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**Introduction**

In John Locke’s *Two Treatises of Government*, “a Swiss and an Indian in the woods of America” are introduced as members of pre-civil society engaged in some form of exchange. The exchange, economic in nature, binds them, not because of the law (indeed, they are in “a state of nature” as Locke points out), but rather, because as “men,” they have obligations owing to a bond that predates, and in a sense, surpasses that found among citizens. This example serves as a point of emphasis – Locke does not begin with this pair, precisely because it is so striking. On the contrary, Locke’s first example is provided by Garcilasso de la Vega from his history of Peru.[[1]](#footnote-1) Vega’s men remain racially unspecified – we may, without too much travail, presume them to be white.[[2]](#footnote-2) But Vega’s men, stranded on “a desert island” and engaged in primitive exchange, do not evoke the deep sentimentality for the state of nature Locke hopes to elicit. Whites trade among themselves all the time. A Swiss and an Indian tableau, however, suffused with red and white, with black and blonde, we might imagine Locke painting for us, conveys the radical premise of his idea. Race charges the scene with greater clarity. In pre-civil society, men from polar opposite worlds (Locke would also perhaps suggest, intellects and creative abilities) have an instinctual bond founded in necessity.[[3]](#footnote-3) It is not friendship, but in its staging, Locke portrays a form of reciprocity that may suggest more than mere trade.

Locke’s example – perhaps the quintessential frame for considering the potentialities for fraternity in modern political theory – is fraught with a host of race-conscious belief systems found in liberal political thought. We could trace the legacy of such pairings (indeed, triangulations, including Tocqueville’s white girl, Native American woman, and black woman in the wilderness, found in *Democracy in America*) to the present. Racial couplings of this sort are designed to evoke a deeper truth than can be conveyed in racially monochromatic examples. Barack Obama’s 2008 speech on race in Philadelphia – the speech that will undoubtedly be hailed as having “made him president” – hangs upon such a paired denouement. In the speech’s closing argument, a poor young white woman named Ashley is connected to a nameless older black man, who attends an Obama rally because of Ashley’s commitment to a more just society. The rhetorical pairing holds a level of political savvy too intricate for discussion here, but let it stand as but a more recent example in which the bonds of fraternity – politically infused friendship – are part of liberal discourse in ways at times curious, inspiring, and often troubling.[[4]](#footnote-4)

My interest in exploring the relationship between W.E.B. Du Bois and William James (1888-1910) is less explicitly tied to this kind of placement within what Claire Jean Kim has called a field of racial positions. On the contrary, Du Bois and James’s ties at Harvard produce a host of questions for democratic and racial political thought; indeed, these are the ones I am most drawn to, including Du Bois’s (implied) appropriation of double consciousness from Jamesian psychology, Du Bois’s influence upon James’s own thinking of race and empire, and, the extent to which Du Bois and James together, helped create the language for thinking of both personal and racial identity in the period described by Eddie Glaude as the first national black public.[[5]](#footnote-5) But my effort to revisit the significance and contemporary relevance of Du Bois and James’s relationship as intellectual interlocutors is not only a task far beyond the scope of this paper, it is also one that I believe cannot be fully engaged without first examining how that very relationship is conveyed in the historical record – and in this, through the lens of friendship.

Du Bois and James are often portrayed by biographers and scholars of their works as “friends.” My initial reaction to the ubiquity of the description has been one of skepticism. Not that I doubt a rich political and intellectual fraternity occasioned by the two men owing to their time together as student and professor at Harvard. Nor do I dismiss the plausibility of any personal friendship they may have shared. But the ease of the descriptor, often without probing of the relationship, I think reveals more of a present longing for an imagined racial fence jumping than a sober examination of the possibilities for friendship of the deep kind implied, in both the time and space invoked in the literature. In short, what do we mean by friendship? What did Du Bois and James mean by it – and what of it? I hasten to add that “the idea of fraternity” as Wilson Carey McWilliams put it in the title of his magisterial work on the subject now, some 43 years ago, deserves far greater scrutiny in present discourse on democratic life – and to be sure – even more so in our accounting of what is often flimsily described as “race relations.”[[6]](#footnote-6) To that end, I will venture but an initial foray into that discussion here, hoping that this first glimpse into what might arguably be called one of the more important intellectual collusions of the twentieth century, bears more than a trivial insight into the deeper challenges of American race-encrusted social and political orders. As Ralph Ellison alerted us, we can never “throw off the mask of custom and manners that insulate man from man” until we can be sure our motives are not impure.[[7]](#footnote-7) And even then, we may not be ready for what we find.

*James and Du Bois as Friends*

Nearly fifty years after his time at Harvard University as William James’s student, Du Bois recalled the great psychologist-philosopher’s influence upon him. “I was repeatedly a guest in the house of William James; he was my friend and guide to clear thinking.”[[8]](#footnote-8) It was in *Dusk of Dawn* where Du Bois recalled being thrown into the Harvard of 1888’s “extraordinary aggregation of great men.”[[9]](#footnote-9) James is the only Harvard faculty member described by Du Bois as a friend here. The list includes Josiah Royce, George Santayana, Nathaniel Shaler, and Albert Bushnell Hart among others. James is also singled out for particular attention, as Du Bois’s gratitude for pursuing studies in philosophy is described as having “landed me squarely in the arms of William James of Harvard, for which God be praised.”[[10]](#footnote-10) These passages would be cited over the years as evidence of James’s profound intellectual, and indeed, to our point, *personal* influence upon the young Du Bois. Indeed, Cornel West would cite long passages from Du Bois’s *Autobiography* – these in a section in which Du Bois is classified as “The Jamesian Organic Intellectual” – in his work on pragmatism, in a then striking effort to fold Du Bois into the canon of American pragmatism and its philosophic tradition. But fraternity, however presumed, is held in abeyance.[[11]](#footnote-11)

This was not so for William James scholar Eugene Taylor, to whom the literary critic and biographer Arnold Rampersad said Du Bois assured him that “the two most important people in my life were my mother and William James.”[[12]](#footnote-12) Granting this insight the widest berth possible as far as sourcing such recollections go, Taylor is effusive in ways that go beyond the oral historical record. For Taylor, the “indication [is] that James and Du Bois were something more than just casual acquaintances. In fact, James appears to have been one of Du Bois’s spiritual mentors.”[[13]](#footnote-13) There is a propulsion towards deep friendship, bordering on the mystical here, well beyond what might be justified by the evidence, including Du Bois’s words. Even Francis Broderick’s mid-century interview with Du Bois where the aging Du Bois recalls James as his “favorite teacher and my closest friend,” doesn’t quite capture the intimacy conveyed in Taylor’s description.[[14]](#footnote-14) Did Du Bois “unconsciously” adopt even James’s writing style? Taylor seems to think so. Indeed, for Taylor, friendship was James’s chief influence upon Du Bois. “Could James’s real impact on Du Bois’s thinking have been in just such an atmosphere of intimacy and friendship, with all the notebooks and published references providing us with empirical but only peripheral clues?”[[15]](#footnote-15)

Few go so far as Taylor, but we can glean an aspirational tone in some of the language of fraternity surrounding James and Du Bois – language that goes well beyond what either of them said or wrote of the other. Du Bois’s “my friend and guide to clear thinking” rendering of James is found in almost any discussion of note where their relationship is touched upon. But the line is rarely, if ever, interrogated, and friendship hangs as a presumed state. It can be found in Louis Menand’s *The Metaphysical Club*, for instance, where James’s influence is emphasized (pushing Du Bois away from the impractical field of philosophy into the social sciences).[[16]](#footnote-16) This is not so much wrong as it is short. Trygve Throntveit’s *William James and the Quest for an Ethical* *Republic* is a rare instance where friendship is stripped of its banality and reconsidered. James’s relationship to Du Bois is not cheapened but rendered more meaningful, when considered in light of what Throntveit calls James’s “casual racism,” as reflected in his private allusions to Booker T. Washington as “the darkey.”[[17]](#footnote-17) Scholarly recollections of those Harvard philosophical dinners are worthy of such inclusive accountings.

Would James have ever referred to Du Bois as his “friend?” It does not appear he ever did. This may be altogether unnoteworthy in evaluating the depth of the relationship. But Du Bois does invoke the term. While James seems to have not, his sentiments towards Du Bois, in more staid terms to be sure, suggest something cooler, but not without meaningfulness: something more like fondness. James’s 1891 letter inviting his then graduate student Du Bois to a “philosophical dinner” at his home on February 14th, is as austere as can be. But, it is clear, that it meant a great deal to Du Bois – and it was but one of numerous occasions where Du Bois and James conversed together outside the bounds of the academy.[[18]](#footnote-18) James would later write with pride about “my old pupil Du Bois, whose ‘Souls of Black Folk’ is a very remarkable literary production – as mournful as it is remarkable.”[[19]](#footnote-19) That letter, coming after the publication of *Souls*, adds a bit more depth to understanding the relationship – but scholars are prone to draw more fire from it and similar missives, than is perhaps warranted. Herbert Aptheker posits a different tone in his edited volume on Du Bois’s correspondence, describing “the relationship between Du Bois and William James [as] always cordial.”[[20]](#footnote-20) Perhaps Lockean racial pairings (to what end?) call for more, but we needn’t employ them to value the comprehensive importance of the relationship in its own right.

In a lengthy footnote concerning James’s reference to Booker T. Washington as a “darkey,” James biographer, Gerald Myers, goes to some length to depict the descriptor as actually a form of respect for Washington by James, rather than one of opprobrium.

I interpret James’s use of *darkey* differently…Using *darkey* was James’s way of trying not to be stilted, artificial, or sentimental, but to indicate that he was himself relating with respect and admiration to a person whom many described, whether endearingly or otherwise, as a “darkey.” I think it was not condescension but rather James’s show of confidence that in *his* use, a word like *darkey*, could take on positive connotations. Because of this confidence, he could afford to show, to his brother [Henry, to whom he was writing] anyway, a lack of fear toward a borderline epithet.[[21]](#footnote-21)

Myers’s defense has the ring of contemporary and prospective equivalents of such casual slurs – “*my nigger*” – used among whites seeking some tenor of validation or affiliation with subaltern black culture – comes to mind. But in light of the broader historic need, and to me, it seems very much a need, to establish a fraternal pairing at nearly all costs (and here, Myers goes to impressive lengths), James’s language is important. While the reference to Washington may not be an instrument of erasure to James’s profound life’s work with respect to democratic theory and egalitarianism in the world (and in his philosophic pragmatism) we also needn’t be compelled to pluck every thorn for every rose of James’s, either.

The need to fashion friendship out of such thin gruel (or worse, contrary evidence) is itself, worthy of some study, certainly more than can be sustained here. Maybe it is best to forge ahead into considerations of James and Du Bois’s ties as colluders of modern identity, with another note from James to his brother Henry, this one concerning Du Bois’s *Souls*. In it, William writes of *Souls*: “I am sending you a decidedly moving book by a mulatto ex-student of mine, Dubois, professor [of] history at Atlanta (Georgia) negro College. Read Chapters VII to XI for local color, etc.”[[22]](#footnote-22) Aside from the poor rendering of Du Bois’s name in James’s letter, the note is not in any way hostile, nor is it particularly effusive. James’s mulatto ex-student has written a decidedly fine book. This is well enough. One must squint to find friendship within it however. All caring isn’t deeply personal, and all bonds aren’t fraternal. Better still, they aren’t always tied as tightly at both ends. James’s seemed to be tied more with cordialness and collegiality; Du Bois’s with admiration and affection. Let that be enough for now.

*James and Du Bois as Intellectual Interlocutors*

“It is tempting to try to establish a strong Jamesian influence on Du Bois,” Kim Townsend wrote in *Manhood at Harvard: William James and Others*.[[23]](#footnote-23) Townsend begins this line of reasoning by challenging the notion that Du Bois’s idea of double consciousness, as espoused in *Souls*, was derived from James’s classroom instruction. Townsend is but one of numerous scholars who’ve pointed out that Du Bois’s famous account of the black psyche in his 1903 text was a unique take on a much older discourse of duality in self-identity. For Du Bois, double consciousness – “the sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others” – is a novel development in that the American socio-political condition has brought about a hollowed out sense of self. The feeling of “two-ness” of being both an American and a Negro, as described by Du Bois, really is a search for a true self, now lost in the refraction of the white gaze (as Toni Morrison has so usefully described it).[[24]](#footnote-24)

Martin Raitiere is one of a number of historians who chronicle the origins of the term double consciousness in America. Raitiere notes that the term goes back at least as far as Herbert Mayo to describe “depression of the cerebral forces,” in 1838. While Dickson D. Bruce, Jr. traces the earliest usage of the term to 1817, the most proximate, relevant usage as far as Du Bois is concerned belongs to that of the French psychologist Alfred Binet, whose book *On* *Double Consciousness*, William James was likely familiar with.[[25]](#footnote-25) But even this is a tenuous direct link as Binet’s book was published in 1896 (Du Bois’s first published use of the term is in his 1897 article in the *Atlantic*, “Strivings of the Negro People”) and James used a version of the term as early as 1890 in his highly influential *Principles of Psychology*. Here, James wrote of the “split-off” self or consciousness, one “buried” yet nevertheless fully conscious.[[26]](#footnote-26) Dickson D. Bruce, Jr. notes that Ralph Waldo Emerson used the term in his 1843 essay, “The Transcendentalist.” In it, Emerson writes “The worst fear of this double consciousness is, that the two lives, of the understanding of the soul, which he leads, really show very little relation to each other: one prevails now, all abuzz and din; the other prevails then, all infinitude and paradise.”[[27]](#footnote-27)

I am happy to concede for the moment that Du Bois at Harvard, and as a student of James, who was literally just beginning the field of modern psychology, had been exposed to, and more consequentially, instructed in this term as a phenomenon of personal identity. What is undisputed, is that Du Bois’s use of the expression is truly innovative – connecting the dimension of racialized experience in America to dissociative thinking. Is it possible, that Zamir Shamoon is correct in arguing that James’s influence has been overstated, and that Du Bois was just as likely, if not more so, to have appropriated the concept, if not the term, from Hegel through his courses in History with George Santayana? Possibly, but I am more convinced by Shawn Michelle Smith, who sees a closer connection to James.[[28]](#footnote-28) Nevertheless, in all of this “consciousness” talk of connections, Shamoon’s analysis is helpful, insofar as it troubles the fraternal pairing of Du Bois and James in ways that are helpful. As Zamir notes in his *Dark Voices: W.E.B. Du Bois and American Thought, 1888-1903*, “The sketching of a generalized field of ‘influence’ must be put in the service of a more detailed investigation of Du Bois’s critical reading of the relevant materials available to him.”[[29]](#footnote-29)

For Zamir, it is not James’s “medicalization of self-consciousness” that hits the mark for Du Bois. Instead, it is Hegelian historical conflict (and dialectics) as presented by Santayana – and most importantly, where “the focus on consciousness is central.”[[30]](#footnote-30) Zamir’s argument is intricate and very much dependent upon Du Bois’s course work at Harvard under Santayana and close readings of the historian’s texts. Zamir is right to extend the sphere of influences upon Du Bois’s thinking – but he does so in ways that leave James far, and I think, unfairly behind. What is most invaluable, I think, is, as Smith puts it, the ways in which Du Bois adapts, rather than adopts Jamesian (or other) perspectives related to consciousness, thus, creating something quite new in racial discourse (and perhaps within psychology itself).[[31]](#footnote-31)

Zamir’s critique of the Du Bois-James pairing has the added benefit of deconstructing the scholarly trope of racial fraternity that does little to advance our understanding of just what Du Bois and James’s significance to identity and racial discourse at the turn of the century might have been. In considering the Du Bois-James relationship, it is worth viewing the two outside of the professor-student relationship and more broadly, as intellectual interlocutors and indeed, effectual collaborators. This is not to suggest that the two men were engaged in a literal race or psychology project, per se; but what we might accrue from a different kind of understanding of them in some joint fashion, is what the two were able to produce in the respective fields of racial politics and studies and modern psychology. To what extent did their intellectual engagement engender a form of collaboration? How, if at all, were Du Bois and James colluders in rethinking race and psychology – by connecting them?

The political theorist Joshua Miller states that Du Bois “revered James for being first among Harvard’s transformational national intellectual leaders, ‘unshackled in thought and custom who were beating back bars of ignorance and particularism and prejudice.’”[[32]](#footnote-32) Did James’s social openness towards Du Bois translate into his public discourse? And did Du Bois shape James’s views on race over the course of their two-decade long relationship? Miller notes James’s anti-lynching stance, along with his opposition to American imperialism in Venezuela, the Spanish American War, and intolerance in general. But where scholars see Du Bois readily adopting Jamesian conceptions of psychology, there are scant references to the ways Du Bois might have shaped James’s thinking. As Adolph Reed warns, however, in his coolness towards efforts to link James’s influence upon Du Bois’s thought (particularly the idea of double consciousness), we should take care not to overstate “what propositions in what great books remind the author of what propositions in what other great books.”[[33]](#footnote-33) Du Bois’s great biographer, David Levering Lewis put these inferences regarding James’s role in shaping Du Bois’s thinking best:

At this distance, James’s imprint on Du Bois is somewhat less distinct than some recent students of ideas have believed. In a general sense, the professor’s extolling of a pluralistic society, robust espousal of democracy, opposition to imperialism, and hostility to religious and racial intolerance shaped his student’s views of politics and society – especially as these positions were accompanied by a natural aristocrat’s flattering accessibility and unconcern for posturing….But to what extent, if at all, the insights in James’s Principles of Psychology were the source of Du Bois’s own special insights into what he would describe as the double nature of the African-American psyche remains highly dubious.[[34]](#footnote-34)

This is a sober point – all the more so because despite Du Bois’s having lived some

additional fifty years after James’s death in 1910, there is a relative dearth of scholarship on Du Bois’s influence upon James, and more broadly, modern psychology. Aldon Morris’s recent work shows Du Bois’s influence in shaping the field of modern sociology, for instance.[[35]](#footnote-35) But we have few similar occasions to consider Du Bois’s iteration of double consciousness (or other insights) as a formative moment within psychology. As Morris notes, “Du Bois affected the study of race across the social sciences and the humanities.”[[36]](#footnote-36) Excavating Du Bois’s contributions to psychology goes beyond the very limited scope of this paper, but it is an integral part of reconsidering Du Bois – and his relationship to James – for future researchers, including this one.

We know, for example, that Du Bois challenged prevailing notions of black inferiority in intelligence during the First World War as psychological testing was done to determine soldiers’ fitness for combat.[[37]](#footnote-37) Alfred Binet’s intelligence test, ironically enough, was one of the earliest ones employed before being deemed too limited. But what beyond refutations of black inferiority in intelligence? We can readily see suggestive evidence of Du Bois’s influence upon black scholars of psychology and psychological trauma – none more so perhaps than Frantz Fanon.[[38]](#footnote-38) T. Owens Moore’s “A Fanonian Perspective on Double Consciousness” in the *Journal of Black Studies* (2005) explores this evident link.[[39]](#footnote-39) This subfield of “black liberation psychology” linking Du Bois and Fanon is critical, but it also tends towards equating or limiting Du Bois’s psychology strictly to that of double consciousness.[[40]](#footnote-40) And it leaves James’s distillation of Du Bois (may we not investigate a different direction to the causal arrow among the two men?) unaddressed. Even when Du Bois’s influence on James is discussed, the tendency seems more away from psychology to sociology. Eugene Taylor hints at “evidence” that “Du Bois’s sociological study of the American negro and his sensitivity to the Afro-American religious experience exerted an influence on the development of James’s little recognized social psychology.”[[41]](#footnote-41) But Taylor’s reference here is to an unpublished paper. Such silences in the chain of influence are relevant insofar as they posit in their quietude a happy place for James and Du Bois within mainstream scholarship – and largely within the confines of the fraternal racial pairing paradigm. An exception is Michael Raposa’s critique of Shannon Sullivan’s book on white privilege (2006), which suggests Du Bois’s influence on modern psychology evolved out of not only Jamesian understandings of the conscious (or more rightly, unconscious), but also his own interpretations of Freud connected back to James’s *Principles of Psychology*. The effect was apparent later in Du Bois’s work (after 1930), but is less evident in its shaping of psychology as a discipline or its grappling with race and its effect on identity.

**Conclusion: Race and Causal Arrows**

The late nineteenth century was a period characterized by America’s growth in global power and rapid advancement in scientific discovery. The racialized paradigm of white superiority was largely bolstered by these developments. Still, the search for a fraternal racial theory to augment liberal theory – and practical politics – went hand-in-hand with the age. As the historian John Pettegrew has pointed out, popular journalistic and state accounts of the Spanish American war were used to unify black and white sentiments concerning American imperialism. “Although the tributes to black soldiering did not last very long past the end of the war against Spain,” Pettegrew reminds us, “the ideological formulation that heroic masculine character rather than race determined true American identity would be used effectively throughout the twentieth century to mobilize an increasingly heterogeneous U.S. citizenry to foreign war.”[[42]](#footnote-42)

While James was an opponent of American imperialism, it can be said of him, as Eddie Glaude, Jr. has written of John Dewey, that James “failed in some significant way to address the evils of white supremacy in his work.”[[43]](#footnote-43) Despite the possible reconsideration of his racial stereotypes during his visit to Brazil and the Amazon with Louis Agassiz at 23, there are few meaningful accounts of James pondering race with any degree of depth.[[44]](#footnote-44) In an 1865 letter to his parents from the expedition along the Amazon, James writes of the Indians he encountered. “We slept on the beaches every night and fraternized with the Indians who are socially very agreeable, but mentally a most barren people.”[[45]](#footnote-45) Such pithy and presumptive insights raise the question: did the causal arrow of friendship and influence merely point from James to Du Bois? Was James largely unchanged (or uninterested) in matters of race after meeting Du Bois in 1888 and being in contact with him up until 1907?

James did have occasion to address the issue of race in his Memorial Day oration of 1897 at the unveiling of the Robert Gould Shaw monument commemorating the white colonel who led the 54th Massachusetts’s famed assault on Fort Wagner in the summer of 1863. James’s brother Wilky fought at the battle and was wounded. At the unveiling of the monument James referred to the “social plague of slavery” and honored the black soldiers who gave their lives to preserve the Union. James’s oration which addressed the black soldiers’ contributions somewhat tangentially, nevertheless went further than a great many similar literary and oratorical remembrances. The poet Robert Lowell recalled James’s words as powerful:

*Two months after marching through Boston,*

*half the regiment was dead;*

*at the dedication,*

*William James could almost hear the bronze Negroes breathe.*[[46]](#footnote-46)

The reference to James is an allusion to James’s comments that day, recognizing the realistic depiction (beyond caricature, perhaps) of the black soldiers. “So true to nature,” James described their images in his oration, “that one can almost hear them breathing.”[[47]](#footnote-47)

Maria DeGuzman may have put James’s encounters with race best in her essay on “Anglo-American Identity.” Noting James’s membership in the Anti-Imperialist League, DeGuzman writes that

James did not engage in racial stereotyping with respect to Spaniards or Spanish-speaking people as did his peer and self-proclaimed ‘anti-imperialist’ Charles Francis Adams. Nevertheless, James did not entirely abandon the enterprise of racial stereotyping promoted in his day as a respectable form of ‘knowledge’ by scholars such as the Harvard based naturalist Louis Agassiz to whom James had served as an assistant. Although James’s writings do not amount to a critique of racial typing, they do reveal a concern with the end that discourse was serving: justified imperialism.[[48]](#footnote-48)

DeGuzman captures the essence of this type of late-nineteenth century liberal discourse on race in her final assessment. “James’s writings,” she argues “suggest a person guiltier of Anglophilia and hope about ‘American’ exceptionalism than of racially motivated ‘anti-imperialist’ isolationism.”[[49]](#footnote-49) By Du Bois’s own account, he too was a fledgling imperialist in these early years.[[50]](#footnote-50) But Du Bois’s concern with race and to be sure American imperialism (certainly by the publication of *Souls*) appear to have had little impact on James’s systematic thinking or predilections concerning race.

That leaves a number of important avenues of research left less than well traversed. There have indeed been new and important examinations of pragmatism’s relationship with race, but few focused studies of James’s thought within this context. Second, Du Bois’s relationship to James and more broadly, the then burgeoning field of modern psychology seems inadequately studied – at least as far as the connection between Du Bois’s ideas of self (including, but not only limited to racial conceptions) and the discipline as a whole are concerned. Lastly (if not finally), how are we to situate Du Bois and James’s relationship within the larger question of “social” rather than political democracy? How can we revisit the idea of fraternity between these two enormously important and iconic thinkers whose intellectual meeting point was at once tied to historic national (re)identification with segregation, imperialism, and white supremacy? What kind of friendships were plausible across the color line, as Du Bois called it – and to what extent might such a reality matter to American political thought, and our own prevailing woes related to racialized inequalities? I wish I were much closer to answering these questions today, but I hope, in the best sense of Jamesian and Du Boisian hope, that such a project merits a deeper understanding of our crisis than it did before.
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