

A “Fine Liberal” in Black Radical History: W. E. B. Du Bois’s Strategic Citation of Carl Schurz

Sarah Papazoglakis

“There is probably no man living who has a more intimate knowledge of the Negro Question than Mr. Schurz,” wrote S. S. McClure in the editor’s introduction to Carl Schurz’s 1903 *McClure’s Magazine* article, “Can the South Solve the Negro Problem?”¹ No one living, except, of course, the entire black community who intimately knew what it was to experience what W. E. B. Du Bois theorized as “double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others.”² In fact, months before Schurz’s essay appeared in *McClure’s Magazine*, Du Bois had published *The Souls of Black Folk*, his profound work on race and double consciousness that explained the “problem of the color-line” as a problem of “the disfranchisement of the Negro.”³ Yet, without a hint of irony, McClure made this hyperbolic claim, naming Schurz, a German American white elder statesman, the ultimate authority on racial conditions in the United States. He did so in the face of a significant body of black activism, writing, and scholarship. Du Bois confronted this fallacy by leveraging Schurz’s acclaim among the political and social white elite to turn him into an unlikely ally, citing Schurz throughout much of his scholarship on Reconstruction as he wrote against the grain of the “standard—anti-negro” revisionist histories proliferating at the turn of the century and beyond.⁴ By strategically citing Schurz, Du Bois could more easily defend against racialized charges of bias and more effectively appropriate and exploit white discourses on race widely considered to be neutral.

Du Bois positioned himself alongside and against Schurz as a widely respected liberal figure. Despite the praise of the prestigious, middle-brow, muckraking magazine, Schurz’s record in the struggle for civil rights was controversial at best,

given that he, like many other Radical Republicans, “abandoned the negro” as the political tide turned against Reconstruction policies in 1872.⁵ Schurz’s liberalism included the belief that racial inequality was a troubling exception to equal rights and opportunity. However, at the turn of the century, he was portrayed as radical by the conservative Dunning School historians who gave scholarly credibility to blatantly racist accounts of Reconstruction, casting it as a failure because of black incompetence. Du Bois shows that the Dunning School’s framing of the liberal Schurz as a radical was part of a larger effort by Southern apologists to rewrite the Reconstruction Era as one of “unrelieved sordidness in political and social life.”⁶ In Du Bois’s works, Schurz emerges as an exemplary liberal figure whose writings could only be seen as radical if placed in contrast to extremist antiblack propaganda. To advance a black radical interpretation of the era that would situate a material history of racial exclusion and oppression at the center of—rather than incidental to—American democracy, Du Bois needed to dramatically shift the discourse on Reconstruction. In Du Bois’s hands, Schurz became the perfect foil for white supremacist views of Reconstruction, legitimated in large part by Dunning School scholars. By moving the narrative of Schurz to the right and exposing exclusionary tenets of liberalism, Du Bois insisted on black radical resistance at a time when much of the popular commonsense discourse on racial inequality focused on accommodation, compromise, and reform.

For Du Bois, Schurz came to represent the racialization of gatekeeping in a number of contexts. In many ways, Schurz’s prominence symbolized the currents of white supremacy that undergird white liberalism, which does not appear openly racist or hostile but relies on more polite forms of racial violence. That “fine liberal,” as Du Bois called him, could silence the black community by promoting a white perspective as more objective and more knowledgeable than even the most credentialed black scholar. While Schurz’s moderate views—later characterized by Du Bois as “fair to indifferent to the Negro”—displaced black voices in magazine outlets, Schurz also embodied the progressive outer limit of elite power circles and demarcated the racial and social boundaries that Du Bois was so often unable to cross.⁷

Before he established *The Crisis* in 1910, Du Bois confronted the antiblack hostility of the mainstream white media by writing to editors and demanding the inclusion of black voices. After Schurz’s death in 1906, Du Bois began to seize upon his stature in correspondence with S. S. McClure and with Andrew Carnegie, strategically using Schurz as a way to gain access to these powerbrokers. Schurz had proven to be a moderate voice in the racial conflicts of his lifetime, in contrast to the white supremacist movement that had been steadily gaining the upper hand in the echelons of power since the “catastrophe of 1876,” as Du Bois called it, which had helped to put an end to Radical Reconstruction.⁸ Popularly known by the turn of the century as the “Patriarch of the Anti-Imperialist Movement” for his writings against the Spanish-American War and as President of the Civil Service Reform League, Schurz was a distinguished elder statesman who served as a general in the Civil War, a senator for Missouri (1869–1875),

and as President Rutherford B. Hayes’s Secretary of the Interior (1877–1881). Born in Germany, he was a revolutionary 1848er who immigrated to the United States in 1852. His reputation as an expert on US race relations reflected several decades of writing and thinking about racial inclusion and exclusion in his role as a liberal reformer, technocrat, and journalist. The historical record shows that Schurz had problematic racial politics, at best. Even his sympathetic biographer notes that he “was not free from all prejudices. He believed that tropical climates were deleterious to self-government and to the prosperity of Europeans.”⁹ Yet, he was regularly cited as the foremost authority on race relations, a testament to the separate and unequal conditions for people of color at the turn of the century who might have called his authority into question. In many ways, Schurz reflects the alliance between liberalism and white supremacy. He outwardly rejected racism while accepting exclusionary practices and policies, as evidenced by his support of the Compromise of 1877, for example. Du Bois exploits this contradiction to show how liberalism functions as a more polite agent of white supremacy.

In Du Bois’s Reconstruction scholarship, Schurz became more than a distinguished political and social figure. He emerged as a critical, liberal historical figure in “Reconstruction and Its Benefits” (1910) and again in *Black Reconstruction in America* (1935). In his 1910 essay, Du Bois used Schurz’s 1865 *Report on the Condition of the South* as the primary source on the immediate postwar climate. The report, a survey of southern states urged on Schurz by President Johnson, offers a potent condemnation of antiblack race prejudice and racism in the aftermath of the Civil War. Forgotten and ignored for many years, the report had a largely unheralded afterlife in Du Bois’s work on Reconstruction. In *Black Reconstruction in America* (1935), Du Bois frames Schurz as a “fair to indifferent” observer of the circumstances in southern states that actually necessitated revolutionary measures in order to create the conditions for a multiracial democracy. According to Du Bois, Schurz’s views on individual rights represented the key tenets—and limits—of liberalism. His use of Schurz functioned as part of Du Bois’s body of scholarship that signals his “radical departure from liberalism.”¹⁰ As many scholars have noted, Du Bois’s ideas were in “continuous revolution” throughout his lifetime.¹¹ And he is, of course, a key figure in the black radical tradition. Cedric Robinson famously defined this tradition as “a single historical identity which is in opposition to the systemic privations of racial capitalism.”¹² Du Bois anchored his work in antiracist, anticolonial Marxist critiques of racial capitalism and emphasized solidarity with global liberation struggles tied to racial oppression. In his work on Reconstruction, Du Bois situated his radical argument against the liberal Schurz’s writings, thereby producing a more comprehensive theory of Reconstruction from the perspective of the emancipated.

This article examines the role of Carl Schurz and his *Report on the Condition of the South* in Du Bois’s efforts to reorient the so-called “Negro Question” and the history of Reconstruction within the context of the antiblack race prejudice that structures, not only scholarship of the era, but the entire social order. It traces the recovery of Schurz’s report amid a growing tide of Reconstruction scholarship led

by the Dunning School that maligned the period as a failure. It observes that Du Bois uses Schurz as a key source in his effort to rewrite the history of the period as a “splendid failure” that “did not fail where it was expected to fail.”¹³ For Du Bois, Schurz played a strategic supporting role in Reconstruction historiography, offering insights on U.S. race relations in the *Report on the Condition of the South* from his own unique vantage as an immigrant. More importantly, Schurz modeled a “norm” of widely accepted white liberalism against which Du Bois put his own radical assertions into perspective. At the end of *Black Reconstruction in America*, Du Bois sardonically imagines Schurz as a prophet in a reversal of racial history when he writes: “Suppose the slaves of 1860 had been white folk. Stevens would have been a great statesman, Sumner a great democrat, and Schurz a keen prophet, in a mighty revolution of rising humanity.”¹⁴ Exposing and critiquing this blatant hypocrisy, Du Bois mobilized Schurz’s personal story and his mixed reception among white scholars and thought leaders to show racism as a structure and a process that ultimately infected even the most objective participant-observer.

Du Bois’s Schurz and the Limits of White Liberalism

Du Bois reads Carl Schurz’s biography as a representative story about the opportunity that the United States offered to some white European immigrants but denied to people of color. Even still, Schurz and other Germans in the United States in the 1850s did not fully escape “the powerful language of racial differentiation.”¹⁵ As Matthew Frye Jacobson points out, “ascriptions of Germanic racial identity were not uncommon”; Jacobson even cites Schurz as a case in point when he details how “Richard Henry Dana could describe the ‘48er Carl Schurz as a ‘red-bearded Teuton.’”¹⁶ Yet Schurz’s long and storied career in the US military and government were indicative of the growing power of the European immigrant community, what Jacobson calls “the probationary white races,” on the verge of being incorporated into whiteness and receiving their privileges while native black children were born into slavery.¹⁷ A comparatively easy assimilation for Europeans, Nikhil Pal Singh explains that, historically, the United States “allowed for the incorporation of not-quite-white, but not-quite-not-white Irish, Jewish, and Southern and eastern European immigrants into the canons of whiteness through the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.”¹⁸ Du Bois critiques this oppressive process of racial inclusion and exclusion when he cites Frederick Douglass’s famous speech: “You invite to your shores fugitives of oppression from abroad, honor them with banquets, greet them with ovations, cheer them, toast them, salute them, protect them, and pour out your money to them like water; but the fugitives from your own land you advertise, hunt, arrest, shoot, and kill.”¹⁹ Such performances of national belonging described here were as much about inclusion for white immigrants fleeing state violence abroad as they were about the exclusion of slaves and black people more generally (especially as a result of the Fugitive Slave Act), who lived under the constant threat of state violence at home. Schurz’s own assimilation—not only into the

full benefits of citizenship but also into high government offices—forms the subtext for the story of black exclusion and dispossession in the United States. “Attuned to domestic manifestations of race,” as Eric Porter shows, “and to the ways its shifting ontological status was connected with U.S. imperialism,” Du Bois situates Schurz as an insider-outsider of the white race and of the United States whose liberalism moderates popular negative views of Reconstruction while supporting Du Bois’s global claims in *Black Reconstruction in America*.²⁰

Throughout *Black Reconstruction in America*, Du Bois positions Schurz as a Radical Republican and model liberal thinker of his time. He finds that Schurz’s views in 1865 represent a level-headed participant-observer whose government-sponsored research on the postbellum South furnishes a rare disinterested primary source from an era defined by deep political divisions and conflicting ideologies. Eric Porter points out that Du Bois’s ideal participant-observer was not the “calm, cool, and detached scientist,” for he “saw with more clarity the mediating role that researchers played in the production of knowledge, as they helped shape the realities they were studying.”²¹ Schurz’s dispassion shines through in the ways that he catalogs and classifies attitudes and behaviors in the South and weighs them against the new national standard of racial equality, ranking biases and prejudices to show the level of threat that each of these views poses to the material enfranchisement of the emancipated. The report in no way suggests that all biases and prejudices are equal. Du Bois, therefore, uses Schurz’s report as a model of objectivity insofar as it reads biases and prejudices by contextualizing them within ethical norms. Here, Schurz produces objectivity not through a false position of someone who stands outside of those ideologies per se, but as someone who is able to see those ideologies at work without imagining they do not exist. Yet, for Du Bois, Schurz’s shifting position on Reconstruction and compromises on black enfranchisement confirms the dangerous alignment of liberalism with white supremacy. Such compromises map onto Schurz’s process of assimilation.

In his *Report on the Condition of the South* (1865), Schurz unequivocally asserted that southern white “incorrigibles” were the source of troubling violence and waning agricultural production.²² He concluded his survey with the finding that the government would need to play a central, mediating role in the South in order to establish and maintain a new postwar order. The report was meant to inform the president’s policies toward “see[ing] those states restored to their constitutional relations,” but the report was disavowed by President Andrew Johnson, even though he had originally commissioned it.²³ As a result, the report stands as Schurz’s least-celebrated political achievement. Consistent with Du Bois’s corrective aims, the suppression of the report is exactly what makes it such a critical and underappreciated historical document, forming part of the body of what Du Bois describes as “government records [that] are an historic source of wide and unrivaled authenticity.”²⁴ As Du Bois would tell it, the 1865 report is Schurz’s crowning achievement.

A seemingly minor historical figure in Du Bois’s Reconstruction scholarship, Schurz has been overlooked, especially vis-à-vis Du Bois’s dismissal of objectiv-

ity as a thinly veiled signifier of whiteness. However, mapping Schurz's presence in Du Bois's two works on Reconstruction reveals the complex intersection of Du Bois's interventions in Reconstruction scholarship, sociology, and debates around scientific objectivity. Du Bois foregrounds Schurz's immigration story and the storied *Report on the Condition of the South* as primary evidence of Schurz's attitude as "fair to indifferent on the negro" and the limitations of his position overall.²⁵ Using Schurz's German origins to fashion him into an insider-outsider of the white race and drawing on Schurz's American political career as a case study, Du Bois insists on the global significance of Reconstruction within the context of US imperialism. Du Bois mobilizes Schurz to represent the limits of liberalism and the need for black radical resistance.

Du Bois's Strategic Use of Schurz with Powerbrokers (1906–07)

Between 1903 and 1904, two of the nation's top muckraking magazines, *Collier's Weekly* and *McClure's Magazine*, featured a series of exposés on race relations representing the mainstream political views of Republicans and Democrats on the so-called "Negro Question." Black voices were notably absent from these forums published in a time when the doctrine of "separate but equal" regulated all spheres of social life in the United States, including the media. W. E. B. Du Bois obviated the glaring omission and appealed to both magazines to include him as a voice for the black community, as the so-called "Negro Question" was often the frame for these debates. In response to an editorial called "Going to Work," which argued that "the Race Problem" could be solved by the black community turning its attention to employment instead of fighting for "social equality or political right," Du Bois submitted a critique to Richard Lloyd Jones, the editor of *Collier's Weekly*, noting the antiblack prejudice represented in the magazine.²⁶ Du Bois proposed a corrective: Let him write a column "or half a column" in the magazine called either "Along the Color Line" or "Voice of the Darker Millions."²⁷ While *Collier's* did publish an editorial by Du Bois called "The Color Line Belts the World," Jones denied the request for a regular column, citing "the wide demands that press for space in our pages."²⁸ It would not be the last time Du Bois was shut out from the mainstream white media. The nation's most widely circulated magazines persistently denied a voice to the black community. This persistent denial, though, did not stop the white media from trading on racial violence and inequality as hot topics that attracted a national readership during a time defined by challenges to racial equality, from the legalization of racial segregation to an emboldened white supremacy movement that terrorized communities of color.

McClure's Magazine's shortsighted (to be generous) and hyperbolic naming in 1903 of Carl Schurz as *the* living authority on the "Negro Question," especially within the broader context of their systematic exclusion of black voices, epitomizes the ways in which opinion makers and knowledge producers of the era

denied the expertise of black scholars and the knowledge of their lived experience. Du Bois used Schurz’s relative celebrity to battle this kind of “patronizing” and “openly bigoted” coverage of the oppression of African Americans, a common feature of muckraking journalism despite the genre’s reformatory aims.²⁹ He also, however, was forced to navigate and strategically maneuver himself within the arena of white “experts” in order to be recognized as a legitimate contributor to these political and scholarly debates. Shortly after Schurz died in May 1906, Du Bois leveraged him in a letter to Andrew Carnegie soliciting funding for the Atlanta conference, reminding Carnegie of their acquaintance: “You will possibly remember me as being presented to you and Mr. Carl Schurz at Carnegie Hall some years ago.”³⁰ Schurz had the ear of many of the most powerful people in the country involved in racial uplift, while Jim Crow relegated Du Bois to the periphery of these white-dominated circles of power. Schurz stood in for black voices by representing a moderate voice in favor of racial equality that stood out from the white supremacist social and political order that ruled the day.

Even in death, Schurz was given a prominent voice in public debates. *McClure’s Magazine* published a series of his writings posthumously in several issues throughout 1906–07. In an example of so-called balanced reporting, *McClure’s* staggered Schurz’s writings with essays by the popular plantation novelist Thomas Nelson Page to represent two differing opinions on the racial strife plaguing the nation. Du Bois took issue with this representation of perspectives as two equally valid points of view; he believed that this framing gave greater legitimacy to antiblack prejudice. In other words, while the black perspective was silenced in mainstream outlets, prejudiced whites found an equal voice with people like Schurz who had reasonable or “fair” opinions. Du Bois wrote to the editor S. S. McClure to point out this asymmetry. He demanded redress from McClure. He proposed to write “an article on Social Equality from the Negro point of view—a perfectly frank article” but was rebuffed.³¹

Du Bois followed up with McClure, invoking Schurz as an ally in the magazine’s running series on race relations in order to advance his appeal to the editor. It worked. After Du Bois derided the magazine for printing Thomas Nelson Page’s “[five] successive vicious attacks on us from one pen as if to atone for one article from Schurz,” McClure responded that he “would be very glad to have [Du Bois] write an article.”³² At the end of this invitation, McClure himself invoked Schurz: “There will be several articles by Mr. Schurz. . . which I am sure will please you.”³³ Schurz became the touchstone in the communication through which Du Bois critiqued the magazine’s debates on race. While McClure subsequently rejected Du Bois’s article, this example shows how Du Bois regularly positioned Schurz and other white liberal thinkers against virulent racists like Page, in order to expose the inadequacies of liberalism and to advance his own radical positions. This kind of strategic historicizing, using the scholarly bibliography to make the argument about the “Propaganda of History” took risks of its own.³⁴ In his 1935 work on the Reconstruction era in particular, Du Bois’s use of secondary sources by white writers who are only “fair to indifferent to

the negro” characteristically defines the contradictions of his lifelong struggle to enter into debates on race and equality dominated by elite white opinion makers in both popular and academic culture.³⁵

Appropriating White Objectivity in “Reconstruction and Its Benefits” (1910)

After years of appealing to include black voices in white-dominated media outlets, Du Bois launched *The Crisis* in 1910, the official publication of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). That same year, Du Bois published “Reconstruction and Its Benefits” in *The American Historical Review*, an essay that went against the grain of Reconstruction scholarship at the time. The essay responded to the increasingly common refrain in academic and popular outlets that blamed “negro suffrage [as] the cause of the main evils of Reconstruction.”³⁶ David Levering Lewis explains how Du Bois’s views on Reconstruction were anathema to scholars at the time when he writes, “To suggest that there had been benefits to Reconstruction was equivalent to decrying benefits in the aftermath of plague.”³⁷ Similar to the way he invoked Schurz in order to negotiate editorial space in *Collier’s Weekly* and *McClure’s Magazine*, Du Bois first introduced Schurz in this essay as an objective observer of post-Civil War antiblack racism that Schurz saw as a threat to racial equality and to the new democratic order that extended citizenship and suffrage to freedmen.

Du Bois positioned Schurz in the story of Reconstruction to refashion the contours of liberalism itself and to take the government to task by pressing its own presidential appointee into the service of his “aggressive reinterpretation.”³⁸ In “Reconstruction and Its Benefits,” Du Bois responds to what he called antiblack historiography by placing “the real hero...the slave who is being emancipated” at the center of this historical moment. In order to do this, he uses the 1865 *Report on the Condition of the South* to ground this argument in historical primary source materials.³⁹ Recognizing that such a radical reframing of the period would butt up against hegemonic frameworks, Du Bois makes Schurz his interlocutor, citing the 1865 report and communications on Reconstruction no less than six times in the first five pages of the article. Quoting Schurz serves simultaneously to authenticate the characterization of the South in 1865 as “a veritable reign of terror” and to bolster Du Bois’s own voice through Schurz’s indictment of the fact that “the negro found scant justice in the local courts against the white man.”⁴⁰ For Du Bois, Schurz’s words perform a double function. On the one hand, these quotes cannot be so easily relegated to markers of bias because they are spoken by an “unmarked” white man. On the other hand, they show how Schurz himself may have developed what Du Bois called the “American Blindspot” between 1865 when he first made these observations and 1876 when he helped to usher the end of Radical Reconstruction.⁴¹ Du Bois radically reframes the common “black message in a white envelope” formula that John Sekora has argued grants “literary authority” by using Schurz’s moderate, liberal position

to foreground his own radical black perspective on the 1876 counterrevolution of white supremacy that ended Radical Reconstruction.⁴² Du Bois ventriloquizes Schurz to indicate that the end of Reconstruction—which marks Schurz’s own conversion into an accommodationist—was not only the closure of a particular moment of experimental inclusion but that its consequences would be felt far into the future. The counterrevolution of 1876 signals a rising political and social tide of white supremacy that continues through the Civil Rights movement and is resurgent once again today. As Schurz’s voice reverberates through Du Bois’s work, the former becomes a “keen prophet” and foundation for articulating the latter’s visions of the struggle for citizenship, the effects of antiblackness on historiography, and the global dimensions of race relations in the United States.⁴³

In the essay, Du Bois uses Schurz’s respect and stature as a great statesman in order to emphasize his own insights into racial violence and terror orchestrated by white people, insights that were being dismissed at the time by other historians who placed the blame for the failure to fully incorporate black men into citizenship onto the black community. Though the evidence of such violence was made blatantly clear by many sources, including Ida B. Wells’ *The Red Record* (1895), recovering Schurz’s *Report on the Condition of the South* (1865) allowed Du Bois, the historian, to launch his critique from behind the shield of a well-respected white liberal, fending off accusations of racial bias. Du Bois witnessed the rise of mainstream and popular discourses that were hostile to the legacy of Radical Reconstruction as redress for chattel slavery. Instead, Reconstruction increasingly emerged in the American imagination as a misguided policy failure. The period became the object of blame for the gross inequality and violence that characterized contemporary racial strife at the time Du Bois was writing. In addition to mobilizing Schurz’s whiteness, Du Bois also relied upon Schurz’s report as the original historical source on the aftermath of the Civil War. The report that was not history-as-interpretation, but rather a social-scientific, sociological account of a participant-observer that made it, for Du Bois, a credible source.

Du Bois, however, was not the only scholar of Reconstruction to use Carl Schurz for his own ends. In 1907, three years before Du Bois published “Reconstruction and Its Benefits,” Columbia University historian William A. Dunning published *Reconstruction: Political and Economic, 1865–1877*. This book was the first in a body of historical scholarship written by highly influential apologists for slavery that came to be classified under the eponymous name of the Dunning School. In contrast to Du Bois, Dunning wrote from the perspective of a defeated, victimized white South, which he portrayed as suffering “uniform humiliation and dejection,” overwhelmed with “the problem of adjusting the blacks to a useful place and function in the southern economy.”⁴⁴ In Dunning’s telling, Schurz’s demands that Congress consider his findings as part of the debates over the measures needed to reunify the divided nation signaled self-indulgent narcissism. Schurz, Dunning writes, was “so impressed with the importance of his own views that, after his return in October from his three months’ trip, he insisted, despite the president’s intimation that it was not necessary, upon embodying them in a

long, skillfully constructed and fully documented report, which was sent to the president."⁴⁵ For Dunning, the *Report on the Condition of the South* exemplified the "sectional passion and partisan political emotion" that led to what he believed were extreme Reconstruction policies. In fact, Dunning cites the report as "a leading item in the case which was made up for the public against the president's policy."⁴⁶ The characterization of Schurz as a radical, narrow-minded, and self-aggrandizing propagandist became the authoritative position in Reconstruction scholarship, undermining Schurz's unblemished reputation.⁴⁷

Du Bois's works show how brushing off Schurz's damning report allowed the Dunning School to debunk at least one major challenge to its interpretation of Reconstruction. According to historian Eric Foner, "From the first appearance of the Dunning School, dissenting voices had been raised, initially by a handful of survivors of the Reconstruction era and the small fraternity of black historians."⁴⁸ However, those voices were too easily suppressed under the weight of authority of the Dunning School. Du Bois recovered Schurz's report as a critical primary source offering a standard of objectivity to bolster his argument that the adoption of Black Codes and the will of the white southerners to ensure that "negro suffrage would fail ignominiously" were the real sources of racial and social strife.⁴⁹ These claims stood in opposition to the "chief charges against the negro governments [of] extravagance, theft, and incompetency of officials."⁵⁰ Far from being a conceited figure as Dunning School historians claimed, in Du Bois's work Schurz emerges as a model of neutrality who stands aside as often as possible, letting interviewees in the report speak for themselves. Du Bois reveals the ways in which Schurz's report deals with the legal, justice, and labor systems that work to maintain conditions of slavery in all but name. Lengthy citations from the report and its addendum demonstrate measured, judicious attention to military personnel, Freedmen's Bureau officials, and civilians, all of which are supported by testimony from those stationed in the South.

Du Bois deployed the report toward this end by quoting Schurz's praise of the Freedman's Bureau for its work in "wield[ing] that moral power whose interposition was so necessary to prevent the southern society from falling at once into the chaos of a general collision between its different elements."⁵¹ He turns to Schurz again to provide evidence that a "veritable reign of terror prevailed in many parts of the South" and to draw upon Schurz's observation that it was a white pathology of antiblack racism that prevented integration.⁵² The black community faced such pervasive hostility simply to be recognized as anything other than inferior beings that even Schurz observed that the real reforms required to rehabilitate the South needed to focus on eradicating white supremacy and terrorism. He noted: "It seems probable that if the South had been permitted to have its way in 1865 the harshness of negro slavery would have been mitigated so as to make slave-trading difficult, and to make it possible for a negro to hold property and appear in some cases in court; but that in most other respects the blacks would have remained in slavery."⁵³ *Report on the Condition of the South* documents the necessity of government oversight, mostly through the Freed-

man's Bureau, to facilitate and oversee material changes in the social order that could ensure the freedom and inclusion of the newly emancipated who, by and large, were still considered "the slave of society."⁵⁴ While many historians had been focused on the limitations of the Freedman's Bureau as evidence of misguided policies, Schurz's report authenticated Du Bois's claims about the racial violence of Black Codes, illuminating the widespread race prejudice and outright violence against freedmen as the source of racial divisions and social ills of the time. Wielding Schurz's report, Du Bois could show that there was a coordinated effort among southern whites, in particular, to stifle black civic participation well before the Fifteenth Amendment was passed in 1870. Du Bois fortifies his critique of scholarship and public opinion about the alleged harshness of policies inflicted on the south by the north with Schurz's observations that "[t]he masses are strongly opposed to colored suffrage; anybody that dares to advocate it is stigmatized as a dangerous fanatic."⁵⁵

By 1910, it was common to argue not only that universal suffrage was the source of the "Negro Problem," but also that granting universal suffrage had somehow been too broadly and haphazardly applied. Arguments went as far as claiming that the focus on the lofty goal of full inclusion and representation as full citizens had somehow actually held the black community back from more "realistic" material gains in terms of education, property ownership, and wealth accumulation. Writing during Jim Crow, Du Bois uses Schurz in a way that suggests he was acutely aware that he needed a white, "unmarked" figure representing standards of objectivity of the day that associated whiteness and maleness as the normative subject position. Using Schurz as a voice of reason, Du Bois launches a defense of Reconstruction policies. He frames Schurz as someone who could elucidate what other elite whites did not want to see: The source of problems for full integration and incorporation of a black citizenry was the extreme white resistance to equality. It was this white resistance whose powerful hold on southern politics, real estate, etc. ensured that black folks would be kept in a state of all-but-legal slavery in spite of federal legislation that formally granted black men full rights of citizenship. Schurz's fierce defense of the Freedman's Bureau and strict government and military oversight of the rebuilding of the South forms the backbone of Du Bois's argument that antiracist policies were necessary in the face of widespread hostility to the very notion of black freedom. Deploying Schurz helps Du Bois to prove that not only was suffrage necessary but, as Schurz even demands in the report, the government needed to take responsibility for changing the hearts and minds of southerners in order to unify the nation.

Du Bois makes the point that "the arguments for universal negro suffrage from the start were strong and are still strong, and no one would question their strength were it not for the assumption that the experiment failed."⁵⁶ Schurz's report indexes the problems at the end of the Civil War, while also anticipating the racial divisions of Du Bois's day if antiblack racism were not abated. Du Bois uses the report to reverse the understanding that placed blame on the victims of

exclusionary policies and attitudes and to expose a gross obfuscation of the real problems at hand: Black Codes, debt peonage, and widespread disenfranchisement. In "Reconstruction and Its Benefits," Schurz's report provides the bulk of evidence that proves this to be true. In *Black Reconstruction in America*, Schurz's report once again provides substantial evidence for Du Bois's argument, but with a key difference: Schurz's whiteness and his identity as an assimilated German American immigrant become part of Du Bois's larger critique of objectivity as a racial construct.

Du Bois's Ideal Participant-Observers in *Black Reconstruction in America*

In the 1930s, Du Bois began working on *Black Reconstruction in America*, producing new scholarship on the subject more than 20 years after "Reconstruction and Its Benefits" appeared in *The American Historical Review*. Du Bois was *still* writing against the Dunning School's revisionist history of Reconstruction, which was upheld for decades as the gold standard in scholarship of the period. David Levering Lewis explains:

The impact of Du Bois's [1910] paper upon mainstream Reconstruction scholarship was as if it had never been written.... For white historians and the public opinion instructed by them, the regime imposed upon the South in the wake of the Emancipation Proclamation and the Thirteenth Amendment had been a political aberration and a cultural travesty, a military dictatorship the work of conspiring fanatics whose criminal designs had inflicted at bayonet point the rule of unlettered, untamed black people over a glorious white race, proud in defeat.⁵⁷

Unlike the 1910 essay, *Black Reconstruction in America* would be so comprehensive that it would be impossible to ignore. Du Bois would confront the Dunning School head on. He would, once and for all, "set reconstruction historiography upright after finding it standing on its head."⁵⁸ He charged Dunning and his students with promoting and perpetuating race prejudice in Reconstruction historiography while attempting to obscure its antiblackness under the guise of historical objectivity. Du Bois's ultimate goal was "to tell and interpret these twenty years of fateful history with especial reference to the efforts and experiences of the Negroes themselves," and he used Carl Schurz to help him achieve that goal.⁵⁹ Writing in a "field devastated by passion and belief," Du Bois recovers Schurz's report as a critical counternarrative against what Michel-Rolph Trouillot calls the "silent past."⁶⁰

The "frontal attack on Reconstruction," writes Du Bois, "began with Columbia University and with the advent of John W. Burgess of Tennessee and William A. Dunning of New Jersey as professors of political science and history."⁶¹ By

recuperating the *Report on the Condition of the South* as a primary source for this corrective history of Reconstruction, Du Bois uses President Johnson's own appointee as an emboldened critique of the president's abandonment of Reconstruction, a move that highlights the president's hypocrisy and questions Dunning's dismissal of the report. In other words, Du Bois employs the report as a particular example that illustrates the whole history of Reconstruction from President Johnson's summons of Schurz in May 1865 to his indelicate disavowal of Schurz's report three months later. In *Black Reconstruction in America*, Schurz's *Report on the Condition of the South* and the story of its silent shelving by President Johnson prove to be a critical case study. Du Bois uses this case study to illustrate the "splendid failure" of Reconstruction as a failure owing to the fact that Reconstruction of the southern states was not "conceived as a major national program of America, whose accomplishment at any price was well worth the effort."⁶² For Du Bois, the life of Schurz's report marks a critical moment leading to the counterrevolution of white supremacy and to the hijacking of Reconstruction historiography by white supremacists.

By dramatizing the confrontation between Schurz and President Johnson, Du Bois stages the political climate in which the *Report on the Condition of the South* was produced and challenges prevailing notions of its purported insignificance except in Radical Republican campaigns. Du Bois pulls from Schurz's *Reminiscences* to explain that Johnson introduced a report by General Grant based on a five-day trip in an effort to suppress Schurz's more comprehensive report. He notes that Grant's report was "devised by President Johnson to the end of neutralizing the possible effect of my account of Southern conditions" and was warmly received on account of Grant's enormous popularity after the war.⁶³ He also wrests Schurz away from Dunning's characterization of him as a radical by casting Schurz instead as a liberal who often diverged from Radical Republicans, especially in his silence around Sumner's civil rights bill of 1871, which "proposed to secure equality of civil rights to colored people and prohibit discrimination against them in railroads, theaters, hotels, schools, cemeteries and churches and in serving as jurors."⁶⁴ Schurz's liberal politics kept him from endorsing significant civil rights reforms. His lack of support of Sumner's bill suggests he was not as radical as Dunning (or McClure) would have us believe. Du Bois uses Schurz as part of a counterdiscourse that disrupts the dominant historiography of Reconstruction providing testimony and evidence in *Black Reconstruction in America's* "arraignment of American historians and an indictment of their ideals."⁶⁵ Repositioning Schurz as an example of liberalism allows Du Bois to move Schurz further to the right in order to shift Reconstruction historiography further to the left. The move also represents a model for historical study that deemphasizes objectivity and emphasizes the historian's mediating role.

By citing Schurz at length throughout the "Transubstantiation of a Poor White" chapter, Du Bois also uses Schurz as a shield for his critique of President Johnson as a "puppet" of the white supremacy movement led by poor southern whites, "the tragedy of American prejudice made flesh."⁶⁶ He concludes the chap-

ter on Johnson by describing “a man who, despite great power and great ideas, became a puppet, played upon by mighty fingers and selfish, subtle minds.”⁶⁷ Wary of the charges of bias that would be levied by virtue of making such a critique as a black scholar, he ventriloquizes Schurz’s memoir to recount Johnson’s betrayals of freedmen and his half-hearted commitment to inclusion and civil rights.

He draws upon Schurz’s personal life and reputation to reestablish the credibility of the report’s author and his findings. For Du Bois, Schurz, “the finest type of immigrant American” is a “dispassionate observer” and a “fine liberal” perfectly situated to advise President Johnson on Reconstruction policy in 1865 and to set the record straight on Reconstruction historiography in 1935.⁶⁸ Such an arbiter was needed for *Black Reconstruction in America*, described by David Levering Lewis as “a contention going against the grain of contemporary historiography.”⁶⁹ Responding to “the wide distortion of facts” in the scholarship on Reconstruction led by the Dunning School, Du Bois situates Schurz, a German immigrant to the United States who fought in the Civil War, as an objective participant-observer, insider-outsider whose whiteness does not make him blind to either American racism or black humanity.⁷⁰ Schurz’s identity, race, national origin, and liberal politics are all strategically deployed by Du Bois to fend off the charges of bias to which he was regularly subjected. From Du Bois’s perspective, Schurz is unlikely to be marginalized simply because of race because he is white. And as an immigrant, Schurz is unencumbered by what Du Bois calls “the American Blindspot” that has led white Americans and historians to “overlook and misread so clear and encouraging a chapter of human struggle and human uplift.”⁷¹

However, Du Bois also signals the limits of Schurz’s neutrality and dispassion in his report by implicating Schurz in the routine omission of the voices and perspectives of the newly emancipated in Reconstruction historiography. Schurz once again figures prominently in Du Bois’s famous indictment of the Dunning School and Reconstruction historiography in the “Propaganda of History” chapter of *Black Reconstruction in America*’s bibliography. The bibliography is an unusual list of references; it is a study in itself, more like an afterword that steps outside of the text to map, in broad strokes, the historical terrain DuBois has teased out for the previous 729 pages. The bibliography includes eleven sections that Du Bois created to chart the available discourses of Reconstruction scholarship:

- 1) **Standard-Anti-Negro** (These authors believe the Negro to be subhuman and congenitally unfitted for citizenship and the suffrage.)
- 2) **Propaganda** (These authors select and use facts and opinions in order to prove that the South was right in Reconstruction, the North vengeful or deceived, and the Negro stupid.)
- 3) **Historians** (Fair to Indifferent on the Negro)
- 4) **Historians** (These historians have studied the history of Negroes and write sympathetically about them.)

- 5) **Monographs** (These authors seek the facts in certain narrow definite fields and in most cases do not ignore the truth as to Negroes.)
- 6) **Answers** (These are the answers of certain carpetbaggers and scalawags to their traducers.)
- 7) **Lives** (These are lives of leaders who took part in Reconstruction and whose acts and thoughts influenced Negro development.)
- 8) **Negro Historians** (These are the standard works of Negro historians, some judicial, some eager and even bitter in defense.)
- 9) **Unpublished Theses** (These are researches by young Negro scholars.)
- 10) **Government Reports**
- 11) **Other Reports**⁷²

Classified according to racial ideologies, the bibliography maps the field of Reconstruction historiography critiqued in "The Propaganda of History." Schurz's memoir and biography are situated within the field as "Fair to Indifferent on the Negro" while *Report on the Condition of the South*, which is only footnoted at the end of the chapters where it is cited, is left out of the bibliography entirely. Despite the fact that Du Bois was regularly critiqued for lacking scientific objectivity, as this bibliography helps to demonstrate, he didn't think pure objectivity was possible in the first place. Du Bois did not believe in the absence of bias at all, especially when it came to race relations in the United States. For Du Bois, scientific reliability and objectivity was a matter of negotiating multiple perspectives, classifying them according to their biases, and making those biases visible. Purporting to be completely neutral, without bias, was impossible, especially in "a field devastated by passion and belief," like US history.⁷³ His strategic citation of Schurz exemplifies this approach to plurality rather than purity as a measure of scholarly credibility. It's also a testament to what Shamoan Zamir calls "Du Bois' conclusion that there can be no single answer to 'What is the Negro Problem?'"⁷⁴ Schurz occupies the midpoint between the "anti-Negro" and the "sympathetic" historians, placing him squarely in the middle ground, a location that represents even the most dispassionate observer's ideological investments. The bibliography shows the limits of liberal discourse by situating Schurz along a spectrum of perspectives that begins with white supremacist historiography.

Du Bois places Schurz, that "fine liberal," just on the other side of propaganda, a dispassionate position that is not nearly strong enough to combat influential antiblack scholarship that frames the "Negro [as] sub-human and congenitally unfitted for citizenship and the suffrage."⁷⁵ Moreover, as a "fine liberal," Du Bois positions Schurz not as a like-minded radical, such as we find in the book's portrayals of Radical Republicans Charles Sumner and Thaddeus Stevens, but rather as a figure representing the "common sense" white liberalism of the time, with the racial, national, and political capital to serve as interlocutor,

both during Reconstruction and in the 1930s.⁷⁶ For Du Bois, Schurz is a moderate public voice who can denounce President Johnson—as when Schurz says, “I think I do not exaggerate that an overwhelming majority of the loyal Union men, North and South, saw in President Johnson a traitor bent upon turning over the national government to the rebels again”—and yet reject Sumner’s radical civil rights proposals.⁷⁷ Presented as an objective observer because of his “foreignness,” Schurz plays a moderating role in this radical revisionist history: a negotiator, interceding between “standard anti-Negro” white southern historians and the positions of Radical Republicans and the black radical Du Bois.⁷⁸

Du Bois thus employed Schurz as a strategic touchstone and recurrent exemplar of those historians “fair to indifferent on the Negro,” representing a popular white liberalism as an available, if limited and weak, middle ground against the “standard anti-Negro” historians.⁷⁹ For Du Bois, Schurz’s experiences invested him with the diplomatic skills and academic training necessary for earnestly assessing postwar conditions and informing Reconstruction policies. Du Bois recuperates Schurz as a model surveyor in the chapter that “Look[s] Backward” to the origins of what is reframed as the “counter revolution of 1876”:

Carl Schurz was of the finest type of immigrant Americans. A German of education and training, he had fought for liberal thought and government in his country, and when driven out by the failure of the revolution of 1848, had come to the United States, where he fought for freedom. No man was better prepared dispassionately to judge conditions in the South than Schurz. He was to be sure an idealist and doctrinaire, but surely the hard-headed and the practical had made mess enough with America.⁸⁰

By framing the “truth and reliability” of the report around the author’s German immigrant background, Du Bois places Reconstruction within a global context, thereby de-essentializing American conceptions of race and crediting Schurz with an independent perspective because of both his foreign roots and his domestic military service.⁸¹ Du Bois positions Schurz as a naturalized American citizen who was not yet indoctrinated into the US ideology of antiblack racism. Through his reading of Schurz’s biography and report, Du Bois theorizes American racism as a domestic formulation exported abroad when he says that “imperialism, the exploitation of colored labor throughout the world, thrives upon the approval of the United States, and the United States gives that approval because of the South.”⁸² By bringing global perspectives into the United States, Du Bois sees the potential for dismantling American racism in the immigrant experience. The story of Schurz’s report leads Du Bois to the conclusion that “because [Andrew Johnson] could not conceive of Negroes as men, he refused to advocate universal democracy.”⁸³

The legal end to slavery did not put an end to the deeply rooted ideologies of white supremacy, of course. During his time surveying southern states,

Schurz documented local attitudes and prejudices, offering important insights into the mediating role the government would need to play in order to establish and maintain a new racial, social, and political order. His report concludes that southern "whites esteem the blacks their property by natural right, and however much they admit that the individual relations of masters and slaves have been destroyed by the war and by the President's emancipation proclamation, they still have an ingrained feeling that the blacks at large belong to the whites at large."⁸⁴ The attitudes and arguments of white southerners collected through interviews construct Schurz's evidence. Importantly, he does not purport neutrality and equality among all points of view but categorizes, contextualizes, and assesses the possibility for "a massive experiment in interracial democracy" to succeed based on prevailing attitudes.⁸⁵ This approach is important for Du Bois because it acknowledges the impossibility of true neutrality while also disrupting general notions of marked and unmarked modes of observation that render white observers and historians more objective than black ones.

As part of his effort to validate Schurz's observations and predictions in the report, Du Bois corroborates Schurz's findings through a variety of sources, including congressional testimonies, newspapers, and the *Journal of Negro History*. He explains that when policy makers who were entrusted with the recovery and reunification of the country in the immediate postwar years conceived of Reconstruction as "experimental," they undermined the entire effort. In his telling, Du Bois achieves the difficult task of making the discourse of racial prejudice and discrimination visible, a discourse not often stated explicitly or openly but articulated clearly through the behavior and decision making of government officials. President Johnson's rejection of the *Report on the Condition of the South* thus emerges as a rejection of black equality, not a rejection of an overeager Schurz, as Johnson would tell it.

Patrick W. Riddleberger writes that in the aftermath of the Civil War, Radical Republicans were the staunchest supporters of federally led Reconstruction, "crusading for the Negro."⁸⁶ Yet by 1872, while Radical Republicans were still in power in the southern states, all of the major figures of the party "abandoned the Negro."⁸⁷ Riddleberger singles out Schurz as a "good sample for the thinking of these men" because he "was genuinely concerned about the Negro's welfare" in the early years of Reconstruction, but by the 1872 election, he "was attempting to explain away his famous report of 1865."⁸⁸ During the election, Schurz became the leader of a breakaway Liberal Republican Party whose policies were rooted in a conciliatory policy on Reconstruction. Less than ten years after emancipation, the author of the report and a majority of politicians moved away from policies needed to ensure the necessary conditions for multiracial democracy. Du Bois emphasizes Schurz's role as a dispassionate observer of the early Reconstruction years, not as a senator who helped to bring about its end.

Du Bois admired Schurz's personal story and early life characterized by fighting for revolutionary changes in Germany and in the United States.⁸⁹ Schurz joined the German revolution of 1848, abandoning his doctoral studies in History

at the University of Bonn. He became famous for orchestrating his professor Gottfried Kinkel's escape from prison after Kinkel was convicted of treason for his participation in a failed revolutionary uprising. In 1852, Schurz immigrated to the United States and became part of a community of German-speaking immigrants in Philadelphia; he taught himself English, achieving fluency soon thereafter. In his recent intellectual biography of Du Bois, Kwame Anthony Appiah writes that "Du Bois's arguments were tethered to the varieties of racial romanticism and postromantic thought that he took from Germany's intellectual traditions; they were kin to the ideas through which Germany sought to define itself as a nation among nations."⁹⁰ In many ways, Schurz's story parallels that of Du Bois as a historian, scholar, world traveler, and ultimately, an exile who lived out his life in a foreign country. In fact, both men informally renounced their native citizenship; Schurz claimed, "If I cannot be the citizen of a free Germany, at least I can be a citizen of free America," and Du Bois accepted Ghanaian citizenship before he died in 1963.⁹¹

Conclusion

Du Bois mobilizes Schurz as a key liberal figure in order to advance his radical challenge to what he called "Standard-Anti-Negro" Reconstruction historiography. As such, Schurz occupies an exceptional place in the Du Bois pantheon of scholars and notables who define Reconstruction. For Du Bois the work of Schurz exposes the antiblack bias within the field of history, a legacy of the Dunning School's stranglehold on Reconstruction, while also highlighting the limits of liberalism by offering a more robust, comprehensive record of our historical past. In *Black Reconstruction in America*, Schurz's life and writings bridge the divide between "propaganda" and "historians [who] have studied the history of Negroes and write sympathetically about them," but Schurz's very position in the middle ground proves to be his weakness as well as his strength.⁹² In Du Bois's hands, Schurz's report and biography of immigration and assimilation re-envision Reconstruction outside of a simple black/white binary of US race relations while the backdrop of Schurz's "abandonment of the Negro" in the 1870s proves to a part of the problem of the "propaganda of history." By both bringing Schurz's report out of obscurity while also positioning it squarely within the discourse of white liberal reformism, Du Bois exposes the limits and possibilities of the official archive. He revises the archive, expanding it to include "Negro Historians," unpublished theses, and lives in order to "establish the truth, on which Right in the future might be built."⁹³

For his entire long life, Du Bois struggled to be heard by the racist mainstream on Reconstruction and the "half-named Negro Problem."⁹⁴ In the liberal figure of Carl Schurz, Du Bois found an unlikely ally under whose strategic cover he could, at times, cross the color line into elite white circles of power. Yet he also exposed Schurz's liberalism as inadequate to the task of historical redress. In doing so, Du Bois created a new foundation for Reconstruction historiography

on which to articulate the struggle for full citizenship, inclusion, and freedom from racial violence.

Notes

Warm thanks to the many readers and interlocutors who helped to shape and sharpen this essay, including Eric Porter, Kara Hisatake, Tsering Wangmo, Katie Trostel, Eric Hayot, Boris Melnikov, Christine Hong, Joanna Meadvin, Sophie Pappenheim, and Samantha Skinazi.

1. Carl Schurz, “Can the South Solve the Negro Problem?,” *McClure’s Magazine* (January 1904), 259.
2. W. E. B. Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk* (New York: Penguin Books, 1996), 5.
3. *Ibid.*, 1, 44.
4. W. E. B. Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction in America 1860–1880* (New York: Free Press, 1998), 731.
5. Patrick W. Riddleberger, “The Radicals’ Abandonment of the Negro During Reconstruction,” *The Journal of Negro History* 45, no. 2 (1960): 88.
6. Eric Foner, *Reconstruction: America’s Unfinished Revolution, 1863–1877* (New York: Harper & Row, 1988), 82.
7. *Ibid.*, 728.
8. *Ibid.*, 352.
9. Hans L. Trefousse, *Carl Schurz, a Biography* (Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee, 1982), 59.
10. Axel R. Schäfer, “W. E. B. Du Bois, German Social Thought, and the Racial Divide in American Progressivism, 1892–1909,” *Journal of American History* 88, no. 3 (2001), 939.
11. Nikhil Pal Singh, *Black Is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 48.
12. Cedric J. Robinson, *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition* (London: Zed, 1983), 451.
13. Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction*, 708.
14. *Ibid.*, 726.
15. Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998), 48.
16. *Ibid.*, 47.
17. *Ibid.*, 205.
18. Singh, *Black Is a Country*, 21.
19. Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction*, 15.
20. Eric Porter, *The Problem of the Future World: W. E. B. Du Bois and the Race Concept at Midcentury* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2010), 22.
21. *Ibid.*, 36.
22. Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction*, 134.
23. *Ibid.*, 133.
24. *Ibid.*, 723.
25. *Ibid.*, 732.
26. W. E. B. Du Bois and Herbert Aptheker, *The Correspondence of W. E. B. Du Bois: Selections, 1877–1934. Volume I* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts, 1997), 72.
27. *Ibid.*, 73.
28. *Ibid.*, 72–73.
29. *Ibid.*, 128.
30. *Ibid.*, 121.
31. *Ibid.*, 128.
32. *Ibid.*, 129.
33. *Ibid.*, 129.
34. Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction*, 711.
35. *Ibid.*, 732.
36. W. E. B. Du Bois, “Reconstruction and Its Benefits,” *The American Historical Review* 15, no. 4 (1910): 781.
37. David Levering Lewis, *W. E. B. Du Bois: The Fight for Equality and the American Century: 1919–1963* (New York: Holt, 2001), 384.
38. David Levering Lewis, introduction to *Black Reconstruction in America* (New York: Free Press, 1998), x.
39. Lewis, *W.E.B. Du Bois*, 350.
40. Du Bois, “Reconstruction and Its Benefits,” 785.

41. Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction*, 577.
42. John Sekora, "Black Message/White Envelope: Genre, Authenticity, and Authority in the Antebellum Slave Narrative," *Callaloo* 32 (1987): 484.
43. Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction*, 726.
44. William Archibald Dunning, *Reconstruction, Political and Economic, 1865–1877* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1907), 10, 13.
45. *Ibid.*, 49.
46. *Ibid.*, 49–50.
47. *The New York Times* article by Edward Cary from January 24, 1897 hails Schurz as "an inspiring example...of what the free institutions of our country may do for the citizen and of what a citizen under those institutions may do for his country." Foner reserves similar praise for Schurz in *Reconstruction* (1988).
48. Foner, *Reconstruction*, xix.
49. Du Bois, "Reconstruction and Its Benefits," 789.
50. *Ibid.*, 789.
51. *Ibid.*, 783.
52. *Ibid.*, 784.
53. *Ibid.*, 785.
54. *Ibid.*, 787.
55. *Ibid.*, 785.
56. *Ibid.*, 786.
57. Lewis, *W. E. B. Du Bois*, 351.
58. *Ibid.*, 367.
59. Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction*, "To the Reader."
60. *Ibid.*, 725.
61. Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction*, 718.
62. *Ibid.*, 708.
63. *Ibid.*, 271.
64. *Ibid.*, 592.
65. *Ibid.*, 725.
66. *Ibid.*, 237.
67. *Ibid.*, 322.
68. *Ibid.*, 133.
69. Lewis, *W. E. B. Du Bois*, 353.
70. Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction*, 705.
71. *Ibid.*, 577.
72. *Ibid.*, 731–37.
73. *Ibid.*, 725.
74. Shamoan Zamir, *Dark Voices: W. E. B. Du Bois and American Thought, 1888–1903* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1995), 101.
75. Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction*, 721, 731.
76. *Ibid.*, 721.
77. Du Bois traces Schurz's career against Sumner's at certain points in the following chapters: "Looking Backward," "A Poor White," "The Price of Disaster," and "Counter-Revolution of Property."
78. *Ibid.*, 342.
79. *Ibid.*, 731–32.
80. *Ibid.*, 133.
81. *Ibid.*, 133.
82. *Ibid.*, 706.
83. *Ibid.*, 322.
84. *Ibid.*, 136. Schurz's methods of discovery align with Du Bois's sociological training as the report necessarily relies on oral histories, interviews, and local opinions and beliefs.
85. Foner, *Reconstruction*, xxiii.
86. Riddleberger, "The Radicals' Abandonment of the Negro," 89.
87. *Ibid.*, 91.
88. *Ibid.*, 90–91.
89. German education and training such as Schurz's had been revered by Du Bois ever since he studied at the University of Berlin in the early 1890s. Du Bois uses Schurz's own awareness of his mediating role, as outlined in the preface to his report, combined with a dose of what Kenneth Barkin has called Du Bois's "Germanophilia" to situate Schurz as an ideal participant-observer—not for his objectivity, but for his mediation.
90. Kwame Anthony Appiah, *Lines of Descent: W. E. B. Du Bois and the Emergence of Identity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014), 22.
91. Trefousse, *Carl Schurz*, 41.

92. Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction*, 731–33.

93. *Ibid.*, 725.

94. W.E.B. Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk* (New York: Penguin Books, 1996), 9.

Works Cited

- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. *Lines of Descent: W. E. B. Du Bois and the Emergence of Identity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014.
- Barkin, Kenneth. “W. E. B. Du Bois’ Love Affair with Imperial Germany.” *German Studies Review* 28, no. 2 (2005): 285–302, *JSTOR* (accessed November 5, 2014).
- Cary, Edward. “Carl Schurz.” *The New York Times*, January 24, 1897 (accessed November 23, 2012).
- Du Bois, W. E. B. *Black Reconstruction in America*. New York: Free Press, 1998.
- . “Criteria of Negro Art.” *The Norton Anthology of African American Literature*. Edited by Henry Louis Gates and Nellie Y. McKay. New York: Norton, 2004. 777–84.
- . “Reconstruction and Its Benefits,” *The American Historical Review*, 15 no. 4 (1910): 781–99, *JSTOR* (accessed March 24, 2018).
- . “Review: The American Dilemma.” *Phylon*, 5 no. 2 (1944): 118–24, *JSTOR* (accessed June 9, 2015).
- . *The Souls of Black Folk*. New York: Penguin, 1989.
- Du Bois, William Edward Burghardt, and Herbert Aptheker. *The Correspondence of W.E.B. Du Bois: Selections, 1877–1934. Volume I*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, 1997.
- Dunning, William Archibald. *Reconstruction, Political and Economic, 1865–1877*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1907.
- Easum, Chester V. *The Americanization of Carl Schurz*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1929.
- Foner, Eric. *Reconstruction: America’s Unfinished Revolution, 1863–1877*. New York: Harper & Row, 1988.
- . “Reconstruction Revisited.” *Reviews in American History*, 10 no. 4 (1982): 82–100, *JSTOR* (accessed May 11, 2015).
- Harlan, Louis R. *Booker T. Washington: Volume 2: The Wizard Of Tuskegee, 1901–1915*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Jacobson, Matthew Frye. *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Lewis, David L. “Introduction.” In *Black Reconstruction in America*. New York: Free Press, 1998. vii–xvii.
- . *W. E. B. Du Bois: The Fight for Equality and the American Century: 1919–1963*. New York: Holt, 2001.
- Omi, Michael, and Howard Winant. “Racial Formation.” In *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1980s*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986. 53–76.

- Porter, Eric. *The Problem of the Future World: W. E. B. Du Bois and the Race Concept at Midcentury*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010.
- Riddleberger, Patrick W. "The Radicals' Abandonment of the Negro During Reconstruction." *The Journal of Negro History*, 45 no.2 (1960): 88–102, *JSTOR* (accessed September 17, 2015).
- Robinson, Cedric J. *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*. London: Zed, 1983.
- Schäfer, Axel R. "W. E. B. Du Bois, German Social Thought, and the Racial Divide in American Progressivism, 1892–1909." *Journal of American History*, 88 no. 3 (2001): 925–49, *JSTOR* (accessed September 17, 2015).
- Schafer, Joseph. *Carl Schurz, Militant Liberal*. Evansville, IN: Antes, 1930.
- Schurz, Carl. *Report on the Condition of the South*. 10th ed. Project Gutenberg, 1865, (accessed November 17, 2012).
- . "Peace, Liberty and Empire." *Speeches of Carl Schurz*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1865. 269–320.
- . "Can the South Solve the Negro Problem?" *McClure's Magazine*, January 1904. 259–75, UNZ.org (accessed September 21, 2015).
- , Frederic Bancroft, and William Archibald Dunning. *The Reminiscences of Carl Schurz, Vol. 3, 1863–1869, with a Sketch of His Life and Public Services from 1869–1906*. New York: Doubleday, Page, 1909.
- Sekora, John. "Black Message/White Envelope: Genre, Authenticity, and Authority in the Antebellum Slave Narrative." *Callaloo*, 32 (1987): 482–515, *JSTOR* (accessed July 29, 2016).
- Singh, Nikhil Pal. *Black Is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Sundquist, Eric J. "Introduction: W. E. B. Du Bois and the Autobiography of Race." In *The Oxford W. E. B. Du Bois Reader*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996. 3–36.
- Trefousse, Hans L. *Carl Schurz, a Biography*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 1982.
- Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Boston, MA: Beacon, 1995.
- Woodward, C. Vann. *The Strange Career of Jim Crow*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Zamir, Shamoan. *Dark Voices: W.E.B. Du Bois and American Thought, 1888–1903*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1995.