BLACK AND WHITE SOCIOLOGY: SEGREGATION OF THE DISCIPLINE

A Dissertation

by

SEAN ELIAS

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

August 2009

Major Subject: Sociology

BLACK AND WHITE SOCIOLOGY: SEGREGATION OF THE DISCIPLINE

A Dissertation

by

SEAN ELIAS

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved by:

Chair of Committee,	Joe R. Feagin
Committee Members,	Sarah Gatson
	Alex McIntosh
	Wendy L. Moore
	Dalia Abdelhady
Head of Department,	Mark Fossett

August 2009

Major Subject: Sociology

ABSTRACT

Black and White Sociology: Segregation of the Discipline.

(August 2009)

Sean Elias, B.A.; M.A., George Mason University

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Joe R. Feagin

The idea that theories of race, racial segregation and racism have played a central role in the development of sociology and that black and white sociologies have formed because of this condition is not new and has been in circulation among sociologists for some time. While a number of sociologists have examined how race has shaped the discipline, only a few have attempted to examine and define black sociology and white sociology. Despite the initial efforts of some, the two sociologies remain vague, undeveloped concepts, and thus open to skepticism and denunciation. No systematic historical-intellectual investigation of black sociology or white sociology exists and, subsequently, no in-depth comparative analysis of the two exists. Therefore, through a comparative-historical analysis and exercise in the sociology of knowledge, this work seeks to provide a more precise history and theory of black sociology and white sociology.

This study argues that black sociology and white sociology represent two distinct intellectual perspectives---sets of ideas---and social practices shaped by past perspectives and practices and social-historical contexts, which are largely racially-defined. More specifically, I will demonstrate that black sociology and white sociology

develop out of two approaches of thought and action primarily influenced by race, a black tradition of ideas and practices and a white tradition of thought and practices.

To map these two traditions, I begin with a review and analysis of works that have discussed (directly or indirectly) black and white sociology and black and white sociologists. Next, I turn to a more focused analysis on the sociological perspectives and practices of W.E.B. Du Bois and Robert Park, examining the ideas and practices that shape each sociologist's thought and actions. I identify ways that Park incorporates and advances earlier ideas and practices of whites, and, conversely, how Du Bois incorporates and advances earlier perspectives and practices of blacks. Lastly, I point out how Du Bois' ideas and methods, shaped by an earlier black tradition, now informs what is described as black sociology, and how Park's ideas and methods, shaped by an earlier white tradition, now informs what is described as white sociology.

DEDICATION

To past and present black souls, primarily the scores of black intellectuals, activists, and everyday people---many whose names we will never know---who challenge damaging, unjust white ideologies and social practices that target blacks and all people of color.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

NOMENCLATURE

AACS   African American Chicago School

AACSRR   African American Chicago School of Race Relations

ABS   Association of Black Sociologists

ACS   American Colonization Society

AJS   *American Journal of Sociology*

ASA   American Sociological Association

ASR   *American Sociological Review*

BSF   Black Sociological Frame

CAACP   Chicago Association for Advancement of Colored People

CC   Carnegie Corporation

CSHR   Case-Specific Human Rights

CSRR   Chicago School of Race Relations

CSS   Chicago School of Sociology

CUL   Chicago Urban League

ECS   Early Chicago School

ECSRR   Early Chicago School of Race Relations

FGBS   First Generation Black Sociologists

FWBS   First Wave Black Sociologists

FWWS   First Wave White Sociologists

HBCU   Historically Black Colleges and Universities

HH	Hull House
HHSRR	Hull House School of Race Relations
HRAB	Human Rights of All Blacks
HRBA	Human Rights of Black Americans
HRCP	Human Rights of Colored People
NAACP	National Association for Advancement of Colored People
NUL	National Urban League
PCS	Park Chicago School
PCSRR	Parkean Chicago School of Race Relations
RHR	Race-Specific Human Rights
SGBS	Second Generation Black Sociologists
SWBS	Second Wave Black Sociologists
SWWS	Second Wave White Sociologists
UDHR	Universal Declaration of Human Rights
UHR	Universal Human Rights
UN	United Nations
UNIC	Universal Negro Improvement Center
WRF	White Racial Frame
WSF	White Sociological Frame

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: THE SOCIOLOGICAL COLOR LINE

Does a color line run through sociology, one that divides the discipline into "black" and "white" sociology, two opposing sociological frameworks shaped by race? Considering the increasing popularity of colorblind and post-racial social philosophies, many sociologists and much of the larger public would likely dismiss this question as off base or outdated. After all, how can there be black and white sociology in a colorblind social world, and how can there be a racially constructed sociology---or any racially formed institution of society---and academic racial segregation in a post-race social world?

Along with adherents of colorblind and post-racial views of the social, many sociologists who shun conflict theory most likely consider division and opposition---conflict---between black and white sociology, in particular, and conflict between and among different types of sociologies, in general, as problematic. Sociologists who view sociology as a unified discipline or science based on universal social truths are bound to reject black and white sociology and other pluralist and positionalist sociological views of the social world. Because most sociologists are trained to claim they are "objective" social science researchers whose investigations reach beyond subjective truth and personal bias, any divisions in sociology according to race, gender, class or other subject-oriented factors are understood to be of secondary importance or superfluous.

_____
This dissertation follows the style of *Sociological Theory*.

Sociologists who are taught the golden rule (or role) of being "value-neutral" and "detached," or "apolitical," in most cases would avoid the value-laden, often impassioned and politicized topic of the opposition between black and white sociology. Additionally, sociologists trained to analyze race as just one of a number of social variables are generally weary of attributing too much significance to race as a factor shaping sociology or the racially constructed frameworks of black and white sociology.

It would seem that to discuss racial construction of the discipline and racial segregation in the discipline---a racially segregated construction of sociology---and the formation of black and white sociology is to argue against many of contemporary sociology's dearest principles and greatest stars who uphold these ideals. A head-on challenge of the discipline's racialized nature and demonstration of the insufficiency of sociology's basic intellectual tools is not a wise career move, so it is no wonder that most sociologists have steered clear of research topics like black sociology, white sociology, their segregation and---more broadly---the racialized development and current racial state of sociology. Yet, the idea that black and white sociologies have formed is not new, nor is the idea that sociology and the other social sciences are racially constructed and that a color line divides the discipline. This dissertation builds on works that address and theorize black sociology, white sociology, and the racial construction and segregation of the discipline, and attempts to integrate these various informative narratives into the more general history and epistemological terrain of sociology. Before outlining the different chapters in this dissertation, let me clarify the sociological concepts, theoretical frameworks, and methodological approaches I will use.

Concepts, Theories and Methods

The central concepts used in this study are race, black sociology, white sociology, and the sociological color line. While the whole idea of this study is to illuminate and elaborate upon these vague, unsettled concepts, I provide the following basic initial definitions.

Race has both a general definition as a group of people distinguished by physical appearance (most notably, skin color) and a more complex meaning as ideas and practices shaped by this salient feature (i.e., physical appearance) of human beings. When social scientists speak of race, they often are referring to one of three meanings of race: 1) concepts, theories or ideologies of race; 2) racial prejudice, racial discrimination or racism; and 3) race relations. *Concepts of race* offer particular understandings of race. *Theories of race* present meaning of the relationships (particularly divisions and unity) among different concepts of race. Built upon concepts and theories of race, *ideologies of race* are more widespread and hegemonic political understandings of race that structure society. *Racial prejudices* reflect beliefs and attitudes about the characteristics of individuals and groups of different races. *Racial discrimination* refers to negative treatment/practices directed toward specific individuals and groups because of their race. And *racism* is the human effect and social condition of racial power---the on-going use of racial prejudices and racial discrimination by certain "powerful" racial groups to exploit, oppress, and weaken other "less powerful" racial groups. *Race relations* are simply the social relations/power dynamics among different racial groups that tend to be

hierarchically ordered and asymmetrically organized in an unjust, non-egalitarian

manner.

As this dissertation will demonstrate, race---like religious, national, class and

gender group relations---orders and organizes the social world, acting as both a powerful

social *structure and force* that profoundly shapes social reality (and sociology, the study

of social reality) in the US and numerous societies across the globe. Despite efforts by a

number of sociologists, a strong sociological definition of race is still in the making. In

addition to the breakdown of the three meanings of race and understanding of race as a

principal structure and force shaping human relations and the organization of society, it

is essential to combine several of the more developed sociological understandings of

race. After a few more points about black and white sociology and conceptual

explanation of the sociological color line, I will address my theoretical framework for

discussing race---a discourse on the sociological color line dividing black and white

sociology---and its lineage with the sociological thought, specifically concepts and

theories of race, developed by W.E.B. Du Bois, Joe Feagin, and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva.

It is important to explain what I mean and do not mean by the concepts, *black

sociology* and *white sociology*, and my grounds for exploring this particular distinction

in sociological thought and the history of sociology. This dissertation is motivated by the

fact that a well-developed discussion of black and white sociology is missing in the

dominant sociological discourse. In particular, no comparative analysis of the two exists.

There are good reasons for the absence of analyses of black and white sociology. Along

with broaching sensitive, taboo issues regarding on-going racial segregation and racist

ideas and practices in the social sciences, one runs the risk of presenting over-simplified, restrictive, essentialist and/or reified meanings of two highly complex concepts. In other words, attempting to develop an honest picture of black and white sociology ensures political controversy, profound theoretical challenges, and career gambling.

Black sociology is sociology that emanates from the sociological *perspectives* and *practices* established by but not limited to 19th, 20th and now 21st century black sociologists. In turn, white sociology is sociology that emanates from the sociological perspectives and practices established by but not limited to 19th, 20th and now 21st century white sociologists. These "perspectives" and "practices" will become clearer as one reads this dissertation. However, for now, in very general terms: black sociology is understood as a type of sociology shaped by perspectives and practices that substantially challenge the racial status quo of white racism and black oppression; whereas white sociology is a type of sociology formed by perspectives and practices that have substantially upheld the racial status quo of white racism and black oppression (and oppression of most people of color). Black sociology offers another view of social reality, opposing false ideologies and destructive epistemologies and practices of white racism and correcting distorted pictures of the social world used to justify whites' domination among the races. White sociology represents the dominant and mainstream sociological framework (with power and resources, legitimization and prestige) that normalizes whiteness, or views white people as the social norm and ideal. In opposition, black sociology is a suppressed, marginalized sociological framework (with lack of

power, resources, legitimization and prestige) that challenges the 'Euronormativity,' or normalization and idealization of whites.[1]

Black sociology is not merely critical race theory or a segment of race relations research, for, while it focuses on race theory and race relations research, it explains much more about social reality than that found in the dominant discourse of critical race theory and central paradigms of race relations. Black sociology is the source and ultimate critic of most mainstream race relations research and critical race theory in sociology, which is not always that critical.[2] An important distinction between black sociology and critical race theory is that black sociology focuses on the systemic, historically established power of white racism, viewed to be the "dominant" racism, and emphasizes the black-white dichotomy of race relations as the base model from which all other race relations are structured. In contrast, critical race theory does not always

---

[1] A primary tension in sociology exists between "mainstream" sociology and "marginalized" sociology. Along with a number of other sociologists who use the term "mainstream" in reference to sociology (Ladner 1973c; Staples 1976; Bonilla-Silva 1997; Feagin 2000, 2006, 2009; Washington and Cunnigen 2002; Morris 2007), I refer to the well-funded, institutionalized sociological production of knowledge in schools, research and policy centers, journals and books, largely legitimated and controlled by whites (a good portion still elite and male), which directly and indirectly maintain white power and social control. While mainstream is not synonymous with white sociology, in most cases mainstream refers to the sociological framework in which most whites operate [Patriarchy and class distinction or elitism are also elements of mainstream sociology, although these power structures have been challenged to a greater degree. More women and non-elites than blacks have integrated with mainstream sociology.]. Not always are sociologists associated with outlets of mainstream sociology (organizations and institutions, books and journals) associated with the mainstream sociology's dominant perceptions and practices---white racism---that reinforce white power. Occasionally, some sociologists who support the goals of marginalized sociologies work within the system.

  Marginalized sociologies normally operate outside mainstream sociology and are not usually celebrated in the "top ten" schools, centers, journals, books, and awards for sociology. Marginalized sociology, in its different forms, deconstructs the mythical portraits of social reality and misguided epistemologies of mainstream sociology that support racism, sexism, classism and other concerns of sociology that address oppression of different subjects. Marginalized sociologies offer counter-perspectives and practices to the dominant perspective and practices of mainstream sociology that often uphold the dominant oppressive power relations in society.

[2] I do not refer to the excellent works of critical race theory composed by Derrick Bell (1973, 1992, 2004) and other critical legal scholars.

focus on white racism, denying its ubiquity and over-arching social impact, and tends to view the black-white dichotomy as just one of the forms, not the base, of race relations. This distinction is clarified in more detail below.

Just like theories and practices of conflict and functionalism, black sociology and white sociology are two fundamental frameworks of understanding and interacting in the social world. This dissertation will show that two disparate sets of perspectives and practices have developed that both explain and affect the social world in different ways. Thus, throughout this work, black sociology and white sociology represent two dissimilar epistemological frameworks and paradigms of action, or, two distinctive sociological perspectives of social reality and modes of being (performances and activities) in the world. Specifically, black sociology and white sociology are both epistemological frameworks and ontological frameworks. Moreover, these two sociological perspectives and modes of being are in tension, generally offering conflicting---not complementary---views and methods of navigating social reality.

Differences between the sociological approaches of black and white sociology can be viewed in the debates surrounding the four-fold model of public sociology popularized by Michael Burawoy in his 2004 ASA presidential address (Acker 2005; Aronowitz 2005; Brewer 2005; Burawoy 2005a, 2005b, 2005c; Calhoun 2005). The major tension between "professional" and "policy" sociology, on one hand, and "critical" and "public" sociology, on the other, resembles the tension between white and black sociology. Black sociology is more like critical and public sociology that seek social justice and radical societal reform or revolution. In many cases, blacks and other

people of color practice critical public sociology along with other marginalized, oppressed social groups. Whereas white sociology is more like professional and policy sociology, which maintains the status of groups and individuals in power (often whites, males, elites). It is often practiced by whites and those who represent whites' power. Like white sociology, professional and policy sociology are forms of mainstream sociology; and like black sociology, critical and public sociology are forms of marginalized sociologies. Like Robert Staples' (1973, 1976) understanding of the liberation potential of black sociology and oppressive condition of mainstream white sociology, professional-policy sociology legitimates and maintains the oppressive social world controlled by people in power (i.e., whites), while critical-public sociology seeks to liberate the oppressed and marginalized (i.e., blacks and people of color) from whites' social control.[3]

While this study will be presenting a particular interpretive picture of black and white sociology, addressing a specific set of ideas and practices of certain individuals and institutions, I strongly believe that no one definitive or monolithic black sociology or no one definitive or monolithic white sociology exists and that these frameworks are not static. The two sociologies are always in the process of transformation, even if the change is only superficial. Among black sociologists, as among white sociologists, one discovers a wide range of thought and action. Moreover, at times, black and white sociological perspectives and practices overlap. With that said, certain consistencies and

---

[3] For a critique of the dominant discourse of public sociology and Burawoy's four-fold scheme, one that highlights the divide between critical-public sociology and professional-policy sociology, see Joe Feagin, Sean Elias, and Jennifer Mueller's "Social Justice and Critical Public Sociology," in Vincent Jeffries (ed.), *Handbook of Public Sociology* (2009).

patterns in sociological thought and practices exist among substantial numbers of individuals from each group of sociologists (i.e., black sociologists and white sociologists), sometimes obviously and other times less conspicuously. To identify key themes and investigative foci that repeatedly appear (noticeable patterns) in the work of each group is one underlying goal of the following project. Focusing on the individuals who best exemplify these patterns is another goal.

Blacks have largely constructed black sociology, and whites have largely constructed white sociology; however, black sociology is not the exclusive domain of blacks and white sociology is not the exclusive domain of whites.[4] While black sociology is comprised mostly of blacks and white sociology is comprised mostly of whites, blacks and other people of color participate in white sociology, just as whites and people of color participate in black sociology. Stated differently, certain whites and people of color occasionally embrace and utilize the dominant ideas and practices of the black sociological tradition; in turn, certain blacks and people of color occasionally embrace and utilize the dominant ideas and practices of the white sociological tradition. As this dissertation illustrates, occasional border crossings and migration that is more permanent occur despite numerous obstacles that separate the two sociologies. One finds that reasons for back-and-forth border crossings and immigration, and examples of

---

[4] Robert Staples (1976:x) writes, "I have reserved judgment on whether only Blacks can practice Black sociology." As Tukufu Zuberi and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (2008:18) note, "White logic and White methods can be---and have been---used by members of all racialized groups and the critique (and defense) of them comes from all quarters." Black and white sociology should not be viewed as literal terms (i.e., sociology by blacks and whites); rather, black and white sociology should be viewed as concepts that distinguish particular sets of ideas and actions.

individuals who have crossed/migrated in both directions, in fact, help reveal important distinctions and tensions between black and white sociology.

Black and white sociology, like all ideal-type concepts and theoretical variables, are characterized by certain inconsistencies, ambiguities, multiple meanings, and thus they require a dialogical, hermeneutical and interdisciplinary approach to get at their meanings. Developing a broad picture of black sociology, white sociology, and the divide between the two is a necessary but overwhelming project, one that explains how race fundamentally shapes sociology and the social world. Such a project requires historical examination of the people, institutions and social world (social structures, forces, and conditions) that form and separate black and white sociology and a comparative theoretical analysis of the two sociological perspectives and practices that define each sociology. Black and white sociology are the product of ideas and material circumstances and, for that very reason, they must be viewed on two levels: the context of ideas and theories and the context of material and physical realities.[5] This dissertation proceeds under the assumption that neither ideas nor material reality can claim precedence as the starting point of black and white sociology, because both are equally engaged and relevant in an on-going dialectal relationship shaping the two sociologies.

---

[5] As Lewis Coser (1971:xiii-xiv) observes, sociological theory and theorists cannot ignore the social world and history, the 'material' structures that reproduce human behaviors and social ordering. He argues that one must have "some familiarity with the *social* and *intellectual* milieu in which…theories [have] emerged…[because] correct appraisal of a particular thought is often difficult, if not impossible, if the social context in which it took root cannot be understood." Since "[t]here has been no sustained attempt to show how social origin, social position, social network, or audience found a reflection in the problems that a theorist addressed," Coser suggests deeper focus on the "social-historical context" and observing "the role sociological theorists within the social structure in which they are variously placed." In contrast to Coser's more balanced approach that neither prioritizes "thought" or "social-historical context," Stanfield argues that social context prefigures social thought, claiming, "we must study the origins and evolution of the social sciences by first taking into account the material societal conditions which produce and institutionalize them, not the reverse" (1985:4).

The *sociological color line* is a logical extension and specific manifestation and model of Du Bois' more universal understanding of the color line (1899, 1903, 1920, 1940, 1945). Du Bois viewed the color line as the social barriers and symbolic boundaries that divide or segregate people, institutions, nations and continents according to a color-coded social system, granting power, privileges and higher status to lighter skinned people, while exploiting, subjugating and dehumanizing people of color.[6] For Du Bois, the color line, or division among people according to a color-coded racial classification and organizational system, was the decisive factor shaping social reality in the US and across much of the globe. He viewed the color line as social-psychological phenomena, explaining the color line as both a mental and physical reality that shapes the psyches of human beings and mechanisms of the social world.

On a psychological level, the color line tends to generate feelings and ideas about superiority and entitlement for lighter skinned individuals and groups and, in contrast, inferiority and unworthiness for blacks and other people of color. The color line's powerful psychological effects often create the experience of marginality and double consciousness for blacks and people of color who are largely denied a "position" and "place"---a sense of identity and home---in society, despite their intelligence, skills and fortitude. In addition to its psychological effects, the color line is manifest in the structures and operations of the everyday social world. As numerous contemporary sociological studies (Massey and Denton 1993; Hacker 1995; Bonilla-Siva 2003; Brown,

---

[6] While Du Bois primarily focuses on the divide between whites and blacks, he acknowledges that the color line is broader than this rigid dichotomy, that the color line is, more broadly speaking, the racial segregation between whites and light skinned people (who "pass" or are "honorary whites"), on one hand, and blacks and people of color, on the other.

Carnoy, Currie, Duster, Oppenheimer, Shultz, and Wellman 2003; Gallagher 2004) have demonstrated, the color line in the US has created black and white social worlds or social environments.[7] Beginning with *The Philadelphia Negro* (1899), Du Bois demonstrated the urban landscape of the color line, noting segregated black and white neighborhoods and social institutions, like schools, churches, hospitals, social clubs and businesses. The color line in society that Du Bois described in the late 19th century has changed little. Today, the US still has rigidly divided black and white neighborhoods, whether urban, suburban or rural. Black and white institutions persist. One still finds a black social world of black colleges and universities (many of which are "historically black colleges and universities" or HBCUs), businesses, churches, hospitals and other institutions on one side of the color line and a white social world of white colleges and universities, businesses, churches, hospitals and other institutions on the other.

One finds a preponderance of black institutions and organizations presently in operation, which would indicate empirically that the color line continues to be a social reality. It would seem that every occupation has a black organization. A Google search reveals a listing of black national associations for nurses, farmers, cardiologists, accountants, MBAs, journalists, social workers, police and prosecutors, among others. If no color line exists, why are there black-specific newspapers (*The Chicago Defender* and *Washington Afro*), law journals (*Harvard Black Letter Law Journal*), popular magazines (*Jet*, *Ebony*), black presses (Africa World Press, Third World Press), black cable TV

---

[7] Red, brown, and yellow social worlds/environments have also been created by the color line (e.g., red "Indian reservations;" brown "Border-town Barrios;" and yellow "Chinatowns."

(BET), radio stations (WKYS in Washington, DC and KMJQ in Houston, Texas) and numerous other cultural-intellectual institutional and organizational outlets? Why is there a need for the Association for Black Psychologists (ABP), Black Political Scientists (BPS), the Association of Black Women Historians (ABWH) and Association of Black Sociologists (ABS) if we are supposedly living in a post-racial, colorblind society?

Like most facets of the larger racially segregated social world, sociology has not escaped the color line and has developed as a segregated discipline with competing racial ideologies. Sociology is divided according to an age-old color-coded system that divides the discipline into black and white sociology, but also red, brown, and yellow sociologies. Thus, a number of color lines exist in the field. This dissertation's concern with defining and theorizing black and white sociology, with emphasis on certain ideas and individuals at the expense of others, will likely be disconcerting to sociologists of all colors. For example, black sociologists and white sociologists might disagree with how I categorize and judge (intellectually and morally) black and white sociology. "Red," "brown," and "yellow" sociologists might feel unrecognized or slighted because this work focuses specifically on the relationship between black and white sociology.

While I acknowledge and support the fields of red, brown and yellow sociology, their importance and viability, and the need for greater sociological understanding of these fields, they are beyond the analytic scope of this work. As is the case with black and white sociologies, much work is needed to demonstrate how red, brown and yellow sociologies have formed. One finds sociological issues central to red sociology with

recent calls for signing an ASA petition that challenged the use of sport team mascots that reflect negatively on Native Americans. One also finds sociological issues important to brown sociology, like immigration, in the Latino/a section of the American Sociological Association (ASA) and sociological issues central to yellow sociology, like East-West social relations, in the Asia/Asian American section of the ASA. Like African Americans (blacks), but in different ways, Native Americans (reds), Latino/a Americans (browns) and Asian Americans (yellows) experience marginalization, discrimination, and exclusion by European Americans (whites) in the white-dominated, hegemonic---Euronormative---US social system, or "white America." Like African Americans' documentation of the black-white color line, experiences of the red-white, brown-white and yellow-white color lines have been documented by Native Americans, Latinos/as and Asian Americans. [8]

White sociology is the 'majority,' 'dominant' and 'mainstream' sociology, while black sociology, red sociology, brown sociology, and yellow sociology are 'minority,' 'subjugated' and 'marginalized' sociologies that must contend with white sociology's power and resource advantages, dominant discourse, and self-avowed legitimization. As

---

[8] For works that illustrate how the color line affects the 'red race' or Native Americans, see: Arnold Krupat's *Red Matters: Native American Studies* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002); James V. Fenelon's *Culturicide, Resistance, and Survival of the Lakota* ["Sioux Nation"] (New York: Routledge, 1998) and Elvira Pulitano's *Toward a Native American Critical Theory* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2003). For works on how the color line affects the 'brown race' or Latino/as, see: Richard Rodriguez's *Brown: The Last Discovery of America* (New York: Viking, 2002); Marcelo Suarez-Orozco and Mariela Paez's (eds.) *Latinos: Remaking America* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2008) and Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic's (eds.) *The Latino Condition: A Critical Reader* (New York: New York University Press, 1998). For works on how the color line affects the 'yellow race' or Asians and Asian Americans, see: Frank Wu's *Yellow: Beyond the Black and White* (New York: Basic Books, 2003); Ronald Takaki's *Strangers from a Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans* (Boston: Back Bay Books, 1998) and Rosalind Chou and Joe Feagin's *The Myth of the Model Minority: Asian Americans Facing Racism* (Boulder, CO: Paradigm, 2008).

this dissertation reveals, the sociological color line is rooted in uneven power relations and conflict among these sociologies. The sociological color line, like the larger societal color line, implies race-based social conflict, not the social harmony, unification, and consensus discovered in functionalism. Considering that the conflict between black sociology and white sociology is the best-documented, most persistent sociological color line, it would seem that this particular framework might serve as a starting point for discussing segregation in the discipline and prototype for analyses of other sociological color lines.

Because the primary goal of this dissertation is to demonstrate how race has shaped sociology, specifically illuminating the linkage of black sociology, white sociology, and the racial construction and segregation of the discipline, I have developed a theoretical framework that employs key sociological insights of three noted sociologists of race. Part of a small group of sociologists who view race as a central factor in shaping most aspects of social reality, W.E.B. Du Bois, Joe Feagin, and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva offer sociological concepts and theories that are best suited for framing this study.

Along with his concept/theory of the color line, which provides a central theme of this dissertation, Du Bois' critique of unstated white social pathologies (also embedded in white sociology) and validation of black knowledge and culture also serve as important theoretical understandings in this study. Throughout his writings, Du Bois develops a critique or theory of the pathology of whites' power, social norms and treatment of people of color and criticisms of theoretical presuppositions discovered in

whites' negative views of blacks and positive views of themselves. Du Bois argues that black knowledge and culture are crucial for the realization of humanity and are distinct from white cultural and epistemological norms, claiming that black sociological knowledge is essential for understanding the social world. This dissertation is guided by three Du Boisian theoretical insights: 1) a theory of white pathologies, mythologies and epistemological fallacies; 2) a theory of blacks' positive contributions to society and overlooked social knowledge and sociological wisdom; and 3) a theory of the social world structured according to a color-coded division among racial groups or color line.

With Du Bois as a foundation, I incorporate Joe Feagin's theoretical understanding of *systemic racism* as an explanatory framework for understanding how race has shaped sociology and US society, the social context that gave birth to and developed sociology. I also utilize his theoretical understanding of the "white racial frame" as a source and explanation of white sociology and his understanding of the "counter-framing" of people of color as a source and explanation of black sociology. Feagin's theories of systemic racism and the white racial frame, discovered in *Racist America: Roots, Current Realities, and Future Reparations* (2001), *Systemic Racism: A Theory of Oppression* (2006), and *The White Racial Frame: Centuries of Racial Framing and Counter-Framing* (2009), present a picture of the social world that views race as a, if not the, primary social construct defining certain societies and human relations. His work focuses on demonstrating how race shapes US society, explaining how racism in America is "centuries-long, deep-lying, institutionalized, and systemic."

According to Feagin (2001:16, 2006), "*systemic racism* includes a diverse assortment of racist practices; the unjustly gained economic and political power of whites; the continuing resource inequalities; and the white-racist ideologies, attitudes, and institutions created to preserve white advantages and power." Systemic racism is a "firmly embedded system of racism," one "in which every major aspect of life is shaped to some degree by the core racist realities." It is a "total racist" system that invades every facet of American society (organizations, national beliefs, and culture), largely determines an individual's/group's position in society according to color-coded racial divisions, and reproduces white oppression and subjugation of blacks and people of color. Systemic racism cuts across all institutions in society, permeates all features of social relations among groups, and is deeply instilled in human consciousness (even the subconscious).

> [E]ach apparently separate institution of this society---including the economy, politics, education, the family, religion and law---on closer examination still reflects in many ways the over-arching reality of racial oppression. Thus, each institutional dimension of systemic racism is linked, directly or indirectly, to other institutional dimensions. While one can separate these institutional aspects of systemic racism for analytic purposes, in the world of the everyday lived reality they are not normally separated but often occur in concert with one another (Feagin 2006:46).

Systemic racism has created, and is itself created, by a *white racial frame*. As Feagin (2006:5) notes, "central to the persistence of systemic racism has been the development of a commonplace racial frame---that is, an organized set of racialized ideas, stereotypes, emotions and inclinations to discriminate." The white racial frame is the underlying structure that supports and maintains systemic racism. Feagin defines it as "an overarching worldview, one that encompasses important racial ideas, terms, images,

emotions, and interpretations," and states that, over several "centuries now, it has been a basic and foundational frame from which a substantial majority of Americans---as well as others seeking to conform to white norms---view our highly racialized society" (2009:3). Feagin's analysis reveals that the white racial frame is more than a just a worldview (human ideas), rather it is a worldview that spurs a set of practices (human action):

> The white racial frame generates closely associated, recurring actions. The frame and associated discriminatory actions are consciously or unconsciously expressed in the routine operation of racist institutions of this society…in the case of most white Americans, their racial frame includes negative stereotypes, images, and metaphors concerning African Americans and other people of color, as well as assertively positive views of whites and white institutions (Feagin 2006:25-6).

The white racial frame and the system of white norms and practices it produces ensure a key feature of systemic racism---its longevity and re-production in the white-controlled American political and economic system and in the psyches of Americans (whites and people of color), who are easily seduced by its power. Some groups and individuals are not so easily oppressed nor swayed by the white racial frame. In opposition, certain individuals and groups have, to different degrees, developed counter-frames that challenge the ideas and practices of the white racial frame (Feagin 2009). Counter-framing is a technique to oppose power structures. Counter-frames against patriarchy have been developed by feminists; counter-frames against capitalism have been created by Marxists; and counter-frames battling the systemic racism of the white racial frame have been developed by anti-racists, predominantly discovered in the black sociological tradition. Black sociology is the counter framing I will be exploring in this dissertation. I view black sociology as part of a larger black counter-framing tradition---

or *black racial frame*---that has fought for equal rights and the human dignity of blacks and other oppressed people. More specifically, I theorize the *black sociological frame* as a particular but very important manifestation of the black racial frame and the *white sociological frame* as a particular but important manifestation of the white racial frame.

Along with the theoretical frameworks presented by Du Bois and Feagin, Eduardo Bonilla-Silva's theories of *structural racism* and *racialization* and concepts of *racialized social systems* and *racial contestation* provide further important theoretical understandings that inform this work. Whereas Du Bois canvasses the picture of race in the broader social landscape and Feagin delineates race in the context of US society, Bonilla-Silva specifically addresses meanings of race, racism and race relations in the social sciences and production of knowledge, and then relates those meanings to experiences and realities in the social world. Bonilla-Silva correctly argues that "race and ethnic studies lacks a sound theoretical apparatus," and then criticizes social scientists "for obscuring the social and general character of racialized societies" and failing to realize that race, racism and race relations are all part of a "larger racial system," part of the structure of a social system defined by race (1997:465, 466-7).

According to Bonilla-Silva, "social relations between the races become institutionalized" and are not just part of the "culture" and "ideology" of society. Thus, racism is no longer racism of individuals and groups, but rather a *structural racism*, a form of racism that includes individuals, groups, institutions and the very social system and fundamental macro structures of the society itself. In other words, the social system is *racialized* throughout and has become predominantly a *racialized social system* [also

see Feagin's (2006) and Feagin, Vera, and Batur's (1995/2001) discussion of "systemic racism"]. Racialized social systems are social systems that "allocate differential economic, political, social and even psychological rewards to groups along racial line; lines that are socially constructed" on all societal levels, creating a "racial structure of society" (474). In an effort to improve upon the idea of "racial formation," Bonilla-Silva proposes the sociological understanding of *racial contestation*, "the logical outcome of a society with a racial hierarchy," emphasizing the conflict inherent in a racialized state (1997:474). According to Bonilla-Silva, not only do race concepts shape society (racialize the social structure), but societal structures also reinforce race concepts. He further explains that social conflict shaped by race is not just battle of ideas or ideologies between race groups, racial conflict is embedded in the tangible-structural-material relations and realities existing between race groups.

Unlike most mainstream race theorists, Du Bois, Feagin and Bonilla-Silva can appreciate and do incorporate race-based sociological understandings from black nationalist perspective, unlike a number of race theorists and sociologists who are attempting to dismiss the discourse on race (Wilson 1978; Appiah 1985; D'Souza 1995; Gilroy 2000). Because black sociology is partially rooted in the black nationalist perspective and offers valid reasons for a black nationalist sociological perspective, most race theory, even the more progressive racial formation theory of Michael Omi and Howard Winant, is inadequate, lacking the conceptual and theoretical tools for addressing elements of my dissertation topic, which seriously investigates the meaning and usefulness of black sociology. I have thus incorporated the theoretical insights of Du

Bois, Feagin, and Bonilla-Silva because their concepts and theories support discussion of black sociology and white sociology and apprehension of the tensions between the two. Moreover, their theoretical frameworks, in combination, depict a more developed register of the racial construction, segregation and contestation of sociology and the social world.

As the following overview of the chapters demonstrates, I use a comparative-historical and contextual-interpretative theoretical analysis---a multi-methodological approach---to provide a description of black sociology, white sociology, and the racial construction and segregation of the discipline.

Overview of Chapters

After this introduction, Part I of the dissertation (Chapters I-V) moves to a contextual and interpretative analysis of works that, in Chapter II, identify and discuss black sociologists (Bracey Meier, and Rudwick 1971a; Blackwell and Janowitz 1974; Washington and Cunnigen 2002) and, in Chapter III, explain black sociology (Ladner 1973b; Staples 1976). These sociological texts, most of which were written in the black sociological movement of the 1970s,[9] outline the historical recollections, life histories, writings and ideas of key black sociologists as well as identify and analyze basic themes in black sociology.

---

[9] The 1970s, particularly the first half of the decade, witnessed a black sociological movement, or black sociological Renaissance, a flurry of social and intellectual activity among blacks in sociology reminiscent of the social-political and cultural-intellectual movement during the 1920s Negro Renaissance. During this period, in 1970, the ABS formed.

John Bracey, August Meier and Elliott Rudwick's *The Black Sociologists: The First Half Century* (1971a) and James Blackwell and Morris Janowitz's *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives* (1974) breathed new life into the discipline, identifying a tradition of long-overlooked black sociologists, their ideas and methods, experiences and social-historical contexts. However, Joyce Ladner's *The Death of White Sociology* (1973b) and Robert Staples' *Introduction to Black Sociology* (1976) are the first works to define black and white sociology, offer theoretical explanations of differences between the two, and present clear examples of the segregation of sociology affecting different areas of the discipline (ideational and material environments). These two path breaking, classic but neglected works in sociological theory, historical sociology and the sociology of knowledge present a strong case for recognizing two distinct sociological frameworks: black and white sociology. Ladner's and Staples' paradigm-shifting sociological texts profoundly inspire this dissertation's goal of further developing theoretical understandings of black sociology and white sociology and a more lucid, critical picture of the long-standing, acutely structured sociological divide or color line between the two sociological frameworks.

Significantly, the histories, writings and ideas of key black sociologists and basic themes in black sociology mentioned above often contrast with histories, writings, ideas of white sociologists and basic themes in white sociology; thus, the studies of black sociologists and black sociology found in the above works reveal much about the operations of white sociologists and white sociology. Without these works on black sociology and black sociologists, explanations of white sociologists and white sociology

would be seriously limited and lacking. Arguably, blacks have done the most to develop theoretical understandings of the sociological color line, the concept of black sociology, and white sociology, and to identify historical, cultural and intellectual distinctions between black and white sociologists.

In Chapter IV, I examine writings that present further explanations of white sociology and white sociologists (Lyman 1972; Stanfield 1985), and in Chapter V, I offer comparative understandings of black and white sociology in a specific context (Deegan 2002). All three of these important sociological texts in one way or another illustrate the development of white sociology and expose the perspectives and practices of white sociologists. As with the black sociologists and black sociology, I delineate the histories, writings and ideas of key white sociologists as well as identify and analyze basic themes and developments of white sociology using Lyman's, Stanfield's and Deegan's sociological studies. I reserve James McKee's *Sociology and the Race Problem: The Failure of a Perspective* (1993) and Stephen Steinberg's *Race Relations: A Critique* (2007), two important works on white sociology and white sociologists, for analysis in Chapter VIII.

My reason for offering such an engaged literature review and analysis of the sociological works above stems from the marginalization and disregard that these important texts have received by mainstream sociologists and the larger public. Because of their valuable---more like, indispensable---insights and examples, all the books mentioned above should be required reading and promoted as fundamental sociological texts. Along with being useful guides for understanding key themes of black and white

sociology, the books discussed in Part I present information and knowledge that are

initial steps for creating a new, improved paradigm and epistemological framework for

understanding the makeup and operations of the social world and very different

historical narrative of the discipline. I have highly utilized these texts on black and white

sociology to provide a strong foundation for the second part of this dissertation. Part II

expands on understandings and information found in the chapters of Part I and presents a

comparative analysis of black and white sociology and more vivid historical picture of

the sociological color line and segregation of the discipline.

In Part II (Chapters VI-X), I utilize a comparative-historical approach to

examine, in greater focus, the ideas and practices and social-historical contexts that

influence and prefigure the development of black sociology and white sociology.

Because pinpointing the actual 'origins' of the two sociologies is problematic, I trace

black sociology to W.E.B. Du Bois and white sociology to Robert E. Park, viewing them

as the principal founders of each tradition.[10] My goal is to demonstrate that Du Bois and

Park develop two disparate sociological perspectives and practices that, in many ways,

have produced and continue to shape two distinctive sociological traditions of black and

white sociology (as witnessed in Part I of the dissertation). Elucidating the sociological

frameworks of Du Bois and Park and conflict between their sociological perspectives,

and their subsequent incorporation or replication by later sociologists, is crucial for

---

[10] A number of sociologists (Bracey, Meier, and Rudwick 1971a:2; Staples 1976:3; Young 2002:79-80) have identified Du Bois as a founder of black sociology. While scholars have viewed Park as the "father" of race relations studies in sociology and a primary figure in the development of Chicago School of Sociology (Deegan 1992, 2002; McKee 1994; Steinberg 2007), I would argue, more generally, that he is the founder of white sociology, and a logical contrast to Du Bois.

understanding the fundamentals of black and white sociology and the present divide and persistent conflict between the two traditions.

However, to better understand the sociology of Du Bois and Park, it is necessary to first reach back and analyze the ideas and actions of people---the traditions---that shape Du Bois' sociology and Park's sociology. Although Du Bois' sociology was influenced in part by whites (Gustav Schmoller and William James, among others) and Park's sociology was influenced in part by blacks (Booker T. Washington and Charles Johnson, among others), this analysis reveals that Du Bois was predominantly influenced by a *black tradition---a black frame of ideas and practices.* Conversely, Park was primarily influenced by a *white tradition---a white frame of ideas and practices* and the everyday experiences of white racism (more specifically, systemic racism). In the first part of Chapter VI, I address key figures of the white tradition from which Park emerges, particularly the first wave white sociologists Auguste Comte, Alexis Tocqueville, George Fitzhugh, Henry Hughes, Herbert Spencer, and Karl Marx.

Next, in the second part of Chapter VI, I address the key figures of the black tradition from which Du Bois descends, specifically first wave black sociologists David Walker, Martin Delany, Frederick Douglass, Alexander Crummell, William Wells Brown, and George W. Williams.[11] In Chapter VII, I compare the intellectual,

---

[11] The inclusion of Frederick Douglass in the pantheon of early black sociologists might appear out-of-line; however, Douglass' perceptions of society, social relations, and power structures certainly earn him the title of social theorist, if not 'sociological' theorist. Moreover, his socio-political understandings and actions serve as a model and prototype of public sociology. William W. Brown and George W. Williams are not just historians, but historical sociologists with explanations of social as well as historical phenomena. Alexander Crummell and Martin Delany are critical social/sociological theorists who most closely resemble the critical sociological tradition that W.E.B. Du Bois, Oliver Cox, and other mostly black sociologists develop.

psychological, social and historical worlds of Du Bois and Park. I contrast their perceptions and practices and the social contexts and historical material conditions that shape their thought and actions as graduate students and early sociologists. In addition, I demonstrate their link to the earlier tradition of first wave black and first wave white sociologists discussed in Chapter VI. In Chapter VIII, I move away from analysis of the forces and structures shaping Du Bois' and Park's sociological ideas and actions to an examination of those ideas and actions themselves and the way they reflect and respond to structures and forces of the social world. In Chapter IX, the last chapter aside from the conclusion, I propose that Du Bois' sociology concerning human rights ought to be viewed as a model of black sociology and show why his understandings of human rights provides a useful and possibly the most logical approach to understanding human relations and the 'racialized' social construction of reality and the best bet for a new sociological paradigm.

CHAPTER II

BLACK SOCIOLOGISTS: HISTORIES AND BIOGRAPHIES, PERCEPTIONS

AND PRACTICES

Despite black sociologists' marginalization and exclusion in the discipline, several books on 'black sociologists' are in print, and yet no books specifically on 'white sociologists' (and named as such) have been published. Deep irony is ingrained in this problematic situation. On one hand, black sociologists have been so marginalized and excluded in the tradition, it has been necessary to generate works that acknowledge the contributions of black sociologists who are mostly ignored by mainstream sociology, 'sociology proper,' neglected in the history of sociology and current 'dominant' sociological discourse. On the other hand, white sociology is so all-pervasive that it goes simply by the name, sociology, without any qualifier---much in the same way 'American' subtly refers to white Americans, whereas African, Asian, Latino/a and other 'hyphenated Americans' must be qualified and distinguished from those who are 'just plain and simply American.'

The purpose of presenting in-depth summaries and analyses of the following works by Bracey, Meier, and Rudwick (1971), Blackwell and Janowitz (1974), and Washington and Cunnigen (2002) is to responsibly address the problematic situation above. If the discipline of sociology is to progress or at least become honest with itself, not only is it necessary to pay attention to neglected important sociological works of black sociologists, it is also essential to present examples of the profundity of black

sociological works that dispel the myth that sociology is white sociology. Each of the following works on black sociologists are unique in content and format, yet, at the same time, all of the works, more or less, identify the same key black sociologists, their primary ideas and practices, and ways that their ideas and practices merge and deviate. Becoming acquainted with black sociologists is the first step toward an understanding of black sociology.

The Black Sociologists: The First Half Century (1971), John Bracey, August Meier and Elliott Rudwick (eds.)

Bracey, Meier and Rudwick's *The Black Sociologists: The First Half Century* (*The Black Sociologists*) is the first major work to discuss black sociologists and present examples of early black sociologists' writings. *The Black Sociologists* identifies and presents writings of black sociologists responding to the social world of the first half of the twentieth century. After a brief introduction that provides background information on the black sociologists in the anthology, the volume begins with works by W.E.B. Du Bois, "the first black sociologist," and George E. Haynes, one of the first blacks to earn a PhD in sociology in 1912 (1971a:2, 4). Next, the work presents writings of the "Robert E. Park Tradition" of black sociologists, Charles S. Johnson, E. Franklin Frazier, Bertram W. Doyle, and then ends with a more critical selection from St. Clair Drake and Horace Cayton's 1945 book, *Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City* (*Black Metropolis*).[12]

---

[12] One might wonder why Oliver C. Cox was absent from this anthology.

In "The Study of the Negro Problems" (1898), Du Bois performs a balancing act that he would employ in later works (up until around 1920), noting both structural constraints of racial "caste" divisions between blacks and whites in American society and identifying certain "problems" with black Americans' agency, what Du Bois dubs the "backward development of Negroes." While this early essay aims to devise a plan that would address "the Negro problem," in his later works Du Bois would increasingly focus less on effects of the black problem, black pathologies, and more on the causes, white racism. Du Bois' essay from *The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study* (1899), "The Organized Life of Negroes," is a detailed analysis of the diversity of social institutions and organizations in the black community of Philadelphia, including newspapers, churches, unions, leagues, co-operatives, hospitals, elderly care centers, lending institutions, and a variety of business. Du Bois (1899/1971a:51) argued that "the ultimate rise of the Negro lies in this mastery of the art of social organized life," developing a strong self-sustaining, self-generating social network in the black community. Du Bois' theory of black self-determinism reappears throughout his work, especially as he became more disenchanted with the exploits of white civilization and lack of social co-operation with whites.

George Haynes' "Conditions among Negroes in the Cities" (1913) writes that "social changes do not frequently keep time with social thought," and that social changes, especially when they occur rapidly, outpace our understanding of the social world:

> [T]he condition of the Negro may receive less attention from the nation; his economic and social difficulties may be less generally known; his migrations and

concentration in cities, North and South, are given less attention. The increasing segregated settlements and life of Negroes within the cities may excite less concern. The resulting intensified industrial, housing, health and other maladjustments and the Negro's heroic struggles to overcome these maladjustments are in these days likely to be little considered. These conditions [however] demand thought (1913/1971a:56).

Haynes documentation of the massive migration of black to cities during the first decades of the twentieth century points to early inner-city segregation that excludes blacks from "the larger community" and from the social resources and institutions that whites possess. Like the early Du Bois, Haynes argues that blacks must take steps to improve their "handicapped" lot, despite inadequate resources and power, emphasizing black agency in spite of serious structural constraints of white society. At the dawn of the twentieth century, both Haynes and Du Bois believed that black progress and assimilation rested on concerted efforts by blacks to integrate into white society ("the national ideal"), thus both attempted to persuade whites to cooperate (i.e., calls for "equality of opportunity") with blacks in their attempts to assimilate.

In Part II, essays by Charles Johnson, E. Franklin Frazier, and Bertram Doyle depict the different concerns of black sociologists often associated with "the Robert E. Park Tradition." Charles Johnson's three essays demonstrate his range of sociological thought, from urban black studies to rural black studies, as well as analyses of "patterns" of black segregation. "Black Housing in Chicago," an essay appearing in *The Negro in Chicago: A Study of Race Relations and a Race Riot* (1922), presents "an interpretative account of Negro family life" in "all sections of Chicago, to show both the hardships of black Chicagoans and attempt to "improve their condition in the community." Johnson's

study demonstrates the appalling social conditions of most housing in the black

community and lack of official response to these squalid conditions.

In "The Plantation during the Depression," an essay in a co-authored project with

Edwin Embree and Will Alexander, *The Collapse of Cotton Tenancy* (1935), Johnson's

description of the tenant farmer in the Deep South demonstrates the socio-economic

problems facing Southern blacks. Johnson writes: "As a part of the age-old custom in the

South, the landlord keeps the books and handles the sale of all the crops…Fancy prices

at the commissary, exorbitant interest, and careless or manipulated accounts, make it

easy for the owner to keep tenets constantly in debt" (1935/1971a:95). Along with

blacks' negative social encounters with poor housing and tenant-farming, he identifies

that a key source of negative living arrangement of blacks is directly related to racial

segregation. In *Patterns of Negro Segregation* (1943), Johnson notes that segregation is

"observed in the spatial distribution of urban population" and "occasioned by the

"inevitable division of labor," establishing disjointed group relations and segregated

worlds. According to Johnson, this outcome is no accident, nor the 'natural course' of

events and 'natural order' of thing.

> The Indian reservations in North America, the kampongs of Java, the compounds
> of South Africa, the Jewish ghettos of Europe, the Chinatowns and "Little Italys"
> and "Black Belts " of the United States are all expression of the social or racial
> policy of the dominant society (1943/1971a:136).

Johnson's analysis of US racial segregation, from the "railroad" and "hotels" to

"restaurants and cafes," raises the issue of the dominant groups' (whites') desire (rather,

lack of desire) for blacks to assimilate, not the question of blacks' ability to assimilate.

Presenting a moral and political statement about segregation and its rooted-ness in the

immorality of discrimination, a move shirked by many of his white colleagues (then and now), Johnson writes, "there can be no group segregation without discrimination, and discrimination is neither democratic nor Christian" (1943/1971a:149).

E. Franklin Frazier's essay, "The Pathology of Race Prejudice" (1927), makes a case that race prejudice is "abnormal behavior," involves "mental conflict," "projection" and "insanity," a serious indictment against the average (white) American of Frazier's time. According to Frazier, those infected with racial prejudice demonstrate "social incapacity" and "show themselves incapable of performing certain social functions" (1927/1971a:86). Moreover, he argues that racial prejudice is not the characteristic of individuals but of "a whole group." In "La Bourgeoisie Noire" (1929), Frazier states that "the Negro group is a highly differentiated group with various interests, that it is far from sound to view the group as a homogeneous group of outcasts," and that even the black bourgeoisie (or elite) is diverse, with different views about how to organize the black community (if at all). While this essay demonstrates the diversity of black Americans, it rejects the idea that blacks possess "African culture" and argues that blacks should embrace "selecting values out of American life," and not shun assimilation to "American culture" (1929/1971a:91-2).

"The Black Matriarchate," appearing in Frazier's *The Negro Family in the United States* (1939), extols the virtues and self-reliance and self-sufficiency of black women in caring for the black family and community in general. This study is one of the pioneering studies of social issues and patterns in "maternal households in the Negro populations." While Frazier indicates that the "maternal family" is a response to

historical and "social" realities of the black family, not a response to a "natural" reality, he is primarily concerned with demonstrating the strength and resolve, hardships and setbacks, of black women in contending with social realities created by racism. In *The New Negro Thirty Years Afterward* (1955), Frazier's examines "the New Negro Middle Class," proclaiming that the black middle class has grown more "pathological" (since 1930) as it has focused more on personal material gain and less on community social development. According to Frazier, the black middle class is "isolated mentally, socially, and morally in American society" and isolated from the larger black community (who is exploited by the black middles class "whenever an opportunity offers itself"), a situation Frazier views "as a pathological phenomenon."

Bertram Doyle's essay "The Etiquette of Race Relations---Past, Present, and Future" (1936) seeks to "discover: (1) the social usages or etiquette customarily employed in social contacts and relations of white persons and Negroes; (2) how these have operated to control those relations; (3) what effect the success and failure of the control has had upon the ability of the two races to enter into, and to cooperate in, an effective corporate life" (1936/1971a:108). After reviewing oppressive measures and mechanisms used by whites to maintain social order, which largely involve creating rules of expected behaviors and boundaries, or etiquette, for blacks to follow, Doyle concludes that:

> A summary of the phases of the code [of etiquette], and a study of the development, show (1) that, over a period of over three hundred years, an etiquette of race relations has governed the association of Negroes and white persons; and (2) that the etiquette has, in some respects, changed but that in many other respects in remains practically intact. The basis of the code is admittedly

the inferiority of the Negro, and the superiority of the white group (1936/1971a:121-2).

Like Doyle's analysis of color-coded race relations between blacks and whites, St. Clair Drake and Horace Cayton's essay, "The Measure of Man," in *Black Metropolis* (1945), observes social dynamics of color-coded race relations based on the 'hierarchy of colors' among black Americans. The essay discusses how negative connotations of black and positive connotations of white have affected the "color-struck" black psyche to the point where lighter-skinned blacks are better respected and treated in the black community, as they are in the white community. As Drake and Cayton point out, "How can Negroes ignore color distinctions when the whole culture puts a premium upon being white, and when from time immemorial the lighter Negroes have been the more favored?" This essay demonstrates the power of whiteness and the complexities of color-coded social relations specifically among the black community, unresolved social issues that continue to be revisited in contemporary social science literature.

According to Bracey, Meier, and Rudwick's Introduction, the first half century black sociologists provide a "sociological study of black America…born in a climate of extreme racism---both in popular thought and among intellectuals and social scientists" (1971a:1). In other words, the editors are subtly arguing that black sociology begins, in part, as a response to whites' racism in social sciences, including white sociology. As an anthology of black sociologists' writing, *The Black Sociologists* unfortunately provided little analysis of the black sociologists' writings (no opening or following up statements or engagement by the editors). The short analysis in the Introduction, while providing a sketch of early black sociologists, does not begin to offer a definition of black sociology,

avoiding the term. Importantly, however, the volume introduces the reader to foundational forgotten works by Du Bois, Haynes, Johnson, Frazier, Doyle, and Drake and Cayton,[13] identifying the primary subjects in their work, subjects of study that are viewed as key sociological themes in black sociology. These subjects include the study of the life, culture, and environment of blacks, race prejudice, segregation and race relations, and the diversity of the black community, among others. I will return later to the sociologists' writings and sociological themes identified in *The Black Sociologists*.

Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives **(1974), James Blackwell and Morris Janowitz (eds.)**

In 1974, several years after the publication of *The Black Sociologists*, James Blackwell and Morris Janowitz's edited work, *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives* (*Black Sociologists*), appeared. Ironically, in the Introduction to the *Black Sociologists*, a book exploring the contributions of black sociologists, Morris Janowitz, writes: "I myself do not believe there was a white sociology and a black sociology…after editing this volume, I remain convinced that the distinction is not a viable one" (1974:xvi).[14] Neither this disclaimer, nor Janowitz's warning about the final

---

[13] As Clifton Jones's review (1973) mentions, *Black Sociologists* acknowledges Oliver C. Cox and Ira De A. Reid, but fails to include their works; moreover, no mention is made of Kelly Miller. Jones' observations indicate that, due to space limitations, *Black Sociologists* is an appropriate, but not complete, representation of early black sociologists.

[14] Like Janowitz, other white sociologists continue this baffling theoretical hopscotch of acknowledging black sociologists and their relation to the black community, but not recognizing a black sociology that develops from black sociologists and the black community.

section of the anthology,[15] does little to offset the message of the numerous black sociological perspectives of the contributors, who do indeed demonstrate, in various ways, that black and white sociology exists.

Despite some disagreements among the biracial editorial team, both editors observed the necessity of exposing black sociologists' writings, agreeing "that few sociologists, black or white, fully understood the scope of contributions by black sociologists" to the discipline of sociology (1974:vii). In a review of *Black Sociologists*, August Meier comments that "underlying nearly all of the essays is a unifying theme: the tensions involved in being a black sociologist in white America" (1977:259). Importantly, this work presents a broad range of black sociologists' work on numerous subjects of sociological study, demonstrating the diversity of black sociological perspectives and practices. However, neither Blackwell nor Janowitz attempt to develop a theory of black sociology. In his extremely brief Preface, Blackwell does indicate that black sociology is a contentious and disputed topic among sociologists, but provides little guidance to the meaning of black sociology, focusing mainly on the importance of recognizing black sociologists' work. While Janowitz is unwilling to concede to theories of the existence of black and white sociology, let alone explore the divide between the two, he nevertheless finds that 'black sociologists' have significantly contributed to the study of race relations and the study of the black community, two sub-fields of sociology that indeed are central foci of black sociologists.

---

[15] Janowitz writes, "The final section of the volume returns to the institutional setting of contemporary sociology. The contributions of both Wilson Record and James E. Blackwell present materials [concerning the contemporary setting of sociology] which black and white sociologists might prefer to avoid" (1974:xxviii).

It is not the editors' words but the sociologists' writings in this work that illustrate examples of black sociology and, occasionally, its counterpart, white sociology. The first section reviews "the life and works of the founding fathers" of black sociology, presenting two essays on W.E.B. Du Bois, and essays on Charles S. Johnson and E. Franklin Frazier. Section II examines issues of "black sociologists in a segregated society," specifically, how black sociology has been confined to the halls of black colleges and toward particular sociological research concerns, and how black sociology has developed a social protest agenda to challenge whites' social system of racial segregation. As Albert McQueen notes:

> Historically the sociological profession, while proclaiming liberal values, has displayed little vigor in examining its own practices or in initiating institutional changes to foster optimal professional development and participation of minority sociologists. Only with the advent of pressures from black sociologists in the late 1960s were there significant movements in this direction (1977:71).

Section III reviews "the contemporary setting" of blacks in sociology, blacks' connections to black studies, and statistical focus on black female sociologists (with very little historical-intellectual biography of black women sociologists). In Section IV, "theoretical issues" of black sociology are discussed, including different theoretical frameworks and conflicting perspectives in black sociology, such as the significance of the "insider-outsider controversy." *Black Sociologists* concludes with a section on "institutional adaptations" of black sociology, specifically the impact of black studies and blacks' conflict with the American Sociological Association (ASA) and development of splinter groups like the Black Caucus and Association of Black

Sociologists (ABS). The following is a breakdown of each of the important chapters in

Black Sociologists, a work that has many merits despite some severe criticisms.[16]

In Section I, The Life and Work of the Founding Figures, Francis Broderick's

"W.E.B. Du Bois: History of an Intellectual" and Elliott Rudwick's "W.E.B. Du Bois as

Sociologist" identify Du Bois as "the preeminent spokesperson for black equality" and

the "most prominent propagandist of the Negro protest during the first half of the

twentieth century" (1974:3, 25). After detailing various highlights of Du Bois' life, from

his years at the NAACP to his vast, often political, output of writings in numerous

outlets, Broderick summarizes Du Bois' "prophetic mission":

> From the beginning and all along the way Du Bois' career had a central thrust—
> equal justice for all men, especially for men of color for whom the experience
> would be so novel. He never ceased to enrich his experience, looking to both the
> white and the colored worlds" (23).

Rudwick argues that "Du Bois was attracted to sociology because he saw in it an

intellectual basis for the redefinition of the issues of race relations," issues that were

central to understanding the basis of social relations. Additionally, Rudwick argues that

Du Bois' understandings of race and studies of the black community shaped a later

tradition of black sociologists.

> Although Du Bois himself thus left the field of sociology, his influence on
> student of the black community was profound. His was more than the obvious

---

[16] In "The Gospel of Feel-Good Sociology: Race Relations as Pseudoscience and the Decline in Relevance of American Academic Sociology in the Twenty-First Century" (2008), John Stanfield writes: "We have yet to read the more radical writings on race in America of E. Franklin Frazier (1927, 1945, 1962), Charles S. Johnson (Stanfield 1987), and William E.B. Du Bois, all sanitized in the University of Chicago's attempt to put their stamp on the history of African American sociologists: James Blackwell and Morris Janowitz's (1974) *Black Sociologists* (while ignoring women such as Anna Cooper and Ida B. Wells). We read in the Blackwell and Janowitz text about the conventional sociological perspectives of those chosen for textual inclusion, such as Frazier and Johnson, while ignoring, among other things, their common disillusionment with race in America as expressed in their last writings" (2008:279).

model for the surveys of Negroes in New York and Boston by Ovington, Haynes, and Daniels in the periods before World War I. His pioneering work also bears important similarities to such later studies as Johnson's *The Negro in Chicago*, Frazier's *Negro Youth at the Crossways*, Davis and Gardner's *Deep South*, and Drake and Cayton's *Black Metropolis* (1974:50).

Richard Robbins' "Charles S. Johnson" states that Johnson played "a multiplicity of roles---scholar, writer, editor, administrator, foundation executive, advisor to countless commissions, research director, university president---forged his sown role integration as social scientist and advocate" (1974:58-9). Robbins writes about the balancing act Johnson performed to access mainstream sociology, but he observes that Johnson's position was not similar to that of his white colleagues, for Johnson always faced the social issues and 'problem' of race in America. His unique position as a black sociologist in white-dominated mainstream sociology was made ever more precarious due to racial ambivalence and lack of personal support from his white colleagues, more specifically, the intellectual weaknesses of Johnson's white colleagues, especially their lack of addressing racial segregation and racism:

> Johnson…devoted his career primarily to demonstrating that the damning indictment of a racist society could be powerfully drawn from the objective data of social science itself…He often worked with white social scientists who were men of reasonably good will but who were extremely obtuse; who did careful research in the same style as Johnson's but who never questioned *au fond* the ideology of racial segregation, or even if they questioned it privately kept a discreet silence in public about it devastating consequences" (1974:58).

G. Franklin Edwards' essay on "E. Franklin Frazier" notes that "when E. Franklin Frazier was the first black president of the American Association of Sociology (now the Americana Sociological Association) in 1948, it marked the first time in the history of this country that a black person was chosen as head of a national professional

association" (1974:85). The fact that it was not until after World War II that a black person was elected to head a professional organization speaks loudly about the segregation blacks face in American society, and is one of the few proud moments in the history of mainstream white American sociology. Some argue that his accommodationist stance was behind his acceptance in white-dominated professional sociology. Criticism of Frazier's accommodationism raise numerous issues, but often Frazier is the subject of analysis, not the society that cutoff blacks, like Frazier, who did not accommodate to some degree. How far backwards would American sociology be today without sociologists like Frazier who broke color barriers and was, through his interactions with his white colleagues, able to advance greater dialogue about race between blacks and whites, even if that dialogue was severely muted and constrained? Frazier's relationship to white sociology and black sociology is an important topic that will be further addressed in later chapters. For now, it is important to recognize that "Frazier's intellectual and research concerns" span "a variety of fields: urbanization, stratification, human ecology, social organization…[and that] his involvement in the subject matter of each of these specialized area was primarily for the contribution that theories in these areas made to a further understanding of family and race relations" (1974:85).

In Section II, Black Sociologists in a Segregated Society, Butler Jones' "The Tradition of Sociology Teaching in Black Colleges: The Unheralded Professionals" presents a mini-history of influential black sociologists who taught at black colleges and universities. This essay deserves special treatment because it provides a rich, untold account of the lives and sociological contributions of important black sociologists who

are largely unknown. As Jones observes, like so many hard-working, social world-changing Americans in US history, "black sociologists will remain unheralded [and virtually forgotten] and their identities lost in a collection of college catalogs and their research and writing preserved only in the sarcophagi of fugitive materials" (1974:121). Jones attempts to offer some correction to this condition by presenting information about black colleges and the "second-generation" black sociologists who taught at these institutions. He explains the black college's importance for black sociologists, providing them a home and a teaching ground that was denied them in the white social world. Jones notes:

> This second generation of black sociologists also had the spirit of the pioneer. They were in sharp contrast to many of their white counterparts in the profession, who were often afforded the facilities, time, financing, and, perhaps most important of all, continuing access to those who could give advice and help in initiating and carrying through significant research projects. The second-generation sociologists, on the other hand, had their early professional development blunted by continuing (albeit lessened) racist practices in academia and the society at large (1974:159).

Jones covers the sociological career of the Fisk research sociologist and educator, George Edmund Haynes (1880-1960), a sociologist whose list of accomplishments, activities, posts, and qualifications are pages long. In short, he earned a BA at Fisk, MA at Yale, and PhD at Columbia, was one of the first black PhDs in sociology, co-founded the National Urban League, directed the Department of Social Sciences at Fisk, and wrote numerous books and research reports, like Conditions among Negroes in Cities (1913) and *The Trend of the Races* (1922).. Despite Haynes' accolades, Butler notes that his career was not promoted in the profession, nor did he receive the same recognition

and professional 'status posts,' like the sociologist, Howard Odum, a white contemporary and occasional collaborator. Whereas Odum went on to become one of the most well-known sociologists of the early twentieth century, Haynes "was not to be granted even the most lowly of organizational rewards: membership in an appointed ad hoc committee" (1974:146).

Kelly Miller (1863-1939) is another important early black sociologist, who, although actually trained as a mathematician, moved to teaching sociology and went on to develop the sociology department at Howard University, where he taught E. Franklin Frazier. A critic of poor statistical research in the social science, sociological research that was often sponsored by the US government and corporate agencies, Miller countered with statistical demystification and more lucid sociological analyses of his own. As Jones notes, Miller's study, "'The Education of the Negro' is a penetrating sociological analysis of the socialization of black children through the manipulation by whites of the formal educative process" and "stratagem used by black teachers to counteract the process and to promote race consciousness among black children" (1974:148). This progressive, ahead-of-its-time understanding of cultural differences in knowledge and learning still meets resistance in social science circles that focus on issues of learning and education. Miller authored a numerous works, including *Race Adjustment: Essays on the Negro in America* (1908) and *Radicals and Conservatives and Other Essay on the Negro in America* (1968), that, like Haynes' work, remain understudied.

Walter Chivers (1896-1969), although he never received a PhD, went on to teach many black sociologists who went on to receive PhDs, including Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., possibly the most effective and powerful black leader in US social history. Chivers made a career at Morehouse College in Atlanta, where he developed the Annual Institute of Successful Marriage and Family Life and the Visiting Lectureship Program in Sociology (1974:149). His sociological interest in the family led him to the realization that the black family model is different from the white family model. He believed that blacks' attempt to aspire to the white family model created more dysfunction than familial functionality. Jones explains and then criticizes the racially segregated, asymmetric social arrangements of blacks and whites in sociology ("the established pattern of placing whites in charge" and assigning "a white sociologist as principle investigator"). According to Jones, even as a senior scholar, Chivers would take jobs led by white sociologists for financial reasons, jobs where "it was an equally common practice for the white sociologist to take full credit for the effort or at best to give a footnote recognition to assistance by the black sociologist" (1974:151). Chivers was more of a teacher and oral scholar than a scholar concerned with writing books; he did however publish the results of several government studies for the state of Georgia, such as "Occupational Status of Negro College Graduates in Georgia" and "A Brief Report of the Vocational Guidance Project for Negro Youths" (1938).

The Tuskegee sociologist, Charles Goode Gomillion, organized the Tuskegee Civic Association in 1947, an association that "launched a program of political activism" for better housing, education and other social issues directly related to the black

community. This civic engagement and political organization, which faced "violent opposition form the local white citizenry" and the Governor of the state, eventually led to Gomillion's defeat of the Alabama state legislature's discriminatory political practices against blacks through a US Supreme Court decision (Gomillion v. Lightfoot, 1960). Jones quite correctly acknowledges Gomillion's example of 'applied sociology' and ability to take the lessons of the classroom, "an unusual methods course," into the real world (1974:153). Gomillion's political activism and administrative responsibilities left him little time for written scholarship.

Ira De Augustine Reid (1901-1970), "the most self-assured and psychologically secure" black sociologist of his day, succeeded Charles Johnson as director of research at the National Urban League in 1928. In 1934, Reid moved to teach at Atlanta University, where, "upon Du Bois' forced departure from that institution, he succeeded him as editor of *Phylon*, the race relations journal founded by Du Bois in 1939." As Jones recounts, during his career at Atlanta and Haverford College, Reid was "a prodigious worker, an effective organizer, and a prolific writer who managed always to appear unharried" (1974:155). Reid's numerous books, including *The Negro Immigrant, His Background, Characteristics and Social Adjustment 1899-1937* (1939), his dissertation from Columbia University, and his numerous government funded sociological research programs have received little attention and deserve to be re-examined.

The Trinidadian-born Oliver Cox is the last black sociologist discussed by Jones. Cox is viewed as the most theoretical of the second-generation black sociologists and is

identified as a black sociologist who, because of his background outside the US, "was psychologically better prepared to escape the bonds which imprisoned the United States black intellectual in the black problem" (1974:156). Jones argues that Cox's primary concern was to correct sociologists' misconceptions about "stratification and the stratification process," especially the caste school of race relations, which "failed to distinguish clearly among race, class, and caste as analytic concepts" (1974:157). As Butler notes:

> In 1948 Cox published his major work, *Caste Class, and Race*. Subtitled "a study of social dynamics," the work does more than explicate the author's views on caste theory of race relations. It offers a restatement of the general principles giving rise to the universal phenomenon of social stratification in human societies (1974:158).

In addition to the useful information already mentioned, Jones' essay provides a list of black sociologists who need to be further investigated as part of the sociological tradition. While able to focus "on that legion of pioneer black sociologists who kept the tradition of sociology teaching alive in the black colleges," Jones' essay does not review other important black sociologists, leaving an opening for future historians of sociology.[17]

In "Sociological Research and Fisk: A Case Study," Stanley H. Smith argues that, because "most contributions of… [black] sociologists were made while they were employed at three predominantly black universities: Atlanta, Fisk, and Howard," one must "analyze the social setting of these institutions as part of the history and

---

[17] Black sociologists who Jones identifies but does not provide any biographical information are Vattel E. Daniel, Henry McGuinn, R. Clyde Miner, Harry Roberts, E. Horace Fitchett, Betram Doyle, Earl Moses, and Eugene S. Richards.

development of black sociologists" (1974:164). Smith uses Fisk as a prototype to display the historical context, specifically the social history of it members, teaching philosophies and curriculum, the college' connection to public and private agencies and associations, research, and scholarly activities, and other antidotes of information, such as the difficult circumstances of segregation, lack of resources, and other struggles facing black colleges and its community (1974:189). This essay is revealing because it demonstrates the social environment of a black college, the environment to which most black sociologists were regulated.

Charles Smith and Lewis Killian's "Black Sociologists and Social Protest" states that "to be a sociologist has meant traditionally to be committed to the rules of logic and the test of empirical verification. Skepticism, detachment, suspension of judgment have been exalted as scientific virtues." They go on to ask "how, then, can the sociologist qua scientist forsake these cherished attitudes to commit himself wholeheartedly to social protest?" Despite some questionable presumptions (blacks don not protest enough) and methodological procedures (overuse of statistical information on qualitative subject matter) of the essay, Smith and Killian arrive at a telling conclusion. They find that the "style of the sociologists still does not seem to be the style of the black-power advocate…[and that] the gulf between the two worlds is at present greater than ever" (1974:219). This statement appears to be true if, when Smith and Killian are speaking of "the sociologist," they really mean "the white sociologist."

In Section III, The Contemporary Setting, James Conyers and Edgar Epps's "A Profile of Black Sociologists" provides a statistically rich description of black

sociologists, noting demographic and familial characteristics, educational characteristics, political and religious affiliations, and other interesting empirical and historical information. For example, we learn that the first PhD "earned by a black was conferred on the late Bishop R.R. Wright in 1911 by the University of Pennsylvania and not on George Haynes from Columbia University in 1912" (1974:238). Also interesting were the responses of black doctorates in sociology to Conyers and Epp's question: "which black sociologists, living or dead, have made the most noteworthy contributions to sociology?" Ranked from 1 to 10 are: E. Franklin Frazier, Charles Johnson, W.E.B. Du Bois, Oliver Cox, Ira de A. Reid, Hylan Lewis, St. Clair Drake, Mozell Hill, Allison Davis, and Joseph Himes (1974:246).

Nathan Hare's "The Contribution of Black Sociologists to Black Studies" is the result of a survey (n=52) asking black sociologists about their attitudes about black studies. Significant reservations to black studies were noted (close to three quarters of the respondents believed that black students should pursue "traditional" degrees, instead of black studies degrees, and close to half believe that the black studies faculty is incompetent). However, despite some criticisms and reservations, Hare finds that black sociologists point to the importance of black studies for aiding the black community, noting that "black sociologists in general envision a 'mutual' or 'reciprocal' or 'symbiotic' relationship between black studies and the black community" (1974:265).

As Jacquelyne Johnson Jackson observes in "Black Female Sociologists," black women sociologists experience double marginality as practitioners in sociology, even in studies of the profession. "Most studies concerned with women professionals ignore

blacks, and most studies concerned with black professionals ignore women" (1974:267), including the Blackwell and Janowitz anthology hosting her essay. Thus, Jackson performs a valuable critique of previous studies of black sociologists that left out discussion of black female sociologists. After expanding the study of black sociologists to include a larger range of schools and publications that include similar numbers of black male and female sociologists, she discovers that black female sociologists were represented in greater numbers than previously documented, numbers comparable to black male sociologists. Jackson provides an invaluable list of black women dissertations and publications in the bibliography,[18] with the hope that "[g]reater development and utilization of black female sociologists could well be a major factor in improving significantly our knowledge and understanding of blacks and of black-white relationships in the United States" (1974:286). As Jackson explains, while black male sociologists are marginalized, black women sociologists are marginalized even greater.

Section IV, Theoretical Issues, presents two essays, Walter Wallace's "Some Elements of Sociological Theory in Studies of Black Americans" and William J. Wilson's "The New Black Sociology: Reflections on the 'Insiders and Outsiders' Controversy." Wallace's essay presents a "systematic analysis of sociological theory," not an analysis of "empirical data," in order to develop "a common interpretive framework for the rapidly expanding literatures and vocabularies of Black studies as well as sociology" that will improve understandings of "the Black community," "the

---

[18] The following is a list of black female sociologists whose dissertations are listed by Jackson: Delores Aldridge, Cora Bagley, Florence Beatty-Brown, Barbara Carter, Jacquelyn Clarke, Henrietta Cox, Sarah Curwood, Mary Diggs, Audrey Forrest, Joan Gordon, Ruth Hamilton, Anna Hardin, Adelaide Hill, Clara Johnson, Gloria Joseph, Joyce Ladner, Wilhelmina Perry, Mary Queenly, LaFrances Rose, Doris Wilkerson, Dorothy Williams.

White community" and "Black-White relations" (1974:300-1). Wallace warns against conceptual confusion in such a project and thus the necessity for developing theoretical clarity for understanding social phenomena of black-white social relations. He argues, for example, that "conceptual distinction [exists] between social organization and culture," which is often overlooked, and that "five levels of social phenomena may be distinguished in theoretical writings in sociology: the interpersonal or small group level; the intergroup or institutional level; the interinstitutional or community level; the intercommunity or societal level; and the intersocial level" (1974:311-12). With observance of these different levels, Wallace believes that new theoretical paradigms of black-white relations and of the black and white communities will develop.

Wilson's essay engages the on-going "insider-outsider" debate. Wilson notes the "Insider's doctrine---the view that individuals of a particular race or ethnic group have a greater intellectual understanding of the experience of that group," and how this perspective has been adopted by certain black sociologists. He finds that black adherents to the insiders doctrine (e.g., Ladner 1971; Billingsley 1971; Akalimat 1969) believe that a "black [sociological] perspective" is needed since "whites are basically incapable of grasping black realities," and thus "distort" the black experience in their sociological analyses. Wilson disagrees with this group of black sociologists and offers some discouraging words about the prospects of black sociology. He argues that, "despite the emphasis given to the 'black perspective,' a coherent and integrated body of thought among proponents of the Insiders doctrine that could clearly establish the direction and set the tone for a new black sociology does not exist" (1974:325).

> This argument does not imply that black sociologists should not be critical of the writings and research of white scholars, or of other blacks for that matter, but it is to urge that the field of race relations be free to develop like any other substantive area in sociology, with the discovery and codification of knowledge, with the search for truth, and with the absence of arbitrary barriers imposed by Insiders and Outsiders doctrines (1974:334). [19]

Wilson's views about the insider-outsider debate are questionable. Indeed, it is *occasionally* important for social scientists to seek a neutral, non-biased stance, and it is the case that outsiders' views can certainly contribute to understanding a social group and their social institutions and community. However, in certain contexts, like societies were racial groups (or any groups) are highly segregated according to asymmetric, hierarchical power relations that divide groups, the social worlds of the groups are so different that sometimes insiders' knowledge is necessary to understand the cultural meanings and social norms of a different groups with regard to their experiences in society's power structure. With experience, an outsider can learn the rules of the insider group. Yet, one wonders what subtle and hidden meanings outsiders fail to catch and the costs of becoming an insider (its effects on one's originary outsider's status).

In the final section of *Black Sociologists*, Section V, Institutional Adaptations, the section we have been forewarned not to read by Janowitz in the Introduction, James Blackwell's "Role Behavior in Corporate Structure: Black Sociologists in the ASA" demonstrates the discrimination in the American Sociological Association (ASA). Blackwell documents how discriminatory practices by white sociologists have sparked the development of the Black Caucus (a section of the ASA) and Association of Black Sociologists, and organization outside the ASA, which presently exists (and will be

---

[19] The insider-outsider, as well as some of Wilson's criticisms, will be revisited later in this paper.

meeting in New Orleans before the ASA meeting in San Francisco). As Blackwell notes, because "institutional dualism exists in the larger society, in terms of black-white relations and the formation of parallel structure, the same phenomenon developed in academic and professional institutions" (1974:347). Blackwell's observation that the divisions between black and white sociology stem from black-white societal divisions is significant, as this study will make clear.

Wilson Record's "Response of Sociologists to Black Studies" is the product of interviews with 209 sociologists who professed a competence in race and ethnic relations, conducted at 70 campuses across the country. He found that "the sociologists could be sorted roughly into four categories with respect to [their] response to black studies": embracers, antagonists, accommodators, and dropouts (those who "left the field of race relations, withdrawing under fire of black militants").[20] Record's study points to a number of interesting findings, the most basic of which finds that blacks and women tended to embrace black studies at higher rates, whereas whites and especially Jews were unsupportive of black studies and, most likely, its cousin, black sociology.

One could analyze each essay in *Black Sociologists* in much greater detail and thus the brief review above is only a small step at revisiting a sociological classic. One can only hope, like Doris Wilkerson, that "this anthology will provide a data base for future incorporation of black sociologists' conceptual paradigms into mainstream sociology" (1975:462). In closing, one can hypothetically imagine one of the

---

[20] For a discussion of how many white sociologists who studied race relations sensed that they were chased out of the field with the rise of black sociology and black studies, see John Stanfield's *A History of Race Relations Research: First Generation Recollections* (1993) and Lewis Killian's *Black and White: Reflections of a Southern White Sociologist* (1994).

controversies between Janowitz and Blackwell, as they discussed the development of

this volume, was the rightful place of Du Bois at the head of this work. Most likely,

Blackwell argued for two chapters for the more "radical" sociologist Du Bois and one

chapter each for the more "accommodationist" Chicago School sociologists Johnson and

Frazier. As a Chicago sociologist and, more importantly, a white sociologist seemingly

opposed to radical black sociology, Janowitz must have reluctantly acquiesced, unable to

escape the realization that whites cannot always write the history of sociology,

particularly that of black sociology.

Confronting the American Dilemma of Race: The Second Generation Black American
***Sociologists* (2002), Robert Washington and Donald Cunnigen (eds.)**

Appearing in 2002, *Confronting the American Dilemma of Race: The Second*

Generation Black American Sociologists (Black American Sociologists), edited by

Robert Washington and Donald Cunnigen, is the latest work on black sociologists. *Black*

American Sociologists, like *The Black Sociologists* and Section I of *Black Sociologists*,

focuses more on historical-intellectual examinations of black sociologists, specifically

the "theoretical worldview" of "second generation" black sociologists (1931-1959).[21]

Cunnigen's Introduction explains that, like "first generation black sociologists" (FGBS),

second generation black sociologists (SGBS) lived during a "time when mainstream

American sociology, and American society in general, was embedded in a racial caste

---

[21] According to Cunnigen, the "African American sociological tradition has been characterized by four distinct periods: first-generation, 1895-1930; second-generation, 1931-1959; third-generation, 1960-1975; and fourth-generation, 1976 to present" (2002:xii).

system," and that most "second-generation African American sociologists…with few exceptions, embraced an assimilationist theoretical perspective." Like the works above, and more recent historical works on race and sociology by Stanfield (1985, 1993), McKee (1993), Deegan (2002), and Steinberg (2007), the essays in *Black American Sociologists* demonstrate that:

> As 'mainstream' sociology developed in the racially segregated white academic community, a parallel African American sociological tradition developed in the African American community (2002:xviii).

Even though they failed to undermine "the prevailing white intellectual paradigm" of assimilation, Cunnigen claims that early FGBS and SGBS nonetheless "possessed a distinctive [sociological] worldview" (2002:xiii). This worldview rejected the more blatant "racist assumptions" of Comtean sociologists like George Fitzhugh and Henry Hughes, and social Darwinists like William Graham Sumner and Franklin H. Giddings. Yet, at the same time, unlike sociological perspectives of FGBS, sociological perspectives of SGBS were deeply influenced by Park and other white sociologists who regurgitated Comtean and social Darwinian social philosophy with newly named concepts and "scientific" theories. Because of the racially structure and racialized nature of academic institutions and funding networks mirroring the race-framed social world, FGBS were, in contrast to FGWS, excluded or severely marginalized and restricted in academia. Unlike FGBS who were unconstrained by institutional demands and intellectual oversight, SGBS who were entering mainstream sociology had to observe

certain boundaries with regard to what kind of ideas and research was acceptable, just as they had to observe certain boundaries in the social world.[22]

To better understand white-dominated "mainstream" sociological perspectives and practices that shaped SGBS, Cunnigen argues that it is necessary to view this cohort of black sociologists in relation to "mainstream sociology" and the social context in which they operated. Essays in *Black American Sociologists* thus "examine the works of second-generation African American sociologists in the light of varied influences: training in elite departments; Robert Park and the Chicago School of Sociology; the Great Depression; the cast-class theoretical school; Gunnar Myrdal's famous study of American race relations; the post war ascendance of functionalist social theory; the changing structure of American universities; and sociology's increased legitimacy as an academic discipline" (2002:xii).

Cunnigen relates that SGBS were assimilationists, noting that SGBSs' "acquiescence to the assimilationist theoretical model" was widespread but not complete, and that some SGBS, like Oliver Cox, actually developed "oppositional paradigms." Of course, the most noted of FGBS, W. E. B. Du Bois, lived long enough to challenge second and third generation black sociologists who embraced sociological theories of assimilation, as well as other white-devised sociological understandings that ignored social truths (e.g., whites' role in creating social dysfunctionality in society) that cast blacks and people of color in a negative light.

---

[22] Deegan (2002) recalls Frazier's insidious on-going confrontations with Jim Crow segregation that disallowed him access to only certain 'spaces and places.' His restriction from certain socials environments were painfully unbending realities in the sociological profession and everyday world (see Chapter III, IV and V of this work).

In addition to Cunnigen's Introduction and Washington's Conclusion (Part III),

Black American Sociologists is divided into two primary sections. Part I examines

"theoretical debates about the role of black sociologists," with a primary focus on

Chicago School black sociologists who studied and worked with Robert Park. For

example, Part I hosts the Bowser-Watts debate, a theoretically stimulating interpretative

exchange over the forces and structures (i.e., slavery, colonialism, professionalism of

sociology, racial segregation and conflict in society, the institutional power of white

sociologists, ideas and research controlled by whites, and hostility toward dissent from

mainstream sociological thought) that shaped the sociological thought of FGBS and

SGBS. After the Bowser-Watts essays, Alford A. Young, Jr. presents a critical, yet

sympathetic analysis of Johnson's and Frazier's sociology, demonstrating that, while

they reproduced certain elements of white mainstream sociological thought and

practices, Johnson and Frazier were also behind the "constitution of a black sociological

tradition" from 1920 to 1935.[23] Concluding Part I, Wilber Watson's "The Idea of Black

Sociology: Its Cultural and Political Significance" (2002) presents a theoretical

understanding of black sociology.

After a historical-intellectual review of the more visible SGBS, like Charles S.

Johnson and E. Franklin Frazier (discussed later in this work), and theoretical analyses

of the existence and meaning of black sociology, Part II examines "lesser known black

sociological careers," specifically St. Clair Drake, Horace Cayton, Walter R. Chivers,

---

[23] Young argues that Frazier and Johnson are behind a "constitution of a black tradition," a much stronger, more accurate proclamation than Mary Jo Deegan's (2002) claim that Frazier and Johnson are *part* of the African American Chicago School of Race Relations (AACSRR), a "segment" of Chicago School Race Relations (CSRR) and, more specifically, the 'Parkian' Chicago School of Race Relations (PCSRR). See Chapter V.

Charles H. Parrish, Daniel Thompson and Butler A. Jones. In this section, one discovers

the nearly forgotten thoughts and practices of the more marginalized SGBS, a range of

sociologists and scholar-activists who were uncomfortable in and worked outside

mainstream sociology. These sociologists engaged non-mainstream sociological

investigations of the African Diaspora, advanced innovative theoretical and

methodological sociological approaches like "situational sociology" and "pragmatist

sociology," a sociological approach geared to attaining black political and civil rights.

Moreover, they promoted alternative and "interdisciplinary approaches to sociology."

Black American Sociologists concludes with Robert E. Washington's "Sociology by

Blacks Versus Black Sociology: Revisioning Black American Social Reality" (2002),

which presents a critique of [white] liberal ideology, a necessary procedure for "revising

black American social reality" and developing a black sociology.

As with other works on black sociologists, because of their utter neglect and

importance, I again briefly review each chapter in *The Black Sociologists* as a means of

providing short analytic summaries that can direct readers to specific subject matter and

themes of black sociologists. Cunnigen's Introduction, "Second Generation Black

Sociologists Discover a 'Place' in American Sociology," states that "if we are to

comprehend these African American sociologists' worldview [SGBS], we must

understand their social-historical development as an intellectual community in

relationship to both 'mainstream' sociological scholarship and the surrounding society"

(2002:xii). The Introduction notes that black sociological thought can be broken down

into different periods, and explains that the reason the book focuses on SGBS---Frazier,

Johnson, Drake Cayton and "lesser known members"---is that "their experiences reveal important insights into the impact of racial segregation on the development of black sociology" (2002:xiii).

After providing a brief overview of the racist origins and development of sociology and describing how racism was early embedded in the study of American race relations, Cunnigen traces black sociology's development both outside and inside the academic profession. He acknowledges the influences of Robert Park and Gunnar Myrdal on SGBS, and explains that SGBS "had to project an intellectual outlook that was acceptable to mainstream sociologists [like Park and Myrdal] in order to get access to research support and publishing outlets" (2002:xxii-iii). Cunnigen then sets a critical tone for the rest of the book with the following words:

> Overall, it seems accurate to say, the intellectual promise of the second-generation African American sociologists was stunted by racial segregation, which blocked their access to positions in major research universities and professional recognition and rewards through scholarly productivity.
>
> In retrospect, if these African-American sociologists had a single major weakness, it was, as we suggested above, their acquiescence to the assimilationist theoretical model. However, it is important to recognize that their training and limited career options provided them few opportunities to pursue alternative theoretical models without jeopardizing their careers. Mainstream white American sociology hardly tolerated challenges to its dominant theoretical models, and challenges from marginalized African American sociologists would have been easily thwarted. As Key put it, the "dominant group [of sociologists were] not compelled to question or make sense of most of their values. Many [took them] for granted, as normative (2002:xxv).

In his two-page introduction to Part I, Conflicting Conceptions of the Turf: Theoretical Debates about the Social Role of Black Sociologists, Robert Washington writes, "chapters in this section examine theoretical issues pertaining to the work of

early black sociologists, with particular emphasis on implications of their sociological writings on black America, as a distinctive mode of intellectual discourse" (2002:1). The first essay, Benjamin Bowser's "The Contribution of Blacks to Sociological Knowledge: A Problem of Theory and Role to 1950," aims "to do four things: 1) show the circumstances under which the social sciences emerged, 2) show that the resulting role the social sciences movement took on in England and later in the United States was anti-black, 3) examine the contribution and potential contribution that the first two generations of black sociologists might have made, and 4) provide a historic context of the establishment of the present and third generation of black sociologists" (2002:4).

Bowser presents an historical review that traces anti-black and colonialist thought back to England and British social thinkers, particularly Herbert Spencer and Rev. Thomas Chalmers. According to Bowser, "by the second half of the nineteenth century, the more conservative tradition of Spencer and the social Darwinists dominated England, while the economic liberalism of Chalmers' case study approach survived in social work. It was these two lines of thinking which were exported to the industrial United States and within which the first generation of blacks in American 'sociology' had to work" (2002:8). In a section on first generation sociologists: W.E.B. Du Bois, George Haynes, and John Daniels, we learn little about these black sociologists, but are, however, treated to a summary of racist thinking of white American sociologists---George Fitzhugh, Henry Hughes, William Sumner, Lester Ward, Franklin Giddings, Edward Ross---that the first generation black sociologist were up against. Even white sociologists such as Howard Odum, Charles Cooley, Mark Baldwin, and Charles

Ellwood, while no longer reflecting a "racial opinion" like their predecessors, established a "social theory [that] appeared to be 'neutral,' in which "one could not know the author's opinion or theoretical application" of race since racist ideas and practices were now viewed as "neutral" (2002:13).

Black sociologists' marginalization as outsiders [experienced by Du Bois, Haynes, and Daniels] "changed somewhat for the second generation of black sociologists, Johnson, Frazier, Doyle, Drake, Reid, as they entered sociology through the University of Chicago (2002:13). Bowser details how the second generation was divided between the more Parkean-influenced camp of Frazier and Johnson and the "counter tradition of a Boas-influenced William L. Warner" and Du Boisian tradition that is discovered in the work of Drake, Cayton, Reid and Doyle (2002:16).[24] Bowser concludes with observations about how white sociologists' work was promoted, while black sociologists' work, of equal or better sociological value, was disregarded. Sociological works by white sociologists like Warner, Robert and Helen Lynd, Gunnar Myrdal, and Talcott Parsons would become classics in sociology. In contrast, the great sociological works by Drake and Cayton, Oliver Cox, and Charles Johnson (as well as Du Bois, Haynes, Frazier and all the other black sociologists who wrote classic works) were "isolated." In sum, the black sociologists and their works "did not fit into the needs or interests of white sociologists" (2002:16-7).

---

[24] William L Warner, who authored *Yankee City Series* (1941-59), was a cultural anthropologist, and Franz Boas, another cultural anthropologist, was influential in discrediting social Darwinist thought, biological determinism, and the idea of pure races.

Jerry Watts' essay, "On Reconsidering Park, Johnson, Du Bois, Frazier, and Reid: Reply to Benjamin Bowser's 'The Contribution of Blacks to Sociological Knowledge,'" presents what appears to be a rather weak critique of Bowser, while managing to further advance the dialogue about the importance of black sociology.[25] Thus, the essay is useful on a number of levels (adding more historical and factual information), but, theoretically, many (but not all) of Watts' criticisms of Bowser's sociological interpretations are off-the-mark. Rather than engage the full range of the debate, let me highlight three important points of contention that Watts has with Bowser's *Phylon* June 1981 article (leaving out the debate over Robert Park, E. Franklin Frazier, Booker T. Washington, and W.E.B. Du Bois). First, Watts finds that Bowser misapprehends the influence of Spencer's sociological thought and social Darwinism. Second, he refutes "Bowser's claim that the emergence of Robert Park and the Chicago School of Sociology became the force which repressed the social-work-inspired social-conditionality approach of Du Bois and his black contemporaries," and lastly, he downgrades Bowser's emphasis on the close relation between Robert Park and Booker T. Washington (2002:24-26, 29, 31).

Watts' claim that social Darwinism is refuted and replaced by Albion Small, Robert Park, and other early American white sociologists is based on arguments made by early American white sociologists, arguments that sought a divorce from social Darwinist thought while maintaining newly formed social Darwinist thought in practice but not in name. In other words, just because one says one is not a social Darwinist does

---

[25] Rodney Coates (2004) disagrees with my assessment of the debate, finding Watts essay to be the more sound of the three. See *Contemporary Sociology* 33(1):26-7

not mean that one is not a social Darwinist. All indications of early American sociological thought demonstrate a lingering connection to the basic tenets of social Darwinism and Comtean social philosophy, the intellectual framework largely influencing social Darwinism. Watts continues his critique of Bowser by arguing that Park's and the Chicago School's ascendancy did not necessarily damage the "social-work-inspired social-conditionality approach of Du Bois and his black contemporaries." He finds that Park's mentoring of Johnson and Frazier led them to pursue 'positive' social reform related sociology and that the Park-Washington relationship wasn't a strong one (no stronger than the relationship between Du Bois and Park), highly dubious claims that a number of scholars reject (Deegan 2002; Feagin 2001; Stanfield 1985; Steinberg 2007).

Aside from serious misinterpretations of several key theoretical issues with regard to the development of black and white sociology, Watts provides a number of propositions, along with interesting historical episodes (like the interpersonal relations among black sociologists) and facts (lists of important texts and names of "white social scientists" who studied blacks during the period of SGBS) that deserve further consideration by future sociologists.

Watts' critique does not go unanswered. In "Classical Black Sociologists and Social Theory: Anatomy of a Controversy," Bowser alerts the reader that "Watts did not correct my 'errors' as much as he provided additional insights and perspectives on early Black sociologists and how they worked within hostile theoretical framework" (2002:49). He answers Watts' discussion of social Darwinism, Park's supposed

reformism (and supposed relationship with Du Bois), and the matter of Washington's influence on Park. During the discussion, Bowser breaks from the debate and makes several observations. He argues that "the only member of the second generation of Black sociologists to produce formal sociological theory was Oliver Cox" and that Cox's "contribution was to Marxist theory," not 'black sociological theory.' Bowser finds that both he and Watts neglect understanding why the second generation reflected such ambivalence about Black culture (2002:62, 64). The essay by recognizing that not all blacks ignored black culture, noting that Du Bois and other black thinkers of the Negro Renaissance, who were outside of mainstream society, were continually promoting works about the vitality of black culture. Yet, he also notes that black sociologists did not share the same freedom to discuss black culture and ideas.

> Unlike the writers and artists who were free to create, and who had other Black people as audiences, the sociologists were not free. They were not writing for their students or the Black community. They were writing for what we now refer to as "public policy." In another words, they were writing then as now to convince powerful White interests to improve conditions for African Americans…Powerful interests such as Andrew Carnegie and power brooking scientists such as Robert Park could not deal with the idea that African customs and Beliefs may have survived slavery and were still around to "pollute" American culture in the assimilation process Park foresaw. So the second generation black sociologists as well as contemporary scholars with access to power leave the cultural question alone (2002:68).

In "'The Negro Problem' and the Character of the Black Community: Charles Johnson, E. Franklin Frazier, and the Constitution of a Black Sociological Tradition, 1920-1935," Alford A. Young, Jr. maintains "that Charles Johnson contributed to a social-psychological perspective concerning the content of Afro-American social character and culture, while Frazier developed a social organizational perspective."

Young argues that Johnson and Frazier "were central figures in the emergence of the black sociological canon---a canon that specially concerned itself with defining "the social and cultural character of black America" (2002:72). Young surveys white racialist thought in early American sociology, noting that that early American sociologists "explicitly and implicitly asserted that the black experience in America would necessarily have to be an effort to adapt to the normative process of American life…complete adaptation was the only option available for blacks" (2002:77). Young argues that an "Afro-American Social Science Tradition" develops in contrast to the concepts and theories of early white sociology, providing a challenge to white sociological thought. Because of his concern with the black community, racism and un-equalized race relations, Du Bois (along with Kelly Miller and George Edmund Haynes) is identified as a prime example of this counter-tradition.

Young locates Park at the transition in American sociology from heredity understandings of ethno-racial groups to environmental explanations and at the center of "structuring the sociological paradigm for studies of race relations," a restructuring with its own set of problems, including failure to move away from hereditary understandings of different races and ethnicities that are in fact socially constructed. Park's race relations cycle and related theory of assimilation are two key features of the restructuring. Problematically, the cycle's implications that white mainstream culture was the ideal to which blacks must assimilate denied the value of black culture and the significant black experience. "Park believed that blacks retained no African cultural resources," and believed that they should remain accommodationist as long as whites

were hostile to their progress. This thinking was passed on to Park's black students. As Young observes, "the race relations cycle of Robert Park, and his views on the culture of Afro-Americans and Africans, affected the sociological development of his two most prolific students, Charles Johnson and E. Franklin Frazier" (2002:85-6).

After explaining Johnson's contributions to the "social-psychological dimensions of the Negro problem" and the Frazier's contribution to the "social-organizational dimensions of the Negro problem," Young explains that "Johnson and Frazier helped to further race studies by enhancing methodological and conceptual approaches to the study of black Americans that de-legitimated the racialist paradigm preceding their work" (2002:102). Young concludes by arguing that cotemporary "Afro-American social scientists" are still forced to demonstrate blacks' capacities and contributions in the social world, "a progressive extension of …Charles S. Johnson and E. Franklin Frazier to the constitution of a black sociological tradition" (2002:104).

Wilbur Watson's "The Idea of Black Sociology: Its Cultural and Political Significance" recognizes that black sociology is "ambiguous" and misunderstood and thus offers an "ideal type of Black sociology," one based on several characteristics. According to Watson, "the ideal type of Black sociology was defined in terms of research (1) initiated by Black sociologist, (2) with a primary focus on Black social behavior, and (3) with a commitment to the liberation of Black people from social oppression" (2002:118). He posits that black sociology emphasizes:

> (1) Identifying factors that contribute to an understanding of Black people's behavior including determinants of social oppression, which when eradicated will facilitate the release of Black people from race-related social oppression; (2) racial- and class-based analyses of intergroup relations, especially focusing on

social conflict and social change; and (3) critical perspectives in analyses of "established" social institutions with a focus on identifying racist survivals in the structures and social effects of existing organizations (2002:119).

Among other useful suggestions and explications of black sociology and race relations research, Watson argues that whites' behavior in the system of social oppression must be analyzed. "From the point of view of some Black sociologists [Frazier 1947; Forsythe 1975; Bryce-Laporte 1975], there has been an 'elitist-like' indifference manifested by some mainstream [white] sociologists when issue are raised about the need for critical analyses of the structural determinants of White people's behavior in race relations" (2002:115). Watson states that black sociology should continue to address critically whites' beliefs in gradual changes in race relations, the blame-the-victim arguments of whites, whites' ignoring white racism and claims to 'value-free' analysis (2002:119).

In "Outside the Spotlight: Case Studies of Lesser Known Black Sociological Careers," Donald Cunnigen introduces Part II of *The Black Sociologists*. Cunnigen states that the "articles in this section examine the careers of a select group of second generation Black sociologists," namely St. Clair Drake, Horace Cayton, Butler, Jones, Daniel Thompson, Charles Parrish, and Walter Chivers. These sociologists were influenced by "the larger social forces that affected their generation, particularly the Great Depression, World War Two, and the gradual post war tide of black civil rights protests" (2002:124).

In "Studies of the African Diaspora: The Work and Reflection of St. Clair Drake" (1989), Benjamin Bowser reports his interview with the anthropologist-

sociologist Drake. Drake's autobiographical reflections, which contain the names of numerous important texts in race relations research and black studies, particularly Africana studies and studies of the African Diaspora, cannot be addressed here, but are required reading in the field of black sociology.[26] Aside from learning more about his three major works, *Deep South* (1941), *Black Metropolis* (1945), co-authored with Horace Cayton, and *Black Folk Here and There* (1987), it is interesting to learn about Drake's later years. In the later part of his life, he embraced the shifts to more critical African-centered and black American-centered sociological knowledge and investigation, particularly employed to dispel widespread "Aryan" and "Hamitic" myths of racial superiority (2002:150). Drake presents a list of 16 future research projects in addition to his many past projects, demonstrating his eruditeness and the enormity of unresolved social issues that he wished to tackle. After listing his research plans, Drake ends his interview exclaiming that his "contributions have not been in mainstream Anthropology, but rather in area studies and peripheral theoretical questions" (2002:153).

Bowser's follow-up on the Drake interview, "Retrospective on St. Clair Drake," provides a strong overview of Drake's personal history, especially the background to the development of *Black Metropolis*, the importance of the 1930s for black advancement

---

[26] See, for example: Martin Bernal's *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization* (1987); Cheikh Diop's *The African Origins of Civilization* (1974); Joseph Harris' *Global Dimensions of the Diaspora* (1982); Chancellor Williams' *The Destruction of African Civilization* (1971); George Jackson's Introduction to African Civilization (1970/1990); Amos Wilson's *The Falsification of Afrikan Consciousness: Eurocentric History, Psychiatry and the Politics of White Supremacy* (1993); P. Morgan and S. Hawkins' *Black Experience and the Empire* (2006); Albert Murray's *The Omni-Americans: Black Experience and American Culture* (1970a); and, Isidore Okpewho, Carole Boyce Davies, and Ali A. Mazrui's *The African Diaspora: African Origins and New World Identities* (1999).
.

and the importance of the Communist Party's aid during this period, and Drake's shift

away from exclusive concern with US race relations research. Bowser notes:

> By 1945 Drake had served in the U.S. Maritime Service during the War, completed *Black Metropolis* with Horace Cayton and contributed to *An American Dilemma*. Drake characterized this point in his career in the following way, "from 1935 to 1945, my attention was focused on trying to understand patterns of racial segregation in the United States and the dynamics of changing this segregation. After the War, I decided to view race relations in the United States in a comparative context." From 1947 to 1953, he completed fieldwork and wrote a doctoral dissertation on value systems, social structure, and race relations in Great Britain. From 1954 to 1965, Drake went back and forth between West Africa and Chicago. In 1954 he taught in Liberia and spent nine months in The Gold Coast as it became a politically independent Ghana; from 1958 to 1961 he was a professor and head of the Sociology Department at University of Ghana; he returned to Ghana in 1965 (2002:166).

Bowser ends the essay by pointing to two of Drake's comparative works, *Black Folk Here and There* (1987) and *Africa and The Black Diaspora* (1995), an unpublished three volume work. He argues that in these studies "sociologists may find the beginnings of that comparative perspective that Drake felt would move us to make vastly more substantial contributions to our community's self understanding and well-being, and bring us into what Oliver Cox called 'the bigger picture'" (2002:173).

Robert E. Washington's essay, "Horace Cayton: Reflections on an Unfulfilled Sociological Career," is "organized in four sections: first, a brief narrative of Cayton's social background and life experiences before he became a sociologist; second, an account of his sociological career; third, an explanation of his departure form sociology; fourth, and finally, an explanation of what became of his quest for an alternative intellectual career" (2002:176-77). Washington presents a picture of Cayton as a tragic figure in American sociology, who possessed "identity confusion derived from his

simultaneous feelings of attachment and hostility toward the white American social

world." Washington writes:

> What's especially revealing about Cayton's dichotomous conception of identity---acceptance by whites or pride in blackness---is that he possessed neither. Yet, because of his attraction to the white American social world, he remained pre-occupied with this feeling of resentment resulting from white exclusion. As a consequence, the problem of race relations became for him a matter not of trying to explain the social structural forces---the political, economic and cultural dynamics---of racial oppression. Rather it became a matter of trying to explain causes and effects of racial rejection in interpersonal relations" (2002:195).

Washington notes that Cayton's earlier sociological insights in *Black Metropolis*

were actually more theoretically sound than his later sociological views, which had

become infested with psychological uncertainties and psychologically-rooted social

explanations absent in his earlier writings. Washington ends with a rather pathetic

statement about Cayton's place in black sociological tradition.

> Cayton's new perspective [in his later years] reinforced his intellectual confusion by deluding him into believing that the problem of black racial oppression could be understood and resolved at the level of interpersonal relations. This was hardly a compelling formulation. Anguished, derivative, and simplistic, his psychoanalytic perspective not only lacked the insightfulness of his earlier sociological work; it failed to comprehend the root causes of his difficulties, the systematic forces of racism, the perils of assimilation and the abyss of self-hatred, that resulted in his tragically unfulfilled intellectual potential (2002:197).

In "Walter Chivers: An Advocate of Situation Sociology," Charles Willie

informs the reader that Chivers taught a generation of black sociologists at Morehouse

College, including James Conyers, Richard Hope, Butler Jones, Martin Luther King, Jr.

and Willie among others (2002:205). "Despite his relative professional invisibility in

sociology nationally, Butler Jones said that 'it is doubtful that any other black sociologist

has had a more seminal influence upon the development of [other] black sociologists

(1974:148)" (2002:201). Willie explains that "Chivers was an advocate of situation

sociology, viewing social problems such as criminality, rioting, daily gambling on

numbers, mental illness, and mortality among blacks as situationally determined"

(2002:208). According to Willie, Chivers argued that black problems stem from "the

refusal of whites to implement their responsibility as dominant members in the power

structure to correct wrongs."

> Chivers saw blacks and whites connected in a symbiotic power relationship in
> which the more powerful had to act in a particular way if the less powerful was
> to be delivered from misery and misfortune. Chivers believed it was incumbent
> on whites to make the first move to overcome the social pathologies of racial
> oppression (2002:210).

Willie finishes the essay by explaining that Chivers wished for a "society that is

fair" and "he believed the leaders of a society should be moral, and that moral leaders

are ethical and honest people who prevent disaster even if they cannot create utopia"

(2002:210).

In "Using Pragmatist Sociology for Praxis: The Career of Charles H. Parrish,"

Anthony Blasi exposes biographical details and the "pragmatic" sociological approach

of one of the least-known black sociologists. Blasi observes that Parrish's "guiding

perspective during his involvement with the Civil Rights movement reflected the

"Chicago school" approach [to race relations]. He was a student of George H. Mead and

"often used to speak principally of Robert Park and Herbert Blumer" (2002:215). Blasi

writes:

> Before earning a Ph.D. in sociology from Chicago (1944), he served as state
> director for the Works Progress Administration project, "Study of Negro White
> Collar Workers" (1936), and received an appointment from E. Franklin Frazier to
> supervise the collection of life histories from African American children and

youths in Louisville (1936-1938)…Parrish used carbon copies of the interview transcripts and notes made during his interviews, for his dissertation on the role of skin color shade in concepts of self and others among African American children and youth" (2002:215-6).

Parrish's sociological pragmatism was kick-started in the Black Civil Rights struggles of the 1950s surrounding racial integration. As Blasi describes, "Parrish was keenly interested in the integration process, and upon integrating the faculty at the University Louisville himself in 1951 he found himself to be an 'activist' by default." Parrish activism was further put to use as a researcher–negotiator. "In February and March, 1954, anticipating a favorable decision on public school integration from the United States Supreme Court, the Southern Regional Council secured the services of Parrish to travel throughout Alabama to draw together local discussion groups on the schools and the courts" (2002:220, 222). His knowledge and experiences of the interconnection of whites' social power and racial prejudices led Parrish to write an insightful note to Kenneth Clark (1955), which 'pragmatically' stated: "I share with you a distrust of programs based upon a [Parkean] gradualist, 'cart-before-the-horse' philosophy that people must somehow be persuaded to change their attitudes as a preliminary step toward desegregation. It is unrealistic to hope that people will relinquish their prejudices as a result of propaganda alone as long as they are continuing to function in a situation which supports these prejudices" (2002:224). Parrish's words demonstrate an understanding of whites' power in shaping social reality for other people, which is often overlooked by white sociologists and some black sociologists. As long as the whites strive to maintain power, the study of racial prejudices will never cease, as sociological studies of race demonstrate today.

In "Daniel C. Thompson and Butler A. Jones: A Comparison of Interdisciplinary Approaches to Sociology," Donald Cunnigen begins discussion of Thompson and Jones by noting their similar educational experiences studying at Morehouse, Atlanta University, and northern PhD granting institutions and their experiences teaching at black colleges. As he was finishing his dissertation at New York University, Jones taught at a mostly black elite college, Talladega, before moving to the mostly white Ohio Wesleyan University. He later moved to Cleveland State University, where he worked "until his retirement in 1982." As Cunnigen notes, Jones "became known by his colleagues as a teacher-activist" (2002:240). Thompson studied with Robert Merton (later moving with Merton to Columbia), Pitirim Sorokin, and Talcott Parsons at Harvard, where "he received a master of arts degree in social relations" (2002:245). "Like Jones, he viewed his role as scholar-activist" (2002:258).

Both Jones and Thompson were active in professional organizations seeking social change and justice for black Americans. After earning a PhD at Columbia, Jones served as editor and a referee for several sociological journals, *Social Problems*, *Sociological Focus* and *The Black Sociologist*; Thompson focused studies of social stratification, writing *The Negro Leadership Class* and *The Black Elite---A Profile of Graduates of UNCF Colleges*. While leaving out much of the information contained in Cunnigen's essay, especially with regard to Jones' and Thompson's civic activity, it must be noted that "Thompson and Jones contributed to African-American sociological tradition through their research and political activism…Despite their shortcomings (descriptive rather than analytic sociological work and assimilationist/accommodationist

perspectives), their work stands as a monument to 'African-American sociology'" (2002:285-86).

Part III, "Conclusion: An Overview on the Black Intellectual Encounter with Sociology," ends *Black American Sociologists* with Robert Washington's "Sociology by Blacks versus Black Sociology: Revisioning Black American Social Reality." Washington's goal is to expose and offer a critique of the liberal ideological hegemony of past black sociology and then present the contours of new and improved "genuine black sociology." He contrasts the ideologically unconscious and unreflexive black sociological writings of the past to the ideologically conscious and reflexive writings that…must develop in the future" with genuine black sociology (2002:334). Virtually no black sociologist, nor white sociologist, escapes Washington's critique of a white dominated and guided sociological tradition that continues to damage and stunt the growth of black sociology. Washington names sociologists who promote the unreflexive liberal ideology: W.E.B. Du Bois, Robert Park, E. Franklin Frazier, Charles Johnson, Gunnar Myrdal, Gordon Allport, Theodor Adorno, Nathan Glazer, Patrick Moynihan, James Coleman, Edward Banfield, Arthur Jensen, Charles Murray, Richard Herrnstein, William Wilson, Robin Williams and Gerald Jaynes.

Offering closing advice for a program "toward a genuine black sociology," Washington presents the do's and don'ts of black sociology. He states that black sociologists should avoid polarization, quit "confusing the liberal assimilationist ideology with the principle of civil society," and reject racism, while simultaneously promoting a black worldview, black experience of social reality, black theoretical

explanations of the social world, a scholarly journal of black sociology, and

communications and programs with the black community (2002:364-6). Washington

finds:

> Our search for understanding through social analysis is conditioned by how we resolve long-standing controversies, not the least of which is the relationship between ideology and science. In the case of African captured in the West (particularly in the United States of America), that has all too often been resolved by black intellectuals acquiescing to a white social science. This has meant swallowing the most favorable white positions without piercing through to the implicit ideological assumptions really used to guide history with white interests (2002:331).

Conclusion

As the three major works on black sociologists indicate, a rich, untapped history and

intellectual tradition of black sociologists' lives and works, ideas and practices, exist.

Even the most well-known black sociologists, their ideas and practices, are marginalized

in the discipline. Those that do address the major black sociologists' work continue to be

perplexed by the balancing acts (some may say 'contradictions') and complexities that

black sociologists performed throughout their careers.

For example, Frazier, despite his embrace of assimilationist ideologies and

disavowal of African cultural traditions in America, recognized that the integration that

most assimilationists espoused was unavailable to blacks, as his 'breeching experiments'

(see Chapter V) and more critical writings demonstrate. Knowing whites attitudes

toward blacks, Frazier was not the kind of assimilationist who believed that blacks' goal

was complete absorption into white society (the white social world). Charles Johnson's

'accommodationism' had its positive effects of developing the Fisk University

Department of Sociology and funding a number of his black colleagues and students. And, Du Bois' willingness to occasionally work with white organizations and individuals, groups such as the early NAACP and American Communist Party and individuals like William James and Herbert Aptheker, does not diminish the meaningfulness of his pointed critiques of whites.

Numerous black sociologists have been forgotten as noted in the essays by Butler Jones, and James Conyers and Edgar Epps in *Black Sociologists* and essays by Benjamin Bowser, Jerry Watts, Donald Cunnigen, Robert Washington, and Charles Willie in The *Black American Sociologists*. As Jacquelyne Jackson (1974) reveals that, while marginalization of black male sociologists is endemic, marginalization of black women is worse yet.

The Black Sociologists, Black Sociologists and *Black American Sociologists* present many snapshots and voices that expose the story of black sociologists and various meanings of black sociology, but none of the books offer an overarching theory of black sociology, nor a clear conceptual understanding of the meaning of the concept, black sociologist. The most systematic approach to explaining the meaning of black sociology and succinct explanation of what it means to be a black sociologist---roles of the black sociologist---is found in Joyce Ladner's *The Death of White Sociology* (1973) and Robert Staples' *Introduction to Black Sociology* (1976), works providing a theoretical understanding of black sociology to which I now turn.

CHAPTER III

THE DEATH OF WHITE SOCIOLOGY AND INTRODUCTION TO BLACK

SOCIOLOGY

Two works on black sociology, Joyce Ladner's edited volume, *The Death of White Sociology* (1973) and Robert Staples' *Introduction to Black Sociology* (1976), formulate a theoretical understanding of black sociology and the tasks that are entailed with being a black sociologist. The works represent not only a statement about the theoretical meaning of black sociology but a statement concerning black sociology's position as a sociological framework for understanding and developing the social world in a new light. Both are revolutionary sociological studies challenging the basic tenets of mainstream sociology that is controlled by whites.

The Death of White Sociology **(1973)***,* **Joyce A. Ladner (ed.)**

Unlike *The Black Sociologists*, *Black Sociologists*, and *Black American Sociologists*, which presents a historical review and sampling of black sociologists' writings in the early twentieth century, *The Death of White Sociology* (*Death of White Sociology*), edited by Joyce A. Ladner in 1973, is actually the first book that attempts "to establish basic premises, guidelines, concerns and priorities which can be useful" for theoretically defining "Black sociology." Ladner and the authors included in this work, mostly black, "present a set of statements that attempt to define the emerging field of Black Sociology" (1973c:xix). Equally important for purposes of this study, several of the

authors also provide definitions of white sociology in the pursuit of defining black sociology. Throughout the essays, a major theme arises that indicates black thought and actions and black sociology are viewed as a contrasting sets of ideas and actions that challenge the ideas and actions of whites and white sociology.

Death of White Sociology includes not just black sociologists but a range of black social thinkers---literary artists and critics, philosophers, political scientists, economists, academic administrators, psychologists, historians, and black studies, community development, and urban planning scholars. This array of social thinkers provides a broad range of topics that represent many of the sociological themes that black sociologists and black sociology address. Part I and II of the book focus on black sociologists, graduate students, intellectuals, and scholars, racism in the academy, the American Dilemma, white norms, issues of equality and non-equality, racist ideology, white theories of black deviance and methods of proving blacks inferior. With its set of theoretical essays, Part III contains the most useful essays for defining black sociology. Parts IV through VII provide a necessary overview of "black psychology," the "black perspective in social research," "subjective sociological research" of blacks, "institutional racism," and "future trends" in black social science. While all the essays in this volume desire special consideration, I will only focus on Ladner's Introduction in detail, providing brief summaries of the other essays. The following discussion of the other essays will therefore be limited to identifying each essay and giving a sentence or two summation of their intent. After this outline of the *Death of White Sociology*, I will examine more

closely Ladner's Introduction, which yields a sound theoretical perception of black

sociology.

In Part I, The Socialization of Black Sociologists, Bracey, Meier, and Rudwick's

Introduction to *The Black Sociologists* is re-presented. Next, in "The Furious Passage of

the Black Graduate Student" (1970), Douglas Davidson describes the trials of blacks in

education with a personal account of his experiences studying sociology at University of

California of Berkeley, a department that hosts and promotes "white liberal colonizers"

who "*see[s] nothing of value in Blackness*" and who exploit, dismiss or attempt to co-opt

Black students (1970/1973b:35). E. Franklin Frazier's "The Failure if the Negro

Intellectual" (1962) delivers a brutal assessment of the failures, broken promises, and

exclusion of white American society that threatens the path of the black intellectual and

black community. Challenging those who would label him an unqualified assimilationist

and echoing Frederick Douglass' 1852 "Fourth of July Speech," he writes:

> [T]he nation has ignored and repudiated the central fact which is the most
> important element in the boasted moral idealism of the United States. The Negro
> is left out of the celebration both physically and as part of the heritage of
> America…Confronted with this fact, the Negro intellectual should not be
> consumed by his frustrations. He must rid himself of his obsession with
> assimilation. He must come to realize that integration should not mean
> annihilation---self-effacement, the escaping from his identification
> (1962/1973:66).

Nathan Hare's "The Challenge of a Black Scholar" (1969) argues that the "black

scholar's main task is to cleanse his mind---and the minds of his people---of the white

colonial attitudes toward scholarship and people as well. This conceptual cleansing

includes the icons of objectivity, amoral knowledge and its methodology, and the total

demolition of the antisocial attitudes of Ivory-Towerism" (1969/1973:78). In some ways,

Hare is recycling a newer more improved version of Comte's notion of 'mental hygiene,' the action of avoiding other people's ideas and theories

Part II, The Sociological Victimization of Black Americans: A Critique, begins with Ralph Ellison's "An American Dilemma: A Review" (1964), a questioning of the meaning of white "American culture" and its "higher values," often viewed in contrast to "Negro culture" and the black community's "social pathologies." In addition to its implicit reinforcement of the white superiority-black inferiority argument, Ellison also recognizes that Myrdal's study fails to acknowledge the significance of black rejection of the negative, pathological aspects of white American culture ("lynching and Hollywood") and, in contrast, the "great value" and "richness" of black culture (1973:94-5).

In "White Norms, Black Deviation," Albert Murray (1970b/1973:111-12) states that "there is little reason why Negroes should not regard contemporary social science theory and technique with anything except the most unrelenting suspicion." Murray (112) proceeds to deliver a stunning critique of problems associated with white social science researchers' mechanisms of bypassing certain social truths in order to maintain 'dominant' theories of whites' supremacy.

> It seems altogether likely that white people in the United States will continue to reassure themselves with black images derived from the folklore of white supremacy and the fakelore of black pathology so long as segregation enables them to ignore the actualities. They can afford such self-indulgence only because they carefully avoid circumstances that would require a confrontation with their own contradictions. Not having to suffer the normal consequences of sloppy thinking, they can blithely obscure any number of omissions and misinterpretations with no trouble al all. They can explain them away with terminology and statistical razzle-dazzle. They can treat the most ridiculous self-refutation as if it were a moot question; and of course they can simply shut off

discussion by changing the subject [or, through control of journals and other venues of communication, never allowing certain subjects any forum for discussion] (1970b/1973:112).

In "Proving Blacks Inferior: The Sociology of Knowledge" (1965), Rhett Jones explores the question of why black scholars have internalized negative views of themselves. He finds that "a vicious cycle" is in operation:

> Whites believed Blacks to be inferior. Therefore white scientists believed them inferior and their experiments 'proved' them to be. The proof offered by these scientists reinforced the beliefs of the general white population…An unhappy by-product of this cycle was that a number of Blacks came to believe themselves inferior, too" (1965/1973:134).

Jones concludes that social science's negative views of blacks will not change until society's negative views of blacks, and positive views of whites, change, a conclusion that demonstrates the intimate links between white racism in social science and white racism in society, and a theme that develops throughout this study. Sidney Wilhelm's "Equality: America's Racist ideology" (1971) presents a highly critical analysis of white America's racist past and present treatment of blacks and Native Americans. He argues that racism perpetually develops new forms and modes of operation to justify segregation and negation of people of color. Paradoxically, the latest form of racism that replaces "racial discrimination" is "racial equality," the ideology most central in supporting racial separation and continued white superiority.

> Whites are more anxious than ever to introduce equality where equality introduces racial division within America. For the arrangement then allows for Negro removal from the affairs of White America in full compliance to an idealistic democratic precept, so vividly confirmed by the Supreme Court, rather

than entrance into mainstream America. Why discriminate when one can eliminate the Negro into nonexistence by practicing equality (1971/1973:145)?[27]

In Part III, Black Sociology: Toward a Definition of Theory, Robert Staples' essay, "What Is Black Sociology? Toward a Sociology of Black Liberation" (1973) presents one of the most elaborate definitions of black sociology. I skip this essay for now and review it in conjunction with his book, *Introduction to Black Sociology* [see below]. "Ideology of Black Social Science" (1969), by Abd-l Hakimu Ibn Alkaliamt (Gerald McWorter), espouses a black social science ideology that is critical of "the most favorable white positions [in the social sciences]" and "their implicit ideological assumptions really used to guide history with white interests." He states that blacks' struggle for liberation from white domination requires becoming aware of "the extent to which science is inevitably a hand servant to ideology, a tool for people to shape, if not create, reality" (1969/1973:174). Understanding the "connection between ideology and social analysis" and using that understanding in "a commitment to struggle for [black] liberation" are two primary goals of the essay.

Ronald Walters' "Toward a Definition of Black Social Science" (1973) states that white sociology is unable to fully grasp blacks' social situation and personal experiences and that it is therefore necessary to develop a black social science that recognizes the limitations as well as the possible benefits of social science when studying the black community. Speaking of "Black social science in a world where white social science dominates," Walters writes that Du Bois believed "that a scientific

---

[27] Wilhelm identifies racism's entrenchment in "democratic precepts," an understanding of the complicated meaning of democracy (I explore Du Bois' theoretical investigation of democracy in Chapter IX).

approach to the analysis of racism would help alleviate its poison…But just as important was his realization that he go only so far with the tools of social science, that some point he had to act out the moral and ethical implications of what his keen senses told him to be true" (1973:212). The conflictual and complementary relationship between moral and scientific approaches to sociology is another major theme important to understanding black and white sociology.

In "Radical Sociology and Blacks" (1973), Dennis Forsythe illustrates the problems of using a "Marxian model" as a primary tool for understanding the black social world. His basic argument is "white radical sociology performs the necessary function of demystifying bourgeois social science, but this does not give it the right or necessary prerequisites to study Blacks" (1973:233). This critique is relevant for social scientists who continue to address issues of blacks' psychosocial experience of institutionalized and structural white racism with ideas and methods that address class group conflict analysis and develop critiques of capitalist society without regard to race group conflict analysis and critique of racist society, and the overlap between the two.

James Turner's "The Sociology of Black Nationalism" (1969) notes that "ideological preoccupations of black nationalism revolve around this central problem, the black man's predicament of having been forced by historical circumstances into a state of dependence upon white society considered the master society and the dominant culture." Turner further states that "black nationalism can be seen as a counter-movement away from subordination to independence, from alienation through refutation, to self-affirmation" (1969/1973:234-5). "[I]nspired by a universal human need for

fulfillment," a sociology of black nationalism "take[s] the form of conscious cultivation of social and cultural pluralism and a movement toward political self-determination" (1969/1973:252).

In Part IV, Black Psychology: A New Perspective, Joseph White's "Guidelines for Black Psychologists" (1970) continues the argument that black scholarship and social science must break free from white social science paradigms and power structures.

> [Black psychologists] must begin to develop a model of black psychology which is free from the built-in assumptions and values of the dominant culture…We must develop a kind of psychological jiu-jitsu and recognize that what the dominant culture deems deviant or anti-social behavior might indeed be the functioning of a healthy black psyche which objectively recognizes the antagonisms of the white culture and develops machinery for coping with them (1970/1973:266).

William Cross, Jr.'s "The Negro-to Black-Conversion Experience" (1973) presents an "Afro-American model for self-actualization under conditions of oppression," one that prepares blacks "for participating in the mass struggle of Black people." Cross posits that a "black movement" of "self-actualization" aims to "synthesize rage, guilt and pride with ideas that lead to productive, creative action…whether we speak of relevant reform or preparation for revolution" (1973:285).

Joseph Scott's "Black Science and Nation-Building," in Part V, Toward a Black Perspective in Social Research, observes that an acknowledgement of the significant differences between black and white social experiences is a necessary prerequisites for any social science research and black nation-building. According to Scott, "[t]o continue to equate white experience with Black experience is fraudulent behavior." Instead, "the methodological aims of Black researchers should be" to "perceive, record and theorize

about the external world from the viewpoint of Black people" and "reevaluate and expose the inapplicabilities of all white experience theories and models as they have been applied to Black behavior" (1973:291, 308). In "Toward the Decolonization of Social Research" (1973), Robert Blauner and David Wellman argue that "social scientists are caught up in an enterprise that is part of the total structure of control and exploitation." This condition of colonized social science in a meta-colonized social system "raises the question of whether it is possible to decolonize research concerned with oppressed racial and economic groups when the fundamental relationship between these groups and the overall society is a colonial one" (1973:330).

Jerome Harris and William McCullough's essay, "Quantitative Methods and Black Community Studies" (1973), argues that, in the struggle for black "liberation and self-determination," the use of "quantitative methods, "despite the misuse often made of them," can help in lighting the way and allocating our resources most efficiently and effectively." (1973:332, 343). Harris and McCullough believe it is necessary to overcome barriers and aversion to quantitative analysis, since this methodology can be employed in the service of advancing black freedom. In "Issues and Crosscurrents in the Study of Organizations and the Black Communities," Walter Stafford discusses the ways that the black community is threatened by the development of complex organizations controlled and run by whites, which exclude blacks from "decision–making roles" and maintain black oppression (1973:365). Stafford calls for greater attention to understanding the ways that the ideas and actions of white organizations affect the black

community, understandings of organized dysfunctionality and organized exclusion that can lead to successful challenges to these white organizational and institutional systems.

Ethel Sawyer's "Methodological Problems in Studying So-Called 'Deviant' Communities" (1973) redirects questions about problems of the research process away from the subject/objects of study (e.g., groups, communities) to the researcher (who often goes unobserved). The "problems encountered by field workers" can be viewed as "methodological problems in the sense that the researcher himself is an instrument and a tool of research. Whatever affects him also affects his perspective toward his data, his performance in the field, the kinds of data he gathers and the conclusions he draws from them" (1973:379). In "Assessing Race Relations Research" (1970), Charles Saunders notes that "emphasis in all the [social science] literature thus far is the measurement of white attitude toward blacks," and that it is necessary to examine racial attitudes of blacks and whites that from a "black perspective." Saunders claims that it is not only necessary to have access to white attitudes about blacks (whether pro-black or anti-black) but also blacks' full range of attitudes about whites. He goes a step further and argues that blacks should focus on black attitudes about blacks as well as whites, a model whites might also emulate in order to become more self-reflexive.

Subjective Sociological Research, Part VI, includes Kenneth Clark's "Introduction to an Epilogue" from *Dark Ghetto* (1965), which examines the black experience in the urban "ghetto" setting of Harlem, an experience that relies more on useful "interpretative" social "truths" than damaging "empirical" statistical "facts." Clark states that *Dark Ghetto*'s story of black life in the "Negro ghetto" is a study that

"seeks to move, as far as it can, beyond a narrow view of fact, beyond the facts that are quantifiable and are computable, and that distort the actual lives of individual human beings into rigid statistics" (1965/1973:411). Joyce Ladner's "Tomorrow's Tomorrow: The Black Woman" (1971/1973a) observes that the challenges facing young black women are the same problems facing the wider black community. Ladner argues for "reinterpreting the many aspects of life that comprise the complex existence of American Black," and developing a new sociological paradigm that emanates from a re-interpretation of social reality.

> Instead of future studies being conducted on problems of the Black community as represented by the deviant perspective, there must be a redefinition of the problem as being that of institutional racism. If the social system is viewed as the source of the deviant perspective, then future research must begin to analyze the nature of oppression and the mechanisms by which institutionalized forms of subjugation are initiated and act to maintain the system intact. Thus, studies which have as their focal point the alleged deviant attitudes and behavior of Blacks are grounded within the racist assumptions and principles that only render Blacks open to further exploitation (1971/1973a:419).

In Part VII, Institutional Racism: Two Case Studies, Andrew Billingsley's essay, "Black Families and White Social Science" (1973), argues that "American social scientists will find no area of American life more glaringly ignored, more distorted, or more systematically disvalued than black family life" (1973:431). As Billingsley notes, "black families who have fared so ill historically in white American society have fared no better in white American social science, and largely for the same reasons" (1973:431-2). After exploring the disastrous white social science studies of the black family, he concludes that "the kind of leadership which is needed for a new series of studies of black family life in America is not likely to come from the white social science

establishment. This leadership must come from black scholars" (1973:450). In "The

Case of the Racist Researcher" (1971), Richard America warns that contemporary social

science researchers of the "knowledge industry" are "highly educated" and thus "their

racism often takes the relatively subtle form blacks have come to recognize in certain

types of corporate liberalism." America further notes that "the consultant and researcher

who is racist is also represented as an expert and a scientist, an objective and

dispassionate analyst who presents findings and conclusions backed by data and

evidence" (1971/1973:457).

Death of White Sociology concludes with Charles Hamilton's "Black Social

Scientists: Contributions and Problems" (1971), which recounts the obstacles historically

facing black social scientists (e.g., part of subjected and oppressed group; lack of

financial support, contending with white decision makers), but also offers advice and

tasks for building black sociology. Hamilton states that "it is not sufficient, although

crucial, to study only black people. White dominated political and economic institutions

that directly and indirectly oppress blacks must receive the immediate attention of black

social scientists," a 'white social problem' examined by Du Bois in the first decades of

the twentieth century. For Hamilton, blacks play a primary role not only as sociologists

in future sociological research but also as leaders in positive future social transformation.

> If this society is to change in any viable way, black people will, of necessity,
> have to play a leading role. It will be, in large measure, the new values, new
> insights, and new alternatives proposed by black people that will have the
> considerable legitimacy. It will not be without the kinds of hard work started by
> our giants of social science scholarship many decades ago (1971/1973b:476).

Ladner's Introduction, to which I now turn, presents one of the first theoretical explanations of black sociology and thus deserves closer inspection. According to Ladner (1973c:xix-xxi), black sociology has "evolved for two reasons: (1) as reaction to, and revolt against, the biases of 'mainstream' bourgeois, liberal sociology [or white sociology]; and (2) as a positive step toward setting forth basic definitions, concepts, and theory-building that utilize the experiences and histories of Afro-Americans." Black sociology battles the status quo and oppressive ideas and methods of white mainstream sociology that inhibits the "progressive changes that would insure that Blacks no longer experience…subjugated status in American society." Moreover, black sociology, in opposition to white sociology, explains "the different historical conditions that differentiate Blacks from European minorities." Ladner argues that black sociology is needed because blacks have been historically and socially segregated and marginalized from "the mainstream," blacks' "unique experiences and culture" have been overlooked by "traditional sociological analyses," which, on the whole, "have excluded Blacks from the general framework of American sociology."

Whites' unfamiliarity with black experiences and culture has led whites (Ladner specifically notes Robert Park and Ernest Burgess) to construct beliefs of blacks' innate racial inferiority and black pathology (Lyman 1972; McKee 1993; Feagin 2006; Winant 2007; Steinberg 2007; Morris 2007), beliefs of "generic determinism" and cultural predispositions of blacks that black sociology must work to dismantle. Ladner criticizes mainstream white sociology for dismissing black culture, advocating assimilation instead of cultural pluralism, creating an "alien set of norms" of middle class whites that

are used to judge people of color, and excluding "the Black perspective from its widely accepted mainstream theories" (1973c:xxiii). The goal of black sociology is to demonstrate how "Black lifestyles, values, behaviors, attitudes...define, describe, conceptualize and theorize…society," promote "black awareness." A black sociology must work to re-establish the field of sociology with a greater emphasis on black social world and the work of black sociologists ("W.E.B. Du Bois, Charles S. Johnson, E. Franklin Frazier, Oliver C. Cox and others") who best understand and explain the social world that most blacks experience. Overall, the goal of black sociology is reconsideration and reconstruction of "every area of specialization in sociology and the other social sciences," a complete overhaul of the discipline, from the micro elements (i.e., sociologists) to its macro structures of theoretical and methodological systems, academic institutions, and professional hierarchies and networks (1973c:xxiv).

Ladner (1973c:xxvi-xxvii) further proposes that black sociology defend the black community from the "white perspective." She argues that a "black perspective" must question the efficacy of the discipline," and take "issue with the traditional roles, structure and content of the disciple."[28] Black sociology must also work to become more practically engaged in "active promotion of social change" and "become more concerned with intergroup relations in the Third World, especially Africa." Ladner proposes that black sociology move away from "value-free" approaches and instead assert "pro-value" sociological approaches, arguing that "black sociology must become more political than

---

[28] Aldon Morris' essay, "Sociology of Race and W.E.B Du Bois" (2007) identifies the "white perspective" and then offers the counter-perspective of "Du Boisian [sociological] thought." I review Morris' essay and further develop an understanding of the Du Boisian sociological perspective in below in Chapter VII.

mainstream [white] sociology." In other words, black sociology recognizes inherent

political biases of the researcher (that social science is not value free), but, unlike Weber,

does not seek 'value neutrality' in the social scientific enterprise, realizing that this is

impossible due to the reality that biased subjects are unable to escape their prejudices

and pre-judgments that are inherently a part of the scientific enterprise. As Charles

Hamilton (1971/1973b) observes:

> At one time, there was a rather widespread, but mistaken, belief that social
> science research could and should be "value–free," that the social scientist could
> and should be "objective." This view is still held by many white (and some
> black) academicians. It is a mistaken notion precisely because it is not possible
> for a human being to divorce himself so dispassionately from his subject of
> study, and especially so, when he is studying human society. When that society is
> his own, he has added subjective notions, whatever his race (1971/1973b:472).[29]

Unlike most mainstream white sociology, black sociology recognizes the

hermeneutical---interpretative---nature of human knowledge and "must develop new

techniques and perspectives" that respond to the changing social world. In an effort to

balance theory and practice, black sociology must "develop theories which assume the

basic posture of eliminating racism and systematic class oppression from…society".

Considering the political power of racism and race relations, black sociology acts a

highly political project responding to racism that does not pretend to be objective.

Ladner's theory of black sociology, identification of the importance of the black

sociological perspective, and program for developing black sociology represents one of

---

[29] One often-marginalized white tradition that recognizes the inherent subjectivity involved in generating
meaning in the social science is the 'hermeneutic tradition' (primarily German) in 'continental' philosophy
of Friedrich Schleiermacher, Wilhelm Dilthey, Martin Heidegger, Hans Georg-Gadamer, Paul Ricoeur,
and Jürgen Habermas. See Richard E. Palmer's *Hermeneutics* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press,
1969) and Jean Grondin's *Introduction to Philosophical Hermeneutics* (New Haven: Yale University
Press, 1994).

the first well-developed definitions of black sociology, discussions of the black

sociological perspective and outlines of the goals of black sociology. She calls for a

black sociology that balances sociological theories and practices, and demonstrates

through her writings, prototypes of black sociological theory and applied black

sociology. As Overt Scott recognizes, "while the emphasis of the book appears to be on

blacks, the book should be read by whites, for whites control the profession of

sociology" (1974:424).[30] The central themes of *black sociological theory* and *applied

black sociology* that Ladner addresses continually reemerge in most of the essays *Death

of White Sociology*, later works on black sociologists and black sociology, and

throughout the course of this study.

**"What Is Black Sociology?: Toward a Sociology of Black Liberation" (1973) and

"The Nature of Black Sociology" in *Introduction to Black Sociology* (1976), Robert

Staples**

Robert Staples' 1976 book, *Introduction to Black Sociology* (*Black Sociology*), sharpens

and expands upon insights of his earlier 1973 article, "What Is Black Sociology? Toward

a Sociology of Black Liberation," in *Death of White Sociology*, and stands as the one and

only book-length study of black sociology (not a history of black sociologists or

collection of works by black sociologists). Not only do Staples' writings deliver a theory

of black sociology, he often theorizes black sociology in contrast to theories of white

---

[30] Scott's review of *Death of White Sociology* in *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 36(2):423-26 is positive and seems to understand the project of the book. Other reviews are less perceptive, viewing the project as undeveloped, politicized and emotionally-charged and void of "alternative methods;" see, for example, reviews by Murray Binderman (1974) in *Social Forces*, 53(4):650-1 and Wade Roof (1975) in *Contemporary Sociology*, 4(1):42-3.

sociology, presenting a comparative theoretical analysis of the two sociologies.[31] His

primary argument is that black and white sociology are conflicting sociologies, with

white sociology acting as the "science of oppression" and black sociology acting as a

"science of liberation."

A principal argument of Staples is that white sociology supports whites'

"oppression" and social "control" of people of color, whereas black sociology supports

"liberation" from white oppression and social "change" for people of color. According to

Staples, "sociology…has been characterized by an ethnocentric bias, which has easily

earned it the title of White sociology," moreover white sociology has "furnished much of

the ideological ammunition for the status quo of race---White privilege and Black

depravation" (1973:162,168, 1976:2).

> White sociology refers to those aspects of sociology designed more for the
> justification of racist institutions and practices than objective analysis of human
> institutions and behavior. It is this body of theory and research that has been
> employed by the power-that-be to sustain white racism and the instruments of its
> implementation. White sociology has provided not only the scientific covering
> for the exploitation of the Black masses, but also the ideological rationale for the
> arrangement of power and the ascendancy of the powerful in human society
> (1973:162).

Staples discovers that a deep hypocrisy infests white sociology, one in which

white sociologists claim sociology should be guided by "value neutrality" and

---

[31] Reyes Ramos's (1977) review of *Introduction of Black Sociology*, in *Contemporary Sociology* 6(5):596-7 argues that Staples "uses terms such as 'white sociology' and 'white sociologists' to define all of American sociology. In doing this he glosses over a great many things, including the qualitative difference between various sociological perspectives and between the proponents of different sociologists." Ramos, while correctly pointing out differences among white sociologists, gets lost in particulars and avoids the more universal understandings of white sociology that Staples identifies. In other words, Ramos misses the larger picture of the forest (white sociology or American sociology) as he points to the different groups of tress (different schools of white sociologists in the white-dominated field of American sociology). In contrast to Ramos' less sympathetic review, Patricia Bell Scott's (1978) review of *Introduction to Black Sociology* in *The Family Coordinator*, 27(3):292 states the work "is recommended reading for all social science scholars."

"humanism," but then generate sociology that is completely biased and anti-humanist, particularly toward people of color and the poor.

> While white sociology has by and large dominated general sociology, its practices have been antithetical to certain important tenets of the discipline: value neutrality and humanism…A function of sociology's humanistic function should be to foster democratic values in society. White sociology has instead perpetuated the undemocratic and racist view that each individual belongs to a certain race, class, or other closed social group and that this membership ipso facto denies [a person] the opportunity to better [themselves] in terms of [their] abilities.

> In the case of white sociology, [white] sociologists…express racist values as value-free…[white] sociologists serve as ideological rationalists for racial and class oppression" (1973:163).

According to Staples (1973:164-66, 1976:4-5), white "sociology and other sciences have been used as instruments of racist ideology," used to "objectively" demonstrate black inferiority [which naturally implies white superiority], and that white sociological research has been used to "justify the subordination of Blacks through political disenfranchisement and racial segregation." Staples observes that white sociologists are guilty of developing sociological theories responsible for justifying racist ideologies, racial segregation, and hierarchies of race. Deficiencies in the sociological perspectives of the luminaries of the tradition---like Auguste Comte, Herbert Spencer, Franklin Giddings, William Graham Sumner, Ernest Burgess and Robert Park---do not escape mention. For these white sociologists upheld the belief that Europeans (whites) "represented the highest form of civilization," developing arguments about the biological and cultural-intellectual inferiority of blacks and other people of color. As Staples notes, even later 'radical' white sociologists coming from the Marxist tradition devalue black culture and the black experience. Staples identifies a critical issue

that this study will develop, the issue of whites sociology's focus on effects rather than causes of social problems, particularly problems of racism caused by whites that most adversely affect blacks and people of color.

> The problem has always been framed in ways that discuss the tragic effects of slavery on the slaves, but omit the atrocities of the slave-master. We hear of the problems that Afro-Americans encounter but little of the pathology of White racism (1976:6).

Staples (1973:166-7) argues that contemporary white sociologists do "not attempt to directly justify a blatantly racist social order," but that they instead have created more subtle racist justifications of whites' higher position in the social order and racial hierarchy. He proposes that the three principal "White sociological theories" used to explain away or justify white superiority and black inferiority are assimilation theory, structural functionalist theory, and theories of the culture of poverty. Assimilation theory, largely developed by Robert Park, describes a process whereby subordinate or marginalized groups attempt to "civilize to" or "develop" into the dominant group's society, culture, and beliefs. For Park, blacks are viewed as an example of a subordinate group that is expected to assimilate to the dominant white group's racial frame despite whites constant creation of barriers to black assimilation. Assimilation theory implies a racial hierarchy with whites on top and view whites' civilization and culture as the social-intellectual norm and moral standard to which blacks and people of color must learn to assimilate.

Along with assimilation theory, contemporary sociologists use "one of the most popular conceptual models in sociology today," structural functionalism, "as an ideological base for white racism." Like assimilation theory, structural functionalism

justifies racist ideologies of white super-ordination and black sub-ordination. This model, which "originated in the biological sciences," ignores structural divisions and social conflict among human groups and stresses "moral order, consensus, stability, and integration;" it hierarchically organizes social groups (races) according to what are perceived to be more important and less important group tasks or functions. As Staples observes, "the ideological content of structural-functional theory lends itself easily to legitimation of the prevailing of [white] racial domination." He notes the way that Talcott Parsons' influential structural functionalist framework---which avoids radical social change for groups in favor of the slower pace of reformist social change and the maintenance of the system with only slight adjustments---works against a basic tenet of black sociology, namely, the black sociological goal to actively seek radical change and revolutionary reconstruction of the social system.

Staples also rejects the culture of poverty argument, a theory that argues that groups are destined to reproduce pathological behaviors and impoverished cultural worlds because they have limited resources and opportunities to escape their social world and socio-economic conditions---the social world and conditions that, in turn, produce and re-produce a culture of limited social opportunities and resources. According to Staples, while the cultural of poverty argument displays the powerful mechanisms of social re-production and cycle of poverty among groups with limited access to resources and power, the model can also lead people to the false beliefs that the social problems of certain groups are insurmountable and completely self-generating.

For Staples, black sociology offers a different sociological perspective of the social world than the white sociological perspective defined by white sociology. Unlike white sociology, "black sociology makes no such claim to value neutrality…Black sociologists must bring to his work…Black values. Those values must be humanist orientations to Black and White society" (1976:9). Black sociologists in *Death of White Sociology* and Staples agree that value–free sociology is a farfetched idea in a world that is socially constructed, a point well made by John Stanfield in *A History of Race Relations Research: First Generation Recollections* (1993). According Stanfield, "As much as scientists may claim to embrace objective, value free logics of inquiry, the production of their knowledge and the creation and reproduction of their social organizational forms and links to the real society are very much social constructions of realities" (1993:x).

Whereas white sociology is seemingly beyond redemption, black sociology has the possibility of becoming a redemptive sociology. Black sociology stresses the multi-dimensionality of human beings and social existence, indicating that no one social group and social world exist, but rather that multiple groups and social worlds exist. Black sociology acknowledges the links between and among racial, class, and gender oppression, and thus works to represent the "view of the oppressed," the most important viewpoint for understanding the dynamics of the social world and human relations. Black sociology acknowledges that the viewpoint of the oppressed is different from that of the oppressor.

As Staples notes, "Black and white peoples have never shared, to any great degree, the same physical environment or social experiences" (1976:2). Blacks, as an oppressed group, inhabit and thus experience a different social world than whites, the oppressor group. Discussing "Black Sociology Versus White Sociology" in *Black Sociology's* introductory chapter, Staples presents a number of differences between black and white sociology that arise from the differences between the social contexts and life-worlds of blacks and whites. He argues that black sociology and white sociology arise as two sociological worldview and thus black and white sociologists differently define race, equality, technological and social progress, integration, education, family, and the black experience, principles shaped according to the sociologists' particular social experiences and interactions in particular social settings (1976:11).

Black sociology "reevaluate[s] White sociological theories and studies…showing the inadequacy of existing White methods," specifically with regard to the study of blacks, black culture and institutions. "Black norms and perspectives" and honest, non-manipulated statistical investigations are needed in sociological studies, particularly the study of the black community, but also in the area of white studies. Although black sociology focuses on the study of the black community and race relations with whites, Staples believes that the black sociological perspective addresses all facets of the social world, providing information about human group behaviors and social structures outside these two domains.

Staples identifies three primary conceptual models and several methodological concerns of black sociology. He views the Colonial, Marxist, and Pan-Africanist models

as important conceptual frameworks to be utilized in black sociology. The Colonial

model, discovered in the writings of W.E.B. Du Bois, Oliver Cox, C.L.R. James, Frantz

Fanon, Edward Said, and Robert Blauner, among others, views the social world as a

division between colonizer, exploiter and oppressor groups, and colonized peoples,

exploited and oppressed groups. A salient characteristic of this relationship is the fact

that the colonizers are, in most cases, whites of European origin, and the colonized are

often blacks and people of color from the Americas, Asia, Africa, Middle East and

Pacific Islands. In other words, "colonialism has meant the dominance of White

Westerners over non-White peoples in other parts of the world" (1976:13). Because

understandings of colonialism are central to black sociologists' thought, Staples outlines

the "characteristics of colonialism," which he draws from Robert Blauner's work (1972).

> (1) the colonized subjects are not in the social system voluntarily but have it
> imposed on them; (2) the subject's native culture is modified or destroyed; (3)
> control is in the hands of people outside the native population; (4) racism
> prevails, i.e., a group seen as different or inferior in terms of alleged biological
> traits is exploited, controlled, and oppressed socially and psychologically by a
> group that defines itself as superior (1976:13).

The colonial model demonstrates the links between racial and class oppression in

the social system of colonialism. "It also illustrates the institutionalized patterns of racist

oppression. Instead of focusing on individual attitudes of racial prejudice, it treats racism

as a political and economic process that maintains domination of Whites over Blacks by

systematic subjugation" (1976:13). Staples notes an important conflict facing colonized

groups, the realization that, if they wish to take advantage of the resources and power of

the colonizers' social world, colonized groups must assimilate or acculturate to the

colonizers' world at the risk of losing their culture and sense of identity in the process.

He also points out that, to challenge colonization of blacks and people of color, black sociology must advance the decolonization process (in both mind and social practice).

While recognizing Marx's neglect of racial conflict and oppression, a central concern of black sociology, Staples nevertheless identifies crucial sociological understandings discovered in the Marxist model. He views Marx's understandings of two classes, the exploiters and exploited, as relevant concepts for race (and gender) analysis as well as class analysis. Marx's understandings of class oppression and conflict serve as a models for understanding racial oppression and racial conflict and are useful for demonstrating connections between the two types of conflict and oppression (although Marx never acknowledges this link). Staples cautions against economic determinism that views racial conflict and oppression as sub-categories, secondary effects or results of class conflict and oppression, and explains that "eliminating capitalism will not necessarily destroy racism" (1976:16).

The Pan-Africanist model is also viewed to be central to black sociology because it demonstrates links among the similar socio-economic, political conditions and cultural experiences of all black peoples. Staples views Pan-Africanism more as a political perspective and less of a conceptual model. While he condones Pan-Africanism as a political means of combating the belief that blacks have no culture, he is also weary of forging a unifying understanding of blackness that overlooks black diversity. Additionally, he is concerned that Pan-Africanism focuses on "cultural forms" at the expense of "political and economic analysis," thereby being preoccupied by "cultural

imperialism," while, at the same time, being side-tracked from addressing issues of "political and economic oppression" associated with racist social systems (1976:16).

Staples argues that several methodological techniques ought to guide black sociology. He believes black sociology needs to be extra conscious of sociological concepts and words used to describe human beings and social reality, noting that many concepts and terms are loaded (by oppressor groups) and signify negative or misleading meanings (about oppressed groups). Specifically, many words and sociological concepts devised by whites (e.g. assimilation, social pathologies, criminality, intelligence, and civilization) reproduce structures of racial oppression. Whites often develop concepts and theories that are demeaning and detrimental in their representations of blacks and people of color, which, through their employment, have the effect of sustaining the subjugation blacks and people of color. In addition to critical examination of widely-accepted concepts, theories, and methods of sociologists, how to go about framing empirical research questions is another important matter for black sociology.

Thus, black sociology needs to re-examine the dominant research questions and methods in use, which, like many dominant sociological concepts and theories, have been constructed by whites, and black sociologists must determine how those research paradigm-generating questions and methodologies require modification or need to be discarded completely. Finally, along with developing new approaches of constructing social meaning and ways of investigating the social world, black sociology must make sure concepts and research questions lead to proper methodical approaches. According to Staples, black sociology should strive to be multi-methodological, combining

ethnographic methodology, historical investigations, and statistical analysis. Multi-methodological approaches to social scientific research have a rich tradition dating back to W.E.B. Du Bois' *The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study* (1899), which was "one of the first works to combine the use of urban ethnography, social history, and descriptive statistics" (Anderson 1996).

One task of black sociological ethnography (involving participant observation, interviewing and examination of "letters, autobiographies, poems, folk tales, proverbs, films, and music," and other "nonsociological sources") must be to present a more realistic picture of blacks and re-write the story of blacks in the history of sociology. Therefore, in contrast to Wilson's argument (1974), Staples posits that this qualitative approach to black sociology must take advantage of black "insider information," knowledge often missed by "outsider" researchers who are not a part of the community or institutions they are studying. One justification of the insider-outsider model of social knowledge can point to the social realities and power dynamics of 'in-groups' and 'out-groups,' a distinction dating back to the origins of American sociology in the writings of William Sumner ("we groups" and "other groups"), W.I. Thomas and his intellectual disciple, Robert E. Park.

Like other authors who have written on black sociologists and sociology, Staples emphasizes the 'centrality of historical analysis' for black sociology. He finds that "use of a sociohistorical approach marks a break with dominant White sociological theory," which is "present-oriented and does not make the crucial historical connections so essential to a full understanding of the dynamics of group behavior, cultural change, and

inter-group as well as intra-group changes,"[32] and largely ethnocentric. When studying

the black community, black sociology should also focus on oral histories, considering

"the rich oral history of Blacks." For Staples, using certain models of historical analysis

and theoretical frameworks of white sociologists, like C. Wright Mills, Max Weber,

Emile Durkheim, and Karl Marx, advances black sociology. At the same time, he notes

that black sociology rests on the shoulders of the history, ideas and practices of black

sociologists like W.E.B. Du Bois, E. Franklin Frazier, Oliver Cox and Nathan Hare

(1973:169, 1976:3).

Similarly, the major advances in black history were the products of blacks.

Among the most noted examples are William Wells Brown's *The Rising Son* (1874) and

George W. Williams' *History of the Negro Race in America, 1619-1880*, two detailed

histories of blacks and black Americans. Additional examples are discovered the

writings appearing in the *Journal of Negro History*, edited by Carter G. Woodson,

biographical-historical accounts from black social leaders like Frederick Douglass

(1855) and Booker T. Washington (1901), and Du Bois' major works in history

especially The *Suppression of the African Slave Trade* (1896), *The Gift of Black Folk*

(1924), *Black Reconstruction* (1935), *Black Folk Then and Now* (1939), *Africa---Its*

Place in Modern History, Volume I and *Africa---Its Geography, People, and Problems,*

Volume II (1930)and *The World and Africa* (1946). Many of these black historical works

revealed the social inequalities between people of color and whites, brutalities realities

---

[32] Similar to the deconstructing of the dominant white sociological narrative by black sociologists, a dismantling of the dominant white historical narrative occurred across the discipline of US history, particularly among those minority groups (Blacks, Jews, and other minorities) who were not included in the dominant US historical narrative. See Larry Levine's *The Unpredictable Past: Explorations in American Cultural History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

of the structural racism maintained by whites, and pinpoint the poor accounts, evasions and misinterpretations of US and global history and social group relations.

In addition to ethnographic field research guided by the black perspective and broad-based historical analysis using ideas and historical models of blacks *and whites*, black sociology must also employ statistical analysis, despite this method's implementation as a means of distorting social truths. Statistics and quantitative studies, when carefully presented, have the potential to provide useful information about different populations or social groups, information that illustrates important societal demarcations and differences among populations. It is the duty of black sociology to question the 'fuzzy math' of white sociologists and the questions and rules guiding whites' quantitative analysis (1976:18-9). Especially today, studies like Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray's *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life* (1994) demonstrate how statistics have been employed in dubious manners to produce negative statistical information about blacks' intelligence, among other misrepresentations of human beings and the social world.[33]

Along with listing conceptual, theoretical and methodological concerns of black sociology, Staples lists some of the more general, extra academic "goals of black sociology." Following Du Bois' chief sociological program, from his earliest days as a graduate student to his last days as a black rights and human rights activist, Staples argues that black sociology's "primary objective [is] the application of sociological

---

[33] See Tukufu Zuberi's (2008, 2001) analyses of the questionable use of statistics. Also, Joel Best (2008, 2004) has written on the continuing problems of discerning information produced by statistics and the ways that statistics are misused, misinterpreted and serve as political tools of behind most poor policy-making decisions.

knowledge to the development of the Black community" and to "serve as the intellectual vanguard for a humanist society." Staple's echoes Du Bois' call for the "quest for basic knowledge with which to help guide the Negro," the quest that led Du Bois to the "study of sociology" (1967:149). Additionally, Staple repeats Du Bois' message in "The Conservation of the Race" (1897), which states, "Negroes inspired by one vast ideal, can work out in its fullness the great message we have for humanity" (1986:820).

Additionally, it is the role of black sociology "to provide legitimation of Black institutions and behavior," demonstrate the "richness and diversity of Black life," and to unify the black community. As the intellectual vanguard for humanity, black sociology must step outside of the sociology of the black community and address poverty, hunger, exploitation, disenfranchisement, enslavement, imprisonment, (human) destruction[34] and other human rights issues affecting all oppressed people (1973:168-72). It is the duty of black sociology to redefine race and race relations, to "introduce the concept of relativism," where "Black and White cultures can be seen as different without being categorized into inferior or superior divisions." Black sociology must investigate and illuminate "the process of how people in a society come to place positive or negative valuations on racial traits…and the role of political and economic factors in influencing those valuations considered" (1973:168).

Black sociology must also continue to lead sociological investigations of racial oppression, and the dreaded topic: racism. To "sensitize" whites to racism they inflict

---

[34] The concept of 'human destruction,' more specially, human death and physical and mental (even cultural) harm, needs to be utilized more to demonstrate the severe and less acknowledged human costs of oppression. Because of the magnitude of human destruction, a more appropriate term might be 'wide-scale human destruction,' a broad based destruction composed of case-specific forms of human destruction.

and maintain, and "prepare" blacks for the endemic effects of systemic racism perpetuate by whites, black sociology must study "the dynamics of White racism…and how it is related to the functioning…in the Black and White world, demonstrating the "relationship between Black status and White racism" (1976:11). Thus, black sociology needs to develop research that addresses earlier black sociologists' analyses of white racism and historical events generated by asymmetrical or unequal race relations (whites' dominating, and excluding blacks from, power and resources) that have influenced the "black condition." As Staples was open to some of earlier white sociologists' ideas, he would likely argue that black sociology would benefit specifically from reviewing the few white sociologists who have written on white racism, despite their privileged position in the social world, which at times can generate misinterpretations and intellectual blind spots.

More specifically, black sociology must produce irrefutable data that illustrates the "structured racist system" of whites that defines the US and other societies. After compiling data on white structural racism and explaining that information, it is necessary to act on that information. Therefore, black sociology not only identifies specific white social problems and institutions associated with racist social system---for example, the white-run, politically corrupt, racist criminal justice system---but also attempts to destruct or radically re-structure white racist social institutions that perpetuate the system of white racial oppression. For the smaller private world of sociologists, Staples' explication of black sociology presents the necessary language and theoretical understandings for unambiguously discussing "black sociology" and the goals of "black"

sociologists. For the larger public world, Staples' sociology of black sociology ultimately points out black sociology's duty to weld theory and practice in an effort to "bring about a requiem for white racism" and liberation for blacks, people of color and all oppressed peoples (1973:169-72).

Conclusion

Ladner's and Staples' books on the positive attributes and possibilities of black sociology and negative social-psychological effects and epistemological and practical limitations of white sociology denote an unresolved tension in sociology of ideas and practices. Despite the diversity of sociological positions of Ladner and the other social theorists in *Death of White Sociology*, several central points of agreement develop, consensus about the nature and role of black sociology that extend to Staples' work, *Introduction to Black Sociology*.

As already mentioned, key themes that emerge are the pathologies of white sociology (justifications of ethnocentrism and tricks of racism) and potential benefits of black sociology (progression of blacks and people of color oppressed by white racism). Black sociology focuses on white pathologies reverses white sociology's focuses on black pathologies. Moreover, black sociology demonstrates that white social pathologies weaken white views of the supremacy of white norms, truths, culture and values.

Where white sociology is value-free, black sociology claims a pro-value position. Black sociology is involved and 'political,' not detached and 'scientific.' Black sociology promotes pluralist group relations, unlike white sociology's promotion of

assimilationist and hierarchical group relations. Black sociology is about the liberation and social change of all social groups, white sociology is about the suppression and control of certain social groups (blacks and people of color) and dominance and power of other groups (whites). White sociology claims to explain the truth of social reality and avoids interpretive theoretical frameworks, black sociology combines interpretive with explanatory frameworks to help explain social realities. Practioners of black sociology view it as both an ontology and epistemology; whereas white sociology is highly epistemic and rarely views itself in ontological terms.

This chapter shows that black sociology has a number of features that distinguish it from white sociology discussed in next chapter. Black sociology offers a new paradigm for social knowledge; it offers sociological ideas and practices that embrace nationalism, self-determination, Pan-Africanism, critiques of colonialism, and Marxist philosophy and other intellectual values that mainstream white sociology tends to avoid. As Ladner and Staples would argue, black sociology has developed ideas and practices that have improved the conditions of social world, and has the potential to further improve human social relations for the better, a claim white sociology has trouble making as the next chapter reveals.

CHAPTER IV

MOVING BEYOND THE AMBIGUITY OF WHITE SOCIOLOGY

Whereas books have been written on black sociology (Lander 1973; Staples 1976) and

black sociologists (Bracey Meier, and Rudwick 1971; Blackwell and Janowitz 1974;

Washington and Cunnigen 2002), one discovers no published works that explain 'white

sociology', nor any collections or anthologies of 'white sociologists.' It is as if white

sociology and white sociologists did not exist. However, persistent use of the two

concepts in social science literature would indicate that black sociology and whites

sociology are realities (at least in the consciousness of some individuals), but that, in the

discourse of mainstream sociology, they are highly avoided and hyper-concealed topics,

both unconsciously and consciously.

Ironically, the one book whose title mentions "white sociology," Joyce A.

Ladner's *The Death of White Sociology* (1973), is a book on "black sociology" that calls

for the death of a racially oppressive white sociology; it does not posit that white

sociology has ended, nor does it construct a 'post-white sociology' argument (1973:xix).

Lewis M. Killian's *Black and White: Reflections of a White Southern Sociologist* (1994)

is the only book whose title mentions "white [Southern] sociologist." While useful as

window into the mind of a self-described "white" (or, his term, "Cracker") sociologist

and his experiences in a segregated academic and social world [see discussion below],

this work does not present a clear picture of the meaning of a 'white sociologist,' only a

loose collection of personal characteristics and beliefs of a particular white sociologist.

Nor does this work consciously or purposefully define what the 'white sociology' of a white sociologist---namely, Killian's---might be.[35]

In contrast to the numerous efforts to outline individuals, ideas, practices of black sociology, very little scholarship has directly addressed the meaning of white sociology or the work of white sociologists. The most useful sources for understanding white sociology and white sociologists are discovered in the major works on black sociology and black sociologists listed above. Many of these works contrast ideas or histories of black sociologists in relation to those of white sociologists, demonstrating that, because of segregated social worlds and divided perceptions of social reality, black and white sociologists produce two dissimilar worldviews and approaches to understanding the social world.

Often viewed to be the antithesis of black sociology and sociologists, white sociology and sociologists are routinely used as counter-examples, usually as points of contrast, subjects of on-going contention and inescapable interrelations. In *Introduction to Black Sociology* (1976), Robert Staples argues there are "crucial differences in the two perspectives," that white sociology represents a "science of [white] oppression" and

---

[35] *White Southern Sociologist* presents a perplexing and paradoxical attitude discovered among many white sociologists. White sociologists, like Killian, acknowledge being "white" sociologists because they are part of a deeply segregated "white-black" discipline and society. Yet, at the same time, many white sociologists support a color-blind social philosophy, claiming that, despite deep-seated segregation between blacks and whites, principles of color-blindness (overlooking skin color) should be implemented in the social world (ideologies and public policy) and define human identity.

Thus, Killian (1994:201-3) is unable to see the differences between legislation of *Brown* (1954) that overlooks color in favor of fair social behavior (de-segregation of schools) and legislation of *Bakke* (1978) intended to address socio-historical color discrimination through social programs that challenge segregation deeply structured within black-white social institutions (affirmative action).[35] In other words, Killian confuses the difference between *social ideals* of color-blindness that attempts to recognize equal human value and opportunities (education) not bound by color and the *social realities* of a systemic, unchanging color line that demonstrates evident differences of power among races along color lines, differences of power that maintain colorblindness as an ideal.

social "control" and that black sociology represents a "science of [black liberation]" and social "change" (1976:2,10). According to Ladner, black sociology presents "a reaction to, and revolt against, the biases of "mainstream" bourgeois, liberal [white] sociology," although "it is impossible to separate the two" (1973:xix-xx).

Works on black sociology and black sociologists illuminate several key characteristics of white sociology (see Chapter III). To summarize some of the key characteristics discussed by black sociologists, white sociology is viewed as a system of ideas and practices that uphold a white racist worldview and racially oppressive social system. According to Staples, "White sociology refers to those aspects of sociology designed more for the justification of racist institutions and practices than objective analysis of human institutions and behavior (1973:162). White sociology exhibits racial biases, despite claims to value-neutrality, and a hypocritical, selective promotion of humanism, liberal ideologies, and social justice issues (exclusively with regard to whites). Staples notes that white sociology's "practices have been antithetical to certain important tenets of the discipline: value neutrality and humanism" and that white sociologists "express racist values as value-free… [and] serve as ideological rationalists for racial and class oppression" (1973:163). For this reason, Ladner argues that black sociology needs to be "pro-value" with regard to black sociological ideas and practices (1973:27).

Works on black sociologists and black sociology have revealed that white sociology fails to acknowledge multiple social worlds/realities and sociological perspectives (of blacks and people of color) in favor of one universal social world and

reality and sociological perspective (of whites). Additionally, white sociology views white people, institutions, culture and societies ("Western civilization") as the social norm and ideal type, whereas non-whites, and their "underdeveloped" institutions and communities, are viewed as abnormal and non-ideal---even pathological. To combat this understanding, Staples, Ladner and other sociologists defining and promoting black sociology have elucidated and advanced the understanding of black sociology's concern with "black norms," "black perspectives," and "black values."

Outside the literature on black sociology and black sociologists, the terms white sociology and white sociologists appear infrequently, and when they do, they are usually found as descriptive terms in histories of sociology, particularly histories of race relations research (Lyman 1972; Stanfield 1985 1993; McKee 1993; Morris 2007; Steinberg 2007; Deegan 2002; Winant 2007; Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva 2008).[36] Noticeably, in the historical sociological works above, the terms 'black sociology and white sociology' are used much less than 'black sociologists and white sociologists.' Another interesting point is that discussion of "black sociologists"---also referred to as "sociologists of color," "critical minority scholars," "African American sociologists" and "black social scientists" (adding conceptual incoherence)---is evoked at a much greater rate than discourse on "white sociologists," who are often simply referred to as "mainstream sociologists" or go unmentioned as whites, just as 'sociologists.'

---

[36] It is important to note that white and black sociology and sociologists are normally discussed in the framework of race relations research and the sociology of race. In many cases, distinction between white and black sociologists and black and white sociology disappear outside the study of race. As this study continues to emphasize, black and white sociology are not limited to the field of race or study of the black community for that matter.

Oddly, several of the most thorough histories of white sociology scarcely use the terms white sociology or white sociologists, while clearly presenting stories of white sociologists' role in sociological studies of race and white sociologists active during various stages of the development of white sociology. While not specifically addressing white sociology, per se, works by Stanford Lyman, John Stanfield, Mary Jo Deegan, James McKee, Stephen Steinberg, Aldon Morris, Howard Winant, Tukufu Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva present a picture of white sociology and white sociologists. I now turn to Lyman's and Stanfield's work in this chapter. Mary Jo Deegan's work is explored in the next chapter and the sociological views of Bonilla-Silva, McKee, Morris, Steinberg, Winant and Zuberi figure prominently in the second part of this study

The Black American in Sociological Thought **(1972), Stanford Lyman**

In *The Black American in Sociological Thought* (1972), one of the first historical and theoretical overviews of white sociologists, Stanford Lyman manages to provide a history of the ideas and practices of influential white sociologists without ever mentioning that the American sociological tradition he is calling into question is composed specifically of 'white' sociologists.[37] He views sociology as a tradition whose roots extend back to the origins of white Western thought, specifically, to the evolutionary naturalism of Aristotlean social thought, which views social change as a slow moving eventual process.

---

[37] Two points: 1) I will add 'white' in front of sociology and sociologists, since Lyman does not. 2) While he identifies that blacks become 'objects' of analysis throughout the American sociological tradition, Lyman fails to identify that it is 'white' sociologists who are those who are objectifying blacks. In his analysis, he provides a list of sociologists, but it is up to the reader to make the connection that the sociologists who have done most to disparage blacks in "American sociology" are in fact white.

Lyman argues that tracing "the [study of the] black[s]…in American sociology is tantamount to tracing the history of American sociology itself," and proceeds to paint a picture of white sociology's obsession with sociological investigations and scientific explanations of blacks and black culture. He begins by identifying the racist roots of early American sociology in the proslavery writings of white sociologists, George Fitzhugh and Henry Hughes, and social Darwinist writings of white sociologists, Lester Frank Ward, William Graham Summer, W.I. Thomas, and Charles Horton Cooley. All the above white American sociologists espoused sociological views that position blacks beneath whites in racially-defined social and intellectual hierarchies.

After reviewing the impact of early white American sociologists ethnocentric racialized views of human beings and the social world on sociological theory, Lyman directs his analysis to the works of five white sociologists, and one black sociologist, who have played an important role in the development of white-defined American sociology. Lyman develops analyses of Robert Park, John Dollard, Gunnar Myrdal, Gordon Allport, and Talcott Parsons with absolutely no mention that they are white sociologists; similarly, nowhere in his lengthy discussion of E. Franklin Frazier does he directly mention Frazier as a black sociologist.

Despite this oversight and sociological obfuscation, Lyman does present an important understanding of destructive (white) sociological thought that has defamed blacks and people of color and influenced ill-considered social beliefs and actions (programs and policies of social exclusion) that have damaged the black population for over a century. Lyman's work on white sociology, one of the first by a white sociologist,

illustrates how white sociologists such as Park, Dollard, Myrdal, Allport, and Parsons (and black sociologists, like Frazier, who worked with whites in an uneven black-white power dynamic), have helped develop a racial paradigm of the social world that supports whites' dominant power and privileged social position in society.

Lyman focuses on the importance of Park's race relations cycle in developing American sociological thought about social relations and ordering among different groups, particularly racial and ethnic groups. He notes that "Robert Park synthesized the thought of the Social Darwinists who preceded him, [and embraced] notions of racial hierarchies, gradual, orderly evolutionary social change," and the "natural" over the "historical," all of which are characteristic of his race relations cycle theory (1972:68). The key concepts in Park's cycle are the four stages: social competition/contact, social conflict, social accommodation, and social assimilation. He explores how the cycle's understandings of accommodation and assimilation have been used to understand and justify race relations (more specifically, social ordering of racial groups into status and power hierarchies) on a number of levels. The cycle is viewed to display a "natural order" of the socialization of social group relations. For example, the idea accommodation---a subordinate group accommodating, or yielding, to a superior group---is used to sociologically "explain" why some groups are less powerful, subservient and less "advanced," hence less "valuable," in relation to other groups to whom they must accommodate. Accommodation is used to justify slow "evolutionary" social change for those "less-advanced," in other words, black Americans and other people of color who are coming up to speed in "the civilizing process"(1972:40-1).

Park's theories of assimilation have had a lasting influence in American sociological thought, continuing to shape understanding and practices of groups and group relations. Assimilation is the dominant model in immigration studies (the primary focus of contemporary race studies) and remains the popular social philosophy in the United States and other societies. Park's "assimilationist-oriented" sociological understandings not only define Park's views of social relations, but those of his students, both black students like E. Franklin Frazier and white students like Louis Wirth. While theories of assimilation worked to describe the natural, slow and orderly progress most groups experience in their assimilation process to the dominant groups' society, it failed to describe blacks' 'arrested development' or un-assimilability in American society and persistence of a "bi-racial society." Both Park and Frazier explained away this "abnormality" as the consequence of "accidental" or "irrelevant" "factors, aberrations and "tendencies" described as "ideal typical interferences" in the cycle (1972:66, 69).

Lyman indicates that, "late in his life, he [Park] returned to the idea that conflict and spoke of the inevitable necessity for blacks to struggle for full equality" and challenged the belief of a whites-only democracy (1972:71-2). To what degree Park embraced a conflict perspective is up to speculation. Numerous scholars continue to debate questions concerning Park's emphasis on assimilation at the expense of social conflict, whether the cycle was orderly or sequential, and the extent to which the cycle is rooted in social Darwinism (Lal 1994, 1990; Shils 1994; Deegan 2002, 1994; McKee 1993; Raushenbush 1979; Steinberg 2007; Matthews, 1977; Ellison, 1953a, 1953b; and Stanfield, 1985, 1993). Whether Park was "assimilationist-oriented" or not is a matter

for theoretical debate, however, Lyman's analysis of Park's race relations cycle illustrates, more pragmatically, that Park's assimilation theory has had detrimental affects on the sociological understanding of blacks and the study of race relations.[38]

After reviewing Park, Lyman examines John Dollard, a white social psychologist trained in psychiatry, who performed a "psychological ethnography of 'Southerntown,'" an examination of "emotional factors" in the maintenance---"accommodation"---of a caste system, "institutionalized caste racism," between Southern blacks and whites. Lyman admits that Dollard's study reveals important knowledge about the racial dynamics of power between whites and blacks, but he criticizes Dollard for offering a functionalist, organicist explanation supporting the "natural order" and functionality of a bi-racial society and for regulating the characteristics of this caste-like black-white social relationship to Southern territories. Furthermore, "Dollard attempts to show that the Southern system of white racial domination provides certain advantages to blacks that might not accrue in a more equalitarian system" (1972:86).[39] Lyman also notes that Dollard's *Caste and Class in a Southern Town* (1957)---a study inspired by *Shadow of the Plantation*, a work by Charles Johnson (a black sociologist who, like Frazier, studied and worked with Park)---is one of a slew of books that incorrectly limited the black-white racial caste system to the South.

Lyman observes that Horace Cayton and St. Clair Drake's *Black Metropolis* (1962) demonstrates that the same racial caste divisions existing in the North are

---

[38] Lyman expands on his discussion of Park in his later work, *Militarism, Imperialism, and Racial Accommodation: An Analysis and Interpretation of the Early Writings of Robert E. Park* (1992).
[39] George Fitzhugh (1854) makes this same argument to justify the slavery system, just as Park (1913) used this argument to explain the social organization of a bi-racial society.

operative in the South. Yet, he finds that most studies of racial "caste" in the United States have focused on Southern black-white relations, specifically noting Allison Davis, Burleigh Gardner, and Mary Gardner's *Deep South*: *A Social Anthropological Study of Caste and Class* (1965), Hortense Powermaker's *After Freedom: A Cultural Study in the Deep South* (1968), and Hylan Lewis' *Blackways of Kent* (1955). This understanding of whites' (and blacks') failure to see the ubiquity of white racism (North and South) is important because it shows how white and black sociologists can deny the systemic nature of the racial caste divide, its infection throughout all of society, even within the discipline and the 'liberal North.'

Like Park, Gunnar Myrdal is another highly influential white sociologist who has shaped white sociology, especially the sociology of race. His landmark Carnegie Corporation-funded study of US race relations, *An American Dilemma* (1944), points to a number of characteristics of white sociology. According to Lyman, "an American Dilemma includes a critique of sociological thought on the race question, a value theory of the origins of racial prejudice and institutionalized racism, and an argument that the 'American Creed' is antithetical to racial prejudice" (1972:100). Lyman (1972:102-106) notes Myrdal's criticisms of American sociology, which find American sociology to be: "naturalistic rather than humanistic," one that "conceals hidden value premises of a conservative and laissez-faire type" ("do-nothing orientation"), and one based on a "functionalist" framework and "uncritical acceptance of the natural-law philosophy" based upon Enlightenment ideals.

Lyman notes that the ideas, methods and conclusions of Myrdal's study did not go unchallenged, and he includes Ralph Ellison's (1953a) criticisms of Myrdal's study of American race relations, a critique that also includes a critique of Park's and other Chicago School sociologists' earlier studies of race. Again, Lyman does not mention that Ellison is black and how that fact might inform his perceptions of Myrdal's study. He notes Ellison's criticisms of the study's corporate sponsorship by Carnegie, "its essentially un-Marxist approach, and its failure to grasp the spirit of black life in America" (1972:102). Along with exposing Ellison's criticisms of Myrdal, Lyman identifies his own criticisms, specifically noting problems with Myrdal's gradualist "mechanical" approach (similar to social Darwinists) and assertion of a "unified culture" (an ethnocentric "common value set," "higher values" or "dominant set of values") as the central tenet of the "American Creed." This ethnocentric "national ethnos" which "rejects a pluralistic image of values and any conception of equal competition among values" reinforces the idea that one dominant group and culture (whites and white culture) are the norm and ideal type---higher values---to which groups, like blacks, must assimilate (1972:111, 119). After considering Lyman's reading of Myrdal, we might ask: to what extent does the dominant white value system (with acknowledgement that other, less powerful, white value systems exist) pervade contemporary American sociology?

Gordon Allport, another influential white sociologist, viewed "race-relations problems" as a consequence of the negative prejudices of individuals. Lyman notes that the "psychological approach to the study of racial prejudice was developed by Gordon Allport," who reduces prejudice to the "prior condition of the person" and the

"socialization process" that generates prejudicial "predispositions" in "human personality." The "personality-rooted" explanations discovered in Allport's writings, like *The Nature of Prejudice* (1958), and like those found in Theodor Adorno's *The Authoritarian Personality* (1950), were the subject of critique by Herbert Blumer in *Pacific Sociological Review* (1958). Blumer redefines prejudice as a behavioral condition rooted in the dominant group or collective, who, for political reasons, generate prejudice beliefs to maintain group power.

Lyman argues that Allport (and Adorno) presents an understanding of prejudice in the private realm and individual level, while Blumer presents an understanding of prejudice in the public realm and group level, and that the two possibly co-exist, reinforcing one another. While this symbolic-interactionist dynamic is necessary component of race studies, a number of scholars (Bonilla-Silva 1997; Feagin 1990; Feagin and Vera 2008; McKee 1993; Steinberg 2007) have argued that sociology's focus on racial prejudice, whether individual or group, while important, overlooks structural racism, that is often a much more effective force in shaping social reality, including the shaping and perpetuating of racial prejudices.

The last white sociologist that Lyman investigates is Talcott Parsons, considered the father of modern structural functionalism. Lyman argues that Parsons presents a "functional theory of racial prejudice" that grounds prejudice in "basic social structures" of "Western" society, structures that relate to "the typical Western individual" (presumably European and white). Lyman draws a comparison of Parson's three-stage "inclusion cycle" (or "citizenship cycle") and Park's "race relations cycle." While he

finds that the inclusion cycle (legal inclusion, political inclusion, socio-economic inclusion) is "distinguished from assimilation because it permits survival of the ethnic community within a pluralistic society (1972:159)," both follow the Aristotlean evolutionary model that understands social development and group advancement in terms of gradual, successive stages, occurring at different speeds for different groups. Blacks' and other minority groups' difficulties or inabilities to successfully move through the inclusion process (into the majority group and dominant culture) were viewed as "accidents" in the cycle.

While Parsons' inclusion cycle is successful in returning sociology to "questions of history…Parsons [problematically] deduces that the cycle is a valid historical sequence for all races in America" and that the cycle follows an evolutionary path of inevitable stages (aside from accidents). As Lyman notes, "Parsons' approach pays little credence to the facts of black history or the values that blacks share….Parsons' approach, like that of all the other [white] sociologists …examined [from Giddings, Sumner, Cooley, Thomas to Park, Dollard, Myrdal and Allport], eschews an examination of the actual nature of black life and black perspectives" and white racism (1972:176).

Lyman's 1972 study reveals that the history of race relations and history of American sociology, in general, routinely examine social "problems," "pathological" human behaviors and overall social-psychological "dysfunctionality" of blacks and people of color (e.g., issues regarding assimilation, mental health, family, employment, housing, education, and criminality), while saying very little of the social problems and

pathological behavior of whites. As Lyman demonstrates, whites, like Park, Myrdal, Parsons and the others, have largely defined the "nature" of black social problems and pathologies, definitions that have been misguided and costly to blacks. Lyman vaguely and indirectly indicates that whites' hyper-concentration on blacks and black pathologies results from whites' ethnocentric biases and whites' efforts to mask their own psychosocial deficiencies.[40]

The Black American in Sociological Thought demonstrates how white sociologists have erred in their sociological understandings of blacks. Yet, in addition to avoiding any discussion of 'whiteness,' Lyman's work fails to critically reflect on the reasons why white sociologists were so preoccupied with blacks and avoids explaining powerful effects of white social pathologies and the historical and social contexts (racism and racial caste divisions) shaping whites sociologists' theoretical perspectives of race. Importantly, however, Lyman identifies problems with Park's race relations cycle, blindness of the racial caste system throughout the US, whites' over-concentration on racial prejudices (not structures of racism) and promotion of a belief in a superior Westernized, white monoculture. As he notes, racial "prejudice and a [racial] caste system are features of a larger and prior phenomenon---racism, a value that arose at a particular time and became embedded in complex ways in the fabric of Western social organization (1972:95). The next step Lyman needed to take, but does not, is to directly link racism to whites and white sociologists.

---

[40] W.E.B. Du Bois (1900, 1920, 1940, 1945, 1946) was the first sociologist to address whites' non-self-reflective-ness, 'projection' and habit of diverting sociological investigation away from whites' unsocial and inhuman behavior, particularly with regard to blacks and people of color (see Chapter VII).

***Philanthropy and Jim Crow in American Social Science* (1985), John H. Stanfield**

Like Lyman's *The Black American in Sociological Thought*, John Stanfield's 1985 book,

Philanthropy and Jim Crow in American Social Science (*Philanthropy and Jim Crow*),

provides indispensable information about the formation of white sociology, although its

stated intention is to reveal the "societal conditioning factors which shape the origins of

social science disciplines, communities, and institutions" in general (1985:3). Whereas

Lyman focused on the sociological ideas and practices of white sociologists, Stanfield

argues that "we must study the origins and evolution of the social scientists by first

taking into account the material societal condition which produce and institutionalize

them, not the reverse" (1985:4).

Stanfield is concerned first with providing, a priori, the material, physical world

(social environment) that shapes sociologists (ideas and practices), the larger field of

sociology and other social science disciplines. Lyman, in contrast, provides more of an

intellectual history of a number of key white sociologists without provided adequate

contextual information that Stanfield intends to provide. For Stanfield, it is necessary to

focus on "links between contextual factors such as institutional settings, political

economy, and patrons and internal factors such as great person's biographies, theories,

methods, and paradigms;" this approach avoids "reification which oversimplifies the

examination of the origins and development of the social sciences as intellectual

enterprises" (1985:3).

By examining "the societal and funding factors in the development of the social

sciences, particularly in shaping the social scientific interest in race relations," Stanfield

aims to illustrate the "racial inequality [or Jim Crow] in American social sciences" (1985:xi). After providing an overview of racial inequality in the formation and evolution of the social sciences (chapter 1), *Philanthropy and Jim Crow* examines sociology prior to 1920 (chapter 2). Next, Stanfield examines Robert Park (chapter 3), the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial (chapter 4), Edwin Rogers Embree and Julius Rosenwald Fund (chapter 5), Charles Spurgeon Johnson (chapter 6), Gunnar Myrdal (chapter 7), and "philanthropy and Jim Crow in social sciences" (chapter 8).

Considering their relevance in the development of sociology, it is not surprising that Stanfield addresses Park and Myrdal, two of the major white sociologists examined in Lyman's work. Additionally, Stanfield and Lyman are both interested in the position of blacks in American sociology and social science---Stanfield, however, addresses the social environment and social condition of blacks in social sciences, whereas Lyman focuses more on the social sciences views of blacks. While Lyman never mentions black or white sociology or sociologists, Stanfield actually speaks of black sociologists (as well as "black social scientists, historians, and scholars"), but fails to mention 'white sociologists' (although he does mention "white academic mentors"). However, he does indicate what differentiates the experiences of black social scientists and white academic mentors under Jim Crow (1985:6).

Both Lyman and Stanfield approach "the inequality in social sciences' perspective" differently. Stanfield develops a "sociology of social science paradigm," which examines institutional contexts that shape the unequal, Jim Crow environment and experiences of social scientists (with particular reference to sociologists), unlike

Lyman's 'sociology of sociologists paradigm,' which focuses on sociologists' ideas and methods that reinforce inequality or Jim Crow in social sciences. Stanfield finds that the social sciences are "powerful intellectual enterprises" that mirror and reproduce "societal patterns of class, gender, and racial inequality," arguing that the social sciences are "microcosms and reproducers of societal racial inequality" (1985:3). More specifically, Stanfield is concerned with demonstrating "how resultant knowledge production [in the social sciences] reinforces hegemonic societal racial ordering" (1985:4).

According to Stanfield, race is more than an idea or ideology used to shape sociologists' thought, race is also a social force or structure that defines social reality and reflects a well-developed system and set of power relations. He notes, "American elites, through their race/class consciousness and powerful social circles, have used race as a central tool for the construction of reality as well as for organizing and stratifying society…In multiracial America, race, as an elite tool of reality construction, creates a normative taken-for-granted social structure in which race is an integral aspect of the flow of everyday life" (1985:4). Stanfield's description parallels Joe Feagin's understanding of the "white racial frame" (2006).

Stanfield exhibits a tension between a Marxist (class) discourse and race discourse when discussing the elite, at times discussing the elite strictly as a class, a class concept, and other times identifying the elite as a 'racial class,' a race-class concept. For example, he uses the more generic class terms: "elites," "corporate ruling class," "American elites," or "power elites," but also uses racially defined class understandings of the elite, more clearly identifying the elite as "Anglo-Saxon elite," "elite status groups

of European descent," or "white elite." Another example, he alternates between the terms, "white Northerners" and "Northern elites" (1985:6, 9). He conflates, thus confuses, race and class by using the combined descriptive "race/class" with regard to consciousness. While, at times, they overlap, racial consciousness and class consciousness are distinctive forms of consciousness that address different social realities and experiences, and as such should not be viewed as combined or inseparable categories.

While Stanfield is quick to recognize the important role race has played in shaping the social sciences and society in general, he seems a little hesitant to clearly identify that "whites," a racial group, have largely occupied the positions of power that influenced the development of the social sciences. True, he posits the conflict between ideas of "Anglo-Saxon superiority" and "black inferiority" as a major force in development of the social sciences, both in the area of race relations research and outside in other areas of research (health, family, education, politics, economics, social psychology, etc…). However, he systematically avoids the term "white," specifically when discussing the influential whites that play a dominant role in shaping the discipline, and he primarily restricts white racism to Anglo-Saxon superiority.

Through development of the text, it becomes clear the "natural historians," "sociocultural evolutionists," financiers, philanthropists, and foundation administrators and earlier, pre-World War I professional sociologists were whites (as black sociologists were excluded from the discipline), Stanfield fails to expressly identify the origins and early formation of American sociology as the development of a 'white sociology.'

Maybe, this is part of his method of addressing such a sensitive issue and white sociology's racism. While he illustrates a vivid picture of a segregated social world that works to promote a segregated social science world ("a variant of apartheid"), he does not spell out that 'white' sociology/social sciences and 'black' sociology/social sciences develop as unavoidable realities responding to the unbending Jim Crow (racial) social structural divisions between blacks and whites in society.

We learn that "natural historians" explained patterns of race relations and resolution to race-relations problems in a society presumed to be permanently biracial, or specifically, apartheid," and that "sociocultural evolutionists" viewed Jim Crow as an "unfortunate evil," a social system that was, nonetheless, needed as blacks and whites learned to interact socially. Yet, the natural historians and sociocultural evolutionists who backed apartheid or Crow ideology are not identified as whites. Similarly, the "corporate ruling class," not a 'white ruling class,' are responsible for producing "the channels needed for the systematic exclusion of blacks from sciences and technologies crucial to the advancement of corporate capitalism" (1985:9-10). Stanfield observes that "many of the ideas developed by the social scientists were used to justify the biological and cultural degradation of racial minorities in the new capitalist society [or one could also say, 'racially structured capitalist society']. He specifically mentions "the anti-Asian thought" of Edward Ross, the anti-immigration eugenic social scientist Robert Yerkes and Henry Fairchild, and the ethnocentric views of assimilationism discovered in William Thomas and Florian Znaniecki's work, *The Polish Peasant* (1985:11). While it may be assumed, never are we informed that these sociologists are white.

Setting the scene for a discussion of the "race-problem in pre-World War professional sociology," Stanfield exclaims that America has been a society ruled by those of European descent," and that even European immigrants who were not elites nonetheless shared a common trait with their elite cousins, whiteness (1985:16-17). Stanfield further states that "Anglo-Saxons and other elite status groups of European descent" (let's just say white elites) historically "exploit and control non-European Americans." To maintain their power and social position, whites---white elites and their powerbrokers, ambassadors, and managers---develop myths that proclaim white superiority,[41] the greatest white myth being "science." In addition to ideologies of "white superiority," Stanfield argues that [white] social scientists, in different ways (more and less extreme or conservative), also embraced ideas of social Darwinism. According to Stanfield, sociological thought supported by social Darwinism and myths of white superiority and black inferiority produced a "neglect" of black sociological studies and negative views of blacks among white sociologists (e.g. Lester Ward, Charles Cooley, Albion Small, W.I. Thomas, Franklin Giddings, and 'the planter-sociologist,' Alfred Stone).

According to Stanfield, during the pre-World War I years, white social scientists generated "scientific" claims about white superiority that were often justified through the disparagement of blacks and other people of color. Sociologists contributing to the *American Journal of Sociology* (AJS) "continued to discuss the mental limitations of

---

[41] Stanfield uses the concept "Anglo-Saxon superiority," a term relevant to the hierarchy of whiteness in the 19th century. However, during the 19th century other white groups form Europe, not just Anglo-Saxons, demonstrated a sense of racial superiority, especially the Germans and French; moreover, Anglo-Saxon superiority was diminishing in the early twentieth century as the Irish, German, Dutch, Swedes, Italians, Jews, Poles, and Spanish became "white" (Roediger, 2006).

blacks, the natural repugnance between white and dark races, and the quality of black 'immorality'" (1985:25). Stanfield notes one white sociologist, in particular, Alfred Stone. In 1908, Stone published the largely influential *Studies in the American Race Problem*, a work that argued for Jim Crow segregation and an apartheid-like "biracial" society for fear that interracial associations would lead to social conflict between blacks and whites. In a move that indicates a theoretical tension between a black and white sociologists, Stanfield notes that W.E.B. Du Bois, a black sociologist, challenged Stone's work as "a variant of Anglo-Saxon (white) social philosophy" (1985:27).

Stanfield identifies a group of black social scientists that stand outside the walls of the institutionalized and professional world of white sociology. He writes that "W.E.B. Du Bois, George Haynes, Richard Wright and other black sociologists were completely excluded from professional affairs" of American sociology, which is identified as a "lily-white profession." With the opportunity to clearly identify *black* sociologies as excluded from the "mainstream" profession of *white* sociologists, Stanfield reverts to vague language, speaking of "researchers marginal to the institutional nexus of mainstream sociology," instead of speaking specifically about *black* sociological researchers marginalized from the institutional nexus of *white* mainstream sociology. While it is important to learn about Thomas T. Jones, a sociologist whose "sociology of black education influenced the direction and ideology of foundation support of black education" (the Tuskegee model),[42] it also seems important

---

[42] Many whites, like Thomas Jones, and certain black leaders, like the powerful Booker T. Washington , believed that blacks should focus on industrial and service training, not higher education for professional jobs that might compete with more powerful whites.

to remind the reader that such a powerful person in education policy making was indeed white, with specific 'white biases and motivations.' He was not just an ambiguous person with "personal views" and "objective evaluations" that happened to frame blacks and black socialization negatively (1985:28-30).

Like Lyman, Stanfield examines the Park's important role in white sociology, which developed in his experiences at Tuskegee as an employee of Booker T. Washington and later as a teacher at the University of Chicago. According to Stanfield, Park distances himself from earlier white sociologists by replacing ideologies of Anglo-Saxon superiority with "horizontal social Darwinism" (1985:31), yet he nevertheless regurgitates the underlying racial ideologies of earlier white sociologists. His support of Jim Crow society is discovered in his accommodationist views, social views that, contrary to most accounts, he emphasized to a greater extent than his boss at Tuskegee, Booker T. Washington. However, "Washington and his machine were also influential in developing …Park's sociological thinking about race relations," directing Park to analyze "statistical information," while overlooking "life histories" of black Americans. Importantly, Stanfield reverses the stereotyped and assumed one-way cultural exchange between blacks and whites, demonstrating that whites, have indeed, been influenced by blacks.

Stanfield identifies a number of ambiguities with Park. For example, "in his writings on Tuskegee and later publications on race relations, he criticized the means by which whites in America exploited and abused blacks and other minorities, but he never called into question the legitimacy of white dominations" (1985:42). "He was dedicated

to a biracial society which should advocate racial justice, but not racial equality," and "at least through the late 1920s, Park did not totally reject biological explanations, nor he totally accept environmental ones" (1985:43, 50). Stanfield points out Park's connection to the racist ideologies of white sociology discovered in the pre-World War II sociologists, noting that "Park had an asymmetrical conception of cultural diffusion…particularly assimilation…So, according to Park, the diffusion of "superior European culture, through advances in technology and communication, was inevitable" (1985:45).

For Park, like earlier white sociologists, "civilization" is equated with "European cultural hegemony," and assimilation is a unidirectional path and absorption to a white social world and 'whiteness of being' (1985:46). "Park implied…when dissimilar racial and cultural groups enter a host society, the form and content of their cultures must completely disintegrate in order to be successfully absorbed into the society…based on the assumption that European culture was superior" (1985:46). Park holds that the European or white race and culture are the societal norms to which other races and cultures must assimilate. He claimed that blacks had different racial temperaments than whites, again, upholding the biological determinism common among earlier white social scientists. Park disparaged African and other non-white cultures, believing they were backward and disappearing (or, like in the case with African cultural tradition in America, completely annihilated), a belief inherited by E. Franklin Frazier and half-heartedly supported by Charles Johnson, two black sociologists deeply connected with and supportive of Park's white sociology

Stanfield proclaims that "Park's ideas [---much of the basis of white sociology---] were in large part developed by his students and lived on through them," and have a lasting effect on the development sociology. Stanfield also claims that a tradition of black social scientists and scholars have been routinely overlooked, noting that "William E.B. Du Bois, Kelly Miller, George Haynes, Carter G. Woodson, and Richard Wright, Jr." were "too marginal to have much of an impact on associational history and sociology" (1985:54). Unlike their more 'radical' brethren working outside the institutionalized walls of white sociology, Johnson and Frazier were allowed to practice white sociology as long as they "emphasized race relations in a (supposed) permanent biracial society," supported or least were not critical of accommodationism (Jim Crow racial relations) and embraced the assimilationist model (movement to a superior white society). Through Park's help (in exchange for not rocking the boat of white sociology), Frazier would go on to become one of the more "prominent sociologists in associational affairs" and "defined as the best black sociologists ever." Johnson would move on to foundation-supported posts and later, with major funding from white philanthropist organizations, shape the social science department at Fisk University (1985:55-6).

Stanfield's discussion of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial and Edwin Rogers Embree and Julius Rosenwald Fund demonstrates the power of white decision makers in the development of social sciences' "white male bias of mainstream social sciences" (1985:70). White overseers or "memorial officers' to the major funds established by philanthropists often segregated white and black funding, dictated the type of research to be conducted and who would lead the research, who would receive

funds (whites or blacks), and many other decisions that had a profound impact on social

science research through the early to mid twenty century. James Angell's mentee,

Beardsley Ruml was one such white administrator who managed "funds totaling $74

million and an annual income of over $4 million," largely determining "how the funds

were to be spent" (1985:65-6).

> Ruml's social science program laid the ideological and institutional groundwork
> for the expansion of European-descent [white] social science in the United States
> and northwestern Europe. It was taken for granted in the phenomenological
> context of an apartheid society that only a white man had the capacity to be
> trained to do research in search of generalizable knowledge. The creation,
> reproduction, and distribution of mainstream social science revolved around the
> experiences of Anglo-Saxon males [whites] occupying elite positions in
> academia, professional associations, and funding organizations. When Ruml and
> his staff discussed "good social science research, they were envisioning
> formalized white conceptions of empirical "realities" (1985:69).

Stanfield demonstrates that organizations like the Social Science Research

Council excluded black sociologists and that black sociologists were denied leadership

roles in the development of various foundation programs. Stanfield notes that "Leonard

Outhwaite [a white] was responsible for black social sciences programs, plus everything

else related to race---further evidence of the memorial officers' assumption that black

social scientists and empirical inquiries into black condition had little to do with

mainstream white social science" (1985:71). Outhwaite, a close associate of Ruml and

Angell, eventually directed funds to address "the Negro Problem," a long-avoided topic

of research by foundations. While, on some levels, study of blacks was a welcome

development, Outhwaite sympathized with the "southern liberal view" promoting

permanent racial segregation (whites' and blacks' "place in society"), asymmetric race

relations, and the "self-help" social philosophy popular among whites and emblemized by Washington's Tuskegee Institute.

While "Outhwaite and the other memorial officers were quite reluctant to award scholarships to blacks who they felt might be 'troublemakers,'" they did sponsor black sociologists like Charles Johnson, who had a "racial philosophy [that] conformed with that of the foundation" (1985:90). As Stanfield notes, in general, black sociologists faced numerous disadvantages related to research funding and occupational opportunities, often being limited to studies of blacks and race relations (1985:89).

> While the white graduates of Chicago and Chapel Hill [white institutions] could get jobs almost anywhere, including black colleges, blacks who received social science degrees from Fisk [a black institution] were forced to find academic employment in the few black institutions that could afford to hire them…This lack of opportunity was due in large part to the attitudes of white foundation administrators and social scientists, who assumed, as discussed earlier, that black social scientists were useful only in the study of black problems (1985:89).

Like the Rockefeller Memorial Fund, the Julius Rosenwald Fund would resound the basic tenets of white social science, accepting the "dialectical idea of accommodation and assimilation [to whites and white society] in American life" and projecting "major aspects of American Anglo-Saxon [white] ideology" (1985:98). When Edwin Rogers Embree eventually became director of the Rosenwald Fund, administrating the fund from 1928-1948, he "did more for black social scientists and the social science of race relations than did any other foundation administrator of that period" (1985:100). For example, he "obtained approval to establish a race-relations department at Fisk University, headed by Johnson."

Embree was a "flamboyant integrationist [though against revolutionary change], but he continued to believe in white domination over nonwhites." Like Outhwaite, he bought into the southern liberal social philosophy already mentioned, "that southerners knew best how to handle 'their Negroes'" (1985:109-11). Along with Embree and Outhwaite, Will Alexander is another white who controlled funding and research in the social sciences as a Rosenwald Fund manager. Alexander, a close associate of Howard Odum, the prominent race relations researcher at he University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, believed that black-white race relations could be studied scientifically, and thus established a research program that attempted to study the "race problem" like any other objective variable. Ambivalent about his positions on race, he "politically supported racial integration by the 1940s," yet by the early 1950s, "he dropped out of the vanguard pushing for racial integration" (1985:113-15).

According to Stanfield, "in the history of American social science, no man did more for the advancement of modern "black social science" than Fisk sociologist Charles S. Johnson, who "dedicated his life to liberating blacks from racial discrimination by conducting scientific research" (1985:119). Stanfield mentions how, under Johnson reign, the numerous detailed studies of race relations conducted by black social scientists at Fisk provided fuel for later Civil Rights activism and legislation. Johnson was instrumental in the study of the Chicago race riots of 1919, and was the lead writer of the influential study, *The Negro in Chicago* (1922), "the first comprehensive social scientific analysis of post-World War I white-black relations" (1985:120). Stanfield notes that, because of his brilliance and adherence to the Parkean

racial social philosophies of accommodationism and assimilationism, Johnson attracted the attention of foundation administrators like Embree and Outhwaite, who connected Johnson to a number of funded projects and posts.

One of Johnson's projects, *Shadow of the Plantation* (1934), carefully balanced the type of study that the fund administrators sought, namely a picture of the pathology of blacks, but also managed to demonstrate the overarching economic problems associated with a collapsed plantation system (white social system) that generates "cultural lag" and "social isolation," socio-environmental factors that cause black problems. Johnson teamed up with fund administrators, Embree and Alexander, to write *The Collapse of the Cotton Tendency* (1934), a study that portrayed the 'cotton tendency' as an "oppressive archaic system" of tenant cotton farming. They argued that the "cotton tendency was an oppressive economic mechanism which outlived the 'Old South,'" one which apparently affected blacks to a greater degree than whites (1985:131). Some of Johnson's more radical ideas were held back from publication for years, works like *Bitter Canaan* (1987), "a historical sociological analysis of the exploitative roles and political economic dilemmas of the Afro-American." According to Stanfield, Johnson's inability to get certain works published had to do with the fact that his "theory of race relations, which went beyond Park's, was too power oriented, too pessimistic" for mainstream social science (1985:133-4).

An American Dilemma (1944) "cost the Carnegie Corporation (CC) half a million dollars and employed over fifty researchers." It was a study of "the moral dilemma" over whites' undemocratic treatment of blacks in a country that toted democracy. More

specifically, it was a study of: "the ever-raging conflict between, on one hand, the valuations preserved on the general plane we shall call the "American Creed," where the American thinks, talks and acts under the influence of high national and Christian percepts, and, on the other hand, the valuations on specific planes of individual and group living, where personal and local interest; economic, social, and sexual jealousies; considerations of community prestige and conformity; group prejudice against particular persons or types of people; and all sorts of miscellaneous wants, impulses, and habits dominate his outlook" (1962:lxxi).

According to Stanfield, "The Carnegie Corporation was the most racially exclusive of the major foundations and was very supportive of white supremacy in apartheid societies. It dared not allow blacks any decision-making power in areas such as race relations research…According to Carnegie Corporation protocol, black destiny was to be decided by whites only" (1985:142). Despite the corporation's reluctance to sponsor race relations research and the fact that CC's president, Frederick Keppel, was a racial conservative, the study was funded as a means to address rising black-white race relations issues in Jim Crow America. Stanfield raises the question, why was a white sociologist and non-American, one who "knew virtually nothing about blacks and the vast literature on race relations," chosen to conduct the study? He finds that the likely reason or given explanation for the selection was Myrdal's outsider stance—the fact that he didn't have "biases" about American race relations and because the fund directors at CC felt that as a "European scholar devoted to the interests of the foundation," he "would not raise embarrassing issues" about race in the US" (1985:142, 150). Myrdal

would act like a "stranger" sociologist among "the natives" people of the US---a "stranger is not a member of the society he is observing….thus the stranger has the capacity to be impartial or objective in the collection and interpretation of data…Carnegie officers and Gunnar Myrdal were true believers in the virtues of stranger objectivity" (1985:151).

Stanfield lists a series of problems with Myrdal's selection as leader of such a complex and delicate study. Along with his knowing "nothing about blacks and the vast literature on race relations," Myrdal was a victim of his own biases, misrepresentations, and lack of knowledge and experience. For example, he failed to recognize whites' control of power in multiracial organizations like NAACP and Urban League, believing that blacks had power they did not in fact have. Among other missteps, Myrdal moved away from cultural pluralist visions of race relations, became convinced, like Park, that blacks retained no African cultural traditions nor had developed their own black American culture, was overly optimistic about future race relations, ignored the "normative features of the black experience," and, in general, presented a "new elaboration of old data" (1985:159-163).

For Stanfield, the project was marred by Jim Crow from the start. Myrdal's bosses and associates espoused the social philosophy of Jim Crow. Jackson Davis, Myrdal's tour guide of the South who "was instrumental in getting *An American Dilemma* accepted by southern [white] liberals," rehashed the Southern liberal position of separate but equal doctrine and the belief in gradual de-segregation (1985:158). Speaking of the CC-funded project, Stanfield writes, "with the exception of contributing

researchers, the whole organization was exclusively white or at least rigidly controlled by whites. Blacks participated in the study only as collectors or sources of data…[although the project was "plagued" with problems, at the hands of the whites in charge] this not disturb the project's exclusive white control or its use of prominent black social scientists as field hands" (1985:159-63).

Stanfield illustrates another example of the problems of Jim Crow associated with the study, involving Louis Wirth, "Myrdal's most instrumental informal consultant," and two of Wirth's graduate students, Horace Cayton and Arnold Rose. Stanfield recalls that "Rose [a white sociologist] rather than Cayton [a black sociologist] was selected as Myrdal's major American assistant,"[43] a move that eventually "paved the way for [Rose's] successful career as a race relations expert." As Stanfield notes, "quite a different fate awaited Wirth's other brilliant, but black, student." Horace "Cayton was the most brilliant sociologist of African descent in the so-called Johnson-Frazier generation;" but, in rejection of racial subordination as a scholar, disputes with white sociologists (Lloyd Warner and Gunnar Myrdal), and supposed personal problems, he was increasingly marginalized in the sociological profession. His move away from academic social science was also self-motivated as he became more involved in civic affairs in the Chicago black community (1985:163-4, 169-170).

Stanfield concludes *Philanthropy and Jim Crow* by summarizing several highlights of Jim Crow in the origins and evolution of social sciences. A primary goal of

---

[43] Stanfield finds that "Wirth's recommendation of Arnold Rose to Myrdal was surprising." Was it? Both Wirth and Rose were white [and shared Jewish identity], not to mention CC's aversion to bringing on a black lead researcher.

social sciences: involves achieving a "positivistic social science…divorced form

humanistic concerns; a patrimonial tradition of giving; and most importantly, the

relationship between philanthropy and Jim Crow in American social science."

> The philanthropists and foundation administrators involved in the sponsorship of race-relations research…had the ability to support any societal organization they chose. But for various reason, ranging from private (to not so private) racist attitudes to fear of repercussions, they mainly chose to promote a race social science embedded in Jim Crow assumptions" (1985:192).

Stanfield ends with a reflection on black sociologists experience in relation to

Jim Crow social science and the basic assumptions and power of whites. He recognizes

that "black social scientists…had to indulge in accommodative abstract empiricism to be

heard---more so than their white colleagues." Yet, he also mentions a group or tradition

of black sociologists that were not the "safe blacks" who "philanthropic sponsors of

race-elations attempted to select."

> From the very beginning of foundation and academic patronage of race-relations researchers—blacks in particular—those with blatant integrationist, nationalist, culturally pluralistic, or Marxist perspectives were seldom considered for funding. Scholars like Zora Neale Hurston, Carter G. Woodson, and William E.B. Du Bois were not consistently supported by the foundations because their views were considered too radical (1985:193).

Carter G. Woodson distanced himself from white-controlled philanthropic

research on blacks. Stanfield notes that "*The Miseducation of the Negro*, published in

1933 was the symbol of Woodson's frustration over philanthropists' control of black

scholars" (194). According to Stanfield, Du Bois accepted the positive and negative

conditions of a black scholar's relationship with white philanthropists. On one hand, the

support of philanthropists allowed him to edit the NAACP's influential journal, *The

Crisis*, for nearly a quarter century (1910-1934), and, on the other, Du Bois was often

unable to challenge whites' views and decisions, who were usually the majority on boards and organizations on which he served. Throughout his career, Du Bois' clashes with whites negatively affected his employment, research project funding, and produced other untold human costs. When E. Franklin Frazier offered a more pointed discussion of American race relations in "The Pathology of Race Prejudice," he was run out of town (Atlanta). Additionally, "mainstream white and black scholars never forgave Oliver Cox for his Marxist perspective on race relations and, more importantly, for his criticism of the Park School and of Gunnar Myrdal, and thus for years he was virtually ignored or ridiculed in professional and social science circles" (1985:195). As Stanfield concludes, "mainstream scholars, both black and white, who dared to write down radical thoughts found that most of these ideas ended up edited…It was better to be accommodative than to be labeled unscientific, unreasonable, or disloyal to one's patron. The careless boldness of E. Franklin Frazier, carter G. Woodson, Oliver Cox, and others was uniformly punished" (1985:196).

Conclusion

Through an analytic review of *The Black American in Sociological Thought* and *Philanthropy and Jim Crow*, a largely concealed picture of the racial construction of American sociology emerges, a picture of largely white sociological framework. While Lyman's work focuses mostly on individual white American sociologists and their ideas and sociological research, Stanfield's work recounts the social contextual environment and material structure influenced by race that shapes the conceptual and methodological

approaches of individual white and black American sociologists. The two works complement one another, illuminating the dialectic between idealist and materialist sociological understandings, as well as highlighting the importance of the relationship between the individual and social structure (society).

Significantly, Lyman and Stanfield focus on similar sociologists, such as Robert Park, Gunnar Myrdal, and E. Franklin Frazier, focusing on their sociology and the social contexts and material conditions shaping their experiences and position in the discipline. The two studies greatly inform the reader about white sociology without using the concept. How do Lyman and Stanfield avoid discussing the framework (ideas and practices, people and institutions) of white sociology that Staples (1976) and Ladner et al. address (1973)? I now turn to Mary Jo Deegan's study of race and sociology in Chicago (2002), which combines the idealist and materialist approaches of Lyman and Stanfield, and which identifies black and white sociology in a specific context, the social context of the Hull House and University of Chicago.

CHAPTER V

BLACK AND WHITE SOCIOLOGY AT HULL HOUSE AND THE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Race, Hull House, and the University of Chicago: A New Conscience Against Ancient Evils **(2002), Mary Jo Deegan**

In *Race, Hull House, and the University of Chicago: A New Conscience Against Ancient Evils* (*Race, Hull and Chicago*), published in 2002, Mary Jo Deegan presents a historical revision of early sociology. She examines the important, but unrecognized, relationship between two "white" social institutions, the male-dominated University of Chicago and the female-headed Hull House, and analyzes "black" sociologists' interactions with and within these two gendered institutions. Throughout the work, Deegan demonstrates an appreciation of the differences between the social experiences and positionalities of blacks and whites in the two institutions, the framework of the discipline, and the larger social context of society and history. This awareness aids her re-reading of the dominant historical accounts of the Chicago School, accounts that largely fail to examine ideas and practices of the earlier Chicago School sociologists, Hull House sociologists, and the African American sociologists connected to the two institutions. Focusing on the intersection of gender and race, two marginalized fields in sociology, Deegan aims to "to pull some tangled threads out of the morass of scholarship that is seriously biased against the critical thought of and the work of women and African American scholars, especially… Jane Addams and W.E.B. Du Bois" (2002:5).

Deegan uses a feminist epistemology to discuss the relationship between blacks and women in sociology that looks to Jane Addams' sociological fight for the social progress and development of all of society's groups. Like Addams' sociological position that is embedded more in feminist and class concerns and has a problematical relation with race concern,[44] Deegan's feminist epistemology used to understand race relations in sociology has its limitations that stem from omission of critical race-based sociological understandings of the social history of sociology. As Addams' (1892, 1895, 1910) and Deegan's (1988/1990, 2002) work portrays, they are part of a social progressive tradition that ideally promotes social progress for all human beings, a tradition that has better track record with race (though not fully satisfactory) than the white patriarchal tradition in Deegan's critique.

In contrast to other Chicago School historians, Deegan draws a more detailed map of history of Chicago School sociology (CSS) from 1892 to 1960, one that divides CSS into several "segments"---"historical location[s] with corresponding faculty and students who help create a specific formal stock of knowledge" (2002:5). Because Deegan is looking specifically at the different ways that gender and race intersect with the two institutions, she develops several schools within this racially and gender-defined institutional framework. In the first two chapters, she provides the following primary breakdown: the Chicago School of Race Relations (CSRR), which is divided into "Early Chicago School of Race Relations (ECSRR), Parkian Chicago School of Race Relations

---

[44] See Bettina Aptheker's edited volume, *Lynching and Rape: An Exchange of Views by Jane Addams and Ida B. Wells* (1977), in which Aptheker recounts Addams compromise on race issues to appease Southerners. See Addams' essay, "Letter for Law," and Ida B. Wells' "Lynching and the Excuse for It" published in *The Independent* in 1931.

(PCSRR), and the African American Chicago School of Race Relations (AACSRR), and, outside the Chicago framework, the Hull House School of Race Relations (HHSRR).

Key sociologists of ESCRR (1892-1920) are W.I. Thomas, Albion Small, Charles Henderson, Charles Zueblin, George Mead. PSCRR is composed of "its white male leader," Robert Park, and his white colleagues and students (Ernest Burgess, Lois Wirth, E.B. Reuter, Robert Redfield...etc) and black colleagues and students (Charles Johnson, Monroe N. Work, and E. Franklin Frazier) (2002:4, 23).[45] The network of AACSRR includes Monroe Work, Charles S. Johnson, E. Franklin Frazier, Kelly Miller, Oliver Cox, and, Wilmouth Carter, and Lorraine Richardson (black women who Deegan agues were marginalized in AACSRR and therefore part of a separate group). Sociologists and "scholar activists" associated with HHSRR are Jane Addams, the white female leader of the school, and white women sociologists such as Julia Lathrop, Soponisba Breckinridge, Mary McDowell, Florence Kelly, Isabel Eaton, Grace and Edith Abbott, as well as black women, such as Ida B. Wells, Fannie Lou Hammer, Frances Keller, and Elizabeth Haynes, and black men such as George Haynes and Richard Wright, Jr.[46]

Many of the individuals above were not confined to their primary segment, and were often associates or members of two or more segments. However, a notable pattern of interrelationships appears. Deegan points to a primary split between Hull House (HH)

---

[45] For a more detailed list of PCSRR, see Deegan (2002:44).

[46] See Deegan's *Jane Addams and the Men of the Chicago School, 1892-1918* (19881990) for a more comprehensive list of HH sociologists.

and Early Chicago School (ECS) team of sociologists, on one hand, and Parkaen

Chicago School (PCS) and AACS (African American Chicago School) team of

sociologists, on the other. She demonstrates that each partnership have distinctive

sociological worldviews and practices. The HH-ESC alliance, despite their internal

conflicts, represents concern with social justice, reform oriented, public sociology active

outside the academic institution, specifically the University of Chicago. In contrast, the

PCS and AACS alliance, in spite of their differences, emphasizes a "patriarchal"

detached, accommodationist stance most influenced by Robert Park at Chicago, who, not

only led the PCSRR, but also was highly influential in shaping the ideas and practices of

AACSRR. Deegan labels Park as a defector of ECSRR, claiming his earlier sociological

career was marked by a greater concern with social reform issues shared by ECS

sociologists, but that changed as he eclipsed the ECS sociologists.

After "establishing the cast of characters and schools," Deegan examines: the

relationship between W.E.B. Du Bois and HHSRR (chapter 3); HHSRR and ECSRR's

"fundamental roles" in the development of the National Association for the

Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and Chicago Association for the

Advancement of Colored People (CAACP) (chapters 4-5), and battle against "Jim Crow

in Chicago's Public Schools" (chapter 6). Additionally, she analyzes the patriarchy of

Robert Park (chapter 7), the gendered and racialized marginalization of Wilmoth A.

Cater (chapter 8), E. Franklin Frazier's "breaching experiments" (chapter 9), and

Oliver's Cox's sociology (specifically his critique of PSCRR and AASCRR). Deegan

concludes with a chapter summarizing her main argument about the forgotten history of

the early cooperation between white and black sociologists and scholar-activists and male and female sociologists and scholar-activists during the beginning days of the discipline, attempting to portray an earlier, more democratic picture of the relationships and intellectual cross-fertilization among different Chicago-based sociologists and social workers.

With regard to study of black sociology and white sociology, *Race, Hull and Chicago*'s major contribution is exposure of forgotten black sociologists and scholar-activists associated with two predominantly white social institutions, Hull House (HH) and the University of Chicago (UC), the institution that birthed a powerful white led-tradition in American sociology, CCS, and equally influential white sociological sub-field, CSRR. Deegan's study of the social dynamics between blacks and whites at HH and UC present an important picture of the early development of black and white sociology in specific socio-historical contexts. While Deegan's study provides rich historical materials and perceptive analyses on a number of levels, her interpretations of historical events, personal relationships, and social contexts raise some important questions and concerns that are addressed in the following brief review of her work.

Early Chicago School of Race Relations and Hull House School of Race Relations

Unlike Stanfield's and Lyman's writings on the white racist and ethnocentric origins of early American sociology, Deegan argues that the mostly white and male ECSRR sociologists and mostly white and female HHSRR sociologists were committed to ending racial discrimination, particularly discrimination against blacks. In other words,

Deegan is claiming that a non-racist white sociological tradition in support of "equality and justice for African Americans" developed in the relationship between ECSRR and HHSRR, a claim that certain scholars question such as David L. Lewis and Rivka Lissak. These scholars view members of HHSRR and ECSRR not as sociologists who "fought to end discrimination" but as "white, elitist, prejudiced, middle-class, insensitive moralists," a view that Deegan aims to refute through her study (2002:4).

Deegan's positive reading of ESCRR and HHSRR rests on several propositions. She develops three key proposals in defense of viewing ESCRR and HHSRR as "race conscious" sociologists out to end racial discrimination, "specifically prejudice against African-Americans." First, ESCRR and HHSRR are framed as inheritors of a white racial justice tradition. Second, Deegan argues that ESCRR and HHSRR developed strong relationships with black sociologists and scholar-activists---ECSRR through training future black sociologists, HHSRR through collaborative efforts with blacks in social movements (challenging educational racial segregation in Chicago and establishing social settlements) and organizations (The NAACP, CAACP, National Urban League (NUL) and (CUL) or Chicago Urban League).[47] Lastly, ESCRR and HHSRR are viewed as oppositional sociological frames to the more powerful Parkean frame that develops around 1920. Deegan mentions that, like HH women sociologists, marginalized and radical black sociologists (e.g., W.E.B. Du Bois, Oliver Cox) resist this

---

[47] Black sociologists and scholar activists, like Ida B Wells, Fannie Lou Hammer, Loraine Green, and Richard Wright had associations with HH; however, as Deegan notes, many blacks that frequented HH were uncomfortable in the largely white social environment.

male and white frame; however, she fails to locate black sociologists as a "school" (not 'outside' segment) in relation to the Chicago School.

To begin, she develops a discussion of a white liberal "social justice" tradition that has opposed racism and stood for blacks' social rights, beginning with ideas and practices of early white abolitionists and national leaders, especially Abraham Lincoln. Deegan argues that the early white abolitionists and Lincoln inspire a white "neo-abolitionist" tradition, the tradition inherited by HH and ECS sociologists. One wonders why Frederick Douglass (or John Brown for that matter) is not mentioned alongside Lincoln, possibly because Douglass had disputes with white abolitionists and Lincoln, who were often paternalistic and out of touch with the black experience. Several questions arise when reading Deegan's analysis. How far does the strong white habit of paternalism extend to the white individuals running the ECSRR and HHSRR? Did sociologists of ECSRR and HHSRR embrace a more conservative abolitionist tradition of slow reform (the gradual evolutionism of social Darwinism) or a more radical tradition of revolutionary change? Are the associations between blacks and ECSRR and HHSRR as significant as Deegan implies? How far can we, like Deegan, equate the social and historical struggles of women with those of blacks, and pursue a line of argument where racial justice becomes lost in broader questions of "social justice" (again, see B. Aptheker's 1977 critique of Addams' compromise on race)?

Parkean Chicago School of Race Relations and African American Chicago School of Race Relations

Deegan announces Robert Park's arrival at the helm of CSS as the beginning of "'the 'dark era in patriarchal ascendancy' in sociology" (12), a fifteen-year period from 1920 to 1935. According to Deegan, the Park-led PCSRR was rooted in Booker T. Washington's accommodationist social philosophy [Stanfield (1985) reverses the direction of this relationship, with Park pushing more accommodationist views on Washington.]. She points out that Park's rise in CSS did not bode well for blacks or women sociologists (10). As Deegan asserts, PCSRR reinforced white male worldviews and practices that perpetuate the color line and patriarchy in CCS, ideas and practices that have lasted up until the 1960s.

> PCRR often played an accommodationist but crucial role in the history of race relations and American thought during this era. Park and his group exhibited a sophisticated form of "white racism" (Feagin, Vera, Batur 2001) where they intended to criticize "white racism" in others but used ideas and an apolitical, "scientific" practice that diluted their efforts to understand and reflect an unjust process" (2002:5).

> The 'legitimated accounts' (Schutz 1962; Scott and Lyman 1968) of PCSRR present a white patriarchal, middle class justification of relations between white and black Americans and suppress important alternative sociological images and scholarship, including the more complex work of the ECSRR, the HHSRR, and the AACSRR which incorporated the work of militant scholars such as Du Bois (2002:44).

> Deegan examines both similarities and differences between the "legitimated" PCSRR and "Veiled" AACSRR. As noted, both promoted patriarchal worldviews and practices, both were post-ECSRR 'segments' that espoused Park's accommodationist and assimilationist understanding of race relations, as well as his post-ECSRR detached,

apolitical "scientific" sociological approach. Both black and white sociologists "were oriented particularly to the academy and their careers there. African-American sociologists shared this orientation to the academy and their careers there," but, at the same time, black sociologists "were [also] committed deeply to the community struggles for African-American freedom from discrimination as well" (2002:12). As Deegan observes, black sociologists experienced a distinct social world that was markedly different, less advantaged and secure, than their white colleagues, and that that PCSRR was the central, dominant frame that oversee the marginalized, suppressed AACSRR frame.

Unlike white sociologists, black sociologists face "structural patterns of racism" in a "white-defined, hegemonic school…and life-world;" black sociologists experience the "indefatigable color line" within CSS, the academic disciple, and society. Deegan recognizes the fact that black sociologists' experiences of the social world are largely excluded from the theoretical knowledge of "white sociology" (2002:45). She describes the practices by which white sociologists exclude black sociologists as the "Veil of sociology," which refers to "differential power, marginality, and legitimacy of white and black sociologists within the structure of knowledge and higher education" (2002:46).

> The "African American Chicago school of race relations" (AACSRR) comprised a network of African-American scholars who worked within the Veil in the larger society and in sociology…The AACSRR was established behind the Veil of sociology and divided by a color line… Managing the Veil and color line while depending on the recommendations, peer reviews, friendship, and alliances with white sociologists, particularly within the PCSRR, required a balancing act between honesty and survival…All African-American Chicago sociologists lived behind the Veil, and this common experience generated a different epistemology and network from their white colleagues at Chicago (2002:46)

Du Bois and Hull House

Like Hull House women sociologists, W.E.B. Du Bois, as a black, was excluded and marginalized from white patriarchal mainstream sociology that developed with PCSRR. Du Bois remained even more marginalized in American sociology than AACSRR because he did not have the connections with powerful white sociologists, nor was he willing to adopt the accommodationist stance necessary to maintain a job as a mainstream professional black sociologist. While seeming to indicate that Du Bois and Hull House had a symbiotic relation, Deegan actually presents a picture of a one-way cultural diffusion/intellectual transmission, one that focuses on ways Hull House sociologists supposedly influence or aid Du Bois' sociology.

For example, while important to note, for example, that the Hull House maps aided his Philadelphia study, it is incorrect to say that this was the primary source or an able model. Du Bois surely learned how to gather empirical evidence on populations during his graduate studies with the highly empirical-oriented Gustav Schmoller (Green and Driver 1978). Moreover, the social history of blacks in Philadelphia, understandings of split social environments, racism, and the black community, and societal critique in the Philadelphia study were not gleaned through study of Hull House maps and data. Deegan claims that three women were integral to the Philadelphia study. According to Deegan, "the idea to study the black population in Philadelphia originated with Susan P. Wharton…Addams was an advisor during the early stages of the Philadelphia project...and Isabel Eaton, a white female sociologist, authored almost one-fifth of *The*

Philadelphia Negro" (2002:55-58). Never does she mention important theoretical and empirical advances made by Du Bois or that it was his first major study.

That Du Bois had respect for Jane Addams and the ideas and work of the Hull House women sociologists, and learned from them, seems to be a reasonable claim. Yet, is the link between Du Bois and HHSRR as profound as Deegan believes? Though Du Bois was an associate and friend of Addams, most of the scholarly links between Du Bois and Addams and her cohort, HHSRR, appear to be too weak. The major intellectual contribution of Philadelphia, an exposure of white racism's effects on blacks, had little to do with the HHSRR. It would appear that Deegan's investigative work of ancillary events involved with the development of the Philadelphia study are historically interesting, but they do not prove to be major influences on the work, as Deegan would seem to indicate.

Hull House's and Early Chicago School's Campaign for Desegregation

Deegan reveals that members form the HHSRR and ECSRR played fundamental roles in the development of the NAACP and CAACP and in challenges to Jim Crow in the Chicago school public system (2002:63). She goes so far as to say that William English Walling is "viewed to be the single most important person in development of NAACP" (65). The history of the formation of the NAACP is viewed to have resulted in response to the 1908 Springfield Riot. According to Deegan, members of Hull House and the University of Chicago generated and helped circulate "the Call," a petition to organize and end racial violence, which became the beacon in the formation of the NAACP.

Surprisingly, in her account of the formation of the NAACP, Du Bois is largely absent and Wells-Barnett's organized efforts with the Negro Fellowship League are peripheral to the actions of whites. Another point not mentioned is that, because of white paternalism and black exclusion, the NAACP was a white-controlled organization that eventually marginalized and then eliminated Du Bois, the one black who, as editor of *Crisis*, held a major position in the organization when it formed. He was not as aligned with the white social justice fighters of HH ilk as Deegan might have us believe. It is important to remember that HH and UC women who were influential in development of the white-run NAACP CAACP, NUL and CUL---women such as Edith and Grace Abbott, Katherine Bement Davis, Loraine Richardson Green, Elizabeth Haynes, Florence Kelley, Frances Keller, Julia Lathrop, Mary McDowell---were mostly white women who didn't always possess the racial justice agenda that Deegan purports. As Deegan herself reveals, accounts of black women at HH depict unease between black and white residents and visitors.[48] Additionally, many HH sociologists supported stunted calls for racial justice embedded in Washington's social philosophy of accommodationism.

The same HH sociologists who helped with 1919 Chicago race riot investigations, Soponisba Breckinridge and Edith Abbott, were supporters, along with Addams, of Booker T. Washington. This apparently caused friction between black sociologists and scholar-activists like Du Bois and Wells-Barnett, however, according to Deegan, "Du Bois and Wells-Barnett made exceptions nonetheless with Addams and

---

[48] See Deegan's discussion of Wells-Barnett's and other black residents' discomfort with HH.

Breckinridge and perhaps other female members of HHSRR" who supported

Washington. Rather than view the important epistemological tension and ideological

conflict between Washington and Du Bois, Washington and Wells-Barnett, Deegan

offers an explanation of a "*third way*," an intellectual position of many HHSRR,

"encompassing both radical and cooperative positions on race" (2002:72). It would

appear that Deegan is arguing that the accommodationism of Washington is an

acceptable compromise, for she appears to be proposing that contemporary sociologists

should respect and even endorse the logic of HH's third way. Also disconcerting is the

way that Deegan labels Du Bois' sociology---which presents reasonable, logical and

rational descriptions of the social world and ethical calls for just human rights-oriented

social action---as "radical" and "militant."

Deegan is correct to state that HHSRR and ECSRR possessed a sincere

"commitment to activism." Yet, how did this activism continue to perpetuate the social

realities of white power/social control and black marginalization/disempowerment that

the white-led activist causes were attempting to eliminate? It may be true that "combined

efforts of members of the black and white communities---the ECSRR, and the HHSRR;

community institutions, especially the network fostered through the CAACP, the

Chicago City Club, the Negro Fellowship League, and *The Chicago Defender* ---

successfully fought Jim Crow education in Chicago between 1912-1918. However, does

this one socio-historical event or example prove that white organizations, like HH and

ECS, were engaged in an all-out effort to de-segregate *all* of society? Or was this

another example of white liberals making some adjustments and concessions to their

power and privilege, while still upholding the white controlled social system of racial oppression that of which they are a part?

Robert Park, Patriarchy and Marginality

As already mentioned, Robert Park "is a pivotal figure in the CSRR, the legitimated school of thought that dominated ideas about race relations in sociology between 1920 and 1935" and beyond (2002:93). Deegan argues that Park lost his more "egalitarian, progressive ideas" when he broke away from his ECS roots. Not only did he remove himself from sociologists who had more progressive understandings of race relations, Park went on to develop a more patriarchal worldview that was antithetical to that of ECS sociologists such as W.I. Thomas and Albion Small, and Charles Zueblin. Deegan symbolizes this break in Park's development of the Marginal Man concept, focusing primarily on the concept's patriarchal nature. According to Deegan, Park's concept of the "marginal man" is problematic because of "his use of men's standpoint as 'the standard' for marginal experience" and because it is an appropriated (stolen that is) concept from W.I. Thomas' *Old World Traits Transplanted* (1921). Deegan argues for recognizing Thomas' role in the creation of the concept and, more importantly, proposes deconstructing the concept by viewing several distinct but related concepts: the "marginal women," the "marginal women of color" and the "marginal person" (2002:94-95).

Deegan states, "Park viewed the marginal man from the perspective of a powerful, able-bodied, heterosexual white male, advancing his majority perspective as

the normative experience for defining the marginal situation." Uncovering the patriarchal practice embedded in the concept of the marginal man allows us to re-analyze the gendered nature of this concept and create new concepts to more fully capture the experience" (2002:110-111).

After reflecting on the ways that marginality results through sexism and patriarchy, Deegan mentions the relationship between marginality and race, specifically, how marginality of black sociologists results from white structural and prejudicial racism. She references Du Bois' concept of double consciousness and two-ness as an expression of blacks' understanding of their marginalized position in a white structured society, a society that has constructed two social worlds (environments and experiences): a black 'marginalized-minority' black social world and a 'dominant-majority' white social world. Deegan uses the remainder of the text exploring specific forms of 'racial marginality' experienced by three black sociologists, Wilmoth Carter, the first black female to earn a PhD at Chicago, E. Franklin Frazier, the first black male earning a PhD at Chicago, and Oliver Cox, the complex critic of PCSRR and AACSRR.

Different Forms of Marginality: The Marginal Positionalities of Wilmoth Annette Carter, E. Franklin Frazier, and Oliver C. Cox

Deegan identifies different forms of marginality facing Wilmoth Carter, E. Franklin Frazier and Oliver Cox, all of who experienced specifically defined forms of marginality related to different characteristic of their personalities. Carter, as "as a woman and African American," experiences racial marginalization (the product of white racism) and

gendered marginalization (the product of patriarchy). E. Franklin Frazier and Oliver Cox both experience the racism and racial marginalization of the color line; however, Deegan notes that Cox also experienced marginality of the disabled and marginality of the non-native (non-US citizen). In her review of Carter, Frazier, and Cox, Deegan's careful reading of the complexity of marginality and different types of marginalization are expressed in her conceptualizations of the patriarchal and racial dimensions of marginality, as well as conceptualizations of 'disabled marginalization' and 'non-native marginalization.'

That Deegan is only able to locate two African American black females graduate students in CSS prior to 1960 demonstrates the hyper-marginalization of black women sociologists in CSS, and particularly reveals the complexities of multi-marginalization---combining 'racial marginalization' and 'gender marginalization'---experienced by the two lone black women sociologists Chicago, Loraine R. Green and Wilmoth A. Carter. Loraine Richardson Green earned a Master's degree at Chicago in 1919; forty years later, in 1959, Wilmoth Carter earned the first PhD in sociology at Chicago.[49] Both of these women faced multi-marginalization, experiencing what Deegan labels, the "Gendered Veil" (2002:114).

In 1937, Wilmoth Carter graduated from Shaw University, the oldest black college in the South. After graduation she took a position teaching at Rosenwald High School (founded by Julius Rosenwald) in Fairmont, North Carolina, where she was

---

[49] Deegan notes that the 'first' black women sociologists at Chicago earned professional degrees at a much later date than the 'first' black male professional degree earners. Loraine Green's MA in 1903 was completed sixteen years after Monroe Work's MA; and Wilmoth Carter completed her PhD in sociology in 1959, twenty-eight years after E. Franklin Frazier's 1931 PhD degree.

responsible for teaching sociology. As Deegan notes, Carter attended Atlanta University to learn skills to better teach sociology courses. While at Atlanta, she attracted the eye of Walter Chivers, who encouraged Carter to continue studies at Atlanta and was able to locate funding for her studies. At Atlanta, Carter was taught by W.E.B. Du Bois, interacted with another black women sociologist, Irene Diggs, Du Bois' assistant, and studied with Ira de Augustine Reid, "an expert in African American immigration and experience" and "editor of *Phylon*," one of the first black social science journals (2002:116). Carter's MA thesis, "Colloquial Language as an Index of Social Adjustment," examines "506 words and their definitions that signify institutional speech patterns shaping lives of black American," a study that exhibited evidence of distinctive black American cultural patterns (2002:116). Reid's connection with Charles Johnson, led Carter to the Rosenwald Fund, funding that aided her move to study at Chicago.

Deegan notes that "Carter was aided by the black male network throughout her training as a student (but not necessarily during her career)." These black sociologists helped her navigate the racism of the color line at Chicago. Through interviews with Carter, Deegan ascertained that "Carter did not identify with her white male faculty as strongly as her white allies did" (2002:117-118). Carter's interviews of blacks and whites were incorporated into William F. Whyte's *Street Corner Society* (1943). Along with studying with Whyte, she studied with Everett Hughes, Louis Wirth, Herbert Blumer, inheriting elements of PCSRR that she had earlier incorporated in her MA thesis work, which utilized Park and Burgess' *Introduction the othe Science of Sociology* (1921).

As Deegan observes, Carter "added several new directions to the core assumptions employed by the men of the PCSRR." She utilized ideas of Du Bois, Reid and other black social scientists, to demonstrate "strengths of the black community instead of focusing on their weaknesses." She rejected "Park's emphasis on African American assimilation to the values and every day life of whites," and exposed the "Jim Crow society in the South" (2002:120). Her dissertation, "Black Main Street," was a study of a Southern city, a departure from CCS's focus on black urban life in Northern cities. Her study revealed that segregation was a much more informative pattern of social relations that Park's assimilation cycle, and that the concentric circle model of the city, popular among CS sociologists, disappeared in the South.

Carter's 1967 book *The New Negro of the South* is an analysis of the "New Negro" social movement and important role of the "Talented Tenth" at the helm of this movement. In the text, Carter examines conflict among black leaders resulting from what she believed to be the media's over-emphasis of divisions among blacks pursuing different social programs and projects;" additionally, she challenged the social philosophies of "black power movement," a movement that, according to Carter, incorrectly assumed they represented all black voices. Carter returned to Shaw to teach and continue to write, writing her third book*, Shaw's Universe* (1973), and devoting her energy to developing black universities, "with few links with the resources of the University of Chicago or with the elite network of many black male sociologists." Carter's writings have been excluded and marginalized by American sociology. As Deegan notes, this is largely due to "unfavorable to mixed book reviews of her work that

were published in major sociological journals." J. Milton Yinger, Hugh Smythe, Stanley

Smith all published criticisms of Carter's work (2002:121-23). According to Deegan,

Carter's marginalization in sociology is based on a number of factors: the patriarchy in

CSS, her connections to a Du Boisian tradition of sociology, her marginalization from

black males in her cohort, and the number of years it took Carter to complete her

dissertation because of funding problems. Moreover, Deegan notes the overlooked

tradition of black women in sociology, and Carter's lack of allegiance to any "one

school" as reasons why Carter's sociology has been marginalized if not excluded from

most histories of sociology (2002:125-26).

Deegan presents a much different, more nuanced picture of Frazier than has been

presented by most white scholars (Lyman 1972; McKee 1993) who often critically view

Frazier's Parkean accommodationist and assimilationist sociological perspectives

without acknowledging his daring challenges to Jim Crow racial segregation of the color

line. Deegan documents Frazier's "breaching experiments" of Jim Crow social rules and

"professional life behind the Veil." She observes that "Frazier did not accept these

restrictions easily, and he recorded his vigorous and courageous resistance to this form

of apartheid throughout his career…In a remarkable series of confrontations with whites

who were enforcing the color line, Frazier deliberately violated everyday norms of

racism surrounding his professional life" (2002:129). While Deegan is impressed with

Frazier's confrontation with white racism, she is less sympathetic to his "conservative"

and "egregious" patriarchal views of the black family, which she finds specifically

damaging to black women.

According to Deegan, "Frazier's account [of his professional life] can inform contemporary sociologists about professional life behind the Veil," and black's occasional transcendence of the Veil (his election as President of Association of American Sociologists, the precursor of the American Sociological Association). She points to a paper authored "in the late 1930s or early 1940s," a "Memorandum Submitted to Dr. Guy E. Johnson Embodying Stories of Experiments with Whites Particularly in the South," in which Frazier "showed how he intentionally used sociology to violate the color line" in different, even life-threatening, social situations (2002:132-33). These breaching experiments ranged, from more conflictual encounters with whites in everyday situations in the Deep South to confrontations with officials (transportation and police officials) attempting to uphold segregation in public space. He also documents his intolerance of racial segregation at professional meetings, explaining the racial discrimination at meetings where blacks and whites were divided in the meeting rooms, hotel accommodations, elevator rides, and meeting spaces. Setting precedence for later cafeteria sit-ins during the Civil Rights movement, Frazier boldly de-segregated the cafeteria at Vanderbilt University in 1934, to the dismay of faculty, students, and the Chancellor.

Deegan rightly claims that Frazier's experiences at ASA meetings present a window into the Veil of sociology. Using Frazier's personal records, she documents how he confronted racism head-on at three ASA meetings held at the Washington Hotel in Washington, DC during the years 1923, 1925, and 1927. During these episodes, Frazier challenged denial of rides on elevators, personally complained about his discriminatory

treatment to the hotel management, and discussed the matter with white ASA members. She notes that Park attempted to discourage Frazier from breaching the "etiquette of Jim Crow elevator travel and special color-coded boundaries at the hotel" (Blacks were supposed to ride the service elevator and restrict themselves to certain parts of the hotel). Ernest Burgess "was less effective or courageous than Park." As Deegan critically observes, "the failure of Park and Burgess, Frazier's mentors and leaders in the PCSRR, to definitely challenge the color line in Washington, DC, and at the ASA reveals something about the white men's character and response to racism" (2002:141).

Deegan argues that Frazier's black colleagues, Kelly Miller, Charles Johnson, and Monroe Work, who also "suffered the indignity of riding freight elevators," were more "compliant" with the rules of segregation and failed to join in or back Frazier's breaching experiments (2002:142). Along with illustrating the importance of engaged, socially-disruptive "political breaching experiments" as a mode of sociological methodology and model of historical examples of ant-racist practices (e.g., Rosa Parks), Deegan's dispelling portrait of Frazier's encounter with racial segregation in American society and sociology presents a broader picture of overlooked the role of racism in the racial formation of the discipline. Deegan states:

> This [the sociological tradition's] racism has remained largely undocumented for a number of reasons---notably continuing racism, face-saving by a white-dominated organization, powerful myths about the "liberal and open" policies of the PCSRR, and lack of research---but it is vital for our understanding of our past and present functioning as professionals to document and eradicate these patterns (2002:142).

Unlike Frazier, Oliver Cox severed his relation with Chicago and, in his later years. He increasingly attacked the CS sociological framework (Feagin and Vera

2001/2008:79-80). Deegan positions Oliver Cox both within and outside the CSS, arguing that while he was associated with PCSRR and the AACSRR (yet marginal "to both white and black Parkian segments"), he maintained an "epistemological continuity with the ECSRR and with the HHSRR" (2002:148, 158). Deegan notices a number of unique characteristics that create difficulties in situating him in any segment of CSS or the discipline sociology at large. Unlike the other members of AACSRR, Cox was from Trinidad, where he leaned a more defiant attitude to conformity (hence his problems with assimilation theory and social philosophies of accommodation). He was trained in economics and history, two perspectives he added to his sociological perspective, which put him at odds with many CS sociologists who practiced a-historical sociology. Additionally, he was marginalized from other sociologists at Chicago, and the larger society, due to his physical disability caused by polio (2008:148).

Deegan notes that, after Cox earned a master's degree in economics at Chicago with a thesis on "Workingman's Compensation in the U.S., with Critical Observation and Suggestion" (1932), he joined the sociology department at Chicago, choosing William Ogburn as his doctoral chair" (2002:149). Cox combined use of statistical sociological analysis, Ogburn's emphasis, and the dominant qualitative approach of the PCSRR. Utilizing the strong influence of Ogburn's understandings of "marriage statistics," his PhD dissertation, "Factors Affecting the Marital Status of Negroes in the United States" (1938), criticized Burgess' and Frazier's "crude" understanding of marriage and the family, thus attacking two CSS "insiders," a move into his growing role as an "outsider," according to Deegan. As a professor at Wiley College in Texas,

Tuskegee University in Alabama, Lincoln University in Missouri, and Wayne State

University in Michigan, Cox continued to develop sociological critiques and positions

antithetical to CSS, especially PCSRR. He criticized the caste and class position

purported by W. Lloyd Warner, "portrayed Park as a conservative and unable to explain

legal and economic [racial] constraints" and "attacked the most prestigious Chicago

scholarship on race relations at that time: Gunnar Myrdal's *An American Dilemma*

(1944)." Moreover, his intellectual disputes were not solely directed at CSS. He also

depicted [Booker T.] Washington as a "white collaborator…[who was] antagonistic to

the people's cause" (2002:151). Describing Cox's "professional marginality" in

sociology, Deegan writes:

> Cox remains an outsider to American sociological thought…negative appraisal of
> Park and his followers played a pivotal role in his neglect within sociology…Cox
> experienced the Veil of sociology, but he did not accommodate to it, in either the
> white or African American segment of the CSRR. Cox's refusal to adapt to white
> Chicago school fundamentally separated him from his African American
> Chicago colleagues (2002:152-3).

Despite its ahead-of-the-times sociological perceptiveness (Feagin and Vera

2001/2008:78-91), Cox's sociology has been criticized, neglected and misunderstood in

analyses of the CSS. Prominent Chicago sociologists, like Everett Hughes and Herbert

Blumer, have criticized Cox's sociology, arguing it "wasn't scholarly," didn't possess

"scientific detachment," or, in other words, was "politically motivated and politically

slanted." Historians of CSS, like Stow Person, Barbara Lal, Stanford Lyman, Fred

Matthew, and Winifred Raushenbush fail to mention Cox in their historical studies of

CSS. Misunderstandings surrounding Cox are common because of his complex character

that can create difficulties in pinpointing his sociological allegiances and concerns. Was

he a part of CSS (an insider) or not (an outsider)? A number of questions develop from Deegan's analysis of Cox. Was Cox more aligned with AACSRR or PCSRR? Was he a radical Marxist or did he envision social change in more moderate terms? Was he an integrationist who supported assimilation and condemned cultural pluralism and separatism, despite the bite of Jim Crow segregation and exclusion? Was he a black American or a black Caribbean?

Deegan concludes her analysis of Cox by arguing that, despite his disagreements with PCSRR and AACSRR, he does, in fact, belong to CSRR, and should be situated in this tradition. For Deegan, Cox's sociological perspective is more aligned with ECSRR and HHCSRR, being that his sociology was more politically engaged and devoid of the patriarchy found in both the AACSRR and the PCSRR. Cox's marginality from black sociologists at Chicago and his lack of allegiance to black sociologists and social thinkers outside Chicago, specifically W.E.B. Du Bois and Booker T. Washington, demonstrate a 'black' sociological perspective from outside the US. Like Marcus Garvey and other West Indies black intellectuals, Cox's 'unique' non-native black sociological perspective brings different insights, a different worldview, experiences, disposition and social historical background to the field, one that allows for a different understanding of the Veil in sociology.

Conclusion

Using rich historical resources to present personalities and events involved in the development of a white-framed social institution, Chicago sociology, and its white sister

institution, Hull House sociology, Deegan presents a broad snapshot of the development

of American sociology. *Race, Hull and Chicago* successfully locates a primary location

of the development of the tension between black and white sociology. However, by

focusing specifically on black sociology and white sociology in relation to CS and HH,

Deegan is largely presenting a picture of black and white sociology in two specific

interrelated 'local' contexts. While this micro level analysis is useful, it presents only a

partial picture of the larger divide between black sociology and white sociology that

reached well beyond the confines of the Chicago area to places like Atlanta, Nashville,

Tuskegee, Washington DC, New York City, and Philadelphia. In many ways, Deegan

links black sociology with CSS or HH, grounding black sociologists like W.E.B. Du

Bois, Monroe Work, and Loraine Green in HH, and situating Frazier, Johnson, and even

Cox in CSRR.

This association of black sociologist with either HH or CSS does not allow for an

autonomous understanding of black sociology. Even though she acknowledges the

existence of a network of black sociologists working at historically black colleges and

universities (HBCUs), Deegan's interpretation of early black men and women

sociologists ultimately fails to view them as members of a distinctive black sociological

tradition who, despite their socio-political and philosophic differences, experienced the

color line and developed alternative worldview to whites' sociological worldview. For

example, rather than simply explain Du Bois' sociology as 'radical' and 'militant' when

compared to CSS, Deegan might have done more to demonstrate the powerful critical

race-based counter-frame that Du Bois develops in contrast to CSS's problematic

understandings of race and society in general.[50] Instead, for Deegan, the only serious counter-frame to CSS is HH sociology; the only contenders to PCSRR are HHSRR and ECSRR, not AACSRR or the outside Du Boisian tradition. In all cases, blacks' counter-frame to dominant white sociology is viewed to be somehow connected to and reliant upon a liberal white sociological tradition or sociologist/s.

Two lasts points about *Race Hull and Chicago*. Throughout the text, Deegan uses "feminist epistemology" as a means of analyzing questions about race, race relations, and racism, subjects that would be best served through the use of 'race-based epistemology.' For example, while feminist epistemology might be useful for understanding gendered marginalization, 'race-based epistemology' is better suited for comprehending racial marginalization. Confusing concepts and theories of race with concepts and theories of gender is problematic, even though, at times, the two categories of concepts and theories overlap or intersect).[51] "Feminist pragmatism" is, indeed, important "to analyze this sociological stock of knowledge, experience, and history" of CSS or any other social institution. Yet, one must ask to what degree are sociologists' critical race-based understandings about CSS and other social institutions overlooked or de-emphasized without reference to race-based epistemology?

Using the information and knowledge discovered in the analyses of the chapters in Part I, I now turn to Part II of this dissertation and further develop a more sound comparative-historical and theoretical understanding of black sociology, white

---

[50] Aldon Morris (2007) provides such an analysis in "Sociology of Race and W.E.B. Du Bois."
[51] Stanfield (1985) makes a similar error by conflating the concepts of race and class. See Chapter IV of this study.

sociology, and the construction of race and segregation of races in the discipline and

larger social world.

CHAPTER VI

FORMATION AND FRAMING OF TWO TRADITIONS: BLACK AND

WHITE IDEAS AND PRACTICES

To argue that black sociology and white sociology possess two distinct perspectives and

practices that have shaped over time into two sociological traditions, necessarily means

that one can locate an approximate moment, or moments, when these two traditions

begin. While W.E.B. Du Bois and Robert E. Park are my chosen starting points, I

believe it is necessary to recount the ideas and practices that Du Bois and Park inherit,

the ideas and practices that provide the foundation for black and white sociology. It is

important to recognize that black and white 'social' perspectives and practices predate

Du Bois and Park. In other words, Du Bois' development of black sociology originates

from a black tradition of ideas and practices, while Park's development of white

sociology originates from a white tradition of ideas and practices, both of which were

active before Du Bois and Park came into this world.

The makings of what may be called a modern 'white frame of social thought and

practices,' what subsequently develops into what Joe Feagin theorizes as the 'white

racial frame' in *Systemic Racism: A Theory of Oppression* (2006) and *The White Racial

Frame: Centuries of Racial Framing and Counter-Framing* (forthcoming), dates back to

at least the seventieth century. In many ways, the modern 'black frame of social thought

and practices' has been a formation and reaction in response to the widespread,

overwhelming, and powerful white frame of ideas and actions that took hold at the dawn

of the modern period. The white frame began when whites came into greater contact

with blacks and people of color through technological advances and social developments

of early modernity. During this period, blacks identified a set of primary concerns about

society and observations about the social world that were vastly distinct from the

concerns and observations of whites. Similarly, blacks experiences and practices were

much different than whites during the social historical development of modernity, a time

period which not only witness the growth of a 'white civilization ideal' aided by the

white frame of ideas and actions but also growth of a 'black civilization ideal'[52] inspired

by the black frame of thoughts and practices.

     Before moving to discussion of the white frame's affect on early 'first wave'

white sociologists of the nineteenth century and black frame's affect on early 'first

wave' black sociologists of the nineteenth century, an historical recounting and

theoretical explanation of the beginnings of the 'modern' black and white frames of

ideas and practices is in order. This historical recap provides the background for

understanding the social, historical and intellectual 'Western and white Zeitgeist' that

was present during the development of sociology, a discipline that did not just magically

appear overnight as 'new' and revolutionary message from Hermes or 'paradigm shift'

(a la Kuhn), as most historians of sociology would have you believe. Because the white

---

[52] A Black civilization system battles against everything that white civilization has been built upon: the exclusion and exploitation of blacks and people of color and the destruction of the cultures and ways of being of those who do not join in the 'civilizing process' of the white racial frame. There is nothing 'civil' about white civilization or the white civilization process, just as there is nothing civil about white civil society, an important reason to move away from or critically deconstruct this over-utilized concept in sociology (see Feagin, Elias, and Mueller 2009). Links between the racial hierarchies of civilization and racial hierarchies of civil society/civil sphere need examination. Problematically, many public sociologists embrace the ideas and practices of civil society (Burawoy 2005a; Alexander 2006).

frame predates the black frame in the modern Western context, I begin with analysis of the white frame before moving to analysis of the black frame.

'Early' Modern Origins of the White Frame of Ideas and Practices

Arguably, the origins of the modern period's white frame of ideas and actions commences with the earliest days of the modern slavery system targeting Africans. The formation of a new Western 'social system' and birth of a global economy supported by the first international business corporations whose profits were gleaned on slave trafficking and slave labor is how 'modern,' 'civilized' Europe and the birth place of democracy, the United States, develop. In other words, the great wealth, societal developments and 'advances' of the 'civilizations' of the United States and Europe are a direct result of white people's ideas and actions used to justify and enforce the enslaved forced labor and exploitation, oppression and destruction of blacks and people of color.

Modern Europe begins with European trade of Africans[53] and establishment of the vast international corporate slavery system that developed in the Americas as colonial powers established their colonial outposts and new homelands. One might argue that white Europeans' ability to perpetuate such large-scale methods of human subjugation and social re-organization of world's peoples can be traced to ideas and practices of pre-modern Europeans. Modern slavery---the enslavement of blacks, people from Africa, by whites, people from Europe---has roots in the Greco-Roman

---

[53] "African slave trade" is a conceptual tactic used by whites to avoid connection to and responsibility for their enslavement and trade of Africans; however, it was not the Africans' slave trade; it was the Europeans' slave trade.

stereotyping of nonwhites, claims to racial distinction and superiority, and positive

attitudes toward slavery---stereotypes, beliefs, and attitudes that were perpetuated

through the middle ages in historical, political, geographical, philosophical and religious

writings of Europeans. Racial consciousness and racist ideologies of early modern

Europeans were kick-started as they increasingly encountered non-whites in their

explorations and conquests. Explorations of Portugal's Prince Henry 'the Navigator' and

Christopher Columbus brought back tales of inferior nonwhite "natives" and "man-

eating" savages fit for enslavement or extermination.

Accounts of the British's early contact with Africans in the mid-sixteenth century

demonstrate the developments of a European color-coded racial consciousness.

Winthrop Jordon's (1969, 1974) historical studies of the origins of U.S. racism

emphasizes the extent to which 'color' and specific meanings associated with color (i.e.,

white is positive and black is negative) shaped British thinking about themselves

(whites) and Africans (blacks) in the sixteenth century. Jordon argues that the British

distinguished themselves from African primarily according to differences in skin color,

but he also identifies several other important non-physical 'markers of distinction' used

by the British to separate themselves from black Africans. In contrast to white

Europeans like themselves, the British viewed black Africans as un-Christian "heathens"

and "savages" who were politically, economically, culturally, morally, and intellectually

underdeveloped; Africans were also characterized as 'beast-like,' 'lustful,' 'lecherous,'

'excessive,' 'dirty,' and 'cursed' by God. These non-physical markers quickly became

synonymous with 'blackness' as Europeans devised reasons for enslaving, exploiting, oppressing, and destroying blacks and people of color.

As European colonization and slavery systems developed during the seventeenth century, other Europeans, in addition to the British, helped perpetuate disparaging and destructive view of Africans based strictly on skin color. Color-coded differences created by white Europeans served not only to easily separate whites from nonwhites, they also distinguished the power of the European enslaver from the powerlessness of the enslaved African and supposed moral-intellectual and religious racial distinctions between nonwhites and whites. These ideas about power and moral-intellectual differences between white and nonwhite races were used to ordain and legitimate whites' domination and nonwhites' enslavement (Elias 2009). Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, reinforcement of the color line occurred through the promotion of racist beliefs along with various racist practices (laws against miscegenation of whites and nonwhites, acts to suppress the freedom and movement of nonwhites, legally enforced segregation of the races, and other race-based legislative and regulatory policies used to subjugate nonwhites).

Europeans' great legitimators, science and religion, provided Europeans with racist ammunition to victimize and persecute nonwhites. If the Treaty of Tordesillas is viewed as the first historically symbolic event of modern racism that separated whites and blacks as well as other people of color, then the papal-national decree that supported the treaty place the Catholic Church, along with Spanish and Portuguese national leaders, at the center of this crucial social-historical moment. One belief shared by the

warring Catholic Church and newly formed Protestant Church was that white was a symbol of holiness and beauty and black was a symbol of evil and ugliness. George Fredrickson (2002) argues that 'black slavery' developed out a particular form of "religious racism" developed in the modern period.[54] Fredrickson connects black slavery with the 'curse of Ham,' an Old Testament story in which God curses Noah' son, Ham, coloring him black and condemning his black offspring, Canaan and his descendents, to be 'the servants of servants.' This religious story of the trans-generational curse of the Canaanites (supposed forefathers of black Africans) buttressed Europeans' association of blacks as servants, which, in turn, lead to divine justifications of black enslavement. This race-based logic was presented as early as the late sixteenth century by the British writer, George Best (1578), who argued that blacks must, in fact, be the cursed black skinned descendents of Ham.

Eighteenth Century Development of the White Frame of Ideas and Practices

Pseudo-scientific explanations of racism originate in the eighteenth century with Europeans' concern with classifying and categorizing all inanimate and animate natural objects, from rocks and plants to animals and human beings. European naturalists, ethnologists, and taxonomists initiated the first 'scientific' explanations of racial

---

[54] According to Fredrickson, anti-Semitism represents another form of religious racism, a product of the Christian belief that God cursed Jews for their role in the betrayal and deicide of Jesus Christ. While anti-Semitism is not clearly color-coded, this form of racism, like anti-black racism, is still considered to be biologically based on traits of 'heredity' or 'purity of blood.' Anti-Semitism is, to some degree, color-coded, as Jews eventually would be identified as nonwhites by Nazis and other white supremacists. In the case of later twentieth century anti-Semitism, invisible biological characteristics are the source of color-coded racism, whereas in the case of anti-black racism, visible biological characteristics are viewed as the source of color-coded racism.

differences among human beings. The foundations of scientific racism are first expressed in Johann Friedrich Blumenbach's *De generis humani varietate native* (1775), Carolus Linnaeus's *Systema naturae* (1735), Charles White's *Regular Gradation of Man* (1799), eighteenth-century writings of Georges-Louis Leclerc (Comte de Buffon), Petrus Camper, and James Burnett (Lord Monboddo), and early nineteenth century writings of Jean-Baptiste Lamarck. In each case, these works classified whites as 'superior' and the most advanced human species and blacks as inferior and the least advanced human species, viewing blacks and other nonwhites as sub-humans subsisting near the level of beasts, a belief used to justify the modern form of chattel slavery experienced by Africans.

Throughout the late seventeenth and eighteenth century, John Locke, François-Marie de Arouet (Voltaire), Immanuel Kant, David Hume, Charles-Louis de Secondat (Baron de Montesquieu), Thomas Jefferson, Georg W. F. Hegel and other Enlightenment thinkers defended slavery or presented negative views about blacks often used to justify slavery. David Goldberg (1993) comments that Locke, the same author who condemns slavery in *First Treatise on Government* (1689), was able to justify enslavement of blacks as a colonial administrator, "specifying the conditions under which…slavery is justifiable" in his *Second Treatise*. As Paul Lauren (1996) observes, "John Locke…was actually a shareholder in the Royal African Company. Voltaire, too owned stock in Compagnie des Indes, the fortunes of which came in part from the slave trade." Lauren explains that David Hume believed "Negroes…to be naturally inferior to whites" (from the essay "Of National Characters") and that the "attitude of racial superiority received

further support from other philosophers such as Montesquieu, who described people of Africa as 'savage and barbarian; bereft 'of industry'…Diderot and Condorcet expressed similar opinion" (Lauren 1996:22-3). Immanuel Kant spoke of "Negro's stupidity," and expressed belief that the "difference between [the Negro and White] races of man" is fundamental with "regard to mental capacities as in color" (Goldberg 1993:32).

Early scientific explanations of 'inherent' differences between whites and nonwhites were means by which proslavery thinkers, slave traders, and corporate slavery investors rationalized enslavement of Africans and other nonwhites. These explanations justifying enslavement of 'less advanced' races migrated to the United States. Using naturalist preconceptions of racial hierarchy, Thomas Jefferson's *Notes on Virginia* (1782) branded black Americans as mentally and physically inferior to Europeans and their white American cousins. Jefferson stated, "I advance it, therefore, as a suspicion only, that the blacks, whether originally a distinct race, or made distinct by time and circumstances, are inferior to the whites in the endowments both of body and mind" (Ducas 1970:21). Most likely, this type of explanation of racial differences led to the "three-fifths compromise" reflected in the United States Constitution (1787). The three-fifths compromise, although pragmatically implemented to cede political power to Southern States, symbolically signified white Americans' view that black Americans were lower on the racial hierarchy scale and not fully counted as human.[55]

---

[55] The United States government's declaration of black inferiority was reiterated in the1856 Supreme Court case, *Dred Scott v. Sanford*, in which the Court ruled that blacks were not recognized as citizens under the Declaration of Independence. The ruling denied freedom and legal representation for blacks and maintained the federal law that blacks were the property of whites.

Eighteenth Century Development of the Black Frame of Ideas and Practices

During the Eighteenth Century, a black frame of ideas and practices developed as blacks were enslaved, transported, exploited and oppressed---creating untold deaths and indescribable suffering among blacks---across the globe. Accounts of blacks' response to events of capture, forced migration, and servitude are documented in the writings and recorded recollections of several blacks who were kidnapped from African and brought to the United States and other European colonial territories during the eighteenth century (Venture Smith 1798; Olaudah Equiano [Gustavus Vasa] 1791; Omar ibn Seid 1831).[56] In response to the utter displacement and brutalization of enslavement at the hands of whites, blacks organized rebellions, revolts, various forms of resistance and other practices. Colonized, enslaved and freed[57] blacks developed intellectual arguments and organized politically to combat racist ideologies that whites used to justify slavery and mistreatment of blacks and other people of color.

The last decade of the eighteenth century witnessed a flurry of black political activity against slavery. A black political and racial consciousness was apparent in the

---

[56] Selections of the writings of blacks who experienced the slave trade are found in Thomas Frazier's edited volume, *Afro-American History: Primary Sources* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1970). In *A Narrative of the Life and Adventures of Venture, A Native of Africa, but Resident about Sixty Years in the United States of America* (New London, 1798), Venture Smith recalls his father's heroic struggle and fight to the death as Venture and his other family members were abducted into slavery (1970:9-10). Olaudah Equiano, who wrote *The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano or Gustavus Vasa, The African*, (New York, 1791), was "actively involved in the anti-slavery movement in England and was interested in colonizing freed blacks in Sierra Leone" (1970:17). In "Autobiography of Omar ibn Seid, Slave in North Carolina, 1831," appearing in *American Historical Review*, Vol. XXX (July 1925), Seid recalls that "he fell into the hands of a small, weak and wicked man, who feared not God at all…a man so depraved and who committed so many crimes…I ran away" (1970:26). Black resistance was a common theme in these three narratives.

[57] The 'free black' was an uncomfortable reminder to whites that blacks were not doomed to servitude and able-less beings requiring white paternal care, and thus free blacks were targets of kidnapping or destruction by Southern whites who could not have the symbol of freedom and contradiction set an example among enslaved blacks.

numerous pamphlets that blacks were producing as intellectual challenges to black

oppression. In *Pamphlets of Protest: An Anthology of Early African American Protest*

Literature, 1790-1860, the editors write:

> African-American pamphleteers recognized the utility of the form and
> appropriated it after the American Revolution to battle racial subjugation.
> Between the 1790s and 1860s, black writers produced hundred of pamphlets.
> These documents capture a range of debate and testified to the remarkable
> diversity of black literary culture and thought. Just as Richard Allen and
> Absalom Jones could use the pamphlet to correct racial stereotypes in the 1790s,
> so too could David Walker use the genre to mobilize the black masses in the
> 1820s (2001:2).

In 1794, Absalom Jones and Richard Allen's "A Narrative of the Proceedings of

the Black People during the Late Awful Calamity in Philadelphia," one finds "An

Address to Those who Keep Slaves and Uphold the Practice." This section of the

document argues that blacks are, by nature, no less intelligent than whites are. Jones and

Allen write, "We believe if you would try the experiment of taking a few black children,

and cultivate their minds with the same care, and let them have the same prospect in

view, as to living in the world, as you would wish for your own children, you would find

them upon trial, they were not inferior in mental endowments" (1794/2001:41-2).

Interestingly, white sociologists, social psychologists and behaviorists would later make

careers arguing this same point. Jones and Allen go on to discuss the "how hateful

slavery is in the sight of that God who hath destroyed kings and princes for their

oppression of the poor slaves," and state that "Men must be willfully blind and

extremely partial, that they cannot see the contrary effects of liberty and slavery upon the

minds of man" (1794/2001:42).

Price Hall (?-1807), another late-eighteenth century black scholar-activist and pamphleteer, wrote "A Charge" in 1797, in which, as the editors note, he "addressed the plight of black Americans and the need for black unity in the face of a hostile racial climate" (1797/2001:44). Hall describes whites as a "strange people" in a "strange land," who employ "the iron hand of tyranny and oppression and "whose mercies are cruel." He notes that, through whites' "pride, wantonness, and cruelty," blacks are "deprived of the means of education." However, this lack of education has not caused blacks to lose their own way of thinking and judging the world and human beings. According to Hall, blacks "are not deprived of the means of meditation" such as "thinking, hearing and weighting matters, men, and things in…[the] mind," rather blacks are fully capable of making "reasonable judgments" (1797/2001:47).

Another significant black American social thinker, Benjamin Banneker attempted to redress white racist ideas and practices, in particular, to respond directly to Jefferson's claims of black inferiority and whites' justifications for slavery. Benjamin Banneker (1731-1806), the noted eighteenth century black intellect who authored an acclaimed series of almanacs, distributed a pamphlet (Philadelphia 1792) with his letter to Thomas Jefferson, addressing Jefferson's racial views of blacks in *Notes on the State of Virginia* (1787), and Jefferson's 'evasive' and intellectually dissatisfying reply to Banneker. Banneker's 1791 letter to Jefferson states:

> Sir, how pitiable is it to reflect, that although you were so fully convinced of the
> benevolence of the Father of Mankind, and his equal and impartial distribution of
> these rights and privileges, which he hath conferred upon them, that you should
> at the same time counteract his mercies, in detaining by fraud and violence so
> numerous a part of my brethren, under groaning captivity and cruel oppression,

that you should at the same time be found guilty of that most criminal act, which you professedly detested in others, with respect to yourselves" (1791/1970:25)

In *Great Documents in Black American History* (1970), George Ducas notes that "'Othello,' ostensibly a free Negro from Maryland who is sometimes thought to have been Benjamin Banneker," published "Essay on Negro Slavery," which appeared "in two issues of the *American Museum* (November and December 1788)" (Ducas 1970:29). This proclamation begins with the statement: "Amidst the infinite variety of moral and political subjects proper for public condemnation, it is truly surprising that one of the most important and affecting (i.e., white enslavement of blacks) should be so very generally neglected" (1788/1970:30). Othello continues:

> Slavery, in whatever point of light it is considered, is repugnant to the feelings of nature, and inconsistent with the original rights of man…The importation of slaves into America ought to be a subject of the deepest regret to every benevolent and thinking mind…So far from encouraging the importation of slaves, and countenancing that vile traffic in human flesh, the members of the late continental convention should have seized the happy opportunity of prohibiting forever this cruel species of reprobated villainy---That they did not do so will forever diminish the luster of their proceedings (1788/1970:31).

Othello further states that whites' "insatiable, avaricious desire to accumulate riches, cooperating with a spirit of luxury and injustice, seems to be the leading cause of this peculiarly degrading and ignominious project [slavery and exploitation of blacks]." Through a detailed, historical and sociological-based explanation of the wrongs of slavery, this pamphlet excoriates whites for their abuse of blacks and self-enrichment at the expense of black suffering. According to Othello, "many persons of opulence in Virginia, and the Carolinas, treat their unhappy slaves with every circumstance of the coolest neglect, and the most deliberate indifference. Surrounded with a numerous train

of servants, to contribute to their personal care, and wallowing in all the luxurious

plentitude of riches, they neglect the wretched source, whence they draw this profusion"

(1788/1970:37). When one thinks about the sustainable tourism industry for wealthy

vacationing whites in the West Indies and Mexico, Othello's sociological observation

resonate with today's racially structured social world, with whites on top and blacks and

people of color on the bottom of the racial group hierarchy. This racial group ordering is

a fundamental characteristic in the structural racism of whites and white racial frame that

Joe Feagin theorizes (2000, 2006, 2009).

Nineteenth Century Development of the White Frame of Ideas and Practices among 'First Wave White Sociologists'[58]

The white frame of ideas and practices is challenged increasingly during the first half of

the nineteenth century by a strong cohort of blacks and progressive white abolitionists

and religious reformers attempting to eradicate the practice of slavery. However, one

notices that Britain's outlaw of the 'legal' slave trade in 1807, and the United States'

official legislation drafted in 1808 to end the international slave trade (not the internal

trade in the US), do not drastically change the situations of blacks in the United States,

Africa, and other lands. What appears is a reshuffling---not real change---of white ideas

and practices, as powerful whites re-grouped and devised new, more legitimate and less

cruel-seeming methods of black subjugation. The US Civil War and supposed

---

[58]I use 'first wave' white sociologists and 'first wave' black sociologists as categories distinct from 'first generation' and 'founding' white sociologists and black sociologists, categories which overlook many of the 'first wave' white sociologists and 'first wave' black sociologists I identify.

emancipation of black Americans was one such maneuver of reconstitution. Despite shifts in 'economic' power between the white North and white South, what develops in this superficial 'social,' even 'political,' transformation is a new form of black subjugation defined as the 'civilizing process'---'human development' and 'social progress'---or, in more critical terms, colonization and internal colonization. During this period, from the transition from slavery to colonization and internal colonization, the first generation sociologists demonstrated the different ways that whites could maintain ideas and practices---the white frame---that perpetuated the oppression of blacks and people of color.

The 'first wave' of white sociologists (FWWS), individuals such as Auguste Comte (1798-1857), Alexis de Tocqueville (1805-1858), Karl Marx (1818-1883), George Fitzhugh 1806-1881), Herbert Spencer (1820-1903), and Henry Hughes (1829-1862), contributed many of the ideas and practices that have shaped the dominant tradition in sociology, white sociology. All were white sociologists who espoused ethno-racial hierarchal divisions of the social world and humans, arranging a primary dichotomy and social order between "civilized races" (whites) and "savage races" (people of color). In one way or another, each of the "first wave" sociologists ethnocentrically separated whites and people of color and justified and/or 'rationalized' enslavement of human beings (George Fitzhugh and Henry Hughes), segregation of

social groups according to race (Auguste Comte, Alexis de Tocqueville), and colonization of people of color (Herbert Spencer, Karl Marx).[59]

Attempts at explaining the social world of segregation, slavery, colonialism, imperialism and war necessarily frame the story of the early days of sociology, or, stated more succinctly, frame the sociological perspectives of Comte, Tocqueville, Marx, Fitzhugh, Spencer, and Hughes. While Comte's structural-functional 'organicist' thinking and Spencer's social Darwinism (modified Comtean thought) are primary theoretical frameworks of FWWS, Tocqueville's views of American race relations, Marx's view of European colonialism, and Fitzhugh's and Hughes' views of the social ordering or ranking in society---social organization---are equally important theoretical schemas of early sociology. I now analyze 'first wave' white sociologists Comte and Tocqueville, Fitzhugh and Hughes, and Marx and Spencer.

Auguste Comte and Alexis de Tocqueville

In *Cours de philosophie positive* (1830-1842) and other writings, Auguste Comte developed an 'organicist' understanding of society and human relations that is the blueprint for structural-functionalism, arguably the dominant sociological framework today. Comte also espoused naturalist understandings of the 'ordering' of the social world, which continue to have profound influence on Christian-Judeo, or Western,

---

[59] Sociology begins around the mid-ninetieth century in the writings of an all-white cohort of European sociologists, Auguste Comte, Alexis de Tocqueville, Karl Marx and Herbert Spencer, and American sociologists, George Fitzhugh, Henry Hughes. All the earliest sociologists were white Europeans or white Americans who were clearly aware of their whiteness (their racial distinction from people of color) and whose sociological writings present ethnocentric and race-based perspectives---ethno-racial supremacist viewpoints---about social difference between whites ('Westerners') and people of color ('non-Westerners').

religious thought. Comte is considered the "Father" or "Founder" of sociology and his work influenced numerous sociologists. Thus, it is important to understand Comte's sociological thought and its importance in the development of sociology and its connections to contemporary mainstream sociology practiced primarily by white Westerners. Comte's sociological ideas---his authoritarian ideas of the state, theory of civilization's three stages of evolution, and his hierarchical understandings of the sciences, cultures, and human beings shape first and second wave sociologists' thought in Europe and America. The sociological views of European sociologists such as Herbert Spencer, John Stuart Mill, and Emile Durkheim rely heavily on ideas already expressed in Comte's writings. Similarly, his writings deeply influence the birth of sociology in the United States, particularly shaping the sociological thought of Fitzhugh and Hughes and a number of other early American sociologists.[60]

In many cases, Comte's organicist model for understanding society still guides sociological thought today. Comte's metaphorical image of society as an organism, the proto-type structural-functionalist model of the society, segregates the different parts or organs (individuals, groups and institutions) according to their functionality, in an effort at keeping the structure or body (society) sound and healthy. Comte proposed that society is a 'natural,' 'structured,' 'functional,' and 'hierarchical' (stratified) division of labor among social groups (races and ethnic groups). Order or social ordering is at the heart of Comte's organicist model of society, for without 'order', 'stability,' 'organization,' 'co-operation' and service to the whole, society becomes dysfunctional

---

[60] See Bernard and Bernard (1965) and Small and Vincent (1894) regarding Comte's influence on American sociological thought.

and open to unhealthy mutations (e.g., revolution) or radical 'pathologies' within the organism (i.e., society).

According to Comte, just as individuals, groups, cultures, and societies have their place in the order of the social world, and are ordered hierarchically in accordance with their respective positions, sociology has its place and is positioned at the top of the hierarchy of the sciences (social, and natural). Comte viewed sociology as a 'science' of society and as the most advanced of all the sciences because it dispels 'religious' and theoretically speculative 'metaphysical' understandings of the social world and, instead, presents a 'non-superstitious' positivist picture of social reality. For Comte, sociology is the new 'positivist science' based on rationality and reason and the logic and methods of science, not a way of knowing based on religious myth and superstition or metaphysical philosophical speculations. Comte applies his logic of the progression and hierarchy of the sciences to social groups and society, viewing the evolutionary ordering and hierarchical organization of the races. In other words, Comte's view of sociology evolving from the 'superstitions' and intuitional speculations of religious and metaphysical understandings matches his views about the evolution of civilization, in which societies, culture and social groups---specifically races---are in the process of breaking with traditional religious and metaphysical beliefs and behaviors and developing into more advanced positivist stages of 'civilization.'

For Comte, some groups and societies, those that are European-based, are more advanced and 'representative of civilization' than other groups and societies, which are viewed to be savage, primitive, barbaric, backwards and underdeveloped---in short,

"uncivilized." As he notes, "on the whole we may say that primitive and barbarous people tend to attribute events to what are commonly called supernatural forces of one kind or another (magic and religion) and that such interpretations slowly give way to rational-positive or scientific ones in the course of cultural progress" (Evans-Pritchard 1970:9). Comte's views of whites, or Europeans, as superior to other people, blacks and people of color, appear repeatedly throughout his writings. In "Plan of Scientific Work" (1822), Comte states that "all degrees of civilization coexist on the different points of the globe, from that of the savages of New Zealand [and "savage nations of North America"] to that of the ["advanced European nations" of the] French and the English" (1822/1998:138). He argues that "civilization is subject to a determined and invariable course" and that divisions of races follow "natural law which governs the development of civilization" (1822/1998:95).

Comte is also considered the first comparativist sociologist. His model for a comparative method for sociology is illustrated through his comparisons of different "states of society" or a comparison of states at different stages of civilization. It follows that the first comparative sociological studies were studies of comparing races. In volume II of *Cours de philosophie positive*, Comte writes:

> To indicate the order of importance of the forms of society which are to be studied by the comparative method, I begin with the chief method, which consists in a comparison of the different co-existing states of human society on the various parts of the earth's surface---those states being completely independent of each other. By this method, the different stages of evolution may all be observed at once. Though the progression is single and uniform, in regard to the whole race, some very considerable and very various populations have, from causes which are little understood, attained extremely unequal degrees of development, so that the former states of the most civilized nations are now to be seen, amidst some partial differences, among contemporary populations

inhabiting different parts of the globe…From the wretched inhabitants of Tierra del Fuego to the most advanced nations of Western Europe, there is no social grade which is not extant in some points of the globe, and usually in localities which are clearly apart" (1830-42/1975:108-9).

Comte believed that "all people, being all alike, fundamentally progress in the same manner," while "some, for reasons of climate or race or other 'inevitable secondary differences' [or] 'exceptional perturbations,' progress slower or faster than others." For Comte, "evolution to its highest point" is discovered in "the civilization of Western Europe… and in particular France" (Evans-Pritchard 1970:14). According to Marvin Harris (Harris 1968:101), influential European thinkers like "Hegel and Comte included racial factors in their analysis of world history and were contemptuous of non-European peoples".[61] In addition to promoting an ethnocentric social evolutionary understanding of race differences, Comte was stuck in the biological understandings of race popular during his day. E.E. Evans-Pritchard notes (Evans-Pritchard 1970:4), "to the embarrassment of erstwhile admirers," Comte endorsed the biologically deterministic, pseudo-scientific racism of "cerebral physiology," and "advocated phrenology as the most appropriate means of studying mental phenomena." Comte's sociology and racialized picture of human beings and society, which has had great affect on the discipline, frames a perception of the social world from a Euro-centric perspective that appreciates European societal advancement and European human development, as models, and depreciates the sociological significance of the social world, culture and of blacks and people of color.

---

[61] Marvin Harris' *The Rise of Anthropological Theory* (New York: Crowell, 1968) provides a thorough breakdown of the "racial determinism" that shaped anthropological theory as well as sociological theory.

Tocqueville's celebrated work, *Democracy in America* (1835), and his position as social critic of American society and culture go unquestioned by many contemporary scholars, who largely view Tocqueville as a liberal progressive and perceptive observer of American culture and society. While he did have many insightful perceptions of American society, even prescriptions, Tocqueville's views of human group relations and social development, like Comte's, is rooted in a flawed and narrow Eurocentric perspective of social reality. In Chapter 18 of Volume I of *Democracy in America*, "The Present and Probable Future Condition of the Three Races which Inhabit the Territory of the United States," Tocqueville compares and contrasts the "three races" in America, blacks, whites and Native Americans. Like Comte, his analysis further represents the FWWS's ethnocentric views of human social relations.

According to Tocqueville, democracy in America is democracy for whites or European Americans. Whites are those who possess democracy, whereas "the Indians and the negroes" are "two races," who occupy a particular place "in the midst of the democratic people" of European descent. Stated differently, Blacks and Native Americans "are American, without being democratic" (1835/2007:269). After positioning blacks and Native Americans outside of US society, outside democracy, Tocqueville states that the "[t]hree races [are] naturally distinct," and even "hostile to each other." He notes that "[a]lmost insurmountable barriers had been raised between them" and that "they do not amalgamate, an each race fulfills its destiny apart" (1835/2007:269-70). Knowing their respective histories, Tocqueville, at times, surprisingly speaks as if blacks and Native Americans had a voice in national matters or

opportunity for integration into society. Tocqueville does not envision the races ever mingling, and he even appears to blame Native Americans and blacks for this condition, claiming Native Americans' stubbornness and "pretended nobility" is the obstacle to their integration, while blacks' obstacles to integration result from their "over-eagerness" and "thousand fruitless efforts to insinuate himself among men who [are] repulse[d by] him" (1835/2007:271). Tocqueville explains the social world from the early white sociological perspective:

> Among these widely differing families of men, the first which attracts attention, the superior in intelligence, in power, and in enjoyment, is the white or European, the MAN pre-eminent; and in subordinate grades, the negro and the Indian. These two unhappy races have nothing in common; neither birth, nor features, nor language, nor habits. Their only resemblance lies in their misfortunes. Both of them occupy an inferior rank in the country they inhabit; both suffer tyranny; and if their wrongs are not the same, they originate at any rate with the same authors.

> If we reasoned from what passes in the world, we should almost say that the European is to the other races of mankind, what man is to the lower animals;---he makes them subservient to his use; and when he cannot subdue, he destroys them (1835/2007:270).

Democracy in America avoids contending with the hypocrisy of democracy and the fact that civilized whites barbarically treated blacks and Native Americans; and while he mentions that blacks were enslaved and Native Americans' land was stolen, Tocqueville does not address this moral-social dilemma and failing in a developing democracy of 'civilized' people. He claims that blacks "lost" their culture, country, language, religion, and customs, not that whites ripped blacks away from their African homeland. He also claims that "Native Americans lost their sentiment of attachment to their country," despite the fact that Native Americans were fighting to the death to

preserve the land that hadn't already been illegally appropriated by 'democratic' whites. The list of broken treaties and illegal, immoral acquisitions of stolen land could not have been unknown to a scholar of such magnitude as Tocqueville. Yet, never does he take white Americans to task for these serious social crimes against blacks and Native Americans. On the whole, his views of democracy in America are severely skewed and hypocritical, and theoretically and morally dubious. Most likely, his avoidance of investigating 'democracy' in large sections of America (he avoided traveling to slave states of the Deep South) is one factor for his blinded sociological view.

Like most European social thinkers of the early nineteenth century, Tocqueville embraced a white supremacist view of the social world, perceiving a racial hierarchy among the races with whites/Europeans on the top. This view was grounded in a belief that promoted beliefs of the superiority of whites as individuals and groups, but also beliefs about the superiority of white civilization, the social world and culture of whites. As he writings in *Democracy in America* demonstrate, Tocqueville undoubtedly viewed whites as superior individuals and groups and white European civilization as the most advanced. He qualified this understanding with the belief that, while whites and white civilization were the superior form of human beings and form of human relations, people of color could over time 'civilize' to white culture and society, if they discarded their own cultural-intellectual traditions and social ways of being. In other words, nonwhite races could eventually amalgamate and accept the "the civilizing process' into the dominant and superior European social world. In his correspondence with Arthur de

Gobineau,[62] Tocqueville wrote, "among the various families which compose the human race, there are certain peculiar inclinations and aptitudes arising from thousands of different causes. But that these inclinations and aptitudes are insurmountable not only has never been proven but is in itself unprovable" (Stone and Mennell 1980:321).

This view directly challenged Gobineau's sociological theory of the "permanence" of the races, a theory upholding the belief that different races have different, unchangeable, and incompatible characteristics and capacities. In *The Inequality of the Human Races* (1853-55), Gobineau purports that nonwhite races were inferior, that this inferiority was permanent, and that cultural and intellectual difference between racially superior whites and racially inferior non-whites produced racial inequality. According to Gobineau, of the three major races---whites, blacks, and yellow---whites were the dominant race and "creators" of history and civilization. Tension between Gobineau's and Tocqueville's sociological perspective about the racial hierarchical order of human relations and racial organization of society and civilization continues to resonate in contemporary sociology. As the vast social science literature reveals, both perspectives serve as dominant models for later and now contemporary sociological views about the construction of society and nature of human relations.

George Fitzhugh and Henry Hughes

As indicated by their inclusion with well-known figures like Comte and Spencer, this study finds the sociological perspectives of Fitzhugh and Hughes to be an important part

---

[62] See *Correspondence entre Alexis de Tocqueville et Arthur de Gobineau*, *1843-1859* (Paris: Plon, 1908).

of the story of the early development of sociology, a view shared by a number of

sociologists (Bernard 1936, 1937; Takaki 1971, 1979; Lyman 1985; Vidich and Lyman

1985; Calhoun 2007). Fitzhugh's *Sociology for the South* (1854) and Hughes' *Treatise*

on Sociology (1854) were two of the earliest works in the United States to engage

Comte's sociology and the first two works in the United States that incorporated the

term 'sociology' in their book titles. Fitzhugh and Hughes, as proslavery apologizers,

were disowned by later sociologists. However, as this work shows, important concepts

and theories supporting their pro-slavery social thought (i.e., paternalism, racial

hierarchy and social order, inferiority of people of color and un-assimilability of blacks,

and bi-racial society) are routinely employed in later sociologists' work, including the

writings of Park and many of the recognized founders of the tradition.

Even though the sociological views of Fitzhugh and Hughes, the two earliest

American sociologists,[63] are largely erased from the history of the discipline because of

their proslavery social theories, their ideas managed to influence (directly) or reflect

(indirectly) ideas and practices of the next generation, or "second wave" sociologists,

who professionalize sociology as a discipline in the United States. A review of major

sociologists responsible for professionalizing sociology in the US---Lester Ward,

---

[63] Bernard's essay (1936) was the first by a sociologist to address Hughes's work and argue that he should be viewed as the "first American sociologist." Along with Bernard's essay, Takaki's essays (1971, 1979) and Lyman's essays (1985a, 1985b) on Hughes present much needed historical and biographical background information on Hughes, address some main arguments and viewpoints discovered in his sociological writings, and acknowledge that his work is sociologically significant. For example, Lyman (1985b:4) observes that "the American South's sociologists [Hughes and Fitzhugh] have not only been expunged from the record of American sociology but also denied recognition for their contributions to the basic conceptual scheme of the discipline, positivism and social systems theory..." He continues: "Hughes's work was the first American sociological treatise elaborating the idea of a society as a *social system*, and that Fitzhugh provided a striking comparative analysis of the political economy of slave and free labor" (1985b:4).

William Sumner, W.I. Thomas, Albion Small, Charles Cooley, George Vincent, Alfred Stone and Edward Ross---reveals that all expressed certain racial views that support and resemble elements of Fitzhugh's and Hughes's proslavery social thought.

Both Fitzhugh and Hughes were significantly influenced by Comte's writings, which called for a positive science to perfect society through proper social organization (ordering) of its parts (different members and institutions). Ronald Takaki and Stanford Lyman indicate that both sociologists borrowed Comte's concept of sociology as a term used to describe their own concern with a study and theory of society (Takaki 1979:133; Lyman 1985a: xi, 14-17). Most likely, they borrowed elemental aspects of Comtean social philosophy because it supported the idea of ordering social relations (between blacks and whites) and developing a state that controls those social relations. Lyman (1985b:4) notes that "Comte's system of positive polity and new social science found its first sociological expression in…Henry Hughes's *Treatise on Sociology* (1854), the first American work to use the term sociology, and George Fitzhugh's *Sociology for the South* (1854)," which appeared the same year. Unlike Hughes who actually read Comte firsthand, Fitzhugh had an indirect, though powerful connection to Comte through George Frederick Holmes, who embraced and regenerated Comte's social thought. Holmes, who corresponded with Comte and wrote on Comte's social philosophy, was Fitzhugh's mentor, lessoned Fitzhugh on Comte, advised and edited Fitzhugh's writings, and came to celebrate Fitzhugh's applications of Comte's work in sociological analyses on American society.

It is purported that Hughes met Comte (Takaki, 1971, 1979; Lyman 1985a:xi) during a trip to France. Whether or not this meeting actually took place does not alter the fact that Hughes, like Fitzhugh and other 19th century American intellectuals, was deeply influenced by Comte's ideas about authoritarianism of the state and Comte's organicist, or structural functionalist, model of society. As noted, the organicist model views certain components (individuals, groups and organizations) of the body of the organism (society) each have their specific role to play (function) and segregated position (structural position) in the organism's system. In this model and metaphor of society, some components (individuals, groups and organizations) are *inherently* endowed with more control and more important functions than other components in the system.

Fitzhugh and Hughes were probably most impressed with the ease to which Comte's ideas could be applied to a pro-slavery argument that acknowledged ideas of dominant (master) group, whites, and a subservient (slave) group, blacks. Comte's vision of society supported and mapped un-equalized social group relations, segregated roles and places in society for its different members, and the controlling function of certain individuals/groups in the social system (metaphorically, the important extra-special organs in the system like the brain and heart). Comte's influence on Hughes and Fitzhugh is so strong that Lyman describes Fitzhugh and Hughes (along with George Frederick Holmes and Joseph Le Conte) as "southern Comteans" (Lyman 1985a:2-3). In addition to Comte's sociological model, proslavery-based Christianity and the creed of naturalist social philosophy inspired the sociological thought of Fitzhugh and Hughes.

Most nineteenth-century proslavery arguments in the United States combined scientific explanations of whites' superior status along with religious beliefs that white Christians were God's chosen masters and morally superior race and that nonwhite heathens were God's chosen servants and morally inferior race. Henry Hughes' and George Fitzhugh's writings are clear examples of proslavery thought that combined religious and scientific explanations for the enslavement of nonwhites. In *Treatise on Sociology* (1854), Henry Hughes argued that a 'societary' system ("warranteeism") in which the white 'race' is 'superodinate' ("warrantors") and the black 'race' is 'subordinate' "(warrantees")' was both a 'natural' relationship ("law of nature") and example of a "divine" society operating according to God's "handiwork" and the "ways of God." In *Sociology for the South* (1854) and *Cannibals All! or, Slaves without Masters* (1857), Fitzhugh upheld the popular belief that slavery was sanctioned by the Bible and he associated Christianity solely with the white race. He echoed the naturalists' belief in the superiority of whites and inferiority of blacks, and proposed that slavery was necessary in order to suppress the 'superior' white race's ability to fully exploit and exterminate blacks and other 'inferior' nonwhite races.

Without book-length sociological analyses of the sociological thought of Fitzhugh and Hughes, American sociology remains intellectually stunted and incomplete. Due to lack of historical development of the discipline and non-investigation, today's sociologists are uninformed of ways Fitzhugh's and Hughes' writings portray "the causes" of current asymmetrical race relations between whites and people of color and clues to the dominant intellectual rifts and debates concerning the

meaning of race and the usefulness of race as a social category and concept. Both Fitzhugh and Hughes make a race-based sociological observation and claim that is chillingly reflected in the current state of US race relations, a claim that most sociologists shy away from in their research and views of society. Fitzhugh and Hughes both argue that, for reasons of societal order and functionality, and, most importantly, the maintenance of social and economic privileges for whites, social relations between whites and people of color must be structured unequally, in racial terms, with whites in positions of power and people of color in subservient, powerless positions.

Herbert Spencer and Karl Marx

Along with Comte's sociological worldview, Herbert Spencer's social Darwinism has had the greatest impact on second wave sociologists (Small and Vincent 1894; Bernard and Bernard 1965; Lyman 1973; Stanfield 1985; Hawkins, 1997; Bowser 2002a). Like Comtean sociology, Spencerian social Darwinism is a way of understanding society and human relations that demands greater critical scrutiny and explanation. In many ways, Spencer's sociological theories and ideas are an extension and modification of Comte's. Spencer borrows liberally from the organicist model and then adds the important social dimensions of 'competition,' 'evolution' and 'adaptation' among different parts (members and groups of specific races or ethno-nationalities) of the organism (society). In *Social Statics* (1865), Spencer discusses the "universal mutation" and "indefinite variation" of human beings, making the case that "superior" groups are the ones that adapt better to the changing circumstances they encounter. This is the 'survival of the

fittest' argument, phraseology invented by Spencer to describe the social process of

racial group competition, conflict, and domination. For Spencer whites or Europeans are,

indeed, the fittest.

> Strange indeed would it be, if, in the midst of this universal mutation, man alone
> were constant, unchangeable. But it is not so. He obeys the law of indefinite
> variation. His circumstances are ever altering; and he is ever adapting himself to
> them. Between the naked houseless savage, and the Shakespeares and Newtons
> of a civilized state, lie unnumbered degrees of difference. The contrast of races in
> form, colour, and feature, are not greater than the contrasts in their moral and
> intellectual qualities. The superiority of sight which enables a Bushman to see
> further with the naked eye than a European with a telescope, is fully paralleled by
> the European's more perfect intellectual vision. The Calmuck in delicacy of
> smell, and the red Indian in acuteness of hearing, do not excel the white man
> more than the white man excels them in moral susceptibility. Every age, every
> nation, every climate, exhibits a modified form of humanity; and in all time, and
> amongst all peoples, a greater or less amount of change is going on
> (1865/1886:46).

Spencer provides a picture of whites as superior because they are able to adjust to

their social environment with techniques and technologies that non-whites do not or are

not supposed to possess. According to Spencer, whites posses certain social skills and

aptitudes---"traits"---that give them an advantage over nonwhites and which allow them

to change more readily in response to social environmental changes. In *The Study of*

Sociology (1873), Herbert Spencer writes:

> Among societies of all orders and sizes, from the smallest and rudest up to the
> largest and most civilized, it has to be ascertained what traits there are in
> common, determined by the common traits of human beings; what less-general
> traits, distinguishing certain groups of societies, result from traits distinguishing
> certain races of men; and what peculiarities in each society are traceable to the
> peculiarity of its members" (1873/1910:47).

In *The Principles of Sociology* (1876), Spencer explicates his understanding of

"Societal Typologies" and simplifies divisions among race groups ("societies") into two

primary categories, "uncivilized" 'simple societies' (races) in contrast to "civilized 'compound societies' (races). This Spencerian breakdown of the races would be further developed in the writings of US sociologists such as Lester Ward, William Sumner, W.I. Thomas, Franklin Giddings, Albion Small, Charles Cooley, George Vincent, Edward Ross, and Alfred Stone. Spencer' social Darwinism, while the most visible was one brand of social Darwinism among a number of others. Social Darwinism represents a part of a highly developed, scientifically rationalized ideology of white racial superiority developed in the nineteenth century writings of Robert Knox, Paul Broca, Josiah Nott, Louis Agassiz, Gustave Le Bon, Arthur de Gobineau, and Charles Darwin himself, all of whom, along with Spencer and his disciples, contributed the development of social Darwinism.

Building on earlier ideas of racial taxonomy, ethnology, and naturalism, racist ideologies that developed in the mid-to-late nineteenth century proposed "scientific" measures for explaining genetic and organic racial differences. In most cases, these racial ideologies---supported by phrenology, craniometry, and physiognomy (studies of physical features of the skull and facial expressions)---emphasized that biological and genetic differences among races are permanent and/or signify a natural order and separation of races. Darwin's theories of natural selection and Spencer's sociological theory of 'survival of the fittest species' advanced the discussion of the 'natural' and irreconcilable differences between biologic races, arguments often accepting the belief in the struggle between 'civilized,' 'superior' whites and 'savage,' 'inferior' nonwhites would result in the extinction of nonwhite races. Numerous white thinkers embraced and

expanded upon various elements of Darwinian racial thought discovered in *On the Origin of Species* (1859) and Darwin's other writings. Influential social theorists such as Ludwig Gumplowitcz, Joseph Le Conte, Frederick Hoffman, Benjamin Kidd, Gabriel Tarde, Georges Vacher de Lapouge, Josiah Strong, John Fiske, and Houston Chamberlain, developed the field of social Darwinism, the leading intellectual tradition of the nineteenth and early twentieth century.

In the late eighteenth century and into the twentieth, European and U.S. imperialists utilized social Darwinist ideas about the struggle between races as rationalizations of an 'organic' international race struggle and need for European conquest in this 'evolutionary battle of the human races.' Out of social Darwinism, a racist imperialist philosophy developed that proposed that (in the competition of the races) nonwhite 'natives' could not be civilized, and thus were condemned to be dominated or destroyed. A developing racist imperialism based upon this philosophy motivated Belgian's large-scale extermination of Congo's native population, the Kaffir wars in South Africa, Australian slaughter of Aborigines, and the continued extermination of many tribes of Native Americans in the United States, Canada, and South American. Nonwhite races that were not slaughtered were forcefully subdued.

Through extermination and force (social Darwinism in unadulterated form), imperial white empires expanded their conquests to every corner of the globe. To organize and divvy the plunder, Africa was divided among European nations. Along with the conquest of African territories, the British, German, French, and Dutch forces invaded and conquered territories throughout Asia and the Pacific. Two soon-to-be

world superpowers joined the white-controlled imperialist movement when Russia invaded its Mongolian and Manchurian neighbors and the United States set up shop in China, annexed Hawaii, and went to war with the Spain over territories in the Caribbean and Philippines. Significantly, around this time of increased international and interracial contact, Chinese, Japanese, Indians and other Asians, as well as Middle Easterners and Pacific islanders, were increasingly defined as nonwhite races, and thus subject to subjugation that blacks experience.

In an 1892 letter responding to Mori Arinori, the Japanese Minister in London, Spencer prophetically forewarned of whites' aggression and potential aggression in non-Western lands, in particular, Japan. With this letter, Spencer points to the global relationship between race and power, the idea of racial domination by some races over others as an international political concern, and the question of miscegenation or intermarriage of whites and people of color.

> Respecting the further questions you ask, let me, in the first place, answer generally that the Japanese policy should, I think, be that of keeping Americans and Europeans as much as possible at arm's length. In presence of the more powerful races your position is one of chronic danger, and you should take every precaution to give as little foothold as possible to foreigners…I regard this as fatal policy. If you wish to see what is likely to happen, study the history of India. Once [you] let one of the more powerful races gain a *point d'appui* and there will inevitably in course of time grow up an aggressive policy which will lead to collisions with the Japanese (1892/1972:255).

With regard to Arinori's query about inter-marriage between Japanese and whites, Spencer replies that "[i]t should be positively forbidden." According to Spencer, intermarriage is "at the root a question of biology," and that one finds "abundant proof, alike furnished by the inter-marriages of human races and by the inter-breeding of

animals, that when the varieties mingled diverge beyond a certain slight degree *the result is invariably a bad one*." Over time "there arises an incalculable mixture of traits, and what be called a chaotic constitution," the mixed-breeds of "Eurasians in India, and the half-breeds in America, show this" (1892/1972:257). Additionally, according to Spencer, anti-immigration policies should be established that prohibit or severely restrict cross-racial migration; and if immigration is allowed, the dominant race of the host country should devise methods of subduing minority races that immigrate. Spencer writes:

> I have for the reasons indicated entirely approved of the regulation which have been established in America for restraining the Chinese immigration, and had I the power [I] would restrict them to the smallest possible amount…If the Chinese are allowed to settle extensively in America, they must either, if they remain unmixed, form a subject race in the position, if not of slaves, yet of a class approaching slaves; or if they mix they must form a bad hybrid. In either case, supposing the immigration to be large, immense social mischief must arise, and eventually social disorganization. The same thing will happen if there should be any considerable mixture of the European or American races with the Japanese (1892/1972:257).

Karl Marx, another important FWWS, is one of the three primary "classical" sociological theorists (along with Emile Durkheim and Max Weber) whose sociological thought has had an enormous effect on the discipline. Marx's critique of capitalism and the bourgeoisie, and his critical materialist understandings of socio-economic class divisions and social structures that enforce those divisions, continue to shape sociological theory. Marx stands as the only one of the FWBS whose work is still routinely referenced by social scientists. Most sociologists who embrace Marxist sociological thought believe that Marx's sociological concerns can lead to positive social transformations between the classes, in which resources and power are more evenly distributed among classes. In many sociologists' eyes, Marx's sociology symbolizes the

proto-type for liberation sociology. Indeed, Joe Feagin and Hernán Vera's introductory chapter in *Liberation Sociology* (2001/2008), "What is Liberation Sociology," commences with the words of Marx, "one of the founders of the liberation social science tradition," and utilizes his ideas in their theoretical development of liberation sociology (2001/2008:1).

While, indeed, Marx's sociological ideas and practices are examples of ways to liberate the working class and poor and offer many useful insights and techniques in fighting oppression exercised by dominant groups, Marx's sociology cannot, by itself, support or primarily structure liberation sociology. As Feagin and Vera make clear, class oppression is not the only oppression and class liberation is not the only form of liberation needed in society. In addition, ethnic-race oppression, gender oppression and other forms of oppression demand racial liberation, gender liberation and so forth. Despite its positive attributes and refinement by neo-Marxists and radical Marxists, Marxism has severe flaws that must not go unmentioned. Marx's sociology fails to directly address racial and gender oppression, the other large-scale forms of oppression affecting human beings in the social world. In fact, its one-sided focus on class oppression is often conducted at the expense of ethno-racial oppression and gender oppression.

As a number of writings have indicated (Acker 2005; Brewer 2005; Feagin, Elias, and Mueller 2009), Marxist sociologists have dominated the 'liberation sociological discourse,' becoming, paradoxically, the oppressor of liberation sociological discourse. Thus, Catherine MacKinnon (1989/91) has had to borrow and reshape

numerous Marxist concepts and theories to discuss gender oppression and work to

devise a feminist sociology that speaks to women issues that Marxist sociology neglects.

Similarly, one notices sociologists of race---normally more radical black sociologists,

like W.E.B. Du Bois (1945, 1946) and Oliver Cox (1948, 1959)---reworking of Marxist

ideas and theories so that they can specifically contend with social issues surrounding

the links between class and racial oppression. As sociologists of race and gender

observe, Marxist sociology only provides intellectual tools for partial liberation of

human beings and society, and therefore is only one segment and artery of liberation

sociology. Moreover, and more importantly for this work, Marxism doesn't escape the

Euro-ethnocentrism and other aspects of the white frame of ideas and practices that are

found in the other FWWS, Comte, Tocqueville, Fitzhugh, Hughes, and Spencer.

One might ask why Marx's concern with the struggle of the worker and

oppressed avoids focusing on (not just mentioning) the struggle and oppression of blacks

enslaved and later Jim Crow-ed in America and fails to critically investigate the

struggles of colored peopled being exploited and oppressed by colonialist white powers

across the globe. This omission is especially glaring considering he wrote prolifically on

the American Civil War for the *New York Daily Tribune* (1861-1862) and the Vienna

Presse (1861-1862) and even spoke of "twofold slavery" or "the indirect slavery of the

white man" and "the direct slavery of the black man" (1937:19). While he was

intellectually fascinated by the "revolutionary" social events in the United States, he did

not see blacks (as the true working class) playing a significant role in their own

liberation and in the revolution. He was more interested in ways the events were

unfolding between capitalists and workers (North and South), socio-economic transformations that he felt would be a catalyst for the real worker's revolution that would occur among whites in Europe.

In some ways, Marx missed out on the first stages of 'the revolution' against (white) capitalists, anticipating that whites, specifically white Europeans, would naturally be the leaders in the revolution. This blindness cost Marx, for he failed to view the political, social and intellectual developments of blacks that helped lead up to the Civil War. He failed to see that the vanguard of the workers' movement and early stages of the revolution against capitalism were blacks (Toussaint L'Ouverture, Nat Turner, David Walker, Martin Robison Delany and others) and thus failed to investigate their ideas and actions accordingly. The reason behind his oversight of blacks might be related to Marx's unflattering views of people of color (Peterson 2005).

Marx's writings on colonialism, particularly British colonization of India, present a number of interesting perceptions about white sociological views of European conquest and the rational behind Europeans' "superior abilities" to conquer and subjugate people of color. Marx repeats the social thought of Spencer, Comte, Tocqueville, Fitzhugh and Hughes, which: 1) divides human beings into two primary groups, superior-civilized races and inferior-barbaric races, or in other words, whites and people of color; and 2) justifies subjugation of inferior-barbaric nonwhite races by superior-civilized white races. In a bipolar manner, Marx continues to use language in his writings that would suggest that whites [bourgeois or proletariat] were superior and civilized and people of color were barbaric uncivilized human beings, even while he

identifies the "profound hypocrisy and inherent barbarism of bourgeois civilization."

One might wonder who the 'real barbarians' are, according to Marx, and how to

interpret his oscillation in thought.

Discussing "The Future Results of the British Rule in India" (1853), Marx finds

that 'European industry,' the exploitations of the ruling classes (bourgeois whites), is the

culprit in colonization, overlooking the Western, white cultural hegemonization of India

as part of the 'civilizing process.' Marx states that "the question, therefore, is not

whether the English had a right to conquer India, but whether we are to prefer India

conquered" by people of color, who will not be able to bring human progress to India in

the same "advanced" manner that Europeans can. Marx appears to be stating that,

although whites', the "superior conquers," rule over people of color in India has been

ruthless, this social condition and stage of world events is preferable than India in the

hands of other "barbarian conquerors" (1853/1960:76-81). In other words, Marx argues

that conquest and subjugation of people of color is bound to occur, therefore it might as

well be whites who are conquering and subjugating. Because India is a country that has

experienced "the predestined prey of conquest," a land with "no history" except "the

history of successive intruders who founded their empires on the passive basis of that

unresisting and unchanging society," Marx believes that:

> England has to fulfill a double mission in India: one destructive, the other
> regenerating---the annihilation of old Asiatic society, and the laying of the
> material foundations of Western society in Asia (1853/1960:77).

Like Tocqueville, Marx's acknowledges and appears to endorse two mechanisms

at work in developing Western power, the destruction of people of color and their culture

and the simultaneous promotion of white Western society. The misery, suffering and

exploitation of people of color is secondary to the advancement and developments of

Western society, which when worked out---through socialist revolution---can then be

transported globally and improve the lot of 'colonized' people. Even though he delivers

detailed descriptions and occasional criticisms of colonialism, Marx doesn't discuss

colonization as the conflict between races and as the global socio-economic, political,

cultural-intellectual domination of whites over people of color. Instead of a larger scale

racial framing of the social world, Marx understands colonialism as a product of

bourgeoisie capitalist expansion overseas. As his close ally, Frederick Engels, noted in a

supplement to *Capital, Volume III*:

> Then colonization. Today this is purely a subsidiary of the stock exchange, in whose interests the Europeans powers divided Africa a few years ago, and the French conquered Tunis and Tonkin. Africa leased directly to companies (Niger, South Africa, German South-West and German East Africa), and Mashonaland and Natal seized for the stock exchange" (1894/1960:273).

For Marx and Engels, colonization was viewed strictly as a capitalist venture,

ignoring the ethno-racial exploitation and the massive social-historical racial system

(intellectual, social, psychological, religious, scientific, cultural beliefs and practices)

that was at the heart of this venture, a system much more developed, ingrained and

primary than capitalism. We now turn to a tradition of black ideas and practices that

forcefully challenge Marxist sociological ideas and practices as well as refuting the

white-framed sociological thought and actions of Comte, Tocqueville, Fitzhugh, Hughes,

Spencer, and Marx.

Nineteenth Century Development of the Black Frame of Ideas and Practices among

'First Wave Black Sociologists'

Major developments of the black frame of ideas and practices emerged during 19th

century. The continued tradition of pamphleteering was joined by petitions to State

Legislative bodies, the US Congress and President, establishment of the black press, 'the

Negro Convention Movement,' and production of numerous sociologically-oriented

books, addresses, pamphlets and letters by a growing black intelligentsia and political-

activist vanguard of blacks attacking the system of white supremacy with both ideas and

actions. During this period, black intellectual leaders, social reformers and

revolutionaries developed a number of approaches and views to achieving black

emancipation from the oppressive social system of white supremacy.

One noticeable divide between the ideas and practices of blacks, one that would

reappear in the early twentieth century, is discovered in the opposition between blacks

who supported the efforts of the Colonization Society and blacks' return to Africa

(specifically Liberia) and blacks who viewed this social philosophy and action as

problematic. The idea of colonization, while embraced by many blacks who eventually

moved to Africa (approximately 12,000), was primarily an idea promoted by a number

of prominent whites to deal with 'the Negro problem,' especially the free black

population who was viewed to be in discord with and a possible threat to the white

population. The American Colonization Society (ACS) was established and endorsed by

such powerful whites as Thomas Jefferson, Henry Clay, James Madison, Daniel

Webster, Paul Cuffe, James Monroe, Stephen Douglas, William Seward, Francis Scott

Key, Bushrod Washington,[64] Roger Taney (Chief Justice in the infamous *Dred Scott* case), as well as Abraham Lincoln.

In 1817, James Forten and Reverend Richard Allen organized a meeting of free blacks in Philadelphia to speak out against black colonization in Africa. In response to the ideas of colonization, Forten and Allen argued that colonization was "a devise to perpetuate slavery" and deny blacks their rightful place in an American nation largely constructed by blacks. In contrast to the anti-colonizationists like Forten and Allen, a number of blacks, who were despondent by American race relations and felt unwelcome in American society, welcomed the opportunity to leave the United States. One such pro-colonization black, and the second black to receive a college degree in the US, John Russworm was the lead co-founder of the first black US newspaper in 1827, *Freedom's Journal*. After a short stint with the journal lasting two years, he joined the Colonization Society in 1829 and soon after moved and settled in Liberia, becoming the editor of the *Liberia Herald* , superintendent of the public school system, and a governor of Liberia before his death in 1851 (Dann 1971:17).

Birth of 'the Negro Convention movement' in 1830 developed another forum for the expression of different political, sociological and philosophical views of blacks. In *A Survey of the Negro Convention Movement*, *1830-1861*, Howard Bell (1953/1969:1) notes, "[t]here were conventions for every conceivable purpose----from the propagation of infidelism to the encouragement of Christianity, and from the condemnation of slavery to the justification thereof." The black convention movement range from local

---

[64] George Washington's nephew, a Supreme Court Justice and ACS's first president.

conventions to the eleven national conventions organized during the middle of the

nineteenth century. Numerous black newspapers also developed during the period.[65]

After Russworm's departure from *Freedom's Journal*, Samuel Cornish, the other co-

founder, reinstituted the journal as *Rights of All* (1829) with a more militant tone and

focused intellectual attack on racism. Cornish went on to edit several other journals,

including *Colored American* (1837), a journal "dedicated to racial pride and unity…with

a greater awareness of and emphasis on political considerations---especially obtaining

full civil rights" (Dann 1971:17-18). A decade later, in 1847, *The North Star* was first

published, an influential journal organized by Frederick Douglas, Martin Delany and

William Lloyd Garrison.

Throughout the nineteenth century, numerous black organizations and

institutions blossomed, primarily in the Northern states such as New York, Ohio, and

Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts. These black organizations and institutions where

venues in which black intellectuals and black political activists (often blacks played both

roles) could present---address---ideas freely and without possible persecution,

restrictions, and harassment. In many cases, churches were the central intellectual and

political meeting grounds---or primary institution---for black organizations. It is

important to recognize however that black challenges to white supremacy were not only

accomplished in pamphlets, petitions, presses, conventions, and churches. Slave revolts

and indigenous groups' resistance to enslavement and exploitation were key factors in

the elimination of legal slavery. In other words, the black frame of ideas and practices

---

[65] In *The Black Press, 1827-1890*, Martin Dann (1971:19-20) notes over thirty different black journals
published prior to the outbreak of the Civil War.

includes, not just black ideas challenging white ideologies and political-socio-economic systems, but black actions against white enslavement and other forms of dehumanization and oppression.

In 1804, Toussaint L'Ouverture led a successful rebellion against slave owners in Haiti and then defeated French, Spanish, and British troops sent to quell the rebellion. This crucial victory against black enslavement by whites sent shockwaves across America and Europe, alerting Europeans and white Americans that anti-slavery crusades could become violent and costly for those benefiting from the system.[66] L'Ouverture's revolution was part of a long tradition of slave revolts throughout North and South America beginning as early as the seventeenth century. To name just a few territories, Brazil, Panama, Suriname, Guyana, Cuba, Barbados, Jamaica and the British Virgin islands experienced slave insurrections. Gabriel Prosser, Denmark Vesey, and Nat Turner would follow in L'Ouverture's footsteps, plotting and leading the most visible of over two hundred slave revolts in the United States, events that, like the Haitian revolution, created social tensions and psychological fear throughout the slave owning south.

In 1800, Gabriel Prosser planned a sizeable slave insurrection throughout the plantation system surrounding Richmond, Virginia. His plot was foiled and he was captured and hanged along with twenty-six other co-conspirators of the slave insurrection. Prosser's actions alarmed whites in the region, who restricted slave

---

[66] See C.L.R James, *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution* (New York: Vintage, 1989) and Laurent Dubois and John D. Garrigus, *Slave Revolution in the Caribbean, 1789–1804: A Brief History with Documents* (Bedford: St. Martin's Press, 2006).

education among blacks, as Prosser's literacy and education were viewed as the causes of his revolutionary attitudes. Nearly a quarter century later, in 1822, Denmark Vesey and thirty-five other black men and women were put to death for organizing a large-scale slave rebellion in Charleston, South Carolina (the plan was to take over Charleston). Vesey's actions, inspired by the Haitian revolution, instilled fear in the white community and led to the creation of the Citadel Military Academy, an early headquarters for a legion of one hundred and fifty armed whites stationed on call to deter or respond to slave insurrections.[67]

Unlike Prosser and Vesey, Nat Turner was able to commence a violent and just rebellion against slavery. The "Southampton insurrection" of 1831 claimed sixty white causalities---men, women, and children, the deadliest known attack on whites by enslaved blacks. In a few days, the insurrection was quashed as legions of white militia joined in the hunt for Turner and the other enslaved blacks. Turner and fifty-five other alleged co-conspirators were executed; additionally over two hundred blacks, who had nothing to do with the rebellion, were murdered by retaliatory white mobs. In response to the Turner-led insurrection, the State of Virginia outlawed education blacks and disallowed black religious services without whites present as monitors.[68] In addition to the black political and intellectual black leaders, the above black leaders of action,

---

[67] See Herbert Aptherker's *American Negro Slave Revolts* (New York: International Publishers, 1943/1983); Douglas R. Egerton's *Gabriel's Rebellion: The Virginia Conspiracies of 1800 and 1802*. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993) and *He Shall Go Out Free: The Lives of Denmark Vesey,* 2nd ed. (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2004).
[68] Herbert Aptheker's *Nat Turner's Slave Rebellion* (New York: Humanities Press, 1966).

martyrs who challenged white supremacy and the evils of slavery, would serve as motivational revolutionary black actors for the first wave of black sociologists.[69]

First Wave Black Sociologists

Possibly the gravest, most serious omission in the history of sociology is the oversight of first wave black sociologists. During the same period Comte, Tocqueville, Fitzhugh, Hughes, Spencer and Marx were developing sociological theories, political statements about social relations, and histories of white civilization and the races, the first wave of black sociologists were countering with their own distinctive, often oppositional, sociological theories, political statements, and histories of black civilization and relationship of the races. Whites' versions of the history of sociology, the dominant versions, resolutely leave out black sociologists who, during the same periods, were performing the same type of sociological analyses as the FWWS. If able to persuade white sociologists to consider the possibility of an early black sociological tradition, the first question that inevitably arises is, "who then are these 'supposed' black sociologists?"

If Comte, Tocqueville, Fitzhugh, Hughes, Spencer and Marx are viewed as FWWS, then who are the first wave black sociologists (FWBS)? In *Confronting the American Dilemma of Race: The Second Generation Black American Sociologists* (2002), Benjamin Bowser argues that a black sociological tradition reaches back to the

---

[69] Prosser, Vesey, and Turner were all literate and educated; Vesey and Turner led religious congregations, thus they not only had the learning but also had a forum for presenting ideas to others and organizing group action. Many of the first wave black sociologists would continue to combine education, politics and religious belief in their sociological thought

work of Alexander Crummell, William Wells Brown, William H. Ferris, and George Washington Williams. In a lively response to Bowser, Jerry Watts disagrees that these black intellectuals represent a sociological tradition, arguing that they, and individuals like T. Thomas Fortune, "offered …historically based counter-assertions to the racist assertions of Spencer and his American disciples" (2002:9, 24, 51-2). Bowser and Watts are both right; many of the above thinkers used historical analysis (Watts), but they did so as sociologists (like a Marx, Weber or Durkheim) to explain social realities or challenge the ideas and social practices of whites (Bowser).

If one is willing to acknowledge social reform, social justice-oriented "public sociologists" as legitimate sociologists, then all the individuals above are unquestionably sociologists. Most were historical sociologists. In addition to the black historical and public sociologists listed above (all of who are also sociological theorists, specifically critical theorists[70]), Frederick Douglass, Martin Delany, and David Walker---arguably the first black sociologist---should also be considered members of the early, or first wave, black sociological tradition or first wave black sociologists (FWBS).

If we dig deep analytically, we find that the early black sociologists listed above were more sociologically sophisticated, theoretically advanced and honest, less caddy and dishonestly misleading in their sociological analyses, and not schizophrenic in their descriptions of social realities (human relations, social structures, and moral order of society) like their white counterparts, FWWS. The early white sociologists---Comte,

---

[70] If critical theory is centered on social justice issues as Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno argue, then first wave black sociologists were performing critical sociology prior to Horkheimer and Adorno, as well as prior to the early reform and social justice American sociological tradition identified in several works (Deegan 2002; Feagin 2001; Feagin, Elias, and Mueller 2009).

Tocqueville, Fitzhugh, Hughes, Spencer and Marx---based their sociological perceptions upon superstitious ideologies extending back to Christian mythologies of white racial superiority. FWWS confused the social and natural worlds and the social and natural sciences, comparing and ordering human being like inanimate objects such as rocks and celestial bodies. All bought into biological determinism and most perpetuated mentally stunted pseudo-scientific explanations of human behavior.

In general, FWWS were ultimately unimpressive sociologists because of their extreme ethnocentric biases and non-empathy that only perceived and responded to part of the social world, the white world. FWBS constructed a more lucid scientifically balanced (if scientific means being honestly objective in reporting carefully systematized understandings of the empirical world) and logical and even picture of human relations and the constitution of society, explicating the raw sociological truths about the twisted social historical relationship between white supremacy and black subjugation.

To demonstrate the better-quality sociological perceptions and practices of the first wave of black sociologists, I review the distinctive, but connected, approaches to sociology of David Walker, Martin Delany, Alexander Crummell, Frederick Douglass, William Wells Brown and George W. Williams. All FWBS are connected in a critique of a white society, white people---their ideas and actions---and white civilization that enslave and oppress blacks and people of color. Each however has a different approach to addressing the conditions of blacks' oppression and enslavement, whether it is reinterpreting the social world and rewriting history or theorizing and attempting to implement the ideal social world through theories and actions, arrangement of social

relations and human understanding. Many of the concepts concerning social group relations that past and present white sociologists have made careers discussing--- assimilation, cultural pluralism, colonization, nationalism, separatism, pan-raciality and pan-ethnicity---were already well-defined and operating in the sociological thought of early black sociologists.

As will become clear in the analysis below, FWBS's sociological thought and practices honestly portray the social nightmare of black subjugation and dehumanization caused by white brutality and exploitation. Unlike white sociologists (especially today's), Walker, Delany, Crummell, Douglass, Brown, and Williams are unafraid of revealing ugly social truths of white racism and focusing on the immoral fact of whites' attempt at producing a history-less, culture-less, society-less, person-less object, people who are the property and tools of whites. FWBS explain how whites' racist ideas and actions perpetuate black oppression and they expose a deeply embedded, white hegemonic social-psychological conditioning that works to manipulate or destroy the black subject and community.

David Walker and Martin Delany

Over two decades prior to Auguste Comte's publication of *Système de politique positive* (1851-1854), David Walker published *Walker's Appeal, in Four Articles; Together with a Preamble, to the Coloured Citizens of the World, but in Particular, and Very Expressly, to Those of the United States of America* (*Appeal*). The 1829 *Appeal* is likely the first systematic theoretical counter-frame to the white racial frame. As George Ducas

explains, "The *Appeal* was the first extended political tract to be produced by an American Negro" (1970:58). Additionally, it was most likely the first sociological track by a black or white US sociologist. In the *Appeal*, Walker delivers a condemning attack on the hypocrisies of white "christian Americans" (Walker purposively uses a small c) and their supposed "Republican Land of Liberty." He begins the *Appeal* with a Preamble that informs the reader that he is presenting his *Appeal* after careful systematic sociological observation and investigation of American society, one that yields the harsh social conditions of black Americans. Walker states:

> Having traveled over a considerable portion of these United States, and having, in the course of my travels taken the most accurate observations of things as they exist---the result of my observations has warranted the full and unshaken conviction, that we, (colored people of these United States) are the most degraded, wretched, and abject set of beings that ever lived since the world began" (1829/1970:59).

Foreshadowing his alleged murder by poison in 1830 (a year after the release of the *Appeal*), Walker wrote that being a "mover of insubordination," speaking truth about the social misery of the oppressed and actively "exposing tyrants," was an invitation to being "put in prison or to death" (1829/1970:60). In contrast to Prosser, Vesey and Turner who were murdered for their actions or planned actions, Walker received a death sentence for his arguments---ideas---about black resistance and insurrection and utter contempt for tyrannical power-yielding whites. Walker proclaims that "the *source* from which most of our [blacks] miseries proceed" stem from "the inhuman system of *slavery*." Walker then proceeds to chastise European nations of "avaricious oppressors" who go about enslaving blacks and people of color. In Article I of the *Appeal*, he

demonstrates awareness of whites' ploy of dehumanizing blacks as a tactic to justify

their enslavement, explaining the white logic of social relations already discussed:

> All of the inhabitants of the earth (except however, the sons of Africa) are called men, and of course are, and ought to be free. But we, (coloured people) and our children are brutes!! and of course are and ought to be Slaves to American people and their children forever! to dig their mines and work their farms; and thus go on enriching them, from one generation to another with our blood and our tears!! (1829/1970:63).

Walker sarcastically demonstrates that he doesn't buy into the myth of white

beauty, stating that "I would not give *a pinch of snuff* to be married to any white person I

ever saw in all my life." Dispelling the idea that blacks desire to be accepted by whites

(Tocqueville's argument), Walker writes: "They [whites] think because they hold us in

their infernal chains of slavery that we wish to be white, or of their color---but they are

dreadfully deceived---we wish to be just as it pleased our Creator." Walker further

professes that "no avaricious and unmerciful wretches have any business to make slaves

or hold us in slavery," asking whites how they would like to be braded a slave because

of the whiteness of their skin" (1829/1970:64, 66). Picking up where Benjamin

Banneker left off, Walker deconstructs Thomas Jefferson's social views of the inferiority

of blacks, and reverses the cards by observing inferior behavior of whites, who "have

always been an unjust, jealous unmerciful, avaricious and blood thirsty set of beings,

always seeking after power and authority" (1829/1970:69).

In Article II, Walker proposes that blacks look to Africa as a source of culture

and history and for development of black unity in an effort to challenge white

domination. Walker pointedly asks: "had you not rather be killed than to be a slave to a

tyrant, who takes the life of your mother, wife, and dear little children?" He then returns

to challenge Jefferson's claims about the inferiority of blacks and delivers a discussion

of the importance of black education (1829/1970:75-80). Article III contends with the

hypocrisies of white Christianity and whites' steady incurring the wrath of God, honing

in on a theme that supports the entire *Appeal*. Like the Hebrew prophet Elijah, Walker

writes: "I call on God—I call on angels---I call [white] men, to witness, that your

destruction is at hand, and will be speedily consummated unless you REPENT"

(1829/1970:85).

In Article IV, Walker concludes the Appeal by rejecting the idea of colonization,

stating, "Methinks colonizationists think they have a set of brutes to deal with, sure

enough. Do they think to drive us from our country and homes, after having enriched it

with our blood and tears" (1829/1970: 99) and again chastising the hypocrisy of white

'democratic' social system:

> See your own declaration, [white] Americans! Do you understand your own
> language? Hear your language, proclaimed to the world, July 4, 1776, "We hold
> these truths to be self-evident---that ALL men are created EQUAL!
> (1829/1970:103).

Walker stands as an early American social critic[71] and sociologist of American

society that few contemporary critics or sociologists who study the US can match. His

insights of whites' perceptions and practices, whites' social system, and whites'

historical oppression of blacks equipped Walker with the knowledge to generate a black

sociological counter-frame to debunk whites' distorted ideas and unjust practices or

white racial framing of the social world. Walker's sociological insights are still timely, a

sad indicator of the persistence of white racial progression. According C. Eric Lincoln:

---

[71] Walker was a regular contributor to *Freedom's Journal*.

David Walker, more than any other historical figure, wrote in the mood of today. His was a voice that the contemporary black revolution can identify with…It seems clear that Walker's indictment against [white] Americans encompasses both their claims to racial superiority---which presupposes for themselves a unique development toward human perfection---and their alleged moral superiority, which is interpreted as a de facto expression of their posture as Christians. Again, the relevance of Walker to contemporary times is almost uncanny. It is almost as though his Appeal had been written with our generation in mind—or as if 147 years had passed while American history stood still" (1971:x-xi).

Martin Delany is a founding father of black nationalism,[72] nationalism combining black pride, black self-determination and black separatism. He knew of and referenced Denmark Vesey's call to social action, demonstrating appreciation of revolutionary black actions and thought. Unlike Vesey, Delany's focus was promoting black revolutionary thought and respect for African traditions. He was a participant at the first national Negro Conference in 1835. Additionally, he helped form several black newspapers throughout the mid-nineteeth century. His articles from *The Mystery* (1843) were also printed in*The Liberator*, William Lloyd Garrison's paper. In 1847, Delany teamed up Garrison and Frederick Douglass to publish the *North Star*.

Delany's *Conditions, Elevation, Emigration and Destiny of the Colored People of the United States, Politically Considered* (*Conditions*), published 1852, a little over a decade after Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*, *Vol. II* appeared (1840), presents a much different argument about the future of blacks in America than the one professed by Tocqueville. For Delany, blacks were not doomed to a second-class status in the US because they had the ability to emigrate from the US, one method of black liberation and black de-integration from US society that Delany proposed over the course of his life.

---

[72] See Victor Ullman, *Martin R. Delany: The Beginnings of Black Nationalism* (1971).

Conditions delivers a critical view of the damages of oppression on the black American community. Delany laments that, because of closed opportunities, blacks are "standing still or retrograding." Delany must have had in mind his unjust dismissal from Harvard Medical School due to complaints by white students who did not wish to study with blacks. He understood that white Americans did not view blacks as "ladies and gentlemen, equal in standing." Instead, blacks face extreme degradation in the US, forced into the lowest rungs of American society and forced into a cycle of oppression stagnating black development 'from the womb to the tomb.' As Delany acknowledges, a "child born under oppression" has diminished life chances and is socially damaged from the get go.

Delany reverses the white sociological logic of race and geography, stemming from Comte and Spencer, and argues that since blacks are 'best suited' for all climates (white justification for black enslavement in particular geographical regions) that black are thus the "superior race" and should take advantage of their geographic adaptability and migrate from the US to more welcoming parts of the globe. He also reverses the white sociological logic that argues that blacks and people of color, because of their alleged racial inferiority, should be white people's servants and pawns and mental creations. According to Delany, "Every people should be the originators of their own designs, the projector of their own schemes, and creators of the events that lead to their destiny---the consummation of their desires" (1852:145). This position directly contradicts Fitzhugh and Hughes' largely paternalistic-based proslavery arguments.

Delany's message of black migration to Africa in *Conditions* was further developed two years later when Delany headed the National Emigration Convention in Cleveland Ohio.

In addition to his continued to battle for black abolition up until the Civil War, Delany became the first commissioned officer, a field doctor, in the Union Army. After the war, Delanay flirted with politics during the era of Recomstruction and also traveled overseas, travels which reinvigorated his vision of black emigration to East Africa. Toward the end of his life, he and other black businessmen from Charleston, South Carolina organized 'Liberia Exodus Joint Stock Steamship Company,' a renewed effort to generate a pragmatic means of black migration from an unbending white racist society.

In one of his last works, *Principles of Ethnology: The Origin of Races and Color with an Archaeological Compendium and Egyptian Civilization from Years of Careful Examination and Enquiry* (1879), Delany challenged the increasingly popular European evolutionary thought that different races occupy different stages of evolution and countered arguments stating blacks had not contributed to civilization. In contrast to whites dishonests accounting of history, he argued thating that blacks were central to dawn and development of Egyptian civilization.

Until the end of his life, Delany fought white racism. He grew weary of the prospects of improved race relations between US blacks and whites. Speaking in *The North Star* (10/26/1848) on (black and) white American society's evasion of addressing the issue of racism (a subject recently broached by Eric Holder, Jr, the US Atttorney General in 2009), Delany wrote:

The overwhelming mass have remained silent as the grave on the subject. The Impartial Citizen, edited by a colored man, did not even notice it. The Ram's Horn has been dumb over it. Very few of our public men have, as yet, given to the idea the slightest encouragement. Pittsburgh, that should always be ready to speak, as she always has an opinion, has been silent! Cincinnati, containing a colored population as intelligent, active and wealthy as any in the country, has not lisped a word, pro or con, on the subject. New York, as usual, has nothing to say (1848).

With regard to racism and social progress on this issue in the United States, very little has changed in the thirty years from the time Delany wrote the statement above, just as very little has changed with regard to this social issue from the time of his death to the present day. If Delany were alive today, his anti-racist views would be turned against him, and he would be viewed as radical extremist like the Dr. Reverend Jeremiah Wright, showing he was, indeed, ahead of his time.

Alexander Crummell and Frederick Douglass

Like Martin Delany, Alexander Crummell is a progenitor of the black nationalist social action and intellectual tradition; yet, according to Wilson J. Moses (2004), Crummell's black nationalism was in contradiction with his Anglophilism and he often exhibited disparagement of African and African American culture in favor of European civilization (Cambridge University education, Episcopalian religion, and 'missionary' social development of non-European lands and enlightenment of non-European peoples). In some ways, Crummell was caught between the two social worlds that Du Bois, his admirer, would later reflect upon in *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903): the two-ness, double consciousness, and co-strivings between the white and black social worlds, a relationship that many blacks living in white societies are forced to manage.

Because of his belief that blacks across the globe needed to unite in the face of white racism, Crummell promoted international relations and cooperation among black leaders, or black unity. He is viewed by scholars of black thought as the father of Pan-Africanism. He upheld a social vision of human ordering in the form of cultural pluralism, a social system in which blacks maintain a national identity in relation to other national identities, and thus he rejected the assimilationist arguments of Frederick Douglass and accommodationist position of Booker T. Washington. In "What This Race Needs in This Country Is Power" (1875), Crummell posits a plan of action for black social organization and development. To begin, he warns against following two powerful forms of dogma: colorblindness and racial assimilation. He argued against color-blindness long before it became a fashionable concept, stating that "the colored people of this country should not forget…that they ARE colored people," and that "the only place I know of in this land where you can forget you are colored is the grave!" (1875/1970b:129-30).

> Forget that you are colored, in these United States! Turn Madman, and go into a lunatic asylum, and then, perchance, you may forget it! But, if you have any sense or sensibility, how is it possible for you, or me, or any other colored man, to live oblivious of a fact of so much significance in a land like this! (1875/1970b:130).

Crummell writes that the "other dogma is the demand that colored men should give up all distinctive effort, as colored men, in schools, churches, associations, and friendly societies. He argues that this deadening of black tradition is equivalent to a demand to the race to give up all civilization in this land and to submit to barbarism. The hypocritical cry is: "give up your special organization." "Mix in with your white fellow-

citizen," despite the "exclusiveness" and "noxious influence" of the white defined racial caste system (1875/1970b:131). Until the day when racial "caste will forever be broken down," blacks must recognize that they are "a nation, set apart, in this country. As such, *we* [blacks] have got to strive---not to get rid of ourselves; not to agonize over our distinctive peculiarities…For if we do not look after our own interests, as a people, and strive for advantage, no other people will" (1875/1970b) kept apart, legislated for, criticized in journals, magazines, and scientific societies," and for that reason, "there is the greatest need for us all to hold on to the remembrance that *we* are colored men," and not to forget it!"

After delivering an argument that blacks' social, cultural, and personal (character) development is the ultimate method for dismantling the white racial caste system, in effect emphasizing a self-help social philosophy, Crummell argues for "industrial co-operation" and collectiveness among different blacks, stating that "what this race needs in this country is POWER---the forces that may be felt." He dismisses political agitation as unproductive outwardly focus, when black should be focused on improving internally, their character, which is the product of religion, intelligence, virtue, family order, superiority, wealth, and the show of industrial force" (1875/1970b:139). As Moses notes, Crummell appears to envision a black nationalism, albeit a black nationalism that borrows heavily from white society, culture, and ideology, particularly the Anglo-Saxon social model. Crummell appears to be at ease using some of the "master's tools," but he is unwilling to attempt to become like the master. In other

words, he is willing to embrace useful and uncorrupt ideas of whites if they aid the cause

of black liberation and if they help develop a stronger black nationalism

Frederick Douglass' assimilationist stance represents a different sociological

perspective than Crummell's 'peculiarities of the races' and racial pluralist approach.

Surprisingly, unlike many conflicts between black leaders, Douglas and Crummell were

able to interact and share ideas despite their social-philosophical differences (Crummell

1891/1969:iv). William Moses' (2004) understanding that the two were in "creative

conflict" is a significant recognition, considering how most scholars emphasis the

negative aspects of conflicts between and among black leaders' social philosophies

without realizing how that diversity of thought develops a more complex, nuanced and

thoughtful discourse of the social world. Indeed, the interactions, tensions and

cacophony of ideas about the social world reveal all the real-world ambiguities,

inconstancies, and disagreements that social reality present.

Unlike Crummell, Frederick Douglas did not tout racial pride or racial solidarity

and, in fact, discouraged racial identification and the establishment of racially-defined

institutions and organizations. As Moses notes, Douglass was not a "race man" like

Crummell.

> [T]there were irreconcilable differences between Douglass and Crummell, and
> the most significant of these related to economic and institutional reform.
> Crummell insisted on collective group action and the necessity of creating
> recognizable black American culture or civilization' Douglass showed little
> interest in such devises. Crummell was a "race man," his program presupposed
> ethic chauvinism and depended on emphasizing social discipline and institutional
> development within black communities. Douglass, unlike Crummell, was not
> technically a "race man," for he worked toward a completely amalgamated
> society. At times, he seemed to advocate the total eradication of race and

ethnicity and the extirpation of all ethnocultural differences through biological mixing" (2004:110)

Despite his lack of identification with blackness and Africa and his appreciation of white values and culture, one aspect of race that Douglass was critical of was the evils of racism and racial segregation of white society. While he was willing to assimilate to political, social and cultural structures that the US claimed to represent, Douglass knew that whites obstructed assimilation. He realized that America had the potential to transform into the societal ideals it represents, namely democracy, liberty, equality, and human happiness, but he was also clearly aware that these ideals were false and hypocritical ideas both prior to emancipation and afterwards. Less that a half of a decade after Marx's *Communist Manifestos* (1848) and autobiography (*My Bondage, My Freedom*, 1855) was published, "What to the Slave is the Forth of July?" was delivered, one of Douglass' most stunning critique of American society. Marx wrote of the workers' class alienation and oppression, while Douglass spoke of blacks' racial alienation and oppression. The fourth of July speech was delivered in public by a "public intellectual" or 'public sociologist,' and the Manifesto was delivered as a written document by a 'private intellectual' and 'armchair sociologist.'

Though it was delivered in a pre-Civil War speech at Rochester on July 5, 1852 (symbolically, the day after the fourth), his message about blacks' exclusion from American society would remain a social reality long after the end of the Civil War and the "emancipation of blacks," as later black social thinkers and sociologists document. Because of its timeliness, a brief analysis of this socio-critical speech is in order.

Douglass asks: "Are the great principles of political freedom and natural justice, embodied in that Declaration of Independence, extended to us?" He then proceeds to explain why it "is not the state of the case" that freedom and justice are extended to blacks and how black "are not included within the pale of this glorious anniversary." In contrast to whites' joy and professed national unity, Douglass speaks of the "disparity" and "immeasurable distance" between blacks and whites. He notes that "blessings in which you this day rejoice, are not enjoyed in common. The rich inheritance of justice, liberty, prosperity, and independence, bequeathed by your fathers, is shared by you, not me…This Fourth of July is *yours*, not *mine* (1852/1969:441).

Douglass' statement that "I shall see this day and its popular characteristics from a slave's point of view" is a powerful sociological statement. It indicates existence of a plurality of viewpoints about society, not just the monolithic, uni-dimensional view of society possessed by many whites or "universal" and "objective" view of the social world and human relations shared my many white sociologists during this period and later periods. For the oppressed black, according to Douglass, "the character and conduct of this nation never looked blacker…Whether we turn to the declarations of the past, or to the professions of the present, the conduct of the nation seems equally hideous and revolting" (1852/1969:441).

> America is false to the past, false to the present, and solemnly binds herself to be false to the future. Standing with God and the crushed and bleeding slave this evening, I will, in the name of humanity which is outraged, in the name of liberty which is fettered, in the name of the constitution and the bible, which are disregarded and trampled upon, dare to call in question and to denounce, with all the emphasis I can command, everything that serves to perpetuate slavery [what is today's systemic racism of the white racial frame]---the greatest sin and shame of America (1852/1969:442).

Douglass obviously questions the realization, let alone progress, of American democracy, arguing that, while there may have been major developments for whites since the dawn of this nation, nothing has changed for black Americans. They still are denied opportunities and inclusion in American society, and worse, are exploited and degraded by whites. He states that social change must come soon, and that the nation is at peril of some cosmic retribution until race relations are mended. He states: "We need the storm, the whirlwind, and the earthquake. The feeling of the nation must be quickened; the conscious of the nation must be roused; the propriety of the nation must be startled; the hypocrisy of the nation must be exposed; and its crimes against God and man must be proclaimed and denounced" (1852/1969:444-45). Douglass ends the speech with critical observations of whites' social behavior, what might be viewed as an early critique of whiteness. Answering "what to the American slave [or today's black American] is your fourth of July?," Douglass concludes:

> I answer, a day that reveals to him, more than all other days in the year, the gross injustice and cruelty to which he is constant victim. To him your celebration is a sham; your boasted liberty, an unholy license; your national greatness, swelling vanity; your sounds of rejoicing are empty and heartless; your denunciation of tyrants, brass-fronted impudence; your shouts of liberty and equality, hollow mockery; your prayers and hymns, your sermons and thanksgivings, with all your religious parades and solemnity, are to him mere bombast, fraud, deception, impiety, and hypocrisy---a thin veil to cover up crimes which would disgrace a nation of savages. There is no nation on the earth guilty of practices more shocking and bloody, than are the people of these United States, at this very hour…for revolting barbarity and shameless hypocrisy, America reigns without a rival (1852/1969:445).

Douglass' critical words of whites' hypocrisy of democracy and black exclusion are as relevant today as they were when spoken over one hundred and fifty years ago. Inaugural balls during economic crises; claims to democracy while enslaving and

extorting whole populations across the globe; preaching benevolence, while torturing and executing political opponents; toppling Saddam Hussein and Manuel Noriega, while backing George Bush, Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld and Co.; preaching corporate responsibility, while corporations economically ruin and socially devastate human beings across the globe. At last, claiming that civil rights have been granted blacks, while blacks are imprisoned, sent to war on the frontline and denied proper education, housing, even nutrition. Douglass was both a public intellectual and sociological theorist of the highest caliber, not one engaged in fanciful abstract theoretical models and argument, but a sociological theorist piercing the most pressing truths about the social world. Very few articles in a major sociological journal have approached the theoretical sophistication, conceptual profundity and intellectual directness about social reality discovered in Douglass speech above.

Even Douglass' social theoretical position of assimilation has caveats that pass over many social thinkers' heads. His idea of assimilation was markedly different than and more theoretically advanced than later white sociologists' understanding of assimilation (Park and Burgess 1921; Lynd and Lynd 1937; Myrdal 1944; Gordon 1964/1979; Glazer and Moynihan 1970/2001) and more nuanced than the more recent distortions of Douglass' meaning of the concept (Sowell 1994; D'Souza 1995). In *Frederick Douglass: A Critical Reader*, Bill Lawson and Frank Kirkland describe Douglass as a "philosopher" and "social thinker," indicating that, additionally, he should be viewed as a sociological theorists, who did not preach the 'end of racism' as a social reality for blacks, but as a challenge for whites. According to Douglass, assimilation is

not fully the responsibility of blacks, who make great attempts to assimilate, but it is

necessary duty of whites to break down the barriers that restrict black assimilation. As

Lawson and Kirkland relate (1999:13), "The struggle for racial integration, Douglass

maintains, is not the 'Negro's problem,' but the [white] 'nation's problem." They then

provide the following Douglass quote form "The Nation's Problem" (1889):

> It is not the, Negro, educated or illiterate, intelligent or ignorant, who is on trial or whose qualities are giving trouble to the nation. The real problem lies in the other direction. It is not so much what the Negro is, what he has been, or what he may be that constitutes the problem….The Negro's significance is dwarfed by a factor vastly larger than himself. The real question, the all-commanding question, is whether American justice, American liberty, Americana civilization, American law, and American Christianity can be made to include and protect alike and forever all American citizens in rights which, in a generous moment in the nation's life, have been guaranteed to them…It is whether this great nation shall conquer its prejudices, rise to the dignity of its professions, and proceed in the sublime course of truth and liberty…It is not what [the Negro] shall be or do, but what the nation shall be and do, which is to solve this great national problem (1889/1999:13).

William Wells Brown and George W. Williams

Like Delany, Crummell and Henry Highland Garnet,[73] WM. (William) Wells Brown and

George W. Williams produced social historical works on blacks, in the US and

throughout the African Diaspora. Brown and Williams writings stand as landmark works

in historical sociology, equal in sociological importance to Marx's and Weber's

historical sociological analyses of European societies. When examining Brown's *The

Rising Son: The Antecedents and Advancement of the Colored Race* (1874), or Williams'

---

[73] Henry Highland Garnet delivered a speech, "The Slave Must Throw Off the Slaveholder" (1843) at a black convention in Buffalo (Frazier 1970); he reissued Walker's *Appeal* in 1848, and wrote one of the first histories of blacks, *The Past and Present Condition, and the Destiny of the Colored Race* (1848).

History of the Negro Race in America, 1619-1880 (1883), one has to wonder how, despite the prevalence of racism in academic scholarship, these works remain obscure and are not classics in the field.[74] One cannot do justice to Brown's work or Williams' work without pages of analysis; however, I identify some of the sociological observations and themes that their works address, themes and observations that reappear in later black sociological analyses.

Before writing *The Rising Son*, Brown authored and published a number of works in history, an autobiograpahy, numerous literary works and narratives for plays. He wrote the *Narrative of William W. Brown, a Fugitive Slave, Written by Himself (*1847), a sociological crtique of racism and black and white social relations, and *Clotel, or, The President's Daughter: a Narrative of Slave Life in the United States* (1853), the first novel written by a black American. Brown is the first black American playwright, writing *The Experience; or, How to Give a Northern Man a Backbone* (1856) and *The Escape; or, A Leap for Freedom* (1858), socio-critical abolitionist works turned educational entertainment. *The Black Man: His Antecendents, His Genius, and His Achievements* (1863) and *The Negro in the American Revolution* (1867) recall the social and historical significance of blacks in the development of American society and world civilization and present a partial view of the social history and sociological understandings of blacks later presented in *The Rising Son*.

---

[74] *The Rising Son: The Antecedents and Advancement of the Colored Race* will be shortened to *The Rising Son* and Williams' *History of the Negro Race in America, 1619-1880* will be shortened to *History of the Negro Race*.

In *The Rising Son*, Brown examines the undocumented, neglected knowledge of culture, history and social world of Africa and Africans, the slave trade, a close examination of the social experiences of blacks in Haiti, other Caribbean island nations, South America, and the United States. He charts the rise of abolitionists to the events of Civil War and the development of the "new era" of Reconstruction. Also included are biographical sketches of important historical and social actors during this period. Brown's use of biographical information of important historical figures as a source for sociological understanding was also a technique used by Marx, who wrote on Louis Napoleon-Bonaparte (1852), and Weber, who wrote on Otto von Bismarck (1921). In his Preface to *The Rising Son*, Brown writes: After availing [myself] of all the reliable information obtainable, the author is compelled to acknowledge the scantiness of materials for a history of the African race" (1874/1969:1).

Brown's work presents sociological, not just historical, analyses. He begins with an analysis of revolution, documentation of revolutionary actions of blacks and whites to end slavery. Brown does not just report socio-historical events and human actions; rather he interprets the social operations and significance of these events and actions. He addresses and measures the motivations and attitudes of people participating in social world and in history, from black revolutionaries and white abolitionists to government and military officials. Additionally, he presents historically informed sociological analyses on such subjects as caste, mob violence, African civil and religious ceremonies, intra-racial conflict between blacks and mulattoes, slave insurrection, immorality of and opposition to the social system of slavery, religion, freedom, resistance, and social

progress. In contrast to the negative sociological views of blacks offered by whites, Brown offers an important sociological view of blacks that represents positive black social characteristics, such as bravery, loyalty, good conduct, determination, and intelligence.

In *The Black Man and His Antecedents*, Brown points to the early influence of Africans on European civilization, noting the pre-Socratic Greeks contacts and cultural-intellectual exchanges with Ethiopians and Egyptians. By including Herodotus's descriptions of Ethiopians' physical makeup, Brown makes it clear that the Africans shaping early civilization were black. This historical example and sociological argument pointing to blacks' non-inferiority and likely superiority at the pre-dawn of Western civilization was not a effort to boast about blacks' historic past as much as it was tool to dispel the myth that blacks were inferior to whites, a belief used to subjugate and enslave blacks, as noted before. Brown then exposes over fifty influential black intellectual and social leaders in American history to demonstrate that contemporary blacks have the same intelligence and skills, but not the same opportunities and freedoms, as their African ancestors. Brown's sociological perception of the social world is a world of social actors of real people with real names and histories and who possessed distinctive perceptions and practices.

By focusing on these social actors and their social activities, Brown's historical sociology is deeply enriched. Unlike white historical sociologists and historians of the time who would focus squarely on one primary charismatic historical figure, Brown demonstrates the array of characters in different positions and ways of life that

contributed to black social history. This appears to be a much more realistic approach than the hero-worship-type sociology and one-sided history of whites.[75] Brown's model of 'biographical sociology,' while later used by W.E.B. Du Bois and few other sociologists has lost legitimacy among contemporary sociologists as a source of sociological knowledge.[76]

In the laboriously researched, meta-prolific two-volume work, *History of the Negro Race in America, 1619-1880*, George W. Williams produced possibly the most impressively documented, informative and analytically intriguing socio-historical document on American history to this day. It is a model for historical sociology that outshines most other historical sociological analysis, not because of its breath (over 1100 pages), but because of its purposeful search for meaning in history through sociological analysis of the social world---its people, institutions, and societies, more specifically, the ideas and practices created by people that shape institutions and societies. Williams' Preface to Volume I of *History of the Negro Race* informs the reader that "in preparation for this work I have consulted over twelve thousand volumes,---about one thousand of which are referred to in the footnotes,---and thousands of pamphlets" (1883/1968:vi). Williams addresses so many important sociological topics that choosing a couple to

---

[75] An interesting question arises: when did sociology transform into form of social investigation that displaced sociological knowledge of real people (who have real names) with numbers, pseudonyms, and the words like "social actors," "subjects," and "units of analysis"?

[76] Sociologists should work on correcting this mistake. Rather than becoming ever more abstract and quantitative, sociology should simplify, avoid fancy jargon and ridiculously complex statistical models that alienate the masses fro understanding of the social world, and speak a language that human beings can understand. One way of bringing back the human dimension to sociological research, creating a model of the social world and human relations that most people can appreciate, is to reconstitute 'biographical sociology.'

focus upon is difficult. I therefore have chosen to provide an overview of the different sections of the book to provide an outline for future research of this work.

Williams' social history (1883/1968:xi-xix) begins by examining arguments about race (supporting the 'unity of the human race' amalgamationist theme discovered in Douglass' social philosophy),[77] social and physical characteristics of blacks, social differences between the "Negro" and "African," the development of black civilization and "Negro Kingdoms of Africa" such as Benin, Dahomey, Yoruba, and Ashantee Empire. In Part I, he explores the effects of environment on human development and activity, the relationship between Christianity and Africans, the "idiosyncratic" political, cultural, legal and economic organizations and habits of Africans, and Africans' languages, literature, and religion. Not only does he provide a historical report of Sierra Leone and the Republic of Liberia, the "First Colony," Williams presents an extensive set of portraits of slavery in the pre-Revolutionary War US colonies of Virginia, New York, Massachusetts, Maryland, Delaware, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Jersey South and North Carolina, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and Georgia (Part II).

His examination of "the Negro during the Revolution" (Part III) illustrates how black American were employed in the Revolutionary War, with analyses of the social experiences of blacks as soldiers, the legal status of blacks and the state of slavery during the war. Additionally, he acknowledges key black intellectuals of the late eighteenth century: Benjamin Banneker, "the Negro Astronomer and Philosopher,"

---

[77] Williams wrote, "I commit this work to the public, white and black, to the friends and foes of the Negro, in the hope that the obsolete antagonisms which grew out of the relation of master and slave may speedily sink as storms sink beneath the horizon; and that the day will hasten when there shall be no North, no South, no Black, no White,---but all be American citizens, with equal duties and equal rights" (1882/1968:x).

Thomas Fuller, "the Mathematician" or "Virginia Calculator," and James Derham, "the Physician." Williams concludes Volume I of *History of the Negro Race* with a sociological analysis of "slavery as a political and legal problem."

Volume II begins with blacks in the US army and navy in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, paying particular attention to blacks' role in the War of 1812 (Part IV). Next, Williams analyzes anti-slavery agitation from 1825-1850, focusing on "the antiquity of anti-slavery sentiment," the production of anti-slavery literature, growth of anti-slavery societies, and development of the Underground Railroad. Most importantly, Williams notes the "intellectual interests" behind the anti-slavery efforts of "Free Negroes," describing the Free Negroes' promotion of the "Negro Convention movement" as a "method" of battling the US slavery system and white American racism. Not only does Williams address the Black intellectual and political organization against the tyrannical system of slavery, he describes the social importance of "Negro insurrections" as more extreme and ultimately effective measures to end slavery. A recounting of the "the Amistad Captives," who won their freedom in a legal ruling in New London, Connecticut, ends the discussion of the US society during first half of the nineteenth century (Part V).

In Part VI, "the period of preparation," Williams describes the key historical social and political events of the decade (1850-60) leading up to the US Civil War, including the creation of the "black laws," the Dred Scott ruling, and an Act passed by the Illinois Legislature prohibiting free blacks' migration to the state. He then examines the organizations of "Northern Negroes" established to fight black discrimination in the

North and end slavery in the South. Next, Williams devotes a lengthy chapter to black education, noting the numerous obstacles to black education, specifically laws enacted to prohibit education of blacks and setbacks associated with poor resources for black education. Yet, despite these hurdles, Williams relates the successful story of early efforts to establish black educational institutions and knowledge outlets for blacks. The section ends with a recollection of the social philosophy and social justice actions of John Brown, the white Abolitionist who died in the name of the anti-slavery crusade.

Part VII examines the Civil War, the social issues and events surrounding and leading up to the war, the racism of the war ("A White Man's War"), the controversy with regard to Emancipation Proclamation, and experiences of black soldiers fighting for the North and South. Part VIII discusses the "first decade of freedom," the failures of Reconstruction ("Misconstruction," according to Williams), the experiences and hopes of blacks who briefly served in Congress in the immediate aftermath of the war, the social importance and effectiveness of the 'African Methodist Episcopal Church, Methodist Episcopal Church, and Colored Baptists of America.' The last section of *History of the Negro Race* acknowledges the "decline of Negro governments" as the once hopeful, but short-lived, Reconstruction era is halted through political compromises between Northern and Southern white politicians, compromises that, in effect, re-enslave blacks to white power, creating similar forms of dispossession, disenfranchisement, and socio-economic arrangements that blacks experiences during slavery.

This disconcerting turn of events, occurring toward the end of Williams life, produced an ambiguous response among Williams and many other blacks who had

envisioned amalgamation or assimilation into American society. This group of blacks who had fought (literally in numerous wars for the nation) steadfastly for integration and respect in American society, now questioned the probability of workable race relations with whites in American society. As whites continued to strip blacks of rights and their humanity, socially conscious, but psychologically frustrated blacks like Williams organized to emigrate from the black-intolerant United States, an "exodus not inspired by politicians, but the natural outcome of the barbarous treatment bestowed upon the Negroes by the whites" (1883/1968:xiii).

Conclusion

The first wave white sociologists shape a white sociological frame, just as the first wave black sociologists shape a black sociological frame. Whites' primary concern with racial ordering, justification for oppressing people of color and techniques for establishing justifications (e.g., creating myths of the inherent moral and intellectual inferiority and 'threat' of people of color) are key mechanisms supporting the white sociological frame. In opposition to this morally-intellectually questionable, devious white sociological frame of oppression stands the ethically-epistemologically sound black sociological frame of liberation (Staples 1976). As the next chapters demonstrate, Du Bois inherits the black sociological frame and shapes it into black sociology, while Park embraces the ideas and practices of the white sociological frame, transforming it into white sociology.

CHAPTER VII

W.E.B. DU BOIS AND ROBERT E. PARK: CONDUCTORS OF BLACK AND WHITE SOCIOLOGICAL FRAMES

Throughout the later part of the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century, racist thought and practices against people of color continued to shape and define nations and international relations. Racism was the driving force behind numerous wars, national and international policies, and the rapid growth of national economies and global capitalism. Several key historical developments shaped white racist ideas and practices during this period: organized and effective resistance to white power, growth of issues surrounding immigration and citizenship, and the intra-racial conflict among European powers, the United States and other white-controlled nation-states.

The death of 'legal' slavery in the West, realized through slave resistance, international diplomacy, and the changing political, economic and social landscape of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century Western world, signaled the end of the first chapter of modern racism. However, an equally devastating new chapter of modern racism motivated by Western racial tyranny unfolded during the early twentieth-century as the more technologically and militarily advanced European powers embarked upon new form of racial conquest, imperialism, and world-wide colonization of Africa, Asia, and the Pacific. No viable lands or people were sparred the horrors of this Western colonial expansion as white Europeans battled over lands and people to exploit with the new and improved technological tools of industry, transportation, and communications.

British, Dutch, Belgians, Portuguese, Germans, French, Italians, Spanish, and US

colonists invaded all populated continents across the globe, and internally colonized the

lands already in their possession.

During this period of global conquest and westernization of foreign lands, Russia

emerged as a new colonial power along with the 'British Dominions'---British imperial

outposts---of Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and South Africa. In each case, the

conquerors were whites and the conquered were people of color, reflecting the racial

dynamics of the previous historical chapter of black slavery in modern racism. Similar to

earlier claims of white racial superiority used to justify the enslavement of blacks, whites

argued that their expanding racial superiority warranted racial domination and imperial

conquest of all people of color (the complete Manifest Destiny). These arguments---and

the white racial prejudices and racists views entwined---surfaced at the Conference of

Berlin in 1884 and 1885, in which European nations negotiated their plan for prolonged

occupation of the 'Dark Continent' and exploitation of its human and natural resources.

Race---ideas about race, race relations, and racism---is the primary structure and

force defining the social world during this historical time-period.[78] Construction of a

global white racial frame spread throughout the different continents. At the dawn of the

twentieth century, the white nations of Europe and the United States reached across

every corner of the globe to colonize people of color. As white powers were colonizing

---

[78] Contemporary sociologists, historians, legalists, political scientists and philosophers have demonstrated that race continue to be is a major factor shaping US society and history (Bell 1973, 1992; Feagin 1988, 2000, 2004; 2006, 2008, 2009; Berry 1994, 1995; Hacker 1995; Davis and Graham 1995; Bonilla-Silva 2001, 2003) and the social context and history of international relations (Fanon 1952,1964; Jordon 1968; Stone 1985; Lauren 1988/1996, Feagin and Batur-Vandelippe 1999; Goldberg 1993, 2002; Mills 1997; Winant 2002, 2004).

Africa, Asia, South America, and the Pacific, however, people of color in these regions were developing resistance forces and, at times, were successful in expelling or warding off the imperialist advances of white colonists (Lauren 1988/1996).

The early twentieth-century United States maintained many features of slave society: enforced segregation between blacks and whites, and a white oppression and exploitation of blacks and other people of color (Gossett 1963; Jordon 1968; Fredrickson 1971; Stanfield 1985, 2008; Davis and Graham 1995; Mills 1997; Feagin 2001, 2006). A neo-slavery system was formed shortly after the American Civil War, in which blacks remained second-class citizens deprived of basic rights, were forced to work a new sharecropping and peonage system, and were disenfranchised despite federal laws enacted to defend of blacks' political participation. As in the days of black enslavement, white "posses" terrorized blacks to keep them 'in their place' as oppressed and dispossessed second-class citizens. Throughout the first half of the twentieth century, the Klu Klux Klan (KKK), the Knights of White Camellia, Southern Cross and other white supremacist organizations were responsible for numerous murderous race riots, a campaign of lynching, and other forms of physical attacks against blacks.

All white 'Citizen Councils' formed across the United States (North and South) to maintain white power at the state level. These groups diverted or withheld federal funding for education, health, and other programs intended for blacks. The popular film, *Birth of a Nation* (1915), best exemplifies whites' racist cultural views about blacks during the first decades of the twentieth century. Like other mass-distributed cultural products dehumanizing blacks, D.W. Griffith's white supremacist film (based on *The*

Clansman, by Thomas Dixon), the first major movie production out of Hollywood,
depicts the KKK as virtuous saviors of the white race and blacks as aggressive, immoral
savages out to rape white women, kill white men and children, and ultimately destroy
white society (US society). Like *Birth of a Nation*, other early twentieth century movies,
books, magazines, radio shows, newspapers, and commercial advertisement either de-
humanized or demonized blacks, instilling the belief in the 'Black Peril,' fear that blacks
are mortal enemies of whites, a belief that continues to be driven into the psyche of
whites.

Early twentieth-century US racism and racial segregation of whites and blacks
was exasperated by successive waves of immigration by white Europeans, who took
over black jobs and quickly learned anti-black discriminatory attitudes and practices.
While most whites were welcome to 'immigrate' to the US, anti-immigration legislation
was enacted in the United States (as in other white nations) to deny 'migration' to people
of color.[79] European nations, the United States and other white nations, such as the
Dominion States of Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and South Africa, were particularly
weary of the "Yellow Peril," after the defeat of Russia by Japan, which, in following
revolutions in Haiti and Ethiopia,[80] was one of the first major defeats of a white power
by people of color. As whites immigrated to the United States from Europe, US blacks

---

[79] I use the term 'immigrate' for white Europeans' transnational social movement and term 'migrate' for
people of color's transnational social movement. Thus,' immigrants' are defined as whites, and people of
color are defined as 'migrants.' These are important conceptual distinctions as witnessed in the different
ways that US government officials create "immigration laws" that affect migrants radically different than
immigrants. For discussion of the disparity in immigration policies between "white" Latinos and "colored"
Latinos, see Juan Gonzales' *Harvest of Empires: A History of Latinos in America* (2001).
[80] Possibly the earliest most notable victory against a white nation was the black Haitian revolution led by
Toussaint L'Ouverture in 1804. The next most major defeat of a European colonial power occurred in
Africa, with Menelik II's 1896 defeat of the Italian army and colonial rule in Ethiopia.

migrated from the South to Northern cities in search of jobs and a better life, a life free from the 'Southern slave society.' Immigrant whites and migrant black Americans vying for jobs in industrial cities were one seed of racial conflict. Another was the fact that First World War black veterans came home to a racial apartheid country that still was unprepared to extend them the same rights and privileges as whites, even the newly-arrived immigrant whites.

Widespread black social action in the form of the 1919 and 1920 race riots spread throughout US cities, in large part, a result 1) of social movements of blacks who demanded a new day of racial equality and 2) actions of whites who set up barriers to this progress. "Revolutionary" ideas and attitudes, backed by action, was one expression in the voices and social practices of the "New Negro," a growing generation of blacks that demonstrated desire for equal treatment, respect, and societal inclusion or, if need be, black separatism. The 1920s witnessed the 'Negro Renaissance' (often described as the Harlem Renaissance, even though the movement spanned different geographies). During this period, there was a flurry of intellectual, artistic, political, and cultural development in the black community that produced heightened awareness among blacks of black consciousness and black culture and the growing sense of black nationalism.

Throughout the 1920s, blacks organized on a number of levels. A "Negro elite" emerges (Du Bois' "Talented Tenth"). Marcus Garvey organized the Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIC), a broad grassroots nationalist movement supported by the larger black community. In addition, Booker T. Washington founded and managed the powerful, 'pull-yourself-up-by-your-boot straps' Tuskegee Machine, a

well-endowed, vocational training institution for blacks in Alabama that promoted the

social philosophy of self-help or economic self-sufficiency of working class blacks.

On the early twentieth century international stage, a number of important events

shape the social world, many with direct links to the relationship between race relations

in the US and those at the international level. During this time, white empires---powerful

international political organizations---emerge to delegate and relegate world events,

particularly, white imperialist expansion into territories of people of color. The white-run

League of Nations (precursor to the United Nations) organized to further exploit people

of color and their land's natural resources. Yet, opposing political organizations

organized by people of color, like the African Communities League and the National

Colored World Democracy Congress, proposed different solutions to the question of

whites' colonization of territories inhabited by people of color. The asymmetric relations

between an oppressor colonizer (whites) and a oppressed colonized (people of color)

becomes the central international relations issue of the time-period, and one that persists

throughout the twentieth century (Fanon 1952[1967], 1961[1967], 1964[1967]; James

1993; Lauren 1988/1996; Said 1978).

Development of a cross-national alliance of white powers and expansion of the

larger global white racial frame is discerned in the imperialist motivations of the all-

white (save Japanese)[81] delegations at the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, who meet

just after the First World War to plot the subjugation of people of color worldwide. In

---

[81] The Japanese, because of their military might and imperialist tendencies, were the only people of color represented at the conference of empires. Not surprisingly, the Japanese, viewed to be 'honorary whites,' 'honorary Aryan,' and 'model minorities' (Stone 1985; Lauren 1988/1996), are the only non-white member of the powerful international body of mostly-white imperialist nations, the G8.

opposition to the white imperialists, anti-imperialist blacks and people of color, who were banned from the conference, organize to battle the ever-ubiquitous white racial frame. This is the social world and history that W.E.B. Du Bois and Robert Park inherit and experience first-hand during the shift into the new century.

From 'First Wave' to 'Second Wave' Black and White Sociology

The late nineteenth and early twentieth century is the period when 'first wave' white sociologists (FWWS) such as Auguste Comte, Alexis de Tocqueville, George Fitzhugh, Henry Hughes, Herbert Spencer, and Karl Marx are being eclipsed by the next wave of white sociologists who professionalize and institutionalize the discipline. Such 'second wave' white sociologists (SWWS) are Albion Small, Charles Cooley, Lester Ward, Edward Ross, Franklin Giddings, William Sumner, W.I. Thomas and Robert Park among others. This is also the period in which a new cohort of black sociologists continues the work of the 'first wave' black sociologists (FWBS) such as David Walker, Martin Delany, Alexander Crummell, Frederick Douglass, WM. Wells Brown, George Williams. Included in the ranks of the 'second wave' black sociologists (SWBS) are Anna Julia Cooper, William H. Ferris, Thomas Fortune, Kelly Miller, William Monroe Trotter, Ida Wells Barnett, Monroe Nathan Work, Richard Wright and W.E.B. Du Bois, to name the most prominent.

Of the different white sociologists who were to emerge in the earlier twentieth century, Robert E. Park best represents the white sociologist who inherits the FWWS paradigm and perpetuates the tradition. On the other side of the sociological color line,

W.E.B. Du Bois emerges as the earlier twentieth century black sociologist who would best represent the disparate social struggles and issues of FWBS and work to synthesize the sociological ideas and practices of the earlier black sociologists.

Du Bois incorporated the politically-oriented public sociology of the FWBS, all of who were politically and publicly active in the struggle for black human rights. His was , taking a proactive scholar-activist approach to knowledge dissemination, communicating social truths in written and spoken word, a sociological approach that moved beyond production of written scholarly works intended solely for a limited academic audience. He inherited the critical socio-theoretical eye of his predecessors, a perceptiveness of the inner social workings (ideas) and outwardly social mechanisms (material) operating in the social world. Additionally, Du Bois inherited the revolutionary and reformist zeal of the first wave and their historical and sociological investigative approach and expertise used in describing social reality and past social history.

Du Bois, while opposed to assimilation, like Crummell, could embrace the critical voice of an assimilationist like Douglass who never ceased to rail against racial segregation. Combining Walker's desire for black Americans to demand rights in the US and Delany's vision of black emigration to Africa, Du Bois developed both a black nationalist approach and Pan-Africanist approach, two approaches to social relations (nationalist and internationalist or diasporic) that, while in tension, are not mutually exclusive. According to Du Bois, one can logically identify with both a nation and a

larger community, and the development of the two (the micro and macro) are necessary for the strength of each one.

Lastly, it is important to note Du Bois' sociological approach as an extension of the scholarly historical sociology of Brown and Williams. When considering Du Bois' socio-historical dissertation topic and later publications on American and African social and cultural history, it becomes clear that the same pressing historical and social issues addressed by 'FWBS historical sociologists' are recurrent subjects of concern for Du Bois. Because of his ability to utilize a mishmash of the different elements of FWBS ideas and practices, Du Bois, in a sense, becomes a leading ambassador of the black sociological frame of ideas and practices, which, despite its differences, is unified in battling domestic racism and colonialism of the white racial frame.

Just as Du Bois absorbed and synthesized anti-racist and anti-colonialist FWBS perspectives and practices, Park and his other FWWS partners incorporated and synthesized the racist and colonialist ideas and practices of FWWS (Turner 1978; Young and Deskin 2001; Bowser 2002a, 2002b). His primary task was re-inventing the language or dominant discourse (concepts and theories) of ethnocentric, white supremacist sociological thought of his predecessors. His assimilation model was a regurgitation of Spencerian, Tocquevillian, Comtean, and Marxist racist evolutionary and hierarchical thought, which divided Europeans and people of color into two segments of humanity: whites/Europeans as superior beings, and people of color as inferior beings.

Park's Jim Crow, apartheid-like justifications for a 'bi-racial society' (1913), a concept of social relations he increasingly embraced in his later years, were not unlike Fitzhugh and Hughes' proslavery sociological arguments that divided the races because of 'inherent differences.' In effect, Park sanitizes the more blatant racist sociological ideas and practices of FWWS with the new science of objectivity and methods of scientific detachment, mechanisms that are supposedly unbiased. Additionally, he transforms the biological deterministic arguments of the character of racial-ethnic groups into cultural deterministic arguments of the hierarchical social ordering of racial-ethnic groups, which are less blatantly racist.

To gain a better understanding of the diffusion of FWWS's ideas and practices--- the white sociological frame---in Robert Park's sociology and the transmigration of FWBS's ideas and practices---the black sociological frame---in the sociology of W.E.B. Du Bois, I now present brief social-historical backgrounds of the two sociologists and then move to an analysis of their sociological perspectives and practices.

Social and Historical Backgrounds of W.E.B. Du Bois and Robert E. Park

Du Bois and Park experienced very different relationships to the social world and social institutions because of the color of their skin. Both spent most of their lives in the United States, a racially segregated, systemically racist society that grants basic rights, privileges, advantages, status, recognition and resources to whites, while denying those same rights, privileges, advantages, status, recognition and resources to blacks. Du Bois and Park were born into a race-torn, late-nineteenth century United States shortly after

the demise of the legally sanctioned enslavement of blacks by whites, a post-Emancipation society whose social institutions were both legally segregated and, just as importantly, unofficially segregated (Du Bois 1935; Franklin and Moss 1947/1994; Gossett 1963/1997; Berry and Blassingame 1982; Frederickson 1988). Some socio-historical background is necessary to understand the segregated institutions and ruptured social world that faced Du Bois and Park and the ways they reacted---the growth of their sociological perspectives---to social realities of the US's segregated institutions and a split social world.

Any history of early American sociology must recognize the rigid, unequal 'totalitarian' apartheid divide between the social worlds and realities of Park and Du Bois, what Du Bois dubbed 'the color line,' the divide that produces a black and white social world. Du Bois' notions of "two social worlds" (1899) and "dual environment" (Du Bois 1940; Dennis 2003b). The segregation of the color line and the resulting in divided social worlds, the black and white social worlds, are primary characteristics and conditions of the social and historical contexts shaping the two sociologists. Stated plainly, Du Bois and Park were socially, economically, culturally and legally (and in every way) divided into two different worlds or life contexts and social environments.

The white social world and the black social world are two social environments worlds/contexts that, in essence, produce two separate forms of existence (social realities), forms of existence produced through extreme differences in social experiences, positions to power, resources, rights, and privileges, freedoms and constraints, worldviews, institutional connections, and social environments within which

Du Bois and Park could navigate (or not). The 'two social worlds' theory developed by

Du Bois (and intimated by Park's notion of a 'biracial society') and theories viewing

race as a primary influence on the development of human relations and societies in the

modern period are necessary tools for perceiving the social-historical context that form

the life-experiences and sociological perspectives of Du Bois and Park.

Two social worlds produce two primary social groups as well as two unique sets

of institutions, institutions that are created by the two primary groups.[82] Reviewing the

biographical, autobiographical and historical writings of Du Bois and Park reveals that

their experiences were shaped, not by one social world and unitary set of social

institutions and group worldviews, but two social worlds that produce two distinctive

sets of institutions and worldviews.[83]

---

[82] In *The Philadelphia Negro* (1889), Du Bois documents how the United States' division into black and white social worlds (or environments) has produced both black and white social institutions: businesses, churches, political unions and so forth.

[83] Several important sources (Du Bois 1903, 1940, 1967; Broderick 1959; Aptheker 1973, 1989; Lewis 1993, 2001; Reed 1997; Blum 2007; Rabaka 2008a, 2008b, 2009) reveal Du Bois' relations with numerous institutions and organizations. These works help one ascertain Du Bois's relationship with 1) black and white academic institutions: Fisk, Harvard, Berlin, Oberlin, Pennsylvania, and Atlanta, 2) the mostly white organization, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), and 3) and three primary 19th and 20th century black organizations, the American Negro Academy (ANA), Niagara Movement, and Pan-African Movement and Congresses. Many of the above sources also discuss Du Bois relationship with the government of the United States, the United Nations, and several key countries across the globe, including the two superpowers, China and Russia, and Du Bois' final resting place, Ghana.

Likewise, there are numerous studies (Matthews 1977; Raushenbush 1979; Deegan 1988, 2002; Lal 1990; Lindner 1990) on Park's relationship with black and white academic institutions. They review his experiences at Harvard, Heidelberg, Tuskegee, Chicago, and Fisk, one of the key 'historical black colleges,' where Park ends his academic career, and oddly, the place where Du Bois commenced his academic career. They also discuss Park's relationship to the Chicago School, but also look at other organizations that he was involved with during his time in Chicago: the American Sociological Association (ASA), which elected Park as president in 1925; the Social Science Research Council; and the Chicago Urban League.

W.E.B Du Bois' and Robert E. Park's Experiences of the Social World

Du Bois and Park were born on different sides of the color line, the psycho-social, material-ideational divide that separated/s black and white Americans. The results of this social positioning are life defining, considering that Park was afforded advantages, power, and privilege given whites in a white-dominated American society, whereas Du Bois faced a white-dominated society that denied blacks equal rights, opportunities and respect. In a society and global social system of international (interracial) relations that legally subjugates, economically exploits, and systematically persecutes blacks and people of color, while privileging, serving, and advancing whites, Du Bois faced a social world and reality radically different from the social world and reality experienced by Park. In theory and practice, the color line rigidly divided the worlds of Park and Du Bois. Park inherited social, political and economic advantages of the white world and experience (first-class citizenry), and, in contrast, Du Bois inherited the social, political, and economic disadvantages of the black world and experience (second-class citizenry). These 'different inheritances of race,' of course, affected the psychological dispositions of the two sociologists.

Park and Du Bois not only experienced two distinct social worlds, they experienced different psychological worlds shaped drastically by the two social worlds. One significant and understudied difference in the racially constructed psychological perceptions of the two sociologists is demonstrated in the distinction between Park's concept of 'marginality' and Du Bois' concept of 'double consciousness.' Du Bois and Park describe psychological tensions and social influences of double consciousness and

marginality. While Du Bois' concept of double consciousness (1897, 1903, 1940) and Park's concept of marginality (1921, 1919) describe individuals/groups who exist in a complex, not-fully-integrated relation with society, the two concepts express different meanings. Simply put, double consciousness refers to an irreconcilable psychological tension and social condition facing individuals and groups, like blacks, whereas marginality signifies a psychological tension and social condition that individuals and groups can overcome, like immigrant whites. Park's understanding of marginality and Du Bois' understanding of double consciousness, not only reveal their specific views of individuals and groups, they reflect a larger picture of the social world's processes of racial exclusion and incorporation that shapes these two unique psycho-social conditions.

In addition to developing different psychological dispositions, Du Bois and Park developed different sociological perspectives, in large part shaped by their disparate psych-social realities. Despite their similar educational training (both studied philosophy with at Harvard University with William James in the 1890s, and both spent time overseas pursuing graduate studies at German universities, where they were exposed to the new field of sociology), Du Bois and Park developed noticeably different sociological perspectives during their early training as sociologists. Key distinctions in their sociological perspectives are observed in Park's detached, disinterested, universalistic, and theoretical-based sociological approach as opposed to Du Bois' engaged, impassioned, particularistic, empirical-based sociological approach (see Chapters VIII and IX).

A significant difference between Park's and Du Bois' sociological thought is the manner in which each embraced and modified the ethnocentric, racist, tendencies of the social Darwinist and organicist understandings of race popularized by Herbert Spencer and Auguste Comte. Yet another major distinction between the two was the fact that Du Bois had developed a race consciousness and concern with race studies prior to graduate studies, whereas Park's concern with race and race consciousness developed after graduate studies. Moreover, these different sociological approaches, influences, and motivations for studying race were shaped by different personal histories, social acquaintances, empirical observations and theoretical understandings of the social world, as well as concrete differences in their status and power in societal institutions and social structures.

While an awareness of race---the "veil of color"---developed during his high school years in Massachusetts (1968/1997:83, 1903/1995:44), it was when Du Bois moved south to Fisk University in Nashville, Tennessee that he developed a critical race consciousness (Du Bois, 1940/1986). This race consciousness resulted from his newfound black identity, discovery of the gifts and riches of black culture, and concern for the plight of poor, uneducated, and oppressed black masses. By the time he left Fisk for Harvard, Du Bois had "developed a belligerent attitude toward the color bar" and affirmed his life-long goal and struggle: "I was determined to make a scientific conquest of my environment, which would render the emancipation of the Negro race easier and quicker" (1968/1997:125).

Once at Harvard, Du Bois began to intellectually prep himself for the task of black liberation, yet it was not until graduate studies in Germany that Du Bois developed a more nuanced, global perspective of the racial 'color line.' During this period, he "began to see the race problem in America, the problem of the peoples of Africa and Asia, and the political development of Europe as one" (1940/1986:588). A fundamental difference between Park's and Du Bois' graduate studies in Germany was that Du Bois had a clear, specific goal that motivated and guided his studies. Du Bois clearly stated his purpose for obtaining graduate training in Germany in a letter to Harvard's Academic Council: "I have devoted most of my college work to Philosophy, Political Economy, and History, and wish after graduation to study in the graduate department for the degree of Ph.D. I wish to take the field of *social science* under *political science* with a view to the ultimate application of its principles to the social and economic advancement of the Negro people" (1887/1985:13). It was the "quest for basic knowledge with which to help guide the Negro" that Du Bois "came to the study of sociology"   (1968/1997:149).

Conversely, Park did not consider race issues until after graduate studies when he became a secretary for the "Congo Reform Association," the organization where he met Booker T. Washington. After earning his PhD, Park wrote, "I had grown tired of books, and while I was looking about for something more thrilling than a logical formula, I discovered a new interest in the study of the Negro and the race problem. The new interest grew out of meeting Booker Washington" (1950/1974:vii). Park "discovered" the "race problem," Du Bois attempted to *solve* the race problem; Whereas Park "discovered" a "new interest" in the study of black Americans, Du Bois, as a black

American, was well equipped with the sociological knowledge of an 'an insider' who already had a life-time of prior experience and study of the subject.

While Du Bois commenced graduate studies with the specified pursuit of gaining intellectual skills to aid the emancipation of blacks, Park approached graduate studies with the general goal of learning to better "describe the behavior of society" and the more universal "ambition to know human nature" (Park 1950/1974:vi). Park stated that his interest in sociology came from reading Goethe's *Faust*, which inspired in him the desire to seek a more common, broad-based understanding about "the world of men" (1950/1974:v); "[h]e was excited by the problem of life as a whole---the life of man, whatever his color, whatever his race, whatever his nationality" (Johnson, Nef, and Wirth 1954:233).

Park's more "broad-based," universalistic sociological approach is reflected in the title of his dissertation: *Crowd and Public: A Methodological and Sociological Inquiry* (1904/1974), a study of "collective behavior" and "crowd psychology" that investigates the shift from the disorder of the crowd to the increasing orderliness of the modern public. In this work, "crowd" and "public" are neutralized and generalized to refer to any crowd and public of the modern period. No specific reference group anchors the study [most likely an effort to create more generalized scientific variables to demonstrate sociology's role as a science]; yet, because his focus was European societies, it seems likely that Park was concerned mostly with explaining white crowds and white publics, and the social transformation occurring in the Western white world.

Whereas Park espoused a detached, objective sociological perspective, Du Bois believed that sociological investigation should be subjectively-guided and politically involved. Park taught his students the strict rule of scientific detachment, claiming it was sociologists' duty to detach themselves from 'objects' (not subjects) of their study. In contrast, Du Bois argued that the study of the social world should focus on a particular group or environment, a manageable, approachable and verifiable subject that could be studied empirically. His primary focus of study were blacks and the black environment (Du Bois 1899, 1940, 1968; Green and Driver 1978), although he also provided detailed understandings of whites and the white environment as key contrasts (empirical counterpoints of reference). As noted, Park instead focused his attention on the "world of men" and the more "universalistic understanding of human nature" (Park 1950; Johnson et al. 1954; Matthews 1977).

Du Bois and Park understood group relations differently. For Park (Park and Burgess 1921), the theoretical model of the race relations cycle and assimilation (henceforth, the assimilation model) were used to describe ethno-racial group relations, specifically, and group relations, in general. In contrast, Du Bois (1897, 1903) proposed theories of racial pluralism or racial separatism as more realistic models for understanding and organizing group relations between whites and people of color. As with the concepts double consciousness and marginality, Park's assimilation model and Du Bois' models of racial pluralism and separatism offer different perspectives of social relations and power dynamics between the two primary race groups, whites and people

of color, and explain the social integration and non-integration of groups in society differently.

Du Bois offered a more focused analysis of a specific group, what he referred to as "the Negro race." Yet, his sociological focus on blacks was not a narrow-minded or constricted approach. "While recognizing that sociologists seek laws which are historically and universally true for the human group (in general), Du Bois felt that sociology's best possibility of generating laws was through the exhaustive study of the small, isolated group" (Green and Driver 1978:49). Thus, after completing his historically and sociologically-rich dissertation, *The Suppression of the African Slave Trade* (1896), Du Bois conducted and supervised several important, historically-informed sociological investigations concerning the black American social experience in the United States: 'the Philadelphia Study' (1896-7); 'the Farmville, Virginia Study' (1897); and 'the Atlanta University Studies' (1896-1914). Even when Du Bois moved away from academic sociology (for he never ceased being a sociologist), his primary concern and activity were the social-historical experience and political advancement of blacks, particularly the social-historical experience and political advancement of black Americans, the social group he knew best.

Park and Du Bois prioritized theory and empirical work differently.[84] For Park, sociological theories guide empirical studies (Janowitz 1969:vii, x), and, for Du Bois, empirical realities and studies lead to sociological theories (Green and Driver 1978:38;

---

[84] In the more abstract terms of philosophy and the social sciences, the sociological perspectives of Du Bois and Park are divided between Park's *rationally detached*, *universalistic, theoretical-centered* approach and Du Bois's emotively (often morally and politically) engaged, particularistic, empirical-grounded approach.

Morris 2007:514). Arguably, it was Gustav Schmoller who "redirected Du Bois' scholarly ambition…ultimately to sociology" (Broderick 1959/1967:32) and, "probably more than any other teacher, influenced his career as a sociologist" (Green and Driver 1978:6). Unlike Park's primary early influences, Herbert Spencer and Auguste Comte, who presented deductive theories without reference to scientific facts and empirical data and who lacked any well-defined methodology, Schmoller stressed the importance of "empirical data collection and the use of the inductive method, the collection of facts as a basis for formulating social policy" (Green and Driver 1978:7).

Schmoller also favored historical analysis and argued that sociological investigations should have practical ends, like promoting social justice or developing more effective social institutions. Schmoller's influence rubbed off on Du Bois, who, in turn, criticized organicists and social Darwinists, like Comte and Darwin, for developing ahistorical theories and for developing theoretical frames without any practical application or moral calling. Along with a brooding concern over their white supremacist racist assumptions, Du Bois was also troubled that "[s]ocial scientists at the time were thinking in terms of theory and vast eternal laws" (Du Bois 1968/1997:217). Like Schmoller, he was "critical of many of his sociological peers and their work, claiming that they were unnecessarily impeding the new discipline by providing an armchair, speculative orientation rather than an inductive, empirical approach" (Green and Driver 1978:31).

In contrast to Du Bois' preference of the inductive approach, Park prioritized deductive theorizing and 'philosophical speculation' about the social world and felt that

certain truths or a conceptual framework must be in place before conducting empirical

sociological investigations. Jerry G. Watts claims that "Park's approach to sociology was

clearly more theoretically oriented than Du Bois'," noting Park's Spencerian influence

and training under the "ultra-theoretical Georg Simmel" and the neo-Kantian

philosopher, Wilhelm Windelband, who directed Park's dissertation (Watts 2002). Ralph

Turner states: "In spite of strong views regarding the essentially empirical character of

sociology and the importance of working with facts rather than suppositions, Park

concerned himself very little with details of data collection and analysis." Backing his

claim, Turner adds: "An essay entitled 'The Sociological Methods of William Graham

Sumner, and of William I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki' turns out to be an exposition

of their conceptual apparatus, without serious consideration of the means employed in

data gathering and data analysis" (Turner 1967:xvii).

With regard to theoretical and empirical sociological understandings of the two

sociologists, there is some truth to the claim that Park was more theoretically oriented

and that Du Bois was more empirically oriented (Green and Driver 1978; Watts 2002;

Wacker 1976; Turner 1967). However, a better explanation was that Park, while valuing

empirical sociology, did little empirical work as a sociologist and avoided real-world

engagement (this was different when he was a journalist, working for the Congo Reform

Association, an associate of Washington at Tuskegee, and throughout the beginning of

his career as a sociologist). Whereas Du Bois, while believing that empirical evidence of

the real world must ground theory, was no less theoretical than empirical. In fact, he

generated a number of important, though fragmented, theories and blueprints for theories

about the social world (the color line, double consciousness, the Talented Tenth [a political, cultural and intellectual elite as opposed to a business elite], racial pluralism, pan-Africanism, Black Nationalist thought, whiteness, and dual environment/social worlds). Had Du Bois not suffered exclusion and marginalization of the color line and continued his career as a professional sociologist, he most likely would have developed a more systematic understanding of his sociological theories and concepts.

Park's career as a sociologist is marked more by his time in the classroom, as a teacher/mentor at Chicago and Fisk, than experience in the field conducting empirical investigations of actual social events. For the most part, Park's students went into the field and did his empirical legwork. This fact does not escape the critical remarks of Stephen Steinberg, who, when discussing the occasion when Park sent Charles Johnson into the streets of Chicago to investigate the 1919 Chicago race riot, writes that Johnson's report of the riot was a "graphic account of the gritty reality of race," and that "Johnson went beyond his mentor.[85] Gone were the a-historical philosophical abstractions…gone was the posture of Olympian detachment" that characterized Park's sociology (Steinberg 2007:47). Despite his career of training a number of empirically oriented sociologists, Park never broke free of prioritizing theory in his writings and, independently, produced little to no empirical research in his later years as tenured professor.

Du Bois and Park, like other classical sociologists, "utilized [social] Darwinism at certain points in their careers…Social Darwinism was an omnipresent reality for the

---

[85] Steinberg (2007:159) notes that Johnson's investigation was the basis for *The Negro in Chicago* (1922), a work credited to Chicago Commission on Race Relations.

practitioners of the social sciences during this period" (Hawkins 1993:13). They

incorporated certain ideas of social Darwinism, while discarding some of the more

troubling claims. In particular, both were part of a wave of late-nineteenth century social

scientists that questioned the primacy given to the 'biological' traits of human behavior

and racial identity (viewed to be fundamental determinants of human identity and

behavior), and shifted sociological investigations toward understanding 'cultural' traits

and socio-historical factors shaping individuals and racial groups. Because Du Bois and

Park absorbed social Darwinism in different ways, they developed different

understandings of the relationship between biology and culture and the ways culture is

related to race. Park's and Du Bois' relationship and response to social Darwinism

greatly influenced their respective understandings of race, as analysis of their respective

sociological understandings of race demonstrate (see Chapters VII and VII).

One way of gauging Park's and Du Bois' association with social Darwinism is to

look at each sociologist's relation to Herbert Spencer, the architect of 'sociological

social Darwinism.' In an 'autobiographical note,' Park (1950/1974:vi) clearly identifies

Spencer as a major influence on his sociological thought. According to Fred Matthews,

Park's biographer, Spencer was the "first sociologist whose work Park studied in detail"

(Matthews 1977:39). Along with Spencer, William James and William Sumner, two

major influences on Park's sociological thought, were social Darwinists (Hawkins

1993). Three key Spencerian themes that Park would incorporate into his own

understanding of society and social relations, which shaped his sociology of race were

the *evolutionary development* of society, unending *competition* for natural resources and

social position among society's members, and the *hierarchical ordering* of individuals and groups in society, which reveals the racist dichotomy: 'civilized'/'cultured' and 'savage'/'folk' societies.

All three of these themes would buttress Park's primary theoretical apparatus, the 'race relations cycle,' and his more specific sociological theories of assimilation and moral-based human ecology. In contrast to Park, Du Bois criticized much of the Spencerian sociological framework, which he felt was methodologically unsound and pseudo-scientific. As Dan Green and Edwin Driver (1978:34) note, Du Bois considered Spencer to be an "armchair philosopher" whose theoretical speculations and "verbal jugglery" were void of the empirical rigor and descriptive analysis necessary for responsible and comprehensive sociological understandings.

Du Bois and Park utilized, in vastly different ways, social Darwinist language to describe mental, physical, and spiritual differences and tensions between racial groups, the competition among races and other groups for natural resources, and the relationship and struggle between dominant and dominated racial and ethnic groups. However, both were critical of the crude socio-biological understandings of human nature that were found in the more "conservative" Social Darwinists, whose extreme views concerning the nature of race and race relations ranged from beliefs in the innate superiority of Europeans to ideas about racial cleansing and genocide of people of color. Du Bois and Park separated themselves from the hardened biologic views of theorists like Walter Bagehot, Johann Blumenbach, Charles Brace, Ludwig Büchner, John Fiske, Ernst Haeckel, Arthur de Gobineau, and Clémence-Auguste Royer. They were critical of

biological understandings of race that failed to account for "non-physical" socio-cultural understandings of human beings and race groups. Park and Du Bois, each in his own way, still believed that some aspects of human nature and the social behavior of races could be explained by biological factors, just as long as these factors were understood to be secondary (Du Bois)[86] or complementary (Park)[87] explanations that were viewed in relation to cultural-historical (even spiritual)[88] factors and the social environment.

Throughout his writings on race and culture, Park proposed well-known social Darwinian distinctions between "more primitive," "marginal," "folk," "minority," and "savage" non-Western cultures/races (the "out-groups" or "other groups") and "more civilized," "complex," "centralized," and "majority" European cultures/races (the "in-groups" or "we-groups").[89] According to Park, blacks, along with other "isolated and provincial people," belonged to a separate, "more primitive and tribally organized" social world distinguished by its "folk" culture and "marginal"/"minority" position in society.[90] Park equated civilization with Europeans and those of European descent (i.e., whites). Park's 'cultural turn' failed to leave behind the biologic racial logic of social

---

[86] Eric Sundquist (1996:37) observes that "Du Bois never quite discarded his own initial view that race had some biological basis, but he constantly refined his own definitions over time, arguing more and more clearly that race must be understood principally as a cultural and political concept."

[87] For Park, "[e]very individual is the inheritor of a double inheritance, physical [biological] and moral [cultural], racial and cultural."

[88] See Du Bois' "The Conservation of the Races" (1897) and *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903).

[89] In "The Nature of Race Relations," Park (1939/1974:87) racialized Sumner's distinction between "in-group" and "out-group." While he does not spell it out, Park appears to associate whites as the in-group and blacks and other nonwhites as out-groups, two groups that experience "in-out conflict."

[90] Park's distinction between "civilized"-"modern" society and "folk"-"savage" society is presented in most of his essays concerning race (1928b; 1931b); see chapters 1-8 in *The Collected Works of Robert Ezra Park: Race and Culture, Volume I* . McKee (1993:97) and Winant (2007:545) note that this distinction was basic to American sociological discourse throughout the early twentieth century.

Darwinism.[91] For Park, the cultural "is inherited" along with the racial, just as the moral

is inherited along with the physical. Each reinforces, shapes and sustains the other. This

inter-connection of moral and physical, racial and cultural inheritance is problematic and

demonstrates that Park's view of culture is based less on socio-historical, experiential,

and environmental factors, and rooted more in biologically grounded, genetically

determined factors. Park's discussion of the "temperament" of blacks and the "more

sophisticated and complex culture" of whites are examples of how Park inappropriately

integrated and confounded biological and cultural understandings of race (see Chapters

VII and VIII).[92]

In contrast to Park, Du Bois downplayed biological determinism in his social

thought (1897), and, over time, moved away from the superordinate-subordinate

distinction between "civilized" races/cultures and "primitive" races/cultures that was so

prevalent in Park's writings and other early nineteenth-century social science literature.

Rather than construct a 'vertical and unequalized' hierarchical system of human

relations, Du Bois proposed a 'horizontal and equalized' cultural pluralist understanding

---

[91] Apologists for Park's biological determinism who avoid its racist underpinnings, such as Morris Janowitz, César Greňa, Barbara Lal and Fred Matthews, have argued that Park was not a Social Darwinist. However, Herbert Blumer, John H. Stanfield II, and Ralph Ellison have convincingly argued that Park was indeed a Social Darwinist. Additionally, see Appendix in Vernon J. Williams (Jr.), *Rethinking Race: Franz Boas and his Contemporaries* (1996).

[92] Du Bois rejected whites' basic theoretical assumptions of racial inequality and white supremacy rooted in social Darwinist thought. Park, on the other hand, incorporated---but disguised---social Darwinism in his work by shifting terminology. Instead of claiming there were 'biological' differences between whites and people of color, Park argued there were "cultural" differences between the two groups (McKee 1993). Rather than speak of 'intellectual' differences between whites and people of color, Park discussed the differences in "racial temperament" between people of color and whites (McKee 1993; Steinberg 2007). Instead of stating outright that whites were 'superior' to people of color, Park proclaimed that whites were more "civilized," "developed," "advanced," and "modern." This 'disguising method' and use of ambiguous code words/concepts become key mechanisms for discussing race in the white sociological tradition, as this paper will further elaborate.

of human relations, one that viewed the 'physical' traits, 'spiritual' ideals, and 'intellectual' contributions of different races/cultures in a more just and egalitarian fashion. He sensed that "the broader humanity…freely recognizes differences in men, but sternly deprecates inequality in their opportunities of development" (1897/1986:822). For Du Bois, each race/culture has a significant place in and contribution to the "broader humanity" and therefore should be granted "opportunities of development," being that each race/culture possesses different but equally important intellectual creations, social skills, and cultural expressions.

Du Bois and Park possessed divergent visions of US society and global relations, what is best described as Park's 'democratic' view of the social world vs. Du Bois' 'apartheid' view of the social world. In general, Park's more optimistic vision of society and civilization (1950) stands in stark contrast to Du Bois' pessimistic and critical worldview (1900, 1920, 1940, 1945, 1967).[93] Although he did have some reservations and criticisms about certain aspects of American society and Western civilization, overall, Park viewed American society and the West (white-run nations) in a rather uncritical and incomplete, often optimistic manner---avoiding fundamental social realities of the brutalities and ignorance of certain practices and beliefs upheld by whites in the United States and other Western nations.

---

[93] Du Bois' pessimism and critical sociological worldview developed through investigating and daily reporting of the crimes against black humanity. Much of the difficulties and violence experienced by blacks was documented in *The Crisis*, the journal of the NAACP edited by Du Bois from 1910 until 1934. Important black-operated journals and newspapers, like Carter G. Woodson's *The Journal of Negro History* and Marcus Garvey's *Negro World*, also helped document social conditions in the racially segregated, violently racist Jim Crow America. One publication, *Phylon*, a journal established by Du Bois at Atlanta University, was possibly the first social science journal focusing specifically on race and definitely the first to address black studies.

Two different motivations guided Du Bois' sociological perspective and Park's sociological perspective. Du Bois' sociological perspective reflects a politically motivated and morally guided concern, concern with social reform, social justice, and challenging white social power and socially uplifting blacks. Park's was resolutely a-political, anti-reformist, and avoided moral questions, fighting for social justice, challenging the status quo of white power (which he was a part of and supported), and involving himself with black social uplift. While Park's sociology avoided moral questions that related to real world events,[94] like the violence of Jim Crow American society, he produced abstract accounts of the morality and moral social behavior of different ethno-racial groups in his discussion of human ecology. For example, Park drew 'moral boundaries' (neighborhoods) according to ethno-racial lines in his study of the city. In essence, he was claiming that that ethno-racial groups exhibit different moral behavior, that different racial and ethnic groups are defined by their morality.[95] Park's theory could have legitimacy for social research; however, if one is unable to distinguish between those who are moral and those who are immoral, like Park, the theory has little use and is detrimental to social science.

Throughout the course of their lives, Du Bois and Park developed unique sociological perspectives---grounded in different intellectual influences, interests and approaches, and different relations to social Darwinism---that would frame their

---

[94] Even Park's exclusive focus on atrocities against people of color by whites in the Belgian Congo would make it seem that Belgium's colonization of Africa was a singular event or exceptional case of colonialism and whites' oppression of people of color. One might wonder why Park failed to address the atrocities against black American by white Americans in his home country.

[95] Key differences between Du Bois' and Park's understandings of morality will be explored in the next two chapters, VIII and IX.

respective understandings of race and varied approaches to the sociology of race. John

Stanfield (2008) links Park with the development of "feel-good sociology," a largely

uncritical approach for understanding fundamental dynamics social world, one that

ignores or downplays the importance of race in human relations and society. In contrast

to this feel-good sociology, Du Bois develops a race-based understanding of the social

world, a theory of society that addresses the problems of race conflict and white racism

and views race---ideas of race, race relations, and racism---as the primary architecture of

the social world. For Du Bois, not universal ideas and practices, but *racial* (and racist)

ideas and practices, fundamentally shape the social world. To highlight differences

between the white and black sociological frameworks, I turn to a more critical analysis

of the sociological perspectives and practices of Robert Park and W.E.B. Du Bois. First,

I critically examine ways Park synthesizes the ideas and actions of FWWS as he further

constructs an oppressive white racial frame. Next, I analyze ways Du Bois synthesizes

the ideas and practices of FWBS and constructs a more solid black sociological frame,

and finally the ways he uses the black frame to challenge the oppressive and destructive

characteristics of the white racial frame in general and white sociological frame in

particular.

CHAPTER VIII

ROBERT E. PARK'S ESTABLISHMENT OF WHITE SOCIOLOGY VERSUS

W.E.B. DU BOIS' COUNTER-ESTABLISHMENT OF BLACK SOCIOLOGY

In the early decades of the twentieth century, Robert Park inherits, reconfigures and then advances the nineteenth-century white sociological frame of ideas and practices of the 'first wave white sociologists' (FWWS), Comte, Alexis de Tocqueville, George Fitzhugh, Henry Hughes, Herbert Spencer and Karl Marx. Park fused different elements of the FWWS's sociological ideas and practices. For Park, like all the FWWS, race is central to defining human beings, social institutions, and societies. Sociological views of race were at the heart of early white sociology's dominant theories of the 'ordering,' 'organization,' and 'evolution' people and the social world. White---mainstream--- sociology was largely defined by race-based sociological theories of society, social group relations, human being's 'nature' and agency, a fact often overlooked in most mainstream historical accounts.

During this same period, W.E.B. Du Bois is heir to the nineteenth-century black sociological frame of ideas and practices of the 'first wave black sociologists' (FWWS), David Walker, Martin Delany, Alexander Crummell, Frederick Douglass, WM. Wells Brown, and George Williams. Du Bois selectively arranges and incorporates FWBS's sociological ideas and practices into a set of central themes that become the basis for black sociology. Just as race is a central feature in the sociological ideas and practices of the FWWS and Park, FWBS and Du Bois view race as the primary social factor arranging the social world.

Significantly and disconcertingly, Du Bois and FWBS comprehend and actively

respond to the social meaning of the structures and forces of race and other aspects of

the social world differently than Park and FWWS. Through elaborations of these

different sociological approaches to race in Park's and Du Bois' sociological

frameworks, a notable sociological color line emerges in the newly founded discipline---

on one side of the color line, black sociology, and on the other, white sociology. I

analysis the unfolding of this process, first with a critique of Park and inadequacies of

the white sociological frame, and next with an study of Du Bois and the worthwhile

attributes of the black sociological frame.

Criticisms of Robert E. Park's Development of the White Sociological Frame

Two primary frameworks for explicating meanings of race, the structure of race

relations, and operations of racism originate at the dawn of twentieth century American

sociology in the conflicting racial theories and investigations of race formulated by

W.E.B. Du Bois and Robert E. Park. While Park and Du Bois both created frameworks

for approaching the sociology of race in the early years of the discipline, Park's

approach has by far had the greatest impact on shaping race studies in American

sociology. Not only is Park considered the progenitor of American race studies (Faris

1967/1970; Blumer 1984; Wright II 2002; Morris 2007; Winant 2007; Steinberg 2007;),

he is also a central figure in the development of the Chicago School (Hughes 1974;

Matthews 1977; Deegan 1988/1990; Lindner 1990; Abbott 1999; Bowser 2002a), the

school most responsible for shaping basic tenets of mainstream American sociology.

Park's understandings about race---particularly his pathological view of blacks, focus on

racial prejudices, and model of the race relations cycle, which charts the process of

assimilation---are deeply embedded in American sociological thought and continue to

shape studies of race (Glazer 1993; McKee 1993; Stanfield 2008).

Robert Park's impact on sociology is a serious problem, considering that his

sociology of race has led to "the failure of a perspective" in the American sociology of

race (McKee, 1993) and what is described as an "epistemology of ignorance" (Steinberg,

2007). James McKee's *Sociology and the Race Problem: The Failure of a Perspective*

and Stephen Steinberg's *Race Relations: A Critique* present critical and historical

analyses of Park's sociology of race and its affect on American sociology's views about

race and ways of studying race. Both works situate Park at the center of American

sociology's failed approach to race relations studies and misunderstandings of race.

While critical of some of Park's more problematic views of race, particularly his views

about African Americans, assimilation, racial attitudes/temperament, the races relations

cycle and assimilation, McKee wishes to "reconstruct" Park, arguing that his more

progressive understandings of race have been overlooked. He claims that Park's earlier,

more problematic, biologically-tinged sociological understandings of race eventually

metamorphosed to cultural understandings of race, but that it was his more problematic

sociological ideas that were selectively appropriated and developed by later generations

of American sociologists who developed the sociology of race relations. McKee writes:

> If most of what he [Park] offered became incorporated into a new study of race
> relations, his own basic conception of the new emerging study of race did
> not…Park's contribution was filtered through the cultural lens of a group of like-
> minded sociologists who learned from and appreciated him, but who did not fully

share his ideas…By selectively choosing from Park what they found intellectually agreeable and discarding what they did not, and then building a new study of race relations…they developed a sociological interpretation that was a consensual product of their time and place. It was this interpretative consensus, not the original thought of Robert Park, that became the sociology of race relations (1993:349-50).

McKee's analysis pinpoints a number of troubling, unresolved themes in Park's writing. However, despite the historical and intellectual depth of his work, McKee systematically misinterprets, misrepresents, and fails to criticize Park's association with problematic themes such as racial temperament, biological and cultural inferiority, racial instincts/attitudes/prejudices, the sociology of blacks and black culture, the race relations cycle and nature of race relations. He also fails to adequately address the consequences of Park's disinterested, apolitical and objective sociology, particularly in relation to the social plight of black Americans (1993:92-135).

McKee argues that, although Park "clung stubbornly to the concept of racial temperament," he "did not make invidious comparisons…different temperament was but a different combinations of character traits, neither better nor worse than the other." This claim is questionable when contrasting Park's positive portrayal of whites and "modern" European "civilization" and his negative and less than flattering picture of blacks and "primitive" non-Western "savage societies." McKee acknowledges that Park views racial temperament as "certain innate racial aptitudes, certain innate and character differences" of personality shaped by the interrelation of biology and race, but claims Park's understanding of "aptitudes" and "character differences" escape association with notions of racial 'intelligence,' 'inferiority,' and 'instinct.' McKee largely avoids analyzing Park's views about racial temperament and the ways that this concept grounds

Park's ideas about of race, indicating that concept lost currency with Park and was

eliminated altogether by later sociologists. According to McKee, with the advent of

cultural anthropologists, the concept of racial temperament "disappeared altogether in

the 1930s, as sociologists finally moved on to a cultural analysis of race relations"

(1993:93-95).

   While it is true that the term "cultural" replaces "biological" in social science

literature and that this shift signifies that differences and relations among races were now

described as 'cultural' rather than 'biological,' McKee overestimates the transformations

and effects of this "shift" in viewing race---proposing a rather clean and sudden shift

from a biologically to culturally grounded concept of race, one in which biological ideas

about race are suddenly eliminated. This outlook significantly misinterprets the demise

of biologically based views of race and social relations, particularly in Park's

sociological concepts and theories.

   McKee does not convincingly demonstrate Park's split with biologically rooted

explanations of race, nor does he critically assess 'the shift' and delineate how cultural

traits separate from, replace, or trump biological traits. He is unable to convincingly

discuss the distinctions and relationship between cultural and biological meanings as

they appear in Park's writings. McKee fails to explore reasons why 'cultural differences'

are now used as new code words for 'biological differences' and neglects demonstrating

how culture comes to represent biologically based assumptions about human behavior

and social groups, which are now described as culturally, not biologically, inferior and

superior, 'cultures instead of 'races.' He indicates that, although Park maintained some

biological ideas about race, he eventually downplayed these ideas and came to describe race as social and cultural phenomena.

This reading overlooks key elements of Park's understanding of race, such as his theory of "double inheritance," which proposes that human beings inherit "physical" traits and "moral" traits, "racial and cultural traits" that are entwined and reinforce one another. Here and throughout most his writings, Park never discarded biologically based understandings of race and the close association and dialectic of race and culture; he continued to maintain a view that each race has a specific culture, and that each culture reflects the different aptitudes and traits (temperament, abilities and morality) of a specific race. Park's cultural understandings of race collapse when stripped from the roots of his biological understandings of race.

In contrast to McKee's view of the cultural turn in Park's sociological thought and the sociology of race, Park and other sociologists that shifted from a biological to cultural *discourse* on race continued to uphold the *epistemological belief* that cultures reflect characteristics---the customs, habits, behaviors and organization, in sum, the personality---of races (biologically defined). Park and other social scientists that were part of the 'cultural shift' appear to have maintained some belief that social characteristics of cultures emanate from biological characteristics of races or, at least, that specific cultures mirror specific 'biologic' races.

Was the shift from the biologic to the cultural merely a shift in terminology to explain the same social concept, race? Specifically, how have assumptions about race based on cultural meanings of race replaced assumptions about race based on biological

meanings of race? As sociobiology and the persistent focus on the relation between race and culture demonstrate, the cultural shift is not complete and sociology has not fully evolved from biologically grounded understandings of culture or race. Today, social scientists continue to present cultural explanations of race or racial explanations of culture, at times, viewing race and culture as synonymous or inseparable. A clear and logical explanation of the sociological difference between culture and race is still lacking in the social science literature.

Along with issues of Park's relationship with racial temperament and the biologic-to-cultural turn, McKee acknowledges other elements of Park's sociological thought that adversely, and inadvertently, shape the sociology of race. In particular, he addresses Park's concept of racial prejudice, perspectives on blacks and black culture, and model of the race relations cycle, which addresses the concept of assimilation and gradualist, evolutionary views of racial change and the progress of race relations. Yet, despite much evidence to the contrary, McKee argues that Park is not directly responsible for the failure of the sociology of race relations and claims instead that misappropriation and misreading of Park's racial theories by other sociologists leads to the failure of a perspective in the American sociology of race.

McKee distances Park from some of the more troubling aspects of his sociology of race. Just as he dismisses the influence of Park's views of racial temperament and exaggerates his ability to escape biological explanations of race, McKee mishandles several other key themes in Park's sociology of race. For example, he inaccurately argues that Park, unlike other sociologists of his time, escaped the trend of viewing

blacks as culturally inferior, writing that "[Park] did not invoke any invidious judgments about [blacks]" (1993:97). McKee fails to dissect Park's double talk on the inferiority of blacks: According to Park (1928a): blacks and whites are similar with regard to "native intelligence," but different with regard to "certain traits and tendencies which rest on biological rather than cultural differences." Thus, a sentence later, Park states that the "Negro and the Jew---to compare the most primitive with the most sophisticated of peoples---have certain racial aptitudes, certain innate and characteristic differences of temperament which manifest themselves especially in objects of attention, in tastes, and in talent" (1928a/1950:264).

Park's most insulting and infamous statement about blacks (one that McKee would explain away) claims: "The Negro is, by natural disposition, neither an intellect nor an idealist...nor a brooding introspective…He is, so to speak, the lady among the races" (1918/1950:280). This statement not only brands blacks as intellectually inferior, it de-powers blacks, and demasculinizes black men, as a weaker, 'feminine' (not the positive sense of the concept) race. In 1931, Park published an *American Journal of Sociology* (*AJS*) article that argued that mulattos and "racial hybrids" where intellectually, socially, and physically superior ("made a better appearance than blacks") to blacks, presumably because they had access to the superiority of white culture and blood. While presumably escaping biological determinist notions of race, Park upheld white racial superiority and black inferiority in his discussion of the Mulatto. Park writes: "If the mulatto displays intellectual characteristics and personality traits superior to and different from those of the black man, it is not because of his biological

inheritance merely, but rather more…because of his more intimate association with the superior cultural group" [whites] (1931a/1950:389).

Park supported an evolutionary understanding of race relations, one that explained the process in which primitive, pre-modern racial groups and society proceed to assimilate to civilized, modern racial groups and society (Park's 'race relations cycle' and views of assimilation are discussed below). While Park's model clearly viewed blacks "at a lower stage of development," McKee nonetheless argues that this classification is "not what Park intended" (1993:105-6). McKee implies that---unlike his colleague Edward Reuter, another key figure shaping early American sociology of race---Park valued black culture and did not perpetuate arguments about the social pathology and immorality of blacks (1993:107:114-119). He claims that Robert Park was "far more sympathetic to the black than any sociologist of his day"[96] and that he somehow embraced "the literary and artistic efforts of blacks" (1993:94, 119).

While Park did associate blacks with artistic efforts, McKee contradicts his claims about Park's sympathetic relation to blacks when he acknowledges Park's disinterested attitude toward blacks and disparaging remarks about blacks' temperament. Park (1928a/1950) acknowledged that his reason for studying blacks was, "not because the case of the Negro is more urgent than or essentially different from that of the immigrant, but because the materials for investigation are more accessible." This statement suggests that Park was unable to distinguish significant differences in the plight of blacks from the plight of white immigrants, and that he was moved to the study

---

[96] More than W. E. B. Du Bois, Anna J. Cooper, E. Franklin Frazier, Charles S. Johnson and other black sociologists who lived during the same period as Park?

the black community, not out of sympathy for the black community, but because of the community's pragmatic availability and convenience. Along with this heart-less disinterestedness, Park slighted blacks with a disparaging, stereotyped intellectual-cultural portrait. Park argued that blacks were devoid of "subjective states and objects of introspection," were predisposed to inaction, mimicry, and foolhardy loyalty and optimism, were naturally "docile, tractable and unambitious," and displayed a "dominant mood of jubilation" (1928a, 1931a/1950:278, 280, 387).

McKee also ignores Park's views about the primitiveness, cultural inferiority, immorality, and lack of culture of blacks. For Park, blacks were primitive and whites were civilized, blacks were culturally inferior and whites were culturally superior, blacks were predisposed to immorality, whereas whites were inherently moral, and blacks had no culture except what was appropriated or copied from whites, a vision of cultural diffusion from the top down, whites to blacks. Aside from voodoo, Park argues that "the amount of African tradition which the Negro brought to the United States was very small." He further states that: "[t]he fact that the Negro brought with him from Africa so little tradition which was able to transmit and perpetuate on American soil makes the race unique among all peoples of our cosmopolitan population" (1928a/1950:267, 269). Park finds that "perhaps the only distinctive institution which the Negro has developed in this country is the Negro church," but then, a few pages later, discounts blacks' distinctive influence on the Negro Church, stating that "[o]n the whole the plantation Negro's religion was a faithful copy of the white man's" (1928a/1950:269, 275). While occasionally seeming to extend blacks agency, racial consciousness and a distinctive

culture, Park ultimately robs blacks of agency, denies blacks have developed a racial consciousness, and dismisses black culture and blacks' cultural contributions in America.

In sum, McKee radically misrepresents Park's views about blacks and black culture, views that prominently define Park's sociology of race. To his credit, McKee observes that negative views of blacks are central to the development of American sociology of race, but, for whatever reason, he does not locate these ideas with Park. McKee's reading of Park is apologetic: either stating that Park's sociology of race eventually transformed over the course of his career or positing that later sociologists of race subsequently distorted his ideas about race. Ironically, the most thorough treatment and greatest distortions of Park's sociology of race can be found in McKee's analysis, which transforms the 'Father of assimilation theory," Robert Park, into a conflict theorist (1993:14-7), proposing that Park's race relations model and ideas about assimilation were peripheral to Park's more pressing sociological concerns with the developments of a bi-racial society (1993:111-13, 117). McKee, like Park, avoids critical analysis of the social meaning and significance of a 'bi-racial' society. One might ask how sociologists confronted with such a 'elephant-in-the-closet concept would not view this social condition ordering as a primary problematic characteristic of the social world, one that should ground and guide sociological understanding and investigations of the society an human relations.

Unlike McKee, Stephen Steinberg cuts Park no slack and unleashes a devastating critique of Park's sociology of race, demonstrating its continued stronghold in the ideas

of the leading American sociologists of race (like William J. Wilson and Nathan Glazer) and within the framework of the tradition itself (publishing, funding, job positions and titles, accolades, organizations like the ASA). Steinberg offers an alternative perspective of Park's role in the development race relations studies in America, one that directly contradicts McKee's view that, although "Park contributed significantly to its [sociology of race] shaping, it was only partly his own construction; its major assumptions, in fact were the antithesis of Park's own ideas about race relations" (1993:350). Along with presenting a well founded---at times excessively passionate--- critical analysis of Park and his sociological influence, Steinberg offers a more convincing argument (than McKee's) that the failure of American sociology's perspective of race originates with Park. As Steinberg plainly observes:

> …the main currents of thought in sociology still reflect the fundamental assumptions and conceptions of race and racism that were embedded in the race relations model, as first propounded by Robert Park (2007:18).

While unwilling to criticize Park's weaknesses and connection to the development of race relation studies in American sociology of race, McKee is willing to provide Park and the American sociology of race with an escape-route: reconstruction. Conversely, Steinberg views Park and others in the tradition of race relations scholarship as intellectual villains who warrant just persecution and replacement, not reconstruction and redemption. While McKee would reconstruct Park and the tradition, Steinberg calls for a "new paradigm," one in which sociologists' "hegemonic discourses on race and ethnicity" give way to "antithetical scholarship" of subaltern groups (2007:146-7).

Steinberg's analysis of Park and the Parkean tradition builds on McKee's "incisive critique of sociology's failures" concerning race relations research (Steinberg, 2007:83). No doubt, McKee's provides and invaluable historical outline and account of American sociology's concern with race, yet, as mentioned, he remains neutral, largely uncritical and theoretically challenged in his delivery of the story. In contrast, Steinberg presents a much more critical and passionate analysis of the failures of Park's sociology of race and failures in later developments in the 'race relations' studies of later American sociologists who perpetuate the Parkean tradition. Steinberg situates Park in the shackles of mainstream sociology and views Park as a vetted hire, a sociologist "hired precisely because he was in sync with the prevailing intellectual and ideological currents" and because of his moderate apolitical views about race (2007:93). According to Steinberg, Park shared similar views about blacks and the divisions of races (i.e., primitive/savage and civilized/modern) as W.I. Thomas, the sociologist who helped Park secure an appointment teaching at the University of Chicago. At Chicago, Park developed the "epistemology of ignorance" with regard to race relations, the fundamentals of which were passed on to future generations of sociologists.

Moving beyond McKee's mere identification of Park's detachment and disinterested, objective sociological approach, Steinberg attacks the immorality and lack of intellectual integrity discovered in Park's sociology of race. Steinberg asks, "How does one go about studying race without crossing the forbidden line into "advocacy"? How does one remain 'neutral' in the face of transparent evil?" According to Steinberg, Park is guilty of moral "detachment," rejecting salient subjective truths, political

activism and "sociology as a moral enterprise." He is also guilty of "evasion," failing "to

speak out or even take notice" and "acquiescence to the status quo." Additionally,

Steinberg identifies Park's slippage into "transcendentalism," escaping into

transcendental philosophical concerns that are far removed from everyday struggles of

human beings and reformist actions necessary to contend with unequal and unjust social

relations, and also criticizes Park's "sophism," his masking understanding of race with

euphemisms and strategically altered terminology.

This is witnessed in McKee's discussion of the substitution of racial "attitudes"

and "prejudices" instead of racial "instincts," and the less scary-sounding concepts of

'cultural' groups and 'cultural' superiority/inferiority in place of 'racial' groups and

'racial' superiority/inferiority. Steinberg describes detachment, evasion,

transcendentalism, and sophism as "four rules of the sociological method" in Park's

sociological framework, qualities that would earn Park a job at Chicago and come to

define the dominant theoretical and methodological frames in American sociology

(1993:42-4). In his 2001 presidential address to the American Sociological Association,

Joe Feagin summarizes important characteristics and consequences of Park's

detachment:

> Park and other prominent sociologists were increasingly critical of activist
> sociology and were moving away from a concern with progressive applications
> of social research toward a more 'detached' sociology. Their work was
> increasingly linked to the interests of certain corporate-capitalist elites…. While
> they frequently researched various types of urban 'disorganization,'…they rarely
> analyzed deeply the harsher realities of social oppression---especially gender,
> class, and racial oppression---in the development of cities. Park and several of his
> colleagues played a major role in shifting the emphasis from a sociology
> concerned with studying and eliminating serious social problems to a more
> detached and academic sociology concerned with 'natural' social forces---

without the humanitarian attitude or interpretation of what Park sometimes called the 'damned do-gooders' (2001:8).

Of the various issues and criticisms concerning Park's sociology of race that are noted above, Park's 'evolutionary views' about the race relation cycle and concept of assimilation have become the central subjects of analysis and objects of debate among sociologists who have commented on Park (Lyman 1972; Lal 1990, 1994; McKee 1993; Glazer 1993; Shils 1994; Steinberg 2001). Rather than systematically rehash what others have already said, I will clarify and engage Park's understanding of these two themes in relation to Du Bois' sociology of race, race relations, and racism and hypothesize

Most contemporary American sociologists of race focus exclusively on the perspectives of one framework, and indeed are the product of one framework---the largely white, "mainstream" Parkean tradition. While focusing on and being a part of the dominant Parkean framework, most American sociologists of race have failed to acknowledge the perspectives of the 'other' framework, the marginalized counter-frame of the Du Boisian tradition.[97] The time has come to resurrect and integrate Du Bois' sociological thought about race and race relations, considering that Park's ideas about race have led to "the failure of a perspective" in the American sociology of race (McKee 1993) and what is described as an "epistemology of ignorance" (Steinberg 2007).

---

[97] A black sociological counter-perspective begins with Du Bois, continues in the work of Chicago-trained black sociologists (Young, 2002) and other 20th century black sociologists, and is noticeable in more recent writings of black sociologists who define the history and role of black sociology. See the following edited volumes: Washington and Cunnigen's *Confronting the American Dilemma of Race: The Second Generation Black American Sociologists* (2002), Blackwell and Janowitz's *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives* (1974), and Joyce Ladner's *The Death of White Sociology* (1973). Also, see Robert Staples' (1976) *Introduction to Black Sociology*.

Counter-perspectives to the 'dominant' white sociological perspective, although long and ardently nurtured by blacks, today emanate from the broader rubric of 'people of color' (although some groups are more representative than others) and a very few whites.

Park's ideas about race and approach to investigating race relations support a sociological tradition still operating according to "white logic, white methods"---the fusion of racism and social scientific methodology (Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva 2008) and development of white-framed racialized (often racist) sociological thought. While a number of sociologists have evaluated the ways that Park has adversely shaped mainstream sociological thought on race and corrupted the study of race in American sociology (Vander Zanden 1967; Lyman 1972; McKee 1993; Feagin 2001; Steinberg 2007), only a few sociologists have indicated how Du Bois' sociology of race has long provided answers to Park's failed approach.

As the next section reveals, Du Bois' sociological framework for understanding and investigating race presents a more accurate and timely approach than Park's sociology of race, one that is still useful for explaining contemporary meanings of race, structures of race relations, and operations of racism. After covering fundamentals of Du Bois' sociology of race outlined by Aldon Morris (2007), I examine Du Bois' critical understandings of whiteness and development of a counter-perspective---necessary, but largely untouched, subjects of inquiry.

W.E.B Du Bois' Critique of the White Sociological Frame and Development of the

Black Sociological Frame

While James McKee (1993) and Stephen Steinberg (2007) offer a critique of race

relations studies in American sociology,[98] specifically, a critique of Robert Park and

other sociologists who develop the 'white perspective of race,' neither present an

alternative framework for the sociology of race. After criticizing McKee for failing to

develop a response to the failed race relations paradigm in American sociology,

Steinberg ends his analysis by deciding against presenting a new paradigm. His reason:

he is a part of the tradition he wishes to be deconstructed and other sociologists have

already developed counter-paradigms "with far more profundity and eloquence"

(2007:83, 146). This exit strategy would be fully disappointing if Steinberg did not

mention W.E.B. Du Bois (along with Karl Marx and Oliver Cox) as one of the group of

"better equipped" sociologists who have already constructed a counter-paradigm that

presents new ways of viewing and investigating race.

Steinberg, and McKee to some degree, suggests that Du Bois' sociology of race

might present a useful contrast and counter-perspective to Park's sociology of race.[99]

Contemporary sociologists of race like Rutledge Dennis (1996), Elijah Anderson (1996),

Dan Green and Edwin Driver (1978), Joe Feagin (2001), Aldon Morris (2007), and

Howard Winant (2007) indicate that Du Bois should be viewed as an originator of the

---

[98] Also, see collected essays in Tukufu Zuberi and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva's edited volume, *White Logic, White Methods: Racism and Methodology* (2008).

[99] I agree with Morris's (2007:510) assertion that McKee "largely ignores the scholarship of Du Bois." Similarly, Steinberg, while valorizing and speaking for Du Bois, fails to critically engage his sociological work. Ironically, both McKee and Steinberg clearly indicate that Du Bois presents an alternative position and path to Park's sociology of race; but, for whatever reason, neither follow up on exploring Du Bois' counter-perspective on race.

sociology of race and founder of the tradition. Several sociologists (Smith and Killian 1974; Anderson 1996; Bowser 2002; Morris 2007) note that Du Bois' sociology predates the sociology of Park and the Chicago School.

Prior to Park's time at Chicago, Du Bois presented a coherent, intellectually sophisticated counter-frame to Park's and the later Parkean---mainstream---sociology of race. From the earliest moments of the American sociological tradition, Du Bois proposed innovative concepts, theories and methodological approaches to the sociological study of race that, at times and in important respects, contradict and provide clear, valuable alternative perspectives to Park's sociology and contemporary mainstream race relations research. In contrast to Park's sociological explanations of black inferiority/white superiority, assimilation, and failure to expose white racism and white social pathologies, Du Bois proposed a sociology of race that considered *white* inferiority and *black* superiority, racial-cultural-ethnic pluralism or separatism, and a focus on white racism and the social pathologies of whites. His sociology indicates how, throughout the modern period, power and resources controlled by whites have been unjustly extracted and then withheld from people of color.

Du Bois' sociology of race is more theoretically penetrating and critically accurate than Park's, realizing that race conflict defines modern societies, racism is systemic, structural, institutional, and socially constructed (strategically) in society, and that modern-day power inequalities and social problems are largely rooted in the rigid racial stratification system and white racial framing and colonizing of the social

world.[100] Du Bois' sociological perspective of race is not only useful as a means of critically assessing Park's sociology of race, Du Bois' "counter-perspective" for understanding and responding to matters of race is necessary for contemporary sociological investigations of race relations and racial thought, which are still largely rooted in mainstream Parkean presuppositions of race---white perspectives---that have been "marred from the start" (Morris 2007:504).

Presently, the most detailed, systematic exposition of Du Bois' counter-perspective of race in relation to the mainstream sociology of race is presented by Aldon Morris in the essay, "Sociology of Race and W.E.B. Du Bois: The Path Not Taken" (2007). In this analysis, Morris (2007:505) argues "that a superior sociology of race relations containing a great deal more analytic accuracy and predictive power could have been developed if Du Bois' conceptualizations of race had guided the field." Morris details the stunted and negative development of sociology associated with the path not taken---the exclusion of Du Bois. Breaking new terrain, he also illustrates how traveling 'the path' to Du Bois' sociological thought can advance contemporary American sociologists' perceptions of race. First, I briefly review Morris's key observations about Du Bois' sociological perspective and then I focus on introducing Du Bois' sociological understandings of whites and critique of whiteness, important elements of Du Bois' sociology of race that Morris identifies but does not develop.

---

[100] Du Bois described what would become more systematically delineated as "systemic racism" (Feagin 2006), "structural racism" (Bonilla-Silva 1997), "institutional racism" (Ture and Hamilton 1967/1992), and a social science-backed racism based on "socially constructed" understandings of race and white supremacist methodologies (Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva 2008).

Morris (1993:505-8) contends that American sociology has viewed race and race relations according to a failed "dual thesis of racial inferiority and assimilation," two subjects at the heart of Park's sociology of race. Specifically, he finds that American sociology, a tradition framed by Park and other white sociologists, has perpetuated the myth of black inferiority, a racial inferiority viewed to be cultural, but biologically linked or with biological underpinnings. Along with the myth of black inferiority, white American sociologists have long argued that blacks, and immigrants, need to assimilate (i.e., "modernize" and "civilize") to white society's dominant cultural beliefs and practices.

According to Morris, Park and other white sociologists helped support white racist beliefs that held that black "culture, institutions, and leadership were…primitive and in need of white guidance and civilization." White sociologists responsible for the development of American sociology, specifically the sociology of race, viewed "black institutions---family, schools, associations, and the church…as inferior," largely unstable, disorganized and unable to produce great leaders and deeds (2007:506-7). Moreover, as Park's and other white sociologists' writings reveal, blacks were viewed to lack agency and creativity, a perception that justified whites' belief that blacks only choice was to mimic white behaviors, attitudes and values and assimilate to the dominant normative framework of white culture.[101] Morris argues that the "dual thesis of

---

[101] As McKee and Steinberg note, white sociologists' perspective of the non-agency of blacks was the cause of their inability to foresee blacks' role as leaders in the civil rights movement and to appreciate the racial consciousness and self-assertiveness of blacks that ignited the black power movement at the heart of the civil rights struggle. What both Steinberg and McKee fail to mention is how resolutely and comprehensively Du Bois answers the missteps made by mainstream American sociologists of race, and fail to outline the extent of his well-developed counter-perspective of race.

racial inferiority and assimilation" are central to the "dominant white perspective," the

hegemonic perspective that shapes American sociology:

> Indeed, the dominant white perspective developed particular explanations of American race relations and produced certain kinds of confirming evidence that were congruent with the assumption of Blacks' inferiority and the ideal of assimilation. These assumptions led white sociologists to develop a perspective that produced very different portraits of Black and white Americans. They led white sociologists to formulate two contrasting social populations: whites were civilized, endowed with agency, and superior; Blacks were subhuman, bereft of agency and inferior (2007:529).

As Morris observes (2007:511-12), "Du Bois rejected the assumption of Black's

inferiority and he also rejected the view that the ultimate goal of Blacks was to

assimilate into America's melting pot," thus rejecting the basic tenets of Park's and other

white sociologists' sociology of race. Du Bois' challenges to theories of ethno-racial

assimilation are relevant for reshaping contemporary sociology's approach to

immigration, considering that many sociologists still utilize assimilation models to study

migration and "social adaptation" of immigrants to white nations, interaction and social

mobility among ethno-racial groups, and patterns of segregation among ethno-racial

groups in housing, education, health care, and other social institutions. Moreover, many

contemporary sociologists view assimilation as the ideal form or most pragmatic form of

social relations.

While many sociologists use neutral language to discuss the ways that "minority"

groups assimilate to the "dominant" group's culture and social system in the US, most

envision a very specific form of assimilation: the social integration, assimilation, of

groups to the rules, customs, and habits of white culture and society.[102] Mainstream race

relations literature would suggest that most sociologists presume that immigrants and

minority groups in the United States fully desire to assimilate to white dominant culture

and that assimilation to the white norm is necessary for "success." Du Bois' writings

challenge these presumptions.

Morris notes that "the inferiority thesis served as a foundational principle of the

white perspective" and that this perspective failed to view "social groups and their

culture" as "historical phenomena that evolved through time and were shaped by the

social environment." He proposes that, in response to the white perspective, Du Bois

presents a "social constructionist view of race," a position that challenges the

'immutability of racial categories,' racial exclusion, and perceived hierarchies of the

races proposed by whites. In essence, Du Bois was claiming that 'whiteness' (viewed to

be a culturally-racially superior, more advanced race) and blackness (viewed to be a

culturally-racially inferior, backward race) were misguided social constructions. Morris

(2007:514) points out that, in contrast to "white sociologists [who] conceptualized races

as pure, unchangeable categories," the earliest theoretical writings of "Du Bois argued

that there were no hard and fast types among" race groups and that races are principally

cultural, social and historical constructs.

Du Bois realized that, just as racial and ethnic groups are social constructions,

white racial oppression and claims to superiority were social constructs, constructions

---

[102] While all immigrants, as well as citizens, must assimilate to a dominant white racial frame, immigrants from different socio-economic backgrounds must also learn the more specific rules of the strata into which they assimilate (i.e., white working class, white middle-class, white elite).

that--- with effort and over time---could be deconstructed. In his landmark essay, "The Conservation of the Races" (1897), Du Bois methodically produces counter-perspectives to the themes in Park's and other white sociologists' understandings of blacks and race relations; he points out that "Negro people, as a race, have a contribution [spiritual message and particular ideal] to make to civilization and humanity, which no other race can make":

> We are Americans, not only by birth and by citizenship, but by our political ideals, our language, our religion. Farther than that, our Americanism does not go. At that point, we are Negroes, members of a vast historic race…We are the first fruits of this new nation, the harbinger of that black to-morrow which is yet destined to soften the whiteness of the Teutonic to-day. We are a people whose subtle sense of song has given America its only American music, its only American fairy tales, its only touch of pathos and humor amid its mad money-getting plutocracy. As such, it is our duty to conserve our physical powers, our intellectual endowments, our spiritual ideals: as a race we must strive by race organization, by race solidarity, by race unity to realization of that broader humanity... (1897/1986:822).

Beginning in *The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study* (1899/1996), Du Bois pays particularly close attention to the ways that the social environment shaped black culture and white culture, noting his goal of demonstrating the fundamental interrelation between the social group and environment. He proclaims that differences exist in the "socio-physical environments" of whites and blacks and distinguishes between "Blacks" and "Whites," the "white and colored environment," and the "Black World" and "White World."[103] Du Bois argued multiple 'social worlds/environments' constitute a society [the black and white worlds/environs being the primary in US society in 19th century Philadelphia]. Morris (2007:515-6) notes that "the role of social environment was central

---

[103] Du Bois specifies more clearly the meaning of "the white world" (chapter 6) and "the colored world within" (chapter 7) in *Dusk of Dawn: An Essay Toward a Race Concept* (1940/1986).

in Du Bois' analysis of racial inequality," and that Du Bois demonstrated the ways that

white racial prejudice and discrimination lead to racial inequalities between white and

black social environments as well as racially-structured inequalities of opportunities.

Philadelphia Negro discloses the distinctive environments that separate the black

social world of the 'Philadelphia Negro' from the white social world, demonstrating that

black Philadelphians are in essence inhabiting "a city within a city—who do not form an

integral part of the larger social group." As Du Bois argues, the group ("the Negro

people" of Philadelphia) cannot be understood as an isolated, self-sufficient social

concept, but instead must be viewed (and for the sociologist, studied) in relation to the

environment or environments the group inhabits. In *Philadelphia Negro*, Du Bois writes:

> …a complete study must not confine itself to the group, but must specially notice
> the environment; the physical environment of city, sections and houses, the far
> mightier social environment---the surrounding world of custom, wish, whim, and
> thought which envelops this group and powerfully influences its social
> development (1899/1996:5).

Throughout his writings (1897/1986, 1899/1996, 1903/1995, 1940/1986,

1945/1990, 1946/1996, 1962/1996, 1968/1997) Du Bois demonstrated how racism, in

effect, creates two social worlds, a "dual environment" of black and white social worlds,

and a divided social experience and way of thinking stemming from the split in social

worlds---what Du Bois dubbed "double consciousness."[104] Despite the black

community's diversity, he proposes that all blacks experience a dual environment, a

hostile, prejudiced white environment (social world) closed off to blacks and a "peculiar

---

[104] Rutledge Dennis' (2003b) concept "dual marginality" builds on the double consciousness theme to
explain the marginality that blacks experience in both the black and white social worlds and the psycho-
social effects of this "dual environment."

social environment in which the whole race finds itself, which the whole race feels" (Du Bois, 1899/1996:7-8). He indicates that blacks are forced to create their own social world and environment because they are excluded from the white environment and denied access to the opportunities and institutions of the white world. Along with being denied access to the white world's jobs, housing, hospitals, churches, political organizations and social services, Du Bois observed blacks' exclusion from the white world's educational system. He noted that "[t]he chief discrimination against Negro children is in the matter of educational facilities" and that "the university of Pennsylvania refused to let Negroes sit in the Auditorium and listen to lectures" (1899/1996:348-9).[105]

Du Bois rejects assimilation, another key element of the white perspective, mainly because he feels that blacks have not yet given their necessary and 'particular gifts, ideals and messages' to society (civilization and humanity) and because of the psychological impediments and social barriers [the "Veil"] to assimilation. In contrast to Park's assimilation model, he proposed a more idealistic model of ethno-racial or cultural pluralism, and later proposed a more realist model of separatism.[106] Du Bois was politically savvy and experienced enough to recognize that more democratic, egalitarian societies encourage models of cultural pluralism, whereas segregated, non-equalized societies might demand strategic separatism and heightened nationalism of subjugated groups.

---

[105] The importance of the higher education of blacks is a central theme in Du Bois' writings, and was at the center of the Washington-Du Bois controversy.

[106] Du Bois possessed a flexible-adaptable, socially and historically-contingent model of race relations. See Rutledge Dennis's (1996) breakdown of Du Bois' transformative social and political thought.

In Park's evolutionary view of the race relations cycle, after competition, conflict, and accommodation, "primitive" racial groups eventually assimilate to the "dominant" white/European culture and civilization. This single-path, one-way model of cultural/racial exchange and development (Park 1939/1974:100; Shils 1994:20; Lyman 1972:27-35) is ethnocentric, hegemonic, and thus insensitive to cultural difference. His understandings of cultural pluralism and separatism reject the idea that one race/culture is, by nature, dominant and should be the model to which other races/cultures aspire or assimilate. He also opposed the idea that cultural diffusion is uni-directional.

One glaring problem with the logic of Park's race relations cycle, aside from its evolutionary view of race relations (Lyman 1972; Steinberg 2007), was that neither Park nor Du Bois had faith that blacks would assimilate to white culture, and both envisioned a "bi-racial organization of society" (though for different reasons). As Stanford Lyman notes, Park commented that blacks (Asians and others whose physical features were dissimilar to whites) would never establish primary ("intimate") relations with whites because of whites' racial prejudice (Lyman 1972:37-40). Du Bois, on the other hand, asserted that blacks were not necessarily striving to assimilate to the dominant white culture and that blacks, in fact, were busy at work developing their own culture alongside white culture. Park viewed black unassimilability as a pathology; Du Bois, on the other hand, viewed blacks' unassimilable-ness as a sign of distinctive culture and racial consciousness.

Du Bois understood and presented a much more complex and flattering portrait of the black community than the culturally inferior picture that Park and other white

sociologists painted. In this pursuit, Morris (2007:516) illustrates that "Du Bois opened the door on the real black world, but white sociologists could not really see it because their sociological imagination was trapped in racial caricatures." Whereas Park and other white sociologists were unable to see the richness, strength and diversity of blacks and black culture, Du Bois perceived and delineated the heterogeneity of blacks, the importance of black institutions, and the value and unheralded contributions of black culture. Du Bois' sociological studies of blacks in Philadelphia, Farmville, Virginia, and across the South (the broad range of his Atlanta studies), depicted the regional differences, differences in social class, urban and rural differences, as well as gender differences among blacks. His studies revealed the important role of black institutions as social organizations that functioned to contend with racial oppression, and the ways that a rich, distinctive black culture has developed outside white perspectives and frames and in the face of oppression (Du Bois 1904; Morris 2007:516-7).

Du Bois' writings ceaselessly countered the negative views of blacks' racial temperament and the 'pathologies' of the group---beliefs in the intellectual and moral inferiority of blacks. In opposition to demoralizing, demeaning, and unintelligent portrayals of black culture and consciousness, Du Bois revealed the redeeming and, as of yet, untold message of black culture. Additionally, he displayed (in his writings and as an individual) the "second-sight" of black racial consciousness and benefits, as well as the difficulties, of black double consciousness. According to Du Bois, blacks possess a "complex subjectivity" and "rich inner life"---a duality of being---witnessed in the black community's tension between conservatism and radicalism and in black people's sense

of distance or belonging in the larger white social system and within the black community.[107] He was sociologically responsible enough to cite problems, certain pathologies, of black culture as well as disclose the positive aspects of black culture, represented, not just in music, humor, arts, and now sports (arts and entertainment), but in economic, political, social, and intellectual matters and traditions. Additionally, he builds the case that black Americans' distinctive culture, set of institutions and complex racial conscious demonstrate that the black community was able to creatively withstand white racism and respond positively and uniquely to a white-dominated American society.

Along with detailing ways that Du Bois' sociological studies of the black community and understanding of race relations refuted white sociology's pathological view of blacks and model of assimilation, Morris points to several other Du Boisian contributions to the sociology of race that were overlooked or understudied by early white American sociologists. He focuses on Du Bois' early and groundbreaking explorations of the intersectionality of race, class, and gender oppression, pioneering theories of global racism, and early development of public---political activist and social reformist---sociology to combat racism. Du Bois was keenly aware of connections between gender and race oppression and inequality, and he discussed similarities and differences between race and gender oppression, between race and class oppression and inequalities, and the interconnection of all three frames of oppression and inequality.

---

[107] See Rutledge Dennis' (2003a) and Bernard Bell's (1996) discussion of Du Bois' understanding of double consciousness.

While aware of the intersectionality of gender, class, and race oppression and inequality, he maintained that the racial dimension, at times, played a more significant role and guiding force in history. Therefore, he did not join the ranks of "neo-Marxist who neglected the racial dimension of class dynamics" (Morris 1993:523),[108] nor did he pursue issues of women's inequality as vigorously as he pursued black liberation.[109] The centrality of race in his writings would indicate that he believed that issues of race, at certain historical moments and social locations (particularly in the twentieth century America), trump class and gender concerns.

Another important advance in the sociology of race is discerned in Du Bois' understanding of the links between local and global racism, and his view that race shapes nations and the interrelation among nations. Du Bois was fully aware of the ways that racial ideologies shape racist practices at home and abroad, for this reason he embraced black Nationalism and Pan-Africanism, organizing national and international campaigns to challenge the ubiquitous and systemic nature of racism (Lauren 1988/1996; Marable 1996; Reed 1997). This constant, far-reaching and highly organized effort reflects his political activist and social reformist approach to sociology. Unlike the Chicago School

[108] Both McKee (1993) and Steinberg (2007) situate Du Bois in a Marxist framework. Du Bois' sociology demonstrates that he embraced Marxist thought, but, more importantly, displays a unique race-based perspective of human relations that transcended Marx's sociological ideas. Thus, Du Bois' sociological insights and approach cannot be reduced to a Marxist framework, just as racial oppression cannot be reduced to class oppression. Du Bois stands as the grand theorist of race alongside Marx, the grand theorist of class (Elias 2006).

[109] [109] Mary Jo Deegan (2002:60) notes that, despite his "belief in equality of the sexes" and associations and intellectual exchange with sociologists like Jane Addams, Florence Kelley, and Isabel Eaton, Du Bois fails to acknowledge these early women sociologists in his writings, and occasionally "revealed biases against women." Addams and Kelley were two Hull House sociologists most responsible for the *Hull House Maps and Papers*, a pioneering ethnographic, statistical 'mapping' social study that, along with Chares Booth's study of the people of London (seventeen volumes produced from 1891 to 1902) served as a blueprint for Du Bois' study of the Philadelphian Black community. Eaton was Du Bois' research assistant in the Philadelphia study, who authored a concluding section of *The Philadelphia Negro*.

and other early American sociologists, he directly engaged the ruthless exploitation and persecution of blacks, reaching beyond the academy and utilizing different methods and "genres" to disseminate knowledge about black oppression to "large audiences" at all levels of society.

Indeed, Du Bois' tireless political activism and social reformism that challenged the ideas and practices of white racism are what distinguish him as one of the early "preeminent public sociologists" (Feagin 2001; Morris 1993:526-8). Whatever role he performed as a sociologist---public sociologist, critical theorist, historical sociologist, ethnographer, statistician, sociologist of knowledge, race, and power, as well as political, cultural and economic sociologist---Du Bois was focused on one specific task: the simultaneous dismantling of white supremacy and pursuit of social justice for blacks and all oppressed minorities.[110]

Although his sociology of blacks---sociological understandings of the black community and sociological practices to aid the black community---has been the focus of much Du Boisian scholarship,[111] little has been said about his sociology of whites. It is true that his focus was rehabilitating tainted sociological perceptions of blacks, but Du Bois was equally concerned with de-constructing the unquestioned mythical perceptions of whites. Whiteness, more specifically, "the construction of whiteness," resonates as an

---

[110] At a young age, Du Bois identified white oppression and his quest for black social justice. By the time he had graduated from Fisk, Du Bois had "…developed a belligerent attitude toward the color bar…" (1968/1997:125). As a graduate student, he noted that he wished to apply the principles of "social science and political science" in the service of "the social and economic advancement of the Negro people" (1887/1985:13).

[111] See Elijah Anderson and Tukufu Zuberi's edited volume, *The Study of African American Problems: W.E.B. Du Bois's Agenda, Then and Now* (2000), a collection of essays that focus on social problems facing blacks today.

important theme in Du Bois' work. However, while Morris and others (Feagin 2003, 2005; Marable 1999; Roediger 1991/1999) have identified the important role of whiteness in his sociology of race, Du Bois' understandings of the concept remain under-analyzed and undeveloped, and thus un-utilized in the emerging field of whiteness studies, a field he helped initiate and can further enhance. Because of this neglect, I explore the important sociological theme of whiteness in Du Bois' writings.

W.E.B. Du Bois' Explanation of White Social Pathologies

An American sociology of race remains incomplete without a critique of whites and white sociology. Most white sociologists have largely overlooked white social pathologies and racist ideas and practices within the white-run mainstream sociological tradition. Additionally, most white American sociologists have failed to look outside the 'white sociological perspective' for counter-perspectives about race, race relations, and racism produced by people of color. Inconvenient truths subsist outside the white perspective of race, unsettling truths generated by 'colored' sociologists like W.E.B. Du Bois. This following analysis examines Du Bois' views of some of the uglier truths about white sociology and the white social world.

A critical, uncompromising theoretical perspective of whiteness is necessary for understanding present-day race relations. Because of their currency and bold insights, Du Bois perceptions about whites provide a good starting point. Du Bois marginalized

and disregarded "black" sociological perspective of race[112] presents an on-going

challenge to the dominant, hegemonic, white sociological perspective, a counter-

perspective that not only views the social world and human relations differently than

whites, but also critically dissects the basic values, assumptions and social effects of the

white perspective. Throughout his writings, Du Bois (1903/1995, 1920/1999, 1940/1986,

1945/1990, 1962/1996) questions and condemns the white perspective, its "construction"

of the social world (individuals, groups, institutions), its 'legitimated' ideas and 'sacred'

beliefs that are purported to represent social reality, and its vision (more accurately,

blindness) of social relations.

Over a hundred years ago, Du Bois (1903/1996) rhetorically asked black

Americans, "How does it feel to be a problem?" Inverting Du Bois' question, we may

now sincerely ask white Americans, over a hundred years later, the same question. Du

Bois was aware that whites created a great deal of the social problems that black

Americans and other nonwhites face. As noted, Du Bois viewed white prejudice and

white discrimination---white racism---as the cause of divisions between 'the colored'

and white worlds and the cause of numerous problems facing the black community.

However, his strong belief in black agency deterred him from discounting self-generated

pathologies in the black community, and throughout his writings, he balanced negative

and positive views of blacks.[113]

---

[112] While Du Bois developed a "black" sociological perspective, he was aware that "brown," "yellow," and all people of color were marginalized and faced the injustices of white racism and the "color line" --- "the relation of the darker to the lighter races of men in Asia and Africa, in America and the islands of the sea" (1903).

[113] This un-reluctance to criticize and judge (at times, too harshly) the black community served to lend Du Bois credibility when he later criticized other groups, particularly whites.

Thus, Du Bois not only examined the *effects* of whiteness---white racism---on black Americans, he also investigated the deep-seated, taboo *causes* of white racism and the social pathology of whites, explorations foreign to Park and contemporary mainstream sociology. Critically and reasonably, he exposed whites' social problems---immorality, greed, decadence, criminality, guilt, insecurities, projection, avoidance, and other 'inferior' and 'savage' qualities of whiteness, focusing primarily on the destructiveness of whites' racist attitudes and practices that perpetuate white oppression of blacks and other nonwhites worldwide.

While Du Bois never straightforwardly asked whites what it was like to be a [or the] problem, he systematically answered the question with his descriptions of white social pathologies and through documenting empirical and historical examples of white injustices and social-intellectual backwardness. Because whites continue to be the sociological problem for most people of color across the globe, oppressively maintaining the rigid color line with only occasional and qualified exceptions, Du Bois' criticisms of whiteness deserve serious reconsideration, especially among sociologists and other social thinkers. Du Bois' most critical views about white power, privilege, and destruction need to addressed, not to "hatefully," "fanatically," "vengefully," or "non-intelligently" bash whites,[114] but to clearly demonstrate how whites, socially and historically, have harmed people of color. Like Du Bois, contemporary sociologists must

---

[114] "Weakness," "error," "passion rather than intelligence," "race-hatred," "fanatical," "avenge," "bitterness," and "tinged with hate, and teaching violence" were words and phrases used by whites to describe Du Bois' critical observations about whiteness. See Manning Marable's Introduction to Du Bois' *Darkwater: Voices From Within The Veil* (1999).

not ignore the serious psychological pathologies, avarice, immoral conduct and criminality evident in the white world.

Du Bois offered a critique of the white world and "the souls of whites," documenting white pathologies, while Park never considered the social pathologies of whites and the numerous problems associated with whites' dominant culture and hegemonic control over society. Park failed to see that blacks might not want to assimilate to a virulently white racist society in the United States, one increasingly being built upon the greed and deception of capitalism and democracy, and increasing materialism, reification, and non-spirituality. Unlike Du Bois, Park's work avoided questioning whites' social and psychological deficiencies: capitalistic excesses and conspicuous consumption; unjust and corrupt legal and political systems; growing jingoistic false consciousness and cultural conformity, soulless existence and human bondless-ness; and, sense of self-worth and predilection to dominate others.

Park and other whites' blindness to the misery of racism felt by blacks and justifications of white imperialism were largely constructed upon an unchecked belief in enlightenment principles of progress, science, modern civilization and the 'rational' subject. Critical questions arise: beside faith in Enlightenment ideals, what prevented Park from identifying and analyzing social problems created by whites (e.g., racism, colonialism, Western capitalist greed, abuse of state power and law, and hypocritical views of democracy and civilization), while developing a hyper-sociological focus on

black problems? Why do so many contemporary white sociologists follow Park's example?[115]

Du Bois' race-based explication of the sociological problems of whiteness provides answers to these questions, exposing the fallacy, pathology, and ill-fated social consequences of whiteness. Because the color line remains intact (Bonilla-Silva 2003/2006; Massey and Denton 1993/1996; Hacker 1992/1995; Farley 1984; Brown, Carney, Duster, Oppenheimer, Shultz and Wellman 2003), his calling for whites to recognize and mend their destructive social practices of racial stratification and Dionysian psychological behavior of racial superiority is as urgent today as 100 years ago. Recognizing the importance and urgency of his message, the remainder of this essay examines Du Bois' stern but necessary reprimand of the problematic social philosophies and actions of whites, specifically, ideologies of white superiority/black inferiority used to sanctify white oppression of nonwhites. This examination reveals Du Bois' unwavering critique of the divided, exploitative, unjust, destructive, intoxicated and incompatible contemporary social world constructed by whites---the racially constructed social reality and power structure of whiteness---so that future investigations of race have the primary and needed tools at hand to dismantle/deconstruct this powerful white racial frame.

Not surprisingly, the texts by Du Bois that offer the most penetrating critiques of whiteness---particularly, *Darkwater: Voices From Within the Veil* (1920), *Dusk of Dawn: An Essay Toward an Autobiography of a Race Concept* (1940), *Color and*

---

[115] Tellingly, sociologists trained in criminology and deviance focus almost exclusively on nonwhite populations and have no problem getting jobs, academic or non-academic, in today's market.

Democracy: Colonies and Peace (1945),*The World and Africa: An Inquiry Into the Part Which Africa Has Played in World History* (1946), and "Whites in Africa After Negro Autonomy" (1962)---are the least well-known and utilized in scholarship on race. Throughout these works, Du Bois shifts to more direct, uncensored criticisms of whites' social problems, removing his prior concern with speaking to (and attempting to educate) a white audience in a non-offensive, delicate manner.

Before his more straightforward and stinging attacks on white power found in *Darkwater* and later works, Du Bois presented a number of techniques for delivering unsettling information about white racism, clever ways of circuitously bringing unpleasant social truths to whites. Even in earlier works, he managed to tell whites what they wished to hear [blacks are pathological], while slipping in some uncomfortable truths along the way [whites greatly contribute to this pathology]. For example, in *The Philadelphia Negro*, one might interpret Du Bois' inflated criticisms of blacks as a ploy, an effort to catch the ear of white readers by providing some of the 'dirt' on blacks they demanded, while, at the same time, injecting uncomfortable truths about whites' role in creating some of blacks' social problems.

In addition to carefully juxtaposing positive and negative descriptions of the black community, Du Bois also alerts the reader that black Philadelphians confront a prejudiced, hostile, and unequal social environment of the white world. He notes that social problems confronting blacks result, not only as a result of the group's own social ills ("the Negro Problem"), but also---and more importantly---result because the group

is, as a race, highly marginalized, if not excluded, from the ranks of "humanity" and the

social environment of "the civilized world" (the white world):

> And still this widening of the idea of common Humanity is of slow growth and
> to-day but dimly realized. We grant full citizenship in the World Commonwealth
> to the "Anglo-Saxon" (whatever that may mean), the Teuton and the Latin; then
> with just a shade of reluctance we extend it to the Celt and Slav. We half deny it
> to the yellow races of Asia, admit the brown Indians to an ante-room only on the
> strength of an undeniable past; but with the Negroes of Africa we come to a full
> stop, and in its heart the civilized world with one accord denies that these come
> within the pale of nineteenth-century Humanity (1899/1996:386-7).

Along with identifying real and exaggerated social pathologies of blacks, Du

Bois discloses unjust racial conditions and discrimination generated by whites---"the

tangible form of Negro prejudice in Philadelphia" that contributes to black pathology.

Du Bois concludes that "[b]eside these tangible and measurable forms there are deeper

and less easily described results of the attitude of the white population toward the

Negroes" (1899/1996:350). With less emphasis on accenting negative aspects of the

black community, Du Bois' softball approach to addressing matters of race for his white

audience was repeated again in *The Souls of Black Folk*.

Souls provides a social-historical portrait of blacks, philosophical arguments for

black liberation and empowerment, and calm plea for whites to dismantle racial

prejudice and barriers to black survival, hope, dignity, and progress. Partially hidden

beneath this plea are examples of how whites' racial oppression and discrimination

destroy the black community and create social dysfunctionality, cultural vacuousness,

and widespread unintelligence, immorality and "mockery" in American society. Key

examples of the disparaging effects of whites' racist attitudes and practices on blacks are

found in the chapters, "Of the Meaning of Progress" and "Of Booker T. Washington and Others."

"Of the Meaning of Progress" documents the human and social devastation of whites' continued exploitation, exclusion and disregard of the black community, which Du Bois witnessed as a teacher in rural Tennessee. Through encounters with impoverished, dispossessed black students and their families and friends, Du Bois documents "the Veil that hung between us [blacks] and Opportunity," "barriers of caste," and a "Jim Crow" white social world that mentally and physically cripples the black community. Du Bois uses the words of his acquaintances to explain that "white folks would get it all" and "how 'mean' white folks were," offering indirect comments about whites' greed and the ugliness of white racist attitudes and practices. Du Bois' critique "Of Booker T. Washington and Others" ("Others" certainly applies to Park) is exceptional on a number of levels, providing a counter-argument to Washington's (and, in turn, Park's) understanding of race relations, problems affecting the black community, and the social role and situation of blacks.

Moreover, unlike Washington and Park, Du Bois provides a critique of whites. This essay marks a shift from Du Bois' more accommodationist explanations of 'the race problem' in *The Philadelphia Negro* to a conflict-based account that highlights social tensions between blacks and whites and blacks' necessary resistance against white domination and struggle for civil and political rights. To remind whites that the dominant image of blacks as servile, unskilled, un-assertive, and lacking a desire for equality is distorted and dangerous, Du Bois recalls the "fire of African freedom" that

inspired revolutions, rebellions and insurrections against white oppression in the United States and across the globe (1903/1995:84-6).

Du Bois presents the reality of the self-assertive, aspiring, politicized black American in response to Booker T. Washington and Park's accommodationist picture of blacks as apolitical, submissive and content as manual laborers. With this move, he is, in essence, producing a critique of the white American sociological perspective of blacks. Because Washington's accommodationist perceptions of race relations and the social integration of blacks into American society were intimately shared and influenced by his collaborator Park (again, for different reasons) and are still perpetuated today,[116] His critique of Washington can be viewed as a critique of the dominant American sociological perspective of race and race relations. Primarily, Washington and Park argued that blacks must concentrate first on economic self-sufficiency, form their own self-reliant community, and accommodate to and even accept a subordinate role to whites.

In contrast, Du Bois proposed that blacks should focus initially on attaining political and social rights, establishing an equal position as American citizens (challenging subordination), and focus on integrating into the larger American society at all levels.[117] The heart of the essay is his analysis of the problems associated with the

---

[116] Washington's accommodationist social philosophy was more pragmatic, Park's more ideological and theoretical; Washington's viewed accommodation as political viability and salvation, whereas Park understood black accommodation as a sign of blacks' political and social inabilities.

[117] Du Bois was not entirely opposed to Washington's efforts to teach black Americans the vocational trades and economic self-sufficiency; he was, however, critical of Washington for establishing an educational program that neglected "higher education" and focused exclusively on training blacks to become manual laborers, offering instruction only in industrial, agricultural and domestic skills. Initially, He criticized Washington's preoccupation with the economic uplift of black Americans and his compliant

"triple paradox" in Washington's social philosophy and the white perspective. This three-level paradox overlooks or complies with "the disenfranchisement of the Negro" (e.g., the racial make-up of the US Senate), "the legal creation of a distinct status of civil inferiority" (e.g., the incarcerated black men), and "the steady withdrawal of aid from institutions for the higher training of the Negro" (e.g., backlash against affirmative action for blacks in higher education). Speaking of Washington, Du Bois writes:

> 1) He is striving to make Negro artisans business men and property-owner; but it is utterly impossible, under modern competitive methods, for workingmen and property-owners to defend their rights and exist without suffrage. 2) He insists on thrift and self-respect, but at the same time counsels a silent submission to civic inferiority such as is bound to sap the manhood of any race in the long run. 3) He advocates common-school and industrial training, and depreciates institutions of higher learning; but neither the Negro common-school, nor Tuskegee itself, could remain open a day if not for teachers trained in Negro colleges, or trained by their graduates (1903/1995:88-9).

Du Bois criticizes Washington---and Park and American sociology indirectly---for failing to discuss white Americans' role in the degradation and oppression of black Americans. He perceived that Washington, Park and white American sociologists, like most white Americans, fully blamed blacks for their social standing and held blacks responsible for the racial prejudice they faced. According to Du Bois, "[Washington's] doctrine has tended to make the whites, North and South, shift the burden of the Negro problem to the Negro's shoulders and stand aside as critical and rather pessimistic spectators; when in fact the burden belongs to the nation" (1903/1995).

---

attitude toward segregation. However, later in his life, after becoming disenchanted with the barriers to black political progress in the United States, Du Bois echoed Washington's call for economic self-sufficiency, even if that meant resorting to segregationist ideology [See Dennis (1996)].

Subscribing to Washington's race relations doctrine, Park's later writings on US race relations also appeared to blame blacks for whites' racial prejudice and for their subordinate position to whites in American race relations. Like Washington, Park felt that blacks "have their place" in American society, and that as long as blacks are aware of their social boundaries, position (status), and identity in American society, they will escape racial prejudice and the violent and deadly acts of racism by whites. According to Park, "the measure of the antagonism [the black American] encounters is, in some very real sense, the measure of his progress....There is evidence to show that, on the whole, the black man accepted the position to which the white man assigned him" (1928a/1974:233-4). Park, like many past and recent white American sociologists, argued that black Americans were at a stage of "accommodation," and were, in large part, compliant regarding their unequal social status and unwilling or unable to challenge the system or assimilate to American society.

Du Bois' key concepts of the "color line" and "double consciousness" appear in *Souls*,[118] though they half-materialize as vague metaphors, not as fully developed, clearly delineated ideas about race. These concepts are not understood in one text alone; rather they are fragmented, complex concepts that come to life only when reading his work as a whole. Without the space to treat these concepts properly, the goal here is to note that double consciousness and the color line were roundabout terminology for expressing that whites' racist behavior and actions drove blacks to a split consciousness,

---

[118] See Bernard Bell's (1996) and Rutledge Dennis' (2003) essay on Du Bois' uses of double consciousness and Bernard Boxhill's (1996) essay on Du Bois' cultural pluralism.

one shaped by a white world and black world separated by the color line. This divided

consciousness produces deep psychological effects, some negative ("un-reconciled

strivings" of being and identity), and some positive (being "gifted with second sight").

Du Bois appears to indicate that the more rigid the color line, the division between the

white world and 'colored world,' the more acute blacks' and other nonwhites' double

consciousness becomes.

As noted, Du Bois, 'the social scientist,' is not content to describe only effects;

he is also interested in the causes. Thus, what is equally important about these concepts,

as Du Bois illustrates throughout *Souls*, is not only the effects of the color line and

double consciousness on blacks, but the segregated and "caste-like" social world created

by whites that reinforces color lines and double consciousnesses. Unlike *The*

Philadelphia Negro, *Souls* critically comments on all whites' behavior and thought, and

for the first time introduces remarks about "white ignorance," "the ignorant Southerner

[who] hates the Negro," and "the ignorant [who] are easily aroused to lynching." In a

daring move for the time, Du Bois proposed that both whites and blacks have the

capacity for ignorance. While he chastises Washington for "apologizing" for and

concealing white injustices and immorality, in reality, this was his indirect method of

informing whites, especially white sociologists like Park, that they remain unjust and

immoral by perpetuating racism, are caught in a state of avoidance and denial about race,

and are unwilling to right a wrong:

> [Washington's] doctrine has tended to make the whites, North and South, shift
> the burden of the Negro problem to the Negro's shoulders and stand aside as
> critical and rather pessimistic spectators; when in fact the burden belongs to the
> nation [the white world]…The South ought to…assert her better self and do her

full duty to the race she has cruelly wronged and is still wronging. The North---her co-partner in guilt---cannot salve her conscious by plastering it with gold…can the moral fibre of this country survive the slow throttling and murder of nine millions of men (1903/1995:94)?

By 1920, the year he published *Darkwater*, Du Bois had grown tired of "objectively" and politely attempting to demonstrate white racism. Du Bois could no longer idly discuss race as lynching, race riots, and Jim Crow policies targeting blacks escalated. Moreover, Du Bois had since departed from his career as a research sociologist quarantined in the walls of academia and was now devoted to real world political activism and reformist, transformative public sociology, helping form the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and edit and grow its journal, *The Crisis*. During this period, he also organized Pan-African congresses and international conferences to combat global racism and demand a voice for people of color in international politics.

Du Bois played a significant role promoting racial justice amendments and legal complaints to the League of Nations and later United Nations (Lauren 1988/1996; Lewis 2001, 1994). Along with his growing political action, one discovers a much more direct, critical analysis of whites in *Darkwater* and his articles in *The Crisis* during this period. As Joe Feagin (2003) notes in his introduction to *Darkwater*, "The Souls of White Folk," the second chapter of the text, "is the first major analysis in Western intellectual history to probe deeply white identity and the meaning of whiteness." The whole work is, in fact, an exploration of the privileged and ill-gotten social world of whites, what whites often tout as a 'democratic world' and 'democratic society.'

Rather than celebrate a one-sided, whites-only democracy and exaggerated rosy picture of whiteness, Du Bois exposes what has been described as the 'hypocrisy of (white) democracy.' He contrasts the mythical ideal of democracy presented by whites, a 'democracy for all', in relation to the devastating and all-to-real 'democracy for whites only.' He theorizes that maintenance of a whites-only democracy---and its associated freedoms, rights, socio-economic advantages, privileges and status for whites alone--- entails exploitation, destruction and denied life chances for those excluded from, but laboring to support, the 'democratic' world of whites. All the beneficial, positive features of a whites-only democracy are reversed for people of color, who face an ominous social world and dire life-chance.

Absent and lacking for people of color are the freedoms, rights, socio-economic advantages, luxuries, privileges and opportunities experienced by most whites. As Du Bois proclaims, "whiteness is the ownership of the earth" and "title to the universe" and whites-only democracy is a part of the "new religion of whiteness," in which whiteness (the white world) and its ideological and organizational front, democracy (and the democratic 'civilizing process'), conspire to suppress and exploit people of color (1920/1999:18-21). He scoffs at the democratic pretensions of US whites and the 'civilizing' and 'missionary' fronts of whites who colonize foreign lands:

> Conceive this nation, of all human peoples, engaged in a crusade to make the 'World Safe for Democracy! Can you imagine the United States protesting Turkish atrocities in Armenia, while the Turks are silent about mobs in Chicago and St. Louis; what is Louvain compared with Memphis, Waco, Washington Dyersburg, and Estill Springs [all sites of race riots against blacks]? In short, what is the black man but America's Belgium [the atrocities of King Leopold's murderous and vicious colonization of the Congo], and how could America

condemn Germany that which she commits, just as brutally, within her own borders.

The number of white individuals who are practicing with even reasonable approximation the democracy and unselfishness of Jesus Christ is so small and unimportant as to be fit for jest in Sunday supplements…In her foreign missionary work the extraordinary self-deception of white religion is epitomized: solemnly the white world sends five million dollars worth of missionary propaganda to Africa each year and in the same twelve months adds twenty-five million dollars worth of the vilest gin manufactured… (1920/1999:20-1).

For Du Bois, democracy---the social system of whites---is a failure at home, just as it is mock realization abroad. He is highly suspect of whites' political agenda both in the US and globally, thus he critically questions the moral authority of the United States' national legal-political system as well as the colonialist-imperialist international policies and practices of the United States and other white nations. Du Bois (1920/1999:28) notes: "It is curious to see America, the United States, looking on herself, first, as a sort of natural peacemaker, then as a moral protagonist in this terrible time. No nation is less fitted for this role." He further states that, "[i]nstead of standing as a great example of the success of democracy and the possibility of human brotherhood," we find that "for two or more centuries America has marched proudly in the van of human hatred,---making bonfires of human flesh and laughing at them hideously." According to Du Bois, whites' anti-democratic ideology and praxis of hatred toward nonwhites is "more than a matter of dislike, rather [it is] a great religion, a world war-cry: Up white, down black," and a highly organized means of control over people of color.

Prefiguring future analyses of the relationship between racial/ethnic conflict and war, he states that modern civil wars and international conflicts result from whites' efforts to control and reap benefits from the nonwhite world. Du Bois (1920/1999:42)

asks: "What shall the end be? The world-old and fearful things---war and wealth, murder and luxury? Or shall it be a new thing---peace and new democracy of all races---a great humanity of equal men." For this new democracy to flourish, a "reorganization of industry" that includes *the majority* of humankind (whites and people of color) in the organizational process would be necessary. In sum, "all humanity must share in the future industrial democracy of the world...industry must minister to the wants (needs) of the many and not the few." He condemns "the world-wide attempt to restrict democratic development to white races," arguing that "modern European white industry does not even theoretically seek the good of all, but simply of all Europeans" (1920/1999:59, 80). Speaking to Booker T. Washington, Robert E. Park, white sociologists and the larger white population, Du Bois professes that:

> The persons who come forward in the dawn of the 20th century to help in the ruling of men must come with the firm conviction that no nation, race, or sex, has a monopoly of ability or ideas; that no human group is so small as to deserve to be ignored as a part, as an integral and respected part, of the masses of men; that, above all, no group of twelve million black folk, even though they are at the physical mercy of a hundred million white majority, can be deprived of a voice in their government and of the right to self-development without a blow at the very foundations of all democracy and all human uplift…(1920/1999:89).

Aside from providing critical analyses that reveal the relations between white wealth and black exploitation, ethno-racial foundations of modern wars, and the sham of white-defined democracy, Du Bois developed a number of insightful perceptions about whites' devious, tyrannical psychological behavior and pathological, destructive social behavior, unexplored topics in *Darkwater* that deserve illumination in future sociological research. In 1940, he again pursues a critique of "the white world" and the continued "mockery of democracy" in *Dusk of Dawn*. In this work, Du Bois (1940/1986:654-5,

658) reinforces his description of white domination, stating that "throughout the world today organized groups of [white] men by monopoly of economic and physical power, legal enactment and intellectual training are limiting with determination and unflagging zeal the development of other [nonwhite] groups." He argues that a "clear-headed student of human action" cannot "avoid facing the fact of a white world which is today dominating human culture and working for the continued subordination of the colored races." Whites are described as "villains who have selfishly and criminally desired and accomplished what made for the suffering and degradation of mankind," yet who conveniently disassociate with their "hypocrisy, force and greed" and remain guilt-free.

Just as he offered the counter-perceptive of an all-inclusive democracy opposed to whites-only democracy, Du Bois counters the negative views of blacks and nonstop praises of whites presented by his fictional "white friend, Roger Van Dieman" (a tactic to disarm whites). Throughout the imaginary exchange about very tangible realities, he oscillates between calm responses and more incendiary comments as he engages the 'white perspective.' When confronted with claims of white superiority and black inferiority (with regard to intelligence, beauty, leadership skills), he provides vivid examples that reverse the logic of this relationship, painting a positive picture of blacks and negative portrait of whites. Answering Van Dieman's claim that "the white race is supreme," Du Bois responds:

> Quite the contrary. I know no attribute in which the white race has more conspicuously failed. This is white and European civilization; and as a system of culture it is idiotic, addlebrained, unreasoning, topsy-turvy, without precision; and its genius chiefly runs to marvelous contrivances for enslaving the many, and enriching the few, and murdering both. I see absolutely no proof that the average

ability of the white man's brain to think clearly is any greater than that of the yellow man or of the black man (1940/1986:658).

Throughout the 1940s until his death in 1963, Du Bois continued to underscore the misgivings of an arrogant, imperialist white civilization. In *Color and Democracy*, he notes that "the continued oligarchical control of civilization by the white race"--- and injustices of white-run societal systems "proceed as if the majority of men can be regarded mainly as sources of profit for Europe and North America" (1945/1990). *The World and Africa*, published a year after *Color and Democracy*, further documents the "rape of Africa" by Europeans and poses a great moral dilemma for whites who wish to enjoy the spoils of imperialism. He asks, "Who now were these Negroes on whom the world preyed for five hundred years? In defense of slavery and the slave trade, and for the up building of capitalist industry and imperialistic colonialism, Africa and the Negro have been read almost out of the bounds of humanity…the world which raped it [Africa] had to pretend that it had not harmed a man but a thing" (1946/1996:80).

Published a year prior to his death in 1963, "Whites in Africa after Negro Autonomy" lamented a "shattered and almost fatally divided world." In this essay, Du Bois (1962/1996:668) reminds whites of the "the debt which the white world owes Africa," a debt that must somehow acknowledge the "eighty-five million black corpses" sacrificed to build the wealth and sustain the operations of the white world. No whites are exempt from this debt, save maybe the likes of John Brown, Harriet Martineau, and William Wilberforce. Du Bois (1962/1996:671-3) addresses "the white world as a whole," stating that there comes "a time when the sins and mistakes of the whole group must be considered and judged, not simply small localities or single individuals"

(conscious-relieving scapegoats). While he reminds whites of their responsibility for developing a divided social world of white power and black subjugation, he does not rely on power-hungry whites to change their centuries-old oppressive racist ideas and practices. Therefore, some of Du Bois' last words were wise words of black uplift and challenge to white domination, a call for blacks and people of color to disrupt the destructive socio-historical relationship in which "white wealth and culture" relies upon "Negro poverty and exploitation."

Conclusion

The field of critical white studies is just one of the many avenues of race relations research and race studies paved by Du Bois. Because very little has changed with regard to the social dynamics of white domination/black subordination, his development of the concept, "whiteness," deserves much more attention than was provided in this study. Indeed, most of his sociological concepts---double consciousness, the Talented Tenth, racial pluralism, the dual environment, the Veil and color line---and perceptions about race (political, historical, cultural, intellectual, biographical, etc..) deserve greater scrutiny and practical implementation in race scholarship and real world politics. Serious consideration of Du Bois' sociological thought has the potential to reconfigure how sociologists study race and understand the significance of the ways that race and racism shape human interactions and the social world.

By closely reading Du Bois' sociological writings, one comes to realize that race, as a primary factor of human organization and social structuring, affects virtually every

topic, subfield, and interest of sociologists. Meanings of race, structures of race relations, and operations of racism intersect and shape: social psychology, social movements and globalization; economic, political, historical, and environmental sociology; the sociologies of knowledge, culture, religion, science/technology, family/marriage, crime/deviance, and health/aging; sociological theories and methods, particularly the most powerful methodology of all: statistics (Zuberi 2001, 2008). The broad field of sociology will only mature when sociologists recognize "the essential social fact of race" (Bonilla-Silva 1999).

Those who do study race cannot escape Du Bois' powerful critique of the assimilation model, which continues to be the primary, influential model used in immigration studies and used as a gauge to determine a group's ability to adapt to what is considered normal, just, and valuable: the cultural and societal ideal of whites. Sociologists must finally begin to investigate whites' social pathologies as well as the social problems of blacks and other ethno-racial minorities, and to identify the links between the social problems of whites and people of color.

Additionally, and most importantly, sociologists must begin to study ways that power is racially structured, realizing that, throughout the modern period, whites have controlled the most powerful social institutions (i.e., dominant international corporations and governments of controlling nations) and have had a monopoly on most natural resources and the human resource of labor and warring. For at least the last four hundred years, whites have held a position of social and economic privilege and power, while rarely questioning or loosening their privilege, power, and wealth. Du Bois reminds us

that white privilege, power, and wealth are not necessarily the result of a great civilization and culture, hard work, and righteousness, rather white privilege, power, and wealth---white supremacy---is often the product of the exploitation and oppression of the under-privileged, disempowered and economically exploited classes, who are mostly people of color. White power, privilege and wealth result from whites' actions of creating barriers and excluding people of color from the 'civilized' world. No white power, privilege, and wealth would exist without the widespread slave-like labor (and accompanying social and human sacrifices), solid work ethic, positive humility and rectitude of people of color.

It would appear that American sociology is only now in the 'recognition' phase of Du Boisian sociology. While the American sociological tradition has now, officially and symbolically, recognized Du Bois (the recent establishment of the 'The W.E.B. Du Bois Career of Distinguished Scholarship Award'), will American sociologists now begin to study his work (like the works of Weber, Marx, and Durkheim) and incorporate his sociological findings in their writings? Will the gatekeepers of American sociology (the editors at leading journals and publishing venues) begin to circulate Du Boisian-influenced scholarship? Will white sociologists become more introspective and self-critical about the pathological, oppressive social world created by whites, embracing his often-disturbing messages about whiteness?

Along with his critique of the white sociological frame, Du Bois developed a powerful black sociological frame of ideas and practices that guided his intellectual-activist human rights campaign. Not only did he provide responses---counter-

perspectives and practices---to the dominant and destructive ideas and practices the white racial frame, with his human rights-based, social-intellectual justice sociology, Du Bois developed an clever (adaptable) and just 'model' for sociology, a sociological framework for achieving particular and universal human rights for oppressed and dispossessed human beings. His sociologically grounded struggle for black liberation, freedom from the oppressive powers of white racial frame, is both a fundamental ingredient of his sociological approach and a primary concern of the development of black sociology. I now turn to an analysis of Du Bois' sociology of race and human rights, a model of black sociology.

CHAPTER IX

A MODEL OF BLACK SOCIOLOGY: W.E.B. DU BOIS, RACE AND HUMAN

RIGHTS

[T]he national and Race ideal has been set before the world in a new light---not as meaning subtraction but addition, not as division but as multiplication---not to narrow humanity to petty selfish ends, but to point out a practical open road to the realization in all the earth of a humanity broad as God's blue heavens and deep as the deepest human heart (1900?/1985:62).

W.E.B. Du Bois

Du Bois' sociological thought reveals an important, overlooked tension in the pursuit of human rights, a tension between universal human rights for all people, in general, and a race-specific human rights agenda for blacks, in particular. Throughout his work, Du Bois recognizes both *universal human rights* for all individuals, groups, nations, and international bodies (regardless of race, gender, class, and other human divisions) and *case-specific human rights* for particular individuals, groups, nations, and international bodies (with regard to race, gender, class, and other human divisions). I aim to demonstrate how and why Du Bois' acknowledgment of universal and case-specific human rights, and dynamics of their interrelationship, improves contemporary sociological thought about the complexities of addressing human rights issues.

Undoubtedly, W.E.B. Du Bois is one of the great sociologists of human rights and still stands as an exemplary model for human rights activists and public sociologists worldwide. Du Bois was among the select few of early social reform, social justice-

seeking public sociologists who initiated a moral sociological approach to investigating and solving pressing human rights issues facing the social world during rapid, widespread changes of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. He, along with other early pioneering public sociologists, such as Harriet Martineau, Karl Marx, W.I. Thomas, Jane Addams and other Hull House women sociologists acknowledged social problems and human suffering caused by dysfunctional social systems and exploitative groups that prey on the disempowered and non-aggressive (Deegan 1988, 2002; Feagin 2001; Hill and Hoecker-Drysdale 2001; Feagin, Elias, and Mueller 2009).

Public oriented, morally grounded sociology concerned with human rights issues was a short-lived movement in the formation of the discipline, as the early generation of public sociologists were quickly eclipsed and de-legitimized by a new generation of early twentieth century sociologists who moved away from sociology concerned with social reform, social justice, and human rights (Feagin 2001; Deegan 2002, 1990). Guided by private interests and government policy formation that, in practice, challenged the welfare of oppressed and marginalized groups, this new generation of sociologists developed and promoted a detached, objective sociological approach that avoided moral questions and the political pursuit of human rights (Stanfield 1985, 1993; McKee 1996; Steinberg 2007). Being a younger member of the first-generation public sociologists concerned with human rights development, and blessed with a long, healthy life, Du Bois continually opposed the moral ambivalence and bias-cloaked objectivity in institutionalized---mainstream---sociology, continuing the challenging work of public sociology into the second half of the twentieth century. Despite intellectual opposition

and social marginalization, he persevered as a sociologist of human rights and kept

public sociology afloat, even as the moral and human rights concerns of public sociology

were rapidly replaced by the "objective," policy-driven professional concerns of

"scientific" sociology that largely defines the discipline to this day (Feagin, Elias, and

Mueller 2009).

Developing a clear theoretical picture of Du Bois' understanding of human rights

is tricky, considering that he presents several conceptual expressions of human rights

that are modified and transform over the years in response to social changes and

historical events. Numerous scholars (Dennis 1996; Lewis 1993, 2001; Marable 1986,

1996; Rampersad 1976; Reed 1997) have noted different stages, layers, and intersections

of his political thought and actions. Over the course of his career, Du Bois embraced

multiple human rights political concerns. He theoretically justified numerous political

movements that respond to different social contexts and historical circumstances, and he

supported the human rights platforms of various oppressed socials groups. Thus,

according to different situational contexts, time-periods and geographic spaces, he

endorsed integration, socialism, Black Nationalism, Pan-Africanism, and campaigns

challenging trans-global oppression of people of color by whites of Western Europe and

the United States.

This paper argues that Du Bois' theoretical explanations of human rights are best

discerned as a tension between two primary human rights categories: universal human

rights and case-specific human rights. These two, diverging, yet interrelated, approaches

to discussing human rights present several questions explored throughout the remainder

of this paper. First, why did Du Bois feel it necessary to generate theoretical discussions of universal human rights and case-specific human rights, particularly the case-specific human rights of black Americans, all blacks outside the United States, and all other people of color? Secondly, how did he understand each category of human rights and the relationship among the different human rights perspectives? Finally, what are possible advantages of incorporating Du Bois' multidimensional framework for understanding human rights?

Universal Human Rights

Sociological focus on human rights issues, from earlier days as a graduate student to his final days as an internationally renowned human rights scholar-activist on the frontline, equipped Du Bois with social theoretical insights and language about the rights of *all* human beings that provide the foundation for contemporary definitions and declarations of universal human rights (UHR). Du Bois was the first sociologist to develop strong theoretical arguments explaining the sociological importance of human rights for all individuals, groups, nations, and international bodies, specifically universal rights that transcends race, class, gender, and other human divisions. He tirelessly fought for basic human rights of all the exploited, dispossessed, "oppressed and staggering masses" in the US and across the globe, concerned with all of "the unfortunate and the welfare of all the world" (1958/1970:332-3).

According to Du Bois, "the slums of London and New York, of Paris and Rome need the exact kind of industrial emancipation that the black people of Africa and the

brown people of Asia need…and the question of imperial colonialism is identical with the problem of poverty in Western Europe and America" (1947/1982:264). He envisioned a "broader humanity" and supported the ideals of "human brotherhood" (1897/1970:75; 1903/1995:52). As Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. (1968/1970:20) observed, Du Bois "loved progressive humanity in all its hues, black, white, yellow, red and brown…Dr. Du Bois' greatest virtue was his committed empathy with all the oppressed and his divine dissatisfaction with all forms of injustice."

Long before the United Nations' (UN) Universal Declaration of Human Rights' (UDHR) pronouncement of "the inherent dignity and the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family" (Preamble from the UN's UDHR),[119] Du Bois called for a social world that respects the rights and freedoms of all the "great families of human beings" (1897/1970:75). Much of the 1948 UN declaration re-presents basic UHR principles that Du Bois identified repeatedly in petitions to the League of Nations and UN (the institution that replaced the League) and throughout his sociological writings dating back to the late nineteenth century. Judith Blau, President of Sociologists without Borders (sociologists committed to exposing and tackling a broad spectrum of human rights issues), echoes the all-inclusive "human rights perspective" discovered in Du Bois' sociological writings and life work when she answers the important question, "Why should human rights be important to sociologists?"

> In a world of exacerbated inequalities, runaway markets, and the merciless disregard of human dignity and security, sociologists will discover that a human rights perspective is useful if they are concerned about social, racial, gender and

---

[119] See "Preamble" to the UN's Declaration of Human Rights on the UN website: http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html.

environmental justice, economic fairness, and equitable nation-states. This perspective holds that all humans are entitled to social, economic, housing, healthcare and political rights; to a cultural, racial, ethnic and sexual identity; and opposes discrimination against minorities and women. It is a subversive perspective, advocating deep forms of democracy and suspicious of capitalism that, by definition, exploits workers.[120]

Throughout his writings and speeches, Du Bois addressed the human rights concerns and perspective that Blau outlines. He was mindful and critical of any form of human inequality, opposed the unchecked, highly exploitative market systems of capitalism (national and global), and courageously attacked those who disregard human dignity and security. Addressing multiple human rights concerns in theory and practice, Du Bois generated rich sociological understandings of human rights as well as public sociology concerned with promoting "social, racial, gender and environmental justice, economic fairness, and equitable nation-states." Foreshadowing Blau's list of key human rights concerns, his sociological ideas and practices opposed discrimination in all forms.

Moreover, as a socialist-leaning critical thinker and actor, he realized that democracy, as a political system, was a far-off ideal and that capitalism remained an unjust, corrupt, exploitative socio-economic system, unless all people possess democratic freedoms and share the fruits of material production. Thus, Du Bois' sociology of human rights promotes "deep" democratic principles best expressed in socialism, anti-racism, and feminism, while criticizing faux or hypocritical forms of democracy tainted by associates with capitalism, racism, and sexism.

---

[120] This quote comes from Judith Blau's "Why should human rights be important to sociologists?" on the Sociologists without Borders website: http://www.sociologistswithoutborders.org/president.html.

While Du Bois believed "all humans are entitled to social, economic, housing, healthcare and political rights," he also recognized that particular human beings (individuals and groups) have case-specific human rights issues directly associated with their "cultural, racial, ethnic and sexual identity." According to Du Bois, human rights are, in reality, reserved for some, but not necessarily intended for all---especially those individuals and groups whose human rights are denied because of their cultural, racial, ethnic, and sexual identity. He writes: "We are willing, and rather glibly, to say that the state is for all but in that all we do not count everybody. We exclude, as the chance may lie, Chinese, or Jews, or Negroes or women… [yet] no such exclusion can be made without injustice or harm" (1910/1985:102)

Therefore, while he could appreciate the UHR claims of socialist and integrationist social philosophies, he understood flaws in their practice. Not everyone enjoyed basic human rights, social inclusion and advantages: equal access to institutions, economic and material resources; political power; social respect or status; and, freedom from oppression, exploitation, and injurious and inhumane treatment. Additionally, some oppressed groups suffer more oppression than other groups, and, at times, oppressed groups exist within oppressed groups. For example, in "Socialism and the Negro Problem" (1913), Du Bois questions the program of American socialism, which excludes black Americans. He chastises exclusionary socialists, stating: "The essence of social democracy is that there shall be no excluded or exploited classes in the socialistic state; that there shall be no man or woman so poor, ignorant or black as not to count …" (1913/1970:241-2).

His writings indicate the necessity of identifying case-specific human rights for those routinely excluded and denied universal human rights (i.e., those workers discriminated against by other workers; those attempting to integrate who face segregation). Awareness of the contradictions and inconsistencies of so-called universal human rights that lack universality prompted Du Bois to create two principal dialogical frameworks for addressing human rights: 1) a UHR theoretical discourse and 2) a theoretical discourse concerning specific human rights cases, particularly cases concerning the human rights of black Americans, all blacks and people of color.

Case-Specific Human Rights

While he acknowledged and respected case-specific human rights (CSHR) of all oppressed and exploited groups who are denied sanctity under the umbrella of universal human rights, Du Bois focused predominantly on the CSHR issues that arise from race, class, and gender inequalities and oppression existing in the social world, often drawing connections binding the three. However, unlike many scholars who discuss the intersectionality of race, class, and gender oppression as co-equal oppressions, without claiming one form of oppression is more widespread and rigid than the others, Du Bois ranks the three oppressions/human rights concerns. Aware that all oppression causes human misery, he nonetheless believes that racial oppression and inequalities create the greatest human misery and social divisions. According to Du Bois, "the oldest and nastiest form of human oppression [is] race hatred" (1920/1999:54).

Thus, among the three, Du Bois prioritized the concerns of oppressed, excluded and exploited racial groups, or race-specific human rights.[121] Although recognizing the manner in which the social categories of race and class overlap,[122] he did not view the two as synonymous or as interchangeable categories. For Du Bois, class-based human rights rank behind race-based human rights issues, and, while he viewed gender inequalities and exploitation as central human rights issues with human costs comparable to the others, gender-based human rights ranks third in Du Bois' hierarchy of human rights concerns.[123] While Du Bois' understanding of a hierarchy of oppression might appear misguided or inappropriate, other scholars have stressed how race has largely shaped the modern world, often trumping class and gender-based human rights issues and social concerns (Lauren 1988/1996; Goldberg 1993; Mills 1997; Feagin 2000, 2006; Fredrickson 2002). In *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination* (1988/1996), Paul Lauren identifies how race has long loomed as the central international human rights issue:

> The first global attempt to speak for equality focused upon race. The first human rights provisions in the United Nations Charter were placed there because of race. The first international challenge to a country's claim of domestic jurisdiction and exclusive treatment of its own citizens centered upon race. The first binding treaty of human rights concentrated upon race. The international convention with the greatest number of signatories is that on race. Within the United Nations, more resolutions deal with race than with any other subject. And

---

[121] In many ways, Du Bois' focus on race and human rights mirrors Marx's focus on class and human rights, which prioritizes the CSHR issues of class exploitation and oppression, or class-specific human rights. However, while Du Bois recognized the importance of class-specific human rights, Marx failed to recognize the importance of race-specific human rights and social structures.

[122] Du Bois critically discussed the interrelationship between capitalism and racism and, more daringly, identified white elites as the capitalist and racist power brokers who generate profit from economic and racial oppression of poor whites and people of color.

[123] At different times, Du Bois would strategically downgrade race-based human rights concerns and prioritize class or gender-based human rights, often in response to heightened class or gender-related human rights abuses associated with specific social-historical contexts.

certainly one of the longest standing and frustrating problems in the United Nations is that of race (1988/1996:4).

Observing the scope, subtleties, and progression of his sociology, one might argue that Du Bois divides race-specific or race-based human rights (RHR) into three analytic categories: 1) RHR of black Americans = HRBA, 2) RHR of all blacks across the globe = HRAB, and 3) RHR of all people of color = HRCP. In other words, Du Bois draws three primary color lines, racial dividing lines and categories of race-specific human rights inequalities and exclusion experienced by black Americans, the larger global network of blacks, and people of color of all nations. As his writings demonstrate, Du Bois reacted to these three RHR divisions by developing and implementing three theories and programs of action: Black Nationalism to address HRBA; Pan-Africanism to address HRAB issues; and, anti-colonialism to address HRPC, specifically the trans-global oppression of people of color by Western Europe and the United States.

Human Rights of Black Americans

Most of Du Bois' early sociology focuses on RHR of black Americans. During his years working at University of the Pennsylvania and Atlanta University, Du Bois conducted in-depth sociological investigations of the black American community in a variety of settings: urban and rural, north and south, as well as black elite, middle-class and working class communities. *The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study* (1899), "The Negroes of Farmville, Virginia: A Social Study" (1898), and the "Atlanta University Studies" (1895-1917), sociological research detailing the early twentieth-century social world of black communities throughout the US, were all concerned with providing

information about specific human rights concerns of black Americans. Throughout these works, he notes that black Americans' human rights are thwarted by a society that promotes whites' human rights and interests at the expense and exclusion of the human rights and interests of black Americans.

In *The Philadelphia Negro*, Du Bois argues that the advancement of basic human rights in the US is reserved for whites, and that whites largely disregard the livelihood and human rights of black Americans. He writes: "the ancestors of the English, and the Irish and the Italians were felt to be worth educating, helping and guiding because they were men and brothers, while in America a census which gives a slight indication of the utter disappearance of the American Negro from the earth is greeted with ill-concealed delight" (1899/1996:387). Du Bois explains that black Americans confront a prejudiced, hostile, and unequal social environment of the white world. He notes that social problems confronting blacks result, not only as a result of the group's own social ills ("the Negro Problem"), but also---and more importantly---result because the group is, as a race, highly marginalized, if not excluded, from the ranks of "humanity" and the social environment of "the civilized world" (the white world):

> And still this widening of the idea of common Humanity is of slow growth and to-day but dimly realized. We grant full citizenship in the World Commonwealth to the "Anglo-Saxon" (whatever that may mean), the Teuton and the Latin; then with just a shade of reluctance we extend it to the Celt and Slav. We half deny it to the yellow races of Asia, admit the brown Indians to an ante-room only on the strength of an undeniable past; but with the Negroes of Africa we come to a full stop, and in its heart the civilized world with one accord denies that these come within the pale of nineteenth-century Humanity (1899/1996:386-7).

Along with pursuing sociological research that demonstrated human rights abuses and exclusion from humanity of black Americans, Du Bois became politically

involved in promoting HRBA outside of the academy. Because of his exclusion from the academy and evolving field of professional sociology and lack of power and resources granted to white sociologists, Du Bois' fight for human rights became more effective after leaving the university and white academic world, a move that marked his shift from a "professional" to "public" sociologist." As a black sociologist in a white-run discipline that was becoming increasingly professionalized and detached from human rights issues, Du Bois was often overlooked and not given the respect and voice he deserved.

Therefore, his most formative sociological voice arose as a public writer and speaker, which presented him a more effective, far-reaching forum to announce and poetically agitate against oppression and human rights abuses. Replaced was the muffled voice and constraints of social action that were required while he was a university profession eliciting needed funding for his studies, funding that was tightly controlled by the very oppressors and human rights violators he was attempting to expose.

As he broke free from the shackles of funding-dictated, professional sociology that was restricted to presenting uncritical, evasive half-truths about society and power abuses in the social world, Du Bois effectively used words and actions to politically challenge (race-class-gender) oppressors' systems and beliefs and advance human rights concerns of the oppressed. Throughout the first half of the century, in addition to editing the NAACP's important journal, *The Crisis*, he organized and helped organize numerous political battles against oppression and campaigns for human rights. He was behind the formation of the Niagara Conference and Movement, a social movement of black Americans struggling for human rights, to Pan-African Conferences and Congresses,

social movements of all blacks struggling for human rights. The early civil rights

movement of US blacks and trans-global Pan-African civil rights movement of all blacks

spoke directly to white oppression in the US and European-dominated colonies in

Africa, the Americas, and other colonized territories. Leading the charge with petitions

and declarations to state and federal US government officials as well as officials of

international political bodies like the League of Nations and UN, Du Bois boldly

challenged white politicians and power brokers of white nations to address their social

misdeeds, specifically their human rights abuses of US blacks and blacks worldwide.

In 1905, the Niagara Movement was born when Du Bois joined forces with other

politically progressive black Americans who wished to address HRBA issues. The group

presented their "Declaration of Principles," a summary of HRBA concerns, in a leaflet

author by Du Bois. In this human rights declaration, he outlines a specific set of human

rights concerns for "Negro-Americans." Yet, before addressing specific human rights

concerns of black Americans, Du Bois humanizes black Americans by first

acknowledging the culture, talents, worth, and strides of black Americans. The pamphlet

begins: the "members of the conference" observe black Americans' "certain undoubted

evidences of progress…particularly the increase of intelligence…and the demonstration

of constructive and executive ability in the conduct of great religions, economic and

educational institutions" (1905/1986:55). After establishing the human-ness or humanity

of black Americans, Du Bois specifies the human rights concerns of black Americans.

> We believe that this class of American citizens [black Americans] should protest
> emphatically and continually against curtailment of their political rights
> ["Suffrage"]…protest against the curtailment of our civil rights ["Civil

Liberty"]…[and] complain against the denial of equal opportunities to us in economic life ["Economic Opportunity"] (1905/1986:55).

The remainder of the pamphlet addresses other HRBA concerns, such as education, the justice system, media representations that fuel public opinion, health, unionization, social protest/agitation, racial discrimination, oppression, and segregation of the color line. Du Bois later addressed all of the above HRBA issues in the pages of journals, like *The Horizon: A Journal of the Color Line* (*Horizons*) and *The Crisis*, and throughout his other sociological writings. He never discarded or diminished HRBA issues, even as he embraced human rights issues of all blacks, people of color, and oppressed whites. HRBA was Du Bois' home ground, his starting point---the human rights issues he knew best. What is more, as a black American desiring a better world fore himself and other black Americans, Du Bois felt a certain obligation and calling to HRBA.

Yet, early in his sociological writings, Du Bois occasionally discussed the importance of RHR on two other levels, the human rights of all blacks (HRAB) and human rights of all people of color (HRPC). He viewed black Americans as part of a larger group of blacks, who, in turn, are part of a larger group of people of color, like browns (Indians, Middle Easterners, and Pacific Islanders), reds (Native Americans), and yellows (Asians), a crude but utilized color-coded breakdown of 'races'). While, for Du Bois, each group---black Americans, al blacks, and people of color---is distinctive, not being reducible to the others, the three are deeply connected by the fact that they all experience the 'problems' of the color line (racial segregation and oppression) created by whites.

Human Rights of All Blacks

While Du Bois used terms like the "American Negro" and "black American" to specify

US blacks, he also occasionally referred to black Americans as "blacks" or "Negroes,"

without any reference to America. Thus, at times, he spoke of blacks as a "vast historic

race" of all Africans and, at other times, spoke of blacks specifically in reference to

black Americans. As he traveled internationally and became more involved with the

Pan-Africanist movement, Du Bois increasingly viewed the experiences of black

Americans and all people of sub-Saharan African descent as "Negroes" or blacks, while

recognizing that each group has particular sets of social, economic, political issues

related to their different homelands.

In a 1909 edition of *Horizons*,[124] Du Bois announced the journal's "policy,"

stating: "This is a radical paper. It stands for progress and advance. It advocates Negro

equality and human equality" (1909/1985:80). What was behind Du Bois' policy to

divide "Negro equality" (case-specific human rights) and "human equality" (universal

human rights)?" Recounting human rights issues and concerns discussed at the 1909

National Negro Conference and Fifth Annual Address of the Niagara Movement, he

provides possible answers to this question.

> Hitherto there has been in this country a strange, to some, almost inexplicable
> hiatus between the cause of Negro uplift and other great causes of human
> advance. If one met the workers for women's rights, prison reform, improvement

---

[124] Du Bois critically addressed human rights issues as the editor of *Moon* (1905-1907) and *The Horizon: A Journal of the Color Line* (1907-1910) before becoming editor of *The Crisis* (1910-1934), the popular and influential journal of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Du Bois used these journals, along with his many other writings and communications, as a method of publicizing human rights abuses of blacks and immoral treatment of all oppressed peoples. See Herbert Aptheker's Introduction to *Writings in Periodicals Edited by W.E.B. Du Bois: Selections from The Horizon* (1985).

in housing, consumer's leagues, social settlements, universal peace, socialism, almost any of the myriad causes for which thinkers and doers are today toiling, one met persons who usually either knew nothing of the Negro problem or avoided it if they did know (1909/1985:80).

Du Bois observed a disconnect between "the cause of Negro uplift and other great causes of human advance," indicating that "the myriad causes for which thinkers and doers are today toiling"---under the name of universal human rights---excludes or overlooks the human rights of blacks. According to Du Bois, "women's rights" (gender issues) and "socialism" (class issues) are recognized categories of the human rights dialogue, while the Negro problem (the issue of race) is thoroughly neglected. Because race-based human rights issues were routinely overlooked in the US and international politics, Du Bois likely deemed it necessary to maintain a separate category that specifically acknowledged the unaddressed, purposefully concealed, race-based human rights issues facing blacks.

Additionally, it would appear that Du Bois endorsed a separate human rights category for blacks because he witnessed that blacks suffer the greatest human rights abuses through the global slave system, viewing these abuses as extraordinary cases. He also realized that blacks require their own human rights platform because the human rights concerns of whites---a whites-only human rights agenda---inevitably bypass and overshadow/drown out human rights concerns of blacks. Even worse, whites, adopting the role of the society-defined superodinate and leader of civilization, culture, and intelligence, often attempt to authoritatively voice and dictate the human rights concerns of blacks. While at times whites act out of a misguided paternalistic sincerity, in most cases whites' attempt to control human rights concerns of blacks involves whites' efforts

to maintain black subordination. According to Du Bois, a universal human rights agenda is incomplete and problematic as long as it ignores or scorns the human rights of blacks. More to the point, a whites-only human rights agenda is not a "universal" human rights agenda. Instead, whites-only human rights demonstrate a hypocrisy of human rights, generating a need for all blacks to oppose white systems of exploitation, inequalities, and oppression, to challenge the "lynching of emancipation" by "allied peoples who have yelled about democracy and never practiced it" (1967:332).

Du Bois was aware that many white political leaders who preach democracy and human rights usually are referring to democracy and human rights for whites. Walter White of the NAACP and Eleanor Roosevelt are examples of whites often associated with the advancement of human rights, particularly through their interactions with the Human Rights Commission of the UN as US representatives of "American" human rights concerns. However, in numerous historical analyses and in biographical and autobiographical writings on Du Bois, it becomes clear that White and Roosevelt, for both similar and different reasons, blocked Du Bois' call for addressing the human rights of blacks. They were reluctant about presenting the thorny issue of RHR, considering the US government and American society staunchly supported the Jim Crow social system responsible for everyday RHR violations against black Americans (Du Bois 1967; Lauren 1996; Lewis 2000; Anderson 2003). Through these unsettling experiences with more sympathetic, liberal whites, Du Bois realized that the human rights concerns of blacks, in the US and abroad, could not be entrusted to white political leaders, who

knowingly or unknowingly "have historical strong interest in preserving their present power and income."

Because of whites' stake in maintaining racial power, which requires the subjugation of blacks, Du Bois advocated that black leaders are necessary actors for securing blacks' human rights. Subsequently, he argued for creation of a "Talented Tenth"---social, political, cultural, and intellectual leaders within the black community---to identify the central human rights concerns of blacks, specifically white oppression, and develop programs of action to address those concerns and other important matters within the black community. According to Du Bois, black leaders would guide the struggle for human rights, both HRBA and HRAB; it would be "their knowledge of modern culture [that] could guide the American Negro into a higher civilization." Without black leaders, "the Negro would have to accept white leadership, and that such leadership could not always be trusted to guide this group into self-realization and to its highest cultural possibilities" (1967:236).

As more examples of the abuses and range of white power dramatically emerged during the first half of twentieth century, Du Bois realized that whites wished to extend and exert colonial power---a totalitarian white empire---over all people of color across the globe. He thus theorized that, while its devastation of black civilization and culture was an exceptionally brutal because of the global slave trade and chattel slavery that early enriched Europe and white America, imperialism of white colonialist powers disregards the human rights of blacks *and* all people of color.

> Not only does Western Europe believe that most of the rest of the world is
> biologically different, but it believes that in this difference lies congenital

inferiority; that the black, brown and yellow people are not simply untrained in certain ways of doing and methods of civilization; that they are naturally inferior and inefficient; that they are a danger to civilization, as civilization is understood in Europe (1944:22).

According to Du Bois, "modern lust for land and slaves in Africa, Asia, and the South Seas" by "so-called civilized peoples" was the fuel for "'colonial' aggression and 'imperial' expansion'" (1913/1967:348). With this knowledge of whites' attempt to dominate nonwhite territories and resources (including the people) across the globe, he worked to forge and develop relations---political, intellectual, economic, educational, cultural, and even military ties---with social and political leaders of black Americans, all blacks, and people of color who would oppose white imperialist domination..

Human Rights of All People of Color

Du Bois realized that, because of their economic deprivation and lack of modern industry and technologies, blacks should join forces with other people of color to combat white imperialism. According to Elliot Rudwick (1982:234), "Du Bois accomplished so little in trying to unite Negroes of various nations, [thus] in 1930 he spoke about the possibility of American Negroes joining China, India, Egypt, and Ethiopia in a 'world movement of freedom for colored races.'" Rudwick points out that, despite repeated attempts, Du Bois was unable to forge alliances among blacks or among blacks and people of color. He increasingly realized that it was unlikely that the "'dark world' (Japan, China, India, Egypt, and the Negroes of the United States, the West Indies, and West Africa) would wage war against the 'white world.'" While Du Bois' vision of unifying "black, brown, and yellow peoples" might not exhibit the wide-ranging

interracial community that Du Bois (or Rudwick) had desired, through his ideas and efforts to unite people of color to challenge whites' abuse of power, however, we are today able to witness partial and selective unity among people of color on different fronts. Asian, African, South American and Island nations have bonded on some levels (normally according to region), forming alliances to offset Western imperialism of whites.

White colonization of people of color continues to this day, over a half of a century after Du Bois called attention to the human rights of all people of color under colonial rule. One of his most powerful critiques against colonization was his criticism of the International Bill of Rights presented at the 1945 UN conference in San Francisco, a vague statement about human rights "without any specific mention of …the 750 million people who live in colonial areas" (1945/1967:348). Writing about the effects of colonization on people of color perpetrated by white economic, political, and military powers, Du Bois paints a disturbing portrait of the colonized under white imperialism:

> The most depressed peoples in the world…who hitherto for the most part have been considered as sources of profit and not included in the democratic development of the world…whose exploitation for three centuries has been the prime cause of war, turmoil, and suffering…omission of specific reference to these peoples is almost advertisement of their tacit exclusion as not citizens of free states, and that their welfare and freedom would be considered only at the will of the countries owning them…" (1945/1967:348).

Although he focused on the general lack of awareness or concern toward human rights of all people of color, Du Bois did not view race-based human rights issues of people of color in isolation from other human rights problems. Moreover, he did not believe that race-based human rights issues should be the only focus of people of color.

Especially with his move toward socialism and appreciation of the socio-political

ideologies and economic idealism of the Soviet Union (a white nation) in his later life,

Du Bois found that human rights problems of people of color, while distinctive, are

interconnected to other groups' human rights issues, even oppressed whites. He

understood that "the attempt to submerge the colored races is one of the world-old

efforts," making emancipation of people of color a singular important issue. Yet, he also

knew that emancipation of people of color was interwoven and necessarily related with

other primary forms of emancipation, gender and class emancipation, and that to ignore

or step on other human groups' oppression and fight for emancipation is to jeopardize

one's own primary group oppression and emancipation.

Conclusion: Du Bois' Color-Coded Web of Human Rights Concerns

Du Bois developed a complex theoretical understanding of human rights that reflects the

complex human rights issues facing human beings throughout the twentieth century and

into the dawn of the twenty-first century. Early in his work, he recognized universal

human rights concerns in the links between the oppression of poor white workers and

blacks, but focused on the plight of blacks because, no matter how poor, white workers

possessed the benefits of white racial privileges (social status, political power, access to

better jobs, housing, education, social freedoms and 'basic' human rights). As his

sociological worldview expanded, Du Bois hoped that blacks could "make common

cause with the oppressed and down-trodden of all races and peoples; with our kindred in

South Africa and West Indies; with our fellow in Mexico, India and Russia and with the

cause of working classes everywhere" (1909/1985:84). In 1946, he would again repeat

the same message, proclaiming that black Americans should strive "not simply for

emancipation of the American Negro but for the emancipation of the African Negro and

Negroes of the West Indies; for emancipation of the colored races; and for the

emancipations the white slaves of modern capitalistic monopoly" (1946/1967:332).

Despite his strong ties with socialism and "realization of that broader humanity

which freely recognizes differences in men [human beings], but sternly deprecates

inequality in their opportunities of development" (1897/1970:81), Du Bois recognized

that UHR is not enough, that the contemporary social world stills needs to seriously

address RHR. While cogent of less-powerful whites who suffer human rights abuses, he

held that the greatest human rights abuses are race-based human rights abuses that target

blacks and people of color, thus a RHR platform was necessary. For Du Bois, RHR are

divided into three subcategories of human rights concerns associated with three principal

social groups: HRBA; HRAB; and, HRCP. Thus he reasoned that, while united against

white oppression, each group possessed their own particular set of human rights issues

related to political, socio-economic, cultural-intellectual and regional differences. It is

the duty of each racially oppressed group to fight their own specific local battle, as well

as the larger global war, against white racial imperialism.

Although most of his writings focus on human violations against black

Americans, blacks and other people of color, Du Bois routinely and tactfully shifts

sociological investigations away from human rights abuses against people of color and

toward the dominant human rights of whites. Du Bois (1920, 1940, 1945, 1946) delivers

harsh criticisms of whites' human rights violations of people of color. By shifting focus away from people of color's subjugation to acts of white oppression, Du Bois exposed a highly concealed social truth about whites' role in stifling human rights of people of color, a realization many contemporary sociologists ignore.

Du Bois' understanding of human rights denotes a conceptual split between UHR and CSHR, specifically RHR, is a necessary theoretical distinction that is relevant for today's social thinkers who wish to comprehend the history and dynamics of human rights. RHR are a necessary theoretical framework for contending with the persistence of ideologies of white superiority/inferiority of people of color, white-controlled social systems of power targeting human rights of all people of color, and people of color's second-class political status and denial of basic human rights. Until this social condition is remedied, Du Bois' model of the relationship between UHR and RHR, as well as his breakdown of HRBA, HRAB, and HRCP, provide essential concepts and theoretical understandings for a more nuanced sociological discourse of human rights, one that demonstrates that the anti-racism human rights project is as urgent today as during Du Bois' lifetime.

According to Du Bois, if a universal human rights agenda is to be truly universal, it must embrace a race-specific human rights agenda of blacks and people of color, just as it must embrace CSHR of women, the poor, and other oppressed, marginalized social groups. While human rights play a central role in "today's global order," human rights in a global context are directly linked with human rights at various localities and among different positionalities. The plurality of human rights concerns reaches beyond the

dichotomy and debates between national (citizenship) and international human rights prevalent in much HR discourse (Turner 1993; Sjoberg, Gill, and Williams 2001; Hafner-Burton and Tsutsui 2005). Du Bois' understanding of RHR (along with class-based and gender-based human rights) are distinct from 'national' (or 'citizenship') or 'international' human rights concerns, and are not subsumed under or regulated to the categories of national/citizenship or international human rights concerns.

Human rights advocates might heed Du Bois' model of race-based human rights concerns as a critique of unidimensional international/global and national/local human rights concerns that are color-blind and overlook case-specific human rights concerns.

CHAPTER X

CONCLUSION: SEGREGATION OF CONTEMPORARY SOCIOLOGY AND THE PERSEVERANCE OF BLACK AND WHITE SOCIOLOGICAL FRAMES

Today, sociology, like all of its cousins in the social sciences, is a deeply segregated discipline structured by the white racial frame of systemic racism. The white sociological frame of ideas and practices continues to dominate the profession, creating a dysfunctional, intellectually stunted white-run discipline. The social dysfunctionality and intellectual underdevelopment of mainstream white sociology have serious, often negative, consequences on knowledge production and social practices in the real world. Sociologists, like any actors in a social network, have different degrees of social power, and for too long white sociologists have abused their 'sociological power' through academic suppression of black sociological thought and methods. Over the course of nearly two centuries, the discipline has been pathologically overdosed in the white sociological frame of ideas and practices, a powerful sociological frame that, despite its often ludicrous, vapid, and destructive assertions and sociological studies, goes unquestioned and maintains power. I have attempted to trace the pathogenesis of the white sociological frame, but this is only a beginning for further research on the machinery of white sociology. It is high time for serious change and rescheduling of the guard in the discipline, for replacement by sociologists who question the frame and in fact work to speedily dismantle it.

This dissertation presents a case that black and white sociology and the segregation of sociology are social realities and historical facts that begin with first wave black sociologists (FWBS) and first wave white sociologists (FWWS) and then become solidified with the early inclusion and incorporation of Park's sociology and exclusion and marginalization of Du Bois' sociology. Because the sociologies of FWBS and FWWS and Du Bois' and Park's sociologies reflect an on-going tension in sociology (and the social world), sociologists ought to familiarize themselves with these different frameworks.[125] Highlighting the conflicting sociological approaches of Du Bois and Park and black and white sociological traditions that existed before (Chapter VI) and after (Chapters II-V) their frameworks, the purpose of this dissertation, presents a more accurate history of sociology and the social world. Moreover, this relationship illuminates seemingly irreconcilable epistemological and methodological differences between the two sociological viewpoints of black and white sociology, a condition that reconfigures the sociology of knowledge as well as most sub-fields of the discipline, and a condition that continues to beg questions about the social forces and structures that create two forms of sociological knowledge and action.

As this investigation reveals, sociological perspectives and practices of FWBS and FWWS, Du Bois and Park, and later black and white sociologists illustrate that race is a central component of the modern social world. Their writings demonstrate that, just

---

[125] For a greater appreciation of the social context and history of sociology, and to gain always-new sociological insights about the world and humans, contemporary sociologists ought to further investigate Du Bois' and Park's myriad concepts, theories, and methods used to investigate and describe society and human relations: economics, politics, history, culture, international relations, knowledge, the family, social psychology, the city, social science, inter-group and intra-group social dynamics, demography (mapping), ethnography, and human ecological studies, to name the most obvious.

as race shaped modern societies, race shaped sociology, the social science that attempts

to make sense of the formation and operation of modern societies. However, the

sociology of FWBS and FWWS and Du Bois' and Park's sociology, like black sociology

and white sociology today, are not limited to the field of "race relations," "critical race

theory," and the "sociology of race." Whereas most scholars who address black or white

sociology and segregation in the discipline do so from the perspective of race relations,

critical race theory or the sociology of race, this study has demonstrated that black and

white sociology inform sociologists and non-sociologists about the social world in

general. The black sociology and white sociology that begins with FWBS and FWWS

and Du Bois and Park represent more than fundamental divisions in the discipline, for

their objects/subjects of analysis expand well beyond the field of race studies.

While black sociology and white sociology provide useful starting points for

understanding the race relations research, critical race theory and the sociology race on a

much grander scale, they also present notable tensions in early sociology's attempt at

understanding broader questions about human relations, society, and the role of

sociology in the modern period. Thus, black sociology's and white sociology's

perspectives and use of race are not confined to sub-categories or area studies within

sociology already mentioned. Rather, it is important to comprehend that black sociology

and white sociology offer two different views of human relations, society and sociology

that are viewed to be, to a great extent, racially organized and constructed. In other

words, race is not a segment or one aspect of human relations, society, and sociology;

instead, as black and white sociology demonstrate, race defines humans relations, society, and sociology.

The intellectual story and material consequences of the segregation of sociology, which produced black and white sociology, as well as the divide between the sociological perspectives of Du Bois and Park, remain neglected, unsettled topics and social realities (Lyman 1972; Stanfield 1985; Deegan 2002; Steinberg 2007). Just as sociological studies of sociologists are lacking, sociological studies of sociology---the discipline---are lacking. Thus, many sociologists are in the dark when it comes to understanding the social-historical contexts and key intellectual features and material operations of the development of sociology. Subsequently, many sociologists fail to realize that, like most social institutions, organizations, and networks in the United States, US sociology, despite its liberal bent, remains deeply segregated. This segregation operates according to a historic color-coded racial stratification system, incorporating and advancing whites and white-defined sociological perspectives, while simultaneously excluding and marginalizing people of color and their sociological points of view (Blackwell 1974:341, 347; Ladner 1973:xxiii; Bowser 2002:53; Cunnigen 2002:xviii; Winant 2007:535).

Problematically, while sociologists retain careers addressing segregation in social institutions and inequalities among social groups, few of these same sociologists address segregation and inequalities in their own institution and ranks.[126] Large numbers of

---

[126] John Stanfield is one of the few. Along with addressing the "inequality in social science" perspective, Stanfield (1985:4) offers a "sociology of social science paradigm," which "sheds lights on the intrinsic linkages between the origin and development of race relations social science and specific societal racial inequality patterns."

sociologists are trained (and often required) to perceive sociology as a 'universal' and 'objective' science that is both all-inclusive and neutral, beyond particular and subjective positions---of black and white, for example.[127] To bluntly speak of race or color as a *primary factor* shaping human relations, the social world, and sociology itself, a sociologist risks being ostracized and labeled essentialist, identity politics-driven, outdated (in a post-racial, colorblind era), and generally off the mark or radical. All of which lead to marginalization, disempowerment and de-legitimization in the discipline---a threat to one's 'respectability' and professional career (Stanfield 1985, 2008; Feagin 2009; Feagin, Elias, and Mueller 2009). It is easy to recognize why most sociologists shy away from the thorny, career-defining issues that surface in critical discussions of race and color-coded racism.

It is ironic that sociologists who challenge the dominant social science narratives of a colorblind and post-racial social world often fail to challenge segregation and colorblind and post-racial philosophies within sociology and other social science disciplines. Indeed, most sociologists tend to avoid controversial questions about color-coded racism and critical understandings of race practiced by many of the leading, well-funded sociologists. Along with failing to recognize the deeply structured racial segregation in sociology and other social sciences, mainstream sociologists specifically

---

[127] Even sociologists who discuss 'black sociologists' and 'white sociologists' are unwilling to admit that 'black sociology' and 'white sociology' exist. In the Introduction to *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, which explores sociological contributions of black sociologists, Morris Janowitz, writes: "I myself do not believe there was a white sociology and a black sociology…after editing this volume, I remain convinced that the distinction is not a viable one" (1974:xvi). Janowitz's dismissal of black and white sociology most likely reflects views of many of today's post-race, color-blind, value-free sociologists.

avoid questions concerning whites' power and privilege in academia, endemic racial

segregation in sociology and other social science disciplines, and on-going debates

between whites and people of color---epistemological and ideological conflicts---over

meanings of race and other aspects of the social world.

Questions that need to be addressed in future studies are: What does the

continued divide between blacks and whites and between black and white sociology

reveal about the social world and sociology? More particularly, in what ways have white

sociology's domination of the discipline created dysfunctional, even harmful

sociological perspectives and practices, and how does this reflect dysfunctionality and

the harmfulness of whites' domination of the social world? In other words, how has

white sociology generated 'crises' in the discipline reflective of those that whites have

created in the social world, crises that not even Sigmund Freud (1929/1989), Edmund

Husserl (1954/1970) or Alvin Gouldner (1970) can fully appreciate?

I have attempted to demonstrate that during the nineteenth century the first wave

black sociologists produced more advanced sociological ideas and practices than first

wave white sociologists. Early black sociologists clearly reveal that whites' social

construction of immoral and unjust slave societies and whites' later imperialist

exploitation of people of color and their lands is, in fact, the true "social problem," and

that blacks are not in fact the social problem as whites' hyper-focus on supposed "black

pathologies" would indicate. FWBS documented how the world's gravest problems are a

direct result of whites' past enslavement of blacks and present colonization of blacks and

most people of color, creation of a segregated, apartheid social world, and attempt to reduce all people of color into servants or pawns.[128]

Battling these tendencies of the white frame, and the way these tendencies are justified by the white sociological frame, first wave and later black sociologists have developed a sounder alternative approach to sociology. This advanced type of sociology began with one 'founder of sociology,' David Walker, who developed a detailed sociological analysis and critique of American society and problems of white racism prior to Auguste Comte's first sociological writings, which justified white racism and white-run social systems like the US. Along with Walker, Martin Delany, Alexander Crummell, Frederick Douglass, William Brown and George Williams developed the foundation for black sociology that W.E.B. Du Bois and later black sociologists have built upon. The advanced construction of black sociology has demonstrated the 'construction flaws' of the white sociological frame, a frame that engages in questionable theories and practices to maintain whites' power in society and the discipline.

Perpetuating the sociological tradition of FWBS, Du Bois and other twentieth and now twenty-first century sociologists who support the black sociological frame of ideas and practices is one of the most important tasks for sociologists today. Because

---

[128] One effect of the white racial frame is the necessary creation of pawns and servants who, both self-knowingly and through hegemonization, buy into the white racial frame. Others, still, are mesmerized and caught up in the public sway of the 'white societal Zeitgeist' and 'ruling religion of whiteness.' Whites, blacks and other people of color go to work for the protection and maintenance of the white frame. Modern day officials guarding and operating the frame include Westernized (Europeanized or white-influenced) soldiers, police, politicians, and corporate plunderers, corporate bandits who earlier got their start with the development of white-owned and directed multinational corporations involved in the slave trade of blacks and white system of slavery.

blacks' sociological ideas and practices have been excluded and marginalized in the discipline so long, time has come to drastically reshape sociology, the failed sociology created by the white sociological frame. As in the past, whites maintain power in the social word and world of sociology, an obstacle to black sociology. However, this power is not absolute, nor unbreakable. Adherents of black sociology need to re-group and reconsider black sociology's valiant past challenges to the white racial frame. Another revitalization period, like the 1970s black sociological Renaissance, is necessary. A revolutionary period is needed in which the powerfully insightful sociological thoughts and actions inherent in black sociology are not shelved (or worse, discarded and kept out of print---the reality of all books on black sociology at present) but put into forceful organized action, employed in on-going campaigns and practices to establish the more perceptive black sociological truths of the social world.

If an egalitarian, deracialized, colorblind, racially pluralistic sociology that includes the sociological ideas and actions of both blacks, other people of color and whites can truly develop, black sociology's mission will be over. Until then, a concerted effort should be made to legitimize and develop the power of the black sociological frame of ideas and practices. As I conclude this paper, I echo the calling of the black tradition of ideas and practices with several suggestions for developing a black sociological frame, while simultaneously working to demolish the white sociological frame in its present guise.

Because of white mainstream sociology's marginalization, exclusion and cruel neglect of black sociologists and black sociology, black sociology is faced with the

daunting task of building and subsisting in hostile terrain with uneven resources, power and privileges. This social condition necessitates a hardened approach in black sociology that openly corrects white sociology's omissions of the black sociological frame. A no-nonsense establishment of black sociology requires, not only greater investigations of ideas and practices of earlier first wave black sociologists and black sociologists of the first and second half of the twentieth century, but also demands knowledge of the sociological ideas and actions of contemporary black sociologists, sociologists of color and even white sociologists, who perpetuate the black sociological framework.

In other words, sociologists of all colors must learn from the tradition of sociology generated by black sociologists, the sociologists who have struggled most for the establishment of black sociology. Black sociology's character rests on those leading black sociologists, and occasional sociologists of color and white sociologists, who have risked their careers and reputations criticizing the white sociological frame that unjustly shapes the discipline and larger white racial frame that unjustly shapes the larger social world. Black sociology should continue to address historical understandings of the development of black sociology, history that makes sense of present social conditions and arrangements of human relations (the current social order and organization of the state) and, more specifically, the hierarchy of races and other social groups. Black sociology, like all color-coded sociologies and sociology in general, must look to black sociologists' work and resist temptation to glorify the sociology of powerful white sociologists just because they open doors to "high-end," "designer" departments and research-funding opportunities, presses and journals, editorships and special invitations

to ASA invited sessions. White sociologists possess the same unfair advantages in the discipline as those unfair advantages that whites possess in the social system. This recognition must be made explicit before any dialogue ensues about 'equal opportunities' and a 'fair and even playing field' in sociology and the larger social context, great white myths that persist regardless of the overwhelming empirical realities of racial inequalities.

Black sociology must, in effect, continue to build its black educational institutions with heightened zeal, and especially focus on establishing a core set of ultra-dynamic learning institutions where resources and teaching talent is concentrated. In other words, the funding that supports numerous HBCUs should be centralized to build up two or three (and then more) primary PhD granting black universities with strong graduate programs, programs that intellectually outshine (in acumen and honesty) any of the most "respected," "well-ranked," highly-resourced sociology departments in the nation. At the same time, black sociology PhD programs need not seek legitimatization as a "top ten" program by white-defined standards such as *U.S News and World Report*. Most of the "leading" and "top ten" institutions are the same leading, top-ten, white-controlled institutions that justify the oppressive ideas and practices of the white racial frame.

Black PhD granting institutions should have satellite colleges or campuses that reach and work with a wider intellectual and social public. These relations should forge alliances strategically, which might mean the birth of some black institutions and the death of others. Yet, an organizational transformation of black educational institutions is

in order and should proceed immediately as long as it does not deny anyone the opportunity to learn.

Similarly, the top sociological journals of white mainstream sociology, *American Journal of Sociology* and *American Sociological Review*, are not necessarily the pages where one will find work inspired by black sociology. Instead, these high-powered, white-controlled journals are normally where one discovers articles, unconsciously and consciously, buttressing the ideas and practices of white racial frame and white sociological frame that reach back to Park and FWWS. Again, the 'top journals mentality' must be dismissed if one is to encounter the progressive thought and actions of black sociology. Some of the most insightful sociological articles are found in now defunct black social science journals such as *Phylon* and *Race and Society* (which is not strictly a black journal), two severally ignored and discounted black outlets for disseminating social knowledge.

These black social science journals, or those like them, deserve renewal and invigoration, funding, devotion of sociologists and mass promotion in order to make sure that their articles' messages receive greater exposure (not for recognition as much as education). For black social science journals are important sources of information about the social world that the larger public can no longer afford to neglect. Black sociology must develop these journals to continue a long-established forum to speak truth about the white racial frame, since white sociological journals avoid addressing white ideas and practices that have gotten us, the world public, into the mess we are in today. The present financial crises sparked by white avarice and decadence---whites' destruction of

human beings, culture and the natural environment in search of profit---and the continued white imperialism fueling numerous wars and social hostilities are critical sociological subjects that black sociology journals must continue to report. Additionally, the same focus on establishing strong, well-disseminated journals should also be dedicated to establishing a strong, well-disseminated black press for the social sciences.

Black policy centers, think tanks, legal institutes, media outlets, churches and community organizations should forge alliances with black PhD granting institutions, incorporating the advice and leadership of leading black intellectuals and scholar-activists and the aid of black business leaders, church leaders and politicians who sincerely care about the community, fight for human rights and social justice, and have access to the tools of power. Black sociology should lead this charge to develop a cooperative, effective and well-funded black social and intellectual community.

As in the past, black sociologists should continue the hard fight for black liberation from the oppression of the white racial frame, in their homelands and across the globe, particularly in Africa. Lastly, a black sociology should maintain intellectual honesty about the evils of white racism and black suppression, despite the social and psychological costs associated with this proud politicized epistemological fight. I hope that by following some of these prescriptions, prescriptions presented by blacks since the origins of the discipline, that the day soon comes when sociologists can realize the actual and not just the symbolic death of white sociology and establish of the noble ideals of black sociology. Because "racism is an integral, permanent, and indestructible

component of this society," as Derrick Bell (1992) suggests, we would all be wise to re-

consider Charles Hamilton's statement:

> If this society is to change in any viable way, black people will, of necessity, have to play a leading role. It will be, in large measure, the new values, new insights, and new alternatives proposed by black people that will have the considerable legitimacy. It will not be without the kinds of hard work started by our giants of social science scholarship many decades ago (1971/1973:476).

REFERENCES

Abbott, A. 1999. *Department and Discipline: Chicago Sociology at One Hundred*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Acker, J. 2005. "Comments on Burawoy on Public Sociology." *Critical Sociology* 31(3):327-31.

Addams, J. 1892a. "The Subjective Necessity for Social Settlements." *Philanthropy and Social Progress*. College Park, MD: McGrath Publishing.

---. 1892b. "The Objective Value of a Social Settlement." *Philanthropy and Social Progress*. College Park, MD: McGrath Publishing.

---. 1895. *Hull House Maps and Papers, by Residents of Hull House, a Social Settlement: A Presentation of Nationalities and Wages in a Congested District of Chicago, Together with Comments and Essays on Problems Growing Out of Social Conditions*. Boston: Thomas Crowell.

---. [1901] 1977. "Respect for Law." In *Lynching and Rape: An Exchange of Views*, edited by B. Aptheker. New York: The American Institute for Marxist Studies.

---. 1910. *Twenty Years at Hull House*. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Addams, J. and I. B. W. Barnett. [1901] 1977. *Lynching and Rape: An Exchange of Views*, edited by B. Aptheker. New York: The American Institute for Marxist Studies.

Adorno, T., E. Frenkel-Brunswick, D. J. Levinson, and R. N. Sanford. 1950. *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Harper Row.

Alexander, J. 2006. *The Civil Sphere*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Alkalimat, A. H. I. (G. McWorter). [1969] 1973. "The Ideology of Black Social Science." In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

Allport, G. 1958. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday Anchor.

America, R. F. [1971] 1973. "The Case of the Racist Researcher." In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

Anderson, C. 2003. *Eyes Off the Prize: The United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights, 1944-1955*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, E. 1996. Introduction. *The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Anderson, E. and T. Zuberi. (eds.). 2000. *The Study of African American Problems: W.E.B. Du Bois's Agenda, Then and Now*. In *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 568.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Appiah, K. A. 1985. "The Uncomplete Argument: Du Bois and the Illusion of Race." In "*Race," Writing, and Difference*, edited by H. L. Gates (Jr.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Aptheker, B. 1977. Introduction. In *Lynching and Rape: An Exchange of Views*, by Jane Addams and Ida B. Wells. New York: The American Institute for Marxist Studies.

Aptheker, H. [1942] 1983. *American Negro Slave Revolts*. New York: International Publishers.

---. 1966. *Nat Turner's Slave Rebellion*. New York: Humanities Press.

---. 1973. *Annotated Bibliography of the Published Writings of WEB Du Bois*. Millwood, NY: Kraus-Thomson.

---. 1985. Introduction. In *Writings in Periodicals Edited by W.E.B. Du Bois: Selections from the "Horizon,"* edited by H. Aptheker. Millwood, NY: Kraus-Thomson.

---. 1989. *The Literary Legacy of W.E.B. Du Bois*. White Plains, NY: Kraus International Publishers.

Aronowitz, S. 2005. "Comments on Michael Burawoy's 'The Critical Turn to Public Sociology,'" *Critical Sociology* 31(3):333-338.

Banneker, B. [1791] 1970. "Letter to Thomas Jefferson." In *Great Documents in Black American History*, edited by G. Ducas and C. V. Doren. New York: Praeger.

Bannister, R. C. 1979. *Social Darwinism: Science and Myth in Anglo-American Social Thought*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Barnett, I. B. W. [1901] 1977. "Lynching and the Excuse for It." In *Lynching and Rape: An Exchange of Views*, edited by B. Aptheker. New York: The American Institute for Marxist Studies.

Bell, B. 1996. "Genealogical Shifts in Du Bois's Discourse on Double Consciousness as the Sign of African American Difference." In *W.E.B. Du Bois on Race and Culture: Philosophy, Politics, and Poetics*, edited by B. W. Bell, E. R. Grosholz, and J. B. Stewart. New York: Routledge.

Bell, D. 1973. *Race, Racism, and American Law*. Boston: Little, Brown Publishers.

---. 1992. *Face at the Bottom of the Well: The Permanence of Racism*. New York: Basic Books.

---. 2004. *Silent Covenants: Brown V. Board of Education and the Unfulfilled Hopes for Racial Reform*. New York: Oxford University Press

Bell, H. H. [1953] 1969. *A Survey of the Negro Convention Movement, 1830-1861*. New York: Arno Press.

Bernal, M. [1987] 1991. *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization*. Rutgers, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Bernard, L. L. 1936. "Henry Hughes, First American Sociologist." *Social Forces* 15 (December):154-74.

Bernard, L. L. and J. Bernard. 1937. "The Historic Pattern of Sociology in the South." *Social Forces* 16 (October):1-12.

---. 1965. *Origins of American Sociology: A Social Science Movement in the United States* New York: Russell and Russell, Inc.

Berry, M. F. 1994. *Black Resistance, White Law: A History of Constitutional Racism in America*. New York: Penguin Books.

---. 1995. "Slavery, the Constitution, and the Founding Fathers." In *African Americans and the Living Constitution*, edited by J. H. Franklin and G. R. McNeil. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Berry, M. F. and J. W. Blassingame. 1982. *Long Memory: The Black Experience in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Best, J. 2004. *More Damned Lies and Statistics: How Numbers Confuse Public Issues*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

---. 2008. *Stat-Spotting: A Field Guide to Identifying Dubois Data*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Billingsley, A. [1970] 1973. "Black Families and White Social Science." In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

Binderman, M. 1975. "Review: The Death of White Sociology, by Joyce Ladner." *Social Forces* 53(4):650-1.

Blackwell, J. 1974a. Preface. In *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, edited by J. Blackwell and M. Janowitz. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

---. 1974b. "Role Behavior in a Corporate Structure: Black Sociologists in the ASA." In *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, edited by J. Blackwell and M. Janowitz. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Blackwell, J. and M. Janowitz. 1974. *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Blasi, A. J. "Using Pragmatist Sociology for Praxis: The Career of Charles H. Parrish." In *Confronting the American Dilemma of Race: The Second Generation Black American Sociologists*, edited by R. E. Washington and D. Cunnigen. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Blau, J. 2008. "Why Should Human Rights Be Important to Sociologists?" http://www.sociologistswithoutborders.org/president.html.

Blauner, R. and D. Wellman. 1973. "Toward the Decolonization of Social Research." In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

Blum, E. 2007. *Du Bois, American Prophet.* Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press.

Blumenbach, J. F. [1775] 1969. *On the Natural Varieties of Mankind*. New York: Bergman.

Blumer, H. 1958. "Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position." *Pacific Sociological Review* I (Spring):3-7.

Bonilla-Silva, E. 1997. "Rethinking Racism: Toward a Structural Interpretation." *American Sociological Review*, 62(3):465-480.

---. 1999. "The Essential Social Fact of Race." *American Sociological Review*, 64(6):899-906.

---. 2001. *White Supremacy and Racism in the Post-Civil Rights Era*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

---. [2003] 2006. *Racism Without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Bowser, B. P. [1981] 2002a. "The Contribution of Blacks to Sociological Knowledge: A Problem of Theory and Role to 1950." In *Confronting the American Dilemma of Race: The Second Generation Black American Sociologists*, edited by R. E. Washington and D. Cunnigen. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

---. 2002b. "Classical Black Sociologists and Social Theory: Anatomy of a Controversy." In *Confronting the American Dilemma of Race: The Second Generation Black American Sociologists*. edited by R. E. Washington and D. Cunnigen. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

---. 2002c. "Studies of the African Diaspora: The Work and Reflections of St. Clair Drake." In *Confronting the American Dilemma of Race: The Second Generation Black American Sociologists*, edited by R. E. Washington and D. Cunnigen. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

---. 2002d. "Retrospective on St. Clair Drake." In *Confronting the American Dilemma of Race: The Second Generation Black American Sociologists*, edited by R. E. Washington and D. Cunnigen. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Boxhill, B. 1996. "Du Bois on Cultural Pluralism." In *W.E.B. Du Bois on Race and Culture: Philosophy, Politics, and Poetics*, edited by B. W. Bell, E. R. Grosholz, and J. B. Stewart. New York: Routledge.

Bracey, J. H., A. Meier, and E. Rudwick. 1970. *Black Nationalism in America*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.

---. 1971a. *The Black Sociologists: The First Half Century*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.

---. 1971b. Introduction. In *The Black Sociologists: The First Half Century*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.

Brewer, R. M. 2005. "Response to Michael Burawoy's Commentary: 'The Critical Turn to Public Sociology.'" *Critical Sociology* 31(3):353-9.

Broderick, F. L. [1959] 1967. *W.E.B. Du Bois: Negro Leader in a Time of Crisis*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

---. 1974. "W.E.B. Du Bois: History of an Intellectual." In *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. J. Blackwell and M. Janowitz. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Brown, M. K., M. Carnoy, E. Currie, T. Duster, D. B. Oppenheimer, M. M. Shultz, and D. Wellman. 2003. *Whitewashing Race: The Myth of a Color-Blind Society*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Brown. W. W. 1847. *Narrative of William W. Brown, a Fugitive Slave, Written by Himself*. Boston: Anti-Slavery Office.

---. 1853. *Clotel, or, The President's Daughter: a Narrative of Slave Life in the United States*. London: Partridge and Oakey.

---. 1856. *The Experience; or, How to Give a Northern Man a Backbone*. Unpublished.

---. [1858] 2001. *The Escape; or, A Leap for Freedom*. Knoxville, TN: The University of Tennessee Press.

---. 1863. *The Black Man: His Antecedents, His Genius, and His Achievement*. New York: Thomas Hamilton.

---. [1867] 1961. *The Negro in the American Revolution*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

---. [1874] 1969. *The Rising Son: The Antecedents and Advancement of the Colored Race*. Miami, FL: Mnemosyne Publishing.

Bryce-Laporte, R. S. 1975. "Review Symposium: Time on the Cross." *Contemporary Sociology* 4 (July):353-61.

Bulmer, M. 1984. *The Chicago School of Sociology: Institutionalization, Diversity, and the Rise of Sociological Research*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Burawoy, M. 2005a. "For Public Sociology: 2004 Presidential Address. *American Sociological Review* 70:4-28.

---. 2005b. "Rejoinder: Toward a Critical Public Sociology." *Critical Sociology* 31(3):3739-390.

---. 2005c. "The Critical Turn to Public Sociology." In *Enriching the Sociological Imagination: How Radical Sociology Changed the Discipline*, edited by R. Levine. Boston: Brill Academic Press.

Calhoun, C. 2005. "The Promise of Public Sociology." *The British Journal of Sociology* 56(3):355-363.

---. 2007. "Sociology in America: An Introduction." In *Sociology in America: A History*, edited by C. Calhoun. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Carter, W. 1967. *The New Negro of the South*. New York: Exposition University.

---. 1973. *Shaw's Universe*. Washington, DC: National Publishers.

Chou, R. and J. R. Feagin. 2008. *The Myth of the Model Minority: Asian Americans Facing Racism*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.

Clark, K. [1965] 1973. "Introduction to an Epilogue." In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

Coates, R. D. 2004. "Review: *Confronting the American Dilemma of Race: The Second Generation Black American Sociologists*, by Robert E. Washington and Donald Cunnigen." *Contemporary Sociology* 33(1):26-7.

Comte, A. [1822] 1998. "Plan of Scientific Work." In *Comte: Early Political Writings*, edited by H. S. Jones. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. [1830-1842] 1974. *Cours de philosophie positive*. London: Croom Helm.

---. [1851-1854] 2002. *System of Positive Polity*, tranlated by J. H. Bridges. London: Thoemmes Continuum, Facsimile edition.

Conyers, J. E. and E. G. Epps. 1974. "A Profile of Black Sociologists." In *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. J. Blackwell and M. Janowitz. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Coser, L. A. [1971] 1977. *Masters of Sociological Thought*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Cox, O. C. 1948. *Class, Caste and Race*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

---. 1959. *The Foundations of Capitalism*. London: Peter Owne.

---. [1944] 1969. "The Racial Theories of Robert E. Park and Ruth Benedict." *The Journal of Negro Education*, 13(4):452-63.

Cross (Jr.), W. E. [1971] 1973. "The Negro-To-Black Conversion Experience." In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

Crummell, A. [1875] 1970b. "What This Race Needs in This Country Is Power." In *Black Nationalism in America*, edited by J. H. Bracey, A. Meier, and E. Rudwick. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.

---. [1891] 1969. *Africa and America: Addresses and Discourses*. New York: Negro University Press.

Cunnigen, D. 2002a. "Second Generation Black Sociologists Discover a 'Place' in American Sociology." In *Confronting the American Dilemma of Race: The Second Generation Black American Sociologists*, edited by R. E. Washington and D. Cunnigen. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

---. 2002b. "Daniel C. Thompson and Butler A. Jones: A Comparison of Interdisciplinary Approaches to Sociology." In *Confronting the American Dilemma of Race: The Second Generation Black American Sociologists*, edited by R. E. Washington and D. Cunnigen. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Dann, M. E. (ed.). 1971. *The Black Press, 1827-1890: The Quest for National Identity*. New York: G. P. Putnam and Sons.

Darwin, C. [1859] 2009. *On the Origin of Species, or, the Preservation of Favored Race in the Struggle for Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davidson, D. [1970] 1973. "The Furious Passage of the Black Graduate Student." In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

Davis, A., B. Gardner, and M. Gardner. [1941] 1965. *Deep South: A Social Anthropology Study of Caste and Class*. Chicago: The University of Chicago.

Davis, A. and B. Graham. 1995. *The Supreme Court, Race and Civil Rights*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Deegan, M. J. [1988] 1990. *Jane Addams and the Men of the Chicago School, 1892-1918*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

---. 2002. *Race, Hull-House, and the University of Chicago: A New Conscious Against Evil*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Delany, M. 1852. *Conditions, Elevation, Emigration and Destiny of the Colored People of the United States*. Philadelphia: King and Baird.

---. 1879. *Principles of Ethnology: The Origin of Races and Color with an Archaeological Compendium and Egyptian Civilization from Years of Careful Examination and Enquiry.* Philadelphia: King and Baird.

Delgado, R. and J. Stefancic (eds.). 1998. *The Latino Condition: A Critical Reader*. New York: New York University Press.

Dennis, R. M. (ed.). 1996. "Continuities and Discontinuities in the Social and Political Thought of W.E.B. Du Bois." In *W.E.B. Du Bois: The Scholar as Activist, Research in Race and Ethnic Relations, Volume 9*, edited by R. M. Dennis. Greenwich: JAI Press Inc.

---. [1996] 2003a. "W.E.B. Du Bois's Concept of Double Consciousness." In *Race and Ethnicity: Comparative and Theoretical Approaches*, edited by J. Stone and R. M. Dennis. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

---. 2003b. "Towards a Theory of Dual Marginality: Dual Marginality and the Dispossessed." *Ideaz, Volume* 2(1):21-31.

---. 2005. *Marginality, Power and Social Structure: Issues in Race, Class, and Gender Analysis*, *Research in Race and Ethnic Relations, Volume 12*. Oxford: JAI Press.

Diop, C. 1974. *The African Origin of Civilization: Myth or Reality*. Mercer Cook, editor. Chicago: Lawrence Hill.

Dollard, J. [1937] 1957. *Cast and Class in a Southern Town*. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday Anchor Books.

Douglass, F. [1852] 1855. "What To the Slave Is the Fourth of July?" In *My Bondage and My Freedom*. New York: Dover Publications

---. 1855. *My Bondage and My Freedom*. New York: Dover Publications.

--. [1889] 1992. "The Nation's Problem." In *Africa-American Social and Political Thought*, edited by H. Brotz. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Doyle, B. W. 1936. "The Etiquette of Race Relations---Past, Present, and Future." *Journal of Negro Education* V (April):191-208.

Drake, S. C. 1941. *Deep South. A Social Anthropological Study of Caste and Class*. Chicago: University of. Chicago Press.

---. [1987] 1991. *Black Folk Here and There*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Center for African Studies.

---. 1995. *Africa and The Black Diaspora*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Drake, S. C. and H. Clayton. [1945] 1962. *Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City*. New York: Harper and Row.

D'Souza, D. 1995. *The End of Racism*. New York: Free Press.

Dubois, L. and J. D. Garrigus. 2006. *Slave Revolution in the Caribbean, 1789-1804*. Bedford: St. Martin's Press.

Du Bois, W. E. B. [1887] 1985. "Letter." In *Against Racism: Unpublished Essays, Papers, Addresses, 1887-1961*, edited by H. Aptheker. Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press.

---. [1895-1947] 2008. "Atlanta University Studies", WEB DuBois.org, http://www.webdubois.org/wdb-AtlUniv.html.

---. 1896. *The Suppression of the African Slave Trade to the United States of America, 1638-1870*. New York: Longmans, Green.

---. [1897] 1971. "The Conservation of the Races." In *The Seventh Son: The Thought and Writings of W.E.B. Du Bois*, edited by J. Lester. New York: Vintage.

---. 1898a. "The Study of the Negro Problems." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* XI (January):1-23.

---. 1898b. "The Negroes of Farmville, Virginia: A Social Study." *The Bulletin of the Department of Labor* 14 (January).

---. 1899[1996]. *The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study*, edited by Elijah Anderson. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

---. 1900[1996]. "The Present Outlook for the Darker Races of Mankind." In *The Oxford W.E.B. Du Bois Reader*, edited by Eric Sundquist. New York: Oxford University Press.

---. [1900 ?] 1985. "The Spirit of Modern Europe." In *Against Racism: Unpublished Essays, Papers, Addresses, 1887-1961*, edited by H. Aptheker. Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press.

---. [1903] 1995. *The Souls of Black Folk*. New York: Penguin Books.

---. [1905] 1986. "The Niagara Movement: Declaration of Principles." In *Pamphlets and Leaflets by W.E.B. Du Bois*, edited by H. Aptheker. White Plains, NY: Kraus-Thomson.

---. 1909. *John Brown*. Philadelphia: George W. Jacobs.

---. [1909] 1985. "Our Policy" and "National Negro Conference." In *Writings in Periodicals Edited by W.E.B. Du Bois: Selections from The Horizon*, edited by H. Aptheker. White Plains, NY: Kraus-Thomson.

---. [1910] 1985. "The Temptation." In *Writings in Periodicals Edited by W.E.B. Du Bois: Selections from The Horizon*, edited by H. Aptheker. White Plains, NY: Kraus-Thomson.

---. [1911-1933] 1983. *Writings in Periodicals Edited by W.E.B. Du Bois: Selections from the "Crisis," Volumes 1-2*, edited by H. Aptheker. Millwood, NY: Kraus-Thomson.

---. [1913] 1970a. "Socialism and the Negro Problem." In *WEB Du Bois Speaks: Speeches and Addresses, 1920-1963*, edited by P. Foner, with a tribute by Dr. M. L. K. King (Jr.). New York: Pathfinder Press.

---. [1920] 1999. *Darkwater: Voice From Within the Veil*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications.

---. 1924. *The Gift of Black Folks: Negroes in the Making of America*. Boston: Stratford.

---. 1930a. *Africa—Its Place in Modern History*. Girad: Haldeman-Julius.

---. 1930b. *Africa---Its Geography, People, and Products*. Girad: Haldeman-Julius.

---. [1934-1944] 1976. *The Correspondence of W.E.B. Du Bois, Volume II*, edited by H. Aptheker. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

---. [1935] 1998. *Black Reconstruction in America: An Essay toward a History of the Part which Black Folk Played in the Attempt to Reconstruct Democracy in America, 1860-1880*. New York: The Free Press.

---. [1939] 1993. *Black Folk: Then and Now*. Millwood, NY: Kraus-Thomson Organization.

---. [1940] 1986. *Dusk of Dawn: An Essay Toward an Autobiography of a Race Concept*. In *W.E.B. Du Bois Writings: The Suppression of the African Slave Trade, The Souls of Black Folk, Dusk of Dawn, Essays and Articles*, edited by N. Huggins. New York: Penguin.

---. 1944. "Prospect of a World without Racial Conflict." *American Journal of Sociology* 49 (March):450-56.

---. [1945] 1990. *Color and Democracy: Colonies and Peace*. Millwood, NY: Kraus-Thomson Organization.

---. [1946] 1996. *The World and Africa: An Inquiry Into the Part Which Africa Has Played in World History*. New York: International Publishers.

---. [1947] 1982. "A Program of Emancipation for Colonial Peoples." In *Writings by W.E.B. Du Bois in Non-Periodical Literature Edited by Others*, edited by H. Aptheker. Millwood, NY: Kraus-Thomson.

---. [1958] 1970b. "The Negro and Socialism." In *WEB Du Bois Speaks: Speeches and Addresses, 1920-1963*, edited by P. Foner, with a tribute by K. Nkrumah. New York: Pathfinder Press.

---. [1961] 1985. "A Petition to the Hon. John F. Kennedy." In *Against Racism: Unpublished Essays, Papers, Addresses, 1887-1961*, edited by H. Aptheker. Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press.

---. [1962] 1996. "Whites in Africa after Negro Autonomy." *The Oxford W.E.B. Du Bois Reader*, edited by E. Sundquist. New York: Oxford University Press.

---. [1968] 1997. *The Autobiography of W.E.B. Du Bois: A Soliloquy on Viewing My Life from the Last Decade of Its First Century*. New York: International Publishers.

Ducas, G. (ed.). 1970. *Great Documents in Black American History*. New York: Praeger.

Edwards, G. F. 1974. "E. Franklin Frazier." In *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, edited by J. Blackwell and M. Janowitz. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Egerton, D. R. 1993. *Gabriel's Rebellion: The Virginia Conspiracies of 1800 and 1802*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

---. 2004. *He Shall Go Out Free: The Lives of Denmark Vesey*. Lanham, MD: Roman Littlefield.

Elias, S. 2006. "W.E.B. Du Bois's Position in Sociological Theory." *Perspectives,* 28(4).

---. 2009. "Racial Discrimination: Origins and Patterns." In *Oxford Encyclopedia of Human Rights*, edited by D. Forsythe. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ellison, R. [1953a] 1964. *Shadow and Act.* New York: Vintage Books.

---. [1953b] 1973. "An American Dilemma: A Review." In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

Engels, F. [1894] 1959. "Supplement." In *Capital, Volume III*, by K. Marx. Moscow: Institute of Marxism-Leninism.

Equiano, O. [1791] 2004. In *The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano or Gustavus Vasa, The African*, edited by S. Eversley. New York: Modern Library.

Evans-Pritchard, E. E. 1970. *The Sociology of Comte: An Appreciation*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Fanon, F. [1952] 1967. *Black Skin, White Masks*, translated by C. Markmann. New York: Grove Press.

---. [1961] 2004. *The Wretched of the Earth*, translated by R. Philcox. New York: Grove Press.

---. [1964] 1967. *Toward an African Revolution: Political Essays*, translated by Haakon Chevalier. New York: Grove Press.

Faris, R. E. L. [1967] 1970. *Chicago Sociology: 1920-1932*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Feagin, J. R. 1986. "Slavery Unwilling to Die: The Background of Black Oppression in the 1980s." *Journal of Black Studies* 17(2):173-200.

---. 2000. *Racist America: Roots, Current Realities, and Future Reparations*. New York: Routledge.

---. 2001. "Social Justice and Sociology: Agendas for the Twenty-First Century." *American Sociological Review* 66:1-22.

---. 2003. Introduction. In *Darkwater: Voices From Within the Veil*, by W.E.B. Du Bois. New York: Prometheus.

---. 2004. "Heeding Black Voices: The Court, *Brown*, and Challenges in Building a Multiracial Democracy." *University of Pittsburg Law Review* 66 (Fall):57-81.

---. 2005. Foreword. In *Being White: Stories of Race and Racism*, by K. McKinney. New York: Routledge.

---. 2006. *Systemic Racism: A Theory of Oppression*. New York: Routledge

---. 2008. "Legacies of Brown: Success and Failure in Social Science Research on Racism." In *Commemorating Brown: The Social Psychology of Racism and Discrimination*, edited by G. Adams. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.

---. 2009. *The White Racial Frame: Centuries of Racial Framing and Counter-Framing*. New York: Routledge.

Feagin, J. R. and P. Batur-Vanderlippe. 1999. *The Global Color Line: Racial and Ethnic Inequality and Strife from a Global Perspective*. Research on Politics and Society. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Feagin, J. R., H. Vera, and P. Batur. [1995] 2001. *White Racism: The Basic*. New York: Routledge.

Feagin, J. R., H. Vera. [2001] 2008. *Liberation Sociology*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.

Feagin, J. R., S. Elias, and J. Mueller. Forthcoming. 2009. "Social Justice and Critical Public Sociology." In *Handbook of Public Sociology: Toward a Holistic Sociology*, edited by V. Jeffries. Lanham, MD: Roman and Littlefield.

Fenelon, J. V. 1998. *Culturicide, Resistance, and Survival of the Lakota ("Sioux Nation")*. New York: Routledge.

Fitzhugh, G. [1854] 1965. *Sociology for the South*. New York: B. Franklin.

---. [1858] 1960. *Cannibals All! or, Slaves Without Masters*, edited by C. V. Woodward. Cambridge: Belknap Press.

Foner, P. 1970. Introduction. In *WEB Du Bois Speaks: Speeches and Addresses, 1890-1919*, edited by P. Foner, with a tribute by Dr. M. L. King. (Jr.). New York: Pathfinder Press.

Forsyth, D. [1971] 1973. "Radical Sociology and Blacks." In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

Franklin, J. H. and A. A. Moss (Jr.). [1947] 1994. *From Slavery to Freedom: A History of African Americans*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Frazier, E. F. 1927. "The Pathology of Race Prejudice." *Forum* 77 (June):856-862.

---. 1929. "La Bourgeoisie Noire*."* In *Anthology of American Negro Literature*, edited by V. F. Calverton. New York: Random House.

---. [1939] 1966. *The Negro Family in the United States.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

---. 1947. "Sociological Theory and Race Relations." *American Sociological Review* 12 (June):265-71.

---. 1955. *The New Negro Thirty Years Afterward*. Washington, DC: Howard University Press.

---. [1962] 1973. "The Failure of the Negro Intellectual." In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

Frazier, T. R. (ed.). 1970. *Afro-American: Primary Sources*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World.

Fredrickson, G. 1971. *The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817-1914*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

---. 1981. *White Supremacy: A Comparative Study in American and South African History.* New York: Oxford University Press.

---. 1988. *The Arrogance of Race: Historical perspectives on Slavery, Racism, and Social Inequality*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

---. 2002. *Racism: A Short History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Freud, S. [1929] 1989. *Civilization and Its Discontents*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Gallagher, C. A. (ed.). 2004. *Rethinking the Color Line: Readings in Race and Ethnicity*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Garnet, H. H. [1843] 1970. "The Slave Musts Throw Off the Slaveholder." In "*Afro-American: Primary Sources*, edited by T. R. Frazier. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World.

---. [1848] 1969. *The Past and Present Condition, and Destiny of the Colored Race*. Miami, FL: Mnemosyne.

Garvey, M. 1986. *Message for the People: The Course of African Philosophy*. Dover, DE: Majority Press.

Gilroy, P. 2000. *Against Race: Imaging a Political Culture beyond the Color Line*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Glazer, N. 1993. "Is Assimilation Dead?" *Annals, The American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530:122-136.

Glazer, N. and D. P. Moynihan. [1970] 2001. *Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gobineau, A. [1853-1855] 1999. *The Inequality of Human Races*. New York: Howard Fertig.

Goldberg, D. 1993. *Racist Culture: Philosophy and the Politics of Meaning*. Oxford: Blackwell.

---. 2002. *The Racial State*. London: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gonzales, J. 2001. *Harvest of Empires: A History of Latinos in America*. New York: Penguin Books.

Gordon, M. M. [1964] 1979. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gossett, T. [1963] 1997. *Race: The History of an Idea in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gouldner, A. W. 1970. *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. New York: Basic Books.

Green, D. and E. Driver. 1978. Introduction. In *W.E.B. Du Bois: On Sociology and the Black Community*, edited by D. S. Green and E. D. Driver. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Grondin, J. 1994. *Introduction to Philosophical Hermeneutics*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Gubert, R. and L. Tomasi. 1994. *Robert E. Park and the Melting Pot Theory*. Trento, Italy: University Trento Publications.

Hacker, A. [1992] 1995. *Two Nations: Black and White, Separate, Hostile, Unequal* New York: Ballantine Books.

Hafner-Burton, E. and K. Tsutsui. 2005. "Human Rights in a Globalizing World: The Paradox of Empty Promises." *American Journal of Sociology* 110(5):1373-411.

Hall, P. [1797] 2001. "A Charge." In *Pamphlets of Protest: An Anthology of early African American Protest Literature, 1790-1860*, edited by R. Newman, P. Rael, and P. Lapsansky. New York: Routledge.

Hamilton, C. V. [1972] 1973. "Black Social Scientists: Contributions and Problems." In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

Hare, N. [1969] 1973. "The Challenge of the Black Scholar." In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

---. 1974. "The Contribution of Black Sociologists to Black Studies." In *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, edited by J. Blackwell and M. Janowitz. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Harris, J. (ed.). 1982. *Global Dimensions of the Diaspora*. Washington, DC: Howard University Press.

Harris, J. and W. D. McCullough. 1973. "Quantitative Methods and Black Community Studies." In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

Harris, M. 1968. *The Rise of Anthropological Theory: A History of Theories of Culture*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.

Hawkins, M. 1997. *Social Darwinism in European and American Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haynes, G. E. 1913. "Conditions among Negroes in the Cities." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* XLIX:105-119.

---. 1922. *The Trend of the Races*. New York: Council for Women for Home Missions and Missionary Educational Movement of United States and Canada.

Herrnstein, R. and C. Murray. 1994. *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. New York: Free Press.

Hill, M. and S. Hoecker-Drysdale (eds.). 2001. *Harriet Martineau: Theoretical and Methodological Perspectives*. New York: Routledge.

Himes, J. S. 1971. "A Theory of Racial Conflict." *Social Forces* 50(1):53-60.

Hofstadter, R. 1944. *Social Darwinism in American Thought, 1860-1915*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hughes, E. [1950] 1974. Preface. In *The Collected Works of Robert Ezra Park: Race and Culture, Volume I*, by R. Park. New York: Arno Press Inc.

Hughes, H. [1854] 1968. *Treatise on Sociology: Theoretical and Practical*. New York: Negro Universities Press.

Husserl, E. [1954] 1970. *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Jackson, G. 1970[1990]. *Introduction to African Civilization*. New York: Carol Publishing.

Jackson, J. J. 1974. "Black Female Sociologists." In *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. J. Blackwell and M. Janowitz. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

James, C. L. R. [1963] 1989. *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution*. New York: Vintage Books.

---. 1993. *American Civilization*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Janowitz, M. 1974. Introduction. In *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, edited by J. Blackwell and M. Janowitz. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Jefferson, T. [1782] 1989. *Notes on the State of Virginia*. New York: Penguin.

Jeffries, V. (ed.). 2009. *Handbook of Public Sociology: Toward a Holistic Sociology*. Lanham, MD: Roman and Littlefield.

Johnson, C. S. 1922. *The Negro in Chicago: A Study of Race Relations and Race Riot*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

--. [1934] 1996. *Shadow of the Plantation*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

---. 1943. *Patterns of Negro Segregation*. New York: Harper & Row.

---. 1987. *Bitter Canaan: The Story of the Negro Republic*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Johnson, C. S., E. R. Embree, and W. Alexander. 1935. *The Collapse of the Cotton Tendency*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Johnson, C. S., J. Nef, and L. Wirth. 1954. "*Phylon* Profile I: *Robert Ezra Park*." *Phylon* 5(3):233-240.

Jones, A. and R. Allen. [1794] 2001. "A Narrative of the Proceedings of the Black People During the Late Awful Calamity in Philadelphia." In *Pamphlets of Protest: An Anthology of early African American Protest Literature, 1790-1860*, edited by R. Newman, P. Rael, and P. Lapsansky. New York: Routledge.

Jones, B. 1974. "The Tradition of Sociology Teaching in Black Colleges: The Unheralded Professional." In *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. J. Blackwell and M. Janowitz. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Jones, C. "Review: *The Black Sociologists: The First Half Century*, by J. Bracey, A. Meier, and E. Rudwick." *Contemporary Sociology* 2(5):489-492.

Jones, R. S. [1965] 1973. "Proving Blacks Inferior: The Sociology of Knowledge." In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

Jordan, W. D. 1974. *The White Man's Burden: Historical Origins of Racism in the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Killian, L. M. 1994. *Black and White: Reflections of a White Southern Sociologist*. Dix Hills, NY: General Hall.

King (Jr.), M. L. 1968 [1970]. "Honoring Dr. Du Bois", *WEB Du Bois Speaks: Speeches and Addresses, 1920-1963*, edited by P. Foner. New York: Pathfinder Press.

Krupat, A. 2002. Red *Matter: Native American Studies*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Ladner, J. [1971] 1973a. "Tomorrow's Tomorrow: The Black Woman." In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

--- (ed.). 1973b. *The Death of White Sociology*. New York: Random House.

---. 1973c. Introduction. In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

Lal, B. B. 1990. *The Romance of Culture in an Urban Civilization: Robert E. Park on Race and Ethnic Relations in Cities*. New York: Routledge.

---. 1994. "The Celebration of Ethnicity as a Critique of American Life: Opposition to Robert E. Park's View of Cultural Pluralism and Democracy." In *Robert E. Park and the Melting Pot Theory*, edited by R. Gubert and L. Tomasi. Italy: University Trento Publications.

Lauren, P. G. 1988[1996]. *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Lawson, B. E. and F. M. Kirkland. 1999. Introduction. In *Frederick Douglass: A Critical Reader*, edited by B. E. Lawson and F. M. Kirkland. Oxford: Blackwell.

Levine, L. 1993. *The Unpredictable Past: Explorations in American Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lewis, D. L. 1993. *W.E.B. Du Bois: Biography of a Race (1869-1919)*. New York: Henry Holt and Co.

---. 2001. *W. E. B. Du Bois, 1919-1963: The Fight for Equality and the American Century*. New York: Henry Holt and Co.

Lewis, H. 1955. *Blackways of Kent*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina.

Lincoln, C. E. 1971. Introduction. In *Great Documents in Black American History*, edited by G. Ducas and C. V. Doren. New York: Praeger.

Lindner, R. [1990] 1996. *The Reportage of Urban Culture: Robert Park and the Chicago School*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Linnaeus, C. [1735] 1939. *Systema naturae*. London: British Museum.

Locke, J. [1689] 1764. *The Two Treatise of Civil Government*, edited by T. Hollis. London: A. Millar.

Lyman, S. M. 1972. *The Black American in Social Thought*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.

---. 1985a. "Henry Hughes and the Southern Foundations of American Sociology." In *Selected Writings of Henry Hughes: Antebellum Southerner, Slavocrat, Sociologist*, edited by Stanford Lyman. Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi.

---. 1985b. "Protestantism, Slavery, and the Social System: Henry Hughes." In *American Sociology: Worldly Rejections of Religion and Their Directions*, edited by A. Vidich, and S. M. Lyman. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

---. 1992. *Militarism, Imperialism, and Racial Accommodation: An Analysis and Interpretation of the Early Writings of Robert E. Park*. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press.

Lynd, R. S. and H. M. Lynd 1937. *Middletown: A Study in American Culture*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co.

MacKinnon, C. [1989] 1991. *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Marable, M. 1986. *W.E.B. Du Bois: Black Radical Democrat*. New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

---. 1996. "The Pan-Africanism of W.E.B. Du Bois." In *W.E.B. Du Bois On Race and Culture*, edited by B. Bell, E. Grosholz, and J. Stewart. New York: Routledge.

---. 1999. Introduction. *Darkwater: Voice From Within the Veil*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications.

Marx, K. [1851-1852] 1937. *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

---. 1853. "The Future Results of the British Rule in India." *New York Tribune*, June 25.

Marx, K. and F. Engels. 1937. *The Civil War in the United States*. New York: International Publishers.

--. [1848] 1998. *Communist Manifestos*. New York: Signet Classic.

---. 1959. *On Colonialism*. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House.

Massey, D. and N. A. Denton. [1993] 1996. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Matthews, F. H. 1977. *Quest for an American Sociology: Robert E. Park and the Chicago School*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.

McKee J. 1993. *Sociology and the Race Problem: The Failure of a Perspective*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

McQueen, A. 1977. "Review of *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspective*, by J. Blackwell and M. Janowitz." *Contemporary Sociology* 6(1):71-3.

Meier, A. 1977. "Review: Black Sociologists in White America." *Social Forces* 56(1):259-70.

---. 1991. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Miller, K. 1908. *Race Adjustment: Essays on the Negro in America*. New York: Neale Publishing Co.

---. 1968. *Radicals and Conservatives and Other Essays on the Negro in America*. New York: Schocken Books.

Mills, C. 1997. *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Morgan, P. and S. Hawkins. 2006. *Black Experience and the Empire*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Morris, A. 2007. "Sociology of Race: The Path Not Taken." In *Sociology in America: A History*, edited by C. Calhoun. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Moses, W. J. 2004. *Creative Conflict in African American Thought: Frederick Douglass, Alexander Crummell, Booker T. Washington, W.E.B. Du Bois, and Marcus Garvey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moynihan, D. and N. Glazer. [1963] 2001. *Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Murray, A. 1970a. *The Omni-Americans: Black Experience and American Culture*. New York: Da Capo Press.

---. [1970b] 1973. "White Norms, Black Deviation." In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

Myrdal, G. [1944] 1962. *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Newman, R., P. Rael, and P. Lapsansky (eds.). 2001. Introduction. *Pamphlets of Protest: An Anthology of Early African American Protest Literature, 1790-1860*. New York: Routledge.

Okpewho, I., C. B. Davies, and A. A. Mazrui. 1999. *The African Diaspora: African Origins and New World Identities*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Omi, M, and H. Winant. 1994. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. New York: Routledge.

Othello (B. Banneker?). [1788]. "Essay on Negro Slavery, Parts I and II." *American Museum* (November and December). In *Great Documents in Black American History*, edited by G. Ducas and C. V. Doren. New York: Praeger.

Outlaw (Jr.), L. T. 1996. *On Race and Philosophy*. New York: Routledge.

Palmer, R. E. 1969. *Hermeneutics*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Park, R. E. [1904.] 1975. *Crowd and Public: A Methodological and Sociological Inquiry*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

---. 1913. "Racial Assimilation in Secondary Groups: With Particular Reference to the Negro." *American Sociological Society* VIII:68-83.

---. 1925a. "Culture and Cultural Trends." *Publications of the American Sociological Society* XIX.

---. [1925b] 1967. "The City: Suggestions for the Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment." *The City*, edited by R. E. Park and E. Burgess. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

---. [1928a] 1974. "The Bases of Race Prejudice." *The Collected Works of Robert Ezra Park: Race and Culture, Volume I.* New York: Arno Press Inc.

---. 1928b. "Human Migration and the Marginal Man." *American Journal of Sociology* XXXIII (May):881-93.

---. 1931a. "Mentality of Racial Hybrids." *American Journal of Sociology* XXXVI (January):534-51.

---. [1931b] 1974. "The Problem of Cultural Differences." *The Collected Works of Robert Ezra Park: Race and Culture, Volume I.* New York: Arno Press Inc.

---. [1937] 1974. "Cultural Conflict and the Marginal Man." *The Collected Works of Robert Ezra Park: Race and Culture, Volume I.* New York: Arno Press Inc.

---. 1939. "The Nature of Race Relations." In *Race Relations and the Race Problem*, edited by E. T. Thompson. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

---. [1950] 1974. "An Autobiographical Note." *The Collected Works of Robert Ezra Park: Race and Culture, Volume I.* New York: Arno Press Inc.

Park, R. E. and E. W. Burgess. [1921] 1969. *Introduction to the Science of Sociology: Including the Original Index to Basic Sociological Concepts*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Peterson, R. 2005. "Marx, Race, and the Political Problem of identity. In *Race and Racism in Modern Philosophy*, edited by A. Valls. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Picca, L. H. and J. R. Feagin. 2007. *Two-Faced Racism: Whites in the Backstage and Frontstage*. New York: Routledge.

Powedermaker, H. [1939] 1968. *After Freedom: A Cultural Study in the Deep South*. New York: Atheneum.

Pulitano, E. 2003. *Toward a Native American Critical Theory*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Rabaka, R. 2009. *Africana Critical Theory: Reconstructing the Black Radical Tradition from W.E.B. Du Bois to Amiclar Cabral*. Lanham, MD: Roman and Littlefield.

--. 2008a. *Du Bois's Dialectics: Black Radical Politics and the Reconstruction of Critical Social Theory*. Lanham, MD: Roman and Littlefield.

---. 2008b. *W.E.B. Du Bois and the Problems of the Twenty-First Century*. Lanham, MD: Roman and Littlefield.

Ramos, R. 1977. "Review: *Introduction to Black Sociology*, by Robert Staples." *Contemporary Sociology* 6(5):596-7.

Rampersad, A. 1976. The *Art and Imagination of W. E. B. Du Bois*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Raushenbush, W. 1979. *Robert E. Park: Biography of a Sociologist*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Record, W. 1974. "Response of Sociologists to Black Studies." In *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, edited by J. Blackwell and M. Janowitz. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Reed (Jr.), A. 1997. *W.E.B. Du Bois and American Political Thought: Fabianism and the Color Line*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Reid, I. D. A. [1939] 1970. *The Negro Immigrant, His Background, Characteristics and Social Adjustment 1899-1937*. New York: AMS Press.

Renzo G. and L. Tomasi 1994. *Robert E. Park and the Melting Pot Theory*. Trento: Italy: University Trento Publications.

Robbins, R. 1974. "Charles S. Johnson." In *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, edited by J. Blackwell and M. Janowitz. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Rodney, W. 1991. *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. Washington, DC: Howard University Press.

Rodriguez, R. 2002. *Brown: The Last Discovery of America*. New York: Viking.

Roediger, D. [1991] 1999. *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*. London: Verso.

---. 2006. *Working Toward Whiteness: How America's Immigrants Became White: The Strange Journey from Ellis Island to the Suburbs*. New York: Basic Books.

Roof, W. C. 1975. "Review: The Death of White Sociology, by Joyce Ladner." *Contemporary Sociology* 4(1):42-3.

Rudwick, E. [1960] 1982. *W.E.B. Du Bois: Voice of the Black Protest Movement*. Urbana, IL: The University of Illinois Press.

---. 1974. "W.E.B. Du Bois as Sociologist." In *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, edited by J. Blackwell and M. Janowitz. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Said, E. 1979. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

---. 1994. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Saunders, C. [1970] 1973. "Assessing Race Relations Research." In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

Sawyer, E. 1973. "Methodological Problems in Studying the So-Called 'Deviant' Communities." In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

Scott, J. 1973. "Black Science and Nation-Building." In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

Scott (Jr.), N. P. 1974. "Review of *The Death of White Sociology* by Joyce Ladner." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 36(2):423-26.

Scott, P. B. 1978. "Review: *Introduction to Black Sociology*, by Robert Staples." *The Family Coordinator* 27(3):292.

Seid, O. [1831] 1925. "Autobiography of Omar ibn Seid, Slave in North Carolina, 1831." *American Historical Review* XXX (July).

Shils, E. 1994. "The Sociology of Robert E. Park." In *Robert E. Park and the Melting Pot Theory*, edited by G. Renzo and L. Tomasi. Italy: University Trento Publications.

Sjoberg, G., E. A. Gill, and N, Williams. 2001. "A Sociology of Human Rights." *Social Forces* 48(1):11-47.

Small, A. and G. Vincent. 1894. *An Introduction to the Study of Society*. New York: American Book Company.

Smith, C. and L. Killian. 1974. "Black Sociologists and Social Protest." In *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, edited by J. Blackwell and M. Janowitz. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Smith, S. 1974. "Sociological Research and Fisk University: A Case Study." In *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, edited by J. Blackwell and M. Janowitz. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Smith, V. [1798] 2004. In *A Narrative of the Life and Adventures of Venture, A Native of Africa, but Resident about Sixty Years in the United States of America*. Whitefish, MT: Kessinger.

Sowell, T. 1994. *Race and Culture: A World View*. New York: Basic Books.

Spencer, H. [1851] 1886. *Social Statics: The Conditions Essential To Happiness Specified and the First of Them Developed*. New York: D. Appleton.

---. [1873] 1910. *The Study of Sociology*. New York: D. Appleton.

---. 1876. *The Principles of Sociology*. London: Williams and Norgate.

---. 1972. "Letter to Mori Arinori." In *On Social Evolution: Selected Writings*, edited by J. D. Y. Peel. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Stafford, W. 1973. "Issues and Crosscurrents in the Study of Organizations and the Black Communities. In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

Stanfield (II), J. H. 1985. *Philanthropy and Jim Crow in American Social Science*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

---. 1993. "Introduction." *A History of Race Relations Research: First Generation Recollections*., edited by J. H. Stanfield, II. Newberry Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

---. 1994. "The Nebulous State of American Race Relations Theories: Anomalies, Paradigmatic Erosion and Decline." In *Research in Race and Ethnic Relations: Racial and Ethnic Politics, Volume VII*, edited by R. M. Dennis. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press Inc.

---. 2008. "The Gospel of Feel-Good Sociology: Race Relations as Pseudoscience and the Decline in the Relevance of American Academic Sociology in the Twenty-First Century." In *White Logic, White Methods: Racism and Methodology*, edited by T. Zuberi and E. Bonilla-Silva. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Stanfield (II), J. H. and R. M. Dennis. 1993. *Race and Ethnicity in Research Methods*. London: Sage Publications.

Staples, R. 1973. "What Is Black Sociology? Toward a Sociology of Black Liberation." In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

---. 1976. *Introduction to Black Sociology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Steinberg, S. 2007. *Race Relations: A Critique*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Stone, A. H. 1908. *Studies in the American Race Problem*. New York: Doubleday, Page and Co.

Stone, J. 1985. *Racial Conflict in Contemporary Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Stone, J. and S. Mennell (eds.). 1980. *Tocqueville: On Democracy, Revolution, and Society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Stone, J. and R. M. Dennis. 2003. *Race and Ethnicity: Comparative and Theoretical Approaches*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Suarez-Orozco, M. and M. Paez (eds.). 2008. *Latinos: Remaking America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Sundquist. E. 1996. *The Oxford W. E. B. Du Bois Reader*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Takaki, R. 1971. "Pilgrim's Progress of a Southern Fire-Eater." *A Pro-Slavery Crusade: The Agitation to Reopen the African Slave Trade*. New York: Free Press.

---. 1979. "'Warranteeism': A Vision of a 'Marx of the Master Class'." *Iron Cages: Race and Culture in 19th-Century America*. New York: Alfred Knoph.

---. 1998. *Strangers from a Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans*. Boston: Back Bay Books.

Thomas, W.I. [1921] 1971. *Old World Traits Transplanted*. Montclair, NJ: Patterson-Smith.

Thomas, W. I. and F. Znaniecki. [1919] 1958. *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*. New York: Dover Publications.

Thompson, K. 1975. *Auguste Comte: The Foundation of Sociology*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Tocqueville, A. [1835] 2007. "The Present and Probable Future Condition of the Three Races That Inhabit the Territory of the United States." *Democracy in America*. New York: W. W. Norton.

---. [1843-1859] 1908. *Correspondence entre Alexis de Tocqueville et Arthur de Gobineau.* 1843-1859. Paris: Plon.

Ture, K. and C. Hamilton. [1967] 1992. *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation*. New York: Vintage Books.

Turner, B. S. 1993. "Outline of a Theory of Human Rights." *Sociology* 27(3):489-511.

Turner, J. [1969] 1973. "The Sociology of Black Nationalism." In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York Random House.

---. 1978. "The Founding Fathers of American Sociology: An Examination of Their Sociological Theories of Race Relations." *Journal of Black Studies* 9(1):3-14.

Turner, R. 1967. Introduction. *Robert E. Park: On Social Control and Collective Behavior*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Ullman, V. 1971. *Martin R. Delany: The Beginnings of Black Nationalism*. Boston: Beacon Press.

United Nations. 1965. General Assembly Resolution 2106 (XX) of 21 December 1965, International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Office for the High Commissioner of Human Rights' Website, http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/d_icerd.htm.

---. [1945] 2008. "Preamble", Declaration of Human Rights, United Nations' Website, http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html.

Vander Zanden, J. W. 1967. "Sociological Studies." In *Race and Racism: A Comparative Perspective*, edited by P. van den Berghe. New York: John Wiley.

Vidich, A. and S. Lyman. 1985. *American Sociology: Worldly Rejections of Religion and Their Directions*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Wacker, R. F. 1976. "An American Dilemma: The Racial Theories of Robert E. Park and Gunnar Myrdal." *Phylon: The Atlanta University Review of Race and Culture*, 37(2):117-25.

Walker, D. [1829] 1970. *Walker's Appeal, in Four Articles; Together with a Preamble, to the Coloured Citizens of the World, but in Particular, and Very Expressly, to Those of the United States of America*. In *Great Documents in Black American History*, edited by G. Ducas and C. V. Doren. New York: Praeger.

Wallace, W. L. 1974. "Some Elements of Sociological Theory in Studies of Black Americans." In *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, edited by J. Blackwell and M. Janowitz. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Walters, R. W. 1973. "Toward a Definition of Black Social Science." In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

Warner, W. L., J. O. Low, P. S. Lunt, and L. Srole. [1941-1959] 1963. *Yankee City Series*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Washington, R. E. 2002a. "Horace Cayton: Reflections on an Unfulfilled Sociological Career." In *Confronting the American Dilemma of Race: The Second Generation Black American Sociologists*. edited by R. E. Washington and D. Cunnigen. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

---. 2002b. "Sociology by Blacks versus Black Sociology: Revisioning Black American Social Reality." In *Confronting the American Dilemma of Race: The Second Generation Black American Sociologists*. edited by R. E. Washington and D. Cunnigen. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Washington, R. E. and D. Cunnigen (eds.). 2002. *Confronting the American Dilemma of Race: The Second Generation Black American Sociologists*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Watson, W. H. [1976] 2002. "The Idea of Black Sociology: Its Cultural and Political Significance." In *Confronting the American Dilemma of Race: The Second Generation Black American Sociologists*, edited by R. E. Washington and D. Cunnigen. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Watts, J. G. [1983] 2002. "On Reconsidering Park, Johnson, Du Bois, Frazier, and Reid: Reply to Benjamin Bowser's 'The Contributions of Blacks to Sociological Knowledge'." In *Confronting the American Dilemma of Race: The Second Generation Black American Sociologists*, edited by R. E. Washington and D. Cunnigen. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Weber, M. [1922] 1978. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology, Two Volumes*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

White, C. 1799. *An Account of the Regular Gradation of Man, and in Different Animals and Vegetables*. London: Dilly.

White, J. [1970] 1973. "Guidelines for Black Psychologist." In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

Whyte, W. F. 1943. *Street Corner Society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Wilkerson, D. Y. 1975. "Review: *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, by J. Blackwell and M. Janowitz." *American Journal of Sociology* 81(2):461-62.

Willhelm, S. M. 1973. "Equality: America's Racist Ideology." In *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by J. Ladner. New York: Random House.

Williams, C. [1987] 1996. *The Destruction of African Civilization: Great Issue of Race from 4500B.B. to 2000 A.D.* Chicago: Third World Press.

Williams, G. W. [1883] 1968. *History of the Negro Race in America*, 1619-1880. New York: Arno Press.

Williams (Jr.), V. J. 1996. "Robert Ezra Park and American Race and Class Relations." *Rethinking Race: Franz Boas and His Contemporaries*. Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky.

Willie, C. V. 2002. "Walter R. Chivers: An Advocate of Situation Sociology." In *Confronting the American Dilemma of Race: The Second Generation Black American Sociologists*, edited *by* R. E. Washington and D. Cunnigen. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Wilson, A. 1993. *The Falsification of Afrikan Consciousness: Eurocentric History, Psychiatry and the Politics of White Supremacy*. New York: Afrikan World InfoSystems.

Wilson, K. (ed.). 1999. *The* Crisis *Reader: Stories, Poetry, and Essays from the NAACP's* Crisis *Magazine*. New York: The Modern Library.

Wilson, W. J. 1974. "The New Black Sociology: Reflections on the Insiders and Outsiders" Controversy." In *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, edited by J. Blackwell and M. Janowitz. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

---. 1978. *The Declining Significance of Race: Blacks and Changing American Institutions*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Winant, H. 2002. *The World is a Ghetto*. New York: Basic Books.

---. 2004. *The New Politics of Race: Globalism, Difference, Justice*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

---. 2007. "The Dark Side of the Force: One Hundred Years of the Sociology of Race." In *Sociology in America: A History*, edited by C. Calhoun. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Wolter, R. 2002. *Du Bois and His Rivals*. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.

Woodson, C. G. [1933] 1990. *Mis-Education of the Negro*. Lawrenceville, NJ: Africa World Press.

Wright (II), E. 2002. "Why Black People Tend to Shout! An Earnest Attempt To Explain the Sociological Negation of the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory Despite Its Possible Unpleasantness." *Sociological Spectrum* 22:335-61.

Wu, F. 2003. *Yellow: Beyond the Black and White*. New York: Basic Books.

Young (Jr.), A. 2002. "The 'Negro Problem' and the Character of the Black Community: Charles S. Johnson, E. Franklin Frazier, and the Constitution of a Black Sociological Tradition, 1920-1935." In *Confronting the American Dilemma of Race: The Second Generation Black American Sociologists*, edited by R. Washington and D. Cunnigen. Lanham, MD: The University Press of America.

Young (Jr.), A. and D. Deskins (Jr.). 2001. "Early Traditions of African-American Sociological Thought." *American Review of Sociology* 27:445-77.

Zuberi, T. 2001. *Thicker Than Blood: How Racial Statistics Lie*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

---. 2008. "Deracializing Social Statistics: Problems in the Quantification of Race." In *White Logic, White Methods: Racism and Methodology*, edited by T. Zuberi and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Zuberi, T. and E. Bonilla-Silva. (eds.). 2008a. *White Logic, White Methods: Racism and Methodology*, edited by T. Zuberi and E. Bonilla-Silva Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

---. 2008b. "Toward a Definition of White Logic and White Methods. In *White Logic, White Methods: Racism and Methodology*, edited by T. Zuberi and E. Bonilla-Silva Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

VITA

Sean Elias received his Bachelor of Arts degree in philosophy with distinction from George Mason University in 1998. He entered Mason's Cultural Studies PhD Program where he earned a Master of Arts degree in sociology in 2005, with specializations in the sociology of race and culture. He has published articles on black American musicians, racism, public sociology, W.E.B. Du Bois, and the power elite. His primary research interests include studying how race functions in the social world and social sciences, 'third coast' Creole culture and zydeco music, and the social ecology of the power elite. He plans to publish works on these topics and transform his dissertation into a book.

Mr. Elias may be reached at Southern Methodist University, Department of Sociology, PO Box 750192, Dallas, Texas 75275-0192. His email is selias@smu.edu and cell phone number is 970.366.8833.