University of Massachusetts - Amherst

From the Selected Works of Ernest Allen

Spring 2012

Notes on the Concept of Integration

Ernest Allen, Jr., *University of Massachusetts Amherst*

SELECTEDWORKS™

Available at: http://works.bepress.com/ernest_allen/21/

NOTES ON THE CONCEPT OF INTEGRATION

by Ernest Allen, Jr.

Abstract

INTEGRATION was one of those enigmatic notions that crept into the vocabulary of the African American liberation struggle of the twentieth century, which then seemingly turned into a palimpsest, blotting out any trace of its historical origins. A term that “everyone” apparently understood but which most failed to interrogate, integration was commonly perceived as the “inverse” of segregation—which was only true insofar one was willing to reduce each term to a spatial metaphor, with segregation indicating societal “exclusion” and integration signifying “inclusion.” This makeshift conceptual simplification was frequently patched over by the drafting of *desegregation* as an intermediate term standing for the inversion of segregation, with integration now elevated to a more or less utopian concept of how a society *sans* racial distinctions ought to appear. The purpose of this essay is to trace the Great Depression origins of integration nomenclature, review the sharpening of its parameters in a long-forgotten “integration versus separation” debate, and provide a baseline argument for a more extensive set of questions and answers to come.

The goal of “integration,” like “freedom” for the anti-colonialists, stands like a great shining blur down at the far end of the struggle road, drawing and inspiring all who fight for it, but becoming not clearer but blurrier the closer one gets to it. Each of these terms has a sufficiently clear and immediate political content; just as “freedom” in the colonial context means “the end of alien rule,” “integration” plainly enough means the free and open access by Negroes to the common rights of all citizens. But what then? In the ex-colonies freedom from alien rule has marked only the beginning of the struggle for freedom. Here the conquest of civil rights carries us toward those vague and shadowy places where all the

new questions about the future of the Negro group identity wait for us. — Harold Isaacs, The New World of Negro Americans (1964), 343

“INTEGRATION” is a once-popular term that began to lose traction around the mid 1970s, coinciding with limitations placed on school busing by the Supreme Court decision known as *Milliken v. Bradley* (1974).¹ In stark contrast to the 1950s, one rarely hears mention of the word today. But what did integration signify, and when did its contemporary use begin? Some interpreted the word as a synonym for civil rights; others felt that it ultimately stood for interracial marriage or, at least, the loss of African American identity. For all of the scorn heaped upon radicals who came up short when attempting to define Black Power, most advocates of integration fared little better in delineating one of their own key slogans. Was that because some of its prime adherents may not have been up to the challenge? or was the lapse deliberate, as some believed, in order that a *sub-rosa* assimilationist agenda might be better served? To understand the concept of integration one must first begin with that of segregation—for in the popular mind, segregation was identified with the exclusion of African Americans from the so-called mainstream of American life, while integration was concerned with prospects of inclusion into those same, prevailing currents. Nothing better exemplified the inseparability of the two concepts as when they were joined together in highly charged “integration vs. segregation” dialogs or disputes, or creative variations thereof: e.g. “integration vs. separation,” “integration vs. isolation,” “integration vs. emigration.” A major problem with all of these terms, however, is

that proponents on all sides sought to reduce complex social relations to the language of spatial metaphor—a practice guaranteed to produce muddled outcomes.

SEGREGATION

DE JURE SEGREGATION — that is to say, the legally sanctioned, spatial separation of whites and blacks in southern life that flourished from 1890 onwards—emerged as a successful effort to rebuild the racial hierarchy of slavery extinguished by the Civil War and its aftermath.²

The first precondition for the enactment of these laws is that those who desired them had the power to enact them. This power was achieved, in part, by disfranchising blacks. The disfranchisement occurred through the use of violence and intimidation, as a result of divisiveness among blacks, through taking advantage of blacks, and because of an absence of strong intervention by those who held power in the national government.³

Under slavery, holders of slaves exercised total control over their captive labor supply; under conditions of emancipation, that control was lost, to be replaced in agriculture, in any case, by other forms of coerced labor.⁴ Segregation laws held sway over the physical mobility of black laborers in general, thus limiting their possibilities for economic advancement. In the same way that white employers might benefit from segregation, laws regulating the physical mobility of black workers tended to benefit some white workers, at least, by serving to limit job competition; at the same time, segregationist measures severely hindered the ability of white and black workers to organize around common material goals: i.e., higher wages and more humane working conditions. Segregation offered an additional means for the continued suppression of black political power. There would be additional benefits to segregationists as well, including a decline in social services to (and subsequent costs of upkeep for) black residential areas, a foisting of substandard education on black children, as well as offerings of shoddy, overpriced products and services to captive groups of black customers on the part of private ven-

dors. Separate and unequal facilities spelled degradation and humiliation for blacks: a daily reminder of one's absolute, lowest status in the social hierarchy. And, finally, the isolation of black folk from the general population denied them possibilities of contact and communication with the majority of society, thereby depriving them of information essential to health, wealth, and overall social development.⁵

Resurrection of Racial Hierarchy

THOUGH never fully attainable in actual life, the *ideal* racial hierarchy assumed the existence of a social structure whereby, in terms of both power and corresponding sense of social worth, whites would occupy an absolute, superordinate position in society and blacks, conversely, a totally subordinate position.⁶ From the standpoint of power, of course, a racially superordinate ranking totally depended on the existence of a subordinate counterpart; correspondingly, from the perspective of social worth, the sense of superiority enshrined in the social construction of whiteness was necessarily complemented by a sense of inferiority embedded in the construction of blackness:

In the popular conception the character of the Negro is transposed and set as the diametric opposite of white character. Nevertheless, it is plain that just as the devil completes the world view of popular religion, so the conception of black folk is an essential antipode in the white-caste ideology. Black folk serve as the complement of white folk in the social philosophy enveloping the biracial society.⁷

This sense of black "otherness" operated not only on the corporeal plane, but on those invoking morality and social esteem as well. In its absolute, Manichean form, whites were said to be the repository of all that was corporeally beautiful, blacks, of everything offensive to aesthetic taste; whites were revealed as archetypes of moral behavior, blacks as the epitome of debasement; whites excelled as contributors to civilization, whereas blacks served as impediments to social progress. Such spurious claims were deemed essential to justifying racial hierar-

chy during slavery, and would be revived in the post-Reconstruction era.

Economic Exploitation

WITH THE END of slavery, the loss of white control over black labor appeared complete. But that situation would not endure for long. The isolation of black toilers under segregation aided in maintaining most blacks in the least remunerative job categories such as tenant farming and domestic work; helped to sustain a pool of cheap agrarian labor; and by keeping many black workers secured to the land, suppressed their potential economic competition with white urban laborers. What is more, segregation hindered the development of trade-union consciousness. At industrial sites, segregation in job categories and within industries themselves kept black wages low. On the commerce side, black merchants were not allowed to compete with their white counterparts outside black segregated zones, while white merchants possessed freedom of movement inside those same zones. Segregation was not the cause of the economic exploitation of black folk above and beyond the normal in the post-Reconstruction era and beyond, but it assuredly acted as a contributing factor.⁸

Racial Etiquette

RACIAL HIERARCHY under slavery required consistent monitoring and enforcement, the first of which was satisfied by means of a draconian system of racial etiquette. The function of etiquette was:

[T]o prescribe correct form for every conceivable sort of contact between whites and Negroes, in such manner as to serve as a constant reminder to the former that they are superior and to the later that they are inferior. . . . in other words, a compulsory ritual denoting first- and second-class citizenship. . . . It [had] more than psychological and social significance, serving also the basic economic and political purpose of facilitating the exploitation of nonwhites by whites, collectively and individually.⁹

Prescribed greetings, forms of address, and manners required deferential behavior from

blacks, from whom every white person possessed an automatic right to demand.¹⁰ Assigned the lowest rung in the overall racial hierarchy, African Americans dared not manifest any hint of refusing their allocated "place."¹¹ Mild reprobation for doing so might carry forth in a charge of their being "impudent," "uppity," "biggity," "out of their place," etc.; but if the infraction be deemed sufficiently injurious, a more serious chastisement might arrive in the form of a death sentence. Much of this racial etiquette remained intact in the transition from slavery to the post-Reconstruction era; indeed, its legacy still haunts American life today.

Unpeaceful Coexistence

TOWARDS the end of the eighteenth century, German philosopher Johann Gottfried Herder predicted that the forced annexation of several nationalities under the aegis of a single state would result in dire consequences:

A nation is as *natural* a plant as a family only with more branches. Nothing, therefore, is more manifestly contrary to the purpose of political government than the unnatural enlargement of states, the wild mixing of various races and nationalities under one sceptre. A human sceptre is far too weak and slender for such incongruous parts to be engrafted upon it. Such states are but patched-up contraptions, fragile machines, appropriately called state-machines, for they are wholly devoid of inner life, and their component parts are connected through mechanical contrivances instead of bonds of sentiment.¹²

Approaching the topic somewhat differently in this same period, Thomas Jefferson averred that the peaceful coexistence of African and European descendants on common soil was impossible: the likely end would be the extermination of one group by the other. After setting forth his argument for the colonization of blacks, Jefferson anticipated a logical counter-response:

Why not retain and incorporate the blacks into the state, and thus save the expense of supplying, by importation of white settlers, the vacancies they will leave? Deep rooted prejudices entertained by the whites; ten thousand recollections, by the blacks, of the injuries they have sustained;

new provocations; the real distinctions which nature has made; and many other circumstances, will divide us into parties, and produce convulsions which will probably never end but in the extermination of the one or the other race.¹³

In 1835 French political thinker Alexis de Tocqueville, no doubt contemplating, from his perspective, the successful examples of slavery in the New World as well as the unsuccessful outcome in San Domingo, advanced a claim similar to that of Jefferson: "Hitherto, wherever the whites have been the most powerful, they have held the blacks in degradation or in slavery; wherever the Negroes have been strongest, they have destroyed the whites: this has been the only balance which has ever taken place between the two races."¹⁴ British philosopher John Stuart Mill also pessimistically concluded in 1861 that "Free institutions are next to impossible in a country made up of a different nationalities. Among a people without fellow-feeling, especially if they read and speak different languages, the united public opinion necessary to the working of representative government can not exist."¹⁵ In the US the myth of inherent racial incompatibility was hardly confined to the black-white binary model, but extended to Native Americans, Mexicans, as well as immigrants from Central and Eastern Europe beginning in the 1880s.¹⁶

Honor and Miscegenation

THE SENSE of social hierarchy under slavery was fiercely accentuated by the idea of honor, which, in addition to buttressing racial division, reflected class and gender stratification as well. In the South, the noblest sense of honor, of social esteem, and the defense of which was ultimately epitomized in the duel, was reserved for "gentlemen"—a group to which the planter class contributed an outsize share.¹⁷ However, lower-class whites also retained a popular code of honor that played out among themselves, and the satisfaction of which tended to manifest itself in the exchange of knife fights and eye-gougings.¹⁸ Woman's honor, on the other hand, rested solely in her sexual virtue, though southern white women may have observed additional honorific standards that were acknowledged

only within their own circles.¹⁹ Woman's honor was never entirely her own, for it belonged primarily, and perhaps totally, to men viewed as her primary protector—be that her husband or male relatives.²⁰ Lower-class females, however, were never assumed to possess sexual honor in the sense exuded by planter-class, southern belles. Under slavery, planters monopolized the highest attributes of honor, while blacks of any stature were credited with none. With the collapse of the planter class following the Civil War, the concept of white southern honor did not disappear along with the principal social pillars that undergirded its existence, but underwent what can only be described as a rough *democratization* that lasted well into the 1920s and beyond.²¹ Gone was the ritualized duel, now frequently replaced by haphazard exchanges of gunfire whenever gentlemanly disagreements exceeded the bounds of civility. Post-war honor took on a more uniformly racial tone in that most southern whites were assumed to possess racial honor, in contradistinction to blacks, who continued to possess none. As in antebellum times, poor whites continued to be excluded from the ranks of honor as well.²² Most important to our discussion, however, is that, unless proved otherwise, most white women of whatever social class were now assumed to be virtuous, that is to say sexually "pure," with white men of whatever social standing serving as self-appointed guardians of said purity. As Ida B. Wells observed in 1892, "The leading citizens' of Memphis are defending the 'honor' of *all* white women, *demi-monde* included." Such an observance could easily be extended to the entire South. Jacquelyn Dowd Hall notes that:

The connotations of wealth and family background attached to the position of the lady in the antebellum South faded in the twentieth century, but the power of "ladyhood" as a value construct remained. The term denoted chastity, frailty, graciousness. . . . If a woman passed the tests of ladyhood, she could tap into the reservoir of protectiveness and shelter known as southern chivalry. Women unable or unwilling to comply with such normative demands forfeited the claim to personal security. Together the practice of ladyhood and the etiquette of chivalry functioned as highly effective strategies of control over women's behavior as well as powerful safeguards of caste restrictions.²³

Wholesale lynchings of black men were carried out in the guise of honor killings.²⁴ The concept of honor itself became one of the driving forces behind a new-found urgency aimed at combating "miscegenation," or the biological mixing of the races. Indeed, on the surface the fear of miscegenation would appear to have been one of the most salient concerns of southern white men of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.²⁵ Rather than expressing a more general disquietude linked to the potential disappearance of white identity, however, this apparent fear was more likely aligned with white male trepidations regarding potential sexual competition posed by emancipated black men *vis-à-vis* white women.²⁶ As Du Bois noted in 1922, "To the ordinary American or Englishman, we have always realized, the race question is at bottom simply a matter of the ownership of women; white men want the right to own and use all women, colored and white, and they resent any intrusion of colored men into this domain."²⁷ Of course, the question "at bottom" was far more complex than that of sexual conquest, as Du Bois himself understood. Yet there could be no denying that a white male fear of sexual competition played a role behind the miscegenationist smokescreen. Nor was there any reason why the fears of both amalgamation and sexual competition might not be combined in a single screed:

If we sit with Negroes at our tables, if we entertain them as our guests and social equals, if we disregard the colour line in all other relations, is it possible to maintain it fixedly in the sexual relation, in the marriage of our sons and daughters, in the propagation of our species? Unquestionably, No! It is certain as the rising of tomorrow's sun, that, once the middle wall of social partition broken down, the mingling of the tides of life would begin instantly and proceed steadily. Of course, it would be gradual, but none the less sure, none the less irresistible. It would make itself felt at first most strongly in the lower strata of the white population; but it would soon invade the middle and menace insidiously the very uppermost. Many bright Mulattoes would ambitiously woo, and not a few would win, well-bred women disappointed in love or goaded by impulse or weary of the stern struggle for existence. *As a race, the Southern Caucasian would be irreversibly doomed.*²⁸

The entire issue appeared to boil down to a single, insipid phrase: "Would you want your sister (or daughter) to marry a Negro?" Du Bois responded to this impoverished logic with a simple rejoinder: "If any white person does not want to marry a colored person, no one is going to compel him. If he is asked, he has simply to say no."²⁹ With the protection of white female purity catapulted to the very pinnacle of white social concerns, a calculated and bizarre "sexualization" of efforts carried out by black men to improve either their material condition or self-respect was often met with lynching.³⁰ Central to our concerns, in any case, the cry of miscegenation served as a major as well as novel subterfuge for an unprecedented implementation of legalized segregation measures in the late nineteenth century.

Summary

MANY of the ideologies and social mechanisms of black control that had developed under slavery spread like malignant cancers in the years following Reconstruction. Most familiar were the dank and frayed ideologies of spurious racial hierarchy, as well as a demeaning racial etiquette that demanded deference and subservience to the idolatrous clay of white supremacy. The ultimate purpose of segregation was social control, and segregation under slavery itself had been a fact of life. But now, cloaked in newly-fitted legislative attire, coerced separation was assigned a berth in every aspect of southern life: public accommodations and transportation, schools, government buildings and services, residential and recreation areas, places of employment, and the like. New to the scene of rationalized justifications was the democratization of honor, which opened the way to the ideological "pedestalizing" of most white women, to a particular denigrating of all black women, and to a related, pathological "sexualizing" of any and all efforts on the part of black men to achieve social equality. And, finally, longstanding ideas concerning the "impossibility" of whites and blacks ever peacefully inhabiting the US on the basis of equality, merely affirmed the seeming necessity for a total

domination and control of the African American population. Had black labor not proved absolutely necessary to the functioning of the southern agrarian economy, it is likely that the history of blacks in America would have taken an even more tragic turn than it actually did. Because segregation intruded into every aspect of black life, it often appeared to constitute the overarching totality of African American oppression. But that was merely a matter of appearance. Segregation functioned as a front-line mechanism for control over the black population, and as the single-most important instrument for the perpetuation of racial hierarchy. Its imposition in the post-Reconstruction era was a direct response to the collapse of social stratification prescribed by slavery, and its eventual demise would leave "normal" modes of political domination and economic exploitation fully intact.

INTEGRATION

THE ABOLISHING of Jewish ghettos in latter nineteenth-century Europe introduced subsequent "problems of racial integration and disintegration" regarding Jewish identity, remarked Israel Zangwill, future popularizer of the concept of the American immigrant "Melting Pot."³¹ T. Thomas Fortune once used the term—but in an opposite sense from that discussed here. When challenging an Afro-American opponent who declared himself against mixed schools and mixed marriages, Fortune accused him of arguing on the grounds of "race integration" — that is, of advocating "integration" exclusively among blacks.³² One of the earliest applications of the term to society — but only in the most general sense — was made by sociologist Lester Ward in 1903. Following positivist tradition in the social sciences, Ward borrowed the biological concepts of "differentiation" and "integration" from the biological sciences and imposed them upon the dynamics of social groups. Ward noted that although "great efforts" had been made to "prevent the mixing of the white with the black races," they had been only partially successful (mixed results?). He distinguished between social integration and race integra-

tion. Finally, his perspective was global. Racial integration meant biological assimilation on a global scale:

Whatever may be the present condition of things, and however great may be the obstacles to race mixture in certain cases, it is clear to those who contemplate the great future of mankind that race integration will go on until all the races of men shall be blended into one. Not that the lower races will overslaugh the higher ones, or that the latter will be dragged down to the level of the former. The dominant races will always dominate the product, whatever it may be, but the less forceful elements will enter into it as modifiers. They represent qualities that in moderate proportions will improve and enrich the whole. The final great united world-race will be comparable to a composite photograph in which certain strong faces dominate the group, but in which may also be detected the softening influence of faces characterized by those refining moral qualities which reflect, the soul rather than the intellect. This final perfected human race will therefore embody all that is great and good in man.³³

Citing a handful of ethnographic researchers (including sociologist Ward above), Lincoln University graduate James M. Boddy interpreted integration in terms of physiological and psychological assimilation. Not only would the races ultimately be "blended into one," but their public schooling and contact with civil, religious, and political institutions would "produce a type of mankind to which all the races have contributed their integral share."³⁴ At a meeting of the American Missionary Association in 1905, its president, the Rev. Amory H. Bradford, spoke on the topic of "Race Segregation and Race Integration," inaugurating a topic that would echo well into the future. A reporter characterized his remarks:

He asked, Is the wisest method of treating the population of any state that of keeping its classes, races and conditions by themselves? Or should every effort be made to obliterate class and racial distinctions and to bring the people into unity religiously, commercially, industrially and politically? . . . The United States in these days is witnessing a revival of the tendency toward segregation, and this time it concerns races rather than states. It is manifest in the treatment by those who are in the majority of all the races, but especially in their treatment of the colored race. . . . If carried out it would compel the colored people to consider their own interests rather than those of the nation, and gradually would create a state

within a state whose interests would be hostile to those of the larger nation. . . . Opposed to that is the theory of integration, which insists that every means possible should be used to bring all classes and races into harmony.³⁵

In 1916 Randolph Bourne viewed the unification of trans-nationalities as "an enterprise of integration" into which the younger intelligentsia of America should pour itself.³⁶ And, speaking generally in 1925, an avowed racist noted that, in the past, people of diverse races who had long been separated and who, as a result of their isolation had acquired distinguishing characteristics, were now caught up in a reverse historical trend leaning towards "integration," a process he claimed would be "accomplished largely through amalgamation."³⁷ Although additional, fugitive sightings no doubt remain to be discovered, thereafter the term seems to have fallen into relative disuse until the Great Depression.³⁸

Contemporary, Popular Use

THE CONTEMPORARY employ of the term "integration" in a racial sense appears to have commenced with W.E.B. Du Bois in early 1933.³⁹ The issue of segregation was undeniably on the *Crisis* editor's mind at the time, as he himself was in the process of elaborating what he would fatefully label a "self-segregation" plan for blacks. Although Du Bois himself made no obvious attempt to counterpose the themes of integration and segregation, his intervention would prepare the way for others to do so. In the February *Crisis* Du Bois unveiled an anticipated list of topics to appear that year under the banner of his new and forthcoming "racial philosophy" (an undertaking, of course, that led to his contentious resignation from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People some seventeen months later).⁴⁰ The topic of "Society and Home Problems of life, social integration and human contact" was initially scheduled for discussion in the October number, but failed to appear. In an article devoted to race pride in the September issue, however, Du Bois lobbed a defiant challenge to the NAACP:

What are we really aiming at? The building of a new nation or the integration of a new group into an old nation? The latter has long been our ideal. Must it be changed? Should it be changed?⁴¹

For fifteen years Du Bois had championed the idea of economic cooperatives for Afro-Americans, and in January, 1934 cooperatives became the centerpiece of his newly advocated program for black survival in the midst of the Great Depression.⁴² Du Bois's subsequent disparaging of interracial contact as fruitless, his endorsement of federally-sponsored, separate (read "segregated") homesteads for blacks, as well as his ill-chosen labeling of his revised program as one of economic "self-segregation" rocked the NAACP to the point of internal convulsion.⁴³ His new departure precipitated a response from Walter White in a March symposium devoted to the topic of segregation: "The Negro must, without yielding, continue the grim struggle for integration and against segregation for his own physical, moral and spiritual well-being and for that of white America and of the world at large," affirmed the NAACP Secretary.⁴⁴ Du Bois responded to White and others the following month: "Extreme opponents of segregation act as though there was but one solution of the race problem," he argued, "and that, complete integration of the black race with the white race in America, with no distinction of color in political, civil or social life." Du Bois did not doubt that "integration" was "the great end" toward which humanity was tending, but opined that said process would require at least a century, and probably ten:

Since this is true, the practical problem that faces us is not a choice between segregation and no segregation, between compulsory interferences with human intercourse and, complete liberty of contact; the thing that faces us is given varying degrees of segregation. How shall we conduct ourselves so that in the end human differences will not be emphasized at the expense of human advance [?]⁴⁵

In his book, *Negro Americans, What Now?*, issued that fall with the blessings of Walter White,⁴⁶ James Weldon Johnson sought to counter Du Bois's controversial stance by

facilely theorizing that Afro-Americans had but two choices in their quest for equality: integration or isolation. The book's publication also may have marked the first time that the term "integrationist" appeared in a written work:

There come times when the most persistent integrationist becomes an isolationist, when he curses the White world and consigns it to hell. This tendency towards isolation is strong because it springs from a deep-seated, natural desire — a desire for respite from the unremitting, grueling struggle; for a place in which refuge might be taken. We are again and again confronted by this question. It is ever present, though often dormant.⁴⁷

References to "integration" of a racial nature also made their way permanently into sociological literature with the publication of Paul E. Baker's *Negro-White Adjustment* (1934), where he claimed that organizations like the NAACP and the International Labor Defense were "working for the integration of American life and the absorption of the Negro into the institutions and organizations of the country."⁴⁸ Although Baker, in his strongly partisan work, advocated the "full integration" of blacks into American society, he surprisingly failed to volunteer any definition of the term.

The term "integration" could just as easily refer to small institutions as to society at large, to objective social relations as to intersubjective ones. Beginning in the 1930s, when applied to specific programs or institutions, it seemed to function more like a synonym for civil rights than anything else — as in "integration of the armed forces," for example. When referring to the larger society, on the other hand, the term appeared to invoke some unspecified form of structural assimilation — as in "integration into the mainstream." From the perspective of those larger social relations, the term left unanswered questions as to whether or how the societal inclusion of black folk would impact existing power relationships between individuals and groups, or what its enacting might portend for African American identity. The label "integrationist," on the other hand, appeared to stamp its bearer as assimilationist-oriented, with the qualifying prefixes of

"extreme" or "consummate" serving to extend the bearer's presumed assimilationist stance to that of biological amalgamation. Ambiguity and confusion were the inevitable result of forcing a simple spatial metaphor denoting inclusion to stand for a complex web of interlocking social relations. Nonetheless, employ of this novel terminology in the black press, inspired no doubt by its ongoing coverage of the NAACP's internal crisis, rapidly made its way into the pages of African American newspapers, attaching itself to racial critiques of New Deal policies, composition of the armed forces, and the state of American society as a whole.

OF ELEVEN news stories or opinion pieces (one a two-part segment) referring to racial integration that were carried by the *Pittsburgh Courier* in 1934, six referred to societal inclusion, two to New Deal relief participation, one to societal inclusion via the New Deal, one to membership within the labor movement, and one to the makeup of the armed forces.⁴⁹ Typical were remarks such as those of Dean Charles Hamilton Houston of Howard Law School, who avowed that the Negro desired "integration into the armed forces in time of peace with equal opportunities in all arms according to merit." At a meeting of black workers called by the St. Louis Urban League, plans were advanced "for the integration of the Negro into the American labor movement. . . ." In New Orleans Forrester B. Washington of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration "suggested that the most effective means of obtaining real integration of the Negro into the relief program" and of interpreting that program to Negroes, would be to organize a committee of representative blacks to secure this goal. As a purely descriptive term with limited scope, such calls for "integration" were not likely to cause confusion — unless, of course, one were attempting to quantify the outcome, as in calculating the percentage of black folk needed in order that an institution qualify as being "integrated."

Among the more enthusiastic supporters of the new nomenclature appearing in black newspapers in 1934 was columnist George S. Schuyler. Of the seven *Courier* articles refer-

ring in one way or another to larger societal integration, Schuyler contributed three. "Social students have long known that one of the forces retarding the Americanization of aliens is the petite bourgeoisie of these various minority groups," affirmed Schuyler in one such article.

While a considerable number of these good folk help to expedite the integration of their people into the life of the adopted country, a larger number work to slow up the process by fostering cultural and social separation from the body of American citizens.

This struggle between these two groups for the leadership of their people is often a dramatic one, with occasional highlights of tragedy and comedy. In the end, however, the group standing for integration: i.e., Americanization, always triumphs, because it is indicating what the masses sense as the proper course.

He then denounced retrogressive, *petit-bourgeois* elements among Jews, Italians, Greeks, Russians, Armenians, Swedes, "and other such alien groups" who resisted Americanization, and likened them to counterparts in the African American population.⁵⁰ Among blacks, he noted, there were only:

a few who, endowed with social vision, discern that if the colored brother and sister are to be saved, they must become assimilated, integrated, merged with the surrounding population as soon as possible, not only culturally but physically; that any policy likely to retard this process of Americanization is dangerous if not suicidal.⁵¹

UNLIKE the undercover championing of ultimate biological assimilation by others of his generation, Schuyler's straight-talk had the merit of allowing that integration was equivalent to Americanization, that full Americanization was dependent on biological assimilation, and that biological assimilation would ultimately lead to civil rights for blacks who, as blacks, would by then no longer exist. But what made Schuyler's conception of Americanization significantly different from that of his nineteenth-century intellectual forbearers had to do with his concept of a broad-based American culture that had already incorporated vast cultural blocs of African American-influenced com-

ponents. This "contributivist" and "vindicationist" concept—frequently confused with the concept of cultural pluralism—was first anticipated by Du Bois in the form of American *artistic* culture, then subsequently acknowledged by James Weldon Johnson as having triumphed in the *popular* realm.⁵² The issue of biological intermingling aside, this was decidedly not the assimilation at the cultural level envisioned by a Charles Chesnut or Frederick Douglass.⁵³

INTEGRATION vs. SEGREGATION: 1937

IN MAY, 1937 George Schuyler and Claude McKay engaged in a now long-forgotten debate on the topic "Shall Negroes Organize as a Racial Group?," hosted by New York City radio station WEVD (named for Socialist Party leader Eugene V. Debs and owned by the progressive *Jewish Daily Forward* newspaper).⁵⁴ Subsequently, they committed their disagreements to print—first in the *Amsterdam News*, then in slightly more polished form in the *Jewish Frontier* magazine.⁵⁵ In many respects, however, this divarication was but a return to the internal debate that had erupted within the NAACP three years earlier, leading to Du Bois's resignation from its board as well as editorship of the *Crisis* magazine. Arguing the case for "integration," Schuyler pointed to several conflicting schools of thought among black Americans: "Some, despairing of complete acceptance into American society, advocate drawing off to themselves, developing separate Negro institutions, a separate economy, and cutting contact with whites to an irreducible minimum." Others, on the other hand, "hold that segregation whether enforced from within or without will only aggravate the situation, increase interracial misunderstanding, make for more friction and worsen the condition of the Negro." Schuyler voluntarily belonged to this second camp, but had much more to add to the program.

The social and economic evils from which colored people suffer, and against which they rightly complain, are in every instance the result of discrimination and segregation. In other words, of isolation. How odd, then, that we should find

Negroes urging *more* segregation! For it doesn't matter whether a group is driven off to itself or goes off voluntarily: such isolation is injurious to both groups. *Both* lose something. Practically all these schemes for racial organization of Negroes imply segregation and isolation and are therefore hopelessly reactionary in an age when peoples everywhere are more socially and economically interdependent than ever before.

The awful realities of lynching, segregation, color discrimination, restricted residence, inadequate hospitalization and educational inequality naturally demand some sort of organization to combat them. As near as possible, however, such organization should be interracial, like the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. . . .⁵⁶

Hence all-black organizations — save for one purpose alone — were illicit:

One of the greater responsibilities of the colored people is to see that the qualities of which they complain in the whites are eliminated in themselves. If any strictly Negro organization is needed, it is needed for *that* purpose alone.⁵⁷

It is to be noted that Schuyler essentially construed the debate between himself and McKay as one of "integration versus segregation," where segregation was quixotically defined — as assimilationists were wont to do — as a separation of races brought about by either voluntary or forcible means. McKay, on the other hand, was hardly arguing for segregation of any sort, but opined that, in order to survive the ravages of the Great Depression, African Americans needed to follow a plan of self-organization. If, argued McKay:

[A] scheme is put forward to establish something beneficial and exclusively for Negroes, such as a hospital, a school or a bank, the black cry of segregation is heard. No sane Negro believes in or desires legal segregation, in which his racial group will be confined by law to ghettos. For such a system of segregation will inevitably result in congestion and increased crime, disease and filth.⁵⁸

To the contrary:

[I]t would seem a most elementary law of self-preservation and survival that wherever a distinct group of people is living together, such a people should utilize their collective brains and energy for the intensive cultivation and development of themselves culturally, politically and economically.⁵⁹

THE SCHUYLER-MCKAY debate entered a chain of heated polemics concerning the role of autonomous black institutions, political action, and organizing that erupted during the Great Depression. Successful in its philanthropic support to segregated black hospitals in the South, as well as in Chicago, the Rosenwald Fund's attempt to underwrite a private hospital for blacks in New York City met with hostility from Harlem Hospital doctors as well as the NAACP. Then came Du Bois's disavowal of the NAACP's traditional program in 1933 and 1934, leading to an uproar among its board of directors as well as branch members. Proposals for all-black, voluntary homesteads had been advanced by the federal government. Then came the "Don't Buy Where You Can't Work" campaign, which had been launched in Chicago, New York, and Washington, DC.⁶⁰ Finally, there arrived The National Movement for the Establishment of a 49th State, an organization dedicated to a federated political existence for blacks in the US.⁶¹ Sociologists also noted the rise of nationalist sentiment in African American literature and politics during the 1930s as well. The issue within the black community of "Segregation versus Integration" had now reached crisis proportions — at least in the minds of *New York Amsterdam News* editors: "shall we become people apart or shall we become woven into our American environment?" the paper asked. By their actions, "white fellow-citizens" had effectively demanded that blacks separate themselves from the country. The federal government, on the other hand, had either sanctioned or ignored the existence of segregation. More important, however, was the attitude of blacks themselves: it was they who had to "decide whether they shall become integrated to our American cultural pattern or segregated within it." The advice of the *Amsterdam News*, therefore, was that blacks should engage the problems of the Great Depression — not separately, but with Americans as a whole: the "battle for equality" had to be won by the efforts of blacks "as an integral part of the nation."⁶²

Endnotes

1. "A season of struggle and hope, of turmoil and guilt, in American racial and ethnic relations has passed. In its place has come a time of apathy, cynicism, exhaustion, and near despair. The civil-rights movement has collapsed, a victim, at least in part, of its successes," wrote historian John Higham in 1974. John Higham, "Integration vs. Pluralism: Another American Dilemma," *Center Magazine* 7, no. 4 (1974): 67-73 at 67.
2. Oscar Handlin, "The Goals of Integration," *Daedalus* 95, no. 1 (1966): 268-86 at 274. And it is true, of course, that not only did segregation manifest itself from 1865 onward, but that it was also a staple of American slave society. Some of the earliest segregation laws originated in the North, beginning around the 1840s, as the free black population began to grow and more fully exert itself. See C. Vann Woodward, *The Strange Career of Jim Crow*, Commemorative ed. (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2002); John W. Cell, *The Highest Stage of White Supremacy: The Origins of Segregation in South Africa and the American South* (Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982); John David Smith, ed., *When Did Southern Segregation Begin?: Readings* (New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2002); Howard N. Rabinowitz, *Race Relations in the Urban South, 1865-1890* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978); Joel Williamson, *The Crucible of Race: Black-White Relations in the South Since Emancipation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984); John Anthony Scott, "Segregation: A Fundamental Aspect of Southern Race Relations, 1800-1860," *Journal of the Early Republic* 4, no. 4 (1984): 421-41.
3. Mary Frances Berry, "Repression of Blacks in the South, 1890-1945: Enforcing the System of Segregation," in *The Age of Segregation: Race Relations in the South, 1890-1945: Essays*, ed. Robert J. Haws (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1978), 29-43 at 30-31.
4. See, for example, Douglas A. Blackmon, *Slavery by Another Name: The Re-Enslavement of Black People in America from the Civil War to World War II*, 1st ed. (New York: Doubleday, 2008); Pete Daniel, *The Shadow of Slavery: Peonage in the South, 1901-1969* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1972).
5. See Kennedy, *Jim Crow Guide*; Charles S. Johnson, *Backgrounds to Patterns of Negro Segregation* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1943); Paul Finkelman, ed., *The Age of Jim Crow: Segregation from the End of Reconstruction to the Great Depression* (New York: Garland Publishers, 1992).
6. For all of its faults, the concept of caste closely approximates the unrealized *ideal* of racial hierarchy in the South. See Raymond T. Diamond and Robert J. Cottrol, "Codifying Caste: Louisiana's Racial Classification Scheme and the Fourteenth Amendment," *Loyola Law Review* 29, no. 2 (1983): 255-86; Oliver C. Cox, *Caste, Class, & Race: A Study in Social Dynamics* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1959), esp. chpt. 22; W. L. Warner and Allison Davis, "A Comparative Study of American Caste," in *Race Relations and the Race Problem, A Definition and an Analysis*, ed. Edgar T. Thompson (Durham: Duke University Press, 1939), 219-45; Allison Davis, Burleigh B. Gardner, Mary R. Gardner, and W. Lloyd Warner, *Deep South: A Social Anthropological Study of Caste and Class* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941); John Dollard, *Caste and Class in a Southern Town*, 3d ed. (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1957).
7. Lewis C. Copeland, "The Negro as a Contrast Conception," in *Race Relations and the Race Problem, A Definition and an Analysis*, ed. Edgar T. Thompson (Durham: Duke University Press, 1939), 152-79 at 162. See also Sander L. Gilman, *Difference and Pathology: Stereotypes of Sexuality, Race, and Madness* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985); Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, trans. Charles Lam Markmann (New York: Grove Press, 1967).
8. Sterling D. Spero, and Abram L. Harris, *The Black Worker: The Negro and the Labor Movement* (1931; rpt. New York: Atheneum, 1968), 74; Edna Bonacich, "Advanced Capitalism and Black/White Race Relations in the United States: A Split Labor Market Interpretation," *American Sociological Review* 41, no. 1 (1976): 34-51 at 36-37; Charles S. Johnson, *Backgrounds to Patterns of Negro Segregation* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1943); John W. Cell, *The Highest Stage of White Supremacy: The Origins of Segregation in South Africa and the American South* (Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982), esp. chpt. 5; Booker T. Washington, "My View of Segregation Laws," *New Republic*, December 4, 1915, 113-14.
9. Stetson Kennedy, *Jim Crow Guide: The Way It Was* (Boca Raton: Florida Atlantic University Press, 1990), 205-6. The standard work on the topic of racial etiquette is Bertram Wilbur Doyle, *The Etiquette of Race Relations in the South: A Study in Social Control* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937).
10. Dollard, *Caste and Class in a Southern Town*, 174.
11. See Davis et al., *Deep South*, 44-49; George S. Schuyler, "Keeping the Negro in His Place," *American Mercury* 17, no. 68 (1929): 469-76; J. William Harris, "Etiquette, Lynching, and Racial Boundaries in Southern History: A Mississippi Example," *American Historical Review* 100, no. 2 (1995): 387-410.
12. J. G. Herder on *Social and Political Culture*, ed. F. M. Barnard (London: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 324.
13. Thomas Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia* (London: 1787), 229.
14. Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, 2 vols., ed. Francis Bowen, trans. Henry Reeve, 3rd ed. (Cambridge, Mass.: Sever and Francis, 1863), 1:460.
15. John Stuart Mill, *Considerations on Representative Government* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1869), 310.
16. See, for example, Richard Slotkin, *The Fatal Environment: The Myth of the Frontier in the Age of Industrialization, 1800-1890* (New York: Atheneum, 1985), chpt. 11; John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1955). Responding to such arguments in 1899, a liberal-minded Chicago weekly newspaper affirmed that blacks and whites could indeed coexist in the same land due to the fact that each possessed complementary characteristics: the "disposition to conquer" on the part of whites and the "disposition to

- serve" on the part of blacks, which tendencies, "when not degraded, are not hostile but complementary." "The American Negro," *The Public*, 73, August 26, 1899, 4-8 at 6. In affirming that it would be possible for blacks to pursue their group interests via the formation of voluntary organizations without disturbing the social fabric of American unity, W.E.B. Du Bois himself was indirectly responding to such arguments. See W.E.B. Du Bois, *The Conservation of Races* ((American Negro Academy Occasional Papers, No. 2, 1897).
17. "Planters were gentlemen—the very embodiment of the class—but mere ownership of land did not make one a planter. Some insisted that title was earned by the ownership of at least twenty slaves—twenty slaves, a planter, fewer than twenty, a farmer. But that is an insufficient definition. A planter had both the tangible qualities of possession and the intangible ones of courtly manners and a precise understanding of what was a gentleman's province and what was not. He had reverence for the past. He cherished the concepts of pride and personal dignity, whatever his surroundings. He epitomized noblesse oblige, hospitality, public service, and honor—honor above all else." Jack K. Williams, *Dueling in the Old South: Vignettes of Social History* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1980), 28-29. See also Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982); Orlando Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982); Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Honor and Violence in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); Kenneth S. Greenberg, *Honor & Slavery* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996); Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *The Shaping of Southern Culture: Honor, Grace, and War, 1760s-1890s* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001).
 18. See, for example, Elliott J. Gorn, "'Gouge and Bite, Pull Hair and Scratch': The Social Significance of Fighting in the Southern Backcountry," *The American Historical Review* 90, no. 1 (1985): 18-43; Grady McWhiney, *Cracker Culture: Celtic Ways in the Old South* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1988). The emergence of a popular code of honor among lower-class Dutch in the eighteenth century was all the more interesting, given that dueling never achieved substantive importance among the Dutch aristocracy. See Pieter Spierenburg, "Knife Fighting and Popular Codes of Honor in Early Modern Amsterdam," in *Men and Violence: Gender, Honor, and Rituals in Modern Europe and America*, ed. Pieter Spierenburg (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1998), 103-27.
 19. Although I am unaware of similar evidence pertaining to the US South, such possibilities were played out in early modern England. See Garthine Walker, "Expanding the Boundaries of Female Honour in Early Modern England," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Sixth Series, 6 (1996): 235-45.
 20. See, for example, Anne Firor Scott, *The Southern Lady: From Pedestal to Politics, 1830-1930*, expanded pbk. ed. (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995); Giselle Roberts, *The Confederate Belle* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2003); Nancy MacLean, *Behind the Mask of Chivalry: The Making of the Second Ku Klux Klan* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994); Jacquelyn Dowd Hall, *Revolt against Chivalry: Jessie Daniel Ames and the Women's Campaign Against Lynching*, rev. ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993).
 21. White male honor was central to the worldview of the second incarnation of the Ku Klux Klan in the 1920s. See MacLean, *Behind the Mask of Chivalry*, 162-63.
 22. See Matt Wray, *Not Quite White: White Trash and the Boundaries of Whiteness* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006). Although Wray does not speak to the issue of honor, his work clearly reveals the low rank in the social hierarchy that poor whites occupied in the eyes of others.
 23. Hall, *Revolt Against Chivalry*, 151-52.
 24. Ida B. Wells-Barnett, *Southern Horrors and Other Writings: The Anti-Lynching Campaign of Ida B. Wells, 1892-1900*, ed. Jacqueline Jones Royster (Boston: Bedford Books, 1997), 55. The connection between lynchings of blacks and white male concepts of honor in the post-Reconstruction era is a topic that has begun to inspire further research; see, for example, the pioneering work by Trudier Harris, *Exorcising Blackness: Historical and Literary Lynching and Burning Rituals* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984); MacLean, *Behind the Mask of Chivalry*, and Hall, *Revolt Against Chivalry*.
 25. The specter of racial admixtures, of course, had been an ongoing issue during the era of slavery; the term miscegenation itself was coined in 1864 as part of an effort to defeat Abraham Lincoln's bid for a second presidential term. But the issue of "race-mixing" assumed exaggerated urgency following emancipation. See Sidney Kaplan, "The Miscegenation Issue in the Election of 1864," *Journal of Negro History* 34, no. 3 (1949): 274-343.
 26. A mulatto is a mulatto, after all, whether the issue of a black mother and white father, or vice-versa. Let us assume, for the moment, that the fear of miscegenation was genuine, that it stemmed from concerns regarding the eventual loss of distinction between white and black individuals, and ultimately, therefore, of the loss of white identity itself. However, the principal cause of miscegenation, where such practices flourished, was to be found in the illicit actions of white men in regard to slave women, as well as to like practices that continued into the postbellum era. White men who fretted over miscegenation, then, had no one to blame but themselves, and needed to direct whatever admonitions they may have harbored towards members of their own tribe. However, the creative way in which miscegenation arguments were sometimes framed drew upon the concept of the female as the bearer of the racial, ancestral line. Miscegenation resulting from white male-black female interactions was thereby considered inconsequential, as it merely involved the "infusion of white blood" into the black ancestral line via the black female. What had to be avoided at all costs, however, was the "infusion of black blood" into the white ancestral line, which could only occur as the result of sexual interactions between

- black males and white females. In addition, under slavery—and in marked contrast to English common law—the legal status of any child followed that of the mother, rendering illicit sexual relations between white females and black male slaves a greater threat to the institution of slavery than similar relations between white males and black slave females. No doubt the prejudicial aura of this perceived threat carried over into the postbellum era as well. From the inherent logic of the argument, then, the perceived problem was not that of miscegenation in general but rather the threat of white female-black male sexual commerce in particular. The charge of miscegenation also tended to mask exploitative sexual advantages that white males continued to exercise over black females. Apologia that relieved white men of their responsibility in furthering miscegenation seem to have lost favor around 1907, when white southern attitudes opposing concubinage intensified. See William Benjamin Smith, *The Color Line: A Brief in Behalf of the Unborn* (New York: McClure, Phillips & Co., 1905), 68-69, rpt. in John David Smith, ed., *Racial Determinism and the Fear of Miscegenation, Post-1900*, vol. 8, *Anti-Black Thought 1863-1925* (New York: Garland Pub., 1993); Theodore G. Bilbo, *Take Your Choice; Separation or Mongrelization* (Poplarville, Miss.: Dream House Publishing Company, 1947), 57-58; Joel Williamson, *New People: Miscegenation and Mulattoes in the United States* (New York: Free Press, 1980), 97.
27. See W.E.B. Du Bois, "Black France," *Crisis* 23, no. 5 (March 1922): 199-200 at 199; and MacLean, *Behind the Mask of Chivalry*, 146-47.
 28. Smith, *The Color Line*, 8.
 29. W.E.B. Du Bois, "Social Equality," *Crisis* 35, no. 2 (February 1923): 61-62 at 61. Some thirty years later, Langston Hughes penned a similar response to the question in a *Chicago Defender* editorial: "If a man, white or colored, says to a woman, colored or white, 'Will you marry me?' all the woman has to do to prevent marrying the man is say, 'No.'" Langston Hughes, "How to Integrate without Danger of Inter-marriage (November 26, 1955)," in *The Age of Jim Crow: A Norton Casebook in History*, ed. Jane Elizabeth Dailey (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2009), 293-95 at 295.
 30. See Martha Hodes, "The Sexualization of Reconstruction Politics: White Women and Black Men in the South after the Civil War," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 3, no. 3 (1993): 402-17; Martha Hodes, *White Women, Black Men: Illicit Sex in the Nineteenth-Century South* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997). Lynching, of course, was not confined to black men, though their numbers dominated lynching statistics.
 31. Israel Zangwill, "The Position of Judaism," *North American Review* 160, no. 461 (April 1895): 425-39 at 425. See also Israel Zangwill, *The Melting-Pot: Drama in Four Acts* (New York: Macmillan, 1909).
 32. ["Separate Legislation"], *Wisconsin Weekly Advocate*, October 14, 1898. Fortune's verbal challenge to John H. Smythe occurred at the first meeting of the Afro-American League, held at Rochester in 1898. My appreciation to Shawn Leigh Alexander for this citation.
 33. Lester F. Ward, "Social Differentiation and Social Integration," *American Journal of Sociology* 8 (May 1903): 732-33.
 34. James M. Boddy, "Integration of the Negro by the American Nation," *Scientific American* 89, no. 2 (1903): 27. My appreciation to Shawn Leigh Alexander for this citation.
 35. Rev. Armory H. Bradford, D.D., "Segregation Versus Integration," *Congregationist and the Christian World* 43, no. 90 (1905): 593; see also "Segregation and Integration," *The Independent* 59, no. 2974 (1905): 1299. My appreciation to Shawn Leigh Alexander for these citations.
 36. Randolph S. Bourne, "Trans-National America," *Atlantic Monthly* 118 (July 1916): 86-97 at 97.
 37. Alexander H. Shannon, *The Racial Integrity of the American Negro* (Nashville: Lamar & Barton, Agents, 1925), 10; rpt. in John David Smith, ed., *Racial Determinism and the Fear of Miscegenation, Post-1900*, vol. 8, *Anti-Black Thought 1863-1925* (New York: Garland Pub., 1993).
 38. In 1931 an Associated Negro Press dispatch announced publication of *Brown America* by Edwin R. Embree, president of the Julius Rosenwald Fund. The book was said to trace the progress of blacks "in education, business, politics, folkways, and in gradual integration into the stream of American life and civilization." Interestingly, Embree's book itself contained no reference to "integration." "Embree Finishes New Book on American Negro," *Norfolk Journal and Guide*, July 25, 1931, 3; Edwin Rogers Embree, *Brown America: The Story of a New Race* (New York: Viking Press, 1931).
 39. Why Du Bois decided to employ the term at this time is unclear; perhaps he was in need of a term that would serve as a counter to his embrace of the flawed idea of "self-segregation." "Integration" does not appear in any of Du Bois's *Crisis* "Postscript" editorials from 1930 to 1932, nor in any other of his published works prior to 1933; nor in any essays by any prominent African American spokespersons that I have been able to locate thus far in the 1920s and early 1930s. Beginning with the 1920s, a digital search of leading African American newspapers—*Atlanta World*, *Baltimore Afro-American*, *Cleveland Call and Post*, *Los Angeles Sentinel*, *New York Amsterdam News*, *Pittsburgh Courier*, *Philadelphia Tribune*, and the *Norfolk Journal and Guide*—yields only sparse mentions of "integration" in a racial sense until 1934.
 40. Although highly relevant to the present discussion, Du Bois's break with the NAACP is far too complex a topic to entertain here, but one I plan to address in a forthcoming essay concerning duality in Du Bois's *praxis*.
 41. W.E.B. Du Bois, "On Being Ashamed of Oneself: An Essay on Race Pride," *Crisis* 40 (September 1933): 199. In December a review of Jessie Fauset's book, *Comedy, American Style*, noted that her failure to address a number of important, prevailing issues in her book—"social and cultural integration in American life," for example—had compromised that work; see Henry Lee Moon, "Chats on the New Books—Tragedy: Fauset Style," *New York Amsterdam News*, December 6, 1933, 6.
 42. For a descriptive overview of Du Bois's championing

- of economic cooperatives, see Joseph P. DeMarco, "The Rationale and Foundation of DuBois's Theory of Economic Cooperation," *Phylon* 35, no. 1 (1st Qtr. 1974): 5-15.
43. W.E.B. Du Bois, "Segregation," *Crisis* 41 (January 1934): 20. "Ill-chosen" in that Du Bois could have simply referred to his shift in position as a tactical one, with an aim towards economic survival; this, as opposed to his advocating a wholesale economic withdrawal of black folk from American society (as wholly improbable as such a goal would have been to accomplish).
 44. Walter White, "Segregation—a Symposium," *Crisis* 41 (March 1934): 81.
 45. W.E.B. Du Bois, "Integration," *Crisis* 41 (April 1934): 117.
 46. Walter White to Marshall Best, September 17, 1934, James Weldon Johnson Papers, Yale University, Beinecke Collection, Box 24, Folder 244.
 47. James Weldon Johnson, *Negro Americans, What Now?* (New York: The Viking Press, 1934), 13; "Du Bois Says James Weldon Johnson Misinterprets His Stand on Integration," *Pittsburgh Courier*, December 8, 1934, A1.
 48. Paul E. Baker, "Negro-White Adjustment in America," *Journal of Negro Education* 3, no. 2 (April 1934): 194-204 at 203; Paul E. Baker, *Negro-White Adjustment; an Investigation and Analysis of Methods in the Interracial Movement in the United States: The History, Philosophy, Program, and Techniques of Ten National Interracial Agencies. Methods Discovered through a Study of Cases, Situations, and Projects in Race Relations* (New York: Association Press, 1934), 256. The journal piece was a direct spin-off containing the book's conclusions.
 49. "'New Deal Opens New Avenues,' C. Foreman," *Pittsburgh Courier*, April 14, 1934, A6; George S. Schuyler, "Views and Reviews," *Pittsburgh Courier*, April 21, 1934, 10; Rev. N. W. Hoffman, "Without Prophecy a Race Will Perish," *Pittsburgh Courier*, April 28, 1934, A10; George S. Schuyler, "Views and Reviews," *Pittsburgh Courier*, Sep 15, 1934, 10; George W. Harvey, "Need of United Front among Rare Leaders Stressed by Rev. Harvey," *Pittsburgh Courier*, Sep 22, 1934, A10; George S. Schuyler, "Views and Reviews," *Pittsburgh Courier*, October 27, 1934, 10; "Student Conference Claims The Urban League, N.A.A.C.P. Must Change Tactics to Help Race," *Pittsburgh Courier*, Dec 15, 1934, 2.
 50. Such observations, of course, parallel conclusions more recently made by Eric Hobsbawm on the subject. See E. J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge England; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
 51. Schuyler, "Views and Reviews," *Pittsburgh Courier*, April 21, 1934, 10.
 52. W.E.B. Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk*, 2d ed. (Chicago: A. C. McClurg, 1903), chpt. 1; James Weldon Johnson, *Black Manhattan* (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1930). See also Alain Locke, "The Negro's Contribution to American Culture," *Journal of Negro Education* 8, no. 3 (July 1939): 521-29; Margaret Just Butcher, *The Negro in American Culture: Based on Materials Left by Alain Locke* (New York: Knopf, 1957).
 53. See Frederick Douglass, "The Future of the Colored Race," *North American Review* 142 (May 1886): 437-40 at 438-39; see also his "The Future of the Negro," *North American Review* 139 (July 1884): 84-86; both reprinted in *The Life and Writings of Frederick Douglass*, ed. Philip S. Foner, 5 volumes (New York: International Publishers, 1950), 4:193-96 at 195 and 4:411-13, respectively (Foner incorrectly dated the 1886 essay as 1866); Charles W. Chesnutt, "The Future American" [1900, in three parts], in *Charles W. Chesnutt: Essays and Speeches*, eds. Joseph R. McElrath, Robert C. Leitz, III, and Jesse S. Crisler (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), 121-35.
 54. "Schuyler-McKay Debate Aroused Wide Attention," *Pittsburgh Courier*, May 29, 1937, 7.
 55. George S. Schuyler, "Must Negro Lose Himself Racially? Yes! Caustic George S. Schuyler Maintains," *New York Amsterdam News*, June 5, 1937, 13; Claude McKay, "Must Negro Lose Himself Racially? No! Claude McKay, Noted Author, Argues," *New York Amsterdam News*, June 5, 1937, 13; George S. Schuyler, "Dilemma of the American Negro. I: The Case for Integration," *Jewish Frontier* 4, no. 10 (October 1937): 17-19; Claude McKay, "Dilemma of the American Negro. II: For Group Survival," *Jewish Frontier* 4, no. 10 (October 1937): 19-21. The *Jewish Frontier* version of the debate is reproduced in this issue of *The Black Scholar*.
 56. Schuyler, "Dilemma of the American Negro," 17.
 57. Ibid.
 58. McKay, "Dilemma of the American Negro," 19.
 59. Ibid.
 60. For background on some of those contentious issues see Claude McKay, *Harlem: Negro Metropolis* (New York: E.P. Dutton & Company, 1940), 181-262; Wayne F. Cooper, *Claude McKay: Rebel Sojourner in the Harlem Renaissance: A Biography* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1987), 322-46; Tyrone Tillery, *Claude McKay: A Black Poet's Struggle for Identity* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1992), 165-73; "New York Physicians Refuse Rosenwald Plan," *Chicago Defender*, December 20, 1930, 4; "Doctors Push Fight on Negro Hospital," *New York Times*, January 30, 1931, 44; Vanessa Northington Gamble, *Making a Place for Ourselves: The Black Hospital Movement, 1920-1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), chpt. 4; Ralph L. Crowder, "Don't Buy Where You Can't Work": An Investigation of the Political Forces and Social Conflict within the Harlem Boycott of 1934," *Afro-Americans in New York Life and History* 15, no. 2 (1991): 7-44.
 61. Kelly Miller, "The Forty-Ninth State," *Norfolk Journal and Guide*, July 28, 1934, 10; Gunnar Myrdal, *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy* (New York; London: Harper & Brothers, 1944), 814-15; Chester Higgins, "Blacks Sought Separate State 35 Years Ago," *Jet*, May 30, 1968, 14-21.
 62. "Singing the Blues Doesn't Help," *New York Amsterdam News*, June 5, 1937, 14.