

---

JAMES BALDWIN'S LIFE ON THE LEFT: A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG NEW YORK INTELLECTUAL

Author(s): DOUGLAS FIELD

Source: *ELH*, WINTER 2011, Vol. 78, No. 4 (WINTER 2011), pp. 833-862

Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41337556>

**REFERENCES**

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

[https://www.jstor.org/stable/41337556?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references\\_tab\\_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/41337556?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents)

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

---

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

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



The Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *ELH*

JSTOR

JAMES BALDWIN'S LIFE ON THE LEFT:  
A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG  
NEW YORK INTELLECTUAL

BY DOUGLAS FIELD

I also realized that to try to be a writer (which involves . . . disturbing the peace) was political, whether one liked it or not; because if one is doing anything at all, one is trying to change the consciousness of other people.

—James Baldwin, *Conversations with James Baldwin*<sup>1</sup>

In the introduction to *The Price of the Ticket: Collected Nonfiction, 1948–1985* James Baldwin looked back to his beginnings as a writer in New York during the 1940s. It was, Baldwin recollected, “unexpectedly difficult to remember, in detail, how I got started,” adding, however, that “I will never, for example, forget Saul Levitas, the editor of *The New Leader*, who gave me my first book review assignment . . . nor Mary Greene . . . but I do not remember exactly how I met them.”<sup>2</sup>

Baldwin's first review was in fact published in *The Nation* in 1947, a confident and caustic overview of the Russian writer Maxim Gorki's collection of short stories, followed by a total of sixteen book reviews between 1947 and 1949: one short story and three articles for *The Nation*, two in *Commentary*, and twelve in *The New Leader*.<sup>3</sup> By 1949 Baldwin had established himself as a promising new writer in Paris where his notorious essay “Everybody's Protest Novel” announced the arrival of a highly gifted essayist and not just a precocious and acerbic book reviewer. Despite cutting his teeth on a group of magazines associated with the “New York Intellectuals” (including later articles for *Partisan Review*), Baldwin repeatedly played down his early political associations whilst at the same time offering tantalizing hints at the importance of these anti-Stalinist editors on his early career. Saul “Sol” Levitas of *The New Leader*, Randall Jarell of *The Nation*, and Elliot Cohen and Robert Warshow of *Commentary*, Baldwin acknowledged, “were all very important to my life. It is not too much to say that they helped to save my life” (*P*, xiii). And yet Baldwin is curiously hazy

about his connections to the political scene of the 1940s. “My life on the Left is of absolutely no interest,” Baldwin wrote in the introduction to *Price*. “It did not last long. It was useful in that I learned that it may be impossible to indoctrinate me” (*P*, xiii).

Baldwin’s reluctance or inability to recall his early years as a writer on the Left is in keeping with other accounts of his youth where he frequently forgets or mis-remembers dates and details or employs what James Campbell calls “an interpretation of events which is not quite a misinterpretation . . . but . . . a heightened reading.”<sup>4</sup> Baldwin’s claim that his “life on the Left” is of no interest echoes the accounts of numerous former left-wing intellectuals of the period, including Sidney Hook and Ralph Ellison who have exercised (or exorcised) what Alan Wald calls “political amnesia” in relation to their radical past.<sup>5</sup> As Lawrence Jackson has pointed out, Ralph Ellison, for example, “censored his public career to omit the years between 1937 and 1947—the indignant leftist years,” in what he describes as an “acrobatics of rhetoric” to distance himself from involvement with Communist publications such as *New Masses*.<sup>6</sup> Although Baldwin, unlike Sidney Hook or Elliot Cohen did not move in that now familiar political trajectory of radical anti-Stalinism to neo-Conservatism, a substantial account of his Leftist past remains untouched by critics and biographers alike.<sup>7</sup>

The relative lack of interest in Baldwin’s Leftist intellectual past has no doubt been influenced by the author who not only let it be known that it was impossible to indoctrinate him, but who also reveled in the role of outsider and maverick. Of the numerous reviews that Baldwin wrote in *The Nation*, *The New Leader*, *Commentary* (and later *Partisan Review*), only one, a review of Ross Lockridge’s *Raintree County*, is collected in *Price*. Although Baldwin later claimed that he wrote “Everybody’s Protest Novel” as “a summation of all the years I was reviewing those ‘be kind to niggers’ and ‘be kind to Jews’ books,” few of his reviews in fact focused explicitly on race.<sup>8</sup> While it may be true that he was offered a number of books on “the Negro problem,” his recollection that “the color of my skin made me automatically an expert” is not reflected in the works of American literature and culture that the young Baldwin reviewed.<sup>9</sup> For Mary McCarthy, Baldwin stood out because he “had read *everything*,” adding “Nor was his reading colored by his color—He had what is called taste—quick, Olympian recognitions that were free of prejudice.”<sup>10</sup>

Despite his cautious recollection of his Leftist past, Baldwin singles out the importance of Eugene Worth, a young African American whom he “loved with all . . . [his] heart” (*P*, xii). Although Worth is most often

remembered as the inspiration for Rufus in his 1962 novel *Another Country* (Worth committed suicide in 1946), Baldwin makes it clear that his friend ignited his political life.<sup>11</sup> Worth, Baldwin recalled, “was a Socialist—a member of the Young People’s Socialist League (YPSL) and urged me to join, and I did. I, then, outdistanced him by becoming a Trotskyite—so that I was in the interesting position (at the age of nineteen) of being an anti-Stalinist when America and Russia were allies” (*P*, xii). Recollecting his early teenage years in *No Name in the Street* (1972), Baldwin recalled that he “had been a convinced fellow traveler.” “I marched in one May Day Parade,” Baldwin recalled, “carrying banners, shouting, *East Side, West Side, all around the town, We want the landlords to tear the slums down!*” (*P*, 464). Baldwin’s involvement with the YPSL is not surprising, especially given the emphasis that the Party’s periodical, *Challenge*, placed on civil rights. The first issue (1943) demanded equality for African Americans and subsequent articles continued to lobby for the desegregation of the army and an end to Jim Crow.<sup>12</sup>

Baldwin’s recollection of his YPSL membership at the age of nineteen (in 1943), however, has yet to be corroborated. It isn’t clear, for example, whether the YPSL Baldwin mentions was Socialist Party or Shachtmanite; whether Baldwin was a member of the Trotskyite association known as YPSL/4ths or the Shachtmanite Youth (which used the name Socialist Youth League).<sup>13</sup> In a 1989 article, “Meetings with James Baldwin,” the trade unionist and writer Stan Weir recalls working with Baldwin at The Calypso restaurant during the war and the author’s later support of West Boat longshoremen in the late 1960s. During his recollections of the eighteen-year-old Baldwin, Weir makes it clear that the aspiring writer considered joining the Workers Party (which later became the Independent Socialist League). “He already knew,” Weir recalls, “that it was the product of a split with orthodox Trotskyism and Trotsky”<sup>14</sup> According to Weir, Baldwin had no complaints about how he had been treated by the Shachtmanites but would not join on account of his sexuality:

I know that your group does not expel those who join and then are “discovered” after the fact. But like you they attempt to ignore this human difference. That it is a matter which cannot be discussed means that the discussion of every subject leads always to the closed door.<sup>15</sup>

Baldwin’s tacit concerns that his homosexuality would close the door to his full participation in political life were no doubt well-founded, although, as Gary Edward Holcomb has shown in a recent study of Claude McKay, being African American, Marxist and queer was a possible—if not easy grouping of identities.<sup>16</sup>

Despite the biographical gaps in Baldwin's Leftist past, his avowed anti-Stalinism and support of Trotsky fit into the wider history of his involvement with New York Intellectual publications—particularly his associations with writers of *The New Leader*—who were known as “Trotskyites.”<sup>17</sup> My aim is not to claim that Baldwin was a committed anti-Stalinist or ardent Trotsky supporter throughout his career, which would be hard to do, given Baldwin's disavowal of organizations and ideologies. At the same time, Baldwin's reviews in the late 1940s suggest that his life on the Left was indeed of interest; his participation in New York Leftist circles at the very least invites us to read his early work in the context of the intellectual circles within which he moved. To do so is to shed light on a political aesthetic that has been either disavowed or airbrushed out of biographical portraits where Baldwin is frequently described as a political lone wolf, a position he helped to maintain. For example even as he proclaims in “Autobiographical Notes” that “all theories are suspect,” his emphasis on the individual—“one's own moral center”—itself connects him to the avant-garde Left, which as Frederick Ferguson has noted, focused “primarily on the individual and the freedoms of the individual.”<sup>18</sup>

In what follows I trace Baldwin's early reviews in key New York Intellectual publications up to and including “Everybody's Protest Novel” and “Preservation of Innocence” in 1949 before he was lured by the financial rewards of more prominent publications such as the *New Yorker*. As Lawrence Jackson rightly points out, Baldwin's reviews and articles for *New Leader*, *Commentary*, and *Partisan Review*, “proved Baldwin's education and turned him into a critical force.”<sup>19</sup> Although Baldwin was frequently cavalier about his early publications, suggesting he was a token black American—a kind of curiosity to the white liberal editors—he quickly garnered a reputation as a vital critical voice. Aside from William Gibson and Anatole Broyard, no other African American of the mid-to-late 1940s enjoyed Baldwin's level of success. Baldwin's numerous publications for the muscularly politicized anti-Stalinist magazine, *New Leader*, for example, were unusual for an African American: Claude McKay was the only black American to have published with the journal.

Far from corroborating his claim that he wrote solely on race, Baldwin's reviews in fact reveal, as Geraldine Murphy has pointed out, that his early publications engage with “the political and literary shortcomings of proletarian and Popular Front literature.”<sup>20</sup> Murphy's observation enables us to see how “Everybody's Protest Novel,” an essay associated with Baldwin's attack on protest and Richard Wright,

is also structured by a language characteristic of the Left. As I show in his earlier reviews, his critiques of types in literature and call for complexity, themes he also addresses in “Everybody’s,” are recognizable to readers of the avant-garde Left. As I also argue, his early writings in key radical publications do much to illuminate the wider connections between Leftist (largely Jewish) radical writers and African-American intellectuals in the 1940s. As James Campbell observes in *Talking at the Gates*, it was “surprising to find young Negro with no formal education beyond the age of seventeen contributing regularly to the nation’s top intellectual circles.”<sup>21</sup>

Baldwin’s introduction to the left-wing artistic scene of the early 1940s coincided with his move from Harlem to Greenwich Village around 1943–4. Born in 1924, Baldwin was too young to have been involved in the numerous cultural and political activities sponsored and promoted by the Communist Party in the 1930s—such as the Negro People’s Theatre or the John Reed Club, although as a teenager he went to League of American Writers workshops and lectures.<sup>22</sup> Through his friendship with the African-American artist Beauford Delaney, Baldwin worked at The Calypso, a small restaurant on MacDougal Street, a favored hangout for artists, musicians, actors and political radicals.<sup>23</sup> As Baldwin waited tables during the evenings he would encounter Marxist and Trotskyite intellectuals, including Claude McKay, Alain Locke and C. L. R. James. Although the move to Greenwich Village certainly accelerated Baldwin’s entrance into the Leftist cultural and political arena, he had mixed with a variety of young intellectuals (both black and white) during his years at DeWitt Clinton High School, an impressive school in the Bronx with alumni including the artist Romare Bearden, the author Richard Condon, Abel Meeropol (who wrote the poem “Strange Fruit”), and Max Shachtman, one of the leaders of the American Trotskyist movement. After leaving DeWitt Clinton Baldwin kept in touch with Brad Burch, a former school friend who launched a short-lived literary magazine in 1945 called *This Generation*—to which Baldwin contributed several articles.<sup>24</sup> According to most accounts, Baldwin met Eugene Worth in December 1943 and Worth provided the aspiring author with introductions to New York Intellectual editors including Sol Levitas, Randell Jarell, and Elliot Cohen.<sup>25</sup> For W. J. Weatherby Baldwin’s early commissions for *The Nation* and *New Leader* and were inextricably linked to his socialist connections—and in particular knowledge of his Young People’s Socialist League membership.<sup>26</sup>

\*\*\*\*\*

Baldwin's Trotskyite leanings, however short-lived, need to be seen in the wider context of shifting left-wing allegiances and post-war ideological twists and turns. By 1934 huge numbers of intellectuals in New York had severed their ties to the Communist Party; that year *Partisan Review* was launched with the editorial statement that "The defense of the Soviet Union is one of our principal tasks."<sup>27</sup> As news of the Moscow trials (where millions of workers, intellectuals and party members were imprisoned or executed) filtered to the United States between 1936 and 1938 New York intellectuals increasingly abandoned the Party, unable to reconcile its ideology with widespread accounts of injustice and cruelty.

Importantly, the New York Intellectuals' repudiation of Stalinism was not a renunciation of communism and many intellectuals strove to keep alive and revive revolutionary Marxism. *Partisan Review*, for example, which began as "the literary arm of the Communist party in the United States" closed at the end of 1936 and was re-launched in 1937 independently of the CP.<sup>28</sup> In keeping with a number of New York intellectuals of the mid-to-late 1930s, the editors of *Partisan Review*, Philip Rahv and William Phillips, vehemently opposed Stalinism but were drawn to the political and aesthetic views of the exiled Leon Trotsky, whom they contacted in the late 1930s. Although the magazine was never officially connected to the Trotskyist movement, Phillips and Rahv published a long letter by the exiled revolutionary, "Arts and Politics" and "Manifesto: Towards a Free Revolutionary Art" in 1938.

Trotsky's appeal was so widespread in metropolitan cultured circles of the mid-to-late 1930s that the group which became known as the "New York Intellectuals" were originally referred to as "the Trotskyist intellectuals" (N, 11). Baldwin's association with the Trotskyite movement, then, was far from unusual for an aspiring writer of the late 1930s and early 1940s. For many intellectuals (including the philosopher Sidney Hook and the editor of *Commentary*, Elliot Cohen), Trotsky's views on art and politics offered a viable Leftist alternative to the betrayal of Stalinist ideology. As Wald has argued in relation to Trotsky's influence on the New York Intellectuals,

It is not surprising that Trotsky, who incarnated internationalism and cosmopolitanism, the Jew who had shattered the manacles of religious identity and who strove to merge himself with the forces of the world revolution in every country and culture, should for a period become their rallying point. (N, 74)

As Wald suggests, Trotsky's non-religious Jewishness appealed to the main players of the New York Intellectuals, many of whom were Jewish but who wore their religion lightly. And yet Trotsky's appeal to the New York Intellectuals went beyond questions of Jewishness or even of politics.

For many intellectuals at the time—and in particular Phillips and Rahv—Trotsky was unique in the ways that he demonstrated impressive revolutionary credentials with a keen critical eye. Even well-respected progressive critics such as Granville Hicks and V. L. Parrington “insisted that the best authors expose the abuses of capitalism.”<sup>29</sup> Trotsky, on the other hand, who had demonstrated his flair as a literary critic in his 1923 classic *Literature and Revolution*, clearly saw the limitations of blindly eliding ideology with aesthetics.<sup>30</sup> Trotsky “had no patience with critics who claimed that a certain political ideology might automatically enhance an aesthetic work or guarantee a more profound and sensitive exploration of life through the imagination” (N, 92).

Uniquely, perhaps, for a prominent Left-wing figure, Trotsky rarely championed works of art solely because they vilified capitalism or glorified the proletariat. In fact Trotsky forcefully distanced himself from the *Proletkult* (the Organization for Proletariat Culture) who championed new writing by working-class writers. In *Literature and Revolution* Trotsky makes it clear that style is important—not just social and political content: “It is not true,” he writes, “that we regard only that art as new and revolutionary that speaks of the worker, and it is nonsense to say that we demand that the poets should describe inevitably a factory chimney, or the uprising against capital!”<sup>31</sup> In fact for Trotsky, the working class needed to build on pre-revolutionary formal and stylistic accomplishments, as they “cannot begin the construction of a new culture without absorbing and assimilating the elements of the old cultures.” Or, as he put it succinctly, “Every peasant is a peasant, but not every peasant can express himself.”<sup>32</sup>

Trotsky's sophisticated grasp of politics and literature clearly inspired a number of New York Intellectuals, most notably Phillips and Rahv at *Partisan Review* who insisted that criticism must be socially engaged but attuned to the aesthetics of the text. In this way, as I argue below, Baldwin's reviews—and in particular “Everybody's Protest Novel,” are in keeping with *Partisan Review's* (and Trotsky's) keen dislike of ideologically-driven art and criticism. As I later argue, for example, Baldwin's criticism of Harriet Beecher Stowe as a pamphleteer—rather than an artist—is clearly reminiscent of *Partisan Review's* editorial line, a view also shared by the likes of Arthur P. Davis, who would state in

the mid-1940s that “a thesis is one thing, a good novel another.”<sup>33</sup> For William Phillips, Trotsky was “the only major Marxist leader who had written authentic literary criticism” and it’s indeed hard to imagine enjoying reading Stalin on poetics (*N*, 141). Importantly, Trotsky’s views on the aesthetics and politics of literature influenced—or at least coincided with the early championing of modernist writing by *Partisan Review*—further connecting Baldwin to the New York Intellectual scene. Baldwin’s early work in particular stresses the importance of modernist writing—most notably the work of Henry James, whom Baldwin referred to as “the greatest of our novelists” as late as 1962.<sup>34</sup> Baldwin’s indebtedness to modernism at first seems to connect him back to his literary forefathers of the Harlem Renaissance; as Cyraina Johnson-Roullier has noted, “an alignment between traditional modernism and African-American literature finds an almost ready-made aesthetic bridge through the intensity of Baldwin’s interest in the Euro-American modernist Henry James.”<sup>35</sup> And yet Baldwin’s interest in modernism has little to do with the experimental writing of Jean Toomer or the angular Cubism of Aaron Douglas. Although critics such as Houston Baker and James de Jongh have demonstrated the importance of race and modernism in the Harlem Renaissance, Baldwin rarely mentions this period at all—and certainly eschews discussing Harlem Renaissance writers’ and artists’ formal contributions to modernism.<sup>36</sup>

My aim is not to castigate Baldwin for failing to recognize the stylistic innovations of Nella Larsen or Bruce Nugent. There are certainly significant reasons why Baldwin was drawn to European modernist writers rather than African-American authors and artists—not least in the way that the modernist canon has historically been dominated by straight white male writers. Baldwin was not alone in his dislike of the term “Negro Literature,” and his insistence that his own work was American. In many ways, as Jackson has pointed out, Baldwin “suggested that there was no cultural retreat for black Americans because they were without a tradition that might enable a conscious return.”<sup>37</sup> In 1941, Arthur Davis, Sterling Brown and Ulysses Lee had forcefully urged African-American authors to reject a specifically black aesthetic in the introduction to *Negro Caravan*, objecting to racially distinguished literature that was placed “in an alcove apart.”<sup>38</sup> By the time Baldwin was establishing himself as a reviewer, Wright had moved to France, and social realism was taking a critical bashing as an effective genre of politicized black American writing. For Baldwin, coming of age in the 1940s, it was unclear which literary forebears he should turn

to. Both white and black critics noted the “astonishing number of manuscripts,” on “what we call the Negro problem” (Edwin Seaver), echoed by Saunders Redding’s exaggerated claim in the mid to late 1940s that “[i]f it’s about colored people, it’ll get published.”<sup>39</sup> Such comments feed into more serious questions about the function and limitations of literature to affect social change. Writing two years later in “Everybody’s Protest Novel,” Baldwin suggested that white Americans experienced a sense of complacent virtue when they picked up a work of protest fiction, an experience that led to self-congratulation rather than direct political action. It is within this political and literary quagmire that Baldwin emerged, citing the master, not Richard Wright as his literary and political hero.

Baldwin’s emphasis on Henry James is a striking and constant feature in interviews and writings on his development as a writer.<sup>40</sup> Baldwin claimed that two of Henry James’s novels, *The Portrait of a Lady* (1881) and *The Princess Casamassima* (1886) helped him to “break out of the ghetto,” a remark that echoes his comment that writing his first novel was a “a fairly deliberate attempt to break out of what I always think of the ‘cage’ of Negro writing.”<sup>41</sup> In fact Baldwin later recalled that reading James helped him with formal difficulties that had plagued him whilst writing *Go Tell it on the Mountain* (1953). In a 1984 *Paris Review* interview Baldwin recollected how

There were things I couldn’t deal with technically at first. . . . This is where reading Henry James helped me, with his whole idea about the center of consciousness and using a single intelligence to tell the story. He gave me the idea to make the novel happen on John’s birthday.<sup>42</sup>

Baldwin’s indebtedness to James continued in recognizable ways certainly until the publication of *Another Country*, where, as Robert Corber has persuasively argued, Baldwin “adopts a Jamesian narrative strategy, relying on what James. . . . called ‘successive reflectors’ or multiple centers of intelligence, through which he filters the novel’s action.”<sup>43</sup> On the one hand, as Corber rightly points out, Baldwin’s strategy of employing Jamesian narrative techniques left him open to charges that he wanted “to deny his debt to his African American antecedents” compounded by Ellison’s 1952 dismissal of “the tight well-made Jamesian novel” which, “for all its artistic perfection,” was “too concerned with ‘good taste’ and stable areas.”<sup>44</sup>

Baldwin’s reasons for employing Jamesian narrative techniques are clearly not straightforward and Cyraina Johnson-Roullier is surely right

to suggest that Baldwin's fascination with James "opens up what might be considered a new cultural path within the framework of African American literature," particularly in the ways that Baldwin rewrote the idea of protest.<sup>45</sup> (Although it is quite possible that Baldwin was drawn to James's muted explorations of homoeroticism in addition to his narrative ingenuity).<sup>46</sup> At the same time, Baldwin's interest in James fits squarely with a 1930s and 1940s championing of the "master"—particularly in *Partisan Review*—which in turn raises important questions about the New York Intellectuals' relationship to modernism.<sup>47</sup> In contrast to Ellison's conclusion that a Jamesian narrative was unable to capture the complexity of post-war American life, critics such as F. O. Matthiessen and Philip Rahv maintained that James's work "succeeded in depicting 'the finer discriminations' of the self within the 'envelop of circumstances' in which they are contained" (*R*, 109).

Rahv, Trilling, and F. W. Dupree in particular championed James as a key modernist writer. A number of New York intellectuals—most notably Clement Greenberg in his essay "Avant-garde and Kitsch" in 1939 and then later Dwight Macdonald's writings on popular culture, such as "The Soviet Cinema, 1930–1938"—viewed mass culture with suspicion, seeing it as little more than propaganda for Stalin's Popular Front campaigns. For the editors of *Partisan Review*, as Harvey Teres has documented, the "justification of modernist literature was largely based on the kind of argument Trotsky made in the Manifesto: modernism is subversive because it exposes and invariably resists the social and psychological ills brought about by capitalism" (*R*, 85). And yet this "radical appropriation of modernism" as Teres terms it, is not clear cut, a point picked up by Trotskyite critics such as Malcolm Cowley who criticized *Partisan Review* for "retreating into a 'red ivory tower'" (*R*, 95, 79). For Rahv in particular, "Modern literature . . . essentially involves a dispute with the modern world" (*N*, 162). In other words, by refusing to publish works that could be easily understood (and sold), modernist authors withdrew from the market, placing emphasis on cultural capital rather than capitalism. Despite such claims, the New York intellectuals' championing of difficult modernist works and distrust of mass culture inevitably smacked of elitism and cultural snobbery. As Wald has argued, "it is difficult to locate a sustained and consistent theoretical statement about the origins and political significance of modernism that justifies their dogged valorization of the genre above all others" (*N*, 222). Despite *Partisan Review's* continued efforts to endorse, support and valorize modernism, their justifications "never seriously answered the question of whether modernism is an authen-

tic antibourgeois tendency or, in fact, a decadent phase in bourgeois culture" (*N*, 222).

#### I. THE AFRICAN AMERICAN AND THE JEWISH INTELLECTUAL

According to Nathan Abrahams in his cultural history of *Commentary* magazine, Baldwin was "the black equivalent of a New York Jewish intellectual," a description echoed by Teres who writes that "Baldwin was in some ways the black analogue of the New York Jew"—and yet this neat encapsulation does not explain why a young African American was publishing in magazines predominantly about Jewish topics and edited, for the most part, by Jewish intellectuals (*R*, 215).<sup>46</sup>

What's more, as a number of critics have noted, Baldwin's later career has been dogged by uncomfortable criticism of his at times ill-advised comments on black-Jewish relations. As Herb Boyd has noted in his biography of Baldwin and Harlem, the author's attacks on Jewish landlords as early as 1948 in "The Harlem Ghetto" were "the source of relentless charges that Baldwin was anti-Semitic."<sup>49</sup> In an article titled "What Do Negroes Expect of Jews?" published in the *Amsterdam News* in 1960, the (unnamed) author discusses *Fortune* magazine's critique of Baldwin's "savage comment on both Gentiles and Jews."<sup>50</sup> Later in his career, Baldwin had to defend several charges that he was anti-Semitic, not least after the publication of his provocative essay "Negroes are Anti-Semitic Because They're Anti-White" in 1967 and an article published the same year in *Freedomways*, "Anti-Semitism and Black Power." In his 1970 essay for the *New York Review of Books*, "My Sister, Angela Davis," Baldwin described Davis as a "Jewish housewife in the boxcar headed for Dachau," which precipitated an acrimonious public debate with Shlomo Katz, editor of *Midstream*.<sup>51</sup>

Boyd rightly points out that Baldwin held close friendships with Jewish writers and editors (including Emile Capouya, Sol Stein and Richard Avedon)—and Baldwin himself recalled in *The Fire Next Time* (1963) that his "best friend in high school was a Jew" (*C*, 308). Such biographical information, however, adds little to an understanding of how Baldwin's early writing fits into wider questions about black-Jewish relations, which by the early to mid-1960s had become increasingly strained. For example, fifteen years after Baldwin's first publications in *Commentary*, Norman Podhoretz was expressing his profound distrust of African-Americans in "My Negro Problem—and Ours" (1963).

Much has been written about the importance of the New York Intellectuals' Jewish identities. As Ruth R. Wisse has pointed out, up until

the 1930s, New York Jewish intellectual life was largely confined to publications in Yiddish newspapers. As she notes in an acerbic and penetrating article, “The New York intellectuals were the first ‘immigrant’ group to be fully absorbed into American literary culture, enlarging the idea of America as it encompassed them.”<sup>52</sup> Crucially, although many of the key contributors and editors of journals such as *Partisan Review*, *New Leader* and *Commentary* were Jewish, most, as Wisse documents, “did not feel compelled to renounce their Jewishness—or, what may be more to the point, to affirm it strongly.”<sup>53</sup> This point is an important one as even magazines such as *Commentary*, which was sponsored by the American Jewish Committee (AJC) gave its founding editor, Elliot Cohen, editorial independence.<sup>54</sup> Cohen would joke about how the “main difference between *Partisan Review* and *Commentary* is that we admit to being a Jewish magazine and they don’t,” and yet Cohen also refused to publish articles on Jewish culture unless they were well crafted and met his exacting editorial standards.<sup>55</sup>

Under Cohen’s editorship, *Commentary* “interpreted race hatred and prejudice very widely to include blacks as well as Jews.”<sup>56</sup> Not only did Cohen publish Baldwin’s early short stories (the only fiction published in *Commentary* at the time that did not deal with the Jewish experience), but he also steered the journal towards an engagement with civil rights issues. Cohen’s decision, then, to publish Baldwin’s essay “The Harlem Ghetto” is not surprising—although the force of the essay shocked a number of readers. Baldwin’s article turns to a discussion of sermons by Harlem preachers who rail against Jews for “having refused the light” but also points out that many African Americans identify themselves “almost wholly with the Jew” (C, 49). Baldwin’s article then moves from journalistic observation to anecdote. “Jews in Harlem are small tradesmen, rent collectors, real estate agents and pawnbrokers,” Baldwin writes. In other words “they are therefore identified with oppression and are hated for it” (C, 50). (The association of Jews and wealth particularly riled Podhoretz, who was at pains to point out the counter narrative in “My Negro Problem—and Ours”). Although Baldwin concludes by stating that “The Negro, facing a Jew, hates, at bottom, not his Jewishness but the color of his skin,” Baldwin’s article is peppered with personal asides—such as “I remember meeting no Negro in the years of my growing up, in my family or out of it, who would ever trust a Jew” (C, 53, 50).

Baldwin’s inflammatory article needs to be seen in the context of wider post-war Black-Jewish relations, what Ethan Goffman has called an “intricate archaeology of hatred and identification.”<sup>57</sup> This uneasy

relationship is illustrated by two 1942 articles, both published in *Negro Quarterly*: L. D. Reddick's essay, "Anti-Semitism Among Negroes," and Louis Harap's "Anti-Negroism Among Jews."<sup>58</sup> In a brief article for *Politics* in 1945 Harold Orlansky writes of how "Anti-Semitism among Negroes and its converse, anti-Negro feeling among Jews, are two of the sadder manifestations of the times."<sup>59</sup> Anticipating Baldwin's comment that "Jews in Harlem are small tradesmen, rent collectors, real estate agents and pawnbrokers," Orlansky, though questioning this prevailing view, writes that, "Concerning the cause of this anti-Semitism, much has been made of the Jew's contact with the Negro on an exploitative or competitive level as landlord, shopkeeper, pawnshop operator, employer, doctor, lawyer or social worker."<sup>60</sup> Writing two years before Baldwin (and again in *Commentary*) the African-American sociologist Kenneth B. Clark anticipated many of Baldwin's themes. "Antagonism toward 'the Jewish landlord' is so common," Clark notes, "as to have become almost an integral aspect of the folk culture of the northern urban Negro."<sup>61</sup> Clark's piece, published as "Candor About Negro-Jewish Relations: A Social Scientist Charts a Complex Social Problem," though it touched on many of Baldwin's themes in "The Harlem Ghetto," was presented as research, not anecdote. In contrast to Baldwin's uncorroborated claims about distrust between African Americans and Jews, Clark's article references statistics, citing, for example how

[a]n investigation of inter-group attitudes in one of the larger, more isolated communities that make up metropolitan New York, found that nearly 60 per cent of Jews held some unfavorable stereotyped reaction toward Negroes and 70 per cent of Negroes had some unfavorable stereotyped reaction towards Jews.<sup>62</sup>

Even Clark's measured article, however, loses its objective cool when countering claims that the black and Jewish struggle is one and the same. Baldwin, too, would continue to argue that Jews were disadvantaged—but at least they were white, a point that he reiterated clumsily at times.<sup>63</sup> For Baldwin, as for other African-American social commentators, race, as I explore in the following section, increasingly took precedence over class as the key problem of the American left.

.....

By the time Baldwin had published his first novel, *Go Tell it on the Mountain*, in 1953, a number of African-American writers were openly

critical of the Communist Party. Richard Wright had contributed an essay to the well-known critique of the CP, *The God That Failed*, in 1950, followed by Ellison's famously scathing description of Communist Party activity in *Invisible Man* (1952). Paul Robeson's *Freedom* faded away in 1953 and the African-American Communist Claudia Jones was deported that year, along with C. L. R. James. By the time Baldwin's first novel was published, The American Communist Party had ceased being a dynamic force in black American radical and cultural politics.

Twenty years earlier, as Christopher Phelps has shown in the re-issuing of Max Shachtman's 1933 *Communism and the Negro*, the Trotskyist Left held a number of progressive, if not at times irreproachable, views on racial oppression. Published a year before the inaugural edition of *Partisan Review* (although not widely circulated), *Communism and the New Negro* anticipates the better known writing of the Trinidadian Trotskyist intellectual C. L. R. James whose articles—particularly *The Revolutionary Answer to the Negro Problem in the United States* (1948) established him as the leading authority on “Negro issues” for the American revolutionary socialist movement, which by the late 1930s included around thirty black members.<sup>64</sup> Shachtman's views, which dovetailed and diverged from those of Trotsky and James, though far from flawless, were prescient and forward thinking at a time when most white Americans were indifferent to struggles for racial equality (*RR*, lxiii). In *Communism and the New Negro* Shachtman dismisses “[s]hoddery theories of scientific charlatans . . . established to prove the inherent racial superiority of the white man over the black man;” he makes it clear that American workers can only “make any real progress towards freedom” with “the support of the vast reservoir of strength and militancy constituted by the twelve million black people” (*RR*, 3, 4). Attuned to the ways in which class and race have interlocked in American history, Shachtman points out how the American Left also has “no distinctions of race,” whilst at the same time ensuring that his own vision for racial freedom was distinctly anti-Stalinist (*RR*, 63). Unlike the Communist Party, Shachtman and other Trotskyites refuted the notion that African Americans desired a “Black Belt,” a map of self-reliant black states put forward by Stalinist theorists including J. S. Allen.<sup>65</sup> For Shachtman, the “the caste status of the American Negro does not place him in the category of a nation,” reminding his readers of how Lenin had distinguished between the Irish (nation) and Jews (nationless) (*RR*, 72).

.....

Shachtman's views on racial oppression have been eclipsed by those of C. L. R. James—not only because the latter had Trotsky's official support—but because James was much more familiar with the cultural achievements and nuances of black literature and art. Shachtman, despite his commendable efforts at dismantling the reasons for lynching and the economic exploitation of sharecroppers, falters, like Trotsky, on the question of African-American culture. "Has the Negro population a common culture distinct from that of the rest of the country?" Shachtman asks (*RR*, 72, 72–3). "Only by the most impossible stretch of the imagination," is Shachtman's response, adding that "[g]enerally speaking, the culture of the Negro is the culture of the section of the country where he resides" (*RR*, 73). By 1946, Claudia Jones, the most senior African-American woman in the CP was insisting that black American culture "is part of the general stream of American culture," but arguing that it nonetheless "is a distinct current in that stream; it arose out of the special historical development and unique status of the Negro people."<sup>66</sup> In the early 1930s, however, Shachtman's well-intentioned but uninformed views suggested the gaps in Left-wing politics for a channeling of political thought, culture and a championing of civil rights—something that *Partisan Review*, founded a year after Shachtman's publication, promised to deliver.

In 1934 the editorial statement of *Partisan Review* signaled its intent to "participate in the struggle of the workers and sincere intellectuals against imperialist war, fascism, national and racial oppression," and yet despite the pledge to participate in the struggle against racism, no article on race appeared in the journal until 1940, and the new editorial statement in 1937 omitted the reference to domestic racial oppression. Aside from a few brief book reviews of works by African-American authors (including Langston Hughes and Richard Wright), *Partisan Review's* contributions to the struggles of racial oppression were few and far between.

After fifteen or so years, *Partisan Review* began to publish essays by African-American writers including pieces by Ellison that I discuss below and LeRoi Jones's (Amiri Baraka) first essay, "The Beat Generation," in 1958. The 1930s and 1940s, however, was a period of ghostly silence for black American left wing radicals who wished to publish with Rahv and Phillips: not even C. L. R. James, who had spent time with Trotsky, graced the pages of *Partisan Review*. Aside from Anatole Broyard's 1948 essay, "A Portrait of the Hipster," the first essay of note by an African American in *Partisan Review* was Baldwin's "Everybody's

Protest Novel.”<sup>67</sup> This is less remarkable when one considers that Broyard was ambiguous about his racial identity and Baldwin’s essay had already been published in France. In William Phillip’s history of the magazine, “there are no entries in the index under civil rights, Montgomery, Martin Luther King, black power, or race. Wright, Ellison and Baldwin are the only African-American writers listed” (R, 213).

*Partisan Review* was by no means the only New York Intellectual magazine that was slow to publish works by and about black American life. Teres rightly concludes that “in the end the New York Intellectuals remained relative strangers to African American life” (R, 210). He adds that “their own success as intellectuals encouraged them to superimpose an ethnic, assimilationist model on an American dilemma fraught with racial and class (not to mention gendered) contradictions” (R, 205). Baldwin is a case in point: although several of his early reviews were on books by or about African-American themes, it wasn’t until his 1948 article “The Harlem Ghetto” for *Commentary* that the writer explored the conditions of racial oppression. Despite occasional articles on race in the 1940s (notably early articles on the desegregation of the armed forces in the short-lived *Politics*) few New York Intellectual magazines discussed race until the late 1950s and early 1960s when a cluster of high-profile books and articles appeared—including Nathan Glazer’s *Beyond the Melting Pot* (1959) and his article “Negroes and Jews: The New Challenge to Pluralism,” in the December 1964 edition of *Commentary*. As Alexander Bloom notes, as “the civil rights movement turned to more specific questions of black identity and Afro-American heritage, the position of both Baldwin and Ellison in the otherwise white literary world of the New York intellectuals grew problematic.”<sup>68</sup> For Ellison in particular, although *Partisan Review* published the prologue of *Invisible Man* in 1952—and then later his seminal essay “Change the Joke and Slip the Yoke” in 1958—the writer is probably best remembered in this milieu for his ongoing spats with Irving Howe as much as for being “welcomed” into New York Intellectual life. Howe’s slight of Ellison in “Black Boys and Native Sons” (published in *Dissent* 1963) precipitated the latter’s seminal essay “The World and the Jug” in *New Leader*. Although Ellison would later accuse *Commentary* of being “apologists for segregation” in 1967, his duel with Howe bolstered Ellison’s role as an intellectual in his own right.<sup>69</sup> As Arnold Rampersad notes, “[p]robably for the first time in modern American history, a black intellectual had fought a public duel against a white intellectual and won.”<sup>70</sup> Baldwin’s own split with the New York Intellectuals, though less dramatic, is illustrated by the publication of

*The Fire Next Time* (1963), which Podhoretz had originally commissioned for *Commentary*. When Podhoretz berated Baldwin for selling his piece to *The New Yorker*, Baldwin told the *Commentary* editor that he should write his own article about race—which became the infamous “My Negro Problem—and Ours.”

Baldwin’s own contributions to a discussion of race in New York Intellectual publications were not as many as he claimed, though there was something of a renaissance of black American writing in 1947. Chester Himes, Richard Wright and Gwendolyn Brooks were widely discussed and Sinclair Lewis’s *Kingsblood Royal* won support from *Ebony* and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. For Helen Parker, writing in 1947, “The issue of racial discrimination should logically have been atomized by now, what with the sheer weight of literary tracts against it.”<sup>71</sup> Baldwin’s own reviews were on Catholic philosophy (*The Person and the Common Good*), Brooklyn Jewish gangs (*The Amboy Dukes*), Russian literature and two works about Robert Louis Stevenson. Baldwin’s first review of an African-American book was for *The Nation*, where he picked apart *There Was Once a Slave: The Heroic Story of Frederick Douglass* by Shirley Graham, the future wife of W. E. B. Du Bois. Graham won the Julian Messner Award “for having written the best book combating intolerance in America,” but Baldwin has little to say about the merits of this prize-winning work.<sup>72</sup> Anticipating his criticism in “Everybody’s Protest Novel” of Uncle Tom who “has been robbed of his humanity,” Baldwin argues that Graham “has robbed him [Douglass] of dignity and humanity by glossing over any of the abolitionist’s imperfections.”<sup>73</sup> Douglass, Baldwin asserts, was “frequently misguided, sometimes pompous, gifted and no saint at all.” Graham’s portrait of Douglass, like Stowe’s characterization of Uncle Tom, Baldwin argues, is little more than the flip-side of the “tradition that Negroes are never to be characterized as anything than amoral, laughing clowns.”<sup>74</sup>

If Baldwin’s first review on African-American culture reads as a warm-up for his critique of Stowe and Richard Wright in “Everybody’s Protest Novel,” then his second, “History as Nightmare,” a damning review of Chester Himes’s 1947 novel *Lonely Crusade*, could only have strained social relations with another future compatriot in Paris. Far from offering any solidarity to another black American writer, Baldwin launches into a languid yet barbed assault on the older writer who uses “what is probably the most uninteresting and awkward prose I have read in recent years.”<sup>75</sup> In a passage that reads like a poor school report, Baldwin awards Himes “an A for ambition—and a rather awe-stricken

gasp for effort,” adding that “Himes seems capable of some of the worst writing this side of the Atlantic” (“H,” 11). Baldwin’s review of Himes’s novel becomes another sketch-pad for his more finely-tuned assault on Wright and Stowe in “Everybody’s Protest Novel,” concluding in his earlier essay that “Uncle Tom is no longer to be trusted . . . [and] Bigger Thomas is becoming irrelevant” (“H,” 15). In “History as Nightmare” in particular, Baldwin shifts gear from harsh reviewer to sharp-eyed essayist. Despite the contemporary plethora of novels about racial oppression, Baldwin asserts that “not one has exhibited any genuine understanding of its historical genesis or contemporary necessity or its psychological toll” (“H,” 11).

Central to Baldwin’s dismissal of contemporary African-American fiction is his criticism that writers continue to draw on types. Like Sterling Brown, whose 1933 essay, “The Negro Character as Seen by White Authors,” took umbrage with what he saw as seven recurring stereotypes of black Americans, Baldwin vociferously resisted stock African-American characters.<sup>76</sup> As he argues in “History as Nightmare” times have changed and authors “no longer [have] the convenient symbol of the minstrel man . . . or the Negro rapist, or the brave, black college student” (“H,” 11). Such depictions are outmoded, Baldwin states, because “human beings are too complex” (“H,” 11), a theme that he would return to in “Everybody’s Protest Novel,” where he warned of the dangers that arise from “overlooking, denying, evading . . . complexity” (C, 13). Anticipating Ernest Kaiser, who complained that left-wing black intellectuals such as Du Bois and Lloyd Brown seemed unable “to deal with Negro psychology,” Baldwin is deeply critical of literature that deals with types.<sup>77</sup> As Frederick Ferguson has argued, Baldwin’s insistence on complexity and resistance to the sociologically-influenced genre of protest fiction once again aligns him with the avant-garde. Like other writers of the avant-garde, Baldwin distanced himself from “what were believed to be hackneyed representations in the literature that Popular Front writers produced,” aiming rather for “a representational complexity that strained toward the unique and unpredictable.”<sup>78</sup>

Baldwin does not publish another review on African-American literature until his April 1948 *Commentary* review of five books under the heading “The Image of the Negro.” Baldwin’s truculent review begins by announcing “the really stupendous inadequacy of the five novels under consideration” and barely lets up its tirade pausing, not for breath, but to wonder “What, in these days, is a novel?”—possibly a reference to John S. Lash’s 1947 article, “What is Negro Literature?”<sup>79</sup>

Baldwin's review, which by now has the hallmarks of his later essays, again pounces on the protest novel, a genre that was inevitable on account of "the initial debasement of literary standards."<sup>80</sup> In "The Image of the Negro" several important features surface that anticipate Baldwin's more well-known views in "Everybody's Protest Novel," but also align him with the post-war New York intellectual landscape.

In "The Image of the Negro" Baldwin objects to the protest novel by comparing it to "a kind of writing becoming nearly as formalized as those delicate vignettes written for the women's magazines."<sup>81</sup> Baldwin's comment would no doubt have riled John Killens and Richard Wright, two well-known writers of protest fiction associated with tough masculine characters and chiseled prose. Baldwin could have compared protest fiction to any number of formulaic cultural products and his choice suggests that he wanted to take a swipe at what he perceived as the hyper masculinity of the genre. In "Everybody's Protest Novel" Baldwin would compare the sentimentality of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* to *Native Son*, suggesting that if you peek beneath Wright's tough exterior you can find a little lady from New England. And yet his comment in "The Image of the Negro" is more than a cheeky parting shot: Baldwin dismisses protest fiction, not only as literary froth, but also as an example of mass culture.<sup>82</sup> When Baldwin asks "whether its [protest fictions'] power as a corrective social force is sufficient to override its deficiencies as literature" his comments open up key contemporary Leftist questions about realism and debates about literary merit versus social worth. "How closely do these novels reflect the social questions," Baldwin asks, "since—admittedly, they are not, by and large, good novels—are their sole reason for being?"<sup>83</sup> "With what reality are they concerned, how is it probed," Baldwin continues, "what message is being brought to this amorphous public mind?"

Baldwin's central questions dovetail with key arguments that circulated in the 1940s (and beyond) regarding social realism and the relationship between politics and art. In an early essay, "The Literary Class War" (1932), Rahv distinguished between proletarian literature and what he termed "social or protest fiction," a genre that he saw as "bourgeois," "based on the premises of idealism" (R, 25). Both Phillips and Rahv, like Baldwin, were skeptical about social realism, which by end of the 1940s was in critical decline. Toward the end of "Image of the Negro," Baldwin writes of how "nothing is illuminated. The worthlessness of these novels consists precisely in that they supposedly expose a reality that in actuality they conspire to mask."<sup>84</sup> In contrast to Marxist critics who applauded realism for its ability to depict the

social inequality of contemporary life, Phillips and Rahv spoke rather of realism in terms of “a deflection with crooked mirrors” (*R*, 50). As I outlined earlier, for Trotsky as well Phillips, Rahv, and Baldwin, works of literature were not to be judged on their political conviction alone. As Baldwin would write in “Everybody’s Protest Novel,” “literature and sociology are not one and the same” (*C*, 15). Baldwin’s emphasis on complexity—psychological, historical, narrative and theological—echoes Phillips and Rahv in their refusal to value literature solely on the basis of its ostensible social commitments. At the same time, Baldwin’s work did not go as far as Rahv’s championing of modernist culture. Whereas Rahv argued that “art does not derive its value from its relation to society but that it has value ‘in itself’” (*N*, 219), for Baldwin, there was simply too much at stake.

Baldwin’s last review of this period to discuss race is an essay on seven books, published as “Too Late, Too Late,” for *Commentary* in 1949 (*The Negro Newspaper*; *Jim Crow America*; *The High Cost of Prejudice*; *The Protestant Church and the Negro*; *Color and Conscience*; *From Slavery to America*; and *The Negro in America*). Again, Baldwin has little positive to say about any of these works. Vishnu Oak’s *The Negro Newspaper* is, Baldwin contends, a “hysterical little pamphlet,” a theme he would again develop in his criticism of Stowe’s pamphleteering.<sup>55</sup> Earl Conrad’s argument in *Jim Crow America*—that the racial problems can be reduced to a question of economics and labor—is not discounted by Baldwin, but again, he pulls up Conrad for not considering the psychological damage on whites and blacks. In what is becoming a familiar refrain, Baldwin writes that Conrad “ignores the complexity and confusion.”<sup>56</sup> Hodding Carter’s *Flood Crest*, Baldwin writes, “is yet another addition to the overburdened files of progressive fiction concerning the unhappy South;” James M. Cain “writes fantasies and fantasies of the most unendurably mawkish and sentimental sort.”<sup>57</sup> Baldwin’s conclusion is that these books “record the facts but they cannot probe the immense, ambiguous, uncontrollable effect,” a task that he would set himself with his fiction and non-fiction.<sup>58</sup>

Baldwin’s reviews prior to the publication of his first short story (“The Death of the Prophet” in *Commentary*, 1950) read, on the one hand, as a warm-up to his more incisive and distilled insights published in “Everybody’s Protest Novel.” At the same time, his pronounced critique of social realism, sentimentality, types and the Popular Front firmly anchor Baldwin in the New York Intellectual milieu. In Baldwin’s reviews of the later 1940s, as Geraldine Murphy astutely points out, “the debt to anti-Stalinist liberal discourse is obvious in his disdain for

left-wing faith in a committed art, for abstractions like ‘the common man,’ and ‘the people,’ for sentimentalism and mass culture as well as his corresponding respect for individuality and psychological complexity, for social contradictions over false unity.”<sup>89</sup> Baldwin’s views on the Popular Front and ideology are best illustrated by two reviews of the Russian writer Maxim Gorki. In “Maxim Gorki as Artist,” Baldwin’s first published piece—a review of the Russian writer’s *Best Short Stories* published in the *Nation*—Baldwin observes that he is “almost painfully verbose and frequently threatens to degenerate into simple propaganda.”<sup>90</sup> Gorki’s range is not only “narrow” and “sentimental,” his writing “remains a report.” Baldwin claims that Gorki does not develop characters with psychological awareness, but “a *type* with his human attributes sensitively felt and well reported but never realized.” Gorki’s writing—which purports to show the reality of oppression—in fact, Baldwin concludes, is little more than “the key to even more dismal failure of present-day realistic novels.”<sup>91</sup>

Baldwin’s dismissal of Gorki (and in particular his social realism) showed no signs of abating in a second review of the Russian author. In a review of Gorki’s *The Mother* (published in *The New Leader*, 1947) considered by many to be a classic work of social realist literature, Baldwin deflates the importance of this acclaimed novel. Baldwin notes that “With some ideological concessions and the proper make up *Mother* would make an impressive vehicle, for . . . Bette Davis,” adding that “It is rich in struggle, tears, courage and good old-fashioned mother love.”<sup>92</sup> Leaving aside Baldwin’s admiration for Bette Davis, it is clear that his review sought to reduce *Mother* to a footnote in popular or mass culture, a mode of production heavily criticized by Dwight MacDonal, Clement Greenberg and other anti-Stalinist intellectuals. (Baldwin opens his review by claiming that “in a word, this is Gorki’s best-seller”—which might have surprised readers who bought *Mother* hoping for an easy read).<sup>93</sup>

Baldwin levels his strongest criticism at Gorki’s barely disguised ideologically driven aims:

He [Gorki] was the foremost exponent of the maxim that “art is the weapon of the working class.” He is also, probably, the major example of the invalidity of such a doctrine. (It is rather like saying that art is the weapon of the American house-wife). . . . Art, to be sure, has its roots in the lives of human beings . . . I doubt that it is limited to our comrades; since we have discovered that art does not belong to what was once the aristocracy it does not therefore follow that it has become the exclusive property of the common man. . . . Rather—it belongs to all of us.<sup>94</sup>

For Baldwin, Gorki's work characterizes the subordination of art to politics, a feature that riled many of the anti-Stalinist left—and in particular Phillips and Rahv. While Baldwin does not discuss race directly, his comment that art does not “become the exclusive property of the common man,” suggests how race, rather than class would dominate the American literary and political scene in the following decades—and it is no coincidence that his most significant early essay would be a piece written about race whilst in another country.

.....

Baldwin's expatriation to Paris in 1948 had a discernible impact on his writing and political outlook. No longer reviewing for magazines associated with the New York Intellectuals, his move to Paris was a departure from his homeland and his connections with the New York political milieu. In Paris Baldwin carved out a name for himself as a promising essayist, not just a reviewer for the *Nation* and *New Leader*, beginning with his first major essay, “Everybody's Protest Novel.” In his essays about the French capital—“Encounter on the Seine,” (1950), “Equal in Paris” (1955) and “Princes and Powers” (1957)—Baldwin reflects on the thin line between exile and isolation. In “Equal in Paris” he recalled that he “floated, so to speak, on a sea of acquaintances,” adding that he “knew almost no one” (C, 103). His essays about Paris are punctuated with references to social and political isolation. In contrast to Richard Wright, who was on the editorial board of *Présence Africaine* and actively involved in Sartre's Rassemblement Démocratique Révolutionnaire, Baldwin kept his distance from established intellectual or artistic communities, illustrated by his skepticism of the 1956 Congress of Black Writers and Artists.<sup>95</sup>

Baldwin's political and artistic trajectory seems unclear, but I want to suggest that “Everybody's Protest Novel” illustrates the way that his political aesthetic developed, that his work became less concerned with the arguments circling in Leftist New York circles—and more attuned to issues of racial identity. Although “Everybody's Protest Novel” has gained notoriety for the ways in which Baldwin distanced himself from Wright and protest fiction, it is also a pivotal essay that marks Baldwin's shift in his political and aesthetic direction.

When Baldwin moved to Paris he was welcomed into the American expatriate community by the writers and publishers Albert Benveniste and George Solomos (known then as Themistocles Hoetis). Towards the end of 1949, Solomos and Benveniste asked Baldwin to contribute a piece to their newly formed avant-garde magazine, *Zero*. In a recent

interview Solomos recalls that he asked Baldwin to submit an essay several days before the magazine was ready to go to the printers, and the result was “Everybody’s Protest Novel.”<sup>96</sup> This famous essay was first published in the inaugural issue of *Zero*, and not, as often attributed, in *Partisan Review*.<sup>97</sup> In *Zero*, Baldwin’s essay appeared alongside impressive British and American contributions, including poetry by John Goodwin, William Carlos Williams, and Kenneth Patchen, and a short story by Christopher Isherwood. Midway through the magazine, Richard Wright’s story “The Man Who Killed a Shadow,” sits before Baldwin’s “Everybody’s Protest Novel.” Solomos is adamant that Baldwin was unaware that Wright was contributing to *Zero* and yet the title of the older writer’s story seems uncomfortably prophetic.

According to the editorial statement, *Zero* “acts as a raw and basic channel for creative assumptions, affiliating itself to all and to no techniques: conscious and unconscious, erudite and untutored, therapeutic and unpragmatic, right, left.” If the editorial veered towards the abstract, claiming allegiance only with creativity, the contributions suggested a leftist political aesthetic. Running for seven issues and published in Paris, Tangier, Mexico and Philadelphia, *Zero* published poetry, art, fiction and essays by a diverse range of international writers, including Gore Vidal, Max Ernst, and Paul Bowles. *Zero*, the editorial statement continued, “will apply itself to the introduction and continuation of American writings and art coming most especially from Europe and secondly from America in order to form a double channel of presentation.” The “double channel of presentation” was no doubt a reference to the cultural ebb and flow between Europe and North America and yet it unwittingly picks up on the way art was used by the U.S. State Department to win over “the hearts and minds” of Europe during the cultural Cold War, where, in Arthur Koestler’s words, post-war Paris “was the world capital of fellow travelers.”<sup>98</sup> Baldwin’s early essays were published in magazines that were ideologically opposed to Stalinism. Avant-garde journals such as *Partisan Review* and *New Leader* sought to efface the legacy of the Popular Front, the Communist International’s attempt to recruit liberal intellectuals to the Communist Party. If the Popular Front sought to revolutionize society through propaganda, the goal of avant-garde magazines such as *Partisan Review* was to revolutionize literature. In the case of “Everybody’s Protest Novel,” Baldwin’s views on truth, complexity and the individual fit squarely with the views of the anti-Stalinist left. “Everybody’s Protest Novel” was republished by *Partisan Review* and then by *Perspectives USA*, an anti-Stalinist magazine started in the

1950s “to woo European intellectuals to the side of freedom.”<sup>99</sup>

“Everybody’s Protest Novel” and “Preservation of Innocence” were published in the first and second issues of *Zero*. Baldwin’s first essay is concerned with race without mentioning homosexuality, in contrast to “Preservation” a bold essay that discusses homosexuality but does not allude to blackness. “Everybody’s Protest Novel” and “Preservation,” share more similarities than their respective themes of protest fiction and homosexual literature. Though neither essay refers directly to the Popular Front, the language in “Everybody’s Protest Novel” and “Preservation” is shot through with the rhetoric of the anti-Stalinist left. Baldwin demands representational complexity in both pieces, whether in protest literature or fictional depictions of sexuality. One of Baldwin’s central objections to *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* (1852) is that it is formulaic: a self-consciously populist novel that Baldwin compares to Cain’s *The Postman Always Rings Twice* (1946). For Baldwin, Cain’s work is the apotheosis of formula-driven mass cultural artifacts, a concept that he picks up on in “Preservation.” Baldwin pillories Cain, like Stowe, because such writers “are wholly unable to recreate or interpret any of the reality or complexity of the human experience” (C, 600). The result, Baldwin concludes in “Everybody’s Protest Novel”, “has now become to reduce all Americans to the compulsive bloodless dimensions of a guy named Joe”. Here Baldwin makes a thinly veiled attack on what he sees as the limitations of Popular Front cultural forms that ignore the complexity of the individual (C, 16).

“Everybody’s Protest Novel,” though an accomplished and incisive essay, is not without its shortcomings. Baldwin never really explains how Stowe’s novel is both a pamphlet and “activated by what might be called a theological terror,” nor does he explain how this “very bad novel” became such a best seller (C, 11, 14). And yet one of the strengths of “Everybody’s Protest Novel”—and surely one of the reasons that it quickly gained a transatlantic readership—is Baldwin’s ability to harness contemporary discussions of the Left with issues of race. In his essay Baldwin combines discussions of protest fiction with wider Cold War concerns, namely the individual, mass culture and ideology. Towards the end of the essay, Baldwin illustrates his understanding of the inter-connections between race and class and the ways in which oppressor and oppressed are imprisoned together. “Within this cage,” Baldwin writes,

it is romantic, more meaningless, to speak of a “new” society as the desire of the oppressed, for that shivering dependence on the props

of reality which he shares with the *Herrenvolk* makes a truly “new” society impossible to conceive. What is meant by a new society is one in which inequalities will disappear, in which vengeance will be exacted; either there will be no oppressed at all, or the oppressed and the oppressor will change places. (C, 17).

Baldwin dismisses what he sees as the vagaries and romanticism of a “new society” in what reads as an oblique critique of Stalinism. At the same time, his language, though charged with vocabulary associated with class, quietly shifts to a discussion of wider, circum-Atlantic power struggles as Baldwin mentions “the African, exile, pagan” who is taken from the auction block to the church. Baldwin was of course not the only writer to harness discussions of race and social oppression. In *The Revolutionary Answer to the Negro Problem in the USA* (1948), C. L. R. James rejected the Stalinist line that black Americans should subordinate racial issues for the sake of class issues. Baldwin’s own writing after “Everybody’s Protest Novel” would arguably subordinate discussions of class, focusing on racial oppression. As his references to Africa in his 1948 essay suggest, Baldwin was nonetheless attuned to the transnational structures of slavery, colonialism and imperialism, which he would return to in *No Name in the Street* in 1972.

While Baldwin continued to publish for *Commentary* and *Partisan Review* in the mid-to-late 1950s, he had started to distance himself from his New York Intellectual roots, publishing his last piece for Rahv and Phillips in 1960, a section from his forthcoming novel, *Another Country*. As an emerging transatlantic writer, Baldwin had moved away geographically but also politically. Focusing more on race than anti-Stalinism, Baldwin’s work also remained committed to a critique of Hoover and McCarthyism. In contrast to New York Intellectuals, who moved from the left to right of conservative, Baldwin continued to tread a disreputable path in the eyes of the establishment. Unlike the former radical Sydney Hook who became an important player in the American Committee for Cultural Freedom or the large number of New York Intellectuals who failed to unite against McCarthy, Baldwin would continue to voice his dissent.<sup>100</sup> In 1963, for example, Baldwin contributed to the satirical collection, *A Quarter-Century of Un-Americana: a Tragi-comical Memorabilia of HUAC* [House Un-American Activities Committee]. Unlike many former Left-wing intellectuals, Baldwin spoke unequivocally of the HUAC as “one of the most sinister facts of the national life” and he would later dismiss McCarthy as “a coward and a bully” in *No Name in the Street* (P, 466).<sup>101</sup> If by the late 1960s Baldwin felt that younger African-American

radicals considered him to be “of too much use to the Establishment to be trusted by blacks,” then it’s important to remember how his early reviews and essays were forged in the crucible of the Left long before Cleaver and other Black Panthers were selling Mao’s little red book to raise funds on university campuses.<sup>102</sup> Bill Lyne may be right when he claims that “The first obstacle that any claim for a radical Baldwin must confront is Baldwin himself.”<sup>103</sup> Baldwin’s early contributions to the harnessing of race with left-wing politics deserve to re-examined, despite—and indeed because of—the author’s unwillingness to embrace his early radical associations.

*Staffordshire University, UK*

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> *Conversations with James Baldwin*, ed. Fred L. Standley and Louis H. Pratt (Jackson: Univ. of Mississippi Press, 1989), 154.

<sup>2</sup> James Baldwin, “Introduction: The Price of the Ticket,” *The Price of the Ticket: Collected Nonfiction, 1948–1985* (New York: St. Martin’s Marek, 1985), ix. Hereafter abbreviated *P* and cited parenthetically by page number.

<sup>3</sup> Baldwin published a total of twenty pieces up until 1949 including short stories. I have not included “Everybody’s Protest Novel,” “Preservation of Innocence” and “Journey to Atlanta” as book reviews. The book reviews that I discuss will be published in the volume, *The Cross of Redemption: Uncollected Writings*, ed. Randall Kenan (New York: Pantheon Books, 2010).

<sup>4</sup> James Campbell, *Talking at the Gates: A Life of James Baldwin* (London: Faber and Faber, 1991), 4. Baldwin rarely talked about the Harlem Renaissance or the Communist Party activity in Harlem during the 1930s, such as rallies for the Scottboro Boys held in Harlem. See Herb Boyd, *Baldwin’s Harlem: A Biography of James Baldwin* (New York: Atria Books, 2008), 11.

<sup>5</sup> Alan M. Wald, *The New York Intellectuals: The Rise and Decline of the Anti-Stalinist Left from the 1930s to the 1980s* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1987), 14. Hereafter abbreviated *N* and cited parenthetically by page number. See Lawrence P. Jackson, *The Indignant Generation: A Narrative History of African American Writers and Critics, 1934–1960* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 2010), who notes how Ellison “censored his public career to omit the years between 1937 and 1947—the indignant leftist years—and to maintain this lacuna required an achieving acrobatics of rhetoric that looked like something else” (361).

<sup>6</sup> Jackson, 361.

<sup>7</sup> See Bill Lyne, “God’s Black Revolutionary Mouth: James Baldwin’s Black Radicalism,” *Science and Society* 74 (2010): 12–36. Lyne seeks to recoup the radicalism of Baldwin’s work through an insightful reading of *No Name in the Street* but he does not focus on his early associations with the Left. See also Roderick A. Ferguson, “The Parvenu Baldwin and the Other Side of Redemption: Modernity, Race, Sexuality, and the Cold War,” *James Baldwin Now*, ed. Dwight A. McBride (New York: New York Univ. Press, 1999), 233–261. Ferguson performs astute readings of “Everybody’s Protest Novel” and “Preservation of Innocence” in relation to Baldwin and the avant-garde.

<sup>8</sup> David Estes, "An Interview with James Baldwin," in *Conversations with James Baldwin*, 276. Baldwin's comment does, however, chime with Edwin Seaver's comments in 1944, who claimed that "An astonishing number of manuscripts" addressed racial injustice, "what we call the 'Negro Problem'" (quoted in Jackson, 178).

<sup>9</sup> Baldwin, "Autobiographical Notes," *Collected Essays*, ed. Toni Morrison (New York: The Library of America, 1998), 5. Hereafter abbreviated C and cited parenthetically by page number.

<sup>10</sup> Mary McCarthy, "Baldwin," *James Baldwin: The Legacy*, ed. Quincey Troupe (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1989), 48. See Jackson, 265, for a brief but convincing analysis of McCarthy's "patronizing snobbery." Jackson makes the point that "Her suggestion that Baldwin had some expert facility that enabled him to evaluate art without a flawed racial consciousness is . . . disingenuous."

<sup>11</sup> Baldwin also discusses Worth in his 1960 essay "The New Lost Generation," originally published in *Esquire* (July 1961) and reprinted in *The Price of the Ticket*, 305–313. Worth appears on the 1930 Federal Census (NY City, Brooklyn Burrough) as an eight-year-old but thereafter is something of a mystery. There are no records of his death in the Social Security Death Index and the Commissioner's Office, City of NY confirmed that his name does not appear in records of deaths reported between 1946–7 and there is no record of his death in the records of the Office of Chief Medical Examiner.

<sup>12</sup> See for example, Richard Parish, "How Jim Crow is Building a Tension That Will Explode in Race Riots," *Challenge* 1 (1943): 2, 6. See also, Robin Myers, "Socialists Expose Sham Old Party Race Pranks," *Challenge* 2 (1944): 1, 8.

<sup>13</sup> For a useful selection of *Challenge!*, the periodical of the Young People's Socialist League, see *Challenge! YPSL*, 4 vol. (1943–1946), introduction by Milton Cantor (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1970). This a useful resource for scholars wishing to see the kinds of articles that Baldwin would have been reading and contains a useful overview of the periodical and YPSL.

<sup>14</sup> Stan Weir, "Meetings with James Baldwin," *Against the Current* 18 (1989): 36.

<sup>15</sup> Weir, 36.

<sup>16</sup> See Gary Edward Holcomb, *Codename Sasha: Queer Black Marxism and the Harlem Renaissance* (Gainesville: Univ. Press of Florida, 2007).

<sup>17</sup> I am indebted to Alan Wald for pointing out the ambiguity of Baldwin's claims and clarifying that Baldwin could have been a member of one of two Trotsky groups.

<sup>18</sup> Ferguson, 243.

<sup>19</sup> Jackson, 260.

<sup>20</sup> Geraldine Murphy, "Subversive Anti-Stalinism: Race and Sexuality in the Early Essays of James Baldwin," *ELH* 63 (1996): 1024.

<sup>21</sup> Campbell, 40.

<sup>22</sup> See Jackson, 261.

<sup>23</sup> See David Leeming, *James Baldwin: A Biography* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1994), 44.

<sup>24</sup> See Leeming, 7.

<sup>25</sup> See Leeming, 50.

<sup>26</sup> See W. J. Weatherby, *James Baldwin: Artist on Fire* (London: Penguin, 1990), 52.

<sup>27</sup> Neil Jumonville, ed., "Partisan Review Editorial Statement" (1934), *The New York Intellectuals Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2007), 56.

<sup>28</sup> Jumonville, 55.

<sup>29</sup> Harvey Teres, *Renewing the Left: Politics, Imagination and the New York Intellectuals* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1996), 46. Hereafter abbreviated *R* and cited parenthetically by page number.

<sup>30</sup> The first English edition was published in 1925.

<sup>31</sup> Leon Trotsky, *Literature and Revolution*, ed. William Keach., trans. Rose Strunsky (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2005), 144.

<sup>32</sup> Trotsky, 185, 64.

<sup>33</sup> Jackson, 233.

<sup>34</sup> Baldwin, "As Much Truth As One Can Bear," *The New York Times Book Review* (14 January 1962): 1.

<sup>35</sup> Cyraina Johnson-Roullier, "(An) Other Modernism: James Baldwin, *Giovanni's Room*, and the Rhetoric of Flight," *Modern Fiction Studies* 45 (1999): 933.

<sup>36</sup> See Houston A. Baker Jr., *Modernism and the Harlem Renaissance* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1987); James de Jongh, *Vicious Modernism: Black Harlem and the Literary Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1990).

<sup>37</sup> Jackson, 268.

<sup>38</sup> Sterling A. Brown, Arthur P. Davis, and Ulysses Lee, ed. *The Negro Caravan: Writings By American Negroes*, introduced by Julius Lester (1941) (New York: Arno Press and the *New York Times*, 1970), 7.

<sup>39</sup> Jackson, 178, 217.

<sup>40</sup> See Jackson, who documents Julian Mayfield's interest in Henry James in the early 1950s, 459.

<sup>41</sup> Horace Porter, *Stealing the Fire: The Art and Protest of James Baldwin* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan Univ. Press, 1989), 126; T. E. Cassidy, "The Long Struggle," *Commonweal* 58 (22 May 1953): 186.

<sup>42</sup> Porter, 126.

<sup>43</sup> Robert J. Corber, *Homosexuality in Cold War America: Resistance and the Crisis of Masculinity* (Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 1997), 161.

<sup>44</sup> Corber, 161.

<sup>45</sup> Johnson-Roullier, 934.

<sup>46</sup> For nuanced and convincing readings of Henry James and homosexuality, see Hugh Stevens, *Henry James and Sexuality* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1998).

<sup>47</sup> See Teres, especially 106–108, for a discussion of the revival of Henry James's reputation.

<sup>48</sup> Nathan Abrams, foreword by Edward N. Luttwak, *Commentary Magazine, 1945–59* (London: Valentine Mitchell, 2007), 63.

<sup>49</sup> Boyd, 104.

<sup>50</sup> "What Do Negroes Expect of Jews," *Amsterdam News* (27 February 1960): 4.

<sup>51</sup> For a brief but useful account of the Baldwin-Katz debate, see Eric J. Sundquist, *Strangers in the Land: Blacks, Jews, Post-Holocaust America* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 2005), 402–3.

<sup>52</sup> Ruth R. Wisse, "The New York (Jewish) Intellectuals," *Commentary* 84 (1987): 29.

<sup>53</sup> Wisse, 34.

<sup>54</sup> Abrams, 47.

<sup>55</sup> Abrams, 73, 75.

<sup>56</sup> Abrams, 61.

<sup>57</sup> Cited by Sundquist, 2. While there are many books on the relationship between black Americans and Jews in the U.S.—including Natt Hentoff, ed., *Black Anti-Semitism and Jewish Racism* (New York: Richard W. Baron, 1969); Murry Friedman,

*What Went Wrong?* *The Creation and Collapse of the Black-Jewish Alliance* (New York: Free Press, 1995); and Maurianne Adams and John Bracey, ed., *Strangers and Neighbors: Relations Between Blacks and Jews in the United States* (Amherst: Univ. of Massachusetts Press, 2000)—Sundquist's book has emerged as the definitive book.

<sup>58</sup> See Sundquist, 17.

<sup>59</sup> Harold Orlansky, "A Note on Anti-Semitism Among Negroes," *Politics* 2 (1945): 250.

<sup>60</sup> Orlansky, 251.

<sup>61</sup> Kenneth B. Clark, "Candor About Negro-Jewish Relations: A Social Scientist Charts a Complex Social Problem," *Commentary* 1 (1946): 8.

<sup>62</sup> Clark, 10.

<sup>63</sup> Baldwin's argument that American Jews were less disadvantaged because of their ability to assimilate was by no means unique and is discussed in detail by Sundquist in *Strangers in the Land*. Sundquist notes how St. Clair Drake's *Black Metropolis* (1938) and Roi Ottley's *New World-A-Coming* (1943) "recognized that anti-Jewish sentiment was effectively *anti-white* sentiment that took on convenient anti-Semitic overtones" (42).

<sup>64</sup> Christopher Phelps, ed. and introduction, *Race and Revolution* by Max Shachtman (London: Verso, 2003), xliii. Hereafter abbreviated *RR* and cited parenthetically by page number.

<sup>65</sup> See *Race and Revolution*, 78–9.

<sup>66</sup> Jackson, 302.

<sup>67</sup> Broyard's essay was the first of note by an African-American writer in *Partisan Review* since Sterling Brown was published in 1936.

<sup>68</sup> Alexander Bloom, *Prodigal Sons: The New York Intellectuals and Their World* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1986), 432n47.

<sup>69</sup> Bloom, 432.

<sup>70</sup> Arnold Rampersad, *Ralph Ellison: A Biography* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007), 402.

<sup>71</sup> Jackson, 241.

<sup>72</sup> Baldwin, "Smaller than Life," *The Nation* 165 (19 July 1947): 78.

<sup>73</sup> Baldwin, "Smaller than Life," 78.

<sup>74</sup> Baldwin, "Smaller than Life," 78.

<sup>75</sup> Baldwin, "History as Nightmare," review of *Lonely Crusade* by Chester Himes, *New Leader* 30 (25 October 1947): 11. All references to this text are hereafter cited parenthetically by page number and abbreviated as "H."

<sup>76</sup> See Sterling Brown, "Negro Character as Seen by White Authors," *Journal of Negro Education* (January 1933); reprinted in *Callaloo* 5.1–2 (1982): 55–89.

<sup>77</sup> Jackson, 314.

<sup>78</sup> Ferguson, 237.

<sup>79</sup> Baldwin, "The Image of the Negro," *Commentary* 5 (1948): 378. See John S. Lash, "What is Negro Literature?," *College English* 14 (1947): 18–27.

<sup>80</sup> Baldwin, "The Image of the Negro," 378.

<sup>81</sup> Baldwin, "The Image of the Negro," 378.

<sup>82</sup> See Andreas Huyssen, *After the Great Divide: Modernism Mass Culture, Postmodernism* (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1986), who traces the nineteenth century concept that "mass culture is somehow associated with women" (47).

<sup>83</sup> Baldwin, "The Image of the Negro," 378.

<sup>84</sup> Baldwin, "The Image of the Negro," 380.

<sup>85</sup> Baldwin, "Too Late, Too Late," *Commentary* 7 (1949): 96.

- <sup>86</sup> Baldwin, "Too Late, Too Late," 96.
- <sup>87</sup> Baldwin, "Change Within a Channel," *The New Leader* 31 (24 April 1948): 11; Baldwin, "Modern Rover Boys," *The New Leader* 31 (14 August 1948): 12.
- <sup>88</sup> Baldwin, "Too Late, Too Late," 98.
- <sup>89</sup> Murphy, 1025.
- <sup>90</sup> Baldwin, "Maxim Gorki As Artist," *The Nation*, 164 (12 April 1947): 428.
- <sup>91</sup> Baldwin, "Maxim Gorki As Artist," 428.
- <sup>92</sup> Baldwin, "Battle Hymn," *New Leader* 30 (29 November 1947): 10.
- <sup>93</sup> Baldwin, "Battle Hymn," 10.
- <sup>94</sup> Baldwin, "Battle Hymn," 10.
- <sup>95</sup> See Baldwin's description of Wright's meeting of the Franco-American Fellowship Club in "Alas, Poor Richard," *Collected Essays*, especially 264–5.
- <sup>96</sup> George Solomos, interview by Douglas Field in London, August 14, 2007.
- <sup>97</sup> See *The Price of the Ticket* where it erroneously states that "Everybody's Protest Novel" was "Originally published in *Partisan Review*, June 1949" (27).
- <sup>98</sup> Frances Stonor Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper? The CIA and the Cultural Cold War* (London: Granta, 2000), 70.
- <sup>99</sup> Murphy, 1034.
- <sup>100</sup> For a useful discussion of the difference between revolutionary anti-Stalinism and simple anticommunism, see Wald, *The New York Intellectuals*, especially 271. For a persuasive account of former radicals' involvement in the Cultural Cold War, see *Who Paid the Piper*.
- <sup>101</sup> Baldwin, "Envoi," in *A Quarter-Century of Un-Americana, 1938–1963: A Tragi-Comical Memorabilia of HUAC*, ed. Charlotte Pomerantz (New York: Marzani & Munsell Publishers, 1963), 127.
- <sup>102</sup> Baldwin, "No Name In the Street"; see also *Price*, 539.
- <sup>103</sup> Lyne, 17.