



we must primarily look to ourselves to free ourselves. And none of these thinkers felt it was necessary to ‘check in’ with The White Man – from the ruler to the revolutionary – to see if it was okay. It was about our survival as a people, not as that mythical “working class” or that equally mythical “citizen.” For me, as this teenager who had just witnessed the 60’s Rebellions in my own thoroughly racist hometown, nationalism was a lifesaver: “WE MUST LOVE EACH OTHER.” “BLACK IS BEAUTIFUL.” “WE MUST CONTROL OUR OWN COMMUNITIES.”

As an anarchist searching for some good anarchist shit from the 60’s to hold up and show “proof” that the anarchists were better on the position of Nationalism than the Marxists and Leninists, I found hardly anything! I found some positive stuff from a “libertarian” publication, but, to my surprise, they represented the “anarcho-CAPITALIST” tendency! Yet, I found them to be on point and consistent on RESPECTING nationalism and national liberation. (The Libertarian Forum of the late 60’s and early 70’s. Karl Hess, Joseph Peden, and Murray N. Rothbard). They at least understood that black people’s nationalist struggle was a struggle against the State, the Babylonian state. They also looked at what the nationalist groups were doing in their actual grassroots practice, like creating concrete defenses against repression and alternatives in survival institutions. Thus, they liked what the Panthers were doing on the ground through their programs and supported that kind of nationalism as being compatible with “anarchism on the ground.” Paul Goodman made similar observations of the early civil rights movement groups. But it was understood that these groups were dealing with issues of survival against genocide, and that these groups were developing their own analyses and programs to rally their communities. The libertarians of LF were, interestingly enough, critical of the Panthers when the Party turned toward Marxism and other authoritarian ideologies because in their “on the ground” practice, the survival programs were no longer spontaneous responses to specific oppressions but were increasingly kept under the tight control of the Party. Power to the People -vs.- Power to the Party?

Nationalism and statism are different because nationalism can be anti-state. But they can have commonalities in that nationalism may only be against a particular kind of state, such as a Racist State, or a Fascist State. Anarchism and nationalism are similar in that they are both anti-statist, but what does it mean when the specific anarchist movements within a specific country are racist and dismissive of any and all nationalism, be it reactionary or revolutionary? For me, even the nationalism of a Louis Farrakhan is about saving my people, though it is also thoroughly sexist, capitalist, homophobic and potentially fascist. Yet, it has played an important part in keeping a certain black pride and resistance going. Their “on the ground” work is very important in keeping an anti-racist mentality going. As a

