



UNIVERSIDAD DE BELGRANO

# Las tesinas de Belgrano

**Facultad de Lenguas y Estudios Extranjeros  
Traductorado Público, Literario y Científico-  
Técnico de Inglés**

**Black power. Poder negro**

Nº 414

Bárbara Barischpolski

Tutora: Gabriela Garrido

**Departamento de Investigaciones**  
Septiembre 2010



---

## Índice

Introducción .....	Página 5
Traducción .....	Página 6
Análisis del proceso de traducción .....	Página 24
Conclusión .....	Página 26
Bibliografía .....	Página 26
Anexo .....	Página 27



## Introducción

El presente trabajo final de carrera está dividido en dos partes. La primera consta de la traducción del inglés al español de un discurso de Stokely Carmichael sobre el Poder Negro. Este discurso fue pronunciado en la Universidad de California en 1966, época de diversos desórdenes sociales en los Estados Unidos: a nivel nacional, por la discriminación racial contra los negros y, a nivel internacional, por la guerra de Vietnam. Cabe aclarar que, dado que el discurso completo excedía ampliamente la cantidad de palabras requerida para este trabajo, decidimos incluir los primeros párrafos a modo introductorio y continuar luego desde la mitad hasta el final.

La segunda parte del trabajo presenta el análisis del proceso de traducción. A su vez, esta sección está dividida también en dos partes. En primer lugar, determinamos las características del texto y, a partir de ello, el enfoque de traducción a emplear. A continuación, seleccionamos algunas de las dificultades que tuvimos al momento de traducir y explicamos, a través de ejemplos y definiciones teóricas, las soluciones que les dimos.

Para finalizar, incluimos una conclusión que analiza, de manera global, lo realizado a lo largo de la tesina.

## Traducción

Thank you very much. It's a privilege and an honor to be in the white intellectual ghetto of the West. We wanted to do a couple of things before we started. The first is that, based on the fact that SNCC, through the articulation of its program by its chairman, has been able to win elections in Georgia, Alabama, Maryland, and by our appearance here will win an election in California, in 1968 I'm going to run for President of the United States. I just can't make it, 'cause I wasn't born in the United States. That's the only thing holding me back.

We wanted to say that this is a student conference, as it should be, held on a campus, and that we're not ever to be caught up in the intellectual masturbation of the question of Black Power. That's a function of people who are advertisers that call themselves reporters. Oh, for my members and friends of the press, my self-appointed white critics, I was reading Mr. Bernard Shaw two days ago, and I came across a very important quote which I think is most apropos for you. He says, "All criticism is a[n] autobiography." Dig yourself. Okay.

[...]

We have to say -- We have to say to ourselves that there is a higher law than the law of a racist named McNamara. There is a higher law than the law of a fool named Rusk. And there's a higher law than the law of a buffoon named Johnson. It's the law of each of us. It's the law of each of us. It is the law of each of us saying that we will not allow them to make us hired killers. We will stand pat. We will not kill anybody that they say kill. And if we decide to kill, we're going to decide who we going to kill. And this country will only be able to stop the war in Vietnam when the young men who are made to fight it begin to say, "Hell, no, we ain't going."

Now then, there's a failure because the Peace Movement has been unable to get off the college campuses where everybody has a 2S and not going to get drafted anyway. And the question is, How can you move out of that into the white ghettos of this country and begin to articulate a position for those white students who do not want to go. We cannot do that. It is something -- sometimes ironic that many of the peace groups have beginning to call us violent and say they can no longer support us, and we are in fact the most militant organization [for] peace or civil rights or human rights against the war in Vietnam in this country today. There isn't one organization that has begun to meet our stance on the war in Vietnam, 'cause we not only say we are against the war in Vietnam; we are against the draft. We are against the draft. No man has the right to take a man for two years and train him to be a killer. A man should decide what he wants to do with his life.

Muchas gracias a todos. Es un honor y un privilegio estar en el gueto intelectual blanco del Oeste. Queríamos comentar algunas cosas antes de comenzar. La primera es que, dado que el SNCC<sup>1</sup> –gracias a que el director articuló su programa –, logró ganar las elecciones en Georgia, Alabama, Maryland, y con nuestra presencia aquí ganará en California, en 1968 voy a postularme como Presidente de los Estados Unidos. Simplemente no puedo hacerlo porque no nací en los Estados Unidos. Es lo único que me detiene.

Queríamos decir que esta es una conferencia estudiantil celebrada, como debería ser, en un campus, y que nunca nos dejaremos atrapar por la masturbación intelectual de la cuestión del Poder Negro. Esa es la función de las personas que hacen propaganda y se hacen llamar periodistas. Ah, para mis amigos y miembros de la prensa, mis críticos blancos personales, hace dos días estaba leyendo a Bernard Shaw y vi una frase muy importante que creo que es ideal para ustedes: “Toda crítica es una autobiografía”. Mírense al espejo y verán.

[...]

Tenemos que decir... tenemos que decirnos a nosotros mismos que hay una ley superior a la ley de un racista llamado McNamara. Hay una ley superior a la ley de un tonto llamado Rusk. Y hay una ley superior a la ley de un bufón llamado Johnson. Es la ley de cada uno de nosotros. Es la ley de cada uno de nosotros que nos dice que no debemos permitir que nos conviertan en asesinos a sueldo. Vamos a resistir. No vamos a matar a nadie a sus órdenes. Y, si decidimos matar a alguien, seremos nosotros los que elijamos a quién. Este país sólo podrá detener la guerra de Vietnam cuando los jóvenes obligados a disputarla empiecen a decir: “no, carajo, no vamos a hacerlo”.

Ahora bien, existe una falla porque el movimiento de paz no logró traspasar los muros de las universidades, donde los estudiantes están eximidos de ir a la guerra y de cualquier forma no van a ser reclutados. Y la cuestión es cómo uno puede salir de eso dentro de los guetos blancos de este país y comenzar a articular una posición para aquellos estudiantes blancos que no quieren ir. No podemos hacer eso. Es algo... es irónico a veces que muchos de los grupos pacifistas hayan comenzado a tildarnos de violentos y digan que no nos pueden seguir apoyando cuando, en realidad, hoy en día, nosotros somos el grupo que más milita en este país por la paz, por los derechos civiles, por los derechos humanos y en contra de la guerra de Vietnam. No hay una sola organización que se acerque a nuestra postura en relación con la guerra de Vietnam, porque no sólo estamos en contra de la guerra, sino que nos oponemos también al reclutamiento. Ningún hombre tiene derecho a llevarse a otro hombre por dos años y entrenarlo para ser un asesino. Un hombre debe poder decidir qué quiere hacer con su vida.

---

1. N. de la T.: SNCC es la sigla en inglés por la que se conoce al Comité Coordinador Estudiantil No Violento.

So the question then is it becomes crystal clear for black people because we can easily say that anyone fighting in the war in Vietnam is nothing but a black mercenary, and that's all he is. Any time a black man leaves the country where he can't vote to supposedly deliver the vote for somebody else, he's a black mercenary. Any time a -- Any time a black man leaves this country, gets shot in Vietnam on foreign ground, and returns home and you won't give him a burial in his own homeland, he's a black mercenary, a black mercenary.

And that even if I were to believe the lies of Johnson, if I were to believe his lies that we're fighting to give democracy to the people in Vietnam, as a black man living in this country I wouldn't fight to give this to anybody. I wouldn't give it to anybody. So that we have to use our bodies and our minds in the only way that we see fit. We must begin like the philosopher Camus to come alive by saying "No!" That is the only act in which we begin to come alive, and we have to say "No!" to many, many things in this country.

This country is a nation of thieves. It has stole everything it has, beginning with black people, beginning with black people. And that the question is, How can we move to start changing this country from what it is -- a nation of thieves. This country cannot justify any longer its existence. We have become the policeman of the world. The marines are at our disposal to always bring democracy, and if the Vietnamese don't want democracy, well dammit, "We'll just wipe them the hell out, 'cause they don't deserve to live if they won't have our way of life."

There is then in a larger sense, What do you do on your university campus? Do you raise questions about the hundred black students who were kicked off campus a couple of weeks ago? Eight hundred? Eight hundred? And how does that question begin to move? Do you begin to relate to people outside of the ivory tower and university wall? Do you think you're capable of building those human relationships, as the country now stands? You're fooling yourself. It is impossible for white and black people to talk about building a relationship based on humanity when the country is the way it is, when the institutions are clearly against us.

We have taken all the myths of this country and we've found them to be nothing but downright lies. This country told us that if we worked hard we would succeed, and if that were true we would own this country lock, stock, and barrel -- lock, stock, and barrel -- lock, stock, and barrel. It is we who have picked the cotton for nothing. It is we who are the maids in the kitchens of liberal white people. It is we who are the janitors, the porters, the elevator men; we who sweep up your college floors. Yes, it is we who are the hardest workers and the lowest paid, and the lowest paid.



La cuestión es clara como el agua para la población negra; es fácil afirmar que cualquiera que está peleando en Vietnam no es más que un mercenario negro, y eso es todo lo que es. Cada vez que un hombre negro abandona el país en el que no tiene derecho de voto para supuestamente votar por otra persona, se convierte en un mercenario negro. Cada vez que un hombre negro abandona este país, es asesinado en Vietnam, tierra extranjera, y vuelve a casa y ustedes no le hacen un funeral en su propia patria, él es un mercenario negro, un mercenario negro.

E incluso si fuera a creer las mentiras de Johnson... Si fuera a creer su mentira de que estamos luchando por la democracia de Vietnam, como un hombre negro que vive en este país, yo no lucharía para darle esto a nadie. No se lo daría a nadie. Tenemos que usar nuestros cuerpos y nuestras mentes de la única manera en que lo creamos posible. Debemos cobrar vida diciendo "¡No!", como el filósofo Camus. Ese es el único acto en el que empezamos a cobrar vida, y debemos decir "no" a muchas, muchas cosas en este país.

Este país es una nación de ladrones. Se han robado todo, comenzando por los negros, comenzando por los negros. Y la cuestión, entonces, es qué podemos hacer para empezar a cambiar la situación actual de este país: una nación de ladrones. Este país no puede seguir justificando su existencia. Nos hemos convertido en la policía del mundo. La Marina está a nuestra disposición para traer siempre la democracia, y si los vietnamitas no quieren democracia, listo, "los borramos del mapa, porque no merecen vivir si no comparten nuestro estilo de vida".

Además, en un sentido más amplio, ¿qué hacen ustedes en su campus universitario? ¿Hacen algo por los cientos de estudiantes negros que fueron expulsados del campus hace un par de semanas? ¿Ochocientos? ¿Ochocientos? ¿Y cómo empieza ese "algo" a gestarse? ¿Ustedes si quiera empiezan a relacionarse con la gente fuera de la torre de marfil y de los muros de la universidad? ¿Creen que son capaces de construir esas relaciones humanas con la situación actual del país? Se están engañando. Es imposible que blancos y negros hablen sobre construir una relación basada en la humanidad cuando el país está como está, cuando las instituciones están claramente en nuestra contra.

Nos creímos todos los mitos de este país y descubrimos que no son más que mentiras descaradas. Nos dijeron que si trabajábamos duro, tendríamos éxito; y si eso fuera cierto, seríamos los dueños de este país de punta a punta, de punta a punta, de punta a punta. Fuimos nosotros los que recogimos algodón por nada. Somos nosotros los que trabajamos en las casas de los liberales blancos. Somos nosotros los conserjes, los porteros, los ascensoristas; nosotros, los que fregamos los pisos de su universidad. Sí, somos nosotros los trabajadores más arduos y los peores pagos, y los peores pagos.

And that it is nonsensical for people to start talking about human relationships until they're willing to build new institutions. Black people are economically insecure. White liberals are economically secure. Can you begin to build an economic coalition? Are the liberals willing to share their salaries with the economically insecure black people they so much love? Then if you're not, are you willing to start building new institutions that will provide economic security for black people? That's the question we want to deal with. That's the question we want to deal with.

We have to seriously examine the histories that we have been told. But we have something more to do than that. American students are perhaps the most politically unsophisticated students in the world, in the world, in the world. Across every country in this world, while we were growing up, students were leading the major revolutions of their countries. We have not been able to do that. They have been politically aware of their existence. In South America our neighbors down below the border have one every 24 hours just to remind us that they're politically aware.

And we have been unable to grasp it because we've always moved in the field of morality and love while people have been politically jiving with our lives. And the question is, How do we now move politically and stop trying to move morally? You can't move morally against a man like Brown and Reagan. You've got to move politically to put them out of business. You've got to move politically.

You can't move morally against Lyndon Baines Johnson because he is an immoral man. He doesn't know what it's all about. So you've got to move politically. You've got to move politically. And that we have to begin to develop a political sophistication -- which is not to be a parrot: "The two-party system is the best party in the world." There is a difference between being a parrot and being politically sophisticated.

We have to raise questions about whether or not we do need new types of political institutions in this country, and we in SNCC maintain that we need them now. We need new political institutions in this country. Any time -- Any time Lyndon Baines Johnson can head a Party which has in it Bobby Kennedy, Wayne Morse, Eastland, Wallace, and all those other supposed-to-be-liberal cats, there's something wrong with that Party. They're moving politically, not morally. And that if that party refuses to seat black people from Mississippi and goes ahead and seats racists like Eastland and his clique, it is clear to me that they're moving politically, and that one cannot begin to talk morality to people like that.

Es ridículo hablar de relaciones humanas hasta que haya voluntad de construir nuevas instituciones. Los negros carecen de seguridad económica. Los liberales blancos están seguros económicamente. ¿Ustedes pueden empezar a construir una coalición económica? ¿Los liberales están dispuestos a compartir sus salarios con los negros, que no tienen seguridad económica, a quienes tanto quieren? Y si no lo están, entonces, ¿están dispuestos a comenzar a construir nuevas instituciones que provean seguridad económica para los negros? Esa es la cuestión que queremos resolver. Esa es la cuestión que queremos resolver.

Tenemos que analizar seriamente las historias que nos contaron. Pero tenemos que hacer algo más aparte de eso. Los estadounidenses son quizá los estudiantes más ingenuos políticamente de todo, todo el mundo. En todos los países, mientras nosotros crecíamos, los estudiantes lideraban las revoluciones más importantes. Nosotros no pudimos hacer eso. Ellos fueron políticamente conscientes de su existencia. En Sudamérica, nuestros vecinos debajo de la frontera hacen una revolución cada 24 horas simplemente para recordarnos que ellos sí son políticamente conscientes.

Y nosotros no logramos ser como ellos porque nos movimos siempre en el ámbito de la moral y el amor, mientras se jugaba a la política con nuestras vidas. Y la pregunta es, entonces, cómo nos movilizamos políticamente e intentamos dejar de movilizarnos moralmente. Ustedes no pueden movilizarse desde la moral contra hombres como Brown o Reagan. Tienen que movilizarse políticamente para sacarlos del medio. Tienen que movilizarse políticamente.

No pueden movilizarse desde la moral contra Lyndon Baines Johnson porque es un hombre inmoral. No tiene idea de nada. Así que tienen que movilizarse políticamente. Tienen que movilizarse políticamente. Tenemos que empezar a desarrollar una perspicacia política, lo cual no implica no parar de hablar: "El sistema bipartidista es el mejor partido del mundo". Hay una diferencia entre no parar de hablar y ser políticamente perspicaz.

Tenemos que plantear cuestiones sobre si necesitamos nuevos tipos de instituciones políticas en este país o no. Desde el SNCC sostenemos que las necesitamos ahora. Necesitamos nuevas instituciones políticas en este país. Cada vez, cada vez que Lyndon Baines Johnson lidere un partido en el que estén Bobby Kennedy, Wayne Morse, Eastland, Wallace, y todos esos gatos, supuestos liberales, algo andará mal con ese partido. Ellos se movilizan políticamente, no desde la moral. Y el hecho de que ese partido se niegue a incluir a gente negra de Mississippi y acepte a racistas como Eastland y su camarilla, me deja en claro que se están movilizandando políticamente, y que no se puede ni empezar a hablar de moral con gente como esa.

We must begin to think politically and see if we can have the power to impose and keep the moral values that we hold high. We must question the values of this society, and I maintain that black people are the best people to do that because we have been excluded from that society. And the question is we ought to think whether or not we want to become a part of that society. That's what we want to do.

And that that is precisely what it seems to me that the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee is doing. We are raising questions about this country. I do not want to be a part of the American pie. The American pie means raping South Africa, beating Vietnam, beating South America, raping the Philippines, raping every country you've been in. I don't want any of your blood money. I don't want it -- don't want to be part of that system. And the question is, How do we raise those questions? How do we ....How do we begin to raise them?

We have grown up and we are the generation that has found this country to be a world power, that has found this country to be the wealthiest country in the world. We must question how she got her wealth! That's what we're questioning, and whether or not we want this country to continue being the wealthiest country in the world at the price of raping every -- everybody else across the world. That's what we must begin to question. And that because black people are saying we do not now want to become a part of you, we are called reverse racists. Ain't that a gas?

Now, then, we want to touch on nonviolence because we see that again as the failure of white society to make nonviolence work. I was always surprised at Quakers who came to Alabama and counseled me to be nonviolent, but didn't have the guts to start talking to James Clark to be nonviolent. That is where nonviolence needs to be preached -- to Jim Clark, not to black people. They have already been nonviolent too many years. The question is, Can white people conduct their nonviolent schools in Cicero where they belong to be conducted, not among black people in Mississippi. Can they conduct it among the white people in Grenada?

Six-foot-two men who kick little black children -- can you conduct nonviolent schools there? That is the question that we must raise, not that you conduct nonviolence among black people. Can you name me one black man today who's killed anybody white and is still alive? Even after rebellion, when some black brothers throw some bricks and bottles, ten thousand of them has to pay the crime, 'cause when the white policeman comes in, anybody who's black is arrested, "cause we all look alike."

Tenemos que empezar a pensar políticamente y ver si podemos lograr el poder para imponer y mantener los valores morales que admiramos. Tenemos que cuestionar los valores de esta sociedad, y sostengo que la población negra es la más indicada para hacerlo porque hemos sido excluidos de esta sociedad. Y la cuestión es que debemos pensar si queremos ser parte de esta sociedad o no. Eso es lo que queremos hacer nosotros.

Y eso es precisamente lo que me parece que el SNCC está haciendo. Estamos planteando cuestiones sobre este país. No quiero ser parte del sueño americano. El sueño americano implica forzar a Sudáfrica, derrotar a Vietnam, derrotar a Sudamérica, subyugar a las Filipinas, abusar de cada país en el que ustedes hayan estado. No quiero ni un poco de su dinero ensangrentado. No lo quiero... no quiero ser parte de ese sistema. Y la pregunta es: ¿cómo planteamos esas cuestiones? ¿Cómo siquiera empezamos a plantearlas?

Crecimos y nos convertimos en la generación que ve a este país como una potencia mundial, como el país más rico del mundo. ¡Debemos cuestionar cómo obtuvo su riqueza! Es eso lo que cuestionamos, y si queremos que este país siga siendo el más rico del mundo a costa de abusar de absolutamente todo el resto del mundo. Eso es lo que debemos empezar a cuestionar. Y que debido a que los negros dicen que no queremos volvernos parte de ustedes, nos llaman racistas a la inversa. Qué cómico, ¿no?

Ahora bien, queremos mencionar la no violencia porque la vemos, una vez más, como un fracaso de la sociedad blanca. Siempre me sorprendió que los cuáqueros que vinieron a Alabama y me aconsejaron que estuviera del lado de la no violencia no tuvieran las agallas para convencer a James Clark de que no fuera violento. Es ahí donde hay que predicar la no violencia: con Jim Clark, no con los negros. Ellos ya fueron no violentos durante demasiados años. La pregunta es si la población blanca podrá dirigir sus escuelas no violentas en Cicero, donde deben hacerlo, y no entre la población negra de Mississippi. ¿Podrán hacerlo entre la población blanca de Granada?

Hombres de casi dos metros que les pegan a pequeños niños negros... ¿Se puede dirigir escuelas no violentas ahí? Esa es la cuestión que debemos plantear, y no la de propagar la no violencia entre la población negra. ¿Alguno de ustedes conoce a un hombre negro que luego de matar a un hombre blanco siga con vida? Incluso después de la rebelión, donde algunos hermanos negros tiraron un par de ladrillos y botellas, diez mil tuvieron que pagar por el delito porque, cuando entra el policía blanco, cualquier negro es arrestado, "porque somos todos parecidos".

So that we have to raise those questions. We, the youth of this country, must begin to raise those questions. And we must begin to move to build new institutions that's going to speak to the needs of people who need it. We are going to have to speak to change the foreign policy of this country. One of the problems with the peace movement is that it's just too caught up in Vietnam, and that if we pulled out the troops from Vietnam this week, next week you'd have to get another peace movement for Santo Domingo. And the question is, How do you begin to articulate the need to change the foreign policy of this country -- a policy that is decided upon race, a policy on which decisions are made upon getting economic wealth at any price, at any price.

Now we articulate that we therefore have to hook up with black people around the world; and that that hookup is not only psychological, but becomes very real. If South America today were to rebel, and black people were to shoot the hell out of all the white people there -- as they should, as they should -- then Standard Oil would crumble tomorrow. If South Africa were to go today, Chase Manhattan Bank would crumble tomorrow. If Zimbabwe, which is called Rhodesia by white people, were to go tomorrow, General Electric would cave in on the East Coast. The question is, How do we stop those institutions that are so willing to fight against "Communist aggression" but closes their eyes to racist oppression? That is the question that you raise. Can this country do that?

Now, many people talk about pulling out of Vietnam. What will happen? If we pull out of Vietnam, there will be one less aggressor in there -- we won't be there, we won't be there. And so the question is, How do we articulate those positions? And we cannot begin to articulate them from the same assumptions that the people in the country speak, 'cause they speak from different assumptions than I assume what the youth in this country are talking about.

That we're not talking about a policy or aid or sending Peace Corps people in to teach people how to read and write and build houses while we steal their raw materials from them. Is that what we're talking about? 'Cause that's all we do. What underdeveloped countries needs -- information on how to become industrialized, so they can keep their raw materials where they have it, produce them and sell it to this country for the price it's supposed to pay; not that we produce it and sell it back to them for a profit and keep sending our modern day missionaries in, calling them "the sons of Kennedy". And that if the youth are going to participate in that program, how do you raise those questions where you begin to control that Peace Corps program? How do you begin to raise them?

Así que tenemos que plantear estas cuestiones. Nosotros, la juventud de este país, tenemos que empezar a plantear estas cuestiones. Y tenemos que empezar a movilizarnos para construir las nuevas instituciones, que van a responder a las necesidades de la gente que las necesite. Vamos a tener que hablar para cambiar la política exterior de este país. Uno de los problemas del movimiento pacifista es que está demasiado metido en Vietnam y, si sacáramos las tropas de Vietnam esta misma semana, a la siguiente habría que levantar otro movimiento pacifista en Santo Domingo. Y la cuestión es cómo comenzar a articular la necesidad de un cambio en la política exterior de este país; una política que se decide según la raza, una política en la que las decisiones se toman con el fin de acumular riqueza, obteniéndola a cualquier precio, a cualquier precio.

Por eso es que debemos unirnos con la población negra del resto del mundo, y esa unión no debe ser sólo psicológica, sino bien real. Si Sudamérica se fuera a rebelar hoy mismo, y la población negra fuera a cagar a tiros a todos los blancos de la región –como deberían hacer –, entonces la Standard Oil se desmoronaría mañana. Si Sudáfrica desapareciera hoy, el Chase Manhattan Bank se desmoronaría mañana. Si Zimbabwe, denominado Rhodesia por los blancos, desapareciera mañana, General Electric se desplomaría en la Costa Este. La pregunta es: ¿cómo detenemos a estas instituciones que están al pie de la lucha contra la “agresión comunista” pero que hacen la vista gorda a la opresión racista? Esa es la cuestión a plantear. ¿Se puede hacer eso en este país?

Mucha gente habla sobre retirar las tropas de Vietnam. ¿Qué va a pasar? Si nos retiramos de Vietnam, habrá un agresor menos ahí... Nosotros no vamos a estar ahí, nosotros no vamos a estar ahí. Entonces, la pregunta es: ¿cómo articulamos esas posiciones? Y no podemos empezar a articular esas posiciones desde los mismos supuestos a los que se refiere la gente en este país, porque hablan desde supuestos diferentes a los que yo supongo que la juventud de este país se refiere.

Nosotros no estamos hablando de una medida, o de ayuda, o de mandar cuerpos de paz con la misión de enseñarle a la gente a leer y a escribir y a construir casas mientras nos robamos sus materias primas. ¿Es eso de lo que hablamos? Porque eso es lo único que hacemos. Lo que los países subdesarrollados necesitan... es información sobre cómo industrializarse, para que puedan mantener sus materias primas donde las tienen, producirlas y venderlas a este país por el precio que se supone que tiene que pagar; no que las produzcamos y se las vendamos de vuelta por una ganancia, y sigamos mandando misionarios, denominándolos “los hijos de Kennedy”. Y si la juventud va a participar en ese programa, ¿cómo se plantean esas cuestiones cuando se comienza a controlar el programa de los cuerpos de paz? ¿Cómo se comienza a plantearlas?

How do we raise the questions of poverty? The assumptions of this country is that if someone is poor, they are poor because of their own individual blight, or they weren't born on the right side of town; they had too many children; they went in the army too early; or their father was a drunk, or they didn't care about school, or they made a mistake. That's a lot of nonsense. Poverty is well calculated in this country. It is well calculated, and the reason why the poverty program won't work is because the calculators of poverty are administering it. That's why it won't work.

So how can we, as the youth in the country, move to start tearing those things down? We must move into the white community. We are in the black community. We have developed a movement in the black community. The challenge is that the white activist has failed miserably to develop the movement inside of his community. And the question is, Can we find white people who are going to have the courage to go into white communities and start organizing them? Can we find them? Are they here and are they willing to do that? Those are the questions that we must raise for the white activist.

And we're never going to get caught up in questions about power. This country knows what power is. It knows it very well. And it knows what Black Power is 'cause it deprived black people of it for 400 years. So it knows what Black Power is. That the question of, Why do black people -- Why do white people in this country associate Black Power with violence? And the question is because of their own inability to deal with "blackness." If we had said "Negro power" nobody would get scared. Everybody would support it. Or if we said "power for colored people", everybody'd be for that, but it is the word "black" -- it is the word "black" that bothers people in this country, and that's their problem, not mine -- their problem, their problem.

Now there's one modern day lie that we want to attack and then move on very quickly and that is the lie that says anything all black is bad. Now, you're all a college university crowd. You've taken your basic logic course. You know about a major premise and minor premise. So people have been telling me anything all black is bad. Let's make that our major premise.

Major premise: Anything all black is bad.

Minor premise or particular premise: I am all black.

Therefore...



¿Cómo planteamos las cuestiones relacionadas con la pobreza? Los supuestos de este país establecen que, si alguien es pobre, lo es por su propia decadencia, o porque no nació del lado correcto de la ciudad, o porque tuvo demasiados hijos, o porque se enlistó en el ejército demasiado rápido, o porque su padre era un borracho, o porque no le importó la escuela, o porque cometió un error. Esas son estupideces. La pobreza está bien calculada en este país. Está bien calculada, y el motivo por el que el programa para erradicarla no va a funcionar es que los mismos que calculan la pobreza lo están administrando. Por eso no va a funcionar.

Entonces, ¿cómo podemos hacer nosotros, la juventud de este país, para empezar a tirar abajo todo eso? Tenemos que adentrarnos en la comunidad blanca. Nosotros estamos en la comunidad negra. Hemos creado un movimiento dentro de la comunidad negra. El problema es que los activistas blancos fallaron completamente en llevar a cabo el movimiento dentro de su comunidad. Y la pregunta es: ¿hay hombres blancos que tienen el coraje de adentrarse en las comunidades blancas y empezar a organizarlas? ¿Podremos encontrarlos? ¿Están ellos aquí y están dispuestos a hacerlo? Esas son las preguntas que debemos plantearles a los activistas blancos.

Y nosotros nunca vamos a vernos atrapados en cuestiones de poder. Este país sabe lo que es el poder. Lo sabe muy bien. Y sabe lo que es el Poder Negro, ya que ha privado a la población negra de él durante 400 años. Así que sabe lo que es el Poder Negro. La pregunta, entonces, es: ¿por qué la población negra... por qué la población blanca de este país asocia el Poder Negro con la violencia? Y la pregunta surge por su propia inhabilidad de lidiar con lo "negro". Si hubiéramos dicho "Poder de los negros" nadie se hubiera asustado; todos lo apoyarían. O si dijéramos "poder para la gente de color", todos estarían de nuestro lado. Pero es el adjetivo "negro"... es lo "negro" la que le molesta a la gente de este país, y ese es su problema, no el mío. Su problema; su problema.

Hay una mentira de la modernidad que queremos atacar y después seguir adelante, y esa mentira es la que dice que todo lo íntegramente negro es malo. Ahora, todos ustedes son una multitud de estudiantes universitarios. Todos ya cursaron lógica básica. Saben lo que es una premisa mayor y una premisa menor. Así que la gente me ha estado diciendo que todo lo íntegramente negro es malo. Tomémoslo como nuestra premisa mayor.

Premisa mayor: todo lo íntegramente negro es malo.

Premisa menor o premisa particular: yo soy negro.

Por lo tanto...

I'm never going to be put in that trick bag; I am all black and I'm all good, dig it. Anything all black is not necessarily bad. Anything all black is only bad when you use force to keep whites out. Now that's what white people have done in this country, and they're projecting their same fears and guilt on us, and we won't have it, we won't have it. Let them handle their own fears and their own guilt. Let them find their own psychologists. We refuse to be the therapy for white society any longer. We have gone mad trying to do it. We have gone stark raving mad trying to do it.

I look at Dr. King on television every single day, and I say to myself: "Now there is a man who's desperately needed in this country. There is a man full of love. There is a man full of mercy. There is a man full of compassion." But every time I see Lyndon on television, I said, "Martin, baby, you got a long way to go."

So that the question stands as to what we are willing to do, how we are willing to say "No" to withdraw from that system and begin within our community to start to function and to build new institutions that will speak to our needs. In Lowndes County, we developed something called the *Lowndes County Freedom Organization*. It is a political party. The Alabama law says that if you have a Party you must have an emblem. We chose for the emblem a black panther, a beautiful black animal which symbolizes the strength and dignity of black people, an animal that never strikes back until he's back so far into the wall, he's got nothing to do but spring out. Yeah. And when he springs he does not stop.

Now there is a Party in Alabama called the *Alabama Democratic Party*. It is all white. It has as its emblem a white rooster and the words "white supremacy" for the write. Now the gentlemen of the Press, because they're advertisers, and because most of them are white, and because they're produced by that white institution, never called the *Lowndes County Freedom Organization* by its name, but rather they call it the Black Panther Party. Our question is, Why don't they call the Alabama Democratic Party the "White Cock Party"? (It's fair to us.....) It is clear to me that that just points out America's problem with sex and color, not our problem, not our problem. And it is now white America that is going to deal with those problems of sex and color.

If we were to be real and to be honest, we would have to admit -- we would have to admit that most people in this country see things black and white. We have to do that. All of us do. We live in a country that's geared that way. White people would have to admit that they are afraid to go into a black ghetto at night. They are afraid. That's a fact. They're afraid because they'd be "beat up," "lynched," "looted," "cut up," etcetera, etcetera. It happens to black people inside the ghetto every day, incidentally, and white people are afraid of that.

Nunca voy a dejar que me embauquen así. Yo soy íntegramente negro e íntegramente bueno, miren ustedes. Todo lo íntegramente negro no tiene por qué ser malo. Lo íntegramente negro sólo es malo cuando se usa la fuerza para dejar a los blancos afuera. Y eso es lo que la población blanca ha hecho en este país, y está proyectando sus propios miedos y culpas en nosotros, y nosotros no vamos a asumírselos; no vamos a asumírselos. ¡Que manejen sus propios miedos y su propia culpa! ¡Que se busquen sus propios psicólogos! Nos negamos a seguir siendo los terapeutas de la sociedad blanca. Nos hemos vuelto locos tratando de hacerlo. Nos hemos vuelto completamente locos tratando de hacerlo.

Veo al Dr. King por televisión todos los santos días, y me digo: “Este es un hombre al que el país necesita desesperadamente. Este es un hombre lleno de amor. Este es un hombre lleno de misericordia. Este es un hombre lleno de compasión”. Pero cada vez que veo a Lyndon por televisión, digo: “Martin, querido, tienes un largo camino por recorrer”.

Así que la cuestión reside en qué estamos dispuestos a hacer, cómo estamos dispuestos a decir “no” al cambio de ese sistema y comenzar, dentro de nuestra comunidad, a funcionar y a construir nuevas instituciones que respondan a nuestras necesidades. En el Condado de Lowndes hemos desarrollado algo llamado “Organización para la Libertad del Condado de Lowndes”. Es un partido político. La legislación de Alabama establece que si uno tiene un partido, tiene que tener un emblema. Nosotros elegimos una pantera negra, un hermoso animal negro que simboliza la fuerza y la dignidad de la población negra; un animal que sólo contraataca cuando se siente acorralado, cuando lo único que le queda por hacer es aparecerse de golpe. Y cuando aparece, no para.

Ahora bien, hay un partido en Alabama llamado “Partido Demócrata de Alabama”. Es íntegramente blanco. Tiene como emblema un gallo blanco, y como lema la frase “supremacía blanca”. Los caballeros de la prensa, ya que son propagandistas, y que la mayoría son blancos, y que son producto de dicha institución blanca, nunca llamaron a la Organización para la Libertad del Condado de Lowndes por su nombre, sino que la llaman el “Partido de la Pantera Negra”. Nuestra pregunta es: ¿por qué no llaman al Partido Demócrata de Alabama el “Partido del Gallo Blanco”? Sería lo más justo... Me parece claro que esto simplemente plantea los problemas que tiene Estados Unidos con el sexo y el color, no nuestro problema; no nuestro problema. Y es ahora cuando los blancos de Estados Unidos van a lidiar con esos problemas de sexo y color.

Para ser auténticos y honestos, tendríamos que admitir... tendríamos que admitir que la mayor parte de la gente de este país ve las cosas en blanco y negro. Tenemos que hacer eso. Todos lo hacemos. Vivimos en un país que está organizado de esa manera. La población blanca tendría que admitir que tienen miedo de entrar a un gueto negro de noche. Tienen miedo. Tienen miedo porque podrían ser “golpeados”, “linchados”, “desvalijados”, etc. A propósito, les pasa a los negros dentro del gueto todos los días, y los blancos tienen miedo de eso.

So you get a man to do it for you -- a policeman. And now you figure his mentality, when he's afraid of black people. The first time a black man jumps, that white man going to shoot him. He's going to shoot him. So police brutality is going to exist on that level because of the incapability of that white man to see black people come together and to live in the conditions. This country is too hypocritical and that we cannot adjust ourselves to its hypocrisy.

The only time I hear people talk about nonviolence is when black people move to defend themselves against white people. Black people cut themselves every night in the ghetto -- Don't anybody talk about nonviolence. Lyndon Baines Johnson is busy bombing the hell of out Vietnam -- Don't nobody talk about nonviolence. White people beat up black people every day -- Don't nobody talk about nonviolence. But as soon as black people start to move, the double standard comes into being.

You can't defend yourself. That's what you're saying, 'cause you show me a man who -- who would advocate aggressive violence that would be able to live in this country. Show him to me. The double standards again come into itself. Isn't it ludicrous and hypocritical for the political chameleon who calls himself a Vice President in this country to -- to stand up before this country and say, "Looting never got anybody anywhere"? Isn't it hypocritical for Lyndon to talk about looting, that you can't accomplish anything by looting and you must accomplish it by the legal ways? What does he know about legality? Ask Ho Chi Minh, he'll tell you.

So that in conclusion we want to say that number one, it is clear to me that we have to wage a psychological battle on the right for black people to define their own terms, define themselves as they see fit, and organize themselves as they see it. Now the question is, How is the white community going to begin to allow for that organizing, because once they start to do that, they will also allow for the organizing that they want to do inside their community. It doesn't make a difference, 'cause we're going to organize our way anyway. We're going to do it. The question is, How are we going to facilitate those matters, whether it's going to be done with a thousand policemen with submachine guns, or whether or not it's going to be done in a context where it is allowed to be done by white people warding off those policemen. That is the question.

And the question is, how are white people who call themselves activists ready to start move into the white communities on two counts: on building new political institutions to destroy the old ones that we have? And to move around the concept of white youth refusing to go into the army? So that we can start, then, to build a new world. It is ironic to talk about civilization in this country. This country is uncivilized. It needs to be civilized. It needs to be civilized.

Así que se buscan a un hombre que lo haga por ellos: un policía. Y así se explica su mentalidad, ante su miedo a los negros. La primera vez que un hombre negro salta, ese hombre blanco lo va a matar. Lo va a matar. Por lo que la brutalidad policial va a existir a ese nivel, por la incapacidad de ese hombre blanco de ver a los negros unirse y vivir en esas condiciones. Este país es demasiado hipócrita, y nosotros no podemos adaptarnos a su hipocresía.

Sólo he escuchado a la gente hablar sobre la no violencia cuando la población negra se movilizó para defenderse de los blancos. La población negra sufre ataques todas las noches en el gueto... pero no se habla de la no violencia. Lyndon Baines Johnson está ocupado bombardeando Vietnam... No me vengan a hablar de la no violencia. Los blancos golpean brutalmente a los negros todos los días... No me vengan a hablar de la no violencia. Pero en cuanto la población negra empieza a movilizarse, entra a jugar la doble moral.

Ustedes no pueden defenderse. Eso es lo que están diciendo, porque saben que existe un hombre que aunque defiende la agresión violenta puede vivir en este país. Muéstrenmelo. Una vez más entra en juego la doble moral. ¿No es ridículo e hipócrita que el camaleón político que se hace llamar vicepresidente de este país le diga a la población que "los saqueos nunca llevaron a nadie a ningún lado"? ¿No es hipócrita que Lyndon hable de saqueos, que diga que no se puede lograr nada con saqueos, y que todo se debe lograr por medios legales? ¿Qué sabe él de legalidad? Pregúntenle a Ho Chi Minh, él les va a contar.

Así que, en conclusión, queremos decir, en primer lugar, que está claro que tenemos que iniciar una batalla psicológica por el derecho de la población negra de definir sus propios términos, definirse como mejor le parezca, y organizarse como quiera. Ahora, la pregunta es cómo la comunidad blanca va a empezar a permitir esa organización, porque una vez que lo haga, va a permitir también la organización que quiere hacer dentro de su comunidad. No hace a la diferencia, porque igualmente nosotros vamos a organizarnos de nuestro modo. Vamos a hacerlo. La cuestión es cómo vamos a llevar esto a cabo: si se va a hacer con mil policías con ametralladoras, o si se va a hacer en un contexto donde los blancos lo permitan manteniendo a esos policías al margen. Esa es la cuestión.

Y la cuestión es cómo los blancos que se autodenominan activistas van a estar listos para empezar a movilizarse dentro de las comunidades blancas en dos aspectos: la construcción de nuevas instituciones políticas para destruir así las viejas que tenemos, y la movilización de la juventud blanca que se niega a ir a la guerra. Para que podamos comenzar así a construir un mundo nuevo. Es irónico hablar de civilización en este país. Este país es incivilizado. Necesita ser civilizado. Necesita ser civilizado.

And that we must begin to raise those questions of civilization: What it is? And who do it? And so we must urge you to fight now to be the leaders of today, not tomorrow. We've got to be the leaders of today. This country -- This country is a nation of thieves. It stands on the brink of becoming a nation of murderers. We must stop it. We must stop it. We must stop it. We must stop it.

And then, therefore, in a larger sense there's the question of black people. We are on the move for our liberation. We have been tired of trying to prove things to white people. We are tired of trying to explain to white people that we're not going to hurt them. We are concerned with getting the things we want, the things that we have to have to be able to function. The question is, Can white people allow for that in this country? The question is, Will white people overcome their racism and allow for that to happen in this country? If that does not happen, brothers and sisters, we have no choice but to say very clearly, "Move over, or we're going to move on over you."

Thank you.

Y tenemos que empezar a plantear esas preguntas sobre civilización: ¿qué es y quién la hace? Es nuestro deber convocarlos a ustedes a luchar para ser los líderes del hoy, no del mañana. Tenemos que ser los líderes del hoy. Este país... este país es una nación de ladrones. Está a punto de convertirse en un país de asesinos. Tenemos que detenerlo. Tenemos que detenerlo. Tenemos que detenerlo. Tenemos que detenerlo.

Entonces, en un sentido más amplio, aparece la cuestión de la población negra. Estamos movilizándonos por nuestra liberación. Estamos hartos de intentar probarles cosas a los blancos. Estamos hartos de intentar explicarles a los blancos que no vamos a lastimarlos. Estamos concentrados en lograr las cosas que queremos, las cosas que tenemos que tener para poder funcionar. La pregunta es: ¿podrá la gente blanca permitir eso en este país? La pregunta es: ¿podrá la gente blanca superar su racismo y permitir que eso ocurra en este país? Si eso no ocurre, hermanos y hermanas, no nos queda otra opción que decir muy claramente: "córranse, o los corremos nosotros".

Muchas gracias.

## Análisis del proceso de traducción

### Introducción

Para llevar a cabo este análisis del proceso de traducción, dividimos el trabajo en dos partes. En primer lugar, identificamos las características generales del discurso y, de acuerdo con estas, decidimos qué tipo de traducción íbamos a implementar (con respecto al enfoque). En segundo término, seleccionamos algunos de los problemas de traducción que surgieron a la hora de abordar el texto e intentamos explicar el porqué de las elecciones realizadas.

### Primera parte: características del texto y tipo de traducción a emplear

Respecto de las características del texto que trabajamos en esta tesina, consideramos importante establecer quién lo pronunció (ya que es un discurso), dónde, cuándo, para quién y en qué contexto.

El autor del discurso seleccionado es Stokely Carmichael. Contemporáneo a Martin Luther King pero de un tinte bastante menos pacifista, Carmichael era un activista por los derechos civiles de la población negra en Estados Unidos. Adquirió popularidad al presidir el Comité Coordinador Estudiantil No Violento (SNCC, por su sigla en inglés), y fue quien popularizó el concepto del “Poder Negro”. Carmichael pronunció este discurso el 28 de julio de 1966 en la Universidad de California ante una multitud de estudiantes universitarios.

El contexto sociopolítico de este discurso es de gran importancia. En cuanto a la política exterior, la situación de Estados Unidos era difícil ya que estaba disputando la guerra de Vietnam. En el caso de la política interna, a pesar de la Ley de Derechos Civiles de 1964 (*Civil Rights Act*), la discriminación contra los negros era moneda corriente. De hecho, un mes antes de este discurso, James Meredith, el primer estudiante de color de la Universidad de Mississippi, había sufrido un intento de asesinato.

Reconocer estas características y adentrarnos en la situación de enunciación resultó muy útil a la hora de traducir este texto. Conocer y comprender la posición política y social del autor y el contexto en el que fue pronunciado el discurso fue muy importante al momento de tomar una posición para traducir y elegir cada palabra en la lengua meta.

Para seleccionar el tipo de traducción a emplear, decidimos centrarnos en las teorías de Peter Newmark. El autor propone dos tipos de traducción, **semántica** y **comunicativa**. El método semántico se centra en el autor de un texto, mientras que el comunicativo está más cerca del lector. Además, Newmark plantea que la traducción semántica se utiliza en el caso de textos expresivos, que los componentes culturales se traducen casi de manera intacta y que su objetivo es la concisión, con el fin de reproducir el impacto pragmático del texto. Por estos motivos, en este trabajo, en líneas generales, optamos por una traducción semántica. Decimos en líneas generales porque hubo instancias en las que el mismo texto necesitaba ser abordado con un enfoque comunicativo. El ejemplo más claro es el de las repeticiones, que se mantuvieron pensando en el lector, en generar en él el mismo impacto logrado en el público original. Este aspecto será desarrollado en profundidad en la segunda parte.

### Segunda parte: problemas de traducción y su explicación

En esta sección, seleccionamos algunas de las dificultades con las que nos encontramos al momento de traducir y comentamos las soluciones que decidimos darles. La primera dificultad fue el paso de la oralidad del discurso a su escritura. El segundo desafío que afrontamos fue respetar repeticiones e ironías (relacionadas con la argumentación presente), y el tercero fue la traducción del concepto *Black Power*.

Un discurso no se confecciona de la misma manera que un texto cuya finalidad es ser leído. De hecho, el propio discurso no suena de la misma manera cuando se lee en voz baja que cuando se pronuncia. Existen factores como las pausas, el cambio de tono y la subida de la voz que son imperceptibles cuando el texto está plasmado en una hoja. En su libro *Describir el escribir* (1988) Daniel Cassany, profesor titular de análisis del discurso de la Universidad Pompeu Fabra de Barcelona, explica que la comunicación verbal se apoya en un gran número de códigos no verbales como la entonación de la voz y los gestos, mientras que las comunicaciones escritas no los utilizan y deben desarrollar recursos lingüísticos para transmitir estos significados. Asimismo, Cassany explica que, en los textos orales, gran parte de los elementos que dan sentido al discurso pertenecen a códigos no verbales como la entonación, velocidad del habla, pausas y gestos.

Lo planteado por Cassany se hizo muy evidente al trabajar con la traducción del discurso de Carmichael; leer el texto en detalle no parecía suficiente. Por eso recurrimos al audio, que nos permitió comprender la intención del orador en cada palabra, frase u oración en la que teníamos dudas. Además, nos dio la posibilidad de identificar dónde y cuándo estaba puesto el énfasis, cuándo había silencios intencionales y cuándo el orador cambiaba el tono de voz. Cabe aclarar que escuchar el discurso no fue una tarea



sencilla, principalmente por dos motivos. El primero es que, si bien está digitalizado, el audio es de 1966, por lo que hay partes que no son muy nítidas. El otro es que el orador es afroamericano y tiene un acento muy particular, por lo que algunas veces teníamos que escuchar alguna oración más de una vez.

Otra dificultad relacionada con el paso de la oralidad a la escritura es el hecho de no tener absoluta libertad para traducir. Con esto nos referimos a que, muchas veces, el traductor corta o bien fusiona oraciones para que el texto sea más comprensible y se adapte mejor a la gramática de la lengua de llegada. En este caso, al ser un discurso, no podíamos hacer esto porque el discurso debía sonar igual y mantener las estructuras del original.

Como dijimos más arriba, algunos aspectos relacionados con la argumentación y persuasión presentes en el texto constituyeron otra dificultad a la hora de traducir, ya que en nuestro trabajo debíamos mantener el impacto producido por el texto original. Es por eso que, aunque sonaran redundantes, tuvimos que conservar ciertas repeticiones. Cabe aclarar que esto se relaciona también con el hecho de que estemos trabajando en el ámbito de la oralidad, que permite más licencias en relación con estos temas. Un ejemplo claro de repetición de una palabra aparece en el tercer párrafo: “[...] hay una ley superior a la **ley** de un racista llamado McNamara. Hay una ley superior a la **ley** de un tonto llamado Rusk. Y hay una ley superior a la **ley** de un bufón llamado Johnson. Es la ley de cada uno de nosotros.” La reiteración de la palabra ‘ley’ se podría haber evitado, por ejemplo, diciendo “hay una ley superior a la de un tonto...”. Pero optamos por repetir la palabra ya que percibimos un tinte político en su uso reiterado.

Otra instancia de repetición para enfatizar que cabe señalar es la siguiente: “**It is we who have picked the cotton for nothing. It is we who are the maids in the kitchens of liberal white people. It is we who are the janitors, the porters, the elevator men; we who sweep up your college floors. Yes, it is we who are the hardest workers and the lowest paid, and the lowest paid.**” En este caso, podríamos decir que el orador recurrió a la figura retórica de **reiteración** o **anáfora**, por la cual se repiten palabras al principio de un verso u oración para resaltar una idea. Además, otro elemento que nos da la pauta de que Carmichael quiso enfatizar esta parte es el uso de las cláusulas hendidas (*cleft sentences*). De acuerdo con el libro *Grammar of Spoken and Written English* (1999), este tipo de cláusulas se utiliza para focalizar y enfatizar elementos en particular. Las diferentes explicaciones teóricas nos sirvieron para darnos cuenta de que las repeticiones en este discurso, más allá de su relación con la oralidad, eran **intencionales**, por lo que debíamos mantenerlas en nuestra traducción.

Para analizar el uso de la ironía, tomamos la teoría de Sperber y Wilson (1978). Estos autores sostienen que “la ironía verbal implica la expresión implícita de una actitud, y la relevancia de un enunciado irónico depende invariablemente, por lo menos en parte, de la información que este transmite sobre la actitud del hablante respecto de la opinión de la que se hace eco. [...] La actitud expresada por un enunciado irónico es, invariablemente, una actitud de rechazo o de desaprobación.” En el discurso de Carmichael aparecen varias instancias de ironía, de las cuales observamos algunas. Al comienzo del texto puede verse la frase “gueto intelectual blanco del Oeste”. En este caso, la palabra ‘gueto’ está cargada de ironía ya que, de forma subyacente, el autor está diciendo que los intelectuales blancos son una minoría étnica.

Podemos ver otro ejemplo interesante de ironía en el siguiente segmento del texto (página 19, segundo párrafo): “La población negra sufre ataques todas las noches en el gueto... pero no se habla de la no violencia.” Esta oración adversativa puede relacionarse directamente con la explicación de Sperber y Wilson. Aquí, el coordinante adversativo ‘pero’ parece dejar en claro la expresión implícita de la actitud de Carmichael, quien repudia la inacción de la gente cuando se trata de la violencia contra la población negra. Así, queda demostrada la actitud de rechazo o desaprobación a través de la ironía que plantean los autores citados.

La tercera dificultad a la que tuvimos que enfrentarnos al traducir el discurso de Carmichael fue la traducción del concepto “Black Power” (la única dificultad terminológica que abordamos). La traducción de esta frase parece transparente, “Poder Negro”; de hecho, eso fue lo que pusimos en nuestro trabajo. Entonces, ¿por qué decimos que fue una dificultad? Uno de los motivos es que el movimiento del “Poder Negro” es más conocido por el público interesado en el tema por su nombre en inglés. En un principio, lo habíamos dejado en la lengua original, pero después, durante la revisión del trabajo, decidimos cambiarlo. Para tomar esta decisión, llevamos a cabo distintos pasos. En primer lugar, buscamos trabajos académicos sobre el tema redactados directamente en español para ver si utilizaban la expresión en esta lengua o en inglés, y notamos que el porcentaje era aproximadamente cincuenta y cincuenta. Lo mismo ocurría con trabajos traducidos del inglés al español. Luego, investigamos si había algún libro publicado de Carmichael, y cómo había sido traducido el término en cuestión. Así, averiguamos que existe un libro publicado por primera vez en 1973 por Carmichael y Hamilton, titulado *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation*, que fue traducido como *Poder Negro: la política de liberación en Estados Unidos*. La traducción

de este libro estuvo a cargo de Florentino M. Torner<sup>2</sup>, prestigioso traductor de diversos libros de historia, antropología y economía, entre otras disciplinas.

Lo realizado por Torner hizo que nos inclináramos un poco más hacia la traducción al castellano del término, y fue algo dentro del propio discurso lo que colaboró con nuestra decisión final. El tercer párrafo de la página 15 se centra en el término 'poder': "Y nosotros nunca vamos a vernos atrapados en cuestiones de poder. Este país sabe lo que es el poder. Lo sabe muy bien. Y sabe lo que es el Poder Negro, ya que ha privado a la población negra de él durante 400 años. Así que sabe lo que es el Poder Negro. La pregunta, entonces, es: ¿por qué la población negra... por qué la población blanca de este país asocia el Poder Negro con la violencia? Y la pregunta surge por su propia inhabilidad de lidiar con lo "negro". Si hubiéramos dicho "Poder de los negros" nadie se hubiera asustado; todos lo apoyarían. O si dijéramos "poder para la gente de color", todos estarían de nuestro lado." Si hubiéramos dejado "Black Power" sin traducir, el juego de palabras alrededor de 'poder' y de 'negro' que Carmichael plantea aquí no tendría ningún sentido en castellano. Entonces, luego de analizar esta parte del discurso y teniendo en cuenta la traducción "oficial" que Torner acuñó, optamos por traducir el término y dejar "Poder Negro".

## Conclusión

Así como la conclusión es el punto final de esta tesina, podríamos decir que esta tesina, a su vez, es el punto final de la carrera cursada. Esta es una verdad a medias. La parte cierta se relaciona directamente con el hecho de que este trabajo final de carrera, como su nombre lo indica, es el último requisito académico que la universidad nos pide. La otra parte, la no tan cierta, tiene que ver con la función de este trabajo: el trampolín al mundo profesional.

Decimos que la presente tesina nos acercó al mundo profesional por diversos motivos. En primera instancia, realizarla nos permitió adentrarnos en el área la traducción desde un punto de vista diferente, un poco menos inocente y un tanto más crítico. Nos dio la posibilidad de analizar temas que no habíamos tratado durante la carrera, e hizo que pudiéramos sacar conclusiones generales que podríamos aplicar de aquí en adelante a otros textos a los que tengamos que enfrentarnos, especialmente con respecto a cómo proceder y qué pasos seguir para lograr una traducción satisfactoria.

Además, esta tesina nos hizo descubrir que, para realmente ubicarnos en el lugar correcto a la hora de traducir, todo trabajo comienza con una investigación. Luego continúa con esfuerzo, tenacidad, paciencia y criterio. Después viene la instancia de revisión. Y finalmente la conclusión. En este caso, después de haber terminado la tesina, podríamos decir que, así como el traductor es un puente entre culturas, este trabajo representa el puente entre nuestra carrera universitaria y nuestra vida profesional. Es el fin de un ciclo, pero el principio de otro nuevo.

## Bibliografía

- ARISTÓTELES, *Tratados de lógica*, Madrid, Gredos, 2000.
- BIBER, D. et al., *Grammar of Spoken and Written English*, Londres, Longman, 1999.
- CARMICHAEL, S., *Poder Negro: la política de liberación en Estados Unidos*, México DF, Siglo XXI, 1968.
- CASSANY, D., *Describir el escribir. Cómo se aprende a escribir*, Barcelona, Paidós, 1988.  
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stokely\\_Carmichael](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stokely_Carmichael), fecha de última visita: lunes 22 de marzo de 2010.
- NEWMARK, P., *A textbook on Translation*, Nueva York, Prentice Hall, 1988.
- SPERBER, D. y DEIRDRE, W., *Les ironies comme mentions*, en Poétique 36, 1978, pp. 399-412.

2. Entre otros autores destacados, Torner tradujo obras del sociólogo Wright Mills, del psicoanalista Erich Fromm y del sociólogo y economista Roberto Merton (padre del premio Nobel de economía).

## Anexo

### Discurso completo

Thank you very much. It's a privilege and an honor to be in the white intellectual ghetto of the West. We wanted to do a couple of things before we started. The first is that, based on the fact that SNCC, through the articulation of its program by its chairman, has been able to win elections in Georgia, Alabama, Maryland, and by our appearance here will win an election in California, in 1968 I'm going to run for President of the United States. I just can't make it, 'cause I wasn't born in the United States. That's the only thing holding me back.

We wanted to say that this is a student conference, as it should be, held on a campus, and that we're not ever to be caught up in the intellectual masturbation of the question of Black Power. That's a function of people who are advertisers that call themselves reporters. Oh, for my members and friends of the press, my self-appointed white critics, I was reading Mr. Bernard Shaw two days ago, and I came across a very important quote which I think is most apropos for you. He says, "All criticism is a[n] autobiography." Dig yourself. Okay.

The philosophers Camus and Sartre raise the question whether or not a man can condemn himself. The black existentialist philosopher who is pragmatic, Frantz Fanon, answered the question. He said that man could not. Camus and Sartre was not. We in SNCC tend to agree with Camus and Sartre, that a man cannot condemn himself.<sup>1</sup> Were he to condemn himself, he would then have to inflict punishment upon himself. An example would be the Nazis. Any prisoner who -- any of the Nazi prisoners who admitted, after he was caught and incarcerated, that he committed crimes, that he killed all the many people that he killed, he committed suicide. The only ones who were able to stay alive were the ones who never admitted that they committed a crimes [sic] against people -- that is, the ones who rationalized that Jews were not human beings and deserved to be killed, or that they were only following orders.

On a more immediate scene, the officials and the population -- the white population -- in Neshoba County, Mississippi -- that's where Philadelphia is -- could not -- could not condemn [Sheriff] Rainey, his deputies, and the other fourteen men that killed three human beings. They could not because they elected Mr. Rainey to do precisely what he did; and that for them to condemn him will be for them to condemn themselves.

In a much larger view, SNCC says that white America cannot condemn herself. And since we are liberal, we have done it: You stand condemned. Now, a number of things that arises from that answer of how do you condemn yourselves. Seems to me that the institutions that function in this country are clearly racist, and that they're built upon racism. And the question, then, is how can black people inside of this country move? And then how can white people who say they're not a part of those institutions begin to move? And how then do we begin to clear away the obstacles that we have in this society, that make us live like human beings? How can we begin to build institutions that will allow people to relate with each other as human beings? This country has never done that, especially around the country of white or black.

Now, several people have been upset because we've said that integration was irrelevant when initiated by blacks, and that in fact it was a subterfuge, an insidious subterfuge, for the maintenance of white supremacy. Now we maintain that in the past six years or so, this country has been feeding us a "thalidomide drug of integration," and that some negroes have been walking down a dream street talking about sitting next to white people; and that that does not begin to solve the problem; that when we went to Mississippi we did not go to sit next to Ross Barnett<sup>2</sup>; we did not go to sit next to Jim Clark<sup>3</sup>; we went to get them out of our way; and that people ought to understand that; that we were never fighting for the right to integrate, we were fighting against white supremacy.

Now, then, in order to understand white supremacy we must dismiss the fallacious notion that white people can give anybody their freedom. No man can give anybody his freedom. A man is born free. You may enslave a man after he is born free, and that is in fact what this country does. It enslaves black people after they're born, so that the only acts that white people can do is to stop denying black people their freedom; that is, they must stop denying freedom. They never give it to anyone.

Now we want to take that to its logical extension, so that we could understand, then, what its relevancy would be in terms of new civil rights bills. I maintain that every civil rights bill in this country was passed for white people, not for black people. For example, I am black. I know that. I also know that while I am black I am a human being, and therefore I have the right to go into any public place. White people didn't know that. Every time I tried to go into a place they stopped me. So some boys had to write a bill to tell that white man, "He's a human being; don't stop him." That bill was for that white man, not for me. I knew it all the time. I knew it all the time.

I knew that I could vote and that that wasn't a privilege; it was my right. Every time I tried I was shot, killed or jailed, beaten or economically deprived. So somebody had to write a bill for white people to tell

them, "When a black man comes to vote, don't bother him." That bill, again, was for white people, not for black people; so that when you talk about open occupancy, I know I can live anyplace I want to live. It is white people across this country who are incapable of allowing me to live where I want to live. You need a civil rights bill, not me. I know I can live where I want to live.

So that the failures to pass a civil rights bill isn't because of Black Power, isn't because of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee; it's not because of the rebellions that are occurring in the major cities. It is incapability of whites to deal with their own problems inside their own communities. That is the problem of the failure of the civil rights bill.

And so in a larger sense we must then ask, How is it that black people move? And what do we do? But the question in a greater sense is, How can white people who are the majority -- and who are responsible for making democracy work -- make it work? They have miserably failed to this point. They have never made democracy work, be it inside the United States, Vietnam, South Africa, Philippines, South America, Puerto Rico. Wherever American has been, she has not been able to make democracy work; so that in a larger sense, we not only condemn the country for what it's done internally, but we must condemn it for what it does externally. We see this country trying to rule the world, and someone must stand up and start articulating that this country is not God, and cannot rule the world.

Now, then, before we move on we ought to develop the white supremacy attitudes that were either conscious or subconscious thought and how they run rampant through the society today. For example, the missionaries were sent to Africa. They went with the attitude that blacks were automatically inferior. As a matter of fact, the first act the missionaries did, you know, when they got to Africa was to make us cover up our bodies, because they said it got them excited. We couldn't go bare-breasted any more because they got excited.

Now when the missionaries came to civilize us because we were uncivilized, educate us because we were uneducated, and give us some -- some literate studies because we were illiterate, they charged a price. The missionaries came with the Bible, and we had the land. When they left, they had the land, and we still have the Bible. And that has been the rationalization for Western civilization as it moves across the world and stealing and plundering and raping everybody in its path. Their one rationalization is that the rest of the world is uncivilized and they are in fact civilized. And they are un-civil-ized.

And that runs on today, you see, because what we have today is we have what we call "modern-day Peace Corps missionaries," and they come into our ghettos and they Head Start, Upward Lift, Bootstrap, and Upward Bound us into white society, 'cause they don't want to face the real problem which is a man is poor for one reason and one reason only: 'cause he does not have money -- period. If you want to get rid of poverty, you give people money -- period.

And you ought not to tell me about people who don't work, and you can't give people money without working, 'cause if that were true, you'd have to start stopping Rockefeller, Bobby Kennedy, Lyndon Baines Johnson, Lady Bird Johnson, the whole of Standard Oil, the Gulf Corp, all of them, including probably a large number of the Board of Trustees of this university. So the question, then, clearly, is not whether or not one can work; it's Who has power? Who has power to make his or her acts legitimate? That is all. And that this country, that power is invested in the hands of white people, and they make their acts legitimate. It is now, therefore, for black people to make our acts legitimate.

Now we are now engaged in a psychological struggle in this country, and that is whether or not black people will have the right to use the words they want to use without white people giving their sanction to it; and that we maintain, whether they like it or not, we gonna use the word "Black Power" -- and let them address themselves to that; but that we are not going to wait for white people to sanction Black Power. We're tired waiting; every time black people move in this country, they're forced to defend their position before they move. It's time that the people who are supposed to be defending their position do that. That's white people. They ought to start defending themselves as to why they have oppressed and exploited us.

Now it is clear that when this country started to move in terms of slavery, the reason for a man being picked as a slave was one reason -- because of the color of his skin. If one was black one was automatically inferior, inhuman, and therefore fit for slavery; so that the question of whether or not we are individually suppressed is nonsensical, and it's a downright lie. We are oppressed as a group because we are black, not because we are lazy, not because we're apathetic, not because we're stupid, not because we smell, not because we eat watermelon and have good rhythm. We are oppressed because we are black.

And in order to get out of that oppression one must wield the group power that one has, not the individual power which this country then sets the criteria under which a man may come into it. That is what is called in this country as integration: "You do what I tell you to do and then we'll let you sit at the table with us." And that we are saying that we have to be opposed to that. We must now set up criteria and that if there's going to be any integration, it's going to be a two-way thing. If you believe in integration, you can

come live in Watts. You can send your children to the ghetto schools. Let's talk about that. If you believe in integration, then we're going to start adopting us some white people to live in our neighborhood.

So it is clear that the question is not one of integration or segregation. Integration is a man's ability to want to move in there by himself. If someone wants to live in a white neighborhood and he is black, that is his choice. It should be his rights. It is not because white people will not allow him. So vice versa: If a black man wants to live in the slums, that should be his right. Black people will let him. That is the difference. And it's a difference on which this country makes a number of logical mistakes when they begin to try to criticize the program articulated by SNCC.

Now we maintain that we cannot be afford to be concerned about 6 percent of the children in this country, black children, who you allow to come into white schools. We have 94 percent who still live in shacks. We are going to be concerned about those 94 percent. You ought to be concerned about them too. The question is, Are we willing to be concerned about those 94 percent? Are we willing to be concerned about the black people who will never get to Berkeley, who will never get to Harvard, and cannot get an education, so you'll never get a chance to rub shoulders with them and say, "Well, he's almost as good as we are; he's not like the others"? The question is, How can white society begin to move to see black people as human beings? I am black, therefore I am; not that I am black and I must go to college to prove myself. I am black, therefore I am. And don't deprive me of anything and say to me that you must go to college before you gain access to X, Y, and Z. It is only a rationalization for one's oppression.

The -- The political parties in this country do not meet the needs of people on a day-to-day basis. The question is, How can we build new political institutions that will become the political expressions of people on a day-to-day basis? The question is, How can you build political institutions that will begin to meet the needs of Oakland, California? And the needs of Oakland, California, is not 1,000 policemen with submachine guns. They don't need that. They need that least of all. The question is, How can we build institutions where those people can begin to function on a day-to-day basis, where they can get decent jobs, where they can get decent houses, and where they can begin to participate in the policy and major decisions that affect their lives? That's what they need, not Gestapo troops, because this is not 1942, and if you play like Nazis, we playing back with you this time around. Get hip to that.

The question then is, How can white people move to start making the major institutions that they have in this country function the way it is supposed to function? That is the real question. And can white people move inside their own community and start tearing down racism where in fact it does exist? Where it exists. It is you who live in Cicero and stop us from living there. It is white people who stop us from moving into Grenada. It is white people who make sure that we live in the ghettos of this country. It is white institutions that do that. They must change. In order -- In order for America to really live on a basic principle of human relationships, a new society must be born. Racism must die, and the economic exploitation of this country of non-white peoples around the world must also die -- must also die.

Now there are several programs that we have in the South, most in poor white communities. We're trying to organize poor whites on a base where they can begin to move around the question of economic exploitation and political disfranchisement. We know -- we've heard the theory several times -- but few people are willing to go into there. The question is, Can the white activist not try to be a Pepsi generation who comes alive in the black community, but can he be a man who's willing to move into the white community and start organizing where the organization is needed? Can he do that? The question is, Can the white society or the white activist disassociate himself with two clowns who waste time parrying with each other rather than talking about the problems that are facing people in this state? Can you dissociate yourself with those clowns and start to build new institutions that will eliminate all idiots like them.

And the question is, If we are going to do that when and where do we start, and how do we start? We maintain that we must start doing that inside the white community. Our own personal position politically is that we don't think the Democratic Party represents the needs of black people. We know it don't. And that if, in fact, white people really believe that, the question is, if they're going to move inside that structure, how are they going to organize around a concept of whiteness based on true brotherhood and based on stopping exploitation, economic exploitation, so that there will be a coalition base for black people to hook up with? You cannot form a coalition based on national sentiment. That is not a coalition. If you need a coalition to redress itself to real changes in this country, white people must start building those institutions inside the white community. And that is the real question, I think, facing the white activists today. Can they, in fact, begin to move into and tear down the institutions which have put us all in a trick bag that we've been into for the last hundred years?

I don't think that we should follow what many people say that we should fight to be leaders of tomorrow. Frederick Douglass said that the youth should fight to be leaders today. And God knows we need to be leaders today, 'cause the men who run this country are sick, are sick. So that can we on a larger sense

begin now, today, to start building those institutions and to fight to articulate our position, to fight to be able to control our universities -- We need to be able to do that -- and to fight to control the basic institutions which perpetuate racism by destroying them and building new ones? That's the real question that face us today, and it is a dilemma because most of us do not know how to work, and that the excuse that most white activists find is to run into the black community.

Now we maintain that we cannot have white people working in the black community, and we mean it on a psychological ground. The fact is that all black people often question whether or not they are equal to whites, because every time they start to do something, white people are around showing them how to do it. If we are going to eliminate that for the generation that comes after us, then black people must be seen in positions of power, doing and articulating for themselves, for themselves.

That is not to say that one is a reverse racist; it is to say that one is moving in a healthy ground; it is to say what the philosopher Sartre says: One is becoming an "antiracist racist." And this country can't understand that. Maybe it's because it's all caught up in racism. But I think what you have in SNCC is an anti-racist racism. We are against racists. Now if everybody who is white see themself [sic] as a racist and then see us against him, they're speaking from their own guilt position, not ours, not ours.

Now then, the question is, How can we move to begin to change what's going on in this country. I maintain, as we have in SNCC, that the war in Vietnam is an illegal and immoral war. And the question is, What can we do to stop that war? What can we do to stop the people who, in the name of our country, are killing babies, women, and children? What can we do to stop that? And I maintain that we do not have the power in our hands to change that institution, to begin to recreate it, so that they learn to leave the Vietnamese people alone, and that the only power we have is the power to say, "Hell no!" to the draft.

We have to say -- We have to say to ourselves that there is a higher law than the law of a racist named McNamara. There is a higher law than the law of a fool named Rusk. And there's a higher law than the law of a buffoon named Johnson. It's the law of each of us. It's the law of each of us. It is the law of each of us saying that we will not allow them to make us hired killers. We will stand pat. We will not kill anybody that they say kill. And if we decide to kill, we're going to decide who we going to kill. And this country will only be able to stop the war in Vietnam when the young men who are made to fight it begin to say, "Hell, no, we ain't going."

Now then, there's a failure because the Peace Movement has been unable to get off the college campuses where everybody has a 2S and not going to get drafted anyway. And the question is, How can you move out of that into the white ghettos of this country and begin to articulate a position for those white students who do not want to go. We cannot do that. It is something -- sometimes ironic that many of the peace groups have beginning to call us violent and say they can no longer support us, and we are in fact the most militant organization [for] peace or civil rights or human rights against the war in Vietnam in this country today. There isn't one organization that has begun to meet our stance on the war in Vietnam, 'cause we not only say we are against the war in Vietnam; we are against the draft. We are against the draft. No man has the right to take a man for two years and train him to be a killer. A man should decide what he wants to do with his life.

So the question then is it becomes crystal clear for black people because we can easily say that anyone fighting in the war in Vietnam is nothing but a black mercenary, and that's all he is. Any time a black man leaves the country where he can't vote to supposedly deliver the vote for somebody else, he's a black mercenary. Any time a -- Any time a black man leaves this country, gets shot in Vietnam on foreign ground, and returns home and you won't give him a burial in his own homeland, he's a black mercenary, a black mercenary.

And that even if I were to believe the lies of Johnson, if I were to believe his lies that we're fighting to give democracy to the people in Vietnam, as a black man living in this country I wouldn't fight to give this to anybody. I wouldn't give it to anybody. So that we have to use our bodies and our minds in the only way that we see fit. We must begin like the philosopher Camus to come alive by saying "No!" That is the only act in which we begin to come alive, and we have to say "No!" to many, many things in this country.

This country is a nation of thieves. It has stole everything it has, beginning with black people, beginning with black people. And that the question is, How can we move to start changing this country from what it is -- a nation of thieves. This country cannot justify any longer its existence. We have become the policeman of the world. The marines are at our disposal to always bring democracy, and if the Vietnamese don't want democracy, well dammit, "We'll just wipe them the hell out, 'cause they don't deserve to live if they won't have our way of life."

There is then in a larger sense, What do you do on your university campus? Do you raise questions about the hundred black students who were kicked off campus a couple of weeks ago? Eight hundred? Eight hundred? And how does that question begin to move? Do you begin to relate to people outside of

the ivory tower and university wall? Do you think you're capable of building those human relationships, as the country now stands? You're fooling yourself. It is impossible for white and black people to talk about building a relationship based on humanity when the country is the way it is, when the institutions are clearly against us.

We have taken all the myths of this country and we've found them to be nothing but downright lies. This country told us that if we worked hard we would succeed, and if that were true we would own this country lock, stock, and barrel -- lock, stock, and barrel -- lock, stock, and barrel. It is we who have picked the cotton for nothing. It is we who are the maids in the kitchens of liberal white people. It is we who are the janitors, the porters, the elevator men; we who sweep up your college floors. Yes, it is we who are the hardest workers and the lowest paid, and the lowest paid.

And that it is nonsensical for people to start talking about human relationships until they're willing to build new institutions. Black people are economically insecure. White liberals are economically secure. Can you begin to build an economic coalition? Are the liberals willing to share their salaries with the economically insecure black people they so much love? Then if you're not, are you willing to start building new institutions that will provide economic security for black people? That's the question we want to deal with. That's the question we want to deal with.

We have to seriously examine the histories that we have been told. But we have something more to do than that. American students are perhaps the most politically unsophisticated students in the world, in the world, in the world. Across every country in this world, while we were growing up, students were leading the major revolutions of their countries. We have not been able to do that. They have been politically aware of their existence. In South America our neighbors down below the border have one every 24 hours just to remind us that they're politically aware.

And we have been unable to grasp it because we've always moved in the field of morality and love while people have been politically jiving with our lives. And the question is, how do we now move politically and stop trying to move morally? You can't move morally against a man like Brown and Reagan. You've got to move politically to put them out of business. You've got to move politically.

You can't move morally against Lyndon Baines Johnson because he is an immoral man. He doesn't know what it's all about. So you've got to move politically. You've got to move politically. And that we have to begin to develop a political sophistication -- which is not to be a parrot: "The two-party system is the best party in the world." There is a difference between being a parrot and being politically sophisticated.

We have to raise questions about whether or not we do need new types of political institutions in this country, and we in SNCC maintain that we need them now. We need new political institutions in this country. Any time -- Any time Lyndon Baines Johnson can head a Party which has in it Bobby Kennedy, Wayne Morse, Eastland, Wallace, and all those other supposed-to-be-liberal cats, there's something wrong with that Party. They're moving politically, not morally. And that if that party refuses to seat black people from Mississippi and goes ahead and seats racists like Eastland and his clique, it is clear to me that they're moving politically, and that one cannot begin to talk morality to people like that.

We must begin to think politically and see if we can have the power to impose and keep the moral values that we hold high. We must question the values of this society, and I maintain that black people are the best people to do that because we have been excluded from that society. And the question is, we ought to think whether or not we want to become a part of that society. That's what we want to do.

And that that is precisely what it seems to me that the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee is doing. We are raising questions about this country. I do not want to be a part of the American pie. The American pie means raping South Africa, beating Vietnam, beating South America, raping the Philippines, raping every country you've been in. I don't want any of your blood money. I don't want it -- don't want to be part of that system. And the question is, How do we raise those questions? How do we .... How do we begin to raise them?

We have grown up and we are the generation that has found this country to be a world power, that has found this country to be the wealthiest country in the world. We must question how she got her wealth! That's what we're questioning, and whether or not we want this country to continue being the wealthiest country in the world at the price of raping every -- everybody else across the world. That's what we must begin to question. And that because black people are saying we do not now want to become a part of you, we are called reverse racists. Ain't that a gas?

Now, then, we want to touch on nonviolence because we see that again as the failure of white society to make nonviolence work. I was always surprised at Quakers who came to Alabama and counseled me to be nonviolent, but didn't have the guts to start talking to James Clark to be nonviolent. That is where nonviolence needs to be preached -- to Jim Clark, not to black people. They have already been nonviolent too many years. The question is, Can white people conduct their nonviolent schools in Cicero where they

belong to be conducted, not among black people in Mississippi. Can they conduct it among the white people in Grenada?

Six-foot-two men who kick little black children -- can you conduct nonviolent schools there? That is the question that we must raise, not that you conduct nonviolence among black people. Can you name me one black man today who's killed anybody white and is still alive? Even after rebellion, when some black brothers throw some bricks and bottles, ten thousand of them has to pay the crime, 'cause when the white policeman comes in, anybody who's black is arrested, "cause we all look alike."

So that we have to raise those questions. We, the youth of this country, must begin to raise those questions. And we must begin to move to build new institutions that's going to speak to the needs of people who need it. We are going to have to speak to change the foreign policy of this country. One of the problems with the peace movement is that it's just too caught up in Vietnam, and that if we pulled out the troops from Vietnam this week, next week you'd have to get another peace movement for Santo Domingo. And the question is, How do you begin to articulate the need to change the foreign policy of this country -- a policy that is decided upon race, a policy on which decisions are made upon getting economic wealth at any price, at any price.

Now we articulate that we therefore have to hook up with black people around the world; and that that hookup is not only psychological, but becomes very real. If South America today were to rebel, and black people were to shoot the hell out of all the white people there -- as they should, as they should -- then Standard Oil would crumble tomorrow. If South Africa were to go today, Chase Manhattan Bank would crumble tomorrow. If Zimbabwe, which is called Rhodesia by white people, were to go tomorrow, General Electric would cave in on the East Coast. The question is, How do we stop those institutions that are so willing to fight against "Communist aggression" but closes their eyes to racist oppression? That is the question that you raise. Can this country do that?

Now, many people talk about pulling out of Vietnam. What will happen? If we pull out of Vietnam, there will be one less aggressor in there -- we won't be there, we won't be there. And so the question is, How do we articulate those positions? And we cannot begin to articulate them from the same assumptions that the people in the country speak, 'cause they speak from different assumptions than I assume what the youth in this country are talking about.

That we're not talking about a policy or aid or sending Peace Corps people in to teach people how to read and write and build houses while we steal their raw materials from them. Is that what we're talking about? 'Cause that's all we do. What underdeveloped countries needs -- information on how to become industrialized, so they can keep their raw materials where they have it, produce them and sell it to this country for the price it's supposed to pay; not that we produce it and sell it back to them for a profit and keep sending our modern day missionaries in, calling them the sons of Kennedy. And that if the youth are going to participate in that program, how do you raise those questions where you begin to control that Peace Corps program? How do you begin to raise them?

How do we raise the questions of poverty? The assumptions of this country is that if someone is poor, they are poor because of their own individual blight, or they weren't born on the right side of town; they had too many children; they went in the army too early; or their father was a drunk, or they didn't care about school, or they made a mistake. That's a lot of nonsense. Poverty is well calculated in this country. It is well calculated, and the reason why the poverty program won't work is because the calculators of poverty are administering it. That's why it won't work.

So how can we, as the youth in the country, move to start tearing those things down? We must move into the white community. We are in the black community. We have developed a movement in the black community. The challenge is that the white activist has failed miserably to develop the movement inside of his community. And the question is, Can we find white people who are going to have the courage to go into white communities and start organizing them? Can we find them? Are they here and are they willing to do that? Those are the questions that we must raise for the white activist.

And we're never going to get caught up in questions about power. This country knows what power is. It knows it very well. And it knows what Black Power is 'cause it deprived black people of it for 400 years. So it knows what Black Power is. That the question of, Why do black people -- Why do white people in this country associate Black Power with violence? And the question is because of their own inability to deal with "blackness." If we had said "Negro power" nobody would get scared. Everybody would support it. Or if we said power for colored people, everybody'd be for that, but it is the word "black" -- it is the word "black" that bothers people in this country, and that's their problem, not mine -- they're problem, they're problem.

Now there's one modern day lie that we want to attack and then move on very quickly and that is the lie that says anything all black is bad. Now, you're all a college university crowd. You've taken your basic logic course. You know about a major premise and minor premise. So people have been telling me anything all black is bad. Let's make that our major premise.



Major premise: Anything all black is bad.

Minor premise or particular premise: I am all black.

Therefore...

I'm never going to be put in that trick bag; I am all black and I'm all good, dig it. Anything all black is not necessarily bad. Anything all black is only bad when you use force to keep whites out. Now that's what white people have done in this country, and they're projecting their same fears and guilt on us, and we won't have it, we won't have it. Let them handle their own fears and their own guilt. Let them find their own psychologists. We refuse to be the therapy for white society any longer. We have gone mad trying to do it. We have gone stark raving mad trying to do it.

I look at Dr. King on television every single day, and I say to myself: "Now there is a man who's desperately needed in this country. There is a man full of love. There is a man full of mercy. There is a man full of compassion." But every time I see Lyndon on television, I said, "Martin, baby, you got a long way to go."

So that the question stands as to what we are willing to do, how we are willing to say "No" to withdraw from that system and begin within our community to start to function and to build new institutions that will speak to our needs. In Lowndes County, we developed something called the *Lowndes County Freedom Organization*. It is a political party. The Alabama law says that if you have a Party you must have an emblem. We chose for the emblem a black panther, a beautiful black animal which symbolizes the strength and dignity of black people, an animal that never strikes back until he's back so far into the wall, he's got nothing to do but spring out. Yeah. And when he springs he does not stop.

Now there is a Party in Alabama called the *Alabama Democratic Party*. It is all white. It has as its emblem a white rooster and the words "white supremacy" for the write. Now the gentlemen of the Press, because they're advertisers, and because most of them are white, and because they're produced by that white institution, never called the *Lowndes County Freedom Organization* by its name, but rather they call it the Black Panther Party. Our question is, Why don't they call the Alabama Democratic Party the "White Cock Party"? (It's fair to us.....) It is clear to me that that just points out America's problem with sex and color, not our problem, not our problem. And it is now white America that is going to deal with those problems of sex and color.

If we were to be real and to be honest, we would have to admit -- we would have to admit that most people in this country see things black and white. We have to do that. All of us do. We live in a country that's geared that way. White people would have to admit that they are afraid to go into a black ghetto at night. They are afraid. That's a fact. They're afraid because they'd be "beat up," "lynched," "looted," "cut up," etcetera, etcetera. It happens to black people inside the ghetto every day, incidentally, and white people are afraid of that. So you get a man to do it for you -- a policeman. And now you figure his mentality, when he's afraid of black people. The first time a black man jumps, that white man going to shoot him. He's going to shoot him. So police brutality is going to exist on that level because of the incapability of that white man to see black people come together and to live in the conditions. This country is too hypocritical and that we cannot adjust ourselves to its hypocrisy.

The only time I hear people talk about nonviolence is when black people move to defend themselves against white people. Black people cut themselves every night in the ghetto -- Don't anybody talk about nonviolence. Lyndon Baines Johnson is busy bombing the hell of out Vietnam -- Don't nobody talk about nonviolence. White people beat up black people every day -- Don't nobody talk about nonviolence. But as soon as black people start to move, the double standard comes into being.

You can't defend yourself. That's what you're saying, 'cause you show me a man who -- who would advocate aggressive violence that would be able to live in this country. Show him to me. The double standards again come into itself. Isn't it ludicrous and hypocritical for the political chameleon who calls himself a Vice President in this country to -- to stand up before this country and say, "Looting never got anybody anywhere"? Isn't it hypocritical for Lyndon to talk about looting, that you can't accomplish anything by looting and you must accomplish it by the legal ways? What does he know about legality? Ask Ho Chi Minh, he'll tell you.

So that in conclusion we want to say that number one, it is clear to me that we have to wage a psychological battle on the right for black people to define their own terms, define themselves as they see fit, and organize themselves as they see it. Now the question is, How is the white community going to begin to allow for that organizing, because once they start to do that, they will also allow for the organizing that they want to do inside their community. It doesn't make a difference, 'cause we're going to organize our way anyway. We're going to do it. The question is, How are we going to facilitate those matters, whether it's going to be done with a thousand policemen with submachine guns, or whether or not it's going to be done in a context where it is allowed to be done by white people warding off those policemen. That is the question.

And the question is, How are white people who call themselves activists ready to start move into the white communities on two counts: on building new political institutions to destroy the old ones that we have? And to move around the concept of white youth refusing to go into the army? So that we can start, then, to build a new world. It is ironic to talk about civilization in this country. This country is uncivilized. It needs to be civilized. It needs to be civilized.

And that we must begin to raise those questions of civilization: What it is? And who do it? And so we must urge you to fight now to be the leaders of today, not tomorrow. We've got to be the leaders of today. This country -- This country is a nation of thieves. It stands on the brink of becoming a nation of murderers. We must stop it. We must stop it. We must stop it. We must stop it.

And then, therefore, in a larger sense there's the question of black people. We are on the move for our liberation. We have been tired of trying to prove things to white people. We are tired of trying to explain to white people that we're not going to hurt them. We are concerned with getting the things we want, the things that we have to have to be able to function. The question is, Can white people allow for that in this country? The question is, Will white people overcome their racism and allow for that to happen in this country? If that does not happen, brothers and sisters, we have no choice but to say very clearly, "Move over, or we're going to move on over you."

Thank you.



