

*One cannot have revolutionary politics unless they've already recognized that "now" is the time to prepare for armed struggle: "preparing" means "now."*



# ***ON REVOLUTIONARY POLITICS***

by

**Mbili**

**Shanna**



In order to win we've got to destroy the prestige of the oppressor in our own minds, and we've got to have an adequate defensive/offensive apparatus. Revolutionary violence is an instrument of People's Justice.

Revolutionary violence is both a means of destroying the sense of legitimacy we hold towards the enemy, and of showing ourselves that we can govern and protect ourselves--and it's the best means of assuring that the enemy gives us enough room to do so.

Originally published in *Notes from an Afrikan P.O.W. Journal*  
*book two: We Still Charge Genocide*

Cover art from the 1978 Liberation Calendar, published by  
the New Afrikan Prisoners Organization (NAPO)

1949, what We saw in China was **REVOLUTIONARY NATIONALISM**. The difference between the “democratic revolution of the old type” and “the **NEW** democratic revolution of the special type,” was really the difference between the old-type bourgeois-democratic nationalism, and the new-type revolutionary nationalism. Mao was pointing out the effect that the rise of imperialism had on national revolutions—on the revolutions carried out by nations oppressed by imperialism. Colonialism.

The new “two stage” revolution, of moving from “democratic revolution of the new type” to the socialist revolution, was the same as our move from national liberation to the building of socialism.

Build to Win!

Mbili Shanna  
2/10–12/1978  
Stateville  
Koncentration  
Kamp

The more moving We do, the more clear our own particular path becomes. It’s also easier to see which of the contributions of others **ARE** exportable; to be able to incorporate other models of practice and theory which We can utilize. Also, to see which ones become ours “of their own accord,” because of the similarity of concrete conditions here and other places.

More than Russia, China, Vietnam or Mozambique, things here have a great potential for becoming similar to places like Cuba or Brazil. Places where the political and military are combined, and where the urban area was the center of action. Where the societies were more industrialized, more technologically developed, and where the masses are much more influenced by the ideas flowing thru the state-controlled media, and more bound by the attitudes which promote and sustain in power those who rule.

When that point is reached in one’s struggle where the necessity of using arms is seen, that is where revolutionary politics begins to define the level that the struggle has reached.

Inherently, revolutionary politics includes violence.

One cannot have revolutionary politics unless they’ve already recognized that “now” is the time to prepare for armed struggle: “preparing” means “now.” So long as you say “We’re exhausting remedies,” you do not yet practice revolutionary politics.

Revolutionary politics is simultaneously “political” and “military.” In revolutionary politics, there is **NO** separation between the political and the military. You cannot “build politically” in revolutionary politics, without at the very same instant “building militarily” as well. If one hand is around the pamphlet, the other must be around the weapon.

In revolutionary politics, you do not talk about “building the underground later”; you don’t say “it’s not time” or, “it’s not possible” to build the army. Revolutionary politics are **PRECISELY** underground politics. If We agree that real revolution is still outlawed in amerikkka, then those who practice true revolutionary politics must be outlaws.

\*\*\*\*\*

“Without armed struggle, there is no well-defined vanguard. And wherever armed struggle against oppression does not exist, the reason is because there is no political vanguard.”

But it works both ways—at once. Political and military both at the same time, under the coordination of one centralized body.

“Because it is a mass struggle...in order to win militarily it must politically assemble around it the majority of the people.”

“Revolutionary politics, if they are not to be blocked, must be diverted from politics as such. Political resources must be thrown into an organization which is simultaneously political

advances and many retreats on our part.

The revolution didn’t start with Robert Williams, RAM, the BPP or the BLA. The revolution was/is not confined to 1968–1970—and it hasn’t “failed.” We’ve simply lost the initiative, the enemy launched a new offensive, and broke thru our lines.

\*\*\*\*\*

A **colonized** people do not wage a “democratic revolution.” Really. China’s experience added to scientific revolutionary theory because they offered lessons for people under semi-feudal, semi-colonial conditions. China also gave the lesson that hers—China’s—was a **NEW** “democratic revolution,” and what went toward distinguishing the **NEW** from the “old-type” democratic revolution, was that the new-type democratic revolution was not about democratic rights. It was resolutely opposed to imperialism.

For the Chinese, the “democratic revolution” was completed when the people seized state power.

What was happening in China was that the “democratic revolution” **WAS** the national liberation revolution. China **ACHIEVED** national independence in 1949, and then began the socialist revolution. Afrikans in amerikkka are waging a national liberation revolution that We tend to sometimes call a “democratic revolution.”

During the Chinese “democratic revolution” of pre-

The peaceful means have already been exhausted. The real problem and issue is having enough people accept what's already a reality. Even the so-called vanguard.

We be talking about “when the means is exhausted, and the man is forced to vamp on us, cause We show that his promise is empty and that there is no other way.” Then We move from “demo rev.” to “national lib.”

The fact is, We have already been vamped on. We are being vamped on right now.

The enemy was forced to vamp when he raided the village, when he went to sleep on the ship, turned his back on the plantation. He vamped in 1877, in 1910, in 1919 and 1948. The enemy vamped on us in 1970. He killed Nat, Malik, George and Randy Evans after We showed that his promise was empty. We heightened the contradictions in Attica, before that in Watts and Detroit and Chicago. The contradictions was heightened in Jackson, Mississippi.

The people showed that they understood there was no other way when they took over the Amistad and put poison in the massa's food, destroyed his crops, burned his barn, and took off for the swamps and mountains, and followed the north star.

The peaceful means have already been exhausted. We are 300 years too late to **START** a war. The only question is how to **WIN** the war. How do We move from this point in what has simply been a **LONG WAR**, with many reverses, many

and military, transcending all existing polemics.”

If the enemy allows us to hold meetings out in the open, it's not because “the conditions ain't ripe,” but simply because We ain't prepared for and otherwise taken advantage of the existing ripe conditions.

If the military thrusts of a few years ago “failed,” it was because no political vanguard existed (or endured), and that no political support was given to the military front. It makes no difference whether We were among those hunted by the pigs, or among those able to hold open meetings, read poems and be poets-in-residence, build the Shule's, celebrate Kwanza in the store fronts, print the papers and pamphlets—if the military thrusts did “fail,” it was because no political vanguard existed. If they failed, it was because neither the BPP, the BLA, APP, nor any other set of alphabets were practicing revolutionary politics.

In revolutionary politics, the “political” folks **SUPPORT** the “military” folks, and vice versa. Revolutionary politics is where the political complements the military, and the military complements the political. But there is really no difference between them, because revolutionary politics is military politics—and a revolutionary military is a political military.

Whoever claims to be a political vanguard must prove themselves to be a military vanguard. Whoever claims to be a military vanguard, must prove themselves to be a political vanguard.

Folks who consider themselves “political” must begin to at least reconsider their positions on the “timelines” of organized revolutionary violence; people who consider themselves “military” must begin to understand that We cannot win, We cannot even present a truly serious threat, if We cannot **ENDURE**. And, We cannot **ENDURE**, unless there is “a long period of preparation, intensive organizational work to set up an efficient, reliable machinery which will not only generate the atmosphere for armed struggle...but will also guarantee their logistic, communication, survival programs and propaganda network.”

The atmosphere for armed struggle must be “created.” We begin the creation by realizing that “all other remedies” have already been exhausted, and the task remains for the vanguard to act on this fact. It’s the duty of the vanguard to convince the people that there already is no other alternative, and win them over to an acceptance of real revolutionary struggle, which by law means employing organized revolutionary violence on a strategical level.

The atmosphere is created by the vanguard—which is simultaneously “political” and “military”—**IF** it’s a true revolutionary vanguard.

We misunderstand the revolutionary aspect of the “democratic revolution” if We seek to pursue so-called democratic rights, rather than discredit the entire process. We cannot undermine the system of the enemy if We continue to ask for better medical care, rather than begin providing our own. We discredit the enemy, and We demonstrate that

all remedies have been exhausted, by building our own “State apparatus.” You don’t argue over busing, you present a challenge for actual control of the schools. (We beef about not having workers/cadre, and not having places to meet, when every other block has a school that closes its doors at 3:30. The schools are full of rooms and blackboards, auditoriums—plenty of room to open the schools at night and use them to agitate, educate, and organize.) You don’t take the landlord to court, you present a challenge thru assuming ownership of the property. Hold a People’s Court. When you go to organize a tenant’s union, lead them not “downtown,” but to a belief that they have the right and the need to ignore “downtown” altogether; that they can discuss the situation, hear opinions, and decide among themselves to take total responsibility for the places they live in, and that they can assume ownership of that and all other property now in the hands of those who rule.

And when the landlord and the enemy courts send the sheriff and the city pigs, the People’s Court will rely on its Armed Front. And the Armed Front will rely on the people. The Armed Front ain’t nothing but the people in arms.

“Well, the people ain’t ready for that.” Bullshit! The people is always ready, always been ready—but their leadership ain’t. Even if it was a question of the people “not being ready,” the responsibility rests with the so-called vanguard to make them ready, to take advantage of the conditions that already exist, and to create the ones that don’t.