Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Gilder Lehrman Center International Conference at Yale University

Collective Degradation:
Slavery and the Construction of Race

November 7-8, 2003
Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut

A Common Nature, A United Destiny: African-American Response to Racial Science from the Revolution to the Civil War

Patrick Rael, Bowdoin College

In the decades before the Civil War, modern American science was born — not out of a glorious celebration of universal human liberty, but out of the need to justify the enslavement and dehumanization of non-white peoples across the globe. Since the time of the American Revolution, European and American thinkers had sought to understand differences within the family of man using the powerful tools of reason and observation. In the antebellum period, those ideas took on a new cast, hardening into the claim that black people were not even part of humanity. This essay examines African Americans' responses to scientific ideas of race from the American Revolution to the Civil War. In that period, free blacks crafted a tradition of public protest that helped shape American abolitionism, and ultimately precipitated the Civil War. This protest tradition openly confronted the arguments made by blacks' detractors — that they could never become a viable part of the body politic, and were fit only for ostracism or perpetual servitude. The usefulness of black responses to racist thought remains an important though unresolved problem.

We may point to three major watersheds in the history of black responses to racial science between the Revolution and the Civil War. The first was the Revolution itself, which drew heavily on the thinking of the Enlightenment. This fostered two important ideas: *universalism*, which argued that everyone in the human family was inherently entitled to the same natural rights, and *environmentalism*, which explained differences among portions of the human family as the product of differing physical conditions of life, generally in opposition to innate factors in

the body. As they steadily became free, African Americans drew deeply upon these two ideas, fashioning them into their first public responses to the twin blights of slavery and prejudice. The second important period runs from the mid-1810s through the 1830s. This period witnessed the rise of plans for African "colonization," a meretricious attempt to convince African Americans of their missionary duty to emigrate from the United States so that they might evangelize Africa. Colonization added new components to racist discourse, challenging African Americans to respond to the dual claims that black skin caused prejudice, which could therefore never be eradicated, and that once freed black people could never become useful and equal citizens. Countering the challenge of colonization placed new premiums on arguing for blacks' elevatability, as well as for their Americanness. The third period marks the birth of what most people think of as scientific racism — the emergence of the "American school" of ethnologists, including Samuel Morton, Louis Aggasiz, Josiah Nott, and George Gliddon. These writers lent a new credence — both to polygenesis as a theory of man's origins, and to professional science as an arbiter of racial discourse. Though the new ideas fostered intense debate among whites, they largely confirmed rather than challenged the ultimate conclusions of popular racism, which suggested that regardless of cause blacks were irredeemably inferior.

The general trajectory of racial thinking between the Revolution and the Civil War was thus downward. It began in a period willing in qualified ways to countenance blacks as part of the family of man, as the gradual abolition of slavery in the North attested. It moved through the retrenchment of colonization, during which American nationalism emerged as a racialized identity predicated upon whiteness. Blacks' and abolitionists' response to racial nationalism spurred antislavery thinking to radical new heights, engendering an increasingly anxious national debate over the meaning of race and slavery in national life. Antebellum racial science can be seen as the nadir of this dialogue.

By the Civil War, African-American arguments against the claims of racial science had long been fully developed. Here's how the argument worked in a nutshell: People of African descent were full members of the human family, created by God different from but equal to others. Differences among the peoples of the earth — both in culture and physical makeup — could be explained by reference to differing conditions of climate and geography rather than to innate differences between the races. Human variation was thus a function of nature, sanctioned by

God. Those who denied the fundamental equality of all men blasphemously denied the benevolence of God's design. Slavery and prejudice did precisely this, by creating artificial and imperfect human hierarchies out of perfect nature. Worse than this, they denied man's capacity and duty to "elevate" those parts of the human character that could be developed: the mind and the morals. They thus denied the conditions under which blacks could demonstrate the falsity of racist conclusions. The possibility of black elevation, as well as the process by which it was denied, had been obscured by the designs of blacks' enemies, who endeavored to convince the public, and even blacks themselves, of their destiny as an inferior caste designed for perpetual servitude.

The historical problem

This summation of black responses to racial science is meant only to suggest the broad outlines of the argument, and to serve as a foundation for understanding the important questions raised by African Americans' efforts to challenge notions of their own degradation. Only recently have scholars begun to directly examine the relationship between black protest and the emergence of racial science in the antebellum period, and two broad schools of thought may be identified in this work. The first paints the darker picture of black responses to racial science, suggesting that in the very process of challenging their own degradation, African Americans internalized the core premises of racial science, unwittingly reinforcing its legitimacy and hence becoming complicit in fostering the very ideas they sought to combat. These studies do not deny the emancipatory intent of black protest, nor do they claim that it was wholly self-subverting. But they identify an unforseen negative consequence in engaging so deeply with the discourse of oppressors. Joanne Pope Melish offers one of the clearest statements of the position, arguing that the rapidly racializing climate of antebellum America rendered it increasingly difficult for African Americans to respond to racist tenets without invoking the very essentialism against which they struggled. While black thinkers sought to subordinate racist discourse to their own freedom struggle, "this strategy undoubtedly had an unintentionally reinforcing effect" on racist discourse.[1]

A second approach softens the negative consequences of the close relationship between black protest and the discourses of the antebellum public sphere.[2] Like those who lean toward the

hegemony thesis, these scholars agree that in fashioning their responses to racist thought, black thinkers closely relied upon the discourses of a world dominated by whites. But these scholars do not concede the inefficacy of a strategy of "appropriation"; rather, they see it as liberating. Stephen Howard Browne, for example, claims that antebellum African Americans responded to the claims of a hostile racial science not by "the repudiation of available means of persuasion but their tactical appropriation." Drawing on approaches from literary criticism, Browne stresses the capacity of the oppressed to empower themselves by borrowing and refashioning the very ideas used in their oppression. Though the strategy did involve some concession, this school of thought generally portrays a positive relationship between black protest thought and the discourses of the public sphere, wherein African Americans succeed through appropriation, using the premises of popular public discourses to pose their condition as mutable, and hence redeemable.[3]

What, then, was the relationship between the oppressed and the discourses used to oppress them? How did the oppressed engage those discourses in the service of their own liberation? Of what consequence for the freedom struggle was this engagement? Did it represent a "weapon of the weak"[4] — an instance of "appropriation" and refashioning "dominant" discourses in the service of emancipation? Or did it represent an instance of ideological hegemony, in which the oppressed believed they resisted oppressive ideas, only to reinforce the fundamental terms of oppressive discourse? Should we endorse Hannah Arendt's maxim that "one can only resist in terms of the identity that is under attack"?[5] Or do we side with Audre Lorde's belief that "the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house"?[6]

Understanding black responses to racial science

The reality was, as is often the case with the past, likely to be more complex than historians' questions permit it to be. There were many relationships between black protest thought and the discourse of race, just as there were multiple consequences to those relationships. Still, black responses to racial science evinced a set of rhetorical motifs that recurred with considerable regularity. Some order, beyond obvious heuristic utility, is thus justified.[7] Let us then survey the tropes that characterized black responses to racial science, considering them from the lowest level of engagement with the discourse of racial science to the highest.

Eschewal occurred when black thinkers simply failed to respond to the arguments of racial science. African Americans spoke and published on hundreds of topics, racial science comprising just one of them. Students of antebellum black thought should be struck first with the *infrequency* with which black thinkers clearly set out to directly refute the claims of antebellum racial science. For African Americans, the threat posed by scientific ideas of race paled in comparison to that posed by popular forms of prejudice such as blackface minstrelsy, proslavery arguments that were not scientific but religious or economic, the alleged indifference to racial uplift of too many of their own people, blacks' declining status in law and constitution, racist mob behavior, developments in other parts of the African diaspora, tensions within the abolitionist movement, and a host of other concerns. Any approach solely concerned with examining the black response to racial science risks over-inflating its significance in the corpus of black protest thought.

One of the reasons that African Americans did not respond more frequently to the charges of scientific racists may lay in the nature of racial science itself. Of all the discourses of the antebellum public sphere, racial science, and particularly polygenesis, was among the newest. The radical claims of the American school of ethnology were not part of a hegemonic mainstream culture, its conclusions assumed as common-sensical and beyond reasonable contention. Rather, polygenesis appeared to the antebellum public as a set of controversial claims, disputed not simply by those it posed as inferior, but by defenders of other explanations for racial difference, notably Biblical defenders of slavery. Culled from the ranks of southern conservatives, these older champions of slavery feared the new science's secularism, despising its overt rejection of sacred sources.[8] They held considerable cultural power. Leading intellectual lights of the South, they set the intellectual tone for the region, and in some ways for the nation. Compared to them, Samuel Morton and Louis Aggasiz seemed upstarts. The stunning success of racial science in post-Civil War years should not obscure its early fragility; in racial science African Americans confronted not a deeply entrenched discourse, but a new one just seeking legitimacy. It may therefore be little wonder that direct attacks on racial science did not occupy black protestors more.

Even when African Americans did respond directly to racial science, they often did not see it the way modern scholars do — as a new and particularly virulent form of racist thought. Rather,

they saw it as simply one manifestation of an overwhelmingly hostile "public mind" — as yet another of the "ten thousand channels through which malign feelings" against blacks found expression.[9] Frederick Douglass viewed the claims of the American school as "the same old question which has divided the selfish from the philanthropic part of mankind in all ages."[10] For Douglass, as for many, racial science did not constitute a qualitatively distinct brand of racist thinking, but simply a new face of an old phenomenon.

Eschewal signified non-engagement with the ideas of racial science — a preoccupation with other matters. Given the historiography's concern with racial science as an ideologically hegemonic force among African Americans, eschewal offers a case that African Americans were not victims of such a process. How could they have internalized ideas of the new racial science when they often failed to speak directly to them? Eschewal may qualify the hegemony thesis considerably, but it did not represent counter-hegemony. That required an awareness of hegemonic discourse which eschewal by definition negated. Eschewal meant that blacks simply did not have the sufficient or sustained access to the discourse of racial science necessary to attack it more frequently, or that the charges of racial science were so diluted by other elements of racist thought that greater hegemony was impossible.

Of course African Americans did acknowledge the threat posed by antebellum racial science, and did not hesitate to challenge it, in myriad ways. The next highest level of engagement with the discourse of racial science could be called *dismissal*. Dismissal occurred when African Americans acknowledged the existence of scientific racism, but consciously refused to dispute its claims. A classic case of dismissal occurred in 1808, in an essay by an anonymous member of the African Society in Boston. The author dismissed one claim that blacks were naturally fit only for servitude as "so trivial, so fallacious and groundless, that we think he must have so hard a study to support it, that we think we had better postpone hearing his objection until some future period."[11]

Instances of dismissal came closest to embodying the position the hegemony thesis seems to say antebellum blacks should have taken. Mia Bay states the case best when she laments that "black Americans felt compelled to disprove, rather than dismiss, even the earliest, tentative arguments for black inferiority."[12] Instances of dismissal demonstrate that there were times when blacks did exactly as their critics would have wished them to do. Through instances of

dismissal, black thinkers refused to engage in the discourse of racial science. They thus minimized possibilities for internalizing its tenets. Unlike eschewal, dismissal often denoted an important degree of self-awareness on the part of black thinkers. By consciously refusing to engage racial science, they illustrated that they understood the arguments arrayed against them, but refused to dignify them with a response, thus inviting those ideas to die of neglect.

But of course the discourse of racial science did not die of neglect. As arbiters of cultural power and legitimators of popular ideas, African Americans simply lacked the power to dismiss racial science into oblivion. This is a powerful counterpoint to those who prize the ideological autonomy of the black working class or the enslaved. Dismissal works best when wielded by those with potent cultural authority. African Americans who practiced it, by permitting hostile speech to go unchallenged, threatened to legitimate racist thought through silence. As theories of polygenesis began gaining new credence in the 1820s, instances of dismissal declined. By the late 1830s, racist arguments that were once beyond sufferance seemed to demand pamphlet-long refutation. As early as 1827, David Walker — hardly an ideological collaborator — argued for the necessity of engaging racist discourse. Speaking of antiblack claims in Thomas Jefferson's *Notes on the State of Virginia*, Walker argued for the necessity of engagement, claiming that "unless we try to refute Mr. Jefferson's arguments respecting us, we will only establish them."[13]

Instead, African Americans sought *engagement* with the discourse of racial science in order to change it. Their effort to combat racist science this way was part and parcel of a larger strategy aimed at transforming public opinion on the entire range of racial matters. The centrality of this strategy to antebellum black protest thought cannot be understated. African Americans viewed it as the cornerstone of the freedom struggle. Time and again they reiterated the need to alter a "public sentiment" which had been "vitiated" by "the false doctrines, [and] base contumelies, that have been so successfully and industriously circulated" about blacks.[14] As the black national convention of 1847 put it: "We struggle against opinions. Our warfare lies in the field of thought."[15] In the form of prejudice, hostile public opinion was "stalking over the land, spreading in its course its pestilential breath, blighting and withering the fair and natural hopes of our happiness."[16] The solution clearly followed: change the public mind. Throughout the period, in countless instances, African Americans sought not to dismiss claims of their inferiority, but to challenge them. Racist science was just one manifestation of these ideas.

How effective were these strategies of engagement? Did they emanate from an oppressive process of ideological hegemony, or from a liberating one in which blacks appropriated and refashioned ideas for their own empowerment? Within the general strategy of engagement, at least five important tropes can be discerned: concession, living proof refutation, arguments from history, the idea of racial genius, and negative environmentalism.

1. Concession. Frequently, the forms of protest thought directed against the conclusions of racial science appeared to result in concessions of black inferiority. It is difficult to read the words of the Northern African Americans who spearheaded the antebellum struggle for freedom without encountering such statements. Thomas Hamilton, who published New York's *Anglo-African Magazine*, claimed that "in no direction can we be said to manifest force of character equal to the whites,"[17] while others went further, claiming that blacks had been "groveling under" a humble state since their earliest existence.[18]

Concession sought to capitalize on the emergence of humanitarian sentiment and antislavery empathy, which required degraded subjects.[19] It posed African Americans as a group needing redemption from injustice; through it, blacks sought to gain the moral leverage of the wronged. Since degradation offered evidence of injustice, no degradation might mean no injustice. Given the weight of proslavery claims that Africans benefitted from slavery (morally through Christianization and physically through benevolent care) such arguments were far from naïve. Their critical premise was that blacks *could* be redeemed. Blacks' natures were mutable; they could be "elevated" through the removal of oppression and the implementation of benign circumstances. Concession promised to redeem blacks' antiprogressive history by holding forth the promise of an elevation yet to come. Blacks were only temporarily degraded; it required only the removal of the undemocratic obstacles of slavery and prejudice for them to demonstrate the fact through speedy elevation. "*Free the slaves,*" challenged Peter Randolph, "give them equal opportunities with the whites, and I warrant you, they will not fall short in comparison."[20]

Concession served endogenous functions as well. Many African-American spokespersons seemed to lay the responsibility for degradation as much at the feet of blacks as of the whites who oppressed them. A national convention claimed that barriers to black "elevation" had been imposed "as much by our own acquiescence, as by the dictate of public sentiment."[21] When African-American leaders told their charges that they lacked the capacity to compete with

whites, they hoped to incite them to ever more strident efforts at self-elevation and race-building. These were jeremiads, directed against those apostates who had failed to enact blacks leaders' vision of racial uplift. They were intended not to degrade their listeners, but to discipline them. As had the jeremiad tradition throughout seventeenth-century New England, and as did the secular jeremiads of the Revolutionary era, black jeremiads served to unite African Americans in a common cause — in this instance moral elevation.[22] Concession was double-edged. While clearly subordinated to the overwhelming need to respond to hostile arguments, black racialism nonetheless conceded much to the contemporary terms of debate. Simultaneously, spokespersons invoked claims of blacks' inherent traits to enhance black political unity.

2. Living proof refutations. Another strategy of engagement involved presenting accomplished members of the race as living refutations of racial science's claims that black people were inherently and irrevocably degraded. The strategy can be traced back to at least 1791, when Benjamin Banneker, the free black astronomer from Baltimore, offered Thomas Jefferson his *Almanac* as proof that blacks could "rise" given the proper environment and inducements. Later generations of black activists enthusiastically embraced the strategy that Banneker literally sought to embody. The literature of the antebellum black protest tradition is replete with examples of such illustrious blacks. Henry Highland Garnet, himself one of these "representative colored men," upheld black revolutionaries Denmark Vesey, Nat Turner, and Joseph Cinque as exemplars of black courage and elevation.[23] R.B. Lewis brought a hint of much-needed gender equity to the list by proclaiming Maria Stewart an example of modern black womanhood equal to the great women of antiquity.[24] Even black entertainers like Ira Aldridge and Frank Johnson enjoyed this treatment.[25] Exemplary blacks not only filled the present but occupied the past as well. The foundations of black history lay in the recounting of the exploits of black patriots such as Crispus Attucks,[26] while celebrations of Haitian revolutionary Toussaint-L'Ouverture began to move the discussion toward national rather than individual examples.

On a broader scale, black leaders sought to make every African American a living proof refutation of racial science's conclusions. In innumerable speeches, sermons, and addresses, black elites urged their people to live lives illustrative of the heights to which blacks as a group might ascend. "I think," wrote Austin Steward, "that our conduct as colored men will have a

great bearing on the question that now agitates this land. . . . Let it be shown that we as a people are religious, industrious, sober, honest and intelligent, and my word for it, the accursed system of Slavery will fall, as did Satan from Heaven."[27]

Concession was inherent in living proof refutations. The exemplary blacks offered by them were exemplary only by being atypically accomplished — a seeming paradox. Black leaders were trying to illustrate not the current state of the race, but its potential. Living proof refutations had managed to overcome the most debilitating circumstances to rise above their oppression. But for every exemplary African American upheld before the public, the argument implied, scores lay in unelevated darkness, awaiting either the personal impetus to reform themselves, or the removal of obstacles to group elevation. The standards by which some were deemed debased and others elevated remained largely unexamined by these arguments; African Americans seemed to accept them rather uncritically.

3. The uses of the past. While modern audiences are most familiar with racial science as a set of arguments about human physiological makeup, it must be remembered that in the antebellum era the "science" of race was as much a discipline of history as it was of biology. American school ethnologists fused methods of biological science, such as close measurement of the cranial capacities of skulls of different "races," with racial histories culled from sacred and secular sources. They argued that modern empirical method confirmed what ancient sources suggested — that blacks had never been a civilized people, and had always been slaves. For blacks, history offered a discipline with methods far more easily replicable than were those of craniology. No blacks had access to their own "golgotha" of ancient skulls such as that which Samuel Morton possessed, and only a few to the medical training and resources necessary to conduct their own research. But most had access to literary societies and other sources of books, which they mined assiduously for arguments to counter the claims of racial science.

The historical argument for black racial inferiority pointed to Africa's lack of great civilizations. Whereas Europeans could boast descent from ancient Greece and Rome, white supremacists maintained that Africans were without historical examples of advanced societies. According to American school ethnologists, the only great historical civilization of Africa, Egypt, was ruled by white people, who kept black Africans enslaved. But blacks claimed Egyptian civilization as their own, as evidence of blacks' capacity to "rise" in the past and hence

in the future. Many northern blacks produced extended arguments to claim, as did an anonymous writer for *Freedom's Journal* in 1827, that African Americans descended from Egyptians, "whose learning the ancients vainly emulated, and to whose eminence in the sciences, the moderns have not attained."[28] As many African-American thinkers saw it, through Egypt black Africa had in fact given birth to modern civilization. They inverted accepted historical understandings, placing Africans not at the bottom of the scale of civilization as eternal children, but at its top, as first parents. Robert B. Lewis typified this approach by claiming that modern civilization was indebted to ancient Africans for rhetoric, architecture, astronomy, seafaring, navigation, the pump, the library, philosophy, mathematics, jurisprudence, medicine, magic, geometry, and fire (Prometheus was black, Lewis claimed).[29]

Antebellum black history served important rhetorical functions. That blacks had once represented the pinnacle of civilization meant that they might do so again. No achievement in civilization lay beyond them, given the proper inducements. According to Samuel Cornish, the ancient record proved that black people "have all the natural requisites to make them, in science and renown, what ancient Egypt once was."[30] Through these kinds of arguments, African Americans applied the logic of environmentalism to the domain of history and nations. Just as individuals could be elevated or degraded by circumstance, so too nations and groups of people.

The conclusion was sound, if the history was not. African Americans were right to skewer the myths of racial Anglo-Saxonism, but in constructing Egypt as their historical antecedent they built their own. Blacks' erections of a noble Egyptian past did little to challenge the malicious argument underlying racial Anglo-Saxonism — the notion that history offered an objective measure by which different races might be judged. Such arguments were hopelessly tautological; invariably whites "found" in the past evidence to support their initial assumptions of white superiority. For blacks to even argue on such terms suggests that they had internalized key elements of racist discourse. In effect, blacks' recollections of past national glories served as group historical living proof refutations. Living proof refutations were simply individual examples taken from contemporary times, while national refutations detailed the group accomplishments of African-descended people in the present or past. Both accomplished the same rhetorical work, which was to demonstrate the capacity of African-descended people to rise, sometimes in spite of their oppression. Both thus also contained the same concession of

black inferiority (even if it was only temporary), and both thus also uncritically accepted the measures by which people — or, in the case of nations, peoples — were to be judged and ranked.

4. The genius of races. Another type of engagement with racial science emanated from African Americans' responses to its historical arguments. Just as whites condemned African-Americans for their incapacity to harken back to ancient models of higher civilization, they drew upon their own Anglo-Saxon past to argue for white racial superiority. White writers working in the idiom of romantic nationalism sought in history proofs that Anglo-Saxons were, naturally, an enterprising, liberty-loving, adventure-seeking people — their destiny to spread their values across the globe. But, as black writers saw it, if Africans were to be castigated on the basis of the past, if history was to be fair game in the effort to oppress, then the much-vaunted Anglo-Saxon record was not free from scrutiny, either. An important strain of parody and satire ran throughout the antebellum black protest tradition, attacking whites' veneration of the Anglo-Saxon past, and calling into question the very standards by which civilizations were to be judged.

Blacks seemed to delight in appropriating whites' concern with national historical precedents, only to turn their premises against them. England, as the ancestral home of the "white" race, frequently fell under critical scrutiny. Several black authors remarked that the people of England, when found by the invading Romans, were hardly the epitome of civilization. According to William Craft, Julius Caesar reported that the British natives "were such stupid people that they were not fit to make slaves of in Rome."[31] According to one black writer, "the Angles and Saxons" who replaced Rome as the dominant power on the island "were both barbaric German tribes, who stole the country of the Britons, and appropriated it to their own uses."[32] And, referring to the Norman Conquest of Anglo-Saxon England in 1066, Alexander Crummell noted that "England herself, grand and mighty empire as she is, can easily trace back the historic footprints to the time, when even she was under the yoke."[33] A writer for the *Anglo-African Magazine* suggested the significance of this ignoble history: "What is to prevent our taking rank with them, seeing that we have a common history in misfortune?"[34] As William Wells Brown put it, "Ancestry is something which the white American should not speak of unless with his lips to the dust."[35]

An important twist on this tradition of satire was a trope Mia Bay has termed, following Anna Julia Cooper, the "angry Saxon." In countless instances, African Americans portrayed

whites' racial ancestors not as enterprising and liberty-loving, but as rapacious and greedy. A writer for the *Anglo-African Magazine* exemplified this trope in skewering the myth of a noble Anglo-Saxon past. While "Noah and Mrs. Noah may be ancestry enough for some folks," he joked, whites claimed that Horsa and Hengist, the two mythic Anglo-Saxons who first invaded England, "are father and mother to the great Anglo-Saxon race." White people would soon be claiming that "the ancient Egyptians themselves were Anglo-Saxons." He continued to assert that, far from imbuing them with a love of freedom, the only claim Anglo-Saxon heritage could make on the character of present-day Americans was "that it runs in the blood to steal."[36]

These historical discussions of national qualities easily slid into discussions of contemporary racial characteristics. Just as blacks transformed whites' glorious histories into tales of national shame, they turned white racial chauvinism against itself by offering alternative interpretations of whites' alleged virtues. The motif of the angry Saxon led many blacks to suspect that whites were not simply unjustified in their claims to achieving high civilization, but that they were actually inferior to blacks. For David Walker, the long history of whites' usurpations raised the question of "whether they are *as good by nature* as we are or not,"[37] while William Hamilton concluded that "if there is any difference in the species, that difference is in favour of the people of colour."[38]

Blacks' portrayal of racial genius offered potent counter-hegemonic possibilities. Satire declared wisdom that was normally considered beyond reproach to be absurd. By posing it as farcical, satire challenged the new social knowledge of scientific racism, controverting the process by which it was assimilated into "common sense" notions of the world, and slowing its incorporation into the mainstream. As Gramsci theorized it, the authority of powerful discourses depends upon the perception of normativity — that some claims are so obviously true that they are simply beyond challenge. This was the one thing black satire would not permit. Even if they could not change white minds on racial matters, black spokespersons could at least guarantee a rhetorical space in which racist ideas would never go unchallenged. Furthermore, for African Americans satire affirmed the legitimacy of a corpus of knowledge they themselves possessed which lay outside the common-sensical knowledge authorized by public sphere discourse. By reinforcing blacks' status as insiders in a marginal community, and by offering such a place of privilege to sympathetic listeners, satire may even have helped persuade potential allies that such

knowledge was not quite as marginal as others would have it, thus buttressing a sense of community in marginality.

5. Negative environmentalism. A final manifestation of blacks' engagement with racial science bears discussion. It is a trope we might call "negative environentalism" — a specific application of the environmentalism African Americans so often invoked. As a form of environmentalism, it conceded black degradation, only to ascribe that degradation to circumstance rather than innate nature. And like environmentalism, it posited the "mutability of human affairs," as John Brown Russwurm had put it — the idea that African Americans *could* "rise" to a level of equality with whites, if provided the proper environment. Yet while black thinkers applied "positive" environmentalism to explain why Africans lagged behind Europeans in achievements in civilization, they invoked negative environmentalism to describe slavery's debilitating consequences. In this, negative environmentalism was a subset of the argument that slavery and prejudice subverted God's design. As that argument went, slavery had imposed conditions on black people that physically degraded them, rendering them inferior to whites. Negative environmentalism strayed, however, in claiming that environmentally-imposed degradation could become almost permanent in blacks, inheritable from one generation to the next.

There was no greater prophet of negative environmentalism than Hosea Easton, the Connecticut minister who experienced firsthand the horrors of northern prejudice. The son of a skilled ironworker who was patriarch to a family active in racial politics, Easton was raised in the creed of self-improvement. His experience in the 1830s of race riots and discrimination in his home town of New Haven led him to reconsider the value of social uplift ideology. The result was *A Treatise on the Intellectual Character, and the Civil and Political Condition of the Colored People of the U. States,* a pamphlet reflecting his growing disillusionment with race in America. The *Treatise* constituted one of the most important statements about race by a black person in nineteenth-century America, and it was significant partly because of its hopeless views of race and prejudice. Easton reproduced an awful catalog of the "opprobrious terms" used by whites to describe inferior slaves:

> Contracted and sloped foreheads; prominent eye-balls; projecting under-jaw; certain distended muscles about the mouth, or lower parts of the face; thick lips and flat nose; hips

> and rump projecting; crooked shins; flat feet, with large projecting heels. . . . With regard to their mind, it is said that their intellectual brain is not fully developed; malicious disposition; no taste for high and honorable attainments; implacable enemies one to another; and that they sustain the same relation to the ourang outang, that the whites do to them.

He conceded "the truth of these remarks," but he attributed blacks' inferiority not to an original hereditary cause," but to the "lineal [i.e., causal] effects of slavery on its victims." The strategy here was a form of tactical concession: only extreme degradation could suggest the monumental injustice that had been done to the enslaved. The significant point is that, of all the ways he might have suggested the magnitude of oppression, Easton chose to claim that slavery imparted heritable negative consequences — an idea derived directly from the discourse of racial science. Easton even extended his logic to his own case. "I wonder that I am a man," he wrote, "for though of the third generation from slave parents, yet in body and mind nature has never been permitted to half finish her work."[39]

Negative environmentalism was concession played to its logical conclusion: since degradation offered evidence of injustice, extreme degradation might mean extreme injustice. Classic environmentalism argued that Africans lagged behind whites because they lacked the environment and geography that propelled Europe into the global forefront, or because the light of Christianity had failed to spread to their dark continent, or even that Africans had brought this darkness upon themselves by failing to acknowledge the one true God. As such, it tended to depict black peoples' plight as the consequence of ancient or faultless causes. Negative environmentalism attributed the inferior position of blacks to slavery and the slave trade, institutions that had actively depressed the prospects of Africans and African-descended people since they came into contact with Europeans. It thus argued that Africans had been degraded in the extreme, and by fellow humans who could still admit to and atone for their sins.

Appropriation also figured heavily in this argument. For those invoking negative environmentalism, the crucial move was to distinguish between human differences produced by nature and human differences wrought by man himself through the perversion of nature. While to black thinkers natural differences were morally meaningless, manmade differences constituted offenses against God requiring rectification. In both cases, though, the consequences of environmental impacts on black bodies became hereditary.

There is no clearer case of appropriation's troubling potential than negative environmentalism. To argue that Easton and those who followed his logic appropriated from racial science is not to undermine the vehemence of their attacks on racist ideology. On the contrary, these efforts to most directly refute the claims of racial science were the most powerful challenges blacks posed to racial science. But this is just the point. By necessity, the arguments that sought the most to refute racism most closely entered into its discourse, and hence were just those most likely to unwittingly internalize its core premises. No other argument so clearly indicted American racial practice, but no other argument came so close to adopting racial science's equation of blood with identity.

Assessments

For African Americans, racial science was a tremendously important arena of ideological contestation. If blacks could not succeed in countering a set of ideas so clearly hostile to their interests, they were not likely to succeed anywhere. If they could not resist the hegemony of polygenesis, they were unlikely to resist the hegemony of any of the antebellum period's public discourses. In assessing blacks' efforts to counter racial science, it is clear that a simple judgement will not suffice. In the history of black thought we can find both instances wherein African Americans appropriated elements of racial discourse only to undermine that oppressive ideology (satirical uses of history), as well as occasions in which blacks' engagement with racist ideas seems to have led them to internalize elements of an oppressive discourse (negative environmentalism). In each form of engagement appear suggestions of both debilitating hegemony and empowering appropriation. What conclusions about the black response to racial science can be drawn from this analysis? What general principles about resistance to ideological oppression do such conclusions yield? Let's consider the strengths and weaknesses of each argument in turn.

The central dilemma of the appropriation thesis is that appropriation did not always equal empowerment, much less counter-hegemony. The counter-hegemonic possibilities of appropriation must be demonstrated rather than assumed. Every instance of engagement necessarily implied at least a minimal act of appropriation. Dialogue presumes latent consensus; intelligibility demands agreement on some basic terms of debate. For African Americans the

mere act of responding to racist charges necessarily conceded the possibility that the original premise was credible enough to require refutation. Furthermore, engagement tended to reify the latent assumptions built into the claims they sought to refute.

This reinforcement of some terms of debate was not necessarily a bad thing. Dialogue always entailed such concessions. It benefitted blacks by offering the potential — but only the potential — for a rhetorical wedge into white values. Blacks who could not appeal to those values — who could not speak a common language with their oppressors — could not hope to change their oppressors' minds through discussion. This appeal to oppressors' values became antebellum black protestors' rhetorical forté. But countering hegemony required more than mere appropriation. Appropriated values had to be refashioned and re-disseminated into the public sphere, where they might counteract racist discourse in some effective fashion. Furthermore, as proponents of the hegemony thesis point out, since internalization frequently accompanied appropriation, those using this strategy had to retain sufficient self awareness from the discourses they sought to undermine to offset the strategy's inherent liabilities. Satire often offered a means of responding effectively to racist discourse while retaining the critical distance necessary to avoid internalization, but it often strayed perilously close to — and indeed sometimes crossed over into — unwitting internalization of hostile discourse.

It was never possible to succeed entirely in appropriating and reconstructing oppressive ideas, any more than it was possible to completely internalize those ideas. Appropriation and hegemony represent not two distinct approaches to the problem, but poles on a range of possibilities. Specific responses to oppressive discourse entailed both the dangers of internalization as well as the promise of countering ideological hegemony. And challenging one discourse of oppression could simultaneously reify others. How, then, do we gauge the consequences of blacks' engagement with racist discourse on the freedom struggle?

This difficulty winds up being the problem with the hegemony thesis. If blacks did internalize elements of racist discourse, how exactly did this harm the freedom struggle? In Gramsci's original formulation, overcoming hegemony required outside ideological intervention. Since the very purpose of hegemony is to uphold oppressive systems by establishing values and norms antithetical to the interests of the oppressed, effective resistance to hegemony cannot come from inside those norms. For Gramsci, the proletariat could never invoke bourgeois

discourse in the service of revolution. Some movement outside the bounds of hegemonic thought was necessary.[40] This seems also to be the route touted by many radical theorists, such as Audre Lorde. For Marxists, the source of this counter-hegemonic ideology was the revolutionary party; updated versions look to the autonomous cultural formations of the oppressed themselves as sources of liberation.[41] In classical terms, then, the failure to step outside of dominant discourses constituted an *a priori* incapacity to mount challenges to hegemony. As an expression of social power, the public sphere could not constitute such a resource.

This presents a considerable problem for liberation theorists, for quite often the oppressed were not slaves in plantation communities or peasants in closed-corporate societies, isolated from the culture of the oppressor. Often they were, like industrial workers, part of a public world the ideological parameters of which were simply inescapable. This was certainly the case with antebellum northern blacks, who lived cheek-by-jowl with a white populace that hugely outnumbered them. For such as these, appropriating the "master's tools" was not just an ideological option, but the only conceivable source of counter-hegemonic thinking. If it was not possible to step completely outside of the discourses of the public sphere, the oppressed had to work within those discourses, and this meant landing somewhere on the slippery slope between hegemony and appropriation, complicity and empowerment.[42]

Yet if it was not possible for antebellum free blacks to craft a protest tradition from outside the dominant public discourses of the day, neither does this mean that hegemony was complete. Gramsci assumed that all internalization (appropriation) was by definition counter-revolutionary. If we concede that in responding to racial science blacks did internalize some elements of racist discourse, how exactly did it undermine their struggle for liberation? On this point the scholars offer only vague evaluations, as if internalization *per se*, rather than its consequences, were the root problem. True counter-hegemony, it is suggested, demands an ideology that does not simply oppose racist claims with inverted claims that do nothing to undermine the principle of racial hierarchy, but which attacks the core of racist discourse itself.

On this score black responses to racial science stand up quite well — far better than the hegemony thesis would have it. It is true that black thinkers imbibed elements of racist discourse. Black newspapers regularly reprinted tales of exotic Oriental peoples, and seemed

willing to cite white authorities who supported the potential of black intellect at the expense of Native Americans'.[43] Rare instances of stereotyping certainly contradict the racial tolerance expected of victims of racial intolerance.[44] But the negative consequences of this internalization — the long-term undermining of the struggle to make blacks free or America better — seem nowhere near as apocalyptic as the critics sometimes seem to intimate. By every standard the hegemony thesis uses, African Americans' internalization of racist discourse did not deal crippling blows to the freedom struggle.

One measure that is surely unfair is to judge on the basis of what later thinkers made of antebellum originals. In antebellum America, even those African Americans most apparently complicit in using the discourse of racial science were not engaged in atavistic "fantasy" solutions to the problem of race.[45] Rather, they sought to respond to hostile ideas in the most progressive terms of the day. If later generations vulgarized their original vision, that can hardly be laid at the feet of the antebellum generation.

By another measure, whatever racial essentialism existed in the speech of black writers was not likely to undermine alliances with whites — at least, not any alliances worth keeping. Some African-American activists, originally grateful for support and all too willing to work with white abolitionists toward a raceless society, did come to abandon hopes for cross-racial alliances. But they did so only after being exposed to ample evidence that abolitionists often carried their own racial baggage, and more easily envisioned blacks as objects of their benevolent intervention rather than as independent activists in their own right. The erosion of the antislavery movement's promising bi-racialism did not result from black leaders' unwillingness to accept subordinate roles within a movement for their own liberation.

Neither did black protest thought do much to reinforce the principles of racial division and racial hierarchy. Overwhelmingly, black thinkers spoke of racial difference in ways designed to further their vision of a society in which race would be meaningless. Their steadfast reliance on radical environmentalism as the best response to the claims of racial science illustrates this. Time and time again they argued that race was an accident of nature, utterly without meaning in ordering society. One searches in vain for "black racists" or "self-hating blacks" in antebellum America.[46] Instead, one finds the sentiments of a William J. Wilson, who wrote: "This we fully believe to be the ultimate design of God. On this continent, . . . God intends, in his providence,

ultimately to bring men of every clime, and hue, and tongue, in one great harmony, to perfect the greater system of man's highest earthly government. Then shall be the reign of perfect peace."[47]

Finally, whatever hegemony was at work among antebellum blacks did not seem to have blinded African Americans to their common interests or to the very fact of their oppression. The black spokespersons who engaged racist discourse clearly understood themselves as part of a group, initially defined by white supremacy, but articulating a sense of common identity built upon resistance to their shared oppression. Rather than craft their notion of blackness around a sense of organic cultural linkages, they did so around a pragmatic sense of shared oppression and historical experience. Samuel Cornish typified the thoughts of many. He did not "love one class of men more than another," and was as much opposed to "complexional distinctions" as anyone. "Yet we are one of an oppressed people," he wrote, "and we deem it alike our privilege and duty, to labor *especially* for that people, until *all their disabilities are removed*."[48] At a time when many white Americans were lauding ethnic identities rooted in mythic pasts, African Americans remained remarkably committed to a sense of unity crafted only by common oppression.[49]

Ultimately, African Americans' responses to antebellum racial science suggests the power as well as the limitations of the sense of pragmatic racial identity crafted by those such as Cornish. Black thinkers set forth a notion of blackness that largely avoided succumbing to the racial essentialism of their day, yet remained deeply engaged with the discourses of the American public sphere. This relationship offered tremendous benefits. It gave free blacks access to a potent set of ideas that promised to change white minds. African Americans spoke, wrote, and published in a world where powerful white enemies might be converted and powerful white allies might be enlisted. Black leaders' very proximity to power rendered their words meaningful. The men and women who forged the antebellum protest tradition engaged in what Kevin J. O'Brien has called in other contexts "rightful resistance," or the art of disputing "the legitimacy of certain political authorities and their actions while affirming (indeed relying upon) other authorities and established values to pursue their ends." Black thinkers used their proximity to power to pose a "critique within the hegemony" (to quote James C. Scott) which resulted in some of the most potent tropes in the history of black protest thought.[50]

To a critical extent they succeeded. They, even more than the radical abolitionists, spoke from the margins of American society. Yet gradually, from the 1830s onward, the fierce and

fiery rhetoric of mere handfuls of radical activists began to influence the center of American politics. Slowly and painfully, the ideas of a scorned and rejected minority infiltrated public debate, polarizing public opinion, and eventually precipitating the colossal ideological battles that raged from 1848 to 1860. The antislavery ideology the Union marched to war with in April of 1861 was a hopelessly co-opted descendent of its antebellum original, yet in the maelstrom of the Civil War it was sufficient to spur the complete obliteration of the hated institution of slavery. Both that great conflict and the emancipation it demanded owed their origins to the efforts of black activists in the antebellum North.

NOTES

[1]Joanne Pope Melish, "The 'Condition' Debate and Racial Discourse in the Antebellum North," *Journal of the Early Republic* 19:4 (Winter 1999), 665, 666. I would be remiss if I did not add that I have also argued a weak version of the hegemony thesis. It speaks of "a creep toward essentialist premises" and "the infiltration of white supremacy's basic premises into black thought." *Black Identity and Black Protest in the Antebellum North* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 249, 252.

[2]Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, Thomas Burger, trans. (Cambridge, Mass. : MIT Press, 1989); Geoff Eley, "Politics, Culture, and the Public Sphere," *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique* 10:1 (Spring 2002), 219_36.

[3]Stephen Howard Browne, "Counter-Science: African American Historians and the Critique of Ethnology in Nineteenth-Century America," *Western Journal of Communication* 64:3 (Summer 2000), 269, 281-82. For the general phenomenon of appropriation, see Kathleen Ashley and Véronique Plesch, "The Cultural Process of 'Appropriation,'" *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 32:1 (2002), 1-15.

[4]James C. Scott, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).

[5]Quoted in Grant Farred, "Endgame Identity? Mapping the New Left Roots of Identity Politics," *New Literary History* 31:4 (Autumn 2000), 637.

[6]Audre Lorde, "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House," in *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches* (Trumansburg, NY: Crossing Press, 1984), and Cherríe Moraga, Gloria Anzaldúa, eds., *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color* (Watertown, Mass.: Persephone Press, 1981). Homi Bhabha's concepts of hybridity and liminality collapse this tension. See "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse," in *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1995), 85-92. More closely related, see Mikko Tuhkanen's survey of and argument about this tension in the "lore cycle" of blackface minstrelsy. "Of Blackface and Paranoid Knowledge: Richard Wright, Jacques Lacan, and the Ambivalence of Black Minstrelsy," *Diacritics* 31:2 (2001), 9-34.

[7]Stepan and Gilman make tentative steps toward such a typology in Nancy Leys Stepan and Sander L. Gilman, "Appropriating the Idioms of Science: The Rejection of Scientific Racism," in *The Bounds of Race: Perspectives on Hegemony and Resistance*, ed. Dominick LaCapra (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), 72-103. Though my typology differs considerably from theirs, I am indebted to their example.

[8]The most recent work to focus on this debate is Lester D. Stephens, *Science, Race, and Religion in the American South: John Bachman and the Charleston Circle of Naturalists, 1815–1895* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000).

[9]"Address of the Colored National Convention, to the People of the United States," *Proceedings of the Colored National Convention, Held in Rochester, July 6th, 7th and 8th, 1853* (Rochester: North Star Office, 1853), 16.

[10]Frederick Douglass, "The Claims of the Negro Ethnologically Considered: An Address Delivered in Hudson, Ohio, on 12 July 1854," in *The Frederick Douglass Papers, Series One: Speeches, Debates, and Interviews, Volume 2: 1847-54*, John W. Blassingame, et al, eds. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), 506.

[11]A member of the African Society in Boston, *The Sons of Africa: An Essay on Freedom* (Boston, 1808), reprinted in Dorothy Porter, ed., *Early Negro Writing, 1760-1837* (Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1995), 17

[12]Mia Bay, *The White Image in the Black Mind: African-American Ideas about White People, 1830-1925* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 37.

[13]David Walker, *David Walker's Appeal to the Coloured Citizens of the World*, Peter P. Hinks, ed. (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000), 18.

[14]J. Holland Townsend, "The Policy that We Should Pursue," *Anglo-African Magazine* 1:10 (October 1859), 324-25.

[15]*Proceedings of the National Convention of Colored People, and Their Friends, Held in Troy, N.Y., on the 6th, 7th, 8th and 9th October, 1847* (Troy, N.Y.: J.C Kneeland and Co., 1847), 18-19.

[16]*Minutes and Proceedings of the Third Annual Convention, for the Improvement of the Free People of Colour in These United States, Held by Adjournments in the City of Philadelphia, from the 3d to the 13th of June Inclusive, 1833* (New York: By Order of the Convention, 1833), 32-33.

[17]"A Word to Our People," *Anglo-African Magazine* 1:9 (September 1859), 295.

[18]Elizabeth Wicks, *Address Before the African Female Benevolent Society of Troy, on Wdensday, February 12, 1834* (Troy, NY, 1834), 4.

[19]Howard Temperly, "Capitalism, Slavery and Ideology," *Past and Present* 75 (May 1977), 94-118; Thomas L. Haskell, "Capitalism and the Origins of the Humanitarian Sensibility, Part 1," *American Historical Review* 90:2 (April 1985), 339_61, and "Capitalism and the Origins of the Humanitarian Sensibility, Part 2," *American Historical Review* 90:3 (June 1985), 547_66; Elizabeth B. Clark, "'The Sacred Rights of the Weak': Pain, Sympathy, and the Culture of Individual Rights in Antebellum America," *Journal of American History* 82:2 (September 1995), 463_93.

[20]Peter Randolph, *Sketches of Slave Life: Or, Illustrations of the "Peculiar Institution,"* 2d ed. (Boston, 1855), 79.

[21]*Colored American*, March 2, 1839.

[22]On the uses of the jeremiad, see David Howard-Pitney, *The Afro-American Jeremiad: Appeals for Justice in America* (Philadelphia: Temple University Pres, 1990); Sacvan Bercovitch, *The American Jeremiad* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978); Sacvan Bercovitch, *The Rites of Assent: Transformation in the Symbolic Construction of America* (New York: Routledge, 1993).

[23]Henry Highland Garnet, "Address to the Slaves of the United States" (1848), in Richard Newman, Patrick Rael, and Phillip Lapsansky, eds., *Pamphlets of Protest: An Anthology of Early African American Protest Literature, 1790-1860* (New York: Routledge, 2001), 163-64.

[24]R.B. Lewis, *Light and Truth; Collected from te Bible and Ancient and Modern History, Containing the Universal History of the Colored and Indian Race, from the Creation of the World to the Present Time* (Boston: A Committee of Colored Gentlemen, 1844), 334.

[25]"The First Colored Convention," *Anglo-African Magazine* 1:10 (October 1859), 308; John H. Johnson, Untitled Lecture to the Banneker Institute, Banneker Institute Papers, Gardiner Collection, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, box 5Ga, folder 1, 1.

[26]Wm. C. Nell, "Colored American Patriots," *The Anglo African Magazine* 1:2 (February 1859), 30.

[27]*Colored American*, June 2, 1838.

[28]"S.," "For the Freedom's Journal," *Freedom's Journal*, August 17, 1827.

[29]R.B. Lewis, *Light and Truth*, 280-312.

[30]*Colored American*, May 6, 1837. J.W.C. Pennington similarly recounted tales of Aesop and Terence to demonstrate the literary capacity of ancient -- and thus contemporary -- African peoples. See J.W.C. Pennington, "A Review of Slavery and the Slave Trade.," *Anglo-African Magazine* 1:4 (April 1859), 124.

[31]Exchange by William Craft and Dr. James Hunt, August 27, 1863, in BAP, I, 541.

[32]S.S.N., "Anglo-Saxons, and Anglo-Africans," *Anglo-African Magazine* 1:8 (August 1859), 247.

[33]Alexander Crummell, *The Man; The Hero; The Christian!: A Eulogy on the Life and Character of Thomas Clarkson* (New York, 1847), 33.

[34]S.S.N., "Anglo-Saxons, and Anglo-Africans," *Anglo-African Magazine* 1:8 (August 1859), 248.

[35]William Wells Brown, *The Black Man, His Antecedents, His Genius, and His Achievements* (Boston, 1863), 34.

[36]S.S.N., "Anglo-Saxons, and Anglo-Africans," *Anglo-African Magazine* 1:8 (August 1859), 247, 249.

[37]Walker, *David Walker's Appeal*, 20.

[38]Hamilton, *An Oration Delivered in the African Zion Church, on the Fourth of July, 1827*, in Porter, ed., *Early Negro Writing*, 101.

[39]Easton, *A Treatise on the . . . Colored People of the U. States*, 83, 113-14, 89.

[40]See Joseph Femia, "Hegemony and Consciousness in the Thought of Antonio Gramsci," *Political Studies* 23:1 (March 1975), 35.

[41]See also James Scott, "Hegemony and the Peasantry," *Politics and Society* 7:3 (1977), 289-96.

[42]Lester C. Olsen, "The Personal, the Political, and Others: Audre Lorde Denouncing 'The Second Sex Conference,'" *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 33:3 (2000), 278-29.

[43]*Colored American*, October 19, 1839; *Freedom's Journal*, January 24, 1829. "'The African,' says Sir James Yeo, who has for a considerable time been stationed upon the coast of Africa, 'is very superior in intellect and capacity to the generality of Indians in North America. They are more sociable and friendly to strangers, and except in the vicinity of European settlements, are a fine and noble race of men.' (Sir James Lucas Yeo's letter to John Wilson Croker, Esq. published in the New York Spectator for Nov. 7th, 1817.)" *Freedom's Journal*, May 18, 1827.

[44]*Frederick Douglass' Paper*, September 22, 1854.

[45]Theodore Draper used this term to describe black nationalism. Theodore Draper, *The Rediscovery of Black Nationalism* (New York: Viking Press, 1970).

[46]The only possibility that comes to mind is the maliciousness of Cyprian Clamorgan, *The Colored Aristocracy of St. Louis* (St. Louis, 1858). For the principle of racial and ethnic self-hatred, see Sander L. Gilman, *Jewish Self_Hatred: Anti_Semitism and the Hidden Language of the Jews* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990).

[47]Ethiop, "The Anglo-African and the African Slave Trade," *Anglo-African Magazine* 1:9 (September 1859), 286.

[48]*Colored American*, March 29, 1838.

[49]See also Eddie S. Glaude, Jr., *Exodus!: Religion, Race, and Nation in Early Nineteenth_century Black America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 134-42.

[50]Kevin J. O'Brien, "Rightful Resistance," *World Politics* 49:1 (1996), 34-35.