

2013

The unveiling of W.E.B. DuBois: A qualitative content analysis of diverse interpretations of the works and life of W. E. B. Du Bois

Sonja Lee Bock
University of Northern Iowa

Copyright 2013 - Sonja Lee Bock

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Sociology Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

Bock, Sonja Lee, "The unveiling of W.E.B. DuBois: A qualitative content analysis of diverse interpretations of the works and life of W. E. B. Du Bois" (2013). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 51.
<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/etd/51>

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

THE UNVEILING OF W.E.B. DUBOIS:
A QUALITATIVE CONTENT ANALYSIS OF DIVERSE INTERPRETATIONS OF
THE WORKS AND LIFE OF W.E.B. DUBOIS

An Abstract of a Thesis

Submitted

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

Sonja Lee Bock

University of Northern Iowa

December 2013

ABSTRACT

W. E. B. Du Bois is one of the founding fathers of sociology. Despite his many contributions, he was not included in the sociological canon and given the recognition he deserves. Du Bois was an African-American scholar whose contributions lead to the development of the first school of sociology in the United States, although he has generally not been recognized for it.

My research explores how the effects of the veil contribute to the interpretations of Du Bois. To investigate this question, I will perform a qualitative content analysis of selected publications by Dubosian experts who have written extensively about his life and work. Throughout the data analysis, I apply Du Bois' theory of the "veil," by using a diverse selection of scholars examining how they each see Du Bois through their individual lenses of race, gender, and theory. By applying the veil to Du Bois, I attempt to see if his own concept can help explain why his work so under recognized.

The dataset includes authors of different genders, races, generations, and cultural backgrounds. Working within the framework of Black sociology, the results show that there is evidence of a veil, and that it does affect scholars' interpretations of Du Bois' life and work. The benefit of this study is to create awareness. Researchers are not aware of the often unconscious effects of the veil on their own work. Furthermore, research focusing on people of color will be more beneficial and accurate if it is free of the veil – or in other words, free of racial bias and more culturally aware.

THE UNVEILING OF W.E.B. DUBOIS:
A QUALITATIVE CONTENT ANALYSIS OF DIVERSE INTERPRETATIONS OF
THE WORKS AND LIFE OF W.E.B. DUBOIS

A Thesis

Submitted

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

Sonja Lee Bock

University of Northern Iowa

December 2013

This Study by: Sonja Lee Bock

Entitled:

THE UNVEILING OF W.E.B. DUBOIS: A QUALITATIVE CONTENT ANALYSIS
OF DIVERSE INTERPRETATIONS OF THE WORKS AND LIFE OF W.E.B.
DUBOIS

has been approved as meeting the thesis requirement for the

Degree of Master of Arts

Date

Dr. Harry Brod, Chair, Thesis Committee

Date

Dr. Scharron Clayton, Thesis Committee Member

Date

Dr. Phyllis Baker, Thesis Committee Member

Date

Dr. Michael J. Licari, Dean, Graduate College

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to the people who have loved me the most. My birth parents Patricia Rheba McKenzie for her sacrifice and Nathaniel “Buck” Horton for fighting for me. Clinton and Dorothy Bock for raising me, loving me, and always supporting me. Cornelius Teer III, “Little Neil” for being an inspiration to a little girl.

A special thanks and dedication to Dr. Scharron Clayton for being a supporter and an amazing mentor. Also to thanks to Rita and Roland Carrillo for all of their support. Thanks to Dr. Harry Brod. Great appreciation to the staff at the Rod Library and Janet Witt of the Graduate College. Thanks to my many friends and family that always had an encouraging word for me. This is dedicated to all the students that have had to suffer I pray we can work together for a better world, for deliverance of justice, freedom, and peace.

I thank God for somehow getting me through this process and all the barriers. My life and work is dedicated to the three people I owe the world to my precious daughters that have had to endure so much with me. Sarah, Cyndi, and Sunny I love you with all of my heart and thank you for helping me in all of the ways you do! I am so blessed. Through the struggle and storms, the wars and battles, at the end is a peaceful grace and mercy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHAPTER 1. THE UNVEILING OF W. E. B. DU BOIS.....	1
CHAPTER 2. HISTORICAL REVIEW	9
CHAPTER 3. BLACK SOCIOLOGY.....	21
CHAPTER 4. METHODS.....	36
CHAPTER 5. DATA ANALYSIS	48
CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSION.....	76
CHAPTER 7. WHY WE ARE NOT WINNING THE FIGHT.....	81
CHAPTER 8. REFERENCES	90

CHAPTER 1

THE UNVEILING OF W. E. B. DU BOIS

Of all the civil rights for which the world has struggled and fought for 5000 years, the right to learn is undoubtedly the most fundamental. The freedom to learn—has been bought by bitter sacrifice. And whatever we may think of the curtailment of other civil rights, we should fight to the last ditch to keep open the right to learn, the right to have examined in our schools not only what we believe, but what we do not believe; not only what our leaders say, but what the leaders of other groups and nations, and the leaders of other centuries have said. We must insist upon this to give our children the fairness of a start which will equip them with such an array of facts and such an attitude toward truth that they can have a real chance to judge what the world is and what its greater minds have thought it might be.
W. E. B. Du Bois (1949/1970:230-231)

Introduction

Sociology over the last hundred years has become an important science. There have been many improvements in the ways that research is conducted, recorded, and measured. Despite the many improvements, errors remain in the research and its interpretation. Many of these errors evolve around lack of reflexivity and cultural awareness when studying other cultures (Ladner 1973; Hunter 2002). As sociological research has become more global, there has been a demand for stricter research guidelines to help eliminate other peoples and cultures from being evaluated only through “the Western Eye” (Mohanty 1984:336). However, in the United States, researchers tend to overlook the “veil” that exists within our own society. W. E. B. Du Bois’ theory of the “veil” is based on how white people in the United States see Blacks and I argue that it is prevalent in current research. To eliminate the “veil” and unintentional biasing or

misinterpretation of research, stricter standards, and reviews need to be applied to studies about people of color in the United States.

There is a need to further develop and apply Black sociology when studying minority groups. Black sociology is Black sociologists studying Blacks (Evans 1983). However, there are few Black sociologists. It is important that sociologists that study Blacks and other minority groups have an understanding of Black sociology and apply its tenets when conducting research to enhance the understanding of their participants.

In the opening quote from Du Bois, he makes a passionate request that teaching contain a global ideology, providing students with all the possible information that is available so that the truth is established. He argues that the truth is not a single society or group's view, but to teach the truth you must include all groups and truths that do not exist for ourselves. Du Bois' reference to 5,000 years is reflective of how the truth has been distorted about races of people who did not write the history books. Without a basis formed in truth, including multicultural and multidimensional lenses, how do we determine what the truth is? Moreover, where do we start?

Identifying institutional racism, which are subtle actions, beliefs, and practices that are biased against Blacks and other minorities, can help eliminate institutional racism by exploiting it (Schwalbe 2008). Holding researchers accountable for their interpretations and ensuring cultural awareness will improve the integrity of their research. Cultural competence refers to an awareness of one's own attitude toward other cultures and an awareness of one's own view toward the world. Cultural competence includes how one interacts with diverse groups of people, their skill set when

understanding different ideas and customs. Cultural competence enables individuals to understand, communicate with, and effectively interact with diverse groups of people. The definition of ethnocentrism is “a blindness, to cultural differences, a tendency to think and act as if they do not exist refer to the negative judgments that people tend to make about others cultures” (Johnson 1995/2000:110). This thesis examines the need for Black sociology to be separate from conventional sociology, to improve methods, research, results, and promotion of Black society (Ladner 1973).

This thesis will be an in depth content analysis of research written about W. E. B. Du Bois and his work. The content analysis is to discover how the veil is affected by race, gender, and application of the writer’s theory. The analysis of the various writers are compared and contrasted to find similarities and differences, trends, and historical content in the writings. The goal will be to discover intersecting themes, common interpretations, contrasting interpretations of Du Bois’ quotes, attitudes, and perceptions of Du Bois and his work. I argue the veil will be evident through contrasting interpretation of his work.

The focus of this thesis is how our perceptions affect our understanding of others. By applying the theory of the veil to Du Bois we may help to identify the root of bias in sociology. Exploring factors of race, class, gender, and theory application we may find where our individual lenses become blurred. Once the veil has been clearly identified and acknowledged then we can take steps to remove it or accept that we each have our individual perceptions of reality. The questions asked are: Did trends appear? How did

race/ethnicity appear to affect the veil? How did gender appear to affect the veil? and How did the application of theory effect the veil?

There are many leading sociologists that believe Du Bois' work is worthy to be in the canon but it is not (Aptheker 1973; Lemert 1994; Marable 1998; Zuckerman 2004). History is important when we begin to study any phenomenon. The sociological "canon" consists of "the history of sociology as an account of its authoritative texts, discoveries, thinkers and ideas of the discipline" (Legerman and Niebrugge 1998:2). The canon includes "the most important works in a particular artistic tradition, individual works that best express universal values. The works are expressed in a particular language for a specific culture" language is important but we do not always understand each other's meaning (Edgar and Sedgwick 1999/2008:34).

Sadly, the canonical works are often about oppressed people as viewed by the dominate culture's stereotypes, but often excludes works done by these groups (Edgar and Sedgwick 1999/2008). Despite being a founder of sociology, Du Bois is not in the canon and largely absent from curriculum about sociology from high school to the graduate level (Lemert 1994; Gabbion, Greene, and Young 2001). In contrast, Historical Black Colleges, HBC's offer whole classes about Du Bois and his theory, one college being Fisk University, his alma mater.

Many sociologists suggest that classical African-American sociologists' work was marginalized since they were Black and made "invisible" (Lemert 1994; Ladner 1973). Zuckerman (2004:7) states why Du Bois was not in the canon "Du Bois was a Black man who wrote about Black people" making his work even less important. Zuckerman (2004)

and Lemert (1994) agree that Du Bois laid the groundwork for how sociologists would conduct their research. Lemert (1994) and Gabbion et al. (2001) write that classical theorists and Du Bois were not held in the same esteem and given the same exposure. Fred Pampel (2007) felt that Du Bois' work was important contribution to sociology and added a chapter about Du Bois to his textbook about classical sociological theorists in 2007. Before 2007, Du Bois was not included in the text. Despite the recent recognition of Du Bois' scholarship, no movement for Du Bois to be canonized has happened in white academia.

History in the United States as a whole has been "white washed" and the works of many people of color, women, and non-conforming whites has been "written out" of the history books and sociology (Gabbion et al. 2001; Jackson 2000). Defining theory from its Greek origin, as Pampel (2007:2) puts it, can explain why Du Bois was not in the canon: "to see, theory can be understood as a lens that directs the eye towards a given reality so that one focuses on some of its features while filtering out others." The white academic majority was a total monopoly at the time of Du Bois' writings; they did not see Du Bois in their lens. This definition of theory also supports Du Bois' (1903/1990:8) theory of the veil because he stated, that the lens that whites viewed him through was covered and blurred, filtering him out. Theory has a "set of underlying assumptions and methods that are questioned, a theoretical perspective" (Johnson 1995/2000:327). Du Bois made empirical generalizations, about the relationships between blacks and whites.

The argument is that being able to understand racial disparities and inequalities does not create an understanding of the people who are suffering from it. That is why Black sociology is important. Evans (1983) defines Black sociology as Black sociologists studying Blacks. Yet, race is not the singular factor that can blur the lens. Du Bois' own lens was blurred by class and lack of exposure to Southern horrors of black life.

Several pieces of research were read that included judgments that could be unfounded because of the "lens" which is covered or clouded by the veil of the researcher. These articles are published because they are reviewed by other academics with the same lens, who are unaware of what questions to ask to check the validity of the research (Hunter 2002). First, it is currently popular and trendy to study African-Americans, and that in itself is demeaning (Lemert 1994). Lemert (1994:384) stated the field of study of Black urban life today "is surely the most controversial and one of the most productive domains of sociological work." There should be a benefit to those being studied. What are the purposes of the studies? The majority of studies are about negative factors of Black life not the successes. If the studies are not going to produce a solution to the problem why conduct them?

Black sociologists are a small percentage of sociologists as a whole. Black sociologists are focusing on their own work and do not have the time to police all the work done on Blacks done around the world. Some types of research does have to be approved by an Institutional Review Board abbreviated as IRB but the lack of diversity on those committees prevents screening to be helpful.

All of these factors, misinterpretations, modeling, subtle bias, false knowledge claims, and lack of reflexivity contribute to inaccurate research done about people of color by white researchers (Evans 1983; Hunter 2002; Ladner 1973). The homogenous views of people of color are accepted without question by many white researchers. People of color do not interject because of their lack of access to higher education and lack of validity they are given when they are in higher education to prevent the situation from improving (Collins 1989).

Briefly stated, the purpose of this research is to create awareness that there is bias in research by applying the veil to Du Bois directly. This also helps cover a gap in the research in two ways: starting at the root, Du Bois being one of the first leading sociologists. Second, Du Bois is often not studied. This work will help give insight to this complicated and complex man (Lemert 1994; Rabaka 2006). The aim is to expose the existence of the veil so we can then determine how best to remove it or acknowledge our own individual standpoints. Reiland Rabaka (2006:736) states, the lack of studies done about Du Bois is a “shameful paucity of scholarship and critical discourse on Du Bois,” he believes this is because of “racial exclusionary practices” that happen in academia.

When the veil is removed interpretations of research will improve and better serve those studied. Black sociology can help establish criteria that will help accurately assess data from research. Review boards need to be created with qualified and diverse people

who can critically scrutinize the validity of the research and if it is necessary to be done.

When these improvements are in place research conducted will aid the subjects and not

cause harm.

CHAPTER 2

HISTORICAL REVIEW

Asserting our humanness, challenging mis-measurement, defying exclusion, holding ourselves, our colleagues, and our disciplines accountable to a truth greater than any of us are all by-products of contact with and respect for the work of W. E. B. Du Bois. (Jackson 2000:166)

When attempting to do a literature review on the bias in sociological studies the many of the articles were based in Black sociology. Black sociology will be discussed in the next chapter. Instead of a literature review, a historical review of education of Blacks in the United States was conducted to show the deep rooted history of barriers to education for Blacks. The historical review will start with Du Bois' theory of the veil and its historical root. Du Bois made a passionate request for teaching to contain a global ideology providing students with as much information that is available so that the truth is established. Du Bois believed that it was important for us to learn what is considered our own beliefs or truths and the beliefs or truths of others. Du Bois' theories were "deeply grounded in history and culture" (Rabaka 2006:744). Du Bois' theory of the veil states that white United States citizens have a veiled view of Black Americans based on what they consider as factual knowledge, stereotypes, or racial bias (Du Bois 1903/1989). Not everyone may agree with his theory but it was his belief.

Du Bois was not an absolutist. He did have many white friends and white coworkers, his theory was a generalization based on his personal experience, historical events and current events of his time. Du Bois used strong language, political action, and propaganda to fight against oppression and the mentality of racism (Marable 1998).

However, Du Bois did not hate white people for being white, he disdained racist attitudes (Lewis 2000). Du Bois was also aware of his white heritage and the privilege that he had over most people of color. To hate white people would be to hate a part of himself.

Race will be a factor in the exploration of the veil. Social class will not be a factor. However, it is important to apply social class to Du Bois to explain his unique position in the Black culture of the time. Du Bois, after first leaving his home town had a very thick veil when it came to Black people. He was raised in the North with mostly whites. He was highly critical of Blacks because he did not live their struggle of living in the South. Once Du Bois started the Philadelphia Experiment, his perceptions, understandings, and veil changed (Lewis 2000). During the Philadelphia Experiment, he gained a better insight into the Black struggle in the now post reconstruction society. He learned to see how some people made the best of their struggle and how others succumbed to addictions (Lewis 2000). He immersed himself and his family in the culture. He learned about survival. Rather than judge he gained personal knowledge about addictions, prostitution, and utter despair, even the death of his own son from unsafe drinking water. Du Bois was living in a level of poverty he had not previously experienced (Lewis 2000).

Du Bois' lens as a scholar and as a human being became less clouded and the veil was lifted. Through this content analysis, others doing research can be encourage to expand their lens and dig deeper into their subjects and ask more questions. To become more culturally aware as Du Bois did about his own people. These components of the

veil are not strictly based on race but also, as in Du Bois' case, social class, life experience, geographic location, and broader even more personal understanding of the human condition.

Du Bois' truth is supported, by Black sociology. Black sociology and the theory of the veil will be used in this research to support the claims that the theory of the veil had effects on the interpretations of Du Bois and his works. The theory of the veil is very simple and is applied in this essay as a blurring of the view of selected writers toward Du Bois. By reviewing writings of a group of diverse sociologists about Du Bois' life, work and interpretations that may have prevented him from being understood and from being accepted into the sociological canon. Not limiting the veil to the black and white binary and including gender and theory application.

Removing the veil of how Blacks are seen is a far more daunting task than one can even begin to imagine. For this research, the veil is applied to the United States however it does exist across the world. For this thesis the "veil" was defined as each writer's individual lens and how their lens influenced their perceptions of history, culture, and theoretical standpoint when interpreting Du Bois. Some United States citizens' attitudes, are not based on the actual knowledge or engagement of the other person, truth about the Black person is veiled by deeply engrained subtle racism, lack of reflexivity, lack of life experience with diverse groups, and identifying with the human condition.

One of the first steps in research is a historical review. If history is not recorded accurately, then the research is skewed from the beginning. The accurate telling of history is important because it gives an overall sense of who we are studying. Modern

sciences and in depth research have uncovered the myths that have been told about ancient times. Anthropological studies have discovered that the oldest traces of life originated in Africa and that we all come from African descent rather than the “white portrayals of a white Adam and Eve” the science proves life began in Africa is ignored (Jackson 2000:161). As Fatima Jackson (2000:158) observes, “we have yet to internalize that science is a human endeavor that predates the accomplishment of ancient Romans, Greeks, or Egyptians. We are taught, and teach, that true science begins with post Renaissance European endeavors and discoveries” this establishes the lack of truth in history that prevents the understanding of the true history of Black people.

Du Bois (1903/1990:16) wrote that the “problem is the color line” and that the color line is “a cultural construct, deeply rooted in the philosophical underpinning of international Western science.” The same norms that entitle “whiteness” also fundamentally debase all persons, places, or things labeled “black” (Jackson 2000:155). The reason that these historical events are important to modern day research is that they lay the foundation to view a group or groups of people as bad or evil. The consciousness is very deep beyond our own ability to recognize it. The principle of “othering” has been with humankind for centuries.

Because historical “othering” goes back for thousands of years, a concern is how to remove something that is believed to be factual and true history? By othering, the dominant group gains power. Schwalbe et al. (2000) defines oppressive othering as defining a group as different and deficient both morally and/or intellectually inferior, leaving the elites to be trustworthy and deserving. Through the process of othering,

Europe was able to invade, conquer, and enslave people all over the world. Du Bois believed in the deep affects of colonialism.

The United States was formed first by the settlers who believed in religious freedom and equality would be the practice of this country. The hypocritical and unrighteous side of the veil immediately emerged by the simple fact that many of the writers of the Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights were slave owners themselves. The United States “othered” Africans who became slaves from its conception. Other immigrants initially may suffer from “othering,” but they are allowed, the bootstrap discourse that blacks are denied for assimilation (Hunter 2002:126). Blacks were not able to blend into the culture even after they assimilated.

The practice of “othering” became law in the United States. The following slave codes laid the basis for institutional racism in the United States. Schwalbe (2008:81) argues that the “reproduction of inequality becomes institutionalized: by getting built into the routine ways that people do things together on a daily basis....taken for granted how things ought to be done and can be done without causing trouble.” Institutional racism exists in education, law, medicine, and other major institutions in the United States because of the ideologies established in slavery. Today it is just less blatant and very subtle. Slave codes practiced as law kept Black people from learning. The following slave codes are example of how institutional racism in education developed the United States:

Alabama, 1833-“Any person or persons who attempt to teach any free person of color, or slave to spell, read, or write, shall upon conviction

there of by indictment, be fined in a sum not less than two hundred and fifty dollars, not more than five hundred dollars.” (Cooper and McCord N.d.:352-356.)

Teaching a slave to read or write could mean punishment and/or death, not only for the slave, but there would be serious penalties for the teacher. This instilled deep fear in the heart of some whites that inhibited desires to improve the lives of slaves. The slave code clearly defined the people of color that were to be considered slaves.

Virginia, 1682 “Act I. It is enacted that all servant which shall be imported into this country either by sea or by land, whether Negroes, Moors, Muslim North Africans, mulattoes or Indian who and whose parentage and native countries are not Christian at the time of their first purchase by some Christian and all Indians, which shall be sold by our neighboring Indians, or any other trafficking with us for slaves, are hereby adjudged deemed and taken to be slaves to all intents and purposes any law, usage or custom to the contrary notwithstanding. Virginia 1705 “All servants imported and brought into the Country...who were not Christians in their native Country...shall be accounted and be slaves. All Negro, mulatto and Indian slaves within the dominion...shall be held to be real estate.” (Cooper and McCord N.d.:352-356)

In short, the slave codes established Christianity as a basis to uphold slavery and devalued the life of any slave because they were viewed as real estate. These practices and laws were enforced for over a hundred years in the United States. A Black life was not valued as human. The ideology would not be easily removed:

Virginia, 1705 “If any slave resists his master...correcting such a slave, and shall happen to be killed in such correction...the master shall be free of all punishment...as if such accident never happened.” (Cooper and McCord N.d.: 352-356)

As the educational systems grew in the United States, so did the strong belief that African slaves were ignorant and should not be educated. Ironically, the attitude not to educate Blacks became stronger as the need for slaves increased with cotton and tobacco

trades. Many early slaves were educated and were able to buy their own freedom. Africans slaves became more ignorant as the need to keep them in slavery increased.

Several centuries of slavery in the United States deeply engrained the “knowledge” of what Black people were. Even the Emancipation did not grant Blacks equality. President Lincoln believed that Blacks were an inferior people. Lincoln saw the African American as "a man but not a brother” (Fredrickson 1975:40). Everything that was “known” about Africans who became Black slaves created a belief that they were inferior to whites, and this belief became “factual” and accepted.

There were many false beliefs about the Africans: that they were wild, more animal than human, sexually aggressive, violent, that they benefitted from beatings, and had low intelligence (Jackson 2000). Fear of improving conditions for Blacks only became worse when history established that an educated Black could be very dangerous.

Du Bois and the Intelligent Rebellion

During the last decades of slavery, a few freed slaves received some attention and acceptance from whites who were abolitionists in the North. Sojourner Truth and Harriet Tubman were known for their work to end slavery. Fredrick Douglas, who was more polished and somewhat educated, was granted acceptance and would speak out for the end of slavery. At one point, he protested segregation on a train and had to be pulled from the train (Huggins 1980). Nat Turner also was an educated slave, who led the most violent attack against slave owners in the South. Nat Turner’s revolt helped solidify whites’ beliefs that Blacks should not be educated (Foner 1971). The revolt also created a fear in Blacks that learning could be dangerous. Many innocent Blacks were killed

because of the slave revolt. This was an early sign of what lay ahead for those people of color who became educated and for the reaction that they would cause and receive.

William Edward Burghardt Du Bois was born in Great Barrington, Massachusetts on February 23, 1868, (Lewis 2000). His parents were Alfred and Mary Du Bois, on his mother's side, they were freed slaves and on his father's side was a mix of French and Black (Lewis 2000). W. E. B. Du Bois did not come from a Southern upbringing and in Massachusetts; he was offered an education with white children. His life was much easier than the Blacks in the South had to endure, but he still experienced the pain of racism. His experiences were not so severe to create the hatred and fear that Southern Blacks had to endure but still created an absolute awareness leading to the theory of the "veil" and "double consciousness":

Then it dawned upon me with a certain suddenness that I was different from others; or like, mayhap, in heart and life and longing, but shut out from their world by a vast veil. I had therefore no desire to tear down that veil, to creep through; I held all beyond it in common contempt and lived above it in a region of blue sky and great wandering shadows. (Du Bois 1903/1989:2)

Du Bois' self-observation brings the veil dividing whites and Blacks in the United States. Du Bois, as a young child, was rejected on the playground by another child. The child was a little white girl he attempted to give a valentine too. She rejected him. He made the astute observation, that he had been judged solely on the color of his skin and not his character (Du Bois 1903/1989). His theory of the veil claims that whites do not see people of color for their character but first see their skin color and then experience a series of racist beliefs that exist in their minds. This single observation is the main theoretical basis for this proposed research project. As a student of color, I have been

taught, primarily and almost exclusively white teachers and professors. What my observation has been is that the veil clearly still exists and exists in education, and it also becomes evident when research is conducted and interpreted about people of color.

The first hurdle is to establish in this project is the existence of the veil. Without that being established, researchers of non-color cannot even begin to know that the veil exists. The veil is so very transparent because what is believed as “factual knowledge” the deep unconscious biases against people of color (Jackson 2000:157). Those original biases include that dark people or “other” people are dangerous, immoral, unintelligent, violent, and unworthy (Du Bois 1903/1989; Jackson 2000; Ladner 1973). Even the slightest amount of bias can taint the researcher’s lens enough to think that people of color are deserving of lesser treatment or have created their own circumstance, or the assumption “of course they are that way,” which is based on false belief.

Du Bois himself fell into that trap. Receiving a white institutional education, he first believed that all Blacks’ experiences were like his and their failure to thrive had to result from their own laziness (Lewis 2000). However, during his Philadelphia research he understood that it was economic disadvantages and not lack of desire, that kept Blacks from thriving. By placing himself within the environment of his subjects, he was able to embrace the truth (Lewis 2000).

The second hurdle is to recognize that researchers that are not of color will have a hard time truly understanding their subjects of color unless they can remove their veil. Removing the veil and believing that the veil is removed are two very different things. Largely this is not the fault of the researcher (Bittner 1973). Because of the centuries of

strongly embedded othering, new ideas about people of color can be hard to believe. Validating the true experiences and intelligence of people of color is also difficult through the mainstream lens. W. E. B. Du Bois is an example of this. This will entail the next factor of the veil, reflexivity. Reflexivity of the author, their ability to recognize their own status separate from the object they are studying. Are they open to the suggestions that the observed are making and in the context of the observed how rigid or flexible are they in their perceptions and understanding?

Du Bois, in his lifetime, was “a leading sociologist, criminologist, ethnographer, playwright, and feminist”, yet we rarely hear him described as such (Zuckerman 2004:4). That fact that he was not canonized itself convincingly establishes the existence of the veil. It also perpetuates the existence of the veil because some researchers did not believe that he should be given the credence to be acknowledged. Rabaka (2006:733) writes that Du Bois “has been long praised and criticized by scholars who have interpreted and reinterpreted his work, often overlooking its deep critical theoretical dimensions.” Another factor in the veil will be to examine the application of theory.

Phil Zuckerman (2004:7) stated directly; why was Du Bois not in the canon? The direct answer was, “He was a black man writing mostly about Black life at a time when most Americans cared little about black men—or women –or their lives.” Du Bois’ techniques used during the Philadelphia research was emulated by many ethnographers and sociologists; however, he was not given credit for its development (Lewis 2000; Lemert 1994). If they let Du Bois in the canon, they would have to let in others. This

would dispel theories of white superiority. There is elitism, that not only excludes Blacks but other groups that do not fit the mold.

A major reason for the continuance of the veil and the negative results of othering was what happened when Blacks became more educated. Seeing through the veil contributed to a nonviolent, intelligent uprising by educated Blacks. However, even in its inception, there was no complete unity. Hostility developed between not only whites and Blacks, but also Blacks and Blacks, and between supportive and non-supportive whites. Whites feared violent racial uprisings like that of Nat Turner, and Blacks feared retaliation.

Ida B. Wells-Barnett and Anna Julia Cooper both led some protests. Wells-Barnett's work was the most controversial with the statement that white women desired black men (Wells-Barnett 1892/1969). Wells-Barnett and Cooper are credited for the development of standpoint theory. Both women spoke from their positions of oppressed Black women. Wells-Barnett and Cooper gave their interpretations of life through their own personal lens. These intelligent people, along with their many followers, would suffer the same fate and rejection. The more educated the people of color, the more uppity we were viewed as and the harder to control. Black's views become marginalized when we try to right wrongs.

These attitudes support the types of racism that cloud the mind and lens of some sociological researchers. These attitudes still exist today when people find issue with or do not understand when people of color expose racism or inequalities. No one wants to be identified as racist on any level. People of color remain labeled as being angry or not

getting over it and mostly not validated because their standpoint is dismissed. Dismissing their standpoint is easy because it has been historically marginalized or their standpoint hasn't been recorded. Marginalization of thoughts and beliefs of people of color has been continually reinforced. Rabaka (2006:737) supports this claim writing "hidden histories and our unofficial stories do not usually make it into the mainstream, but the fact remains that they often subtly and silently reach and raise consciousness."

Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver also dismissed the theory that Negroes were not intelligent. However, these men were much more mild mannered and did not protest, but concentrated more heavily on their own work. They were rewarded for their compliance by many whites, but often not appreciated by their own people for being too conforming (Du Bois 1903/1990).

However, during the time of reconstruction and thereafter, many Blacks did become educated and well-trained laborers. Blacks were pitted against each other to choose what school of thought they should follow: Du Bois versus Washington, with fear of white retaliation (Ladner 1973; Lewis 2000; Metcalf 1968). This exploitation established that Blacks could not work together and showed their lack of solidarity and need for white supervision. When whites would be addressed on the facts that many Blacks were intelligent and capable, the explanation would be this: Because of our mixing of blood over the many years of slavery, the Negro has benefited from the white gene to help his intellectual being (Jackson 2000).

CHAPTER 3

BLACK SOCIOLOGY

A historical review was done instead of a literature review due to the fact that research that specifically questioned the validity of studies done by white researchers about subjects of color were discussed in Black sociology. The literature primarily focuses on the development of Black Sociology. The main factors in Black sociology are that the sociologists are Black, the break from conventional sociology, the myths of assimilation, continued correction of false information about Blacks and the evidence of what is considered knowledge (Armstrong 1979; Evans 1983; Jackson 2000; Ladner 1973). In sum, the literature on Black Sociology supports the previous claims about Du Bois' veil, history, and false knowledge claims.

Black sociology truly started in the most violent and dangerous time for Blacks during reconstruction. Sociologists like Du Bois, Cooper, and Wells-Barnett were pioneers in the field. However, the official stance for Black sociology happened during the Civil Rights Movement in 1968 with the Caucus of Black Sociologists (Ladner 1973). The Caucus of Black Sociologists did not separate from the American Sociological Association, but they did take a stance against the ASA hiring practices, reduced opportunities, and lack of recognition of Black sociologists' works. The Caucus called for a heightened Black awareness (Ladner 1973).

Joyce Ladner describes in "The Death of White Sociology" that there clearly does need to be two separate classes of sociology. Black Americans were separated from their arrival because of slavery and not truly allowed in the melting pot. Blacks were here

involuntarily, they were given second-class status, a status that they could not work their way out of due to the color of their skin. Black life was excluded from the framework of sociology; there was no white comparison. The lives of Blacks were distorted, disorganized, pathological, and innately inferior (Ladner 1973).

White history applied to Blacks created “conceptual and methodical inaccuracies” mainstream sociology did not recognize that Blacks were forced into their positions (Ladner 1973:xxi). Black sociology called for an end to false knowledge claims about Blacks. Although recognized for his contribution to sociology, Du Bois is often overlooked, yet white contemporaries Robert E. Park, Ernest Burgess, and Edward Reuter are held in high regard in sociology although their theories on racial inferiority have been discredited (Ladner 1973).

Ironically, the greatest critics of mainstream sociology were literary men, not sociologists. The Black writers Ralph Ellison and Albert Murray were critical of how white sociologists portrayed Blacks (Ladner 1973). Blacks were expected to assimilate and cultural pluralism was not an option. Blacks were measured against an inaccurate set of norms, and then when they did not meet them, they were considered deviant (Ladner 1973). Black lifestyles, values, behaviors, attitudes, and family survival were not accurately reported. Black life was not usually reported unless it was deviant in nature (Ladner 1973). Blacks were portrayed as only the perpetrators and not the victims. Blacks were simply observed, classified, and analyzed.

The research question asks how a diverse group of sociologists are affected by the veil when writing about and evaluating Du Bois and his works. By applying what Black

sociologists have identified as the misinterpretation and representation of Blacks to Du Bois the veil should be evident. What is obvious to someone of color may be difficult for some other sociologists to see. Experience is a matter of evidence; white sociologists may not understand black sociologists' evidence (Husserl 1931/1960).

How Black Sociology Can Help

Black sociology, as described by Edward G. Armstrong (1979:388) consists of the following: “(1) it is a conduct of inquiry conducted by one whose racial identity is Black; (2) it is a subject matter—race relations—researched by Black sociologists; (3) it is a theoretical frame based on matters of concern to Blacks; and (4) it is a radical ideological stance”. Black sociology is research done by a sociologist “(1) whose social identity is Black, (2) whose ideological allegiance, as expressed in the formulation of research problems and the interpretation of research results, is for the release of Black people from race related social oppression, and (3) whose primary research population is constituted by Black people” (Watson 1976:118).

In other works, Black life has to be viewed through new methodologies that accurately represent the experience of Black life. Arthur Evans (1983) writes that Black sociologists have a unique relationship with their community and need to develop new theories and methods to accurately study black communities. He states that white sociology or conventional sociology has done little to improve the lives of Black people. However, Black sociologists have a much closer relationship, including shared concern, and desire to improve Black lives.

Part of the role of the Black sociologist is to protect the Black community from racial bias in research (Evans 1983; Ladner 1973). Black sociology surpasses conventional sociology by adding the factor that the Black community will directly benefit from the research. Part of the goal of Black sociology is to help “construct theories of social organization, create social organizations, and raise the consciousness of Black people to help improve their lives” (Evans 1983:475).

The prior model that was accepting of viewing Blacks as a part of society that was pathological and biologically inferior (Armstrong 1979; Evans 1983; Jackson 2000; Ladner 1973). Conventional sociology simply classified Blacks’ social reality and did not explain it. Also, conventional sociology is too ethnocentric and implies that Blacks and whites have shared history, life experiences and culture that is based on “equality rather than domination” (Evans 1983:479). Indeed “Black sociologists have unique qualities that better equip them to understand black people,” Black sociologists have a personal awareness and experiential knowledge (Evans 1983:483).

In addition, value neutrality is rejected by Black sociology. As Black sociologists, we claim and declare the injustices that have kept Black people from succeeding. We reject the conventional thought that education equals racial equality because of our awareness of institutional racism that is designed to keep Blacks from learning.

Institutional racism existed from the beginning of the formation of the United States. Black people may integrate or reject the white majority to create their own culture. Black sociologists are vividly aware of ethnocentric values that are placed on

people of color, although we have not had the same resources, economic advantages, educational opportunities, or moral acceptance. Black sociology claims bias (Armstrong 1979). Black sociology does not promote detachment in observation and interpretation but states “if a scholar is biased against bias he is possessed by a bias” basically saying how can anyone be completely unbiased (Hare 1973:73). Black sociology is pro-Black, pro-race awareness, pro-value, and promotes the welfare of all people of color. Black sociologists are culturally competent in their research and interpretations (Armstrong 1979).

Perception is important. The presence of paradigmatic biases limits conventional sociology by limiting research topics and interpretations. “White European-immigration-fixation is applied to blacks but they were brought here against their will. Their failure to thrive was then placed on them” this is not a full accounting of Black history and the barriers to their success (Armstrong 1979:391). Blacks were not allowed to have any of their own culture and then forced to accept the world of their oppressor. Unlike the immigrant who may have desired to emulate the majority’s way of life, the Black person had no choice. Blacks were further disadvantaged by not having their own learning institutions based in their original culture. Immigrants, on the other hand, were able to maintain their culture and teachings. Immigrants also could integrate into existing learning institutions.

All research questions are “raced” because they are created from a “particular epistemology, which creates blind spots when looking from one set position” (Hunter 2002:131). Exposing blind spots is a crucial part of changing social science research

methods (Hunter 2002). Hunter (2002:121) suggests that conventional sociologists must continually practice the “act of critical reflexivity” and look past their standard lens. The example of default epistemologies of immigrant assimilation does not work for the Black population. Black sociology would view it as immigrant versus slave. White ethnics could assimilate, but the African American suffers from blocked assimilation (Hunter 2002). A result of the veil and unequal power relations in the United States affects our knowledge production. We have to move beyond the racial binary of black and white.

Hunter (2002:120) writes, “racial knowledge is infused in the knowledge production process from start to finish, and how the act of critical reflexivity, coupled with an examination of and ultimate change in power relations, can help researchers see their hidden assumptions.” Conventional sociologists have to be aware of history and learn to critically question what they believe to be “knowledge.” In Black/white racial epistemology only, “African Americans are thought of as raced, whites are just human” (Hunter 2002:124).

Personal experience is often viewed with more legitimacy than social science surveys and other data collection methods (Hunter 2002). It is imperative to uncover the way that United States power relations validate some ways of knowing and denigrate others (Cazenave and Maddren 1999). Power coerces people to do things against their own interests; it affects our understanding, the power of dominant epistemologies to elicit submission to elites (Hunter 2002). Knowledge production will only truly change with significant shifts in racial power changes. Race is a social construction that identifies different types of human bodies for the purpose of creating and maintaining material and

ideological domination of one group by another (Hunter 2002). Some whites in the United States have developed racial discrimination, but it is subtle and deeply embedded. It enables them to stay in power and hides the fact that the system is unfair: racism is not just an ideology, but also a material reality (Hunter 2002).

Epistemologies are “ways of knowing”. Epistemologies can also be theories of knowledge that make basic claims about the nature of knowledge: who can know, how we know and what counts as evidence for our claims (Harding 1987). Epistemologies are situated within political, historical, and economic contexts that can provide power and legitimacy to their knowledge claims. These epistemologies have been accounted for in this paper of some whites’ knowledge toward Blacks. This paper also accounts for Blacks’ epistemologies about Blacks.

Bittner (1973:115) states “Dealing with human matters from a distance and by means of instruments is no mere mistake; it is artful deception (even when the individual practitioner is not himself personally deceitful), the ultimate effect of which cannot be anything but the further spiritual deracination of man and the increase of the sum of alienation in society.” The rule in Black sociology is “the researcher must become involved and accountable to his subject community” (Armstrong 1979:391). This supports Du Bois’ call for a “first hand account of Black life” (Armstrong 1979:392). Du Bois (1903/1989:154) called white sociologists “theorist car window sociologist” because of their leisurely approach to observance of Black life from a distance that gave no insight to the actual struggles of Black life. Du Bois was aware that the white sociologist only wanted to focus on the negative aspects of Black life such as prostitutes, crime, and

children out of wedlock. He made a demand for sociologists to go in deeper and get the depth of black existence. Du Bois could not be limited to the “typical tools of sociology, the moral and ethical implication made him closely observe his subjects and use their expression so that whole Black truth could be told” (Armstrong 1979:392). The experience of being Black is the central component and fundamental resource of Black sociology. This experience provides the distinctive legitimating ability for understanding uniformities of Black life. As Patricia Hill Collins (1989:749) states “we have shared experience.”

Scientific observation versus firsthand experience, how can we answer the questions? How do we know if the researcher is culturally aware and fair? What is validity and reliability? Is the test to prove that whites’ have missed the mark or do we have to prove our own knowledge? Validity in Black sociology is based upon the idea that to “study black life one must be Black” (Armstrong 1979:393). Walters (1973:202) argues that Black researcher’s “field experience” in being Black gives a better understanding of the techniques of analysis, which are relevant in a given situation. White “theorizing” does not equal Black fact, reality, or experience. Blacks and whites have different experiences and different frames of reference (Armstrong 1979). Reliability, the purpose of Black sociology, is to formulate concepts that point toward the ultimate goal of mobilizing Black people to seek their liberation from white American racism. Objectivity is replaced with “sense of Black consciousness” and “redefine reality” (Walters 1973:199). Armstrong’s concept of Black sociology is understandable but not absolute. Elsa Barkley Brown (1989:922) states, “all people can learn to center in

another experience, validate it, and judge it by its own standards without the need of comparison or need to adopt that framework as their own” by practicing reflexivity.

People can study another culture if they have the ability to learn the best practices to do so.

When whites attempted to do participation observation, they often cannot collect accurate data due to the “Black put-on” (Staples 1976:17). Blacks participants tell the white researcher what they think the white researcher thinks is appropriate. Therefore, research done on Blacks is arguably inaccurate. Du Bois (1968:51) wanted “to put science into sociology” by “facing the facts of [his] own social situation and racial world.”

Why can whites not “get” it? There are “certain aspects of racial phenomena, however, that are particularly difficult, if not impossible, for a member of the oppressing group to grasp empirically and formulate conceptually” and experience is a matter of evidence (Husserl 1931/1960:140). White sociologists may not understand the “black sociologist’s evidence” (Husserl 1931/1960:148). We do not have a shared reality.

The barriers to white sociologists seeing through the veil have been discussed. There is also a reason that Blacks sociologists may have better insight when interpreting Du Bois and that would be because of standpoint theory. Other early sociologists of Du Bois’ time struggled with the issues of race and gender. Ida B. Wells-Barnett (1892/1969) and Julia Anna Cooper (1892) laid the groundwork for sociology with the development of the standpoint theory. Wells-Barnett and Cooper wrote from their standpoint of oppressed Black women. Both Wells-Barnett and Cooper are also often left

out of major sociological discussions (Lemert and Bhan 1998). Lemert and Bhan (1998) suggest that Cooper in part laid the foundation for standpoint theory in her writing “The Negro’s Dialect” because she was culturally critical of the white mockery of Black language and culture.

Joyce Ladner, Patricia Hill Collins and Zora Neale Hurston continued to build on standpoint theory in Black feminist thought. Standpoint theory simply defined is the interpretation of the information seen through the lens of the persons experiencing it. Collins (2000) states our commonalities combine us into a group. Collins (2000:24) describes the origins of standpoint theory as “historically, racial segregation in housing, education, and employment fostered group commonalities that encourage the formation of group based collective standpoint.” Like Du Bois, our history is important to Collins’ definition of standpoint theory. Standpoint theory like the veil is not absolute. Collins (2000) recognizes that we live in society that has historically demeaned Black women and we have enough “core themes” to create a group standpoint. “Despite differences of age, sexual orientation, social class, region and religion...we still have common experience” Collins (2000:25).

For ordinary African-American women, those individuals who have lived through the experiences about which they claim to be experts are more believable and credible than those who have merely read or thought about such experiences (Collins 1989:759).

Truth was important to Du Bois; whether anyone else believed it or not it was his truth. The same is true for Collins. Collins (2000:269) addressed the combined experiences of race and gender, African American women have “two types of knowledge, the taken for granted knowledge and knowledge attained through academia.” Collins

(2000) recognizes how our social condition affects our standpoint and recognized how we are dominated. “African- American women have long struggled to find alternative locations and epistemologies for validating our own self definitions” our truth as Black women is our truth (Collins 2000:269).

Collins (2000) stated that the more oppressed the group the clearer their sight, however that is not absolute. She recognizes the oppression of many other groups and does not deny their truths. The focus is on the fact that no standpoint or alternative view really makes any difference because the oppressor quickly dismisses it. Standpoint theory is rooted in feminist theory using a “standpoint” that is different from the mainstream white male academic view (Collins 1989). The intent of this research is to examine the writings on Du Bois to see how the writers portray him and to find answers to why such a great scholar and leader in the field of sociology is so often misunderstood, misinterpreted, and not in the canon. The research is not to look for or identify racism per se because other factors will be considered, not just race. Identifying the possible bias or misinterpretations of Du Bois, that may have lead to him not receiving recognition, may help remove the veil.

Justifications, We Want to Have Our Truth

This thesis is important because it matters to people of color who it is that is giving us information and sharing information about us. On our side of the veil, we also scrutinize and question the validity of information, having long ago learned that not everything that is taught is true.

Current feminists have written about the fact that people of color take seriously their portrayal. Collins (1989), hooks (1990), Mohanty (1984) and Lugones and Spellman (1983) have all written articles about their concerns on how people of color are researched and the interpretations. We want to know who is talking about us! Collins (1989) gives an example of how she taught a class that only had African-American females. The students wanted to know as much as they could about the writer before they began to study their work. Knowledge claims and knowledge-validation are important in Black sociology. Respected individuals and individuals with personal experience are simply considered more valid (Collins 1989). The massive amount of inaccuracies about Blacks has made Blacks want to go deeper when presented with information.

There is very little literature that deals directly with the questioning of the validity of research done about people of color. Several articles have been written that deal with not being ethnocentric when doing global research (Lugones and Spellman 1983). It is interesting that sociologists can see the veil when we cross the border but not with in our own country. That observation supports the power of the veil in the United States. Ladner (1983) wrote that the Black Sociologists should show concern in research about the Third World countries, when in fact it was feminists that stepped to that battle. Today, Black sociologists are making little progress in creating a separate school of thought for Blacks; in research the movement has all but halted since 1973.

The lack of research done about the validity of studies about people of color reveals a serious gap in the research. That is why this thesis is important, as it will create

more awareness for researchers. As Jackson (2000) states, we have a duty to make sure the truth is told and that we hold each other accountable. There were several articles that discuss the theory of the veil. However, most of the articles written by people of color are based on the common experiences and frustrations of dealing with institutional racism or racism in general. Many address the common concerns of not feeling validated or ostracized, the ever present “double consciousness” and knowing we are viewed through a veil and deciding how to handle it (Du Bois 1903/1990:xii).

Schwalbe’s (2008) and Shapiro’s (2004) research explains that no matter how many studies are done about people of color, nothing will actually change because of the current policies that reflect deeply embedded racism. What little momentum is created behind Black sociology is based on the lack of change and improvement for Blacks. In addition, the long-term damaging effects of research can be promotion of stereotypes for Blacks and ineffective public policy. The false representation of the Black mother in the Moynihan report led to more studies of its kind (America 1973). Sadly, the negative information that influences research and is believed to be factual is often built upon for further studies. This is complicated by the fact there are not enough Black sociologists to combat or disprove poorly done research.

The number of studies done about people of color is large but no apparent change or improvement results from these studies. This lack of change is one of the justifications for this study. Why continue to examine and reexamine the hardships of Blacks, Black youth and gang violence if it serves no purpose. Schwalbe (2008) and Shapiro (2004) show that no matter how many studies are done on people of color, it will not change the

situation because the United States' economic system is designed to keep people of color from achieving major successes in large numbers. Are any more of these types of studies necessary or should there be a shift in the interest to design and research real solutions?

Another justification for my study is to bring awareness to the damage and negative messages about Blacks that can result from research. The damage caused by misinterpretation is furthering stereotypes, negative self-imagery, and it is pitting Blacks against each other. Study after study has been done on African-American men and boys and their societal problems, but no real solutions have come out of these studies.

The challenge of Black sociology will be to develop new techniques and perspectives to promote better lives for all people of color. "Conciliation between culture (theory) and politics (practice) will be the key" supported by Nathan Hare who stated "uniting of the Black academy and the street" will help us be successful (Ladner 1973:xxvii). The creation of awareness, survival skills, effective public policy, and action will enhance Black life rather than exploit it.

By using Black Sociology to see if a diverse group of researchers see Du Bois through the veil, we can see the identifying factors that contribute to the misinterpretations, assuming they exist. By examining how each writer evaluates Du Bois and his work based on history, facts, cultural differences, race awareness, theory application and interpretations of the level of bias, if it existed, should be measurable. This research question asks what factors contribute to the diverse interpretations of Du Bois. If these factors were a barrier to a great scholar like Du Bois from being properly recognized by the most educated people in the field of sociology, do these same factors

contribute to biased and inaccurate sociology when studying minorities today? By starting at the root we can start to cure the affliction of racism, create a better awareness and understanding of others.

CHAPTER 4

METHODS

The Study

This thesis is an in depth content analysis of writings about W. E. B. Du Bois and his work. The hypothesis is that the writings and evaluations conducted by sociologists with diverse lenses will be affected by W. E. B. Du Bois' theory of the veil. Evidence of the veil will be examined by reviewing works done by specific groups of researchers to identify reflexivity, cultural issues, similarities, differences, and interpretations of Du Bois' work. By discovering the intersecting themes and interpretations about Du Bois across race, gender, ethnicity and theory it will help identify the veil, if it exists. For this thesis the "veil" was defined as each writer's individual lens and how their lens influenced their perceptions of history, culture, and theoretical standpoint when interpreting Du Bois. The purpose of this research is to explore the sociologists' lens in research to see how the veil blurs data. By exposing the veil's existence, we may be able to learn to be more accurate in our interpretations.

Procedures

Content analysis involves examining a number of materials or articles to find the answers to questions one is investigating. Elo and Kyngas (2007:113) state "one challenge of content analysis is the fact that is very flexible and there is no simple, 'right' ways of doing it." This content analysis is to "describe the phenomenon in a conceptual form." The phenomenon in this thesis is the veil (Elo and Kyngas 2007:113). Different articles and books written from a diverse group of authors will be reviewed to make

“replicable and valid inferences from data to their context” to find evidence of the veil (Krippendorff 1989:403). To support claims of the existence of the veil, “systematic treatment” of the content will be used (Krippendorff 1989:403). By using these social-science practices I hope to create a better understanding of the veil and the works of Du Bois.

Inductive analysis will be used because there has not been any other research done about the veil applied to Du Bois. This approach works well with this research because it “moves from the specific to the general” words in the text are used to draw broader conclusions about the author and groups (Elo and Kyngas 2007:109). Content analysis will be beneficial in this research because it is “content-sensitive and it is flexible in terms of research design” by comparing articles written by a diverse group of sociologists from different times, different genders, and different races (Elo and Kyngas 2007:108). Each writer has their own unique perspective and theory. Descriptive and interpretive questions are used to understand what the authors’ articles contain and what those words are likely to mean.

Although there are no “systematic rules for analyzing data” the main phases of content analysis are: preparation, organizing, and reporting (Elo and Kyngas 2007:108). For the preparation process two processes had to be done the selection of authors and then selection of data. For the authors, a list of books and articles was created to be reviewed. Using Google Scholar, searches were ran for authors that had written about W. E. B. Du Bois. From the results of the Google Scholar search, data sheets were made that counted how many citations each writer had and how many works they had written on Du

Bois. Then the writer's race, gender, ethnicity, and the year of their work were accounted for. This information helped determine whom to consider experts on Du Bois and ensure a diverse sample. It was important to have as many different perspectives as possible. A diverse sample can help identify what scholars agree upon when it comes to Du Bois and where they differ. The identification of agreement and disagreement specifically identifies factors that could establish the existence of the veil.

Using ISI Web O' Knowledge, a site that tracks citations for journal articles, the same search with Du Bois as the topic was ran. Cross-referencing the two lists, it was noted which authors wrote about Du Bois and how many citations they had. To have a balanced sample each writer had to have at least two types of articles that were similar in their concepts, then two books that were similar, i.e. biography, forewords, and introductions.

The authors that were Du Bois experts were as follows: David L. Lewis, Herbert Aptheker, Elliot M. Rudwick, Phil Zuckerman, Charles Lemert, Kenneth Mostern, Farah J. Griffin, Shaun L. Gabbion, Francis L. Broderick, Manning Marable, and Henry L. Gates. All the authors have written a minimum of three books or articles about Du Bois. A few more authors were added to make sure that gender, time lines, ethnicity, and subject matter were covered. The additional authors were repeatedly cited. Some authors knew Du Bois personally while others only knew of his works.

The additional writers were also repeatedly cited as Du Bois experts. These additional writers helped to cover the gaps of women, additional whites, Blacks, Jewish, and Pan-African perspectives and timelines. The studies of discipline covered include

feminists, African-Studies, post-modern and literary works. These writers include Cynthia Schrager, Dickenson Bruce, Garth Pauley, George Metcalf, John Wideman, James Stewart, Reiland Rabaka, Shamoan Zamir, and Claude Mckay.

The writers that would be analyzed for this thesis were reduced from that sample. The broad sample was used to help identify trends, similarities, and differences. The core groups that developed from the writers were four white men, two white Jewish men, two Black men, a Black woman, and a white woman. Within the white racial group and male gender categories a sub-group of Jewish men emerged. While examining white writers there was a split in the trends between whites and Jewish white men. White men and Jewish white men were separated for two reasons. Jewish men either identified themselves as Jewish or it was in their biography and the trends were clearly different between white men and Jewish men. Their works were juxtaposed to show how diverse lenses can look at the same work and come to very different conclusions.

Charles Lemert, Kenneth Mostern, Garth Pauley, and George Metcalf were the white writers. David L. Lewis and Reiland Rabaka were the black writers. Herbert Aptheker and Phil Zuckerman were Jewish writers. Farah J. Griffin, a Black feminist writer and Cynthia Schrager a white feminist writer. The authors wrote about Du Bois' theory, his activism, his work in women suffrage, and events in Du Bois' personal life. All writers were able to be counted in the content analysis' samples of quotes, trends, and comparisons.

The Selected Writers

Charles Lemert is in the white male category, 1937-present, he is a leading expert on Du Bois. Lemert is a sociologist with a focus in globalization and the influence of culture. He teaches sociology at Wesleyan University where he is the John C. Angus Professor (Lemert 1994). In 2004, he received an honorary degree from the University of the West of England. The article used from Lemert was “A Classic from the Other Side of the Veil: Du Bois’s ‘Souls of Black Folk’” written 1994.

The second white male is Kenneth Mostern (1999:x), who describes himself as a “white anti-racist activist.” He has written several articles and books, politics and race are his subjects. Mostern is an Assistant Professor in the Department of English at the University of Tennessee. The book used for this analysis was “Three Theories of the Race of W. E. B. Du Bois” written in 1996.

Garth Pauley 1971-present, is an Associate Professor of Communication Arts and Sciences at Calvin College in Grand Rapids, Michigan. His interests are in protest rhetoric and civil rights (Pauley 2000). The article used for this thesis was “W. E. B. Du Bois on Woman Suffrage: A Critical Analysis of His Crisis Writings” written in 2000.

George R. Metcalf, 1914-2002 was a graduate from Princeton and Columbia holding a degree in Journalism. He was a State Senator and was a lifelong supporter of Civil Rights. The book used was “*Black Profiles*” written in 1968 (Metcalf 1968).

One of the Black writers was David Levering Lewis, 1936-present, who won the Pulitzer Prize Award for his achievements in the biography of W. E. B. Du Bois. He is currently the Julius Silver University Professor and Professor of History at New York

University (Lewis 2000). Lewis wrote a two volume biography on W. E. B. Du Bois. The text of that book has been used throughout the thesis for historical information on Du Bois.

The second Black writer is Reiland Rabaka 1973-present. He is an Associate Professor of African, African American, and Caribbean Studies in the Department of Ethnic Studies and Humanities Program at the University of Colorado at Boulder. Rabaka has written several articles and books about Du Bois (Rabaka 2006). The article used here was “The Souls of Black Radical Folk: W. E. B. Du Bois. Critical Social Theory and the Start of Africana Studies,” written in 2006.

The first Jewish writer was Herbert Aptheker, 1915-2003, who was a friend of Du Bois. Aptheker received his degree from Columbia University and worked on Du Bois’ manuscript after he died. The book used was *Du Bois: The Education of Black People* written in 1973 by Du Bois and edited by Aptheker who also wrote the Forward (Aptheker 1973).

The second Jewish writer was Phil Zuckerman, 1969-present, who is a professor of sociology at Pitzer College. He teaches social theory, sociology of religion, and sociology of deviance (Zuckerman 2004). Zuckerman has written many pieces on Du Bois. The quotes used from Zuckerman were from *The Social Theory of W. E. B. Du Bois* where introduction he wrote in 2004.

Farah J. Griffin, 1963-present, is a Black feminist writer. Griffin taught at the English at the University of Pennsylvania. She is the William B. Ransford Professor of English and Comparative Literature and African-American Studies at Columbia

University (Griffin 2000). The article used was “Black Feminists and Du Bois: Respectability, Protection, and Beyond,” written in 2000.

Cynthia Schrager, 1960-present, is a white feminist who at the time of her writing was an independent scholar at Berkeley University (Schrager 1996). She is now Assistant Vice Provost, Office of Teaching, Learning, Academic Planning and Facilities at UC Berkeley. The article used was “Both Sides of the Veil: Race, Science, and Mysticism in W. E. B. Du Bois” written in 1996.

Operationalizing the Data

The next process was to create a framework with which to work with the books and articles reviewed. The text needed to be classified into smaller categories (Elo and Kyngas 2007). To do this notes were taken when reviewing the articles. A random sample was created of a small but diverse group of authors; from their works units of meaning were created. A unit of meaning is defined as “more than one sentence and contain several meanings” (Elo and Kyngas 2007:109). Quotes of Du Bois became units of meaning. It is natural to assume that “when classified into the same categories, words, phrases and the like share the same meaning” but this was not always the case in this review. A unit of analysis can be a word or theme (Elo and Kyngas 2007). Some themes began to trend among writers.

Specific questions were suggested to help formulate the data in qualitative research (Elo and Kyngas 2007). The questions and answers for this research are as follows:

Who is telling?	The writers give their interpretations.
Where is this happening?	The veil appears in the trends/themes, quotes, comparisons, and theory application.
When did it happen?	Within certain racial and gender groups.
What is happening?	The appearance of various interpretations, the use of varying theories, agreements and disagreements.
Why?	The difference seems to appear because of different races, understanding or misunderstanding Black experience, gendered ideals, and how theory was applied.

Notes were taken as the articles and books were being reviewed. From those notes these observations were made into trends/themes, Du Bois' quotes that were often used, comparisons that were made of Du Bois to others, language used, discussion on skin color, Du Bois' personal life, Du Bois' work, Du Bois not being a part of the canon, and how theory was applied. Another trend was making negative statements about Du Bois' personal life and then not explaining the point of the statements. Many authors had criticisms of Du Bois but gave evidence why. The writers did not leave the reader to make their own assumptions. From the observations, the data was collapsed into three main groupings of quotes of Du Bois, comparisons of Du Bois, and trends or themes that appeared when discussing Du Bois' work and personal life (Elo and Kyngas 2007).

Du Bois' quotes were used often in many of the texts. A few quotes were used by many of the same writers in this study. Quotes are important because of "the frequency

or volumes with which such subject matter is mentioned;” these multiple appearance of the same quotes show that the authors may believe they are representative of Du Bois (Krippendorff 1989:404). A few of the writers made comparisons of Du Bois to other Black men, these comparisons were important to study because they expose what the author thinks about the individuals compared. In their comparison they give a deeper narrative of the persons they are describing. The trends that appeared within racial groups were selected because “the attention paid to particular phenomena, ideas, or attitudes is the target of many social research efforts” these trends may demonstrate a like attitude toward Du Bois (Krippendorff 1989:404).

Research Questions

These questions will help identify the writer’s strengths and weakness in their evaluation of Du Bois (Johnson, et al. 2006). William A. Johnson, et al. (2006:185) state “critique based on thesis, methods, evidence and evaluation finding if the supporting evidence is weak or strong” will help ensure an accurate review. These questions have been designed to accomplish that goal.

During the content analysis did trends appear? The answer was a resounding yes. The trends that appeared were the use of the same quotes and referencing the same events from Du Bois’ life. There also was an overall consensus on the validity and value of Du Bois’ work. Each writer had their own theoretical critique of Du Bois’ work. From that point what lines did the trends come across? The categories were race, gender, and the use of theory.

The quotes that were most often used were as follows:

Then it dawned upon me with a certain suddenness that I was different from others; or like, mayhap, in heart and life and longing, but shut out from their world by a vast veil. I had therefore no desire to tear down that veil, to creep through; I held all beyond it in common contempt and lived above it in a region of blue sky and great wandering shadows. (Du Bois 1903/1989:2)

Two considerations...broke in upon my work and eventually disrupted it: first, one could not be a calm, cool, and detached scientist while Negroes were lynched, murdered and starved; and secondly, there was no such definite demand for scientific work of the sort that I was doing. (Du Bois 1940/1984:67)

All that day and all that night there sat an awful gladness in my heart,--nay, blame me not if I see the world thus darkly through the Veil,--and my soul whispers ever to me saying, "Not dead, not dead, but escaped; not bond, but free. (Du Bois 1940/1984)

With a flood of Negro blood, a strain of French, a bit of Dutch, but, thank God, no 'Anglo-Saxon. (Du Bois 1940/1984)

How did race appear to affect the veil? By juxtaposing whites, white Jewish, and Black writers to see how they were similar and how they differed when describing the same quotes and events. Does the researcher make reflexive statements that demonstrate that he or she is aware of their own statuses (race, class, historical context) when evaluating Du Bois' life, work and interpretations?

How did gender appear to effect the veil? The interpretations of Du Bois were compared by men and women to see how they were similar or contrasting. The comparisons were Black men to the Black woman, the white men to the white woman, white men to the black woman, and the Black men to the white woman. Then both women with the intersection of race and gender Black women to white woman.

How did each writer's use of theory effect the veil? A major factor was how each scholar applied theory to the works of Du Bois. Were their theories or arguments applied to Du Bois in his time, experience, and history rather than the writer's? In addition, does the writer support their claims with theory, fact, and evidence rather than personal bias?

Findings

First, a brief overview of the trends that were found will be discussed. Next a brief overview of the effects of race and gender that appeared. The next section will have the direct comparison and contrasts of authors who used the same quotes. At the end of each section the trends will be identified and how they were different within groups. The following section will compare and contrast writers by the trends they followed. Many of the sections start with a white writer and juxtapose the other writers with them. The categories of race will be examined to show any similarities or differences. Both women writers will be reviewed in the gender category being contrasted with the other writers. The next section will discuss how the veil has been penetrated by sociologists, trend breakers. The last section will be a summary of all of the data.

Summary

A major factor in this argument is the researcher's understanding and interpretations of Du Bois' worth as a scholar. Du Bois, as a Black man was aware enough to know that his experience and education did not give him a clear or complete insight to the plight of the Black people in the United States. He placed himself in their environment without judgment, to learn and observe. His awareness that they were alike but not the same was imperative.

In Du Bois' own words, he was a difficult character who was very faulted. Many of the writers did acknowledge Du Bois at times was arrogant, brutal, and had snobbish attitudes. Du Bois recognized many of these things about himself. He had a reputation for being abrasive at times and his work considered by many as worthy of being in the canon. At the same time nearly all the scholars believed Du Bois to be a talented sociologist. By separating the two the hope is to discover how much they influenced each other and therefore the importance to the writer.

The purpose of this research is to create awareness that there is a problem. If experts on Du Bois portray him in ways that may be biased, how can sociologists look at African-American society as whole without applying similar biases? There is a need to establish or reestablish criteria that will help accurately assess data from research. Du Bois (Stewart 1984) suggested "establishing that great and guiding ideal of group development and scholarship." Du Bois recognized that groups needed to be established to help resist the spread of falsehood about Blacks, taking into account that if the research is not valid, it causes harm.

W. E. B. Du Bois was a great sociologist, who developed the theory of the "veil." He is one of the founding fathers of sociology, and the creator of a model of how we do sociological research today. However, Du Bois is left out of the canon, is largely absent from curriculum, and not credited for his contributions. Why has he not received the honor, status, and recognition that he deserves? Through the examination of these writings, the clues to how we can be aware of the veil and remove it may be found.

CHAPTER 5

DATA ANALYSIS

Brief Overview of Findings

During the analysis many repeated themes and trends were discovered, in various comparisons and contradictions. It was not unusual to find that writers often used the same quotes from Du Bois. However, their interpretations of the same quote could be very different. Race was not only a factor in the difference but also the writer's standpoint, the application of theory and gender. James Stewart (1984) writes about the difficulties "Du Bois' scholars (have) to describe accurately his totality with the use of traditional labels." Race and gender were two major factors when it came to interpretation. There was a consensus on Du Bois' personal character of being difficult, brilliant, and friendly with a close few. The writers also were consistent in describing Du Bois' work in 3 or 4 periods of development. There was agreement in the fragmenting of Du Bois' work but not everyone agreed on what those stages included. All but one writer, Kenneth Mostern, state that Du Bois' work is worth being recognized by the canon or at least a foundation for sociology.

However, the interpretation of Du Bois done by white writers stated he had difficulties with whites, often identified as Du Bois having a "disdain" for whites. This could be supported by the language Du Bois uses in his own writings. When his difficulties with women were described by women Du Bois was labeled as sexist, again which could be supported by Du Bois' own language. When Black men described Du Bois' difficulties with other Black men it was understood that Du Bois just was not very

good at relationships, which also could be supported by Du Bois' own writings. These examples will be further detailed in the following sections, this is noted because in the previous chapter it was stated, how we express ourselves, our experiences, and our languages are different and cannot be judge by the researcher's standards or norms. At the beginning of the thesis a description of the works in the canon was shared, "The works are expressed in a particular language for a specific culture" (Edgar and Sedgwick 1999/2008:34). Du Bois' language is very important in his writing and the understanding of it applied to his culture.

The Effects of Race and Gender Overview

In the categories of race and gender are Black men, Jewish men, a Black woman, white men, and a white woman. In the previous chapter, Jewish men became a sub-group of white men because of how they trended differently. The main factors in their division were interpretations of Du Bois' work (trends), reflexivity, and how the theory was applied. The trends that were often described were specific events in Du Bois' life, quotes used to support arguments, and interpretation of quotes.

Factors that were observed as the writers were compared and contrasted are as follows. Their interpretations were in harmony or in contrast with the majority of the other writers. Their arguments were supported with solid information and evidence. What were their analytical interpretations of Du Bois' work? How did they describe Du Bois' achievements with the primary focus being his scholarly works or on his personal life?

Gendered issues were expressed in four ways in the writings. The first, Du Bois lack of recognition of women as intellectuals either by not working with them or acknowledging their works. Writers agree that Du Bois was a supporter of women's rights but yet he continued to objectify them. He had focused on their looks, sexual allure over him, and a preference but not exclusiveness for light skinned women. Du Bois' writings were described as feminine due to his romantic style or as masculine because his language embedded male dominance. Women and men writers did have different perceptions of the same works of Du Bois.

Many of the African-American writers were more thesis focused. They did not dig into deep analytical interpretation of his quotes. They tended to stay focused on their points using Du Bois' works and quotes to support their arguments. They also were more balanced in describing Du Bois' achievement overall in all fields, usually the primary focus being his scholarly works. The Black writers tended to be far more detailed and fact based in their writing. Ironically, Black writers rarely share their personal experience, as black men, juxtaposed with Du Bois. What Du Bois wrote was understood, so no need for further discussion because of their shared experience (Collins 2000). A few Blacks writers wrote when they read Du Bois they felt affirmed and not alone in their experience, in a general statement not specific.

Jewish male writers were very similar to their Black contemporaries. This category emerged by the writers identifying themselves as Jewish. They stated this either in their writing or in their mini-biography for their book. The Jewish writers were adamant supporters of Du Bois' work and called for Du Bois to be in the canon.

Jewish writers differed from white writers by not making assumptions in their interpretations. They trended differently, supporting these writers being in their own category.

White writers had two themes, great praise for Du Bois' work but struggled with the interpretation and often made arguments that cast doubt on what Du Bois was stating. White men were more likely to recognize their whiteness or status but least likely to support their interpretations with fact or theory. White writers appeared to be veiled, because they tried to interpret life as a Black man through the lens of white man. The exception was Garth Pauley the second youngest writer, his article was written 2000. This was also one of the newer articles written about Du Bois. This was the only evidence that age of the writer and the age of the corpus has any influence.

Metcalf and Schrager

George Metcalf's writing on Du Bois was written in the 1960s, even though this is an older corpus it is still valid and similar in content to the modern works. Interestingly, Metcalf wrote his book to inspire Blacks and inform whites. To do so, he concentrated heavily on Du Bois' activism. Although it may have been inspiring to Blacks, it may have been offensive to whites. Metcalf's choice of Du Bois' quotes were some of Du Bois' harshest directed at some whites.

With a flood of Negro blood, a strain of French, a bit of Dutch, but, thank God, no Anglo-Saxon. (Du Bois 1940/1984)

Metcalf and Schrager use this quote by Du Bois stating he is thankful that he is not Anglo Saxon. Metcalf (1968:55) does not go on to explain what Du Bois means in this quote. The tone is that Du Bois is glad he is not white because of his dislike for

them. Cynthia Schrager (1996:572), the white feminist, also used the “thank God, no Anglo Saxon” quote. Schrager does give an interpretation. She states that Du Bois speaks of his lineage that includes white people but claims he has no Anglo Saxon blood. Schrager (1996:572) suggests that “Du Bois initially occupies the position of the sentimental bourgeois subject who is witness to a strange, almost savage Otherness” explaining how Du Bois was separate from Black people when he first went to the South due to his very Anglo Saxon formal ways yet he was still Black and not accepted by whites.

This is a comparison of a white male and a white female. The contrast is Metcalf simply does not give any explanation about Du Bois words. Not giving a reason for the statement trends with other white male and Jewish writers. Schrager gives a simple interpretation. Gender does not have an apparent effect here. Schrager does not trend with whites by not giving an explanation of Du Bois’ words.

Aptheker, Mostern, and Metcalf

Then it dawned upon me with a certain suddenness that I was different from others; or like, mayhap, in heart and life and longing, but shut out from their world by a vast veil. I had therefore no desire to tear down that veil, to creep through; I held all beyond it in common contempt and lived above it in a region of blue sky and great wandering shadows. (Du Bois 1903/1989:2)

The misunderstandings of Du Bois are often due to partial information and/or confusion about Du Bois’ experiences as child. The primary example would be Du Bois sharing that his childhood was largely free of racism did not mean it was absent of racism. The discovery of the veil is a known fact for Du Bois experts. How and when the veil was discovered is consistent.

Aptheker, Mostern, and Metcalf all interpret Du Bois' childhood as absent of racism, despite the quotes of how he discovered the veil on the schoolyard and his saying he rose above the incidents. Aptheker (1973 N.P.) writes "Startling, for example, in light of the impression conveyed in other works that racism hardly touched his childhood." All three writers wrote being shocked by Du Bois' attitudes because they did not account that he was still black and not fully accepted. Mostern (1996:37) stated "Du Bois has already taken pains to demonstrate that he is first a New England child, and not a black child" Du Bois has no other Black children to identify with. Du Bois was aware of the veil that separated him from the other children and he could not be fully accepted as friend.

Metcalf (1968:56) writes "There were only one or two minor incidents, but nothing could shake his standing in the community" there appears to be an assumption by Metcalf. He did not share that Du Bois did not describe only two incidents of racism while growing up. Racism was daily for Du Bois but not in the context of lynching and whippings. The racism Du Bois experienced was that of not being fully accepted, knowing his place, and wounds of words of children. The absence of racism in Du Bois' life may have been in the classroom by his teachers. They encouraged him and embraced his potential. The authors missed the subtle of the daily experiences of racism in Black life.

This comparison was two white writers and one Jewish writer. All three trended using the same quote and marginalizing Du Bois' experience growing up one of few Blacks in his home town. The three were not able to expand their lens to envision that

racism was a daily event in Du Bois' life. There is no concluding evidence that gender played a part in their findings. Race and ethnicity may have an influence because of the lack of reflexivity not being able to understand the position of Blacks in the 1870's.

Metcalf and Schrager

All that day and all that night there sat an awful gladness in my heart,--nay, blame me not if I see the world thus darkly through the Veil,--and my soul whispers ever to me saying, "Not dead, not dead, but escaped; not bond, but free. (Du Bois 1940/1984)

Metcalf (1968:63) wrote when Du Bois' son died he experienced an "awful gladness". Metcalf would have better served Du Bois if he had expanded on that quote more because readers may interpret that Du Bois was heartless. The content of how this quote is used is important. Metcalf did not support the quote with any further explanation or clarity. Du Bois experienced a devastating loss for his child but also glad that his son would not have to grow up in such turbulent times.

Schrager used with same quote about the death of Du Bois' son but embraces the sentiment. Schrager, whose theory is based in gender and race, understood the deep meaning of Du Bois' passionate words of an "awful gladness." She also refers to Du Bois as a "seer" and ties his references about his son's death to the occult (Schrager 1996:568). The awful feeling of losing his only son and child, at that time, was coupled with knowing his son would not suffer from racism (Schrager 1996). Schrager (1996:574) writes "Du Bois comforts himself with the thought that his son is 'not dead, not dead but escaped; not bond, but free'" Du Bois knows his son escaped a life of oppression. Schrager (1996:574) further interprets "piercing or rending the veil becomes

not just an occasion for evoking a departed loved one, but rather a powerful metaphor for political liberation” Du Bois’ son is gone but his fight still continues.

Metcalf trends with white and Jewish men making a statement about Du Bois but then not supporting it. Schragar does not trend with male or whites in her statement. She does not trend with women in this sample because Griffin does not use this quote. She uses her theory to help make sense of Du Bois’ emotions during his time of loss.

Mostern and Schragar

Two considerations...broke in upon my work and eventually disrupted it: first, one could not be a calm, cool, and detached scientist while Negroes were lynched, murdered and starved; and secondly, there was no such definite demand for scientific work of the sort that I was doing. Du Bois 1940/1984:67

Mostern and Schragar both used Du Bois’ quote stating “he could not be a calm, cool, and detached scientist while Negroes were lynched, murdered, and starved” (Schragar 1996:566-567). Mostern (1996:40) interpreted this quote “evident in the phrase ‘one could not,’ is an ironic invocation of race; obviously ‘one’ could engage in a variety of strategies, but Du Bois could not as he was literally the one trained Negro social scientist in the country positioned to do and experienced in doing” as Du Bois thinking that he was the only Black that was able to do anything about this situation. Du Bois may have been the only “trained” Black man but he was not the only Black person, as Mostern focused on the word one in his interpretation. Mostern is focused on the word one rather than the emotion that Du Bois is expressing of his anger of the killing of Black men.

Later in his text Mostern (1996:53) does recognize another Black person who is also in the fight, “Du Bois’s *Crisis* writings, consistently attempted to sidestep its most talented and persistent writer, Ida Wells Barnett” Ida Wells Barnett was also doing protest work educating people about lynching. Therefore, Mostern identified another Black who could be in the fight. Nowhere does Du Bois state that he is the only one, in the quote he stated that he could not be emotionally detached from the crisis.

Schrager’s in contrast understanding of the same quote is very different than Mostern’s. She states that Du Bois was angry over the discourses in social science and describes them as “the preservation of white supremacy through a program of racist terrorism” (Schrager 1996:567). Schrager found that Du Bois’ lack of funding for his organization was what left him alone in his fight, not the fact that he was the only one qualified.

The contradictions between Mostern and Schrager appear to be more about how they applied their theory and critique than simply gendered ideals. There is some evidence that their gender may have influenced the theory they chose to use. However, it does not clearly show that their gender affected their interpretation. Mostern finds Du Bois to be masculine, sexist, and confuses his race theory. Schrager uses theory that does categorize beliefs as male or female, factual and scientific or suspicious and mystical. She finds Du Bois to be dedicated and in touch with his emotions. Schrager aligns feminine struggles parallel to race.

Mostern, Metcalf, and Rabaka

Kenneth Mostern, a professor in African American studies wrote about Du Bois' autobiographies and his race politics. Mostern, while examining Du Bois' theories, struggled with interpretations, historical application of theory, and often questions the validity of Du Bois' works. Mostern's analysis of Du Bois' theory and his autobiography lacks sufficient understanding of how Du Bois' race and politics were a part of his life (Mostern 1996). Mostern struggles with race and politics being written in Du Bois' autobiography as he applies critical theory and race as a social construction. Mostern does not appear to grasp the idea that the politics of the nation deeply affected Du Bois' life. Mostern states that Du Bois agrees that race is socially constructed, and then asks why Du Bois' theory is based on race. Mostern (1996:37) "Du Bois first conception of the 'problem of inheritance' is neither biological nor racial but economic and regional" in the time Du Bois lived the world was Black and white. Although race is a social construction in Du Bois time his race was a determining factor in his opportunities to succeed. Reiland Rabaka (2006), a Black professor in Africana studies writes specifically about the struggles with strict interpretation of Du Bois. Mostern does not take into account that historically Du Bois lived in a very Black and white world.

Mostern identifies Du Bois having three different theories over his lifetime as do the other writers. Mostern differs from the other writers by not seeing these three theories as evolving but contradictions. Mostern writes "I take the particularly unpopular position that identity politics is not something that 'we' can somehow 'go beyond'." He states Du Bois' work does not help "understand the meaning of racial identity" (Mostern

1996:55). Rabaka (2006) writes that this is a common struggle when sociologists try to apply modern theory as a one dimensional view of Du Bois. Rabaka (2006:739) interprets Du Bois using three different theories, but views them as providing “intellectual guidance and political direction”. In the eyes of Rabaka Du Bois was able to “anticipate future political developments and discursive dilemmas” leading Du Bois to be flexible and his political views did change over his lifetime (Rabaka 2006:743).

Metcalf chronicled Du Bois’ growth and changing political view by his disappointment in the acceptance of Blacks. Metcalf described that after World War I Du Bois believed Blacks should have received more acceptance due to their brave service but what happened was “instead, to Du Bois’ horror, there was a revival of race riots, of discrimination inside organized labor, and of Ku Klux Klan activity in the South” this phenomenon influenced Du Bois’ political stance. Du Bois focus became economic and strengthen his belief that “colonialism and imperialism were the unquestioned roots of war” (Metcalf 1968:76). Race and politics cannot be removed from Du Bois’ life experience.

Mostern insinuates questions about gender and Du Bois’ sexuality without concrete basis or explanation. He writes “Nina Gomer Du Bois is not named in *Dusk’s* world history. Du Bois’ onetime mistress, Jessie Fauset, is entirely absent from the discussion” Mostern (1996:56) gives no explanation for bringing up the mistress or expands on their relationship. This was a common trend among white and Jewish writers, to make a statement about Du Bois’ life then not expand on it. However, Jasmine Griffin, the Black feminist writers does this as well.

Mostern also misses the Black experience in many of his interpretations. As an example, Mostern (1996:33) quotes Du Bois “I was born by a golden river and in the shadow of two great hills five years after the Emancipation Proclamation....That river of my birth was gold because of the woolen and paper waste that soiled it. The gold was theirs, not ours: but the gleam and glint was for all”. Mostern (1996:33) tries to tie the reference to “gold” and “golden” to Du Bois’ skin color. Du Bois was not talking about his skin color but how the river had made the white man rich. Du Bois could experience the beauty of the river and its spoils but not profit from it. Mostern gives no evidence of why he thinks this has to do with Du Bois’ skin tone and then drops the subject. This appears to be an attempt to infer that Du Bois was superior due to his complexion. Other writers do this as well but support their claims with evidence.

Metcalf (1968:73) describes Du Bois’ skin color to describe him but is in a context of how Du Bois gave “impressions of aloofness”. Metcalf (1968:73) describes Du Bois as “in a room full of people might go unnoticed by all save the artist, who would see the fine mold of the copper-colored features and the beautiful head” this an appropriate use of the description of skin that is direct and does not make an assumption of Du Bois’ thoughts on his own skin tone. Metcalf (1968:73) also describes how Du Bois’ appearance could be off putting to others “even his appearance aroused resentment-his mustache and goatee, his pince-nez glasses and his cane” describes Du Bois’ aristocratic dress.

Using another quote Mostern (1996:33) states “the narrator expresses amazement that he could have been impoverished, as is illustrated by the peculiar use of exclamation

points: 'I never remembering being cold or hungry, but I do remember that shoes and coal, and sometimes flour, caused mother moments of anxious thought in winter, and a new suit was an event!'.’” In his lens, Mostern believes that Du Bois using an exclamation point at the end of the sentence reflects amazement that he was poor.

The more accurate interpretation is that Du Bois knew he was poor and the new suit was a big deal. Du Bois is not shocked about being poor but shocked about getting a new suit. Not all poor people are starving and naked. Du Bois’ family was able to eek by with the essentials and at times with aid from sympathetic white people. Often children living in poverty know nothing else and are not so keenly aware of their position. Du Bois was reflecting on memories. Mostern’s lens is rigid and doesn’t allow the variables of the Black experiences to be understood.

Rabaka writes how understanding the Black experiences makes the statements more factual. Mostern’s comments were not always backed up with fact. He stated that Du Bois grew up with no other black students, which “demonstrated his conformity” (Mostern 1996:37). How can it demonstrate conformity when there was no other model to replicate? Mostern stated there were no other black students, so how else would Du Bois learn how to act. Mostern is the only writer that reviewed that really appears to lack reflexivity. His conclusion drawn reflected the earlier statement, white “theorizing” does not equal Black fact, reality, or experience. Blacks and whites have different experiences and different frames of reference (Armstrong 1979).

In this comparison Mostern is not trending with Metcalf even though they are both white males. Both writers use skin color in reference to Du Bois but Metcalf point

is clear and he provides evidence to makes sense of his claim. Mostern does not.

Mostern and Rabaka have different views, race and theory application appear to be an influence here. When describing the three theories of Du Bois Mostern's view on race is different than Rabaka's and Rabaka is in agreement with Du Bois.

Black and Jewish Writers

Jewish writer Rudwick (1968) stated that Du Bois believed he was the savior of his race when Rabaka (2006) quotes Du Bois stating he felt he did little to help his peoples' position. Metcalf (1968:72) wrote that Du Bois "by his own estimate, was not a natural leader." This is an example of how one writer-Rudwick- made a statement as if it is fact, that Du Bois believes he was the savior of his race, in contrast with Rabaka who quotes Du Bois as saying he felt he did little to help his people. A quote from Du Bois is more accurate than the belief statement of another.

The Black writers paid more attention to details when describing Du Bois' life, if it was mentioned in the text. David Levering Lewis wrote an intensely detailed two volume biography on Du Bois. Lewis used information from Du Bois' own writings, his family, and historical records. He titles Du Bois as "the first sociologist of race" (Lewis 2000:550). Lewis (2000:228) believed that Du Bois had "profound understanding of the human condition was often matchless." Rabaka used Du Bois' works and theory to show how Du Bois contributed too many disciplines and examined his political beliefs and transition from capitalism to communism over the years. Rabaka (2006:733) describes Du Bois as "long been praised and criticized by scholars who have interpreted and

reinterpreted his work, often overlooking its deep critical theoretical dimensions”. These two writers have been contrasted with other writers throughout this text.

Even the most avid Du Bois supporter had negative innuendos. One example is that of Phil Zuckerman, who praised Du Bois for his work and chastises against the fact that Du Bois was not in the canon. Phil Zuckerman stated directly; why was Du Bois not in the canon? The direct answer was, “He was a black man writing mostly about Black life at a time when most Americans cared little about black men—or women –or their lives” (Zuckerman 2004:7). However, in his critique of Du Bois as a theorist and writer, Zuckerman (2004:11) states Du Bois often used “historical illustrations and ethnographic analyses, rather than succinct statements or exact theoretical declarations” this is supported by other writers. Confusingly, later he interjects that Du Bois had “shortcomings as a father and husband” (Zuckerman 2004:11). This statement discredited Du Bois as a man and reinforced stereotypical views of Black men not being good husbands and fathers. Zuckerman does not back up this statement but just leaves those words out there as fact, stated for no apparent purpose. This is a trend that is repeated most often by white and Jewish males.

Jewish writers overall trended with Black writers. Aptheker and Zuckerman were strong advocates for Du Bois to be in the canon and receive recognition for his work. They did not trend with white men by going into interpretation of Du Bois’ personal experience. They applied their theories to Du Bois with evidence to support their claims. Only on the occasion of mentioning a negative comment about Du Bois’ personal life and not explaining why did they trend with white men. They did trend with Griffin this way

as well. Schrager's theory was much different she trended with Jewish men with her use of theory and interpretations of Du Bois. Gender does not appear to be an influence.

Race appears to have some influence.

Black and White Feminist Interpretations with Lewis, Mostern, Pauley and Zuckerman

Farah Griffin writes from a Black Feminist perspective. She credits Du Bois for the great works that he accomplished in his time. However, she makes many valid arguments about his objectification of women and lack of intellectual support.

Griffin trends with Jewish men by adding one line to her work that remains unsupported that casts a shadow on Du Bois as a man. Griffin makes a brief undefined statement about Du Bois' family. She writes that Du Bois is a sexist "in his personal life (specifically concerning the treatment of his daughter)" she does not explain the accusation any further (Griffin 2000:29). Griffin did not give any evidence of how Du Bois was sexist. Du Bois' supported his daughter in education. His daughter Yolande received an excellent education by attending private schools and colleges. Du Bois also supported Yolande in marriages and divorces, she earned a degree to teach school. Yolande was a divorcee and independent working woman when women, much less Black women, did not have those privileges (Lewis 2000). Griffin says nothing of these facts and does not support her statement. Griffin praises Du Bois for what he did for women and in the rest of her article provides evidence for her arguments but not in the case of his daughter.

Previously, stated Phil Zuckerman trends with Griffin in a similar allegation about Du Bois. After writing about Du Bois' accomplishments Zuckerman (2004:11) writes

one line stating Du Bois “had shortcomings as a father and a husband” but makes no further statement. Both of these authors may be correct in their allegations however they did not provide any evidence. Griffin did give examples of how Du Bois was sexist but never did tie it back to his daughter.

Farah Griffin interprets Du Bois from the Black Feminist viewpoint. Griffin (2000:568) focused on the “promise of protection.” Griffin acknowledges that Du Bois in his time would have been considered a feminist; however she makes strong arguments about his sexist behaviors. Although she states that Du Bois speaks in the language of his time, she finds that his romantic and often very sexual descriptions of women marginalizing. Griffin argues that Du Bois had a veil between Black men and women. Considering the time Du Bois lived, years after the end of slavery, protection for Black men and women was vital. Black men were just having the first opportunities to protect their wives and families. For masculinities of the time, it would have been pivotal for a man to protect.

Lemert is also critical of feminists who do this type of critique. When defending Anna Julia Cooper for her feminist views, Lemert and Bhan (1998:35-36) states “context of her times” is important to interpretation. Lemert and Bhan (1998) continue to state that when theory is applied appropriately for the corpus it offers new insight this argument holds true for Du Bois as well. Du Bois was ahead of his time in his thinking when it came to feminism. He was a supporter. He did indeed appreciate beauty and admired women. Du Bois may have had some strained relationships with black women activists; however, he had strained relationship with many people.

Griffin writes that Du Bois failed to see women as intellectual and kept them in gendered roles. Griffin (2000:30) stated “Du Bois had troublesome relationships with independent Black women activists” yet we know he had strained relationships with many people this was not exclusive to women. Pauley (2000:396) suggested, “Du Bois did not reject the female suffragist or their cause; instead, he depicted them as misguided” he dismissed them because he believed the Black women suffragists’ ideas were misguided.

Zuckerman and Mostern also critiqued Du Bois in his failure to recognize Black women’s work at the time. Zuckerman (2004:11) states “he did not always incorporate gender into his analysis to a degree we might expect today.” Mostern (1996:31) writes about Du Bois “his failure to address gender’s part in the formation of race in *Dust of Dawn*,” supporting the view that Du Bois does not use gender in his analysis. Mostern (1996:53-54) also describes Du Bois’ work as “necessarily masculine” and that Du Bois “consistently attempted to sidestep its most talented and persistent writer, Ida Wells Barnett”. Griffin described Du Bois as being absent of misogyny but still objectifying women.

Mostern and Griffin both question why Du Bois did not do more to support the effort of Ida Wells Barnett at the time, or include her in his intellectual circles. Griffin believed that Du Bois reinforced the masculine domination within Black intellectuals. Griffin (2000:31) wrote “Du Bois was sexist, just as he was elitist and ‘color-struck’” she believed Du Bois defined beauty by shade. Black women were also described by Du Bois in ways that Griffin (2000) identified, preferring light skinned, fine-boned women as

demure, contrasting others as dark skinned and primitive. In her research, she stated “I have never lost sight of the fact that most of the authors of these text believed fairer-skinned black people to possess more beauty, intelligence, and worth than those of a darker hue” because of this Du Bois had his own veil between men and women and women light and dark (Griffin 2000:32). Griffin described Du Bois’ writing as masculine supporting patriarchy. Mostern also tried to imply Du Bois’ issues with skin tone as shared previously but does not provide the evidence that Griffin does.

Griffin has a deep appreciation for Du Bois and demonstrated evidence of his sexist marginalizing views by the language he uses to describe women and how he does not recognize them as intellectuals. Griffin writes that when Du Bois does write of women’s contribution he was still focused on their looks. Griffin (2000:33) exploits Du Bois description of Mary Shadd a Black woman activist: “For three sentences prior to stating her contribution to the black freedom struggle, he writes of Shadd’s appearance, her beauty, her color” Du Bois has an emphasis on Shadd's looks.

In contrast, Cynthia Schrager defines the language that Du Bois uses as feminine. She makes concise arguments about how Du Bois’ romantic, lyrical, descriptions that express feeling are more feminine than the masculine lusty pictures they may paint. Schrager agrees with her peers that Du Bois’ works have been marginalized due to his race. She also agrees that Du Bois is correct, in the belief that your race standpoint creates bias (Schrager 1996).

Schrager, a white feminist, views the same quote and language as a lyrical tribute to praise women, believing that Du Bois is expressing his emotions. Schrager’s theory is

focused on how race and gender both are marginalized. Her stance that “contemporary critics have been uneasy with Du Bois’s mysticism, they have, I suggest, reproduced a deep suspicion of the irrational the spiritual that is endemic to academic criticism in general and historical materialist critical approaches in particular” is more defending of Du Bois against strict white academia and the emotional translation of Du Bois’ quotes (Schrager 1996:555).

Griffin was focused on Du Bois’ sexist expression and lack of support for women intellectuals. Schrager (1996:556) interpreted Du Bois’ language as “a text whose generic experimentation and impassioned mysticism” allows Du Bois to express emotion. Griffin also spoke to Du Bois’ instances of preferring light skin to dark skin women. Schrager did not take note of Du Bois’ views on women’s skin color but rather his standpoint of his overall description and use of language to paint a mystical picture of the described. Schrager is unique in her writing in focusing on the emotion of Du Bois’ work. She applies her theory of using gender and race, embracing and contrasting white as materialism, black as spiritual, feminine-mystic as superstition and masculine as scientific (Schrager 1996). She supports Du Bois’ idea against being a “car-window sociologist” and believes that we have to understand the emotions of the subject (Du Bois 1903/1987:107). Using expressive emotional language as Du Bois did is scientific.

Schrager, in contrast to Mostern and Griffin, who describes Du Bois’ writing as masculine, states that it is feminine. Both Mostern and Schrager use similar quotes but come to very different conclusions. Although both are white their theory more than gender or race appears to influence their writings. Griffin and Schrager did not have

similar interpretations. Gender did not align them but race did not appear to separate them. The application of two very different theories contributed to the difference in interpretations.

Lemert a Leading Du Boisian Scholar Comparisons

Charles Lemert, a well-respected sociologist who is a champion for those people of color who did not make into the canon, also displays evidence of trends commonly observed among white male writers. While reviewing the work and lives of both Du Bois and Anna Julia Cooper he makes comparisons with other people of color and focuses on their personal lives, often with strong negative overtones. This is simultaneously crediting and discrediting his subjects.

Lemert's interpretation of Du Bois' line "I held all beyond it in common contempt and lived above it in a region of blue sky and great wandering shadow" (Du Bois 1903/1989:2) by comparing Du Bois to Malcolm X. Lemert writes:

Unlike Malcolm X, Du Bois had no subsequent Pauline conversion of this attitude toward whites (Malcolm X 1964, ch. 17). Yet, unlike Malcolm X in the years before his pilgrimage to Mecca, the contempt in which Du Bois held whites did not prevent him from working closely with certain of them and forming close friendship with a few. Lemert 1994:385

This is the comparison of two very different men with unique backgrounds. Malcolm X was raised in a home where there was contempt for whites. Where night raiders terrorized his home as a child and possibly murdered his father. Malcolm's mother was ashamed of her light skin and white bloodline (Haley and Malcolm X 1964). Yes, after Malcolm X went to Mecca he was more receiving of whites, but his sole goal was that to help his Black brothers and sisters to a better way of life. Du Bois' childhood was not full of

terror, and he lived peacefully with whites most of his life. In Europe, he was embraced by many whites and had many white friends (Lewis 2000). Du Bois also was trying to better the lives of his people.

Du Bois did not have the contempt or hate for white people that Malcolm X had in early years. Du Bois grew up being embraced by whites; some encouraged his education and paid for his schooling. Du Bois held in contempt the “attitude” that he would be treated with from those who looked at him through the veil. Those who embraced Du Bois, he in return embraced them (Aptheker 1973). He had the same dynamic with other Blacks. Du Bois’ background, manners, education, and demeanor often alienated him from his own people (Metcalf 1968). Rather than race being the main factor creating the veil, Du Bois’ socioeconomic status separated him from other Black people. Lemert did not appear to familiarize himself with Du Bois’ definition of race being “a set of shared identity, common experiences, and social position,” not the color of one’s skin (Pampel 2007:230). Du Bois’ friendships reflected his kinship with whom he shared like experiences, not pigmentation.

Metcalf also made an interesting comparison between Booker T. Washington and Du Bois. He stated “one was an idealist, an intellectual who resented being classified below white people, the other a realist, who was able to accept white domination to achieve his aim” (Metcalf 1968:67). This was interesting because it implies that the only way Blacks can “really” survive is to be subservient to the white man.

These interpretations are important because the work of people of color is often marginalized. Lemert’s portrayal of Du Bois and Metcalf’s concentration on “anti-white

quotes” could easily have him be dismissed as “another white hater” or as a racist himself. Charles Lemert is a white sociologist and his views held in high esteem. His example of scholarship is what most sociological researchers follow and believe, not that of Du Bois or Cooper. His opinions validate or invalidate. White students accept his interpretations because they do not have the knowledge or experience to question his authority. Therefore, false knowledge becomes fact and continues to be shared.

Lemert (1994:385) misunderstands Du Bois’ quote of living with “common contempt” toward whites by stating “the contempt in which Du Bois held whites did not prevent him from working closely with certain of them and forming close friendship with a few” as having contempt directly for all white people. The use of the word “common” is not hostile, but is instead a reference to a regular amount of disgust toward something that you believe to be wrong. Du Bois states that he simply rises above that attitude and soars like a bird in the sky distancing from the negative feelings others felt toward him. Stating that clarification, Lemert’s comparison to Malcolm X was even more inappropriate. White society’s view of Malcolm X would be of someone who was very militant and someone who condoned violence.

Even though the white writers often state the Du Bois should be canonized, there has been no movement to do so. This appears to represent the idea of talking the talk but not walking the walk. The power lies with the white academia to make the change now. Consistently, using Du Bois’ strongest arguments and quotes against the white establishment and attitudes of the times without the balance of his positive relationships with whites demeans his character. If Du Bois is viewed as a brilliant scholar and a

Black Supremacist, his stance could exclude him from the canon. Far more damaging is the misinterpretation of who the man really was and what he was trying to achieve.

Lemert trends with other white writers by trying to understand the Black experience through their lenses. Lemert and Metcalf trend together trying by comparing Du Bois to other Black men. There is a great respect for Du Bois' work but a lack of reflexivity when it comes to his life as a Black man. Some statements made of Du Bois' life are made but it is not explained why they are relevant to the discussion.

Seeing through the Veil

Garth Pauley's writing was an example of how the veil appears to be removed. Pauley's lack of interpretation of Du Bois' quotes or personal life trended with Black male writers. The opposite of the other white writers, Pauley made no attempt to apply his ideas or concepts of Blackness to Du Bois' work. Pauley recited and reported Du Bois' work in the Women Suffrage Movement with interpretation, but it read as Du Bois' meaning not Pauley's.

Pauley stated his arguments, then provided evidence to support it. He did not go into the intimate personal details of Du Bois' life. He did use Du Bois' own words to support his interpretation. Unlike Mostern and Griffin, Pauley believed that Du Bois did not dismiss the Black women suffragist at the time because they were women. Pauley (2000:394) stated "W. E. B. Du Bois argued that African-Americans should support woman suffrage" but Du Bois had to get past the racist views many white women suffragists had. Du Bois had a strategy to break down the barriers between Black and white people so that they could unite on women's suffrage. Pauley (2000:394) described

“after a cursory reading of Du Bois’ early essays on woman suffrage, an auditor might assume that Du Bois did not support suffrage”. What Du Bois was creating was a movement to “shift the burden to the woman suffrage movement and invited its audience to interpret further conflicts between Blacks and suffragists” (Pauley 2000:394). Pauley (2000:396) suggested, “Du Bois did not reject the female suffragist or their cause; instead, he depicted them as misguided;” he dismissed them because he believed the Black women suffragists’ ideas were misguided. Lewis (1993:417) supported this idea by stating people who read Du Bois’ articles “were often forced to face prejudices they would not have finessed, but for Du Bois’ edifying wrath and vision of deliverance. Votes for women was a case in point.” Du Bois’ issue was not gender but ideology.

Pauley, Lewis, and Schragar trend the same identifying Du Bois’ language as supportive of women. Both suggested his lyrical and romantic expression was not to objectify but represent the deep admiration he felt toward woman. Pauley (2000) used Du Bois’ quotes to show that Black women were the cornerstone of Black society. Pauley wrote “he depicted Black women as superior to African American men in terms of spirituality, intellect, and leadership” showing Du Bois respect for women. Pauley believed “Du Bois honored African American women for overcoming the oppression of slavery, for raising their families, for laying the foundation of the Black church, and for their hard labor” Pauley (2000:403) agreed with Schragar that Du Bois was a leading feminist of his time. Schragar and Pauley’s agreement here do not appear to be because they are both white but because of the theory and evidence they used to support their claims.

Pauley did a thorough job of writing an essay to cover a gap in Du Bois' work. His standpoint was to apply critical theory to Du Bois. He does this through doing a historical analysis of Du Bois' writing and analyzes his rhetoric supporting women's suffrage (Pauley 2000). He references bell hooks, David Levering Lewis, and other experts on the conflicts between white suffragists and Blacks, often including pieces written during the time to support his arguments and show historical accuracy. Pauley did not rely just on his own personal understanding but referenced many sides of the conflict. By using many of the main player's own words and text, it gave his work a sense of credibility and authenticity. He was clear in his reporting and supporting fact. He stated Du Bois' tactics and avoided making extended interpretations about how Du Bois arrived at those conclusions as a Black man.

Pauley did not trend with other white male or Jewish male that made personal statements about Du Bois without explanation. Pauley trended with Black males with his use of Du Bois quotes, historical facts, and application of theory. Pauley trended with Schragger although their theories were different he found Du Bois to be a strong supporter of women. He did not trend with Griffin in her view as Du Bois as a sexist. Race was not a factor and gender is not a clear issue either.

Summary of Data

All but one of the writers praised Du Bois' work as remarkable from its beginning. The most influencing factors are that of race and gender. This sample may not be large enough to be valid proof, but there was a significant difference in the results.

Contrasting two women scholars, one black and one white, their theory, and interpretation were very different from each other. However, it did not appear those differences were because of their race. They did not have any strong similarities due to their gender. This sample is extremely small, both women made good arguments, both used historical content, and made their standpoint clear. No determination was made about how their intersections of race and gender may have influenced their views. It was clear that they applied their theory with evidence to support their individual arguments.

Comparing male and female writers within their races and other races and ethnicities there were differences. Schrager most often disagreed with white men in their interpretation of Du Bois' quotes. Schrager did agree with Pauley on interpretation on Du Bois' view on women. Griffin trended with Black male writers with the exception that she felt Du Bois supported male dominance while the Black male writers believed that Du Bois was an avid feminist striving for the equality of women. Griffin trends with Jewish writers by not expanding on comments made about Du Bois' personal life. Both women had contrasting views with men from all backgrounds.

The most influencing factor is the race of white men. This is very concerning because white men still hold the majority of power in academia. White men exhibited a need to further define race as experienced by a Black man. The white writers created more doubt and questioned the reliability of Du Bois, even his own personal experience. They did not have the same understanding of the work that their peers of color had and did not appear to have reflexivity. There is some evidence that more recent works were far more balanced.

The data also represented that white men were the least helpful in supporting Du Bois to be entered into the canon. White men are least helpful because they were not always factual and cast doubt on Du Bois' work. White men did in contrast state that Du Bois should be in the canon but made interpretations that weakened Du Bois' convictions. However, white men appeared to be more biased in their accounts. The bias appears by casting doubts on Du Bois' motives and the accuracies of the reporting of his own life. Du Bois was often misunderstood. Why this is so important is because we are still under a white male dominated academic agenda. We need to continue to push and create new paradigms.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

This thesis was written to start a process to remove institutional racism from academia. To accomplish this, the thesis started at the root with one of the greatest Black scholars of our time. W. E. B. Du Bois' talents crossed many disciplines along with sociology, yet he is hardly recognized in any and absent from the canon. The common factor across all the disciplines is that Du Bois is Black.

Charles Lemert (1994:387) states “canonical exclusions are the indirect but powerful requirements of the dominant culture.” White academics are still the majority today. Even though my research found many white sociologists who believe that Du Bois should be in the canon, few have done anything to make that happen. Rabaka (2006:736) supports Lemert by suggesting the lack of studies about Du Bois is due to “racial exclusionary practices and/or the institutionalized racism of many traditional academic disciplines.” Rabaka (2006:736-37) also suggests that if white researchers made a true effort for change, it would be “treasonous thoughts and/or seditious acts against the state”; the barriers to change are serious. Black scholarship has been left out of the academic core, excluding Du Bois' work from being viewed as a classic (Gabbion et al. 2001). Schrager (1996:563-564) argues “Marginalized within his profession because of his race, Du Bois never received the kind of recognition or academic appointments he deserved”.

Du Bois knew how valuable history is to truth, fact, and research. Again, to right this wrong, we have to take a serious look at history. An awareness of who wrote history

and what they wanted future generations to know is pivotal. The unique history of Black men in the United States and their relationship with their country is complex. By having a true understanding of factual knowledge and personal experience of Black men theory can be improved.

History, of course, is taught in schools; the importance of education is key to eliminate institutional racism. The essay opened with Du Bois' call for education for all people from all points of view. By developing "alternative explanations and paradigms" different from the standard white academic view, we can improve knowledge of Blacks and other groups (Rabaka 2006:740). The continued development of Black Sociology will help set standards and theories to help eliminate ethnocentric standards (Evans 1983).

Whether we are able to cross racial lines and barriers, Black scholars can still build momentum for change and rewrite the history books. We have an incredibly difficult battle ahead of us; however, the true blood, sweat and tears have already been shed. We/Blacks and active white supporters can continue to combat institutional racism or choose to create our own institutions with our own truth.

The power structure maybe too embedded to overcome but improving the communication and understanding between the races is possible. Many of the white writers wanted to hold up Du Bois but lacked the cultural awareness to understand the nature of his writings. If the scholars can recognize their misinterpretations together, we can create cohesion and understanding. This is not an easy undertaking demonstrated by the data showing a white scholar in African-American studies seemed to lack the

understanding of the Black experience when examining and understanding Du Bois. Griffin (2000:38) suggested that we create “institutions-building outside of the academy,” this may be the only to create quick effective change.

White academics have to strive to remove the desire to dissect the meaning of being Black without the proper understanding and research methods. Repeatedly, many white researchers chose not to believe and cast doubts on Du Bois’ very personal accounts of his life. What makes us so unbelievable? Even when we are talking about our own experiences, some researchers look past the data collected and apply their own understanding. White sociologists have to ask themselves why they made that choice. Awareness is the key for this transformation.

In addition, specific to Du Bois, scholars must recognize the diverseness of his works. Not only did he cover many disciplines, but also he wrote during a time when this country going through great growth and change. Throughout his works, Du Bois himself experienced great changes in theory, politics, and personal growth. The very multifaceted man cannot be viewed easily through a narrow lens.

Why is Du Bois not in the canon and why has his work been sidelined? It does not appear to be because of the quality of his work. White sociologists praise what Du Bois has done for sociology. Currently, race is not the only issue. Racism and exclusion may be a tradition. History repeats itself and change is slow. Institutional racism is so subtle that we cannot answer this question simply. There is overall agreement that Du Bois’ work is worthy. The evidence shows that there was a substantial amount of writings about Du Bois’ personal life when evaluating his work. Is he receiving more

scrutiny? Metcalf (1968:83) writes “Unjustified as it may be, Booker T. Washington, who did little to challenge America’s racial mores, but did possess the talent of leadership, thrift and industry, has been included in the Hall of Fame, while Du Bois, the intellectual giant, who provoked the Negro to angry assertion, is virtually unknown to Americans today” because of Du Bois’ defiant stance he may not have the acceptance of Washington. For Du Bois’, acceptance into the canon, we have to increase awareness among white academia, increase reflexivity, raise cultural awareness through understanding, and eliminate ethnocentrism.

Lemert (1994:384) stated the field of study of Black urban life today “is surely the most controversial and one of the most productive domains of sociological work.” With that understanding, this is time for change. The first step would be for white sociologists and writers to recognize that the veil does exist. Even the most avid supporter of racial equality can have traces of the veil. Cultural awareness and reflexivity should be increased within our examination of articles and research. Individual lenses need to be careful when they try to dissect and further expand upon interpretations. Interpretations are difficult because they are done from the writers’ lens and experience that may unconsciously become ethnocentric. White writers should consult with their peers of color to provide clarity in their understandings. White academics that support the canonization of Du Bois have to move to the next step of action. Simply verbally supporting the idea is not enough. Race is still the main factor because the majority of

the power lies with one group. The minority groups of color and women should cross disciplines and band together to create a coalition of support for the canonization of Du Bois.

CHAPTER 7

WHY WE ARE NOT WINNING THE FIGHT

Those of us people of color who make it to the academic level have a number of our own issues to handle. There is a great amount of emotion work while attempting to be successful in academia, often we cannot speak freely or are marginalized if we do. Hochschild (1983/2003:7) defines emotion work as “to induce or suppress feeling in order to sustain the outward countenance that produces the proper state of mind in others, the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display.” While practicing good emotion work, it is a struggle to do our own research, much less police the work of others. In the perfect world, we would not have that concern. However, because of the existence of the veil and being on the other side, we can see clearly the injustices and wrongs that continue to happen.

Racial minorities are less than seven percent of the total graduate population (Spraggins 1999). Because there are such a small number of minority graduate students, it is difficult to have a powerful voice. Through isolation also comes defeat. Von Robertson, Mitra, and Delinder (2005:31) did a study on the social adjustment of African American female college students in the Midwest, the three themes were: “1) racial prejudice; 2) social alienation; and 3) faculty-student relations.” These factors block our/Blacks ability to get through the veil. The need for multiracial staff and faculty is imperative to help improve success.

Regena Michelle Booze focused her study on African-American faculty at predominately white colleges. One of the purposes of her study was to help find coping

strategies for other African-American women. “The second strategy is called situation discrimination, wherein each woman chooses her battle to fight, and selects the appropriate technique for optimum outcome. Verbally speaking up and confronting acts of racism is the predominant approach of this strategy” (Booze 2000:4618). It takes true mastery to decide what battles to fight. Because we have to choose our battles, some issues will, sadly, not be confronted.

Juanita Johnson-Bailey did a qualitative study based on the participation and retention issues of Black graduate women. Johnson-Bailey found four factors that ensured retention. They were “the presence and mentoring by supportive faculty and staff, the presence of and networking by Black students, respect from professors and continued funding” (Johnson-Bailey 2004:331). Low numbers of students of color and faculty of color limits the amount of support that students of color have. White faculty may not have the same sensitivity to issues because of the veil. My personal experience in graduate school has been similar: the lack of supportive faculty with the understanding and sensitivity to views other than their own.

Those Black women with academic credentials who seek to exert the authority that their status grants them to propose new knowledge claims about African-American women face pressures to use their authority to help legitimate a system that devalues and excludes the majority of Black women. One way of excluding the majority of Black women from the knowledge-validation process is to permit a few Black women to acquire positions of authority in institutions that legitimate knowledge and to encourage them to work within the taken-for granted assumptions of Black female inferiority shared by the scholarly community and the culture at large. Those Black women who accept these assumptions are likely to be rewarded by their institutions, often at significant personal cost. Those challenging the assumptions run the risk of being ostracized (Collins 1989:753).

History repeats again. One has to make the choice to stand, to be counted and/or suffer the consequences, like Cooper and Wells-Barnett or choose to be more like Booker T. Washington and conform then suffer internally. The only choice for us/Blacks either way is to suffer. The low number of graduate students of color prevents the creation of a diverse staff simply because there are so few of us. The suffering can end if the majority embraces that there is a problem and validates the concerns with action and change.

My Personal Experience

Two considerations...broke in upon my work and eventually disrupted it: first, one could not be a calm, cool, and detached scientist while Negroes were lynched, murdered and starved; and secondly, there was no such definite demand for scientific work of the sort that I was doing. (Du Bois 1940/1984:67)

I decided to include my personal story in this thesis because it is reflective of the struggles of many people of color. My feelings were the same as the quote from Du Bois above. I found myself becoming angry over the misrepresentations of people of color when I was in school. Also, the treatment that produced both bad and good was often a result of my race. I could no longer be quiet and fit in. Somehow, I had to try to make a difference and change the circumstances for those who came behind me.

This subject became a particular concern for me because of my experiences and observations during college and graduate school. The veil first became apparent to me when I was attending a small Midwestern community college where I had four different teachers either discredit or misinterpret research and facts about people of color.

Throughout my entire education, I had only one teacher of color, and that was at the community college. Du Bois and his contemporaries of color were not significant in the curriculum.

I heard statements in class by teachers that students believed as fact. One specific instance was a literature teacher stating, “Everyone knows that a Black man’s deepest desires are to have a white woman.” Another teacher disgustingly spoke of how Malcolm X stated after the shooting of President Kennedy that the “chickens would come home to roost” then he said, “Ha, well look what happened to him.” It was a very uncomfortable situation for me.

I have experienced many personal blows in college. In two separate classes at two different colleges I was not called by my name. At the first college, the professor routinely called me the name of another student, who was Mexican. Not only was I not Mexican, but I was about a foot taller than she was and we did not look alike. The teacher would say my name wrong and then follow it up with “whatever your name is” or “it doesn’t matter.” She totally disrespected me as an individual. The teacher also made dismissing and derogatory remarks about the Trail of Tears, which was personally offensive because I am Cherokee. Ironically, the teacher was Jewish and spoke of her sensitivity about the Holocaust. This was hypocrisy to me.

The second incident happened in a criminology class, for half of the semester the professor called me by my name; however, he dismissed most of my input. When we began to read the book “Life on the Outside, the Story of Elaine Bartlett” by Jennifer Gonnerman, the story of a Black woman who was arrested in New York during the

Rockefeller Laws in the 1970, the professor then began to call me Elaine. Elaine sounds nothing like Sonja. Although many of my white cohort shared with me their outrage that he would not call me by my correct name, none of them did anything to support me. Often they would encourage me to tell him off or walk out of class, but I was wise enough to know that would get me nowhere.

At the graduate level, I was shocked by how apparent the veil really was. In graduate school, I personally experienced and witnessed events that inspired me to delve deeper into why these things were happening! One of the first lessons I learned is that people of color are the objects of research, not the researchers.

I witnessed the veil during a class discussion. In class, I shared that my former Black students, who had been removed from public school, experienced success for the first time, within a more homogenous group with more staff of color than they have ever had. I stated that my Black students had wished in regular school they had more Black teachers and Black counselors because they felt a stronger amount of trust. My words were quickly dismissed because the research did not support my claims.

For ordinary African-American women, those individuals who have lived through the experiences about which they claim to be experts are more believable and credible than Those who have merely read or thought about such experiences (Collins 1989:759).

At that point, I realized that the experts had missed something and that the experts were not of color. In the classroom, my years of professional experience were simply dismissed, as if I was not credible or had any authority to speak of my own experience or the experiences of my own people.

I discovered that the research done about the success of African-American children in schools was based on test scores. The research is correct based on the factors used. Because the research focuses on academic successes, it showed Black students did better in integrated schools because they used student's tests scores. However, the same research shows that integrated schools and schools with more white students are better funded. Therefore, the few Black students in those schools received a better education and scores based on better-funded and better-equipped schools. The research shows that in predominately Black schools, Black children do worse because the schools are poorly funded. One factor is also missing from the research. The fact is that the majority of the teachers in both settings are still white. Research shows that charter schools, magnet schools, and other similar schools that have more Black teachers have better performing children (Milner 2006).

Kimmel and Mahler (2003:1440) states "experts" can and have "missed the mark." Research can be wrong, especially when critical factors are not considered. Kimmel made this determination while researching school shooters. The focus was on the form of the shootings, not on the content. "The stories and narratives that accompany the violence, the relationships, interactions among students, and local school and gender cultures" are important in understanding (Kimmel and Mahler 2003:1440). The fact that school shooters were bullied and suffered from gay bashing was not considered in earlier studies that focused on school violence (Kimmel and Mahler 2003). Kimmel's discovery stated that research could be flawed. What is more important is it demonstrates the value of the subject's experience.

What also struck me was the lack of peer respect between academics when peers of color shared experiences. Some white academics again held fast to their research discrediting their peers. I attended a town hall meeting to share with the community information about prison sentencing and racial disparity. A Midwestern African-American professor shared a story of being racially profiled by the police. He stated that when he was pulled over by the police, the police officer asked him “Is this your car?” The doctor asked the officer to ask him another question. Later during the forum, the reigning Miss Black Iowa pageant queen shared frustration about young Black males that were racially profiled in her neighborhood. The academic response from a white professor was “the research doesn’t support that.” Again, our knowledge, our experience, even when from a peer, means nothing.

I personally refuse to participate in studies about upward mobility or anything that will categorize me as “one that got through” because I am aware that I have been blessed with privileges that some others may not have had. Therefore, it is an unfair comparison and my privilege and/or protection does not make me more capable, moral, or intelligent than someone who has not made it “out.”

Du Bois’ theory of the social self is different from the other theories of self because he argues that Black people not only have an idea of themselves but they also have a concept of how they are viewed by whites and white society. The amount of emotion work that goes into the double self and the double consciousness is an added burden that our white counterparts do not have to deal with because of the color of their skin. There is a clear benefit to having second sight. Second sight enables a person to

see themselves in the eyes of others; very often people cannot do that. They believe they are one way but are perceived as another. People of color quickly learn that there is a measuring rod applied by most white people. There is an awareness of being judged for not who you truly are but what you are. This feelings and awareness can also be applied to other oppressed groups.

One of the most painful blows to me was how the veil deeply attacked my personal character and future. I was not fairly considered for a scholarship because my voice had offended the committee members. I made a choice to take a stance, it cost me teaching experience and money. My personal character was talked about behind my back and many ostracized me. However, the lowest of lows was discovered when I read in a report that was done when I made a complaint. The teacher that I disagreed with stated that she felt “in danger” and that I would cause her personal harm. Why? I never threatened her or even swore at her, I just did not want to work with her. If her claim was not bad enough, what was worse was that a police officer and the Dean of Students were placed outside of the classroom in case I caused a problem. I was the one who made the complaint, I was the victim not the perpetrator.

I had just spent the previous five years working with juveniles to keep them out of the system, it was believed that I, a woman over forty, with children and no record, would attack the teacher. Why? Because I am Black? I was simply shocked, hurt, and amazed. The veil is so thick sometimes that all anyone has to do is make an accusation against a person of color and it sticks. I personally was academically lynched.

Black people share the same oppression (Collins 1989). We often will write and talk about our shared experiences, but the plans for action are not developed. The recurring theme for this is in part because we lack the resources and any true power to make the necessary changes in white male dominated academia. Until the veil is removed and clearly exposed, it will be difficult to make any real progress. Whatever we chose, we do suffer. It is time for a revolutionary change.

REFERENCES

- America, Richard F. 1973. "Public Research and Racism: The Case of Racist Researchers." Pp. 451-461 in *Death to White Sociology*, edited by Joyce Ladner. New York: Random House.
- Aptheker, Herbert. 1973. *Du Bois: The Education of Black People*. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press.
- Armstrong, Edward G. 1979. "Black Sociology and Phenomenological Sociology." *The Sociological Quarterly* 20:387-397.
- Bittner, Egon. 1973. "Objectivism and Realism in Sociology." Pp. 109-25 in *Phenomenological Sociology*, edited by George Psathos. New York: John Wiley.
- Booze, Regena Michelle. 2000. "Protecting Our Essence: Coping Strategies of African American Female Faculty at Predominantly White Colleges and Universities." *The Humanities and Social Sciences Abstracts* 60:4618-A-4619-A.
- Brown, Elsa Barkley. 1989. "African-American Women's Quilting: A Framework for Conceptualizing and Teaching African-American Women's History." *Signs* 14:921-29.
- Cazenave, Nicolas and D. A. Maddren 1999. "Defending the White race: White Male Faculty Opposition to a 'White Racism' Course." *Race & Society* 2:25-50.
- Collins, Patricia H. 1989. "The Social Construction of Black Feminist Thought." *Signs* 14:745-773.
- Collins, Patricia H. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought*. New York: Routledge.
- Cooper, Anna Julia. 1892. *A Voice from the South by a Black Woman from the South*. Xenia, OH: Aldine Press.
- Cooper, Thomas and David J. McCord, ed. N.d. *Statutes at Large of South Carolina*, (10 Vols., Columbia, 1836-1841) VII, pp. 352-356 (<http://rs6.loc.gov/ammem/sthtml/stpreso2.html>)
- Du Bois, W. E. B. 1940/1984. *Dusk of Dawn: An Essay Toward an Autobiography of a Race Concept*. New Brunswick: Transaction.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. 1903/1989. *Souls of Black Folk*. New York: Bantam Books.

- Du Bois, W. E. B. 1903/1990. *Souls of Black Folk*. Intro. by John Edgar Wideman. New York: Random House.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. 1949/1970. "The Freedom to Learn." Pp. 230-231 in *W. E. B. Du Bois Speaks*, edited by P. S. Foner. New York: Pathfinder.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. 1968. *The Autobiography of W. E. B. Du Bois: A Soliloquy on Viewing My Life from the last Decade of its First Century*. Canada: International Publishers Co.
- Edgar, Andrew and Peter Sedgwick. 1999/2008. *Cultural Theory: The Key Concepts*. New York: Routledge.
- Elo, Satu and Helvi Kyngas. 2007. "The Qualitative Content Analysis Process." *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 62(1) 107-115.
- Evans, Arthur S. 1983. "Role Relations of Black Sociologists with the Black Community: Perceptions of Sociologist." *Journal of Black Studies* 13:477-487.
- Foner, Eric. 1971. *Nat Turner*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Frederickson, George M. 1975. "A Man But Not a Brother: Abraham Lincoln and Racial Equality." *Journal of Southern History* 41:39-58.
- Gabbion, Shaun L., Helen Taylor Greene, and Vernetta D. Young. 2001. *African American Classics in Criminology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Griffin, Farah. 2000. "Black Feminists and Du Bois: Respectability, Protection, and Beyond." *The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 598:28-40.
- Haley Alex, and Malcolm X. 1964. *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Harding, Sandra 1987. *Feminism and Methodology*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hare, Nathan 1973." The Challenge of a Black Scholar" Pp. 67-78 in *The Death of White Sociology* edited by Joyce Ladner. New York: Random House.
- Hochschild, Arlie R. 1983/2003. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- hooks, bell. 1990. "Postmodern Blackness." *Postmodern Culture* 1:1.
- Huggins, Nathan. 1980. *Slave and Citizen: The Life of Frederick Douglass*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

- Hunter, Margaret. 2002. "Rethinking Epistemology, Methodology, and Racism: Or, is White Sociology Really Dead?" *Race & Society* 5:119-138.
- Husserl, E. 1931/1960. *Cartesian Meditations: An Introduction to Phenomenology* (trans. D. Cairns). The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff (org. 1931).
- Jackson, Fatima L. 2000. "Anthropological Measurement: The Mismeasure of African Americans." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 568:154-171.
- Johnson, Allan G. 1995/2000. *The Blackwell Dictionary of Sociology A User's Guide to Sociological Language*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Johnson-Bailey, Juanita. 2004. "Hitting and Climbing the Proverbial Wall: Participation and Retention Issues for Black Graduate Women." *Race, Ethnicity and Education* 7:331-349.
- Johnson Jr., William A., Richard P. Rettig, Gregory M. Scott, and Stephen M. Garrison. 2006. *The Sociology Student Writers Manual*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Kimmel, Michael S. and Matthew Mahler. 2003. "Adolescent Masculinity, Homophobia, and Violence: Random School Shootings, 1982-2001." *American Behavioral Scientist* 46:1439-1458.
- Krippendorff, Klaus. 1989. "Content Analysis." Pp. 403-407 in *International Encyclopedia of Communication*, edited by Erik Barnouw et al. Vol. 1. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ladner, Joyce A., ed. 1973. *The Death of White Sociology*. New York: Random House.
- Lemert, Charles. 1994. "A Classic from the Other Side of the Veil: Du Bois's 'Souls of Black Folk.'" *The Sociological Quarterly* 35:383-396.
- Lemert, Charles and Esme Bahn, eds. 1998. *The Voice of Anna Julia Cooper: Including a Voice from the South and Other Important Essays, Papers, and Letters*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Lengermann, Patricia Madoo and Gillian Niebrugge. 1998. *The Women Founders: Sociology and Social Theory 1830-1930*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Lewis, David Levering. 1993. *W. E. B. Du Bois: Biography of a Race. 1868-1919*. New York: Henry Holt.

- Lewis, David Levering. 2000. *W. E. B. Du Bois: The Fight for Equality and the American Gateway 1919-1963*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Lugones, Maria C. and Spellman, Elizabeth V. 1983. "Have We Got a Theory for You!: Feminist Theory, Cultural Imperialism and the Demand for "the Woman's Voice." *Women's Studies International Forum* 6 (6): 573-581.
- Marable, Manning. 1998. *Black Leadership*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Metcalf, George. 1968. *Black Profiles*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Milner, H. Richard IV. 2006. "The Promise of Black Teachers' Success with Black Students." *Educational Foundation* 20(3 -4): 89-104.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 1984. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses." *Boundary 2* (12-13):333-358.
- Mostern, Kenneth. 1996. "Three Theories of the Race of W. E. B. Du Bois." *Cultural Critique* 34:27-63.
- Mostern, Kenneth. 1999. *Autobiography and Black Identity Politics: Radicalization in Twentieth-Century America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pampel, Fred C. 2007. *Sociological Lives and Ideas: An Introduction to the Classical Theorists* (2nd edition). New York, NY: Worth Publishers.
- Pauley, Garth E. 2000. "W. E. B. Du Bois on Woman Suffrage: A Critical Analysis of His Crisis Writings." *Journal of Black Studies* 30:383-410.
- Rabaka, Reiland. 2006. "The Souls of Black Radical Fold: W. E. B. Du Bois, Critical Social Theory, and the State of Africana Studies." *Journal of Black Studies* 36:732-763.
- Rudwick, Elliot. 1968. *W. E. B. Du Bois, Propagandist of the Negro Protest*. New York: Atheneum.
- Schrager, Cynthia D. 1996. "Both Sides of the Veil: Race, Science, and Mysticism in W. E. B. Du Bois." *American Quarterly* 48:551-586.
- Schwalbe, Michael, Sandra Godwin, Daphne Holden, Douglas Schrock, Shealy Thompson, and Michelle Wolkomir. 2000. "Generic Processes in the Reproduction of Inequality: An Interactionist Analysis." *Social Forces* 79:419-452.

- Schwalbe, Michael. 2008. *Rigging The Game: How Inequality is Reproduced In Everyday Life*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Shapiro, Thomas M. 2004. *The Hidden Cost of Being African American: How Wealth Perpetuates Inequality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Spraggins, Renee Ericka. 1999. "Fly Girls in the Buttermilk: The Graduate Experiences at a Predominantly White Institution of Black Women who Attend Various Undergraduate Environments." *Dissertation Abstracts International* 60:559-A.
- Staples, Robert. 1976. *Introduction to Black Sociology*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Stewart, James B. 1984. "The Legacy of W. E. B. Du Bois for Contemporary Black Studies." *The Journal of Negro Education* 53:296-311.
- Von Robertson, Ray, Aditi Mitra and Jean Van Delinder . 2005. "The Social Adjustment of African American Females at a Predominantly White Midwestern University." *Journal of African American Studies* 8(4):31-46.
- Walters, Ronald W. 1973. "Toward a Definition of Black Social Science." Pp. 190-212 in *The Death of White Sociology* edited by Joyce Ladner. New York: Random House.
- Watson, Wilbur H. 1976 . "The Idea of Black Sociol-ogy: Its Cultural and Political Significance." *American Sociologist* 11:115-23.
- Wells-Barnett, Ida B. 1892/1969. "Southern Horrors." Reprinted in *On Lynching*, New York: Arno.
- Zuckerman, Phil. 2004. "Introduction." Pp. 1-12 in *The Social Theory of W. E. B. Du Bois*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

