

Black Scholars on the Line

*Race, Social Science, and American Thought
in the Twentieth Century*

edited by

JONATHAN SCOTT HOLLOWAY

and

BEN KEPPEL

University of Notre Dame Press

Notre Dame, Indiana

Copyright © 2007 by University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556
www.undpress.nd.edu
All Rights Reserved

Manufactured in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Black scholars on the line : race, social science, and American thought in
the twentieth century / edited by Jonathan Scott Holloway and Ben Keppel.

p. cm. — (The African American intellectual heritage series)

ISBN-13: 978-0-268-03079-7 (cloth : alk. paper)

ISBN-10: 0-268-03079-0 (cloth : alk. paper)

ISBN-13: 978-0-268-03080-3 (pbk. : alk. paper)

ISBN-10: 0-268-03080-4 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. African Americans—Social conditions—20th century. 2. African
Americans—Intellectual life—20th century. 3. African American intellectuals—
History—20th century. 4. African American scholars—History—20th century.
5. Social scientists—United States—History—20th century. 6. United States—
Intellectual life—20th century. 7. Social sciences—United States—History—
20th century. 8. United States—Race relations—History—20th century.
9. Racism—United States—History—20th century. 10. United States—Social
conditions—20th century. I. Holloway, Jonathan Scott. II. Keppel, Ben.

E185.86.B535 2007

305.5'5208996073—dc22

2007003385

*∞ The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence
and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity
of the Council on Library Resources.*

INTRODUCTION

Segregated Social Science and Its Legacy

Perhaps the most enduring snapshots of American apartheid are of the “colored only” and “whites only” signs that hung outside of public washrooms throughout the segregated South. Beside these photographs place another, this one of Thurgood Marshall and his colleagues standing on the steps in front of the United States Supreme Court after the triumph of *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1954. These images, reprinted in American history textbooks for every grade level, effectively compress and symbolize an extremely complicated historical process. As important as these pictures are, however, they cannot transmit the full texture of the world they seek to represent. *Black Scholars on the Line: Race, Social Science, and American Thought in the Twentieth Century* gives readers the opportunity to develop a more refined understanding of segregation and its legacy. More specifically, *Black Scholars on the Line* asks how segregation has influenced, and continues to influence, the development of American social thought and social science scholarship. Our reference to scholars being “on the line” has a multiple significance. In the most basic and obvious sense, these were intellectuals writing about “the line,” the color bar that cleaved American society apart. As black intellectuals whose scholarship traversed an ideological fault line of their society, they were also “on the line.” Lastly, as African Americans, no matter what their politics or professions, these individuals were not just students of racism and segregation, they were also constantly “on the line” as their targets.

One of the most important manifestations of our one-dimensional awareness of segregation’s comprehensiveness can be seen in the way we represent its impact on the creation and transmission of knowledge in the United States. For most Americans, the segregation of American education is symbolized by

the elementary and secondary school, which was the subject of the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*. While we do not seek to overrule this image in the American mind, we do seek to add to it.

The unanimity of attention given to *Brown* in teaching about how legal segregation was overcome has some unintended consequences when it is trimmed to fit into the American curriculum. *Brown* was but one chapter in a larger historical narrative that must be better understood. Between the generation after slavery and the generation after the Second World War, black scholars played important roles in the founding, elaboration, and refinement of American social science. The groundbreaking work that black attorneys and social scientists—many of whom were trained and worked at historically black colleges and universities—pursued in *Brown* was but one part of this larger development. We honor the scholarship that was related to *Brown* by reprinting social psychologists Kenneth and Mamie Clark's most ambitious discussions of their research on racial attitudes. However, as our first obligation in this project is to place this well-known intellectual priority within a larger context, we showcase other black scholars' work on different topics: migration and its effects, the structure of the black family, the disparate impact of race on economic opportunity, the relationship of cultural production and projection to debates over cultural assimilation, and so forth.

Although the black scholars whose work is found in this anthology received their graduate training at some of the nation's leading historically white universities, they lived, worked, and most frequently published from behind the line of segregation. To the extent that they have been seen at all in the curriculum of contemporary higher education it is typically as supporting players, contributing to but not innovating beyond, for instance, the intellectual edifice built by the white sociologists of the "Chicago School." Black social scientists working at Howard University are a case in point. These figures, ranging from Alain Locke to Abram Harris to Emmett Dorsey to E. Franklin Frazier—all of whom were affiliated with that school's Division of Social Science—are seen as constituting an interesting side chapter in the interwar era debates about capitalism and socialism, but they are not fit within a larger and continuing tradition of dissenting social science. The Howard group, however, was not alone in all of this. Many other brilliant analysts of American culture and political economy also struggled to be heard beyond their professional homes on this nation's black campuses. While we cannot linger long on this point, it bears noting that long-ignored institutions within the African American academy played key roles in the development of social scientific thought: Howard, Fisk, Atlanta, Tougaloo, and Wilberforce, to name but a few. In a

similar light, it behooves us to mention the central role that Howard's *Journal of Negro Education* played in the dissemination of cutting-edge modern social science scholarship. A safe harbor for scholarship that asked uncomfortable questions about the role of race in American society, the *Journal of Negro Education* deserves attention from any scholar studying social science in the middle third of the twentieth century. A handful of that journal's gems are published here.

Before proceeding further in this historical discussion, we must set forth some of the assumptions that make this textbook different from other anthologies that chronicle the African American intellectual tradition. First and foremost, our intention in this volume has been to query the effects of a particular social, economic, and political system on the creation, structuring, and distribution of specialized knowledge about that society. How does one's location in the racially segregated American social order affect one's ability to obtain material support and visibility for one's social science? How does the intellectual scaffolding of such a society affect how one organizes and expresses one's point of view, especially if it dissents from received wisdom within that society? How does one calibrate the balance between having one's say—"speaking truth to power"—and preserving one's effective right and ability to speak and gain access to that power? All of these questions are crucial to the work at hand because they point to the relation of "social science" to the broader category of "social thought." Social scientists and the work they generate are subject to social and political forces because, like everything else a society produces, they are made from these materials and processes. What is made from these materials and how these processes are expressed by individuals making choices, seeking and seizing opportunities, and responding to the unexpected are what make the social sciences necessary to study. Given the above, we decided that the most efficient and effective way to address this panoply of issues was to train our sights only on those scholars who were African American and either graduated from or had sustained careers at historically black colleges and universities.

We also recognized early on that too close a fidelity to the boundaries of certain disciplines would lead to an intellectual rigidity that could foster an arbitrary absolutism. For example, while a strong case could be made for the poet Langston Hughes as an intellectual who was more important to social analysis and cultural interpretation than many a social scientist, he nonetheless made no claims upon social science expertise or knowledge. The same cannot be said for his contemporaries Zora Neale Hurston, Sterling Brown, and James Weldon Johnson, whose works have been included here.

Finally, fidelity to our intellectual mission required that we set some boundaries about the writings of social scientists themselves. Because we are particularly concerned with the practice of social science, we have stayed away from writings by social scientists that were intended to fulfill a different, if equally worthy goal, such as outright political advocacy. We also chose not to include selections that, in our opinion, were too narrowly bounded by the needs of a particular political crisis or historical moment. To the best of our ability, we strove to include essays that spoke both to the requirements of their particular moment without seeming too remote from our own.

This history is presented in six parts, proceeding in chronological order. In part 1, we introduce the founding parents of African American social science. These were individuals who produced their scholarship outside the boundaries of sustaining institutional support and yet presented cogent arguments about the social, economic, and political problems engendered by racial thinking in America. In part 2, we turn our attention to the first real generation of professionally trained black scholars. These were the academics who often introduced modern social science curricula to their respective home institutions. In part 3, we examine the interactions between cultural production and social scientific knowledge. The issues that are raised in this section prefigure the more elaborate and sustained debates in cultural studies in our current academic world. In part 4, we find the scholarship produced by the leading progressive social scientists of the day on issues of race and class. The conflicting strategic advice offered by these intellectuals underlines the abiding tension between the primacy of race and class in American society. In part 5, we examine social scientific scholarship that put African American struggles in an international context. While the place or role of blacks in the international sphere predates this country's founding, the sustained social science analysis of this vital dimension was a necessity of the Second World War. In part 6, we capture the scholarship that most effectively highlights the terrifically complex state of "raced" social science thought during the age of desegregation in academia. Perhaps the ultimate irony in the history of race and social science is found here: at the moment when black social scientists undeniably came into their own, other intellectual and civil rights activists, black and white, attacked the very value or premise of social science itself.

Before moving to the thirty-one primary sources that comprise this collection it is important to place the entire body of work in context. In the remainder of the introduction we seek to accomplish this by examining the tensions between race and scholarship, the development of the black scholar as a "type," the emergence of modern social science, the challenges posed to

“racial thinking” by desegregation, the continuities and discontinuities that the civil rights era brought to the practice of social science, and then the political economy of higher education in our post-civil rights era.

Social Science and Society

In 1899, Fisk- and Harvard-trained scholar W. E. B. Du Bois published *The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study*, a path-breaking sociological analysis of urban space and race. In what was the first of many painstaking social surveys of African American life that put him at “the frontier of American social science research,” Du Bois ruminated over blacks’ place in American society, thinking out loud about the phenomenon of a racial group of people being considered a national problem.¹ “Two sorts of answers,” Du Bois mused, “are usually returned to the bewildered American who asks seriously: What is the Negro problem?”

The one is straightforward and clear: it is simply this, or simply that, and one simple remedy long enough applied will in time cause it to disappear. The other answer is hopelessly involved and complex. . . . Both of these sorts of answers have something of truth in them: the Negro problem, looked at in one way is but the old world questions of ignorance, poverty, crime, and the dislike of the stranger. On the other hand it is a mistake to think that attacking each of these questions single-handed without reference to the others will settle the matter: a combination of social problems is far more than a matter of mere addition—the combination is itself a problem. Nevertheless, the Negro problems are not more hopelessly complex than many others have been. Their elements despite their bewildering complication can be kept clearly in view: they are after all the same difficulties over which the world has grown gray: the question as to how far human intelligence can be trusted and trained; as to whether we must always have the poor with us; as to whether it is possible for the mass of men to attain righteousness on earth.²

Du Bois’s observations here are instrumental for several reasons. First, they capture the highest ideals and aspirations of the founders of social science. Du Bois’s thoughts are also valuable because they express an appreciation for the complexity and interdependence of social forces and social problems. Finally, Du Bois’s reference to the attainment of “righteousness on earth” points

back to the roots of black social science in a preexisting genre of African American protest grounded in the biblical promise of the unitary nature of humanity.³

Du Bois was, by far, one of the most accomplished intellectuals of the several generations that constitute his professional career. Nonetheless, the color line constantly delimited his personal and professional life. One can see the effect of racism in his professional life by examining Du Bois's relationship to established social science more than a century ago. Despite the publication of *The Philadelphia Negro* and a critically important series of conferences and sociological studies he organized at Atlanta University when he taught there in the early 1900s, Du Bois is haltingly acknowledged as a founder of social science because, like the other very few African Americans of his class and training, he could only briefly visit the institutions where the formal founding was underway. For example, although he already held a doctorate from Harvard and had published his first book, *The Suppression of the African Slave Trade to the United States of America, 1638–1870* (the inaugural book in the Harvard Historical Studies series, no less), Du Bois had to complete *The Philadelphia Negro* as a “temporary assistant in sociology,” invited to the University of Pennsylvania by Professor Samuel McCone Lindsay.⁴

Like other African Americans of his generation (including those who did not share his advantages of class and education), Du Bois worked in a social, political, and cultural context that provided virtually no institutional support for studies dissenting from the segregationist consensus. And, again, like his African American peers, Du Bois had to be especially attentive to how the world that celebrated segregation would receive his contributions to the founding and professionalization of social science. If we broaden the scope of inquiry to include more individuals, we can see that Du Bois's observations and experiences really are illustrative of broader themes and patterns in the evolving relationship between race and social science thought in the twentieth century.

Industrialism, Segregation, and Social Science

All ideas and institutions are the products of the historical contexts into which they are born. The American system of higher education on both sides of the color line was the offspring of a segregated society. On one side of that line, those attending historically white colleges (and in some states this did include a miniscule number of black Americans) learned a version of the “science of

society” that endorsed the racial hierarchy of the day. Even if every state in the Union did not enforce separation with the same exactitude, the idea that African Americans were not fit to be participants in the intellectual work of a rapidly industrializing nation (while they were accepted as among the primary providers of physical labor) was a belief that crossed the lines of class, region, and political party.

In the late 1800s, social science was practiced with a strong moralistic and humanistic tone that was rarely far removed from conservative theological and political practices that justified both segregation and imperialism as part of the natural and hierarchical order of things. Early social science primarily ratified deeply held unscientific assumptions about the rise of some people from “savagery” to “civilization.”⁵ Following the publication of Charles Darwin’s *Origin of Species* in 1859 and *The Descent of Man* in 1871, the three stages of human evolution took on a racial cast such that anthropology, sociology, and evolutionary ethnology supported a “racio-cultural hierarchy” that declared that “only large-brained white men, the highest products of organic evolution, were fully civilized.”⁶

On the other side of the line, between the last years of the nineteenth century and the middle years of the twentieth, outstanding African American scholars provided virtually the only objective examinations of African American life. Their segregation away from the centers of intellectual, social, and political power had two results: (1) they were only dimly perceived by the white leaders of social science, and (2) their research received paltry outside financial support when it was supported at all. In spite of this material barrier, Du Bois produced his renowned Atlanta University Studies, which historian Michael R. Winston correctly observed, “were among the first of their kind in any American university and obviously superior to the work supported at that time by white universities.”⁷

One set of figures highlights the resource deficit faced in these years by historically black institutions. According to historian Dwight O. Holmes, the sum total of all the money spent in 1928 to operate the country’s seventeen black land grant institutions—\$1,379,484—was roughly equal to the amount given to each of the several white land grant colleges in the same states.⁸ This fact makes plain the material underpinning behind the systematic segregation of the creation of knowledge.

In addition to the difficulties rising from the limited resources available at black colleges and universities, African American academics faced other challenges to generating original scholarship. First, teaching, not research, was the mission at even the most prestigious institutions. In 1911, Du Bois described

the conditions at his Atlanta University, then the capital of African American social science research, quite directly:

Our financial resources are unfortunately meager. Atlanta University is primarily a school and most of its funds and energy go to teaching. It is, however, also a seat of learning and as such it has endeavored to advance knowledge, particularly in matters of racial contact and development. . . . In this work [Atlanta University] has received unusual encouragement from the scientific world. . . . On the other hand the financial support given this work has been very small. The cost of the fifteen publications [the Atlanta series] has been about \$17,000. . . . Three years ago a small grant from the Carnegie Institution of Washington, D.C., greatly helped us; and for three years our work was saved from suspension by the John F. Slater Fund. . . . May we not hope in the future for such increased financial resources as will enable us to study adequately this greatest group of social problems that ever faced America?⁹

Predictably, these material circumstances had important tangible and intangible consequences for the daily life and work of the black scholar. Decades after Du Bois lamented the tepid financial support for research at Atlanta, sociologist Hylan Lewis outlined the other customary challenges that defined life at historically black colleges:

With few exceptions, the college for Negroes operates in a setting which is largely alien: if the setting is not actively hostile, it is nearly always potentially so. This is a mental hazard to which adjustment must be made. Most colleges are in the South and many are in small towns or rural areas. In even the most favorable situations, there is but limited access to community resources—meager as they usually are—for classroom and research activities, for leisure time activities, and for the satisfaction of incidental personal interests of students and staff. . . . There is a kind of uneasy self-sufficiency forced upon persons in the campus community. For many, learning and working comes to be a tour of duty and the periodic “return to civilization”—the vacation trip to the metropolis—is a seasonal rite. Many teachers and would-be scholars are wont to moan of their lack of production, their frustration and loneliness.¹⁰

It ought not come as a surprise that black and white scholars and historically black and white institutions faced qualitatively and quantitatively differ-

ent hurdles in their respective quests for personal and professional satisfaction and solvency. But, as frustrating and debilitating as the effects of the political economy of racism must have been for individuals and institutions, we cannot afford to be blind to the ways in which the black and white worlds of academe overlapped. Most black and white scholars, for example, mutually embraced some values that we no longer celebrate. What historian Waldo Martin observed about Frederick Douglass applies equally to his immediate successors in “race leadership.” Although Douglass denounced the oppression of non-Western people by Europeans and Americans, he “essentially accepted . . . the dominant Anglo-American cultural paradigm . . . though he rejected its racism.”¹¹ In a similar way, Du Bois, despite being a pioneering student of ancient African civilization, an anti-imperialist, and a tireless advocate for African American equality, held a paternalistic attitude toward Africa and the non-Western world generally. Like the other intellectual leaders of his time, Du Bois believed that Africans did not possess among their millions sufficient indigenous leadership for self-rule. Whether one finds it ironic or not, just as leading white scholars felt that they spoke to and for the world’s civilized people, Du Bois and his peers were quite convinced that they spoke to the civilized for the uncivilized.¹²

We draw attention to the elitism in the African American scholarly tradition not to engage in some politically facile or morally gratuitous revisionism. For us, these contradictory values must be given some attention because they were also part and parcel of the intellectual world on both sides of the color line. No matter the color of their skin, most individuals who pursued intellectual careers came from environments in which the separation of the intellectual from the masses was cherished if not encouraged. This ideology that separated the “talented tenth” of black America from those they were expected to lead often skewed the analysis that followed in ways that stand out to contemporary eyes.

In addition to this mutual intellectual inheritance of presumptive individual authority and Western superiority, there are also some shared patterns of institutional development in the late nineteenth century that bear noting. For example, where the development of African American institutions is typically seen from a very narrow, restricted, and racial context, the truth is more complicated. For instance, the development of black colleges and land grant schools are seen as creations of segregation and as pawns in a strategic debate between two “race men”—the conservative accommodationist Booker T. Washington and the liberal interracialist Du Bois. Although these interpretations contain important elements of truth, they are never connected to the

unifying historical context of industrialization. Higher education in the United States, on both sides of the color line and in all regions of the nation, was created to serve the requirements of the industrial economy.

It is true, for instance, that black colleges and universities operated for many years as the equivalent of high schools before having a majority of students who were enrolled in college-level courses.¹³ But, in so doing, these schools were reenacting, to a more extreme degree, a pattern followed by some leading state universities founded in the nineteenth century.¹⁴ The establishment of collegiate institutions to educate newly freed African Americans was part of a larger national effort to professionalize American higher education, and make it at once less exclusive and also more geared to the needs of an expanding industrial order in need of highly trained workers. When we observe the heavy-handedness of Booker T. Washington we should keep in mind the words of historians Merle Curti and Vernon Carstensen. Writing about the particular circumstances of the American state university, they arrive at a conclusion that applies on both sides of the color line, in both public and private contexts. Curti and Carstensen pointed out that “a host of politically pertinent but educationally irrelevant elements,” especially the “conflicting and contradictory impulses imposed by individuals and groups who at one time or another have stood in a position of power,” have shaped the development of colleges and universities.¹⁵

What we recognize today as the basic modern university structure—a student body comprised of undergraduates and graduates, and an expressed dual commitment to teaching and research—came later to historically black institutions than to historically white ones. But in the 1930s, an increase in and regularization of federal support for Howard University and the equally heavy investment of philanthropies—especially the Julius Rosenwald Fund and the Rockefeller Foundation—in Howard, Atlanta, and Fisk Universities translated into a new institutional design and structure for these schools.¹⁶ With this largesse, the very best black universities now mirrored their white counterparts, and in short order these institutions attracted the very best black intellectual talent to their respective campuses.

All of the above is not to suggest that black and white scholars shared the same ideological outlook in all aspects of their lives, nor is it to suggest that segregation was an uncomplicated boon to the development of historically black colleges. Rather, this richly contradictory history and intellectual heritage demonstrates two realities of segregated life. First, as much as the color bar worked to separate the black and white worlds of higher education, there were always commonalities that brought them together. Arguably the most important of these, as we have noted earlier, was a deeply entrenched

belief in the superiority of Western culture and the corresponding immaturity of African peoples. Second, although the color bar meant that black and white institutions developed at different paces and with different sets of resources, this does not mean that black institutions were structurally incapable of fulfilling any mission beyond the circumscribed one envisioned by some of their philanthropic supporters. As we document the structural barriers faced by black colleges and universities, it is also important that we do not artificially add to the distance created by segregation by holding high the historically white institutions as idealized models of what was meant by the phrase “higher education.”

The Development of the Black Scholar

As we have seen, the ideology of white supremacy and the concomitant policy of segregation placed special obstacles in the path of creating an African American intellectual class. The determination of former slaves and their allies to overcome these forces caused a dramatic push to educate blacks. Black schools were built at a stunning rate, black churches extended their work into the educational realm, and a host of normal (teaching) and industrial colleges dotted the landscape. More than any other institution, the church and the school rapidly became the stable center of black community affairs and just as often served similar purposes: the training of good citizens who would then travel forth to save the rest of the race.¹⁷ This practice, commonly referred to as “uplift,” was at once simple and complicated. It represented an honest attempt by educated and middle-class blacks to improve the quality of life for those who were less fortunate. But uplift was also burdened with socially conservative class and gender ideologies that denigrated the subjects it sought to cleanse literally and figuratively.¹⁸ Churches and schools were the “discursive spaces” where the ideas for this sort of work took root and then flourished.¹⁹

Building upon the institutional framework of the black church, the pedagogical training of the black school, and the cultural and moral collaboration of the home, other entities joined this social welfare project. Social service organizations and betterment groups sprang up in the late 1800s and turned their attention to struggling blacks. The National Association of Colored Women, established in 1896, serves as a case in point. Its motto, “Lifting While We Climb,” acknowledged both the distance even middle-class blacks had to travel to gain full citizenship rights and the social obligation these blacks had to assist those they identified as beneath them.

It is in this context that we can best understand the genesis of the black scholar. Much as ministers respond to a call to faith in the church, early black thinkers responded to a call to service in their scholarship. As often as not, the church, the school, the home, and the academy were intertwined. Although the institutions of the middle to late 1800s were not literally training the black scholars of the future, they were doing critical work in training a cadre of black teachers, lay and religious, to educate the black masses and improve their life chances. Indeed, these worlds interacted with great frequency and apparent ease. For example, scholarly practices in the black community emerged from critical and, as historian Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham points out, feminist interpretations of the Bible.²⁰ While this practice did not represent a watershed moment in the history of the Bible as text, it was a dramatic break for a community that less than a generation earlier was denied the opportunity to become literate, much less practice an organized faith. Simply put, the standard educational training for blacks was for an explicit political purpose—uplift—and was often rooted in the traditions of the black church, the black schoolhouse, the home, and the betterment organization.

It is customary to attack segregation for the manifest social and economic inefficiency created by the need for duplicate and alternate institutions. The preceding discussion of the intellectual missionary work done by African American churches and other self-help agencies touches upon something equally important but far harder to capture. Segregation shaped the very texture and substance of the ideas themselves.

The most important move toward an institutional framework for black scholars can be seen in the Reverend Alexander Crummell's brainchild, the American Negro Academy (ANA). Founded in 1897, the ANA represented an attempt by black scholars to improve the community's intellectual life and the quality of its leadership. This new leadership, in turn, would be better equipped to disprove arguments about black social, cultural, and intellectual inferiority.²¹ In his capacity as the first president of the ANA, Crummell urged its members to join in his quest to uplift the race. He believed that intellectuals—those who had “secured the vision which penetrates the center of nature”—would provide salvation for blacks: “In all the great revolutions, and in all great reforms which have transpired, scholars have been conspicuous; in the re-construction of society, in formulating laws, in producing great emancipations, in the revival of letters, in the advancement of science, in the renaissance of art, in the destruction of gross superstitions and in the restoration of true and enlightened religion.”²² The backbone of Alexander

Crummell's agenda, then, was a clearly stated and unbending belief in a hierarchically ordered society where the enlightened intelligentsia guided the masses toward salvation. For Crummell, "The Negro problem in the U.S. [was] a problem of ideas."²³ But Crummell did not expect all blacks to participate in solving this problem. Although he opposed Booker T. Washington's politics and educational policies, he conceded there was an important role to be played by industrial education schools. In this regard, Crummell felt that women had a special, if secondary, role to play.

Crummell epitomized the double-edged nature of uplift when he urged women to do the important work of cleansing the unclean and protecting the unprotected while simultaneously respecting their own second-class status within the black community. Crummell believed, for example, that too many women were receiving "improper" education. He felt that women-only industrial training schools needed to be established in order to support the civilizing of the race. After all, he argued, women would be better able to support their male partners' struggles if the women were properly trained in the "practical" and the "home life."²⁴ The intelligentsia was for men only.

True to form and to Crummell's beliefs, over the course of its thirty-three year existence, the ANA only entertained one female guest speaker: writer and educator Anna Julia Cooper.²⁵ Cooper, whose 1892 opus *A Voice from the South* embodied both Victorian uplift ideology and a gender analysis of black leadership, was adamantly opposed to Washington's vocational education schemes. In fact, her anti-Washington opinions in *A Voice from the South* predate Du Bois's similar sentiments in *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903). However, those men who would have been Cooper's colleagues in academia largely ignored her. Cooper perfectly summed up this willful blindness in *A Voice from the South*: "It seems hardly a gracious thing to say, but it strikes me as true, that while our men seem thoroughly abreast of the times on almost every other subject, when they strike the woman question they drop back into sixteenth century logic. . . . I fear the majority of colored men do not yet think it worth while [*sic*] that women aspire to higher education."²⁶

The very nature of social science work emerged in a contentious struggle with the daily and professional lives of black scholars. They often accepted the methodological imperatives of their respective disciplines within the orbit of social science, but they did so often by perpetuating destructive stereotypes about group and individual behavior: uncivilized Africans, unworthy poor, and unqualified females. As we consider the intellectual substance of their contributions, it is important to remember the material context in which this generation of black scholars worked.

The Development of Modern Social Science

The pioneers of modern social science self-consciously strove for a more avowedly relativistic tone and scientific method than their moralistic predecessors of the middle to late nineteenth century. William Thomas and Florian Znaniecki's *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, which historian Eli Zaretsky notes stood "on the cusp between nineteenth-century social theory and modern empirical social science," is an excellent starting point for examining the founding assumptions of American social science.²⁷ Thomas and Znaniecki, both sociologists, set out to catalog and understand the forces assisting or preventing immigrant populations from adjusting to life in the United States. Among Thomas and Znaniecki's many methodological innovations was the fact that the scholars let the reader hear the immigrants speak in their own voices—going so far as to convince one of their subjects to write a three hundred page autobiography.²⁸ Thomas and Znaniecki concluded that Polish immigrants struggled in America because their community's social structures collapsed under the pressure of migration and conflict with a different, dominant culture. Ultimately, the immigrants' best hopes resided within their own social networks. Until these networks learned to assimilate into the dominant cultural norms and mores of American society—and thus created a new Polish American identity—the immigrant community would suffer from its own vice and creeping immorality.²⁹ Their claims about Polish immigrants aside, here we can see Thomas and Znaniecki's lasting and most problematic conceptual contribution to the social sciences: the concept of "social disorganization."

Robert Park, founder of the "Chicago School" of urban sociology, sought to apply Thomas and Znaniecki's conceptual model to the lives of African Americans who were migrating from the rural South to the urban North in search of greater economic opportunity and personal freedom. Park believed that blacks, though native-born Americans going back generations, were nonetheless "socially disorganized" because they had been stripped of their African culture by slavery. Park argued that this rupture in black American social and cultural structure was a natural phenomenon—as social interaction was cyclical and always tended toward balance, disorganization was simply a step toward reorganization.³⁰ Park thought balance, which for blacks meant the assimilation into the dominant, white culture, would be achieved as they progressed through the cycle: contact-competition-accommodation-assimilation.³¹

Compared to the ideas that characterized social thought in the first years of the twentieth century, Park's work was an advance, but a relatively modest

one. It was no great leap to go from the logic of the anthropologist Robert Bennett Bean to that of the sociologist Park. Writing in 1906, Bean drew conclusions from his measurements of white and black brain capacity. For Bean, whites were “dominant and domineering, and possessed primarily with determination, will power, self control, [and] self-government.” In contrast, “the Negro is primarily affectionate, immensely emotional, then sensual, and under stimulation passionate. There is love of ostentation, of outward show, of approbation; there is love of music, and capacity for melodious articulation; there is undeveloped artistic power and taste—Negroes make good artisans, handicraftsmen—and there is instability of character incident to lack of self-control, especially in connection with the sexual relation; and there is lack of *orientation*, or recognition of position and condition of self and environment, evidenced by a peculiar bumptiousness.”³²

Park had similar things to say about blacks in his *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, a textbook he coauthored in 1924 with fellow Chicago sociologist Ernest Burgess. Park found that blacks’ characteristics manifested themselves in a “genial, sunny, and social disposition, in an interest and attachment to external, physical things rather than to subjective states and objects of introspection, in a disposition for expression rather than enterprise and action. . . . He is primarily an artist, loving life for its own sake. His *metier* is expression rather than action. He is, so to speak, the lady among races.”³³

Even though Park became well known for the role he played in training important black sociologists, the fact remains that his viewpoints represented a fundamental challenge for his students. By their very presence at the University of Chicago, his students either were true exceptions to Park’s theories about black potential (and, therefore, at some sociological level they could no longer be “black”) or they were living embodiments that disproved Park. In addition to finding the intellectual space to incorporate Park’s ideas along with their own theories, students such as E. Franklin Frazier had to preserve the sanctity of this space in light of the external realities created by the racial veil. For example, even though Frazier agreed with Park that the ravages and social stresses of the middle passage, slavery, emancipation, and migration erased African culture, Frazier did not subscribe to the view that blacks possessed an inferior culture or that they were “the lady among races.” Frazier found comparisons to other cultures “invidious” and, in any event, believed that “black culture” was American culture.³⁴ Modern social science, because of its critical engagement with the problems of such social processes as cultural contact, migration, assimilation, and struggle, became an area of scholarship particularly germane to the black experience over the course of the

twentieth century. Not only did the discipline pay special attention to African Americans, black intellectuals dedicated themselves to the development of the discipline. As the brief Park-Frazier example makes clear, these two streams often flowed in different directions, frequently coming together but creating eddies of dissension where they met. But the story of the black intellectual, social science, and their mutual development did not end with the mid-century emergence of the graduate programs in the social sciences at black universities or the generalized acceptance of modern social science methodologies on college campuses across the country. In fact, quite the opposite occurred.

Desegregated Thinking in a Segregated World

Try as they might, the white leadership of the nation did not have absolute control over the generation of new ideas or the institutions that spawned them. Individual and collective thought and action are too complicated and open-ended to fall easily into line with any particular system of hegemony. For example, the hegemony of segregationist thinking did not prevent the formation of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), although it did materially impede its effort to make lynching a federal crime. Segregation did not muzzle Du Bois as he systematically wrote against white supremacy and the repression of African Americans. It did, however, powerfully control the distribution of his ideas and those of his colleagues behind the line.

This brings us to two essential episodes immediately preceding the desegregation of American social science: the publication of Gunnar Myrdal's pioneering indictment of segregation, *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy*, and the lesser-known release by the University of North Carolina Press of the important protest anthology *What the Negro Wants*, edited by Howard University historian Rayford Logan. These texts, both published in 1944, tangibly capture the power of the segregationist paradigm even as world events were bringing it down. *An American Dilemma*, a summary of a collaboration between Myrdal and some of the most outstanding social scientists of that time, was six years in the making and was given instant credibility because it had been funded by the Carnegie Corporation. In addition, *An American Dilemma* stood apart because its formal author was a Swedish political economist, someone who had lived outside of American culture and was thus perhaps not so sympathetic to well-worn ra-

tionalizations for the dichotomy between American professions of egalitarianism and American practices of discrimination. The intellectual prestige of *An American Dilemma* was so great that the Supreme Court cited it in footnote 11 to its 1954 ruling in the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision.³⁵

Myrdal's findings delighted many while infuriating others. Those who advocated a racial status quo were sorely disappointed when Myrdal claimed that the "Negro problem" originated primarily in "what goes on in the minds of white Americans" and that race discrimination was an irrational deviation from the "American Creed" that recognized liberty and justice for all.³⁶ Although Myrdal was, in a sense, quite brave and revolutionary in assigning responsibility for the unequal treatment of blacks to the psychological delusions of whites, such an approach continued a process of historical evasion by examining black achievement only to the degree that it demonstrated the damage done by whites.³⁷

What is most important about *An American Dilemma* for our discussion is that, although published as a single-author study, it was in fact a large-scale recognition of the black scholar as social science expert. Over thirty social science consultants were hired for the project, the majority of whom were African American. Among this group, Howard University political scientist Ralph Bunche was, without doubt, the most important. His prodigious writings covering four book-length volumes provided the factual and analytical foundation for much of Myrdal's writing. Nonetheless, Bunche's and others' work, when accepted by Myrdal, was sequestered to the footnotes.³⁸ As such, for all its intellectual courage, *An American Dilemma* also reflected the segregation of scholars within the social science of its day.

The decision to mute black scholars' contributions to *An American Dilemma* was symptomatic of publishing practices in academe. In *Social Forces*, the established journal most receptive to publishing work by leading black scholars, African American academics' essays on black life were published in a section at the back on "minorities." Furthermore, much of black social scientists' scholarship was published behind the color line in journals tied to historically black universities, such as *Phylon* at Atlanta University and the *Journal of Negro Education* at Howard. Black social scientists also found publication opportunities in the journals of extra-institutional organizations dedicated to racial matters, such as the *Journal of Negro History*, produced by Carter G. Woodson's Association for the Study of Negro Life and History; *Crisis*, published by the NAACP under Du Bois's editorship; and *Opportunity*, edited by Charles Johnson and published by the National Urban League.

For this reason alone, the publication of *What the Negro Wants* is important for the way that it tested the boundaries of the segregation of intellectuals and ideas. This indispensable collection of African American thought originated in 1942 with W. T. Couch, director of the University of North Carolina Press, and Guy Johnson, a leading sociologist at the university. *What the Negro Wants* was intended as an answer to what Couch and Johnson, both southern white liberals, learned was Myrdal's forthcoming indictment of white America. Couch and Johnson recruited Rayford Logan to edit the volume. Logan's task was, on the surface, simple: have some of the most prominent black leaders in the country across the political spectrum write an essay declaring "what the Negro wants."³⁹

The final product angered Couch because it reinforced Myrdal's assertion that segregation was an indefensible conflict with the "American Creed." *What the Negro Wants* was even more effective in scoring this point as it provided what Myrdal did not: direct testimony from African Americans (of all political stripes) that equality was their foremost demand and aspiration. Couch was not to be denied, and wrote an introduction to the text that provided an opportunity to "remove any possible ambiguity" about his own view on the subject of black equality: "the Negro's condition is produced by inferiority, but that this inferiority can be overcome, and the prejudice resulting from it can be cured. The white man can help, *but the main part of the task rests on the Negro.*"⁴⁰ Couch also added a peculiar postscript, wrapping his urgings of political quietism on the part of black leaders in a language that clumsily manipulated the rhetoric and logic of egalitarianism to preserve its opposite: "today the Negro's interest requires . . . that he not be so much concerned over the label 'equal,' but that he concentrate all of his energies on being not merely equal to, but better than the white man."⁴¹

The Civil Rights Movement Challenges Social Science

If the continuing power of segregation as an accepted social norm shaped both the content and distribution of social science through the 1950s, it is natural that the destruction of this consensus by the death of European colonialism and by the rise of the civil rights movement in the United States had important consequences for social science disciplines. This process began with one of the proudest moments for progressive social science: the Supreme Court's verdict in *Brown v. Board of Education*. However, as the implementation of *Brown* moved forward, the role of these scholars got lost in a debate that was made

sometimes brutally polarized because it was so long overdue.⁴² Intellectual activists with experience in the civil rights movement rose to ask fundamental questions about the established practice of social science with reference to African Americans: What was the role of social science in society—was it primarily descriptive? On what basis were certain practices privileged as “normative” while others were categorized as “deviant”? What should be the role of the social scientist in the process of social change?

The pivotal moment in the collision between social science and the civil rights movement arrived with the 1965 publication of Daniel Patrick Moynihan’s *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action* (more commonly known as “the Moynihan Report”). Moynihan, then an Assistant Secretary of Labor in Lyndon B. Johnson’s presidential administration, claimed that black urban poverty was a result of family disorganization, matriarchy, and a pathological culture. In drawing these conclusions Moynihan leaned heavily, but incompletely, on E. Franklin Frazier’s pioneering work on the black family. Whereas Frazier saw disorganization as a necessary step in a process of reorganization, Moynihan saw disorganization as the final state of being. Unfortunately for Frazier, the prominence of Moynihan’s highly selective citation of his work led to Frazier’s indictment, along with Moynihan, as a member of a “pejorative tradition” that attacked black cultural patterns and the urban poor.⁴³ But perhaps most infuriating to its early critics was that Moynihan dedicated forty-five pages of the report to describing a “tangle of pathology” and a scant few words in its page and a half conclusion to possible solutions beyond advocating, without any further elaboration, a “national effort . . . towards the question of family structure.”⁴⁴ Given the report’s documentation of the history of racism in American life, the subsequent decision to highlight only the depth of the problem struck many as, at best, an act of professional and political negligence of the most serious kind.

For their part, critics of the Moynihan Report within social science and within the civil rights movement treated the text as an official government pronouncement whose thesis had been the basis for an important and well-received presidential address (which it was) and took justified exception to its rhetorical excesses and methodological shortcomings (especially Moynihan’s carelessness on the subject of out-of-wedlock births; he neglected to point out the ways in which, for instance, race and class conceal the true rate of out-of-wedlock births among white Americans).⁴⁵ The end result, critics charged, was to suggest the intractability of the social dimension of racial segregation at the very moment when American public opinion seemed most supportive of tackling it. For some social scientists whose training included

their participation in the civil rights movement, the Moynihan Report symbolized much that was wrong with social science: the unexamined use of language and statistics merely to confirm the widespread stereotypes held by those in power toward those without it.

Young scholars who entered social science in order to continue the work of the civil rights movement were determined to scrutinize the practice of social science disciplines and find ways to include more fully those being studied in the research process. They were, in essence, subjecting the discipline of their elders to a new kind of outside peer review. Although we invoke the phrase “peer review” here as a metaphor, it was also quite literally undertaken. In his contribution to Joyce Ladner’s *The Death of White Sociology: Essays on Race and Culture*, the most important revisionist social science anthology of the civil rights years, political scientist Ronald Walters offered the following account of the practices of Boston’s Community Research Review Committee:

The Committee is composed of a primary group of Black social scientists who are accountable to the community through the Black United Front. Its function is to detect the kind of research planned and in progress that relates to the Black Community, to screen actual research proposals and otherwise to evaluate the project and, finally, to provide the results to the community, which decides whether or not it would be advisable for the studies to be carried out there. If the community decides the study is needed—cool. But if it decides that it is either unnecessary or harmful, then, in the age-old manner, it takes care of business. The Black social scientist must participate in a process which says, in effect, we will no longer participate by passiveness [*sic*] in the destruction and dehumanization of our communities through white social science research. But in order to participate, we need to pay much closer attention to the kind of research that is funded, who does the funding, who carries out the research, what the findings are, who is responsible for dissemination of the findings, and how they are used, and be willing to intervene at any stage of the process. This is one type of viable defensive strategy which also has an offensive connotation.⁴⁶

The dangers of such oversight to the conduct of ideologically and politically independent research here are clear. For the moment, however, it is important to focus on what movement social scientists saw as the proper relationship between social science and those groups and individuals being studied. That some blacks were uneasy about social science and its assumptions can

be seen as far back as the late 1800s when Du Bois was researching *The Philadelphia Negro*. When Du Bois began his meticulous door-to-door rounds through Philadelphia's Seventh Ward in August 1896, David Levering Lewis tells us that "more than a few times, [Du Bois] was challenged at the front door with the question, 'Are we animals to be dissected and by some unknown Negro at that?'"⁴⁷

As necessary and essential as the questions asked by the civil rights era social science revisionists were, they were no more capable than Moynihan of anticipating the consequences of that debate. Sociologist William Julius Wilson has persuasively argued that the debate over the black family caused by the Moynihan Report squelched further research and caused some scholars to overemphasize strengths at the expense of genuinely worsening conditions.⁴⁸ This, Wilson suggested, discouraged liberal social scientists from further investigating the issues spotlighted by Moynihan and created an opening for conservative politicians and their allies in social science to redefine the problems of the African American underclass as originating with that group's alleged pathology.⁴⁹

Black scholars of the civil rights movement came to their work with a different set of values and standards that they believed would better serve objective scholarship and constructive action. In this context, it was not that words such as "deviance" should be banished from the social scientist's descriptive and analytical vocabulary. Rather, such words or concepts needed to be scrutinized and used sparingly. The founding generation had given too little attention to the possibility that the premise of deviant behavior could be, to quote Joyce Ladner, "the invention of a group that uses its own standards as the ideal by which others are to be judged."⁵⁰

Revisionist social scientists who were living through the upending of a social system too long in place proposed a "conflict model" that, in the words of sociologist Edgar G. Epps, "allows us to give full value to the efforts of minority groups to effect change in their own positions relative to other groups."⁵¹ Prior scholarship by the founding generation of African Americans in social science had, like their mentors, interpreted African American life through the prism of the "'order model' [by which] members of ethnic and racial minorities are viewed as 'deviant' groups which must adjust to the institutionalized norms of society."⁵²

Even Kenneth and Mamie Phipps Clark, whose "doll studies" remain iconic as examples of research for constructive social action, came in for serious critique.⁵³ Ladner spoke diplomatically for many of her generation when she argued that, because the Clarks' studies focused so exclusively on the

damage caused by white racism, they had missed an important dimension of the black experience. “While it cannot be denied that the system of oppression has taken a heavy toll on the psychological and physical development of the Black child and adult,” Ladner acknowledged, “it can be questioned . . . whether or not the impact has been as severe as some scholars maintain.”⁵⁴ According to social critic Albert Murray, Kenneth Clark’s brief for “community action” in Harlem, a monograph titled *Dark Ghetto*, represented “a point of view which is essentially white” because it viewed “all black behavior [as] only a pathetic manifestation of black cowardice, self-hatred, escapism and self destruction.” Here, Murray submitted Clark to the same process of distortion that Moynihan and some of his critics had inflicted upon E. Franklin Frazier.⁵⁵

Even though there were real differences separating them, some of the most important scholars who toiled “behind the line” and those blacks who crossed that line during the civil rights movement in the 1960s shared a heightened awareness of the dangers of being too quick to label and theorize about the complex lives of those without power. They insisted that the professional students of human behavior use words like “dysfunctional,” “deviant,” or “pathological”—and the models of which they are an integral part—sparingly and with exquisite care, understanding that these words are laden with all kinds of unscientific associations and implications about which races, people, and classes are worthy of respect and which are not. Hylan Lewis warned that these words, carelessly deployed, become little more than mere “slogans,” a shorthand substitute for doing meticulous fieldwork. Speaking to the conceptual reductionism that the profligate reliance on such terms generated since the 1960s, Lewis asked an especially pertinent question: “If we identify a group of people who live in a certain area by some trait, what do we know about them? We know nothing that we did not *believe* already. And what do we do about their plight? The answer is nothing that we did not already plan to do.”⁵⁶

As we look back upon the shifts in ideology and perspective that defined social science’s evolution over the twentieth century and place them beside the world in which we live, we must acknowledge the misplaced hope that a socially scientific critical engagement with society would fundamentally change things for the better. Part of the reason for this, of course, lies in the long-term backlash against the mid-century period of reform. Also, social science itself has changed. The range of ideas and approaches represented within the disciplines of social science is far wider and more varied than it was when Gunnar Myrdal acted as a spokesman to the public for an ascending ideology

within social science. Today, as historian Dorothy Ross has observed, divisions created during the 1960s have been institutionalized as subfields “rarely communicating with each other or contributing to a common matrix.”⁵⁷

The Political Economy of Higher Education in the Postwar Era

The debates over poverty, social structure, and culture ignited by the civil rights generation led to an important reorientation of method and ideology within those disciplines most directly engaged with the issues posed by that movement, especially history, sociology, and psychology. When turning from ideas and intellectual priorities to institutions, however, change is less evident. American higher education, like the society of which it is part, has, in a narrowly legal sense, been desegregated, while the social and economic challenge of access has become a deepening problem as federal and state governmental support for both students and schools decreases. New perspectives on race and poverty from within the academy have not led to a new politics in the communities exterior to them. As historian Charles V. Hamilton suggested in 1971, “the black social scientist has no more certain influence or power with white decision-makers than his forefathers. And, in most cases, he has very little more research funds.”⁵⁸ Even at their strongest moments, support for sustained attention to the divides of race and class was both fleeting and fragile.

Turning to institutional issues, historically black colleges have, with difficulty, survived the threat to them posed by the desegregation of elite historically white institutions. Black schools have enjoyed a modest growth in federal support, but because they are predominantly small institutions dedicated to teaching rather than research, they never benefited from the vast increase in defense-related federal spending on higher education that began in the 1950s. The most important non-defense source of federal support, and the only one to reach black colleges and universities, was the Higher Education Act of 1965, which established the first student aid awarded entirely on the basis of an individual’s economic need and allocated substantial funds for campus buildings.⁵⁹ Nonetheless, those historically black colleges and universities that, in the words of Benjamin Mays, long-time president of Morehouse University, had “been kept on ‘short grass’ for a hundred years” remained there.⁶⁰ As late as 1984, only 0.4 percent of National Science Foundation research funds went to an historically black college or university.⁶¹

The Higher Education Act did earmark \$20 million in Title III funds (aimed at assisting “developing institutions”) to raise the “academic quality

of colleges which have the desire and potential to make a substantial contribution to the higher education resources of our Nation but which for financial or other reasons are struggling for survival and are isolated from the main currents of academic life.”⁶² This section, according to close students of the legislation, was directed at the needs of small black colleges in the South. It is, perhaps, important evidence of the fragility of the consensus behind the reforms of the 1960s that the allocation to Title III was largely symbolic—and minuscule enough not to trigger debate, much less outright Southern opposition to a bill with otherwise nearly unanimous bipartisan support. As things turned out, according to scholars Hugh Davis Graham and Nancy Diamond, “the most numerous beneficiaries of Title III were historically white, rural, sectarian colleges whose institutional resources were similarly depressed.”⁶³

It is helpful to raise the question here of the consequences of a road not taken. In view of the historical and structural deficits under which historically black colleges and universities have labored from the beginning, it is worth asking why a larger and more sustained effort was not made to help certain capstone schools among these institutions reach full parity with comparable historically white ones as producers of research as well as graduates. Would this have had the unfortunate unintended consequence of having research on African American life migrate to historically black colleges, at the expense of historically white ones? Such speculation cannot be answered definitively, but given the importance of these issues and their interconnectedness with the challenges facing the general American population, such an outcome should not be assumed as automatic. We can be less speculative, however, about the consequences of the development of other academic models that had and continue to have a direct impact upon the lives and minds of black intellectuals and the scholarship that they produce. We are speaking here about the emergence and development of Black Studies as an institutional space on many college campuses as well as a disciplinary field spanning the globe.

Black Studies—Reinstituting the Line?

This book examines how the social fact of segregation affected the development of a social scientific scholarly discourse in the greater part of the twentieth century. Black academics who were trained or worked behind the veil of segregation at one point in their careers brought to their scholarship a special perspective on the distance between the rhetoric of an equal society and the reality of something quite different. But when the veil began to lift after the Sec-

ond World War it did not mean that this special perspective—what Du Bois termed a “second sight”—disappeared. Indeed, as black scholars began to teach on historically white campuses (an absolute trickle at first in the early 1940s and then only becoming something approaching a trend in the late 1960s) there was an often explicit understanding that their institutional value was based in the presumptive special knowledge that they brought to bear. More often than not, black scholars were hired at white research universities to placate a rising tide of frustration and disaffection by black undergraduates who saw nothing of their life experiences reflected in the curriculum. These new hires were, in effect, pressure valves. Also, beginning in 1968 (and increasing with a torrid pace in the following five years), black scholars were hired to teach in the new Black Studies programs that were cropping up across the academic landscape.

Concluding our introduction with a discussion of the development of formal Black Studies programs and Black Studies as a recognized discipline is something of a departure from our steady focus on individuals and bodies of knowledge that were fostered behind the color line of higher education. However, a closer examination of much of the founding logic of Black Studies speaks loudly to the persistence of the color line even in an academic world that is desegregated by all obvious legal measures. What we want to suggest is that, for many people, once Black Studies began to appear on historically white college campuses (and that is where it made its presence known at first and then almost exclusively) the color line that defined the life and thought of generations of black scholars merely relocated to these new sites.

We have earlier demonstrated how racist thinking and explicitly segregated social structures provided the scaffolding for American social science for much of the last century. Although our public institutions and culture reject racism and segregation, both continue to shape our institutions and our lives. Think for a moment about how easy it is for us to recognize that Black Studies had political origins. Social conventions in American culture and in the academy remind us of how student-led protests at such schools as San Francisco State, Cornell University, and Yale University led directly to curricular changes and the establishment of Black Studies programs.⁶⁴ Too often, these same conventions tell us that such “politically motivated” changes have no place in higher education and have weakened this country’s once vibrant and wholesome liberal education. These conventions make it equally difficult to see that one hundred years ago far more powerful social and political interests came together to found institutions that ratified another set of assumptions about social relations and political economy. The obscurity of the founding

politics of social scientific fields lies in the fact that sociology or anthropology, to pick but two disciplines, were established in accordance with dominant ideologies that embraced a social and economic hierarchy in which white, middle- and upper-class Americans and their experiences were normative.

The circumstances pertaining to the founding of Black Studies programs reflected the cultural, political, and intellectual debates about what Black Studies actually was from the standpoint of a discipline. Was it sufficiently “intellectual”? Was it merely “recuperative”? Was it “redemptive”? Was it “liberatory”? The only fitting answer to these questions is that Black Studies could be any of these things depending on where it was taught and by whom. Some Black Studies programs were founded or staffed by openly political individuals who were convinced that these new programs had a moral commitment to tell “the truth” to America about its own internal failings. Other programs were organized around a determination to destabilize the Eurocentric approach to education and to present a scholarship and philosophy that adhered to Afrocentric models. And yet others were fiercely traditional in their interdisciplinary approach to studying broad themes that grew out of established modes of inquiry found in fields like history, English, political science, psychology, and sociology.

The debate over what Black Studies should be and how it should be taught traveled beyond the literal space on university campuses and was taken up in print. Several journals began to appear in the late 1960s that were dedicated to scholarship that explored Black Studies as an intellectual project. In no small measure, this was a body of knowledge that constituted the foundation of the emerging discipline. Two of the most important journals in this regard are *Black Scholar* and the *Journal of Black Studies*, established in 1969 and 1970, respectively.⁶⁵ Even just a quick glance at these two journals illuminates the extent to which the method, structure, and meaning of Black Studies were contested from its inception.

Black Scholar aimed to provide a forum in which “black ideologies can and will be examined, debated, disputed and evaluated by the black intellectual community.”⁶⁶ This was not outright racism, reverse discrimination, or intellectual resegregation but an explicit attempt to delineate the terms upon which black scholars’ ideas would operate and should matter. Floyd B. McKissick, a founding member of *Black Scholar*’s editorial board, spoke directly to this mission when he offered the following analysis of the black academic’s role in contemporary American society:

It is the task of black intellectuals to provide the cohesive philosophy which will propel the black-led revolution which must happen if justice is

to be achieved in America. But these . . . intellectuals cannot provide that philosophy if they continue to be diverted by the opinions and pressures of the surrounding white society. We need not justify any black demands for “separatism” to anybody white. The real separatists moved to the suburbs long ago. . . . We cannot hope to escape interaction with the dominant whites. We cannot wish them out of existence, nor can we avoid their presence completely. What is important is that we remain aloof to their criticisms and reactions.⁶⁷

Although it relied predominantly on well-established scholars for editorial leadership and publications (including Joyce Ladner and Ronald Walters whose work is found in the pages that follow), *Black Scholar* eschewed establishing a home base at a traditional academic institution and reached out to some of the most important African American politicians, writers, and activists of the day like Alice Walker, Eldridge Cleaver, Bobby Seale, and Shirley Chisholm. This was in tune with the desire of *Black Scholar* to court a new kind of thinker: “the man of thought and action, a whole man who thinks for his people and acts with them, a man who honors the whole community of black experience, a man who sees the Ph.D., the janitor, the businessman, the maid, the clerk, the militant as all sharing the same experience of blackness, with all its complexities and its rewards.”⁶⁸

By comparison, the *Journal of Black Studies* emphasized a more traditional sense of intellectual mission and structure. Arthur L. Smith, the director of the UCLA Afro-American Studies Center and the journal’s editor, made this much evident in his opening editorial when he stated that “the sustained intellectual development of an area cannot be based upon awakening rhetoric” but instead upon the previous tradition developed by an interracial cadre of scholars including Alain Locke, Carter G. Woodson, and Melville Herskovits “who have labored to tell the truth about people of African descent.”⁶⁹ Under Smith’s editorial hand the *Journal of Black Studies* was unambiguous about the kind of work it sought to publish. The *Journal* welcomed submissions that were “intellectually provocative so long as they indicate scholarly rigor. For these purposes, scholarly rigor cannot be limited to the formal setting down of footnotes and documentation; it is an attitude of authorship.”⁷⁰ Clearly, the “attitude” that Smith sought was not necessarily the same attitude desired by the editors at *Black Scholar*. Even though it first appeared a year after the genre-breaking *Black Scholar*, the *Journal of Black Studies* more closely resembled the models provided by earlier generations of black-run academic journals like the *Journal of Negro Education*, *Phylon*, and the *Journal of Negro History*.

Seemingly representing different ends of the intellectual and methodological spectrum, seen in the proper light *Black Scholar* and the *Journal of Black Studies* reflect the breadth of the evolving Black Studies scholarly project. We do not minimize legitimate differences about how to create an intellectual community and discipline under the heading of “Black Studies” when we argue that a careful reading of *Black Scholar* and the *Journal of Black Studies* reveals a shared commitment to examine in rich detail the warp and woof of African America.

The struggles over the growth of Black Studies from a disciplinary standpoint were in many ways no different from that of any other emergent discipline. The social sciences, after all, appeared as formal disciplines in the late nineteenth century and then evolved in different ways over the next one hundred years, and their shape and style were consistently dependent upon who was taking a particular approach to addressing a problem and where that approach derived its logic. There is a significant distinction to be made, however, between the disciplinary development of Black Studies (which is typically considered a field within social science) and sociology or anthropology or political science: Black Studies experts have had to face down constant challenges to their basic claim that Black Studies is a discipline in the first place.⁷¹

This is not to say that Black Studies programs and practitioners operate in a purely defensive mode, nor that Black Studies as a field has been unable to thrive in the nearly four decades since its founding. While the number of Black Studies programs has fallen since its early explosion, the disciplinary contributions of Black Studies scholarship to English, history, political science, sociology, anthropology, economics, psychology, and philosophy are widely recognized; a growing number of Black Studies departments are adding PhD programs to their curricula; and some scholars who are universally recognized as Black Studies specialists have attained unprecedented power and influence in the broader academic/cultural marketplace.⁷² Despite the new world in which this scholarship has been produced we cannot afford to forget that it has deep roots that tie it to the previous generations of intellectuals whose work comprises the core of this book.

As an intellectual enterprise, the attention of African Americanists to the interplay of race and economics in demography continues to expand upon, or perhaps outgrow, its origins in the “Chicago School” discussed earlier. The city remains a key laboratory and field of study, joined increasingly by the suburb. To cite but a few examples, we can see how sociologist William Julius Wilson and historians Earl Lewis and Joe William Trotter have built upon Horace Cayton and St. Clair Drake’s work as they demonstrate with admirable precision how class and race are mutually embedded in life—impossible

to parse out and measure separately.⁷³ And true to their intellectual ancestors they also examine carefully the variety of cultural practices, traditions, and extended relationships that enabled people to survive. In a similar spirit, sociologist Lawrence Bobo and his colleagues document with impressively conclusive research the ways in which even the post–World War II “Los Angeles growth machine”—part “rustbelt” economy and part “sunbelt” economy—was not strong enough to significantly break down historic racial segregation in the city’s economy and neighborhoods.⁷⁴

Scholars studying the lives of the black middle class and black suburbanization bring to their work the same analytical skill, ambition, and attention that Charles Wesley and Abram Harris devoted to the study of African Americans in the industrial workforce at a similarly formative moment seventy years ago. If their counterparts in the industrial economy were relegated to jobs that were both low paying and dangerous, recent research indicates that African Americans in the white-collar executive ranks face a not entirely different fate. According to sociologist Sharon Collins and others, African American executives are often tracked into “racialized jobs” in community relations, personnel, and human relations, positions that are distant from centers of decision making and are therefore more vulnerable to layoffs and downsizing.⁷⁵

Studies of the postwar middle class have also brought the suburbs into clearer focus as a center of middle class African American life, an historical phenomenon that gained special momentum since the 1970s but extends historically back much further to the 1920s.⁷⁶ Not surprisingly, the suburbs provide no easy or instant refuge from the problems African Americans encountered in the city. The abiding nature of some of these difficulties is apparent when reading Mary Pattillo-McCoy’s observations in *Black Picket Fences*, her important study of black life in a Chicago suburb. In many ways it is dispiriting that one can hear so clearly in Pattillo-McCoy echoes of Du Bois in his *Philadelphia Negro* or Cayton and Drake in their *Black Metropolis*: “Blacks of all socio-economic statuses tend to be confined to a limited geographic space by discriminatory practices of banks, insurance companies and urban planners. . . . Thus, while the size of the black belt has increased, extending beyond the administrative boundaries of cities into adjacent suburbs, it remains effective in strapping in the black community.”⁷⁷

Michael Dawson, Adolph Reed Jr., and Cathy Cohen have each in their own way moved the scholarly dialogue in political science well beyond the one-dimensional portrait of African American leaders as flawed giants sliding predictably between the opposing poles of “protest” and “accommodation.” Dawson’s statistical models and historical narratives about black

political behavior, Reed's analyses of black elite brokerage politics and labor activism, and Cohen's discussions of cross-racial political alliances regarding health care crises, poverty, and sexuality are more than a step removed from the 1930s work of Ralph Bunche and Emmett Dorsey, but they share the same commitment to highlighting the diversity of black political expression at the same time that they underscore the alluring power of race-thinking in American society.⁷⁸

Even in the world of cultural studies—a mode of inquiry that has become increasingly influential over the last thirty years—one can see clear linkages between the present and the social science work of past years. Most prominent in this regard would have to be cultural sociologist Paul Gilroy and historian and cultural anthropologist Robin D. G. Kelley. Both scholars pay careful attention to the transnational dimensions of racial formation and the various ways that cultural performance can be employed to subvert the traditional exercise of power. In this way, their work brings together the internationalist commitments that drove much of Rayford Logan's and W. E. B. Du Bois's scholarship and the cultural sensibilities that are at the heart of Zora Neale Hurston's and Sterling Brown's scholarly and creative writing.⁷⁹

The best scholarship of this generation, like that of those past, leaves an essential record to the comprehensive understanding of our society. As historically minded social scientists seek to analyze how race and class continue to shape demography and, hence, destiny in the twenty-first century, these studies—and many others we have not mentioned—will do for them what the work of Du Bois, Frazier, Hurston, and Johnson has done for us: to see reality in all of its contradictory complexity and think in new ways about how the past and the present relate to one another.

There is little doubt that our world is very different from the one in which American social science was founded more than a century ago. Nonetheless, just as we are glad to see signs of a world that has gone, we know that many unwelcome challenges lie ahead. Indeed, the architecture of the present bears a disturbing resemblance to the past. We have no choice but to admit that even as the quality of life for black scholars improved dramatically during the course of the twentieth century our nation remains deeply divided by significant inequalities that run along racial and economic lines. We end this introduction, then, in all too close proximity to where we began, and with less an analytical thunderclap than a frank acknowledgement of a certain enduring reality: the color line continues to be drawn in the lives of millions of Americans. Black scholars, too, live on the line and will continue to move ahead by the best light they can make.

NOTES

1. David Levering Lewis, *W. E. B. Du Bois: Biography of a Race, 1868–1919* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1993), 223. See also Lewis, *W. E. B. Du Bois: The Fight for Equality and the American Century, 1919–1963* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2000), and Michael Katz and Thomas Sugrue, eds., *W. E. B. Du Bois, Race, and the City: “The Philadelphia Negro” and Its Legacy* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998). Du Bois’s historical survey of Reconstruction, *Black Reconstruction in America, 1860–1880* (New York: Harcourt Press, 1935), is equally important to understanding his legacy to American social science.
2. W. E. B. Du Bois, *The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1899; repr., with a new introduction by Elijah Anderson, 1996), 385.
3. Mia Bay, “‘The World Was Thinking Wrong About Race’: *The Philadelphia Negro* and Nineteenth Century Social Science,” in Katz and Sugrue, *W. E. B. Du Bois, Race, and the City*, 44–47.
4. Lewis, *Biography of a Race*, 179. For a sense of the intellectual milieu in which the social sciences were established, see Dorothy Ross, *The Origins of American Social Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
5. George Stocking Jr. *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology* (New York: Free Press, 1968; repr., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 114.
6. *Ibid.*, 122.
7. Michael R. Winston, “Through the Back Door: Academic Racism and the Negro Scholar in Historical Perspective,” *Daedalus* 100, no. 3 (1971): 691.
8. The seventeen schools include: State Agricultural and Mechanical Institute (Alabama), Agricultural, Mechanical, and Normal College (Arkansas), State College for Colored Students (Delaware), Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College for Negroes, Georgia State Industrial College, Kentucky State Industrial College, Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College (Louisiana), Princess Anne Academy (Maryland), Alcorn Agricultural and Mechanical College (Mississippi), Lincoln University (Missouri), The Negro Agricultural and Technical College (North Carolina), Colored Agricultural and Normal University (Oklahoma), State Colored Normal, Industrial, Agricultural, and Mechanical College of South Carolina, Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State Teachers College, Prairie View State Normal and Industrial College (Texas), Virginia State College for Negroes, and West Virginia State College. Florida, Tennessee, Kentucky, and West Virginia, respectively, appropriated close to or more than the same amount for their single, white land grant school than the amount cumulatively appropriated for the seventeen land grant schools for blacks. Dwight O. Holmes, *The Evolution of the Negro College* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934; repr., College Park, Md.: McGrath Publishing Company, 1969), 150–156.

9. W. E. B. Du Bois and Augustus Granville Dill, *The College-Bred Negro American* (Atlanta: Atlanta University Press, 1910), 3–4.

10. Hylan Lewis, “Higher Education for Negroes: A ‘Tough’ Situation,” *Phylon* 10, no. 4 (1949): 358–359. For a further discussion of these issues see Richard Bar-dolph, *The Negro Vanguard* (New York: Holt Rinehart, Winston, 1959; repr., West-port: Negro University Press, 1971), 134–135.

11. Waldo B. Martin, *The Mind of Frederick Douglass* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 213.

12. Historian Cedric Robinson puts the matter bluntly: “In these early decades of the [twentieth] century . . . the significance of the metropole for colonial Black in-telligentsias was their interest in preparing for a role in, and for some share of, the Em-pire.” Robinson, *Black Marxism: The Making of a Black Radical Tradition* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 261.

13. James M. McPherson, “White Liberals and Black Power in Negro Educa-tion, 1865–1915,” *American Historical Review* 75, no. 5 (June 1970): 1363–1364.

14. The University of Michigan, established in 1817, spent its first quarter-century establishing “common schools” around the state and did not admit its first students to its college curriculum until 1841. In one of its earliest incarnations, what became the University of California was first known as a “family high school for boys.” See, re-spectively, Howard Peckham, *The Making of the University of Michigan, 1817–1867* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1967), 22, and Verne A. Stadtman, *The University of California, 1868–1968* (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1970), 8.

15. Mel Curti and Vernon Carstensen, *The University of Wisconsin* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1949), ix.

16. Winston, “Through the Back Door,” 695; Jonathan Scott Holloway, *Con-fronting the Veil: Abram Harris Jr., E. Franklin Frazier, and Ralph Bunche, 1919–1941* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 48.

17. Michael Winston claims that the black church and school were the two main institutions made by black Americans. Winston, “Through the Back Door,” 679.

18. Kevin K. Gaines, *Uplifting the Race: Black Leadership, Politics, and Culture in the Twentieth Century* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), xiv–xv.

19. Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham, *Righteous Discontent: The Women’s Move-ment in the Black Baptist Church, 1880–1920* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univer-sity Press, 1993), 2–13.

20. *Ibid.*, 120–149.

21. As defined by its constitution, the American Negro Academy would be an organization of “authors, scholars, artists, and those distinguished in other walks of life, men of African descent, for the Promotion of Letters, Science, and Art.” The constitution enumerated the Academy’s purposes as follows: “a. To promote the pub-lication of scholarly work; b. To aid youths of genius in the attainment of the higher culture, at home or abroad; c. To gather into its archives valuable data, and the works

of Negro authors; d. To aid, by publication, the dissemination of the truth and the vindication of the Negro race from vicious assaults; e. To publish, if possible, an 'Annual' designed to raise the standard of intellectual endeavor among American Negroes." Alfred A. Moss Jr., *The American Negro Academy: Voice of the Talented Tenth* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981), 1.

22. Alexander Crummell, "Civilization, the Primal Need of the Race," Occasional Papers, No. 3 (Washington, D.C.: The American Negro Academy, 1898), 6.

23. Alexander Crummell to F. Miller, 30 June 1898, Crummell Papers, The Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture.

24. Alexander Crummell, "The Black Woman of the South: Her Neglects and Her Needs," an address before the Freedman's Aid Society in 1883. Published by the Freedman's Aid Society.

25. The invitation may have reflected a friendship. According to Cooper's biographer, Leona C. Gabel, Cooper boarded with the Crummell family when she first arrived in Washington, D.C., in 1887. She also attended St. Luke's Episcopal Church, where Crummell served as rector. Gabel, *From Slavery to the Sorbonne and Beyond: The Life and Writings of Anna J. Cooper* (Northampton, Mass.: Department of History, Smith College, 1982), 33.

26. Anna Julia Cooper, *A Voice from the South* (Xenia, Ohio: Aldine Printing House, 1892; repr., New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 75.

27. Eli Zaretsky, "Editor's Introduction," in William Thomas and Florian Znaniecki, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, ed. Zaretsky (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984), 2.

28. Ross, *Origins of American Social Science*, 352–355.

29. *Ibid.*, 355–357.

30. Anthony M. Platt, *E. Franklin Frazier Reconsidered* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1991), 167–168. Frazier frequently reiterated this argument. For example, in the concluding paragraph of *The Negro Family in Chicago*, Frazier wrote, "The widespread disorganization of Negro family life must be regarded as an aspect of the civilizational process in the Negro group. It is not merely a pathological phenomenon." Frazier, *The Negro Family in Chicago* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932), 252.

31. Robert Bannister, "Sociology," in *The Modern Social Sciences*, ed. Theodore M. Porter and Dorothy Ross, vol. 7 of *The Cambridge History of Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 344.

32. Robert Bennett Bean, "Some Racial Peculiarities of the Negro Brain," *American Journal of Anthropology* 5 (1906): 353–432. As quoted in Stocking, *Race, Culture, and Evolution*, 128.

33. Robert Park and Earnest Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1924), 138–139. As quoted in Platt, *E. Franklin Frazier Reconsidered*, 83.

34. Holloway, *Confronting the Veil*, 136.

35. The same footnote also referenced the work of E. Franklin Frazier, then a star on the Howard University faculty, and that of social psychologist Kenneth B. Clark, a Howard alumnus. At minimum, their presence here should remind us of the important work done by scholars behind the line in the battle against segregation.

36. Gunnar Myrdal, *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy* (New York: Harper Brothers, 1944), xlvii, xliii.

37. Ralph Ellison confronted the implications of this approach in a famously scathing review of *An American Dilemma*. Ellison was incensed by the Myrdalian idea that blacks' conditions were the result of whites' failure to believe in blacks' ability to be creative or generative. Ellison understood that this logic eliminated black agency and he wondered aloud: "But can a people (its faith in an idealized American Creed notwithstanding) live and develop for over three hundred years simply by reacting? Are American Negroes simply the creation of white men, or have they at least helped to create themselves out of what they found around them? Men have made a way of life in caves and upon cliffs, why cannot Negroes have made a life upon the horns of the white man's dilemma?" Ellison, "An American Dilemma: A Review," in *Shadow and Act* (New York: Vintage, 1972), 315–316.

38. Holloway, *Confronting the Veil*, 182–184; Ben Keppel, *The Work of Democracy: Ralph Bunche, Kenneth B. Clark, Lorraine Hansberry, and the Cultural Politics of Race* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995), 50–58; Ralph Bunche, *A Brief and Tentative Analysis of Negro Leadership*, ed. Jonathan Scott Holloway (New York: New York University Press, 2005), 1–2, 25.

39. The contributors to *What the Negro Wants* include Du Bois, labor leader A. Philip Randolph, educator and political radical Doxey Wilkerson, educator and political moderate Mary McLeod Bethune, writers Langston Hughes and Sterling Brown, and the conservative Frederick D. Patterson, head of the Tuskegee Institute.

40. Rayford Logan, ed., *What the Negro Wants* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1944). Quoting from the reprinted edition (with a new introduction and bibliography by Kenneth Janken, Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), x–xi, xv. Emphasis added.

41. *Ibid.*, xi.

42. As Dorothy Ross has observed, this debate was part of a larger crisis of confidence in social science in the West; see Ross, "The Changing Contours of the Social Science Disciplines," in Porter and Ross, eds., *The Modern Social Sciences*, 234–237.

43. G. Franklin Edwards, "E. Franklin Frazier," *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1965); Charles Valentine, *Culture and Poverty: Critique and Counter-Proposals* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968). On Moynihan's selective use of Frazier's scholarship, see Platt, *E. Franklin Frazier Reconsidered*.

44. Lee Rainwater and William L. Yancey, *The Moynihan Report and the Politics of Controversy* (Cambridge, Mass.: M. I. T. Press, 1967), 93, 164. This quotation is from page 47 of the full report, reprinted in Rainwater and Yancey.

45. *Ibid.*, 162, 221–232, 451–452, 458–463.
46. Ronald W. Walters, “Toward a Definition of Black Social Science,” in *The Death of White Sociology: Essays on Race and Culture*, ed. Joyce A. Ladner (New York: Random House, 1973; repr. Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1998), 206–207.
47. Lewis, *Biography of a Race*, 190.
48. William Julius Wilson, *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996), 172–174, and *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City Underclass and Public Policy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 8.
49. Wilson, *The Truly Disadvantaged*, 13–16; Wilson, *When Work Disappears*, 175–178.
50. Joyce A. Ladner, *Tomorrow’s Tomorrow: The Black Woman* (New York: Doubleday and Company, 1971), quoting from the revised edition (with a new introduction by the author, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995), xx.
51. Edgar G. Epps, “Introduction,” in *Race Relations: Current Perspectives*, ed. Edgar G. Epps (Cambridge, Mass.: Winthrop Publishers, 1973), x.
52. *Ibid.*
53. On Kenneth Clark’s public career see Ben Keppel, “Kenneth Clark in the Patterns of American Culture,” *American Psychologist* 57, no. 1 (2002): 29–37.
54. Ladner, *Tomorrow’s Tomorrow*, 71.
55. Albert Murray, *The Omni-Americans: New Perspectives on Black Experience and American Culture* (New York: Outerbridge and Dienstfrey, 1970), 40.
56. Hylan Lewis, “Pursuing Fieldwork in African-American Communities,” in *Against the Odds: Scholars Who Challenged Racism in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Benjamin P. Bowser and Louis Kushnick (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002), 137.
57. Ross, “Changing Contours,” 235.
58. Charles V. Hamilton, “Black Social Scientists: Contributions and Problems,” in Ladner, ed., *The Death of White Sociology*, 473.
59. Lawrence E. Gladioux and Thomas R. Volanin, *Congress and the Colleges: The National Politics of Higher Education* (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1976), 17–18.
60. Benjamin Mays, “‘The American Negro College’: Four Responses and a Reply,” *Harvard Educational Review* 37, no. 3 (1967): 457.
61. Judith B. Roebuck and Kumanduri S. Murty, *Historically Black Colleges and Universities: Their Place in American Higher Education* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger Publishers, 1993), 6.
62. U.S. Congress, House Committee on Education and Labor, *Higher Education Act of 1965: Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Education*, 89th Congress, 1st Sess., 1965 (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1965), 10.
63. Hugh Davis Graham and Nancy Diamond, *The Rise of American Research Universities: Elites and Challengers in the Postwar Era* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 44.

64. Students at San Francisco State, Cornell, and Yale offered three different approaches to calling for significant curricular change. In 1968, San Francisco State created the first Black Studies department. The university administration did not do this without pressure, however, as San Francisco State had to shut its doors in the wake of a student-led campus strike that was a direct outgrowth of a call for major curricular and institutional reform that reflected the need for diverse intellectual and structural approaches to running a university. The following year, students at Cornell armed themselves with shotguns and insisted the university address the needs of its rapidly expanding black undergraduate enrollment. Fairly quickly, the Cornell administration established the Africana Studies and Research Center. At the same time that Cornell officials were sent scurrying in the face of the threat of real violence, Yale administrators were meeting with a small cohort of determined undergraduates who also sought curricular and institutional change at their school. Through a combination of good luck, timing, and the stated recognition that a university was an institution that was in a perpetual state of flux, Yale students, faculty, and staff were able to work together to create a Black Studies program as a result of a series of high-level meetings and a national conference. On San Francisco State, see Nathan Huggins, *Afro-American Studies: A Report to the Ford Foundation* (New York: Ford Foundation, 1985), 22; on Cornell, see Faith Berry, "Introduction," in *A Scholar's Conscience: Selected Writings of J. Saunders Redding, 1942–1977* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1992), 8; on Yale, see Huggins, *Afro-American Studies*, 26, and Armstead L. Robinson, Craig C. Foster, and Donald H. Ogilvie, eds. *Black Studies in the University: A Symposium* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1969).

65. Nathan Hare and the Black World Foundation established *Black Scholar* in 1969, and the *Journal of Black Studies* had its home at the University of California, Los Angeles's Center for the Study of Afro-American History and Culture beginning in 1970.

66. Untitled editorial statement on the inside front cover of *Black Scholar* 1.1 (November 1969).

67. Floyd B. McKissick, "Toward a Black Ideology," *Black Scholar* 1.2 (December 1969): 16.

68. Ibid.

69. Arthur L. Smith, "Editor's Message," *Journal of Black Studies* 1.1 (September 1970): 3.

70. Ibid., 4.

71. "Black Studies Struggling for Respect," *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* 3 (Spring 1994): 28; "The Rodney Dangerfield of Academic Pursuits: Black Studies Wins No Respect," *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* 29 (Autumn 2000): 30–31.

72. Kendra Hamilton, "A New Spectrum," *Black Issues in Higher Education* 17.7 (2000): 24–28.

73. See William Julius Wilson, *The Truly Disadvantaged* and *When Work Disappears*; Earl Lewis, *In Their Own Interests: Race, Class, and Power in Twentieth*

Century Norfolk, Virginia (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), and editor with Joe W. Trotter, *African Americans in the Industrial Age: A Documentary History, 1915–1945* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1996); and Joe W. Trotter, *African American Workers: An Urban Perspective from the American Revolution to the Present* (New York: Basic Books, 2004) and *Black Milwaukee: The Making of a Black Proletariat* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988).

74. Lawrence D. Bobo et al., eds., *Prismatic Metropolis: Inequality in Los Angeles* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2000), 55–56. For a close study of the special problems faced by African Americans in an older “rust belt” suburb, see Bruce D. Haynes, *Red Lines, Black Spaces: The Politics of Race and Space in a Middle-Class Suburb* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2000).

75. On blacks in corporate America see Sharon M. Collins, *Black Corporate Executives: The Making and Breaking of a Black Middle-Class* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1997), 141–143; on the economic fragility of the black middle class see Bart Landry, *The Black Middle-Class* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 74–75, 85–89, 193–196, 221; for a comprehensive survey of African American life between the 1940 and the 1970s, see Dorothy K. Newman et al. *Protest, Politics, and Prosperity: Black Americans and White Institutions, 1940–75* (New York: Pantheon, 1978); extending the debate beyond the 1970s, see Joe R. Feagan and Melvin Sikes, *Living with Racism: The Black Middle-Class Experience* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1994).

76. See Andrew Wiese, *Places of Their Own: African-American Suburbanization in the Twentieth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

77. Mary Pattillo-McCoy, *Black Picket Fences: Privilege and Peril among the Black Middle Class* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 25.

78. For examples of this work see Michael Dawson, *Black Visions: The Roots of African-American Political Ideologies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001); Adolph Reed Jr., *Without Justice for All: The New Liberalism and Our Retreat from Racial Equality* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview, 2001); and Cathy Cohen, *The Boundaries of Blackness: AIDS and the Breakdown of Black Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999).

79. See Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993) and *Against Race: Imagining Political Culture Beyond the Color Line* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 2000); Robin D. G. Kelley, *Race Rebels: Culture, Politics, and the Black Working Class* (New York: Free Press, 1996); and Sidney J. Lemelle and Robin D. G. Kelley, eds., *Imagining Home: Class, Culture, and Nationalism in the African Diaspora* (New York: Verso, 1994).