“Chicago Has No Intelligentsia”?

The term “New Negro” in American history and culture has become a conventional way of referring to the literary and visual artists and intellectuals of the Harlem Renaissance. According to cultural critic Alain Locke, the New Negro represented a new generation of masses coming out of the Jim Crow South, “with a new psychology.” In direct response to “Negro problem” studies within the emerging social sciences, the New Negro no longer wanted to be seen as a “formula . . . to be argued about, condemned, or defended.” Locke’s 1925 edited anthology, The New Negro: Voices of the Harlem Renaissance, upheld arts and letters as the medium through which a New Negro personality and culture would emerge to counter damaging stereotypes and cultivate relationships between the “enlightened” segments of the races. Ideally, locating the Black “folk” content of spiritual hymns, folktales, dialect, etc. within “civilized” European forms of literacy, composition and verse would uplift Black culture and create a new interracial American cultural modernism. Moreover, Black critics argued that this new “primitive” and “virile” African American aesthetic would challenge the standards of “high” art and culture, while providing a balm from the “soulless” materialism of the industrial age and the “chaos” of urban, working-class, “low” culture.¹
This composite image of the Harlem Renaissance is less important for its accuracy than for the ways it has dominated our understandings of the larger “New Negro Era” and conceptualizations of Black urban art and intellect in the early twentieth century. For example, in direct comparison with Locke’s *The New Negro*, both Harlem and Chicago scholars erected harsh conceptual distinctions between Harlem as a place of ideas and art and Chicago as the site of enterprise and more “practical accomplishments.” Black Chicago seemed dominated and defined by an industrial lifestyle and an entrepreneurial spirit; in the “shadows of the stockyards,” University of Chicago-trained sociologists E. Franklin Frazier and Charles Johnson lamented, “Chicago has no intelligentsia.” Despite Frazier and Johnson’s dismissal, later studies of Chicago’s Black community have continually served as correctives to visions of the New Negro Renaissance that focus solely on 1920s Harlem. But many of these larger Chicago projects were not directly concerned with challenging Alain Locke’s dominant New Negro framework. Most continued to transplant Locke’s equation of New Negro and Renaissance with university-trained intellectuals, visual/literary artists and possibly concert musicians to Chicago and ignored mass cultural forms as expressions of intellect. The irony is that even in Harlem, before the “Renaissance” had become a cultural movement, it was an all-Black professional basketball team that played in the Renaissance ballroom with a level of race-consciousness that equaled any literary critic. In our scholarship, however, we have yet to fully explore the larger context of the New Negro production of ideas in Harlem, Chicago or anywhere else, and how these contexts defied distinctions between culture and enterprise, “high” art and mass culture, or individual thinkers and social movements, despite Locke’s prescriptions.

As a case study, this essay examines “Chicago” underneath “the shadows of the stockyards” to offer a reconsideration of the New Negro. The popular arts and ideas of “Chicago’s New Negroes,” did not transcend but were fully embedded in the social “chaos” of the Great Migration, World War I, race riots, and a combined economic and cultural race consciousness emerging all over the country in the early twentieth century. Chicago’s “new” Negro consciousness found primary expression not just in essays, poems, and concert recitals but also, like the Harlem Renaissance basketball team, this new “spirit” was literally “played out” in the post-war consumer marketplace.

Five years before Locke’s famed proclamation of the Harlem Renaissance and in direct response to the race riots of 1919, word began to spread in Chicago about the rise of a “New Negro.” In 1920, America’s “race” paper, *The Chicago Defender*, immediately dismissed the adjective “new” as a misnomer but recognized that “the same old tainted individual was roused into self-consciousness” and “awakened . . . with new desires, new hopes for the future.” The radical Chicago *Whip* added, “New Negroes are those who have conceived of a new line of thought . . . that the intrinsic standard of beauty does not rest in the white race.” They went on to emphasize that because white dollars had
previously compromised or heavily informed black cultural and intellectual visions, the autonomy of both cultural and industrial labor could only be achieved through a “general pooling together of race finance.” Chicago historian Frederick Robb summed up the quest for cultural and economic autonomy best: “the New Negro . . . does not seek philanthropy but an opportunity.”

The overt desire for autonomous Black cultural production through economic control and, specifically, consumer strategies, was an important point of self-conscious departure between official New Negro visions in Harlem and Chicago. Local Chicago writer Howard Phelps foresaw that “[t]he stability of the Negro rests upon his financial independence [which] means the employment of race men and women by race business men and women.” While Harlem thinkers advocated self-determination and cultural autonomy, Black entrepreneurs, war veterans, artists, politicians, and intellectuals in Chicago attempted to build a separate economic and institutional worldview known as “the metropolis.” The “metropolis” model was to be driven by a symbiotic relationship between Black producers and consumers to secure community control of ideas and labor. Later made famous through Horace Cayton and St. Clair Drake’s 1945 publication, *The Black Metropolis*, opinions about the separate economy model varied from celebration to dismissal. Yet all concluded that the “metropolis” was instrumental in galvanizing Chicago’s Black Belt into what Frazier termed a “race conscious community.” That residents turned to the “metropolis” as a solution to white economic control over Black ideas forces us to rethink where and how knowledge is produced and recognize the specificity of a New Negro consciousness within local contexts.

The most important point about Chicago’s “metropolis” model is that the economic framework is not distinct or separate from the production of arts and ideas, and in fact it was the site for a more comprehensive New Negro consciousness. At the center of this New Negro vision of a “city within a city” stood Black Chicago’s civic, commercial amusement, and business district, known as “The Stroll.” The marginalization of Black people from mainstream sources of education, enterprise, and education made the Black consumer marketplace, in all senses of the term, a Black public sphere, a site of discourse and debate, and, hence, of intellectual production. Pushed and pulled as a battleground over images of Black primitivism, racial respectability, and leisure-based labor, The Stroll became the spatial articulation of competing New Negro intellectual positions within the Black Metropolis. Placing the physical and discursive site of The Stroll, and the marketplace intellectuals who emerged from this space at the center of study provides not simply a different history of Black Chicago; it also offers a re-conceptualization of knowledge production and a re-writing of American “histories of ideas.”
Traversing the Divide Between “Intellectual History” and “Cultural Production” in American Studies

The existence of a consumer-based intellectual life in Chicago forces us to revisit some of the historic and continuing tensions within the field of American studies. Those who are critically self-conscious about disciplinarity—how American studies as a discipline came to be and how we practice such a thing—continue to grapple with the “official” legacy of the field as it emerged from its “myth and symbol” roots within the cold war machine of U.S. nationalist propaganda. People like Michael Denning have offered compelling critiques of this official history for the ways in which it ignores the more radical roots of American studies within the “popular front” of the 1930s. However, most agree that as the humanities in general became increasingly influenced by the social sciences during the 1960s, American studies scholars became increasingly attuned to the social and cultural dimensions of the experiences of underrepresented racial, ethnic, gendered, and economic social groups. Bluntly, the intimate relationship between American studies and intellectual history was being challenged. American culture, capital “C,” was not universally thought to be the exclusive preserve of the best that had been written and said by the White fathers of the American republic.9

Particularly in the last 15 to 20 years the term “intellectual” has been even more acutely marked by many as rarified and easily dismissed in comparison to the broader title “cultural worker.” The latter term recognizes thought as labor, as socially situated, while taking into account the diversity of places where ideas and group interests are produced as a result of unequal access to or lack of desire for the traditional means of intellectual production, like churches and universities.

This critical intervention from scholars influenced by cultural studies is important and has been significant to the point that many would now probably question the positioning of a study like “Chicago’s New Negroes” within the elitist framework of intellectual history. At the same time, others contend that any attempt to identify distinctions between a “history of ideas” and “cultural studies” is a dubious undertaking that creates a series of “straw man” arguments, because we don’t have clear definitions of either term. However, it is my personal contention that while we cannot oversimplify how intellectual and cultural histories have changed over time, we must also recognize that very real points of contention sit right under the surface of a shallow pool of academic politeness about where intellect ends and culture begins. For example, why isn’t Lawrence Levine’s groundbreaking, Black Culture and Black Consciousness: Afro-American Folk Thought taught in intellectual history courses? Moreover, when this actual project about marketplace intellectuals was first shopped around to academic publishing houses, one particular scholar/editor remained impressed but also specifically stated “that it may pose a challenge to reach the plateau of—to achieve—an ‘intellectual historical’ perspective: what you have now we
see as mostly ‘cultural studies.’” The editor went on to mention that the “undeveloped” examinations of recognizable Black intellectuals (like W.E.B. Du Bois and Harold Cruse) could be further elaborated upon to establish the project as an “intellectual history.”\footnote{10}

The above exchange doesn’t provide an answer about where “ideas” end and “culture” begins, but it does suggest that we begin asking about the implied or unspoken boundaries that exist between the two. In my mind, to never ask the question implicitly concedes that intellectual history is still reserved for the study of university-trained, patron-sponsored, congregation-funded individuals who compose texts that are a direct expression of an unfettered mental production above and beyond group interests and market pressures. The handing over of intellectual projects that attempt to interpret group ideologies or extend beyond written/oral texts, to cultural studies courses and book series, dangerously suggests that everyday people don’t produce knowledge. But thought is not a self-contained individual act above and beyond the messiness of the everyday; common everyday people theorize constantly and in the most unlikely places. I just simply want to “beg the question” about sub-disciplinary boundaries within our interdisciplinary field of American studies. We must continue to work through the very important “theories of the everyday” to further investigate how historical actors of the everyday theorized themselves in ways that complicate many of our present conventions of academic analysis and even disciplinarity.\footnote{11}

The issue raised here has its roots in the work of American studies scholars who were trying to understand the changing production of knowledge in precisely the socio-historical context from which “Chicago’s New Negroes,” emerged. Many of these texts were written before “cultural studies” or “intellectual history” emerged as scholarly fields. Scholars ranging from W.E.B. Du Bois to C.L.R. James to Harold Cruse wrote directly at the intersection of intellectual production and cultural consumption within their studies of American society and culture. The everyday circulation and contestation of ideas in places like Chicago’s Black marketplace inspired these Black scholars, who realized that consumption habits were indicators of race consciousness and hence, sites of knowledge production. In fact, many of these consumer studies were driven by a desire to alter inequalities in cultural production, using the White patron/Black artist relations of the Harlem Renaissance as their problematic.\footnote{12}

Drawing upon the insights of Black scholars of consumerism, it is apparent that the everyday activities of New Negroes on Chicago’s Stroll engaged, if not reconciled, these debates about the production of ideas. However, it is not enough simply to recognize that an examination of consumer-based intellectual life is a project of American studies scholarship. We must also relocate Chicago’s New Negroes themselves and commercial sites, such as The Stroll, as central legacies to the field. To begin a project of re-situating “thought” as an embodied process, we must first reconstruct the actual spaces where thought takes place. The next section offers a cultural geography of Chicago’s Stroll district from which Chicago’s New Negro intellectuals emerged.
Mapping the Black Metropolis: A Cultural Geography of “The Stroll”

As the ranks of Chicago’s Black citizenry swelled within cramped spaces beginning around 1915, White reformers, reporters and thrill seekers turned a new eye to what they called the “Black Belt” as a site of urban primitivism and pleasure. In response, Black leaders hoped to showcase the more respectable “race” enterprises in what they called the Black Metropolis. But all had to concede that the music clubs, movie theaters, beauty parlors and “sporting dens” on The Stroll were the most popular and profitable institutions in the community. In the face of “industrial strength” (forms of power supported by the industrial economy), White racism, and “labor intensive” Black reform, many Black migrants used leisure spaces to create their own visions of the Black Metropolis. The dialectic of disgrace and desire between “Old” and “New Settlers,” about the behaviors, styles and spaces of leisure and enterprise, became the driving force behind Chicago’s New Negro intellectual life.

Chicago’s Black commercial amusement and business district, known as The Stroll, was the spatial articulation of New Negro intellectual life within the Black Metropolis vision. The Stroll was located along State Street from 26th to 39th street. Its major intersection of theaters, restaurants, dancehalls, and businesses centered around 35th and State until the late 1920s, when it moved further south to 47th. This area was variably lauded as “The Bohemia of Colored Folk,” “the black man’s Broadway and Wall Street,” and “just like Times Square.” However, these celebratory proclamations were not without context. The Defender announced that “The Stroll” was “Not so Bad as Painted—Reputable Business Men and Women Make Up This Wonderful Thoroughfare.” The paper’s sarcastic retort “A careful investigation—or, I might say, visit . . . will show less that tend to be bad” was a direct response to both White “slummers” and pleasure seekers’ consumption of The Stroll under the guise of uplift, sociology and/or journalism. The spatial fixity of urban vice and amusement to the geographical location of The Stroll physically marked and conceptually mapped deviance as a “Negro” trait. White tourists could enter, partake of, and enjoy the “vitality” and “spirit” of the African safari in the city, as both a threat and balm that existed outside and away from their own over-industrialized “White” civilization.13

In newspapers, legislative investigations, and academic studies, Black Chicago, among other ethnic enclaves, was represented as the antithesis of Progressive-era industriousness and productivity. At the beginning of the Great Migration, White newspapers screamed “HALF A MILLION DARKIES” bring “PERIL TO HEALTH.” Migrants were demonized as helpless peasant refugees ignorant of urban life with a culture that needed adjustment, containment, and discipline.14 Yet there was still a mix of fascination and fear of the “foreign” culture these migrants carried with them from the South that would simply be reinforced by the physical concentration of more Black bodies in a confined
space. Articles focused on the primitive release and pre-modern pleasures White tourists could find in the race-mixing sites of black-and-tan clubs, buffet flats, and brothels along or near The Stroll. Reporting on a show of famed jazz musician Joe “King” Oliver, *Variety* described his music as “loud, wailing, and pulsating,” a jazz with “no conscience.” Depicting Black urban space as a foreign reserve, the *Chicago Tribune* would describe a nearby streetcar line as “African Central.”

This picture of Black primitivism was reinforced through the “scientific” findings of the University of Chicago’s “Chicago School” of sociology and its eventual chair and former Urban League president, Robert Park, in particular. Through his urban ecology theories, Park argued that the city was a liberating force of natural growth from the confines of the past and unfortunately those that did not evolve were the dysfunctional casualties of progress. At this time, “Chicago School” social scientists used the term “race” where we would now use “ethnicity.” In Park’s work, he designated, for example, Jews, Poles, Irish, and Negroes as distinct races with their own “temperaments” that determined the state and speed at which each group would assimilate into the “American” social order. Park observed that all “foreign” racial groupings had deviant temperaments, but he also saw first hand, with Chicago’s race riots of 1919, that “non-White” racial groups would not be simply incorporated into a national whole through acculturation. Instead of focusing on the very real systemic and personal resistance, on the part of both White citizens and European ethnic immigrants to Black migrants, Park turned to the Negro’s temperament as a rationale. He wrote that Black people manifested “an interest and attachment to external, physical things rather than to subjective states and objects of introspection, in a disposition for expression rather than enterprise and action. . . . He is so to speak, the lady among races.” So if the industrial symbols of “enterprise and action” designated a culture of “civilization,” the Negroes’ specific “disposition” was the natural explanation for their slow advance. While Negroes could be assimilated, unlike Poles, Jews, or the Irish, they were culturally fixed as the negation of civilization from the start.

Moreover, in the most important co-edited work of urban sociology, *The City*, Ernest Burgess took Park’s theories about “racial temperaments” and literally mapped them on urban space. The Black Belt and its leisure district, The Stroll (never named) was represented as an inassimilable mass of “free and disorderly life” that was distinguished from the “immigrant colonies—The Ghetto, Little Sicily, Greektown, Chinatown—fascinatingly combining old world heritages and American adaptations.” Moreover, Burgess marked the “excessive increase . . . of southern Negroes into northern cities since the war” as the standard by which to measure disturbance in the natural “metabolism” of urban order. Ironically, as early as 1911, the Vice Commission of Chicago argued that links between Negro life and urban vice were not a result of temperament or some natural order in the city. Unlike many White “Chicago School” sociological studies that attempted to naturalize and rationalize racial inequality, the
commission made clear that the link between Negro life and vice was an intentional project of municipal re-zoning that put Chicago’s red light district in the Black community.\textsuperscript{17} Just as in other cities, residential segregation, racist zoning practices, and White violence confined all Black classes, leisure, vice, and religion to the same racially confined space, making The Stroll a perceived model for urban dysfunction and disorganization.

However, underneath racist visions of the Black Metropolis as an undifferentiated racial mass existed varied responses to economic, residential, and ideological discrimination that refuted Park’s theory that the Negro had no disposition for “enterprise and action.” In Chicago, the period roughly between 1915 and 1935 highlighted a moment of structural/cultural contact and transformation between “Old” and “New” settlers within the Black Metropolis. At the turn of the twentieth century, the “old” and “new” markers of distinction within the Black Metropolis referred to an early rift between an emerging middle-class that attempted to capitalize on the concentration of Black residents to the physical ghetto and an older elite who feared this turn inward would justify segregation, impede their business relationships of service to the White elite and force them to associate with Black people who did not possess their refinement. However, after 1915 these two groups merged in response to the much larger “Great Migration” from the “Deep South.” Within the post-war New Negro culture, the terms “Old” and “New” became much less about when one arrived in Chicago and began to signify one’s relationship to ideas about industrialized labor and leisure as symbols of respectability.\textsuperscript{18}

Despite the shared position of marginality for all Black people within Chicago’s socio-economic structure, lines of distinction were drawn around the markers of refinement and, most importantly, respectability. In the broadest sense, “Old Settler” notions of respectability located the industrial standards of labor function and efficiency within the outward appearance and behavior of economic thrift, bodily restraint and functional modesty in dress. However, these distinctions were not as rigid as they may appear. For example, entrepreneurs like Robert Abbott and Anthony Overton were migrants, but they also highly criticized many rural and urban “folk” traditions that were thought to inspire conspicuous consumption and excessive displays of public behavior. Ironically, while those who adopted an “Old Settler” position wanted to reform migrant lifestyles, many also believed that clear class distinctions in behavior and activity were true markers of urbanization and proof that Blacks had entered modernity. At the same time, many of those very migrants (and older citizens) had just come from lives where they were defined strictly by their function within a labor system and continued to encounter a racist division of labor in Northern industrial life. In this context, respectability was re-oriented and sometimes expressed through brash, public displays of style, sexuality and even citizenship, while also serving as moments of dissent against White supremacy, Black reform, and a labor identity. A “New Settler” ideology emerged that worked within the
Black Metropolis model but turned primarily to The Stroll’s commercialized leisure world to create new kinds of labor, new routes to upward mobility, and new visions of the racial community.  

As one version of Chicago’s New Negro culture, those who identified with the “Old Settler” ideology attempted to capitalize on their forced proximity to migrant voters and patrons to create the Black Metropolis. At the same time, the physical structure of the Black Belt forced them “to live with those of their color who [we]re shiftless, dissolute and immoral” and manifested “the brazen display of vice of all kinds.” This created a paradox for “Old Settlers”: they both depended on and distinguished themselves from the Black migrants they felt reinforced White visions of Black life, most clearly embodied in Stroll nightlife. Moreover, when those of the self-described “better class” wanted to engage in recreation, they resented the limited option of being “mixed with the undesirable or remain[ing] at home in seclusion.” They understood the “racial amusement problem” to be one of “boisterousness and defiance of public sentiment.” In fact, after the race riots of 1919, many “Old Settlers” argued that it was the vulgar behaviors and southern ways migrants brought with them “like a disease,” that brought on racial tensions and violence. Because this “better class” could not move away from the masses, they hoped to reform or police the leisure and labor habits of Black migrants to prove that there was a Black leadership of distinction and that Black people could be modernized.  

From the beginning of the Great Migration, Black clubwomen’s organizations compensated for the, at best, benign neglect of newcomers by Chicago’s mainstream lodging homes and agencies. However, it was soon clear that the Phyllis Wheatley Home, for example, was most concerned with the “already” respectable women migrants who, they observed, had been improperly led to “disreputable homes, entertainment and employment,” primarily in nearby brothels. While Ida B. Wells’ Negro Fellowship League was one of the few organizations that catered to all migrants regardless of their social standing, Wells still warned that The Stroll contained “not a single uplifting influence.” The leisure solution for many clubwomen was to hold card parties, musicales, luncheons, and charity balls for themselves while hosting youth clubs, dances, picnics, and other recreations both to raise funds for their important charity work and to lure young women away from The Stroll.  

In Chicago’s dynamic and diverse Black sacred sphere, churches ranging from Presbyterian to Pentecostal embodied a wide range of social positions based on the parish’s specific form of worship and relationship to the community. Some “Old Line” African Methodist Episcopal, Baptist, and Pentecostal churches offered decorous service and industry-sponsored programs of social adjustment that would attract migrants looking for assistance and those desiring social positions of service and mobility. Many churches offered youth clubs, athletic leagues, and literary societies, while presenting a decorous service to combat perceived migrant worship practices linked to the southern slave past. Intellectual
sermons and restrained, classically composed, Negro spirituals reinforced the view of Walters AME Zion pastor W.A. Blackwell that, “singing, shouting and talking” are “the most useless ways of proving Christianity,” because they reinforced an image of primitive spiritualism.22

As the Great Migration increased, White philanthropic and factory-sponsored institutions, like the YMCA, NAACP, and Urban League would also seek to reform leisure spaces and behaviors to fight any cultural “disorganization” that could compromise an efficient Black labor corps. The all-Black Wabash Avenue YMCA was celebrated by the Chicago Defender as equal to the Emancipation Proclamation, but the radical Chicago Whip and Ida B. Wells charged that it catered to the “better styled cod fish aristocracy of the race,” never reaching those “farthest down and out.” The YMCA never did reach a wide audience, but it devised a series of leisure activities including glee clubs, baseball leagues, and efficiency clubs that tied recreation to labor. Even the stridently integrationist and elitist NAACP got into the act with a three-page flyer pairing “refined and gentle manners” with voting and citizenship rights.23

The Chicago Urban League was the most comprehensive, far-reaching, and well-funded organization, seeking employment for both Black working and professional classes as laborers and researchers in the city. The heavy-handed industrial influence of the Urban League was exemplified in the words of Black sociologist and Urban League researcher, Charles S. Johnson. When considering reasons for the migration, he urged northern employers to focus more on a Black desire for employment over the oppressive southern racial climate. For Johnson this distinguished “wholesome and substantial life purpose” from the “symptom of a fugitive incourageous opportunism.” The local Urban League’s job referral system, pro-union stance, and race first advocacy were highly celebrated. Equally important, however, were the cultural values it emphasized, reflected by instructional cards warning migrants to “not carry on loud conversations in street cars and public places.”24

“Old Settler” ideology within New Negro visions is further revealed in the direct relationship between industry, the social sciences, and race enterprise. University of Chicago-trained Black sociologists Johnson and Frazier would work with Robert Park at the university and at the Urban League. In their important New Negro studies, The Negro in Chicago and The Negro Family in Chicago, neither Johnson nor Frazier agreed with Park that the race was averse to “enterprise” or “action.” Johnson did not posit a “racial” character, he was optimistic that Black migrants could excise their rural traits of “disorganization.” In The Negro in Chicago, Johnson gave historical context to the 1919 riot that, combined with a wealth of information on the living conditions of Negroes, challenged misconceptions, misinformation and prejudices that, for Johnson, produced many of the “race problems” in the city. However, his detailed and innovative analysis of newspaper articles and public opinion about race suggested, like Park, that better understanding and more accurate reporting were solutions equal to the demands for adequate housing, employment and policing.25
Frazier was directly critical of Park’s inability to recognize the broader socio-economic forces that prevented black assimilation, and argued that the Negro’s “social disorganization” was not the result of racial temperament but extended from the socio-economic conditions of slavery and discrimination. In *The Negro Family in Chicago*, Frazier did not look at the Black Belt as a homogeneous mass, but recognized its socio-economic diversity. However, both Johnson’s and Frazier’s notions of assimilation were still based on the norms of White cultural standards of industriousness and efficiency within a capitalist social order, which reinforced the idea that Black folk culture was something that ultimately had to be reformed, disciplined, and normalized.\(^{26}\)

At the same time, Black historian Carter G. Woodson ironically used the space of the industry-sponsored Wabash YMCA offices to found the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History (ASNLH) in 1915. Through this forum he contended that Black workers and entrepreneurs were making progress in the city because of their ancestral legacy from African and southern cultures and any regression was the responsibility of the U.S. nation-state. In “Fifty Years of Negro Citizenship as Qualified by the United States Supreme Court,” *The Negro as Businessman, The Negro Wage Earner,* and *The Negro Professional Man and the Community* Woodson detailed the strides and setbacks of all Black workers. From the YMCA basement, and later in Washington D.C., Woodson and the ASNLH pioneered annual Negro History Week celebrations, supported the *Journal of Negro History,* served as a clearinghouse of information for scholars and the general public, and continued to provide a forum for research presentation and publication.\(^{27}\)

The focus on enterprise and action among Black social scientists reflected a larger interest in the Black Metropolis model. Black reformers, scholars, and journalists shed light on the productive daytime Stroll activities of Jesse Binga’s banking and real estate empire, Anthony Overton’s Overton Hygenic/Douglass National Bank Building, the Your Cab Company, Robert Abbott’s *Defender,* Claude Barnett’s Associated Negro Press, and the boom in Black-owned insurance companies along The Stroll.\(^{28}\) Ironically, the new direction in business required that entrepreneurial leadership appeal to the specific consumer habits and tastes of migrants in order to secure economic self-sufficiency. While many entrepreneurial leaders personally had serious reservations about the diversity of tastes that migrants brought and created, they had to appeal to the tastes of migrants as their primary consumer base within the Black Metropolis.

This struggle over consumer ideology is embodied in the cultural enterprises of “race” newspapers. The more conservative *Broad Ax* and *Chicago Bee,* radical *Chicago Whip* and mass appeal *Chicago Defender* condemned many Black migrant behaviors and amusements. The *Whip* hoped to direct migrant energy away from street parades and strolling and toward “labor organizations and behind Negro business;” the *Defender* published Urban League “do’s and don’ts”—behavioral lists aimed directly at newcomers, while the *Bee* argued
that migrant behavior was perhaps the "cause of race prejudice." Both the *Whip* and the *Defender*, however, depended on the achievements of commercial leisure and contained extensive entertainment sections celebrating Stroll nightlife. As the nation's leading "race paper" until the mid-thirties, the *Defender* in particular, took on a "mass appeal" identity that required as broad a reach in content as it hoped for in circulation. It accomplished such a dominant position within the Black community by serving as community watchdog and cultural tastemaker in its coverage and commentary on everything from Southern lynching and race riots to love scandal stories, dream books, and Stroll nightlife. Thus, the dissemination of ideas through mass-marketed consumer products, like newspapers, weakened any hope of leaders to control community opinion or circulate a unitary meaning of respectability.

The force of diverse consumer tastes sheds light on the lifestyles of working class migrant men and women and their re-mapping of The Stroll, and hence the New Negro. While patrons of mass Black enterprises did not control the means of cultural production, they did control the way goods were used—how they were consumed in everyday life. New Settlers came with and created their own ideas about what the New Negro meant to them and used these visions to develop consumer-based styles and institutions within the Black Metropolis. Most important, images of a naïve mass of rural peasants turning cityward was far from the actual migrant experience. Only 25 percent of Chicago's migrants had been agricultural laborers. A significant number in the remaining 75 percent had had between five and ten years of experience in southern cities and hence, were familiar with urban conditions before they arrived to Chicago.

Part of the early engagement with southern cities and towns included participation in commercialized leisure. Black southerners bought automobiles and radios, many had visited Chicago in 1893 for the World's Columbian Exhibition and continued to encounter and respond to Jim Crow shopping limitations with purchases from Chicago-based stores like Sears and Roebuck and Montgomery Ward. In fact, Chicago's Black marketplace was so strong because of its support by southern consumers. By World War I, two-thirds of those who read about The Stroll in the *Chicago Defender* lived outside Chicago. The North may have offered images of cultural freedom but it was southern dollars and desires that made Chicago's Black consumer culture so viable.

Many migrants found consumer culture to be an important place where they could express individual desires and even collective forms of dissent, because there was such a fundamental disconnect between the ideals of the American work ethic and the very real inequities African Americans faced in factories, unions, and schools in northern and southern cities. With few exceptions, the powerful trade unions excluded Black working men who had acquired skilled trades in southern cities, except in foundries, where the work was heavy, hot and dangerous. Yet, there clearly had been strides in the number of Black workers who could find positions during wartime expansion. Relative
progress had been made in the steel industry where by 1920, the census counted 4,313 Black workers where there had only been 220 in 1910. However, Black men were, at best, considered a last option and usually only as strikebreakers, furthering tensions with labor unions. Those who found work started primarily as short-term employees on the bloody, slippery, killing room floors of stockyards and meat packing plants like Armour and Swift. A large segment of Black workers were still restricted to unskilled non-industrial labor and service positions as porters, waiters, janitors, and general laborers.33

As the bottom rung on the employment ladder, conditions for Black women were even less promising. While Chicago was one of the few wartime cities where Black women could struggle to leave domestic labor, they simply moved to dangerous, low-paying, unskilled industrial positions in mechanical laundries and stockyards. At the end of the day, a reported 68 percent of documented Black women workers were still restricted to domestic labor. As the war ended and the country faced a severe recession, the few strides Black women had made were quickly taken away. Some Black male and even fewer Black female workers found solace in the Chicago Federation of Labor’s local 651 and 231 respectively, but because this local was reserved primarily for the Black Belt, it became another form of industrial marginalization. Migrants had been sold a tale of freedom, but their Chicago experience was continually influenced by the inability to move freely. From the morning train to the work place to union affiliation, migrants were heavily restricted by the time rules of train schedules, domestic surveillance, the suspicions of White unions, hourly and piece productivity rates, time cards, assignment sheets, and standardized and subdivided tasks. Even the leisure time activities provided by the workplace, like company picnics and industrial baseball leagues, were designed to instill the labor-centered values of sobriety and efficiency.34

The insecurity of inconsistent labor and the broken promises of thriftiness, worker brotherhood, and education reinforced interests in public spheres of personal and communal expression outside the industrial workplace. For example, reformers and social scientists saw the buffet flats and brothels near The Stroll as a social threat, but they were understood by some to be an alternative to domestic and industrial labor and living. One Chicago buffet flat prostitute stated, “When I see the word maid—why, girl, let me tell you, it just runs through me! I think I’d sooner starve.” The status of maid was collectively resisted because, as one woman stated, there was no “place to entertain your friends but the kitchen, and going in and out of the back doors. I hated all that. . . . They almost make you a slave.” The subservient memory of “slavery” or slave-like labor was still fresh in migrants’ heads and many women, in particular, developed various strategies (from prostitution to beauty culture) to “never work in nobody’s kitchen but my own anymore.”35

“New Settlers” worked hard and sought mobility through industrial labor, but many were sympathetic to what scholar C.L.R. James termed the “popular
arts” in ways that complicated “Old Settler” prescriptions about where labor and leisure could take place. James prophetically saw in the popular arts—films, comic strips, soap operas, detective novels, jazz, and blues music—complex levels of creativity that reflected the desires of the masses for the same kind of autonomy and free association they wanted in the labor process. While both “old” and “new” settlers believed in Black cultural and economic autonomy, as part of their New Negro philosophies, there were various disagreements about where labor and leisure could take place and how one’s physical “standing” altered definitions of respectability. Alongside and many times in support of Marcus Garvey’s Universal Negro Improvement Association, Noble Drew Ali’s Moorish Science Temple, Wendell Phillips High School, the “fellow traveling” John Reed literary club, Jack Cooper’s “All Negro Hour” radio program, Elder Lucy Smith’s All Nations Pentecostal Church, or the Chicago Whip’s “Don’t Buy Where You Can’t Work,” consumer boycott campaign, The Stroll became an equally important site where Chicago’s New Negro intellectuals would emerge.

Under the labels of “reserve labor” by industry, “nigger scabs” by unions, the “Negro Problem,” by sociologists; and “undesireables” by “Old Settlers,” “New Settlers” found in mass-produced consumer culture the possibility to create truly representative work and identities. Comments by a Chicago essayist echoed Alain Locke’s observations that the New Negro resisted being a “social problem.” It was on The Stroll, he wrote, that for a minute or so one forgets the “Problem. It has no place here. It is crowded aside by good cheer.” While not rigid, Old and New Settler struggles about respectable spaces as sites of labor or leisure, function or fashion, as puritanical or profane reflected a contest for the direction of the race. Moreover, the diversity and volume of “Old Settler” efforts to provide healthy recreational distractions away from amusement attractions signaled the failure of reformers and their abysmal attempts to police Black bodies. When one migrant was asked if he had gone to work every day, he replied, “Goodness no. . . . I had to have some days of the week off for pleasure.” “Old Settlers” upheld the daytime Stroll activities of banking and insurance. But actually it was the “New Settler” nighttime Stroll of an interconnected leisure world of “sporting” and entertainment that provided the real socio-economic base for the Black Metropolis. In between the scrutiny of Black reformers and the low status employment in the formal economy, the world of illegal policy gambling (now legalized as state lottery), leisure, and recreation made official institutions of respectability possible.

**From Day to Night:**
**Re-examining Respectability on The Stroll**

In the last decade of the nineteenth century, John “Mushmouth” Johnson took his earning from work as a porter in a white gambling establishment and
opened his saloon and gambling house at 464 South State Street. Johnson’s gambling house foreshadowed a popular arts sensibility by creating games for patrons with both “deep” and “shallow” pockets. His appeal to diverse gambling tastes attracted many poor Black migrants. When Dempsey Travis’ father, Louis Travis, looked back on Johnson’s establishment he remembers: “Where else could a country boy go just ten days out of Georgia and feel like a big time gambler for only a nickel?” The opportunity to feel “big time” in the world of leisure is an overlooked moment of social respectability that had as deep an impact as the Urban League or Olivet Baptist Church. Moreover, Johnson was able to amass enough wealth to make his enterprise one of the largest gambling syndicates in the city and himself one of the largest real estate moguls on the South Side. The attention Johnson gave small time gamblers benefited him while also serving the cause of Negro-owned banking, real estate, and entertainment growing on The Stroll.39

New York’s Lafeyette and Lincoln theaters have been lauded as the birthplace of Black dramatic activity, but almost ten years before their start, in 1905 Robert T. Motts opened the Pekin Temple of Music (or Theater) in the heart of “The Stroll” at 2700 South State. This theater, which Dempsey Travis called “the formal cradle of Negro drama in the United States” was made possible because of Motts’ background in gambling. Motts came to Chicago in 1881 and, as a disciple of “Mushmouth” Johnson, in 1900 he first opened a café and gambling house (The Pekin Inn) at the State Street location. The profits from this operation gave life to the Pekin Temple of Music. More important, when “Mushmouth” Johnson died, his sister Eudora inherited 60 percent of his wealth. When she married Jessie Binga in 1912, her family’s policy money provided the economic support for Binga’s Bank at 3637 South State and his larger real estate empire. Directly across the street, Johnson’s brother Elijah leased property at 3618 South State, where he built the Dreamland Ballroom, later converted into the famous Dreamland Café. When Motts died in 1911, his sister, along with her husband Dan Jackson, ran the Pekin in order to keep this community institution in Black hands. Jackson’s undertaking business, next door to the Pekin, was made possible through his own gambling activities and would later become the prominent Metropolitan Funeral Systems Association. As a second ward politician Jackson was able to protect both his illegal and legal business interests. Later under the direction of another gambler, Robert Cole, Metropolitan was able to diversify its holdings and take over the Chicago American Giants Negro League baseball team, fund the early Black magazine the Bronzeman, and sponsor the first black radio program in the United States, Jack Cooper’s “All Negro Hour.”40

The official history of Chicago’s black business world credits Jessie Binga’s business acumen for the creation of the black belt’s “Broadway and Wall Street.” In fact, it was the underworld of gambling, policy gambling in particular, that stabilized the city’s respectable black economy and social world. From policy baron Julian Black’s Apex supper club to Elizabeth and “Pops” Lewis’ Vincennes
Hotel and Platinum Lounge (36th and Vincennes), policy bankers underwrote a vibrant urban culture of theaters, dancehalls, and business enterprises that provided the venues for Chicago’s legendary jazz and blues musicians. Profits derived from policy gambling and leisure activities would provide—directly or indirectly—the capital with which to finance the Chicago Whip, The Royal Gardens Café, a number of insurance companies, and the political career of the first black congressmen elected after the Reconstruction, Oscar DePriest. Even the work of noted Harlem Renaissance poet Fenton Johnson was underwritten, from beyond the grave, by his grandfather “Mushmouth” Johnson. Despite legitimate criticisms, Drake and Cayton were forced to concede that policy bankers in Chicago were the ones who “ha[d] given some reality to the hope of erecting an independent economy within black Metropolis.”

Many reformers argued that gambling deluded working people into wasting their money on a long-shot dream, and city officials made attempts to thwart its corrupting effects. However, many migrants saw gambling and the lottery racket of “policy,” as another avenue towards race advancement in a discriminatory job market. In interviews, residents compared policy to the stock market and described it at worst as a “victimless crime.” Urban historian Victoria Wolcott argues that many residents agreed with Drake and Cayton that, if anyone, policy bankers were most accurately enacting larger community dreams of a “strong base of African American entrepreneurs who would hire within the community.” In fact, policy barons became identified as respectable “race leaders,” albeit reluctantly, because they offered employment and supported “legitimate” establishments and charitable activities. Struggling Black businesses like beauty salons, barbershops, and lunch counters served as legal “fronts” and benefited from increased customer circulation while employees made extra money serving as “numbers runners.” The high point of the symbiosis between the charity of the informal economy and race respectability in the formal economy took place when policy barons, the Jones brothers (Edward, George and McKissack), backed the South Side’s first Ben Franklin store. The ambivalence of Bronzeville residents toward viewing policy as a vice foreshadows the eventual co-optation and legalization of the game by many states in the United States. Despite ideological resistance, the structural stability that policy provided went on to encourage pursuits in culture and industry all along The Stroll.

The continual domination of community institutions with “Old Settler” ideologies of behavioral reform and bodily restraint would encourage many migrants and some residents to adopt brash styles of exhibition and leisure-based labor with their own rules, “rationality,” and forms of exclusion. The new possibilities offered by the blurring lines between labor and leisure would serve as the catalyst for New Negro “popular arts” and institutions that both paralleled and even funded cultural production within the famed Harlem Renaissance. Alongside the more noted Chicago popular arts of jazz and blues, The Stroll set the stage for the rise of gospel music on “race records,” “race films,” a Black beauty industry, and even the National Negro baseball leagues.
The “Popular Arts” of Chicago’s New Negroes

Beauty Culture

One of the most unrecognized locations where the racist ideologies of social Darwinism were disseminated and debated was in beauty/cosmetic advertisements and products at the turn of the century. Black women were bombarded with “before and after” advertisements of a “dark-skinned, woolly-haired” primitive transformed into a more refined, “high-class” “lady” after the scientific treatment of some random skin whitener or hair straightener. While this image is etched in our heads, an examination of the beauty culture and industry that emerged around Chicago’s Black Belt community exposes a very complex and fractured conceptual landscape. As early as the nineteenth century, Black women’s bodies literally became a battleground in the resistance to and development of a modern Black, even New Negro, womanhood. A heightened discourse and debate ensued over the practice and consumption of hairstyles and bodily adornment during the period of the Great Migration. At the intersection between “Old Settler” denunciations, migrant folk practices, and techno-spatial innovations, Black women inserted their own visions and desires into the mass marketplace to create a Black beauty culture. More than simply a politics of “straight vs. natural,” the specific consumption habits and tastes of Black migrant women reconstructed White commercial intentions and middle-class distinctions between labor function and leisure fashion through their personal choices about adornment practices. Black women’s entrée into beauty culture created new sources of employment, relatively equitable labor/leisure relations, and platforms for political explorations on the local, national, and world stage. At the same time, the Black beauty industry had to balance the tensions between economic capital generated by migrant desires and cultural capital provided by hesitant Negro leaders. The commercial negotiation of these race positions, through speeches, advertisements, and social and political policies is where the most pronounced “intellectual” discussions within Black beauty culture are observed.44

Black entrepreneurs in the hair care and cosmetic industry attempted to distance themselves from the controversies surrounding “artificial beauty.” Anthony Overton focused on his position as a “race man” and entrepreneur in cultural and financial control of Black women’s beauty choices. Annie Turnbo Malone presented beauty as a service industry supportive of “domesticity” that female beauty agents could provide for uplifting the race. Madam C.J. Walker challenged such gender divisions by arguing that her company offered working women relative autonomy over their civic, economic, and aesthetic choices in both the private and public world. Out of this discursive struggle emerged innovations including Malone’s pan-African adoption of a Haille-Selaisse influenced robe for beauty school graduation; the funding of The Messenger, a Black radical magazine by Lucille Randolph (wife of A. Philip Randolph and a Walker agent), and the organization of beauty culturalists into a union that protested the East St. Louis race riots of 1917 and even their leader Madam C.J.
Walker’s business practices. Walker in particular, did not just influence her consumers; the realities of the Black consumer marketplace also affected her. She never endorsed hair straightening, but instead placed pictures and images of her accomplishments in ads as a source of female desire. Because Walker particularly catered her products to those who shared her washerwoman origins, she remained ambivalent about the elitism that came with respectability and, hence, advocated politically on behalf of working-class women.\textsuperscript{45}

The agents and patrons of hair care products were clear in their desires for some measure of middle-class respectability, but by bringing women outside the home to work in roles equal to men, they redefined the terms. This process is most evident in the work of the Walker System’s national organizer, Marjorie Stewart Joyner. From her beauty shop in Chicago, Joyner invented a beauty machine, took students to Europe to exchange the latest beauty and hair care techniques, engaged actively in politics, and lobbied the Illinois state senate for the protection of hair care businesses.\textsuperscript{46} This seemingly simple reworking of style and bodily adornment broadened the concerns generally associated with New Negroes by redefining acceptable representations and occupations for working-class African American women. Through the force of agents and consumers, women like Walker and Joyner and the people who purchased their products transformed beauty culture into a sphere of race pride, labor, and politics.

\textit{Independent Filmmaking and Exhibition}

It was also during the New Negro Renaissance that Chicago became arguably the Mecca of Black urban film culture. The location of film images within the context of The Stroll’s diversity of visual spectacles—like vaudeville, minstrel and tent shows, sporting events, and other forms of entertainment produced in and for the Black mass marketplace—reveals a much more dynamic space of experience and knowledge production. The silent film, within the context of a Black jazz orchestra pit, on-going variety (speeches, jugglers, wrestling, comedy, etc.) entertainment, spirited youth tastes, reform-oriented leaders and white storefront owners, made the exhibition of film a dynamic spectacle of racial representation and reconstruction. The film and its social and spatial contexts on The Stroll continually made and re-made the race’s “public image” at every screening.\textsuperscript{47}

Moreover, Chicago provided the larger socio-cultural context from which “race films” exploded onto the national stage. From the first feature length recorded independent films by William Foster and Peter Jones in 1913 and 1914, respectively, to the controversial Black-cast comedies of White-owned Ebony Films, Chicago’s Black cultural consciousness was keenly attuned to the power of the film medium. This ideological and structural foundation set the stage for one of the most prolific cultural producers of the period: Oscar Micheaux. The “sensational realism” of Micheaux’s films challenged “Old
Settler” prescriptions about proper Black film representations by appealing to the desires and consumption habits of primarily working-class migrants. Many Negro leaders argued that Micheaux’s steamy love scenes and action films were simply geared at increasing larger revenues and keeping light-skinned actors on the screen. Nevertheless, Micheaux’s parodies of preachers and gangster action dramas seemed to resonate with many who savored these “pulp” images of urban “freedom” and critiques of Black leadership. Underneath any simple dismissal of Black urban film culture lay anxieties over the new urbanized, race conscious Negro who resisted white control, contested Negro leaders, criticized urban life, and consumed commercial amusements.  

Micheaux’s film productions attracted audiences by engaging issues that Black family-oriented dramas (such as Lincoln Pictures) avoided. For example, his film *The Homesteaders* (1919) showed perhaps the first love scene between a Black man and White woman that was not depicted as rape. His film *Within Our Gates* (1920) was one of the first responses to D.W. Griffith’s racist but influential film *Birth of a Nation*. Because of its graphic engagement with lynching and its critical representation of an actual Chicago race leader, who happened to be Micheaux’s father-in-law, the censorship board fought against a Chicago screening of *Within Our Gates*, fearing it might re-incite the race riots of a year earlier. Noteworthy, Micheaux’s films were financed independently through the selling of shares to Black and White consumers who identified with the stories, and his films became an embodied negotiation of race uplift and ribald pleasure.

Gospel Music

The hybrid form of gospel (blues) music emerged at the intersection of traditional Protestant ideology, the Pentecostal/Holiness movement, and migrant forms of musical expression on sacred and secular “race records” and music venues in Chicago. At the center of this contestation and eventual synthesis stood the musical development of migrant Thomas Andrew Dorsey. The blues inflected, up-tempo rhythms and emotional forms of worship that gospel inspired challenged the tastes of local old-line Black Protestant churches. Before the arrival of gospel, old-line forms of worship, with their classical music and concretized Negro spirituals, served as proof of Black refinement, “civilized” tastes, and religious respectability. These churches were particularly reluctant to embrace a musical style, such as gospel, that pulled from the secular genres of jazz and blues and inspired expressive worship practices that reminded many of primitive stereotypes of a (slave) past that could compromise racial respectability. Such reluctance required the creation of a commercial market for gospel music that could sidestep ministerial authority in resistant churches and directly reach migrant consumers who desired and adopted this new urban sound.
However, locating the rise and circulation of gospel music within a marketplace context, between producers and consumers, complicates the chronicling of this important musical phenomenon. Many genealogies uphold or celebrate gospel music as bringing a southern “brush arbor” sound of folk singing and musical authenticity back into the church in the face of the “denatured,” “non-traditional,” concert spirituals that “annihilated indigenous black worship practices.” However, the emergence of gospel music in Chicago was cultivated and arranged by trained musicians who sought to express urban migrant visions of respectability and religious modernity. As Thomas A. Dorsey admits, the compositional medium of song sheets failed to fully convey the improvisational style that made gospel music sound distinct. With the help of his practitioners, Dorsey developed a distinct performance style, showmanship, and educational method within the sphere of demonstration that would distinguish him from both his competitors and critics.51

The specific sites and self-conscious strategies of music demonstration and exhibition in the city de-centers romances with an authentic folk music. Placing the music within its physical context also challenges intellectual paradigms that prize Dorsey’s individual authorship, and forces us to acknowledge the urban desires and the largely female corps of demonstrators and preachers who helped make gospel music possible. Moreover, as Dorsey “took [his] struggle to the street,” he negotiated a pre-existing commercial world of Pentecostal “race records” and radio shows. Dorsey also accessed important marketing and musical strategies from his own days as a “race records” composer/arranger of secular music that enabled him to establish musical authority through his gospel music unions, community choirs, and publishing business. The mass appeal and marketing of gospel music exposes a larger struggle over religious cultural authority and intellectual dialogue among parishioners, consumers, music producers, and preachers, within Chicago’s sacred world.52

Athletics

Americans have increasingly come to recognize that the realm of sport is an important stage where social perceptions are magnified, subverted, and sometimes directly challenged. At the outset, Black participation in and production of both amateur and commercial recreation events have simultaneously been appeals for racial integration while also “playing out” moments of race pride and distinction. However, studies of race and athletics are rarely spatially and geographically situated, and Chicago was a central place in the rise of a Black “sporting life” consciousness. Moreover, local athletic events were the inspiration for a number of New Negro expressions that ranged from rioting to community celebrations.

On the surface, the sporting life (athletics and related gambling activities) ran counter to visions of Black and White reformers who believed that a strict work ethic and/or knowledge of the “higher arts” were the sole routes to
interracial understanding, self-reliance, and respectability. At best, the progressive and industrial advocates of “Muscular Christianity,” the “Playground Movement,” or factory leagues revisited and modernized the relationship between sport and social discipline that had, not coincidentally, been perfected in the era of slavery. Late nineteenth- and twentieth-century reformers understood that regulated recreation and play could potentially produce efficient and sober workers, citizens, and possibly new “American” men. Within the Black world, the wider circulation of virile, competent and accomplished “Race men” on the playing field could also potentially counter stereotypes of Black physical and mental inferiority.

As recreation moved further into the commercial world, however, it offered many Black male migrants alternative forms of labor and hence a racial identification that did not necessarily rely on Victorian, industrial, or racial uplift ideals about manhood. In this context, it becomes even more significant that, as historian Jeffrey Sammons has observed, “Jack Johnson foreshadowed, and in some ways helped to create, the New Negro.” His title as world heavyweight boxing champion, which he gained in 1908, and his role as a social spectacle of Black male sexuality and interracial desire outside the ring, forced recognition of the “sporting life,” as a significant dimension of New Negro culture. Commentators cited the “scientific” prowess of baseball’s Chicago American Giants or the efficient speed of the Chicago Blackhawks on the gridiron, alongside the official New Negro mediums of art, as manifestations of the mental and physical equality of the races. Some even argued that the success of sports entrepreneurs surpassed the authority of race leaders like Booker T. Washington.53 Events like the East-West Negro League all-star baseball game, which was held in Chicago every summer, or Harlem Globetrotter (from Chicago, never from Harlem) events with their half-time jazz dances, expressed Black dignity, distinction, and even defiance of Black servitude. These public displays of Black masculinity, in particular, also caused problems for sports entrepreneurs when “raucous” sporting incidents compromised images of civility and respectability. The commercial and community success of the “sporting life” provided a relative autonomy where athletes and owners could produce new and competing public declarations of Black masculinity on the field and in the box office. By identifying with a team, individual athlete or even the betting and fighting that went on during events, the “sporting life” simultaneously offered different racial identities and visions in the stands.54

It becomes clear, then, that the marketplace did not stand in opposition but was the site for cultural production, consumption, and criticism in the Black Metropolis. The discourse and debate over hairstyles, musical rhythms, cinematic images and “sporting” recreations on The Stroll, are what gave life to the Black Metropolis as a vision, an intellectual project. It is precisely in these consumer-based “amusements,” alongside the traditional spheres of church and academe, where class struggles and theoretical insights were produced historically and
where many of the "thoughts" of the "people" are now revealed to the historian. Moreover, marketplace intellectuals, like Madam C. J. Walker, Oscar Micheaux, Thomas Dorsey, Jack Johnson, and Andre "Rube" Foster were "thrown up" from The Stroll as simply individual articulations of the incomplete yet collective visions of their mass consumer patrons. Through their articles; compositions; textbooks; educational, media, and community institutions; and support of political causes and social movements, these intellectuals facilitated a "transformation" of Chicago's physical and discursive urban landscape. But more important, the work of these New Negro intellectuals in Chicago displays how people used the marketplace and consumer support not just to push cheaper products on Black publics, but also to invest their commercial successes in interests that were not market-driven. The visions and desires of sharecroppers, entertainers, and factory, domestic, clerical, and sex workers were put in conversation with traditional intellectuals and leaders including Ida B. Wells, Richard Wright, and Woodrow Wilson.

The continual reconstruction of the Black Metropolis as both a built environment and as an ideal helps us to get at a more comprehensive New Negro Renaissance and the diversity of ideas produced within that world. Moreover, the pairing together of "autonomous" thought and "mindless" consumption within a reconstructed notion of "Renaissance," suggests new directions for the study of "ideas" within American studies. The transition from pen, paper, and paint in ivory towers to record, radio, and celluloid on city streets, did not signal the demise of creative agency. The "modern" canvas for the production of knowledge represented the voice of different groups, different visions, and a different consciousness directly within and not in evasion of twentieth century socio-economic relations. "Chicago's New Negroes" self-consciously negotiated, struggled over, and upheld the categories of race, class, gender, nation, and intellect literally, as academics like to say, "on the ground." Even though these marketplace intellectuals and their consumer patrons wouldn't use this language, they understood such identities as socially (even commercially) constructed, while both spatially and historically specific.

In many cases, the consumer marketplace of The Stroll was the only site where New Negroes could buy culture, dreams, and products of self-transformation and create both personal and communal desires for a different Chicago and a different world.

Notes


2. Just to reiterate, I am using Locke and his anthology as an example of the conceptual framework that has been most prominently handed down to us when talking about the New Negro Renaissance. In no way was Locke or his anthology a definitive representation of the history and literature of the New Negro Era or the Harlem Renaissance. One could equally look at the anthology *Fire!!,* published one year later or *Anthology of American Negro Literature* published in 1929. That these two texts were at least responding to Locke’s limited vision and the present absence of their challenge in our present memory helps make the point about the dominance of Locke’s New Negro vision, and, even in their response, the continual focus on essays and literary and visual arts when discussing Black intellectual life of the early twentieth century. See Wallace Thurman, ed. *Fire!!: Devoted to Younger Negro Artists* (1926) (Westport, Conn.: Negro Universities Press, 1970); V.F. Calverton, ed. *Anthology of American Negro Literature* (New York: The Modern Library, 1929); Michael L. Cobb, “Insolent Racing, Rough Narrative: The Harlem Renaissance’s Impolite Queers,” *Callaloo* 23:1 (2000).


definitions of the Harlem Renaissance are notoriously elusive, descriptions of it as a moment of intense literary and artistic production, or as an intellectual awakening, or as the period of the self-proclaimed “New Negro” are concepts that are not applicable only to Harlem or to the twenties (163).


10. One of the most important works that locates Black consciousness within the everyday world of popular culture is Lawrence Levine's Black Culture and Black Consciousness. For a reflection on Levine's legacy see Robin D.G. Kelley, "Notes on Deconstructing 'The Folk,'" The American Historical Review (Dec. 1992).

11. As an attempt at reconciling this possibly contentious cultural studies (read theoretical Marxists/intellectual history divide, see Thomas Bender's rendition of the evolution of intellectual history and history more generally, "Intellectual and Cultural History," in Eric Foner, ed. The New American History (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1997).
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Hertel, Jenkins & Co., 1907) (New York: AMS Press, 1906). These yearbooks were published in volumes 1 through 9 from 1912-1917.


15. See Variety (Dec 2, 1925), 47 and (April 21, 1926), 45; “African Central” reference is from Tribune (March 5, 1917); (May 5, 1917) and Daily News (March 14, 1917). For the linking of the Great Migration to reportage of Black community see Tribune (March 16, 1917; Jan 18, 1917; Nov 20, 1916 and Oct 14, 16, 17, 19, 1916; Jan 19, 20, 22 and 30, 1917) and Daily News (Jan 18 and 19, 1917).


18. Old Settler is a term that goes back to a Chicago club founded in 1902. However, I’m using Drake and Cayton’s more general idea that old settler refers to anyone “who lived in Chicago prior to the First World War.” See *Black Metropolis*, 66-67 and “History of Chicago Old Settler Club, 1902-1923,” pamphlet in Dunmore Collection, DuSable Museum. Secondary work on these class/cultural distinctions include Alan Spear, *Black Chicago and Grossman, Land of Hope*.


It is also important to recognize another extremely important Chicago scholar like Woodson. 24. On Urban League see Charles Johnson, “How Much of the Migration was a Flight from Persecution,” Opportunity 1 (Sept, 1923); Urban League leaflet in Special Collections, University Library, University of Illinois at Chicago and in Grossman Land of Hope, 145. Also see Strickland’s important History of the Chicago Urban League.


36. There is not enough space to draw special attention to the term “popular arts.” But C.L.R. James was a pioneer in cultural studies, and his analysis of consumer culture as a power
base for the working class heavily informs this study. See C.L.R. James American Civilization and Beyond A Boundary (1963) (Durham: Duke University Press, 1983).


46. Adam Langer, "You Know, I'm 95 and I Know What I'm Talking About," Chicago Reader (Sept. 11, 1992); Toni Cottom, "Memories of an Early Salon," ShopTalk (Spring 1984); Archivist Michael Flug has also conducted important oral histories from Joyner that are housed in the Marjorie Stewart Joyner Papers, Vivian Harsch Collection.


49. Films that remain can be screened at Motion Picture, Broadcast and Recorded Sound Division, Library of Congress, Washington D.C.; Black Film Archives, Indiana University. Also look at the "Richard E. Norman Collection," Lilly Library of Rare Books and Manuscripts, Indiana University.


51. Quotes come from Lawrence Levine, Black Culture and Black Consciousness, 166 and Michael Harris, The Rise of Gospel Blues, 107-113.


53. For comments about Jack Johnson, the comparative quality of arts and athletics and the importance of Athletic entrepreneurs over other race leaders see, Jeffrey Sammons, Beyond the Ring: The Role of Boxing in American Society (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 46; Baltimore Afro-American (July 14, 1928) p12 and Frederick North Shorey, Indianapolis Freeman, (Sept. 7, 1907) p7.


55. The idea of “make over” here responds to Urban League attempts to turn migrants into efficient, ambitious workers. See Helen B. Sayre, “Making Over Poor Worker.” Opportunity 1, no. 2 (February 1923).

Comments on “Chicago’s New Negroes”

Beth Loffreda

It’s a risky proposition in American studies to call scholarship “new”—it can invite some vociferous upbraiding in response (Djelal Kadir, for example, has recently critiqued a range of American studies scholars who lay claim upon what he calls “new newness”).¹ You might just end up being told how old, or even superannuated, you actually are. Feeling new, of course, can also be thrilling (one need look no further than the New Negro Renaissance for an example of that); but for the purposes of this response, I’m going to sub usefulness for