Chapter Four:

"Education for Racial Understanding"

and the Meanings of Integration at Howard University, 1932-1954

In 1944, the *Journal of Negro Education* (JNE) dedicated its summer edition to an investigation of "Education for Racial Understanding." Martin Jenkins used his introduction to explain the journal's focus:

> The term *racial understanding* is used here for want of a better and more definitive term. We mean by this term not 'tolerance' alone, for tolerance implies a superior-inferior relationship. Nor do we mean better race relations necessarily (at least in the short-term view), for… improvement in the status of a subordinate racial group frequently results in deterioration of good race relations. Nor do we mean, even, better racial understanding, exactly, since better understanding does not *necessarily* result in a modified attitude. What we do mean by racial understanding is the development of an attitude which will permit and favor the adjustment of a subordinate racial group on a higher level than previously obtained.[1]

Like many journal contributors—as well as intercultural educators and religious activists committed to fighting prejudice—Jenkins believed that education, "can be effective in modifying racial attitudes" and "can initiate a changed social trend."[2] He recognized that the race problem must be fought "on many fronts"—in the courts, in the legislature, in labor unions, and through direct action.[3] Still, by 1944, Jenkins assumed that changes in racial attitudes must precede and would help to foster the transformation of the social, economic, and political structures sustaining racial oppression.[4]

This dispositional conception of the race problem made education a crucial battleground in the struggle for racial justice. Still, as Jenkins' difficulty defining "racial understanding" reveals, how education should be employed in the fight for improved race

relations was not entirely clear. This chapter shows how JNE contributors—who had espoused class-based conceptions of racism in the 1930s and who discussed the ways the race problem originated in labor exploitation and political oppression under slavery and colonialism into the late 1940s—came to more narrow objectives: anti-prejudice education and integration. The JNE's history also reveals that school integration could be demanded using both dispositional and redistributive logics.

From its origins in 1932, Howard University's JNE provided a context where activists and intellectuals argued over the nature of the race problem and the best strategies for change. The only journal committed explicitly to the scientific study of African American schooling, the JNE brought social scientists into dialogue with civil rights litigators, national political activists, philanthropists, educators, and social workers.[5] Like Fisk's Race Relations Institutes, as we have seen, the JNE aimed to use social science to inform social action. Politically engaged scholars of race relations—including social anthropologist Ina Corinne Brown, psychologist Eugene L. Hartley, sociologist Charles S. Johnson, anthropologist Hortense Powdermaker, sociologist Edgar T. Thompson, and historian Caroline F. Ware—contributed to the journal consistently from the 1940s through the 1960s.

At the same time, the journal focused as consistently on the struggle for civil rights as on African American education. Defining education broadly, the JNE included analyses of adult education in religious and labor organizations, African American political groups, government agencies, and the mass media. Social scientists and political activists regularly assessed the state of race relations and offered recommendations for change, without touching on education explicitly. Prominent civil rights activists and

black intellectuals—philosopher Alain Locke; NAACP leaders Roy Wilkins, Walter White, and Thurgood Marshall; President of Atlanta University Rufus Clement; media specialist and future advisor to Martin Luther King Jr. L.D. Reddick; and Director of Tuskegee Institute's School of Education J. Max Bond—published in the JNE throughout the interwar and postwar periods. Blurring the lines between scholar and activist—and challenging the emphasis on objectivity in mid-century social science—many who wrote in the JNE believed that social science was an essential tool in the struggle for racial justice.[6]

JNE authors had not always proceeded from the assumption that changing white attitudes would transform the social structural and political-economic foundations of the race problem. Arguing that the 1930s was a time when "conceiving of the world in economic terms was intellectually fashionable" historian Jonathan Holloway maintains that Howard University was a center of interwar leftist politics.[7] Throughout the 1930s—and into the late 1940s—many JNE scholars and activists suggested that interracial competition and labor exploitation were the root causes of racial injustice.[8] In chorus with the NAACP's *Crisis* and the Urban League's *Opportunity*, JNE authors translated class-based theories of the race problem into strategies for action. Depression-Era JNE contributors saw reforming American economic structures as a necessary first step in the struggle for improved race relations and called for increased funding for black educational institutions, cooperative agricultural ventures, and interracial class-based politics. They also debated the merits and, notably, articulated the drawbacks of school integration.[9]

The JNE's wartime and postwar publications, nonetheless, reveal the emerging power of individualistic, especially psychological, approaches to race relations in what had been a center of African American leftist thought.[10] By the mid 1940s, an emphasis on the psychology of prejudice and on the importance of education to foster tolerance increasingly motivated JNE calls for change. The focus on dispositional theories of and approaches to the race problem evident in the JNE's 1944 summer edition consolidated trends that slowly emerged in the 1930s and came to dominate JNE discussion by the early 1950s.

This shift would have a significant impact on how the JNE approached school desegregation. Although most interwar JNE authors demanded school integration as a tool for equalizing educational resources, this justification for desegregation competed with alternatives by the mid 1940s. The argument that school integration was necessary because it would produce tolerance and foster the development of healthy white and black personalities gained considerable ground among JNE authors between the mid 1940s and the ruling in *Brown v. Board of Education.* In the process, the attention to educational equity that had been so central to interwar JNE politics quietly fell out of debate.

The JNE, Howard's Leftist Tradition, and Intercultural Education, 1932-1944

In the mid 1930s W.E. B. Du Bois and Charles H. Thompson represented opposite ends of a spectrum of debate on the utility of school integration. In 1935, Du Bois claimed that schools were not an appropriate context to agitate for integration. Criticizing integrationists for forcing black children into "hells where they are ridiculed

and hated," Du Bois believed that as a result of white prejudice "most Negroes cannot receive proper education in white institutions." African Americans, instead of working for desegregation, should agitate for equal funding for black public schools and should strengthen black private institutions.[11] In contrast, throughout his thirty year tenure as JNE chief editor, Howard University dean and education specialist Charles H. Thompson argued emphatically for integration as a tool for increasing black students' access to educational resources. Challenging Du Bois' vision, Thompson emphasized that integration was the "best and only means to correct educational inequality."[12] Like Du Bois and Thompson, interwar JNE authors agreed that providing additional resources for African American education was the primary concern facing black educators but disagreed about whether school integration was an appropriate mechanism for reaching that goal.

"The 'Educational Slums' of Every Community"

The majority of social scientists writing in the Depression Era JNE considered economic forces the foundation of the race problem. Historians of African American politics have shown that attention to the economics of racial injustice remained at the center of grassroots civil rights organizing throughout the twentieth century.[13] Concern with the economic manifestations of the race problem, as legal historian Risa Goluboff has shown, motivated much legal and political activism outside university settings, especially among lawyers at the NAACP and in the U.S. Department of Justice in the 1930s and 1940s.[14] Class-based analyses of racism, Holloway has argued, were particularly popular among Howard intellectuals in the 1930s—including sociologist E.

Franklin Frazier, economist Abram Harris, political scientist Ralph Bunche, legal scholars William Hastie and Charles Houston, philosopher Alain Locke, and professor of education Charles H. Thompson.[15] Beginning in the Depression years, but continuing through World War II and the postwar era, the network of politically engaged social scientists of race relations that emerged from Howard described economic competition as the source of racial conflict and conceptualized interracial unionization as essential for racial progress.[16]

Depression era JNE authors did not suggest that economics alone could explain the race problem. Authors certainly saw white attitudes—especially when they produced discrimination in the provision of state and federal resources—and African American disenfranchisement as intertwined with the economics of American race relations. Nonetheless, in the 1930s in particular, a wide array of JNE contributors suggested that capitalist exploitation of black labor and competition for resources between social groups were basic causes of racial tension, injustice, and inequality. For example, in a speech given at "The National Conference on the Fundamental Problems in the Education of Negroes" that the JNE published in 1934, Eleanor Roosevelt connected her discussion of racial equity in education to a broader analysis of social inequality. She expressed concern in response to data highlighting racial discrepancies in per capita educational expenditures, explaining, "You can have no part of your population beaten down and expect the rest of the country not to feel the effects from the big groups that are underprivileged."[17] J. Scott McCormick of the Julius Rosenwald Fund similarly pointed to the economic roots of America's race problem. He described the foundation's mission by noting that Mr. Rosenwald believed the time was past "when two races could live

peacefully and prosperously together with one of them in poverty and without opportunity to elevate its standards of living." The idea that improved standards of living for African Americans meant social and economic progress for all Americans motivated foundation expenditures on black educational institutions and libraries in the South.[18]

Some authors articulated broad critiques of capitalism and of the exploitative nature of capitalist liberal democracy. Political scientist Ralph Bunche emphasized the economic foundations of America's race problem, although he made clear that capitalism, liberal democracy, and white prejudice reinforced one another. "Modern democracy," according to Bunche, had been "conceived in the womb of middle-class revolutions" and "was early put out to work in support of those ruling middle-class interests of capitalistic society which fathered it. It has remained their loyal child and has rendered profitable service for them."[19] Therefore, minority peoples living in any "theoretically democratic modern society" had to struggle to participate in democratic processes.[20] The political scientist did recognize that racial attitudes wielded great power. Prejudice advantaged the ruling classes interested in maintaining an exploitable workforce and solidified the low political and economic status of minority peoples.[21]

Although Bunche exposed the intersections between the economic, political, and psychological forces sustaining racial injustice, capitalist systems, he maintained, were of primary significance. Any program for change that failed to recognized the shared needs of black and white workers—and the underlying economic forces sustaining racial injustice—was doomed to failure. He critiqued popular "don't buy where you can't work campaigns" because supporters failed to acknowledge that African Americans were out of work not simply due to white prejudice, but largely because the economic system

demanded a marginal labor supply.[22] Even movements for securing individual rights for African Americans by political means were misguided, Bunche argued, since they failed to take account of the fact "that the political arm of the state cannot be divorced from its prevailing economic structure, whose servant it must inevitably be."[23] Religious groups, social welfare agencies, and interracial commissions engaged in attempts to create interracial fellowship were also "dubiously valuable" because they failed to challenge capitalist ideologies.[24] A civil rights activist who worked for the U.S. Department of State and the United Nations in the 1940s and 1950s, Bunche came to be considered a moderate. And yet, in the 1930s he presented both prejudice and the politics of white supremacy as results of an underlying capitalist system and believed that only challenges to liberal capitalism itself were likely to improve African American status.

W.E.B. Du Bois was also a vehement critic of capitalism. In 1932, the JNE published "Education and Work," Du Bois' 1930 Howard University commencement address. The talk critiqued the immorality of capitalism and suggested that only the development of a redistributive social order, one where none earned more than they needed, would effectively solve the race problem. Chiding black colleges for producing materialistic graduates, Du Bois complained that black universities neither understood nor developed a program to address "the age in which they live: the tremendous organization of industry, commerce, capital, and credit which today forms a super-organization dominating and ruling the universe, subordinating to its ends government, democracy, religion, education and social philosophy."[25] Reversing inequality required redistribution and sacrifice from the privileged, Du Bois asserted. It was only Russia that was "making a frontal attack" on the problem of capitalist privilege by questioning the

inevitability of capitalism.[26] Although Du Bois was one of the more extreme voices, both in his criticism of capitalism and in his support for all-black institutions, many Depression-era JNE authors suggested that labor exploitation, capitalist power relations, and economic structures stood at the foundation of the race problem.

Attention to the economic causes of the race problem—and to the intersections of the economic, political, and social foundations of racial inequality—led JNE authors to demand equalization in school finances and increased funding for African American schools. According to Charles Thompson, economic forces, African American disenfranchisement, and white prejudice worked together to produce segregated and unequal schooling. Throughout the 1930s, Thompson emphasized that the most pernicious effect of legal segregation was the educational inequality it created. African Americans were "thrice penalized" in their ability to acquire education, Thompson often repeated, "first for living in the wrong section of the country… second, for belonging to the wrong class… and third, for belonging to the wrong race…."[27] Black disenfranchisement explained both segregation and the inequality it produced, since African Americans in segregated communities had no access to the administration of school funds, no ability to hold office, and were unable to vote for the individuals that made educational policy.[28] In addition, since many southern states were struggling to fund the education of white children, there was little chance that white parents would voluntarily sacrifice for African American youth.[29] While intersecting factors produced segregation, in the South segregated schooling itself created "notorious discrimination in the provision of school facilities, so that Negroes always have poorer schools than the white schools in the same community."[30] In this context African Americans had four

choices: they could migrate North, they could work to secure access to the vote, they could try to use the courts to secure justice, or they could continue to appeal to whites for justice. Though Thompson believed that the last choice was used most frequently, he was skeptical that it would help African Americans secure "'a new deal' in education."[31] As a result he demanded increasing funding for black schools and equalizing educational resources by race within and between states.

How federal funding and administration could redistribute resources towards African American schools, especially in the face of state resistance, was a central concern of Depression-era JNE writers. In the JNE's first issue, published in April of 1932, David A. Lane Jr. discussed the relationship between African American schooling and the Report of President Hoover's 1929 National Advisory Committee on Education.[32] Lane defined educational equality strictly in terms of financial redistribution. He was alarmed by the report's suggestion that all federal grants to states should be general and, thus, administered at the discretion of state officials. He also derided the report's finding that because private philanthropy had so successfully advanced African American education, no direct federal aid for black schooling was necessary. It was only in a minority report, produced by three members of the committee with knowledge of African American education, that the unique needs of African American schooling were acknowledged. "Historically descended political, economic, and social conditions," the minority report held, ensured that African American education in southern and border states occupied "the most sorely disadvantaged status in the range of education under state jurisdiction." This status was evident in low per capita expenditures and "inferior and inadequate" school facilities. As a result Lane, echoing the minority report, argued

that the federal government had "a moral, historical, and practical obligation to act, for all the states, to remove these educational disadvantages."[33] Lane agreed with Thompson that federal action to equalize educational resources both within and between states was essential if African American education was to be improved.

Like Lane, Myrtle R. Philips argued in 1939 that discrimination on the part of local school officials and African American exclusion from the political processes that determined school board leadership ensured that black schools failed to receive the resources they were officially due. Philips' discussion of school finance revealed startling inequalities between and within states—and between localities, even for students of the same race. "The Negro schools suffer not only all of the disadvantages inherent in the national problem of school finance, but are further disadvantaged by the fact that they are not permitted to share *equally* in the educational advantages made possible by state and local funds," Philips maintained. "As a consequence Negro schools are the 'educational slums' of every community."[34] Philips' data exposed widespread racial differences in expenditures per pupil, in capital outlay, in values of school property, and in teacher salaries within states. These inequities, she argued, drastically limited African American children's opportunities to learn. Thus Phillips integrated economic and political theories of the race problem to argue for fairly administered federal grants and the reform of state tax systems to both increase educational resources and alter the mechanisms by which educational funds were allocated in dual systems.[35]

The tendency to prioritize the economic foundations of American racism had implications for interwar discussions of school integration. The JNE allowed debate on the benefits of integration, but the majority of JNE authors agreed with Thompson that

challenging legal segregation provided the best mechanism for effectively equalizing educational resources. Thompson did believe that educators needed to devise strategies for improving black schooling within a segregated system. He also understood the arguments black parents and teachers made for separate African American schools. And yet, he repeatedly argued that integration was the best strategy for producing educational equality and that inequality was inevitable in segregated schools. The basic problem black educators faced in the 1930s, Thompson believed, involved providing African American children with an adequate education in "the separate school" at the same time that they "pave the way for its extinction."[36]

Other Depression-era JNE scholar-activists emphasized how segregation exploited, disenfranchised, and stigmatized black people, but believed that one could only challenge segregation by challenging the political-economic system that created it. While Bunch supported the NAACP fight against educational segregation, he believed, in 1935, that this struggle attacked the symptoms, not the root causes, of African American disenfranchisement and economic marginalization. Segregation, in Bunche's view, resulted both from the failure of the courts to protect African American rights as citizens and from the total exclusion of African Americans from American political processes. It was since widespread black disenfranchisement forced African Americans to use the judiciary to accomplish what other Americans sought through voting that black people had historically been "a special ward of the Supreme Court." Still, fighting for African American rights in the courts was likely to produce few gains, Bunche believed, since the legal system could not be separated from the political-economic system of which it was a part.[37] It was because African Americans were unable to challenge American liberal

capitalism that the fight for civil rights focused on “such impairments and deprivations of civil liberties as segregation, together with inferior accommodations and instruction in the public schools, unequal apportionment of school funds, segregation and inferior accommodations on common carriers, residential segregation, exclusion from jury service, disenfranchisement, and peonage.”[38] In contrast, Bunche believed that effective interracial working class politics—not simply school integration—was necessary for creating equity for all African Americans.[39]

Horace Mann Bond also argued, in 1935, that segregated schools resulted from African American exclusion from democratic processes and ensured educational inequality. He was more hopeful than Bunche, however, about the benefits of school integration. Bond outlined the history of separate schools for African Americans in both northern and southern contexts and emphasized that educational segregation nearly always resulted from white decision-making. The intent of segregated schools, Bond made clear, was to stigmatize.[40] In southern communities, moreover, inequality was “an almost inevitable feature of a separate school system.” “The causes for this consistent inferiority of Negro schools in a separate system are inherent in the very reason for their being,” Bond maintained. By whatever index used—duration of school term, teacher salaries, or qualities of facilities—separate systems, Bond argued, created an “undeniable inequality.”[41] Bond emphasized the need to recognize “the institution” of the separate school “for what it is”—a tool for maintaining white status and advantage.[42] He certainly understood black parents’ desires to protect their children from the inevitable prejudice and maltreatment they were likely to encounter in mixed schools, but he ultimately

argued, like Thompson, that separate schools would always be unequal—and were intended to maintain racial hierarchies.

In contrast to Bunche, Alain Locke, Howard University philosopher and leader of the Harlem Renaissance, emphatically supported struggling for integration through the courts in the mid 1930s. Despite the short-term harms that African American children might experience, Locke, like Thompson, believed that integration was the only realistic mechanism for producing equal education.[43] Segregation, Locke was convinced, aimed to produce not only separation but inequality—and therefore almost never co-existed with equal educational standards.[44] In addition, Locke believed the gradualist argument that changes in popular attitudes must precede legal change was based on false claims.[45] Locke concluded that both creating equal schools and undermining legal segregation demanded court action. "The principle of equitable sharing in the public taxation and the social facilities which are established under it" did not allow for separate accommodations, because the expense of such a situation prohibited separate but equal facilities in most communities. In addition, in many instances the inferior education African Americans received was used to "rationalize…his inferior capacity and social need."[46] Believing that law was the most promising avenue through which to agitate for integration, Locke emphasized that desegregation would create more good than harm.[47]

And yet for Locke, equality was not the only justification for integration. In 1935, the philosopher developed an argument that would be widely articulated in the postwar period—that segregation was essential because public schools provided one of the few locations where interracial tolerance could be taught. The educational interaction of black and white students "under…advantageous circumstances" represented a distinct

benefit of integrated schooling.[48] The school was the "logical and perhaps the only effective instrument" to foster positive intergroup contact, interaction Locke believed necessary for interracial understanding.[49]

Despite Thompson, Bond, and Locke's support for court enforced desegregation, whether integration was the best strategy for improving African American education was a topic of intense debate in the Depression-era. In 1935, the JNE dedicated its summer issue to "The Courts and the Negro Separate School."[50] Notably, given the postwar JNE's ubiquitous support for integration, the 1935 summer edition published critiques of integrationist politics, critiques suggesting that equalizing educational resources in segregated schools was preferable.

Du Bois' 1935 JNE article revealed both the breadth of opinion on the issue and exposed how psychological assumptions could be used to defend segregated education. Mixed schools, Du Bois explained, not the damaging segregated schools that would become the focus *Brown v. Board*, were likely to damage black personalities.[51] "Using a little child as a battering ram" with which to open the doors locked shut by *Plessy v. Ferguson* was immoral, Du Bois maintained, arguing "we must give greater value and greater emphasis to the rights of the child's own soul."[52] Viewing white prejudice as intractable, Du Bois contended that the racial antipathy African American children would encounter in mixed schools would irreversibly damage developing personalities. He therefore strongly opposed integration as a tool for redistributing educational resources.[53] Convinced that small children were not prepared "for the kind of battle thus indicated," Du Bois was aghast that parents forced their children into schools where white students, teachers, and parents made life "a living hell." The experience, he feared, was likely to

ruin "character, gift, and ability" and ingrain a "hatred of schools and men."[54] Du Bois did not point explicitly to any psychological research, but his arguments for "the separate school" were based on assumptions about the conditions necessary for fostering healthy personalities. In cases where popular white support for integrated schools existed, Du Bois did believe, it might be worthwhile for African Americans to agitate for mixed schools. He thought it useless, however, for African Americans to try to fight popular will. Instead, Du Bois believed black parents should work to ensure that black schools and universities were adequately funded. He criticized the NAACP for spending a great deal on the fight for integration and "scarcely a single cent" to equalize the distribution of educational resources in segregated schools.[55]

Du Bois' critique of school integration was one of the most vehement published in the Depression-Era JNE. Many authors, however, took seriously his argument that "the separate school" would protect black youth. In her comparison of racially mixed and segregated African American schools, Mary R. Crowley recognized the "race-conscious argument for segregated schooling as a better educational context for African American children." She also cited a report showing that African American students suffered from the prejudices of their white peers. Ultimately, using evidence she collected from schools in Cincinnati, she concluded that segregated schools were as effective as mixed schools in training African American youth, a powerful defense of "the separate school" given its financial disadvantages.[56] Rayford W. Logan analyzed educational segregation in the North and lamented that many institutions of higher education were attempting to exclude African Americans. He certainly understood, however, that the difficulty of placing African American teachers trained in the North in

integrated school systems encouraged many African Americans to support segregated education.[57] Paul E. Baker suggested in 1934 that "trend toward bi-racial life in America"—by which he meant increased segregation and the establishment of exclusive African American economic, social, and cultural institutions—might be desirable. He recommended studies to assess "all the implications of the present biracial drift in America."[58] Du Bois was not the only JNE author to consider equalizing educational resources within a segregated context as a viable and desirable alternative to school integration.

Throughout the 1930s, in both their social theories and their calls for educational reform, JNE authors highlighted the economic foundations of the race problem. Social scientists, educators, and political activists chronicled the economic needs of black schools in both northern and southern states and blamed inadequate funds for most of the problems black students faced. Interwar JNE authors largely agreed that equalizing educational resources was essential for improving African American education. What they debated over was how that goal could best be achieved and whether the benefits of integrated schooling outweighed the harms. Certainly Du Bois, as well as many black parents and teachers, supported "the separate school" because of the psychological benefits it promised for black students and because of the presumably intractable nature of white prejudice. At the same time, Thompson, Bunche, Locke, and a wide array of JNE contributors remained committed to integration, because they saw this as the only reasonable tool for producing educational equity.

Cultural Democracy and "the Walls of Prejudice"

Despite the political-economic emphasis of interwar JNE discussions of race relations, dispositional approaches to fighting for racial justice were also evident. Many scholars who highlighted the political-economy of race relations recognized that prejudice was also crucial. In addition, some psychologists, representatives of interracial organizations, and especially proponents of intercultural education presented an alternative to political-economic theorizing by suggesting that white racial attitudes were the chief cause of the race problem. The idea that integrated schools were especially well suited to teaching interracial tolerance—a defense of integration that Locke articulated briefly in 1935—also originated in the interwar period, though it only gained a small number of supporters at the JNE.

Beginning in the mid 1920s, proponents of intercultural education developed school-based programs to ease the transitions of second generation immigrants to American life and to encourage tolerance of ethnic diversity by white Americans.[59] Leading intercultural educator Rachel Davis DuBois, and her colleagues at the Service Bureau for Intercultural Education, believed that fighting white prejudice was crucial to fostering interracial tolerance, that exposing white Americans to immigrant "cultures" would reverse negative attitudes, and that interracial contact would increase racial harmony. DuBois' educational programs grew in popularity throughout the early 1930s. In 1936 the Progressive Educational Association hired her to run its Commission on Intercultural Education. DuBois left the association in 1938 because, according to historian Nicholas Montalto, her program was too radical for the organization. She continued to influence teachers and educational leaders, however, promoting her theories

through the *Journal of Educational Sociology* and *Teachers College Press.* She regularly served on the faculty of Fisk's Race Relations Institutes, advised the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and taught in a variety of institutions of higher education. DuBois also worked on the script for *Americans All-Immigrants All*, a World War II Era Federal Radio Project sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education.[60]

Certainly intercultural education influenced educators outside DuBois' New York-based organization and beyond the Depression years. In 1948, with backing from the American Council on Education and the National Conference of Christians and Jews, another intercultural educator, Hilda Taba established a Center for Intergroup Relations in conjunction with the Department of Education at the University of Chicago. Members of the University of Chicago's Committee on Education, Training, and Research in Race Relations (CETRRR) were well aware of intercultural education programs going on in the schools. In fact, as we have seen, some members of Chicago's race relations committee worked hard to distinguish their own involvement with the Chicago Public Schools from intercultural educational programs that they believed lacked scientific justification.[61] Rachel Davis DuBois and Hilda Taba corresponded regularly with leaders of the Society of Friends, the American Jewish Congress, the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and the American Council on Education. In addition, during the 1930s, leading scholars of race relations—among them E. Franklin Frazier, Charles S. Johnson, Louis Wirth, Arnold Rose, and Gordon Allport—attended summer race relations institutes sponsored by the American Friends Service Committee at Swarthmore College and New York University that DuBois helped to lead.[62]

Although DuBois recognized that economic inequality was related to racial injustice, her method for fighting interracial hostility was explicitly dispositional: she proposed educational programs to combat interracial misunderstanding and to reverse white prejudice.[63] In 1939, for example, DuBois explained in the *Journal of Educational Sociology* that "because the school is the only institution which is or may become the meeting ground for all our varieties of culture, and because it can provide the facilities for open-minded study and comparison of the social values of each group," schools must break down the "walls of prejudice" that separated Americans. Articulating a program for the fostering of "cultural democracy" developed throughout the 1930s, DuBois recommended cultural experiences and planned interracial contacts in order to foster intergroup understanding. These included school-based assembly performances that highlighted the contributions of minority groups to the American nation, programs in which students met successful adults who were members of minority groups, and "get to know you teas" where a group of white parents interacted with minority group representatives. This sort of programming, DuBois and her associates believed, could reduce the intergroup tension that challenged domestic and international peace.[64] While disagreeing about the benefits of cultural pluralism, intercultural educators challenged political-economic analyses of race relations common in the Depression Era JNE. The race problem, as presented by intercultural educators, was not an issue of politics, economics or even sociology, but of culture and psychology. DuBois never actually published in the JNE. But, because she published so widely, because she regularly attended conferences with core JNE authors, and because intercultural programs, by the mid 1940s, were common in many schools and mass media propaganda, the dispositional

approach to the race problem she promoted would influence the journal's postwar discussions of how education could best be employed in the fight for racial justice.

The assumption that educational programs—especially those that presented factual information about minority groups and that fostered interracial contact—were essential to improving race relations was a recurring, though not a dominant, theme in the interwar JNE.[65] In 1933, authors Walter C. Reckless and Harold L. Bringen argued that a better understand of how social attitudes were formed and about the kinds of information that shaped individual attitudes was essential for improving American race relations. Although social scientific literature was divided on the malleability of prejudice, Reckless and Bringen believed there was too little attention "paid to the effect which non-partisan information about different peoples of the world has in reshaping already established racial and class attitudes."[66] They recommended research projects that measured the relationship between an individual's knowledge of factual material about ethnic groups and "favorable" racial attitudes towards those groups.[67] Throughout the 1930s, moreover, the JNE did report on intercultural educational techniques being promoted by educational and religious organizations.[68]

Often JNE authors interwove the dispositional theories that motivated intercultural education with analyses of the economic and political foundations of racial oppression. This was especially true in discussions of employment discrimination, when authors revealed how blocked employment opportunities resulted from white prejudice. Although he emphasized that the availability of jobs critically affected African American socio-economic status, W .D. Weatherford of the Y.M.C.A. Graduate School claimed that educating prejudiced whites was the best approach for opening opportunities for African

Americans. "The most important thing to be done for the Negro," Weatherford held, "was to create an open-minded sympathy for and understanding of him on the part of the white people." Thus he described a series of educational projects for white college students, including discussion groups on the textbook "Negro Life in the South" and courses in race relations and slavery. He also recommended interracial cooperation around shared tasks as a way to encourage "racial understanding."[69] Maude Carmichael made a similar argument. By changing white attitudes, she held, "the two races may cooperate harmoniously in lifting the Negro out of a position in which he is more or less of a social and economic liability…into one in which he is a decided social and economic asset."[70]

Still the JNE's support for intercultural education was tempered in the 1930s. Thompson certainly believed that white prejudice presented obstacles to African American advancement, especially given white control of politics and educational resources throughout the South.[71]

And yet, Thompson believed dispositional approaches alone would prove insufficient in the fight for racial justice. In 1933 Thompson described the development of "race-relations programs'" that assumed that "'unsympathetic and antagonistic racial attitudes are due to misunderstanding, and that misunderstanding is due to lack of knowledge and proper contact with the object of antagonism." These assumptions, he held, had led to the development of programs to study "the Negro in our American civilization" as well as projects "embarking upon 'The Quest for [Interracial] Understanding'" in high schools, normal schools, colleges, universities, and national organizations throughout the South.[72] There was little evidence, Thompson concluded, about whether these programs had

actually increased access to educational resources for African Americans.[73] In fact he argued that the "race-relations ideal" presented many difficulties as "an *ultimate* solution of the problem of the Negro separate school" and that educational programs to alter white attitudes were likely to have little effect on the "*immediate* problem of getting equitable provision of school facilities." Other methods, he concluded—including migration, the courts, and securing the ballot—should be used in the short term.[74]

While the Depression Era JNE prioritized the economic foundations of the race problem and saw integration as a tool for reversing educational inequality, contributors debated over how to most effectively provide resources to black children. In fact, although scholars of *Brown v. Board* have paid considerable attention to the NAACP's mid-century decision to put "the image of the damaged black psyche" at the center of their litigation strategy, interwar JNE defenders of "the separate school" emphasized how *integration* would harm black personalities.[75] Even JNE integrationists conceded that integration was likely to negatively affect black psyches. It was because, given black disenfranchisement, desegregation represented only the way to redistribute educational resources that it was worth the trade-off.

"Education for Racial Understanding," 1939-1945

In their social scientific theorizing, wartime JNE authors continued to point to the economic foundations of the race problem. Anthropologists and sociologists suggested, through the late 1940s, that the race problem originated in the structures of capitalism and the politics of colonialism. Many also maintained that racial prejudice, in the mid-century U.S., resulted from competition for power, resources, and status between

members of different racial and ethnic groups. Nonetheless, although systemic, relational, and dispositional theories of the race problem were all articulated between 1939 and 1945, the emphasis on redistributing resources that had been the focus of the interwar JNE educational agenda declined markedly. Instead, bolstered by psychological work on prejudice and seeking to capitalize on growing enthusiasm for anti-prejudice education, wartime JNE authors increasingly claimed that the struggle for racial justice necessitated fighting white prejudice.

"If beliefs per se could subjugate a people…":
Exploitation and Colonialism in Wartime Theories of Race Relations

Despite attention to the economics of race relations in the 1930s, the JNE moved with broader intellectual and political trends by avoiding class-based racial politics in the wartime and postwar years.[76] By the end of World War II, according to Holloway, the economic analyses of Howard University scholars had been eclipsed by race-based conceptions of justice and equality.[77] "The economism of the radical black intellectuals in the 1930s and 1940s failed," Holloway argues, as class-based analyses of racism "were subverted for the sake of the moral suasion that grew from racial cohesion."[78] Historians Gary Gerstle and Ira Katznelson support Holloway's suggestion. By the mid 1940s, they argue, race had supplanted class as the basis for understanding American inequality.[79] Certainly, in his biography of Martin Luther King Jr., Thomas F. Jackson shows that economic concerns remained central to the southern and northern civil rights movements throughout the 1950s and 1960s.[80] Still, historians have emphasized that class-based theories of racial justice were less frequently advanced in the wartime and postwar years than they had been previously.

Compared to their Depression-era pronouncements, the JNE's calls for economic reforms—and especially their demands for redistributing educational funding—were muted by the mid 1940s. What did not decline in prominence, however, were theories that saw political-economic forces as the historical origin and continued foundation of the race problem. In the 1944 summer edition, in particular, anthropological and sociological analyses of "the idea of race" revealed clearly that power relations, conflicts over resources, and labor exploitation lay at the heart of the race problem. Still, JNE authors, like their colleagues at the Fisk Race Relations Institutes, generally did not translate political-economic analyses of race relations into calls for change.

JNE authors' analyses of the ways the race idea emerged and the function the idea of race served exposed the systemic and relational nature of racial oppression. Sociologists and anthropologists often began by "proving" that race was a cultural construct that served historically distinct functions. Following Franz Boas, *JNE* anthropologists Hortense Powdermaker, Ina Corrine Brown, and sociologist Edgar T. Thompson began their analyses by refuting biological arguments for racial difference. Like Robert Park and the Chicago School social ecologists, *JNE* authors then explored how cultural and historical factors shaped inter-group relations.[81]

The social scientists writing in the *JNE* agreed that race was a fictional idea developed out of inter-group conflict. In 1939, sociologist Charles S. Johnson argued that race "is a state of mind and an historical philosophy." The values and meanings individuals gave to observable physical differences, Johnson maintained, were determined largely by social and economic factors of a particular historical moment. Asian American racial characteristics held different significance "according to their

[Asian Americans'] position as economic competitors." When their labor was essential on the West Coast, race relations were relaxed, but when Asians competed for jobs with white Americans, "the physical and cultural differences have been given acute racial significance." Discriminatory restrictions against Japanese immigrants were based in economic motives but used "the emotional strength of race prejudice" as a justification. Racism, in this view, was a tool deliberately employed by whites to gain advantage against economic competitors. Racial prejudice, Johnson continued, could also serve as a tool for the maintenance of political power. German anti-Semitism provided an example of the manner in which racialism "can be used as a weapon of economic nationalism," as it had throughout much of European history.[82] Although Johnson certainly recognized that prejudice was inextricably intertwined with the political-economy of race relations, for Johnson the idea of race was derivative. Prejudice was a tool used, both deliberately and unconsciously, in conflicts whose origins were economic or political.

Duke University sociologist Edgar T. Thompson, along with Scarritt College social anthropologist Ina Corrine Brown, also pointed to the historically determined nature of race relations. They emphasized that interracial competition—for space, authority, or status, not only for jobs or resources—led to the development of racial castes. Brown suggested viewing race relations in the United States as a particular kind of group relations, "in the context of the age-old, world-wide problem of self-conscious groups which occupy or compete for the same territory."[83] Following Park and the social ecologists, Brown held that how diverse groups reacted to meetings with one another depended on the "the circumstances of the initial contact, the patterns set up by previous contacts of similar nature, or on the cultural patterns previously established." The history

of colonial North America, the slave trade, and regional racial slavery in the United States revealed that white beliefs about African American inferiority and taboos against miscegenation functioned ultimately "to preserve status."[84] Nonetheless, echoing Lloyd Warner and the class and caste school of social anthropology, Brown noted that cultural norms—and she considered prejudice a cultural norm—could continue to function long after the economic or political context that gave rise to them had passed.

Thompson, a sociologist of plantation life, was even more explicit in his suggestion that racist ideology developed from and functioned to sustain labor exploitation. Race was an idea shaped and employed in particular historical circumstances—in plantation societies, in employer-employee relationships, in cross-cultural trade, and in wartime. Twentieth-century Americans' concepts of race, therefore, derived from interracial encounters that occurred under European colonialism. The American racial situation was formed out of the need for black labor, Thompson held, as "the idea of race developed as a working element in colonial areas as a means of effecting control over the Negro's labor and of fixing him in a permanent caste position." Although racism took different forms depending on the social and historical circumstances in which it functioned, Thompson found that, "essentially it always involves the imputation of traits and characters to the members of the other group which are regarded as biologically inheritable and immutable. These traits and characters contrast with those of ourselves in ways that are favorable to us."[85] Thompson agreed with Johnson that the idea of race existed because it justified labor exploitation under slavery and colonialism.

Marxist sociologist Oliver Cromwell Cox (who contributed to the JNE until 1951) built on analyses like Johnson's and Thompson's to develop a theory of the race problem rooted in capitalist labor relations, bourgeois ideology, and exploitation. The furthest left of the *JNE* scholars, Cox, who criticized the Chicago school, Warner, and Myrdal for failing to highlight the class exploitation at the root of American racism, revealed Howard's continued intellectual breadth in the mid-1940s. Race relations, Cox argued in 1943, depended on the economic, demographic, and sociological characteristics of a particular historical setting—population ratios, economic circumstances, and the nature of interracial contact.[86] Thus, both Johnson, who was considered by many to be a political moderate, and Cox, a well-known radical, suggested that the meanings given to racial characteristics differed based on the economic and political needs of those in power.[87]

Where Cox went further than his colleagues was in his critique of the ideological function the concept of prejudice served. Cox challenged Myrdal's concept of the "vicious circle," the idea that white prejudice and African American status were mutually reinforcing. In the JNE in 1945, Cox argued:

> The point which the author [Myrdal] seems to have avoided is this: that both race prejudice and Negro standards are consistently dependent variables. They are both produced by the calculated economic interests of the Southern oligarchy….Here [in Myrdal's theory] beliefs are assumed to be prime movers; they 'keep the Negroes low.' This is mysticism…. If beliefs per se could subjugate a people, the beliefs which Negroes hold about whites should be as effective as those which whites hold about Negroes.[88]

Cox powerfully challenged the assumption that racial attitudes caused racial oppression. He even suggested that scholars and activists' attention to racial attitudes itself justified labor exploitation. And yet, a toned down version of Cox's basic claim—that racial

prejudice emerged from and continued to exist because it served white economic interests—ran through analyses of the race problem offered by many scholars who were not known as radicals.

Articulated between 1939 and 1945, such arguments were striking for their deviation from both the emerging "liberal consensus on the race problem" and from the psychology of prejudice.[89] They also directly challenged calls for "education for racial understanding," the organizing principle of the JNE's 1944 summer edition. And yet, JNE contributors shied away from the political implications of their conclusions. Although they suggested that the idea of race had historically justified exploitation under slavery and colonialism, none of the social scientists, except Cox, went on to recommend interracial class based politics or challenges to American capitalism as JNE authors like Bunche, Du Bois, and even Johnson had in the 1930s. It was the psychology of attitude formation, not the sociology, anthropology, and political economy of inter-group conflict that JNE contributors considered most relevant for developing policy.

"In the Minds of Ordinary Men and Women": The Wartime Psychology of Prejudice

The programmatic implications of psychological and civic understandings of the race problem fared better in the postwar intellectual climate. While psychologists and psychiatrists increasingly contributed to the JNE, psychological assumptions also permeated conceptions of the race problem articulated by sociologists, anthropologists, and a broad group of postwar activists. Social science had dismantled biological racism for the academic community, but, JNE authors made clear, scientific facts had little effect on ordinary people's racial attitudes. "It is difficult to discuss race relations

scientifically," argued Johnson in 1939. "The kind of knowledge out of which human relations are built is not systematic, but personal."[90] Racial attitudes might be an effect, not the root cause of the race problem, but prejudice still wielded great power. During wartime, JNE authors, in striking contrast to the Depression-era, shied away from articulating the programmatic implications of social structural and political-economic theories of racism. The psychology of attitude formation, however, provided the rationale for many postwar scholars' calls for reform. Analyses of racial attitudes were much easier to translate into action because they made anti-prejudice education—which was never as controversial as interracial class politics or resource redistribution—a crucial weapon in the struggle for racial justice.

The wartime JNE both reflected and contributed to wider intellectual and political trends by emphasizing the importance of white attitudes to the race problem. Early-twentieth-century psychiatrists broke new ground by deeming the day-to-day problems of "nearly normal" people within the scope of scientific expertise.[91] By the 1940s, Gary Gerstle maintains, social scientists began to see the psychological realm as an arena in which social policy could intervene.[92] Wielding social psychological research on the malleability of prejudice, and motivated by the specter of Nazi racism, wartime activists expanded anti-prejudice programming in schools as well as religious, labor, and civic groups. Reflecting assumptions that permeated interwar intercultural education, wartime anti-prejudice educators, as historian Walter Jackson has shown, argued that education was an essential tool in the struggle against prejudice and that psychology held the secrets for how to best educate Americans to "think clearly" about racial and ethnic minorities.[93]

While only a few psychologists wrote in the JNE during World War II, psychological assumptions permeated many writers' conceptions of the race problem. Increasingly for JNE authors, everyday beliefs were not only an appropriate subject of scientific investigation, they were a context in which the fight for civil rights had to be waged. And yet, how racial attitudes could best be improved was not completely clear. Too often, Edgar Thompson, Ina Corrine Brown, psychologist Eugene Hartley, and Hortense Powdermaker noted, scientific findings about the fallacy of racial categories failed to alter ordinary people's beliefs. As Edgar Thompson explained, social scientists "may be willing to give up race but ordinary men and women will not do so, and it is in the minds of ordinary men and women, not in the concepts of scientists that the race problem exists."[94] Social scientific findings had little meaning for ordinary people, he argued. In fact, ordinary people's lack of a "clearly formulated definition of race" did not weaken the power of the concept but made it more potent.[95] Irrational attitudes and emotions, many JNE social scientists concluded, not factual knowledge, determined most white Americans' thoughts about race.

Psychology often revealed the profound irrationality and rigidity of racial thinking. It was partly because the formation of racial attitudes occurred during early childhood, many social scientists maintained, that racial ideas proved so tenacious. Once attitudes were fixed, they determined what factual information an individual would accept or reject. Eugene L. Hartley (formerly E.L. Horowitz), a leading interwar psychologist of race relations, argued that regardless of what students learned in school, community pressures and parental beliefs primarily shaped racial attitudes. Ideas about race were formed at a state of development "where we can expect little in the way of

factual information about inherent racial abilities."[96] Hartley also cited work showing that factual information at times had little effect on existing racial attitudes. Psychologist Theodore Newcomb's analysis of college students revealed that while the development of individual racial attitudes was influenced by the pattern of the college community, individuals "accepted or rejected" new information in accordance with existing personality structures.[97] V. Seelman showed that while people liked to think that their attitudes were based on knowledge, "in the field of interracial understanding the attitudes are often primary, with the 'information' functioning as a rationalization." Preexisting attitudes, Hartley concluded, "determine what we shall accept as basic facts and what we will explain away or consider unimportant."[98] By implying that racial attitudes were primarily irrational, and were therefore often unaffected by relevant information, the literature Hartley synthesized raised questions about the efficacy of anti-prejudice educational programming.

Prejudice was also difficult to fight because it was embedded in widely held cultural norms. According to Powdermaker, an anthropologist increasingly interested in racial attitudes by the war years, since racism was learned through family and community socialization, it was particularly difficult to "unlearn." Very young children absorbed prejudice from their social environment—from parents, siblings, teachers, neighbors, and others with whom they come into immediate contact—both consciously and unconsciously.[99] Children learned racial prejudices "in the same way they absorb other social norms" such as table manners, types of dress, religion, and political ideas, Powdermaker explained. As a result:

> The attitudes of white children towards Negroes will mirror in general the attitudes of the adults whom they love and look up to. The attitudes are formed long before the individual comes into contact with scientific facts about race. Later, as he grows up, the feelings are substantiated by the mores of the society, in our case, by all the subtle and overt manifestations for keeping the Negro in an inferior status. The individual also usually chooses certain experiences to further bolster his attitudes and ignores those which contradict it.[100]

Like Hartley, Powdermaker argued that attitudes developed before the young encountered facts about race. When individuals did encounter scientific arguments revealing the fallacy of biological conceptions of race, they generally dismissed information that did not fit with existing world-views. Schools could do little to limit racial prejudice, Powdermaker and Hartley's work implied, when children learned racism in all of their daily encounters.

Irrational white racism was so insidious, some JNE contributors believed, that it threatened American democracy. To be truly democratic, argued J. Max Bond, director of the Tuskegee Institute's School of Education, education must "strive courageously and honestly to free the minds of children and adults from the American psychosis of racial hate and all of its attendant evils." Not only did fighting racism abroad while condoning it at home make a mockery of democracy, Bond claimed, but it also contributed to mass psychosis among white Americans. While Nazis used their schools to teach hate and racism, Bond emphasized that in America, "the souls of American children…are being warped and conditioned against democracy by those disciples of infamy, who preach their blasphemous doctrines of race hate and race superiority from legislative chambers, the pulpits of churches, and the classrooms of our schools."[101] Although Bond presented a particularly vehement criticism of American hypocrisy, the assumptions on which Bond based his attack—that white society was engulfed in social sickness, that white children,

not black youth, were psychologically damaged, and that racism was at root a problem of white attitudes—ran throughout JNE wartime discussions of education for racial understanding.[102] Post-war civil rights activists dismantled the legal edifice of racial segregation based on the argument that segregated schooling damaged the psyches of black youth. Ten years before *Brown v. Board*, however, JNE authors were largely concerned with the social psychosis of white racism—a problem, many believed, that segregation exacerbated.[103]

"Counteracting Undesirable Learning": Anti-Prejudice Education as the Solution to the Race Problem

One might have expected psychologists' pessimistic predictions about the tenacity of racial attitudes to produce disillusion. Instead, JNE authors consistently presented educational programs to reduce prejudice as a necessary component of the fight for racial justice. By the mid 1940s, JNE authors began seeing attitudes as an appropriate site for social action and increasingly dismissed large scale political-economic reform as unfeasible. Wartime JNE authors like Charles Johnson and Edgar Thompson continued to point to both historical and contemporary political-economy when describing the ultimate causes of the race problem. Despite this continued theoretical concern, it was dispositional individualism that determined wartime and postwar JNE political strategy. When defending calls for action, wartime JNE authors claimed that flawed white racial attitudes and a lack of interracial understanding produced the race problem—and that anti-prejudice education and school integration were appropriate solutions. These assumptions justified calls for a variety of educational programs to foster interracial understanding as well as a number of debates over the best techniques to reach these

goals. For example, in the JNE's summer 1944 edition, contributors debated over the most appropriate age to initiate anti-prejudice education, the relative importance of factual and emotional material, whether curricular or extra curricular programs were most useful, and what sort of programs could best challenge "undesirable attitudes" in adults.[104] It was these programmatic debates that concerned many JNE contributors throughout the 1940s and 1950s.

Although political-economic, social structural, psychological, and civic explanations of the origins of racial oppression competed in the JNE's wartime publications, reform proposals largely derived from a combination of psychological and civic frameworks. Much of the JNE's wartime discourse on race relations involved debate over the best methods for improving white racial attitudes and fostering interracial understanding. By 1944, JNE authors called ubiquitously for school integration but the desire to produce educational equity no longer provided the primary justification. Instead, it was because authors believed improved racial understanding was impossible in segregated schools that they demanded an end to legal segregation—and no longer published critiques of integrationist politics. In addition, JNE authors suggested, if flawed attitudes led to the abridgement of African Americans' democratic rights, then one could strengthen democracy by teaching tolerance.

The best age at which to employ anti-prejudice educational programming was one subject of debate for JNE authors. Despite his attention to the intractable nature of racial prejudice, Hartley called for studies showing when to begin education for racial understanding. Ultimately, "if we are concerned with educational economy," it would be best to provide "sound fundamental instruction in how to regard your fellow-man" at the

youngest age possible, he concluded. Methods for "counteracting undesirable learning later on" were necessary as well.[105] Some contributors suggested that racism was solidified by early childhood, while others argued that high school was the appropriate time in which to introduce anti-prejudice education. Eduard Lindeman, Professor of Social Philosophy in Columbia University's School of Social Work, recommended teaching race relations in the secondary school curriculum. "This is the period of genuine understanding," he maintained. "It is also the period of clearest thinking. I doubt whether people ever again ask as important questions as they do when in high school."[106] Although many JNE contributors had shown that psychological theorizing raised profound questions about the utility of anti-prejudice programming, authors went on, nonetheless, to engage in extended discussions of the best techniques for challenging prejudice through curricular and extra-curricular activities.

The relative utility of emotional as opposed to factual material in anti-prejudice education was another topic of disagreement. Hartley ultimately recommended educational programs—those that appealed to students' emotions—to alter the racial attitudes of white youth. While many anti-prejudice programs presented factual information about minority groups to challenge bigotry, Hartley emphasized that education for racial understanding must concern itself with "the attitudes themselves, with the realities of the understanding process, and not simply with cold, relatively objective facts about other races."[107] A series of psychological experiments revealed that field trips to Harlem, reading a story with a favorable depiction of a Jewish character, and hearing lectures meant to improve feelings towards African Americans could positively impact white students' racial attitudes.[108] Lindeman, in contrast, believed that all youth

living in interracial settings should receive "factual" education about different cultures in the United States and throughout the world.[109]

Powdermaker, who had also emphasized the difficulty of altering white prejudice, advocated that a combination of factual and emotional material should be integrated into school curricula. The earlier and wider teaching of anthropology, Powdermaker suggested, was the best mechanism for altering white racial beliefs. "It is rare to find an anthropologist with race prejudice," Powdermaker claimed, because anthropologists' scientific thinking forced them to take for granted "that there is no racial superiority."[110] She argued for incorporating anthropology into school curricula in ways that would alter students' intellectual and emotional development. "At the intellectual level," weaving anthropological findings into primary and secondary school curricula, "would probably have more effect on attitudes than all the college courses put together." Education at the "emotional level" should also begin in kindergarten and continue throughout high school, employing "the planned use of situations and activities to break down mistrust, fear and other socially undesirable attitudes towards Negroes and to substitute cooperative attitudes of respect and trust."[111] Additionally, recognizing that teachers' racial attitudes were central to the emotions they elicited in youngsters, Powdermaker called for more anthropological work in teacher training schools.[112]

Other authors, emphasizing the importance of factual material to challenging racial intolerance, demanded the revision of school curricula. Roy Wilkins, assistant secretary of the NAACP and then editor of *The Crisis*, argued that government must use the schools to "teach an appreciation of all the races" that composed the American nation. While individual teachers at times used special projects to "indoctrinate our children

positively with the American democratic ideal," Wilkins believed that democratic, anti-racist teaching should be systematized. Changing textbook and curricular depictions of African Americans and integrating African American history into public school curricula were necessary first steps. "The textbook treatment of the Negro cries aloud for revision," Wilkins maintained, "and we will make little progress in education for racial understanding until the average boy and girl stops absorbing this poison from the first grade through high school."[113] In integrated schools all students should be encouraged to participate equally in extra curricular activities. In all-white schools students should be lectured by black and white leaders on the race problem and exposed to films and courses in black history. In all-black schools, offerings in black history needed to be improved, especially in the South where African American students were exposed "to the vicious propaganda of Negro inferiority from birth."[114]

J. Max Bond suggested that discussions of power relations and capitalism, not simply of the achievements of minority group members, should be included in public school curricula. Since the chief function of American schooling should be to further the process of democracy, Bond claimed that school systems must fundamentally rethink their philosophy. Curricula should help students understand the society in which they live and the social problems they faced, especially racism. In particular, curricula should provide the "student-citizen" with materials that enabled him to "solve the riddle of poverty in a country of abundance." Students should also be taught to address a broad range of social problems—standards of living for the laboring classes, poor housing for the masses, and the existence of the poll-tax. Bond even recommended teaching about the need for "cooperative marketing and buying enterprises" and national health care

plans.[115] While Bond's educational proposal implied that unfettered capitalism threatened democratic ideals, his calls for change, which remained curricular, were ultimately dispositional in orientation. Bond did not demand socio-economic or political transformations, or even equality in school funding.

In addition to calling for educational programs to improve white racial attitudes and African American self-esteem, the JNE, by 1944, no longer published critiques of integrationist politics. Some authors continued to suggest that integration was necessary for securing resources for black students. With increasing frequency, however, authors demanded integration as a tool for promoting racial understanding. Caroline Ware's critique of the psychological and social implications of segregated schooling was particularly thorough. "The experiences of students, even more than their studies, will condition their ability to react constructively to racial situations," the Howard University history professor contended. Because schools were primary agents of socialization, education for improved race relations was impossible in segregated schools.[116] One could never instruct children about the immorality of racial injustice, Ware surmised, in a context where legal segregation undermined those lessons at every turn. Creating a "gulf which few can cross," segregation forced those who did cross its barriers to serve as messengers whose relationships can never be "simple and human, free from self-consciousness, restraint, and the burden of responsibility."[117] Both legal and *de facto* segregation, Ware emphasized, created "barriers to knowledge, to the development of habits of interracial action, and, especially, to the ability to cut through stereotypes and to recognize the individuality behind different exteriors." A segregated school system, therefore presented "almost insuperable obstacles" to improved race relations.[118]

Because segregation created misunderstanding and intolerance between fellow Americans, the "social distance" it engendered provided more significant obstacles to improved race relations than racial conflict itself.[119]

Echoing arguments Alain Locke had made in 1935, and assumptions that motivated intercultural education throughout the interwar period, Ware held that since schools were primary socializing institutions, school integration could engineer racial harmony. Schools could help improve race relations, Ware believed, by bringing together racial groups so that each recognized common interests, needs, problems, experiences, and characteristics. Fostering "habits of association rather than dissociation" and encouraging students to learn from differences in values and backgrounds, integrated schooling could contribute to all Americans' emotional and intellectual growth.[120] Using the basic assumptions of intercultural education, Ware made a powerful bid for integration, not to produce equity but to foster tolerance.

It was not simply integration—or curricular and extra-curricular programming—that was necessary for improved racial understanding. Wartime JNE authors did expand on intercultural educators' calls for curricular innovation by demanding changes to the structure and culture of school communities. Improved race relations "must be a product of the school's whole character—its democratic spirit and procedures, its spirit of free inquiry, its attention to current problems and issues," Ware argued.[121] Regardless of what was taught in the classroom, Ware and her colleagues offered, schools provided students with the daily experiences that shaped future personalities, beliefs, and values. In addition to ending school segregation, Ware, Bond, Wilkins, Hartley, Brown, and others maintained, schooling for racial understanding demanded a commitment to racial

equality on the part of school administrators and teachers. Suggesting that engineering school cultures was necessary to democratic education, authors recommended a focus on racial issues in teacher training schools and the removal of any traces of racial discrimination in teacher hiring and the treatment of students. While Hartley suggested both curricular and extra-curricular anti-prejudice programming could be useful, Powdermaker and Wilkins demanded a revision to school curricula, and Ware and Bond insisted that institutional innovation and the transformation of teachers' and administrators' beliefs were essential as well.[122] Still, in 1944, demands for the restructuring of school environments focused not on the distribution of educational resources but on the democratic attitudes school administrators and teachers brought to their work.

Recognizing that the effects of schooling were limited in a racist society, most contributors agreed with Ware that, "educators cannot be indifferent to the behavior sanctioned out of school, in home, street, church club; or to the attitudes contained in the movies, expressed over the air, reflected in the press."[123] Defining education extremely broadly, the journal examined any "organized programs which have as their primary aim the modification of racial attitudes."[124] Thus, *JNE* articles assessed the educational activities of religious agencies, interracial committees, philanthropic foundations, organized labor, African American advancement organizations, government agencies, and mass media.

Many discussions of the educational work being conducted by interracial committees, government agencies, philanthropies, religious groups, and labor organizations were based on the assumption that educating the general population

concerning the achievements of black people would reduce racial prejudice. In his article on interracial committees Rufus E. Clement reported that the Commission on Interracial Cooperation published "readable tracts and pamphlets dealing with the race question, many of them emphasizing the contributions which the American Negro had made to American life and letters." Through its department of education and race relations, the commission included educational materials in the libraries and classrooms of white educational institutions in the South and encouraged courses on race relations in southern schools and colleges.[125] Recognizing mass media to be a particularly potent force shaping Americans' attitudes, L.D. Reddick held that negative media images of African Americans were slowing racial progress. Since a main task of the educative process was "the transmission of the culture of the society," film, newspapers, magazines, radio, and public libraries were the "greatest educational agencies of the United States."[126] "Democracy in race relations will never be achieved until the minds of the people are changed," Reddick concluded. Since "the direct route to these minds is through the great agencies of mass communications," Reddick called on African American improvement agencies to systematically compile information on negative depictions of black people. He also envisioned using the media to produce positive images of African Americans and to enlighten white Americans about the nature of racial inequality.[127] The dispositional assumptions that permeated Reddick's and Clement's discussions also ran through JNE authors' analyses of anti-prejudice educational programming for adults in labor unions, religious institutions, and civic associations.

JNE authors debated the relative significance of emotional experiences, intellectual training, and school culture to the attitude development of American youth

and adults. What they agreed on was that education broadly conceived was a necessary tool in the fight against racial injustice and inequality. Largely concerned with the best mechanisms for altering white Americans' psychological development, JNE authors argued over the how to use education to transform white attitudes and emphasized that integrated schooling was crucial to racial understanding.

A few wartime authors, however, expressed concern that anti-prejudice education might be limited in its effects, especially if it was not combined with programs to challenge discriminatory practices in schools, churches, and philanthropies. In an article on philanthropic foundations, Fred L. Brownlee, General Secretary of the American Missionary Association, concluded that both civil rights agitation leading to the courts and legislature and work by philanthropic foundations were essential, in addition to anti-prejudice education. Increasing expenditures for black education—even if additional funds came from private philanthropy—Brownlee still believed to be necessary.[128] Margaret C. McCulloch, a religious extension worker for the Federal Council of Churches of America's Department of Race Relations, criticized religious institutions that called for improved race relations but tolerated segregation within their home churches and failed to commit money and energy to far-reaching social change.[129]

Implying that anti-prejudice education often involved discussion that did not produce meaningful legal, political, or economic changes, others emphasized that action for racial justice—especially movement towards legal desegregation and anti-discrimination legislation—was essential. For Alain Locke the growth of solidarity between different factions of the movement for African American racial equality, as well as a rising reformist impulse by white Americans, had led to intensification of the

"opposition camps." "Out of such a triangle of forces," Locke argued, "comes both the danger and the promise of the current racial situation, and all our authors make us vividly aware that we have come to a crisis, where action and action alone can convince and count."[130] Producing a veiled criticism of interracial dialogue that failed to produce political change, Lindeman argued "Discussion which does not produce action is likely to result in phobias. There is a danger that we may talk our so-called race problem "to death….Among sophisticated people talk can and does become a substitute for action."[131]

And yet, the course of action wartime JNE authors proposed was a limited one, based on optimism that transforming white beliefs would produce the legal and political-economic changes necessary to mitigate racial injustice. Although JNE authors were committed to using social science to inform social action, at least in 1944, their calls for change often sidestepped the scientific findings they articulated. Sociologists continued to emphasize the ways the race problem was rooted in interracial competition and labor exploitation, both past and present but were increasingly unwilling to translate political-economic theories into concrete reform proposals. Psychology, at times, pointed to the irrational and intractable nature of racial attitudes. Nonetheless, JNE educators built on momentum from religious, civic, and educational groups to make anti-prejudice education a weapon in their own fight for racial justice and improved education for African American youth. In so doing they broadened intercultural educators' narrowly curricular conception of how to improve race relations by recommending changes in school hiring policies, teacher placement, teacher education, and school administration. JNE authors also attempted to turn wartime enthusiasm for anti-prejudice education

toward the fight for school integration. As a result, integration appeared as a tool for promoting tolerance rather than a mechanism for redistributing educational resources.

The Results of "Enforced Isolation," 1950

Using the Mid-Century Whitehouse Conference on Children and Youth as a backdrop, the JNE's 1950 summer edition asked how "the facts of the Negro's minority status" affected African American youth.[132] Editor Charles H. Thompson presented an argument that reappeared throughout postwar JNE discussions of the relationship between education and race relations. Although the economic, political, social, and cultural components of the race problem were intertwined, he held, segregation and discrimination provided the root causes of racial inequality. He explained:

> The Negro community in any section of the country is a world within a world, segregated by law or custom or both; and it is characterized by certain pathological features which are direct results of its enforced isolation. The economic status of the Negro is generally defined by the fact that the large majority of Negroes are restricted to the most insecure and poorly paid jobs in the community; and proscriptions because of race have served to keep them on this level. The education and cultural level of the Negro is lower than that of the population as a whole, and is due primarily to his inferior minority status and the proscriptions which go along with that status.[133]

Legal segregation and de facto racial separation combined with institutionalized patterns of discrimination, Thompson and his colleagues suggested, to impede African American economic and social advancement. In addition, articulating a second theme that ran through JNE discussions by the early 1950s, Thompson pointed to cultural and social pathologies among the African American, urban poor. While an end to school segregation would certainly not solve all the problems black youth faced, desegregation was "absolutely necessary as an effectual beginning."[134]

Beginning in the late 1940s, the momentum generated by the NAACP's battle against segregation in the courts strongly influenced the approach JNE authors took to working for equal education. The titles of the JNE summer editions between 1950 and 1960 point to the central place school integration and civil rights law took in the Journal's political priorities. Following the 1950 summer edition, which focused on "The Negro Child in the American Social Order," the JNE published issues on: "The American Negro and Civil Rights in 1950" (1951), "The Courts and Racial Integration in Education" (1952), "The Relative Status of the Negro Population in the United States" (1953), "Next Steps in Racial Desegregation in Education" (1954), "The Desegregation Decision—One Year Afterward" (1955), "Educational Desegregation" (1956), "The Negro Voter in the South" (1957), and "Desegregation and the Negro College" (1958). The Journal only began to change focus in 1959, when it examined "Juvenile Delinquency Among Negroes in the United States" (1959). How to secure and, after 1954, how to implement court-ordered school desegregation were core concerns of JNE leaders, especially Charles H. Thompson.

Arguments about the nature and causes of American racism also shifted in response to the NAACP's successes fighting segregation in the courts. Depression-era JNE authors had pointed to capitalist structures as the primary cause of the race problem, arguing that economic competition and exploitation made necessary prejudice, discrimination, and segregation. By the 1950s JNE authors reversed the equation. Segregation and institutionalized discrimination appeared not as products of the race problem, but as causes of the economic dislocation and social pathologies researchers found in African American populations.

Though some authors continued to point to white prejudice, and most emphasized the economic effects of American racial injustice, starting in 1950 JNE scholars increasingly presented segregation and discrimination as decisive causes of the race problem—and therefore essential sites for reform. The JNE's 1950 summer edition, which examined the factors responsible for African Americans' "inferior status," assessed census data on population, economic conditions, and the social, political, and educational characteristics of black communities. Segregated workplaces and discriminatory hiring practices, the edition made clear, confined black workers to the most dangerous and worst paying jobs, ensuring that African American families "received only three-fifths as much income as the median white family."[135] In addition, Thompson outlined the "well known fact that economic discrimination against the Negro group is not only a result of their second class citizenship status in general, but it is a basic cause of many other aspects of their inferior status—in health, education, and their social and cultural life in general."[136] This understanding of the race problem led Thompson to recommend federal fair employment practices legislation and integration as the best ways to fight economic injustice.

Other authors suggested that segregation itself produced economic and social problems among African Americans. Harry Walker, a sociologist from Howard University, citing Myrdal, argued that residential segregation produced "confinement to a highly congested community which affords inferior institutional accommodations, such as schools, hospitals, and other community facilities."[137] By forcing African Americans to live in physically deteriorated urban areas "where the neglect is greatest in the provision of community services" especially in terms of education, health facilities, and

sanitation, segregation compounded other social and economic problems.[138] It was segregation, he held, that restricted African Americans to low paying jobs, overcrowded, substandard housing, and communities with inferior schools, hospitals, and recreational facilities. Segregation also explained why African Americans, according to Walker, were disproportionately troubled by "many of the social problems which beset urban civilization."[139] Like many of his colleagues, Walker believed that "a fundamental improvement in the Negro's social problems can be made only through the integration of the Negro into the general society."[140] Integration was both a social and a legal process.

Economist and housing expert Robert Weaver pointed especially to the ways segregation circumscribed African American economic status. A synopsis of African Americans' shifting economic fortunes in the first half of the twentieth century led Weaver to conclude that employment discrimination and residential segregation provided the primary obstacles to black economic advancement. Like sociologists writing in the Depression-era JNE, Weaver began by suggesting that the race problem originated from white economic and political needs.[141] In the early twentieth century economic circumstances led to interracial hostility, as European immigrants and African Americans competed for jobs and African Americans were used as scabs during labor disputes.[142] And yet, in the postwar period, Weaver believed, it was discrimination and segregation that most threatened black workers. In northern and western industrial centers, "the principal postwar problem facing Negroes has not been major losses of wartime gains but *cessation of economic integration and upgrading as well as gross discrimination against younger workers and other recruits to the labor market.*"[143] In the South, where wartime gains were less significant, "the color occupational system remains entrenched and

unchallenged in the region save in a few outstanding instances…"[144] The enforcement of FEPC legislation in northern states and the enactment of federal FEPC laws were both necessary for securing African American access to employment even in the context of economic growth.[145] In fact, Weaver argued that "enforced segregation takes its place with continuing discrimination in employment as a principal impediment to the Negro's attainment of full and equal economic status." In his theory, residential segregation, the "most economically oppressive expression of this negation of a competitive society," both caused inequality and was a manifestation of economic injustice.[146] Weaver both highlighted the economic roots of racial inequality and maintained that challenging residential segregation was an essential first step towards improving African American status.

As part of their increased attention to the social and economic effects of segregation, postwar JNE authors examined cultural and social pathologies they identified among the African American urban poor. Many built on E. Franklin Frazier's claim that "family disorganization probably has been the most important social problem that has retarded the development of the Negro since his emancipation."[147] In a 1950 JNE article, Frazier outlined his argument that illegitimacy, desertion, and divorce among African Americans produced high numbers of children who were not sufficiently supported, who left school early, who lacked a sense of family identification, and who experienced emotional rejection by overworked mothers.[148] Many JNE contributors built on Frazier's ideas to suggest that the racial isolation and economic disadvantages segregation created had negative social, cultural, and educational effects on black communities and black youth in particular. According to Harry Walker, the isolation of

African Americans from the larger American community created "cultural distortions and peculiar values that were reflected in the institutional and individual behavior of the Negro."[149] Citing Frazier, Walker argued that black exclusion from interracial socialization combined with neighborhood overcrowding to produce what he considered cultural problems—consumerism among black elites, delinquency among black youth, and high levels of illegitimacy among black lower classes.[150] In addition, George N. Redd, Head of the Department of Education at Fisk University, explained that some of the most "rigid patterns of racial segregation in any society," placed African Americans at a "disadvantage in competing with members of the white race for social and economic gains."[151]

School segregation was especially to blame for "cultural deficiencies" among black youth. Redd, like Depression-era JNE authors, exposed how segregation and discrimination by school officials resulted in inequality in the distribution of school funds. This inequality was reflected in racial disparities in teacher salaries, the value of school property, the length of school terms, levels of crowding, and the availability of supplies.[152] These inequalities meant that by a variety of measures—statistics of school years completed, scores on standardized intelligence tests, and "vocational and avocational pursuits"—African American educational performance lagged behind that of whites. Where Redd diverged from Depression-era terms of analysis—and reflected growing attention to cultural pathology among African Americans—was in highlighting the "cultural deficiencies of the American Negro" that, he suggested, educational inequity produced.[153]

Postwar JNE authors also continued to presume that white prejudice mattered to African American social, economic, and political status. Segregation, prejudice, and discrimination, some posited, combined in intricate ways to disadvantage black youth. Preston Valien, Chairman of the Department of Social Sciences at Fisk University, claimed in 1950 that the "attitudes and values of the communities" where African Americans lived largely determined the social and educational experiences of black youth.[154] While demographic patterns were important—the age distribution of communities were Valien's main concern—a combination of unequally funded public resources, discrimination, segregation, and cultural pathologies produced "the problems of delinquency, crime, low morals and low standards of living," African American communities experienced.[155] Ira de A Reid, who in 1950 was a professor of sociology at Haverford College, more narrowly pointed to the ways prejudice and discrimination influenced African American socialization. "The attitudes of non-Negro America with respect to FEPC, segregation in housing, education, and on public carriers," Reid argued, "are not merely the reflection of the superior status of a dominating group but are designed to protect and preserve that status and all of its privileges from the dominated group.[156] Reid was so pessimistic about white racial attitudes that he was critical of race relations programs and believed prejudice was likely to undermine African American gains in the courts.[157]

Conclusions authors reached in the 1950 summer edition exposed themes that ran through the JNE's postwar discussion of the race problem. Integrating dispositional and systemic conceptions of the race problem, JNE authors suggested that prejudice, the discrimination it caused, and economic and demographic patterns worked together to

shape African American status. And yet, what distinguished postwar analyses of the race problem from earlier discussions was the considerable attention given to the causal power of segregation. As Charles H. Thompson put it, “Unfortunately…the Negro has been isolated to a great extent from the main stream of American life.” This isolation meant that African Americans “had to make such progress as has been made under the severe handicap of group discrimination, many times legally imposed.”[158] Both *de facto* and legal segregation—in combination with individual acts of discrimination—appeared as primary forces producing the social, cultural, and economic problems JNE authors increasingly identified in African American communities.

In 1968, five years after he retired as editor, Charles H. Thompson published his last article in the *Journal of Negro Education*, an essay entitled “Race and Equality of Educational Opportunity: Defining the Problem.” Defining educational equity, Thompson argued, echoing James Coleman’s 1966 *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, continued to perplex educators committed to racial justice. Thompson asked:

> What does equality of educational opportunity mean? Does it mean the *same* opportunity to get an education? Or does it mean an opportunity to get the *same* education? Or opportunity to be educated up to the level of one’s capabilities and future occupational prospects? Or opportunity to learn whatever one needs to develop one’s own peculiar potentialities? In the case of the ‘culturally-deprived,’ whose ‘background…has built-in resistance to learning,’ does equal educational opportunity mean compensatory education? Is only racially integrated education equal, irrespective of whether lack of integration is intentional or accidental? Is equality of educational opportunity a moral as well as a mathematical concept?[159]

Thompson supported Coleman’s focus on educational outcomes and believed compensatory education for poor and minority students was essential. And yet, the life-

long integrationist was increasingly pessimistic about whether school desegregation would ever create educational equality.

An understanding of racism quite different from the irrational prejudice that concerned wartime JNE authors—one that rooted racism in white self-interest—led Thompson to make dire predictions about the future of both integration and educational equality.[160] Integration across class lines, the JNE editor had come to believe, was necessary for improving schooling for African Americans. Thompson recognized, however, that given the tenacity of segregation in America's postindustrial cities—and especially given middle class, white Americans' unwillingness to sacrifice their privileges—class integration was nearly impossible to engineer.[161] Although Thompson recommended continued attempts at integration, he also began to articulate some of the points W.E.B. Du Bois had made in 1935. Thompson encouraged supporting African American institutions of higher education and called for compensatory educational programs. By the late 1960s, Thompson even implied that alternatives to public education might be necessary for improving black schooling.[162] Integrationist politics and anti-prejudice education, Thompson sadly conceded, failed to produce the equality of opportunity he had spent his life hoping they would foster.

Thompson's pessimism about whether integration could create educational equality reflected broader changes in ideas about the role education could play in the struggle for racial justice at the JNE. Contributors to the Depression-era JNE emphasized the economic bases of the race problem and presented the redistribution of educational resources as a first priority. Whether the costs of integration—the psychological damage that might result from exposing black youth to white prejudice—outweighed the benefits

was an ongoing topic of debate in the 1930s. Even Bunche, Du Bois, and Johnson—who believed that economic forces were the primary causal agents explaining racial injustice—recognized the importance of individual prejudice. Du Bois considered white racial attitudes so pernicious that he believed equalizing resources within a segregated system preferable to school integration as a tool for resource redistribution. Still, for many interwar authors like Thompson and Locke the crux of the race problem in education was under-funding. They promoted integration because they believed it would be the most effective mechanism for producing educational equity.

By the mid-1940s both theories of the race problem and discussions of appropriate solutions had shifted. Integration was defended not simply as the best tool for producing equity, but because it would foster improved racial understanding and would stop the damage segregation inflicted on black—and white—personalities. Integration and anti-prejudice programming were embraced as core civil rights goals, moreover, despite the fact that the psychology of prejudice often suggested that racial attitudes were learned so early and were so engrained in cultural patterns that they could not be effectively fought by education. The integrationist consensus and the focus on education for racial understanding also stood in tension with sociological analyses that continued to present prejudice as a product of and justification for labor exploitation and interracial competition for resources. Despite substantial inconsistencies between theory and calls for action, wartime JNE authors supported integration to produce tolerance and anti-prejudice educational programming for children and adults as core components of the struggle for racial justice.

The integrationist consensus that emerged by 1944 only grew in strength as the NAACP's legal battle against segregation made gains in the courts. By the early 1950s, as JNE authors increasingly turned their attention to the African American urban poor, they presented segregation as a root cause of the race problem. Economic theories certainly shaped JNE analyses of "enforced separation." In contrast to Depression-era theorists who suggested that economic factors were decisive, however, postwar JNE authors argued that segregation itself represented the base and primary cause of the race problem. De facto and de jure segregation, authors argued, created the systemic patterns of discrimination that, in combination with "family disorganization," produced social and cultural pathologies among the urban, black poor. Despite continuing to pay attention to the economic effects of racism, JNE scholar-activists increasingly identified segregation, not the structures of liberal capitalism, as the most important systemic cause of racial injustice and inequality.

The postwar focus on segregation—which was certainly a legal and social system, although, it could be argued, one that resulted from the institutionalization of white prejudice—reveals that dispositional frameworks never completely won out against systemic or relational social theories at the JNE. Many scholars suggested, throughout their careers, that economic forces and individual racial attitudes combined to produce racial injustice. Still, since the JNE had been an especially vocal center of black leftism in the 1930s—remaining far enough left that it published Oliver Cromwell Cox until 1951—the journal's postwar embrace of racial liberalism is striking. The JNE's unwavering commitment to integrationist politics by the early 1940s, the availability of psychological theories of prejudice, and the predisposition towards educational reforms

all led the journal to embrace individualistic racial politics. By the mid to late 1940s, moreover, widespread wartime anti-prejudice programming and the NAACP's momentum fighting *Plessy v. Ferguson* in the courts both encouraged JNE authors that anti-prejudice education and integration to produce tolerance were realistic political goals.

The JNE made itself, on the issue of segregation at least, a self-perpetuating group of like-minded thinkers. By the mid-1940s, outspoken critics of school integration like Du Bois were no longer writing in the journal. In fact, the JNE refused to publish critiques of integrationist politics well before it rejected articles by known communists. In a period when overthrowing school segregation in the courts appeared possible but far from certain, it is likely that journal editors wanted to avoid any presentation of intra-group division. Given Thompson's long-standing commitment to integration as a tool for producing equity, moreover, that he narrowed the parameters of acceptable debate at the journal as segregationist politics became increasingly contested—and as desegregation became increasingly possible—is also understandable.

The growth of the behavioral sciences also shaped theories of the race problem at the JNE by the mid 1940s. It was not only leading psychologist Eugene Hartley who contributed to discussions of education for racial understanding. Anthropologists Hortense Powdermaker and Ina Corrine Brown, whose own work argued that the idea of race functioned to sustain white status, debated over how educational programs could best alter white racial attitudes and wrote textbooks on intercultural education. The growing prestige of social psychological approaches combined with wartime concern, by religious and civic organizations, with the psychosis of white prejudice to encourage JNE

authors to examine the best ways to alter white prejudice. The JNE, like Fisk's Race Relations Institutes, provided an intellectual refuge, where political-economic theories of racism could be articulated years after they had been deemed inappropriate in mainstream white institutions. These institutions simultaneously reveal the ultimate reach, the trickle-down effect of big philanthropy's support for the behavioral sciences.

Expanded funding for the behavioral sciences pushed JNE authors towards anti-prejudice education. But it was practical rather than theoretical concerns—the momentum of the struggle for integration in the courts and the popularity of anti-prejudice programming—that most strongly influenced JNE authors' reformist agendas. The journal's predisposition to educational approaches to social change certainly provides one reason why "education for racial understanding" became so appealing. When religious groups and intercultural educators across the country began recommending anti-prejudice programming in response to Nazi atrocities, JNE authors were eager to apply these techniques—and to direct this enthusiasm—to the fight for racial justice for African Americans. In order to appeal to a broader group of liberal white activist, JNE authors emphasized how the improving African American education fit within a cause to which a diverse coalition of religious, civic, and educational activists were already actively committed.

The legal strategy employed in the court cases against segregation also led JNE authors towards dispositional approaches to the race problem. Risa Goluboff argues that although wartime and postwar civil rights law "evolved from a state of disarray to one of considerable clarity," *Brown v. Board* narrowed the parameters of civil rights law in the decades that followed. As lawyers at both the NAACP and the U.S. Justice Department

"culled from the diversity of 1940s civil rights practice equal protection claims focused on state imposed segregation in public education," they also chose from the many and varied harms imposed by Jim Crow, "the psychological wounds such segregation inflicted."[163] By focusing on psychological harms and on legal segregation—and by minimizing the significance of the inequity segregation produced—NAACP legal strategists did not simply alter the legal cannon. The JNE's history reveals how widely this strategy affected debate about the nature and ultimate goals of integration, especially among social scientists closely following or engaged in the court proceedings. By the mid to late 1940s even scholars like Locke, Bunche, and Thompson, who had prioritized equity so fully in their interwar discussions of desegregation, moved away from these arguments. In their zeal to help in the struggle to achieve legal desegregation, JNE authors followed the NAACP by turning to the lessons of psychology as opposed to sociology and economics when fighting for racial justice. By the early 1950s, in the mounting anti-communist context, JNE authors identified segregation and institutionalized discrimination—problems that were becoming considered legitimate objects of social reform—rather than interracial competition or labor exploitation as primary causes of racial oppression. Theories of the race problem reflected more than they produced the shifting parameters of the politically reasonable.

Despite Depression-era JNE authors' emphasis on the economic foundations of American racism, by 1944 JNE authors avoided economic analyses of the race problem in their calls for change and even de-emphasized inequity in school funding. Demanding nothing more "than is theirs already in principle," the intellectuals and activists writing in the journal made integration and anti-prejudice education central components of an

agenda for change.[164] In so doing, the JNE followed the long-standing American tradition of using education as a central weapon in the fight for racial justice and—at the same time—came to treat the redistribution of educational resources as a secondary concern. The JNE thus built on and contributed to race relations activism by religious and civic groups, such as the National Conference of Christians and Jews, an organization whose struggle against prejudice is the subject of the next chapter. It was not until 1968 that JNE editor Charles H. Thompson returned to the Depression-era claim that resource redistribution was essential if integration was to produce equity. By the late 1960s, however, as rigid racial and class segregation appeared immutable in America's cities, even Thompson could not envision how integration to produce equity could be achieved.

---

[1] Martin D. Jenkins, "Editorial Comment: Education for Racial Understanding," *Journal of Negro Education*, 13, no.3 (1944), 266-7.
[2] Ibid., 266-267.
[3] Perhaps expecting criticism from activists with more direct political strategies, editor Martin Jenkins emphasized that education was one tremendously important context in which to fight for racial understanding, but certainly not the only one. Tactics whose primary goals are not educational, such as the NAACP's model of legal action, the CIO's labor activism, government action by the Fair Employment Practices Committee, pressure tactics at national and local government levels, and direct action, Jenkins argued, "all have their contribution to make to the ultimate integration of the Negro in the American social order." Ibid, 268. Historian John Jackson notes that the idea that changes in popular attitudes must precede legal change was widely embraced by interwar and wartime proponents of improved race relations, psychologist T.M. Newcomb being one of the most famous proponents of this approach. Kenneth Clark, Gordon Allport, and most of the social scientists who were involved in the NAACP's legal struggles against segregated schools, however, suggested the opposite, that changes in law must precede and could initiate changes in social mores. John P. Jackson Jr., *Social Scientists for Social Justice, Making the Case Against Segregation* (New York: New York University Press, 2001), 172-176.
[4] Jenkins, "Editorial Comment: Education for Racial Understanding," 268.
[5] "Editorial Comment, Why a Journal of Negro Education," *The Journal of Negro Education* 1, no. 1 (1932), 1-4.
[6] On the quest for objectivity in interwar and postwar social science see: JoAnne Brown, *The Definition of a Profession: The Authority of Metaphor in the History of Intelligence Testing, 1890-1930* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), Jean M. Converse, *Survey Research in the United States: Roots and Emergence 1890-1960*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), Alice O'Connor, *Poverty Knowledge: Social Science, Social Policy, and the Poor in Twentieth-Century U.S. History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), Jennifer Platt, *A History of Sociological Research Methods in America, 1920-1960* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Dorothy Ross, *The Origins of American Social Science* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Daryl Michael Scott, *Contempt and Pity: Social Policy and the Image of the Damaged Black Psyche, 1880-1996* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997), and Marc C. Smith, *Social Science in the Crucible: The American Debate Over Objectivity and Purpose, 1918-1941* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1994). On the ways postwar social scientists

committed to racial justice negotiated the false dichotomy between science and advocacy in their work for the NAACP's Legal Defense and Education Fund see J. Jackson, *Social Scientists for Social Justice*, Chapters 8-10 and Conclusion.

[7] Jonathan Scott Holloway, *Confronting the Veil: Abram Harris Jr., E. Franklin Frazier, and Ralph Bunche, 1919-1941* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002) 9.

[8] For historiography that points to African Americans' linking of race and class throughout the twentieth century, see Michael C. Dawson, *Black Visions: The Roots of Contemporary African-American Political Ideologies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), Chapter 5; Michael Eric Dyson, *I May Not Get There With You, The True Martin Luther King Jr.* (New York: The Free Press, 2000); Risa L. Goluboff, *The Lost Promise of Civil Rights* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007); Holloway, *Confronting the Veil*; Robin D.G. Kelley, *Hammer and Hoe: Alabama Communists during the Great Depression* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990); Robin D.G. Kelley, *Race Rebels, Culture, Politics, and the Black Working Class* (New York: The Free Press, 1994); Robin D.G. Kelley, *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2002); Thomas F. Jackson, *From Civil Rights to Human Rights: Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Struggle for Economic Justice* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007); Adolph Reed Jr., *Stirrings in the Jug: Black Politics in the Post-Segregation Era* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999); and Barbara Diane Savage, *Broadcasting Freedom: Radio, War, and the Politics of Race, 1938-1948* (Durham: University of North Carolina Press, 1999). On the centrality of jobs and housing to northern urban African American activism throughout the 1940s and 1950s, see Wendell E. Pritchett, "Where Shall We Live? Class and the Limitations of Fair Housing Law," *The Urban Lawyer* 35, no.3 (2003): 399-470; Preston Smith, "The Quest for Racial Democracy: Black Civic Ideology and Housing Interests in Postwar Chicago" *Journal of Urban History* 26, no.2 (2000): 131-157; Thomas J. Sugrue, *The Origins of the Urban Crisis, Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996); and Thomas J. Sugrue, "Affirmative Action from Below: Civil Rights, the Building Trades, and the Politics of Racial Equality in the Urban North, 1945-1969," *Journal of American History* 91, no.1 (2004): 145-173.

[9] While these themes are evident in the *JNE*'s pages, articles on these topics were also published in the NAACP's *Crisis* and the Urban League's *Opportunity* throughout the 1930s. For preliminary examples from the JNE see Ralph J. Bunche, "A Critical Analysis of the Tactics and Programs of Minority Groups," *Journal of Negro Education* 4, no.3 (1935): 308-320; W. E. B. Du Bois, "Does the Negro Need Separate Schools?," *Journal of Negro Education* 4, no.3 (1935): 328-335; and E. Franklin Frazier, "The Status of the Negro in the American Social Order," *Journal of Negro Education* 4, no.3 (1935): 293-307.

[10] On the explosion of foundation support for psychology and social psychology in the postwar years, see Ellen Herman, *The Romance of American Psychology: Political Culture in the Age of Experts*, (Berkeley: University of California Press,1995) O'Connor, *Poverty Knowledge*, Chapters 4-5; Walter A. Jackson, *Gunnar Myrdal and America's Conscience: Social Engineering and Racial Liberalism, 1938-1987* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990), Chapter 7, and J. Jackson, *Social Scientists for Social Justice*.

[11] W. E. Burghardt Du Bois, "Does the Negro Need Separate Schools?" *Journal of Negro Education* 4, no.3 (1935): 328-335, 329, 331.

[12] Charles H. Thompson, "Some Aspects of Higher Education for Negroes in the United States," Summary 1945, Fisk University Race Relations Institutes, 91-92.

[13] Kelley, *Hammer and Hoe*. Also see Dawson, *Black* Visions, Chapter 5; Thomas Jackson, *From Civil Rights to Human Rights*; Kelley, *Freedom Dreams*; Pritchett, "Where Shall We Live"; Smith, "The Quest for Racial Democracy"; Sugrue, *The Origins of the Urban Crisis,* and Sugrue, "Affirmative Action from Below."

[14] In her analysis of civil rights lawyers at the NAACP and the U.S. Department of Justice, legal historian Risa Goluboff has shown that throughout the 1930s and into the 1940s the economic demands of African American workers were central to civil rights litigation, though workers' concerns were pushed aside as the NAACP focused its legal efforts on school segregation by the late 1940s. Goluboff, *The Lost Promise of Civil Rights*.

[15] Holloway, *Confronting the Veil,* 45, 48-49. Howard University drew support from the federal government as well as the Julius Rosenwald Fund, the General Education Board, and the Phelps-Stokes Fund throughout the interwar years.

[16] Ibid., 9, 15-17, 34.

[17] Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, "The National Conference on the Education of Negroes" *Journal of Negro Education*, 3, no.4 (1934): 573-575.

[18] J. Scott McCormick, "The Julius Rosenwald Fund," *Journal of Negro Education* 3 no.4 (1934): 605-626.

[19] Ralph J. Bunche, "A Critical Analysis of the Tactics and Programs of Minority Groups," *Journal of Negro Education* 4, no.3 (1935): 308-320, 308.
[20] Ibid., 308.
[21] Ibid., 309-311.
[22] Ibid., 314.
[23] Ibid., 315.
[24] Ibid., 318.
[25] W.E.B. DuBois, "Education and Work," *Journal of Negro Education*, 1, no.1 (1932): 60-74, 63.
[26] Ibid., 69.
[27] Charles H. Thompson, "Editorial Comment: Federal Aid to Education and Negro Separate Public Schools," *Journal of Negro Education* 18, no.4 (1949): 445-451, 445.
[28] "Editorial Comment: Race Relations and the Education of Negroes," *Journal of Negro Education* 2, no. 2 (1933): 121-127.
[29] Ibid., 121-122.
[30] Ibid., 121-122.
[31] Ibid., 123-124.
[32] After initially excluding individuals involved with African American education, the Committee ultimately included the Presidents of Howard University, West Virginia State College, and Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute. David A. Lane Jr., "The Report of the National Advisory Committee on Education and the Problem of Negro Education," *Journal of Negro Education* 1, no.1 (1932): 5-15.
[33] Ibid., 6-7.
[34] Ibid., 135.
[35] Myrtle R. Phillips, "Financial Support," *Journal of Negro Education* 1, no.2 (1932): 108-136, 118-120.
[36] An example of his outlining of these arguments—and his claim that segregated schools exist partly because of widespread support from African Americans—is available in Charles H. Thompson, "Introduction," *Journal of Negro Education* 1, no.2 (1932), 102. Speaking of black parents and teachers, he writes "In many instances, they have chosen the separate school—a fact which has enhanced the extension of the principle of segregation, and at least raised the question whether they have chosen wisely." Ibid., 102.
[37] Ralph J. Bunche, "A Critical Analysis of the Tactics and Programs of Minority Groups," *Journal of Negro Education* 4, no.3 (1935): 308-320, 318.
[38] Ibid., 317, 319.
[39] Ibid., 320.
[40] Horace Mann Bond, "The Extent and Character of Separate Schools in the Untied States," *Journal of Negro Education* 4, no.3 (1935): 321-327, 325-326.
[41] Ibid., 324
[42] Ibid., 326-327.
[43] Alain Locke, "The Dilemma of Segregation," *Journal of Negro Education* 4 no.3 (1935): 406-411, 406. In fact, the issue of educational integration raised "inevitable conflict" between short-term and long-term civil rights goals. Believing that African Americans should determine their approach to the issue of segregation by principle and not expediency, Locke argued that many private African American schools might have to close lest they "become an alibi, an extenuation or a substitute for public obligation."
[44] Ibid., 407.
[45] Ibid., 407-408.
[46] Ibid., 409.
[47] Ibid., 410.
[48] Ibid., 411. An appropriately egalitarian mixed school would provide needy black children with the guidance and extra attention necessary and would also prepare black children for the inevitable stress they will face as adults living in an integrated world.
[49] Ibid., 411.
[50] Charles H. Thompson, "Editorial Comment," *The Journal of Negro Education*, 4, no.3 (1935): 289-292.
[51] Du Bois, "Does the Negro Need Separate Schools?" 329.
[52] Ibid., 329.
[53] Ibid., 328
[54] Ibid., 331.
[55] Ibid., 332.

[56] Mary Crowley, "Cincinnati's Experiment in Negro Education: A Comparative Study of the Segregated and Mixed School," *Journal of Negro Education* 1, no.1 (1932), 25-33.
[57] Rayford W. Logan, "Education Segregation in the North" *Journal of Negro Education* 2, no.1 (1933), 65-67.
[58] Paul E. Baker, "Negro-White Adjustment in America," *Journal of Negro Education* 3, no.2 (1934), 194-204, 203.
[59] Walter Jackson, *Gunnar Myrdal and America's Conscience,* 279-284 and John Jackson, *Social Scientists for Social Justice,* Chapter 4. On the intercultural education movement in the 1930s and 1940s, see Nicholas V. Montalto, *A History of the Intercultural Educational Movement, 1924-1941*, (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc, 1982) and Michael R. Olneck, "The Recurring Dream: Symbolism and Ideology in Intercultural and Multicultural Education," *American Journal of Education*, Feb 1990, 147-174.
[60] See Montalto, *A History of the Intercultural Educational Movement,* 145-146 and Barbara D. Savage, *Broadcasting Freedom: Radio, War, and the Politics of Race, 1939-1948* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), Chapter 1.
[61] See University of Chicago, Committee on Education, Training, and Research in Race Relations, "Minutes of Meeting of December 11, 1947, Univ. of Chicago"; University of Chicago, Committee on Education, Training, and Research in Race Relations Papers, [Box 3, Folder 15], Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library, 4-5.
Also see National Conference of Christians and Jews, 20th Annual Report, 1948, W2 Annual Reports 1940-1949 folder, box 1, National Conference of Christians and Jews records, Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota.
[62] Letter from Charles S. Johnson to E. Franklin Frazier, July 11, 1933 and Letter from Charles S. Johnson to E. Franklin Frazier, Feb 26, 1934. E. Franklin Frazier Papers, box 131-11, folder 15, Manuscript Division, Moorland-Spingarn Research Center, Howard University.
[63] On DuBois' support for social democratic politics, see Montalto, *A History of the Intercultural Educational Movement,* 145-146. Intercultural educators believed that education to alter racial attitudes was essential because the integration of minority peoples into American life involved both building self-esteem in minority youth and familiarizing native-born Americans with the values and practices of minority peoples. Montalto, *A History of the Intercultural Educational Movement* , 53-54
[64] Rachel Davis DuBois "Peace and Intercultural Education," *Journal of Educational Sociology* 12, no.7 (1939), 418-424.
[65] I discuss this literature at more length in the introduction. For useful surveys of it, see Arnold Rose, *Studies in the Reduction of Prejudice, A memorandum summarizing research on modification of attitudes* (Chicago: American Council on Race Relations, 1947) and Gordon Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co, 1954, 1958, 1979).
[66] Walter C. Reckless; Harold L. Bringen, "Racial Attitudes and Information About the Negro," *Journal of Negro Education* 2, no.2 (1933): 128-138.
[67] Ibid., 128.
[68] In 1933, under the heading "A Quest for Understanding," the JNE outlined a variety of educational activities that attempted to promote interracial tolerance and cooperation as part of its discussion of current events. "Current Events of Importance in Negro Education" *Journal of Negro Education* 2, no.2 (1933): 224-252. Paul E. Baker, "Negro-White Adjustment in America," *Journal of Negro Education* 3, no.2 (1934): 194-204.
[69] W.D. Weatherford, "Changing Attitudes of Southern Students," *Journal of Negro Education* 2, no.2 (1933): 147-150.
[70] For examples see: Maude Carmichael, "A Program for 'A Better Understanding Between the Races'" *Journal of Negro Education* 2, no.2 (1933): 151-156.
[71] Charles H. Thompson, "Introduction," *Journal of Negro Education* 1, no.2 (1932): 101-107, 101 and Charles H. Thompson, "Editorial Comment: Race Relations and the Education of Negroes" *Journal of Negro Education* v2, no.2 (1933): 121-127, 121, 126.
[72] "Editorial Comment: Race Relations and the Education of Negroes," *Journal of Negro Education* 2, no.2 (1933): 121-127, 124.
[73] Ibid., 124.
[74] Ibid., 126.
[75] Daryl Michael Scott, *Contempt and Pity: Social Policy and the Image of the Damaged Black Psyche, 1880-1996* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997) makes this argument particularly forcefully. On the significance of psychology to the *Brown v. Board of Education* litigation and decision, see J. Jackson, *Social Scientists for Social Justice*, Chapters 7-9, Lani Guinier, "From Racial Liberalism to Racial Literacy: Brown v. Board of

Education and the Interest-Divergence Dilemma," *The Journal of American History,* 91, no. 1 (2004): 92-118 James T. Patterson, *Brown v. Board of Education: A Civil Rights Milestone and Its Troubled Legacy* (USA: Oxford University Press, 2001), Daryl Michael Scott, "Postwar Pluralism, Brown v. Board of Education, and the Origins of Multicultural Education," *The Journal of American History* 91 no. 1 (2004) 69-82; and J. Harvie Wilkinson III, *From* Brown *to* Bakke: *The Supreme Court and School Integration: 1954-1978* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979)

[76] On racial liberalism, see Jackson, *Gunnar Myrdal and America's Conscience* and David W. Southern, *Gunnar Myrdal and Black-White Relations: The Use and Abuse of An American Dilemma, 1944-1969* (Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1987). On the relationship between Myrdalian racial liberalism and therapeutic liberal pluralism see Scott, "Postwar Pluralism." Also see Gary Gerstle, "The Protean Character of American Liberalism." *The American Historical Review* 99, no.4 (1994): 1043-1073 and Ira Katznelson, "Was the Great Society a Lost Opportunity" in Steve Fraser and Gary Gerstle, *The Rise and Fall of the New Deal Order, 1930-1980* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1989).

[77] "The significance of their work at Howard in the 1930s," Holloway writes of his subjects, "is that it provides the bridge from the establishment of modern social science and its technocratic faith in objectivity to the emergence of the social science race relations expert who dominated the academic scene during the modern civil rights movement." Holloway, *Confronting the Veil*, 16.

[78] Holloway, *Confronting the Veil*, 34. Ordinary African Americans' skepticism about the potential of interracial class-based politics, the emerging cold war context, and the racial organization of American higher education muted class based analyses of the race problem, especially for Harris, Frazier, and Bunche by the early 1950s. Ibid., 15-17.

[79] Gerstle, "The Protean Character of American Liberalism." and Katznelson, "Was the Great Society a Lost Opportunity."

[80] Thomas F. Jackson, *From Civil Rights to Human Rights: Martin Luther King Jr., and the Struggle for Economic Justice* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007)

[81] Hortense Powdermaker, a social anthropologist who had studied race relations in the rural south and was teaching at Queens College and Yale's Institute for Human Relations in 1944, began "The Anthropological Approach to the Problem of Modifying Racial Attitudes" by outlining the key components of Boas' theory that cultural rather than biological differences distinguished races from one another. Hortense Powdermaker, "The Anthropological Approach to the Problem of Modifying Race Attitudes" *Journal of Negro Education*, 13, no.3 (1944): 295-302, 296-7. In "Race in the Modern World" Edgar T. Thompson, a Duke University sociologist, began by citing social scientific work disproving the existence of race as a meaningful biological category: Hankins, who has shown that "race is only a highly variable statistical concept," Barzun, who "dismisses it as a mere superstition," Benedict and Weltfish, "who argue with sweet reasonableness that all men are really brothers under the skin," and Huxley and Haddon, who argue that, "there really is no such thing as race and that we ought to substitute such terms as ethic group or sub-species." Edgar T. Thompson, "Race in the Modern World." *Journal of Negro Education* 13, no.3 (1944): 270-279, 270-271. That Thompson and Powdermaker felt they needed to refute biological explanations of racial difference suggests the novelty of cultural and historical frameworks for understanding race relations, even among the leftist *JNE* readership.

[82] Charles S. Johnson, "The Present Status of Race Relations, with Particular Reference to the Negro," *Journal of Negro Education* 8, no.3 (1939): 323-335, 324.

[83] Ina Corinne Brown, "Race Relations in the United States." *Journal of Negro Education* 13, no.3 (1944): 280-286,281.

[84] Ibid., 281, 284.

[85] Thompson, "Race in the Modern Word," 277.

[86] O'Connor, *Poverty Knowledge,* 77 Six neat categories described the possible effects of interracial contact: situations in which persons of color are strangers in a white society (Hindus in the US, Africans in Canada), situations of original white contact where the culture of the darker group is "very simple" (such as conquistadors and Indians), situations in which a small minority of whites in a "colored society is bent upon maintaining a ruling class status" (for example the British in the West Indies), situations in which "there are large proportions of both colored and white persons seeking to live in the same area, with whites insisting that the society is a 'white man's country'" as in the U.S. and South Africa, situations in which mixing between black and white peoples is "far advanced" as in Brazil, and situations in which "a minority of whites have been subdued by a dominant colored population" as in Haiti during the turn of the eighteenth century. Oliver C. Cox, "Race Relations," *Journal of Negro Education*, 12, no.2 (1943): 145.

[87] Johnson, 1939, 324
[88] "The belief is an empty, harmless illusion, like beliefs in werewolves or fairies, without the exploitative interest with which it is impregnated. The effective interest is a need for slaves, or peons, or unorganized common laborers—a need for 'cheap, docile labor.' The latter interest, of course, is involved in a complicated web of feeling established by both immemorial and recent rationalizations." Oliver C. Cox, "An American Dilemma: A Mystical Approach to the Study of Race Relations" *Journal of Negro Education*, 14, no.2 (1945): 132-148, 143.
[89] W. Jackson, *Gunnar Myrdal and America's Conscience*; Southern, *Gunnar Myrdal and Black-White Relations;* Scott, "Postwar Pluralism"; O'Connor, *Poverty Knowledge*; and McKee, *Sociology and the Race Problem.*
[90] Johnson, "The Present Status of Race Relations", 323
[91] A "psychiatric persuasion," historians have argued, one that included assumptions about the functioning of the subconscious, a "metric of the normal," and a language of pathology increasingly shaped federal policy in the years after World War II. For an examination of the emergence of the "psychiatric ethos" through the activities of the Boston Psychopathic Hospital in the early twentieth century, see Elizabeth Lunbeck, *The Psychiatric Persuasion: Knowledge, Gender, and Power in Modern America* (Princeton, NJ; Princeton University Press, 1994). Herman's, *The Romance of American Psychology* examines the ways psychiatrists and psychologists shaped and were influenced by federal policies in the second half of the twentieth century.
[92] Gary Gerstle, "The Protean Character of American Liberalism," 1071 While depression era American liberals believed that the economy could be scientifically managed but that racism was uncontrollable, by the 1940s liberals increasing assumed that social engineering and "rational social action could remedy ethnic and racial hostilities." The growth of the social sciences provided the theoretical "rationale for this new-found confidence," and the discovery of new methods of social engineering—especially those emerging from the field of social psychology— led liberals to believe they could tackle problems like prejudice "whose irrational nature had frustrated reformers in the past."
[93] W. Jackson, *Gunnar Myrdal and America's Conscience,* 280-281.
[94] E. Thompson, "Race in the Modern World," 270.
[95] Ibid., 270.
[96] Eugene L. Hartley, "Psychological Investigations and the Modification of Racial Attitudes" *Journal of Negro Education*, 13, no.3 (1944): 287-294, 289.
[97] Ibid., 288
[98] Ibid., 289
[99] Powdermaker, "The Anthropological Approach to the Problem of Modifying Race Attitudes," 300.
[100] Ibid., 300
[101] J. Max Bond, "Educational Programs for the Improvement of Race Relations: The Schools," *The Journal of Negro Education* 13, no.3 (1944): 390-397, 391.
[102] Ibid., 391
[103] Scott, *Contempt and Pity,* Chapter 5
[104] Hartley, "Psychological Investigations and the Modification of Racial Attitudes," 293. Lindeman recommended teaching "factual" material about different cultures in the United States and throughout the world to all secondary school children living in interracial settings. He also suggested that short-term institutes could provide contexts where white and black teachers and students could learn about each other. Edward C. Lindeman, "Next Steps in Education for Racial Understanding: A Philosophical Approach," *The Journal of Negro Education* 13, no.3 (1944): 407-413, 407.
[105] Hartley, "Psychological Investigations and the Modification of Racial Attitudes," 293.
[106] Lindeman, "Next Steps in Education for Racial Understanding," 409.
[107] Hartley, "Psychological Investigations and the Modification of Racial Attitudes," 291.
[108] Ibid., 292.
[109] Lindeman, "Next Steps in Education for Racial Understanding," 407
[110] Powdermaker, "The Anthropological Approach to the Problem of Modifying Race Attitudes," 301.
[111] Ibid., 300-301.
[112] Ibid., 300.
[113] Roy Wilkins, "Next Steps in Education for Racial Understanding," *The Journal of Negro Education* 13, no.3 (1944): 432-440, 437
[114] Ibid., 438

[115] J. Max Bond, "Educational Programs for the Improvement of Race Relations: The Schools," *The Journal of Negro Education* 13, no.3 (1944): 390-397, 390.
[116] Caroline Ware, "The Role of the Schools in Education for Racial Understanding," *The Journal of Negro Education* 13, no.3 (1944): 421-431, 421.
[117] Ibid., 422.
[118] Ibid., 424.
[119] Scott, *Contempt and Pity,* 21.
[120] Ware, "The Role of the Schools in Education for Racial Understanding," 423.
[121] Ibid., 424
[122] Bond, "Educational Programs for the Improvement of Race Relations: The Schools," 390-392; Hartley, "Psychological Investigation and the Modification of Racial Attitudes," 292-294; Powdermaker, "The Anthropological Approach to the Problem of Modifying Racial Attitudes," 300-302; Ware, "The Role of the Schools in Education for Racial Understanding," 432-424, 429-431; and Wilkins, "Next Steps in Education for Racial Understanding," 435-438.
[123] Ware, "The Role of the Schools in Education for Racial Understanding," 431.
[124] Jenkins, "Editorial Comment: Education for Racial Understanding," 267.
[125] Rufus E. Clement, "Educational Programs for the Improvement of Race Relations: Interracial Committees" *The Journal of Negro Education* 13, no.3 (1944): 316-328, 319.
[126] L. D. Reddick, "Educational Programs for the Improvement of Race Relations: Motion Pictures, Radio, the Press, and Libraries," *The Journal of Negro Education* 13, no.3 (1944): 367-389, 367.
[127] Ibid., 389.
[128] Fred L. Brownlee, "Educational Programs for the Improvement of Race Relations: Philanthropic Foundations" *Journal of Negro Education* 13, no.3 (1944): 329-339.
[129] Margaret C. McCulloch, "Educational Programs for the Improvement of Race Relations: Seven Religious Agencies" *Journal of Negro Education* 13, no.3 (1944): 305-315, 314.
[130] Alain Locke, "Whither Race Relations? A Critical Commentary." *Journal of Negro Education* 13, no.3 (1944): 398-406, 400-401.
[131] Lindeman, "Next Steps in Education for Racial Understanding," 407-408.
[132] Charles H. Thompson, "Editorial Comment: The Relative Status of the Negro Population in the Untied States," *Journal of Negro Education* 22, no3 (1953): 221-231.
[133] Charles H. Thompson, "Editorial Comment: The Negro Child in the American Social Order" *The Journal of Negro Education*, 19, no. 3 (1950): 215-218, 215, 216-217.
[134] Ibid., 217-218.
[135] Charles H. Thompson, "Editorial Comment: The Relative Status of the Negro Population in the Untied States," 225-226.
[136] Ibid., 224.
[137] Harry J. Walker, "The Nature and Characteristics of the Negro Community," *Journal of Negro Education,* 19 no.3 (1950): 219-231, 221-222.
[138] Ibid., 230
[139] Ibid., 230
[140] Ibid., 229.
[141] Robert C. Weaver, "The Economic Status of the Negro in the United States," *Journal of Negro Education* 19 no.3 (1950): 232-243, 232. Citing Sterling Spero and Abram L. Harris' 1931 *The Black Worker*, Weaver held that because most southern whites had no direct economic interest in slavery, "the relatively few who did" popularized "the concept of inherent superiority of all whites" in order "to identify such interest with those of a much wider segment of the population."
[142] Ibid., 234.
[143] Ibid., 240. Emphasis in original.
[144] Ibid., 240.
[145] Ibid., 240.
[146] Ibid., 243.
[147] E. Franklin Frazier, "Problems and Needs of Negro Children and Youth Resulting from Family Disorganization," *Journal of Negro Education* 19, no3 (1950): 269-277, 269.
[148] Exhibiting an emerging psychologizing of African American social problems, Frazier argued that juvenile crime, delinquency, truancy, school drop out rates, irregular work habits, and a lack of ambition among many

African American youth resulted ultimately from "family disorganization." Certainly, however, Frazier noted that single mothers faced great economic pressure due both to their status as household heads and the limited employment opportunities available to them. He also emphasized that the demand for work among men at times contributed to family dissolution. Ibid., 272-274. On the significance of arguments about the "culture of poverty" and on the Moynihan Report's complex relationship to Frazier's scholarship, see Herman, *The Romance of American Psychology*, 200-207; Michael B. Katz, *The Undeserving Poor: From the War on Poverty to the War on Welfare* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1989), Chapter 2; O'Connor, *Poverty Knowledge*, Chapters 3, 4, and 8; and Anthony M. Platt, *E. Franklin Frazier Reconsidered* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1991).
[149] Harry J. Walker, "The Nature and Characteristics of the Negro Community," *Journal of Negro Education,* 19 no.3 (1950): 219-231, 231.
[150] Ibid., 228.
[151] George N. Redd, "The Educational and Cultural Level of the American Negro," *Journal of Negro Education*, 19, no.3 (1950): 244-252, 250.
[152] Ibid., 250.
[153] Ibid., 252.
[154] Preston Valien, "The Negro Child and Youth Population in the Untied States," *Journal of Negro Education* 19, no.3 (1950): 261-268, 267.
[155] Ibid., 268.
[156] Ibid., 254.
[157] Ibid., 256.
[158] Charles H. Thompson, "Editorial Comment: The Relative Status of the Negro Population in the Untied States," 221.
[159] Charles H. Thompson, "Race and Equality of Educational Opportunity: Defining the Problem," *Journal of Negro Education* 37, no.3 (1968): 191-203, 194.
[160] Ibid., 194. Thompson quotes the *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders*, 10.
[161] Ibid, 198, 201-202.
[162] Ibid, 202-203.
[163] Goluboff., *The Lost Promise of Civil Rights,* 239. In the process, Goluboff adeptly argues, "the NAACP's legal department created a litigation strategy devoid of the myriad labor-oriented civil rights complaints of the prior fifteen years and the material harms they had sought to redress."
[164] Charles S. Johnson, "The Next Decade in Race Relations," *The Journal of Negro Education* 13, no.3 (1944): 441-446, 441.