

# “Defend the Ghetto”: Space and the Urban Politics of the Black Panther Party

James A. Tyner

*Department of Geography, Kent State University*

Founded in 1966 by Huey Newton and Bobby Seale as a grassroots organization, the Black Panther Party achieved national and international prominence through their local activities and global ideas. By employing the concepts of spaces of dependency and spaces of engagement, I detail the spatial transformations associated with the evolving political thought of the Black Panther Party. I chart how the four “moments” of the Black Panther Party’s doctrine (black nationalism, revolutionary nationalism, revolutionary internationalism, and intercommunalism) are geographically contingent, and argue that these four moments demonstrate, both ideologically and materially, how space matters within the political thought of black radical intellectuals. Despite considerable work within geography in articulating alternative conceptions of race and racism, serious lacunae remain. The concepts associated with black separatism, black radical thought, and, crucially, the Black Power Movement have received minimal attention in the geographic literature. And yet fundamental geographic concepts, including territoriality and scalar politics, are key components of black separatism and black power. I argue that a case study of the Black Panther Party provides insights into the fundamental questions of social justice and public space.

*Key Words:* Black Panther Party, scalar politics, territoriality.

Writing in 1971, Bobby Seale, cofounder of the Black Panther Party, explained: “when I met Huey P. Newton, the experience of things I’d seen in the black community—killings that I’d witnessed, black people killing each other—and my own experience, just living, trying to make it, trying to do things, came to the surface” (Seale 1991, 12). Seale identified an immediate dimension to spatial struggles for social justice, that his motivation behind the demands for social change were grounded on personal experiences and observations. The history of Seale, Newton, and the Black Panther Party is that of a grassroots organization initiated by two young college students attempting to understand the poverty and violence that characterized their communities. The Black Panther Party articulates crucial alternative spatial conceptions of urban politics and the quest for social justice. This article bridges four main areas of inquiry: radical black thought (Boyd 1998; Dawson 2001; Joseph 2001; Tyner 2003; Tyner and Kruse 2004); territoriality (Sack 1983, 1986; Storey 2001; Cox 2002); scalar politics (Swyngedouw 1997; Cox 1998; Marston 2000); and the contestation of public space (Mitchell 1996a, 1996b, 2003; Domosh 1998; McCann 1999).

Within geography and certain other social sciences, the concepts and movements associated with black separatism and black power have received little attention (Hall 1977; Joseph 2001). This lacunae speaks to a larger neglect of the political and theoretical contribu-

tions of radical black activists (Boyd 1998; Bogues 2003). The Black Panther Party, and the Black Power Movement in general, were not, however, solely focused on separatism as an end point. Indeed, the geographic strategies employed by the Black Panther Party were contextually specific. This observation challenges a dominant misunderstanding of the Black Panther Party as radical militants bent only on the establishment of a separate black community.

In part these gaps are the result of misunderstandings perpetuated both in academia and in the media. For example, in history textbooks, college classrooms, films, and popular celebration, African American protest movements in the North appear as ancillary and subsequent to the “real” movement in the South (Theoharis 2003, 2). Northern, urban-based black radical activities, moreover, have been perceived as disorganized and uncoordinated, and as facades for criminal activities. As Theoharis (2003, 11) contends, however, these “struggles were not anarchic, spontaneous outpourings of anger but well-organized social protest.” Self (2003, 94) likewise observes that it is customary now to see “Northern and Pacific Coast cities not as places where civil rights organizing stalled or failed but as places where the postwar black freedom movement took unique forms and trajectories, where African American politics overlapped with the racialized logic of urban industrial and postindustrial capitalism, and where a dynamic black political culture nurtured multiple strat-

egies and ideologies of resistance, accommodation, and liberation.”

The Black Power Movement is also portrayed by some as the “evil twin” that wrecked the Civil Rights Movement (see Theoharis 2003), sparking a reticence to consider the Black Power Movement given the prevailing negative association of violence with political radicalism. We should mind Mitchell’s (2003, 5) argument, however, that spatial struggles, especially those that represent the only way that social justice can be advanced, are “never without danger of violence” and that how this “potential for violence is policed, encapsulated in law, sublimated in design, or turned toward either regressive or progressive ends makes all the difference in the world.” The fact that the Black Power Movement advocated violence—or more properly, did not forward nonviolence as a strategy—hardly justifies academic silence. Moreover, a simple “North/South” dichotomy of the Civil Rights Movement, frequently personified as a contrast between Martin Luther King Jr. and Malcolm X, fails to convey adequately the geographic contingency of the many and varied strategies employed by activists.

While not imparting too much of a dichotomy, the different spatial expressions of the overall Civil Rights Movement must be better acknowledged. In northern and western cities, for example, *de facto* rather than *de jure* segregation was largely the norm. One might argue that without legally prescribed racialized spaces, the contestation for African American social justice was spatially more ambiguous. Therefore, whereas many of the southern-based civil rights campaigns were predicated on integration (e.g., the lunch counter sit-ins, school desegregation), a prime focus articulated by Malcolm X, and later by the Black Panther Party, was a control of their own communities rather than integration into white communities. Theirs was a very different geographical understanding of the Civil Rights Movement, one based on separation; power within one’s own community was paramount. Although a geographic engagement with black separatism and radical black thought remains minimal, geographers have considered other examples of separatism (see also Wilson 2000). For example, many groups have sought to separate themselves and their territories from the governing state as a means of defending their separate identities. Such studies document the importance of territory and territoriality, which are key components of the Black Power Movement (see also Tyner 2004).

The work of Robert Sack, Kevin Cox, David Storey, and others has highlighted the multifaceted context of territoriality. In particular, the study of territoriality has

been invigorated with recent discussions of scalar politics. Cox (1998, 2), for example, questioned the conceptions of “fixed” scales, such as local, regional, or global, as terms that speak of “closed spaces defining a set of enclosures each with their own politics: local politics within the territorial bounds of local governments, national politics within those of the nation state.” He asked: “is it defensible to conceptualize the scales of activity so constructed in areal terms?” Marston (2000, 220) raised similar concerns, arguing that “scale is not necessarily a preordained hierarchical framework for ordering the world—local, regional, national and global. It is instead a contingent outcome of the tensions that exist between structural forces and the practices of human agents.”

That the scaled territorial politics of the Black Power Movement were (and are) played out largely in public space provides the motivation for my fourth area of inquiry. The concept of urban public spaces—of streets, parking lots, shopping malls, and parks—pervades numerous discussions in geography, planning, and related disciplines (McCann 1999, 167). Often inspired by the writings of Henri Lefebvre, these studies have attempted to gain insight into the contestation of public spaces and the “right” to the city. Indeed, as Lefebvre (2003, 19) suggests, revolutionary events generally take place in the street. The street serves as a meeting place, a spontaneous theater characterized by disorder: “All the elements of urban life, which are fixed and redundant elsewhere, are free to fill the streets and through the streets flow to the centers, where they meet and interact, torn from their fixed abode” (Lefebvre 2003, 18–19). The streets are simultaneously contested, regulated, and resisted. Movement and interaction are “both obligatory and repressed.”

The purpose of this article, therefore, is to examine the scalar territorial politics of the Black Panther Party as manifested in public space. Drawing insight from Cox’s dualism of “spaces of dependence” and “spaces of engagement” (Cox 1998), I consider how territoriality is invoked in the discursive and material practices of the Black Panther Party. Cox’s approach recognizes local politics as embedded in processes occurring at higher and lower levels of abstraction and reality. A case study of the Black Panther Party as such provides insight into the fundamental questions of social justice and public space. I follow the lead of Mitchell (2003, 4) in asking: “Who has the right to the city and its public spaces? How is that right determined—both in law and on the streets themselves? And how does that right—limited as it usually is, contested as it must be—give form to social justice in the city?”

## Territoriality and Black Separatism

The sustained interest in concepts of territory and territoriality (Sack 1983, 1986; Cox 2002; Storey 2001) provides a good opportunity to consider the geographies of black separatism, particularly those espoused by participants labeled under the rubric of the Black Power Movement. Territory and territoriality are defining concepts of political geography in that they bring together the ideas of power and space: territories as spaces that are defended, contested, claimed against the claims of others through territoriality (Cox 2002, 1). Black separatism is predicated on territoriality. Our understanding of black separatism, territoriality, and indeed the emergence of black nationalism has been hamstrung, however, by myopic concepts of assimilation and integration, as geographers have not adequately addressed the nuances that differentiate separation and segregation, a distinction that is critical for understanding the alternative geographies espoused by disenfranchised and marginalized groups. Assimilation and integration are seen by many such groups as disciplinary techniques by which dominant groups exert their power over others.

There is no single theory or movement called “Black Separatism.” Rather, various organizations and social movements have advocated historically some form of territory-based separation. Some movements demanded a separate “territory” or “nation-state” in the United States. The Forty-Ninth State Movement, for example, founded in 1934, forwarded the idea of establishing a “49<sup>th</sup>” state in the United States for African Americans. Other movements encouraged and/or facilitated African Americans to return to Africa. Perhaps the best-known “Back-to-Africa” campaign was that of Marcus Garvey, who proposed the formation of a strong African state that would serve as home to members of the African diaspora. Also, Paul Cuffee founded the American Colonization Society in 1816, a movement associated with the establishment of Liberia in 1822 as an African “homeland” for manumitted slaves and “free blacks.” Aside from these schemes were local movements, including attempts to found black-controlled communities within the United States. In 1879, for example, “Pap” Singleton, known colloquially as the “Black Moses,” led an exodus of Southern blacks to Kansas.

Despite the diversity of separatist movements, some core concepts are identifiable. Black separatism is geared not only to eliminate black oppression, but also to enhance black culture and black lifestyles (Hall 1977). In this way, separatist movements are as much cultural movements as they are political and economic. Claude McKay, Langston Hughes, and other black artists and

intellectuals wrote and spoke about the African homelands, which, according to Hall (1977, 6), while not necessarily expressions of separatism per se, were indications that “Africa” no longer had the same kind of negative pejorative meanings for blacks as it did for whites. Separatist movements were, and are, also socio-spatial critiques of racist institutions. In other words, a physical separation may not always be the intended goal. Separatist activities may coexist in “integrated” neighborhoods, for example.

Although these movements remained part of the American landscape throughout the antebellum and postbellum periods, Hall (1977, 5) documents that black separatism, through whatever medium, was a reaction by relatively few individuals. At the beginning of the twentieth century, however, there emerged a transformation of black nationalism and, consequently, black separatism. The urban growth of black communities was a catalyst for this transformation.

Woodard (1999, 23) claims that the early twentieth century was marked by “increasing class formation, rapid urbanization, unprecedented ghetto formation, and anti-colonial unrest.” Moreover, he argues (1999, 6) that as blacks migrated to the North, they were not absorbed into white America; instead they developed a distinct national culture and consciousness. Black ghetto formation generated a new black ethos and contributed to an unprecedented degree of black nationalism in the urban areas. Nevertheless, black separatism remained limited to locally oriented small-scale group efforts in large metropolitan areas during the 1940s and 1950s. This pattern would change though with the rapid growth of the Nation of Islam and especially the orations of Malcolm X.

The Nation of Islam<sup>1</sup> was founded in the 1930s by Wallace Fard. Coming from an economically depressed area of Detroit, Michigan, Fard began preaching to black working-class citizens. Known as the Prophet, he proclaimed that Christianity was a European religion that oppressed blacks. In its place, Fard espoused an unorthodox form of Islam. An early devotee to Fard’s movement was Elijah Poole, a migrant from rural Georgia. Poole, who changed his name to Elijah Muhammad, became the spiritual leader of the Nation after Fard mysteriously disappeared in 1934; he controlled the movement until his death in 1975. It was the activities of Malcolm X, though, that catapulted the Nation of Islam into national prominence and subsequently spurred an intensification of black separatism (see Sales 1994; DeCaro 1998; Natambu 2002).

Malcolm X was born on 19 May 1925 in Omaha, Nebraska.<sup>2</sup> He was the fourth child of his mother, Louise Norton, who was an immigrant from Grenada, and the

seventh child of his father, Earl Little, a reverend and native of Reynolds, Georgia. Both of Malcolm's parents were active in Marcus Garvey's Universal Negro Improvement Association, a fact that certainly influenced the political thinking of Malcolm in his later years. As a civil rights' activist, Malcolm X's adamant stance against integration and his demands for separation resonated strongly in the urban communities of New York, Boston, and Detroit. Moreover, these ideas forcefully expounded not so much those of Elijah Muhammad and the Nation of Islam but Malcolm X's own political ideologies (see Tyner 2003; Tyner and Kruse 2004). As discussed below, the writings of Malcolm X provided a catalyst for the territorial claims of the Black Power Movement, and especially the Black Panther Party, of the 1960s and 1970s.

### Placing the Black Panther Party

The Civil Rights Movement was profoundly local. Many of the northern struggles of the Civil Rights Movement, for example, were urban-based; accordingly, housing and public services became crucial sites of struggle in cities, somewhat different battlegrounds than in the southern states (Theoharis 2003, 9). In the north, activists were largely fighting *de facto* segregation as manifested in discriminatory housing and educational policies (Back 2003; Theoharis 2003). Different targets, however, require different techniques. Southern-based strategies not infrequently were inadequate or misplaced in confronting prejudicial *de facto* policies such as gerrymandering and school site selection. As Jones and Jeffries (1998, 25) write, by 1966 "it was clear that the traditional civil rights organizations were unable to alter the systemic forces that adversely impacted the lives of African American people, particularly in the northern urban settings."

Black communities in the North, far from being in disarray and plagued by dysfunction, waged a protracted fight for justice and equity but constantly had to contend with theories and policies that blamed them for their condition (Theoharis 2003, 7). Theoharis explains that rural, southern African Americans were seen as emblematic of long-suffering struggles, whereas the urban-based African Americans were portrayed—in the media, in academia—as pathological. She contends, for example, that "the activism of welfare mothers disappears from view because they cannot hold [a] place of American hero and symbol of national progress."

Many urban-based movements, moreover, were led by college-educated African Americans who grew up in northern and western ghettos. Woodard (1999), for ex-

ample, writes of an "emerging black intelligentsia," and Elbaum (2002, 28) documents that a "host of new Black student organizations . . . emerged on campus, and hybrid combinations of nationalism and socialism became a powerful ideological force among Black college students." Significantly, these student-led movements of women and men transformed the urban politics of the Civil Rights Movement. The Black Panther Party was one such movement, and Bobby Seale and Huey Newton, cofounders of the Black Panther Party, should be viewed as grassroots activists who achieved national and international prominence through their local activities.

Originally named the Black Panther Party for Self-Defense, the Party was founded in 1966. As described by Seale (1991, 78), "Huey and I sat there . . . and began a revolutionary party, knowing that the program was not just something we had thought up." Rather, Newton and Seale viewed their program as a continuation of earlier African American movements that grappled with oppression and exploitation. In October 1966, Newton (as the Party's Minister of Defense and theoretician) and Seale (as Party Chairman) specified the ten-point Platform and Program of the Black Panther Party. Demands included freedom; full employment for blacks; an end to capitalist exploitation of the black community; decent housing; education, including African-American-based education; exemption from military service; an end to police brutality; freedom for black prisoners; fair representation in trials; and, ultimately, "land, bread, housing, education, clothing, justice, and peace" (see Newton 2002, 55–56). As Newton (2002, 249) would later explain, "Once 'emancipated', U.S. blacks—who were neither owners nor workers in the Marxist sense of the terms—were shoved into ghettos, where they were given neither reparations for years of institutional chattel slavery nor employment in the new industrial state." Seale (1991, 78) effectively summed up their attitudes: "The Platform and Program is nothing more than the 400-year-old crying demands of us Black Americans."

The Black Panther Party envisioned itself as a "vanguard" of the people; however, their educational campaigns were locally derived and experientially grounded. Following the lead of Malcolm X (see Tyner 2003), Newton and Seale encouraged people to assess their own experiences and to develop plans accordingly. Seale (1991, 82) explained, "I think people, especially white people, have to come to understand that the language of the ghetto is a language of its own and as the party—whose members for the most part come from the ghetto—seeks to talk to the people, it must speak the people's language." Newton followed a similar line of thought, although he argued that cultural discourses

were insufficient in fostering structural change. Addressing the imbrications of politics and culture, Newton explained (quoted in Foner 1995, 50):

The Black Panther Party, which is a revolutionary group of black people, realizes that we have to have an identity. We have to realize our black heritage in order to give us strength to move and progress. But as far as returning to the old African culture, it's unnecessary and it's not advantageous in many respects. We believe that culture itself will not liberate us.

The Black Panther Party, therefore, did not emerge as a cultural nationalist group, nor a variant of Pan-Africanism; rather, the Party was a founded initially as a grassroots organization formed to address local concerns. Consequently, the Black Panther Party was generally more receptive to forming alliances with other nonblack groups and organizations. It formed coalitions (Jones and Jeffries 1998, 31–32), for example, with the Peace and Freedom Party and the White Panther Party (a college-student-based radical organization with headquarters in Ann Arbor, Michigan); it worked with the Brown Berets (a Chicano leftist organization in southern California), the Young Lords (a Puerto Rican group in Chicago and New York), and the Red Guard Party (a Chinese-American revolutionary group located in the Oakland Bay area). The Party also established connections with both the women's liberation and gay liberation movements (Jones and Jeffries 1998).<sup>3</sup>

Ideologically, the Black Panther Party drew inspiration from a variety of sources. Newton and Seale were informed by the writings of Frantz Fanon, Mao Zedong, and Ernesto Guevara largely because they “saw them as kinsmen. . . . We believed it was necessary to know how they gained their freedom in order to go about getting ours” (Newton 2002, 50). It was critical, however, for these political ideologies to be adapted to the particularities of the urban-based black communities. Newton (2002, 50) wrote that “we did not want merely to import ideas and strategies; we had to transform what we learned into principles and methods acceptable to the brothers on the block.” Eventually the Black Panther Party developed a broad socialist program influenced also by the ideas of Mao Zedong, Mikhail Bakunin, V. I. Lenin, Kwame Nkrumah, and Kim Il Sung.

Arguably, though, no source of inspiration was greater to the initial political thought of the Black Panther Party than were the writings and speeches of Malcolm X. Both Newton (2002) and Seale (1991) have written about the influence of Malcolm X on their own political philosophies. Newton, for instance, explained that “the Black Panther Party exists in the spirit of Malcolm”

(2002, 51), and Seale began his book *Seize the Time* (1991) with a story of his learning of Malcolm X's assassination in 1965.

The significance of Malcolm X for the Black Panther Party is a combination of Malcolm X's black urban roots and his concomitant urban-based territorial politics. Prior to his death, Malcolm X advocated a program of black liberation that spanned the local-global continuum. He argued that escape from oppression and exploitation for African Americans would only occur when *all* peoples of the world were liberated from unequal power structures. Local strategies, however, were required; namely, it was imperative for communities to reconnect, to establish a sense of place while remaining cognizant of a global sense of humanity. As explained by Malcolm X in 1964: “As long as we think . . . that we should get Mississippi straightened out before we worry about the Congo, you'll never get Mississippi straightened out. . . . We have to realize what part our struggle has in the over-all world struggle” (1965, 90). For Malcolm X, the connection between the struggles of blacks with other oppressed peoples of the world was central to his political thought. This was a spatial connection fundamental to his move from a focus on “civil rights” to one of “human rights.”

## The Spaces of the Black Panther Party

Action and intervention must be approached from a position of contextualized processes as opposed to a stable, rigid conception of scale. Swyngedouw (1997), for example, argues that the ontological priority for a process-based view removes the necessity of using either the global or the local as a starting point for analysis. Spatial scale has to be theorized as something that is produced, a process that is always deeply heterogeneous, conflicted, and contested (Swyngedouw 1997). This point has profound implications for an understanding of the Civil Rights Movement in general, and forms of black power in particular. In this section I employ Kevin Cox's conception of spaces of dependency and spaces of engagement. Cox makes this distinction to provide an understanding of local politics that recognizes its local contingency. This understanding of a politics of scale is thus critical to my project, given that Newton and Seale conceived of the Black Panther Party in response to their localized experiences of exploitation and oppression.

Spaces of dependency, as defined by Cox (1998), consist of more-or-less localized social relations upon which people depend for the realization of essential interests. In other words, such spaces “define place-specific conditions for our material well being and our sense of significance” (Cox 1998, 2). “Local” knowledge of

“local” conditions figures prominently in these spaces of dependency. This assertion speaks to the regional civil rights strategies employed throughout the United States, which, as discussed below, were adopted by Newton, Seale, and other members of the Black Panther Party based on particular knowledges of their urban black communities. Indeed, as existing research indicates, the various Black Panther Party chapters that emerged in cities such as Oakland, Los Angeles, New York, and Seattle all reflected localized adaptations to localized conditions.

In contrast, spaces of engagement consist of those spaces in which the politics of securing a space of dependence unfolds (Cox 1998, 2). Accordingly, the attempt by people, firms, or agencies to secure the conditions for their spaces of dependence are contingent on other sociospatial relations. Cox (1998, 4) explains that “typically agents are participants in a much more spatially extensive—or perhaps even restrictive—set of exchange relations than those contained within the bounds of a particular place.” He concludes (Cox 1998, 7) that “The ability to realize [local interests] is critically conditioned by the ability to exercise territorial power. The goal is to control the actions and interactions of others both within and between respective spaces of dependence; the means is control over a geographic area.”

The political ideology of the Black Panther Party, and especially that of Huey Newton, was not static. Indeed, the evolving political thought of the Black Panther entails four “moments”: black nationalist, revolutionary nationalist, revolutionary internationalist, and intercommunalist (see Hayes and Kiene 1998). There is an explicit spatiality to the transformation of the Black Panther’s political thought. Moreover, these changes may be captured through a focus on their “spaces of dependence” and “spaces of engagement.” Specifically, I argue that these “moments” are best conceived of as different spaces of engagement. The changing material practices within the spaces of dependence are more clearly viewed as contingent to expanded sociospatial relations.

From its inception, the Black Panther Party identified a localized space of dependence circumscribed by the black urban ghetto. The concerns of both Newton and Seale were those of community residents. Seale (1991) wrote that in the beginning he and Newton would talk with other African Americans about the conditions of the community. Seale drew heavily from his experiences of teaching Black American history at the North Oakland Neighborhood Anti-Poverty Center. He explains that “I tried to get them . . . to think in ways related to black people in the black community surviving and black people in the black community unifying” (Seale 1991, 35).

It is not surprising that such locally-based, locally-derived programs were focused on the everyday level of the street. Neighborhood programs (later renamed “survival programs”) were contingent on local conditions and thus designed to satisfy the immediate needs and concerns of community residents. Specific programs included petitioning for community control of the police, teaching Black history classes, promoting tenant and welfare rights, establishing “health clinics,” and investigating incidents of police brutality (see Abron 1998; Jones and Jeffries 1998). During Bobby Seale’s 1972–1973 mayoral campaign, for example, the Black Panther Party initiated the Seniors Against a Fearful Environment (S.A.F.E.) program. According to Abron (1998, 180), the Black Panther Party learned that nearly half of the victims of strong-arm robbery and purse snatching were over the age of fifty. Consequently, the Panthers provided free transportation and an escort service for elderly residents. Through the S.A.F.E. program the Black Panther Party also successfully lobbied the Oakland City Housing Authority to make major repairs and clean up a low-income residence for senior citizens in downtown Oakland (Abron 1998, 180–81).

The safety of children was also a prime concern. In early 1967, the Black Panther Party lobbied for the installation of a traffic light at the corner of 55th and Market in Oakland “because kids were getting hurt and killed regularly on that corner” (Seale 1991, 99). In *Seize the Time*, for example, Seale (1991) describes a series of accidents he witnessed at the intersection, located near the North Oakland Poverty Center where he worked. Newton assembled a petition and submitted the request to the Oakland City Council. Informed that a traffic light could not be installed until late 1968, Newton continued to insist on the installation of a light until it was installed in October 1967.

Other practices enacted by the Black Panther Party for children’s safety and welfare included “Free Breakfasts for Children” programs, “Free Clothing for Children” rallies, and “Free Food and Shoe” programs. In 1968 several Bay Area branches of the Black Panther Party, as well as the Seattle branch, established free breakfast programs. As described by Abron (1998, 182),

Party chapters . . . offered breakfast at multiple sites. Teams of Panthers served a no frill breakfast consisting of eggs, grits, toast, and bacon to children before the school day started. Community churches, nationwide, hosted the Party’s breakfast programs. . . . [Panther] members solicited financial contributions from community residents and food donations from local businesses . . . [and] parents and other community residents volunteered to help implement

the program. In 1969 Bobby Seale issued an organizational directive making this survival program mandatory.

The first, and perhaps the most controversial, survival program, however, was the police-alert patrol (Abron 1998, 179–80). This program involved armed Panther members who patrolled the streets and, in effect, monitored police activities. Strategically, these patrols satisfied a number of objectives. Consistent with the Party’s self-proclaimed vanguard role and concomitant emphasis on political education, the patrols were conceived as strategies of recruitment and information dissemination. As explained by Newton, “[since we were] interested primarily in educating and revolutionizing the community, we needed to get their attention and give them something to identify with” (Newton 2002, 58). Aware of other organized citizen patrols that observed the police, Newton recognized that *armed* patrols offered unique opportunities. He concluded that “We hoped that by raising encounters to a higher level, by patrolling the police with arms, we would see a change in their behavior” (Newton 2002, 58).

Recruitment was directed toward those people Newton and Seale felt were most oppressed and exploited: the *lumpenproletariat* (see Booker 1998). In line with their reading of both Fanon and Malcolm X, Newton and Seale specifically targeted those “on the streets.” As Seale (1991, 64) recalls, “We talked to brothers and sisters in colleges, in high schools, who were on parole, on probation, who’d been in jails, who’d just gotten out of jail, and brothers and sisters who looked like they were on their way to jail.” The failure of other Black political organizations, reasoned Newton, was that they failed “to recruit and involve the very people they professed to represent—the poor people in the community who never went to college, probably were not even able to finish high school” (Newton 2002, 46).

The armed patrols were also intended to promote a sense of cohesiveness throughout the community. Newton reasoned that “By standing up to the police as equals, even holding them off, and yet remaining within the law, we had demonstrated Black pride to the community in a concrete way.” He concluded that the armed patrols “created a feeling of solidarity” (2002, 67)

The most significant reason for the patrols, however, was to counter the perceived police brutality that existed in the black communities of Oakland. Theoretically, these patrols are significant in that they speak to the material and spatial practices embedded in urban struggles. Foucault (1979, 141) asserted that discipline proceeds from the distribution of individuals in space, and is exercised through controlling mechanisms, including surveillance. Within urban areas, police de-

partments frequently exercise power through such mechanisms. For example, Herbert’s (1994, 10) study of police behavior in Los Angeles illustrates that “the control of space” is “a fundament of overall police efforts at social control.” He continues (1994, 11) that many police strategies to create public order involve enacting boundaries and restricting access; police power rests upon a political geography. It was this aspect of the armed patrols that was most threatening, for the visible presence of armed blacks challenged the status quo in their attempt to reclaim the space of the ghetto. According to Newton (2002, 49), “We had seen the Oakland police and the California Highway Patrol begin to carry their shotguns in full view as another way of striking fear into the community. We had seen all this, and we recognized that the rising consciousness of Black people was almost at the point of explosion.” Seale (1991, 65) elaborates:

We have to defend ourselves against [the police] because they are breaking down our doors, shooting black brothers on the streets, and brutalizing sisters on the head. [The police] are wearing guns mostly to intimidate the people from forming organizations to really get our basic political desires and needs answered. The power structure uses the fascist police against people moving for freedom and liberation. It keeps our people divided, but the program will be what we unite the people around and to teach our people self-defense.

The armed patrols, not surprisingly, intensified the existing tension between the police and the Black Panther Party. A series of showdowns and confrontations between members of the Black Panthers and members of the police resulted from these practices (see Seale 1991, 125–32). In April 1967, for example, twenty-two-year-old Denzil Dowell was shot to death by a white deputy sheriff in Richmond, California. At the request of Dowell’s family, the Black Panther Party conducted an investigation of the killing. They discovered a number of questionable shootings by the Richmond sheriff’s department, including those of two black men who had been killed in North Richmond in December of 1966.

Huey Newton decided to stage a public rally in an attempt to reclaim the streets both symbolically and physically. Bobby Seale (1991, 136) recalls that, according to Newton, “we were going to have a rally . . . to tell the people it was necessary for us to arm ourselves for self-defense. The public protest was held at the corner of Third and Chesley.” As described by Bobby Seale (1991, 139), there were “twenty Panthers out there armed with guns, disciplined, standing thirty or forty feet apart, on

every corner of the intersection.” Members of the Panthers explained to onlookers how Dowell had been killed by the police, and that blacks must begin to unify and organize with guns and force. Later, the police arrived to disperse the crowd of about 300, resulting in a tense showdown with the Black Panther members. A second Richmond rally was held, with about 300 to 400 people gathered. Newton’s strategy was to block the streets and then inform the crowds that the Black Panther Party was attempting to protect the communities from police brutality.

Consequently, Oakland representative Donald Mulford introduced a bill “prohibiting the carrying of firearms on one’s person or in a vehicle in any public place or on any public street.” The ensuing legislative maneuvering revealed the dialectics of spatial struggle and laws. Newton (2002, 68) explains that “We knew how the system operated. If we used the laws in our own interest and against theirs, then the power structure would simply change the laws.” In reaction to the proposed “Panther Bill,” Newton prepared a statement, Executive Mandate Number One, to be read by Seale and twenty-nine other members of the Black Panther Party at the State Capital. Aside from condemning the pending gun law, the mandate also critiqued the “racist California legislature” and the “racist war of genocide in Vietnam” (Newton 1999, 7). Moreover, the mandate charged that

The enslavement of Black people at the very founding of this country, the genocide practiced on the American Indians and the confinement of the survivors on reservations, the savage lynching of thousands of Black men and women, the dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and now the cowardly massacre in Vietnam all testify to the fact that toward people of color the racist power structure of America has but one policy: repression, genocide, terror, and the big stick.

—(Newton 1999, 7)

The state capital confrontation of 2 May 1967, and Executive Mandate Number One, encapsulated the spatial struggles over public space. On one hand, at issue was a disciplining of society through the control of space—in this instance, literally, the streets. At the time the Black Panther Party members were well within their constitutional rights to carry weapons. These actions, however, transgressed *de facto* racial relations. As McCann (1999) writes of urban struggles, the state produces and enforces normative definitions of space in order to maintain the segregation of people. The “Panther Bill” is such an example of counterresistance, of a hegemonic institution rewriting legislation in the face of

resistance. McCann (1999, 171) contends that “through their everyday practices, and through more unusual and dramatic events, . . . groups such as African Americans, whose lives, histories, and spaces are so often marginalized, . . . can challenge the dominant representations central to [those] space[s].” Both the armed patrols, as everyday practices, and the state capital confrontation may be read as such. On the other hand, the Black Panther Party, but especially as personified by Newton, effectively linked the contemporary repression of African Americans with a much longer history and geography of oppression, exploitation, and genocide.

The capital confrontation significantly transformed the spaces of engagement for the Black Panther Party. Williams (1998) notes that the sight of armed black men and women entering a session of the California legislature had an immediate impact on the image of the Black Panther Party. It was a calculated risk, one that carried both positive and negative implications for the Party. On one hand, the event provided a highly visible forum, complete with national media coverage. Newton (2002, 67) recalls that other activities of the Black Panther Party “were confined to a small area” and that they “wanted Black people throughout the country to know the Oakland story.” This motivation, in part, explains the visible stance taken at the state capital in Sacramento. On the other hand, their actions led to passage of an even tougher gun control legislation as well as increased surveillance and harassment by law enforcement agencies.

We are left with the question of the efficacy of the spatial strategy as an initial attempt to garner a larger space of engagement. Shoats (2001, 131), for example, contends that whereas the “civil rights leaders needed this type of exposure to get their message across and to help protect themselves from the most flagrant abuses,” in the urban context this strategy “was maladaptive in its application to the Black liberation struggle, which necessarily demanded more clandestine ways of operating.” However, given Newton’s conception of the struggle, which did not necessarily carry over to other members’ opinions, this enlarged space of engagement did make sense. In particular, Newton began to promote a variant of revolutionary nationalism, which entailed a greater emphasis on socialism. Like Malcolm X, who shifted ideologically in the last year of his life, so too did Newton, as the Party’s “political philosopher,” move away from a predominantly race-based understanding to one predicated on class divisions. Newton (2002, 185) explained the early transformations: “We developed from just plain nationalists or separatist nationalists into revolutionary nationalists. We said that we joined with all of

the other people in the world struggling for decolonization and nationhood, and called ourselves a ‘dispersed colony’ because we did not have the geographical concentration that other so-called colonies had.”

Newton desired to transform the struggle over the black ghetto to a larger stage. A shift from cultural nationalism to revolutionary nationalism was therefore predicated on a literal, not a metaphorical, view of the black ghetto as a colonized territory. Social justice, self-liberation, and self-determination of all oppressed peoples were to be achieved through a process of decolonization. Capturing these sentiments, in 1969 Seale argued that “Community imperialism is manifested or is readily seen with respect to the domestic colonization of Black, Chicano, Indian, and other non-White peoples being cooped up in wretched ghettos and/or on Southern plantations and reservations with the murdering, fascist, brutalizing pig, occupying the communities and areas just like a foreign troop occupies territory” (see Foner 1995, 78) Elaborating on the view of black communities as occupied territories, Seale further explained that “I think Black people if we go over the concrete experiences that we’ve had in America and what’s going on now against us we can understand exactly what it is to be corralled in wretched ghettos in America and look up one day and see numerous policemen occupying our community, and brutalizing us” (Foner 1995, 94).

Such a rearticulation of the perspective of black communities contributed to changing the space of engagement, and translated into different spatial practices. As a developing revolutionary nationalist, Newton proposed that the Black Panther Party unite with the world’s oppressed people who struggled for decolonization and liberation (Hayes and Kiene 1998, 165). During this period, Newton and the Black Panther Party “assumed that people could solve a number of their problems by becoming nations” (Newton 2002, 185). Consequently, and resonating with Malcolm X’s earlier geopolitical connections of Mississippi and the Congo, Seale argued: “What we have to understand is that right here at home in America we have to oppose imperialism, also. That you can’t just fight imperialism, the acts of imperialism abroad . . . without recognizing community imperialism here of Black people, Brown people, Red people and even to the point of protesting students and radicals and progressive peoples here, in America” (Foner 1995, 94).

It was from a sense of solidarity with other colonized peoples, and a significant departure from cultural nationalist attitudes, that Newton and Seale determined that the Panthers should work with White leftists (Hayes

and Kiene 1998, 165). Indeed, it was this ideological shift, through an expanded space of engagement, that translated into modified spatial practices such as the initial biracial alliance in 1967 with the Peace and Freedom Party.

This shift caused problems with the public “constituency” and other members of the Party. Those espousing a more rigid and separatist approach—to include both social and spatial meanings—opposed the formation of biracial alliances. Although these alliances did provide material and financial resources, they also entailed a loss of social capital in the community. Moreover, a shift to revolutionary nationalism pitted the Black Panther Party against other black nationalist organizations, such as Maulana Karenga and his Us organization.

The next major shift occurred in 1970. In the summer of that year, Newton was released from prison, having served time for a manslaughter conviction that ultimately was reversed. Reflecting the impact of an increasingly global consciousness, Newton transformed the ideology of the Black Panther Party to one of revolutionary internationalism (Hayes and Kiene 1998, 169). Significantly, Newton no longer viewed black communities as colonies; furthermore, he broadened his space of engagement to include the territoriality of the United States. In 1971 Newton explained that “We in the Black Panther Party saw that the United States was no longer a nation. It was something else; it was more than a nation. It had not only expanded its territorial boundaries, but it had expanded all of its controls as well. We called it an empire” (2002, 186).

Newton’s operational definition of “empire” is instructive. An “empire” was “a nation-state that has transformed itself into a power controlling *all* of the world’s lands and people” (emphasis in the original). This conception had strategic implications. Around 1971, Newton offered the National Liberation Front and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam a number of troops to assist in the fight against American imperialism; the Party also opened an International Section of the Black Panther Party in Algiers on 13 September 1970; and Party members attempted to establish contact with other liberation movements in North Korea and China (see Hayes and Kiene 1998, 170).

A redefinition of the United States also necessitated a conceptual change in understanding the plight of African American communities. In December 1972, Newton (2002, 248) reasoned that “Black Americans cannot be said to be colonial subjects, strictly speaking. That would require the invasion of a sovereign territory by a foreign force. . . . Instead, blacks in the United States are forced transplants, having been brought from foreign territory

as slave labor.” Newton’s reasoning, however, was buttressed by an additional, more material, component. He explained that, “We believe that there are no more colonies or neocolonies. If a people is colonized, then it must be possible for them to decolonize and become what they formerly were. But what happens when the raw materials are extracted and labor is exploited within a territory dispersed over the entire globe?” Within this type of totalitarian system, “the people and the economy are so integrated into the imperialist empire that it’s impossible to ‘decolonize,’ to return to the former conditions of existence” (Newton 2002, 187).

It was from this conception of the demise of the nation-state that Newton (2002, 187) advocated a position of intercommunalism: “We say that the world today is a dispersed collection of communities. A community is different from a nation. A community is a small unit with a comprehensive collection of institutions that exist to serve a small group of people.” For Newton, therefore, intercommunalism implied a situation whereby sovereign borders were no longer recognized. Oppressed “nations” no longer existed, but were replaced by oppressed “communities.” In so doing, Newton viewed the problem as one of totalitarian globalization, dominated by a single superpower, the United States. Indeed, in his geopolitical worldview, the Soviet Union was rendered impotent. In 1972, Newton explained that the arms and trade agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union made clear the superiority of the United States. He concluded that “all [the Soviet Union] can do is whimper like whipped dogs and talk about peaceful co-existence so that they will not be destroyed. This presents the world with the hard fact that the United States is the only state power in the world. Russia has become, like all other nations, no more than a satellite of the United States” (Newton 2002, 260–61).

Spatially, I suggest that Newton’s appreciation of a communal perspective is predicated on his experiences of growing up in the black urban ghettos of Oakland. In discussing his conception of intercommunalism, for example, Newton (2002, 197) explained that when people control the productive and institutional units of society, “they will have a more rather than less conscious relationship to the material world—people, plants, books, machines, media, everything—in which they live. They will have power, that is, they will control the phenomena around them and make it act in some desired manner, and they will know their own real desires.” This attitude toward communalism resonates with Newton’s earlier statements regarding African American communities. In 1969, for example, he explained that “Because [African Americans] lack political power, Black people are not

free” (Foner 1995, 45). The formation of the Black Panther Party occurred, therefore, because “We began . . . by checking around with the street brothers. We asked them if they would be interested in forming the Black Panther Party for Self-Defense, which would be based upon defending the community against the aggression of the power structure, including the military and the armed might of the police” (Newton 2002, 53)

Put into practice, Newton believed that a program of intercommunalism would foster a nonoppressive and nonexploitative system in which a new “identity” could be forged among all peoples. As he argued,

When the people seize the means of production, when they seize the mass media and so forth, you will still have racism. But the fact that the people will be in control of all the productive and institutional units of society—not only the factories, but the media too—will enable them to start solving these contradictions. It will produce new values, new identities; it will mold a new and essentially human culture as the people resolve old conflicts based on cultural and economic conditions.

—(Newton 2002, 197)

By 1972, Newton believed, though certainly not all members of the Black Panther Party agreed, that African Americans occupied a liminal geographic space.<sup>4</sup> African Americans were neither members of the United States nor of Africa. He explained: “Tied only historically to Africa, they can lay no real claim to territory in the U.S. or Africa. . . . U.S. blacks form not a subjugated colony but an oppressed community inside the larger boundaries” (2002, 253). This reasoning led Newton to conclude that Pan-Africanism and black cultural nationalism were insufficient as programs for liberation. He argued (2002, 253–54) that Pan-Africanism “fails to encompass the unique situation of black Americans” since “Black Americans have only the cultural and social customs that have evolved from centuries of oppression.” Although we may argue that Newton failed to grasp fully the implications of a diasporic perspective, we should also acknowledge that he understood that solutions were to be found in localized responses to global processes:

If it is agreed that the fundamental nature of oppression is economic, then the first assault by the oppressed must be to wrestle economic control from the hands of the oppressors. If we define the prime character of the oppression of blacks as racial, then the situation of economic exploitation of human being by human being can be continued if performed by blacks against blacks or blacks against whites. If, however, we are speaking of eliminating exploitation and

oppression, then the oppressed must begin with a united, worldwide thrust along the lines of oppressed versus oppressor.

—(Newton 2002, 254–55)

To work effectively within the communal spaces of dependence, Newton believed that it was imperative to enlarge the spaces of engagement. Ultimately, he saw no other solution than a socialist revolution. When Newton and Seale founded the Black Panther Party, they were motivated by “trying to solve some of the ideological problems of the Black movement” and to explain “why no Black political organization had succeeded” (Newton 2002, 45). Five years later, Newton perceived the Black revolution as “the vanguard of the world revolution”:

We believe that black Americans are the first real internationalists. . . . We are internationalists because we have been internationally dispersed by slavery, and we can easily identify with other people in other cultures. Because of slavery, we never really felt attached to the nation in the same way that the peasant was attached to the soil in Russia. We are always a long way from home.

—(Newton 2002, 193)

The shifting ideological positions of the Black Panther Party, as espoused largely by Newton, were not received uncontested. Umoja (2001, 14), for example, contends that many Panthers in New York disagreed with Newton’s ideological shift away from black nationalism; very few understood his abstract theory of imperialism. Hayes and Kiene (1998, 172) likewise argue that the “rapidly advancing character of Newton’s and the Panthers’ thinking proved problematic. Often ideological shifts were not accompanied by sufficient political education so that rank-and-file Panthers could understand fully the new set of ideas.” Eldridge Cleaver favored a more restrictive space of engagement and advocated an “offensive” mode directed at police forces within the United States. Newton, however, maintained that the best strategy lay in a more expansive space of engagement. Particular spatial practices likewise contributed to splits within the Party. Newton’s open communiqué to the North Vietnamese government that he would make Party members available to fight in the conflict against U.S. forces angered other members who were upset because Newton was not pressing the armed conflict within the United States (see Shoats 2001, 135). In short, we are left with Henderson’s (2001) argument that the Black Panther Party’s attempt to organize the most disorganized group in the United States—the lumpenproletariat—combined with a diverse array of ideologies

(e.g., Mao, Guevara, Fanon) was problematic. Henderson (2001, 204) concludes that “the people required examples more consistent with their own experiences.” Thus, although Newton attempted to resolve this epistemological obstacle, the linkages among the material spaces of dependency were often obfuscated when framed within his more expansive spaces of engagement.

## Concluding Remarks

Although geographers have made substantial contributions to the understanding of spatial struggles within urban areas, little research in the discipline has explicitly considered the contestations of urban-based African American movements, especially those that fall under the rubric of “Black Power” (though see Wilson 2000). This lack is symptomatic of larger omissions in the study of the Black Power Movement. As Joseph (2001, 13) has noted, “the Black Power Movement’s influence on labor, poor people, urban uprisings, and community control movements require further study.” However, we need to “know how black political radicalism differed and converged, dependent on geographical location, political organizations, and historical circumstances.” As Matthews (1998, 267–68) has pointed out,

The issues raised by the Black Panther Party remain salient for Black communities at the turn of the twenty-first century. Economic conditions for the majority of Black people have declined since the late sixties in large measure as a consequence of structural adjustment programs in advanced capitalism in response to global competition and the shift from industrial to service-based economies, all of which undermine the security and safety of workers globally. The social consequences of these changes, including more sophisticated and insidious forms of racism and sexism, demand not only new responses, but also a closer investigation of and learning from past practices of collective, organized resistance.

Through an employment of scalar politics and territoriality, this article has examined the urban spatial politics of the Black Panther Party. Active between 1966 and 1982, the Black Panther Party transformed liberation struggles not only in the United States, but around the world (see Jones and Jeffries 1998; Clemons and Jones 2001). Indeed, as Clemons and Jones (2001, 38) conclude, “a small black nationalist organization from the slums of west Oakland, California, with fewer than fifty members, developed into one of the most significant actors of the global insurgency of the late 1960s.” Crucially, a scalar territorial politics was at the core of the Black Panther’s political philosophy. Progressing from

localized concerns to a conception of global intercommunalism, the doctrine of the Black Power Party “represented an effort by a generation of young, dispossessed, and defiant Black Americans to formulate a theory and practice of fundamental social transformation” (Hayes and Kiene 1998, 172). Moreover, the Black Panther Party attempted to combine their political philosophy with material programs. Philosophically, however, Newton’s enlargement of the spaces of engagement proved troubling, as he was unable to reconnect with members of the community once he had shifted scales.

In their newspapers and other promotional literature, the Black Panther Party called on its members to “defend the ghetto.” Huey Newton, Bobby Seale, and others viewed the struggle for civil rights as a spatial contestation for social justice. Through an extension of the radical lead provided largely by Malcolm X, the Black Panther Party attempted to remake their urban environments.

What are the geographical implications of the urban politics of the Black Panther Party? On the one hand, Black Panther Party branches based their survival programs on the immediate needs and concerns of their respective communities. In this strategy, the political thought of the Party did not exist as distant, abstract ideas, but was translated into material practices with a direct relevance to the residents. The Black Panther Party was consonant with other “Black geographies” in rethinking the underpinnings of black oppressions. These struggles situate “Black geographies” materially, ideologically, and experientially; in so doing, they provide alternative framings of social justice that are not fixed to particular territories. Thus, the geopolitical thought of the Black Panthers, and others such as Malcolm X, demonstrates a particular human geography that is predicated on the respatialization and repoliticization of urban space. On the other hand, however, the evolving geopolitical thought of Newton did not necessarily translate into immediate and effective material practices. Henderson (2001, 203) argues, “In its rejection of the revolutionary role of cultural transformation, the BPP was distancing itself not only from revolutionary practice but from the core of the black liberation movement itself.” Henderson further suggests that through the use of a “revolutionary compass grafted from foreign struggles that were not oriented to the demands of the United States political economy” and by “eschewing black nationalism for intercommunalism” the Black Panther Party “dislodged themselves from the very basis of their support in the black community” (Henderson 2001, 207). This interpretation posits a latent tension in the imbrication of spaces of dependency

and spaces of engagement. Without a corresponding material practice, a globalized discourse may sound hollow on the everyday street level.

## Acknowledgments

Thanks must first be extended to Audrey Kobayashi; this paper would not have been possible without her editorial guidance and support. Thanks are also extended to Don Mitchell and two anonymous reviewers who provided critical and positive feedback. Finally, I thank the many students and colleagues who provided insights and commentary on earlier discussions and versions of this paper, including Robert Kruse, Josh Inwood, Steve Butcher, Stacey Wicker, and Milton Harvey.

## Notes

1. For more detailed histories of the Nation of Islam, see Marsh (2000).
2. For biographies of Malcolm X, see Breitman (1968); Goldman (1979); Wolfenstein (1989); Clarke (1990); Sales (1994); DeCaro (1996, 1998); Natambu (2002). For geographic perspectives on Malcolm X, see Tyner (2003, 2005) and Tyner and Kruse (2004).
3. The gender ideology of the Black Panther Party, both as formally stated and as exemplified by organizational practice, was as critical to its daily functioning as was the Party’s analysis of race and class dynamics in black communities (Matthews 1998, 268). Bobby Seale, in particular, was highly critical of cultural nationalists, such as Maulana Karenga’s Los Angeles-based Us organization. For Seale, the link between racism and sexism was that both were practices of domination that fed upon each other, an idea that may be derived from Malcolm X’s later views (see Matthews 1998, 273; see also Tyner 2005). For further discussions, see also Angela Davis’s (1974) autobiography and essays by LeBlanc-Ernest (1998) and Jennings (1998).
4. Newton’s reference to the “liminal” geographic space is in direct reference to W. E .B. Du Bois’s (1903) *The Souls of Black Folk*. Du Bois had argued that blacks in the United States were neither African nor American. Newton’s reference to Du Bois’ “double consciousness” is important because it establishes a continuity between himself (Newton) and a longer history of black radical thought, including the ideas of Malcolm X. In particular, these ideas of liminality raise serious concerns about blackness, belonging, and citizenship.

## References

- Abron, J. M. 1998. “Serving the people”: The survival programs of the Black Panther Party. In *The Black Panther Party reconsidered*, ed. C. E. Jones, 177–92. Baltimore: Black Classic Press.
- Back, A. 2003. Exposing the “whole segregation myth”: The Harlem Nine and New York City’s school desegregation battles. In *Freedom North: Black freedom struggles outside the*

- South, 1940–1980, ed. Jeanne Theoharis and Komozi Woodard, 65–91. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bogues, A. 2003. *Black heretics, black prophets: Radical black intellectuals*. New York: Routledge.
- Booker, C. 1998. Lumpenization: A critical error of the Black Panther Party. In *The Black Panther Party reconsidered*, ed. C. E. Jones, 337–62. Baltimore: Black Classic Press.
- Boyd, H. 1998. Radicalism and resistance: The evolution of Black radical thought. *The Black Scholar* 28 (1): 43–53.
- Breitman, G. 1968. *The last year of Malcolm X: The evolution of a revolutionary*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Clarke, J. H., ed. 1990. *Malcolm X: The man and his times*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.
- Clemons, M. L., and C. E. Jones. 2001. Global solidarity: The Black Panther Party in the international arena. In *Liberation, imagination, and the Black Panther Party: A new look at the Panthers and their legacy*, ed. K. Cleaver and G. Katsiaficas, 20–39. New York: Routledge.
- Cox, K. R. 1998. Spaces of dependence, spaces of engagement and the politics of scale, or: Looking for local politics. *Political Geography* 17 (1): 1–23.
- . 2002. *Political geography: Territory, state, and society*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Davis, A. 1974. *Angela Davis: An autobiography*. New York: International Publishers.
- Dawson, M. C. 2001. *Black visions: The roots of contemporary African-American political ideologies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- DeCaro, L. A., Jr. 1996. *On the side of my people: A religious life of Malcolm X*. New York: New York University Press.
- . 1998. *Malcolm and the cross: The Nation of Islam, Malcolm X, and Christianity*. New York: New York University Press.
- Domosh, M. 1998. Those “gorgeous incongruities”: Polite politics and public space on the streets of nineteenth-century New York City. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 88:209–26.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. 1989. *The souls of black folk*. New York: Bantam Books. (Orig. pub. 1903.)
- Elbaum, M. 2002. *Revolution in the air: Sixties radicals turn to Lenin, Mao, and Che*. New York: Verso.
- Foner, P. S., ed. 1995. *The Black Panthers speak*. New York: De Capo Press.
- Foucault, M. 1979. *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (trans. A. Sheridan). New York: Vintage Books.
- Goldman, P. 1979. *The death and life of Malcolm X*, 2nd ed. New York: Harper and Row.
- Hall, R. L. 1977. Introduction. In *Black separatism and social reality: Rhetoric and reason*, ed. R. L. Hall, 1–11. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Hayes, F. W., III, and F. A. Kiene III. 1998. “All power to the people”: The political thought of Huey P. Newton and the Black Panther Party. In *The Black Panther Party reconsidered*, ed. C. E. Jones, 157–76. Baltimore: Black Classic Press.
- Henderson, E. A. 2001. Shadow of a clue. In *Liberation, imagination, and the Black Panther Party: A new look at the Panthers and their legacy*, ed. Kathleen Cleaver and George Katsiaficas, 197–207. New York: Routledge.
- Herbert, S. 1994. *Policing space: Territoriality and the Los Angeles police department*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Jennings, R. 1998. Why I joined the Party: An African womanist reflection. In *The Black Panther Party reconsidered*, ed. C. E. Jones, 257–65. Baltimore: Black Classic Press.
- Jones, C. E., and J. L. Jeffries. 1998. “Don’t believe the hype:” Debunking the Panther mythology. In *The Black Panther Party reconsidered*, ed. C. E. Jones, 25–55. Baltimore: Black Classic Press.
- Joseph, P. E. 2001. Black liberation without apology: Reconceptualizing the Black Power movement. *The Black Scholar* 31 (3–4): 2–19.
- LeBlanc-Ernest, A. D. 1998. “The most qualified person to handle the job”: Black Panther Party women, 1966–1982. In *The Black Panther Party reconsidered*, ed. C. E. Jones, 305–34. Baltimore: Black Classic Press.
- Lefebvre, H. 2003. *The urban revolution*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Malcolm, X. 1965. *Malcolm X speaks*, Edited with prefatory notes by George Breitman. New York: Grove Weidenfeld.
- Marsh, C. E. 2000. *The lost-found Nation of Islam in America*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Marston, S. A. 2000. The social construction of scale. *Progress in Human Geography* 24 (2): 219–42.
- Matthews, T. 1998. “No one ever asks, What a man’s place in the revolution is”: Gender and the politics of the Black Panther Party, 1966–1971. In *The Black Panther Party reconsidered*, ed. C. E. Jones, 267–304. Baltimore: Black Classic Press.
- McCann, E. J. 1999. Race, protest, and public space: Contextualizing Lefebvre in the U.S. City. *Antipode* 31 (2): 163–84.
- Mitchell, D. 1996a. Introduction: Public space and the city. *Urban Geography* 17:127–31.
- . 1996b. Political violence, order, and the legal construction of public space: Power and the public forum doctrine. *Urban Geography* 17:152–78.
- . 2003. *The right to the city: Social justice and the fight for public space*. New York: Guilford.
- Natambu, K. 2002. *The life and work of Malcolm X*. Indianapolis, IN: Alpha Books.
- Newton, H. P. 1999. *To die for the people: Selected writings and speeches*, ed. Toni Morrison. New York: Writers and Readers Publishing.
- . 2002. *The Huey P. Newton reader*, ed. David Hilliard and Donald Weise. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Sack, R. 1983. Human territoriality: A theory. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 73: 55–74.
- . 1986. *Human territoriality: Its theory and history*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Sales, W. W., Jr. 1994. *From civil rights to black liberation: Malcolm X and the organization of Afro-American unity*. Boston: South End Press.
- Seale, B. 1991 [1971]. *Seize the time: The story of the Black Panther Party and Huey P. Newton*. Baltimore, MD: Black Classic Press.
- Self, R. O. 2003. “Negro leadership and Negro money”: African American political organizing in Oakland before the Panthers. In *Freedom North: Black freedom struggles outside the South, 1940–1980*, ed. Jeanne Theoharis and Komozi Woodard, 93–123. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Shoats, R. 2001. Black fighting formations: Their strengths, weaknesses, and potentialities. In *Liberation, imagination, and the Black Panther Party: A new look at the Panthers and their legacy*, ed. Kathleen Cleaver and George Katsiaficas, 128–38. New York: Routledge.
- Storey, D. 2001. *Territory: The claiming of space*. London: Prentice Hall.

- Swyngedouw, E. 1997. Excluding the other: The production of scale and scaled politics. In *Geographies of economies*, ed. Roger Lee and Jane Wills, 167–76. New York: Arnold.
- Theoharis, J. 2003. Introduction. In *Freedom North: Black freedom struggles outside the South, 1940–1980*, ed. Jeanne Theoharis and Komozi Woodard, 1–15. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tyner, J. 2003. Geography, ground-level reality, and the epistemology of Malcolm X. *Journal of Geography* 102:167–78.
- . 2004. Territoriality, social justice, and gendered revolutions in the speeches of Malcolm X. *Transactions, Institution of British Geographers* 29:330–43.
- . 2005. *The geography of Malcolm X: Black radicalism and the remaking of American space*. New York: Routledge.
- Tyner, J. A., and R. J. Kruse II. 2004. The geopolitics of Malcolm X. *Antipode* 36 (1): 24–42.
- Umoja, A. O. 2001. Repression breeds resistance: The Black Liberation Army and the radical legacy of the Black Panther Party. In *Liberation, imagination, and the Black Panther Party: A new look at the Panthers and their legacy*, ed. K. Cleaver and G. Katsiaficas, 3–19. New York: Routledge.
- Williams, Y. R. 1998. In the name of the law: The 1967 shooting of Huey Newton and law enforcement's permissive environment. *Negro History Bulletin* 61:6–12.
- Wilson, B. 2000. *Race and place in Birmingham*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Wolfenstein, E. 1989. *The victims of democracy: Malcolm X and the Black Revolution*. London: Free Association Books.
- Woodard, K. 1999. *A nation within a nation: Amiri Baraka (LeRoi Jones) & Black Power politics*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Correspondence: Department of Geography, Kent State University, Kent, OH 44242, e-mail: jtyner@kent.edu.

Copyright of *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* is the property of Blackwell Publishing Limited and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.