



W.E.B. Dubois: A Perspective on the Bases of His Political Thought

Author(s): Adolph L. Reed, Jr.

Source: *Political Theory*, Aug., 1985, Vol. 13, No. 3 (Aug., 1985), pp. 431-456

Published by: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/191241>

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

https://www.jstor.org/stable/191241?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Sage Publications, Inc. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Political Theory*

JSTOR

W.E.B. DUBOIS
A Perspective on the Bases
of His Political Thought

ADOLPH L. REED, Jr.
Yale University

W

E.B. DUBOIS is by all accounts a central figure in the history of Afro-American political activity, a major contributor to a half-century's debate over the condition of and proper goals and strategies for the black population. Yet little scholarly work has concentrated on the specifically political component of his thinking. Moreover, such attention as has been given to DuBois's political ideas either is ancillary to some other intellectual purpose—for example, general biography—or is simply hagiographical.¹ The paucity of systematic analysis has coincided with his longevity and persistent intellectual engagement to make DuBois appear as a champion who can be appropriated on an equal basis by any and all political tendencies.

There is little need to rehearse the various appropriations. Against Washington, DuBois has been understood as a defender of radical activism and a pristine idealist. Against Garvey, he appears as an elitist integrationist, even though he was within a few years to leave the NAACP in part as a result of the latter's rejection of his proposals for organizing the race behind segregation's walls. Communists claim him, his elitism notwithstanding, as do anticommunist Pan-African nationalists.

Yet among prominent Afro-American political actors in this century, DuBois is perhaps the most systematic thinker (at least insofar as coherent writing is the expression of systematic thought). Therefore, one might expect less eclecticism among categorizations of his place in black thought. What bases are there for the anomaly that DuBois should be more variously interpreted than less explicit writers?

POLITICAL THEORY, Vol. 13 No. 3, August 1985 431-456
© 1985 Sage Publications, Inc.

The confusion about locating DuBois's ideas has two sources. The first is quite simple: DuBois lived and acted through several discrete social and political situations that seemed to him to require different strategic responses for the race. Sometimes, especially when sundered from the situations to which they were responses, the strategies that he proposed appeared to contradict one another. Analysts, then, have chosen and defended one or another set of strategies or one or another period as authentically DuBoisian. This is a problem of temporal focus.

The other source of confusion has to do with conceptual focus. If examination is restricted to DuBois's various racial strategies, which were usually the central concerns of his writing, analysis will record a *mélange* of discrete political positions, but will gloss the normative and conceptual logic that organized his worldview. Inattentiveness toward those social theoretical foundations of political discourse is the source of much of the confusion about DuBois's political thought, and is a major problem in scholarship in Afro-American thought in general.² The larger problem is beyond the scope of this monograph; however, I hope that by indicating the coherence that unites his various strategic positions, my reconstruction of the theoretical bases of DuBois's political ideas suggests an approach to social theory and its history that will stimulate creative dialogue among students of Afro-American social and political thought.

Through examination of DuBois's utterances on three areas of programmatic political orientation with which he is typically associated, I shall argue that his pronouncements cohere around certain core assumptions and values that he maintained over the course of his lengthy intellectual career. I examine DuBois's views on (1) interracialism as an organizational principle for American society; (2) Pan-Africanism as an interest of the black world; and (3) socialism as a model for social organization in general. My specific concerns are with establishing DuBois's actual positions on those issues and uncovering the structuring logic of his thought by locating those positions in relation to one another and to the contexts of history and discourse within which they were developed.

INTERRACIALISM

Greater interpretive ambiguity surrounds the character of DuBois's interracialism than other aspects of his thought. This is so in

part because the status of interracialism as a political value was not controversial in the same way for DuBois and his communicants as it has been among subsequent political theorists and intellectual historians.³ The search for DuBois's position requires extrapolation, often from incidental comments scattered over several decades and situations. When the broad range of possibly germane utterances is combined with the intentionality of the analysts, it is not surprising that conflicting, if not incompatible, interpretations occur.

Brotz, for example, describes DuBois as a "cultural nationalist."⁴ Cruse identifies him, although with qualifications, as a principal member of the integrationist tendency in the history of Afro-American thought.⁵ And Harding proposes that DuBois should be seen as an anticipation of both radical nationalism and radical anti-colonialism, as well as militant integrationism.⁶ Moreover, each of these assessments is or could be derived directly from statements made by DuBois. Yet consideration of certain contextual and intentional mediations on DuBois's thinking allows an interpretation that integrates those discrete stances that have provided the basis for the varied and conflicting assessments of his position on this issue. These mediations are as follows: (1) his dual commitments to race pride and the distinctive outlook of Euro-American modernity that values "progress" and administrative rationality; (2) his commitment to the hegemony of the black elite within the Afro-American population; (3) his growing perception, influenced by the Depression and his reassessment of the sources of racism, of a need for the development of a self-help program within the race; and (4) his experiences within the NAACP.

DuBois's pride in race coexisted with his enthusiasm at participating at the forefront of modern (European) culture and values, and statements lauding the latter and deprecating spontaneous Afro-American behavior coexist with statements that exalt black behavior and values, and decry the bankruptcy of the European heritage. The dissonant ring to his ambivalent race pride to some extent is a function of his bombastic literary style; but the oft-mentioned phenomenon of his "twoness" or "double consciousness" is an expression of his antinominal commitment to what he perceived to be the Dionysian attractions of black culture and the Apollonian virtues of Euro-American civilization. Writing during the Harlem Renaissance, for example, his references to black folk life, both in Africa and in the United States, emphasized what he considered its primitive aspects. He lauds blacks' "sensuous, tropical love of life, in vivid contrast to

the cool and cautious New England reason.”⁷ “The Negro,” he proclaimed, “is primarily an artist.”⁸ However, this racial characteristic did not imply for DuBois, as it did for so many who extolled black spirituality, that the race required external tutelage to prepare it for modern civilization.

He asserted very early a conviction that Afro-Americans best handle Afro-American affairs. About this he was insistent, even in the early 1900s, as he advocated formation of a coalition of the best men of black and white races to attempt rationally to reorganize life in the South.⁹

DuBois’s insistence on Afro-American primacy in determination and pursuit of Afro-American interests—regardless how elementally reasonable and appropriate that position was—also resonates with his intentions concerning the role of the elite within the Afro-American population. If the group is to speak for itself, still not everyone can speak at once—especially not if a single, collective agenda is to be fashioned. Cacophony could be avoided by allowing the race’s “natural leaders” to rise. In an early call for unity and protest, DuBois observed:

Here is the path out of the economic situation and here is the imperative demand for trained Negro leaders of character and intelligence—men of skill, men of light and leading, college-bred men, black captains of industry, and missionaries of culture; men who thoroughly comprehend and know modern civilization, and can take hold of Negro communities and raise and train them by force of precept and example, deep sympathy, and the inspiration of common blood and ideals.¹⁰

As he noted in his Philadelphia study, the race’s developmental needs actually would have been best served in his view by a dictatorship of the elite; however, because the race had been thrust prematurely into interaction with the more advanced society and democratic institutions, the incubative stage of elite dictatorship was blocked.¹¹ Nevertheless, the historic mission of the elite stratum included demonstrating “the ability of the Negro to assimilate American culture.”¹² In this sense, DuBois’s view of the collective racial interest in the black community’s generation of its own spokesmen at least coincided with the hegemonic interest of the elite. However, although this position acknowledges a need for intraracial organization that at least qualifies opposition to separation in principle, it was

not until the Depression era that DuBois sought to work out a program that accepted segregation as given.

He had begun developing his program of cultural-economic nationalism in the 1920s. The foundation of this program was advocacy of racially based cooperative economics. Cooperativist racial economics long had held an attraction for DuBois. Both as an economic practicality and as a model for economic democracy, the cooperative recommended itself to him.¹³ After World War I, though, DuBois credits two realizations with gradually pushing the cooperative-consumer organization idea to prominence. In the postwar environment he felt that the slogans of political democracy developed a hollow ring; the pressing problems were then economic rather than political “in an oligarchic world.”¹⁴ Thus was he prepared to emphasize a strategy of economic organization. Although he had little support from the NAACP, by 1930 DuBois was convinced that the organization needed to adjust its program to meet needs generated by “economic dislocation.”¹⁵ Simultaneously, he came to appreciate the extent to which deep-seated complexities and subrational behaviors define public attitudes.¹⁶ From this perspective he decided that the

present attitude and action of the white world is not based solely upon rational, deliberate intent. It is a matter of conditioned reflexes; of long followed habits, customs and folkways; of subconscious trains of reasoning and unconscious nervous reflexes. To attack and better all this calls for more than appeal and argument. It needs carefully planned and scientific propaganda.¹⁷

What this meant in his view was that there needed to be a shift of emphasis in black uplift activity. Previously, when DuBois had assumed rational motivations to explain racial prejudice and exclusion, the focus of his activism was directed toward education and changing whites' attitudes. Once he determined, however, that the bases of much racial prejudice are nonrational, his stress moved away from education and propaganda among whites—which had not by any means been DuBois's only previous concern anyway—to what he identified as his post-1928 strategy; that is, “(s)cientific investigation and organized action among Negroes, in close cooperation, to secure the survival of the Negro race, until the cultural development of America and the world is willing to recognize Negro freedom.”¹⁸

In the meantime, in DuBois's view, simple, good judgment called for fortifying such black institutions as existed behind the walls of segregation. That practical viewpoint at times forced him into conflict with doctrinal foes of segregation, as when he supported Cheyney State being chartered as a black school. DuBois made clear that, although he opposed segregation as a principle, when confronted with the choice between a black school and no school, the black school would have to be supported. Indeed, when faced with already segregated institutions, he was left with a "paradox":

We must oppose segregation in schools; we must honor and appreciate the colored teacher in the colored school. . . . We recognize one thing worse than segregation and that is ignorance.¹⁹

The consumer-cooperative organization strategy, however, was not only defensive; the consumer movement could develop into a powerful vehicle for social transformation as well. He maintained,

The consuming public, who should also be the real working producers of the world, must resume its logical and rightful place as the final directing force in industry. This can be done without violence or revolution.²⁰

Consumer groups then would be able to take over production, filling their own needs, breaking the chain of external dependence, and installing industrial democracy.²¹ Nor was the consumer model restricted to the United States; DuBois explored its possibilities for "freeing thought and action in the colonial areas."²²

The cooperative commonwealth-consumer organization strategy never really took off, and in part its failure recalls a tragic aspect of political thought. As other than ideology for group mobilization, the strategy likely was too late when proposed. A "new industrial democracy established on a firm basis of individual knowledge and initiative built up to contest the occupation of the industrial field with the present individualists, monopolists, high-binders, and freebooters"²³ probably faced overwhelmingly bad odds in 1939. However, as a mobilization ideology, the consumer-cooperative organization that DuBois advocated also resonated with the legitimation needs of the Afro-American elite as DuBois saw them. DuBois indicated that the program was designed, among other things, to answer the following question: "Can ten million Negroes, led by cultured classes numbering less than a million, achieve efficient and

voluntary democracy without force, without police power, without the domination of wealth and capital?"²⁴

DuBois was concerned, however, about the readiness of the elite to shoulder its nationalist responsibility in what he saw as a "long siege against the strongholds of color caste."²⁵ He expressed the basis for his concern:

The upper class Negro has almost never been nationalistic. He has never planned or thought of a Negro state or a Negro church or a Negro school. This solution has always been a thought up-surg-ing from the mass, because of pressure which they could not withstand and which compelled a racial institution or chaos. Continually such institutions were founded and developed, but this took place against the advice and best thought of the intelligentsia.²⁶

He reminded them, however:

When the NAACP was formed, the great mass of Negro children were being trained in Negro schools; the great mass of Negro churchgoers were members of Negro churches; the great mass of Negro citizens lived in Negro neighborhoods; the great mass of Negro voters voted with the same political party; and the mass of Negroes joined with Negroes and cooperated with Negroes in order to fight the extension of this segregation and to move toward better conditions. What was true in 1910 was still true in 1940 and will be true in 1970. But with this vast difference: that the segregated Negro institutions are better organized, more intelligently planned and more efficiently conducted, and today form in themselves the best and most compelling argument for the ultimate abolition of the color line.²⁷

To have started out in this organization with a slogan "no segregation," would have been impossible. What we did say was no increase in segregation; but even that stand we were unable to maintain. Whenever we found that an increase of segregation was in the interest of the Negro race, naturally we had to advocate it. We had to advocate all sorts of organized movement among Negroes to fight oppression and in the long run end segregation.²⁸

Despite their reluctance and tentativeness, DuBois was consistent throughout the period of his active commitment to this nationalistic organizational strategy—roughly through World War II—on the cruciality of the elite's role; he was emphatic about the need for "trained" leadership.²⁹

Although, as has been noted, DuBois always seems to have been committed without reservation to black leadership of blacks, his experience with the white-dominated NAACP at least reinforced his

disposition toward black self-organization. As his antagonism with the NAACP's board grew over the issue of editorial autonomy for *The Crisis*, DuBois's advocacy of the nationalistic program became more and more insistent.³⁰ Finally, he challenged the NAACP board to acknowledge the utility of segregation as a support for positive black institutions.³¹ In the fervor to make his point, DuBois even stooped to endorse black fraternities and sororities as exemplars of the racially useful side of segregation.³²

Although his nationalistic program was the specific issue that precipitated DuBois's departure from the organization, his course had not meshed well for some time with the thrust defined by the white liberals in the NAACP's leadership. Broderick points out that the latter supported none of his post-World War I initiatives, noting that one Republican director even resigned over DuBois's support of LaFollette in the 1924 presidential election.³³ It is not unlikely that this experience with the apparent incongruence of black and white agendas for black uplift strengthened DuBois's resolve for arguing the primacy of intraracial initiative as the appropriate strategy for realization of the ultimate objective of an integrated society.³⁴

PAN-AFRICANISM

The motif of stepping back into intragroup organization as a step toward realizing universalist objectives also helps to bring into focus the place of Pan-Africanism in DuBois's thought.

Pan-Africanism appears in DuBois's writing first in relation to his proposals for decolonization in Africa. However, his commitment to Pan-African unity and self-determination was tempered from the first by his distinction of the blacks who had appropriated the characteristics of "civilization" from those who had not. The former, in his view, should be responsible for the administration and guidance of the latter. In his program for dispensation of former German colonies after World War I, DuBois acknowledged that the "principle of self-determination . . . cannot be wholly applied to semi-civilized peoples." Therefore, he argued, those colonies should be placed "under the guidance of organized civilization," with special consideration given to the administrative opinions of the "chiefs and intelligent Negroes among the twelve and one-half million natives of

German Africa [and the] twelve million civilized Negroes of the United States.” Direct governance of the colonies, he proposed, should be assumed by an “International Commission [representing] not simply governments, but modern culture—science, commerce, social reform and religious philanthropy.”³⁵

This construction of the Pan-African mission reveals in yet another context DuBois’s confidence in the capacity of the race’s elite elements to define and realize the interests of the black world. Over the period at least of the first four Pan-African Congresses, he maintained detailed proposals for disposition of the colonial territories. This general program was directed in essence toward “preparing” African colonial territories for self-determination through gradual, supervised extension of autonomy. This supervised extension was to include participation in colonial administration by indigenous peoples as well as West Indian and North American “civilized” and “educated” blacks. Education of the indigenous population was to be extended and with it the franchise, which DuBois considered the basis of political participation.

The key in the early program goes back to the point at which this consideration of DuBois began, the distinction between “civilized” and “uncivilized.” The resolutions of the first Pan-African Congress stated in part:

The natives of Africa must have the right to participate in the Government as far as their development permits in conformity with the principle that the Government exists for the natives, and not the natives for the government. They should be allowed to participate in local and tribal government according to ancient usage, and this participation shall gradually extend, as education and experience proceeds, to the higher offices of State, to the end that, in time Africa be ruled by consent of Africans. . . . Whenever it is proven that any African natives are not receiving just treatment at the hands of any state or that any state deliberately excludes its civilized citizens or subjects of Negro descent from its body politic and culture, it shall be the duty of the League of Nations to bring the matter to the civilized world.³⁶

The relevant social actors for DuBois in this period were blacks from North America and the West Indies, and the indigenous elites generated by the colonial system. Those groups represented within the African world the bearers of civilization, which in turn entails those attributes valued most highly in rational administrative organi-

zation. Those social actors were to function as the carriers of the Enlightenment to Africa.

DuBois soon modified his position to explore what he perceived to be a chauvinistic impulse toward Africa on the part of blacks in the Western hemisphere and his own manifestations of that impulse.³⁷ He felt constrained to point out that, while reiterating that Africa should be administered by Africans, that position did not mean "that Africa should be administered by West Indians or American Negroes." He declared that the latter groups "have no more right to administer Africa for the native Africans than native Africans have to administer America."³⁸ Moreover, he contended that qualified opportunity did exist in Africa for Western blacks "with capital, education and some technical or agricultural skill, who have the courage of pioneers, good health, and are willing to rough it,"³⁹ but that the continent "has no place for empty-headed laborers . . . sick people or old people or orators or agitators."⁴⁰

The leading mediation of Western blacks was made clearly unnecessary for decolonization in Africa:

Africans began to demand more voice in colonial government and the Second World War had made their cooperation so necessary to Europe that at the end actual and unexpected freedom for African colonies was in sight.

Moreover, there miraculously appeared Africans able to take charge of these governments. American Negroes of former generations had always calculated that when Africa was ready for freedom, American Negroes would be ready to lead them. But the event was quite opposite. The African leaders proved to be Africans. . . . American Negroes for the most part showed neither the education nor the aptitude for the magnificent opportunity which was suddenly offered. Indeed, it now seems that Africans may have to show American Negroes the way to freedom.⁴¹

Still, the civilizing mission remained, and in this respect the significance of DuBois's Pan-Africanism as it faced Africa lay in the extent to which he saw it as an element of a modernization strategy. From a view based on instrumental rationality, the most efficient governmental or social unit among a common group is that which is able to administer to and plan for the entire group, thereby minimizing duplication of effort, contradiction in policy, and other forms of social waste. As part of development into the "modern world," to the extent that Africa forms a basically common cultural unit, the requirements

of rational social administration would suggest combination and unification.

This rational-utilitarian view was enhanced by DuBois's embedded notions of society and history, which emphasize harmonious social organization and progress through advances of civilization. Precolonial Africa appeared in DuBois's reconstruction as a series of societies moving in lockstep toward collective teleological goals. He paid little attention to likely internal conflicts within his contemporary African unity,⁴² and took for granted the coordinating apparatus both in its existence and its progressive function. Indeed, he maintained as follows:

If Africa unites, it will be because each part, each nation, each tribe gives up a part of its heritage for the good of the whole. That is what union means; that is what Pan-Africa means. . . . When the tribe becomes a union of tribes, the individual tribe surrenders some part of its freedom to the paramount tribe. . . .

When the nation arises, the constituent tribes, clans and groups must each yield power and some freedom to the demands of the nation or the nation dies before it is born. Your local tribal, much-loved languages must yield to the few world tongues which serve the largest number of people and promote understanding and world literature.⁴³

This statement reflects the predatory and solipsistic optimism that characterizes the rational-administrative outlook. The flippancy with which DuBois dispatched intra-African particularity indicates not only the naivete typically shown by the relatively more homogeneous Afro-Americans and West Indians concerning such matters. His attitude demonstrates as well the centrality of the universalist and homogenizing assumptions of social engineering in his thinking. The necessity of sacrificing provincial languages to the "world tongues" indicates the commitment of DuBois's Pan-Africanism to an ultimately universalist goal. Where can history as increasing administrative rationality lead, other than to a united and coordinated world? Provincialisms that retard such development must be jettisoned in favor of progress.

This universalist basis for his Pan-Africanism is hardly only an inference from DuBois's text; for in his own words,

The broader the basis of a culture, the wider and freer its conception, the better chance it has for the survival of its best elements. This is the basic hope

of world democracy. . . . Peace and tolerance is the only path to eternal progress. Europe can never survive without Asia and Africa as free and interrelated civilizations in one world.⁴⁴

Another aspect of DuBois's Pan-Africanism is of interest here. Pan-Africanism for DuBois, in addition to being part of a strategy for decolonization and modernization in Africa, also represented a mechanism for constitution of an international black elite and its consciousness. He observes:

Pan-Africa means intellectual understanding and cooperation among all groups of Negro descent in order to bring about at the earliest possible time the industrial and spiritual emancipation of the Negro peoples.⁴⁵

One of the planks in his program for Africa in the early 1920s, in addition to promoting education among the natives and "industry, commerce and credit among black groups," entailed bringing "together for periodic conference and acquaintanceship the leading Negroes of the world and their friends."⁴⁶

In this respect, his Pan-Africanism is directed more toward the United States than toward Africa. From the onset of his involvement with and agitation for Africa, DuBois, unlike others in the Pan-African pantheon, granted the fundamental Americanness of Afro-Americans. He clarified his position early: "Once for all let us realize that we are Americans . . . there is nothing so indigenous, so completely 'made in America' as we."⁴⁷ Yet he saw Africa as offering "a chance for the colored American to emigrate and to go as a pioneer to a country which must, sentimentally at least, possess for him the same fascination as England does for Indian-born Englishmen"⁴⁸ and Pan-Africanism as a mechanism for development of a consciousness among the Afro-American elite appropriate to the historical tasks required of it. He indicated:

I tried to say to the American Negro . . . there are certain things you must do for your own survival and self-preservation. You must work together and in unison; you must evolve and support your own social institutions; you must transform your attack from the foray of self-assertive individuals to the massed might of an organized body. You must put behind your demands, not simply American Negroes, but West Indians and Africans, and all the colored races of the world.⁴⁹

Pan-Africanism, then, was for DuBois largely an instrumentality. Although he built his Pan-Africanist vision on a foundation that acknowledged the spiritual ties binding people of African descent, Pan-Africanism constituted for him at most a basis for wide-scale racial organization within the context of a global pluralism. In this sense, his Pan-Africanism differed from the emigrationist-redemptionist orientation of Garveyism and the millenarian-tinged revolutionism of the post-Black Power American Pan-Africanism.⁵⁰ Unlike those other tendencies, DuBois saw Pan-Africanism as an expression among blacks of the developmental logic of modern society. Although, for example, he suggested that the institutional foundation for a self-determining Africa would be a “socialism founded on old African communal life,” he pointed out at the same instant that “Pan-African socialism seeks the welfare state in Black Africa.”⁵¹ Perhaps as a reflection of the cavalier or superficial attitudes about ethnic culture that abound in Afro-American thought, or perhaps as another expression of his “two-ness,” at the same time that DuBois called for “sacrifice” of intra-African particularity on the altar of progress, he assured that “Pan-Africa will seek to preserve its own past history.”⁵² Pan-Africa ultimately was to DuBois the form of African pluralist participation in a global socialist order that he saw as the highest expression of rational social organization. DuBois assured that “[g]radually, every state is coming to this concept of its aim.”⁵³ It is at this point that DuBois’s Pan-Africanism converged with his conception of socialism.

SOCIALISM

The place of socialism in DuBois’s thinking is another area about which conventional wisdom is not as conventional as it appears; everyone agrees that DuBois died a socialist, but few agree on when he became one or on what kind of socialist he was. Broderick, for example, sees DuBois as having made “advances to socialism in 1907, although in early 1908 he affirmed his attachment to the principles of the Republican party.”⁵⁴ Rudwick’s view is less ambivalent: He contends that by that year DuBois was under socialist influence; and to support his claim, Rudwick adduces DuBois’s advocacy of “coop-

eration in capital and labor, wider distribution of capital.”⁵⁵ Cywar, however, maintains that in the early part of this century DuBois advocated a sort of left-wing social Darwinism,⁵⁶ and that his “decisive swing to the left would begin to become evident in the pages of the *Crisis* only after World War I.”⁵⁷ Holmes asserts that as “a materialist, it was only natural that ethically and economically Dr. DuBois’s sympathies were always along socialist lines of thinking.”⁵⁸ Fonlon⁵⁹ and Lester⁶⁰ agree that DuBois opted for socialism in 1907, whereas Hunton⁶¹ and Nelson⁶² emphasize DuBois’s commitment to socialism in general.

A problem common to all these interpretations is the failure to account for the mercurial content that the term socialism had in the United States in the early twentieth century. Socialism was identified variously with support of trusts, public ownership of utilities, corporate regulation, municipal reform, trade unionism, industrial unionism, or any of a myriad of social and economic policies.⁶³ Determination of whether DuBois, or any other agent active at that time, should be considered a socialist is dependent on which of the variety of socialist tendencies the critic takes as authentically socialist.

However, this impasse of defining socialist authenticity, an intellectually feckless activity, can be circumvented by identifying the core unifying principles around which the variety of socialist tendencies cluster. James Gilbert’s study of industrial-era American ideologies is helpful in this regard, as he proposes a common rubric that “signifies the general area of agreement among those intellectuals who committed their careers and hopes to such different movements as socialism, progressivism and managerialism.”⁶⁴ Those movements and intellectual tendencies converge around an outlook that Gilbert describes as entailing an emphasis on expertise as an impartial, legitimate basis for social decision making, identification of technological change as an intrinsically progressive force in social life, and advocacy of a model of scientific neutrality and impersonality as a major means to achieve social justice.⁶⁵ Because of its commitment to a view of the centrality of the economy among social institutions, Gilbert implicates this outlook, which he calls collectivist and dates in the United States roughly from the 1880s, in the advance of modern secularism.⁶⁶ This rubric subsumes theoretical continuities that unite the various social programs advocated by twentieth-century reform-oriented intellectuals. The essence of the

industrial democracy and social rationality around which those individuals—both Marxist and not, socialist and progressivist—converged tends toward a technicalization of social life that amounts to extension of a civil service model to the private sector,⁶⁷ including acceptance of a meritocratic definition of equality.⁶⁸

Although he observes that often socialist and progressivist visions are difficult to distinguish theoretically,⁶⁹ Gilbert contends that socialism constitutes a central theme around which other collectivist ideologies have oscillated.⁷⁰ Therein lies the strength of his formulation for the present purposes; notwithstanding Gilbert's attempt to differentiate Marxism qualitatively from other collectivist ideologies,⁷¹ collectivism suggests a way around the basically scholastic and probably futile debate over when and whether DuBois became a Marxist or any other kind of socialist.

Argument of whether "Marxist" influences on DuBois's thought were dominant, or whether Pan-Africanism or non-Marxist socialism constituted the central orienting principle of his ideas, is beside the point. The ensemble of these perspectives represents a distinctive response to elements of the development of industrial capitalism as a national and global system in the twentieth century. Insofar as any underlying rubric might exist, it can be located adequately in the context of collectivism as a theoretical orientation. The future of DuBois's Pan-Africa was broadly socialist; his consumer-cooperative organization likewise was a step toward realization of an integral collectivist society, and official Marxism represents perhaps the apotheosis of collectivism.⁷² In this sense, the collectivist perspective offers the advantage of dissolving superficial antagonisms among the strategies toward which DuBois was drawn by integrating them as ideological and programmatic elaborations of a coherent if not systematically articulated political outlook.

In considering these programmatic themes in relation to the problem of agency, DuBois's writing expresses an assumption of the rational movement of historical forces along a continuum of progress the terminus of which is already knowable, at least in general terms. Thus, socialism, defined as "the assertion by the community of its right to control business and industry; the denial of the old assumption that public business can ever be a private enterprise,"⁷³ stands as the unequivocal long-term goal of social development. That DuBois saw this socialist ideal as a point on the continuum along which Western society is advancing teleologically is hinted by his insistence

that the path to socialism must not be led by proletarians, who are untutored and without the capacity for making judgments about the thrust of civilization,⁷⁴ and must be sought by evolutionary rather than disruptive means.⁷⁵

He observed shortly after World War I that the great question facing the world concerned distribution of the wealth created by modern technique, that is, the issue of rationalizing the distributive system of large-scale capitalism.⁷⁶ Socialism, in this 1920 perspective, constituted the challenge to private ownership in “property and tools” and the call for elevation of need over the perquisites of power in distribution of the social product.⁷⁷ Moreover, he condemned monopoly primarily because of its irrationality, for under monopoly “it is not the Inventor, the Manager, and the Thinker who today are reaping the great rewards of industry, but rather the Gambler and the Highwayman.”⁷⁸ His proposal for rectification is an interesting amalgam of work ethic and social rationalization—perhaps indicative of the behavioral preferences of intellectuals or other petit bourgeois. DuBois wrote:

Present Big Business—that Science of Human Wants—must be perfected by eliminating the price paid for waste, which is Interest, and for Chance, which is Profit, and making all income a personal wage for service rendered by the recipient.⁷⁹

The fact that monopoly hegemony refuses to acknowledge technical interests sufficiently should not be taken lightly:

Today the scientific and ethical boundaries of our industrial activities are not in the hands of scientists, teachers, and thinkers; nor is the intervening opportunity for decision left in the control of the public whose welfare such decisions guide. On the contrary, the control of industry is largely in the hands of a powerful few, who decide for their own good and regardless of the good of others.⁸⁰

The problem of twentieth-century capitalism was therefore that its laudable technical capacities had developed beyond the rational limits of its institutional steering apparatus.⁸¹ The task before the world, then, was to move to correct the disjunction. However, that charge implies two questions: Who? And how? DuBois, the careful analyst, strained with only limited success to answer those questions.

DuBois early discarded the proletariat as the lever of social transformation. He was left without an effective agency even as he proclaimed class struggle to be a reality.⁸² Although his writings toward the latter years of the interwar period are dotted increasingly with references to the need for democracy to “fan out from politics to industrial life,”⁸³ he persisted in distinguishing—apparently with such self-assurance as to feel no need to argue the matter—a “logical social hierarchy” from one that can be penetrated only by wealth, with the strong implication that only the latter is unacceptable.⁸⁴ Moreover, it is suggestive in this regard that his enthusiastically held model for the vision of economic democracy was the Soviet Union. Perception of Russia as being in the lead “for realizing industrial democracy in the world”⁸⁵ was not uncommon among intellectuals in the United States, especially before the Stalin trials.⁸⁶ DuBois retained his enthusiasm, however, noting, as World War II drew to a close, that “Russia . . . still is to my mind, the most hopeful land in the modern world.”⁸⁷

Certain indications of how he would resolve the agency problem are sprinkled throughout DuBois’s interwar texts. Notwithstanding his charge that the “workers of the world must have voice not only on conditions of work but also as to what kinds of goods shall be produced and what methods of production used,”⁸⁸ he maintained that

distribution of wealth and services by plan, emphasizing ability and deserts, and especially the public weal; and guarding mankind from ignorance and disease must be a primary object of civilization.⁸⁹

A tension exists between his two stated concerns, a tension that does not surface for direct consideration in his writing. Even though DuBois by no means lacked sophistication in his critical attention to socialism,⁹⁰ he never seemed aware (or at least was not sufficiently troubled to engage the issue formally) of the intrinsic tension between planning—as the expression of macrological, technical interests—and democratic decision making.

His focus on the Soviet model, it turns out, was not fortuitous. DuBois’s agency revealed its identity through comparison with its Bolshevik confreres. In discussing steps necessary to build a cooperative economy in the Afro-American community, he broke the spell of invisibility. The “talented tenth,” the natural leadership of the

black population, he tells us, must “subject” black labor to its guidance in the same way that survival of the Soviet Union “involves vast regimentation, unquestioning obedience until the cumbersome superhuman economic machine can run in rhythmic order.”⁹¹ The invisibility of the agency, then, appears to be more a matter of class unconsciousness than of simple confusion on DuBois’s part. Moreover, it indicates an essential continuity in his view of socialism even through his period of association with Bolshevism.

Writing after he finally had joined the CPUSA and left the United States permanently, he responded to the question, “What is socialism?”:

It is a disciplined economy and political organization in which the first duty of a citizen is to serve the state; and the state is not a selected aristocracy, or a group of self-seeking oligarchs who have seized wealth and power. No! The mass of workers with hand and brain are the ones whose collective destiny is the chief object of all effort.⁹²

For his part, DuBois’s conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat seems not to have been too dissimilar from industrial democracy.

Thus it is clear today that the salvation of American Negroes lies in socialism. They should support all measures and men who favor the welfare state; they should vote for government ownership of capital in industry; they should favor strict regulation of corporations or their public ownership; they should vote to prevent monopoly from controlling the press and the publishing of opinions. They should favor public ownership and control of water, electric, and atomic power; they should stand for a clean ballot, the encouragement of third parties, independent candidates, and the elimination of graft and gambling on television and even in churches.

The question of the method by which the socialist state can be achieved must be worked out by experiment and reason and not by dogma. Whether or not methods which were right and clear in Russia or China fit our circumstances is for our intelligence to decide.⁹³

Consonant with Gilbert’s general critique of collectivism, DuBois’s socialism and his gravitation toward the CPUSA orbit indicate, rather than assumption of revolutionary consciousness at 80 years of age, more the convergence of Bolshevist and New Deal ideological stances in the postwar period. American Communism reached its nadir during those years and was forced increasingly to tail

behind ordinary civil rightist and other front-type programs, only now without much “boring from within.”⁹⁴ DuBois’s affinity for the Communist agenda was one of the movement’s few bright spots after 1948; for DuBois, who had been ostracized from mainstream black institutions, the CP was a port in an endless storm.

From the collectivist perspective, DuBois did not really have to move much at all from the positions he had held for five decades to accommodate his Communist turn. As his continuing enthusiasm in the pages of *The Crisis* over the Russian Revolution indicated, he always had felt a certain fascination with Bolshevism’s Jacobinist element. Furthermore, given the exigencies of the new atomic period and the consuming weakness of the Communists in the United States, DuBois was not required even to revise his long-standing commitments to non-violence and reason as the means of social transformation. He maintained in 1946:

We cannot escape the clear fact that what is going to win in this world is reason if this ever becomes a reasonable world. The careful reasoning of the human mind backed by the facts of science is the one salvation of man. The world, if it resumes its march toward civilization, cannot ignore reason.⁹⁵

Again in 1957 he described his outlook thus:

I should call myself a Socialist, although that isn’t a very definite term. But I mean I believe in the welfare state. I believe that business should be carried on not for private profit but for public welfare. I believe in many of the steps which are usually associated with socialism. . . . The Communist state will come about by the increase of socialism, by the change in our attitude toward each other, by making an individual American think of the progress of America and the welfare of America rather than thinking of his own advantage over his fellows, by ceasing to make the butt of our jokes the person who has suffered injury . . . by the extension of sacrifice and of love and of sympathy for our fellow beings. . . . I think it will come about democratically, not by violence . . . the violence that accompanies revolution is not the revolution. The revolution is the reform, is the change of thought, is the change of attitude on the people who are affected by it.⁹⁶

DuBois’s Communist theoretical turn can be seen in part as an attempt to resolve the perennial problem of agency in the American left by revising his expectation of the black elite as bearers of black collective subjectivity and assigning transformative responsibilities to the international proletariat. His revision of the role assigned to the

black middle class reflects disappointment at the latter's Cold War opportunism, especially as his "talented tenth" failed to support him during his persecution. Similarly, the rise in prominence of the proletariat in DuBois's view does not appear to indicate a qualitative shift in his outlook. His faith did not rest with empirical proletarians inside lived history. He noted that American workers, for example, were not up to their task.⁹⁷ The proletariat in which DuBois had faith is a collective subject whose empirical and historical embodiment is constituted in the Party. As a core principle of Bolshevism, the Party stands above the proletariat, represents its collective will, and thus constitutes a true universal subject. The Party, therefore, is in effect a central planning directorate for the proletariat. When consideration is given that the ruling circles within the Party are both centralized and composed overwhelmingly of intellectuals and intelligentsia, it seems that in turning to the proletariat as his last hope for realization of reason in the social world, DuBois in principle only rationalized and streamlined the commitment to the hegemony of the "new class" elite with which he had been identified over the previous half-century.

CONCLUSIONS

DuBois's racial pluralism, his Pan-Africanism, and his socialism come together around a distinct view of the world. Socialism was desirable for DuBois ultimately because it promised to realize the principles of administrative rationality and meritocratic equality. Pan-Africanism similarly was a mechanism to rationalize Africa's participation in an integral world order. His racial pluralism reflects a focus on elite/mass organization and group competition,⁹⁸ and this pluralism was for DuBois an instrument for enhancing black membership in an integral society. The coherence of DuBois's political thought is disclosed in its components' convergence around the unifying principles of the collectivist outlook characteristic among reform-oriented, industrial-era intellectuals.

Those principles and the outlook that they indicate seldom are discussed directly in DuBois's work because they were generally shared through the discursive arena within which he operated. Because they were not controversial, and were in fact part of the least common denominator of conventional attitudes that made reform dialogue possible, there was little reason for those principles ever to

be discussed. Therefore, they are accessible to us, the inhabitants of a different discursive situation, only through a reading that is sensitive to the location of a text in relation to its audience and the shared understandings that cement that relation.

It is more than likely, moreover, that similar principles have undergirded Afro-American political discourse throughout the industrial era. This certainly seems to be the case in the famed Washington/DuBois controversy, in which both sides demonstrate commitment to a project of "Americanizing" the rank and file black population by subordinating it to the imperatives of industrialization.⁹⁹ In any event, the search for structuring assumptions at the base of black social thought could disclose important meanings presently obscured in literal textual or superficially biographical analyses of writers' views on such theoretically pregnant issues as intraracial stratification, the nature of leadership or spokespersonship, and definition of community. Perhaps a useful heuristic is the simple question, seldom asked of black subjects: What sort of society would they create if allowed, or forced, to create their own?

NOTES

1. The standard works by Francis L. Broderick (*W.E.B. DuBois: Negro Leader in a Time of Crisis* [Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959]), and Elliott M. Rudwick (*W.E.B. DuBois: A Study in Minority Group Leadership* [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1960]) discuss the political positions explicitly stated by DuBois in the unfolding of his activist intellectual career. As the focus of each of those volumes is more broadly biographical, the authors are not primarily concerned with examining rigorously the structuring principles of DuBois's political thought. The hagiographical tendency is exemplified in too much of the collection by John Henrik Clarke et al., *Black Titan: W.E.B. DuBois* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1970).

2. Exemplary, although unevenly successful, efforts to confront this general problem are Hanes Walton, "Black Political Thought: The Problem of Characterization," *Journal of Black Studies* 1 (December 1970), pp. 213-218; S. P. Fullinwider, *The Mind and Mood of Black America* (Homewood, Dorsey Press, 1969); Herbert Storing, "Introduction," in *What Country Have I?* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1970); Alex Willingham, "Ideology and Politics: Their Status in Afro-American Social Theory," *Endarch* 1 (Spring 1975); William S. Toll, *The Resurgence of Race: Black Social Theory From Reconstruction to the Pan-African Conferences* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1979); and Harold Cruse's seminal study, *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual* (New York: William Morrow, 1967).

3. This is not to say that interracialism was generally accepted among DuBois's contemporaries; rather, in the system of relevance that structured the earlier political debates the proper forms of interracial contact seldom surfaced as an issue for explicit discussion. Even though different writers might be shown to have held different implicit positions on the matter, it was not sufficiently meaningful in the context of their commonly conceived project of discourse to warrant contention.

4. Howard Brotz, ed., *Negro Social and Political Thought: Representative Texts* (New York: Basic Books, 1966).

5. Cruse, *Crisis of the Negro Intellectual*.

6. Vincent Harding, "W.E.B. DuBois and the Black Messianic Vision," in Clarke et al., *Black Titan*.

7. W.E.B. DuBois, *The Gift of Black Folk* (1924; New York: Washington Square Press, 1968).

8. *Ibid.*, p. 158.

9. DuBois, *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903; New York: New American Library, 1969), p. 118.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 195.

11. DuBois, *The Philadelphia Negro* (1899; New York: Schocken Books, 1967), p. 317.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 318.

13. See, for example, the two studies by DuBois: *Some Efforts of American Negroes for Their Own Social Betterment* (Atlanta: Atlanta University, 1898) and *Economic Cooperation Among Negro Americans* (Atlanta: Atlanta University, 1907).

14. DuBois, "A Pageant in Seven Decades" (1938) in Philip S. Foner, ed., *W.E.B. DuBois Speaks: Speeches and Addresses, 1920-1963* (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1970), p. 66.

15. DuBois, *Dusk of Dawn: An Essay Toward an Autobiography of a Race Concept* (1940; New York: Schocken Books, 1968), p. 295.

16. *Ibid.*, p. 296.

17. *Ibid.*, pp. 171-172.

18. DuBois, "My Evolving Program for Negro Freedom," in Rayford W. Logan, ed., *What the Negro Wants* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1944), p. 70.

19. DuBois, "The Tragedy of 'Jim Crow,'" *The Crisis* 26 (August 1923), p. 170. On Cheyney State, see *Ibid.*, p. 172. See also DuBois, "The Dilemma of the Negro," *American Mercury* 3 (October 1924), pp. 179-85.

20. DuBois, "The Position of the Negro in the American Social Order: Where Do We Go From Here," *Journal of Negro Education* 8 (July 1939), pp. 565ff.

21. *Ibid.*

22. DuBois, "Prospect of a World Without Race Conflict," *American Journal of Sociology* 49 (March 1944), p. 456.

23. DuBois, "Position of the Negro," p. 565.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 569.

25. DuBois, *Dusk of Dawn*, p. 296.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 305.

27. *Ibid.*, pp. 309-310.

28. *Ibid.*, p. 310.

29. See, for example, DuBois, "On Being Ashamed of Oneself: An Essay on Race Pride," *The Crisis* 40 (September 1933), pp. 199-200, and "Prospect of a World."

30. See DuBois's editorials in *The Crisis* 41.

31. DuBois, *The Crisis* 41 (May 1934), p. 149.

32. *Ibid.*, (June 1934), p. 184.

33. Broderick, *DuBois*, pp. 172-173.

34. It is significant here to note that DuBois defined his conflict within the NAACP as "not an absolute difference of principle, but it was a grave difference as to further procedure," *Dusk of Dawn*, p. 313.

35. DuBois, "The Future of Africa—A Platform" (1919) in Foner, *DuBois Speaks*, p. 273.

36. DuBois, "The Pan-African Movement" (1945) in Foner, p. 166. Moreover, the second Pan-African Congress declared in part that, "The Negro race, through their thinking intelligentsia, demand . . . recognition of civilized men as civilized, despite their race or color," *Ibid.*, p. 170.

37. "There are . . . in the United States today several commendable groups of young people who are proposing to take hold of Liberia and emancipate her from her difficulties, quite forgetting the fact that Liberia belongs to Liberia," DuBois, "Pan-Africa and the New Racial Philosophy," *The Crisis* 40 (November 1933), p. 247.

38. *The Crisis* 23 (February 1922), p. 155.

39. *Ibid.*, p. 154.

40. *The Crisis*.

41. DuBois, "American Negroes and Africa's Rise to Freedom," *National Guardian* (February 13, 1961), reprinted in Julius Lester, ed. *The Seventh Son: The Thought and the Writings of W.E.B. DuBois* (New York: Random House, 1971), vol. 2, pp. 693-694.

42. That "tribalism" and its variants are mainly European colonial imports to Africa, cf. "The Saga of Nkrumah," (*National Guardian* [July 30, 1956]) and that "Pan-African socialism seeks the welfare state in Africa" ("A Future for Pan-Africa: Freedom, Peace, Socialism," in *Seventh Son*, p. 649) obviate any such attention.

43. "The Future of Africa," pp. 660-661.

44. DuBois, *The World and Africa: An Inquiry Into the Part Which It Has Played in World History* (1947; New York: International Publishers, 1965), p. 259.

45. DuBois, "Pan-Africa and the New Racial Philosophy," p. 247.

46. DuBois, *The Crisis* 23 (April 1922), pp. 251-52.

47. DuBois, *The Crisis* 17 (February 1919), p. 166.

48. *Ibid.*

49. DuBois, *Dusk of Dawn*, p. 304.

50. For critical interpretation of Garveyite Pan-Africanism, see Adolph Reed, Jr., "The Political Philosophy of Pan-Africanism: A Study of the Writings of DuBois, Garvey, Nkrumah & Padmore and Their Legacy," unpublished M.A. thesis, Atlanta University, 1975. Post-Black Power-era Pan-Africanism is analyzed systematically in Charles Hopkins, "Pan-Africanism: A Theoretical Examination of Contemporary Afro-American Involvement," unpublished M.A. thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1974.

51. DuBois, "Future for Pan-Africa," p. 649.
52. *Ibid.* Preservation in this context evokes the appropriate image—that of the fossilized museum piece.
53. DuBois, "The Future of Africa (Address to the All-African People's Conference, Accra)," *National Guardian* (December 22, 1958), reprinted in *Seventh Son*, pp. 658-659.
54. Broderick, *DuBois*, p. 123.
55. Rudwick, *DuBois*, p. 51.
56. Alan Sigmund Cywar, "An Inquiry into American Thought and Determinate Influence of Political Economic and Social Factors in the Early Twentieth Century: Bourne, Dewey, DuBois, Nearing, Veblen and Weyl," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester, 1972, pp. 330-331.
57. *Ibid.*, p. 340.
58. Eugene C. Holmes, "DuBois: Philosopher," in *Black Titan*, p. 80.
59. Bernard Fonlon, "The Passing of a Great African," in *Black Titan*, p. 220.
60. Lester, "Introduction," in *Seventh Son*, vol. 1, p. 137.
61. W. Alphaeus Hunton, "W.E.B. DuBois: The Meaning of His Life," in *Black Titan*, p. 176.
62. Truman Nelson, "W.E.B. DuBois as a Prophet," in *Black Titan*, p. 145.
63. See Ira Kipnis, *The American Socialist Movement, 1897-1912* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1952) and James Weinstein, *The Decline of Socialism in America, 1912-1925* (New York: Random House, 1969).
64. James Gilbert, *Designing the Industrial State: The Intellectual Pursuit of Collectivism in America, 1880-1940* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1972), p. 7.
65. *Ibid.*, p. 31.
66. *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.
67. *Ibid.*, pp. 34-35.
68. *Ibid.*
69. *Ibid.*, p. 18. Nowhere is the disappearance of socialism into progressivism much more pronounced than in the career of Charles Steinmetz, who Gilbert discusses in detail. Kipnis cites an article by Victor Berger, the Wisconsin Socialist Party leader, titled "Socialism: The Logical Outcome of Progressivism," *American Socialist Movement*, p. 226.
70. Gilbert, *Industrial State*, p. 64.
71. *Ibid.*
72. For theoretical discussion of the convergence of Marxism and liberal collectivism see Russell Jacoby, "What Is Conformist Marxism?," *Telos* (Fall 1980), pp. 19-44; Alvin W. Gouldner, *The Two Marxisms: Contradictions and Anomalies in the Development of Theory* (New York: Seabury, 1980); and Michael Urban, *The Ideology of Administration: American and Soviet Cases* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1982).
73. DuBois, *The Crisis* 22 (September 1921), pp. 199-200.
74. *Ibid.*, (October 1921), p. 245.
75. *Ibid.*, p. 246.
76. DuBois, *Darkwater: Voices From Within the Veil* (1920; New York: Schocken Books, 1969), p. 98.
77. *Ibid.*, p. 100.
78. *Ibid.*, p. 101.
79. *Ibid.*, p. 103.

80. Ibid., p. 157.

81. He observed that the "essential difficulty with liberalism in the twentieth century was not to realize the fundamental change brought about by the worldwide organization of work and trade and commerce," DuBois, "Pageant in Seven Decades," p. 64.

82. DuBois, "Marxism and the Negro Problem," *The Crisis* 40 (May 1933), p. 103.

83. DuBois, *Dusk of Dawn*, p. 289. Also, after citing inequitable taxation, imperialism, fluctuation in gold prices, and myriad indicators of the "fundamental unsoundness" of industrial capitalism, he observed, "Beyond all this lies the great fact that income is a social product and not simply the result of individual effort. Income is and must be divided by human judgment. That judgment must eventually be determined by social ethics and controlled by wider and more intelligent democracy in all industry," *The Crisis* 37 (December 1930), p. 426.

84. DuBois, *Dusk of Dawn*, pp. 189-90.

85. DuBois, *The Crisis* 32 (June 1926), p. 64.

86. See, for example, John P. Diggins' two volumes: *Up From Communism: Conservative Odysseys in American Intellectual History* (New York: Harper & Row, 1975) and *The American Left in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973).

87. DuBois, "My Evolving Program," p. 60. The circumstances that, as Broderick (*DuBois*, p. 193) observes, DuBois in the interwar period tended to support Trotsky and Radek over Stalin has little bearing here. At issue is the outlook that the three Soviet antagonists shared, commitment to a model of a command society of mass mobilization.

88. DuBois, *World and Africa*, p. 256.

89. Ibid.

90. He detected early, along with and presumably independently of his German contemporaries associated with the Frankfurt Institute, the fundamental homology uniting Fascism, Bolshevism and the New Deal (*Dusk of Dawn*, p. 288); he expressed a need to adjust the orthodox critique of capitalism to account for the rise of a "new class of technical engineers and managers" and other internal systemic changes in the twentieth century, ("Marxism and the Negro Problem," p. 104), and he demonstrated a sense of the significance of the mass culture apparatus, planned obsolescence and intensified marketing in the contemporary social management synthesis (*World and Africa*, pp. 254-256).

91. DuBois, Pittsburgh *Courier* (June 5, 1937), cited in Broderick, *DuBois*, p. 187.

92. "Future of Africa," pp. 658-659.

93. DuBois, "The Negro and Socialism" in Helen Alfred, ed., *Toward a Socialist America* (New York: Peace Publications, 1958), pp. 190-191.

94. For detailed examination of the atrophy of the CPUSA in this period, see Joseph R. Starobin, *American Communism in Crisis, 1943-1957* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972). On the decline of a left opposition in the postwar West more generally, see Irving Louis Horowitz, ed., *Power, Politics and People: The Collected Essays of C. Wright Mills* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1963), Peter Clecak, *Radical Paradoxes: Dilemmas of the American Left, 1945-1970* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973) and E.J. Hobsbawm, *Revolutionaries* (New York: Pantheon, 1973).

95. DuBois, "Behold the Land" in *Seventh Son*, vol. 2, p. 583.

96. "Interview with Dr. W.E.B. DuBois" in *Ibid.*, pp. 701-703.

97. "The American worker himself does not always realize [his mission]. He has high wages and many comforts. Rather than lose these, he keeps in office by his votes the servants of industrial exploitation so long as they maintain his wage. His labor leaders represent exploitation and not the fight against the exploitation of labor by private capital," DuBois, "Hail Humankind!" in Foner, ed., *DuBois Speaks*, p. 318.

98. Cf. Gilbert, pp. 7-8 and Louis Lindsay, "The Pluralist Persuasion in American Democratic Thought," *Social and Economic Studies* 22 (December 1973), pp. 479-513.

99. See, for example, Toll's discussion of the structuring principles of black discourse in this period in *The Resurgence of Race*. The theme of adjustment to industrialization is also visible in August Meier's account in *Negro Thought in America, 1880-1915: Racial Ideologies in the Age of Booker T. Washington* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1963).

Adolph L. Reed, Jr. is Assistant Professor of Political Science and Afro-American Studies at Yale University. He is the author of The Jackson Phenomenon: The Crisis of Purpose in Afro-American Politics (Yale, forthcoming) and editor of Race, Politics and Culture: Critical Essays on the Radicalism of the Sixties (Greenwood, forthcoming). This article is an excerpt from a larger study of DuBois's political thought.