

The International Marxist-Humanist

Journal of the International Marxist-Humanist Organization

Summary: Current anti-immigrant sentiment and policies highlight the need to clarify our position as Marxist-Humanists on the dialectics of race and class. The courageous challenge to these policies presented among Women of Color demands that we think about extending Dunayevskaya's concept of "Black Masses as Vanguard" in the US to the contexts of today
- Editors

Marxist-Humanist Perspectives on Race, Gender and Immigration

Lilia D. Monzó

August 3, 2018



International Marxist-Humanist Organization
Email: arise@internationalmarxisthumanist.org
Web: www.imhojournal.org

Anti-immigrant policies and White nationalist narratives have taken on a strikingly cruel edge under the Trump administration. Many in the US and around the world were appalled at the cruelty of separating families and literally taking babies from their mothers and fathers and caging asylum seekers as punishment for coming to this country in search of safety and a life with dignity for themselves and their children. The treatment and intimidation that many of these asylum seekers have reported, being put in chains and being told they would never see their children again, is unbelievable. These are crimes against humanity made more heinous by the fact that people come to the US seeking refuge from poverty, violence, and wars which the US is highly implicated in creating and the fact that we deploy false narratives of US freedom and opportunity around the world, which pull people to our borders.

But this seems the most callous in a long list of policies aimed at preventing people of the non-western world from entering or staying in the US, some of which Trump has called “shit hole countries.” These include the promise to build a Mexican wall; massive numbers of deportations; limiting immigration to a merit-based system and elimination of family reunification programs; an end to programs for existing Haitian and Central American refugees; the end of a 1994 agreement on Cuban

immigration; and of course, the travel ban on Muslim majority countries which was recently upheld by the courts.

Even in the face of these and other attacks on People of Color, many people continue to support Trump and these policies on the grounds that “these people” pose a “threat” to “Americans” and “our way of life.” Trump has certainly garnered support among the White working class. This is a group that has experienced economic stagnation since neoliberal policies, coupled with conservative racist ideologies, facilitated opportunities for corporate greed to triumph outside our borders on the backs of cheap labor in the so-called “developing” world, leaving US unskilled labor without jobs.

Yet this is not the whole story. The blatant racism and xenophobia that we are experiencing and that has been purposely fueled by the Trump administration cannot be solely attributed to economic precarity. Many legislators, conservative commentators, corporate bosses and management, and other middle and upper class folks are also supporting Trump. The portrayal of poor working class Whites as the sole culprits of this racist attack on immigrants, refugees, and Muslims is a concerted strategy to downplay the role of racism and categorize it as a pragmatic and necessary strategy to “protect” those who are said to have a “right” to be here. Of course, this is an attempt to obfuscate a long history of White supremacy that dates back

to the time of so-called primitive accumulation and the dispossession of Native people's lands and resources through mass genocide, settler colonialism, American slavery, the encroachment and dependency of the Global South, and now mass incarceration and detention.

Invisible in the majority of discussions related to the economy, racism, genocide, and White supremacy is the role of women. Women are implicated in the continued development of capitalist production and White supremacy as socially appointed caretakers of the family unit, which supports the production of the next generation of workers and their labor power and the reproduction of capitalist ideologies and the antagonisms that support capitalism, including racism, sexism, and heteronormativity. Women are also highly commodified in numerous billion-dollar industries that enrich predominantly White men. But White women also benefit from the exploitation of People of Color, as well as the hyperexploitation of Women of Color in the US and across the world under global capitalism.

My goal in this presentation today is to provide a theoretical landscape with regard to the relationship of class, race, and gender as a way of explaining what we are seeing today manifested as a White nationalist movement that is engaging in a racial cleansing by attempting to limit entry into the US and pushing out those who are already here. I will start with the dialectical relationship between race and class and move

on to discuss how gender plays a part in the process. I will end with a discussion of what constitutes a Marxist-Humanist response to immigration and call for extending what Raya Dunayevskaya called “Black masses as vanguard” to the context of today.

So, What Is Behind These Policies Exactly and Who Benefits?

As Marxist-Humanists we recognize that class relations and the accumulation of capital are at the heart of or at least implicated in most domestic and global concerns.

While the anti-immigrant argument is that “they are taking our jobs,” or pose a national threat because they are “criminals and terrorists,” the evidence is clear that this is not the case. Research makes very clear that immigrants today, legal or undocumented, do not displace American workers or take their resources. Research shows that Mexican and other immigrants take jobs that Americans do not wish to do. Further, most Americans have high school diplomas and perceive these jobs to be beneath them. The jobs most immigrants take are often back-breaking work, that are seen as not worth the low wages, poor working conditions, danger of pesticides, or other conditions that threaten life and wellness.

While thousands are deported everyday presumably because they take “American jobs,” the US continues to maintain

guest worker programs under which workers are hired to come from across the world to fill jobs in the agricultural, construction, and other sectors of the economy because these jobs cannot be filled. In 2016, approximately 160,000 guest workers were hired through these guest worker programs and according to *Farmworker's Justice*, these guest worker programs are being planned for expansion.[i] In a similar vein, the fear of Muslim extremism has been strategically built up to support US policy toward the Middle East. In fact, in the US, White supremacists or neo-Nazis have committed over twice as many mass shootings that have resulted in twice as many deaths than jihadist groups.[ii] The reality is that immigrants pose little threat to our jobs or our safety.

Instead, the criminalization of immigrants and Muslim travelers provides a significant bonus to the billion-dollar prison and military industrial complexes. For example, according to Carson and Diaz's *Payoff: How Congress ensured private prison profit with an immigration detention quota*, CCA and GEO Group are two private prison companies that run jails and detention for immigrants have profited enormously in the past decade. Indeed, GEO group profits rose by 244% from 2007-2014.[iii] It has also been documented that GEO group spent \$350,000 on lobbying during the first quarter of 2017.[iv]

Yet, although corporations and their government allies are motivated by capital interests and the working class (including some People of Color) by economic necessity and fear, it is important to recognize that racism, xenophobia and White supremacy have been part and parcel of the fabric of American life since the founding of this nation and are deeply embedded in the politics of today.

To be sure, the overt belief that Whites are superior to People of Color may not be clearly articulated among all Whites. However, many White people maintain a deeply ingrained sense of privilege and ownership of this country that is rooted in an historical amnesia, wherein they conveniently forget that this nation was founded on genocidal wars waged against Native peoples to encroach and steal their lands, a fight that continues to this day. It is also shameful to claim that “America” was built by Whites when in fact it was founded on the slave trade economy and the brutally violent and dehumanizing forced labor of Black peoples. Of course, few recognize the significant role that Women of Color and Indigenous women have played in building America and they are, as elsewhere, relegated to an invisibility, which positioned them then and still today at the bottom of the working class hierarchy, making them the most exploited workforce in this country and alienated in multiple ways.

Today, many working class Whites are looking around at a society that is increasingly multicultural, where the Civil Rights movements of the 60s brought about significant social changes that allowed some People of Color to move into positions of power. These individuals are wondering if, without this multicultural society, those positions would have been available to Whites and their children. They argue that they are the new victims of discrimination. Although they reject any notion of having White privilege, they revile the loss or potential loss of these privileges that they perceive as natural rights.

Here we see that race and class work in tandem and play on each other to support a White supremacist capitalist class.

Race and Class – A Longstanding Debate

There is a long-standing debate about which comes first – race or class. This is a deeply felt debate within the left, which has alienated many racialized peoples from the Marxist tradition and Marxist organizations.[v] Indeed this is an issue that has come up on a number of occasions as points of heated contention within our own organization. With respect to the current xenophobic climate, this question manifests itself in numerous ways: Is the racism of today primarily a function of the economic downturn or job loss of the working middle classes? How do we respond to the very popular “identity politics” of today that, whether or not exploited by liberals to divide us further, has garnered

significant traction among People of Color? How do we engage with communities that come together without a clear class analysis but who are nonetheless critically important to building a Marxist-Humanist movement? How do we address the racialized fractures that exist among the left in a more fruitful way than to merely tell People of Color that we have to “get past it”? Thus, the issue of how we understand the relationship between race and class and what our position is as a Marxist-Humanist organization merits careful analysis and clarity.

Although we often think of capitalism as an economic system, Marx argued that the mode of production and our material conditions structure our social relations in ways that impact almost every aspect of our lives. This has led many to mistakenly assume a class reductionist position, meaning that other antagonisms are relegated to secondary importance and/or the notion that if we maintain a focus on class struggle then we can address other antagonisms once capitalism is brought down.

This classical interpretation stems from the idea, discussed in much Marxist literature, that Marx corrected Hegel and stood him upright. As the so-called Marxist argument goes, Hegel’s focus was on freedom as consciousness. Marx developed a historical materialist philosophy in which material reality – objective reality such as class and material conditions outside the self – were the base (materialism)

from which the superstructure (consciousness) was determined.[vi]

Raya Dunayevskaya critiqued this misrepresentation of Marx that fails to take into account his dialectical method and the humanism inherent in his entire project.[vii] Rather than simply turning Hegel “right side up”, Marx attempted to bring in the material along with Hegel’s notion of consciousness to explain existing conditions *dialectically*, recognizing that material conditions and consciousness were each an aspect of the other.[viii]

Following this dialectical reasoning, class relations function through a deeply discriminatory racialized hierarchy, which is used to justify inequalities and a White supremacy that exists both ideologically and materially.[ix] Class also functions through a gendered division of labor that is manifested materially in the types of work men and women do and in the value this work generates. Less discussed, there is also a clearly racialized division of labor, with People of Color overrepresented in blue-collar jobs. The gendered and racialized valorization of work translates into relations of domination and a stratified working class that fights among itself for limited resources, making it less likely that they may come together around shared interests to challenge the capitalist class.

Raya Dunayevskaya, taking serious note of Marx’s early humanist work in the *Economic and Philosophical*

Manuscripts of 1844, argued for a Marxist-Humanist interpretation that recognizes women's oppression, racism and other antagonisms as intricately connected to class and the maintenance of capitalism.[x] Further, she argued that Marx was not concerned merely with the eradication of class exploitation but with building a new humanism. Marx argued that capitalism distorts humanity and his goal was to create a society wherein we could develop a nature that was indeed a *human* nature. Marx points out that the degree to which we have become human can be measured by the extent to which gender relations are *human* relations. Although this meaning was lost in the original English translation because the word "mensch," which means "human" was translated as "man." The subsequent translation by Kevin Anderson in *Marx on Suicide* makes Marx's intent clearer. This translation of Marx reads:

"The direct, natural, necessary relationship of human being [*Mensch*] to human being is the *relationship of man* [*Mann*] *to woman* [*Weib*].... Therefore, on the basis of this relationship, we can judge the whole stage of development of the human being. From the character of this relationship it follows to what degree the *human being* has become and recognized himself or herself as a *species being*; a *human being*; the relationship of man to woman is the *most natural* relationship of human being to human being. Therefore, in it is revealed the degree to which the *natural* behavior of the

human being has become *human*... (see also Marx, *Selected Writings*, pp. 86-87 for the earlier translation).”[xi]

Although, in this passage we witness Marx’s heteronormative worldview – he was a man of his time -- the passage makes clear that Marx was at least as concerned with transforming gender relations as he was with the eradication of class. In a passage from *The German Ideology*, Marx and Engels describe the family as a microcosm of capitalist relations:

“The division of labour in which all these contradictions are implicit, and which in its turn is based on the natural division of labour in the family and the separation of society into individual families opposed to one another, simultaneously implies the distribution, and indeed the unequal distribution, both quantitative and qualitative, of labour and its products, hence property, the nucleus, the first form of which lies in the family, where wives and children are the slaves of the husband. This latent state of the family, though still very crude, is the first form of property, but even at this stage it corresponds perfectly to the definition of modern economists, who call it the power of disposing of the labour power of others. Division of labour and private property are, moreover, identical expressions: in the one the same thing is affirmed with reference to activity as is affirmed in the other with reference to the product of the activity.”[xii]

When Marx states that private property and the division of labor are identical expressions he is referring to the identical process of disposing of the labor power of others, which defines the individual in society, including the woman, solely as worker, as commodity, and in which both the labor and the product of labor turns on the individual and confronts her antagonistically to confine her as a slave. Here, we see Marx and Engels apply the concept of alienation to women in the family.

The bourgeois family is thus a context, perhaps the most fruitful context, for the reproduction of capitalist relations, including the production of the next generation of workers and their labor power as well as the reproduction of attitudes and values that support the maintenance of capitalism, including sexism, racism, and other antagonisms.

Clearly, then, Marx regarded the eradication of gendered relations of domination to be necessary, if not sufficient, to the development of an alternative to capitalism. By extension, then, relations of domination that are alienating to any peoples are implicated in capitalist production. So long as the oppression and exploitation of particular groups exist, any class struggle would be short lived, since it would retain the dehumanizing principle of relations of domination.

Thus, Marxist-Humanists understand that class struggle involves the struggle against all forms of oppression and exploitation and that, at times, these other struggles must

take precedence. Marx paved the way for this principle with his support of national and ethnic liberation movements. Indeed, Marx stated unequivocally, "Labor in the white skin can never free itself as long as labor in the black skin is branded."[xiii]

Although initially hopeful that the working class would unite against the horrors inflicted upon Black slaves in the South, the Serfs in Russia, and the Fenians in Ireland, he finally came to understand that racism and ethnic identity were very effective tools for dividing the working class and minimizing the threat of class struggle. In a letter to his friends Sigfrid Meyer and August Vogt written in 1870, Marx explains this division between the working class of England and Ireland:

“Every industrial and commercial center in England now possesses a working class divided into two camps, English proletarians and Irish proletarians. The English worker hates the Irish worker as a competitor who lowers his standard of life ... He regards himself as a member of the ruling nation, and consequently, he becomes a tool of the English aristocrats and capitalists against Ireland, thus strengthening their domination *over himself*. He cherishes religious, social, and national prejudices against the Irish worker. His attitude towards him is much the same as that of the “poor whites” to the Negroes in the former slave states of the U.S.A.”[xiv]

Marx continues:

“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 class maintains its power. And the latter is quite aware of this.”[xv]

Marx’s comments reflect the three important functions of racism beyond slavery – 1) to create an ideological ferment against People of Color that serves to justify inequality, 2) to minimize the value of a segment of the working class and drive down the wages of all workers, and 3) to divide the working class and thereby stunt the working class consciousness and unity necessary to bring down capitalism.

This has been evidenced also within the feminist movement, wherein White women have historically sided with their race interests, opting for an equal rights and workforce agenda that facilitated their own successes at the expense of the hyperexploitation of Indigenous women and Women of Color. This hyperexploitation is evident where many Indigenous women and Women of Color have become White women’s nannies and housekeepers, in each case facilitating the wealth and material conditions that have allowed middle class, mostly White women, to pursue higher education and careers without too much upset to their bourgeois families.

That developing class-consciousness among the working class is made difficult by racism and other antagonisms does not mean, however, that it cannot happen. There have been important cases in which labor has successfully organized across racial lines. One example often cited is that of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, which espoused egalitarianism among its union organizations in 1934-1935. Many of these took on civil rights issues and outright challenged White supremacy, including publicly opposing the KKK, committing to wage based equality, having integrated meetings and social events. However, some of these proved egalitarian only in so far as it was necessary to collectivize and protect White interests and later engaged practices to “lock out” Black workers from the better jobs.[xvi] Michael Goldfield has pointed out that the complexity in creating and sustaining racial equality among the unions at the time involved the racial make up of the leadership, racial attitudes of White leadership, racial make up of union membership, and the city’s broader societal context and race relations.[xvii]

There is no doubt that many White persons, today and in history, have challenged racism and worked with and alongside Indigenous peoples and People of Color to improve their living conditions. Yet, we can see across every sphere of life that our material conditions, as People of Color, still reflect a racism that is deeply rooted in the

American unconscious and that is manifested in education, housing, employment, health, politics, and the arts.

Indeed, although the development of race as a construct can be traced to American slavery, the prior existence of prejudice based on cultural differences cannot be ignored. Certainly, it was through a brutal and unforgivable violence and dispossession that the White man instituted the era of colonialism, settler colonialism, and American slavery that further spawned capitalism and established the White man as the capitalist class. Although, of course, not all White men became capitalists, a racial and gender stratification was created among the working class that clearly positions Indigenous peoples, People of Color, and women at the bottom of a stratified working class while the White working class retains race-based privileges.

Although accumulation was clearly at the heart of the colonial project, there is no denying that colonized peoples were treated with a ruthless barbarism that evidenced a xenophobic hatred of Indigenous peoples. Certainly, this had to do with the imperial belief in the superiority of their so-called “civilized” western culture and Christian doctrine. While the construct of race itself had not yet been developed the sense of Western White supremacy was already present.

Decolonial theorist Walter Mignolo argues that from the vantage point of the subaltern, any explanation of colonial expansion must focus on both *the Subjects that act* and *those*

that are acted upon. Deeds do not just happen in the abstract, rather they happen *to* and *by* a racially marked, gendered body that includes other characteristics located in a particular space and time.[xviii] This kind of explanation necessitates a dialectical approach that not only supports the explanatory power of capital accumulation, but also grasps the importance of the subjective positioning of the White man as Imperial being – superior to and conquering all – as well as the values and beliefs inherent to that positioning. However, this does not change the fact that such ideologies emerge out of conditions that have arisen from the mode of production and the desire of the capitalist class to maintain this system that they rule for their own benefit. Here, we see capitalism in dialectical relation to racism.

If we challenge the historical amnesia that prevails in American society, People of Color and Indigenous peoples have every reason not to trust White peoples, particularly because their position of power and wealth gives them the ability to limit our opportunities, education, employment, etc. Indeed, Peter Hudis has argued that although racism began as an economic construct it took on a life of its own, one that continues to embed every institution and most interactions.[xix] People engage in racist activities, even without any economic bearing, simply because they believe negative stereotypes about People of Color or see themselves as superior to them.

Thus, People of Color or other groups seek out social spaces that reflect our experiences of oppression and exploitation, our concerns and interests and where we can feel at ease and can be recognized as worthy and smart, something that we often don't experience among the dominant group. I am convinced that invalidating the needs of People of Color to connect through our experiences of oppression will ultimately mark us, as an organization, as being unconcerned with issues of race and out of touch with the realities of racism, and it will reinforce what I have found to be a pretty established belief among my friends and colleagues that Marxism is a White man's game.

There is no doubt that these experiences of oppression and marginalization have led to a postmodern age that highlights difference and identities as defining markers of how people understand and experience the world. These identities – race, gender, sex, sexuality, religion, etc. – often become the basis by which people connect. Yet, while the postmodern age brought with it an important challenge to positivism and opened paths for women and People of Color to articulate world views that challenged the White male lens as objective Truth, its further development toward a multiplicity of singular experiences and subjectivities that are made equally valid present a world of multiple realities that preclude any sense of shared interests.[xx] Here, collectivizing across difference is not only made unlikely

but also unnecessary as oppressive conditions exist only in so far as particular people perceive them. Of course, we must present a strong challenge to this usage of the concept, which is too individual-centered. Yet, to reject the existence of identities as critical markers of experience and political positioning when the oppressed are clamoring to find spaces of community where they can be in the words of Frantz Fanon, “seen,” is to claim an arrogance of “knowing” – and thus a western positioning - about that which only Persons of Color or other marginalized groups can have first-hand experience and felt responses.

I would argue that from a dialectical historical perspective we cannot simply go back to a time in which “identity politics” were not present. In fact, I would argue that a race identity politics went un-named because it prevailed unquestioned in the context of segregation. It is in the era of integration and the continued sense of marginalization and discrimination wherein diverse peoples have found traction in this notion of identity. Thus, rather than ignore or reject the validity of the concept of identity, we need to figure out how to work with it so that difference is recognized and valued while still maintaining a strong commitment to recognize our shared exploitation and alienation and to working together to pave a path to freedom.

Returning to the Issue of Immigration and the Current Crisis

I question how, as a society, we can legislate against people who merely want to find a place where they can work and provide for their families and where their children can grow healthy and get an education. What makes us as Americans more worthy than anyone else? Immigrants and refugees, authorized or unauthorized, are all people too.

A Marxist-Humanist approach is one that recognizes the inherent right of every people to labor, to feed themselves and their families, to live with dignity, and to be free. We must be in support of those who seek refuge in this or any nation and to challenge any state that would deny these rights to any people. In the long term our goal would be to eradicate borders altogether – land is not a commodity to be bought or sold but a sacred aspect of our human nature and we, as humans, are also a part of nature. In the short term we must be ready to support all people's rights to dignity, life, work, and self-determination. We must also be wary of hypocrisy. As a settler nation, we have to recognize our own complicity living in stolen lands and support the rights of Indigenous peoples but also to recognize the human right of every person to do what they must to survive and support their children.

Women of Color as Vanguard

As a Marxist-Humanist organization one of the more pressing issues we face is reaching out to the masses. Toward this goal, it is imperative that we consider the

dialectic and recognize how the various antagonisms work in tandem with class to maintain systems of domination and capitalism. In light of *who* is leading the fights against *what*, we have to consider what Peter Hudis has previously noted, that a focus on class is not going to draw in the most likely revolutionary Subjects and that it may take a race-first struggle to galvanize communities to stand up together.^[xxi] As evident in the example of the Black Panther Party, a race-first struggle will undoubtedly develop into a class struggle since racial justice cannot be achieved within capitalism, especially if we as Marxist-Humanists engage in these struggles to share our perspectives. Joining movements that are fighting for their interests challenges the stereotype of class reductionism and intellectual elitism and gives us a voice that will reach larger numbers. Perhaps, more importantly, it will give us the opportunity to learn *from them* – the people who are actually living out the daily realities of hyperexploitation and alienation – and in this way build an organization that will one day be taken up and led by the oppressed.

Attacks on immigration brings together documented and undocumented immigrant communities, political and environmental refugees and asylum seekers, and guest workers from around the world, including Mexico and Central America, Latin America, Asia, Africa and the Middle East. They find common interests around human

rights, labor rights, language rights, access to education, and family reunification, and in the struggle against deportation, racism, and the hyperexploitation of women in their communities. They also bring ties to international concerns in their respective countries of origin. Here, we see the concept of multiple identities and intersections actually working *for* us.

In *American Civilization on Trial: Black Masses as Vanguard*, Raya Dunayevskaya noted that a historical analysis of US uprisings revealed the Black masses as having particular “revolutionary reason and force” and noted the strong commitment of Black women. Of course, the Black liberation movement remains a strong force to be reckoned with, still leading the people to social change and inspiring other social movements in this generation with Black Lives Matter, as they did in the Civil Rights Movements of the 60s and prior to that during abolition.

Yet, we cannot discount the revolutionary reason and force of other groups that are clearly growing in strength and numbers. The Latinx community, and Latinx women especially, are certainly leading the way in cities like Los Angeles. We have also seen that the heart-breaking scenes of young children torn from their families and the criminal treatment they have received for seeking refuge in our country has brought out people across multiple sectors to

support massive demonstrations and numerous women's groups to publicly denounce this devastating injustice.

Indeed, immigration has been proclaimed a "feminist issue," since women comprise three quarters of all people migrating to the US each year. Numerous women's groups, including the National Domestic Workers Alliance, the National Asian Pacific American Women Forum, Black Lives Matter, and the National Organization for Women have joined forces to keep families together and fight deportations.

While most of these groups are not explicitly anti-capitalist and seek immediate changes to create better conditions within the existing capitalist system we must keep in mind that our goal is not to work only with those who are already Marxist-Humanists or socialists but to expand our organization, provide political education, and build a larger movement from the ground up.

Engagement in any social movement helps to develop revolutionary potential. It is in the process of struggle that theoretical understandings are sharpened and commitment and solidarity develop. The struggles for migrant rights, anti-racism, and women's rights will undoubtedly lead us back to the class struggle since these rights cannot be secured within capitalism. We must remember that revolutionaries are not born but made.

[i] Farmworker Justice, Guestworker Programs, <https://www.farmworkerjustice.org/advocacy-and-programs/guestworker-programs>

[ii] Scott Shane, Homegrown Extremists Tied to Deadlier Toll Than Jihadists in U.S. Since 9/11, *The New York Times*, June 24, 2015, <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/25/us/tally-of-attacks-in-us-challenges-perceptions-of-top-terror-threat.html>

[iii] Bethany Carson and Eleana Diaz, *Payoff: How Congress Ensures Private Prison Profits with an Immigrant Detention Quota. Grassroots Leadership*, April 2015, http://grassrootsleadership.org/sites/default/files/reports/quot_a_report_final_digital.pdf

[iv] Mike Ludwig, Private Prisons and Border Security Contractors Lobby Congress over Trump's Border Wall. *Truthout*, April 25, 2017, <https://truthout.org/articles/private-prison-and-border-security-contractors-lobby-congress-over-trump-s-border-wall/>

[v] Gregory Meyerson, Rethinking Black Marxism: Reflections on Cedric Robinson and Others. *Cultural Logic: An Electronic Journal of Marxist Theory* 3, no. 2. (2001), <https://clogic.eserver.org/gregory-meyerson-rethinking-black-marxism-reflections-cedric-robinson-and-others-0>

[vi] Jose Porfirio Miranda, *Marx Against the Marxists*, Orbis Books, 1980.

[vii] Raya Dunayevskaya, *Marxism and Freedom*, Humanity Books, 2000.

[viii] Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *The German Ideology*. Prometheus Books, 1998.

[ix] Lilia D. Monzó, *A Revolutionary Subject: Pedagogy of Women of Color and Indigeneity*, Peter Lang, in press.

[x] Raya Dunayevskaya, *Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution*, University of Illinois Press, 1991.

[xi] Kevin Anderson, introduction, *Marx on Suicide*, ed. Anderson and Plaut, Northwestern University Press, 1999.

[xii] Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *The German Ideology*. Prometheus Books, 1998: 51–52.

[xiii] Karl Marx, *Karl Marx: On America and the Civil War*, McGraw-Hill, 1972: 275

[xiv] Karl Marx, Letter to Sigfrid Meyer and August Vogt, para 12,
https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1870/letters/70_04_09.htm

[xv] Ibid., para. 13.

[xvi] Michael Goldfield, Race and the CIO, *International Labor and Working Class History* 44 (1993): 1-32.

[xvii] Ibid.

[xviii] Walter Mignolo, Epistemic Disobedience, Independent Thought and Decolonial Freedom, *Theory, Culture & Society* 26, no. 7-8 (2009): 1–23.

[xix] Peter Hudis, Presentation at the public meeting of the International Marxist-Humanist Organization – Los Angeles, March 11, 2018.

[xx] Lilia D. Monzó and Peter McLaren. The Future is Marx: Bringing Back Class and Changing the World – A Moral Imperative, In M.Y. Eryaman & B. Bruce (Eds.), *International Handbook of Progressive Education* (pp. 643-670), Peter Lang, 2015.

[xxi] Peter Hudis, Presentation in IMHO-LA.