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ABOUT THIS READING KIT

The articles in this reading kit are meant to give abroad overview of the relationship between capitalism, the State and racism.

(1) "The origins of racism" from L. Callinicos, (1980), Gold and Workers 1886-1924, Volume one of a People's History of South Africa, Ravan Press, Johannesburg. Chapter 17

(2) "The divided workers" looks at why both the capitalists and the White workers tended to favor racism in SA (also from L. Callinicos, (1980), Gold and Workers 1886-1924, Volume one of a People's History of South Africa, Ravan Press, Johannesburg. Chapter 17)


(5) "The organic crisis" looks at the crisis that the system of racial capitalism in SA entered in the 1980s, as a result of both economic and political factors (from JS Saul and S. Gelb, (1986) The Crisis in South Africa, (London: Zed Books) (revised edition))

(6) "Can capitalism deliver "Reconstruction and Development"? The way forward for the post- apartheid period" from Workers Solidarity: A Magazine of Revolutionary Anarchism (Magazine of the Workers Solidarity Federation). May/June 1995

INTRODUCTION #1: ANARCHISM AND THE FIGHT AGAINST RACISM

South Africa is characterized by massive racial inequality. Only 45% of Africans live in houses. Whites on average earn 9 times more than Africans. Only 2 in 10 African pupils reach matric. Black people as a whole (Indians, Coloureds, and Africans) own about 14% of land in the country; the remaining 85% is held by 60,000 White farmers, and by the State. Historically, this inequality has also expressed in terms of civil and political rights: Blacks were votoless, subject to the pass system, denied the right of trade union organization, and the main Black political organizations were also banned.

A similar picture can unfortunately also be drawn for other countries. In the USA, "of Black men between the ages of 20 to 29, 1 in 4 will go to prison or be placed on probation. 60% of women in prison are women of color. Poverty and the absence of other opportunities to escape it compel many Black youth to turn to gangs, drugs and anti-social crime ... Half of all Black and Hispanic youth in South Central Los Angeles belong to gangs. In Central Los Angeles, half of all Black families fall below the poverty line, and youth unemployment hovers at 50% ."

(1) Are there human "races"?

We reject the idea that racial oppression is the inevitable result of contact between two different "races".

It seems common sense that humanity is divided into distinct races on the basis of physical characteristics like skin color, hair type, nose and eye shape etc. However, this view is totally wrong.

There is only one "race": the human race. It is true that people differ by skin color and so forth, but it has proven impossible to rigidly and clearly define people into clear cut "races" because there is no known single physical feature or group of physical features that clearly mark off one race from another . For example, Whites are said to have straight hair: but so do Asians, and some Africans; and many Whites in fact have woolly hair.

This is not a coincidence. The fact of the matter is that there is no "race" gene. Only 6% of genetic variations among human groups can be accounted for by "race" differences such as exist between Asians and Africans. Lewthlin, who is an expert in the field, remarks that "If the holocaust comes and a small tribe deep in the New Guinea forests are the only survivors, almost all the genetic variation now expressed among the innumerable groups of our four billion people will be preserved" . The genetic or biological variation between people of any given "race" is as great as the genetic variation between that race and any other given "race" .

In practical terms this means that Eugene Terre'Blanche may be genetically closer to a Australian Aboriginal or an American Indian
than he is to Paul Kruger. It also means that it is impossible for different "races" to be biologically "inferior" or "superior" to each other. Instead, many of the physical differences between people (like skin color and eye color) reflect environmental conditions.

But while race has no meaning as a scientific reality it has a horrible reality as a way of organizing oppression. We need to know the roots of racism in order to know how to properly fight it.

(2) The roots of racism in capitalism and the State

Racism in its modern form is rooted in capitalism and its associated processes: slavery (slaves were said to be subhuman); colonialism (Blacks were seen as "backward" and "uncivilized"); the drive for super-profits (creating a large, rightless, coerced Black labor force to work in the most dangerous jobs); and the need to divide the working class (making them see oppression in ethnic terms, rather than recognizing their common enemy: the exploiting class). It is not just the bosses that keep these processes going; workers also sometimes act on "race" lines, for example, seeing themselves as superior to each other, fighting for job reservation etc. This sort of behaviour on the part of workers is the direct result of the way that capitalism makes the masses of the needy fight among themselves for the few crumbs it offers.

We must therefore attack racism at its roots: destroy racist capitalism that breeds the oppression of Blacks; and fight for the unity of the workers and the poor against the rich ruling elite.

(Racism existed in some earlier class societies for the same sort of reasons. In feudal society (based on the exploitation of peasants/servants by landlords/knights) racism was used to prop up the class system. It was said that there were racial differences between the two main classes, and that the rule of the lords was justified by their superior nature or "blue blood"... used to justify the division between the lords and the serfs. It was said that the lords had "blue blood" and were innately superior to the mass of peasants.)

We therefore reject the idea that racism is somehow an irrational, behaviour that stands in contraction to capitalism and the State.

(3) Black liberation through working class revolution

Anarchism stands for a revolution by the working class and the poor. We believe, in the words of the old anarcho-syndicalist slogan, that all workers must be organized in "One Big Union" to seize the means of production and to abolish the State. This must involve as many working class and poor people in every country as possible.

Why do we say class politics must be central?...

Firstly, we believe that all forms of oppression are rooted in capitalism and the State (and class society in general). Secondly, only a productive class can create a free anarchist/classless society, because only these classes do not need to exploit other classes to exist. The workers, the poor, and in some countries, the working peasantry, produce all value, but most of this is taken over by the bosses to build their own wealth and power (i.e. this is exploitation).

The bosses can only exist as a class through exploitation; this is at the root of the poverty of the masses, and this is the main justification for socialism/anarchism.

(4) Class struggle not Black nationalism

Because of these relations of production, it follows that Blacks, women, gays etc...in the middle and upper class, while facing discrimination have contradictory interests to the workers and the poor. These privileged groups are generally mainly interested in improving their own opportunity to exploit the masses. They want to remove the obstacles to their career advancement and business enterprises, not tear capitalism and the State down.

As victims of racist, sexist and other discrimination, they do have an interest in fighting these oppressions; and they may join hands with the masses to do so. This is often in the form of nationalist movements; all classes are supposed to unite around these "national-democratic" demands to realize all their interests.

But the fact of the matter is that these movements cannot secure the demands of all classes that make them up. Firstly, they are dominated by the privileged class elements. Because of their class power, for example, in the form of education and financing, the middle and upper class elements in nationalist-type movements generally tend to control the ideas and leadership posts. Secondly, these privileged elements are aiming at increasing their opportunities to exploit and rule (badly the best outcome for the workers and the poor). Thirdly, these movements typically aim at seizing State power (the State is seen as the expression of the "national will"). But as we will show below the State can never be anything other than the tool of an oppressive minority.

Besides this, the privileges of those in the middle and upper classes, arising from their exploitative and dominating positions modify their experience of oppression. There is a world of difference between the life of Mayor Dinkins of New York, a Black man, and the lives of the Black masses in the Harlem ghetto. A Black farmworker in SA does not share the same experience of life as a Cabinet Minister in the GNU merely because they are both Black.

As anarchists we must oppose on principle every form of oppression wherever it exists, and in whatever class it exists. But because we believe in building a revolutionary movement of the workers and the poor, we reject class alliances with the "national" or "progressive" bourgeoisie and middle class. We stand for working class autonomy, not populist politics.

We always stand in solidarity with the struggles of the masses, even if they fight under the banner of nationalism. We support all progressive struggles for their own aims. But as anarchists, we believe that our role is to take up the battle of ideas (most effectively done in struggle) and as such will neither hide our politics to fit in, nor subsume ourselves into the tail-end of nationalist and statist politics. Instead, we will always argue for the need for workers autonomy, direct action, anti-statist and revolution.
(5) Rejection of the State as a mechanism of Black Liberation

We have already touched on the issue of the State and now we will look at this issue in greater depth. As anarchists we believe that the State is a structure created to make possible the rule of the majority by the minority. Firstly, only a small number of people can ever participate in the State apparatus, because of its hierarchical structure that concentrates all power in the hands of the few. Secondly, the State will always serve the bosses: partly because the taxes from exploitation and investment fund it, partly because its top personnel are to a large degree socially the same as the bosses, and partly because this is exactly what the state is created to do. Real power does not lie in parliament but in the civil service, the company boardrooms and the military. Thirdly, those controlling the State develop a vested interest in the power and privilege of their position (the gravy train).

We therefore reject arguments that the establishment of a "national-democratic" state as the key to Black liberation. Not the people, but only an elite of leaders can govern in the hierarchical structure of the State, and the "people's government" will not be able to abolish the class system that generates racism and inequality. At most, the State can create a new exploitative group of rulers (and this is exactly what has happened in many ex-colonies in Africa and elsewhere). The new rulers may nationalize the economy, perhaps calling this "socialism" (as in Mozambique), when in fact they are creating State capitalism, i.e. a system (still) based on the separation of the producers from the means of production, on paying wages, and on rule by a minority.

Similarly we reject the two-stage theory of revolution. As put out by the South African Communist Party (SACP) and many other Marxist groups, this theory says that revolution in colonial and semi-colonial countries must take place in two phases: first a "national-democratic revolution" to set up a bourgeois democracy and liberate Black people; and second, and later, a "socialist revolution" to liberate workers.

This is wrong for several reasons. One is that the oppression of Blacks and workers is so intertwined, that these issues cannot be isolated and dealt with separately. A second reason is that this theory sees the mechanism of liberation in both stages as the State. But neither the liberation of the majority of Black people or of the international working class as a whole can take place through the State. Thirdly, your means and ends must be consistent. You cannot reach socialism by telling the workers and the poor to constantly surrender to nationalism and the nationalist middle class.

Black liberation and working class revolution are inseparable and both will be realized through the abolition of the State and capitalism through the mass action of the people themselves.

It is a massive advance for the South African struggle for us to win the State in place of a racist dictatorship. At least some civil rights are provided, some semblance of accountability is maintained, and overt discrimination on the basis of sex, sexuality, race and belief is illegal. But the State remains a tool of the ruling class and thus will always give priority to the interest of the bosses (profits, power, "stability" over the interests of the workers and the poor (like redistribution of wealth, addressing the legacy of apartheid)). This is why striking workers are told that they are "harming the economy" and why the RDP will not be funded by more taxes on the bosses (and will thus in all likelihood fail to deliver on its quite moderate aims). This is why struggle on the ground is the only way forward for the masses.

(6) Principled class unity: the question of separate organization

Working class unity is as we have said a must, but is meaningless if it is based on ignoring the specific oppressions faced by different groups of workers and the poor. We cannot ignore, for example, Black issues in the name of the "working class". The revolutionary movement that is needed to destroy capitalism and the State must oppose all forms of oppression now, and not leave them until after the revolution. We are building tomorrow today.

Where people of color form a persecuted minority in a country, it sometimes happens that their issues are ignored or marginalized by the Left and/or the working class movement. This is totally unacceptable. We recognize the right of such groups to organize separately to ensure that this problem is dealt with: therefore we defend the formation of Black caucuses in mass organizations like trade unions, and in political organizations; as well as the formation of independent Black worker and community groups.

(7) The leading role of the Black working class in the South African context

It is meaningless to call for the formation of separate Black working class organizations in South Africa. Firstly, there is no large White working class or left wing movement that is in the position to marginalize Black issues. Black people not only form the vast majority of the South African working class and poor, but also have a history of militant organization and struggle against the State. If anything the White working class needs the aid of the Black working class (hence the recent alignment of FEDSAW with COSATU and NACTU), something that is impossible except on the basis of an anti-racist platform. We should welcome this as a positive step, but guard against White worker conservatism undermining the fighting spirit of the Black unions. In any case, almost all organization in SA has been separate historically—the ANC, for example, only fully opened its doors to all races in the 1980s—and this points further to the emptiness of calls for the "need" for separate Black organizations.

NOTES


4. Lewonthin, (1984), Not in our Genes

5. same references for point 3.


Note: parts of these books are to be found in the reading kit.

7. B. Magubane Political Economy ...

8. The arguments for class politics are fully discussed in the reading kit on class.


THE ORIGINS OF RACISM

Racism did not start in South Africa. Many Europeans had racist ideas before the first whites arrived at the Cape in 1652. European countries like England, Portugal and Spain became rich through the slave trade. Millions of slaves from Africa were taken to north and south America to work in the sugar and cotton plantations there. Of course, slaves were not paid for their work — they were bought by their masters and put to work in the same way as oxen are today. They were treated as property — like animals, not like people.

The slaves were black. The masters were white. Whites thought of themselves as born to be masters because of their skin colour.

In the 18th and 19th centuries, European countries began to establish factories. These factories needed raw materials to process and sell. They began to look for other countries which could supply these raw materials. For example, they needed warm climates to grow cotton, rubber, tea, coffee and sugar.

Britain conquered India, north America and parts of Africa after much fighting and resistance from these countries. Most of the rest of Africa was taken by France (who also conquered Indo-China). Portugal and Spain also took parts of Africa (in addition to their colonies in South America).

The control of one country over another is known as colonialism. By the end of the 19th century, a large part of the world was colonised by Europeans.

The British, for example, boasted of an empire so big that the sun was always shining on some part of it.

The colonisers began to think of themselves as the 'superior race', and looked down on darker skinned people as the 'lower breeds'. They began to believe that they were 'helping' their colonies by bringing 'civilisation' to them — teaching them Christianity, teaching them to read and write and to wear European clothes. But while the colonised people benefited in some ways, these changes meant that they began to need clothes, books, transport and often food and drink made in Europe. Europe's factories grew richer from their colonies, while the colonies themselves grew poorer.

In South Africa, the most blatant racism is expressed by those whites who feel threatened by blacks in the competition for land, jobs and wealth. But racism goes deeper than aggressive behaviour and insulting words. The history of colonisation shows us that racists often congratulate themselves for 'advancing' the 'developing' peoples, while extracting profits at their expense.
economic opportunities provided by the war—rapid economic growth highlighted by secondary industrialization was taking place. The fresh demands for African labor, including that of the semi-skilled and therefore more stabilized variety, meant that an active pull was also being exerted by the towns and by emergent industrial capital. It was these trends, then, which produced not only a vast—and ultimately irresistible—growth in the urbanized African population, but also a dramatic escalation of trade union organization and working-class militancy. When the latter process advanced so far as even to include migrant workers, and culminated in the extraordinary African mine workers’ strike of 1946, South African ruling circles were shaken to the core.

As O’Meara has argued, “The violence of the state’s response [to the mine workers’ strike] not only indicated the degree to which it felt threatened, but foreshadowed the extreme repression after 1948.” But this hard line was not the only possible response to the crisis. There were other tangible cross-currents within the white community concerning the question of the best long-run solution to the urban-cum-working-class problem, and some liberal capitalist alternatives were already under discussion. Thus the reports of the several commissions (Smit, Fagan, and the like) appointed by the United Party in the 1940s to consider this problem reflected industrial capital’s desire for a stabilized and semi-skilled labor force; accepting urban Africans as a given, these reports flirted with ways—modification of the pass laws, better education, even further trade union rights—to integrate them more tightly and smoothly into the capitalist system. It bears noting, however, that as regards any possible liberalizing/democratizing implications for the political sphere which might have been expected to follow from the emphasis upon the existence of an integrated economy, the commissioners invariably waffled—mumbling, at best, about the need for increased “consultation”—this being a failure of nerve that has beset South African liberalizers to the present day.

Moreover, such waffling was actually to be found embedded within the more strictly economic recommendations as well, the Fagan Commission opting for the migrant labor sys-

tem even as it pressed its case for stabilization! In so doing, of course, it was merely striving to reflect the concerns of other fractions of capital—mining and agricultural—and the white working class. The former were nervous about the rising wage levels which liberalization might entail (levels industrial capital was better set to meet) and the implications for their own labor requirements of the drift to the towns; the latter were fearful of the increased job competition from underpaid Africans which was also implicit in liberalization. Yet, in the event, such waffling was not enough to stem the nervousness of all members of these various groups, and with the United Party’s response to crisis so hesitant and contradictory, the way was open for the National Party to proffer its own solution.

The National Party project which underlay its narrow electoral victory in 1948 and its subsequent consolidation of power can be interpreted at several different levels, of course. What is unequivocal is that it offered a hard solution—the freezing of segregation into the institutions of apartheid rather than its liberalization—to racial capitalism’s crisis. There followed tightened controls over the movement and activities of African labor, rigid separation of the races wherever possible, and fierce political repression (e.g., the Suppression of Communism Act). But whose class interests did this solution serve? Most overtly, no doubt, those of the main elements the Nationalist Party had grouped together into its winning coalition: the Afrikaner petty bourgeoisie, agrarian capital, the white working class. As noted earlier, the state now more aggressively pushed forward the interests of specifically Afrikaner capital—including both those of the petty bourgeoisie on the one hand and of certain more developed bourgeoisie elements, especially in the Cape (Sanlam, et al.)—within the ranks of capital-in-general. With a tightening-up of “influx control” and a refining of the system of passes and of labor bureaus, the state facilitated a favorable allocation of labor—beyond the immediate pressures of the market—toward agriculture and other competitive spheres. And, in a related manner, reinforcement of the job color bar was presented as a reward to the white working class.

Not that the Nationalists’ project even then can be interpreted as being merely the sum of such class interests. As hinted
above, the nature of its racist and exclusivist-ethnic (Afrikaner nationalist) preoccupations lent this project much of its fire, its political focus and clout, its "extremism." Nonetheless, having done full justice to the complex interplay of class, racial, and national assertions which was present here, one may still doubt whether the outcome was really so very far out of line with the basic interests of the most developed (and essentially non-Afrikaner) sectors of capital. Of course, even after initial ultra-populist threats from the Nationalists—the nationalization of the gold mines, for example—had evaporated, there were some costs to be borne by such sectors: distortions introduced into an optimal allocation and utilization of labor by migrancy and by the highlighting of racial criteria in training and job definitions (problems which were never quite to disappear) and a measure of embarrassing pressure upon the growing number of multinational corporate participants in the apartheid economy from anti-apartheid forces at home.

There were also dangers. The hard line was merely sweeping under the rug—albeit with a very stiff and effective broom—the structural problems of the urban African and of the declining reserves. Yet in the short run it was effective, putting a lid on rising African political demands (a process which had culminated, by the early 1960s, in the banning of the leading African nationalist organizations) and, most important, disorganizing the African working class while driving down the wage bill. This latter dimension—the reinforcement of the exploitation color bar—meant rising profits, and as, on this basis, the South African economy settled into a long-term expansion, any potential contradictions within the camp of capital became muted. Small wonder that one Marxist analysis of the time could note that it was "naive utopianism to expect the forces of international capitalism, either directly or as mediated by various Western states, to risk a most profitable outlet for investments and exports for the sake of marginal improvements in the 'logic of the market.'" 7 The agonies of the United Party in the 1940s had already demonstrated the profound difficulties, under South African conditions, of conceiving, let alone mounting, an alternative project. Then, after 1940, capital found that apartheid worked; the bill would not come due for two decades.
THE CRISIS OF RACIAL CAPITALISM THAT BEGAN IN THE 1970s

Then, after 1940, capital found that apartheid worked; the bill would not come due for two decades.

That there should be such a bill is not surprising. For the dark side of the boom was present from the outset, racial capitalism's buttressing of both color bars, dictating that economic growth came to embody serious contradictions: limits on the size of the consumer market, a high rate of black unemployment, and, paradoxically, a shortage of skilled labor. These, it ultimately became evident, were not mere functions of the capitalist business cycle, but permanent structural phenomena with an adverse impact upon accumulation. Some brief elaboration of these weaknesses is in order here.

1. The inclusion within the ruling Afrikaner coalition of a growing number of urbanized "poor whites" guaranteed them a privileged status in the labor market and channeled to them some small fraction of capital's rising profits. On this basis, the living standards of all white South Africans rose rapidly after 1948, providing ample demand in the 1950s and 1960s for the expanding consumer goods industries. From the late 1960s, however, the growing saturation of the white consumer market limited not only sales but also the ability of secondary industry to benefit from economies of scale. Since an expansion of the black consumer market was not then contemplated, this made more urgent the state's often reiterated, yet difficult to realize, call for an increase in manufacturing exports.

2. A permanently high rate of black unemployment was, Legassick and Wolpe argue, an important condition of the postwar emergence of secondary industry. The large reserve army of the unemployed was crucial in facilitating the reinforcement of the exploitation color bar, allowing the "living wage" for blacks to be pegged at little more than the level of physical subsistence in the reserves, while compounding the difficulties of working-class organization (already restricted by harsh legislation). Yet, as even the very high growth rates of the 1960s failed to create sufficient jobs to absorb the growing labor force (partly because of a bias toward capital-intensive investment), unemployment rose steeply, reaching over 12 percent in 1970 and defining a looming political threat. As then-Prime Minister John Vorster noted: "The biggest danger in South Africa today is not terrorism, but unemployment."

3. The freezing of the job color bar to protect white
workers perpetuated the "racist hierarchical social division of labor," as well as the related racial inequalities in wages and in education and training. Although white population growth (boosted by immigration) was sufficient to fill new skilled labor positions in the first, slower, phase of the expansion, shortages had already begun to appear in the early 1960s, reaching a figure of 95,035 in 1971. The result of these shortages, which occurred in secondary industries as well as in commerce and services, was lower productivity and less efficiency (i.e., higher costs), even though capital could neutralize such costs to some degree during the boom by ignoring the color bar or "floating it upward" (fragmenting and deskilling skilled jobs, moving low-paid blacks into the less-skilled tasks, and promoting the white to supervisor); or by obtaining extra credit to pay for higher inventories.
the growing challenge to racial capitalism springing from the dominated classes. This was a challenge—we have described it above as part of the deepening of economic crisis into organic crisis—brought to a boil in the 1970s by the considerable exertions of these classes and linked, in turn, to both the successes of capitalist development, and to its weaknesses.

To its successes, in that the trend toward an industrial economy and the growing concentration of an urban-centered, working-class black population—the baseline of trouble in the 1940s—has necessarily continued, despite the Canute-like protestations, and actions, of Verwoerd and his successors. To its weaknesses, in that the 1970s combination of high rates of black unemployment and of inflation helped stoke the resentment of this expanding urban population. The results were explosive: Durban, Soweto, and the like. Unfortunately, we cannot talk about everything at once; we shall have to analyze these events—from the bottom up, as it were—later, but it bears emphasizing here that they are the bottom line of the dominant classes' concern, more urgently demanding their response than even the economic imperatives we have been discussing. Moreover, the resuscitation of critical consciousness and political self-confidence on the part of blacks which these events exemplify is not readily reversible. The current boom is unlikely, therefore, to displace the need for "political crisis management" by the regime, whatever its economic implications might be.
CAN CAPITALISM DELIVER "RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT"?
THE WAY FORWARD FOR THE POST-APARTHEID PERIOD

FROM WORKERS SOLIDARITY: A MAGAZINE OF REVOLUTIONARY ANARCHISM,
no.1. May/June 1995
(The Magazine of the WORKERS SOLIDARITY FEDERATION)
Legalized apartheid is finally dead. For the first time in 350 years Black South Africans are not ruled by a racist dictatorship but by a democratic parliament.

Along with this capitalist democracy came a whole series of rights we never had before. We have guaranteed freedom of association and speech. We have the right to strike and protest. We have some protection from racist and sexist practices.

These changes did not come from the benevolent hand of the National Party. They are the result of decades of struggle. We broke the pass laws. We broke the ban on African trade unions. We broke the racist education system. We broke the Land Act of 1913.

BUT FREE AT LAST?

However, the legacy of apartheid is still with us. 2.3 million South Africans suffer from malnutrition. Only 45% of Africans live in houses. Only 2 in 10 African pupils reach matric. Even though South Africa produces 50% of Africa's electricity, only 30% of the population has electricity.

In any case, the RDP's ability to deliver is doubtful. The RDP will not be funded by increased tax on the bosses. Instead the focus is on make "more efficient" use of existing resources.

NO STATE CAN LIBERATE

The State mechanism is not some neutral tool that can be used to benefit the poor. The State always prioritizes the needs of the bosses. This is one reason why the RDP's aims are so moderate. It is also why the State continues to attack struggle, even with a new government.

The only Black people that the State has helped since the elections has been the politicians. Their lavish lifestyles and salaries are far removed from the oppressive conditions of their supporters. The State aims to build a Black middle class that will help manage and defend capitalism.

THE STRUGGLE CONTINUES

The only way we can force the new government to deliver its promises is through struggle. This is the only way our needs will be heard above those of the bosses who are in a business crisis. It is only through keeping up the fight on the ground that we can force the State to give in to our demands. Force the bosses to deliver!

But we need to break out of the cycle in which the needs of the majority take second place to the profits and power of the bosses and their State.

We need to attack and destroy the system of capitalism that caused our hardships and racism in the first place. We need a society without bosses or governments. A society based on workers and community councils which puts people before profit. Build for working class revolution!