

Marxism and Anti-Racism: A Contribution to the Dialogue

Abigail B. Bakan
Department of Political Studies
Queen's University
Kingston, Ontario

A Paper Presented to the Annual General Meetings of the
Canadian Political Science Association and the Society for Socialist Studies

York University
Toronto, Ontario
June, 2006

Draft only. Not for quotation without written permission from the author.

Introduction: The Need for a Dialogue

The need for an extended dialogue between Marxism and anti-racism emerges from several points of entry.¹ It is motivated in part by a perceptible distance between these two bodies of thought, sometimes overt, sometimes more ambiguous. For example, Cedric J. Robinson, in his influential work, *Black Marxism*, stresses the inherent incompatibility of the two paradigms, though the title of his classic work suggests a contribution to a new synthesis. While emphasizing the historic divide, Robinson devotes considerable attention to the ground for commonality, including the formative role of Marxism in the anti-racist theories of authors and activists such as C.L.R. James and W. E. B. Dubois.² In recent debates, anti-racist theorists such as Edward Said has rejected the general framework of Marxism, but are drawn to some Marxists such as Gramsci and Lukacs.³ There is also, however, a rich body of material that presumes a seamless integration between Marxism and anti-racism, including those such as Angela Davis, Eugene Genovese and Robin Blackburn.⁴ Identifying points of similarity and discordance between Marxism and anti-racism suggests the need for dialogue in order to achieve either some greater and more coherent synthesis, or, alternatively, to more clearly define the boundaries of distinct lines of inquiry.

Another motivation for pursuing such a dialogue is posed by events, framed by the post-9/11 climate of contemporary imperialism and globalization. The "war on terror", including the US-led wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, have been justified by US President George W. Bush's administration in terms that provide increasing legitimacy to overt racial profiling.⁵ The recent climate of domestic targeted repression, a climate that threatens in particular people of Arabic origin or Muslim faith, is all too reminiscent of the period of Japanese internment during World War Two.⁶ It is well known that racism is not new to the United States. The history of slavery and civil war testify to this. The recent experiences of life threatening negligence and inhumane treatment of black Americans in New Orleans during and after Hurricane Katrina confirm the legacy in the present day.⁷ Britain, the second major power after the US involved militarily in the war on Iraq, has displayed no break in its racist history under the social democratic leadership of New Labour's Tony Blair from the period of Tory governments of John Major and Margaret Thatcher.⁸

There is also a particular need to pursue the dialogue between Marxism and anti-racism in the Canadian context. Regarding the post-9/11 policy implications, the increasing and more transparent involvement of the Canadian military as an occupying force in Afghanistan has been justified on the grounds of a contribution to the US-led war on terror.⁹ Racial profiling has been legitimized as part of Canada's new security regime, witnessed in part by the deportation to torture of Canadian and Syrian citizen, Maher Arar.¹⁰ Sections of the Canadian media have recently cited favourably the overtly racist prose of Rudyard Kipling to explain the military's mission in Afghanistan.¹¹ Canada is also currently part of the occupation forces in Haiti, a country with a long history of anti-racist resistance, including the first successful revolutionary challenge to Atlantic slavery.¹²

This brings us to another motivation for extending the dialogue between Marxism and anti-racism: the potential that what could be accomplished through such a process could advance the level of clarity and strategic effectiveness of both paradigms. Both Marxism and anti-racism, as methods of enquiry and as frameworks to guide progressive

practice and social change, have suffered, particularly in the Canadian context, from an emergence in relative isolation from each other over recent decades. The need for a dialogue between Marxism and anti-racism is revealed in stark relief by events in a post-9/11 era; it is not, however, these events that have caused such a need. It is in fact long overdue.

What follows is an attempt to contribute to this dialogue between Marxism and anti-racism from a viewpoint that minds the gap. As an author committed to both paradigms, this takes the form, in a sense, of a double dialogue, with a view to addressing Marxists about the pivotal contribution of anti-racist theory, and a view to critical race theorists about the potential for a non-reductionist reading of Marxism. The hope is to provide a modest step in advancing and rendering relevant an application of Marxism to the reality of racism as an integral element of how really existing capitalist society produces and reproduces social relations.

These social relations are commonly understood to be solely about one form of human suffering, exploitation, that is considered to define the writings of Marx, and is in turn emphasized among those who identify as his adherents. The argument here, however, is that in fact the social relations under scrutiny are rooted in not one, but three forms of human suffering, or socially constructed human “difference”: exploitation, oppression and alienation.¹³ The divide between Marxism and anti-racism has resulted, at least to a considerable extent, I maintain, from this wrongheaded reading of Marx, and a similarly wrong-headed application of Marxism. Marxist theory has been reduced, and social relations have been distorted so as to be reducible to, exploitation only. This reduction has tended to create a theoretical polarization between a Marxist emphasis on class, and a post-modernist/post-colonial/critical race theory emphasis on oppression and alienation, though not necessarily under these rubrics or “signifiers”, with apparently minimal room for constructive synthesis.

An alternative starting point considers the original framework developed by Marx and Engels in the context of its applicability to conditions of contemporary capitalism. Such a framework is grounded in an explanation of three distinct, but related, processes of human suffering: alienation, oppression, and exploitation.¹⁴ “Difference”, as well as the potential for solidarity and collective action towards liberation, are elements in each of these processes; but each process operates with its own dynamic, and is manifest in relation to the other processes variably, in historically specific social formations.¹⁵ The dialectic of race and class in capitalist society, and the potential for anti-racist, anti-capitalist collective resistance, can be understood, and brought into focus, from such a perspective.

Alienation, oppression and exploitation are processes that interact, but they are not the same and they do not operate in the same way. Each form of human suffering offers the vision, the potential, for its opposite, for a conscious movement against alienation, against oppression and against exploitation. But only if there is a challenge, a mass challenge from below, to all of three of these processes can an alternative to the capitalist system be created. In this sense, a Marxist theory of “difference” can be understood to be one that explains three distinct forms through which capitalism organizes socially differentiated experiences. However, none of these processes is linear, nor is any one completely de-linked from the other two. In this discussion, racism is taken as a manifestation of how capitalism is maintained and perpetuated, integrated into

the hegemonic bloc.

An elaboration of this reading of classical Marxist theory is presented here, specifically considering alienation, oppression and exploitation successively, in terms of each category's relevance to our understanding of racism and contemporary conditions of capitalism and imperialism. The organization of the argument shifts the lens to focus on each one of these three processes respectively. Each is brought into focus in succession, while the other two are not absented, but moved to the background for the purposes of clarification. The discussion concludes by considering some of the implications of the approach, and suggestions regarding the roots of the chasm between Marxism and anti-racist theory are considered. The potential risks of failing to address the divide, and the potential contribution to a strategy of reclamation and resistance in striving for a greater synthesis, are also suggested.

Alienation

Alienation, a concept drawn from Hegel and the German school of idealist philosophy, refers to the general distance of humanity – all humanity – from its real potential. All who live in class society, any form of class society, suffer from alienation. This concept is developed most clearly in the early writings of Marx and Engels in the 1840s, and later by Marx in the *Grundrisse*, the notebooks that outline the foundations of *Capital*, only the first volume of which was completed during Marx's lifetime.¹⁶ Marx's theory of alienation is assumed as a condition, like background music, to his life's intellectual work.¹⁷ Marx aimed to challenge the notion that human suffering was natural, the inevitable result of the will of God or a spiritual being outside the realm of human action. The contradictions so starkly visible in capitalist society, the immense gap between potential and reality, indicate the extent of human alienation.

Marx saw these contradictions in the infant years of the capitalist system:

On the one hand, there have started into life industrial and scientific forces, which no epoch of the former human history had every suspected. On the other hand, there exist symptoms of decay, far surpassing the horrors of the Roman Empire. In our days everything seems pregnant with its contrary. Machinery, gifted with the wonderful power of shortening and fructifying human labour, we behold starving and overworking it. The new-fangled sources of wealth, by some strange weird spell, are turned into sources of want.¹⁸

Marx saw that there were several aspects to human alienation. Alienation arose from the distance from humanity from the products of human labour; from the alienating process of labour itself; from alienation among fellow human beings, where antagonisms between classes and within classes are endemic; and finally alienation from what makes us uniquely human as a species, or what Marx called "species being".¹⁹

If alienation is the product not of a divine spirit, as the German idealist school saw it, but of human action, then human action could also see to the end of human alienation. Istvan Meszaros identifies Marx's unique contribution to our understanding of alienation as one which incorporates, but also goes beyond, the dialectic of Hegel and the historicity of Feuerbach.

“‘Alienation’ is an eminently historical concept. If man is alienated, he must be alienated from something, as a result of certain causes – the interplay of events and circumstances in relation to man as the subject of this alienation – which manifest themselves in a historical framework. Similarly, the ‘transcendence of alienation’ is an inherently historical concept which envisages the successful accomplishment of a process leading to a qualitatively different state of affairs.”²⁰

Marx looked at human suffering with a view to understanding its material roots in concrete historical conditions. He looked at the contradictions posed by these conditions, and saw in these contradictions the potential for a world free of all human alienation, a world where human labour and the natural world interact in a way that expands human potential and protects the natural world at the same time.²¹ Because Marx’s theory of alienation maintained that it was an historical creation, he did not merely look to political democracy or legal equality within an advancing capitalist society as an alternative; rather, he envisioned emancipation, or what we would today call liberation, from alienation.²²

Marx considered the relationship of political emancipation to human emancipation in some detail. For example, in a short essay in 1843, “On The Jewish Question”,²³ he argued that while democratic freedom of religion was a precondition for emancipation, real emancipation went further. Marx clearly defended the democratic rights of Jews to freedom of religious expression without persecution. But he also argued that all people, Jewish and Gentile, would only really be free when the conditions no longer existed that made religious feelings so important as a form of comfort from oppression. Emancipation depended upon the achievement of conditions where there would be no desire to look for freedom from the suffering of daily life only after death, because life on earth would be genuinely free from suffering and want. As early as 1843, Marx had a vision of emancipation that was premised first on the democratic right to express one’s religion as a matter of private choice removed from the state. But it did not stop there.

“*Political* emancipation certainly represents a great progress. It is not, indeed, the final form of human emancipation, but it is the final form of human emancipation within the framework of the prevailing order. It goes without saying that we are speaking here of real, practical emancipation.”²⁴

Marx on Suicide

A particularly notable example of Marx’s theory of alienation is indicated in his writings on suicide. The works on suicide that attracted Marx were the posthumous writings of a French police officer.²⁵ This economist, dictionary writer, poet, turned police administrator and legal archivist, insisted these writings could only be published after his death, and so they were eight years later. Peuchet was incensed at the artificial morality that claimed France in its post-revolutionary period to be a society of the emancipated, but yet condemned people as “sinners” when they were driven to suicide. This fascinated Marx, and he edited, introduced and translated into German selections of Peuchet’s writings about actual suicides in France. Marx’s concern was to make

Peuchet's views on suicide accessible publication to a wider European audience.

Marx quotes Peuchet: "The revolution did not topple all tyrannies. The evil which one blames on arbitrary forces exists in families, where it causes crises, analogous to those of revolutions."²⁶ And: "One sees that, for anything better, suicide becomes the most extreme refuge from the evils of private life."²⁷ Peuchet, in a phrase emphasized by Marx, refers specifically to the impact of bourgeois morality on the lives of women. Peuchet sees that the suicides he recorded were:

"...based on social conditions which deem love to be unrelated to the spontaneous feelings of the lovers, but which permit the jealous husband to fetter his wife in chains, like a miser with his hoard of gold, for she is but a part of his inventory."²⁸

Marx gives most space in his account to four particular cases of suicide, three of them young women. Peuchet was outraged by the ability of society to blame the victim, driving innocent women to suicide often because of charges of immoral sexual conduct. One case is about a woman who spends the night with her fiancée, but then is condemned and publicly berated for her pre-marital union. In humiliation, she drowns herself in the Seine river. In another case, a married woman is victim of spousal abuse. In a third, an eighteen year old girl finds out she is pregnant as a result of a union with her aunt's husband and approaches a doctor to try to obtain an abortion. The doctor refuses and says he cannot be involved, but then discovers that the woman has committed suicide, as she indicated she would if forced to continue the pregnancy.²⁹

The fourth case is about the experience of unemployment. A member of the royal guard suddenly loses his job and cannot find another. As he watches his family collapse in poverty, he takes his own life rather than being a "burden" on them. As Kevin Anderson, editor of the English version of *Marx on Suicide*, summarizes:

"Here Marx's revolutionary humanism from 1844 shines forth, as he mocks the notion that human emancipation would consist of raising the working class to the level of those latter-day bourgeois *Candides* who are naively satisfied with their lot. Instead Marx focuses on a total transformation of human relations, including the abolition of social classes altogether, the overcoming of alienated labour, and the critique of the family as yet another form of oppression."³⁰

Alienation, then, is not counterposed to exploitation and oppression, but is expressed within and through these other processes. As long as humanity has not achieved its full potential in a society motivated by the satisfaction of human need – what Marx considered a world of genuine socialism – then alienation would continue. Moreover, alienation affects all classes, so that the oppressor and the oppressed alike are considered alienated from the human condition – a condition that is inherently social and collective. Capitalist society is an extreme form of alienation. Competitive relations among individuals, cultivated by the fetishism of the market and the universalization of the commodity form, compel a sense of alienation of one human being from another, often for absolutely no rational or apparent reason.

Racism and Alienation

From this perspective, racism can be understood as an ideological codification and practical expression of extreme alienation. But it is not only this. It also works to divide workers from other workers, alienating not only individuals from other individuals in a manner that appears random, but in a specific way that are organized as if to have a rational element. Racism offers ideologically to systematize at least some aspects of alienation. Racism provides a framework, defined by certain ascribed characteristics of physical or cultural traits, that pits members of the exploited against other members of society, including members of their class. At the same time, it blurs class distinctions that might otherwise be more visible.

There is a considerable debate in Marxist historiography regarding the specific nature of the relationship between racism and the rise of capitalism. For the purposes of this discussion, it is important to note simply that: (i) the racism of Atlantic slavery was unique in its universalism and its connection to the capitalist notion of “property”; and (ii) a version of racist ideology emerged in this context that was understood to be compatible with the “universal rights of man” on the grounds that certain humans, defined by ascribed racial characteristics, were in fact not to be considered “human” at all.³¹ This ideological expression of inhumanity was matched with a legitimation of mass brutality and abuse in the pursuit of profit, meted against those of black skin and African origin. A pro-slavery writer’s account in the early 18th century, describes the punishment that accompanied plantation slavery in the English Caribbean.

“The Punishment for Crimes of Slavery, are usually for Rebellions burning them, by nailing them down on the ground with crooked sticks on every Limb, and then applying the Fire by degrees from the Feet to the Hands, burning them gradually up to the Head, whereby their pains are extravagant. For crimes of lesser nature Gelding, or cropping off half the Foot with an axe. These punishments are suffered by them with great constancy. For running away they put Iron Rings of great weight on their Ankles. . . . For negligence they are usually whipt by the overseers with hard-wood switches, till they be all bloody. After they are whipped till they are Raw, some put on their skins Pepper and salt to make them smart.”³²

This is tragically typical of the period of the dominance in the Americas of the plantation slave system of production, in full ascendance between 1640 and 1715. The English and French colonies in particular saw the construction of “intensive systems of exploitation. . . [based on] newly elaborated social distinctions and racial identities.”³³

The white elite was exempt from the exploitation and oppression experienced by the slaves, cultivating a tradition of “whiteness” as part of the origins of capitalist expansion in Europe and throughout the Americas.³⁴ Racism has of course continued well beyond the period of Atlantic slavery, and has proven to be an immensely adaptive source of division even in the most “democratic” phase of capitalist development. However, the centrality of the slave trade in the original expansion of capitalism, and racism as a defining element of how “really existing capitalism” expands and develops, is important to note. Racism, as one form of systematizing alienation, and capitalist expansion, arose as part of a single historical process.

Racism as an expression of alienation takes varied and diverse forms in specific moments of capitalist accumulation, not least in colonial and imperialist occupation. Franz Fanon can be understood to be a pivotal contributor to our understanding of this process, though he does not explicitly operate in a Marxist framework.³⁵ In graphic detail, Fanon articulates the experience of deep alienation of the colonized, affecting the bodies, thoughts and feelings of life under imperialist military, political, economic and social occupation.

Fanon also focuses on the contradictions of this process, the capacity to rebel, to reclaim one's humanity through the act of revolutionary, collective resistance. There has been considerable debate in Marxist circles regarding the focus on the "lumpenproletariat" as a strategic agent of change in Fanon's work.³⁶ However, less attention has been paid to what Fanon offers in terms of advancing our understanding of the relationship between alienation and capitalism in its colonialist expression. The continuation and escalation of colonial-style occupation in recent years, in conditions of modern imperialism, draws attention to the need to correct this weakness in contemporary Marxist analysis, and compels reconsideration of Fanon.³⁷

Importantly, Fanon identifies the colonialist process as one that includes racism and oppression against the occupied, but also the alienating process that colonialism imposes on the occupier. Class society, in this case capitalism in its imperialist moment, depends upon the alienation of a section of society from their humanity, from the human "species being" in Marx's terms. Once this humanity is lost, it cannot be reclaimed simply by discussion or education; it reproduces itself as a condition of the capacity of the ruling class to rule. Fanon identifies this process starkly:

"As we see it, the bankruptcy of the bourgeoisie is not apparent in the economic field only. They have come to power in the name of a narrow nationalism and represent a race; they will prove themselves incapable of triumphantly putting into practice a program with even a minimum humanist content, in spite of fine-sounding declarations which are devoid of meaning since the speakers bandy about in irresponsible fashion phrases that come straight out of European treatises on morals and political philosophy. When the bourgeoisie is strong, when it can arrange everything and everybody to serve its power, it does not hesitate to affirm positively certain democratic ideas which claim to be universally applicable. There must be very exceptional circumstances if such a bourgeoisie, solidly based economically, is forced into denying its own humanist ideology. The Western bourgeoisie, though fundamentally racist, most often manages to mask this racism by a multiplicity of nuances which allow it to preserve intact its proclamation of mankind's outstanding dignity."³⁸

Atlantic slavery relied on racism enforced almost exclusively through coercion, though religious institutions such as the Anglican and Catholic churches served ideologically to support this coercion with an effort to earn the consent of oppressed. In general however, slaves who were well versed in religious instruction refused consent, and only threatened and real coercion served to enforce the institution.³⁹ In conditions of liberal democracy,

racism develops and is reproduced through a combination of consent and the threat of coercion. Racism has become more fully integrated into the ideology of the ruling class in bourgeois democracies. Fanon offers an early recognition of this process, one that is more fully identified as “democratic racism” by Frances Henry, et al.⁴⁰ But racism when considered as part of occupation and conquest relies on blatant force no less in an era of modern imperialism than in earlier periods of colonialism. The alienation of the occupying forces from any humanistic identification with the occupied is an essential element of the process. The reality of this inhumanity, for example, is well exposed and explained in Sherene Razack’s close look at Canada’s so-called “peacekeeping” mission in Somalia.⁴¹ In conditions of imperialist occupation, historically and in the present, coercion replaces the quest for mass consent; the only goal in terms of consent is to recruit a local minority elite in the image of the occupiers.

However, racism as alienation is also a contradictory process. Antonio Gramsci is useful here, as he considered not only the early years of capitalist society, but also how it continued to recreate itself in periods of bourgeois democracy.⁴² To justify its rule, capitalism needs to maintain the myth of “equality”, especially in the face of open challenges from mass movements, as part of its efforts to retain hegemony. The specific form and target of racism is therefore not static. And mass, organized resistance to racism can be successful in forcing an amendment or reversal of specific forms of racism. At the same time, these gains are often not secure, as hegemony is a site of continued contest and debate; therefore new forms of racism are continually being invented. The relationship of rule by coercion and consent is not the only process that affects the divisions in society. Divide and conquer strategies are also crucial to the perpetuation of ruling class authority.⁴³ This brings us to a discussion of oppression.

Oppression

Oppression is the least complete in its theorization of all the forms of human relations that Marx and Engels studied.⁴⁴ But it was nonetheless very much a part of their framework. Oppression includes both ideological and material elements, and, importantly, it cuts across class lines. It is also historically specific.

A brief summary of a Marxist theory of oppression can be gleaned from a wide variety of the descriptive accounts presented by Marx and Engels.⁴⁵ Marx understood capitalism as a mode of production based on commodity production, and the measure of value through exchange of commodities on the market. Capitalism is therefore seen as an inherently competitive system. A two-fold division within capitalism includes the division between capitals, and the division between capital and labour. Competition, therefore, occurs not only between units of capital; workers are also pitted against one another in competition for employment necessary to their survival and reproduction, and for scarce opportunities to limited rights, usually won as the produce of class struggle.⁴⁶ This competitive system is the basis of some elements of alienation within capitalist society. Competition once established, however, depends upon perpetuating divisions among individual people both across and within social classes. The capacity for unity among the working class, as a majority commonly alienated from the process of production and accumulation, generates the potential for a powerful challenge to the rule of capital. The working class has the potential because of its numbers and social relationship to the production of profit to unite and overtake the minority rule of capital. The special oppression of some sections of the working class is therefore not only

valuable, but necessary to long term, stable, capitalist production. Oppression operates to codify and perpetuate divisions along designated lines. But how oppression operates, the specific form and nature of the oppression in any given social context, is historically variable.

Marx and Engels studied how specific forms of oppression affected the working class, and other oppressed classes, in the interests of the ruling class. Their writings stress the ways that oppression held back the ability of the working class to resist the domination of capitalist rule. Oppression in their work is described to take two distinct forms: (i) class oppression; and (ii) the specific oppression of sections of classes. Class oppression is the lived form of the experiences of the exploited, but can include those who are not directly exploited – such as the unemployed. Marx often referred, for example, to the oppressed classes – meaning the proletariat, the unemployed, the peasantry, sharecroppers, slaves, serfs, etc. What can be called special oppression, which divides the working class among itself in conditions of capitalist accumulation, is necessary to force a sense of competition among the workers and thereby weaken their collective ability to resist exploitation and oppression. But at the same time, the relations of production of capitalist society, of exploitation and the drive for profit, work in the opposite direction, forcing workers into common, collective activity and creating a massive divide with workers on one side, and the bosses on the other.

There are then, regarding oppression, basic contradictory tendencies within capitalism. Capitalism has tendencies both to divide workers on the grounds of special oppression within the class, and at the same time to press workers into a common experience of oppression as a class, where they see that their interests are shared.

Oppression, in general, serves to perpetuate ruling class hegemony, both through class oppression and by weakening and dividing the working class within any specific national or local setting. Workers are divided by specific forms of oppression, but this also serves to hide, or reify, the lived reality of each individual.

In the *Poverty of Philosophy*, Marx elaborates a distinction between class oppression, based on the common experiences of the working class and which produces the formation of a class “in itself”, and the act of resisting class oppression, which depends upon the conscious self-emancipation of the working class, or becoming a class “for itself”. His argument, developed as a polemic challenging the views of contemporary Proudhon, is in the context of defending the rights of workers to form early forms of trade union associations, or combinations. Marx saw the experience of collective workplace organization as an exercise in class organization and the development of collective class consciousness, shaped through its conflict with capital and therefore limited and defensive in nature, but a necessary and valuable step beyond purely individualistic efforts to achieve survival or individual forms of resistance.

“Economic conditions had first transformed the mass of the people of the country into workers. The combination of capital has created for this mass a common situation, common interests. The mass is thus already a class as against capital, but not yet for itself. In the struggle, of which we have noted only a few phases, the mass becomes united, and constitutes itself as a class for itself. The interests it defends become class interests. But the struggle of class against class is a political struggle.”⁴⁷

Marx notes the phenomenon of class oppression, a distinct category from exploitation and its particular form in capitalist society.

“An oppressed class is the vital condition for every society founded on the antagonism of classes. The emancipation of the oppressed class thus implies necessarily the creation of a new society. For the oppressed class to be able to emancipate itself it is necessary that the productive powers already acquired and the existing social relations should no longer be capable of existing side by side. Of all the instruments of production, the greatest productive power is the revolutionary class itself.”⁴⁸

Class oppression compels the drawing together of workers in common conditions of labour as the system becomes more productive and expands. It is organized through the process of labour extraction, or exploitation, but it entails the vast realm of experiences that take place both in the workplace and away from it. The limited access to employment, poor housing, limited access to schools and medical care, ideologies of elitism, etc., are all aspects of class oppression. The penetration of ruling class ideology as part of the training and socialization of the working class is also a feature of class oppression. In the *German Ideology*, Marx wrote that the ruling ideas of any age are the ideas of the ruling class:

“The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas, i.e., the class which is the ruling material force of society, is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of mental production, so that thereby, generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subject to it.”⁴⁹

Racism, Rule and Management

Capitalism as an economic system corresponds historically to certain forms of social and ideological systems of domination. The ethos of individualism in bourgeois or liberal democracies combines with the lived, alienated experience of isolation and a sense of separateness, or “difference”, from other individuals. Class oppression in the development of capitalism first treats all workers as more like slaves than as “free” labourers; over time, the bourgeoisie learns to rule by divide and conquer tactics, where special oppression within the working class serves to hide common oppression as a class. Racial oppression is a key form of oppression for capitalism, both in its origins and in its capacity to reproduce and expand capitalist relations as the system has developed and spread. The racism that defined the accumulation of capital under the period of Atlantic slavery, and marked the rise of the capitalist system on a global scale, proved to be entirely consistent with the ruling class project of the industrial phase of capitalist accumulation.

What Marx referred to as the “labour of supervision and management”, dependent upon the antithesis between labour and capital, was justified at least in part by reliance upon the racist ideology and practices learned by the ruling class in the period of slavery.

Marx, in the third volume of *Capital*, addresses this reliance by citing a specific example of how the US ruling class learned from plantation slavery the importance of class servitude, or class oppression.

“The work of management and supervision – so far as it is not a special function determined by the nature of all combined social labour, but rather by the antithesis between the owner of means of production and the owner of mere labour-power, regardless of whether this labour-power is purchased by buying the labourer himself, as it is under the slave system, or whether the labourer himself sells his labour-power, so that this production process also appears as a process by which capital consumes his labour – this function arising out of the servitude of the direct producers has all too often been quoted to justify this relationship. . . . [And] never better than by a champion of slavery in the United States, a lawyer named O’Connor, at a meeting held in New York on December 19, 1859, under the slogan ‘Justice for the South’: ‘Now, gentlemen’, he said amid thunderous applause, ‘to that condition of bondage the Negro is assigned by nature He has strength, and has the power to labour; but the Nature which created the power denied to him either the intellect to govern, or willingness to work.’ (Applause.) ‘Both were denied to him. And that Nature which deprived him of the will to labour, gave him a master to coerce that will, and to make him a useful . . . servant in the clime in which he was capable of living useful for himself and for the master who governs him. . . . Now the wage-labourer, like the slave, must have a master who puts him to work and rules over him.’”⁵⁰

The condition of common class oppression is not linear, or unidirectional. The commonality of experience as a class is contradicted by the differentiation imposed by special oppression and alienation. The tendency to divide workers in competitive relations with one another takes the forms of the search for scarce employment, higher wages, limited rights, and the selective offering of a “psychological wage”⁵¹ to certain sections of the working class in an effort to divide and fragment the oppressed classes. Engels describes this contradictory pattern of oppression – uniting workers as a class, and at the same time pitting individuals against other individuals within the class – in graphic detail in *The Condition of the Working Class in England*.⁵² In discussing the tendency to create a class in itself, Engels describes the process of centralization, urbanization, and the development of mass poverty.

“It has been ... suggested that manufacture centralises property in the hands of the few. It requires large capital with which to erect the colossal establishments that ruin the petty trading bourgeoisie and with which to press into its service forces of Nature, so driving the hand-labour of the independent workman out of the market. ... The centralizing tendency of manufacture does not, however, stop here. Populations become centralized just as capital does; and, very naturally, since the human being, the worker, is regarded in manufacture simply as a piece of capital for the use

of which the manufacturer pays interest in the form of wages.”⁵³

But Engels also stresses that this is not the only process. Regarding the expansion of capitalism in England, he writes:

“We shall now have to observe its influence on the working class already created. And here we must begin by tracing the results of competition with single workers with one another. Competition is the completest expression of the battle of all against all which rules modern civil society. This battle, a battle for life, for existence, for everything, in case of need a battle of life and death, is fought not between the different classes of society only, but also between individual members of these classes. Each is in the way of the other, and each seeks to crowd out all who are in his way, and to put himself in their place.”⁵⁴

Oppression is intrinsic to class experience; but it is not reducible to it. Oppression is not only based on class division. Special oppression also operates to affect sections of society that are from different classes, but whose experiences and methods of resistance or accommodation will be affected by class position. The degree of commonality of oppression across class lines, or divergence based on class polarization, can vary greatly in different social settings and over historical time. Importantly, Marx and Engels maintained that the relationship between the oppressor and the oppressed is not the same as the relationship between the exploiter and exploited, particularly regarding the special oppression of sections of classes. The form of division of society based on exploitation separates workers from bosses, and any given capitalist will use any means at their disposal to increase profits based on the exploitation of workers. White workers, black workers, men, women, peasants, children, etc., were all forced by the spread of capitalism to subordinate their lives and bodies to the drive of industrial expansion. But they are not driven into this process in a consistent or even-handed way.

These same workers are compelled into relationships of competition with one another – pitted against each other rather than in unison against their common exploiter. Forms of oppression that predated capitalism – such as women’s oppression, anti-Semitism, and the colonialism of the feudal empires – were important tools for rising capitalist classes over the early period of industrial expansion. But new forms of oppression were also developed as capitalism expanded, including the ideology of the modern form racism directly associated with private property that developed with the slave trade, and immigration controls that developed with national borders.⁵⁵

Ruling classes of necessity strive to divide the oppressed classes, fomenting specific oppression of certain groups, because it is the unity of the oppressed classes that marks the ultimate end of the ability of the ruling class to rule. This oppression appears in itself to be devoid of class content, to be based on non-economic criteria – race, gender, sexual orientation, nationality, religion, etc. And this form of oppression applies across classes, and affects members of the oppressed group regardless of class. But in the lived reality of capitalism, class position in certain historical moments can mitigate the experience of oppression considerably.

The “Condoleeza Rice Effect” and Hegemonic Whiteness

Individuals can challenge the effects of oppression, without necessarily challenging the structures that generate systemic oppression. Hence, we see in contemporary conditions of capitalism, what may be called the “Condoleeza Rice effect.”⁵⁶ Arguably, Rice, an African-American woman, would not be welcomed to the highest echelons of the US governmental administration, as a representative of corporate America, were it not for the success of the civil rights and women’s movements in breaking down previous barriers. However, she would also not be welcome were she not serving the interests of corporate America with full dedication and competence. The ability of the ruling class to yield concessions to movements against oppression, and to support the advance of individuals of colour as organic intellectuals, to use Gramsci’s concept, to advance a collective project is a feature of the struggle for ruling class hegemony. One element of this project is that of hegemonic whiteness, which includes the capacity to mask larger dynamic processes of oppression, and to recruit individuals who serve to hide and advance the class project.

The Condoleeza Rice effect indicates the adaptability of some sections of the ruling class to rely on hegemonic whiteness even with the use of African American organic intellectuals, in the interests of advancing the overall aims of modern capitalism and imperialism. The goal remains to maintain ideological hegemony to ensure the ability of the class to rule. The greater the level of consent in this process among the oppressed, the greater the capacity of the system to operate in stable conditions conducive to higher profits. It is those who are specially oppressed and also concentrated among the most oppressed classes – in the US example, the vast majority of the African-American population is concentrated among the working class and the unemployed – who pay the greatest price. And it is the ruling class that reaps the greatest material and ideological benefits.

Key to a Marxist theory of oppression is the understanding that special oppression within capitalism is not autonomous from the social relations of production within a capitalist society, but neither is it reducible to it. Oppression is a class issue because it operates within and through class society; in capitalist society oppression commonly pits one section of the exploited classes against another within the same class, forging fault lines that can either become deeper divisions, or can be challenged by common movements for reclamation from below. But oppression cannot be mechanistically defined in class terms, equating the oppressed purely in terms of relations to the means of production.

Oppression is fluid, operating in part to render the exploitation process untransparent, reified,⁵⁷ or fetishized, hiding the reality of the ruling class’s minority and exploitative status. It is also a means through which sections of the working class can explain their sense of alienation from others who are more like them than different, but with whom they feel a sense of competition and distance. Through the perpetuation of a constructed ideological mechanism of identifying with the ruling class, one section of the exploited can come to believe that they are in fact superior to another section of workers. This sense of “privilege” over another human being, however, may be more or less “real” in terms of material advantage, in terms of the relationship of other members of the same class. Such a sense of privilege can be and often is propped up by a certain levels of material, social or political advantage. But this advantage is also contingent, determined

not by the working class, but by those who have access to the surplus labour extracted from the working class as whole. Differential access to employment, higher wages, better housing, education, and numerous forms of political and social exclusion are systemically practiced in conditions of modern capitalism. Such patterns of systemic discrimination have been extensively documented, and indicate the scope of oppression.⁵⁸ The determination of relative gains of one section of an oppressed class over another section of the same class are not controlled or determined by members of that oppressed class, regardless of race, gender, sexual orientation, etc. The nature and course of distribution of relatively less or more within the common bounds or class oppression, are determined by agents and processes of capital.⁵⁹

Marx and Engels

The writings of Marx and Engels on special oppression are not systematically described in a single text. This has been one factor leading to the claim that they did not take oppression seriously. But the way in which Marx and Engels addressed oppression is in itself a feature of the nature of oppression – that is, it is always historically specific. It is also a feature of the writing of Marx and Engels in general, which was often grounded in the contemporary debates of the day.

The politics, nature, and affects of oppression, however, run through their writings on issues including, imperialism and colonialism,⁶⁰ the origins of the state and the family,⁶¹ the Jewish question,⁶² Ireland,⁶³ and slavery.⁶⁴ One theme that returns repeatedly is that the oppression of any one section of the population holds back the class struggle as a whole. Marx commented in response to “Napoleon the Little’s” effort to revive the slave trade in France: “To convert France into a slave-trading nation would be the surest way to enslave France.” Engels, in 1847, when asked to speak at a commemoration of the 1830 Polish rebellion against Prussia, stated that: “A nation cannot become free and continue at the same time to oppress other nations.” In 1870, Marx stated the following regarding British rule in Ireland: “A people which enslaves another people forges its own chains.” In *Capital*, Marx wrote in reference to slavery in the US: “Labour cannot emancipate itself in a white skin where the black is branded.”

Some of the most developed of Marx’s views on oppression are written regarding the national oppression of Ireland, and slavery and racism during the American Civil War. In both these instances, Marx stressed the interplay between capitalist class interests, and the use of racism to divide the working class. Marx identified how the ideology of anti-Irish prejudice projected an artificial cross class identity between British workers and the British imperialist state.

In a letter written on April 9, 1870, regarding the relations of Irish oppression to British capitalism, Marx summarized how oppression, here racist oppression particularly, in combination with nationalism, operates within the capitalist system.

“Every industrial and commercial centre in England possesses a working class *divided* into two hostile camps, English proletarians and Irish proletarians. The ordinary English worker hates the Irish worker as a competitor who lowers his standard of life. In relation to the Irish worker he feels himself a member of the *ruling* nation and so turns himself into a tool of the aristocrats and capitalists of his country *against Ireland*, thus strengthening their domination *over himself*. He cherishes religious, social

and national prejudices against the Irish worker. His attitude is much the same as that of the ‘poor whites’ to the ‘niggers’ in the former slave states of the USA. The Irishman pays him back with interest in his own money. He sees in the English worker at once the accomplice and stupid tool of the *English rule in Ireland*. This antagonism is artificially kept alive and intensified by the press, the pulpit, the comic papers, in short by all the means at the disposal of the ruling classes. This *antagonism* is the *secret of the impotence of the English working class*, despite its organization. It is the secret by which the capitalist maintains its power. And that class is fully aware of it.”⁶⁵

Marx in this passage suggests three key elements towards a theory of specifically racial oppression: (i) capitalism promotes the economic competition between workers; (ii) the appeal of racist ideology to white, in this case English, workers is a feature of ruling class ideology in its efforts to divide the working class; and (iii) when a racial minority within the working class suffers oppression, in this case Irish workers, the racial majority is also weakened, incorporated into consenting to the project of capitalist accumulation and further held back from becoming a class “for itself”.⁶⁶

The analysis that Marx and Engels developed about oppression and class society was not only argued in general terms; strategic implications are also suggested. Each form of oppression that Marx and Engels studied had relevance for the contemporary debates in which they were involved. And their ideas changed in some cases over time. This is particularly evident in the writings on nationalism and colonialism.⁶⁷ But there is a consistent thread, where Marx and Engels maintained that to organize a struggle against oppression meant fighting not only for the democratic right to equality with all others in class society, but ultimately for the elimination of class society as a whole. The challenge was two-fold: to eliminate special oppression within class society; but also to eliminate class oppression, and therefore the class society itself which relied upon, cultivated, and generated oppression.⁶⁸ It was not, however, a question of reducing the movement against oppression to a movement against capitalism; their argument was that to effectively challenge the source of oppression, the capitalist system would have to be challenged if the root of all oppression was to be eliminated.

Alienation is in part, then, perpetuated by the divisions fuelled by oppression; systemic oppression ensures that these processes are rendered endemic, entrenched in the system of capitalist society. Racism, as an ideology that supports and expresses one form of systemic oppression, is a means of giving a perverse order to human alienation. Racism acts, at least in part, as a means to explain the sense of distance that is endemic to a society where all human activity is removed from collective, socially productive, creative labour. Stereotypes and scapegoating, legal justifications and enforcement of double-standards, distortions and deletions of lived historical reality – all this works to divide sections of society, within and across classes, who might otherwise find a common sense of humanity.

Special oppression, importantly, is not reserved only for the working class and the poor. It also amplifies the ability of certain sections of the ruling class to rule effectively, and therefore sometimes is used against other sections of the ruling class in the rivalry of

market and imperial competition. This is the way, for example, that formal colonial oppression historically, or imperialist oppression today operates. It enforces oppression against weaker states, or against sections of society within developed states who continue to be treated as colonized peoples. On a global scale, ruling classes or elites in Third World poor countries are oppressed by other sections of the world capitalist classes. This is exemplified, for example, in the hegemonic role of the “Quad” in the World Trade Organization, where the US, the EU states, Japan and Canada, effectively dictate global trade policy and the outcome of disputes.⁶⁹

The recruitment of military soldiers to imperialist armies, for example, relies upon, amplifies, and codifies the sense of alienation among a targeted population. Oppression is an integral feature to this process. Those who experience oppression are most vulnerable to the promise that volunteer military participation will offset the depth of their alienation. Targeting the working class and the poor as its potential recruitment pool, for example, the US and Canada have attempted to offset male alienation by promising a sense of pride and purpose, as well as material advantages, to those who sign up for military service.⁷⁰ Racism, as well as sexism and homophobia which are distinct forms of systemic oppression, are integral to military recruitment and training. As Sherene Razack points out, in Canada the assertion of “peacekeeping” as a humanistic motivating force for military acts of war and aggression against people of colour in countries of the global South, including overt acts of violence against civilians, becomes normalized through mythologies of racism. In the post-9/11 atmosphere, this process has been amplified. Razack summarizes:

“[T]he terrorist attacks on the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon and the resulting ‘war on terrorism’ have made us all aware, if we were not before, of the racial underpinnings of the New World Order. . . . Embedded deep within the conceptual foundations of the Bush administration’s notion of a life-and-death struggle against the ‘axis of evil’ is a thoroughly racial logic. Disciplining, instructing and keeping in line Third World peoples who irrationally hate and wish to destroy their saviours (as [Rudyard] Kipling’s poem [The White Man’s Burden] predicted) derives from the idea that Northern peoples inhabit civilized lands while the South, in Chinua Achebe’s words, ‘is a metaphysical battlefield devoid of all recognizable humanity into which the wandering European enters at his peril.’”⁷¹

To foreshadow the argument below, exploitation refers to social relations that develop and are reproduced in the process of the economic extraction of surplus, at the base of the system.⁷² Unlike exploitation, which Marx saw as following certain general patterns or “laws of motion” common to all capitalist societies, oppression is variable and contingent. It is, however, necessary to the reproduction of the social relations of capitalism. And to summarize the discussion previous, alienation refers to the general distancing of human beings from what makes them human. Oppression is distinct from both exploitation and alienation; it is part of how any given, historically specific class society operates – how the ruling class rules and perpetuates divisions among those it rules over. It is variable, and subject to specific conditions, options and restraints that are

historically specific. As part of the cultural, legal, and social fabric, or “superstructure” of society, oppression operates with exploitation, and can express specific forms in which exploitation occurs concretely.⁷³ It also operates with alienation, often as the concrete expression of any given form of alienation in a specific moment. However, when oppression occurs, only the dominated is oppressed; the oppressor does not suffer in the same way as the oppressed, and may benefit in various ways from the act of oppressing the “other”. But the nature of the “benefit” needs to be studied historically. It may be the appearance of benefit, a feature of the fetishization of human relations, but in fact actually hide a material deficit or loss. Both oppressor and oppressed suffer alienation; the act of oppression ensures that they do not experience their alienation as a common human condition. Rather, the experience of the alienation of the oppressor and the alienation of the oppressed is reinforced, codified, rendered “rational” and reified, as if to constitute a permanent condition of separation and distance.

W.E.B. Dubois, writing about the American South in 1935, tried to account for the division between white and black workers after the defeat of a period called radical reconstruction when former slaves and white radicals tried to uproot racism in the aftermath of the US Civil War.⁷⁴ This is where the notion of the “psychological wage” is introduced. Dubois noted that:

“[T]here probably are not today in the world two groups of workers with practically identical interests who hate and fear each other so deeply and persistently and who are kept so far apart that neither sees anything of common interest. It must be remembered that the white group of labourers, while they received a low wage, were compensated for by a sort of public and psychological wage. . . . On the other hand, in the same way, the Negro was subject to public insult. . . . The result of this was that the wages of both classes could be kept low, the whites fearing to be supplanted by Negro labour, the Negroes always being threatened by the substitution of white labour.”⁷⁵

Theorizing “Privilege”

The relationship of oppression to “privilege” is therefore not universal. While the privileges of the oppressor class are structured into the process of accumulation, and enforced by alienation and oppression, the “privileges” meted out to sections of the oppressed are contingent. Any given specific form of oppression may be cultivated by the exploiting class, including through the state, to encourage competition among the workers. Members of the working class can and do embrace oppressive ideologies and practices against others of their own class, not in an instrumental manner, but because they come to fully believe and support such views. At the same time, these ideas can be challenged, and are often contradicted by common experiences of class oppression. There are no general, abstract laws of motion about these processes; they need to be considered in specific historical contexts.

For example, the construction of working class “whiteness” as privilege was in some historical circumstances the product of considerable ideological effort on the part of sections of the ruling class. Noel Ignatiev describes the original, spontaneous identification of poor Irish immigrants who came to the United States with the American

black population. This was met by a conscious and sustained effort on the part of elite interests to divide the Irish-American working class, and to win a majority of Irish-Americans of all classes to a conscious identification with white society. The ideological construction of what we may call a culture of racism defined by hegemonic whiteness can be traced historically.

“What did it mean to the Irish to become white in America? It did not mean that they all became rich, or even ‘middle-class’ (however that is defined); to this day there are plenty of poor Irish. . . . To Irish laborers, to become white meant at first that they could sell themselves piecemeal instead of being sold for life, and later that they could compete for jobs in all spheres instead of being confined to certain work; to Irish entrepreneurs, it meant that they could function outside of a segregated market. To both of these groups it meant that they were citizens of a democratic republic, with the right to elect and be elected, to be tried by a jury of their peers, to live wherever they could afford, and to spend, without racially imposed restrictions, whatever money they managed to acquire. In becoming white the Irish ceased to be Green.”⁷⁶

In another example, evidence suggests that in the tobacco plantations of colonial Virginia, the plantocracy relied first “primarily on the backs of English indentured servants, not African slaves”.⁷⁷ A shortage of labour attracted the interests of planters in importing African labourers from Africa, and binding them to the vast land available through slavery. The relationship of white to black labourers was altered as historical conditions changed. In a study of white and black workers in the southern United States, Al Szymanski found that “the higher the black earnings relative to white, the higher the white earnings relative to other whites” in other states in the country. White workers’ earning power was enhanced by greater organization on the part of black workers.⁷⁸ The psychological wage, or ideology of privilege, in this case, operates as a substitute for a loss of material privilege, rather than a justification for it.

In yet another example, in Canada, the Quebec population, following the conquest of New France from the British, were expected to live in a hostile relationship to the indigenous native population. This, however, was commonly not the custom of the impoverished French peasants, the *Canayens*, who identified with and came to share their lives with indigenous native peoples, in part resulting in the development of the Métis in the western prairies.⁷⁹ Lord Durham identified the French Canadians as similar to the Irish, “a nationality . . . destitute of all that can invigorate and elevate a people”, who suffered from a “peculiar language and manners” and who carried with them “no history, and no literature”.⁸⁰ But this proved to be a “race” stubbornly resistant to assimilation. Moreover, the risk of the expansion of the rebellious colonies of the United States challenged the grip of the British empire in North America.⁸¹ The federal English state, upon conquest of Quebec, consciously cultivated a strategy of division, a culture of divide and conquer between the Québécois and the indigenous Native peoples, that has continued with considerable success to the present day.⁸²

The sense of privilege cultivated among one section of workers over another may or may not be accompanied by material benefit, and the nature of that material benefit is

variable. Individuals in the oppressor group can and do develop a sense of superiority over other workers. But this sense of superiority is not the only sentiment. Maintaining that sense of superiority is part of how oppression operates in capitalist society, and part of the contested terrain in the battle for ruling class hegemony. The sense of superiority or privilege is contradicted by the experience of common class oppression. There are contradictory dynamics that vary historically and cannot be reduced to a single, consistent pattern. This brings us to a discussion of waged work and capitalist exploitation.

Exploitation

If racism cannot be reduced mechanistically to a system of exploitation, it is also important not to reduce Marx's conception of exploitation to a purely economic category isolated from social relations. Exploitation is not specific to capitalism, but characteristic of all class societies. There is a unique characteristic in capitalist exploitation, however, in terms of its motivating force, the drive for commodity production. This generates an historically unique tendency for units of capital to expand, or to be defeated in a competitive market where all commodities are compared against one another. Capitalist exploitation compels the universalized, competitive drive towards extraction of surplus labour from the mass of the population. However, exploitation does not necessarily involve surplus production, as capitalism also relies on the production of services, both in the form of social reproduction of labourers in mind and body, and in servicing commodities produced to ensure the surplus value embodied in them is realized on the exchange market.

Marx's most famous work, *Capital*, is dedicated largely to explaining the specific nature of exploitation in a capitalist mode of production. Exploitation is not a relationship between "things", in the sense of crude economic measurement, but a social relationship that is mediated through the process of production. Labour under capitalism is transformed into a unique commodity, labour power. There is a relationship between those who own nothing but their ability to work for a living, who only have the capacity to sell their labour power, and those who own the means of production, the capitalists, who rely on labour power to produce new sources of wealth and therefore profit. Wages take the form of "variable capital", distinct from the means of production, which Marx refers to as "constant capital." The wages paid to the worker appear as if they are in compensation for a "fair day's work", when in reality they compensate for the most minimal amount of labour necessary to ensure that the worker will return to work for another day.

In the third volume of *Capital*, Marx offers a description of capitalist exploitation in terms of its capacity to reproduce already established relations of production. He discusses the drive of the capitalist to extract unpaid surplus labour from workers, who are paid in wages.

“...[T]he direct interest taken by the capitalist, or the capital, of any individual sphere of production in the exploitation of the labourers who are directly employed is confined to making an extra gain, a profit exceeding the average, either through exceptional overwork, or reduction of the wage below the average, or through the exceptional productivity of

the labour employed. Aside from this, a capitalist who would not in his line of production employ any variable capital, and therefore any labourer (in reality an exaggerated assumption), would nonetheless be as much interested in the exploitation of the working-class by capital and would derive his profit quite as much from unpaid surplus-labour, as, say, a capitalist who would employ only variable capital (another exaggeration), and who would thus invest his entire capital in wages. But the degree of exploitation of labour depends on the average intensity of labour if the working-day is given, and on the length of the working-day if the intensity of exploitation is given. The degree of exploitation of labour determines the rate of surplus-value for a given total mass of variable capital, and consequently the magnitude of the profit.”⁸³

In the first volume of *Capital*, Marx devotes considerable attention to the working day in a capitalist society.⁸⁴ He emphasizes that the process of extracting surplus labour derives from compelling the labourer to work only a small portion of the day for their own motivations, principally survival and self-reproduction, while the better part of the labour expended over the working day is extracted and retained by the capitalist in the form of surplus labour. This process is, however, not transparent, but hidden, a feature of the “fetishism” of the commodity form of production. Production is driven for the purpose of exchange on the market, rather than use. At the same time, unless products contain some use value, either real or cultivated by the market’s production of artificially generated “needs”, the exchange value of the commodity cannot be realized.

Because of these pressures, exploitation under capitalism has a tendency to subordinate virtually all human differences – based on age, language, nationality, sex or race, etc., in a common drive for profit. However, labourers who are considered to be the most “productive”, itself a socially constructed and variable concept, are favoured by certain capitalist in certain periods of time relative to those who are considered to be less productive or not productive at all. Exploitation therefore interacts with human differences, which serve to define and re-define certain human characteristics. At the same time, other factors such as capitalist expansion, social organization, political rights, and movements of resistance, can and do alter the nature of the exploitation process. The capitalist class over the centuries has proven to be remarkably adaptable, generating new and different criteria for differential rates exploitation, subsumed under the systemic goal of profit expansion.

The drive for profit operates like a “law of motion” of the system, motivated by the exchange of commodities on the market. Marx identified how this expansionist tendency of accumulation was not easily or readily universalized. The generalization of the capitalist system was the product of centuries of struggle, only partially completed in Marx’s lifetime. In conditions of modern capitalism, new sources of labour, new sources of production, and new markets have seen the massive spread of capitalist exploitation, and of the social relations of production that accompany it. Because of the competitive nature of the system, the rate of profit of the system as a whole is not uniformly distributed among units of capital; some capitalists find their investments yielding the highest rate of profit, others the lowest, collectively generating an overall “average” rate of profit. This average is also fluid, as new sources of productivity, or cheaper sources of

labour, can at any point alter the hierarchy in the competitive system.⁸⁵ Harry Braverman, in his classic study, *Labor and Monopoly Capital*, describes how the work process has been altered by the capitalist drive for profit in modern conditions of exploitation. Writing in 1974, he noted:

“[T]he capitalist mode of production takes over the totality of the individual, family, and social needs and, in subordinating them to the market, also reshapes them to serve the needs of capital. It is impossible to understand the new occupational structure – and hence the modern working class – without understanding this development. How capitalism transformed all of society into a gigantic marketplace is a process that has been little investigated, although it is one of the keys to all recent social history.”⁸⁶

The reproduction of the capitalist system, and its inherent contradictions in the accumulation process, are distinguished in Marx’s work from the process of original development, or “primitive accumulation” of capitalism.⁸⁷ The drive to produce for the sake of production creates tendencies to over-produce, and a cycle of economic booms followed crises is therefore structural to the system. While such cycles of production have indeed characterized modern capitalism, the timing, nature and outcome of such crises has proven to be extremely variable and difficult to predict.⁸⁸ In late capitalism, the capacity of the system to sustain itself and to continue to expand involves the commodification of virtually all human activity, including the incorporation of all corners of accessible land, water, services and even outer space. This is also, at every point, contested, within capitalist societies and by revolutionary challenges against capitalism.⁸⁹ But the reality of capitalism, commonly referred to in contemporary discourse as “corporate capitalism”, has become a defining feature of political debate over the period of time from the late 19th century to the present.⁹⁰

Economic and Extra-economic

In the lived conditions of capitalism, however, economic and extra-economic forms of surplus extraction work together. Another way to think of this is that capitalist exploitation and the capitalist state in a struggle to maintain hegemony, arise together, even if unevenly, and they are mutually dependent upon one another. One of the roles of the capitalist state is to ensure that working class life is regulated by capitalist competition not only at the point of production, or at the workplace, but also in the hours away from work. The self-emancipation of the working class, the freeing of the working class from these oppressive, alienating and exploitive conditions, is a process of conscious, self-transformation. It is a process that is in a certain sense organized by the capitalist class, which forces unity in the working class through its drive to common exploitation.

If the economic drive of capitalism tends to nullify differences among human beings as commodified labourers, the hegemonic state tends to emphasize differences, articulated in liberal democracies as the principle of individual rights and freedoms, and asserting the universalized individual “citizen”.⁹¹ The state relies upon atomization, and an ideology of the competitive individual is part of the way in which systemic relations of alienation,

oppression and exploitation are rendered invisible and reified. Exploitation, as distinct from oppression, and as distinct from alienation, is fundamentally defined in terms of a material relationship between groups of people, the exploited and the exploiter. It is based on a relationship that is, at least conceptually, measurable: the rate of exploitation is determined by the ratio of profit to wages. Surplus labour, in the framework developed by Marx, is that portion of human labour expended in the production process that goes beyond the amount for which the labourer is compensated. In the case of capitalism specifically, surplus labour is the result of a specific set of social relations, capitalist exploitation.

Marx's work on this form of unequal relationship – exploitation – motivated much of his life's work, in particular the form of exploitation in capitalism. Exploitation has been commonly seen as the totality of Marx's understanding of unequal human relationships. As argued here, this is a misreading. Marx concentrated on analyzing exploitation under capitalism because it was the specific form of alienation that was posed historically, and because it revealed in an extreme way the stark divisions among human beings in history. Also, exploitation was for Marx and Engels understandable, knowable, by the identification of certain abstract patterns, laws of motion that were hidden and fetishized. Therefore these relations demanded explanation in order to be challenged. Through coming to understand capitalism, its main contradictions, and indeed the main contradictions of all class societies, could be identified and demystified.

Capitalist exploitation was understood to be dependent upon the division among capitals, creating competition and the drive to productive expansion for the very survival of any given unit of capital. Capitalist exploitation also depended on the division of the production system into two great classes – a capitalist class that owned and controlled the means of production, or the means to produce all the goods of the society – and at the same time, a working class. The middle class, representing both a component of private producers who were threatened by the emergence of industrial development, and a new component of self-employed “petit-bourgeois”, was seen by Marx and Engels to be historically fragile, subject to proletarianization in fact if not in consciousness. In modern capitalism, a “new” middle class has developed in the professions, but over time this segment has increasingly come under pressures of the market.⁹² Capitalist profit could only be generated, in this framework, from two sources: the appropriation of nature, which in capitalism took the form of private property in land and ground rent; and through the exploitation of the working class, which produced surplus value through its collective labour.

Gravediggers of Capitalism

The working class was seen as the most collective of all labouring classes in human history. As with alienation and oppression, exploitation presented itself as a contradictory, dialectical process. The working class constitutes, for Marx and Engels, the “gravediggers of capitalism”, a class that owned nothing but its ability to work, to sell its labour power to the capitalist, and therefore had “radical chains”. It is in terms of strategy for transformation that the focus on the working class and its relationship to capital is theoretically emphasized in Marxist analysis. A decisive, revolutionary challenge to the rule of capital depends on challenging the monopoly of control of this class over the means of production, and its related structures of hegemony and state

control. For the working class to achieve such capacity, however, to become a class for itself, collective action is necessary. Marx and Engels maintained that the assertion of humanity from the inhumanity of capitalism could realistically be achieved. The working class, they perceived, had the potential, through mass, active revolutionary transformation, not only to oppose the ruling class, but in the process to take control of the products of human labour and produce for the satisfaction of collective human need.

Exploitation under capitalism bears contradictions that reveal the human potential for the achievement of emancipation – the self-emancipation of the working class. This was what Marx and Engels saw as socialism.⁹³ To move from a class in itself to one for itself, is a path that depends upon reclaiming elements of humanity that have been robbed not only through the process of exploitation, but also, simultaneously and necessarily, through alienation and oppression. Where the social relations of production directly relate to the accumulation of surplus, there is a tendency to create a common experience among the oppressed as they are drawn into exploitation, and this tends to break down the special oppression of certain groups. But this is only one side of the contradiction. The ideas and social relations generated by competition also continue to divide workers. Oppression and alienation are central to these relations. The key issue in understanding the psychological wage, offered to one section of the working class over another, is that the benefits are accrued at the behest of the class that controls the surplus, not the working class. The control over the surplus product of society as a whole is not yielded to the oppressor section of the working class, nor is the surplus product divided up according to any set of visible or accountable criteria. Such control is alienated from the working class as a whole.

Racism and the Hegemonic Bloc

Capitalism in liberal democracies relies on ideological constructions of hegemony in order to maintain its ability to rule. This demands a battle to win over, significant sections of the working class with ideas that benefit the ruling class, in what Gramsci has called the hegemonic bloc.⁹⁴ An ideology of hegemonic whiteness has been historically necessary to this process, related to but continuing well beyond the period of Atlantic slavery. Racism is therefore not only about holding back a section of the population by exclusion from citizenship rights, equal wages, access to equal education and employment opportunities, positions of authority within the capitalist system, etc.; it is also about forging and re-forging the consent of the oppressor section of the working class in the hegemonic process.

Capitalism depends upon deep alienation, and the construction of shards of rationality, presented as “theories” and “facts” that justify racist ideas and practices, among all classes of society. Not all classes, however, experience racism in the same way. And there is an inherent contradiction in liberal democratic theory, where discrimination formally with disdain, and illegal and punishable if proven in a court of law in advanced liberal democracies.⁹⁵ The reliance on “discourses of domination” is an essential feature of the struggle to maintain and reproduce racist ideas and practices, and the hegemony of whiteness as an apparently neutral, classless norm in capitalist society justifies discrimination while denying its very existence.⁹⁶ Seen from this perspective, the relationships among alienation, oppression and exploitation can be understood to be variable, and subject to change depending on specific conditions and changing forms of

social relations of production.

The linkages between the various forms of capitalist domination can, in a sense, be tight or loose, depending on the specific historical circumstances. During the period of Atlantic slavery, for example, the relationships among alienation, oppression and exploitation was very tight. Though distinct categories in the abstract, under Atlantic slavery processes of oppression and exploitation were unified in the lived experience of the black slaves and the white plantation owners. Capitalism was shaped by the accumulation of capital that was accrued during the mercantile phase that bridged feudal and wage based exploitation in Europe. The slave plantations were, as C. L. R. James has put the case, “factories in the field.”⁹⁷ Racial oppression and slavery, colour and class, were tightly linked, and each defined the nature of the other. But analytically, slave labour on the plantations was a specific form of class exploitation; and racism against the African captured population was the form of social, ideological and political oppression articulated in the colonial states in the specific conditions of slavery. Extreme alienation from human relations characterized the lives of each class, but in antagonistic and mutually exclusive ways because of the nature of the exploitive and oppressive processes.

It is therefore impossible to study the origins, expansion, and reproduction of capitalism as a system without close attention to slavery and racism.⁹⁸ Indeed, the experience of slavery of the southern plantations in the US was a focus of Marx’s work, though many Marxists since then have chosen to ignore it.⁹⁹ Class oppression, racial oppression, and extreme alienation from the human potential, affected every aspect of the life of a slave, within and away from the immediate conditions of the extreme exploitation of the plantation. And those in white elite society who dared to cross the line and interact with the slave population in any way other than punitive, derogatory or patronizing, were victimized, sometimes severely, for the transgression.¹⁰⁰ Today, in conditions of modern liberal democracy, racism has become de-linked from slavery. The relationships connecting the process of exploitation to those of alienation and oppression are, in a sense, loose. But racism is no less intrinsic to the capitalist system; it is simply more successfully reified, integrated into the acceptable fabric of “normal” relations. It is rendered less overtly transparent, and less immediately and visibly tied to the process of exploitation. The modern wage system had adapted racism to divide and weaken workers’ capacities within the wage labouring class itself.

In Canada today, for example, there is clear evidence of racialized practices by employers, where lower income is associated with recent immigration status from Third World countries. And the oppression of Aboriginal peoples within the Canadian employment market is also well documented.¹⁰¹ In countries of the global North, commonly the relationship of racism to the economic conditions is denied, or identified only as an exceptional moment of discrimination in an otherwise fair and equal system. This is largely no doubt because racism is formally illegal. However, racism is widely integrated into the fabric of alienated human relations, rendering it more evasive, harder to name, but no less effective as a systemic body of ideas and practices that serve to divide people from one another.

An example of how oppression relates to the experience of alienation, as distinct categories in the abstract, but as a lived totality in capitalist society, is offered in graphic relief in the experiences articulated by Himani Bannerji:

“Every employer knows how to do this . . . without Derrida’s help on difference and identity, as the three old ladies who asked me in the elevator, ‘Which floor are you doing today dear?’ knew how to do class without any help from Marx. The people in the subway car who did not help me with my daughter when she screamed, caught between the subway doors, and instead told me, ‘You people don’t know how to get into a subway,’ did not need to know ‘race’ theorists to be racists. It is always like that, this being in society, it lacks neatness, a proper compartmentalization, it needs a lot of clay to make its constructions.”¹⁰²

In the course of hiding the linkages between racism and capitalism, we see sections of the world’s ruling classes in Africa and other Third World states where there are members of racial minorities fully integrated as ruling class representatives. In the West, we see the likes of Colin Powell or Condoleeza Rice in the inner circle of the US ruling class. In Canada, we have Liberal Party MP and leadership hopeful Hedy Fry, or Governor General Michael Jean. As Jo-Anne Lee and Linda Cardinal aptly summarize:

“Hegemony is achieved when ideas and beliefs are no longer questioned but are taken for granted and assumed as natural (Gramsci). However, Gramsci also observed that hegemony is never total. It is constantly challenged and contested through counter-hegemonic ideas and practices . . . A hegemonic formation is an outcome of ongoing processes of counter-hegemonic challenges and hegemonic reformulations in the political, economic, and civil spheres of life.”¹⁰³

Loosening of the relationships between the processes of exploitation, oppression and alienation regarding racist ideas and practices is not, however, an automatic feature of the evolution of capitalism. It is not the case, as some liberal analysis would have it, that capitalism inevitably increases freedom from oppression over time.¹⁰⁴ In some cases, such as the US South or apartheid South Africa, entrenched interests stalled the movement to create any legal freedoms. In both cases, mass movements from below, resisting oppression at great cost and in conditions nearing civil war, were needed before even the most minimal concessions to equality were offered. Nor is this a linear process, a side effect of “modernization”. The state of Israel, for example, was established ostensibly as a modern “democracy” in a war of occupation and ethnic cleansing in 1948. Israel’s state structure has been defended by supporters as a model of “democracy”, but it is increasingly recognized to be founded on racialized, apartheid structures of division and domination.¹⁰⁵ In the post-9/11 atmosphere, racial profiling has become the accepted norm in state policies and legislation in countries around the world. Another indication that there is no inevitable evolutionary path towards the elimination of racism in capitalist society, is associated with George W. Bush’s “endless war” against terrorism. Features of old-style colonial occupation of Third World states have returned. The widespread acceptance of Samuel Huntington’s conception of a ‘clash of civilizations’, described in culturally racialized terms, confirms the point.¹⁰⁶ In other words, the relationships among racial oppression, alienation and exploitation, associated with the interests of the global capitalist system, have tightened.

The expansion of the capitalist system has been reliant not only on exploitation, but also on oppression and alienation. Racism, historically and in the present, as it has developed as part of Atlantic slavery and colonialism, through racially discriminatory immigration controls, and the perpetuation of hegemonic ideologies of natural whiteness through a vast array of institutions necessary to liberal democracy, is an intrinsic feature of the capitalist process of accumulation and the reification of social relations that accompany it.

Explaining the Chasm

The dialogue between Marxism and anti-racism suggests a wider question, regarding how and when such a divide could have occurred. Some argue the problem is rooted in Marx's work, in the inherent Eurocentrism of historical materialism as a method.¹⁰⁷ However, there is certainly a long list of Marxist anti-racist theorists who integrate these issues in a unified framework.¹⁰⁸ A notable divergence, however, has emerged between the contemporary currents of debate and enquiry in the Marxist and anti-racist paradigms in Canada.

There seems to be a particular blind spot in Canadian political economy regarding racism in the Canadian context, associated with an uncritical acceptance of left nationalism.¹⁰⁹ A misunderstanding of the Canadian state, as a weak dependency rather than as an imperialist power, can at least partially explain the roots of the current chasm.¹¹⁰ A particular application of the Marxist tradition to the Canadian state has tended to hide or diminish the significance of racism as an ideology of the Canadian ruling class, and the role of slavery in the early years of the development of the Canadian national capitalist project.¹¹¹

Rather than positioning a critical analytical tradition in anti-imperialism, anti-colonialism and internationalism, the Canadian political economy tradition has accepted one particular form of nationalism, English Canadian nationalism, as an intellectual starting point and natural home.¹¹² The field, despite challenges, tended to place theoretical and empirical emphasis on the Canadian state in relationship to the US state, where Canada is taken as relatively weak or as a dependency.¹¹³ A particular form of nationalism, albeit with a left bent, in defense of the English Canadian and federalist state, has been heralded as a progressive and necessary "stage" in the development of a successful socialist movement.¹¹⁴ In depth, creative, anti-racist theory and historical analysis of the Canadian state has certainly continued, but it has tended to be treated as the subject of a "special interest" not only from critics from the right but also the left.¹¹⁵ Alternatively, the absence of plantation slavery in Canada has been taken, wrongly, as an indication of Canada's race-neutral history. Robert Chodos, in *The Caribbean Connection*, for example, suggests it "would be closer to the truth to call Canadians a nation of innocents about race relations."¹¹⁶ George Elliot Clarke summarizes the point, regarding the starkly limited study of the slave experiences in Canada, even by those who claim expertise in a critical tradition:

"The avoidance of Canada's sorry history of slavery and racism is natural. It is how Canadians prefer to understand themselves: we are a nation of good, Nordic, 'pure', mainly White folks, as opposed to the lawless, hot-

tempered, impure, mongrel Americans, with their messy history of slavery, civil war, segregation, assassinations, lynching, riots and constant social turmoil. Key to this propaganda – and that is what it is – is the Manichean portrayal of two nations: Canada, the land of ‘Peace, Order and Good Government’, of evolution within the traditional constraints of monarchy and authority, where racism was not and is not tolerated, versus the United States of America, the land of guns, cockroaches, and garbage, of criminal sedition confronted by aggressive policing (and jailing), where racism was and is the arbiter of class (im)mobility. Indeed, in Canada, ‘race’ and racism are concepts used to refight the American Revolution, to establish that the Yankee Revolt against the Crown was wrong, while Canada’s loyalty to monarchy, hierarchy, and public order fostered a more harmonious and, ironically, *rouge*-tinted society. But the price of this flattering self-portrait is public lying, falsified history, and self-destructive blindness.”

The argument suggested in the foregoing discussion, however, is that capitalism as a system cannot be effectively understood, and effectively challenged, unless Marxism and anti-racist theory arrive at a comprehensive synthesis, one that is greater than the sum of the parts. There is a need to deepen the interrogation of, and to challenge, the social and ideological elements of a Canadian state project fully reliant on racism. This racist ideology was not an aberration, but an articulate expression of the origins of the Canadian capitalist class, defined and shaped through its loyalty to the British empire. It developed in opposition to the rebellion of the thirteen colonies that formed the United States of America, and then became further entrenched through the support of the southern states in the US Civil War.¹¹⁷ This ideology developed as an intrinsic part of the making of the Canadian state.

However, tracing the roots of the divide goes beyond the Canadian context. The limitations of a Marxist methodology that fails to adequately address forms of oppression beyond class relations has generated extensive debate, not least a significant current in the establishment and development of post-modern and post-colonial critiques. A detailed re-visiting of this debate goes beyond the scope of this discussion. In terms of socialist theory, however, it should be noted that the hegemony of Stalinist interpretations of Marxism have indeed asserted a mechanical and vulgar consideration of class, applied more as a sociological category than one consistent with Marx’s dialectical notion of social relations of production.¹¹⁸

Even some of the most sophisticated anti-racist critics have tended to collapse the dialectic of race and class. For example, Robert Miles, from a position favourable to Marxism, has counterposed the idea of labour migration to what he considers to be the misplaced notion of “race”, a suggestion that has provoked extensive debate not least among anti-racist Marxists who resist such reductionism.¹¹⁹ According to Miles, racism, rather than race, is motivated by the same or similar forces of production that generate the accumulation process.¹²⁰ However, this emphasis on production relations, while applicable to certain social formations, most notably racialized slave or apartheid states, tends to minimize the significant role of racism in capitalist hegemony, and in supporting oppression and alienation in capitalist societies. The insistence on a direct association

with the process of accumulation minimizes the complex and often contradictory experiences of racism across classes in capitalist society.

On the other end of the theoretical spectrum, post-modernist emphases on race, gender and other forms of difference as similarly positioned to class in a continuous spectrum of oppression, suggests a collapse of the dialectic in another direction. Chantal Mouffe and Ernesto Laclau, for example, in *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*, call upon socialists to abandon an ostensible misplaced emphasis on “classism”, on the grounds of its reductionist theoretical and strategic implications.¹²¹ In a later work, Mouffe claims that a form of radical democracy, apparently compatible with an enlightened capitalism, can adjust and accommodate the unequal power relations of oppression.

“Radical democracy demands that we acknowledge difference – the particular, the multiple, the heterogeneous – in effect, everything that had been excluded by the concept of Man in the abstract. Universalism is not rejected but particularized; what is needed is a new kind of articulation between the universal and the particular.”¹²²

A theoretical reduction of the relationship of racism and class to a mechanistic assertion of the universality of accumulation, one that is purported to be inherent in any Marxist approach, has been “corrected” by an assertion of the supremacy of essentially individualized experience in advanced capitalism. But not all individuals are in fact the same, nor are they similarly, universally, different; not all differences are parallel. Himani Bannerji has aptly summarized the resultant theoretical cul-de-sac:

“The politics of ‘difference’ hides in its radical posture a neo-liberal pluralist stance, even when power and brutality are stressed as ‘differential’ factors. Generally it amounts to advancing a metatheory of competing interests built on the concept of a free market. The political sphere is modeled on a market place and freedom amounts to the liberty of all political vendors to display their goods equally in a competition. But this view of society as an aggregate of competing individuals, or at best as fragmented groups of communities, makes the notion of an overall social organization theoretically inconceivable and thus unnameable. All such attempts are dismissed as totalizing and detrimental to individuality, uniqueness of experience and expression. Concepts such as capital, class, imperialism, etc., are thus considered as totalizing, abstract ‘master narratives’, and untenable bases for political subjectivity since they are arrived at rationally and analytically, moving beyond the concreteness of immediate experience.”¹²³

Racism operates at the levels of alienation and oppression, and combines with the process of exploitation in specific, varied, and contradictory ways. These processes need to be studied historically, specifically, and with a view to understanding the lived realities that collectively are shaped by and shape social reality.

Towards Reclamation

Capitalism depends upon ensuring that those who experience exploitation collectively do not consciously perceive their capacity to unite and reclaim their humanity. Thus, special oppression holds back class unity and serves to blur the class lines based on exploitation and common class oppression. Importantly, from a Marxist perspective, oppression holds back the class interests among those who are oppressed, and at the same time also holds back those from among the oppressor section of the exploited class. Oppression therefore belies a more profound disadvantage under the dynamic of exploitation. This underlying reality is not obvious subjectively. Ruling classes in liberal democracies depend upon ensuring that this reality is not obvious, and oppression and alienation are central to the ability of the ruling class to continue to rule.

There is the potential in human action, in the act of resistance, for taking back some of what is taken from humanity in the daily life of capitalist exploitation, alienation and oppression. Through resistance, some hours of the day, and some moments of dignity and humanity, can be reclaimed. One of the ways Marx studied the relationship of labour to capital was through a focus on the hours of the working day. He saw in workers' resistance to the extraction of unpaid surplus value, a step towards self-emancipation. Franz Fanon studied the relationship of the colonial occupier to the occupied, and saw in the act of anti-colonial resistance a step towards self-determination. The act of resistance, especially collective, conscious and organized resistance, can challenge capitalist domination. Reclamation is a process that starts within capitalism, but also has the potential to inspire and attract masses of the oppressed, alienated and exploited, in a struggle for a new and better type of society.

Acts of reclamation can be partial, accumulative, or strategic and forward moving, and may involve resistance against all forms of capitalist hegemony or only against a moment for a day or week. It involves reclaiming the humanity that is robbed in the competitive, alienated relations of capitalism, of reclaiming the dignity and self-respect that is robbed in the experience of systemic oppression, and of reclaiming the vast products of labour robbed in the process of exploitation. The potential for common actions of reclamation demands a conscious, collective, organized movement from below. There can be pessimistic or optimistic approaches to this; but it is certainly worth revisiting Marx's very optimistic idea that genuine human emancipation could be a realistically achievable goal.

¹ The original idea that provoked this author to contribute to the dialogue in this form was suggested on a panel discussion on "Is Marxism Still Relevant?" at a conference titled "Globalizing the Resistance: Marxism and the Movement Today" held in October, 2005 at the University of Toronto. The speakers on this panel were Carolyn Egan (President, Toronto Area Steelworkers Council), Grace-Edward Galabuzi (Ryerson University) and Ena Dua (York University). It was Ena Dua who specifically addressed the need for an extended dialogue regarding the relationship between Marxism and anti-racism, an issue that became the centre of a lively and animated discussion among the panelists and the audience attending the conference session. "Globalizing the Resistance: Marxism and the Movement Today", October 1, 2005, organized by the University of Toronto International Socialists, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario. A. Bakan, Observers' Notes.

² Cedric J. Robinson, *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition* (London: Zed Press, 1983; rpt. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000).

³ See Nouri Jarrah, "Edward Said Discusses 'Orientalism', Arab Intellectuals, Marxism and Myth in Palestinian History", *Aljadid Magazine*, vol. 5, no. 28 (Summer, 1999) <www.aljadid.com>

⁴ See for example, Angela Davis Y. Davis, *Women, Race and Class* (New York: Random House, 1983); Eugene Genovese, *The Political Economy of Slavery* (New York: 1968); Robin Blackburn, *The Making of*

New World Slavery: From the Baroque to the Modern, 1492-1800 (London: Verso, 1997); *The Overthrow of Colonial Slavery, 1776-1848* (London: Verso, 1998)

⁵ See for example Abigail B. Bakan, "Imperialism and its Discontents", *Labour/Le Travail*, 56 (Fall, 2005), pp. 269-82; Yasmeen Abu-Laban, "Regionalism, Migration and (Fortress) North America", *Review of Constitutional Studies* (vol.10, 1: 2005); Sunera Thobani, "War Frenzy", *Marxism*, vol. 1 (2003).

⁶ The history of Japanese internment is shared by the US and Canada. See Ken Adachi, *The Enemy That Never War: A History of Japanese Canadians* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976); Barry Broadfoot, *Years of Shame, Years of Sorrow: The Story of Japanese Canadians in World War II* (Toronto: Doubleday, 1977); and Roy Miki, *Redress: Inside the Japanese Canadian Call for Justice* (Vancouver: Raincoast Books, 2005).

⁷ Emma Dixon, "An Unnatural Disaster", *Znet*, November 16, 2005; L. Sustar, "Katrina Exposes Racism", *Znet*, August 31, 2005 <www.zmag.org>

⁸ Huw Beynon and Lou Kushnick, "Cool Britannia or Cruel Britannia: Racism and New Labour", in *Fighting Identities: Race, Religion and Ethno-nationalism, Socialist Register 2003*, eds. Leo Panitch and Colin Leys (London: Merlin Press, 2002), pp. 229-44.

⁹ See "Notes for an Address by Peter Harder, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, at the London Conference on Afghanistan", Government of Canada, "Protecting Canadians: Rebuilding Afghanistan", January 31, 2006 <www.canada-afghanistan.gc.ca/london-conference-en.asp>

¹⁰ See Abu-Laban, "Regionalism, Migration and (Fortress) North America"

¹¹ *Sunday Star*, March 19, 2006 quoting Rudyard Kipling.

¹² The most informative history of the Haitian revolution remains, C. L. R. James, *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution* (Vintage: second ed., 1989).

¹³ Part of this argument is developed in a previous paper, Abbie Bakan, "Marxism, Oppression and Liberation", in *Marxism*, vol. 2 (2004), pp.51-61.

¹⁴ This section is a revision and amendment of my "Marxism, Oppression and Liberation".

¹⁵ The concept of "cultural politics of difference" is traceable to Cornell West. See Cornell West, "The Politics of Difference", in Russell Ferguson, ed., *Out There: Marginalization and Contemporary Cultures*, (New York: New Museum of Contemporary Art, 1990). For the genealogy of the term difference, see Frances Henry and Carol Tator, "State Policy and Practices as Racialized Discourse: Multiculturalism, the Charter, and Employment Equity", in Peter S. Li, ed., *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada* (Toronto: Oxford University Press Canada, 1999), p. 108, n.3.

¹⁶ Karl Marx, *Early Writings*, trans. and ed., T. B. Bottomore (New York: 1963); *Grundrisse: Introduction to the Critique of Political Economy*, trans. Martin Nicolaus (Harmondsworth: 1973); *Capital*.

¹⁷ Althusserian Marxism, which contributed substantially to intellectual confusion in the Marxist left by insisting on a crude separation of Marx's 'immature' theory of alienation from his more 'mature' focus on exploitation, needs to be understood as a long detour in an appropriate application of Marxism to modern capitalism. See Louis Althusser, *For Marx*, trans. Ben Brewster (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969); Louis Althusser and Etienne Balibar, *Reading Capital*, trans. Ben Brewster (New York: Pantheon and NLB, 1970). For an antidote, see Georg Lukacs, *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*, intro. Rodney Livingstone (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1971); Istvan Meszaros, *Lukacs' Concept of Dialectic* (London: Merlin Press, 1972; *Marx's Theory of Alienation* (1970) Internet Archive <http://www.marx.org/archive/meszaros/works/alien/meszar01.htm>); Roman Rosdolsky, *The Making of Marx's 'Capital'*, trans. Pete Burgess (London: Pluto Press, 1977); E. P. Thompson, *The Poverty of Theory; Or an Orrery of Errors* (London: Merlin Press, 1995).

¹⁸ Karl Marx, "Speech at the Anniversary of the Peoples' Paper", cited in E. Lunn, *Marxism and Modernism*, in Judy Cox, "An Introduction to Marx's Theory of Alienation", *International Socialism*, Series 2, no.79 (Summer, 1998), p. 41

¹⁹ See Judy Cox, "An Introduction", pp. 47-51

²⁰ Meszaros, *Marx's Theory of Alienation*.

²¹ See John Bellamy Foster, *Marx's Ecology: Materialism and Nature* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2000).

²² For a Marxist account of equality and inequality within capitalism, see Alex Callinicos, *Equality* (Cambridge UK: 2000).

²³ Karl Marx, “On the Jewish Question” in Robert C. Tucker, ed., *The Marx-Engels Reader* (New York: 1972), pp. 24-51. For a general discussion of Marxism and the Jewish Question, see Abbie Bakan, “The Jewish Question: A Marxist Analysis”, *Marxism: A Socialist Annual*, no. 1 (2003), pp. 75-83.

²⁴ Marx, “Jewish Question”, p. 33 (italics in original)

²⁵ This section relies on Kevin Anderson, “Marx on Suicide in the Context of his Other Writings on Alienation and Gender”; and Karl Marx, “Peuchet on Suicide”, in *Marx on Suicide*, Eric A. Plaut and Devin Anderson, eds. and intro., trans., Eric A. Plaut, Gabrielle Edgecomb, and Kevin Anderson (Evanston Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1999), pp. 3-28; and pp. 43-76.

²⁶ Karl Marx, “Peuchet on Suicide”, pp. 50-51. This may seem a curious sympathy for a young revolutionary like Karl Marx. Marx lived in Paris from October of 1843 to January of 1845, after fleeing from his native Prussia for his political activities. He was later also expelled from France, for the same reason, and while in Belgium, from 1845 –1846, he read the published Memoirs of the Police Archives, published in French, by one Jacques Peuchet (1785-1830).

²⁷ Karl Marx, “Peuchet on Suicide”, p. 67

²⁸ Karl Marx, “Peuchet on Suicide”, p. 58

²⁹ The fourth case is about the experience of sudden unemployment. A member of the royal guard suddenly loses his job and cannot find another. As he watches his family collapse in poverty, he takes his own life rather than being a “burden” on them.

³⁰ Anderson, “Marx on Suicide”, p. 12

³¹ See Blackburn, *Making of New World Slavery*; and *The Overthrow of Colonial Slavery*.

³² Hans Sloane, *A Voyage to the Islands*, vol. I, (London: 1706), p. lvii, as quoted in R. Blackburn, *Making of New World Slavery*, p. 345.

³³ Blackburn, *Making of New World Slavery*, p. 311.

³⁴ See Noel Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White* (New York: Routledge, 1995). For a summary of contemporary contributions, see Cynthia Levine-Rasky, “The Practice of Whiteness Among Teacher Candidates”, *International Studies in Sociology in Education*, vol. 10, 3 (2000); Sherene Razack, ed., *Race, Space and the Law: Unmapping a White Settler Society* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2002).

³⁵ Franz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, preface by Jean-Paul Sartre, trans. Constance Farrington (New York: Grove Press, 1963).

³⁶ Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth*, pp. 111ff.

³⁷ To their enormous credit, some contemporary anti-racist scholars have reminded us of Fanon’s continued relevance. See Sherene Razack, *Looking White People in the Eye: Gender, Race and Culture in Courtrooms and Classrooms* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998); and Himani Bannerji, *Thinking Through*.

³⁸ Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth*, p. 163.

³⁹ See Bakan, *Ideology and Class Conflict in Jamaica*.

⁴⁰ Frances Henry, Carol Tator, Winston Mattis, and Tim Rees, *The Colour of Democracy: Racism in Canadian Society* (Toronto: Harcourt Brace, 1995).

⁴¹ Sherene Razack, *Dark Threats and White Knights: The Somalia Affair, Peacekeeping and the New Imperialism* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004).

⁴² Antonio Gramsci, *Selections From the Prison Notebooks* (New York: International Publishers, 1971).

⁴³ The phrase, “Divide and Rule”, was originally used by the Roman Emperor, Tiberius, in the first century AD. See Callinicos, *Race and Class*, p. 39.

⁴⁴ For the purposes of this study, the intellectual project of Marx and Engels are considered to be linked and consistent. This is however, a contested assumption. See August H. Nimtz Jr., *Marx and Engels: Their Contribution to the Democratic Breakthrough* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000).

⁴⁵ These works are described in more detail below.

⁴⁶ See Karl Marx, *Capital*, vol. 1 (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1887, rpt. nd.), especially part 1, “Commodities and Money”, and part V, “The Production of Absolute and Relative Surplus Value”, pp. 43-144 and pp. 476-500.

⁴⁷ Karl Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy*, intro. Frederick Engels (New York: International Publishers, 1973), p. 173.

⁴⁸ Marx, *Poverty of Philosophy*, pp. 173-174.

⁴⁹ Karl Marx, *The German Ideology*, ed. and intro. C. J. Arthur (New York: International Publishers, 1970, rpt. 1973), p. 64

⁵⁰ Karl Marx, *Capital*, volume 111 (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1959, rpt. 1978), p. 385

⁵¹ The phrase comes from W. E. B. DuBois. See below.

⁵² Frederick Engels, *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, vol. 4, 1844-1845 (New York: International Publishers, 1975).

⁵³ Engels, *Condition of the Working Class*, p. 325.

⁵⁴ Engels, *Condition of the Working Class*, p. 375

⁵⁵ For a summary of the relationship of gay oppression and Marxism, see Peter Morgan, "Class Divisions in the Gay Community", *International Socialism*, series 2, no. 78 (March, 1998), <<http://pubs.socialistreviewindex.org.uk/isj78/morgan.htm>>. For a discussion of the social construction of racism in the US, see Noel Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White*.

⁵⁶ Dr. Condoleezza Rice an African-American woman born and raised in Birmingham, Alabama, was appointed by the George W. Bush presidential administration as Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, referred to as the "National Security Advisor" in January 2001, and in January of 2005, was sworn in as the 66th Secretary of State in the US. She was previously Provost at Stanford University, and Professor of Political Science at Stanford. She is author of numerous books and publications on US foreign policy, eastern European foreign policy and German unification. She was also an advisor to George Bush Sr., and a member of the boards of directors for the Chevron Corporation, the Charles Schwab Corporation, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation and the University of Notre Dame. For this and other biographical information, see the US Whitehouse website

<<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/ricebio.html>>. For the context in which the vast majority of African-American women live, and the conditions of oppression they face, see for example, Davis, *Women, Race and Class*; and for the more common experience even of educated, professional, African-American women, see Williams, *Alchemy of Race and Rights*.

⁵⁷ See Georg Lukacs, "Reification and the Consciousness of the Proletariat", in *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*, trans. Rodney Livingstone (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1968), pp.83-222.

⁵⁸ See for example, Carol Agogs, ed., *Workplace Equality: International Perspectives on Legislation, Policy and Practice* (London: Kluwer Law International, 2002).

⁵⁹ This is an argument that can be most clearly explained through empirical rather than theoretical examination. See for example Pamela Sugiman, "Privelege and Oppression: The Configuration of Race, Gender, and Class in Southern Ontario Auto Plant, 1939 to 1949", *Labour/Le Travail*, no. 47, Spring 1002, pp. 83-113.

⁶⁰ Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *On Colonialism* (New York: 1972). See publisher's note for compilation of relevant quotes, some of which are cited below, pp. 7-8. See also Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Marx and Engels on the United States*, (Moscow: 1979).

⁶¹ Frederick Engels, "Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State", K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, vol. 3, (Moscow: 1976), pp. 191-334

⁶² For a summary of Marx's views on the Jewish question and religion in general, see Paul M. Siegel, *The Meek and the Militant: Religion and Power Across the World* (London and New Jersey: 1986).

⁶³ On Marx's views on Ireland, see Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Ireland and the Irish Question* (New York: 1972); and Chris Bambery, *Ireland's Permanent Revolution*, 3rd edition (London: 1990).

⁶⁴ For a summary of Marx's analysis of slavery and racism see Alex Callinicos, *Race and Class* (London: 1993); Peter Alexander, *Racism, Resistance and Revolution* (London: 1987); and Robin Blackburn, *The Making of New World Slavery and The Overthrow of Colonial Slavery*.

⁶⁵ Marx and Engels, *Selected Correspondence* (Moscow: 1965), pp. 236-7, cited by Callinicos, *Race and Class*, pp. 34-35

⁶⁶ This interpretation relies in part on a summary suggested by Alex Callinicos, in "Race and Class", *International Socialism*, series 2, no. 55 (Summer, 1992) p. 19.

⁶⁷ There is considerable debate about the thrust of Marx's writings on imperialism. This is because he emphasized not only the oppressive nature of capitalism, but also its revolutionary dynamic. By the last years of his life, he was altering his views in the process of lengthy correspondence with a group of Russian

Marxists, related to the development of the specifically Asiatic mode of production. For a summary and interpretation of this debate, see Bakan, "Is Marxism Eurocentric".

⁶⁸ In the *Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State*, Frederick Engels developed a detailed explanation of the origins of women's oppression as part of the historical process that saw the rise of class society and the state. This work was based on Marx's notebooks, and is partial and very controversial among Marxist and feminists. However, it took seriously the early, radical anthropology of Lewis Morgan in his study of the indigenous life styles of the Native Iroquois of New York state. It was, for its time, a very advanced and radical study, seeing the potential for a society free of women's oppression exemplified in the non-Victorian division of labour displayed among the Iroquois. A similar line of argument has been advanced in current debates among supporters of indigenous peoples against colonial oppression. See Government of Canada, Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (Ottawa: 1996) http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/ch/rcap/index_e.html; Karen Sachs, *Sisters and Wives: The Past and Future of Sexual Equality* (Chicago: University of Illinois, 1983).

⁶⁹ See Abigail B. Bakan, "Capital, Marxism and the World Economy", in Abigail B. Bakan and Eleanor MacDonald, eds., *Critical Political Studies: Debates and Dialogues from the Left* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002), pp. 232-57; Abbie Bakan, "After Seattle: the Politics of the World Trade Organization", *International Socialism Journal*, series 2 (Spring, 2000), pp. 19-36; and "From Seattle to Washington: the Making of a Movement", *International Socialism Journal*, series 2, (Summer, 2000), pp. 85-94.

⁷⁰ This is a common part of the background to recruitment described by many of the US soldiers who have refused to serve in the war on Iraq, some of whom have come to Canada in search of refugee status. See War Resisters Support Campaign, www.resisters.ca.

⁷¹ Razack, *Dark Threats and White Knights*, p.7; citing Chinua Achebe, "An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad's Heart of Darkness," in *Hopes and Impediments: Selected Essays, 1965-1987* (London: Heinemann, 1988), p. 8.

⁷² Exploitation is specifically addressed below. Here it is mentioned insofar as it is relevant to a specific explication of a Marxist understanding of oppression in general, and racism in particular.

⁷³ The "base/superstructure" dichotomy has commonly been rejected by contemporary Marxists, and similarly pointed to as a reason to reject Marxism by critics. Absented from a wider framework that considers alienation, oppression and exploitation, and one that retains a dialectical method, the dichotomy is indeed unhelpful. However, the vulgar rendition of the couplet is quite far from the original meaning of the concept. On this debate, see Ellen Meiksins Wood, *Democracy Against Capitalism*, ch. 2, "Rethinking Base and Superstructure", pp. 49-75; and Chris Harman, "Base and Superstructure", in *Marxism and History: Two Essays* (London: Bookmarks, 1998), pp.7-54.

⁷⁴ See Eric Foner, *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863-1877* (New York: Harper and Row, 1988).

⁷⁵ W.E. B. Dubois, *Black Reconstruction in America 1860-1880*, (New York: 1969), pp. 700-1

⁷⁶ Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White*, pp.2-3

⁷⁷ B. J. Fields, "Slavery, Race and Ideology in the United States of America", *New Left Review*, no. 181 (1990), p. 102. A similar pattern of labour recruitment occurred in the English Caribbean, moving from European white indentured workers to African black slavery. See Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery*.

⁷⁸ A. Szymanski, "Racial Discrimination and White Gain", *American Sociological Review*, 41 (1976), pp. 409-12; See Hugh Thomas, *The Slave Trade: the History of the Atlantic Slave Trade 1440-1870* (London: Simon and Schuster, 1997), p.194;

⁷⁹ A. Bakan, *Quebec: From Conquest to Constitution* (Toronto: I.S. Canada pamphlet series, 1991).

⁸⁰ Gerald M. Craig, ed., *Lord Durham's Report: An Abridgement of Report on the Affairs of British North America* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1963), p.150.

⁸¹ On the continuing legacy of the perspective developed by Durham, see, Paul Kellogg, "William Gairdner as Lord Durham: The Intellectual Basis of the Anti-French New Right", paper presented to the Society for Socialist Studies, Carleton University, Ottawa (June, 1993), available at www.paulkellogg.net.

⁸² See Bakan, *Quebec: From Conquest to Constitution*.

⁸³ Marx, *Capital*, volume III: *The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole*, ed., Frederick Engels (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1959, rpt. 1978), p. 197

⁸⁴ Marx, *Capital*, vol. I, ch. 10, "The Working Day", pp. 222-86.

⁸⁵ Of the multiple volumes of *Capital*, and *Theories of Surplus Value*, only the first volume of *Capital* was completed by Marx, the remaining notebooks edited and published by Marx's lifelong collaborator, Frederick Engels.

⁸⁶ Harry Braverman, *Labor and Monopoly Capital* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974), p. 271.

⁸⁷ In *Capital*, volume I, Marx focuses on the origins and definition of capitalism as a system of generalized commodity production; volume II on capitalist circulation; and volume III on the reproduction of the capitalist system as a whole. See Marx, *Capital: Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy (Rough Draft)*, trans. Martin Nicolaus (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973); and Roman Rosdolsky, *The Making of Marx's 'Capital'*, trans. Pete Burgess (London: Pluto Press, 1977)

⁸⁸ This has been the subject of extensive debate among Marxist political economists for many decades. For a summary of some of the debates see Chris Harman, "Other Theories of Crisis", in *Explaining the Crisis: A Marxist Re-appraisal* (London: Bookmarks, 1999), pp. 122-54.

⁸⁹ This massive reach of the capitalist market has been the subject of challenge in the movement for social justice that found its voice in the Zapatista rising in Chiapas, Mexico in 1994, and more globally in the Seattle protests against the World Trade Organization in 1999. There is now an extensive literature on this movement. See for example Emma Bircham and John Charlton, eds., *Anti-Capitalism: A Guide to the Movement* (London: Bookmarks, 2001); and Marjorie Mayo, *Global Citizens: Social Movements and the Challenge of Globalization* (Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc., 2005).

⁹⁰ See Joel Bakan, *The Corporation: The Pathological Pursuit of Profit and Power* (Simon and Schuster: 2005).

⁹¹ See Daiva Stasiulis and Abigail Bakan, *Negotiating Citizenship: Migrant Women in Canada and the Global System* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005).

⁹² On class structure in capitalism see for example, Eric Olin Wright, *Classes* (London: Verso, 1989); T. B. Bottomore, *Classes in Modern Society* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1967); Patrick Joyce, ed., *Class* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1995).

⁹³ Several authors have focused on the notion of self-emancipation as central to a Marxist understanding of socialism. See Nimitz, *Marx and Engels*; Tony Cliff, *State Capitalism in Russia* (London: Bookmarks, 1948; rpt. 1946); Hal Draper, *Socialism From Below* (New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1992).

⁹⁴ Gramsci, *Prison Notebooks*, *passim*.

⁹⁵ This contradictions is increasingly visible to those who care to see, and the efforts to render the contradictions invisible have strained the parameters of the justice system. Certainly this phenomenon has generated an extensive critical literature, including the development of critical race theory and feminist critiques of the justice system. See for example, Iris Marion Young, *Justice and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1990); Razack, *Race, Space and the Law; Looking White People in the Eye*; Patricia J. Williams, *The Alchemy of Race and Rights: Diary of a Law Professor* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1991).

⁹⁶ The phrase is the title of Frances Henry and Carol Tator, *Discourses of Domination: Racial Bias in the Canadian English-Language Press* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002).

⁹⁷ James, *Black Jacobins*.

⁹⁸ There is, however, an established tradition in Canadian political economy of, somehow, avoiding the condition of slavery in Canada and internationally as a central feature of the development of the Canadian state. This is the subject of further study. On the centrality of slavery to in a more accurate picture of political economy, see for example, Cooper, *The Hanging of Angelique*.

⁹⁹ On the relationship between slavery and capitalism, see "Plantation Slavery and the Capitalist Mode of Production: An Analysis of the Development of the Jamaican Labour Force", *Studies in Political Economy*, 22 (Spring 1987); Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery*; and Robin Blackburn, *The Making of New World Slavery*.

¹⁰⁰ See Abbie Bakan, "Slavery and Anti-Slavery in Canada: the Underground Railroad", unpublished ms., and F. M. Bordewich, *Bound for Canaan: The Triumph of the Underground Railroad* (Toronto: Harper Perennial, 2005).

¹⁰¹ See Galabuzi, *Canada's Economic Apartheid*; Todd Gordon, "Canada, Empire and Indigenous People in the Americas", *Socialist Studies*, vol. 2, no. 1 (Spring, 2006), pp. 47-76.

¹⁰² Bannerji, *Thinking Through*, pp. 12-13

¹⁰³ Lee and Cardinal, "Hegemonic Nationalism", p. 216.

¹⁰⁴ See Alan C. Cairns, "Empire, Globalization, and the Fall and Rise of Diversity", in Alan Cairns, et al, eds., *Citizenship, Diversity and Pluralism: Canadian and Comparative Perspectives* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999), pp. 23-57.

¹⁰⁵ The literature identifying this basic fact about the Israeli state, while obviously controversial, is also now extensive and overwhelmingly persuasive. See, for a clear summary and outline of the argument, Virginia Tilley, *The One State Solution: A Breakthrough for Peace in the Israeli-Palestinian Deadlock* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005). Other notable texts include: Uri Davis, *Apartheid Israel: Possibilities for the Struggle Within* (London: Zed Books, 2003); Norman G. Finkelstein, *Image and Reality of the Israel-Palestine Conflict*, 2nd ed., (London: Verso, 2003); John Rose, *The Myths of Zionism* (London: Pluto Press, 2004).

¹⁰⁶ Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order* (Riverside, N.J.: Simon and Shuster, 1998). For a review of critical literature, see Bakan, "Imperialism and its Discontents."

¹⁰⁷ For an elaboration of this argument, see Abbie Bakan, "Is Marxism Eurocentric?", *Marxism*, vol. 3 (2004).

¹⁰⁸ See for example, in addition to names and texts cited earlier, Peter Alexander, *Racism, Resistance and Revolution* (London: Bookmarks, 1987); Alex Callinicos, *Race and Class* (London: Bookmarks, 1993); ed., *Between Apartheid and Capitalism: Conversations with South African Socialists* (London: Bookmarks, 1992); Robert Miles, *Racism After 'Race Relations'* (New York: Routledge, 1993); Abigail B. Bakan, *Ideology and Class Conflict in Jamaica: The Politics of Rebellion* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990); Peter Fryer, *Staying Power: The History of Black People in Britain* (London: Pluto Press, 1984); Stuart Hall, *Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies* (London: Routledge, 1996); Colin Leys, *Underdevelopment in Kenya: The Political Economy of Neo-Colonialism, 1964-71* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975); George Breitman, *The Last Year of Malcolm X: The Evolution of a Revolutionary* (New York: Pathfinder, 1967); C. L. R. James, George Breitman, Edgar Keeman, et al., *Fighting Racism in World War II* (New York: Monad Press, 1980); Ken Post, *Arise Ye Starvelings: The Jamaica Labour Rebellion of 1938 and its Aftermath* (Boston: Martinus Nijhoff, 1978); James Jennings, ed., *Race and Politics* (London: Verso, 1997); Noel Ignatieff, *How the Irish Became White* (New York: Routledge, 1994); Richard Hart, *Slaves who Abolished Slavery*, two volumes (Kingston, Jamaica: Institute of Social and Economic Studies, 1985); Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery* (New York: G.P. Putnam and Sons, 1966); Walter Rodney, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa* (London: Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications, 1972); Robin Blackburn, *Making of New World Slavery*; and Oliver C. Cox, *Caste, Class and Race: A Study in Social Dynamics* (New York: Modern Reader, 1948).

¹⁰⁹ See Nandita Sharma, Letters exchange, *Canadian Dimension*, May/June, 2003.

¹¹⁰ See Paul Kellogg, "Kari Levitt and the Long Detour of Canadian Political Economy", *Studies in Political Economy*, 76 (Autumn, 2005), pp. 31-60.

¹¹¹ The legacy of slavery, including the present justification of occupation, sanctions and reprisals against Haiti, a state that dared to challenge slavery, is not an abstract issue. The Canadian delegation that traveled to Caracas, Venezuela for the World Social Forum in January, 2006, estimated to be around 1100 in total from Quebec and English Canada, was imbued in debates regarding the role of the Canadian state, and Canadian NGOs, involved in Haiti since the coup d'état against elected President Jean-Bertrand Aristide in February, 2004. The central involvement of the Canadian state in that coup, and in the occupation that has followed, poses the need for clarity about the relationship between anti-racism and Marxism in stark terms. Observers' Notes, Abigail Bakan, Delegate to World Social Forum, January 21-28, 2006, Caracas, Venezuela. For background to this debate, see Yves Engler and Anthony Fenton, *Canada in Haiti: Waging War on the Poor Majority* (Vancouver: Fernwood, 2005) and Canada Haiti Action Network <CanadaHaitiAction.ca>.

¹¹² For the implications of this for a Marxist perspective on the Canadian state, see Paul Kellogg, "After Left Nationalism: The Future of Canadian Political Economy", *Marxism*, vol. 2 (2004), pp. 21-31; for the implications for feminism and multiculturalism, see Jo-Anne Lee and Linda Cardinal, "Hegemonic Nationalism and the Politics of Feminism and Multiculturalism in Canada", in *Painting the Maple: Essays*

on *Race, Gender and the Construction of Canada*, eds. Veronic Strong-Boag, Sherill Grace, Avigail Eisenberg and Joan Anderson (UBC Press: Vancouver, 1998), pp. 215-41.

¹¹³ See Daniel Drache and Duncan Cameron, eds., "Introduction" to *The Other MacDonald Report: The Consensus on Canada's Future that the MacDonald Commission Left Out* (Toronto: James Lorimer and Co., 1985), pp. ix-xxxix; Kari Levitt, *Silent Surrender: The Multinational Corporation in Canada* (Toronto: 1970); Robert Laxer, ed., *(Canada) Ltd.: The Political Economy of Dependency* (Toronto: 1973); Ian Lumsden, ed., *Close the 49th Parallel, etc.: The Americanization of Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970); Gary Teeple, ed., *Capitalism and the National Question in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972). For a summary and critique see Kellogg, "After Left Nationalism"; and "Kari Levitt and the Long Detour of Canadian Political Economy".

¹¹⁴ This argument has found expression in the Canadian Communist Party, the Waffle movement both inside and outside the NDP, and in the "sovereignty" debates presented in *Canadian Dimension* magazine. See A. Bakan and Philip Murton, "Origins of the International Socialists", *Marxism*, vol. 4 (2006): 55-65; James Laxer, *Red Diaper Baby: A Boyhood in the Age of McCarthyism* (Toronto: Douglas and McIntyre, 2004).

¹¹⁵ See for example, Philip Resnick, *The European Roots of Canadian Identity* (Peterborough: Broadview, 2005). Examples of works that have greatly advanced our understanding of the racist character of the Canadian state, some closer to a Marxist analysis than others, are extensive. Some notable authors include Yasmeen Abu-Laban, Joseph Mensah, Patricia Angus-Monture, Sedef Arat-Koc, Himani Banarji, Dionne Brand, Afua Cooper, Ena Dua, Christina Gabriel, Grace-Edward Galabuzi, Frances Henry, Audrey Kobayashi, Mostafa Koc, Bonita Lawrence, Peter Li, Sherene Razack, Daiva Stasiulis, Carol Tator and Robin Winks among many others.

¹¹⁶ Robert Chodos, *The Caribbean Connection* (Toronto: 1967), p.221. This is quoted in Harold Barratt, "West Indians in Canada", in Brian Douglas Tennyson, ed., *Canadian-Caribbean Relations: Aspects of a Relationship* (Sydney, N.S: Centre for International Studies, University College of Cape Breton), p.66

¹¹⁷ This connection is clearly traced in Stanley B. Ryerson, *Unequal Union: Confederation and the Roots of Conflict in the Canadas, 1815-1873*, (Toronto: Progress Books, 1983).

¹¹⁸ See for example, Maurice Cornforth, *Materialism and the Dialectical Method* (New York: International Publishers, 1953).

¹¹⁹ See Robert Miles, *Racism and Migrant Labour: A Critical Text* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982); "Marxism versus the 'Sociology of Race Relations'", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 7, 2 (1984): 217-37; *Capitalism and Unfree Labour: Anomaly or Necessity?* (London: Tavistock, 1987); "Beyond the 'Race' Concept : the Reproduction of Racism in England", in M. de Lepervanche and G. Bottomley, eds., *The Cultural Construction of Race* (Sydney: Sydney Association for Studies in Society and Culture, 1988).

¹²⁰ Miles, *Racism After "Race Relations"*, p. 104

¹²¹ Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy* (London: 1985). For critical responses, see Ellen Meiksins Wood, *The Retreat from Class* (London: 1986); *Democracy Against Capitalism: Renewing Historical Materialism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); and Alex Callinicos, *Against Postmodernism: A Marxist Critique* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990).

¹²² Chantal Mouffe, *The Return of the Political* (London: Verso, 1993, 2005), p. 13

¹²³ Himani Bannerji, *Thinking Through: Essays on Feminism, Marxism and Anti-Racism* (Toronto: Women's Press, 1995), pp. 72-3.