ROBERT EZRA PARK

Robert Ezra Park

RACE AND CULTURE

The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois

CHAPTER 9

OUR RACIAL FRONTIER ON THE PACIFIC

"The race relations cycle—contact, competition, accommodation and eventual assimilation—is apparently progressive and irreversible"

WHAT is taking place around the Pacific is what took place some centuries ago around the Mediterranean; what took place a little later around the Atlantic. A new civilization, or, as Ramsay Traquair puts it, a new Commonwealth of the Pacific is coming into existence. For civilization is not, as some writers seem to believe, a biological, but a social, product. It is an effect of the coming together for trade and for intercourse of divergent races of divergent cultures.

We may observe the effect of this impact of divergent peoples and cultures around the whole rim of the Pacific, as well as in the scattered islands that lie within its wide circumference. The present ferment in Asia and the racial conflict on the Pacific Coast of America are but different manifestations of what is, broadly speaking, a single process; a process which we may expect to continue until some sort of permanent equilibrium has been established between the races and peoples on both sides of the oceans.

In the course of the long struggle which began with the Sand Lot riots in 1876, and ended with the Exclusion Law of 1924, the Pacific Coast has formulated a policy with reference to the peoples of the Pacific, the effect of which is to set the people of Asia apart from the people of Europe and the rest of the world. This policy, now formally written into the federal statutes and supported by a long series of legislative enactments and court decisions, has come to have something of the character, in so far as it represents the deliberate

Survey Graphic IX (May, 1926), pp. 192-196.

intention of the American people, of a constitutional enactment. These laws have created on our Western Coast a barrier to immigration that is distinctly racial. Its purpose is not merely to limit but to stop immigration from Asia. It is as if we had said: Europe, of which after all America is a mere western projection, ends here. The Pacific Coast is our racial frontier.

All the problems of the Pacific tend to focus about this racial barrier. Will it be maintained? What will be its reflex influence upon Asia? Will it tend in the long run to give Japan the hegemony of Asia? What effect will the inhibition of Asiatic immigration have upon international commerce? Will it hasten the industrialization of Asia, now well under way? Will it give Asiatic states a common cause sufficient to guarantee united political action? Incidentally, it may be said that if America, the front door of Europe, is closed to Asiatic immigration, Russia, the back door, is wide open.

What follows is not to be regarded as an attempt to answer the questions raised. Most of them are, for the moment, probably quite unanswerable. It is intended rather to serve the purpose of what in natural science is called a *frame of reference;* it is intended to define the problem; to indicate the limits within which it is possible to think and estimate the consequences of specific acts and specific tendencies.

What are races and what are racial relations which racial barriers seek to regulate?

I. GEOGRAPHY AND RACE RELATIONS

Race relations are, or were, primarily geographic rather than human and social. The races grew up in isolation and acquired distinct racial characteristcs slowly by adaptation and by inbreeding. Man, like every other animal, has been and is a creature of his environment, even when that environment has consisted largely of other men. Biological and inheritable differences represent man's responses to the kind of world in which he has learned to live. They are, so to speak, his biological capital; the accumulations of successive generations of men in their struggle to live.

The tendency of man to achieve some sort of equilibrium between himself and his environment is constant. But this is merely one instance of that more general tendency which has brought all living things, plant and animal alike, into relations of vital interdependence. This

interdependence of all living organisms is what J. Arthur Thomson has described as "the web of life."

So close and complex are the relations of man and his living environment that the introduction of a new insect or the extermination of an existing micro-organism may change the course of history. It was not until the American Yellow Fever Commission of 1900 discovered the "yellow fever" mosquito, the *aedes calopus*, that the completion of the Panama Canal, which had cost the French government nearly two million francs and an unestimated number of human lives, was rendered practicable.

If it is impossible to predict the ultimate consequences of the migrations of organisms so minute and seemingly insignificant, it is certain that we cannot estimate the remote effects upon human life and human relations of the vaster and more subversive migrations of man. And this is true for one reason if for no other—because man is himself a carrier of disease.

Steamships and railways have effectually altered the geography of the world, and the barriers which formerly protected the races from one another have been swept away. With the multiplication of modern means of transportation, and with the increasing movement and migration of peoples, no part of the world is so remote from one another as to be secure from the invasion of the diseases of which man is the principal carrier.

Under these conditions race relations take the very elementary form of biological competition, which means the struggle to determine, within any geographical area, which race and which races are to survive. Some races have already disappeared, others are dying. The Moravians, the oldest and the most zealous of missionary denominations, maintain a mission devoted to the dying races. Most of these dying races are located on the inlands of the Pacific—Polynesia and Melanesia—or in the countries bordering it.

Back of every other objection and prejudice of the people of the Pacific Coast to oriental immigration is the desire to survive. They see the older New England stocks being replaced by French-Canadians and Slavs; they do not want to see the Native Sons of the Pacific replaced by Asiatics.

The fact is that for almost the first time in history the world has become "race conscious." We have in the past sought immortality in various ways, in our family and our clan, in our tribe and in our nation. Now we are seeking it in that somewhat mythical entity that we call race.

II. RACE RELATIONS AND WORLD ECONOMY

If racial differences are the effects of geography and isolation, civilization, on the other hand, seems to be a product of contact and communication. Every civilization, in extending the area of human intercourse, has invariably brought about new concentrations of population and a new intermingling of races.

This means that in the long run it is difficult if not impossible to maintain, in America or elsewhere, racial frontiers. All the deeper currents of modern life run counter to a policy of racial or national isolation.

One thing that has invariably tended to widen the circle of human relationship has been the very natural desire of individuals and peoples to effect an exchange of goods and services. Just because they are different physically and culturally, the races are useful to one another. The best evidence of this is the enormous expansions in very recent times of international commerce.

The effect of the steady expansion of international commerce has been to create over the whole earth a vast unconscious cooperation of races and peoples, such that a wheat corner in Chicago a few years ago caused a bread riot in Liverpool, and the price of rubber on the London market has been at times a matter of life and death to the native of Central Africa.

This world-wide division of labor, which every new device of transportation and communication has progressively made possible, and every new application of science to industry has made increasingly desirable, has not been effected without some costs and some disorganization of industrial and social life.

The effect upon European agriculture of the growth of railway transportation in America is an illustration in point:

> In 1870 the cost of transporting a bushel of grain was so great as to prohibit its sale beyond a radius of two hundred miles from a primary market. By 1883, the importation of grains from the virgin soil of the western prairies in the United States had brought about an agricultural crisis in every country in Western Europe.

The effect of the agricultural crisis in Europe was immediately reflected in the rising tide of immigration to America. If this immi-

gration since 1880 has continued to come in in an increasing degree from southern and southeastern Europe it is because these regions have not developed in the meantime the machine industries and the great cities which have absorbed the population in the northern European States.

What has already taken place in the region around the Atlantic is apparently taking place around the Pacific.

The expansion of trade has been followed by a vast movement of populations. The same motives and the same devices of transportation and communication have mobilized both goods and persons. It is natural enough that the same interests which have led merchants to sell in the highest markets and buy in the lowest, should—once the ties that bind man to the soil are loosened—lead the populations in overcrowded regions, with limited resources, to seek their fortunes, either permanently or temporarily, in the new countries of undeveloped resources.

The motives which have inspired Asiatic migrations are, on the whole, not different from those that have led to similar movements in Europe. Asia is, to be sure, not Europe, and the United States is no longer a country of open resources. Yet the population pressures in Asia, in the long run, provoke the same tendencies and the same migration as population pressures in Europe.

What, under all the circumstances, may we expect of the racial barrier on the Pacific Coast? We do not know as yet how far it will be possible to enforce exclusion regulations. As long as there is work that the immigrant, European or Asiatic, can perform better and more economically than the native population can or will, exclusion laws will make migration more of an adventure but will not wholly inhibit it.

For some years past there has been no adventure that has so inflamed the imagination of the European, and even more of the Asiatic peasant, as the great adventure of migration, and especially migration to America. The files in the offices of the United States inspectors of immigration contain the records of some of the most romantic episodes in the history of smuggling in any country. The earlier records are mainly those of the unsuccessful attempts of Chinese laborers to cross the American border, or they are the records of some enterprising tongman seeking to conduct a Chinese slave girl through the perils of the American customs office. But since the passage of exclusion laws, other races are, in increasing numbers, surreptitiously

crossing our borders. A new underground railway has come into existence.

Since the period of the fugitive slaves, there has been no chapter in American history just like it, unless it is that earlier and even more romantic episode of the slave pirates who smuggled African slaves into the United States.

The thing that is significant in this connection is that the competition of goods, which is an effect of foreign trade, tends inevitably to bring about a competition of persons, which is an effect of immigration. Finally, both the movements of goods and of populations seem to be merely aspects of a general tendency to redress the economic balance and to restore the equilibrium between population and food supply, labor and capital, in a world economy.

III. RACE RELATIONS AND WORLD POLITICS

It was inevitable that a world which had become, through the medium of international commerce, an economic unit, should eventually seek to establish a political organization capable of protecting international trade. In order that the continually expanding industrial processes might not be interrupted, it was necessary for the European states to find markets for their manufacturers and secure the sources of raw materials for their industries and for the rapidly increasing populations for which the industrial revolution had made a place.

The result of the colonial wars in Asia and Africa, and of the political maneuvers in Europe, has been to create over and above the economic organization of the world not a super-state, to be sure, but a political organization loose and ill-defined but world-wide. This political organization came into existence first of all as a result of exploration, conquest, and settlement. The two Americas are actually nothing but extensions of Europe, so largely have Europeans displaced with their populations and cultures the native peoples. In other regions—West and Central Africa, for example—political control has taken the form, first, of spheres of influence, and, since the world war, of political mandates. Where Europe has not extended its control by conquest and immigration, or by conquest without immigration, it has established a political control through the medium of international understandings and treaties. Whether we accept the existence of such an international government as the League of Nations, or not, there is no doubt about the actual existence over the whole world of a political

organization so complete that any future struggle between the peoples of the world is bound to assume more and more the character of an internecine war.

Within the organism thus established, it was inevitable that there should arise, irrespective of all other interests, a struggle of the subject peoples to be free and of the peoples occupying an inferior position to improve their status. Among the independent peoples, status goes by the name of prestige. For a nation or a people to be without prestige, is to be without status. Among the subject peoples status is defined in terms of independence or self-determination.

In a recent volume dealing with international and interracial relations, Herbert A. Miller has sought to describe what he calls the "oppression psychosis." The oppression pyschosis occurs when the wish or urge for independent action of one group, i.e., race or nationality, is frustrated and inhibited by another. This wish, urge, or will, as he expresses it, is "created to struggle." That is its function. "Opposition stimulates it to struggle harder." At bottom the struggle to maintain national prestige and the struggle for national self-determination are one and the same. They are struggles to gain, to increase and maintain international recognition and status.

One of the evidences of the existence of an international society and an international political order is just this fact of national and racial consciousness. Where nations and races are not at all concerned about their position in the "family of nations," political relations may be said not to exist.

But the demands that one nation, race or people makes upon another for consideration of its interests or recognition of its status are the very stuff of which politics is made. The fact that such demands made by one people are entertained by another implies the existence of an understanding, a law, a code, or rule of some sort, to which either party may appeal. The struggles of peoples and races for independence and self-determination have been, after all, but the struggles for recognition and status in an international or political order that is maintained by the common consent of the peoples involved.

That is the meaning of the nationalist movements which have made so much of the history in Europe during the past seventy-five years. That is the meaning, also, of the rising nationalism in Egypt, in Korea, in India, and in China. India, Korea and the Philippines want independence, or something as near that as it is safe to hope for in an armed world.

China, like Turkey, wants to be mistress in her own house. Japan wants, in the councils of the dominant powers, the status of a political equal.

It is for this reason that Japan insists that Japanese in America should have the same rights and privileges as European immigrants; the right to enter, to settle, and eventually to make her contribution, racial and cultural, to our present "racial and cultural pluralism," to use a phrase which has already gained certain popularity in the United States.

The Japanese government has been very explicit in regard to this matter. In a note of June 4, 1913, the Japanese ambassador declared that in the opinion of the Japanese government:

> The provisions of law, under which it is held that Japanese people are not eligible to American citizenship, are mortifying to the government and people of Japan, since the racial distinction inferable from these provisions is hurtful to their just national susceptibility . . . when that distinction is made use of, as in the present case, for the purpose of depriving Japanese subjects of rights and privileges of a civil nature, which are freely granted in the United States to other aliens, it becomes the duty of the Imperial Government, in the interest of the relations of cordial friendship and good understanding between the two countries, to express frankly their conviction that the racial distinction, which at best is inaccurate and misleading, does not afford a valid basis for the discrimination on the subject of land tenure.

The Handbook of International Organizations, published at Geneva in 1923, lists not less than 350 international organizations of various sorts. Of these, at least twenty are either organizations seeking to exercise some sort of political control, or they are organizations which seek to educate and form public opinion in respect to some matter of international importance.

The result of every conference and of every investigation in the field of international relations is to prepare the way for new agreements and new treaties, these being at present the only forms in which international legislation takes place.

With this continuous expansion of international communication and international politics, race relations have ceased to be a domestic problem.

The rigid enforcement of racial distinctions at home leads "oppressed" races to seek alliances abroad. The First Universal Races

Congress, in London, in 1911, is an instance. The Pan-African Congress, which followed, is another. Race has in recent years come to be what religion has always been since the dawn of Christianity, an interest which divides and unites peoples irrespective of national boundaries.

As far as concerns race relations, at any rate, the distinctions which we seek to enforce at home are complicated with the relations which we seek to maintain abroad.

The fact is that races and peoples are coming out of their isolation, whether it be geographical, economic or political. In a world in which every act, every significant gesture, reverberates around the globe, the concept of national independence, in the sense in which that word was once used, becomes a mere legal fiction.

IV. RACE RELATIONS AND THE MELTING POT

The distances which in the past have separated peoples and races have been not only physical, but moral and social. The races have looked at one another invariably with curiosity, but they have not always understood what was behind the faces into which they looked. The sense of distance has made them wary, and often a little lonely, in one another's company.

Social distances maintain themselves longest, but eventually they, too, give way. One of the means by which this change has been effected in recent times has been by the rapid increase in literacy among the masses of the people in all parts of the world. "In the great centers of Islamic life," it is said, "the shrill call of the newsboy is as much a part of daily life as the sonorous cry from the minaret," and in the gulf ports of Iran the most popular literature is likely to be a translation of a penny dreadful published in London. The introduction of universal education in Japan, the reform and simplification of the written language in China, and the multiplication of newspapers and journals in both countries, have opened for great masses of people new windows upon a world no longer bounded by the horizon of their earlier villages. The expansion of commerce and the rise of great cities have likewise accelerated the movement. The growth of literacy seems to run parallel to the growth of cities. In the cities, literacy ceases to be a mere luxury for a special class of intellectuals, and becomes a necessity for the common man. The common man cannot keep pace with the changes in modern life; he can not know how to

use the new mechanical devices which are constantly multiplying, unless he knows how to read. The amount of knowledge the ordinary man must have in the modern world in order to live, requires that he be able to get it through the printed page rather than by mere rule of thumb or oral tradition, as he used to do.

An incidental consequence of the extension of international trade and travel has been to extend vastly the use of these European languages which have become the medium of international communication in business, in politics, and in science; namely, English, French and German.

Just as there is a struggle, silent and often unnoticed, to determine what races shall survive, and what places, occupations and states they shall have in the new world society, so there is competition among the great world-languages to determine what form of speech shall survive and become the accepted medium of communication in what Graham Wallas calls The Great Society.

Life is more than food and shelter. Human beings, when they live at all, live in their memories and in their imaginations; in their hopes and their dreams. The ability to read, to gain visual impressions through photographs of other lands and other peoples; to learn through literature something of motives and human passions behind their strange exteriors, has enormously intensified the curiosity of every part of the world in regard to every other. These vicarious experiences have aroused new hopes, new ambitions, and stimulated the desire to travel and seek new adventures, in new and strange worlds.

This is today the most romantic period in the history of the whole world; not even the period of the discovery of America has influenced man's imagination more. And, still more significant, this flair for adventure in the modern world has not merely taken possession of the upper classes, the literati and the intellectuals, but has penetrated to the great masses of the people who in previous generations, and until very recent years, have been living in the peaceful seclusion of their peasant communities.

Migration has had the effect of an emancipation, upon most of the immigrant peoples. But books and literature have greatly enhanced the effects of these migrations. And now the printing-press has been supplemented by the cinema and the radio. The American films, with their realistic and thrilling pictures of American life, have transmitted to the Orient some of the restlessness and romanticism of the Occident. Particularly in the outlying regions and among the common

people, where America is more a legendary place than it is elsewhere, the effect of the American movies has been more devastating than elsewhere.

A few years ago the average man in China and in Japan got his most lively conceptions of America from two sources: the returned immigrant and the missionary. From the former, America acquired the title "the mountain of gold." From the latter, the oriental students sometimes gained the impression that America was a nation of missionaries. These sources of information have since been superseded by a press founded more or less upon western models; a press, at any rate, that is directed more or less to an understanding of the common man. But, as Walter B. Pitkin has pointed out, in discussing Japanese-American relations, the news despatches are no longer the most important sources of knowledge and understanding of the Occident by the Orient. "They are," he says, "little more than confirmatory of hypotheses which they [the Japanese] derive from another source so much more widely known in the islands, so vivid, and so copious that every other channel of knowledge has become petty in comparison. This source is the American motion-picture."

The films exported to Asia, to the West Indies, and to South America are largely of two classes: those which have failed in America because they were inferior, and, as Pitkin puts it, are "dumped on the helpless heathen, who can pay only the lowest rentals, and hence ought not to expect much," or they are films that have never been exhibited in America because they were forbidden by the board of censors. "The mildest description of these films," he says, "is unfit to print. Yet missionaries and business men both testify that they are being shown regularly in all the larger cities of Asia, and a high official of the government of India personally told me that the effect of these loathsome displays on the natives of that country was so evil that plans for a severe censorship were being considered, especially against what Asia knows as the American film." In Japan a censorship has already been established, and a similar censorship would be established in China, I am told, if China were master of her own house.

The cinema may be regarded as the symbol of a new dimension of our international and racial relations which is neither economic nor political, but cultural. But culture is merely the objective and collective aspect of the inner and personal life of individuals and peoples, and it is in men's minds and in their intimate personal experiences that the most profound and significant changes in the world are taking

place today. It is in the obscure, dream-haunted recesses of our inner lives that the future of the world is taking form and shape.

As long as races and peoples remained imprisoned within the limits of their differing languages; as long as we knew them only through records of their overt acts, communication was difficult and understanding not always possible. But the silent drama is now bringing the great masses of peoples, who have known each other only indirectly and at second hand, face to face. In the movies we see strange peoples in action, and these actions reveal to us behind their alien manners and foreign faces, passions that we can both understand and share; motives that we admire or fear or hate.

It is impossible to estimate at the present time the consequences which the realism of the motion pictures is likely to bring about in the relations of races and peoples. It has at least brought the ends of the earth into an intimacy unimaginable a few years ago. In this intimacy all that was individual, strange and peculiar in the customs and manners of different races and peoples has been brought into solution and is in process of change. If America was once in any exclusive sense the melting pot of races, it is so no longer. The melting pot is the world.

The really new factors in international and race relations are the devices like the cinema and the radio; these, with the rapidly increasing literacy, are steadily bringing all the peoples of the earth measurably within the limits of a common culture and a common historical life.

V. THE RACE RELATIONS CYCLE

The impression that emerges from this review of international and race relations is that the forces which have brought about the existing interpenetration of peoples are so vast and irresistible that the resulting changes assume the character of a cosmic process. New means of communication enforce new contacts and result in new forms of competition and of conflict. But out of this confusion and ferment, new and more intimate forms of association arise.

The changes which are taking place on the Pacific Coast—"the last asylum," in the language of Professor Ross, "of the native-born"—are part of the changes that are going on in every other part of the world. Everywhere there is competion and conflict; but everywhere the intimacies which participation in a common life enforces have created new accommodation, and relations which were merely formal or utilitarian have become personal and human.

In the relations of races there is a cycle of events which tends everywhere to repeat itself. Exploration invariably opens new regions for commercial exploitation; the missionary, as has frequently been said, becomes the advance agent of the trader. The exchange of commodities involves in the long run the competition of goods and of persons. The result is a new distribution of population and a new and wider division of labor.

The new economic organization, however, inevitably becomes the basis for a new political order. The relations of races and people are never for very long merely economic and utilitarian, and no efforts to conceive them in this way have ever been permanently successful. We have imported labor as if it were mere commodity, and sometimes we have been disappointed to find, as we invariably do, that the laborers were human like ourselves. In this way it comes about that race relations which were economic become later political and cultural. The struggle for existence terminates in a struggle for status, for recognition, for position and prestige, within an existing political and moral order. Where such a political and moral order does not exist, war, which is the most elementary expression of political forces, creates one. For the ultimate effect of war has been, on the whole, to establish and extend law and order in regions where it did not previously exist.

The race relations cycle which takes the form, to state it abstractly, of contacts, competition, accommodation and eventual assimilation, is apparently progressive and irreversible. Customs regulations, immigration restrictions and racial barriers may slacken the tempo of the movement; may perhaps halt it altogether for a time; but cannot change its direction; cannot at any rate, reverse it.

In our estimates of race relations we have not reckoned with the effects of personal intercourse and the friendships that inevitably grow up out of them. These friendships, particularly in a democratic society like our own, cut across and eventually undermine all the barriers of racial segregation and caste by which races seek to maintain their integrity.

It was the intimate and personal relations which grew up between the Negro slave and his white master that undermined and weakened the system of slavery from within, long before it was attacked from without. Evidence of this was the steady increase, in spite of public opinion and legislation to the contrary, of the number of free Negroes and emancipated slaves in the South. Men who believed the black man

fore-ordained to be the servant of the white were unwilling to leave the servants they knew to the mercy of the system when they were no longer able to protect them.

In spite of the bitter antagonism that once existed toward the Chinese, the attitude of the Pacific coast is now generally amiable, even indulgent; and this in spite of the nuisance of their tong wars and other racial eccentricities. The Chinese population is slowly declining in the United States, but San Francisco, at any rate, will miss its Chinese quarter when it goes.

There has never been the antagonism toward the Japanese in this country that there once was toward the Chinese. Even such antagonism as existed has always been qualified by a genuine admiration for the Japanese people as a whole. Now that the exclusion law seems finally to have put an end to Japanese immigration, there is already a disposition to relax the laws which made the permanent settlement of Orientals on the Pacific coast untenable.

It does not follow that because the tendencies to the assimilation and eventual amalgamation of races exist, they should not be resisted and, if possible, altogether inhibited. On the other hand, it is vain to underestimate the character and force of the tendencies that are drawing the races and peoples about the Pacific into the ever narrowing circle of a common life. Rising tides of color and oriental exclusion laws are merely incidental evidences of these diminishing distances.

In the Hawaiian Islands, where all the races of the Pacific meet and mingle on more liberal terms than they do elsewhere, the native races are disappearing and new peoples are coming into existence. Races and cultures die—it has always been so—but civilization lives on.

CHAPTER 10

EXPERIENCE AND RACE RELATIONS

Opinion Attitudes, and Experience as Types of Human Behavior

EXPERIENCE DEFINED

IN THE STUDY of race relations, we are concerned with more than the formal facts. We are concerned with experiences and with the personal reactions of individuals and races.

It is not sufficient to know what happened; we want to know how the transaction looked through the eyes of individuals seeing it from opposing points of view. If there were not racial points of view there would be no race problems.

What is experience? How shall we distinguish experience from other forms of knowledge? The same experiences may be data for both the historian and the sociologist, but these different sciences deal with these data differently. How differently and why?

Experience, in the limited sense in which we ordinarily use that term, as distinguished from other forms of knowledge, is concrete, personal, and unique. To say that it is personal is merely to say that it is the result of action rather than reflection. We may describe experience, from this point of view, as James Harvey Robinson has described history, as "the reaction of man's instincts and traditions to new conditions." [1]

To say on the other hand that experience is unique is merely to

Journal of Applied Sociology, IX (1924), pp. 18-24.

[1] See *Saturday Review of Literature*, August 9, 1924, "These Eventful Years," James Harvey Robinson.

say that experiences do not repeat themselves. We sometimes say that we had today the same experience that we did yesterday or a week before. This, however, is never quite accurate. We never have the same experience twice. An experience is like an historical fact; it always has a date and a location and it happens only once. Ideas on the other hand, as Plato first of all observed, are timeless and not located.

Experience is not fact, not even historical fact. It is merely A's or B's personal reaction to, and interpretation of, an event. Until A's experience has been checked up with B's and with C's experiences of the same event we would not call it an historical fact.

WHERE HISTORY AND SOCIOLOGY PART

This is, however, just the point of view at which the historian and the sociologist part company. The historian is quite as interested in the experiences of individuals, and groups of individuals, as is the sociologist, but for a somewhat different reason. The historian wants to know what actually happened. His material is, to be sure, the *naïve* narratives of the persons participating in the transaction. Out of this mass of circumstance he seeks to disentangle and interpret the actual transaction.

The sociologist is not primarily concerned with the event itself. He rather takes that for granted. What he is more particularly concerned about are the attitudes of the persons involved, as they are reflected in their very differing accounts of the same historical event. He is interested in anything, in fact, that will throw light upon these attitudes and make them intelligible. It is just this difference in the points of view of the different groups,—racial and political,—that he seeks to discover and record. It is not the event but the attitude—the individual or the group mind—that the sociologist, as distinguished from the historian, is seeking to describe and explain.

For that reason, any expression of those different points of view, whether it pretends to be fact or not, just so long as it fairly reflects the sentiments and attitudes, is interesting and important.

MYTH AND LEGEND AS SOCIOLOGICAL DATA

Much that the historian might characterize as myth and legend; much that is pure poetry, even gossip, so far as it reflects the dominant

attitude of the races and parties involved, may furnish material for the student of race relations—may, in fact, furnish material for the student of society. What is society, finally, but just this whole vast complex of human relations in which parties, races, and nations are involved?

The value of "experiences" to the sociologist is then that they are the sources, not the only, but perhaps the best, from which the student can gain a knowledge and an understanding of the attitudes of strange and unassimilated peoples.

Attitudes, however, are not opinions. An individual's own account of his attitude is his opinion; but opinions are after all largely what the psycho-analysists call a "rationalization." They are his explanations and justifications of his attitudes, rather than his actual "tendencies to act."

It is certain, at least, that every man's opinion becomes more intelligible if we know the particular circumstances under which it was conceived; particularly if we know also, the circumstances that have reaffirmed and intensified it. It is for this reason that, in studying opinions, we seek to go back to the point of genesis, seek to define the concrete circumstances under which opinions took form, and the motives which inspired them. Knowing these things we may say we not only *know* an opinion but we *understand* it. An opinion becomes intelligible in one sense at least, not when we approve of it, but when, knowing the *circumstances*, we are able to appreciate the motives that inspired it.

WHAT IS MEANT BY MAKING OPINIONS

To make an opinion intelligible in the sense here indicated is to discover and describe the concrete experiences in which it is imbedded. There is always some sort of complex behind every motor tendency, every motor tendency that is not a mere reflex.

To make an attitude intelligible it is necessary to study its natural history; to reproduce the circumstances under which it arose so completely that the observer can enter imaginatively into the situation and the experience of which the attitude is a part. This, at any rate, is the first step.

Reproducing an experience in such a way that it can be made an object of observation involves what Ellwood calls "sympathetic introspection." Let us see how this reproduction, and the subsequent

interpretation and *explanation*, actually take place. The experience *contains*, so to speak, both the event and the attitude. As students of race-relations we are not concerned primarily with the event. The event is what actually happened.

What actually happened is a matter for historical investigation. What the student of race-relations wants to know is: (1) the social situation, (2) the individual's reaction in that situation, as reflected in his experience.

What is a social situation? Well, it is always something more general than an historical situation. I may begin a narrative by saying: "I once had the experience of an earthquake in Java." The social situation here is defined by "earthquake," not by the fact that it was in Java, although the fact that it took place in Java may be found later to introduce some important modification in the situation that it is necessary to take account of. However, in general this is an "earthquake situation" and I go on to tell how I felt and acted in that situation.

Some one else relates a similar experience. The two experiences are different but they have points of comparison. The student of human nature is interested in this comparison, in the similarities and in the differences. He gathers from a comparison of these experiences something about the way people in general behave in earthquakes.

Here again the sociologist parts company with the historian. The historian is interested in these generalizations about human nature in so far as they enable him to determine just what actually happened in a given place and at a given date. The historian *interprets* the experience. The sociologist is interested in the particular experience only so far as it enables him to say something about human nature in general, irrespective of any particular time or place. The sociologist classifies the experience and so *explains* it. Let us return for a moment to our earthquake in Java.

If the experiences in the earthquake are peculiar and quite foreign to ordinary experiences, the student may want to gather a number of cases to see how true to type the individual cases are. Having found the type, he is interested mainly in the variations from it. The question he asks is: Taking account of the variations in the situation, how far can they be reduced to certain general types?

The procedure here is just the same as in any of the natural and explanatory sciences. We explain things by putting them under some

general category, classifying them, in short, and then discovering where we can, the reason for the deviation from type.

Of course, the situation cannot always be defined so simply and so explicitly as we have sought to do here. It might be described, for example, as "earthquake plus fire, general terror, and crowd excitement." The crowd excitement might have so intensified the reaction as to almost totally change it.

Most of the experiences of the alien and oriental population will fall under certain general and familiar categories, there will be certain modifications that need to be explained by further observation and analysis. The presumption is that they will be explained by differences in the situation. These differences may be (1) the physical appearance of the Oriental, (2) his traditions, (3) minor changes in the situation defined by time, place, and circumstance.

TYPICAL EXPERIENCES

The general assumption is that experiences are likely to be more intelligible than opinions, which are the inferences we draw from them. If we are able to reproduce the experience we will be able to appreciate the motives and share the feelings that entered into them. Ordinarily the behavior of another individual becomes intelligible as soon as we are able to reproduce all the circumstances, including perhaps the previous history of the individual involved.

Ordinarily explanation of an experience does not mean more than such an imaginative reproduction of it. If the thing is still strange, if it is still unintelligible, we need more details and we ask further questions. If, however, we can bring ourselves to feel how, under the circumstances, we might have behaved the same way: as soon, in short, as we can reduce this new and strange experience to some pattern that we are familiar with, it becomes intelligible.

The fact is, however, that as soon as we are able imaginatively to reproduce an experience, we have already classified it. Our general class or category, under which the particular experience is subserved, may be explicitly stated, may in fact be quite below the level of clear consciousness—still it is there and functions as a category.

When the class or general pattern under which the particular experience is subserved is explicitly stated, we have an explanation of the experience in the more formal sense of that word.

We may re-state the matter this way: We explain opinions when

we refer them to the attitudes of which they are a rationalization. We make attitudes intelligible when we are able to reproduce the experiences, in which they are imbedded. We explain experiences as we are able to reduce them to general types—types of human behavior —where behavior includes not merely the external act but the feelings ordinarily associated with it.

CHAPTER II

A RACE RELATIONS SURVEY

Suggestions for a Study of the Oriental Population of the Pacific Coast

I

THE PROBLEM DEFINED

THERE have been two, perhaps three, previous studies that clearly fall within the field of "race relations" as the term is here used. The first was made by Ray Stannard Baker for the *American Magazine*, and was subsequently published in the volume, *Following the Color Line*. The occasion of this investigation was the Atlanta riot of September, 1906.

In this study Mr. Baker sought first of all to go behind the newspaper reports and investigate the events that led up to the catastrophe. But he did more; he sought to discover what were the conditions which made such an outbreak of elemental passions possible. His researches took him a long way and his report is not merely the first authentic account of a race riot, but the first disinterested study of the peculiar character of the racial relations under which these social eruptions arise.

Thirteen years later a second and somewhat similar investigation was undertaken under the auspices of the Chicago Commission on Race Relations, appointed by Governor Lowden to investigate and

Journal of Applied Sociology, VIII (1923), pp. 195-205. EDITORIAL NOTE: This paper was written in answer to the question: "What is a Survey of Race Relations?" It is a tentative outline, intended to indicate and emphasize what is, perhaps, novel and unusual in studies of this kind, rather than an attempt to offer a complete outline for such studies.

report on the causes of the Chicago race riot of July 27, 1919. This is probably the most complete and thoroughgoing study of any racial group that has yet been made in the United States.

Race conflicts have their biological and economic aspects but it is the attitudes that they express and provoke which are of first importance.

The Chicago report is unique in one respect: more than any previous study it has succeeded (a) in uncovering the sources of racial friction, and (b) in showing the effects of these sometimes obscure irritations upon public opinion.

Modern medicine has made us familiar with the fact that the aches and pains from which we suffer are frequently due to infection from unsuspected sources. A pain in the back may lead a physician to examine the patient's teeth and tonsils. It is possibly true that many of the ills and pains of which the community complains have a more obvious origin, but human nature is quite as complicated as physical nature, and quite as much in need of study and observation. For this reason, a Race Relations Survey, whatever else it may be, will inevitably turn out to be a study of public opinion.

Other investigations which fall in this field are studies in Americanization, like those made a few years ago under the direction of Allen T. Burns. These studies attempt to throw light upon the processes by which the foreign-born and their descendants are incorporated into the economic life and the social traditions of American communities. The problems of the European and the Asiatic, though different in certain respects, are enough alike to be comparable.

What is then the specific problem with which a survey of race relations is concerned? Briefly stated, it is the problem which arises from the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of peoples of a markedly different racial type, as well as standards of living, entering freely, and without conflict, into the competitive cooperation of an individualistic and democratic society; that is to say, a society in which there are no generally recognized castes or class distinctions by which free competition is restricted. Competition is used here broadly to include not mere economic competition but competition in the indirect sense of that word—the struggle for existence of races and peoples.

The Oriental, partly because of his language, but more particularly because of his color, and other physical characteristics, is a marked man. Like the Negro, he wears a racial uniform which he cannot lay

aside. The effect of this is to intensify racial consciousness, both in himself and in the community of which he seeks to be a part. Race consciousness, in turn, produces racial segregation. It tends to set the yellow, as it has the black, man socially and economically apart from the other peoples among whom he seeks to live. The result is that the Oriental, like the Negro, rarely attains to a position where he is accepted simply on his merits, as an individual. On the contrary, he is invariably regarded as a representative of his race. Under these circumstances, outside of his own racial group, he almost ceases to be a person: he is likely to be regarded as another example of the species merely. And this, in turn, accounts for the fact that competition between Orientals and Occidentals ceases to be individual and personal and becomes impersonal and racial.

Racial competition leads easily, and more or less inevitably to racial conflict. The only situation in which the Oriental is able to live without prejudice is in some occupation in which he does not come into too direct competition with other members of the community. This exclusion, although not always formally and legally recognized, is enforced by the prejudices and public opinion that racial conflict engenders.

These seem, in general, to be the inevitable tendencies of the racial situation, and the problem for investigation is to discover how far, in spite of them, the different immigrant races, because of their differences in culture or organization, have been able successfully to accommodate themselves in the local communities in which they live.

The problem thus defined in terms of economic competition has its reverberations in political and in social life. All these are necessarily part of an investigation which seeks, not merely to describe but to explain, in terms of fundamental human nature, the existing race relations.

II

MATERIALS WANTED

Materials for the study of any immigrant group may be classified under four general headings:

1. Geographical distribution of racial groups i.e., Orientals, Mexicans, etc., (a) on the land, (b) in cities.

It is important to note (1) the changes in distribution of the different racial groups within the limits of the period within which each group has been a factor in the industrial life of the community, (2) present tendencies, (3) movement to or from the cities, or from one rural area to another.

Maps should eventually be made of the agricultural areas in which the races to be studied are settled. These maps should distinguish the type of organization of the agriculture in each area.

(a) Kind of agricultural product, i.e., citrous fruits, vegetables, etc.
(b) Irrigated and non-irrigated lands
(c) Large estates, resident owners
(d) Large estates, tenant farmers
(e) Small farms

A series of maps will make it possible to visualize these facts for different periods, exhibiting at the same time, (a) changes that have taken place in the organization of the industry and, (b) present tendencies.

Maps for cities should indicate to what extent the various racial groups are segregated and isolated, delineating, where possible, residential and business areas.

2. Division of Labor, i.e., occupations of the different Oriental and competing immigrant groups.

(a) First occupations
(b) Changes in occupations
(c) Occupations now dominant
(d) Present tendencies
(e) Extent to which business of Orientals is limited to members of their own race.

3. Competition, Conflict and Accommodation.

(a) With what native American groups are the immigrant races in competition: that is, as laborers, tenant farmers, land owners, business men, etc.?
(b) When and where have conflicts arisen: that is, where has complaint been made, and what, in general, has been the character of the complaints?
(c) In what region and in what relations have complaints been more bitter: that is, in relation of servant and master, employee and employer, in business, in schools, in the relation of neighbor, etc.?
(d) In what situations and under what conditions, if at all, have the several racial groups succeeded in reaching an accommodation with the native born American, so that they have been able to live and work on friendly terms?

4. Public Opinion.

(a) What has been the nature and how intimate have been the racial contacts in different geographical regions and in different occupations?
(b) What are the *sources* of irritation in the relation of the immigrant races with the native born population?
(c) What are the *actual experiences* in any of the relations that have been most exasperating and least tolerable?
(d) How far do the racial contacts and sources of irritation differ

for the different racial groups, i.e., the Chinese, Japanese, Mexicans, etc.?

(e) How far do these racial differences in attitude seem to depend upon the extent and character of the racial contacts, and, in general, upon the personal experiences of the individual, class, occupational or social group of which each is a member?

(f) To what extent do native born Americans differ among themselves in their attitude toward immigrant groups?

III

THE COLLECTING AND RECORDING OF MATERIALS

1. In general the materials for a Race Relations Survey will take the form of single documents, i.e., letters, narratives of personal experiences, newspaper clippings, detailed descriptions of individual cases, i.e., case-histories, autobiographical materials and life histories.

In addition to these it will be necessary to collect official reports, monograph studies, statistics, etc. In general, the latter are not difficult to obtain. It is the documents based on personal observation in which the experiences of individual groups, classes and communities are deposited and recorded that are important.

In general a study of this nature requires the materials that an historian might want, fifty or a hundred years hence, if he were to give a lively, intimate and authentic picture of the relations of the immigrant races and the native population of the present day. Such a picture would tell us not merely what took place, but how the people felt about the matter, and why.

2. The sources of such materials will naturally be:

(a) The memories of "old settlers," the first inhabitants, those who have lived long in the country and who have had experiences with the Indians, Mexicans, Chinese, Japanese and others.

(b) Employers of labor, business men, and those who have known the races to be studied in any or all of the ordinary relations of life.

(c) Farmers, laborers, and others who have come into personal competition with these races or have known them as neighbors or in business.

(d) Scientific observers, travelers, missionaries, etc., all those who have known the immigrant races in their own countries, and particularly those who have succeeded in establishing intimate and friendly relations with them, and can therefore assist in securing materials that would explain their so-called "racial traits."

3. A census of persons who have known the races studied in any one of the ways indicated is one of the first things to be undertaken. The names of these persons should be written on small 3x5 sheets, including notes on occupation, extent and character of their contacts and associations with the races studied, thus:

> Jones, Ralph, M.D., 1215 L St., Los Angeles. Owner estate 350 acres, San Diego County. Has employed Chinese, Japanese, and Mexican labor. Knows Chinese best. Remembers the Sand Lot agitation and is familiar with the whole history of the effort to exclude Orientals from the United States.

4. Case studies may be made of (a) City neighborhoods, (b) Urban and rural communities, (c) Small farms and farmers, (d) Estates.

Case studies should be first of all, "case histories," indicating how and to what extent the regions and persons studied have been affected by (a) the growth of immigrant populations, (b) the co-incidental expansion and reorganization of industry, (c) the arrival of successive racial groups, i.e., Chinese, Japanese, etc.

The case history should include, of course, any incidents that seem likely to throw light upon past or present race relations, or upon local opinion in regard to the several racial groups.

Particular care is necessary in writing out a case history to describe accurately locations, physical boundaries, etc., and to suggest the general social and historical setting. Names, dates, and addresses are important. Local personages who are sources of information should be characterized; differences of opinion, where there are two or more recognized opinions in a given community should be carefully noted.

A case-study should eventually be typewritten in three copies and each be given eventually the form of a single document. Names and addresses recorded in the case-study are confidential and should not be used in the final report of the survey except where permission is given.

5. Life Histories are in the long run the most important materials for the purpose of a race relations survey. A life history, for the purposes of this study, is the account which one individual is able to give of his own first-hand encounter, in a problematic situation, with members of another race. In such an encounter of the alien with the native-born and of the native-born with the alien the following items are important: (a) first contacts and impressions, (b) early impressions,

particularly those formed before the age of reflective thought and formal opinion, (c) later opinions and attitudes, particularly those based on experiences, (d) conclusions and reflections which these experiences have enforced.

A life history may be autobiographic, that is, one in which the writer tells his own story; it may be elicited and recorded by a third person through the medium of an interview. In the latter case the interviewer should set down freely his or her own impressions of the subject of the interview. In any case a life history should be anecdotal, a record of first-hand experience, and like the Padre's description of a confession, it should be "sudden, bitter, and complete." These are the sort of materials which throw most light upon race relations and the fundamental traits of human nature which, in the long run, not only determine the character of race relations but, at the same time, explain them.

6. Interviews should be recorded as far as possible in the language and reflect the accents and emphasis of the person interviewed. Answers to leading questions are usually misleading unless both question and answer are recorded in the precise form in which they were uttered. Formal language is an imperfect instrument of expression of attitudes, which are only adequately revealed in actual behavior. What one does is always the best commentary on what one says. For this reason a record of personal experience, in which action and sentiments are recorded as integral parts of the whole transaction, are the best indices as to what the attitudes actually are.

7. An attitude is a tendency to act. Individuals are frequently surprised and chagrined by their own behavior and this serves to emphasize the fact that individuals are not always the best judges of their own minds.

It is important, in recording an interview, to distinguish between attitudes, opinions, convictions, and theory, all of which are ordinarily recorded as opinion. Attitudes are formed quite unconsciously, on the basis of experience. Opinions, on the other hand, arise usually in discussion, in the effort of the individual to define and to justify an attitude already defined. Opinions are usually expressed in conventional phrases, and if formulated under attack, are inevitably framed to meet that attack. Opinions, therefore, are usually public opinion; they reflect the fighting attitude of the group or party to which the persons who hold them belong. Such opinions pass over into doctrines or theories, more or less philosophical in character. As such they

represent the efforts of the intelligentsia to rationalize the attitudes and wishes of the group to which they belong.

As Dean Inge has remarked, "Philosophy is always an attempt to find out, not what is, but what we want." A scientific theory, on the contrary, is an attempt to describe what we may expect to happen, irrespective of what we want.[1]

Opinions are of course right or wrong in so far as they are justified by all the facts, but we are very little concerned, in a study of public opinion, with the question of justification. Most opinions, as far as they are individual opinions, are justified by the experience of the people who hold them, and so far as they are not the opinions of a single individual only, but of a group, they will be justified by the tradition of the group.

Tradition is simply vicarious experience, which individuals inherit from other individuals. That is the reason why, in the study of public opinion, it is important to get the actual experiences upon which opinions rest.

In collecting opinions, or rather, materials spoken or written in which attitudes are directly or indirectly reflected, it is important not merely to state the opinion, but to indicate also the intensity with which it is held. As Lowell pointed out long ago, it is not merely the number of persons who subscribe to an opinion that counts, but the conviction with which they hold it, that determines in the long run whether one view or another shall prevail. It is the convinced minorities that make legislation.

The conviction with which men hold their opinions is largely determined by the character of the experiences in which these opinions are rooted. What one wants, therefore, in studying opinion is not merely the formal statements and theories which men advance to rationalize and justify their views, but something that reveals the sources and intensity of their convictions.

It frequently turns out, in disputes, that arguments fail to convince because words do not mean the same to the parties at dispute. One of the purposes of studying public opinion upon a particular issue is to bring the parties into the same "Universe of Discourse" and make them in this way intelligible to one another. Perhaps that is the most that such an investigation can hope to do.

---

[1] What Dean Inge actually said was: "The object of studying philosophy is to know one's own mind, not other people's. Philosophy means thinking things out for oneself." William Ralph Inge, Dean of Saint Paul's, *Outspoken Essays*, (Second series) Confessei Tidei, p. 1, London, 1923.

CHAPTER 12

POLITICS AND "THE MAN FARTHEST DOWN"

I

SOME twenty-five years ago, in the summer of 1910 to be exact, Booker T. Washington conceived the notion that he would like, for once, to get quite away from the United States and see what this America, in which he had been so long and so actively immersed, looked like from the outside. Accordingly, he took seven weeks out of a very busy life to visit and see Europe.

What made this journey unique was the fact that, though he visited most of its capitals, he did not, in the sense of the ordinary traveler, see Europe at all. So far from visiting the historical shrines and seeing the customary sights he sedulously avoided them, limiting his observations to the life and labor of what he described as "the man farthest down." His purpose was, so far as possible in the time at his command, to meet and make the acquaintance of the classes in Europe which, in respect to their opportunities, their handicaps, and their conditions of life generally, were comparable, not, to be sure, with the élite, but with the masses of the Negro people in the United States.

What Washington wanted to see abroad, and from the distance and point of view of Europe, was America, and not America merely but the American Negro. He therefore visited in preference the slums of London instead of the art galleries; hunted out the abandoned

Being "Introduction" to Harold F. Gosnell, *Negro Politicians* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935), pp. xiii-xxv.

ghettos of Prague and Cracow; explored the sulphur mines of Sicily and discovered in remote villages returned Polish or Italian immigrants. Eventually he published his observations in a volume to which he gave the title, suggested by his own description of the object of his journey, *The Man Farthest Down.*

Booker Washington's conception of "the man farthest down," it perhaps needs to be said, was not racial. He did not, at any rate, think of him either as a man foredoomed to be a hewer of wood and drawer of water, nor as one whom the oppression of a more favored class had reduced to a position of hopeless inferiority. On the contrary, with an optimism characteristic of other self-made Americans, Washington was disposed to believe that all men were predestined to rise and that those who found themselves behind were, in all probability, merely those who, like the Negro, had started late and were now, or would soon be, on their way.

In any case, the backwardness of peoples seems to be, on the whole, a historical and not a biological phenomenon. So conceived it loses some of the tragic interest ordinarily attributed to it. The Negro's case was not at that time and is not now as exceptional as it has sometimes seemed. There are, for example, in the Appalachian Mountains, on the high plains of New Mexico, and in the swamps of southern Louisiana, other peoples who have not yet emerged, or are just beginning to emerge, from their ancient isolation. They are, like the "Habitants" of Quebec, the "Pennsylvania Dutch" of Pennsylvania, and the so-called "Cajuns" of southern Louisiana, what Benton MacKaye calls "the indigenous and colonial" as contrasted with "metropolitan" peoples. They are, in short, the provincial peoples who have not yet left home to try their fortune in cities and centers of civilization.[1]

America and, perhaps, the rest of the world, can be divided between two classes: those who reached the city and those who have not yet arrived.

Now it happens that since Booker Washington went to Europe twenty-five years ago in quest of the man farthest down, there has been a great migration of the Negroes from the plantation and small towns of the South to the manufacturing cities and metropolitan centers of the North. This migration has brought about, for good and for all, a great change in the condition and in the outlook of the

[1] Benton MacKaye, *The New Exploration: A Philosophy of Regional Planning* (New York, 1928).

Negro people in America—a change that Washington, who assumed that Negroes were destined to remain for an indefinite period in the rural South—could not have foreseen.

In the cities rural Negroes have become involved in a competition —biological and economic—more intense and pervasive than they had ever known. On the other hand, in this stimulating environment the Negro has developed an intellectual life and produced a literature for which otherwise and elsewhere there would have been neither the occasion nor the opportunity. Finally, in the city the masses of the Negro have gone into politics.

When in January, 1901, George H. White, the last Negro member of Congress from the southern states, delivered his valedictory speech, the incident, although it attracted little attention at the time, marked the end of an epoch. Since that time the public—the public at any rate that gets its politics from the press—has become accustomed to the notion that the Negro was, humanly speaking, out of politics, if not for good and all, at least for an indefinite period.

The public was therefore surprised and a little disconcerted when in 1928 Republicans of the First Congressional District of Illinois elected a Negro to Congress. Still more surprising, six years later, a Negro was elected from the same district on the Democratic ticket to succeed a Republican. This shatered all traditions.

What makes this the more interesting and significant is that both Republican and Democratic congressmen were presumably elected by the votes of Negro migrants from the South, voters who at home had been effectively dispossessed of the franchise. The First Congressional District includes Chicago's First and Second wards, where Negroes constitute 58 per cent of the population, most of them comparatively recent arrivals.

It is still true of the Negro in America, as it once was of the serfs in Europe, that city air makes men free, and this is true in more ways than are ordinarily conceived of. The great cities are now what the frontier and the wilderness once was, the refuge of the footloose, the disinherited, and all those possessed by that undefined *malaise* we call social unrest.

This volume [*Negro Politicians*], if I might characterize in a word, is at once a chapter in the local history of Chicago and at the same time an account of the way in which the rural Negro, "the man farthest down," came to the city and got into politics.

II

The motives which, since 1914, have turned the faces of the Negro people cityward have been primarily economic rather than political. However, the prospect of regaining in the North some measure of the political power they had lost in the South undoubtedly did speed up the exodus. There are, besides, historical reasons why the ballot should have for Negroes a sentimental and symbolic significance, quite out of proportion to any positive value it may have had in the past or is likely to have in the future.

The Negro's first experience in politics was gained during the anti-slavery agitation which—so far as Negroes participated in it—may be said to have begun with the publication in 1829 of *Walker's Appeal*, an anti-slavery pamphlet which General Giles of Virginia referred to at the time as "a seditious pamphlet sent from Boston." Coming as it did as few years after the Denmark Vesey conspiracy in Charleston in 1822 and just before the Nat Turner insurrection in Virginia in 1830, its influence upon public opinion, North and South, was profound.

In the course of the anti-slavery struggle, which began at this time and in this way, Frederick Douglass, who had been a fugitive slave before he became an anti-slavery orator and journalist, played a leading rôle. It is probably the prestige he gained at that time, rather than the prominence he achieved afterward during the period of reconstruction, that has made him the one outstanding figure in Negro politics.

It was unfortunate in some respects, but not in others, that Negroes got their introduction to politics in connection with a radical and more or less revolutionary movement. It was inevitable that the abolition crusade should have created expectations that could not, at the conclusion of the Civil War, be suddenly and miraculously fulfilled. The failure of reconstruction to realize the millennial hopes it had inspired was the first and most tragic disillusionment which emancipation brought to the Negro.

It has been customary to refer to Negro politicians of the reconstruction period as if they deserved the contempt that a partisan public opinion has bestowed upon them. The fact seems to be that very few of them were the downright rascals they are sometimes described to be. Politicians are rarely either as noble or as despicable

as their contemporaries conceive them to be, and Senator Tom Reed's saying, "a statesman is a politician who is dead" is quite as likely to be true of black men as of white.

Not all Negro office-holders under the reconstruction government were either as ignorant or as incompetent as they have been represented to be. Among them were, for example, men like John Mercer Langston, who graduated in 1844 from Oberlin College, and Robert Brown Elliott, born in Boston and educated in England, who seems to have been, of all the twenty-two Negro members of Congress, the one man who could be described as brilliant.

Of the two colored United States senators elected at different times from Mississippi, Blanch K. Bruce had been a school teacher in Missouri, and Hiram Revels, after graduating from Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois, had been a preacher and lecturer before he got into politics.

Men such as these, who had succeeded either at the cost of a long and desperate struggle, or by the grace of some unusual good fortune, in getting any kind of superior education, were disposed to take themselves seriously and to be, if anything, a little too conscious of their responsibilities. In fact, if I might base an opinion upon men of that period whom I have known I should say it was characteristic of them that they put too high an estimate upon their respectability, and were rather more ambitious than would be true of the Negro intelligentsia of today to behave correctly and in what James W. Garner describes as "an Anglo-Saxon manner."

It was said of John R. Lynch, who was a member of the legislature of Mississippi in 1872, that he presided over the deliberations of the House with a dignity and impartiality to which, upon his retirement, even his political opponents bore testimony.[2]

Another reconstruction legislator, Hannibal Thomas, a Negro carpet-bagger from Ohio, was so shocked by what he heard and saw after he went South, of the life of the Freedman, that he was impelled to write a book describing "the insensate follies of a race blind to every passing opportunity."

The book is mainly interesting now as an evidence of the idealism of the politicians of the reconstruction era. It is characteristic of idealists that they expect too much of human nature and are hence

[2] James W. Garner, *Reconstruction in Mississippi* (New York, 1901).

likely to become embittered and pessimistic when they discover how far ordinary human beings fall short of what they expected of them.[3]

There were at the time, and there have been since, among Negro leaders those who shared the misgivings with regard to the future of the Negro in America which Hannibal Thomas has so candidly expressed, but they have not, as one might expect, been effective leaders of the masses. They have not been successful politicians.

Not all of the Negro politicians of the reconstruction shared the illusions of the anti-slavery crusaders. There were men like Isaiah Montgomery, the founder of the Negro town at Mound Bayou, who was born, reared, and educated on the plantation which he, his father, and his brother later purchased and conducted.[4] Isaiah Montgomery was the only colored man to participate in the constitutional convention of 1890, which adopted a constitution which effectively disfranchised the Negroes in that state.

In that convention he made a notable speech in defense of his race, which was so moderate, wise, and realistic in tone that it attracted wide comment at the time and was regarded of sufficient importance to be printed in full in the New York World.

The Negro politicians described in this volume are perhaps not as moderate and as considerate of white folks as they should be. They have very few illusions, however, in regard to the people they seek to represent. On the other hand, they are making no apologies for them either.

III

Reconstruction in the South seems to have passed through most of the characteristic phases of other revolutionary movements. There was a brief period of violence and exaltation, when the new order was introduced, followed by a longer period of adjustment, disillusionment, and general deflation.

Probably no one expected the Negro would be permitted, without a struggle, to enjoy all his newly acquired civil rights; but it was hoped that, having the ballot, he would at least be able to enforce in the new social and political order a consideration that he had not received in the old.

[3] William Hannibal Thomas, *The American Negro: What He Was, What He Is, and What He May Become* (New York, 1901).

[4] The famous Hurricane Plantation, located on the river below Vicksburg and owned by Joseph Davis, brother of Jefferson, President of the Confederacy.

As it turned out, the interests of race and caste triumphed over the interests of class and party. With the rise of the so-called Solid South, at any rate, Negroes lost their representation not only in southern legislatures but in congress. They continued to share, to be sure, in the federal patronage, but they ceased to participate, in any effective way, in local politics.

Meanwhile, in the ensuing struggle to enforce the Negro's civil rights and to prevent a more or less complete nullification of the reconstruction legislation, by interpretation, qualification, and legal chiseling, the battle-ground shifted from the legislatures to the courts.

It is not enough, it seems, that laws, like New York's resolutions, be solemnly proclaimed and inscribed on the statute books. They must, eventually, be enforced. In no other way can they be so effectively incorporated in the habits of a people and in the customs of a country as to be, relatively at least, self-enforcing. The courts must complete the work of the legislature, and until the law, as interpreted and enforced, has brought about what the psychologists might describe as a "reconditioning" of the people for whom it was enacted, one cannot say that the political process is complete.

The task of securing the enforcement of the Negro's civil rights was eventually taken up by the emerging Negro intelligentsia, led by men like Burghardt Du Bois, supported by the Society for the Advancement of Colored People, of which he was the founder. This society inherited the idealism and the radicalism of the abolitionists, but radicalism, at this time, amounted to no more than an insistence that the Negro should have, here and now, the rights which the new order promised but in practice postponed.

Meanwhile the masses of the Negro people, where they were permitted to vote at all, continued to support the Republican party. In this way they were acting in accordance with, if not in response to, the admonition of their number one political leader, Frederick Douglass. "The Republican party," he once told them, "is the ship. All else is the open sea."

The migration to the northern cities, caused by the shortage of labor during the World War, has resulted in a renaissance in Negro politics. The character of this new Negro politics seems to have been largely determined by the fact that, like other immigrants, Negroes moving northward settled first where they encountered least opposition, either in the way of high rents or social prejudice, namely, in the slums.

In Chicago, for example, the first Negro settlement was on Dearborn Street in close proximity to the old red-light district of the First Ward. From there they moved southward, along State Street, and eastward, into more spacious and respectable quarters, in the direction of Lake Michigan. In New York Negroes were mainly settled in Greenwich Village as late as 1880. Later they were numerous in and around West Fifty-third Street and the San Juan Hill district, notorious for the riots which occurred there in 1900. At present the largest Negro settlement in New York is in Harlem, from north of 110th Street. Negro Harlem has been adequately characterized in Carl Van Vechten's novel, *Nigger Heaven*, and in Langston Hughes' volume of poems, *The Weary Blues*.

The slums of cities, where people live ordinarily from necessity rather than from choice, are in many respects the most democratic of all the territorial units into which the urban complex finally resolves itself. Here, where neighbors are mostly strangers, there is likely, if anywhere, to be some sort of equality and a general disposition to live and let live not characteristic of more highly organized communities. It was in the slums and the adjoining territories into which the Negro migrants moved that Negroes first achieved a voting preponderance that made them a political power to be reckoned with.

It is significant also, that the migration of the Negroes to the northern cities took place at a time when urban residents were abandoning their homes in the center of the city for the more spacious suburbs. As these suburbs multiplied the abandoned and the so-called "blighted" area surounding the central business core steadily expanded. These areas are now largely occupied by immigrants and Negroes. The result has been that by a singular turn of fortune the southern Negro, lately from the "sticks"—the man politically farthest down—now finds himself living in the center of a great metropolitan city where his vote is not only counted but where, in various ways and for various reasons, it counts.

IV

Not all Negro politicians of the new era got their political education in the slums. Some of them have merely held office and kept out of the dirt. But in the crowded Negro quarter, where most of the voters live, there is always a good deal of vice and disorder, and the

men who owe their influence in politics to the fact that they have been able to get out the vote are likely to be on such intimate terms with the underworld that they are not received in colored society.

Some of them, like "Mushmouth" Johnson and "Teenan" Jones in Chicago, and R. R. Church, Sr., of Memphis, the boss of Beale Street, where the "blues" come from, who seem to have been political personalities before Negro politics achieved an organization, never quite emerged from the underworld in which they grew up.

Men who succeed in the jungle politics of a city slum are likely to be a hard-bitten, disillusioned, and cynical sort, not overscrupulous about police regulations, but faithful, on the whole, to their friends and respected by their enemies. Politics in the wards and among the lowly is more than elsewhere organized on a personal and a feudal basis.

In the case of Negroes, however, ward politics has assumed at times a dignity and importance it would not otherwise have had because it has been associated with the Negro's struggle for fundamental civil and political rights.

In any case, men of the sort here described, accustomed to the freedom and democracy of the city, are of a type different from the politicians of the reconstruction era, who grew up on the tradition of the anti-slavery movement and under the influence of the missionary schools.

They are, for one thing, not inhibited by the necessity of living at the same time in two different worlds, the world of the white man and the world of the black. Ward politicians are likely, in any case, to understand and feel at home among the people of whom they are the political shepherds.

If Negro politicians of the reconstruction era were, by temperament and training, idealists, the men who have recently come to power are realists. They are realists, for one reason, if not for others, because they are the products of the struggle to survive and live in a free and competitive world such as did not exist for most Negroes before emancipation. In this world, where every man is on his own, he is expected—whatever he may eventually do for the general good—at least to make an individual success.

From the Yankee school-ma'ams, who came South after the war to complete in the schools the emancipation of the Freedmen, Negroes learned, among other things, that they, like other Americans, were destined and expected to rise.

In the early days of freedom, when Negro schools and Negro colleges were springing up in every part of the South, General O. O. Howard, who as head of the Freedman's Bureau was more or less responsible for many if not most of them, visited Atlanta University. In concluding an address to the students he asked them what message he might take to the benefactors and well-wishers of the school in the North. Thereupon a small voice piped up: "Tell 'em," it said, "we'se aris'n."

The story, which has been repeated so often that it has become legendary, owes its wide currency at the time and since to the fact that it so aptly expresses the faith with which the Yankee teachers, more or less consciously, inspired their colored pupils.

"We'se aris'n" is, like the Declaration of Independence, an expression of the American spirit—the spirit most conspicuously manifest in the personalities, from Benjamin Franklin to Andrew Carnegie, of our so-called self-made men.

Nowhere has this American spirit—its optimism and its individualism—found a more complete embodiment than in the philosophy and the career of the author of *Up From Slavery*. At any rate, it is probable that no American was ever more convinced than Booker Washington that the main business of life was to rise and succeed. The future of the Negro—that was the substance of his teaching—rests finally on the ability of the individual Negro, each for himself, to make his way in the world. Only out of the struggle to rise will the race get the discipline that will make it master of its fate.

The secret of success for the man farthest down, is, as he put it, "to take advantage of his disadvantages."

The Negro politicians described by Gosnell, are, on the whole, men like that. They are, so to speak, self-made politicians. They are no longer obsessed with a sense of their dependence on Washington and the central government. They no longer regard themselves as the wards of the Republican party. They cherish no vain hopes and, like Margaret Fuller, they "accept the universe."

There is among the members of the Negro intelligentsia in New York and elsewhere a radical school of thought that gets its inspiration from Moscow. During the depression communist propaganda has made deep inroads in the ranks of the Negro proletariat. But the Negro politicians of Chicago are no more likely than Tammany Hall to go radical or indulge in romantic dreams about the future either of the country or the race.

The older generation of Negro politicians were very largely the descendants of old free Negro families, who have constituted, and still do, a colored aristocracy within the Negro race. But like most aristocracies they have been jealous of their privileged position, both within and without the race, and have been mainly interested in maintaining it.

Meanwhile, there has emerged a robust and vigorous middle class, men of the mental type of Booker Washington, and of the men of the Negro Business League which he organized. These men have more or less the attitudes of pioneers, men who have grown up on an advancing frontier—in this instance a racial frontier.

The Negro politicians who have risen in ward politics, as distinguished from those who still take their cue from Washington, seem to be, in most every case, of this type. They are not infrequently men of superior education and are active in promoting the interests of the race as they see them, but they act on the principle that the best way to solve the problem of the race as a whole is for each member to solve the problem as an individual. They are, in short, "We'se Arisers," who as a result of their conflict and competition with the white man have become race, rather than class, conscious.

What seems to be taking place in Negro politics, then, not only in Chicago but elsewhere, is a transfer of political power. A new generation and a new type of man has arisen within the ranks of the race, occupying a position between the traditional leaders and the masses of the Negro. It is upon this middle class that Negro political leadership has descended.

In sketching, by way of introduction to this study of Negro politics in Chicago, the story of the Negro's political adventures in the United States, I have sought, incidentally, to indicate the relation of Negro politics to some other aspects of Negro life which though significant are not so obvious and open to observation. In doing this I have been moved by the conviction that for most readers this volume [*Negro Politicians*] might have a double interest: First, because it illuminates the obscure region of local and racial politics; and second, because it adds another chapter in the career of the Negro race in America—a career which for sheer human interest, at any rate, is not equaled by that of any other element of our population, except the Jew.

CHAPTER 13

THE ETIQUETTE OF RACE RELATIONS IN THE SOUTH

A GOOD many years ago when I first became interested in the South and its problems I ran across in a little volume by John Spencer Bassett, entitled *Slavery in the State of North Carolina*, a reference to a legal decision by Chief Justice Ruffin of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, which set forth the character of the institution of slavery in such uncompromising terms that I have never since forgotten it, and I can still recall some of its more incisive phrases.

It was a decision, rendered in 1829, dismissing an indictment of a master for an assault upon his slave, the memorable thing about it being the Chief Justice's opinion affirming the master's right to inflict any kind of punishment upon his slave short of death. In support of this decision Justice Ruffin cited the fact that, in the whole history of slavery, there had been no such prosecution of a master for punishing a slave, and added, "against this general opinion in the community the court ought not to hold."

It had been said, the opinion continues, that the relation of master and slave was like that of parent and child. But this was a mistake. It was to the interest of the parent to give his son moral and intellectual instruction in order to fit him to live as a free man. The case of the slave was different. What sense could there be in addressing moral considerations to a slave?

The Chief Justice summed up his conception of the relations of

Being "Introduction" to Bertram W. Doyle, *The Etiquette of Race Relations in the South* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937), pp. xi-xxiv.

THE CAREER OF THE AFRICANS IN BRAZIL

DURING the years in which it has been a subject of discussion and investigation in the United States, the conception of what constitutes a race problem has undergone an extraordinary number of changes—one might say transfigurations. In recent years interest and research in the problematic aspects of race have centered about what is called technically "race relations." But new studies of race relations have invariably revealed new complexities in racial situations and have added new dimensions to the problem as originally conceived. The consequence is that with every new inquiry the conception of what constitutes race relations has steadily expanded until the term seems to include all or most human relations that have anywhere been defined and given formal recognition in the social sciences.

The most obvious and elementary of these relations are ecological and biological, that is, the territorial distribution of races and the inevitable miscegenation or interbreeding which changes in distribution inevitably bring about. The term also includes, by implication at least, all the special problems that emerge on every other level of social integration (i.e., economic, political, personal, or religious) as a consequence of the migration and mixture of races.

I say "personal" or "religious" because it is only within the fold of a family or of a religious society that human relations have anywhere assumed a character that can be described in any exclusive sense as personal and moral. Economic and political relations of individuals and of peoples are always relatively impersonal and external.

Meanwhile, a growing awareness of the complexities of the problem has been accompanied by a continuous expansion of what one may describe as "the racial horizon." As the world has grown smaller and our relations with other races and peoples more intimate, the race problem is no longer conceived either in the United States or elsewhere as a local problem or one that is limited to the Negro.

It is obvious today, as it possibly never was before, that race problems are neither a temporary nor an isolated phenomenon. On the contrary, it seems that, wherever European economic expansion has brought European peoples and the peoples or races of the world outside Europe into an association sufficiently intimate to produce a mixed-blood population, the resulting racial situation has inevitably constituted a race problem.

But race problems are not confined to colonial countries. Similar conditions, or at least conditions which make complete assimilation difficult or impossible, have produced in recent years, in Germany and elsewhere in Europe, a more conspicuous and more poignant instance of a race problem than the world outside of Europe has ever known. In fact, it is fair to say that if the race problem of the United States is pre-eminently the problem of Negroes, the race problem of Europe is and has been, ever since the Roman Empire first sought not only to conquer but to denationalize them, the problem of Jews.

Stated abstractly, and from the point of view of the Jewish people in Europe and the Negro people in the United States rather than from the point of view of the dominant majorities with whom they are associated, the race problem is that of a racial or cultural minority seeking to achieve, in a community in which it is regarded as in some sense and to some degree an alien, a status that is at once secure and unqualified by the stigma of any sort of inferiority. Elsewhere the race problem may take the form of a nationalistic struggle in which the native peoples, within the limits of an imperium where they have been conquered but not assimilated, are seeking, if not national independence, then some further measure of self-determination. This is the case of India. It may presently be, if the present German government succeeds in carrying out its program, the case of Europe.

The expansion of the racial horizon, which has changed and is changing current conceptions of the race problem in the United

Being "Introduction" to Donald Pierson, *Negroes In Brazil* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942), pp. xi-xxi.

States and elsewhere, has brought about—and this is particularly true of sociology and social anthropology—something like a reorientation of the social sciences, with respect to the race problem and to all that is ordinarily included under race relations.[1]

Social anthropology is, apparently, no longer regarded, to the extent that it once was, as a purely historical science, interested mainly in unraveling and tracing to their sources the varied threads that make up the cultural patterns of primitive societies.

Anthropology, as it has become "functional," has become less interested in cultural diffusion and more interested in acculturation and in the processes by which cultural traits have been not merely diffused but integrated into those larger and more complex cultural patterns we call civilizations.

Anthropology has begun, also, in recent years to turn its attention to contemporary social problems, including that of education. In England anthropologists have become technical advisers in colonial administration.[2] In the United States they are beginning to study "marginal peoples," that is to say, peoples who, under the influence of European culture, are now in the process, sometimes slowly but more often rapidly, of being assimilated and incorporated into an emerging world-society—the society which the expansion of Europe has brought into existence.[3]

The race problem has assumed new dimensions and new significance, likewise, with the recent researches of sociologists in the field of race and culture and in areas of observation and research immediately contiguous. Probably nothing has been more influential than the publication of the monumental work by W. I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki, *The Polish Peasant*, in directing the attention of sociological students to the possibility and the importance of studies in the field of race and culture. Thomas and Znaniecki were the first, or almost the first, to call attention to the fact that the situation of the European immigrant in the United States can be defined in terms

[1] R. E. Park, "The Nature of Race Relations," in Edgar T. Thompson (ed.), *Race Relations and the Race Problem* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1939), pp. 3-45.

[2] See G. Gordon Brown and A. McD. Bruce Hutt, *Anthropology in Action: An Experiment in the Iringa District of the Iringa Province, Tanganyika Territory* (London: International Institute of African Languages and Cultures; Oxford University Press, 1935). See also various papers on "Education and the Cultural Process," *American Journal of Sociology*, XLVIII, May, 1943, no. 6.

[3] See Robert Redfield, *The Folk Culture of Yucatan* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941).

that imply its logical relation to that of the Negro, even though the Negro, in the Americas, North and South and particularly in the West Indies, is not an alien or an immigrant but has become, in the course of some three hundred years' residence, an indigenous race intimately related by blood to the Indian who preceded him.

Perhaps I should add, now that I have mentioned the *Polish Peasant*, that it was the rather elaborate "methodological note" with which the authors prefaced that study which first defined "social attitudes" and indicated the way in which that concept could be used in characterizing local cultures as well as in measuring, in some fashion, cultural and institutional changes.[4]

If I have ventured by way of introduction to this study of race relations in Brazil to sketch the outlines of an expanding though as yet very little integrated field of sociological and anthropological research, it has been less with the purpose of reporting on the state of knowledge in that field at the moment than of indicating the context in which this study had been conceived and the place it seems to have in the sequence of studies that have preceded and which will presumably follow it.

In suggesting the possibility of future studies to follow this one, I am reckoning with two facts: (1) that Brazil is one of the more conspicuous melting-pots of races and cultures around the world where miscegenation and acculturation are obviously going on and (2) that a comparative study of the problematic aspects of race and culture is likely to have a special importance at this time when the structure of the existing world-order seems to be crumbling with the dissolution of the distances, physical and social, upon which that order seems to rest.

It has become fairly obvious that, in a world which in the midst of wars is steadfastly seeking peace, a stable political order can be erected only on a moral order that does not terminate at the boundaries of national states. The problem that emerges is this: How is it

[4] William I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (1st ed.; Boston: Richard C. Badger, 1918-20; 2d ed.; New York: Alfred Knopf, 1927). Herbert Blumer, *Critiques of Research in the Social Sciences. I. An Appraisal of Thomas and Znaniecki's "The Polish Peasant in Europe and America"* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1939). As an illustration of how "attitudes" have been used in measuring fundamental institutional changes see Alfred Winslow Jones, *Life, Liberty, and Property: A Story of Conflict and a Measurement of Conflicting Rights* (New York and London: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1941).

possible to establish and maintain an effective social order in a more or less completely urbanized, industrialized, and cosmopolitan world?

In the past it has been, in the main, the task of religion and more especially of Christian missions to create within the limits of an expanding world-economy a moral order and moral solidarity commensurate with the economic and political interdependence which the expansion of European commerce has brought about. But the totalitarian states have now apparently seceded from the ecumenical councils of international Christianity, and the task of re-creating a moral order that includes all mankind has assumed an importance that it did not have when it was regarded not merely as a religious but as a religious denominational enterprise.

It is obvious that studies of race and culture are destined to assume increasing importance in a world in which the ancient local and tribal cultures, as an ineluctable incident of the rise of the so-called "great society," are visibly going into the melting-pot.

One thing that makes the racial situation in Brazil interesting is the fact that, having a Negro population proportionally larger than the United States, Brazil has no race problem. This is, at any rate, what might be inferred from the occasional and apparently disinterested reports of visitors to that country who have ventured to inquire into the subject. Among these visitors there are two—James Bryce and Theodore Roosevelt—whose knowledge of conditions in the United States make their reports upon the situation in Brazil peculiarly interesting.

Viscount Bryce, whose "observations and impressions" of South America were first published in 1912, remarked that in Brazil, in contrast to the United States, the color line is nowhere sharply drawn and that "the fusion of whites and blacks by intermarriage goes steadily on." Mr. Roosevelt—Theodore and not Franklin Delano—who visited the country a few years later, is more explicit. He says: "If I were asked to name the one point in which there is a complete difference between the Brazilian and ourselves, I should say it was in the attitude to the black man."

This attitude manifests itself in the fact that in Brazil "any Negro or mulatto who shows himself fit is without question given the place to which his abilities entitle him." However, the most conspicuous difference—the "one real difference"—is "the tendency of Brazil to absorb the Negro." This tendency is, however, not merely a historical

and biological fact; it is rather an expression of a national policy, in so far as Brazil can be said to have a policy with respect to the Negro.

Statistics of population, which are never very accurate in this matter of race and less so perhaps in Brazil than in the United States, indicate that the number of Africans of unmixed blood is growing steadily less so that "with two or more racial crossings"—so say those Brazilians who are conscious of the Negro or concerned about his future—"the Negro blood tends to disappear." This so-called Aryanization of the African, from the point of view of Brazilian national policy, is a thing, perhaps one should say *the* thing, to be desired. The policy of the United States, on the other hand, from the Brazilian point of view, particularly in so far as it counts every man a Negro who, to use the census definition, "is known to be a Negro in the community in which he lives," tends to perpetuate "a menacing element"—menacing not to the racial purity of the dominant race but to the political and cultural solidarity of the nation.

As a matter of fact the attitude of the Brazilian people to the race problem so far as concerns the Negro seems, on the whole, to be academic rather than pragmatic and actual. There is a certain ethnological and archeological interest in the survivals of the African fetish cults, the so-called *candomblés*, of which there seem to be an extraordinary number, especially in and about the cities of Bahia and Pernambuco. This archeological interest in the African is evidenced by two successive *Congressos Afro-brasileiros* which met in Recife and in Bahia in 1934 and 1937.

Since most of these *candomblés* are living and functioning forms of African religious practices, although obviously in process of assimilation to the ritual and mythology of local Catholicism, perhaps they should not be classed as survivals.

In any case it is a somewhat bizarre experience to a stranger in Bahia, walking along one of the ridges where *os ricos*, that is, the rich folk, live, to hear from the palm groves in the neighboring valleys where *os pobres*, the poor folk, live, the insistent boom of African drums. So narrow are the spatial distances that divide Europe on the ridges from Africa in the valleys that it is difficult to realize how wide the social distances are that separate them.

It is even more difficult for those of us whose conception of the Negro problem and of race relations generally has been formed in the United States to comprehend, in all its concreteness, the racial situation in a country with a different history and a different tradition.

Comprehension in these matters is not something that can be achieved, it seems, through the medium of any formal statement. Insight and understanding come only with intimate and firsthand acquaintance—and not even then if those barriers which race consciousness invariably raises are not removed. That is why little children are likely in these matters of race relations to be wiser than their elders.

This observation seems pertinent here because, after reading the manuscript and proofs of this volume [*Negroes in Brazil*], I have come to the conclusion that the difference between Brazil and the United States in respect to race is due to the fact that the people of Brazil have, somehow, regained that paradisaic innocence, with respect to differences of race, which the people of the United States have somehow lost. I mention this fact, but I shall not attempt to explain it. The situation is complex and the explanations are only partial and not wholly convincing. One circumstance mentioned by Donald Pierson, I am, however, disposed to underscore.

Brazil is a vast country and has been colonized, as has the United States, by a wide variety of peoples: Germans from northern Europe; Latins, particularly Italians, from southern Europe; not to mention the original settlers, the Portuguese. It has been colonized more recently by Orientals. There are possibly some two hundred thousand Japanese in Brazil today. With the exception of the Italians, these different peoples have settled in more or less closed communities in widely separated parts of a vast territory. Dependent upon water transportation rather more than upon rail to maintain economic and political unity, Brazil has been haunted by the fear that the country would some day fall apart. Under these circumstances it has seemed that the security and the solidarity of the nation depended upon its ability to assimilate and ultimately to amalgamate its different immigrant populations. From this point of view the Negro has not constituted a problem.

The first task of this, as of every other attempt to study the race problem rather than to solve it, has been to define the racial situation in the country and in the culture in which the problem exists. But the author of this volume has done something more, it seems, than that. He has, as he puts it, given an account of "the career of the Negro in Brazil," and he has made this account a chapter in the life-history of the Negro outside of Africa, in what one might, to use a term that has been usually applied to the Jewish people, call the Diaspora.

The term "diaspora" was first used by the Greeks to designate a nationality, or some part of it, dispersed among other nations but preserving its own culture. The Negro outside of Africa is neither a nation nor a nationality, and, with the exception of Brazil, there is no country outside of Africa, so far as I know, where a people of African origin has sought to preserve African customs or African culture. Nevertheless, the attitude of Europeans has imposed upon peoples of African origin under European domination, either in or outside of Africa, a certain degree of race consciousness and racial solidarity. It has tended to make them a nationality.

Living thus, as Booker Washington once said of the Negro in the United States, as "a nation within a nation," the Negro has been subjected to extraordinary changes of fortune but changes that are nonetheless typical not merely of Negroes abroad but of other peoples who, in the interest of European commercial expansion, have been dispersed to widely separated parts of the world.

The diaspora, however, is no longer what it once was—an area of dispersion merely. It has become rather an area of integration, economic and cultural. It is in this sense that this history, I might better say natural history, of the career of the African in Brazil has sought to describe the processes by which the Negro has been assimilated and to measure the success he has had in finding a place in what was the diaspora but now is, to use Graham Wallas' term, *The Great Society*.

CHAPTER 16

RACIAL ASSIMILATION IN SECONDARY GROUPS[1]

With Particular Reference to the Negro

I

THE RACE PROBLEM has sometimes been described as a problem in assimilation. It is not always clear, however, what assimilation means. Historically the word has had two distinct significations. According to earlier usage it meant "to compare" or "to make like." According to later usage it signifies "to take up and incorporate."

There is a process that goes on in society by which individuals spontaneously acquire one another's language, characteristic attitudes, habits, and modes of behavior. There is also a process by which individuals and groups of individuals are taken over and incorporated into larger groups. Both processes have been concerned in the formation of modern nationalities. The modern Italian, Frenchman, and German is a composite of the broken fragments of several different racial groups. Interbreeding has broken up the ancient stocks, and interaction and imitation have created new national types which exhibit definite uniformities in language, manners, and formal behavior.

It has sometimes been assumed that the creation of a national type is the specific function of assimilation and that national solidarity is based upon national homogeneity and "like-mindedness." The extent and importance of the kind of homogeneity that individuals of the

[1] The distinction between primary and secondary groups used in this paper is that made by Charles H. Cooley.
Publication of the American Sociological Society, VIII (1913), pp. 66-83.

same nationality exhibit have been greatly exaggerated. Neither interbreeding nor interaction has created, in what the French term "nationals," a more than superficial likeness or like-mindedness. Racial differences have, to be sure, disappeared or been obscured, but individual differences remain. Individual differences, again, have been intensified by education, personal competition, and the division of labor, until individual members of cosmopolitan groups probably represent greater variations in disposition, temperament, and mental capacity than those which distinguished the more homogeneous races and peoples of an earlier civilization.[2]

What then, precisely, is the nature of the homogeneity which characterizes cosmopolitan groups?

The growth of modern states exhibits the progressive merging of smaller, mutually exclusive, into larger and more inclusive social groups. This result has been achieved in various ways, but it has usually been followed, or accompanied, by a more or less complete adoption, by the members of the smaller groups, of the language, technique, and mores of the larger and more inclusive ones. The immigrant readily takes over the language, manners, the social ritual, and outward forms of his adopted country. In America it has become proverbial that a Pole, Lithuanian, or Norwegian cannot be distinguished, in the second generation, from an American born of native parents.

There is no reason to assume that this assimilation of alien groups to native standards has modified to any great extent fundamental racial characteristics. It has, however, erased the external signs which formerly distinguished the members of one race from those of another.

On the other hand, the breaking up of the isolation of smaller groups has had the effect of emancipating the individual man, giving him room and freedom for the expansion and development of his individual aptitudes.

What one actually finds in cosmopolitan groups, then, is a superficial uniformity, a homogeneity in manners and fashion, associated with relatively profound differences in individual opinions, sentiments, and beliefs. This is just the reverse of what one meets among primitive peoples, where diversity in external forms, as between different groups, is accompanied with a monotonous sameness in the men-

[2] F. Boas, *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, quoted by W. I. Thomas, in *Source Book for Social Origins*, p. 155.

tal attitudes of individuals. There is a striking similarity in the sentiments and mental attitudes of peasant peoples in all parts of the world, although the external differences are often great. In the Black Forest, in Baden, Germany, almost every valley shows a different style of costume, a different type of architecture, although in each separate valley every house is like every other and the costume, as well as the religion, is for every member of each separate community absolutely after the same pattern. On the other hand, a German, Russian, or Negro peasant of the southern states, different as each is in some respects, are all very much alike in certain habitual attitudes and sentiments.

What, then, is the rôle of homogeneity and like-mindedness, such as we find them to be, in cosmopolitan states?

So far as it makes each individual look like every other—no matter how different under the skin—homogeneity mobilizes the individual man. It removes the social taboo, permits the individual to move into strange groups, and thus facilitates new and adventurous contacts. In obliterating the external signs, which in secondary groups seem to be the sole basis of caste and class distinctions, it realizes, for the individual, the principle of *laissez-faire, laissez-aller*. Its ultimate economic effect is to substitute personal for racial competition, and to give free play to forces that tend to relegate every individual, irrespective of race or status, to the position he or she is best fitted to fill.

As a matter of fact, the ease and rapidity with which aliens, under existing conditions in the United States, have been able to assimilate themselves to the customs and manners of American life have enabled this country to swallow and digest every sort of normal human difference, except the purely external ones, like the color of the skin.

It is probably true, also, that like-mindedness of the kind that expresses itself in national types, contributes, indirectly, by facilitating the intermingling of the different elements of the population, to the national solidarity. This is due to the fact that the solidarity of modern states depends less on the homogeneity of population than, as James Bryce has suggested, upon the thorough-going mixture of heterogeneous elements.[3] Like-mindedness, so far as that term signifies

[8] "Racial differences and animosities, which have played a large part in threatening the unity of States, are usually dangerous when unfriendly races occupy different parts of the country. If they live intermixed, in tolerably equal numbers, and if in addition they are not of different religions, and speak the same tongue, the antagonism will disappear in a generation or two and especially by intermarriage. . . . . But in one set of cases no fusion is possible; and this set of cases forms the despair of statesmen. It presents a problem which no constitution can solve. It is the juxtaposition on the same soil of races of different color."—James Bryce, *Studies in History and Jurisprudence*, pp. 245-46.

a standard grade of intelligence, contributes little or nothing to national solidarity. Likeness is, after all, a purely formal concept which of itself cannot hold anything together.

In the last analysis social solidarity is based on sentiment and habit. It is the sentiment of loyalty and the habit of what Sumner calls "concurrent action," that gives substance and insures unity to the state, as to every other type of social group. This sentiment of loyalty has its basis in a *modus vivendi*, a working relation and mutual understanding, of the members of the group. Social institutions are not founded in similarities any more than they are founded in differences, but in relations, and in the mutual interdependence of parts. When these relations have the sanction of custom and are fixed in individual habit, so that the activities of the group are running smoothly, personal attitudes and sentiments, which are the only forms in which individual minds collide and clash with one another, easily accommodate themselves to the existing situation.

It may, perhaps, be said that loyalty itself is a form of like-mindedness, or that it is dependent in some way upon the like-mindedness of the individuals whom it binds together. This, however, cannot be true, for there is no greater loyalty than that which binds the dog to his master, and this is a sentiment which that faithful animal usually extends to other members of the household to which he belongs. A dog without a master is a dangerous animal, but the dog that has been domesticated is a member of society. He is not, of course, a citizen, although he is not entirely without rights. But he has got into some sort of practical working relations with the group to which he belongs.

It is this practical working arrangement, into which individuals with widely different mental capacities enter as co-ordinate parts, that gives the corporate character to social groups and insures their solidarity.

It is the process of assimilation by which groups of individuals, originally indifferent or perhaps hostile, achieve this corporate character, rather than the process by which they acquire a formal like-mindedness, with which this paper is mainly concerned.

The difficulty with the conception of assimilation which one ordinarily meets in discussions of the race problem, is that it is based on

observations confined to individualistic groups where the characteristic relations are indirect and secondary. It takes no account of the kind of assimilation that takes place in primary groups where relations are direct and personal—in the tribe, for example, and in the family.

Thus Charles Francis Adams, referring to the race problem in an address at Richmond, Va., in November, 1908, said:

> The American system, as we know, was founded on the assumed basis of a common humanity, that is, absence of absolutely fundamental racial characteristics was accepted as an established truth. Those of all races were welcomed to our shores. They came, aliens; they and their descendants would become citizens first, natives afterward. It was a process first of assimilation and then of absorption. On this all depended. There could be no permanent divisional lines. That theory is now plainly broken down. We are confronted by the obvious fact, as undeniable as it is hard, that the African will only partially assimilate and that he cannot be absorbed. He remains an alien element in the body politic. A foreign substance, he can neither be assimilated nor thrown out.

More recently an editorial in the *Outlook*, discussing the Japanese situation in California, made this statement:

> The hundred millions of people now inhabiting the United States must be a united people, not merely a collection of groups of different peoples, different in racial cultures and ideals, agreeing to live together in peace and amity. These hundred millions must have common ideals, common aims, a common custom, a common culture, a common language, and common characteristics if the nation is to endure.[4]

All this is quite true and interesting, but it does not clearly recognize the fact that the chief obstacle to the assimilation of the Negro and the Oriental are not mental but physical traits. It is not because the Negro and the Japanese are so differently constituted that they do not assimilate. If they were given an opportunity the Japanese are quite as capable as the Italians, the Armenians, or the Slavs of acquiring our culture, and sharing our national ideals. The trouble is not with the Japanese mind but with the Japanese skin. The "Jap" is not the right color.

The fact that the Japanese bears in his features a distinctive racial hallmark, that he wears, so to speak, a racial uniform, classifies him. He cannot become a mere individual, indistinguishable in the cosmopolitan mass of the population, as is true, for example, of the Irish

[4] *Outlook*, August 2, 1913.

and, to a lesser extent, of some of the other immigrant races. The Japanese, like the Negro is condemned to remain among us an abstraction, a symbol, and a symbol not merely of his own race, but of the Orient and of that vague, ill-defined menace we sometimes refer to as the "yellow peril." This not only determines, to a very large extent, the attitude of the white world toward the yellow man, but it determines the attitude of the yellow man toward the white. It puts between the races the invisible but very real gulf of self-consciousness.

There is another consideration. Peoples we know intimately we respect and esteem. In our casual contact with aliens, however, it is the offensive rather than the pleasing traits that impress us. These impressions accumulate and reinforce natural prejudices. Where races are distinguished by certain external marks these furnish a permanent physical substratum upon which and around which the irritations and animosities, incidental to all human intercourse, tend to accumulate and so gain strength and volume.

II

Assimilation, as the word is here used, brings with it a certain borrowed significance which it carried over from physiology where it is employed to describe the process of nutrition. By a process of nutrition, somewhat similar to the physiological one, we may conceive alien peoples to be incorporated with, and made part of, the community or state. Ordinarily assimilation goes on silently and unconsciously, and only forces itself into popular conscience when there is some interruption or disturbance of the process.

At the outset it may be said, then, that assimilation rarely becomes a problem except in secondary groups. Admission to the primary group, that is to say, the group in which relationships are direct and personal, as, for example, in the family and in the tribe, makes assimilation comparatively easy, and almost inevitable.

The most striking illustration of this is the fact of domestic slavery. Slavery has been, historically, the usual method by which peoples have been incorporated into alien groups. When a member of an alien race is adopted into the family as a servant, or as a slave, and particularly when that status is made hereditary, as it was in the case of the Negro after his importation to America, assimilation followed rapidly and as a matter of course.

It is difficult to conceive two races farther removed from each

other in temperament and tradition than the Anglo-Saxon and the Negro, and yet the Negro in the southern states, particularly where he was adopted into the household as a family servant, learned in a comparatively short time the manners and customs of his master's family. He very soon possessed himself of so much of the language, religion, and the technique of the civilization of his master as, in his station, he was fitted or permitted to acquire. Eventually, also, Negro slaves transferred their allegiance to the state, of which they were only indirectly members, or at least to their masters' families, with whom they felt themselves in most things one in sentiment and interest.

The assimilation of the Negro field hand, where the contact of the slave with his master and his master's family was less intimate, was naturally less complete. On the large plantations, where an overseer stood between the master and the majority of his slaves, and especially on the Sea Island plantations off the coast of South Carolina, where the master and his family were likely to be merely winter visitors, this distance between master and slave was greatly increased. The consequence is that the Negroes in these regions are less touched today by the white man's influence and civilization than elsewhere in the southern states. The size of the plantation, the density of the slave population, and the extent and character of the isolation in which the master and his slave lived are factors to be reckoned with in estimating the influence which the plantation exerted on the Negro. In Virginia the average slave population on the plantation has been estimated at about ten. On the Sea Islands and farther south it was thirty; and in Jamaica it was two hundred.[5]

As might be expected there were class distinctions among the slaves as among the whites, and these class distinctions were more rigidly enforced on the large plantations than on the smaller ones. In Jamaica, for example, it was customary to employ the mulattoes in the lighter and the more desirable occupations about the master's house. The mulattoes in that part of the country, more definitely than was true in the United States, constituted a separate caste midway between the white man and black. Under these conditions the assimilation of the masses of the Negro people took place more slowly and less completely in Jamaica than in the United States.

In Virginia and the border states, and in what was known as the

[5] *Documentary History of American and Industrial Society*, Vol. I, "Plantation and Frontier": Introduction, pp. 80-81.

Back Country, where the plantations were smaller and the relation of the races more intimate, slaves gained relatively more of the white man's civilization. The kindly relations of master and slave in Virginia are indicated by the number of free Negroes in that state. In 1860 one Negro in every eight was free and in one county in the Tidewater Region, the county of Nansemond, there were 2,473 Negroes and only 581 slaves. The differences in the Negro population which existed before the Civil War are still clearly marked today. They are so clearly marked, in fact, that an outline of the areas in which the different types of plantation existed before the War would furnish the basis for a map showing distinct cultural levels in the Negro population in the South today.

The first Negroes were imported into the United States in 1619. At the beginning of the nineteenth century there were 900,000 slaves in the United States. By 1860 that number had increased to nearly 4,000,000. At that time, it is safe to say, the great mass of the Negroes were no longer, in any true sense, an alien people. They were, of course, not citizens. They lived in the smaller world of the particular plantation to which they belonged. It might, perhaps, be more correct to say that they were less assimilated than domesticated.

In this respect, however, the situation of the Negro was not different from that of the Russian peasant, at least as late as 1860. The Russian noble and the Russian peasant were likely to be of the same ethnic stock, but mentally they were probably not much more alike than the Negro slave and his matser. The noble and the peasant did not intermarry. The peasant lived in the little world of the *mir* or commune. He had his own customs and traditions. His life and thought moved in a smaller orbit and he knew nothing about the larger world which belonged exclusively to the noble. The relations between the serf and the proprietor of the estate to which he was attached were, perhaps, less familiar and less frank than those which existed between the Negro slave and his master. The attitude of the serf in the presence of the noble was more abject. Still, one could hardly say that the Russian peasant had not been assimilated, at least in the sense in which it has been decided to use that term in this paper.

A right understanding of conditions in the South before the War will make clear that the southern plantation was founded in the different temperaments, habits, and sentiments of the white man and the black. The discipline of the plantation put its own impress upon, and largely formed the character of, both races. In the life of the planta-

tion white and black were different but complementary, the one bred to the rôle of a slave and the other to that of master. This, of course, takes no account of the poor white man who was also formed by slavery, but rather as a by-product.

Where the conditions of slavery brought the two races, as it frequently did, into close and intimate contact, there grew up a mutual sympathy and understanding which frequently withstood not only the shock of the Civil War, but the political agitation and chicane which followed it in the southern states.

Speaking of the difference between the North and the South in its attitude toward the Negro, Booker T. Washington says: "It is the individual touch which holds the races together in the South, and it is this individual touch which is lacking to a large degree in the North."

No doubt kindly relations between individual members of the two races do exist in the South to an extent not known in the North. As a rule, it will be found that these kindly relations had their origin in slavery. The men who have given the tone to political discussion in southern states in recent years are men who did not own slaves. The men from the mountain districts of the South, whose sentiments found expression in a great antislavery document, like Hinton Helper's *Impending Crisis*, hated slavery with an intensity that was only equaled by their hatred for the Negro. It is the raucous note of the Hill Billy and the Red Neck that one hears in the public utterances of men like Senator Vardaman, of Mississippi, and Governor Blease, of South Carolina.

III

The Civil War weakened but did not fully destroy the *modus vivendi* which slavery had established between the slave and his master. With emancipation the authority which had formerly been exercised by the master was transferred to the state, and Washington, D.C., began to assume in the mind of the freedman the position that formerly had been occupied by the "big house" on the plantation. The masses of the Negro people still maintained their habit of dependence, however, and after the first confusion of the change had passed, life went on, for most of them, much as it had before the War. As one old farmer explained, the only difference he could see was that in slavery he "was working for old Marster and now he was working for himself."

There was one difference between slavery and freedom, nevertheless, which was very real to the freedman. And this was the liberty to move. To move from one plantation to another in case he was discontented was one of the ways in which a freedman was able to realize his freedom and to make sure that he possessed it. This liberty to move meant a good deal more to the plantation Negro than one not acquainted with the situation in the South is likely to understand.

If there had been an abundance of labor in the South; if the situation had been such that the Negro laborer was seeking the opportunity to work, or such that the Negro tenant farmers were competing for the opportunity to get a place on the land, as is so frequently the case in Europe, the situation would have been fundamentally different from what it actually was. But the South was, and is today, what Nieboer called a country of "open," in contradistinction to a country of "closed" resources. In other words there is more land in the South than there is labor to till it. Land owners are driven to competing for laborers and tenants to work their plantations.

Owing to his ignorance of business matters and to a long-established habit of submission the Negro after emancipation was placed at a great disadvantage in his dealings with the white man. His right to move from one plantation to another became, therefore, the Negro tenant's method of enforcing consideration from the planter. He might not dispute the planter's accounts, because he was not capable of doing so, and it was unprofitable to attempt it, but if he felt aggrieved he could move.

This was the significance of the exodus in some of the southern states which took place about 1879, when 40,000 people left the plantations in the Black Belts of Louisiana and Mississippi and went to Kansas. The masses of the colored people were dissatisfied with the treatment they were receiving from the planters and made up their minds to move to "a free country," as they described it. At the same time it was the attempt of the planter to bind the Negro tenant who was in debt to him, to his place on the plantation, that gave rise to the system of peonage that still exists in a mitigated form in the South today.

When the Negro moved off the plantation upon which he was reared he severed the personal relations which bound him to his master's people. It was just at this point that the two races began to lose touch with each other. From this time on the relations of the black man and the white, which in slavery had been direct and

personal, became every year, as the old associations were broken, more and more indirect and secondary. There lingers still the disposition on the part of the white man to treat every Negro familiarly, and the disposition on the part of every Negro to treat every white man respectfully. But these are habits which are gradually disappearing. The breaking down of the instincts and habits of servitude, and the acquisition, by the masses of the Negro people, of the instincts and habits of freedom have proceeded slowly but steadily. The reason the change seems to have gone on more rapidly in some cases than others is explained by the fact that at the time of emancipation 10 per cent of the Negroes in the United States were already free, and others, those who had worked in trades, many of whom had hired their own time from their masters, had become more or less adapted to the competitive conditions of free society.

One of the effects of the mobilization of the Negro has been to bring him into closer and more intimate contact with his own people. Common interests have drawn the blacks together, and caste sentiment has kept the black and white apart. The segregation of the races, which began as a spontaneous movement on the part of both, has been fostered by the policy of the dominant race. The agitation of the Reconstruction Period made the division between the races in politics absolute. Segregation and separation in other matters have gone on steadily ever since. The Negro at the present time has separate churces, schools, libraries, hospitals, Y.M.C.A. associations, and even separate towns. There are, perhaps, a half-dozen communities in the United States, every inhabitant of which is a Negro. Most of these so-called Negro towns are suburban villages; two of them, at any rate, are the centers of a considerable Negro farming population. In general it may be said that where the Negro schools, churches, and Y.M.C.A. associations are not separate they do not exist.

It is hard to estimate the ultimate effect of this isolation of the black man. One of the most important effects has been to establish a common interest among all the different colors and classes of the race. This sense of solidarity has grown up gradually with the organization of the Negro people. It is stronger in the South, where segregation is more complete, than it is in the North where, twenty years ago, it would have been safe to say it did not exist. Gradually, imperceptibly, within the larger world of the white man, a smaller world, the world of the black man, is silently taking form and shape.

Every advance in education and intelligence puts the Negro in

possession of the technique of communication and organization of the white man, and so contributes to the extension and consolidation of the Negro world within the white.

The motive for this increasing solidarity is furnished by the increasing pressure, or perhaps I should say, by the increasing sensibility of Negroes to the pressure and the prejudice without. The sentiment of racial loyalty, which is a comparatively recent manifestation of the growing self-consciousness of the race, must be regarded as a response and "accommodation" to changing internal and external relations of the race. The sentiment which Negroes are beginning to call "race pride" does not exist to the same extent in the North as in the South, but an increasing disposition to enforce racial distinctions in the North, as in the South, is bringing it into existence.

One or two incidents in this connection are significant. A few years ago a man who is the head of the largest Negro publishing business in this country sent to Germany and had a number of Negro dolls manufactured according to specifications of his own. At the time this company was started Negro children were in the habit of playing with white dolls. There were already Negro dolls on the market, but they were for white children and represented the white man's conception of the Negro and not the Negro's ideal of himself. The new Negro doll was a mulatto with regular features slightly modified in favor of the conventional Negro type. It was a neat, prim, well-dressed, well-behaved, self-respecting doll. Later on, as I understand, there were other dolls, equally tidy and respectable in appearance, but in darker shades with Negro features a little more pronounced. The man who designed these dolls was perfectly clear in regard to the significance of the substitution that he was making. He said that he thought it was a good thing to let Negro girls become accustomed to dolls of their own color. He thought it important, as long as the races were to be segregated, that the dolls, which like other forms of art, are patterns and represent ideals, should be segregated also.

This substitution of the Negro model for the white is a very interesting and a very significant fact. It means that the Negro has begun to fashion his own ideals and in his own image rather than in that of the white man. It is also interesting to know that the Negro doll company has been a success and that these dolls are now widely sold in every part of the United States. Nothing exhibits more clearly the extent to which the Negro has become assimilated in slavery or

the extent to which he has broken with the past in recent years than this episode of the Negro doll.

The incident is typical. It is an indication of the nature of tendencies and of forces that are stirring in the background of the Negro's mind, although they have not succeeded in forcing themselves, except in special instances, into clear consciousness.

In this same category must be reckoned the poetry of Paul Lawrence Dunbar, in whom, as William Dean Howells has said, the Negro "attained civilization." Before Paul Lawrence Dunbar, Negro literature had been either apologetic or self-assertive, but Dunbar "studied the Negro objectively." He represented him as he found him, not only without apology, but with an affectionate understanding and sympathy which one can have only for what is one's own. In Dunbar, Negro literature attained an ethnocentric point of view. Through the medium of his verses the ordinary shapes and forms of the Negro's life have taken on the color of his affections and sentiments and we see the black man, not as he looks, but as he feels and is.

It is a significant fact that a certain number of educated—or rather the so-called educated—Negroes were not at first disposed to accept at their full value either Dunbar's dialect verse or the familiar pictures of Negro life which are the symbols in which his poetry usually found expression. The explanation sometimes offered for the dialect poems was that "they were made to please white folk." The assumption seems to have been that if they had been written for Negroes it would have been impossible in his poetry to distinguish black people from white. This was a sentiment which was never shared by the masses of the people, who, upon the occasions when Dunbar recited to them, were fairly bowled over with amusement and delight because of the authenticity of the portraits he offered them. At the present time Dunbar is so far accepted as to have hundreds of imitators.

Literature and art have played a similar and perhaps more important rôle in the racial struggles of Europe than of America. One reason seems to be that racial conflicts, as they occur in secondary groups, are primarily sentimental and secondarily economic. Literature and art, when they are employed to give expression to racial sentiment and form to racial ideals, serve, along with other agencies, to mobilize the group and put the masses *en rapport* with their leaders and with each other. In such case art and literature are like silent

drummers which summon into action the latent instincts and energies of the race.

These struggles, I might add, in which a submerged people seek to rise and make for themselves a place in a world occupied by superior and privileged races, are not less vital or less important because they are bloodless. They serve to stimulate ambitions and inspire ideals which years, perhaps, of subjection and subordination have suppressed. In fact, it seems as if it were through conflicts of this kind, rather than through war, that the minor peoples were destined to gain the moral concentration and discipline that fit them to share, on anything like equal terms, in the conscious life of the civilized world.

IV

The progress of race adjustment in the southern states since the emancipation has, on the whole, run parallel with the nationalist movement in Europe. The so-called "nationalities" are, for the most part, Slavic peoples, fragments of the great Slavic race, that have attained national self-consciousness as a result of their struggle for freedom and air against their German conquerors. It is a significant fact that the nationalist movement, as well as the "nationalities" that it has brought into existence, had its rise in that twilight zone, upon the eastern border of Germany and the western border of Russia, and is part of the century-long conflict, partly racial, partly cultural, of which this meeting-place of the East and West has been the scene.

Until the beginning of the last century the European peasant, like the Negro slave, bound as he was to the soil, lived in the little world of direct and personal relations, under what we may call a domestic régime. It was military necessity that first turned the attention of statesmen like Frederick the Great of Prussia to the welfare of the peasant. It was the overthrow of Prussia by Napoleon in 1807 that brought about his final emancipation in that country. In recent years it has been the international struggle for economic efficiency which has contributed most to mobilize the peasant and laboring classes in Europe.

As the peasant slowly emerged from serfdom he found himself a member of a depressed class, without education, political privileges, or capital. It was the struggle of this class for wider opportunity and better conditions of life that made most of the history of the previous

century. Among the peoples in the racial borderland the effect of this struggle has been, on the whole, to substitute for a horizontal organization of society—in which the upper stratum, that is to say the wealthy or privileged class, was mainly of one race and the poorer and subject class was mainly of another—a vertical organization in which all classes of each racial group were united under the title of their respective nationalities. Thus organized, the nationalities represent, on the one hand, intractable minorities engaged in a ruthless partisan struggle for political privilege or economic advantage and, on the other, they represent cultural groups, each struggling to maintain a sentiment of loyalty to the distinctive traditions, language, and institutions of the race they represent.

This sketch of the racial situation in Europe is, of course, the barest abstraction and should not be accepted realistically. It is intended merely as an indication of similarities, in the broader outlines, of the motives that have produced nationalities in Europe and are making the Negro in America, as Booker Washington says, "a nation within a nation."

It may be said that there is one profound difference between the Negro and the European nationalities, namely, that the Negro has had his separateness and consequent race consciousness thrust upon him, because of his exclusion and forcible isolation from white society. The Slavic nationalities, on the contrary, have segregated themselves in order to escape assimilation and escape racial extinction in the larger cosmopolitan states.

The difference is, however, not so great as it seems. With the exception of the Poles, nationalistic sentiment may be said hardly to have existed fifty years ago. Forty years ago when German was the language of the educated classes, educated Bohemians were a little ashamed to speak their own language in public. Now nationalist sentiment is so strong that, where the Czech nationality has gained control, it has sought to wipe out every vestige of the German language. It has changed the names of streets, buildings, and public places. In the city of Prag, for example, all that formerly held German associations now fairly reeks with the sentiment of Bohemian nationality.

On the other hand, the masses of the Polish people cherished very little nationalist sentiment until after the Franco-Prussian War. The fact is that nationalist sentiment among the Slavs, like racial sentiment among the Negroes, has sprung up as the result of a struggle against

privilege and discrimination based upon racial distinctions. The movement is not so far advanced among Negroes; sentiment is not so intense, and for several reasons probably never will be. One reason is that Negroes, in their struggle for equal opportunities, have the democratic sentiment of the country on their side.

From what has been said it seems fair to draw one conclusion, namely: under conditions of secondary contact, that is to say, conditions of individual liberty and individual competition, characteristic of modern civilization, depressed racial groups tend to assume the form of nationalities. A nationality, in this narrower sense, may be defined as the racial group which has attained self-consciousness, no matter whether it has at the same time gained political independence or not.

In societies organized along horizontal lines the disposition of individuals in the lower strata is to seek their models in the strata above them. Loyalty attaches to individuals, particularly to the upper classes, who furnish, in their persons and in their lives, the models for the masses of the people below them. Long after the nobility has lost every other social function connected with its vocation the ideals of the nobility have survived in our conception of the gentleman, genteel manners and bearing—gentility.

The sentiment of the Negro slave was, in a certain sense, not merely loyalty to his master, but to the white race. Negroes of the older generations speak very frequently, with a sense of proprietorship, of "our white folk." This sentiment was not always confined to the ignorant masses. An educated colored man once explained to me "that we colored people always want our white folks to be superior." He was shocked when I showed no particular enthusiasm for that form of sentiment.

The fundamental significance of the nationalist movement must be sought in the effort of subject races, sometimes consciously, sometimes unconsciously, to substitute, for those supplied them by aliens, models based on their own racial individuality and embodying sentiments and ideals which spring naturally out of their own lives.

After a race has achieved in this way its moral independence assimilation, in the sense of copying, will still continue. Nations and races borrow from those whom they fear as well as from those whom they admire. Materials taken over in this way, however, are inevitably stamped with the individuality of the nationalities that appropriate them. These materials will contribute to the dignity, to the prestige,

and to the solidarity of the nationality which borrows them, but they will no longer inspire loyalty to the race from which they are borrowed. A race which has attained the character of a nationality may still retain its loyalty to the state of which it is a part, but only in so far as that state incorporates, as an integral part of its organization, the practical interests, the aspirations and ideals of that nationality.

The aim of the contending nationalities in Austria-Hungry at the present time seems to be a federation, like that of Switzerland, based upon the autonomy of the different races composing the empire.[6] In the South, similarly, the races seem to be tending in the direction of a bi-racial organization of society, in which the Negro is gradually gaining a limited autonomy. What the ultimate outcome of this movement may be it is not safe to predict.

[6] Aurel C. Popovici, *Die Vereinigten Staaten von Gross-Oestreich, Politische Studien zur Lösung der nationalen Fragen u. staatsrechtlichen Krisen in Oestreich*, Leipzig, 1906.

PART III *Racial Attitudes*