

The Anarchist Library
Anti-Copyright



Not on Donovan Jackson, on Haters Who Claim We're White

juan de la cruz

December 1, 2004

This is borne out of an article entitled, "On Donovan Jackson and White Race Traitors Who Claim They're Down" by Heather Ajani and Ernesto Aguilar. I say borne out of the article, because this is not a direct response to it, even if it did provoke what is written here. That it is not a direct response is both from refusal and inability due to three fundamentally problematic and highly unprincipled ways in which Ajani and Aguilar's article is written.

Foremost, it is a deliberate distortion of the politics of Bring the Ruckus (BTR). Deliberate because, as their notes to authorship of the article states, both were former members of BTR, Ajani a founding member, and to put forth distorted views of a politic one helped develop is not achieved by mistake. Second, the basis for their argument is the notion that BTR believes Mitchell Crooks is a race traitor. This false assumption was derived from the article, "The Color of Authority" by BTR member Roy San Filippo in which he states, "Crooks's act was

juan de la cruz

Not on Donovan Jackson, on Haters Who Claim We're White
December 1, 2004

Retrieved on March 14, 2019 from web.archive.org
juan de la cruz is a member of Bring the Ruckus.

theanarchistlibrary.org

instance of race treason”(my emphases). It is not possible to debate arguments based on this false assumption until they can at least argue against San Filippo’s actual points. Third, this false assumption along with other false or ill-conceived arguments made in the article, seem to be used simply as a platform to critique BTR as a group not entirely made up of people of color. Therefore, we have “white” politics. This demeans, downgrades, and ignores the people of color representation, contribution, and leadership within BTR. Ajani and Aguilar themselves undeniably had leadership during their shared and separate tenures in BTR. However, to intimate that people of color representation, contribution, or leadership left with them and was non-existent before them is not only fraudulent, but also self-important. This “BTR is white” distortion has tremendous personal resonance with me. Indeed, it is the reason why I strongly believed that I alone should be the one to write something up in regards to this rather than, as a Coordinating Committee member, solicit volunteers from the membership.

Based on these three fundamental problems as well as the lack of principle practiced, a direct response is neither appropriate nor possible. Frankly, a timely response was not given due to a now lacking political respect for the authors.

Instead, I would like to focus on a point in the article that was made twice simply in passing, that “White ‘race traitor’ theory is wholly based on the participation of white folks” and “the approach of groups like BTR make the discussion of race too dependent on the participation of whites.” Essentially, I agree with the sentiment behind this argument. Indeed, I have made it myself more than a few times within BTR. Had this been the crux of the authors’ argument rather than a footnote, a valuable and necessary debate would have taken place much sooner outside of our organization.

Still a point of contention between those influenced by Race Traitor politics within BTR and me, this all-too-heavy reliance on whites is the flaw of Race Traitor theory, even if I do not

necessarily disagree with the theory. That this long standing point of contention exists, particularly as a long standing member of BTR, is merely one illustration that BTR as an organization is neither simply a derivative nor copycat of Race Traitor or a Race Traitor organization. We have never represented ourselves in this way or in the ways put forth in Ajani and Aguilar’s article. Race Traitor is simply one of many political influences within our group.

I welcome and highly encourage critique of the actual politics and practice of Bring the Ruckus. It will only help further develop the politics and practice of our organization, as well as further develop debate outside our organization. However, I fail to see how misrepresenting what we say or do, and critiquing us based on those distortions benefit anyone, particularly the authors of such distortions. Personally, I would like to see the discussion centered in what I perceive to be the flaw of Race Traitor theory as well as the strategy put forth in Bring the Ruckus politics.