only be achieved through new regimes of racial subjugation; as a result, the "civil and political liberties of African Americans ... were slowly becoming sacrificial offerings on the alter of reunion."[31]

Following the period of Reconstruction, voting fraud, intimidation, and violence intensified, actions intended to oppress African Americans politically, economically, and socially. Between 1890 and 1910 a majority of African Americans in Southern states lost the right to vote as statutes specifying poll taxes, "grandfather" clauses, voter examinations, and property qualifications were enacted; in Alabama, for example, there was a requirement of ownership of forty acres of land or real personal property worth three hundred dollars on which the taxes for the preceding year had been paid.[32]

The emergent spatial practice of segregation was ultimately codified in the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling of *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896) which legitimated a policy of "separate but equal." Known as Jim Crow, de jure (or legal) segregation constituted a representation of space wherein "making and perpetuating the myth of absolute racial difference ...required the creation of racial segregation as the central metaphor of the new regional culture."[33] In short, the reappropriation of space following emancipation and Reconstruction was about remaking racial formations. It is imperative to understand, however, that "Jim Crow was not the logical and inevitable culmination of civil war and emancipation, but rather the result of a calculated campaign by white elites to circumscribe all possibility of African American political, economic, and social power."[34]

The emergence of systematic (de jure) segregation as the policy of governments with authority over large areas—as opposed to (de facto) segregation by local custom or regulation—was a racist response to

broader social and economic changes and a reflection of the new configuration of race and class that they engendered.[35] In chapter 3 I argued that the production of geographic knowledge, especially following emancipation, was capitalist-induced. African Americans were constructed as objects of cheap, docile labor. An elaborate system was constructed, one consisting of disguised forms of slave labor (e.g., the prison system). The "place" of African Americans was to occupy the lower rungs of a racially defined class hierarchy. Education, furthermore, prepared African Americans to expect and accept this placement. The educational system, however, carried a spatial counterpart in that certain areas were to include or exclude African Americans. The northern urban ghetto, in particular, emerged as an urbanized space of capitalism and advanced capitalism.

Both the southern and northern regions of the United States underwent massive, and rapid, economic and social changes in the latter decades of the nineteenth century. In the South, the ravages of the boll weevil and of floods operated as push factors. These environmental conditions compounded underlying structural inequalities, such as the increased dependency of southern agriculture on northern industries. The South of 1910, according to Carole Marks, was an agrarian society that had lost its source of wealth and an industrial economy was only beginning to expand.[36] African Americans in the South likewise sought escape from racist legal and educational systems. The North was represented as the "Promised Land."

The northern states, in contrast, were undergoing tremendous industrialization. This was, in part, a reflection of the introduction of the factory system. Throughout much of the nineteenth century vital labor supplies were provided by European migrants. Between 1880 and 1920, for example, approximately twenty-three million Europeans entered the United States; the majority were destined for the industrializing North. The onset of the First World War in 1914 further stimulated the U.S. economy, facilitating the development of, among other things, munitions factories. However, the war also decreased the available supply of labor. In 1917, labor shortages became even more acute after the United States entered the war.

The northern shift toward African-American labor was, in many respects, born of necessity. Northern industrialists were initially reticent to utilize large numbers of African-American workers. Marks identifies three main reasons.[37] First, there was in the North a fear of black workers inundating cities, which made employers hesitant, because of community opposition. Second, the critical role that cotton played not only in the southern economy, but also in the national economy, made southern black labor indispensable. Third, through the 1870s, it was largely impractical for a northern company to travel to the South and recruit workers. By 1916, however, these conditions had mostly been removed. As Eugene Wolfenstein suggests, labor recruiters from northern industries along with the African American press played a critical role in bringing the possibilities of self-improvement to the conscious attention of southern blacks.[38]

Combined, the push-pull of southern agricultural poverty and northern industrial prosperity contributed to the "Great Migration" (1910–30) of African Americans.[39] Situated, therefore, within a context of migrations, urbanizations, and industrializations, segregation by law became more and more inscribed on the American landscape. The first U.S. housing segregation ordinance, enacted in San Francisco in 1890, was directed against the Chinese. State-prescribed segregation directed toward African Americans, however, was soon to follow.[40] In 1910 an African-American lawyer and his wife purchased a home east of the traditional African-American section of Baltimore. In light of continued harassment against the couple, local politicians demanded legal action to prevent the further "spread" of blacks into the neighborhood. Ironically, as Stephen Meyer writes, many policies and laws were created to ostensibly keep the peace and maintain stability, given the prevailing violence and intimidation tactics used to scare African Americans out of white neighborhoods.[41] By December the City Council passed an ordinance establishing separate white and black neighborhoods.[42] Subsequently, residential segregation ordinances were passed in Richmond, Norfolk, Ashland, Roanoke, Portsmouth, Winston-Salem, Greenville, Atlanta, Louisville, St. Louis, Oklahoma City, and New Orleans. Regulations varied by

local and state jurisdiction, but all may be conceived as hegemonic representations of space. In Virginia, for example, the state act of 1912 required each city and town to be divided into segregated and clearly demarcated districts; it was unlawful for whites and blacks to move into one another's districts.[43]

These segregated spaces were not intended to prevent a white-dominated economic integration. Consider, for example, the unsuccessful proposal forwarded by Clarence Poe. The editor of an influential North Carolina farm journal, Poe proposed a segregation plan that was influenced by the Natives' Land Act in South Africa. Poe intended that whites would be prohibited from purchasing land in areas legally designated as "black" and blacks would be prohibited from doing so in areas legally designated as "white." His plan, however, did not receive support from even self-proclaimed white supremacists who believed in the inferiority of African Americans. Significantly, Poe's proposal failed principally because white political leaders feared that the plan would give too much independence to blacks and would put them geographically and economically beyond the reach of white employers who wanted to hire them at low wages or take them on as disadvantaged sharecroppers.[44] As Hale writes, "Making race and making money did not always coincide."[45] This episode speaks to the complex intricacies of segregation, and the fact that spatial segregation was desired as long as economic integration was maintained—a point I return to later.

Both segregation by custom and by law contributed to the spatial formation of the "black ghetto." Richard Morrill has noted that, as the poorest and newest migrants, African Americans were forced to double up in the segregated spaces allocated to them.[46] Increased population densities, combined with institutional neglect, legal restrictions, and violence and intimidation, all contributed to the concentrations of African Americans in impoverished spaces. The influx of African Americans and an increase in white fear, coincident with the virtual stoppage of building construction, created an increased African-American demand with a decreasing or static market. Over time, though, the "existence of black ghettos became justifications, in

and of themselves, for continuing segregation."[47] Black people lived in ghettos; ghettos were the spaces of blacks.

The Representational Spaces of Separatism

If African Americans had accommodated without protest to customary segregation and discrimination there would have been no need to pass laws to sustain the color-caste system.[48] Fredrickson continues that "One might think of Jim Crow [and segregation in general] as the effort to maintain caste distinctions between racially defined groups that lived in close proximity...but there would have been no need for new laws if African Americans had not been making rapid gains in education, economic efficiency, and political-legal sophistication—advances that made many of them unwilling to defer to informal or extralegal means of denying them equal access to public amenities."[49]

It was within this context of African-American resistance to discrimination and prejudice that Malcolm X and other black intellectuals participated. The crucial distinction, however, was how best to resist. For Malcolm X, self-determination and social justice, respect and dignity, for African Americans could only be achieved through the sociospatial dialectic of representing both identity and space. We saw in chapter 3, for example, how Malcolm X began to reappropriate the "identities" of African Americans through his deconstruction of the term *Negro*. In this chapter I argue that Malcolm X likewise deconstructed the spaces of racism through his rearticulations of segregation, integration, and separatism. Geographers, as a whole, have been too lax in their theoretical conception of separatism with respect to African Americans. Likewise, social scientists in general seem far too ready to accept *integration* as the end-point. And yet integration is a normative judgment; integration is a representation of space, replete with complex and often ambiguous meanings. Separatism constitutes a representational space, one that counters the prevailing representations of spaces within American society. Delaney explains, "Nineteenth-century debates about the merits of emigration or colonization, twentieth-century debates about the

practical meaning of integration, and recurrent strands of separatism and black nationalism that have found expression in the stated desire for—or necessity of—a black nation in North America or community control in inner-city neighborhoods, all have been directed at imagining and creating alternative geographies of race."[50] By neglecting the political aims of black separatism, Geographers and other social scientists may neglect the most significant and salient dimensions of urban geography.

Although there is no single theory or movement called black separatism, two core concepts are identifiable. First, black separatism is geared not only to the elimination of oppression and exploitation of African Americans, it is also forwarded to enhance black culture and black lifestyles.[51] In this way, separatist movements are as much cultural movements as they are political and economic. Claude McKay, Langston Hughes, and other black artists and intellectuals wrote and spoke about the African homeland which, according to Raymond Hall, while not necessarily expressions of separatism per se, were indications that "Africa" no longer had the same kind of pejorative meanings for African Americans as it did for whites.[52] Second, separatist movements were, and are, sociospatial critiques of racist institutions. In other words, a physical separation may not always be the intended goal. Separatist activities may coexist in "integrated" neighborhoods, for example.

Despite the efforts of previous scholars, it remains difficult to type-cast African-American intellectuals as either separatists or integrationists.[53] Oftentimes these individuals were confronted with immediate and pragmatic concerns; proposals for either separation or integration were therefore selectively applied to any given situation. Moreover, as reflected in the long career of W.E.B. DuBois, it is not uncommon for an individual to change his or her outlook over time. Given these caveats, however, it is possible to gain a sense of the different ideas forwarded by earlier generations of intellectuals, both of African Americans and others, and to compare and contrast these with the ideas of Malcolm X.

During the 1870s, for example, Benjamin "Pap" Singleton of Tennessee determined that African Americans would never achieve

equality under white rule. Accordingly, he helped organize a massive exodus of African Americans to Kansas. Singleton founded several colonies, the most notable being Dunlap and Singleton's Colony. Other African Americans who established and promoted economically viable and politically independent all-black towns and agricultural settlements included Edward P. McCabe in Kansas and Oklahoma, Allen Allensworth in California, and David Turner, Thomas Haynes, and James E. Thompson in Oklahoma.[54]

Frederick Douglass, conversely, was a strong opponent of separatist movements. In response to the efforts of "Pap" Singleton, for example, Douglass argued that "As a stinging protest against high-handed, greedy and shameless injustice to the defenseless; as a means of opening the blind eye of oppressors to their folly and peril, the Exodus has done invaluable service. As a strategy however, it is a surrender as it would make freedom depend upon migration rather than protection. We cannot but regard the present agitation of an Exodus from the South as ill-timed and hurtful."[55]

Booker T. Washington viewed separation as a necessary step toward eventual racial integration.[56] Agreeing in principle with the separate-but-equal ruling of the Supreme Court, Washington argued that only through separation could African Americans develop economic self-determination. Washington argued that in all things social, blacks and whites could be as separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress. His approach, therefore, was a composite of social separation joined with economic integration. Washington, however, did not suggest that he favored *spatial segregation*, such as public transportation systems, and he was increasingly outspoken against residential segregation legislation. As a promoter of black business enterprise, Washington complained that segregation laws never prohibited whites from owning stores and businesses in black neighborhoods; accordingly, segregated spaces where inherently inequitable since, as a practical matter, there was no equivalent opportunity for African Americans in white neighborhoods.[57]

W.E.B. DuBois, conversely, was an outspoken critic of Washington. DuBois maintained that political, social, and educational

opportunities in an integrated society were the initial means by which African Americans were to seek racial empowerment.[58] Later, however, DuBois did modify his position, arguing that a period of separation was necessary prior to integration.

In contradistinction to DuBois, Marcus Garvey was a prominent champion of separatism. Indeed, it was Garvey who promoted the idea of "race first" to solidify peoples of the African diaspora. Garvey's strategy of racial separation was predicated on a fairly simple theory: people of different races would never treat each other as equals until they were on the same economic level. Therefore, to achieve economic parity, it was necessary—indeed paramount—for African Americans to control their own institutions, including banks, businesses, and educational facilities. Garvey further argued that such control would be most effective and forthcoming if African Americans and other peoples of the diaspora had their own homeland. This was often presented as an independent state in Africa, although it remains debatable as to the extent Garvey truly believed in either the feasibility or the desirability of a large-scale emigration scheme to Africa. Indeed, as Roy Brooks writes, Garvey's back to Africa movement was not a call for a mass emigration of blacks worldwide or even of all African Americans.[59] His intention was probably to settle a limited number of skilled African Americans in Liberia.

In the late twentieth century, the Nation of Islam was best known for advocating separation. This platform preceded Elijah Muhammad, of course, and is found in the early pronouncements of W.D. Fard. It was Fard, for example, who argued that total separation from the United States was the first alternative. If this was not forthcoming, then it was necessary for African Americans to establish separate communities within the United States, communities that would operate as nations within a nation; whites would be legally barred from participating in these communities. And finally, Fard proposed as a third alternative that African-American educational and economic institutions would be established within African-American communities. Muhammad continued these arguments, providing refinements in the pronunciation of race consciousness. It was the Black Muslims, for example, who consistently claimed that black

self-conception and identity did not mean hatred for white people per se; rather, it was a negation of the symbols of white culture, white power, and white status.[60] This negation could only be achieved through spatial and cultural separation. While a member of the Nation of Islam, Malcolm X believed, as did Elijah Muhammad, that total separation was the simplest and most effective way to repudiate white society in its entirety.[61] Muhammad, for example, argued that African Americans needed to separate themselves mentally, economically, and physically.

Malcolm X on Separation, Segregation, and Integration

David Kaplan and Steven Holloway identify a number of theoretical tensions undergirding the causal factors of segregation.[62] They write:

> The dominant tension that has plagued this research for over a century concerns the extent to which the geographic patterns we observe result from the desires/beliefs/actions of the segregated group, vs. the desires/beliefs/actions of others. Similar tensions that can be included within this rubric are voluntary vs. involuntary motivations; the structure of the society or of the migration stream vs. the power of societal gatekeepers vs. the agency of the individual migrants; and the preferences of individuals in choosing where they live vs. discriminatory constraints placed on where individuals may live. However these tensions are articulated, *they stem primarily from the dichotomy between choice and constraint.*[63]

This theoretical impasse, however, is potentially easily resolved. As articulated by Malcolm X and others, no one would choose to live in a segregated space. Thus the voluntariness evinced by Kaplan and Holloway refers to the concept of separatism. It is no doubt unfortunate that our traditional mappings of "racial" patterns (e.g., where "black" and "white" people live) and attendant statistical techniques are woefully deficient in distinguishing between segregation and separatism, for the distinction is crucial. Simply mapping the distribution, or empirically validating these patterns, is insufficient for the fundamental reason that neither segregation nor separation

are purely spatial problems. As social scientists continue to rely on a static notion of fixed, absolute space, that reliance will continue to hamper a more nuanced understanding of the dialectics of society and space. Segregation and separatism are not synonymous. The insights of Malcolm X, and other black radicals, therefore offer the possibility of a reinvigorated discussion of the sociospatial dialectics of identity and space. Moreover, such an engagement permits a more sophisticated understanding of African-American resistance to dominant racial representations of space. As Natter and Jones write, "space, no less than identity, will always...offer the potential for tactical refusal and resistance."[64]

Malcolm X's understanding of integration, segregation, and separation changed throughout his life. Certainly, while a member of the Nation of Islam, Malcolm X advocated the party line of Elijah Muhammad, arguing for, at times, a literal separation of African Americans from whites and the establishment of a sovereign state. But by the end of his life Malcolm X was more circumspect. This is crucial, for it highlights the transformations both of Malcolm X's philosophy as well as the instability of the term *separation*.

Residential segregation, whether in the form of "ghettos" or other confined spaces, translated materially in the sense that attempts by African Americans for self-improvement and entrepreneurship were curtailed. By limiting the rights of African Americans to buy and sell property in response to market opportunities, or to gain access to housing loans and credit, residential segregation places a ceiling on their ability to accumulate wealth and to improve their physical environment.[65] Accordingly, the denunciation of the economic exploitation of the northern ghetto was a mainstay of Malcolm X's speeches. "Why should white people be running all the stores in our community?" he asked in April, 1964. "Why should white people be running the banks of our community? Why should the economy of our community be in the hands of the white man?"[66] Through this focus, Malcolm X called into question the *meaning* of integration, questioning the validity of this as a goal. "If a black man can't move his store into a white community, you tell me why a white man should move his store into a black community."[67]

In his speech of February 14, Malcolm X presented, albeit in broad strokes, the unequal material dimensions of segregation. Emphasizing the control of resources, Malcolm explained that "In Harlem ...all of the stores are owned by white people, all of the buildings are owned by white people. The black people are just there—paying rent, buying the groceries; but they don't own the stores, clothing stores, food stores, any kind of stores; don't even own the homes that they live in."[68] Malcolm X continued:

> These [homes and businesses] are all owned by outsiders, and for these run-down apartment dwellings, the black man in Harlem pays more money than the man down in the rich Park Avenue section. It costs us more money to live in the slums than it costs them to live down on Park Avenue. Black people in Harlem know this, and that the white merchants charge us more money for food in Harlem—and it's the cheap food, the worse food....So black people know that they're being exploited and that their blood is being sucked and they see no way out.[69]

The statements of Malcolm X were sweeping and general in an attempt to convey a sense of a particular racialized space. He did so not from the position of a social scientist, seeking to empirically document, verify, and describe accurately an authentic landscape. Instead, the realism of Malcolm X—his ground-level reality—was used rhetorically. Malcolm X grounded his geography in his casual observations, as well as his audience's life experiences. Malcolm X did not try (usually) to support his assertions with the kind of evidence that whites would accept, because he was not trying to persuade them; rather, he was speaking from an *Africanist* point of view, and he wanted to identify the enemies to African Americans so that they would know whom they had to fight against in their struggle for dignity and human rights.[70] Consequently, Malcolm X constructed composite landscapes, scenes of oppression and exploitation that his African-American listeners would understand. And it was through this process that Malcolm X was able to rail against social injustice, and it was through this "geo-graphing" that Malcolm X assumed the role of the jeremiad.

Other social scientists would empirically document these observations. Research conducted by Kenneth Clark, for example, confirmed many of the assessments made by Malcolm X. In *Dark Ghetto*, Clark writes that "When tumult arose in ghetto streets [in Harlem] in the summer of 1964, most of the stores broken into and looted belonged to white men." Clark continues that "In Harlem there is only one large department store and that is owned by whites. Negroes own a savings and loan association; and one Negro-owned bank has recently been organized. The other banks are branches of white-owned downtown banks. Property—apartment houses, stores, businesses, bars, concessions, and theaters—are for the most part owned by persons who live outside the community and take their profits home."[71] Clark described the residential concentration of Harlem. He explains that the area "houses 232,792 people within its three and one half square miles" and that "there are more than 100 people per acre. Ninety percent of the 87,369 residential buildings are more than thirty-three years old, and nearly half were built before 1900."[72]

Residential segregation, in short, was (and remains) undergirded by economic integration. The hypocrisy lies in the observation that African Americans were to be *placed* in segregated neighborhoods, barred from crossing the color line. Racist techniques, including redlining, were used to maintain a physical separation of peoples. And yet the system permitted—indeed encouraged and facilitated—the unidirectional economic integration of the ghetto. Whites were permitted to buy up land, set up shops, and profit from the spatial entrapment of African Americans. Moreover, residential concentration often proved inconvenient to whites who preferred to have African-American servants close at hand.[73]

Malcolm X additionally argued fervently against the perceptions of "white" society that blamed African Americans for their economic plight in the ghetto. During a telephone call-in radio show on February 17, 1965, Malcolm X was accused of inciting violence among African Americans. Malcolm X responded to this charge:

> I don't think so. How are you going to incite people who are living in slums and ghettos? It's the city structure that incites. A city that continues to let people live in rat-nest dens in Harlem and

> pay higher rents in Harlem than they pay downtown....Who lets merchants outcharge or overcharge people for their groceries and their clothing and other commodities in Harlem, while you pay less for it downtown. This is what incites. A city that will not create some kind of employment for people who are barred from having jobs just because their skin is black. That's what incites it. Don't ever accuse a black man for voicing his resentment and dissatisfaction over the criminal condition of his people as being responsible for inciting the situation. You have to indict the society that allows these things to exist.[74]

The argument of Malcolm X was about the material inequalities existent within the segregated spaces of America. His critique was of a hypocritical system that promoted integration as a part of the American Dream but in reality was a further technique that served to subjugate African Americans. The present situation of segregation would not be resolved through integration, for integration was yet another tool of the oppressor, one that retained the basic inequalities in society while permitting economic exploitation to continue.

Malcolm X explained, on the subject of integration, that he grew up with white people. He said, "I was integrated before they even invented the word." However, he elaborated that "I have never met white people yet...who won't refer to you as a 'boy' or a 'gal,' no matter how old you are or what school you came out of, no matter what your intellectual or professional level is. In this society we remain 'boys'."[75] To Malcolm X, integration was a deception. It mattered little that whites and African Americans interact; what was important was the context of those interactions. Integration, without a change in the underlying attitude of a racist society, for Malcolm X, was a hollow prospect. Integration, for Malcolm X, was a form of hypocritical rhetoric, used to placate an oppressed and exploited population. At its worst, integration was an instrument of social domination through the control of space to materially subjugate those peoples. And it was this subjective understanding of spatial relations that guided Malcolm X in his rearticulation of American spaces.

Malcolm X understood further that integration actually served a symbolic function that reproduced white supremacy. Whites—as the

normative group—are seen as naturalized. This is the idea underlying much current discussions on white privilege—that racism is a matter only for "nonwhites." In a relational process, blacks are the marked Other, to be refracted against the unmarked white. The superiority of whites was to be symbolically represented through the day-to-day interactions of society.

Separation called into question this function. Malcolm X, in short, perceived *both* segregation and integration as exploitative and oppressive to African Americans. The only possible route to achieve human dignity and self-determination was through separatism, articulated not as a Back to Africa movement, but rather as a call for political, economic, and social representation. In this fashion, Malcolm X was arguing for an alternative space, eschewing the segregation/integration dichotomy that was, and continues to be forwarded. This is why Malcolm X argued that the best way to eliminate segregation was through separation. "The white man is more afraid of separation than he is of integration," Malcolm X explained. "Segregation means that he puts you away from him, but not far enough for you to be out of his jurisdiction."[76] His statement reveals clearly his understanding that segregation was never complete. In particular, communities may be residentially segregated, in that whites and African Americans did not live side-by-side, but economically there remained a unidirectional, and unequal, form of integration. White capitalists continued to benefit from a spatially trapped labor supply, as well as a spatially trapped consumer market. In effect, segregated communities operated as plantations. And this is why Malcolm X argued that "Separation means you're gone. And the white man will integrate faster than he'll let you separate." Indeed, it was through integration that African Americans would remain dependent upon white capitalists and, in the process, continue to symbolically represent this dependency and subservience. Malcolm X therefore spoke not only to the material dimensions of urban poverty, but also to the symbolic functions. To integrate into such a system of white supremacy was to placate a racist hegemony. Integration was a capitulation to domination.

Malcolm X identified a further trap of racism that is associated with the concepts of segregation, integration, and separation.

Malcolm X explained that, "Every effort we make to unite among ourselves on the basis of what we are, they label it as what? Racism." He asked rhetorically, "But what basis are we going to get together on?" Noting the hypocrisy of this trap, Malcolm X elaborated that "Italians got together because they were Italian, the Jews got together on the basis of being Jews, the Irish got together on the basis of being Irish." And yet, he continued, "as soon as we mention the only basis that we've got to get together on, they trick us by telling our leaders ... that anything that's all Black is putting segregation in reverse." He concluded: "So the people who are Black don't want to get together because they don't want segregation."[77]

Malcolm X also understood the geographic difference of the Civil Rights Movement in the North as opposed to the South. In many respects, Malcolm X was prescient in understanding that the tactics employed by Martin Luther King, Jr., while suited to the Southern situation, were ineffective in the African-American communities of the urban North. Indeed, following his unsuccessful attempt to carry his civil rights' strategy to Chicago in 1967, King said "You can't talk about ending slums without first seeing that profit must be taken out of slums. You're really ... getting on dangerous ground because you are messing with folk then. You are messing with Wall Street. You are messing with the captains of industry."[78]

As Clark explains, in southern cities like Birmingham, Atlanta, and Memphis, the pattern of segregation was often so complete that African-American communities were impelled to be largely self-sufficient (though not immune from violence and intimidation). In the North, however, African Americans were "allowed" to participate partially in the city, and whites were willing to open businesses within the black spaces. The result, Clark concludes, was that the white power structure collaborated in the economic serfdom of African Americans. Economic integration, coupled with residential segregation, may thus be viewed as a means of greater economic dependency, reminiscent of colonial relationships.[79] African Americans, in effect, become spatially entrapped, providing a fixed source of both cheap labor and dependent consumers. Greater integration, according to Malcolm X, would only augment this colonial relation.

Separation—in the form of communal control of political, social, and economic functions—was required.

Such an understanding is reflected in the goals and objectives of the OAAU's Basic Unity Program. As outlined in that document, the OAAU as an institution considered the word *integration* as a "misleading, false term." Specifically, the term "has been applied to the current regulation projects which are supposedly 'acceptable' to some classes of society. This very 'acceptable' implies some inherent superiority or inferiority instead of acknowledging the true source of the inequalities involved."[80] The pursuit of integration, therefore, was an acknowledgment and reification of social, economic, and political inequalities. The OAAU program affirmed that "the usage of the term 'integration' was designated and promoted by those persons who expect to continue a (nicer) type of ethnic discrimination and who intend to maintain social and economic control of all human contacts by means of imagery, classifications, quotas, and manipulations based on color, national origin, or 'racial' background and characteristics." Arguing that integration was both hypocritical and exploitative, the program concluded with the statement:

> "Integration" actually describes the process by which a white society is (remains) set in a position to use, whenever it chooses to use and however it chooses to use, the best talents of non-white people. This power-web continues to build a society wherein the best contributions of Afro-Americans, in fact of all non-white people, would continue to be absorbed without note or exploited to benefit a fortunate few while the masses of both white and nonwhite people would remain unequal and un-benefitted.[81]

The hypocrisy of integration was further substantiated as American spaces increasingly revealed a process of *white* separatism. Throughout the 1950s (and continuing to the present day), a phenomenon known as "gated" cities and communities emerged. Through government restrictions of land, taxes, and so forth, white residents literally and figuratively erected walls to provide a spatial insulation from Others. Reflecting an entrenched white privilege, gated white communities were and are vivid examples of separatism.

Conclusion

As scholars attempting to provide an antiracist pedagogy, acknowledgment must be made of the fact that integrationist,or at least nonsegregationist, schemes may augment racial oppression. The failure of Poe's apartheid plan serves to remind us of this fact. Important psychological and symbolic components of segregation underlie the forwarding of separatist arguments. This is the direction of Malcolm X's argument at the time of his death. How separation was to be achieved, of course, remains unclear. His prudent approach to the Civil Rights Movement, particularly following his split from the Nation of Islam, suggests that he was well aware of the sociospatial dialectics of racialized identities *and* spaces. Crucially, a remaking of American space was to be a necessary component of the search for social justice and self-determination.

In his "The Ballot or the Bullet" speech delivered on April 3, 1964, Malcolm X argued that "We don't want to be integrationists. Nor do we want to be separationists. We want to be human beings. Integration is only a method that is used by some groups to obtain freedom, justice, equality and respect as human beings. Separation is only a method that is used by other groups to obtain freedom, justice, equality or human dignity."[82] On numerous occasions Malcolm X distinguished between methods and objectives. He explained, for example, that "Our people have made the mistake of confusing the methods with the objectives." Instead, he said, "We have to keep in mind at all times that we are not fighting for integration, nor are we fighting for separation. We are fighting for recognition as human beings."[83] The objective, for Malcolm X, was consistently the attainment of respect and equality within American society. How that was to be achieved was contingent on many factors, including the attitudes of both whites and African Americans. Within a racialized society Malcolm X did not hold out optimism that whites would willingly give up their privilege and truly extend equality and dignity to the African American population. Consequently, it was up to African Americans themselves to deliver themselves to the Promised Land. Mitchell questions: "Who has the right to the city and its public spaces? How is that right determined—both in law

and on the streets themselves? And how does that right—limited as it usually is, contested as it must be—give form to social justice in the city?"[84] Separation was seen as a technique, a strategy, one that would most effectively enable African Americans to gain a right to American spaces. Separatism, therefore, is not incompatible with desegregation, although a map of both would appear strikingly similar. Desegregation is the removal of legal barriers to free choice; following Malcolm X, no one would willing choose to live in a segregated space. Conceptually, "choice" is not an issue. Oppression refers to the lack of choice; segregationist policies and practices are therefore, by definition, oppressive. Desegregation movements thus constitute efforts to end oppressive practices. Given a condition of free choice, however, separation may in fact be the desired outcome rather than integration.

Throughout the late 1960s and early 1970s many (white) Americans were becoming concerned about the growth of a seemingly new, threatening social movement promoting the principles of black power and black separatism. This was apparent, for example, in the music of Marvin Gaye, the Chi-Lites, the O'Jays, and James Brown. Separatism as a movement, of course, was not new. However, the black separatism that gained notoriety during the 1960s—in large part because of the actions of Malcolm X—was unique because it entailed a harsh critique of the American Dream. Clark writes that the discrepancy between the reality and the dream burns into the consciousness of African Americans.[85] This was a separatist movement that had as its objective the uplifting of black consciousness through the reappropriation of space.

5
Social Justice and the Revolutions of Malcolm X

Profit is a nice word for stealing which the society has legitimatized.
—**H. Rap Brown**[1]

During a speech given at the Audubon Ballroom in Harlem, New York, on February 15, 1965, just six days before his assassination, Malcolm X asked his audience: "As the African nations become independent and mold a new image—a positive image, a militant image, an upright image, the image of a man, not a boy—how has this affected the Black man in the Western Hemisphere?" Malcolm X himself provided an answer: "It has taken the Black man in the Caribbean and given him some pride. It has given pride to the Black man in Latin America and has given pride to the Black man right here in the United States."[2]

Months earlier, in a 1964 interview Malcolm X elaborated:

> One thing that I became aware of in my traveling recently through Africa and the Middle East, in every country you go to, usually the degree of progress can never be separated from the woman. If you're in a country that's progressive, the woman is progressive. If you're in a country that reflects the consciousness toward the importance of education, it's because the woman is aware of the importance of

> education. But in every backward country you'll find the women are backward, and in every country where education is not stressed, it's because the women don't have education.[3]

Ruth Wilson Gilmore argues that "A geographical imperative lies at the heart of every struggle for social justice."[4] Malcolm X, as revealed in the above passages, spoke of both a gendered revolution and an identity politics in his quest for social justice. His geographical repositioning of the African-American Civil Rights Movement away from local concerns to global affairs is also readily apparent. He addressed not only the everyday racial discriminations of segregated spaces but more so a larger diasporic system of colonial oppression and capitalist exploitation predicated on territoriality.

As argued in chapter 4, Malcolm X disagreed in principle with integration as a method to obtain respect and dignity for African Americans. Social justice was achievable through separation, a strategy that at its core was predicated on a control of communal resources. Rhetorically, Malcolm X advocated another strategy: revolution. If communal control through separation was not an option, then social justice would be forthcoming through the violent overthrow of the white racist society. Malcolm X argued that it would never be possible for African Americans to achieve full equality—and with this, respect and dignity as human beings—within the racist spaces of America. Therefore, an oppressed group must either carve out their own autonomous spaces—separatism—or they must radically transform the existing system—revolution.

The revolutions of Malcolm X were predicated largely on the material conditions of urban-based African Americans during the 1950s and 1960s. The proximate concerns of the post-Second World War Civil Rights Movement focused largely on issues such as voting rights and desegregation.[5] As Michael Goldfield summarizes, African Americans demanded the right to be recognized as citizens with equal rights to go to school, to eat in integrated public spaces, to ride buses, and to vote.[6] Tactics included lunch counter sit-ins, bus boycotts, Freedom Rides, and voter registration campaigns. To Malcolm X, these tactics—which dominated the Civil Rights activities in the southern states—were insufficient and misguided, for they

neglected the broader structural questions of economic inequality, the elimination of institutional racism, and the demand for social justice—concerns that were more readily apparent in the supposedly "integrated" urban areas of the northern states. In contradistinction to the broader Civil Rights Movement, for Malcolm X, as discussed in chapter 4, an uncritical acceptance of integration as either a method or an objective served only to reify white supremacy. From his perspective, a revolution was required to dismantle both the local and global segregationist policies and practices that maintained a racist political economy. Only through such a redemptive revolution would America be remade into a humane and socially just space.

Malcolm X is also notable because of the gendered component of his revolutionary thought. Robin Kelley identifies that masculinity has been especially pronounced in black nationalist politics because of its roots in the struggle against slavery. He argues, for example, that abolitionist struggles were cast as struggles for manhood, because servility of any kind was regarded as less than manly.[7] Nevertheless, once separated from the Nation of Islam, Malcolm X reconsidered the role of women in revolutionary movements. James Cone writes that "Following his split with the Nation of Islam and his subsequent trips to the Middle East and Africa, Malcolm made an about-face regarding his views on women's rights, as he began to consider the issue not only in the context of religion and morality, but, more importantly, from the standpoint of mobilizing the forces needed to revolutionize society."[8] bell hooks concurs, noting that it was Malcolm's break with the father-figure of Elijah Muhammad that created the social space for Malcolm X to transform his thinking about the place of women in the movement.[9] To be sure, Malcolm X was unable, in the last eleven months of his life, to provide a definitive statement on women in the revolution. As such, a continual tension of viewing the revolution as a test of manhood remains in his geopolitical vision.

The Language of Revolutions

Revolutions have been well studied in political science, international relations, and history. Geographers, however, have devoted less

attention to the study of revolutions. This is somewhat surprising, given that territorial control is often at the center of revolutionary movements. Forrest Colburn, for example, writes that the "purest meaning of revolution is the sudden, violent, and drastic substitution of one group governing a territorial political entity for another group formerly excluded from the government." Apart from political control over territories, moreover, revolutions entail a remaking of social spaces. Again, following Colburn, we can understand revolutions as movements that displace and destroy old orders and attempts to rebuild something new.[10]

The political thought that supports such a radical transformation of society does not appear devoid of human agency. Instead, the actions of specific intellectuals assume a prime importance in our understanding of revolutionary movements. Revolutionaries, through their language, images, and daily political activity, strive to reconfigure society and social relations.[11]

Malcolm X, as discussed in chapter 3, was a radical intellectual who produced new geographical knowledges from a dialectical engagement of lived experiences and critical interpretations. This is significant in that, as Misagh Parsa identifies, ideologies do not emerge in a vacuum and should always be understood in the social and historical context.[12] Anthony Bogues, to this end, explains that given the nature of antiblack racism and the racialized object, the black radical intellectual as critic is first of all engaged with challenging the knowledge regime of the dominant power.[13] Malcolm X understood the language of the racist, and sought to provide a corrective vocabulary, one contextualized within a historical grounding of the indicted society. This is immediately clear in his critique of the term *Negro*, a critique he carried into his forwarding of a revolution. In his "Message to the Grass Roots" speech, Malcolm X explained the difference between the "Negro" revolution and the "Black" revolution:

> The only kind of revolution in which the goal is loving your enemy is the Negro revolution. It's the only revolution in which the goal is a desegregated lunch counter, a desegregated theater, a desegregated park, and a desegregated public toilet; you can sit down next to white folks—on the toilet. That's no revolution. Revolution is based

on land. Land is the basis of all independence. Land is the basis of freedom, justice, and equality.[14]

Revolutions were understood by Malcolm X as violent attempts to bring about liberation, an understanding that finds consonance with the Old Testament portrayal of redemption as bloody and violent.[15] It was this Christian theology, for example, that motivated both Nat Turner's rebellion and David Walker's appeal for rebellion. Malcolm X argued that "Revolutions are bloody, revolutions are violent, revolutions cause bloodshed and death follows in their paths."[16]

For Malcolm X, therefore, the black revolution, unlike the Negro revolution, was global in scope and encompassed the wars of liberation that were sweeping across Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In articulating this connection—one which I explore more fully in chapter 7—Malcolm X firmly situated his revolutionary praxis within the territorial-based, anticolonial movements of the third world. As Rod Bush writes, "Whereas the logic of the integration of Black people into American society led Black people to view themselves as an isolated minority dependent on the goodwill of their oppressors, Malcolm was able to change Black people's frame of reference."[17] By changing the spatial scale Malcolm X revolutionized the territorial dimensions of the African-American Civil Rights Movement and set it on a course of demanding human social justice.

Malcolm X effectively situated the demands of African Americans within the context of American independence. He explained that "There are 22 million African Americans who are ready to fight for independence right here. When I say fight for independence right here, I don't mean any non-violent fight....If George Washington didn't get independence for this country nonviolently, and if Patrick Henry didn't come up with a nonviolent statement, and you taught me to look upon them as patriots and heroes, then it's time for you to realize that I have studied your books well...."[18] This is a well-placed statement in that Malcolm X draws an explicit connection between the production of knowledge and the political implications of revolution. Turning the tables on American history, Malcolm X continued that "America is a colonial power. She has colonized 22 million Afro-Americans by depriving us of first-class citizenship,

by depriving us of civil rights, actually by depriving us of human rights. She has not only deprived us of the right to be a citizen, she has deprived us of the right to be human beings."[19]

The American Revolution, as well as the Civil War, remained unfinished, for the simple reason that a large segment of the American population was deprived of its basic human rights. Malcolm X said that, "If the Emancipation Proclamation, issued by that great shining liberal called Lincoln, had freed [the African American], we wouldn't be singing 'We Shall Overcome' today. If the amendments to the Constitution had solved his problem, his problem wouldn't still be here today. And if the Supreme Court desegregation decision of 1954 was genuinely and sincerely designed to solve his problem, his problem wouldn't be with us today."[20]

Malcolm X argued that a release from oppression, for both women and men, was not feasible within existing political, economic, and social systems. Rather, a complete, and world, revolution was required, a revolution that would address all facets of society. Based on his observations that most newly independent countries he had visited had turned away from the "so-called capitalistic system in the direction of socialism," he explained that:

> ...it's impossible for a chicken to produce a duck egg....A chicken just doesn't have it within its system to produce a duck egg....The system in this country cannot produce freedom for an Afro-American. It is impossible for this system, this economic system, this political system, this social system, this system, period....And if ever a chicken did produce a duck egg, I'm quite sure that you would say it was certainly a revolutionary chicken![21]

Based on these historical and geographical insights, Malcolm X advocated a complete overthrow of the American political, economic, and social system. And stretching his revolutionary thought, Malcolm X was equally clear on his perspective of racism and capitalism. "It's impossible for a white person to believe in capitalism and not believe in racism," Malcolm X explained, "and if you find one and you happen to get that person into a conversation and they have a philosophy that makes you sure they don't have this racism in their outlook, usually they're socialists so their political philosophy is

socialism."[22] Avoiding the veracity of his statement regarding socialist systems and socialists as being nonracist, this statement is telling in that it underscores Malcolm X's political thought regarding capitalism and racism. Ideologically, therefore, Malcolm X was promoting and supporting a variant of black radical thought that includes such figures as Claude McKay, Richard Wright, Cyril Briggs, and Paul Robeson. Moreover, it indicates that color still figured prominently in his understandings in that he continued to equate racism with capitalism and with colonialism.

Malcolm X's Mau Mau Revolution

Malcolm X's understanding of revolutions resonates with those of third world revolutionaries, including Ernesto "Che" Guevara and Frantz Fanon. Guevara, for example, explained in the context of the Cuban revolution that "People must see clearly the futility of maintaining the fight for social goals within the framework of civil debate. When the forces of oppression come to maintain themselves in power against established law, peace is considered already broken."[23] Fanon, likewise, began his influential text *The Wretched of the Earth* with the following statement: "National liberation, national renaissance, the restoration or nationhood to the people, commonwealth: whatever may be the headings used or the new formulas introduced, decolonization is always a violent phenomenon."[24]

Although it is not known how much either the writings of Fanon or Guevara directly influenced Malcolm X, it is clear that Malcolm X drew considerable inspiration from the Mau Mau uprising of colonial Kenya. British settlers arrived in Kenya at the turn of the twentieth century. Settlement focused around the cool, temperate central highlands that were the traditional Kikuyu homeland. Through taxation, residency restrictions, and limits on education, British policy aimed at turning the Kikuyu into an agricultural proletariat.[25] After World War II clashes intensified between white British settlers and the indigenous peoples. Access to land was a major source of unrest. Through assassination, arson, and sabotage, the Mau Mau tried to drive whites from Kenya.[26] Between 1952 and 1954, British counterinsurgency forces killed more than eleven thousand rebels; torture

and heavy mortality prevailed at the concentration camps that housed eighty thousand rebel survivors.[27]

Brenda Plummer relates that black Americans seeking an understanding of the Kenyan crisis had to study a society that geographic and cultural distance, the absence of a direct historical connection, the racist policies of the white settler regime, and the geopolitical infrastructure of imperialism had made remote.[28] Malcolm X, who had spent several days with Kenyan Prime Minister Jomo Kenyatta, spoke of the Mau Mau often in the last months of his life. And thus as he attempted to provide a counterdiscourse of the Congo crisis (see chapter 6), so too did Malcolm X attempt to provide an alternative geographic knowledge of the significance of the Mau Mau. At a Freedom Democratic Party campaign rally held in Harlem on December 20, 1964, Malcolm X said that an understanding of the Mau Mau is key to straightening out the plight of African Americans. He stated that:

> ...right here in New York City, you and I can best learn how to get real freedom by studying how Kenyatta brought it to his people in Kenya, and how Odinga helped him, and the excellent job that was done by the Mau Mau freedom fighters. In fact, that's what we need in Mississippi. In Mississippi we need a Mau Mau. In Alabama we need a Mau Mau. In Georgia we need a Mau Mau. Right here in Harlem, in New York City, we need a Mau Mau.[29]

Two months later, in Detroit, Malcolm X told his audience that "The Mau Mau played a major role in bringing about freedom for Kenya, and not only for Kenya but other African countries. Because what the Mau Mau did frightened the white man so much in other countries until he said, 'Well I better get this thing straight before some of them pop up here.'" He continued that the Mau Mau rebellion "is good to study because you see what makes him react. Nothing loving makes him react, nothing forgiving makes him react." A thinly veiled critique of the Civil Rights Movement, Malcolm X suggested that it was insufficient to "ask" the government for recognition, compensation, or political, social, and economic equality. According to Malcolm X, "The only time he reacts is when he knows you can hurt him."[30]

The Mau Mau, for Malcolm X, were a tangible example of self-

determination; a movement to redeem and reclaim not only dispossessed territories, but also one's manhood. Indeed, it is imperative to understand that self-determination was intimately associated with a discourse of masculinity. In Rochester, New York, Malcolm X delivered a speech titled "Not Just an American Problem, But a World Problem." In this speech Malcolm X extolled:

> ...when [the Black man in America] saw the Black man on the African continent taking a stand, it made him become filled with the desire also to take a stand. The same image, the same—just as the African image was negative, and you get that old hat-in-hand, compromising, fearful look—we were the same way. But when we began to read about Jomo Kenyatta and the Mau Mau and others, then you find Black people in this country begin to think along the same lines....[31]

For Malcolm X, the Mau Mau presented black America with an opportunity to remake their image into a positive image, an alternative production of geographic knowledge of the process of decolonization. However, this reconfigured nationhood was to be achieved through a reappropriated manhood. Consider, for example, the quote that opened this chapter, of Malcolm X equating independence with maturity from boyhood to manhood. Malcolm X continued in that same speech:

> When the Black man in the Caribbean sees the brother on the continent of Africa waking up and rising up, the Black man in the Caribbean begins to throw back his shoulders and stick out his chest and stand up. Now, when that Black man goes to England he's right inside the English power structure, ready to give it trouble. When the Black man from the French West Indies goes to France, why the effect upon him of the African revolution is the same effect upon us here in the States by the African revolution.[32]

The struggle for liberation was imagined as one of a proud black man, with head held high and chest thrust forward. In so doing, Malcolm X replaced the subservient slave image with a positive image of a powerful black man standing up against the oppression of a white power structure. These ideas, in part, are rooted in Malcolm

X's Garveyite upbringing. Within Garveyism, defending Africa from imperialism was tantamount to defending black womanhood from rape; black men were called upon to redeem the oppressed and degraded black woman.[33] As hooks concludes, the "manhood" Malcolm X evoked in his speeches, and especially those he made while a member of the Nation of Islam, were clearly defined along patriarchal lines.[34] Malcolm X spoke about the need to "protect" black women and thus promoted a position of black patriarchy.

Garveyism however was also one of the few Pan-Africanist movements that did provide a substantial role for women. As Kelley explains, Garveyite women—of whom Malcolm's mother was one—spoke, taught, organized local meetings, and wrote and edited texts.[35] Also, Malcolm X's understanding largely emerged following his sojourns in Africa and the Middle East. It was not until Malcolm X began to speak and think more openly about the position of women in third world revolutionary movements, such as the Mau Mau, did he more directly question his earlier sexist attitudes. In December 1964 Malcolm X implored his audience: "Don't you ever be ashamed of the Mau Mau....Those brothers were freedom fighters. Not only brothers, there were sisters over there."[36] Women, Malcolm X realized, were not inseparable from the revolutionary movement; moreover, the role of women was decidedly greater than as a symbolic touchstone of masculinity. Rather than simply being seen as the guardians of culture, and hence requiring protection, women for Malcolm X were increasingly seen as active participants in the revolution. He explained: "And I hope that our brothers, especially our brothers here in Harlem, listened very well, very closely....You don't have to be a man to fight for freedom. All you have to do is be an intelligent human being."[37]

These statements reflect a substantial change in the political philosophy of Malcolm X and thus are part of a significant shift in black nationalism. With the exception of Garveyism, women barely figured in most Pan-Africanist or emigrationist imaginings of what a New Land might look like.[38] Malcolm X, however, was forwarding a more structural interpretation, and was moving toward a causal relationship between women's position in society, the role of

education, and political economic advancement; rhetorically, though, his interpretation was strongly prudential in its configuration. The contestation of geographic knowledge, as controlled through institutions such as the educational system, were thus intertwined with the status of women in the conduct of revolution. And whereas earlier statements of Malcolm X suggested that the "weaknesses" of women were partially to blame for men's political, economic, and social emasculation, now Malcolm X began to consider the possibility that the exploitation and oppression of women was intimately bound to the quest for social justice. Just as the marginalization of African Americans was related to the colonization of Africa, so too was the discrimination of blacks associated with the discrimination toward women in general. Malcolm X continued in the same interview to say that, "one of the things I became thoroughly convinced of in my recent travels is the importance of giving freedom to the woman, giving her education, and giving her the incentive to get out there and put that same spirit and understanding in their children."[39] Although Malcolm X still viewed women as the primary influence on children, he also recognized that in his earlier statements he seriously underemphasized the contributions of women. Now Malcolm X concluded that "I frankly am proud of the contributions that our women have made in the struggle for freedom and I'm one person who's for giving them all the leeway possible because they've made a greater contribution than many of us men."[40]

One indication of the increased role of women within Malcolm X's thinking is provided by the emergence of Malcolm X's Organization of Afro-American Unity. In both the inception and day-to-day activities of the OAAU, the contributions of women, including Yuri Kochiyama, Lynn Shifflet, and Patricia Robinson were pivotal. Malcolm X also acknowledged the importance of other women in the Civil Rights Movement, such as Ella Baker of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and Fannie Lou Hamer, cofounder of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party.

Malcolm X's gendered perspective, while in many ways revolutionary, was also exceptionally conservative and contradictory. Indeed, it is significant that whereas Malcolm X advocated agency on behalf

of (presumably male) African Americans, Malcolm X ignored any agency on behalf of women. As the above quotes reveal, for example, Malcolm X framed the issue as one of "giving" women access to education, freedom, and incentive. Women were seen to follow from the lead of men, rather than having their own initiative. This is a vastly different message from his exhortation to not wait on the white society to give African Americans anything. Indeed, Malcolm X argued that a racist society would never give anything away for free; rather, it must be taken through revolutionary means. In 1965 Malcolm X explained, "You never will get the solution from any white liberal. Let you and I sit down and discuss the problem, come up with what we feel the solution will be....But don't let them come and tell us [what] we should do to solve our problem."[41] He continued: "If they want to help in their way, a way that they can help, good; but don't come and join us and try and sit down and tell us how to solve our problem. They can't do it, and they won't."[42]

hooks writes that there is no justification for Malcolm's sexism. However, she also notes that had Malcolm X lived, it does not seem in any way incongruous to see him as someone who would have become an advocate for gender equality. hooks concludes, "To suggest, as he did in the speeches of his last year, that black women should play an equal role in the struggle for black liberation, constitutes an implicit challenge to sexist thinking. Had he lived, Malcolm might have explicitly challenged sexist thinking in as adamant a manner as he had advocated it."[43]

The Violence of Revolutions

Critics of Malcolm X portray him as a revolutionary who incited people to violence. As indicated in chapter 4, Malcolm X was routinely charged with inciting African Americans to violence. And to these charges Malcolm X would invariably respond with a circumspect and considered reply, often stressing the hypocrisy of American society. On one occasion, for instance, Malcolm X indicated that "when the black man starts reaching out for what America says are his rights, the black man feels that he is within his rights—when he becomes the victim of brutality by those who are depriving him

of his rights—to do whatever is necessary to protect himself."[44] For Malcolm X, this was less an incitement to violence than it was an observation. He explained that, "You should not feel that I am inciting someone to violence. I'm only warning of a powder-keg situation. You can take it or leave it. If you take the warning, perhaps you can still save yourself. But if you ignore or ridicule it, well, death is already at your doorstep."[45]

His dismissal of charges of violence, as seen in this last statement, was indeed tinged with violent imagery. However, critics have wrongly interpreted, or have failed to consider, Malcolm X's actual stance on violence and revolution. Conforming with a prudent rhetoric, Malcolm X saw violence as contingent upon the course of revolution. As he explained in a number of speeches and interviews, America *was* in a position to witness a bloodless, nonviolent revolution. Malcolm X stressed that "America is the only country in history in a position to bring about a revolution without violence and bloodshed."[46] He indicated that freedom could come to the African American either by ballots or bullets. For Malcolm X, "These are the only two avenues, the only two roads, the only two methods, the only two means...." Malcolm X, in stark gendered terms, further explained that "the only way without bloodshed that this can be brought about is that the black man has to be given full use of the ballot in every one of the fifty states. But if the black man doesn't get the ballot, then you are going to be faced with another man who forgets that ballot and starts using the bullet." Malcolm X concluded, though, that violence was the most likely scenario, given that "America is not morally equipped" to give the black man his freedom.[47]

Robert Terrill interprets Malcolm X's "Ballot or Bullet" speech in rhetorical terms. He suggests that "Malcolm never explicitly advocated violence, but at the same time, this rhetoric does seem to encourage violent action." Accordingly, the "resulting tension fosters an incipient willingness to consider acting in ways that ignore the expectations of the dominant culture, but issues no command to take such action."[48] Whereas I concur with Terrill's assessment that Malcolm X's oratorical strategy of not advocating or modeling an unproblematic course of action opens up some conceptual space in

the Civil Rights Movement, I also believe that there are other, more practical issues at hand. In particular, Malcolm X as a public figure must have been aware and concerned about being indicted on charges of sedition. Peter Goldman, who had interviewed Malcolm X on a number of occasions, explains that Malcolm X "was rather more cautious with his language than his reputation as a fire-eater suggested; he has an almost lawyerly sense of where consciousness-heightening ended and where sedition began."[49] Both Louis Lomax and Goldman agree that Malcolm X always stopped short of advocating armed revolution, but that revolution was also described in dire terms. No doubt Malcolm X was aware of the governmental harassment directed against other black activists, including Paul Robeson and W.E.B. DuBois. Indeed, within his speeches Malcolm X did allude to the possibility of sedition charges.

Malcolm X, however, *was* decidedly opposed to the principle of nonviolence as advocated by Martin Luther King, Jr., for one basic reason: he believed that this practice unfairly placed African Americans in an inferior position—as well as an emasculated position—vis-à-vis their daily struggles against violence. Recall the context of the times. On September 15, 1963, four African-American schoolgirls died, and twenty other people were injured, when the Ku Klux Klan bombed the Sixteenth Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama. That same day a thirteen-year-old African-American boy, Virgil Ware, was shot and killed by two sixteen-year-old white boys. Given this context, Malcolm X reasoned: "If Martin Luther King was teaching white people to turn the other cheek, then I would say he was justified in teaching Black people to turn the other cheek. That's all I'm against....If I'm going to be nonviolent, then let them [white people] be nonviolent."[50] During a December 1964 interview with Les Crane, Malcolm X was asked to define and defend his position on violence. Crane went on the offensive: "Violence or the threat of violence has always surrounded you. Speeches that you've made have been interpreted as being threat. You have made statements...about how the Negroes should go out and arm themselves, form militias of their own." Malcolm X responded: "No, I said this: That in areas of this country where the government has proven its—either its inability

or its unwillingness to protect the lives and property of our people, then it's only fair to expect us to do whatever is necessary to protect ourselves."[51] The youthful killers of Virgil Ware, described as Eagle Scouts and regular churchgoers, admitted to the murder, but were released into custody with a warning to not have another "lapse."[52]

Jeff Goodwin argues that states, through their inability or unwillingness to protect certain populations, are culpable in the creation of revolutionary movements.[53] Malcolm X's stance on violence is an affirmation of this argument. In his "World Problem" speech, Malcolm X explained "We believe that our fight is just....This doesn't mean that we're for violence. But we have seen that the federal government has shown its inability, its absolute unwillingness, to protect the lives and the property of Black people."[54] On numerous other occasions Malcolm X elaborated his position. In a statement delivered in London on February 9, 1965, Malcolm X said bluntly, "I do not advocate violence. In fact, the violence that exists in the United States is the violence that the Negro in America has been a victim of, and I have never advocated our people going out and initiating any acts of aggression against whites indiscriminately."[55] And later, in a lecture delivered two days later at the London School of Economics, Malcolm X explained that "We are not for violence in any shape or form, but believe that the people who have violence committed against them should be able to defend themselves. By what they are doing to me they arouse me to violence. People should only be nonviolent as long as they are dealing with a nonviolent person."[56]

For Malcolm X, therefore, a crucial component of the black revolution was a reconstituted (separate) black community; to (re)gain control of all political and economic resources. Within the community, however, traditional roles were largely retained. Black men, in particular, were expected to provide not only for their families, but also for the community and the nation as a whole. Provision, moreover, was to be seen not only in economic terms, but in corporeal terms. In particular, African-American men were to protect African-American women and children from the physical abuses meted out by a white racist society. In December 1964 Malcolm X asked the men in attendance:

> How can you and I be looked upon as men with black women being beaten and nothing being done about it, black children and black babies being beaten and nothing being done about it? No, we don't deserve to be recognized and respected as men as long as our women can be brutalized....and nothing being done about it, but we sit around singing "We Shall Overcome."[57]

Elsewhere Malcolm X was more specific. Referring to a news account of an African-American woman being beaten in Selma, Alabama, Malcolm X said, "It showed the sheriff and his henchmen throwing this Black woman on the ground—on the ground. And Negro men standing around doing nothing about it saying, 'Well, let's overcome them with our capacity to love.' What kind of phrase is that? 'Overcome them with our capacity to love.' And then it disgraces the rest of us, because all over the world the picture is splashed showing a Black woman with some white brutes, with their knees holding her down, and full-grown Black men standing around watching it."[58] In his speeches Malcolm X stressed the historical and contemporary exploitation and oppression of black women. He spoke of their being raped by white slave owners, of four little girls being killed in an explosion in a Birmingham church. Malcolm X interpreted these acts as signifying the emasculation of African-American men. Physical force, rather than violence per se, for Malcolm X was deeply implicated in the revolutionary struggles for black liberation.

Conclusions

Colburn suggests that the "values, expectations, phraseology, iconography, and implicit rules that expressed and shaped collective intentions and behavior can be called the 'intellectual culture of the revolution.'"[59] Malcolm X was a prominent *intellectual* of revolutionary movements. And in so doing he forwarded a decidedly black radical intellectual culture of revolution. It is inappropriate, however, to categorize Malcolm X as a revolutionary in the sense of Che Guevara or Fidel Castro in Cuba, or Ho Chi Minh and Vo Nguyen Giap in Vietnam. Malcolm X certainly employed the rhetoric of revolution,

and contributed a theoretical understanding of the black revolution, but he did not advocate armed rebellion. His message—directed largely toward the African-American populace—was to remake American spaces through self-determination and personal empowerment. Self-defense was intimately associated with this remaking. Furthermore, Malcolm X implored his audiences to not rely on the oppressors and exploiters to change. Rather, it was up to African Americans to assume the initiative.

Colburn writes that "Revolution brings the moment of supreme political choice. To an extent otherwise never possible, it can be asked: *How should we be governed*, and to what ends shall our government propel us?"[60] Through the rhetoric of revolution, Malcolm X demanded of a racist society that it confront the questions of oppression and exploitation. He demanded also of his African-American audiences to understand clearly the issues at hand. His was not a "wait-and-see" approach. There was an immediacy to his message. The call for revolution was more a demand for African Americans to assume responsibility for their plight. Malcolm X, for example, evinced significant changes in his attitudes to "white liberals" and others who sought to achieve social justice. Ultimately, however, he maintained that African Americans must take the initiative. In December 1964, Malcolm X explained that, "I believe that there are some white people who might be sincere....Now if you are with us, all I say is, make the same kind of contribution with us in our struggle for freedom that all white people have always made when they were struggling for their own freedom. You were struggling for your freedom in the Revolutionary war. Your own Patrick Henry said, 'Liberty or death,' and George Washington got the cannons out, and all the rest of them that you taught me to worship as my heroes, they were fighters, they were warriors."[61] The salience of Malcolm X's message is well expressed by H. Rap Brown: "Malcolm was the first Black leader to come out and tell Black people that they had a right to defend their own lives....He knew where it was at. America doesn't rule the world with love. It rules with guns, tanks, missiles, bombs, the Army, Air Force, Navy and the Marines."[62]

Malcolm X recast the black revolution and black liberation in the United States in terms of masculine self-realization. In this respect, Malcolm X was not immune from the dominant ideologies of gender prevalent in many black social movements. However, as his arguments became increasingly socialist in orientation, he also evinced a more nuanced understanding of sexism. Thus, although Malcolm X did not identify himself as a Marxist, let alone a third world Marxist, he did provide a foundation that later revolutionaries built upon. In particular, Malcolm X was moving toward a critical interpretation of the triple oppressions of racism, classism, and sexism. As such, his writings and speeches were as instrumental to later groups, such as the Black Panther Party, as were the writings of Frantz Fanon, Ernesto Guevara, and Mao Zedong.

6
Geographical Imaginations and the Place of Africa

The world is wide and beautiful.
But almost everywhere, everywhere, the children are dying.
—**Edward Abbey**[1]

"We routinely make sense of places, spaces, and landscapes in our everyday lives," Derek Gregory writes, "in different ways and for different purposes—and these "popular geographies" are as important to the conduct of social life as are our understandings of...biography and history." Gregory elaborates that "when we are required to think critically and systematically about social life and social space, we usually need to distance ourselves from those commonplace, taken-for-granted assumptions." Gregory maintains that "we need to interrogate those 'common sense' understandings: We need to make them answer to other questions, to have them speak to other audiences, to make them visible from other perspectives."[2] Gregory concludes that the "task of a critical human geography—of a geographical imagination—is...to unfold [one] utopian gesture and replace it with another: one that recognizes the corporeality of vision and reaches out, from one body to another, not in a mood of arrogance, aggression, and conquest but in a spirit of humility, understanding and care."[3]

Malcolm X was an intellectual who developed his political thought from a dialectical dialogue of lived experience and critical interpretation. Anthony Bogues asserts that this dialogue—this geographical imagining—is a feature of the black radical intellectual tradition, where there is a radical hermeneutic of everyday experiences.[4] For Malcolm X, his experiences—his ground-level reality—did not conform with the promise of the American Dream, nor to the rhetoric of the Civil Rights Movement. The former, according to Malcolm X, was a myth; the latter was an integrationist stance that reaffirmed white supremacy.

In a December 1964 speech Malcolm X spoke of "image-making." Regarding the representation of African Americans in the United States, Malcolm X argued, "Anytime black people in this country are not able to be controlled by the man, the press immediately begins to label those black people as irresponsible or as extremists. They put all these old negative labels up there."[5] Two months later Malcolm X addressed the London School of Economics, an occasion on which he discussed the use of representations with respect to violence: "I have never said that Negroes should initiate acts of aggression against whites, but where the government fails to protect the Negro he is entitled to do it himself. He is within his rights. I have found the only white elements who do not want this advice given to undefensive Blacks are the racist liberals. *They use the press to project us in the image of violence.*"[6] Five days later Malcolm X elaborated on the use of representations:

> They take the press, and through the press, they feed statistics,...call them crime statistics, to the white public. Because the white public is divided. Some mean good, and some don't mean good....The racists, that are usually very influential in the society, don't make their move without first trying to get public opinion on their side. When they want to suppress and oppress the Black community, what do they do? They take these statistics, and through the press, they feed them to the public. They make it appear that the rate of crime in the Black community is higher than it is anywhere else.[7]

In these statements Malcolm X demonstrates an understanding of the complex interactions of power, knowledge, and the representation

of people, places, and events—themes that resonate in contemporary debates of social theory. This is seen most clearly, for example, in the writings of Frantz Fanon, Michel Foucault, and Edward Said. In *Orientalism*, as a case in point, Said is concerned with the production of the "Orient" as distinct from the western "Occident." Said explains: "The Orient was almost a European invention, and had been since antiquity a place of romance, exotic beings, haunting memories and landscapes, remarkable experiences....the Orient has helped to define Europe (or the West) as its contrasting image, idea, personality, experience. Yet none of this Orient is merely imaginative. The Orient is an integral part of European *material* civilization and culture."[8]

Just as Orientalism defined the West in a relational sense, so too has the discursive construction of African Americans defined whiteness. Toni Morrison introduces the term *Africanism* to capture this idea.[9] She explains that the term *Africanism* refers not to the larger body of knowledge on Africa—the accumulated geographical knowledge produced by academics, travelers, and so on—nor to the varieties and complexities of African people and their descendants. Instead, Morrison uses the term "for the denotative and connotative blackness that African peoples have come to signify, as well as the entire range of views, assumptions, readings, and misreadings that accompany Eurocentric learning about these people." She continues that "Africanism has become, in the Eurocentric tradition that American education favors, both a way of talking about and a way of policing matters of class, sexual license, and repression, formations and exercises of power, and mediations on ethics and accountability."[10]

Malcolm X, as discussed in chapter 3, understood the power of representations and the control of knowledge—the presence of Africanism sentiments—and how the use of representations was crucial in the construction not only of African Americans, but also of nonwhite spaces. Malcolm X, in his deconstruction of the term *Negro* (see chapter 3) exposed the racism inherent in the label. By indicating the absence of self in "Negro," Malcolm X argued that for African Americans to adopt this term is to negate their own existence. *Negro* and other externally imposed terms, such as *race riots*, were tools of discipline and domination, produced and circulated

within education, the media, and other mediums. Describing the representation of "race riots," Malcolm X explained that:

> ...This message—this is a very skillful message used by racists to make the whites who aren't racists think that since the rate of crime in the Black community is so high, this paints the Black community in the image of a criminal. It makes it appear that everyone in the Black community is a criminal. And as soon as this impression is given, then it makes it possible, or paves the way to set up a police-type state in the Black community, getting the full approval of the white public when the police come in and use all kind of brutal methods to suppress Black people, crush their skulls, sic dogs on them, and things of that sort. And the whites go along with it. Because they think that everybody over there's a criminal anyway. This is what—the press does this.[11]

The recognition and analysis of negative representations of African Americans, therefore, provided an important building block to the development of Malcolm X's own political thought and geographical imaginations—ideas that reappear in contemporary discussions of race and racism. Indeed, three decades after Malcolm X, Orlando Patterson would echo these same sentiments:

> American social science is either uninterested in, or befuddled by, the fact that the vast majority of Afro-Americans, including the majority of those born and brought up poor, overcome their circumstances and lead healthy, happy, productive lives. For the same reason that they exhibit little interest in the growing number of poor Euro-Americans, who now greatly outnumber their Afro-American counterparts and are as crime committing, violent, wife battering, child abusive, and drug addicted....with economic and health consequences for the nation that are absolutely and proportionately greater than those caused by any other group. It is, however, consistent with the obsessive over-racialization of social problems and their confinement to a homogenized population of 33 million Afro-Americans....[12]

I suggest that we connect Malcolm X's concern over geographical representations with his earlier experiences in grade school, namely the representation of both Africa and African Americans in class-

room settings. Malcolm X argued that the construction of negative images of African Americans facilitated the perpetuation of racist and discriminatory practices, including residential and educational segregation legislation. For Malcolm X, an antiracist pedagogy was imperative to confront the continued violence perpetuated against nonwhites. Indeed, Malcolm X identified the potential consequences of these representations. In his speech at the London School of Economics, Malcolm X explained:

> ...as soon as the public accepts the fact that the dark-skinned community consists largely of criminals or people who are dirty, then it makes it possible for the power structure to set up a police-state system. Which will make it permissible in the minds of even the well-meaning white public for them to come in and use all kinds of police methods to brutally suppress the struggles on the part of these people against segregation, discrimination, and other acts that are unleashed against them that are absolutely unjust.[13]

For Malcolm X, these representations fostered an environment that facilitated a banal perpetuation of discrimination and prejudice, oppression, and exploitation. Consequently, it is this context of overracialization that allowed Susan Smith, in 1994, to claim that she was the victim of a car-jacking by an armed, black male, twenty to thirty years old, and that her children were abducted along with the car. The assailant never existed; indeed, Smith had drawn on a stock representation of "black criminals" to divert attention from the fact that she herself had murdered her children.[14] Morever, the lack of a general outcry over the deceit of Smith provides an indication on how "natural" her story appeared to much of white society.

An awareness of Africanism is crucial to the countering of racist practices. Morrison writes: "Through the simple expedient of demonizing and reifying the range of color on a palette, American Africanism makes it possible to say and not say, to inscribe and erase, to escape and engage, to act out and act on, to historicize and render timeless. It provides a way of contemplating chaos and civilization, desire and fear, and a mechanism for testing the problems and blessings of freedom."[15] This last statement is worth considering more fully. Africanism—the construction of an inferior blackness—is necessary

for the simultaneous construction of American ideals: freedom, liberty, independence, and self-determination. Only through the existence of a subservient, unfree people was the ideal of freedom truly revealed. This, of course, was the basis of integration, from Malcolm X's perspective. Conversely, if African Americans *chose* to separate themselves, their actions signified a renunciation of American society. Separatism was a symbol of liberation and independence: They were *free* to live where they wanted. And once separated, they were no longer positioned as the negative Other, to be juxtaposed with a constructed sense of white supremacy.

Africanism, of course, has not remained unchallenged. Just as African Americans countered the production of geographical knowledge, just as African Americans advocated separatist movements, and just as African Americans demanded—through revolution if necessary—equal treatment as human beings, so too have African Americans countered the construction of Africanism. Malcolm X, although certainly neither the first nor the last, redirected attention away from the overracialized representations, the Africanist geographical imaginations of a racialized society. Rather than perpetuating an essentialist conception of race and crime, Malcolm X honed in on the existent social, political, and economic inequalities of society and, consequently, challenged the dominant "public" explanations of these events.

But crucially, Malcolm X, as explained in chapter 3, understood also that the negative representations of African Americans were intimately associated with negative images of the African homeland. To redeem the "identity" of African Americans, to counter the Africanism that flourished, and continues to flourish, in American society, Malcolm X and other intellectuals turned their attention to the "place" of Africa.

Africa has remained an intricate part of African American's (and other peoples of African descent's) imaginative geographies. I concur with James Meriwether who writes that "Examining African Americans' discourses about Africa...ultimately not only deepens our understanding of this relationship but also opens a window onto black America as it transformed itself during the mid-twentieth

century."[16] Given the nature of Africanism, however, it is perhaps to be expected that the lack of understanding of this relationship is further evidence of an entrenched Africanism in our society. Missing from our geographies are the social and spatial practices that form the African diaspora. As Meriwether further explains, "the downplaying of international forces that informed black America divorces our understanding of the black freedom struggle in America from the broader, worldwide context."[17] Malcolm X was explicit, especially in his last year, in his acknowledgment of Africa in his political thought. And in this manner, Malcolm X continued a long tradition of redeeming the discursive and material spaces of Africa through Pan-Africanism.

Pan-Africanism

Pan-Africanism (not to be confused with Morrison's Africanism) is both a movement and an idea. Although its inception is debated, there is general consensus that Pan-Africanism "is a political and cultural phenomenon that regards Africa, Africans, and African descendants abroad as a unit." It thus refers to an imaginative diasporic geography, one that "seeks to regenerate and unify Africa and promote a feeling of oneness among the people of the African world."[18]

The intellectual roots of Pan-Africanism are grounded in the understanding of Africa in the thoughts, actions, and expressions of peoples of the African diaspora. Robin Kelley identifies a long tradition of African visions among the diaspora.[19] As reflected in literature, music, and political texts, African Americans have historically represented particular imaginative geographies of Africa as a space of salvation and redemption. Often these geographies would incorporate a biblically informed dream of Exodus, as seen, for example, in the back to Africa movements and other "Black colonization" schemes. Moreover, as written in the sixty-eighth Psalm, "Ethiopia stretches forth her hands unto God." According to Kelley, this passage was as important to Pan-Africanist and emigrationist sentiment as the book of Exodus. In particular, references to Ethiopia became the theological basis for what became known in the nineteenth century

as Ethiopianism. The Bible, therefore, provided much inspiration for a redemption of Africa.

Pan-Africanism, as an idea and movement, challenged both racism within the diaspora and colonialism in the African homeland. From its intellectual inception, therefore, it was transnational in scope. Pan-Africanists understood the interconnections of localized forms of racism—whether these were practiced in New York, Haiti, or the Congo—and the larger regional and international systems of colonialism.

Although not the first to express Pan-Africanist sentiments, Edward W. Blyden is generally credited with coining the term *Pan-Africanism*. Blyden was born in 1832 on the Danish West Indian island of St. Thomas. He arrived in the United States, hoping to continue his education. However, as a "black," Blyden was denied admission into U.S. institutions of higher learning. He subsequently emigrated to Liberia in 1851, with the aid of the New York Colonization Society. Through education, Blyden became fluent in classics and mathematics; he also spoke numerous languages, including Hebrew. In 1861 became professor of Greek and Latin at Liberia College and within twenty years he was president of the college. He also worked as a journalist, serving as editor of the *Liberia Herald* and, later, *The Negro* and *The African World*. Apart from these activities, Blyden was also a Presbyterian minister and a diplomat (he served as Minister of the Interior and Secretary of State and Ambassador to London and Paris).

The Pan-Africanism of Blyden consisted, in part, in an attempt to redeem the "nature" of the African. He wrote widely on racial prejudice and he repudiated dominant "scientific" conceptions of African inferiority. Through appeals to the Bible, as well as to classical writers, including Homer, Herodotus, and Aeschylus, Blyden argued that Africans were in no way inferior to Europeans. Concerned with the production of geographic knowledge of Africa and Africans, Blyden attempted to demonstrate that Africans indeed possessed not only an enviable past, but also had made immense contributions to the progress of humankind.[20] Consequently, Blyden promoted a strong admiration and respect for African culture. He likewise argued

against assimilation and the "Europeanization" of African peoples, countering racist theories of culture and civilization. In so doing, he advocated the establishment of African universities, and the promotion of African subjects, including languages. Blyden argued:

> "Let us do away with the sentiment of Race. Let us do away with our African personality and be lost, if possible, in another Race." This is as wise or as philosophical as to say, let us do away with gravitation, with heat and cold and sunshine and rain. Of course, the Race in which these persons would be absorbed is the dominant race, before which, in cringing self-surrender and ignoble self-suppression they lie in prostrate admiration.[21]

Blyden would advocate that Africans not succumb to the racist overtures of European society; that Africans should not subject themselves to the colonizer's rhetoric. Instead, through education and self-determination, Africans were to reclaim their sense of self and, consequently, truly achieve their dignity. Moreover, Blyden did not believe that peoples of the African diaspora would ever fully be treated as equals within the United States or Europe. Accordingly, he advocated the formation of an African nationality, and the simultaneous development of strong, independent African states with complete autonomy in political, economic, and religious affairs. He likewise argued against the continued exploitation of Africa by European colonial powers.

Blyden was not alone in his forwarding of Pan-Africanism. Henry Sylvester-Williams, a Trinidadian-born lawyer living in London, convened a gathering of scholars in 1900. His goal was to assemble a "congress" of peoples of the African diaspora. With representatives from Ethiopia, Sierra Leone, Liberia, and the Gold Coast, as well as many others from North America and the West Indies, Sylvester-Williams used the occasion to discuss issues facing blacks living in England and elsewhere around the world.

One notable person in attendance at the 1900 congress was W.E.B. Du Bois. It was Du Bois, subsequently, who assembled the first Pan-African Congress, held in Paris in 1919. Arranged to coincide with the Paris Peace Conference in the aftermath of the First World War, Du Bois hoped to draw attention to the injustice

of European colonialism in Africa, the treatment of black soldiers in Europe, and the need for an African presence at the Paris Peace Conference. This first Pan-African Congress was attended by sixteen black Americans, twenty-seven delegates from the Caribbean, and twenty representatives from Africa.

Encouraged by the participation at the 1919 Congress, Du Bois organized subsequent congresses in 1921, 1923, 1927, and 1945. These congresses continued to focus on European colonialism in Africa as well as the condition of peoples of African descent throughout the diaspora. Recommendations were routinely presented to the League of Nations. To be expected, there were debates and disagreements over the proper course of action. Some Pan-Africanists, including Du Bois, favored some form of separatism. Others favored more international cooperation with European governments.

Equally important to the development of Pan-Africanism was the growth of Marcus Garvey's movement. As discussed in earlier chapters, Garveyism is often erroneously portrayed as simply a Back-to-Africa movement. Garvey did, however, believe that the solution to the problem of black inequality in the New World required a powerful black nation in Africa and he did propose that the formation of a strong African state could serve as home to members of the African diaspora.[22] However, Garvey also advocated a selective emigration rather than a mass exodus.[23] In so doing, Garvey drew inspiration from the modern Zionist movement, and even called his own movement *Black Zionism*.[24] He patterned his Universal African Legion, for example, after the Jewish Legion, and even received significant patronage from Jewish financiers.[25]

The political thought of Garvey provided important foundations for the formulation of subsequent Pan-African ideas. Penny Von Eschen, for example, writes that Garvey made African Americans conscious of their African origins and created for the first time a feeling of international solidarity between Africans and peoples of African descent. She concludes that in "a brutal era of Jim Crow, lynchings, and political disenfranchisement, Garvey transformed African Americans from a national minority into a global majority."[26] P. Olisanwuche Esedebe, likewise, contends that Garvey introduced

the "masses" to the ideas of an African nationality and an African personality, which had hitherto been restricted to a handful of intellectuals.[27] This concern for the everyday person would manifest most strongly in the later activities of Malcolm X and his successors such as Huey Newton and Bobby Seale.

Pan-African sentiment underwent significant transformations in the 1950s and 1960s. Following the 1945 Pan-African conference, held in Manchester, England, the movement largely passed into the hands of African politicians. Indeed, present at the 1945 conference were many of the future leaders of the anticolonial movement in Africa, including Jomo Kenyatta and Kwame Nkrumah. It was Nkrumah, in particular, who called for African independence of the Gold Coast (present-day Ghana) and became a leading advocate of a more revolutionary understanding of Pan-Africanism. This was a crucial development in that these ideas contributed to the formation of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). In 1963 thirty of the then thirty-three African heads of state met in Addis Ababa. The organization was developed to foster regional unity, promote economic growth, and end colonial rule.

Dialectically, the Pan-Africanist movements based in Africa would have a profound influence on events in the United States. According to Meriwether:

> Events in Africa held meaning, be they the joyful outpourings from African nations gaining independence or the painful, sometimes deadly, progress toward true freedom. If, historically, frustration and disillusionment had driven some African Americans to seek a stronger relationship with Africa, clearly now a new basis for the relationship pervaded broader black America. Disillusionment and anger with America certainly were involved, but beyond this the hope and pride generated by contemporary Africa resonated in black America.[28]

African Americans, in the early 1960s, following independence struggles across the African continent, helped frame discourses about Africa. African Americans found that bringing attention to bear on liberation movements that were fighting readily identified proponents of white supremacy offered an effective rallying point,

much more so than did independent countries that were struggling against economic, political, and cultural problems.[29] Malcolm X was both a product of, and catalyst for, this reconfigured geographical imagination. As discussed below, it was the sense of pride and hope that Malcolm X was drawn to during his sojourn to the African homeland in 1964, and it was this sense that Malcolm X advocated during the last months of his life.

Malcolm and the Place of Pan-Africanism

Following his separation from the Nation of Islam, Malcolm X initially advocated black nationalism as the foundation of his future Civil Rights work. Black nationalism, for Malcolm X, consisted of political, economic, and social control. Conforming to his earlier pronouncements on the viability of separate communities, Malcolm X (echoing Blyden, Garvey, and other Pan-Africanists) believed that it was imperative for African Americans to control their own resources and institutions. In subsequent months, however, there was a shift in the geographic contours of his political philosophy. Specifically, Malcolm X maintained that a material liberation could only emerge in tandem with a psychological emancipation. Pan-Africanism, with Africa serving as a geographical touchstone, would provide the framework.

On April 22, 1964 Malcolm X embarked on the first of his two African trips of that year. He returned, on June 20, with a Pan-Africanist-inspired perspective on the conduct of the Civil Rights Movement. The reasons for this shift are threefold. First, Pan-Africanism offered Malcolm X a model upon which to foster African-American solidarity within the Civil Rights Movement. Specifically, Malcolm X was fascinated and inspired by the formation of the OAU, an event that must have resonated with his earlier interest in the Bandung Conference. This sense of community as expressed in the ideals of the OAU—to promote unity and solidarity—was of tremendous appeal to Malcolm X. Particularly since his separation from the Nation of Islam, Malcolm X spoke regularly on the divisiveness and splintered nature of the Civil Rights Movement. In his "Declaration of Independence" speech of March 12, 1964, Malcolm

X, for example, informed his audience that he was not out to fight other leaders of the Civil Rights Movement; rather, they "must find a common approach, a common solution, to a common problem."[30] He urged community leaders to "concentrate [their] united efforts toward solving the unending hurt that is being done daily to our people...in America."[31] Malcolm X concluded, "There can be no black-white unity until there is first some black unity. There can be no workers' solidarity until there is first some racial solidarity. We cannot think of uniting with others, until after we have first united among ourselves."[32]

Second, for Malcolm X, Pan-Africanism afforded a tangible philosophy upon which to build and strengthen African-American communities. In so doing, Pan-Africanism conformed to his earlier separatist arguments. First, however, a spatial distinction between what I term *communal* separatism and *transnational* separatism must be introduced. By the former term I refer to separate communities, such as black towns, wherein African Americans retain political, economic, and social control of their surroundings. This conforms to the arguments of separatists such as Washington and Garvey. Transnational separatism, conversely, may be used to indicate the literal return of diasporic peoples to the African homeland.

Malcolm X clearly moved away from advocating transnational separatism. During a March 1964 rally Malcolm X said that "We have to be realistic and flexible" and that "Africa is a long way off and there's a lot of water in between."[33] In his "Declaration of Independence" speech, Malcolm X further explained that while he still (at that point) believed that a literal separation to Africa was the best solution, he also acknowledged that "separation back to Africa is still a long-range program, and while it is yet to materialize, 22 million of our people who are still here in America need better food, clothing, housing, education and jobs right now."[34] In a December 1964 interview Malcolm X articulated more clearly his geographical imaginings of Africa: "I believe this, that if we migrated back to Africa culturally, philosophically and psychologically, while remaining here physically, the spiritual bond that would develop between us and Africa through this cultural, philosophical and psychological

migration, so-called migration, would enhance our position here, because we would have our contacts with them acting as roots or foundations behind us."[35]

In part drawing on his Garveyite upbringing, Malcolm X equated the spiritual return of African Americans to the Jewish diaspora. He explained that "Just as the American Jew is in harmony (politically, economically, and culturally) with world Jewry, it is time for all African-Americans to become an integral part of the world's Pan-Africanists, and even though we might remain in America physically while fighting for the benefits the Constitution guarantees us, we must 'return' to Africa philosophically and culturally and develop a working unity in the framework of Pan-Africanism."[36] A communal separatism, therefore, remained a viable, if not preferable option for Malcolm X. William Sales argues in a similar vein that any quest for social justice must preserve the plurality of cultures and nationalities and not take place as a result of the forced homogenization of "integration."[37] Pan-Africanism as an ideology would serve to guide the development of separate communities.

Third, Pan-Africanism provided Malcolm X with a means to broaden the American Civil Rights Movement to encompass larger questions of human rights. As Sales maintains, it was Malcolm X who attempted to unite the African unity movement, which reached its high point with the creation of the OAU, with the human rights thrust of African-descended communities in the diaspora.[38] I discuss this shift in greater detail in chapter 7; at this point, suffice it to say that Malcolm X expounded on the idea that black nationalism, which he forwarded in March of 1964, was too limiting; in particular, it excluded large segments of society that were oppressed and exploited by the same structures and institutions of white supremacy. And although Pan-Africanism was predicated on the use of Africa as a symbolic touchstone, Malcolm X also understood that significance of the prefix *pan*. The liberation of African Americans was inseparable from other instances of oppression and exploitation; simply put, the Eurocentric international system had to be transformed into one which could extend justice and equality to all of the world's people.[39] Pan-Africanism opened the door for Malcolm X to include all of humanity.

In 1964 Malcolm X created the Organization of Afro-American Unity. At its core, the purpose of the newly formed organization was to combat the injustices of American society and to formulate a coalition to champion the cause of human rights for all peoples. The formation of the OAAU, however, was not simply the product of Malcolm X acting in isolation. Indeed, the OAAU resulted from numerous discussions and interactions between Malcolm X and other African-American, and African, leaders. During the early months of 1964, for example, Malcolm X spoke often with Akbar Muhammad Ahmed (formerly known as Maxwell Stanford), the field secretary and founder of the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM). Founded in 1962, Robert Williams, former head of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) chapter in Monroe, North Carolina, was drafted as president. It was Williams who advocated revolutionary violence in pursuit of black liberation. Although it remains unclear if Malcolm X ever met Williams (who, at the time, was living in exile in Cuba), it is known that Malcolm X was aware of Williams's advocacy of black self-defense. Ultimately, based on these discussions, the OAAU was to be the organizational platform for Malcolm X as international spokesperson for RAM's revolutionary nationalism.[40]

Malcolm X also met with other scholars and activists, including James and Grace Lee Boggs. The Boggs, coauthors of the seminal book *Revolution and Evolution in the Twentieth Century*, were deeply committed activists who forwarded socialist arguments for black liberation.[41] They maintained that it was necessary to develop a vanguard of black revolutionaries. Malcolm X likewise corresponded with Julian Mayfield, an African-American expatriate living in Ghana. It was Mayfield who wrote to Malcolm X about organizing links between African-American communities with African-American expatriates in Africa. Mayfield likewise introduced Malcolm X to many dignitaries and intellectuals in Ghana during the summer of 1964.

It is important to recognize, therefore, that Malcolm X was drawing insight from a range of individuals during these last eleven months. He arranged with Lynn Shifflet, an NBC television producer, to assemble a group of activists to consider the proper course of action. Shifflet, like Malcolm X, was a former member of the Nation

of Islam. She left, however, because of the repression of women within the NOI. Through her efforts, Shifflet became instrumental in the operations of Malcolm X's organization and, significantly, it was through Shifflet that Malcolm X's attitude toward women in the movement changed (see chapter 5). Others in attendance included the Black feminist Patricia Robinson, the Asian-American activist Yuri Kochiyama, historian John Henrik Clarke, and A. Peter Bailey. According to Sales, it was Clark who secured from the United Nations the mission text and charter of the OAU and, subsequently, modeled the OAAU after the letter and spirit of the OAU.

The Realism of Malcolm X

It was imperative for Malcolm X to represent a Pan-Africanist-centered vision of Africa, one that countered the geographical knowledges produced in the media, educational systems, and elsewhere. Malcolm X said, "Millions of so-called Negroes in this country have a distorted image of our homeland. They think Africans eat each other and live in mud huts. They've been brainwashed by the white man—why, I'll show you muddier huts in Harlem than they've got over in Africa."[42] Pan-Africanism could in this way provide a strong foundation for a reclaimed African-American subjectivity.

The struggle for representation, however, was inseparable from a struggle over material concerns. At stake in the discursive contestation over Africa, in particular, was the control over resources and territory. Accordingly, during the last few months of his life, a materialist geography of Africa figured prominently in the speeches of Malcolm X. In this section I examine more closely the "place" of the Congo, for it was this international crisis that captured much of Malcolm X's attention.

The Congo Free State, located on the western edge of the African continent, was created, following the 1884–85 Berlin Conference, as a personal empire by and for Belgium's King Leopold. On May 29, 1885 the King of Belgium named his new, privately controlled colony the Etat Indépendant du Congo, or the Congo Free State. King Leopold's colony was spatially larger than England, France, Germany, Spain, and Italy combined; it occupied one-thirteenth of

the entire African continent, and was seventy-six times the size of Belgium.[43] In order to return a profit, Leopold granted leasing rights to private companies (concessionaires). One prominent company was the Anglo-Belgian India Rubber Company (ABIR), founded in 1892. The ABIR was granted exclusive rights to exploit all forest products in the Congo for thirty years. To take advantage of this, the ABIR and other companies introduced horrific systems of forced labor, torture. Many of the atrocities, such as floggings, murders, and the mutilation of bodies were exposed through the work of journalists and other investigators.

In 1908 Leopold transferred control of the Congo Free State to the Belgian government. The Belgian government, during its administration of the Congo, restricted general education to the primary level. In part, this was intended to reduce political agitation. Additionally, the government disallowed African representatives in political affairs.[44] Over the next decades, even as colony after colony in Africa achieved independence, Belgium remained steadfast, determined to retain the Congo as a colony. During the 1950s, two regional parties had emerged: the Alliance des Baskongo (Abako), led by Joseph Kasavubu, and the Confederation des Associations Tribales du Katanga (Conakat), led by Moise Tshombe. A third party, geographically more inclusive in scope, was the Mouvement National Congolais (MNC), headed by Patrice Lumumba. Lumumba was a Pan-Africanist. In 1958 he attended the All-African Peoples Conference held in Accra, Ghana. It was this event, in part, that shaped many of his philosophical beliefs.

Opposition parties to Belgium rule intensified to the point of outright rebellion in 1959. Reluctantly, the Belgian government announced that it would move toward that goal. In April a congress of Congolese political parties met to discuss and establish a schedule for independence. In the process, however, representatives of the Congolese political parties became increasingly fragmented. Kasavubu's party, Abako, for example, refused outright to participate. Ultimately, however, a date of June 20, 1960 was set for independence, and parliamentary elections were to be held in May. At that time, Lumumba's party won 40 of 137 seats; this did not constitute a ruling majority.

Lumumba emerged as prime minister, with Kasavubu assuming the largely ceremonial position of president.

Within days of political transition, from Belgian colony to sovereign state, the situation deteriorated. The former colonial army mutinied, in part responding to unfulfilled demands of pay raises and promotions. Reports circulated throughout the foreign press that Congolese troops were "rampaging" across the country. In response, Belgian troops were deployed in an attempt to stabilize the country. The Congolese leaders, in fact, had initially requested Belgian assistance. Moise Tshombe, for example, who now served as president of Katanga province, had requested foreign troops. Lumumba and Kasavubu, also, initially requested Belgian troops. However, after learning of Belgian attacks on the port of Matadi, which killed a number of civilians, Lumumba turned to the United Nations to demand the removal of Belgian troops.

Events in the Congo quickly enlarged into a international crisis. Lumumba, for example, dissatisfied with the United Nations, increasingly turned to the Soviet Union for support. The United States, in turn, watched with intensified concern, fearing that the Congo might "fall" to communism. Compounding the problem was the possibility of the provinces of Katanga and South Kasai seceding from the Congo. Katanga especially was a key region, both domestically and internationally, in the crisis. At the time of independence, more than 20 percent of the Congo's GNP and 60 percent of its exports came from mining, with more than 75 percent of these resources originating in Katanga alone.[45] Moreover, on the international market, the Congo in 1959 had produced a tenth of the "Free World's" copper, half of its cobalt, and more than two-thirds of its industrial diamonds; deposits of uranium, vital for the aerospace industry, also heightened Katanga's strategic importance.[46]

On July 11, 1960 Tshombe declared his independence from the Congo, with the Belgian government quickly supporting the secessionist movement in Katanga. Tshombe, in his decision, claimed that he was blocking a communist takeover of the Congo. Elsewhere in the country, Kasavubu adjourned parliament and Lumumba's private

secretary, who had been elevated to the position of Army Chief of Staff, seized control of the military.

At the United Nations, debate centered on the leadership of the Congo. After intense lobbying by the United States, on November 22 the Kasavubu delegation received a majority vote. Lumumba himself was imprisoned and subsequently murdered at the hands of Katanga soldiers and Belgian officers. The U.S. Central Intelligence Administration (CIA), it was later revealed, played an active role in facilitating the arrest and death of Lumumba.

Malcolm X followed intently the events in the Congo. He was a harsh critic of both Belgium and the United States. Just as he critiqued the misrepresentation of African Americans and, especially, "riots" in the United States, so too did Malcolm X confront the representations of the Congo crisis as it played out in the "white" media. Stories and photographs of the crisis, for example, routinely focused on the "savagery" of the Congolese soldiers, roaming the country raping and murdering Belgian women. These accounts seemed to confirm the long-entrenched fears of "freed" blacks running amok in the United States—stories that fueled America's imagination in the postbellum years.

Malcolm X was not alone, however, in his condemnation of Western involvement in the Congo. It was widely debated, for example, in the editorial pages of leading African-American newspapers. However, given the political anticommunist climate of the United States, the African-American community was divided in its response to Lumumba. According to Brenda Plummer, the crisis over the Congo, one heavily discussed by Malcolm X, marked a deepening fissure between established African-American authority figures and their constituencies. Moreover, it furthered the growing distance between popular black opinion and conventional Civil Rights organizations, paralleling a declining trust in U.S. institutions.[47] On the other hand, more radical African Americans gave their unquestioning support to Lumumba, as the Congo crisis became a crucial force in helping frame African Americans' ensuing discourse on Africa.[48] In many ways, therefore, the African-American community's response to the

Congo, and specifically to Lumumba, mirrored the broader divisions within the Civil Rights Movement and reactions to Malcolm X himself.

For Malcolm X, I believe, the Congo crisis crystallized many of his ideas regarding self-determination and communal control. Through his speeches and writings of 1964 in particular, Malcolm X honed in on the more pressing issue of resource exploitation. In a letter sent while traveling throughout Africa, Malcolm X explained that Africa "has such great fertility and the soil is so profusely vegetated that with modern agricultural methods it could easily become the 'breadbasket' of the world."[49] Malcolm X, through his letters and speeches, revealed a sustained interest in the material geographies of Africa; his evolving relationship with the homeland, therefore, was much more than a symbolic or spiritual return, for it coincided with his separatist arguments of communal control.

Adopting a realist position, Malcolm X argued that Africa was strategically located: he surmised that Africa was "the most valuable piece of property involved in the struggle between East and West."[50] In certain respects, Malcolm X believed that Africa as a whole could serve as an entrepot, and perhaps function much as Singapore does for its economic growth. Malcolm X explained that Africa "sits snuggled into a nest between Asia and Europe; it can reach either one. None of the natural resources that are needed in Europe that they get from Asia can get to Europe without coming either around Africa, over Africa, or in between the Suez Canal which is sitting at the tip of Africa."[51] He further supported a strategic view of Africa, noting that "[Africa] can cut off Europe's bread. [Africa] can put Europe to sleep overnight, just like that. Because [Africa's] in a position to; the African continent is in a position to do this."[52] Reminiscent of earlier geopolitical theories that posited a deterministic role in the location of territories, Malcolm X surmised that leaders of the African continent could, in time, unite together and form a considerable bloc in opposition to Europe's political economic hegemony.

Malcolm X detailed the strategic significance of both the Suez Canal and the Strait of Gibraltar, geography lessons that remain applicable in the twenty-first century:

> All of the oil that runs Europe goes through the Suez Canal, up the Mediterranean Sea to places like Greece and Italy and Southern Spain and France and along through there; or through the Strait of Gibraltar and around on into England. And they need it. They need access through the Suez. When Nasser took over the Suez, they almost died in Europe. It scared them to death—why? Because Egypt is in Africa, in fact, Egypt is in both Africa and Asia....[53]

In his arguments, Malcolm X forwarded a decidedly overoptimistic conception of Pan-Africanism, but a conception nonetheless that addressed the fundamental questions of geopolitics. Underlying the discursive representation of Africa lay a primary contestation over the actual control and material exploitation of a continent. It is for this reason that Malcolm X increasingly turned to socialist arguments. He recognized that racism and racist ideologies had more to do with the expansion of capitalism than they did simply with essentialized differences among people of different "color." Malcolm X drew a connection between Africa's critical location—as a potential blockade to European trade, the deployment of militaries, and flows of oil—and the West's military involvement in certain African countries, including the Congo. Malcolm X explained that the media, however, continued to represent Africa as a jungle, as a continent of no value or consequence. If Africa was so destitute, Malcolm X reasoned, then why were Western countries so keen on maintaining their colonies? He concluded that "if you knew how valuable [Africa] was, you'd realize why they're over there killing our people. And you'd realize that it's not for some kind of humanitarian purpose or reason."[54]

To dispel the myth of humanitarism, and to direct attention to the hypocrisy that masked the exploitation of Africa, Malcolm X provided detailed geography lessons for his audiences. Of the biogeography of Africa, Malcolm X explained, "It's so heavily vegetated you can take any section of Africa and use modern agricultural methods and turn that section alone into the breadbasket for the world. Almost any country over there can feed the whole continent, if it only had the access to people who had the technical know-how to bring into that area modern methods of agriculture."[55] Malcolm X also

acknowledged the crucial questions of accessibility and distribution. These ideas, however, remained ill-defined at the time of his death.

Apart from the agricultural potential of Africa, Malcolm X stressed the importance of mineral exploitation. Malcolm X explained that Africa "has some of the largest deposits of gold on earth, and diamonds...industrial diamonds...that are needed to make machines—machines that can't function or can't run unless they have these diamonds. These industrial diamonds play a major role in the entire industrialization of the European nations, and without these diamonds their industry would fall."[56] As discussed above, a primary motivation behind both the Belgian government and the American government was to guarantee continued access to the mineral wealth of Katanga province. Malcolm X was adamant in his connections between foreign involvement in the affairs of African states and the struggles for independence. He noted, "All of these natural minerals [bauxite, oil, iron uranium] are needed by the Western industrialists in order for their industry to keep running at the clip that it's been used to."[57]

Malcolm X informed his listeners that it was the resources, the strategic position—the overall economic potential—of the African continent that "the man is after." He explained:

> You know that France lost her French West African possessions, Belgium lost the Congo, England lost Nigeria and Ghana and some of the other English-speaking areas; France also lost Algeria, or the Algerians took Algeria. As soon as these European powers lost their African possessions, Belgium had an economic crisis....It affected the French economy. It affected the British economy. It drove all of these European countries to the point where they had to come together and form what's known as the European Common Market.[58]

Malcolm X concluded, "When these countries fall, it would mean that the source of raw materials, natural resources, some of the richest mineral deposits on earth, would then be taken away from the European economy."[59] This is part of the lesson that Malcolm X taught, a geography lesson that surpassed the discursive representation of Africans to strike at the heart of colonialism. These

connections, for Malcolm X, were inseparable from the plight of African Americans.

Conclusions

Drawing a connection with the integrationist aims of the Civil Rights Movement, Malcolm X argued that "the man is keeping you over here worrying about a cup of coffee, while he's over there in your motherland taking control over minerals that have so much value they make the world go around. While you and I are still walking around over here, yes, trying to drink some coffee—with a cracker."[60] The Civil Rights Movement, Malcolm X maintained, was misguided. African Americans expended years of efforts to combat everyday forms of discrimination, as manifest in segregated restaurants, buses, and toilets. All the while, however, the United States and other European governments were ravaging the resources of the African homeland.

In short, an imaginative return to Africa, for Malcolm X, served as a touchstone for the psychological emancipation of African Americans and, more to the point, served to offset the residue of a colonial mentality that, at times, seemed to plague the community. This is reflected in current debates on postcolonialism, and especially the argument that colonization entailed a psychological component. In particular, the representation and stereotyped images of colonized peoples and places, as detailed in chapter 3, served to maintain a disciplinary control by the colonizers. Moreover, the use of Africa served as a bridge toward linking African Americans to the material inequalities throughout the diaspora. In his 1964 New Year's Eve speech, Malcolm X asserted that "the greatest accomplishment that was made in the struggle of the black man in America in 1964 toward some kind of real progress was the successful linking together of our problem with the African problem, [of] making our problem a world problem."[61] Malcolm X strenuously argued that African Americans must equate their own conditions, their lived experiences, with the broader anticolonial movements that were sweeping across Africa, Asia, and elsewhere. Malcolm X was thus prepared to enlarge the Civil Rights Movement into a broader quest for human rights.

Page Intentionally Left Blank

7
The Scalar Politics of Malcolm X and Beyond

A revolutionist does not hate the country in which the illegitimate and oppressive system and government continues to rule.
—James and Grace Lee Boggs[1]

The founding rally of Malcolm X's Organization of Afro-American Unity (OAAU) was held at the Audubon Ballroom in Harlem, New York, on June 28, 1964. On that occasion Malcolm X delivered two speeches: the first outlined the basic aims and objectives of the OAAU, while the second addressed the structure and perspective of the organization. Explicit in both speeches was a spatial understanding of black liberation, an understanding that binds together Malcolm X's geographies of knowledge, separatism, revolution, and materialism. He explained that the purpose of the OAAU was to begin in Harlem because Harlem had "the largest concentration of people of African descent" that existed anywhere on earth. But Harlem, geographically, was just the beginning. "We start in Harlem," Malcolm X continued, "with the intention of spreading throughout the state and from the state throughout the country, and from the country throughout the Western Hemisphere. Because when we say Afro-American, we include every one in the Western Hemisphere of African descent." For Malcolm X, the OAAU was to provide

an institutional bridge between all peoples of African descent, and through this organization "freedom, equality, justice and dignity" were to be achieved.[2]

Malcolm X, in the last months of his life, maintained that the Civil Rights Movement was too narrow in focus. Black liberation would not, indeed could not be achieved while sizable portions of the world remained colonized by white supremacist governments. Only through a combined attack on Western imperialism would social justice be forthcoming. The OAAU was to serve as vanguard of that attack.

On February 21, 1965 Malcolm X was assassinated. And with his death died the potentially revolutionary role of the OAAU. This is not to suggest, however, that the *spirit* of the OAAU died. Rather, the basic foundation, as well as the spatial insights of expanding the black liberation movement, continued in other venues. Subsequent organizations, most notably the Black Panther Party, built upon the legacy of the OAAU. It is through an engagement with these organizations that the legacy of Malcolm X may be revealed.

Scalar Politics and Black Liberation

Geographers and other social scientists have attempted to capture the interconnections between the local and the global. Indeed, the extent to which phenomena at one "scale" are influenced by those at other scales is so great that some scholars talk about a *global–local continuum*.[3] Recently, however, researchers have unpacked the traditional view of scale as static, and instead, have explored the fluidity and malleability of scale. In this realm, the work of Neil Smith, Philip Kelly, Kevin Cox, Doreen Massey, and Erik Swyngedouw, among others, has been especially insightful in the development of a *politics of scale*.

Kelly argues that the analytical containment of social processes at particular scales is socially constituted rather than naturally determined.[4] As David Delaney and Helga Leitner indicate, the political construction of scale as a theoretical project necessarily involves attention to relationships between space and power that social actors bring to practical efforts to change the world and to resist change.[5]

Scale is not, therefore, a preordained framework for ordering the world—local, regional, national, and global. A politics of scale (or scalar politics) suggests that scale is itself a contingent outcome of the tensions that exist between structural forces and the practices of human agents. Swyngedouw writes that spatial scale has to be theorized as something produced, a process that is always deeply heterogeneous, conflicted, and contested.[6]

A politics of scale does not figure prominently in most accounts of black nationalism or internationalism. And yet, a reconfiguration of scale may greatly augment our understanding of the geographies embedded within black radical thought. Malcolm X followed in a long tradition of what has been termed *black nationalism* as well as *internationalism*. Many of these debates center on whether Malcolm X was a nationalist, internationalist, or Pan-Africanist; subsequently, researchers become mired in a bog of semantic confusion. As Dean Robinson argues, "There is no 'essential' black nationalist tradition, despite similarities; the positions of nationalists of different eras have diverged because their nationalisms have been products of partly similar but largely unique eras of politics, thought, and culture. Missing this point can result in an a historical, teleological interpretation of black nationalism as an historical phenomenon."[7] I believe that this explains, in part, Malcolm X's reticence about being labeled: Malcolm X was, certainly in the last year of his life, concerned with results. The political thought of Malcolm X was *process-oriented*: it was also highly contingent, and, as such, refuses any concrete categorization.

To articulate the scalar politics of Malcolm X, I employ Cox's distinction between *spaces of dependency* and *spaces of engagement*.[8] Theoretically, Cox offers a conception of "proximate" politics that recognizes their embeddedness in processes occurring at higher and lower levels of abstraction and reality. Cox defines spaces of dependency as those social relations upon which people, firms, or agencies depend for the realization of their activities. These include place-specific conditions. Cox provides as an example housing developers; these are individuals who acquire a considerable knowledge of particular markets and subcontractors, and who develop reputations with local lenders and builders. These social relations, though, are

spatially circumscribed. That is, although it may not matter where these individuals develop properties within a particular geographic area, they cannot operate beyond that area since their knowledge and reputation are not portable elsewhere.

People, firms, and agencies organize in order to secure the conditions for the continued existence of their spaces of dependence. However, in so doing they must engage with other centers of social power: governments, media, foreign institutions. Cox refers to these additional relations as spaces of engagement. These spaces are more variable than spaces of dependence, and may be spatially more extensive or restrictive. Most significant is that these spaces include social relations that are established to galvanize support or to deflect criticism from the immediate tasks at hand. Any individual or institution (e.g., the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People) must periodically engage in other social relations that may be narrower or broader than their spaces of dependence. An agency focused on local concerns (e.g., desegregation of a single school) may have to engage in negotiations at state or regional levels; conversely, multinational corporations must often enter into negotiations at scales of finer resolution. In short, what the work of Cox and others indicate is that the *level* of analysis is far from fixed; rather, action and intervention must be approached from a position of contextualized, contingent processes as opposed to a stable, rigid scale.

Spaces of dependency, as defined by Cox, consist of more-or-less localized social relations upon which people depend for the realization of essential interests. In other words, these spaces "define place-specific conditions for our material well being and our sense of significance."[9] Local knowledge of local conditions figures prominently in these spaces of dependency. This assertion immediately speaks to the regional Civil Rights strategies employed throughout the United States. As discussed below, the strategies adopted by Malcolm X, Newton, Seale, and other members of the Black Panther Party were implemented based on particular knowledges of their urban black communities. Indeed, as existing research indicates, the different Black Panther Party chapters that emerged in cities such as Oakland, Los Angeles, New York, and Seattle, all reflected localized adaptations to localized conditions.

In contrast, spaces of engagement consist of those spaces in which the politics of securing a space of dependence unfolds.[10] Accordingly, the attempt by people, firms, or agencies to secure the conditions for their spaces of dependence are contingent upon other sociospatial relations. Cox explains that "typically agents are participants in a much more spatially extensive—or perhaps even restrictive—set of exchange relations than those contained within the bounds of a particular place."[11] Cox concludes, "The ability to realize [local interests] is critically conditioned by the ability to exercise territorial power. The goal is to control the actions and interactions of others both within and between respective spaces of dependence; the means is control over a geographic area."[12] In the following section I construct a particular narrative of Malcolm X's scalar politics. I demonstrate that a binding thread of Malcolm X's political thought was to simultaneously enlarge and reduce the spaces of engagement of the movement for Black liberation. This is followed with an analysis of the scalar politics of the Black Panther Party. I suggest that through such a juxtaposition of Malcolm X's political thought with the ideology and material practices of the Black Panther Party, it is possible to more fully articulate the spatiality of radical black intellectual thought.

The Scalar Spaces of Malcolm X

There was a sense of immediacy in the message of Malcolm X. This immediacy was seen in his insistence on rapid and revolutionary change. But this immediacy was present also in his critique of the localized focus of the Civil Rights Movement. Malcolm X understood that his audiences were concerned with their immediate circumstances: the exploitation and oppression prevalent in their communities. Malcolm X also argued, however, that justice for African Americans would not be forthcoming if the struggle remained too provincial. Malcolm X demonstrated that seemingly distant political events could have an impact on the everyday lives of his audiences.

Speaking not as a prophet but as an educator, Malcolm X facilitated the critical geographical understanding of his listeners. He did so in ordinary, grounded scenarios and stories. In his "The Ballot or the Bullet" speech, Malcolm X discussed the scalar process

of gerrymandering. Conceptually, this is a well-trod issue among geographers. Gerrymandering represents the deliberate distortion of boundaries for political purposes. For Malcolm X, though, gerrymandering "means when Negroes become too heavily concentrated in a certain area, and begin to gain too much political power, the white man comes along and changes the district lines."[13] Consequently, the spatial distribution of African Americans becomes a tool to manipulate political outcomes that are thus overly determined by the white racist political structure in power. Spatially, Malcolm X detailed further the geographies of voting. On December 20, 1964, in a speech delivered at the Williams Institutional CME Church in Harlem, Malcolm X urged his audience to recognize that what happened in Mississippi had a direct bearing on their everyday lives in Harlem. In reference to the organizational structure of Congress, Malcolm X explained:

> Out of sixteen committees, ten of them are in the hands of Southern racists. Out of twenty congressional committees, thirteen are in the hands ... of Southern racists. Out of forty-six committees that govern the foreign and domestic direction of this country, twenty-three are in the hands of Southern racists. And the reason they're in the hands of Southern racists is because in the areas from which they come, the black man is deprived of his right to vote.[14]

Through this approach Malcolm X clearly established a connection between the denial of voting rights among African Americans in the South with broader policy implications for the rest of the country. The plight of northern-based African Americans was inseparable from that of the southern-based African Americans.

The influence of gerrymandering did not end at America's borders. Malcolm X's speeches reveal a geopolitical understanding that connected discriminatory practices in the United States with imperialistic foreign policy practices such as the war in Vietnam and the revolution in the Congo and the assassination of Patrice Lumumba. Consequently, Malcolm X rescaled his understanding of the Civil Rights Movement, claiming: "It's a case of realizing that the Afro-American problem is not a Negro problem, or an American problem, but a human problem, a problem of humanity."[15] Speaking at the

Audubon, Malcolm X cautioned his audience: "It's impossible for you and me to know where we stand until we look around on this entire earth. Not just look around in Harlem or New York, or Mississippi, or America—we have got to look all around this earth. We don't know where we stand until we know where America stands."[16] And later, just days before his death, Malcolm X reiterated: "This society is controlled primarily by the racists and segregationists who are in Washington, D.C., in positions of power. And from Washington, D.C., they exercise the same forms of brutal oppression against dark-skinned people in South and North Vietnam, or in the Congo, or in Cuba or any other place on this earth where they are trying to exploit and oppress."[17]

Malcolm X identified that this spatial relation was a catalyst in transforming his political thought, and moreover, it was this geographic lesson he attempted to convey to his audiences. In December 1964 Malcolm X explained, "you have to change your method according to time and conditions that prevail. And one of the conditions that prevails on this earth right now, that we know too little about, is our relationship with the freedom struggles of people all over the world."[18] Subsequently, Malcolm X more explicitly developed a scalar geopolitical philosophy. His understanding of racism was intricately connected to broader political–economic issues and, more significantly, he suggested that the resolution of civil rights in America was linked to human rights and revolutions in other countries.

This transition enabled Malcolm X, at times still the prophet, to articulate more clearly his vision. In January 1965 Malcolm X spoke on the prospects for freedom in the coming year. He explained:

> In 1964, oppressed people all over the world, in Africa, in Asia and Latin America, in the Caribbean, made some progress. Northern Rhodesia threw off the yoke of colonialism and became Zambia....Nyasaland became Malawi....Zanzibar had a revolution, threw off the colonialists and their lackeys and then united with Tanganyika into what is now known as the Republic of Tanzania....Also in 1964, the oppressed people of South Vietnam, and in that entire Southeast Asia area, were successful in fighting off the agents of imperialism. All the king's horses and all the king's

> men having enabled them to put North and South Vietnam together again. Little rice farmers, peasants, with a rifle—up against all the highly-mechanized weapons of warfare—jets, napalm, battleships, everything else, and they can't put those rice farmers back where they want them. Somebody's waking up.[19]

Having established the dimensions of a globalized revolution, Malcolm X then redirected his analysis to the progress of African Americans. He suggested that "here in America it's different. When you compare our strides in 1964 with strides that have been made forward by people elsewhere all over the world, only then can you appreciate the great double cross experienced by black people here in America in 1964."[20] The double cross to which Malcolm X alluded was that of the hypocrisy of the Civil Rights Movement in the face of real progress (i.e., independence through decolonialization) that was occurring in other parts of the world. Malcolm X explained that "1964 was the Year of Illusion and Delusion. We received nothing but a promise." He continued: "In 1963, one of their [white racist society's] devices to let off the steam of frustration was the march on Washington. They used that to make us think we were making progress. Imagine, marching to Washington and getting nothing for it whatsoever."[21]

For Malcolm X, this connection between the as-yet unrealized struggle of African Americans with other oppressed peoples of the world was central to his political thought. This was a spatial connection and was fundamental to his move from *civil rights* to *human rights*. He explained: "It is not a Negro problem, nor an American problem. It is not a problem of civil rights but a problem of human rights."[22] He stressed that the purpose of his recently formed Organization for Afro-American Unity was to "elevate our freedom struggle above the domestic level of civil rights" and to "internationalize it by placing it at the level of human rights."[23]

It was within this context that Malcolm X sought to garner the support of African leaders to take the African-American cause to the United Nations. Between July 17 and 21, 1964 the OAU convened a conference in Cairo, Egypt. Malcolm X was not allowed to

speak, although he was granted observer status. During the conference, however, Malcolm X was permitted to submit an eight-page memorandum. He indicated that he was participating as a member of the OAAU to "represent the interests of 22 million African Americans whose *human rights* are being violated daily by the racism of American imperialists." He continued that "Since the 22 million of us were originally Africans, who are now in America not by choice but only by a cruel accident in our history, we strongly believe that African problems are our problems and our problems are African problems."[24] He explained that African Americans had spent over three centuries enduring the most inhuman forms of physical and psychological tortures imaginable, and that the American government was either unable or unwilling to protect the lives and properties of African Americans. Malcolm X urged the leaders of the independent African states to help the OAAU bring their problem before the United Nations. Peter Goldman writes that the UN project was to be Malcolm X's monument, his lasting legacy to the African-American peoples. According to Goldman, Malcolm X "wanted it said of him that he had renewed the link between black America and the mother continent and so had been able to bring the plight of his people before a tribunal of the nations of the world."[25]

No doubt Malcolm X was deeply influenced in his actions by the earlier efforts of W.E.B. DuBois, William Patterson, and Paul Robeson to internationalize the plight of African Americans. In 1951, for example, the Civil Rights Congress (CRC) submitted a document written by CRC leader Patterson to the United Nations entitled "We Charge Genocide." The CRC had been founded in 1946 as an organization to protect African Americans from lynching and Ku Klux Klan activities. Its 1951 petition, submitted jointly with DuBois, sought UN relief for African Americans from the crimes of the United States against them; the CRC viewed the repression of African Americans not simply as a local or regional issue, but instead as a more globalized instance of white supremacy.[26] However, the petition received little support from white liberals, including Eleanor Roosevelt, who felt that the document exaggerated U.S. conditions

and failed to distinguish between "institutionalized murder," as had occurred in Europe under Nazi rule, and the "institutionalized oppression" from which African Americans continued to suffer.[27]

Robeson, in particular, has been described as Malcolm X's only living hero.[28] Indeed, it was in part through the activities of Robeson that Malcolm X internationalized the struggle for freedom, social justice, and equality for African Americans. Robeson, an internationally known performer and political activist, was educated at Rutgers University and the Columbia University Law School. He won critical acclaim for his work as a concert singer and stage and film actor. However, he was also an outspoken critic of white supremacy. Throughout the 1940s and 1950s Robeson supported antilynching campaigns, unionism, and other fights against injustices.

On February 9, 1965, Malcolm X flew from London to Paris for a speaking engagement. Upon landing at Orly Airport, however, Malcolm X was detained and refused entry into France; he was forced to return to England. A telephone interview was conducted with Malcolm X, the text of which was read in the auditorium where Malcolm X would have spoken. In that interview Malcolm X was asked what the Afro-American community in France and in Europe could do in the overall struggle. Malcolm X answered: "The Afro-American community in France and in other parts of Europe must unite with the African community." He spoke of the "necessity of the Black community in the Western Hemisphere, especially in the United States and somewhat in the Caribbean area, realizing once and for all that we must restore our cultural roots, we must establish contacts with our African brothers, we must begin from this day forward to work in unity and harmony as Afro-Americans along with our African brothers." Malcolm X continued in the interview: "Unity will give our struggle a type of strength in spirit that will enable us to make some real concrete progress whether...in Europe, America, or on the African continent." He explained, "Although the theme of my talk was the importance of unity between the Black people of the Western Hemisphere and those of the African continent, it was going to be a regionalist approach—which I find no different

from what they have there in Europe, what they call the European common market."[29]

Malcolm X thus encouraged his listeners to make the connection between the local and the global. As Rod Bush concludes, Malcolm X did not lead from on high, but was able to obtain and sum up the sense and wisdom of the people on the basis of very personal and intimate relationships that he established with ordinary people in one-on-one encounters.[30] By drawing on the ground-level reality of both his audience and himself, Malcolm X was able to enlarge the spaces of engagement in a clarified form.

Malcolm X forwarded an explicitly regional-based, geographically informed understanding of racism and imperialism, an understanding grounded in his personal experiences, travels, and readings of history. He argued that the exploitation and oppression of African Americans was related to the struggles of colonized peoples throughout Africa, Asia, and the Americas. Malcolm X instructed his audiences to recognize: "As long as we think...that we should get Mississippi straightened out before we worry about the Congo, you'll never get Mississippi straightened out....We have to realize what part our struggle has in the overall world struggle."[31] This was, however, a long-standing concern of Malcolm X, one that he attempted to cultivate while still a member of the Nation of Islam. This is seen, for example, in Malcolm X's references to the 1955 Bandung Conference and the inner workings of the United Nations. Goldman writes that Malcolm X was "positively entranced by the arithmetic of the [UN's] General Assembly, where, since Bandung, the dark majority of the world had become a voting majority of the world's nations." As Goldman concludes, "he took that majority to be a locus of real power, or at least great psychological leverage, and he wanted desperately to identify the American black nation with it."[32]

The association between African Americans and the "dark majority of the world" for Malcolm X was also a strategic move. By linking the plight of African Americans with the oppressed colonized peoples throughout the world, Malcolm X presented a new balance sheet of power. As he explained in numerous speeches,

by limiting the political discussion to American civil rights issues, African Americans were positioned as minorities seeking integration into the larger society. However, through the conjoining of African Americans and colonized peoples, the minorities became majorities. For Malcolm X, this was a crucial repositioning of social relations. In a panel discussion on February 18, 1965, Malcolm X explicitly compared the African-American situation as colonial in nature. African-American communities were literally colonies of a white supremacist government that simultaneously exploited, oppressed, and degraded African Americans, while failing to provide basic human rights. In short, Malcolm X saw the merging of the black revolution with broader anticolonial movements as psychologically important for African Americans.

This message, of African-American colonialism and the minority/majority reversal remains misunderstood by many contemporary scholars of the Civil Rights Movement. Kevern Verney, for example, writes, "the notion of internal colonialism ... although interesting as a concept, was, in practice, flawed and inconsistent. In the Third World the obvious solution to colonial oppression was for the majority indigenous population to expel the occupying colonial power and achieve national independence. This was clearly not the situation of black Americans, who were only a small minority of the U.S. population and not the original inhabitants of the country."[33] Malcolm X viewed the situation differently. Specifically, Malcolm X (unlike Verney) perceived the liberation of African Americans as intimately connected with the broader move to end white supremacy. By this point the spaces of engagement for Malcolm X significantly transcended the boundaries of Harlem or even the United States. On April 8, 1964 Malcolm X addressed a predominantly white audience. He explained: "There are whites in the country who are still complacent when they see the possibilities of racial strife getting out of hand. You are complacent simply because you think you outnumber the racial minority in this country; what you have to bear in mind is wherein you might outnumber us in this country, you don't outnumber us all over the earth."[34] Later in the year, speaking in Harlem, Malcolm X observed that "As long as we think we're over here in America isolated and all

by ourselves and underdogs, then we'll always have that hat-in-hand begging attitude that the man loves to see us display. But when we know that all of our [African] people are behind us...almost 500 million of us—we don't need to beg anybody."[35] As a final example, in a speech given on December 31, 1964, Malcolm X informed his mostly black audience that, "As long as you think you're alone, then you take a stand as if you're a minority or as if you're outnumbered, and that kind of stand will never enable you to win a battle."[36]

It was this geographic expansion, moreover, that buttressed his position both on revolution and violence. For example, as discussed in chapter 5, violence figured prominently in the speeches of Malcolm X. To make his argument against the feasibility of nonviolence, and to demonstrate the hypocrisy of nonviolence in American specifically, Malcolm X enlarged the spaces of engagement on the subject. In his "Grass Roots" speech Malcolm X explained:

> As long as the white man sent you to Korea, you bled. He sent you to Germany, you bled. He sent you to the South Pacific to fight the Japanese, you bled. You bleed for white people, but when it comes to seeing your own churches being bombed and little black girls murdered, you haven't got any blood....How can you justify being non-violent in Mississippi and Alabama, when your churches are being bombed, and your little girls being murdered, and at the same time you are going to get violent with Hitler, and Tojo, and somebody else you don't even know?[37]

Moreover, Malcolm X argued that:

> If violence is wrong in America, violence is wrong abroad. If it is wrong to be violent defending black women and black children and black babies and black men, then it is wrong for America to draft us and make us violent abroad in defense of her. And if it is right for America to draft us, and teach us how to be violent in defense of her, then it is right for you and me to do whatever is necessary to defend our own people right here in this country.[38]

Malcolm X, in effect, was enlarging the spaces of engagement. He explained that debates about violence and nonviolence should not be limited solely to a discussion of the Civil Rights Movement. Instead,

violence was contingent upon other concerns. During World War II African Americans died in defense of America. But were not African Americans in need of defense from some Americans? Why, Malcolm X wondered, was violence as self-defense permissible at one level but not at another? Malcolm X's argument thus centered on a basic core of the black radical tradition. Malcolm X evinced, in the words of Robinson, a "revolutionary consciousness that proceeded from the whole historical experience of Black people and not merely from the social formations of capitalist slavery or the relations of production of colonialism."[39] For Malcolm X, this revolutionary consciousness was decidedly spatial, one that entailed a geographic sensitivity of justice and equality.

Malcolm X's Legacy and the Spaces of the Black Panther Party

Malcolm X's international project remained unfinished. His death in 1965 prevented the realization of his recently formed Organization of Afro-American Unity. This is not to say, though, that Malcolm X's influence died on that cold February day in 1965. Instead, as William Sales maintains, Malcolm X impacted a movement that continued to exist as others attempted to put his ideas and his model of struggle into practice.[40] Malcolm X's ideological orientation was taken up by new and existing organizations in the black community after his death. These included, in various ways, the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), and the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM). Arguably, however, no organization reflected the geopolitical thought and legacy of Malcolm X more than the Black Panther Party.

Originally named the Black Panther Party for Self-Defense, the Party was cofounded in 1966 by Huey Newton and Bobby Seale. As described by Seale, "Huey and I sat there ...and began a revolutionary party, knowing that the program was not just something we had thought up."[41] Rather, Newton and Seale viewed their program as a continuation of earlier African-American movements that grappled with oppression and exploitation. In October 1966 Newton (as the Party's Minister of Defense and theoretician) and Seale (as Party Chairman) specified the ten-point platform and program of the

Black Panther Party. Demands included freedom; full employment for blacks; an end to capitalist exploitation of the black community; decent housing; education, including African-American-based education; exemption from military service; an end to police brutality; freedom for black prisoners; fair representation in trials; and ultimately, "land, bread, housing, education, clothing, justice, and peace."[42] As Newton would later explain, "Once 'emancipated,' U.S. blacks—who were neither owners nor workers in the Marxist sense of the terms—were shoved into ghettos, where they were given neither reparations for years of institutional chattel slavery nor employment in the new industrial state."[43] Seale effectively summed up their attitudes: "The Platform and Program is nothing more than the 400-year old crying demands of us Black Americans."[44]

The Black Panther Party envisioned itself as a vanguard of the people. However, their educational campaigns were locally derived and experientially grounded. Following the lead of Malcolm X, Newton and Seale encouraged people to assess their own experiences and to develop plans accordingly. Seale explains, "I think people, especially white people, have to come to understand that the language of the ghetto is a language of its own and as the party—whose members for the most part come from the ghetto—seeks to talk to the people, it must speak the people's language."[45] Newton followed a similar line of thought, although he argued that cultural discourses were insufficient in fostering structural change. Addressing the interconnections of politics and culture, Newton explained: "The Black Panther Party, which is a revolutionary group of black people, realizes that we have to have an identity. We have to realize our black heritage in order to give us strength to move and progress. But as far as returning to the old African culture, it's unnecessary and it's not advantageous in many respects. We believe that culture itself will not liberate us."[46]

The Black Panther Party, therefore, did not emerge as a cultural nationalist group, nor as a variant of Pan-Africanism; rather, the Party was founded initially as a grassroots organization formed to address local concerns. Consequently, the Black Panther Party was generally more receptive than other groups of the period to forming alliances with other nonblack groups and organizations. Coalitions

were formed, for example, with the Peace and Freedom Party and the White Panther Party (a college-student-based radical organization headquartered in Ann Arbor, Michigan); the Black Panthers worked with the Brown Berets (a Chicano leftist organization in southern California), the Young Lords (a Puerto Rican group in Chicago and New York), and the Red Guard Party (a Chinese revolutionary group located in Oakland Bay area).[47] The Party also established connections with both the women's liberation and gay liberation movements. The gender ideology of the Black Panther Party, both as formally stated and as exemplified by organizational practice, was as critical to its daily functioning as was the Party's analysis of race and class dynamics in black communities.[48]

This is not to say, however, that the Panthers were not in conflict with other groups or philosophies. Seale, in particular, was highly critical of cultural nationalists, such as Maulana Karenga's Los Angeles-based US organization. US, which was formed in the aftermath of the Watts uprising of 1965, was a West Coast-oriented black nationalist organization. Its founder, Karenga, promoted African dress and the learning of Ki-Swahili as an alternative to English. For Seale, the link between nationalism, racism, and sexism was that all were practices of domination that fed upon each other, an idea that may be derived from Malcolm X's later views.[49] More germane was the sense among some members of the Black Panther Party that cultural nationalism, as espoused by US, was philosophically incomplete and deficient in a practical sense.

Ideologically, the Black Panther Party drew inspiration from a variety of sources. Newton and Seale were informed by the writings of Frantz Fanon, Mao Zedong, and Ernesto Guevara, largely because they "saw them as kinsmen.... We believed it was necessary to know how they gained their freedom in order to go about getting ours."[50] However, it was crucial for these political ideologies to be adapted to the particularities of the urban-based black communities. Newton wrote that "we did not want merely to import ideas and strategies; we had to transform what we learned into principles and methods acceptable to the brothers on the block."[51] Eventually, the Black Panther Party developed a broad socialist program influenced also

by the ideas of Mikhail Bakunin, V.I. Lenin, Kwame Nkrumah, and Kim Il Sung.

Arguably, though, no source of inspiration was greater to the initial political thought of the Black Panther Party than were the writings and speeches of Malcolm X. Both Newton and Seale have written on the influence of Malcolm X to their own political philosophies. Newton, for instance, explained that "the Black Panther Party exists in the spirit of Malcolm,"[52] while Seale begins his book *Seize the Time* with the story of when he learned of Malcolm X's assassination in 1965.

The significance of Malcolm X for the Black Panther Party is a combination of Malcolm X's black urban roots and his concomitant urban-based territorial politics. As discussed above, prior to his death Malcolm X advocated a program of black liberation that spanned the local–global continuum. Malcolm X argued that escape from oppression and exploitation for African Americans would only occur when *all* peoples of the world were liberated from unequal power structures. Local strategies, however, were required; namely, it was imperative for communities to reconnect, to establish a sense of place while remaining cognizant of a global sense of humanity.

Spaces of the Black Panther Party

The political ideology of the Black Panther Party, and especially that of Huey Newton, was not static. Indeed, previous research identifies four "moments": black nationalist, revolutionary nationalist, revolutionary internationalist, and intercommunalist.[53] I argue that these moments are best conceived of as different spaces of engagement. In this way, the changing material practices within the spaces of dependence are more clearly viewed as contingent to expanded sociospatial relations.

From its inception, the Black Panther Party identified a localized space of dependence circumscribed by the black urban ghetto. The concerns of both Newton and Seale were those of community residents. Seale writes that, in the beginning, he and Newton would talk with other African Americans about the conditions of the community. Seale drew heavily from his experiences of teaching at the

North Oakland Neighborhood Anti-Poverty Center. At the community center, Seale taught black American history. He explains, "I tried to get them ...to think in ways related to black people in the black community surviving and black people in the black community unifying."[54]

It is not surprising, therefore, that the locally based, locally derived programs articulated by the Black Panther Party were focused on the everyday level of the street. Neighborhood programs—later renamed "survival programs"—were designed to satisfy the immediate needs and concerns of community residents. Specific programs included the petitioning for community control of the police, teaching black history classes, promoting tenant and welfare rights, establishing health clinics, and investigating incidents of police brutality. During Bobby Seale's 1972 to 1973 mayoral campaign, for example, the Black Panther Party initiated the Seniors Against a Fearful Environment (S.A.F.E.) program. According to JoNina Abron, the Black Panther Party learned that nearly half of the victims of strong-arm robbery and purse snatching were over the age of fifty. Consequently, they provided free transportation and an escort service for elderly residents. Through the S.A.F.E. program the Black Panther Party also successfully lobbied the Oakland City Housing Authority to make major repairs and clean up a low-income residence for senior citizens in downtown Oakland.[55]

The safety of children was also a prime concern. In early 1967, the Black Panther Party lobbied for the installation of a traffic light at the corner of Fifty-fifth and Market in Oakland "because kids were getting hurt and killed regularly on that corner."[56] In *Seize the Time*, for example, Seale describes a series of accidents he witnessed at the intersection, located near the North Oakland Poverty Center where he worked. Newton assembled a petition and submitted the request to the Oakland City Council. Informed that a traffic light could not be installed until late 1968, Newton continued to insist on the installation of a light until, in October 1967, it was installed.

Other practices enacted by the Black Panther Party for children's safety and welfare included "Free Breakfasts for Children" programs, "Free Clothing for Children" rallies, and "Free Food and Shoe"

programs. In 1968, for example, several Bay Area branches of the Black Panther Party, as well as the Seattle, Washington branch, established free breakfast programs. As described by Abron, "Party chapters...offered breakfast at multiple sites. Teams of Panthers served a no frill breakfast consisting of eggs, grits, toast, and bacon to children before the school day started. Community churches, nationwide, hosted the Party's breakfast programs....[Panther] members solicited financial contributions from community residents and food donations from local businesses...[and] parents and other community residents volunteered to help implement" the program.[57] Bobby Seale, in 1969, issued an organizational directive making this survival program mandatory.

The first, and perhaps the most controversial survival program, however, was the police-alert patrol.[58] This program consisted of armed Panther members who would patrol the streets and, in effect, monitor police activities. Strategically, these patrols satisfied a number of objectives. Consistent with the Party's self-proclaimed vanguard role and concomitant stress on political education, the patrols were conceived as strategies of recruitment and information dissemination. As explained by Newton, " [since we were] interested primarily in educating and revolutionizing the community, we needed to get their attention and give them something to identify with." Aware of other organized citizen patrols that observed the police, Newton recognized that *armed* patrols offered unique opportunities. He concluded that, "We hoped that by raising encounters to a higher level, by patrolling the police with arms, we would see a change in their behavior."[59]

Recruitment was directed toward those people Newton and Seale felt were most oppressed and exploited. In line with their reading of both Fanon and Malcolm X, Newton and Seale specifically targeted those people who were "on the streets." As Seale recalls, "We talked to brothers and sisters in colleges, in high schools, who were on parole, on probation, who'd been in jails, who'd just gotten out of jail, and brothers and sisters who looked like they were on their way to jail."[60] The failure of other black political organizations, reasoned Newton, was that they failed "to recruit and involve the very people they professed to represent—the poor people in the community

who never went to college, probably were not even able to finish high school."[61]

The armed patrols were also intended to promote a sense of cohesiveness throughout the community. Newton reasoned that, "By standing up to the police as equals, even holding them off, and yet remaining within the law, we had demonstrated Black pride to the community in a concrete way." He concluded that the armed patrols "created a feeling of solidarity."[62] In this way, the activities of the Black Panthers would facilitate a sense of communal separatism. Direct material actions, such as armed patrols, were tangible examples of desegregating the underlying power structures within urban ghettos.

The most proximate reason of the patrols, however, was to counter the perceived police brutality that existed in the black communities of Oakland. Theoretically, these patrols are significant in that they speak to the material and spatial practices embedded in urban struggles. Michel Foucault writes that discipline proceeds from the distribution of individuals in space; discipline is exercised through controlling mechanisms, including surveillance.[63] Within urban areas, police departments frequently exercise power through these mechanisms. Steve Herbert's study of police behavior in Los Angeles illustrates these Foucauldian concepts. "The control of space," Herbert writes, "is a fundament of overall police efforts at social control." He continues that many police strategies to create public order involve enacting boundaries and restricting access; police power rests upon a political geography.[64] However, visibility is also a required component for resistance and the re-appropriation of space. It was this component of the armed patrols that was most threatening, for the visible presence of armed blacks challenged the status quo. African Americans were seen as out-of-place; armed, their visible presence was even more threatening. The armed patrols, however, constituted an attempt to reclaim the space of the ghetto. According to Newton, "We had seen the Oakland police and the California Highway Patrol begin to carry their shotguns in full view as another way of striking fear into the community. We had seen all this, and we recognized that the rising consciousness of Black people was almost at the point of explosion."[65] Seale elaborates:

> We have to defend ourselves against [the police] because they are breaking down our doors, shooting black brothers on the streets, and brutalizing sisters on the head. [The police] are wearing guns mostly to intimidate the people from forming organizations to really get our basic political desires and needs answered. The power structure uses the fascist police against people moving for freedom and liberation. It keeps our people divided, but the program will be what we unite the people around and to teach our people self-defense.[66]

The armed patrols, not surprisingly, intensified the existing tension between the police and the Black Panther Party. A series of confrontations between members of the Black Panthers and members of the police resulted from these practices.[67] In April 1967, for example, twenty-two-year-old Denzil Dowell was shot to death by a white deputy sheriff in Richmond, California. At the request of Dowell's family, the Black Panther Party conducted an investigation of the killing. They discovered a number of questionable shootings by the Richmond sheriff's department, including two black men who were killed in North Richmond in December of 1966.

Newton also decided to stage a public rally—an attempt to reclaim the streets both symbolically and physically. Bobby Seale recalls that, according to Newton, "we were going to have a rally...to tell the people it was necessary for us to arm ourselves for self-defense."[68] The public protest was held at the corner of Third and Chesley. As described by Bobby Seale, there were "twenty Panthers out there armed with guns, disciplined, standing thirty or forty feet apart, on every corner of the intersection."[69] Members of the Panthers explained to the onlookers how Dowell had been killed by the police, and that blacks must begin to unite and organize with guns and force. Later, the police arrived to disperse the crowd of about three hundred, resulting in a tense showdown with the Black Panther members. A second Richmond rally was held, where about three to four hundred people gathered. The strategy of Newton was to block the streets and to then inform the crowds that the Black Panther Party was attempting to protect the communities from police brutality.

Consequently, Oakland representative Donald Mulford introduced a bill "prohibiting the carrying of firearms on one's person or

in a vehicle in any public place or on any public street." The ensuing legislative manueverings revealed the dialectics of spatial struggle and laws. Newton explained: "We knew how the system operated. If we used the laws in our own interest and against theirs, then the power structure would simply change the laws."[70] Consequently, in reaction to the proposed "Panther Bill," Newton prepared a statement—Executive Mandate Number One—to be read by Seale and twenty-nine other members of the Black Panther Party. Aside from condemning the pending gun law, the mandate also critiqued the "racist California legislature" and the "racist war of genocide in Vietnam."[71] Moreover, as written by Newton, and delivered by Seale at the state capitol, the mandate charged that:

> The enslavement of Black people at the very founding of this country, the genocide practiced on the American Indians and the confinement of the survivors on reservations, the savage lynching of thousands of Black men and women, the dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and now the cowardly massacre in Vietnam all testify to the fact that toward people of color the racist power structure of America has but one policy: repression, genocide, terror, and the big stick.[72]

The state capitol confrontation of May 2, 1967, and Executive Mandate Number One, encapsulated the spatial struggles of public space. On the one hand, at issue was a disciplining of society through the control of space—in this instance, literally, the streets. At the time the Black Panther Party members were well within their constitutional rights to carry weapons. These actions, however, transgressed de facto racial relations. As Eugene McCann writes of urban struggles, the state produces and enforces normative definitions of space in order to maintain the segregation of people. The "Panther Bill" is just such an example of counterresistance, of a hegemonic institution rewriting legislation in the face of resistance. McCann contends that "through their everyday practices, and through more unusual and dramatic events...groups such as African Americans, whose lives, histories, and spaces are so often marginalized..., can challenge the dominant representations central to [those] space[s]."[73] The armed patrols, as everyday practices, and the state capitol confrontation, may be read

as such. On the other hand, the Black Panther Party, and especially as personified by Newton, effectively linked the current repression of African Americans within a much longer history and geography of oppression, exploitation, and genocide.

The capitol confrontation significantly transformed the spaces of engagement for the Black Panther Party. The sight of armed black men and women entering a session of the California legislature had an immediate impact on the image of the Black Panther Party.[74] It was a calculated risk, one that carried both positive and negative implications for the Party. On the one hand, the event provided a highly visible forum, complete with national media coverage. Newton recalled that other activities of the Black Panther Party "were confined to a small area" and that they "wanted Black people throughout the country to know the Oakland story."[75] This motivation, in part, explains the visible stance taken at the state capitol in Sacramento. On the other hand, their actions led to passage of even tougher gun control legislation as well as increased surveillance and harassment by law enforcement agencies.

As an initial attempt to garner a larger space of engagement we are also left with a question as to the efficacy of the spatial strategy. Russell Shoats, for example, contends that whereas the "civil rights leaders needed this type of exposure to get their message across and to help protect themselves from the most flagrant abuses," in the urban context this strategy "was maladaptive in its application to the Black liberation struggle, which necessarily demanded more clandestine ways of operating."[76] However, given Newton's conception of the struggle—which did not necessarily carry over to other members' opinions—this enlarged space of engagement does make sense. In particular, Newton began to promote a variant of revolutionary nationalism, one that entailed a greater emphasis on socialism. Similar to the ideological shifts that Malcolm X made in the last year of his life, so too did Newton, as the Party's political philosopher, moved away from a predominantly race-based understanding to one predicated on class divisions. Newton explained the early transformations: "We developed from just plain nationalists or separatist nationalists into revolutionary nationalists. We said that we joined with all of the other

people in the world struggling for decolonization and nationhood, and called ourselves a 'dispersed colony' because we did not have the geographical concentration that other so-called colonies had."[77]

Newton desired to transform the struggle over the black ghetto to a larger stage. A shift from cultural nationalism to revolutionary nationalism was predicated thus on a literal, not metaphorical view of the black ghetto as a colonized territory. Social justice, self-liberation, and self-determination of all oppressed peoples were to be achieved through a process of decolonization. Capturing these sentiments, in 1969 Seale argued that "Community imperialism is manifested or is readily seen with respect to the domestic colonization of Black, Chicano, Indian, and other non-White peoples being cooped up in wretched ghettos and/or on Southern plantations and reservations with the murdering, fascist, brutalizing pig, occupying the communities and areas just like a foreign troop occupies territory."[78] Elaborating on the view of black communities as occupied territories, Seale further explained that "I think Black people if we go over the concrete experiences that we've had in America and what's going on now against us we can understand exactly what it is—to be corralled in wretched ghettoes in America and look up one day and see numerous policemen occupying our community, and brutalizing us...."[79]

Such a rearticulation of black communities contributed to a changed space of engagement, one that translated into different spatial practices. As a developing revolutionary nationalist, Newton proposed that the Black Panther Party unite with the world's oppressed people who struggled for decolonization and liberation.[80] During this period, Newton and the Black Panther Party "assumed that people could solve a number of their problems by becoming nations."[81] Consequently, and resonating with Malcolm X's earlier geopolitical connections of Mississippi and the Congo, Seale argued: "What we have to understand is that right here at home in America we have to oppose imperialism, also. That you can't just fight imperialism, the acts of imperialism abroad...without recognizing community imperialism here of Black people, Brown people, Red

people and even to the point of protesting students and radicals and progressive peoples here, in America."[82]

It was from a sense of solidarity with other colonized peoples—and a significant departure from cultural nationalist attitudes—that Newton and Seale determined that the Panthers should work with white leftists.[83] Indeed, it was this ideological shift, through an expanded space of engagement, which translated into modified spatial practices such as the initial biracial alliance in 1967 with the Peace and Freedom Party.

This caused problems with the public constituency and other members of the Party. Those espousing a more rigid and separatist position—to include both social and spatial meanings—opposed the formation of biracial alliances. These did provide material and financial resources. However, these moves also entailed a loss of social capital in the community. Moreover, a shift to revolutionary nationalism pitted the Black Panther Party with other black nationalist organizations, such as Maulana Karenga and his US organization.

The next major shift occurred in 1970. In the summer of that year Newton was released from prison, having served time for a manslaughter conviction that ultimately was reversed. Reflecting the impact of an increasingly global consciousness, Newton transformed the ideology of the Black Panther Party to one of revolutionary internationalism.[84] Significantly, Newton no longer viewed black communities as colonies; furthermore, he broadened his space of engagement to rearticulate the territoriality of the United States. Beginning in the early 1970s, Newton conceived of the United States not as a nation-state, but rather as an empire. In 1971 Newton explained that: "We in the Black Panther Party saw that the United States was no longer a nation. It was something else; it was more than a nation. It had not only expanded its territorial boundaries, but it had expanded all of its controls as well. We called it an empire."[85]

Newton's operational definition of empire is instructive. Specifically, as defined by Newton, an empire was "a nation-state that has transformed itself into a power controlling *all* of the world's lands and people."[86] This conception had strategic implications. Around

1971 Newton offered the National Liberation Front and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam a number of troops to assist in the fight against American imperialism; the Party also opened an International Section of the Black Panther Party in Algiers on September 13, 1970; and Party members attempted to establish contact with other liberation movements in North Korea and China.[87]

A rearticulation of the United States again necessitated a conceptual change in understanding the plight of African-American communities. In December 1972 Newton reasoned, "Black Americans cannot be said to be colonial subjects, strictly speaking. That would require the invasion of a sovereign territory by a foreign force....Instead, blacks in the United States are forced transplants, having been brought from foreign territory as slave labor."[88] Newton's reasoning, however, was buttressed by an additional, more material component. Newton explained: "We believe that there are no more colonies or neocolonies. If a people is colonized, then it must be possible for them to decolonize and become what they formerly were. But what happens when the raw materials are extracted and labor is exploited within a territory dispersed over the entire globe?" He continued that within this type of totalitarian system, "the people and the economy are so integrated into the imperialist empire that it's impossible to 'decolonize,' to return to the former conditions of existence."[89]

It was from this conception of the demise of the nation-state that Newton advocated a position of intercommunalism. As explained by Newton, "We say that the world today is a dispersed collection of communities. A community is different from a nation. A community is a small unit with a comprehensive collection of institutions that exist to serve a small group of people."[90] For Newton, therefore, intercommunalism implied a situation whereby sovereign borders were no longer recognized. Oppressed nations no longer existed, but instead were oppressed communities. In so doing, Newton viewed the problem as one of totalitarian globalization, dominated by a single superpower, specifically the United States. Indeed, in his geopolitical worldview the Soviet Union was rendered impotent. In 1972 Newton explained that the arms and trade agreements between

the United States and the Soviet Union made clear the superiority of the United States. Newton concluded that "all [the Soviet Union] can do is whimper like whipped dogs and talk about peaceful coexistence so that they will not be destroyed. This presents the world with the hard fact that the United States is the only state power in the world. Russia has become, like all other nations, no more than a satellite of the United States."[91]

Spatially, I suggest that Newton's appreciation of a communal perspective, much like that of Malcolm X, was predicated on his experiences of growing up in the black urban ghettos of Oakland. In discussing his conception of intercommunalism, for example, Newton explained that when people control the productive and institutional units of society, "they will have a more rather than less conscious relationship to the material world—people, plants, books, machines, media, everything—in which they live. They will have power, that is, they will control the phenomena around them and make it [sic] act in some desired manner, and they will know their own real desires."[92] This attitude toward communalism resonates with Newton's earlier statements regarding African-American communities. In 1969, for example, Newton explained that: "Because [African Americans] lack political power, Black people are not free."[93] This, in part, contributed to the formation of the Black Panther Party, for, as Newton wrote, "We began ...by checking around with the street brothers. We asked them if they would be interested in forming the Black Panther Party for Self-Defense, which would be based upon defending the community against the aggression of the power structure, including the military and the armed might of the police."[94]

Put into practice, Newton believed that a program of intercommunalism would foster a nonoppressive and nonexploitative system in which a new "identity" could be forged among all peoples. As argued by Newton, "When the people seize the means of production, when they seize the mass media and so forth, you will still have racism. But the fact that the people will be in control of all the productive and institutional units of society—not only the factories, but the media too—will enable them to start solving these contradictions. It will produce new values, new identities; it will mold a new and essentially

human culture as the people resolve old conflicts based on cultural and economic conditions."[95]

By 1972 Newton—though certainly not all members of the Black Panther Party—believed that African Americans occupied a liminal geographic space. African Americans were neither members of the United States nor of Africa. He explained: "Tied only historically to Africa, they can lay no real claim to territory in the U.S. or Africa.... U.S. blacks form not a subjugated colony but an oppressed community inside the larger boundaries."[96] It was this reasoning that led Newton to conclude that Pan-Africanism and black cultural nationalism were insufficient as programs for liberation. Newton argued that Pan-Africanism "fails to encompass the unique situation of black Americans" since "Black Americans have only the cultural and social customs that have evolved from centuries of oppression."[97] Although we may argue that Newton failed to grasp fully the implications of a diasporic perspective, we should also acknowledge that Newton understood that solutions were to be found in localized responses to global processes. According to Newton:

> If it is agreed that the fundamental nature of oppression is economic, then the first assault by the oppressed must be to wrestle economic control from the hands of the oppressors. If we define the prime character of the oppression of blacks as racial, then the situation of economic exploitation of human being by human being can be continued if performed by blacks against blacks or blacks against whites. If, however, we are speaking of eliminating exploitation and oppression, then the oppressed must begin with a united, worldwide thrust along the lines of oppressed versus oppressor.[98]

To effectively work within the communal spaces of dependence, Newton believed that it was imperative to enlarge the spaces of engagement. Ultimately, he saw no other solution than a socialist revolution. When Newton and Seale founded the Black Panther Party, they were motivated by "trying to solve some of the ideological problems of the Black movement" and to explain "why no Black political organization had succeeded."[99] Five years later Newton perceived the black revolution as "the vanguard of the world revolu-

tion." According to Newton, "We believe that black Americans are the first real internationalists....We are internationalists because we have been internationally dispersed by slavery, and we can easily identify with other people in other cultures. Because of slavery, we never really felt attached to the nation in the same way that the peasant was attached to the soil in Russia. We are always a long way from home."[100]

The shifting ideological positions of the Black Panther Party, as espoused largely by Newton, were not received uncontested. Akinyele Omowale Umoja, for example, contends that many Panthers in New York disagreed with Newton's ideological shift away from black nationalism; very few understood Newton's abstract theory of imperialism.[101] Hayes and Kiene likewise argue that the "rapidly advancing character of Newton's and the Panthers' thinking proved problematic. Often ideological shifts were not accompanied by sufficient political education so that rank-and-file Panthers could understand fully the new set of ideas."[102] Eldridge Cleaver, moreover, favored a more restrictive space of engagement and advocated an offensive mode directed at police forces within the United States. Newton, however, maintained that the best strategy lay in a more expansive space of engagement. Particular spatial practices, likewise, contributed to splits within the Party. Newton's open communiqué to the North Vietnamese government that he would make Party members available to fight in the conflict against U.S. forces angered other members who were upset because Newton was not pressing the armed conflict within the United States.[103] In short, we are left with Errol Henderson's argument that the Black Panther Party's attempt to organize the most disorganized group in the United States—the lumpenproletariat—combined with a diverse array of ideologies (e.g., Mao, Guevara, Fanon) was problematic. Henderson concludes that "the people required examples more consistent with their own experiences."[104] Thus, although Newton attempted to resolve this epistemological obstacle, the linkage between the material spaces of dependency was often obfuscated when framed within his more expansive spaces of engagement.

Conclusions

Malcolm X left his political heirs little that was tangible—no viable organization, no systematic program, no comprehensive theory or model of social justice. However, as Goldman writes, Malcolm X did bequeath a legacy of words and a series of priorities: the beauty and the worth of blackness; the racism of white America; the legitimacy of defending oneself, by any means necessary; the irrelevance of integration and the self-loathing in begging for it; the futility of appeals to the conscience of the conscienceless; the connection with Africa and the African past; the necessity of confronting power with power; the urgency of black control of the African-American community.[105] In short, Malcolm X continued the work of his black radical predecessors, such as DuBois, Patterson, and Robeson, and furthered the understanding of spatial struggles for social justice that would later characterize the Black Power Movement.

Geographers have made substantial contributions to the understanding of spatial struggles within urban areas. However, little research in the discipline has explicitly considered the contestations of urban-based African-American movements, and especially those that fall under the rubric of Black Power. This is symptomatic of larger omissions in the study of the Black Power Movement. The Black Power Movement's influence on labor, poor people, urban uprisings, and community control movements require further study.[106] However, we need to "know how black political radicalism differed and converged, dependent on geographical location, political organizations, and historical circumstances." As Tracye Matthews writes:

> The issues raised by the Black Panther Party remain salient for Black communities at the turn of the twenty-first century. Economic conditions for the majority of Black people have declined since the late sixties in large measure as a consequence of structural adjustment programs in advanced capitalism in response to global competition and the shift from industrial to service-based economies, all of which undermine the security and safety of workers globally. The social consequences of these changes, including more sophisticated and insidious forms of racism and sexism, demand not only new

responses, but also a closer investigation of and learning from past practices of collective, organized resistance.[107]

Both Malcolm X and the Black Panther Party transformed liberation struggles not only in the United States, but also around the world. Significantly, a scalar territorial politics was at the core of both Malcolm X's and the Black Panthers' political philosophies. Progressing from localized concerns to a conception of global intercommunalism, the doctrine of the Black Panther Party, following that of Malcolm X, "represented an effort by a generation of young, dispossessed, and defiant Black Americans to formulate a theory and practice of fundamental social transformation."[108] Moreover, the Black Panther Party attempted to combine their political philosophy with material programs, an objective outlined by Malcolm X's OAAU. Philosophically, however, Newton's enlargement of the spaces of engagement proved troubling, as he was unable to reconnect with members of the community.

What are the geographical implications of the urban politics of Malcolm X's legacy on the Black Panther Party? On the one hand, the Black Panther Party branches based their survival programs on the immediate needs and concerns of their respective communities. In so doing, the political thought of the Party did not exist as distant, abstract ideas, but rather was translated into material practices with a direct relevance to the residents. This conforms readily with the ground-level, prudential rhetoric of Malcolm X. What the Black Panther Party forwarded is also consonant with other black geographies, namely a rethinking of the underpinnings of the oppression and exploitation of African Americans. These struggles situate black geographies materially, ideologically, and experientially; and in so doing, they provide alternative framings of social justice, ones that are not fixed to particular spaces. Thus, the *geo*political thought of the Black Panthers and others, such as Malcolm X, demonstrates a different human geography that is predicated on the respatalization and repoliticization of urban space.

Page Intentionally Left Blank

8
The Social Justice of Malcolm X

To engage in a serious discussion of race in America, we must begin not with the problems of black people but with the flaws of American society....

—Cornel West[1]

The term *social justice* has traditionally referred to the morally proper distribution of benefits and burdens among society's members.[2] As David Smith explains, "A central issue in distributive justice is how to justify differential treatment, or how to identify the differences among people which are relevant to the particular attribute(s) to be distributed."[3] Iris Young argues, however, that distributive justice is insufficient. Rather, one needs to include questions of oppression and domination. Young contends that oppression and domination should be the primary terms for conceptualizing *injustice*. In this way, the structures responsible for inequality may be more effectively dismantled, thus contributing to a broader understanding of social justice that includes not just issues of distribution but also both self-development and self-determination. Don Mitchell concurs, noting that "attention to just distribution within its geographical contexts demands struggle toward the transformation of those geographical contexts."[4] In other words, the structures and institu-

tions responsible for oppressive and exploitative inequalities must be addressed. Malcolm X's conception of social justice for African Americans extended beyond questions of distribution, for he was concerned first and foremost with the elimination of structural and institutional barriers to African-American self-development and self-determination. Two weeks before his death Malcolm X explained in a press conference that he maintained an uncompromising stand against the injustice of racism that existed in the United States. He predicted that 1965 would be a "long, hot, bloody summer" because of the continuance of deplorable conditions confronting African Americans: "inferior housing, inferior employment, inferior education—all the evils of a bankrupt society" that still existed.[5] According to Malcolm X, it was necessary for those who were taken from the African continent and who continued to suffer exploitation and oppression to reach out and unite with other peoples, to work in unity and harmony for a positive program of mutual benefit.[6]

Mitchell writes that "both oppression and domination are exercised through difference: it is difference that is oppressed and it is differentially situated actors who dominate. Autonomy—the freedom to be who one is—requires not just the recognition of difference but also its social promotion."[7] Recently, a *politics of difference* has broadened the scope of social justice and challenged the ways in which people may be treated unfairly. Difference has also been promoted as a source of political strength, as a means of countering hegemonic structures of oppression and exploitation. Difference, therefore, retains a dual significance: both as a source of inequality and of solidarity against injustice.[8]

Such a focus on difference has been crucial in the struggle for justice by "various groups, mobilized under such banners as nationality, ethnicity, race, gender, and sexuality, whose voices had hitherto been muted by what was held to be an essentializing and homogenizing modernism."[9] Malcolm X, in his challenge of racism, did not discount racialized differences. Instead, Malcolm X saw racialization as a complex process of differentiation, one that was intimately associated with the political and economic exploitation of African Americans. Malcolm X noted, "The American system was produced from the

enslavement of the black man. This political, economic, and social system of America was produced from the enslavement of the black man and that particular system is capable only of reproducing that out of which itself was produced."[10] Consequently, the enduring struggle and contestation over American space was inescapably racialized.

A politics of difference requires a readiness on the part of any one movement to show how its particular strategy in contesting exploitation and oppression overlaps with the objectives of other movements in contesting different forms of oppression. This is why Malcolm X's strategic linking of the oppression of African Americans with broader liberation movements in the third world was so crucial. Malcolm X understood that any understanding of the structures of oppression facing persons of African descent was necessarily partial and situated. It is also because of this recognition that Malcolm X gradually came to see the injustices directed toward African-American women as both part of and separate from racial injustices.

A focus on "difference" as a core concept underlying social justice is not without its problems. While a focus on difference has drawn attention to the marginalization and powerlessness of specific groups, there has also been a tendency to erode the sense of human sameness underpinning the ideal of moral equality crucial to a just society.[11] Accordingly, Smith maintains that a "geographical perspective on social justice has to work between universality and particularity."[12] In short, we should work toward a sense of human sameness without abandoning insights gained from understanding the particularity of persons and places.[13] As Smith concludes, "while recognition of salient forms of difference has helped to counter oppressive aspects of universalising modernism, some of the greatest struggles for social justice in recent history ...were more a case of the universalist notion of equal moral worth countering particular social constructions of difference."[14]

This point cannot be overemphasized. Political contestation is always in the name of equality. However, equality itself is a discursive construct. To this end, Mitchell argues for the promotion of a "logic of representation." According to Mitchell, this entails the ability and the right of groups and individuals to make their desires and needs

known, to represent themselves to others and to the state—even if through struggle—as legitimate claimants to public considerations.[15] Without negating cultural difference, Malcolm X imagined a truly democratic society, one based on Mitchell's notion of autonomy and of a logic of representation. In November 1964 Malcolm X explained that African Americans "should never let the white man represent us to them, and we should never let him represent them to us. It is our job today to represent ourselves, as they are representing themselves."[16]

Representation, whether of oneself or of a group, demands space.[17] It is for this reason that Malcolm X steadfastly refused to consider integration as a viable option. For Malcolm X, Black liberation would result only when African Americans were seen as equals. This was not to be accomplished through integrationist practices. Integration was a technique of cultural genocide and economic imperialism, one that favored the status quo and marginalized the politics of difference. Integration policies, as well as assimilation and acculturation beliefs and practices, deprived African Americans of their fundamental right of self-determination. Simply put, to integrate into a white supremacist society would negate the spaces of African American. To adopt the norms, values, and nomenclature of the dominant society, African Americans would cease to exist as a people. As such, integration contributed to the dehumanization and displacement of African Americans just as strongly as segregation policies. In neither case were African Americans in control of their own communities and, hence, their self-determination.

Communal separatism, consequently, was essential to the social justice of Malcolm X. Separation, in this context, becomes a necessary expedient. Only through the autonomous control of public and private resources, Malcolm X maintained, would it be possible for African Americans to achieve self-determination and self-development. Consequently, Malcolm X promoted the necessity of securing basic human needs within African-American communities, including access to land, the ability to exert political power, and participation in systems of production. As Malcolm X asserted, "We believe that our communities must be the sources of their own strength politically,

economically, intellectually, and culturally in the struggle for human rights and human dignity."[18] These objectives are seen, for example, in the aims and statements of the Organization of Afro-American Unity (OAAU): freedom, equality, and justice. African Americans were to be guaranteed their constitutional right of representation and participation in the American system. But Malcolm X also understood that such autonomy would translate into a recognition of their humanity. It was this moral sense of an equality of sameness that Malcolm X referred to when he demanded respect as a human being.

Although Malcolm X's forwarding of Pan-Africanism and black communal separatism may seem discordant with notions of universal human rights, it is entirely consistent with contemporary ideas of difference and social justice. Malcolm X identified the particular conditions confronting African Americans specifically, and oppressed peoples more generally. He did not deny difference, for he recognized that constructed differences were used as tools of oppression. But Malcolm X also understood that difference could function as a source of solidarity. This is why, in the last months of his life, Malcolm X worked strongly for reconciliation within the African-American community. A fractured and splintered social movement would be ineffective against the solidarity of white supremacy and white privilege. This is also why Malcolm X attempted to form bridges between the American Civil Rights Movement and third world revolutions. All the while, Malcolm X promoted self-defined collective identities, for this process directly challenged the language of the oppressors. It was imperative for oppressed and colonized peoples to achieve autonomy through self-determination and self-liberation. Malcolm X, through his enlargement of the Civil Rights Movement to one of human rights, was attempting to create black autonomy through a plea toward a common humanity.

The black radical tradition, as Cedric Robinson writes, "cements pain to purpose, experience to expectation, consciousness to collective action." He maintains that the "resoluteness of the Black radical tradition advances as each generation assembles the data of its experience to an ideology of liberation."[19] Malcolm X was one of many

African Americans who struggled for social justice within a racist society. His ideas were not entirely novel; nor were they necessarily successful. Indeed, the legacy of Malcolm X remains as contested as his life. However, the geography of Malcolm X was unarguably one of producing a space for social justice. And this geography is revealed in one simple, yet intensely contested statement by Malcolm X: "We are human beings, and our fight is to see that every Black man, woman, and child in this country is respected and recognized as a human being."[20] By any means necessary.

NOTES

Chapter 1

1. Aime Cesaire, *Discourse on Colonialism* (1955; repr., New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972), 52.
2. Numerous biographies of Malcolm X exist; see, for example, George Breitman, *The Last Year of Malcolm X: Evolution of a Revolutionary* (New York: Schocken Books, 1968); Louis E. Lomax, *To Kill a Black Man: The Shocking Parallel in the Lives of Malcolm X and Martin Luther King, Jr.* (Los Angeles: Holloway House, 1968); Eugene Wolfenstein, *The Victims of Democracy: Malcolm X and the Black Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981); John Henrik Clarke, ed., *Malcolm X: The Man and his Times* (Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 1990); Bruce Perry, *Malcolm X: The Life of the Man Who Changed Black America* (New York: Station Hill Press, 1991); Williams W. Sales Jr., *From Civil Rights to Black Liberation: Malcolm X and the Organization of Afro-American Unity* (Boston: South End Press, 1994); Michael E. Dyson, *Making Malcolm: The Myth and Meaning of Malcolm X* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); Louis A. DeCaro, Jr., *On the Side of My People: A Religious Life of Malcolm X* (New York: New York University Press, 1996); Louis A. DeCaro, Jr., *Malcolm and the Cross: The Nation of Islam, Malcolm X, and Christianity* (New York: New York University Press, 1998); Rodnell P. Collins, *Seventh Child: A Family Memoir of Malcolm X* (New York: Kensington Publishing, 1998); Kofi Natambu, *The Life and Work of Malcolm X* (Indianapolis, IN: Alpha Books, 2002).
3. Malcolm X, *The Autobiography of Malcolm X* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1965a), 388.
4. Malcolm X, "Racism: The Cancer That Is Destroying America," in *Malcolm X: The Man and his Times*, ed., John Henrik Clarke (1964; Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 1990), 302–306; at 304.
5. Steve Estes, *I Am a Man! Race, Manhood, and the Civil Rights Movement* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 106.
6. David Harvey, *The New Imperialism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 39.
7. Max Elbaum, *Revolution in the Air: Sixties Radicals Turn to Lenin, Mao and Che* (New York: Verso, 2002), 2.

8. Elbaum, *Revolution in the Air*, 2.
9. Mary L. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000), 11
10. Rod Bush, *We are Not What We Seem: Black Nationalism and Class Struggle in the American Century* (New York: New York University Press, 1999), 20.
11. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights*, 6.
12. Malcolm X, *The End of White World Supremacy* (New York: Marlin House, 1971).
13. Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin, *America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 12.
14. Stephen Grant Meyer, *As Long as They Don't Move Next Door: Segregation and Racial Conflict in American Neighborhoods* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000), 116.
15. Meyer, *Segregation and Racial Conflict*, 117.
16. Isserman and Kazin, *America Divided*, 25.
17. Kenneth L. Karst, *Belonging to America: Equal Citizenship and the Constitution* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989), 13.
18. David Harvey, "Revolutionary and Counter Revolutionary Theory in Geography and the Problem of Ghetto Formation," *Antipode* 4, no. 2 (1972): 1–12; at 10–11.
19. William Bunge, "Perspective on Theoretical Geography," *Annals, Association of American Geographers*, 69, no. 1 (1979): 169–74; at 171.
20. Bunge, "Perspective," 170.
21. Owen J. Dwyer, "Geographical Research About African Americans: A Survey of Journals, 1911–1995," *The Professional Geographer* 49, no. 4 (1997): 441–51; at 448.
22. Mona Domosh, "Geography and Gender: The Personal and the Political," *Progress in Human Geography* 21 (1997): 81–97; at 81.
23. For further discussion, see the articles in the special issue of *The Professional Geographer* (1994).
24. Audrey Kobayashi, "Coloring the Field: Gender, 'Race,' and the Politics of Fieldwork," *The Professional Geographer* 46 (1994): 73–80 ; at 73.
25. Robin D. G. Kelley, *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination* (Boston: Beacon Press, 9.
26. David Delaney, *Race, Place and the Law, 1836–1948* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998), 9–10.
27. Kelley, *Freedom Dreams*, 9.
28. Ibid., 9–11.
29. A. Bogues, *Black Heretics, Black Prophets: Radical Black Intellectuals* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 13.
30. Kelley, *Freedom Dreams*, 8.
31. Bogues, *Black Heretics*, 13.
32. Ibid., 18.
33. Robert Terrill, "Protest, Prophecy, and Prudence in the Rhetoric of Malcolm X," *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 4 (2001): 25–53.
34. David Howard-Pitney, *The Afro-American Jeremiad: Appeals for Justice in America* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990), 6.
35. Howard-Pitney, *Afro-American Jeremiad*, 5.
36. Ibid., 12.
37. E. Vander Lei and K.D. Miller, 'Martin Luther King, Jr.s "I Have a Dream" in Context: Ceremonial Protest and African American Jeremiad', *College English* 62 (1999): 83-99.
38. Terrill, "Protest, Prophecy," 28.
39. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Speaks* (New York: Pathfinder Books, 1965b), 26.

40. Ibid., 26.
41. Terrill, "Protest, Prophecy," 32.
42. Ibid., 34.
43. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Talks to Young People: Speeches in the US, Britain and Africa* (New York: Pathfinder Books, 1991), 49.
44. David M. Smith, *Moral Geographies: Ethics in a World of Difference* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000), 214.
45. Richard Wright, *The Color Curtain: A Report on the Bandung Conference* (New York: World, 1956), 116.
46. Sales, Jr., *From Civil Rights to Black Liberation*, 24.
47. bell hooks, *Outlaw Culture: Resisting Representations* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 185.
48. Elbaum, *Revolution in the Air*, 21.

Chapter 2

1. Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), 17.
2. Steve Pile, "The Troubled Spaces of Frantz Fanon," in *Thinking Space*, ed., Mike Crang and Nigel Thrift (New York: Routledge, 2000), 260–77; at 260.
3. George Breitman, *The Last Year of Malcolm X: The Evolution of a Revolutionary* (New York: Schocken Books, 1968); William W. Sales, Jr., *From Civil Rights to Black Liberation: Malcolm X and the Organization of Afro-American Unity* (Boston: South End Press, 1994).
4. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X: The Last Speeches* (New York: Pathfinder Books, 1989), 11.
5. Dean E. Robinson, *Black Nationalism in American Politics and Thought* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 46.
6. Sales, Jr. *Civil Rights to Black Liberation*, 85.
7. Michael C. Dawson, *Black Visions: The Roots of Contemporary African-American Political Ideologies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 10.
8. Larry Brown, "Change, Continuity, and the Pursuit of Geographic Understanding," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 89, no. 1 (1999): 1–25.
9. David Lowenthal, "Geography, Experience, and Imagination: Towards a Geographical epistemology," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 51, no. 3 (1961): 241–60; at 260.
10. Heidi Nast, "Opening Remarks On 'Women in the Field,'" *The Professional Geographer* 46 (1994): 54–66; at 60.
11. Anthony Bogues, *Black Heretics, Black Prophets: Radical Black Intellectuals* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 21.
12. Crang and Thrift, *Thinking Spaces*, chapter 1.
13. Malcolm X, *The Autobiography of Malcolm X* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1965a), 388–89.
14. P. Olisanwuche Esedebe, *Pan-Africanism: The Idea and Movement, 1776–1991*, 2nd ed. (Washington, DC: Howard University Press, 1994), 55.
15. Michael L. Conniff and Thomas J. Davis, *Africans in the Americas: A History of the Black Diaspora* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994), 259.
16. Esedebe, *Pan-Africanism*, 61.
17. Louis A. DeCaro, Jr., *On the Side of My People: A Religious Life of Malcolm X* (New York: New York University Press, 1996), 39–40.
18. Malcolm X, *Autobiography*, 2.
19. Ibid., 6–7.

20. Kofi Natambu, *The Life and Work of Malcolm X* (Indianapolis, IN: Alpha Books, 2002), 3.
21. Malcolm X, *Autobiography*, 1.
22. Ibid., 21.
23. Ibid., 22.
24. Ibid., 30.
25. Ibid., 37–38.
26. Ibid., 36.
27. Michael E. Dyson, *Making Malcolm: The Myth and Meaning of Malcolm X* (New York: Oxford Press), 5.
28. DeCaro, Jr., *On the Side of My People*, 61.
29. Ibid., 58.
30. Malcolm X, *Autobiography*, 152-3.
31. Ibid., 153.
32. DeCaro, Jr. *On the Side of My People*, 73–74.
33. Louis E. Lomax, *To Kill a Black Man: The Shocking Parallel in the Lives of Malcolm X and Martin Luther King, Jr.* (Los Angeles: Holloway House, 1968), 28.
34. Ibid., 59–60.
35. Louis A. DeCaro, Jr., *Malcolm and the Cross: The Nation of Islam, Malcolm X, and Christianity* (New York: New York University Press, 1998), 75.
36. Malcolm X, *Autobiography*, 162–63.
37. Ibid., 165.
38. Ibid., 184.
39. Ibid., 165–66.
40. Robert E. Terrill, "Protest, Prophecy, and Prudence in the Rhetoric of Malcolm X," *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 4 (2001): 25–53; at 29.
41. See Eric C. Lincoln, *The Black Muslims in America* (Canada: Saunders of Toronto, 1961); Clifton E. Marsh, *The Lost-Found Nation of Islam in America* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2000).
42. Malcolm X, *Autobiography*, 203.
43. Rodnell Collins with A. P. Bailey, *Seventh Child: A Family Memoir of Malcolm X* (New York: Kensington, 1998), 89.
44. Natambu, *Life and Work of Malcolm X*, 165.
45. Terrill, "Protest, Prophecy," 29.
46. Natambu, *Life and Work of Malcolm X*, 288.
47. Ibid., 287–88.
48. Terrill, "Protest, Prophecy," 26.

Chapter 3

1. David Harvey, *Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical Geography* (New York: Routledge, 2001), 231.
2. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X on Afro-American History* (New York: Pathfinder Books, 1967), 28–29.
3. Ibid., 29.
4. Michael C. Dawson, *Black Visions: The Roots of Contemporary African-American Political Ideologies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 2.
5. Leon Litwack, *Trouble in Mind: Black Southerners in the Age of Jim Crow* (New York: Vintage Books, 1998), 91.
6. James M. Blaut, *The Colonizer's Model of the World: Geographical Diffusionism and Eurocentric History* (New York: Guilford Press, 1993), 22.
7. Ibid., 24.

8. David N. Livingstone, *The Geographical Tradition: Episodes in the History of a Contested Enterprise* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1992), 220.
9. Preston E. James and Geoffrey J. Martin, *All Possible World's: A History of Geographical Ideas*, 2nd ed. (New York: John Wiley, 1981), 27.
10. Keith Johnston, *A Physical, Historical, Political, and Descriptive Geography*, 5th ed. (London: Edward Stanford, 1896), 147.
11. Litwack, *Trouble in Mind*, 71.
12. A. von Steinwehr and D.G. Brinton, *An Intermediate Geography with Lessons in Map Drawing* (Cincinnati: Van Antwerp, Bragg, 1870), 16–18.
13. Johnston, *Descriptive Geography*, 367.
14. Philip S. Foner, ed., *W.E.B. DuBois Speaks: Speeches and Addresses, 1920–1963* (New York: Pathfinder Books, 1970), 69.
15. Madan Sarup, *An Introductory Guide to Post-Structuralism and Postmodernism* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1993), 73.
16. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage Books, 1979), 27.
17. Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*, ed. Colin Gordon (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980), 98.
18. Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, Vol. 1, *An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage Books, 1990), 94–95.
19. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 215.
20. Ibid., 138.
21. Ibid., 218.
22. Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, 140–41.
23. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 25.
24. Ibid., 25–26.
25. Ibid., 138.
26. Litwack, *Trouble in Mind*, 95.
27. William H. Watkins, *The White Architects of Black Education: Ideology and Power in America, 1865–1954* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2001), 1.
28. George M. Fredrickson, *Black Liberation: A Comparative History of Black Ideologies in the United States and South Africa* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 165.
29. Jeffrey R. Hummel, *Emancipating Slaves, Enslaving Free Men: A History of the American Civil War* (Chicago: Open Court, 1996).
30. George T. Winston, "The Relation of the Whites to the Negroes," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 18 (1901): 103–18.
31. Ibid., 105, 106.
32. Ibid., 108.
33. H.E.A. Belin, "A Southern View of slavery," *American Journal of Sociology* 13 (1908): 513–22; at 517.
34. Winston, "Relation of Whites to Negroes," 108.
35. Belin, "A Southern View," 519.
36. Ibid., 522.
37. M.F. Berry, *Black Resistance, White Law: A History of Constitutional Racism in America* (1971; repr., New York: Penguin, 1995).
38. Litwack, *Trouble in Mind*, 71.
39. Ibid., 71.
40. Ibid., 69.
41. Watkins, *White Architects*, 47.
42. Ibid., 54.
43. Ibid., 55.

44. Ibid., 47.
45. Ibid., 48, 50–51.
46. Ibid., 58.
47. Jacqueline M. Moore, *Booker T. Washington, W.E.B. DuBois, and the Struggle for Racial Uplift* (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 2003), 22.
48. Watkins, *White Architects*, 53.
49. Ibid., 48.
50. Ibid., 59.
51. Moore, *Struggle for Racial Uplift*, 19.
52. John Hope Franklin and Alfred A. Moss, Jr., *From Slavery to Freedom: A History of African Americans*, 7th ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1994), 270.
53. Litwack, *Trouble in Mind*, 79.
54. Franklin and Moss, *From Slavery to Freedom*, 270.
55. Watkins, *White Architects*, 99.
56. Ibid., 106.
57. Ibid., 155.
58. Litwack, *Trouble in Mind*, 74.
59. Foner, *W.E.B. DuBois Speaks*, 69.
60. Litwack, *Trouble in Mind*, 72–73.
61. Ibid., 74.
62. Cornel West, *Race Matters* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), 136.
63. Ibid., 136.
64. Carter G. Woodson, *The Mis-Education of the Negro* (1933; repr., Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 1998), 84.
65. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Talks to Young People: Speeches in the US, Britain and Africa* (New York: Pathfinder Books, 1991), 54–55.
66. Ibid., 94.
67. Ibid., 94.
68. Ibid., 55–56.
69. Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks* (New York: Grove Press, 1967), 113.
70. Ibid., 18.
71. Malcolm X, *Talks to Young People*, 54.
72. Ibid., 84.
73. Woodson, *Mis-Education*, 6.
74. Malcolm X, *Afro-American History*, 25.
75. Ibid., 47.
76. Ibid., 25.
77. Ibid., 26.
78. Ibid., 27.
79. Ibid., 27.
80. Ibid., 26.
81. Fanon, *Black Skin*, 100; italics in original.
82. Malcolm X, *Afro-American History*, 26–27.
83. Iris M. Young, *Justice and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990), 123.
84. Malcolm X, *February 1965: The Final Speeches* (New York: Pathfinder Books, 1992), 277.
85. Ibid., 278; italics in original.
86. Malcolm X, *Talks to Young People*, 55.
87. Ibid., 55.
88. Ibid., 85–86.
89. Ibid., 86.

90. R. Rabaka, R. "Malcolm X and/as Critical Theory: Philosophy, Radical Politics, and the African American Search for Social Justice," *Journal of Black Studies* 33, no. 2 (2002): 145–65; at 153.
91. Malcolm X, *Talks to Young People*, 89.
92. Terrill, "Protest, Prophecy," 26.
93. Ibid., 41.

Chapter 4

1. Kwame Ture and Charles V. Hamilton, *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation* (1967; rpt., New York: Vintage Books, 1992), 35.
2. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Speaks* (New York: Pathfinder Books, 1965b), 166.
3. Ibid., 166.
4. Don Mitchell, *The Right to the City: Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space* (New York: Guilford Press, 2003), 81.
5. Wolfgang Natter and John Paul Jones, "Identity, Space, and Other Uncertainties," in *Space and Social Theory: Interpreting Modernity and Postmodernity*, ed. Georges Benko and Ulf Strohmayer (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), 141–61; at 149.
6. Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993) 7.
7. Rob Shields, "Spatial Stress and Resistance: Social Meanings of Spatialization," in Benko and Strohmayer, 186–202; at 197.
8. David Delaney, *Race, Place and the Law, 1836–1948* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998), 4.
9. Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1991), 38–39.
10. Mona Domosh, "Those 'Gorgeous Incongruities': Polite Politics and Public Space on the Streets of Nineteenth-Century New York City," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 88 (1998): 209–26; at 10.
11. Grace E. Hale, "'For Colored' and 'For White': Segregating Consumption in the South," in *Jumpin' Jim Crow: Southern Politics from Civil War to Civil Rights*, ed. Jane Dailey, Glenda Elizabeth Gilmore, and Bryant Simon (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000), 162–82; at 165.
12. L. Stewart, "Bodies, Visions, and Spatial Politics: A Review Essay on Henri Lefebvre's *The Production of Space*," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 13 (1995): 609–18; at 611.
13. Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, 41.
14. Grace Elizabeth Hale, *Making Whiteness: The Culture of Segregation in the South, 1890–1940* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1998).
15. Don Mitchell, "The End of Public Space? People's Park, Definitions of the Public, and Democracy," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 85 (1995): 108–33; at 115.
16. Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, 85.
17. Mitchell, "End of Public Space," 115.
18. Lynn A. Staeheli, and A. Thompson, "Citizenship, Community, and the Struggles for Public Space," *The Professional Geographer* 49 (1997): 28–38; at 31.
19. Natter and Jones, "Identity, Space," 142.
20. Edward Soja, *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London: Verso, 1989), 81.
21. Shields, "Spatial Stress," 192.
22. Ibid., 192.
23. David Delaney, "The Space that Race Makes," *The Professional Geographer* 54, no. 1 (2002): 6–14; at 7.

24. Natter and Jones, "Identity, Space," 150.
25. Ibid., 156.
26. George M. Fredrickson, *Black Liberation: A Comparative History of Black Ideologies in the United States and South Africa* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 94.
27. George A. Davis and O. Fred. Donaldson, *Blacks in the United States: A Geographic Perspective*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1975), 113.
28. Delaney, *Race, Place*, 47.
29. Hale, *Making Whiteness*, 23.
30. David W. Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2001), 45.
31. Ibid., 139.
32. Carole Marks, *Farewell—We're Good and Gone: The Great Black Migration* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), 45.
33. Hale, *Making Whiteness*, 21–22.
34. Jane Dailey, Glenda E. Gilmore, and Bryant Simon, "Introduction," in *Jumpin' Jim Crow: Southern Politics from Civil War to Civil Rights*, eds. Jane Dailey, Glenda Elizabeth Gilmore, and Bryant Simon (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000), 3–6; at 4.
35. Fredrickson, *Black Liberation*, 96.
36. Marks, *Good and Gone*, 67.
37. Ibid., 94.
38. Eugene V. Wolfenstein, *The Victims of Democracy: Malcolm X and the Black Revolution* (New York: Guilford Press, 1993), 59.
39. Ibid., 58.
40. Davis and Donaldson, *Blacks in the United States*, 128.
41. Stephen G. Meyer, *As Long as They Don't Move Next Door: Segregation and Racial Conflict in American Neighborhoods* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000), 8.
42. Roger L. Rice, "Residential Segregation by Law, 1910–1917," *Journal of Southern History* 24 (1968): 179–99; at 181.
43. Davis and Donaldson, *Blacks in the United States*, 128; see also C. Vann Woodward, *The Strange Career of Jim Crow*, 3rd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974).
44. Fredrickson, *Black Liberation*, 128.
45. Hale, "Segregating Consumption," 173.
46. Richard L. Morrill, "The Negro Ghetto: Problems and Alternatives," *The Geographical Review* 55 (1965): 339–61; at 340.
47. Davis and Donaldson, *Blacks in the United States*, 128–29.
48. Fredrickson, *Black Liberation*, 98–99.
49. Ibid., 103.
50. Delaney, *Race, Place*, 9.
51. Raymond L. Hall, "Explorations in the Analysis of Black Separatism," in *Black Separatism and Social Reality: Rhetoric and Reason*, ed. Raymond L. Hall (New York: Pergamon Press, 1977), 13–22; at 13.
52. Raymond L. Hall, "Introduction," in *Black Separatism and Social Reality: Rhetoric and Reason*, ed. Raymond L. Hall (New York: Pergamon Press, 1977), 1–11; at 6.
53. Fredrickson, *Black Liberation*, 108.
54. Franklin and Moss, *Slavery to Freedom*, 279.
55. Richard Wormser, *The Rise and Fall of Jim Crow* (New York: St. Martin's/Griffin, 2003), 25.
56. Roy L. Brooks, *Integration or Separation? A Strategy for Racial Equality* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996), 119.
57. Fredrickson, *Black Liberation*, 129.

58. Brooks, *Integration or Separation*, 125.
59. Ibid., 137–38.
60. Ibid., 147.
61. Ibid., 149.
62. David H. Kaplan and Steven R. Holloway, "Scaling Ethnic Segregation: Causal Processes and Contingent Outcomes in Chinese Residential Patterns," *GeoJournal* 53 (2001): 59–70.
63. Kaplan and Holloway, "Scaling Segregation," 61; italics added.
64. Natter and Jones, "Identity, space," 150.
65. Fredrickson, *Black Liberation*, 128.
66. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Speaks*, 38–39.
67. Ibid., 39.
68. Ibid., 166.
69. Ibid., 167.
70. James H. Cone, *Martin & Malcolm & America: A Dream or a Nightmare?* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1991), 96.
71. Kenneth B. Clark, *Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), 28.
72. Ibid., 30.
73. Meyer, *Segregation and Racial Conflict*, 5.
74. Louis E. Lomax, *To Kill a Black Man: The Shocking Parallel in the Lives of Malcolm X and Martin Luther King, Jr.* (Los Angeles: Holloway House, 1968), 239.
75. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Speaks*, 51.
76. Ibid., 42.
77. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X on Afro-American History* (New York: Pathfinder Books, 1967), 21.
78. Adam Fairclough, *Martin Luther King, Jr.* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1990), 110.
79. Clark, *Dark Ghetto*, 29.
80. Malcolm X, *February 1965: The Final Speeches* (New York: Pathfinder Books, 1992), 276.
81. Ibid., 277.
82. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Speaks*, 51.
83. Ibid., 51.
84. Mitchell, *The Right to the City*, 4.
85. Clark, *Dark Ghetto*, 12.

Chapter 5

1. H. Rap Brown [Jamil Abdullah Al-Amin], *Die Nigger Die! A Political Autobiography* (Chicago: Lawrence Hill Books, 1969), 18.
2. Malcolm X, *February 1965: The Final Speeches* (New York: Pathfinder Books, 1992), 124.
3. James H. Cone, *Martin & Malcolm & America: A Dream or a Nightmare?* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1991),279.
4. Ruth Wilson Gilmore, "Fatal Couplings of Power and Difference: Notes on Racism and Geography," *The Professional Geographer* 54 (2002): 15–24; at 16.
5. Kevern Verney, *Black Civil Rights in America* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 44.
6. Michael Goldfield, *The Color of Politics: Race and the Mainsprings of American Politics* (New York: New Press, 1997), 288.
7. Robin D.G. Kelley, *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2002), 26.

8. Cone, *Martin & Malcolm*, 279.
9. bell hooks, *Outlaw Culture: Resisting Representations* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 192.
10. Forrest D. Colburn, *The Vogue of Revolution in Poor Countries* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), 6.
11. Colburn, *Vogue of Revolution*, 12.
12. Misagh Parsa, *States, Ideologies, and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of Iran, Nicaragua, and the Philippines* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 7.
13. Anthony Bogues, *Black Heretics, Black Prophets: Radical Political Intellectuals* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 70.
14. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Speaks* (New York: Pathfinder Books, 1965b), 9.
15. Kelley, *Freedom Dreams*.
16. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Speaks*, 56.
17. Rod Bush, *We Are Not What We Seem: Black Nationalism and Class Struggle in the American Century* (New York: New York University Press, 1999), 187–88.
18. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Speaks*, 49.
19. Ibid., 50.
20. Ibid., 52–53.
21. Ibid., 65, 68–69.
22. Ibid., 69.
23. Ernesto Guevara, *Guerrilla Warfare* (1961; rpt., Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 8.
24. Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (New York: Grove Press, 1963), 35.
25. Brenda G. Plummer, *Rising Wind: Black Americans and U.S. Foreign Affairs, 1935–1960* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 240.
26. Ibid., 241.
27. Ibid., 241.
28. Ibid., 240.
29. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Speaks*, 106.
30. Malcolm X, *February 1965*, 82.
31. Malcolm X, *February 1965*, 166.
32. Ibid., 124.
33. Kelley, *Freedom Dreams*, 27.
34. hooks, *Outlaw Culture*, 185.
35. Kelley, *Freedom Dreams*, 26–27.
36. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Speaks*, 133.
37. Ibid., 135.
38. Kelley, *Freedom Dreams*, 26.
39. Cone, *Martin & Malcolm*, 279.
40. Ibid., 279.
41. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X on Afro-American History* (New York: Pathfinder Books, 1967), 6.
42. Malcolm X, *Afro-American History*, 60.
43. hooks, *Outlaw Culture*, 187–88.
44. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Speaks*, 49.
45. Ibid., 49.
46. Ibid., 56–57.
47. Ibid., 57.
48. Robert E. Terrill, "Protest, Prophecy, and Prudence in the Rhetoric of Malcolm X," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 4, no. 1 (2001): 25–53; at 38.
49. Peter Goldman, *The Death and Life of Malcolm X*, 2nd ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1979), 153.

50. Malcolm X, *February 1965*, 145.
51. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X: The Last Speeches* (New York: Pathfinder Books, 1989), 83.
52. Sara Bullard, *Free at Last: A History of the Civil Rights Movement and Those Who Died in the Struggle* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 64.
53. Jeff Goodwin, *No Other Way Out: States and Revolutionary Movements, 1945–1991* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
54. Malcolm X, *February 1965*, 170.
55. Ibid., 37.
56. Ibid., 46.
57. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Speaks*, 107.
58. Malcolm X, *February 1965*, 87.
59. Colburn, *Vogue of Revolutions*, 14.
60. Ibid., 99; italics added.
61. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Speaks*, 112–3.
62. Brown, *Die Nigger Die!*, 85.

Chapter 6

1. Edward Abbey, *Abbey's Road* (New York: Plume, 1972), 97.
2. Derek Gregory, *Geographical Imaginations* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell. 1994), 11–12.
3. Ibid., 416.
4. Anthony Bogues, *Black Heretics, Black Prophets: Radical Political Intellectuals* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 21.
5. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Speaks* (New York: Pathfinder Books, 1965b), 96.
6. Malcolm X, *February 1965: The Final Speeches* (New York: Pathfinder Books, 1992), 47; italics added.
7. Ibid., 155–56.
8. Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Random House, 1978), 1–2.
9. Toni Morrison, *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992).
10. Ibid., 7.
11. Malcolm X, *February 1965*, 156.
12. Patterson, Orlando. 1997. *The Ordeal of Integration: Progress and Resentment in America's 'Racial Crisis'*. Washington, D.C.: Civitas, 4.
13. Malcolm X, *February 1965*, 47.
14. Katheryn K. Russell, *The Color of Crime: Racial Hoaxes, White Fear, Black Protectionism, Police Harassment, and other Macroaggressions* (New York: New York University Press, 1998).
15. Morrison, *Playing in the Dark*, 7.
16. James H. Meriwether, *Proudly We Can Be Africans: Black Americans and Africa, 1935–1961* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 10.
17. Ibid., 6.
18. P. Olisanwuche Esedebe, *Pan-Africanism: The Idea and Movement, 1776–1991*, 2nd ed. (Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1994), 5.
19. Robin D.G. Kelley, *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2002).
20. Esedebe, *Pan-Africanism*, 28.
21. Ibid., 28.
22. Dean E. Robinson, *Black Nationalism in American Politics and Thought* (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 8.
23. Robinson, *Black Nationalism*, 25.

24. Kelley, *Freedom Dreams*, 24.
25. Ibid., 24.
26. Penny M. Von Eschen, *Race Against Empire: Black Americans and Anticolonialism, 1937–1957* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997), 10.
27. Esedebe, *Pan-Africanism*, 55.
28. Meriwether, *Proudly We Can Be Africans*, 239.
29. Ibid., 239.
30. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Speaks*, 20.
31. Ibid., 21.
32. Ibid., 21–22.
33. Peter Goldman, *The Death and Life of Malcolm X*, 2nd ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1979), 148.
34. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Speaks*, 20.
35. Ibid., 210.
36. Ibid., 62–63.
37. William W. Sales, Jr., *From Civil Rights to Black Liberation: Malcolm X and the Organization of Afro-American Unity* (Boston: South End Press, 1994), 84.
38. Sales, *Civil Rights to Black Liberation*, 37.
39. Ibid., 84.
40. Ibid., 106.
41. James Boggs and Grace Lee Boggs, *Revolution and Evolution in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974).
42. Goldman, *Death and Life*, 148.
43. Adam Hochschild, *King Leopold's Ghost: A Story of Greed, Terror, and Heroism in Colonial Africa* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1998), 87.
44. Meriwether, *Proudly We Can Be Africans*, 211.
45. Ibid., 215.
46. Ibid., 215.
47. Brenda G. Plummer, *Rising Wind: Black Americans and U.S. Foreign Affairs, 1935–1960* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 304.
48. Meriwether, *Proudly We Can Be Africans*, 239.
49. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Speaks*, 62.
50. Ibid., 122.
51. Ibid., 122.
52. Ibid., 122.
53. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Speaks*, 123.
54. Ibid., 122.
55. Ibid., 122.
56. Ibid., 123.
57. Ibid., 124.
58. Ibid., 123–24.
59. Ibid., 125.
60. Ibid., 124.
61. Ibid., 143.

Chapter 7

1. James Boggs and Grace Lee Boggs, *Revolution and Evolution in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974), 260.
2. Malcolm X, *By Any Means Necessary* (New York: Pathfinder Books, 1970), 37–39.
3. Harm J. de Blij and Alexander B. Murphy, *Human Geography: Culture, Society, and Space*, 6th ed. (New York: John Wiley, 1999), 7.

4. Philip F. Kelly, "The Geographies of Politics and Globalization," *Progress in Human Geography* 23, no. 3 (1999): 379–400; at 381.
5. David Delaney and Helga Leitner, "The Political Construction of Scale," *Political Geography* 16, no. 2 (1997): 93–97; at 96.
6. Eric Swyngedouw, "Excluding the Other: The Production of Scale and Scaled Politics," in *Geographies of Economies*, ed. Roger Lee and Jane Wills (New York: Arnold, 1997), 167–76.
7. Dean E. Robinson, *Black Nationalism in American Politics and Thought* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 6.
8. Kevin R. Cox, "Spaces of Dependence, Spaces of Engagement and the Politics of Scale, or: Looking for Local Politics," *Political Geography* 17, no. 1 (1998): 1–23.
9. Ibid., 2.
10. Ibid., 2.
11. Ibid., 4.
12. Ibid., 7.
13. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Speaks* (New York: Pathfinder Books, 1965b), 30.
14. Ibid., 109.
15. Ibid., 99.
16. Ibid., 117.
17. Ibid., 163.
18. Ibid., 117.
19. Ibid., 148.
20. Ibid., 151.
21. Ibid., 151.
22. Ibid., 75.
23. Ibid., 65.
24. Ibid., 75.
25. Peter Goldman, *The Death and Life of Malcolm X*, 2nd ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1979), 240.
26. Rod Bush, *We Are Not What We Seem: Black Nationalism and Class Struggle in the American Century* (New York: New York University Press, 1999),129.
27. Brenda G. Plummer, *Rising Wind: Black Americans and U.S. Foreign Affairs, 1935–1960* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 202.
28. Bush, *We Are Not What We Seem*, 183.
29. Malcolm X, *February 1965: The Final Speeches* (New York: Pathfinder Books, 1992), 40.
30. Bush, *We Are Not What We Seem*, 184.
31. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Speaks*, 90.
32. Goldman, *Death and Life*, 156.
33. Kevern Verney, *Black Civil Rights in America* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 83.
34. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Speaks*, 46–47.
35. Ibid., 103.
36. Ibid., 143.
37. Ibid., 8.
38. Ibid., 8.
39. Robinson, *Black Nationalism*, 169.
40. William W. Sales, Jr., *From Civil Rights to Black Liberation: Malcolm X and the Organization of Afro-American Unity* (Boston: South End Press, 1994), 168.
41. Bobby Seale, *Seize the Time: The Story of the Black Panther Party and Huey P. Newton* (1968; rpt., Baltimore, MD: Black Classic Press, 1991), 78.
42. Huey P. Newton, *The Huey P. Newton Reader* (New York: Seven Stories Press, 2002), 55–56.

43. Newton, *Huey P. Newton Reader*, 249.
44. Seale, *Seize the Time*, 78.
45. Ibid., 82.
46. Philip S. Foner, ed., *The Black Panthers Speak* (New York: De Capo Press, 1995), 50.
47. Charles E. Jones and Judson L. Jeffries,. "'Don't Believe the Hype': Debunking the Panther Mythology," in *The Black Panther Party Reconsidered*, ed. Charles E. Jones (Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1998), 31–32.
48. Tracye Matthews, "'No One Ever Asks, What a Man's Place in the Revolution Is': Gender and the Politics of the Black Panther Party, 1966–1971," in *The Black Panther Party Reconsidered*, ed. Charles E. Jones (Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1998), 268.
49. Matthews, "'No One Ever Asks,'" 273; see also Angela Davis, *Angela Davis: An Autobiography* (New York: International Publishers, 1974); Regina Jennings, "Why I Joined the Party: An Africana Womanist Reflection," in *The Black Panther Party Reconsidered*, ed. Charles E. Jones (Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1998), 257–65; and Angela D. LeBlanc-Ernest, "'The Most Qualified Person to Handle the Job': Black Panther Party Women, 1966–1982," in *The Black Panther Party Reconsidered*, ed. Charles E. Jones (Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1998), 305–34.
50. Newton, *Huey P. Newton Reader*, 50.
51. Ibid., 50.
52. Ibid., 51.
53. Floyd W. Hayes III and Francis A. Kiene III, "'All Power to the People': The Political Thought of Huey P. Newton and the Black Panther Party," in *The Black Panther Party Reconsidered*, ed. Charles E. Jones (Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1998), 157–76; Michael L. Clemons and Charles E. Jones, "Global Solidarity: The Black Panther Party in the International Arena," in *Liberation, Imagination, and the Black Panther Party: A New Look at the Panthers and Their Legacy*, ed. Kathleen Cleaver and George Katsiaficas (New York: Routledge, 2001), 20–39.
54. Seale, *Seize the Time*, 35.
55. JoNina M. Abron,. "'Serving the People': The Survival Programs of the Black Panther Party," in *The Black Panther Party Reconsidered*, ed. Charles E. Jones (Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1998), 180–81.
56. Seale, *Seize the Time*, 99.
57. Abron, "'Serving the People,'" 182.
58. Ibid., 179–80.
59. Newton, *Huey P. Newton Reader*, 58.
60. Seale, *Seize the Time*, 64.
61. Newton, *Huey P. Newton Reader*, 46.
62. Ibid., 67.
63. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979), 141.
64. Steve Herbert, *Policing Space: Territoriality and the Los Angeles Police Department* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 10–11.
65. Newton, *Huey P. Newton Reader*, 49.
66. Seale, *Seize the Time*, 65.
67. Ibid., 125–32.
68. Ibid., 136.
69. Ibid., 139.
70. Newton, *Huey P. Newton Reader*, 68.
71. Huey P. Newton, *To Die for the People: Selected Writings and Speeches* (New York: Writers and Readers, 1999), 7.

72. Ibid., 7.
73. Eugene J. McCann, "Race, Protest, and Public Space: Contextualizing Lefebvre in the U.S. City," *Antipode* 31, no. 2 (1999): 163–84; at 171.
74. Y.R. Williams, "In the Name of the Law: The 1967 Shooting of Huey Newton and Law Enforcement s Permissive Environment," *Negro History Bulletin* 61 (1998): 6-12.
75. Newton, *Huey P Newton Reader*, 67.
76. Russell Shoats, "Black Fighting Formations: Their Strengths, Weaknesses, and Potentialities," in *Liberation, Imagination, and the Black Panther Party: A New Look at the Panthers and their Legacy*, ed. Kathleen Cleaver and George Katsiaficas (New York: Routledge, 2001), 131.
77. Newton, *Huey P Newton Reader*, 185.
78. Foner, *Black Panthers Speak*, 78.
79. Ibid., 94.
80. Hayes and Kiene, "'All Power to the People,'" 165.
81. Newton, *Huey P. Newton Reader*, 185.
82. Foner, *Black Panthers Speak*, 94.
83. Hayes and Kiene, "'All Power to the People,'" 165.
84. Ibid., 169.
85. Newton, *Huey P Newton Reader*, 186.
86. Ibid., 187; italics in original.
87. Hayes and Kiene, "'All Power to the People,'" 170.
88. Newton, *Huey P. Newton Reader*, 248.
89. Ibid., 187.
90. Ibid., 187.
91. Ibid., 260–61.
92. Ibid., 197.
93. Foner, *Black Panthers Speak*, 45.
94. Newton, *Huey P. Newton Reader*, 253.
95. Ibid., 197.
96. Ibid., 253.
97. Ibid., 253–54.
98. Ibid., 254–55.
99. Ibid., 45.
100. Ibid., 193–94.
101. Umoja Akinyele Omowale, "Repression Breeds Resistance: The Black Liberation Army and the Radical Legacy of the Black Panther Party," in *Liberation, Imagination, and the Black Panther Party: A New Look at the Panthers and their Legacy*, ed. Kathleen Cleaver and George Katsiaficas (New York: Routledge, 2001), 14.
102. Hayes and Kiene, "'All Power to the People,'" 172.
103. Shoats, "Black Fighting Formations," 135.
104. Errol Anthony Henderson, "Shadow of a Clue," in *Liberation, Imagination, and the Black Panther Party: A New Look at the Panthers and their Legacy*, ed. Kathleen Cleaver and George Katsiaficas (New York: Routledge, 2001), 204.
105. Goldman, *Death and Life*, 387.
106. P.E. Joseph, "Black Liberation without Apology: Reconceptualizing the Black Power Movement," *The Black Scholar* 31, nos. 3–4 (2001): 2–19.
107. Matthews, "No One Ever Asks," 267–68.
108. Hayes and Kiene, "'All Power to the People,'" 172.

Chapter 8

1. Cornel West, *Race Matters*. New York: Random House, 1993), 6.
2. Iris Marion Young, *Justice and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990).
3. David M. Smith, *Geography and Social Justice* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1994), 24.
4. Don Mitchell, *The Right to the City: Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space* (New York: Guilford Press, 2003), 30.
5. Malcolm X, *By Any Means Necessary* (New York: Pathfinder Books, 1970), 170.
6. Ibid., 173–74.
7. Mitchell, *Right to the City*, 32.
8. David M. Smith, *Moral Geographies: Ethics in a World of Difference* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000), 137.
9. Smith, *Moral Geographies*, 197.
10. Malcolm X, *By Any Means Necessary*, 116.
11. Smith, *Moral Geographies*, 138.
12. Ibid., 138.
13. Ibid., 144.
14. Ibid., 138.
15. Mitchell, *Right to the City*, 32–33.
16. Malcolm X, *By Any Means Necessary*, 146.
17. Mitchell, *Right to the City*, 33.
18. Malcolm X, *By Any Means Necessary*, 49.
19. Cedric J. Robinson, *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1983), 317.
20. Malcolm X, *Malcolm X Talks to Young People* (New York: Pathfinder, 1991), 67.

Bibliography

Abbey, Edward. *Abbey's Road*. New York: Plume, 1972.

Abron, JoNina. "'Serving the People': The Survival Programs of the Black Panther Party," in *The Black Panther Party Reconsidered*, edited by Charles E. Jones, 177–82. Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1998,

Belin, H.E.A. "A Southern View of Slavery." *American Journal of Sociology* 13 (1908): 513–22.

Berry, M.F. *Black Resistance, White Law: A History of Constitutional Racism in America*. New York: Penguin, 1995. First published 1971.

Blaut, James M. *The Colonizer's Model of the World: Geographical Diffusionism and Eurocentric History*. New York: Guilford Press, 1993.

Blight, David W. *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2001.

Boggs, James, and Grace Lee Boggs. *Revolution and Evolution in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974.

Bogues, Anthony. *Black Heretics, Black Prophets: Radical Black Intellectuals*. New York: Routledge, 2003.

Breitman, George. *The Last Year of Malcolm X: Evolution of a Revolutionary*. New York: Schocken Books, 1968.

Brooks, Roy L. *Integration or Separation? A Strategy for Racial Equality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986.

Brown, H. Rap [Jamil Abdullah Al-Amin]. *Die Nigger Die! A Political Autobiography*. Chicago: Lawrence Hill Books, 1969.

Brown, Larry. "Change, Continuity, and the Pursuit of Geographic Understanding." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 89, no. 1 (1999): 1–25.

Bullard, Sara. *Free at Last: A History of the Civil Rights Movement and Those Who Died in the Struggle*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Bunge, William. "Perspective on *Theoretical Geography*." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 69, no. 1 (1979): 169–74.

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

Cesaire, Aime. *Discourse on Colonialism*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972. First published 1955.

Clark, John Henrik, ed. *Malcolm X: The Man and his Times*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 1990.

Clark, Kenneth B. *Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power*. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Clemons, Michael L., and Charles E. Jones. "Global Solidarity: The Black Panther Party in the International Arena," in *Liberation, Imagination, and the Black Panther Party: A New Look at the Panthers and Their Legacy*, edited by Kathleen Cleaver and George Katsiaficas, 20–39. New York: Routledge, 2001.

Colburn, Forrest D. *The Vogue of Revolution in Poor Countries*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Collins, Rodnell P., with A. Peter Bailey. *Seventh Child: A Family Memoir of Malcolm X*. New York: Kensington, 1998.

Cone, James H. *Martin & Malcolm & America: A Dream or a Nightmare?* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1991.

Conniff, Michael L., and Thomas J. Davis, Thomas J. *Africans in the Americas: A History of the Black Diaspora*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994.

Cox, Kevin. "Spaces of Dependence, Spaces of Engagement and the Politics of Scale, or: Looking for Local Politics." *Political Geography* 17, no. 1 (1998): 1–23.

Dailey, Jane, Glenda E. Gilmore, and Bryant Simon. "Introduction," in *Jumpin' Jim Crow: Southern Politics from Civil War to Civil Rights*, edited by Jane Dailey, Glenda Elizabeth Gilmore, and Bryant Simon, 3–6. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Davis, Angela. *Angela Davis: An Autobiography*. New York: International Publishers, 1974.

Davis, George A., and O. Fred Donaldson. *Blacks in the United States: A Geographic Perspective*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1975.

Dawson, Michael C. *Black Visions: The Roots of Contemporary African-American Political Ideologies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

De Blij, Harm J., and Alexander B. Murphy. *Human Geography: Culture, Society, and Space*. 6th ed. New York: John Wiley, 1999.

DeCaro, Jr., Louis A. *On the Side of My People: A Religious Life of Malcolm X*. New York: New York University Press, 1996.

———. *Malcolm and the Cross: The Nation of Islam, Malcolm X, and Christianity*. New York: New York University Press, 1998.

Delaney, David. *Race, Place, and the Law, 1836–1948*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998.

———. "The Space that Race Makes." *The Professional Geographer* 54, no. 1 (2002): 6–14.

Delaney, David, and Helga Leitner. "The Political Construction of Scale." *Political Geography* 16, no. 2 (1997): 93–97.

Domosh, Mona. "Geography and Gender: The Personal and the Political." *Progress in Human Geography* 21 (1997): 81–97.

———. "Those 'Gorgeous Incongruities': Polite Politics and Public Space on the Streets of Nineteenth-Century New York City." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 88 (1998): 209–26.

Dudziak, Mary L. *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Dwyer, Owen J. "Geographical Research about African Americans: A Survey of Journals, 1911–1995." *The Professional Geographer* 49, no. 4 (1997): 441–51.

Dyson, Michael E. *Making Malcolm: The Myth and Meaning of Malcolm X*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Elbaum, Max. *Revolution in the Air: Sixties Radicals Turn to Lenin, Mao and Che*. New York: Verso, 2002.

Esedebe, P. Olisanwuche. *Pan-Africanism: The Idea and Movement, 1776–1991*. 2nd ed. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1994.

Estes, Steve. *I am a Man! Race, Manhood, and the Civil Rights Movement*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005.

Fairclough, Adam. *Martin Luther King, Jr.* Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1990.

Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press, 1963.

———. *Black Skin, White Masks*. New York: Grove Press, 1967. First published 1952.

Foner, Philip S., ed. *W.E.B. Du Bois Speaks: Speeches and Addresses, 1920–1963*. New York: Pathfinder Books, 1970.

——— ed. *The Black Panthers Speak*. New York: De Capo Press, 1995.

Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1972.

———. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.

———. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*, edited by Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

———. *The History of Sexuality*. Vol. 1, *An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage Books, 1990.

Franklin, John Hope, and Alfred A. Moss, Jr. *From Slavery to Freedom: A History of African Americans*. 7th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1994.

Fredrickson, George M. *Black Liberation: A Comparative History of Black Ideologies in the United States and South Africa*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Gilmore, Ruth Wilson. "Fatal Couplings of Power and Difference: Notes on Racism and Geography." *The Professional Geographer* 54 (2002): 15–24.

Goldfield, Michael. *The Color of Politics: Race and the Mainsprings of American Politics*. New York: The New Press, 1997.

Goldman, Peter. *The Death and Life of Malcolm X*. 2nd ed. New York: Harper & Row.

Goodwin, Jeff. *No Other Way Out: States and Revolutionary Movements, 1945–1991*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Gregory, Derek. *Geographical Imaginations*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1994.

Guevara, Ernesto. *Guerrilla Warfare*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1998. First published 1961.

Hale, Grace Elizabeth. *Making Whiteness: The Culture of Segregation in the South, 1890–1940*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1998.

———. "'For Colored' and 'For White': Segregating Consumption in the South," in *Jumpin' Jim Crow: Southern Politics from Civil War to Civil Rights*, edited by Jane Dailey, Glenda Elizabeth Gilmore, and Bryant Simon, 162–82. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Hall, Raymond L. "Introduction," in *Black Separatism and Social Reality: Rhetoric and Reason*, edited by Raymond Hall, 1–11. New York: Pergamon Press, 1977a.

———. "Explorations in the Analysis of Black Separatism," in *Black Separatism and Social Reality: Rhetoric and Reason*, edited by Raymond Hall, 13–22. New York: Pergamon Press, 1977b.

Harvey, David. "Revolutionary and Counter Revolutionary Theory in Geography and the Problem of Ghetto Formation." *Antipode* 4, no. 2 (1972): 1–12.

———. *Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical Geography*. New York: Routledge, 2001.

———. *The New Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Hayes III, Floyd W., and Francis A. Kiene III. "'All Power to the People': The Political Thought of Huey P. Newton and the Black Panther Party," in *The Black Panther Party Reconsidered*, edited by Charles E. Jones, 157–76. Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1998.

Herbert, Steve. *Policing Space: Territoriality and the Los Angeles Police Department*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.

Henderson, Errol Anthony. "Shadow of a Clue," in *Liberation, Imagination, and the Black Panther Party: A New Look at the Panthers and Their Legacy*, edited by Kathleen Cleaver and George Katsiaficas, 197–207. New York: Routledge, 2001.

Hochschild, Adam. *King Leopold's Ghost: A Story of Greed, Terror, and Heroism in Colonial Africa*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1998.

hooks, bell. *Outlaw Culture: Resisting Representations*. New York: Routledge, 1994.

Howard-Pitney, David. *The Afro-American Jeremiad: Appeals for Justice in America*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990.

Hummel, Jeffrey R. *Emancipating Slaves, Enslaving Free Men: A History of the American Civil War*. Chicago: Open Court, 1996.

Isserman, Maurice, and Michael Kazin. *America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

James, Preston E., and Geoffrey J. Martin. *All Possible Worlds: A History of Geographical Ideas*. 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley, 1981.

Jennings, Regina. "Why I Joined the Party: An Africana Womanist Reflection," in *The Black Panther Party Reconsidered*, edited by Charles E. Jones, 257–65. Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1998.

Johnston, Keith. *A Physical, Historical, Political & Descriptive Geography*. 5th ed. London: Edward Stanford, 1896.

Jones, Charles E., and Judson L. Jeffries. "'Don't Believe the Hype': Debunking the Panther Mythology," in *The Black Panther Party Reconsidered*, edited by Charles E. Jones, 25-55. Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1998.

Joseph, P.E. "Black Liberation Without Apology: Reconceptualizing the Black Power Movement." *The Black Scholar* 31, nos. 3–4 (2001): 2–19.

Kaplan, David H., and Steven R. Holloway, Steven R. "Scaling Ethnic Segregation: Causal Processes and Contingent Outcomes in Chinese Residential Patterns." *GeoJournal* 53 (2001): 59–70.

Karst, Kenneth L. *Belonging to America: Equal Citizenship and the Constitution*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989.

Kelley, Robin D.G. *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2002.

Kelly, Philip F. "The Geographies of Politics and Globalization." *Progress in Human Geography* 23, no. 3 (1999): 379–400.

Kobayashi, Audrey. "Coloring the Field: Gender, 'Race,' and the Politics of Fieldwork." *The Professional Geographer* 46 (1994): 73–80.

LeBlanc-Ernest, Angela D. "'The Most Qualified Person to Handle the Job': Black Panther Party Women, 1966–1982" in *The Black Panther Party Reconsidered*, edited by Charles E. Jones, 305–34. Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1998.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1991

Lincoln, Eric C. *The Black Muslims in America*. Canada: Saunders of Toronto, 1961.

Litwack, Leon. *Trouble in Mind: Black Southerners in the Age of Jim Crow*. New York: Vintage Books, 1998.

Livingstone, David N. *The Geographical Tradition: Episodes in the History of a Contested Enterprise*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.

Lomax, Louis E. *To Kill a Black Man: The Shocking Parallel in the Lives of Malcolm X and Martin Luther King, Jr.* Los Angeles: Holloway House, 1968.

Lowenthal, David. "Geography, Experience, and Imagination: Towards a Geographical Epistemology." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 51, no. 3 (1961): 241–60.

Malcolm X. *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1965a.

———. *Malcolm X Speaks*. New York: Pathfinder Books, 1965b.

———. *Malcolm X on Afro-American History*. New York: Pathfinder Books, 1967.

———. *By Any Means Necessary*. New York: Pathfinder Books, 1970.
———. *The End of White World Supremacy*. New York: Marlin House, 1971.
———. *Malcolm X: The Last Speeches*. New York: Pathfinder Books, 1989.
———. "Racism: The Cancer That Is Destroying America," in *Malcolm X: The Man and his Times*, edited by John Henrik Clark, 302–306. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 1990.
———. *Malcolm X Talks to Young People: Speeches in the US, Britain and Africa*. New York: Pathfinder Books, 1991.
———. *February 1965: The Final Speeches*. New York: Pathfinder Books, 1992.
Marks, Carole. *Farewell—We're Good and Gone: The Great Black Migration*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.
Marsh, Clifton E. *The Lost-Found Nation of Islam in America*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2000.
Matthews, Tracye. "'No One Ever Asks, What a Man's Place in the Revolution Is': Gender and the Politics of the Black Panther Party, 1966–1971," in *The Black Panther Party Reconsidered*, edited by Charles E. Jones, 267–304. Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1998.
McCann, Eugene J. "Race, Protest, and Public Space: Contextualizing Lefebvre in the U.S. City." *Antipode* 31, no. 2 (1999): 163–84.
Meriwether, James H. *Proudly We Can Be Africans: Black Americans and Africa, 1935–1961*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.
Meyer, Stephen G. *As Long as They Don't Move Next Door: Segregation and Racial Conflict in American Neighborhoods*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000.
Mitchell, Don. "The End of Public Space? People's Park, Definitions of the Public, and Democracy," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 85 (1995): 108–33.
———. *The Right to the City: Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space*. New York: Guilford Press, 2003.
Moore, Jacqueline M. *Booker T. Washington, W.E.B. Du Bois, and the Struggle for Racial Uplift*. Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 2003
Morrill, Richard L. "The Negro Ghetto: Problems and Alternatives," *The Geographical Review* 55 (1965): 339–61.
Morrison, Toni. *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992.
Nast, Heidi. "Opening Remarks on 'Women in the Field,'" in *The Professional Geographer* 46 (1994): 54–66.
Natambu, Kofi. *The Life and Work of Malcolm X*. Indianapolis, IN: Alpha Books, 2002.
Natter, Wolfgang, and John Paul Jones. "Identity, Space, and Other Uncertainties," in *Space and Social Theory: Interpreting Modernity and Postmodernity*, edited by Georges Benko and Ulf Strohmayer, 141–61. Oxford: Blackwell, 1997.
Newton, Huey P. *To Die for the People: Selected Writings and Speeches*. New York: Writers and Readers, 1999.
———. *The Huey P Newton Reader*. New York: Seven Stories Press, 2002.
Parsa, Misagh. *States, Ideologies, and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of Iran, Nicaragua, and the Philippines*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
Patterson, Orlando. *The Ordeal of Integration: Progress and Resentment in America's "Racial Crisis."* Washington, D.C.: Civitas, 1997.
Perry, Bruce. *Malcolm X: The Life of the Man Who Changed Black America*. New York: Station Hill Press, 1991.
Pile, Steve. "The Troubled Spaces of Frantz Fanon," in *Thinking Space*, edited by Mike Crang and Nigel Thrift, 260–77. New York: Routledge, 2000.
Plummer, Brenda G. *Rising Wind: Black Americans and U.S. Foreign Affairs, 1935–1960*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Rabaka, Reiland. "Malcolm X and/as Critical Theory: Philosophy, Radical Politics, and the African American Search for Social Justice." *Journal of Black Studies* 33, no. 2 (2002): 145–65.

Rice, Roger L. "Residential Segregation by Law, 1910–1917." *Journal of Southern History* 24 (1968): 179–99.

Robinson, Cedric J. *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1983.

Robinson, Dean E. *Black Nationalism in American Politics and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Russell, Katheryn K. *The Color of Crime: Racial Hoaxes, White Fear, Black Protectionism, Police Harassment, and other Macroaggressions*. New York: New York University Press, 1998.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Random House, 1978.

———. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993.

Sales, Jr., William W. *From Civil Rights to Black Liberation: Malcolm X and the Organization of Afro-American Unity*. Boston: South End Press, 1994.

Sarup, Madan. *An Introductory Guide to Poststructuralism and Postmodernism*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1993.

Seale, Bobby. *Seize the Time: The Story of the Black Panther Party and Huey P. Newton*. Baltimore, MD: Black Classic Press, 1991. First published 1968.

Shields, Rob. "Spatial Stress and Resistance: Social Meanings of Spatialization," in *Space and Social Theory: Interpreting Modernity and Postmodernity*, edited by Georges Benko and Ulf Strohmayer, 186–202. Oxford: Blackwell, 1997.

Shoats, Russell. "Black Fighting Formations: Their Strengths, Weaknesses, and Potentialities," in *Liberation, Imagination, and the Black Panther Party: A New Look at the Panthers and Their Legacy*, edited by Kathleen Cleaver and George Katsiaficas, 128–38. New York: Routledge, 2001.

Smith, David. *Geography and Social Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1994.

———. *Moral Geographies: Ethics in a World of Difference*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000.

Soja, Edward. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London: Verso, 1989.

Staeheli, Lynn A., and A. Thompson, A. "Citizenship, Community, and the Struggles for Public Space." *The Professional Geographer* 49 (1997): 28–38.

Stewart, Lynn. "Bodies, Visions, and Spatial Politics: A Review Essay on Henri Lefebvre's *The Production of Space*." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 13 (1995): 609–18.

Swyngedouw, Eric. "Excluding the Other: The Production of Scale and Scaled Politics," in *Geographies of Economies*, edited by Roger Lee and Jane Wills, 167–76. New York: Arnold, 1997.

Terrill, Robert E. "Protest, Prophecy, and Prudence in the Rhetoric of Malcolm X," *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 4 (2001): 25–53.

Ture, Kwame, and Charles V. Hamilton. *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation*. New York: Vintage Books, 1992. First published 1967.

Umoja, Akinyele Omowale. "Repression Breeds Resistance: The Black Liberation Army and the Radical Legacy of the Black Panther Party," in *Liberation, Imagination, and the Black Panther Party: A New Look at the Panthers and Their Legacy*, edited by Kathleen Cleaver and George Katsiaficas, 3–19. New York: Routledge, 2001.

Verney, Kevern. *Black Civil Rights in America*. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Von Eschen, Penny M. *Race Against Empire: Black Americans and Anticolonialism, 1937–1957*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997.

Von Sheinwehr, A., and D.G. Brinton. *An Intermediate Geography with Lessons in Map Drawing*. Cincinnati: Van Antwerp, Bragg, 1870.

Watkins, William H. *The White Architects of Black Education: Ideology and Power in America, 1865–1954*. New York: Teachers College Press, 2001.

West, Cornel. *Race Matters*. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.

Williams, Y.R. "In the Name of the Law: The 1967 Shooting of Huey Newton and Law Enforcement's Permissive Environment," *Negro History Bulletin* 61 (1998): 6-12:.

Wilson, Bobby M. "Critically Understanding Race-Connected Practices: A Reading of W.E.B. Du Bois and Richard Wright." *The Professional Geographer* 54, no. 1 (2002): 31–41.

Winston, George T. "The Relation of the Whites to the Negroes," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 18 (1901): 103–118.

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

Woodson, Carter G. *The Mis-Education of the Negro*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 1998. First published 1933.

Woodward, C. Vann. *The Strange Career of Jim Crow*. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Wormser, Richard. *The Rise and Fall of Jim Crow*. New York: St. Martin's/Griffin, 2003.

Wright, Richard. *The Color Curtain: A Report on the Bandung Conference*. New York: World, 1956.

Young, Iris M. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Page Intentionally Left Blank

INDEX