Black Pulp Fiction: George Schuyler's Caustic Vision of a Panafrican Empire

Fritz Gysin

George S. Schuyler had been known to scholars of African American literature first as the author of *Black No More* (1931), a satirical novel about an artificial change of skin color and its effects on racist America, secondly as one of the most versatile and competent black journalists and essayists of his time – "the Negro's Mencken" (*Black Empire* 263)[1] –, and thirdly as the author of a critical novel about a contemporary African state, *Slaves Today: A Story of Liberia*. The re-publication of two serial novels of the 1930s by Robert A. Hill and R. Kent Rasmussen in 1991 aimed to make the literary establishment aware of a considerable store of newspaper fiction by Schuyler, published pseudonymously and expressing rather controversial ideas. However, the critical response to the newly edited novels, *Black Internationale* and *Black Empire*, has been rather meager. This may be due partly to the dubious literary quality of the texts, their uneven style, their stereotypical treatment of character and action, partly to their later dismissal by the author as "hokum and hack work" (260) as well as to the excesses of violence and brutality in which the implied author indulges in his fictional establishment of a new world order. A further reason may be the narrator's idiosyncratic attitude towards Africa and towards the strategies deployed to achieve its liberation and empowerment.

Both stories are narrated by Carl Slater, a journalist who becomes the secretary of Dr. Henry Belsidus, the demonic leader figure. In *The Black Internationale*, Belsidus, a famous surgeon, by legal and illegal means establishes and finances a Panafrican revolutionary network, builds a secret black army in the United States, and supports the development of innovative technology by means of which the liberated African continent can be turned into a prospering world power. Due to his organizational skills, his ruthless se-

---

[1] Page numbers in parentheses refer to the edition by Hill and Rasmussen.

lection of collaborators, his power of persuasion, and his instilling of fear into his collaborators, he then successfully invades Liberia and uses that state as a stronghold from which to subdue the rest of the European African colonies, while his associates in Europe commit ghastly acts of terrorism to cause international strife and thus divert the attention of the Western powers. The second novel, *The Black Empire*, describes the invaders' attempt to consolidate their gains and defend the new empire against the onslaught of several European armies. After initial, albeit rather ambiguous praise of innovations in the fields of nutrition, health, energy, communication, and entertainment, the narrator's attention shifts to specific incidents of Belsidus's successful instigation of an atrocious war among the European powers, which are then topped by descriptions of bacterial warfare and the use of cyclotrons and death rays to cause an apocalyptic defeat of Africa's enemies and bring about everlasting peace and prosperity to the newly established Black empire.

Hill's and Rasmussen's Afterword is a storehouse of information on Schuyler and his serial fiction; there is no need to reiterate in detail what they have collected, although, of course, I shall have to refer to their general interpretation of the texts. What I should like to do above all, however, is discuss how far these novels' alleged "redemption" of the African continent makes use of particular American strategies and betrays a specifically American value system as a basis of the thoughts and actions of its characters and its narrator, how far such contradictory signals in the texts would modify the recent editors' emphasis on Schuyler's prewar radicalism (cf. 261), and how far his ideological complexity may be responsible for some of the texts' formal and stylistic idiosyncrasies. I should also like to give my reasons for rejecting an ironic reading, which might appear to be the easiest solution of the problem. I shall make use of Schuyler's pseudonym "Samuel I. Brooks" whenever I refer to the implied author, a device that might help us to cast more light on the complex relationship between the two.[2]

What strikes a European reader first of all is Brooks's comparatively benign treatment of the United States as a political and social power, if compared to the atrocities his protagonists commit against European nations. To be sure, the first novel documents quite a bit of subversive activity on home turf, such as the employment of thieves and robbers in Harlem to stuff the war chest, the establishment of a secret air force in New Jersey, the clandestine training of an invasion army in Texas, as well as the ruthless removal of

---

[2] I am aware of the risks involved in this approach, as Schuyler used the same pseudonym in newspaper articles to express conflicting political views. Cf. *Black Empire* 259,261,264,313 n.26.

whites who know too much or otherwise get in the way, or the use of radical religious organizations to produce large scale clashes of Protestants and Catholics or Jews and Christians in major American cities to keep the public mind busy while the Black Internationale shifts into high gear. But these are rather mild measures compared to the assassinations of the British Prime Minister and the head of Scotland Yard, the blowing up of the French Chamber of Deputies, the sinking of a British battle cruiser with 900 people on board, the bombing of Westminster Abbey, the British Embassy in Rome, and the Italian Embassy in London, as well as the gassing of 15,000 English toolmakers during a dance recital and the dropping of diseased rats over the main cities of Europe.

Hill and Rasmussen rightly point to the defeat of Ethiopia by Fascist Italy as one of the major occasions for Brooks's revenge fantasy (270-272), and one may also explain Belsidus's vicious hatred of some European governments with the fact that they head the colonial powers responsible for the disastrous state of the African continent. One may furthermore point out that in the 1930s Africa did not lie in the political sphere of interest of the increasingly isolation-minded United States. Yet it still seems rather strange that a comparatively small black military force should happily take on the concerted attack of the world's strongest armies while ignoring the country that has held African Americans in bondage for centuries at a time when that country's military power is rather feeble. Maybe this also has something to do with the fact that Belsidus has his money in the "American National Bank" (95).

This strange position only makes sense if we take into consideration that Brooks's novels do not actually describe the liberation of Africa but its recolonization. The enterprise consists of four stages: invasion, conquest, suppression, and reorganization. The continent is finally divided into 500 departments and 3,000 districts (250): "'Each department will be just about the right size: twenty thousand square miles, twice the size of the American state of Maryland" (164). General living conditions are "improved" by means of the "installation" of the "latest" technical and scientific inventions, such as solar energy plants, heat storage, radio and TV stations, fax machines, dictaphones, photoelectric devices, fast roads, stratosphere planes, airports with underground hangars, whose runways can be restored within fifteen minutes after an attack, etc. To keep production at peak, these installations are run by Africans trained in the United States and supervised by African Americans, the latter being praised as "some of the cream of the Negro race" (123).

To be sure, many of these new devices have more to do with control of the population than with improving the living standard of the African people. That is especially true of the new, inflexible medical policy based on a healthy diet, on prohibition, and on euthanasia: "Every person in the district is given a rigid physical examination. No one can refuse. [. . .] If the examination shows them to be incurable we give them something to end their sufferings. [. . .] it's quite sensible and altogether humane. Incurable people are not only a drain on our all-too-meagre resources but they are a worry and strain on their relatives, and besides, they are often in constant pain. It is better to end it all and devote our time to those whom we can help"(151). This seems a fitting health program for a government that at an early stage tortured its traitors and then dissolved them in acid tanks (38-39); it also echoes some contemporary practices of fascist totalitarian regimes. Altogether, in spite of Schuyler's obvious misgivings about oligarchic systems in Africa (which is one of the major themes in *Slaves Today*) these sociopolitical strategies betray a blatant disregard of democratic principles, except for those of sexual democracy (94), and thus on the surface they seem to disagree with the most basic concepts of American political philosophy, as long as one ignores the racial situation, that is.

As a matter of fact, the new colonizers feel highly superior to the indigenous populations of the African continent. With a few exceptions of collaborating individuals, the indigenous population is treated in a rather derogatory manner, which borders on racism. It is almost as if "the new land of opportunity" (123) was considered as a *tabula rasa* in the manner of the early Puritan settlers of America. At any rate, the natives are denounced as savages (194), described as "jabbering" (151) or as "screaming in strange gibberish" (236), said to perform grotesque orgies (232), and above all accused of cannibalism (236). Their chiefs can be bought off, and when he addresses them for the first time, Dr. Belsidus uses language that sounds very familiar:

> "Great Kings," he began, "today you are greater than you have been in countless moons. Great Kings, today you have the power of the white man in your hands. Great Kings! No longer must you bear oppression and fear the floggers. For you are the brothers and comrades of one who is greater than the white man. White man makes guns, I make guns. White man makes bullets, I make bullets. White man makes hut that runs along the road, I make hut that runs along the road. White man has big palaver kitchen that floats across the sea. I also have big floating palaver kitchen. White man rich, I am also rich.
> [. . .]
> "I am the King of Kings. I have thousands of warriors. I have iron birds that fly across the sea. I have power greater than the white man. You are my com-

rades. You will have big stone houses like the white man. You will talk over wires. You will eat and grow fat and have rich cloth and many young wives shall occupy your compound.

[. . .]

"Return to your homes. Make the drums talk all over Africa. Tell strangers far away what has come to pass. And when I call you and your warriors, you will come running as does the baby elephant to its mother. I have spoken." (112-113)

This kind of "Injun talk" not only suggests that Brooks's fictional colonizers are Americans (African Americans, to be sure, but nevertheless Americans); it also indicates that Belsidus's utopian redemption of Africa is based on principles that are diametrically opposed to any Black Nationalist or Afro-centric program.

Despite what Hill and Rasmussen say about Schuyler's fascination with his grandmother's respect for African American folk magic and his alleged interest in African psychology (287-288), neither *The Black Internationale* nor *The Black Empire* display any admiration for African cultural achievements. In this respect the two texts provide a remarkable contrast to Schuyler's earlier praise of African culture and of the dignity of the tribal chiefs and his denunciation of the "Americo-Liberians" in *Slaves Today* (cf. Peplow 85-97). This may have something to do with Schuyler's rejection of the over-romanticizing of the African Heritage as practised by a majority of the black writers of the Harlem Renaissance (cf. *Black Empire* 299-301; Petesch 165-166). On the other hand, it may also reveal at least the pseu-donymous author's conviction of the superiority of American civilization and his consequent desire, in true colonial spirit, to superimpose an African American version of its achievements on the old continent, never mind the effects on the native culture.

From the beginning, the gothic brimborium the doctor displays in his larger meetings and the various kinds of music accompanying the celebrations have the purpose to impress the inferior native population and make it easier to manipulate it. This is also true with regard to the new religion imposed on the old continent: Rev. Samuel Binks's so-called Temples of Love, though allegedly built in imitation of Egyptian models and praised for re-introducing pagan fertility rites, are designed to attract their followers by means of exaggerated charity and by the latest technical achievements, such as radio sets, gigantic robots functioning as god-figures, etc. (61), i.e. gadgets that have nothing whatsoever to do with African religion. The Temples of Love also have adjoining economic centers with shops and restaurants and are thus meant to be the focus of social and economic life. Coming close to

parodies of American versions of applied religion, these multi-purpose installations clearly function as totalitarian tools in the hands of the colonizers.

The same thing is true with regard to the liberators' "new" philosophy or what goes for it. Although Belsidus claims to have "tossed aside the white man's morals and scruples," the values he postulates are simplifications of American clichés: besides self-reliance he emphasizes "a philosophy of courage, singleness of purpose, of loyalty, of intelligence" (257). No specific African ideas can be discerned in such stereotypes. In terms of political philosophy, it is quite interesting that Samuel I. Brooks embraces what one might call an anticyclical approach: at a time of increasing isolationist tendencies in the United States, his account combines an imitation of earlier American expansionist politics with an anticipation of the later "arrogance of power" – sometimes it almost seems as if the cynical treatment of European foes and African inferiors initiated a Black revival of the concept of Manifest Destiny. Furthermore, whereas Schuyler was adamantly opposed to Marcus Garvey as a person and especially as a strategist, Brooks embraces Garveyist principles, as Hill and Rasmussen point out in great detail (274-277), and yet whereas Garveyism is full of admiration for African culture,[3] Brooks's ideology, as we have seen, cares very little about it. Instead, he caters to a kind of elitism derived from, but greatly exaggerating, another American concept, W.E.B. Du Bois's Talented Tenth (cf. John A. Williams's "Foreword," *Black* Empire xii).

In his victory celebration at the end of the second novel, Dr. Belsidus addresses a word of warning to his subjects: "'You must not make the mistake of the white man and try to enslave others, for that is the beginning of every people's fall. You must banish race hatred from your hearts, now that you have your own land, but you must remain ever vigilant to defend this continent which is rightfully ours'"(257). Coming at the end of a series of horrifying cases of interracial and intraracial bloodshed as well as extremely violent campaigns of revenge and retaliation, which has left the European nations in a turmoil of war and waste, the United States in a state of social strife, and Africa in the hands of a dictator, such a statement smacks of a brand of cynicism that makes one doubt the sanity of the anonymous author or question the gullibility of the readers who accepted his serialized fantasies if not as the literal truth but as fascinating entertainment at least. Such contradictions in the text make one wary of some of the explanations offered by the editors of *Black Empire*, such as their insistence on Schuyler's presentation of Belsidus as a mythical figure (286), their endeavor to interpret him at

---

Cf. e.g. Garvey's "African Fundamentalism" (published 1925) in Clarke 156-159.

the same time as a trickster (288) and as a "revolutionary in the theoretical, behavioristic sense" (294).

Equally doubtful are the editors' attempts to disentangle some of the ideological confusions in the two novels by placing them at a particular point in what they consider the actual author's quite linear political history, his shift from leftist, anti-capitalist politics in his youth to his later conservative, if not reactionary attitude. In the light of the rather contradictory, if not downright paradoxical political signals emitted by Samuel I. Brooks's narrative, it helps comparatively little to insist that George Schuyler was still a radical in the 1930s. First of all, it is not clear what the term "radicalism" would mean in such a context. Hill and Rasmussen insist that in the 30s Schuyler was an anti-capitalist and "an articulate critic of imperialism" (261), which, as we have seen, does not provide a very helpful link to the text of *Black Empire*. John A. Williams, in his foreword to the edition, suspects a certain fascination with fascism, which would anticipate Schuyler's later conversion to the conservative camp (xiv). Henry Louis Gates, in an early review of the re-edition, reads Schuyler's political development as an extreme version of W.E.B. Du Bois's double consciousness and finds a subversive black militant strain in the author's already conservative mental setup (Gates 31ff.). These readings seem to me to conflate to a binary opposition a discourse that comprises at least four ideological stances: Socialism, Conservatism (both black and white), Black Nationalism, and Panafricanism. I should like to add two more: Imperialism and Colonialism.

To put it more schematically: Hill and Rasmussen present Schuyler at the time of writing the *Black Empire* texts as a leftist radical and contrast him with the Panafricanist Samuel I. Brooks, to whom they in vague terms ascribe a revolutionary strategy that is broader than race (299). Gates claims that at that moment in time Schuyler was already a conservative, whereas his alter ego was a radical black nationalist. Williams, the only one of the four to recognize a difference between the treatment of Black Americans and Africans in the texts, stresses Samuel I. Brooks's elitism and his fascination with European fascism and attributes to George Schuyler a predilection for both. My own reading would suggest that in the 1930s Schuyler's writings display a combination of leftist and conservative tendencies, depending on the issue, but that Samuel I. Brooks in *Black Empire* favors a form of black nationalism that is strongly steeped in American nationalism and colonialist ideology. At a time when Modernists like Hemingway actively participated in the (international) fight against fascism in Spain, Schuyler's alter ego indulged in a form of Panafricanism that privileged African Americans over Africans and

primarily attacked European hegemonic claims by borrowing many of its methods and attitudes from earlier (and later) US-imperialist practice.

In yet another review of the re-edited *Black Empire* serials, John C. Gruesser tries to go beyond what he calls Gates's psychoanalyzing of Schuyler. In his view, the argument for a schizophrenic author only makes sense if one reads the novels "straight – that is, as expressing how Schuyler (or, as Gates would have it, Schuyler as Brooks) believed blacks should respond to colonialism and white oppression in America in the wake of the subjugation of the oldest independent African state [Ethiopia] by a minor European power [Italy]" (682). Considering Schuyler's contradictory positions on political and racial matters – what others have called his opportunism – Gruesser gives more emphasis to his "role playing, masquerading, whiting and blacking up in response to America's racial phobias," which he finds as a major theme in *Black No More* but then projects onto the author's own complex personality. Based on such a different reading of the author, he then proposes a generically and rhetorically different reading of the texts, one which also takes issue with the editors' remarks on the formal aspects of the serials. Although he does not actually carry out his reading, Gruesser's suggestions raise a number of questions that seem to me worthwhile pursuing for a moment, because they involve more general problems one encounters with this kind of fiction.

The key term in this context is "irony" (in the traditional sense), and the major question, it seems to me, is whether pulp fiction of the brand of *The Black Internationale* and *Black Empire* can or must be read ironically. The question (and Gruesser's argument) addresses the problem on the level of discourse, but before we can deal with this, we must pay attention to the use of irony within the text itself. And there, in contrast to Schuyler's satirical novel *Black No More*, we find only scant instances. Hill and Rasmussen have pointed out some examples of verbal irony, notably the use of an ironic title, *The Black Internationale* (295), and the irony in the use of names, beginning with the pseudonym Samuel I. Brooks, which contains Schuyler's second name and the first person singular (313 n. 26), including locations such as "Intercourse, Alabama" (74), and offering a sprinkling of personal attributes and historical as well as intertextual references in names such as Patricia Givens, head of the air force and the narrator's lover, whose name refers to a white anthropologist and race expert in *Black No More*, Ransom Just, the director of transportation, Gustave Linke, a black French metallurgist, whose name seems to suggest a surveying term, "Gunter's link" (305), or Vincente Portabla, according to Hill and Rasmussen a caricature of the Italian 16th

century scientist and comic writer Gianbattista della Porta (323 n. 198). Indeed this is a far cry from the names in *Black No More*, such as Dr. Junius Crookman, Arthur Snobbcraft, Samuel Buggerie, Reverend McPhule, Bishop Ezekiel Whooper (of the Ethiopian True Faith Wash Foot Methodist Church), Professor Handen Moutthe, President Goosie, Senator Kretin, Forkrise Sake, or Santop Licorice (Marcus Garvey; cf. 275).

In contrast to Schuyler's satirical novel, the two newspaper serials show almost no additional (situational) irony, i.e. unless one were to read such a function into the narrator's gratuitous asymmetric reactions to certain horrid crimes in a comment such as "It was all too tragically evident that Plan No. 1 [the gas poisoning of 15,000 people] had been a success" (203) or in a pilot's last-minute explanation of the release of huge thermite bombs to a totally unexperienced crew while the bomber's engines are being warmed up (69). To be sure, there are a number of such discrepancies. We are hard put to take seriously the suggestion that the Black Internationale foments World War II as a mere cover-up of its invasion of Africa (127), and the invaders' attitude towards war borders on comedy or even on the absurd, such as when, before the description of the final battle against Italy, France, and England, we read: "Then we all took a bit of a nap in preparation for the ordeal to come" (254) or when Slater ponders on the conspirators' cynicism and their excessive use of violence: "Was there no end to this cruelty, this ruthlessness, this cold and calculating killing? But then what omelet was ever made without breaking eggs?" (189-190). Yet such statements verge on the sick joke rather being expressions of traditional irony, and, on the other hand, they are too weak to turn the entire text into a modernist or even postmodern parody.

Hill and Rasmussen explain the difference between *Black No More* and the newspaper serials as a difference between satire and melodrama, insisting, in addition, on the allegorical purpose of the melodramatic mode in the latter texts: "In fact, the stories about Africa and Africans make use of all the melodramatic elements of intrigue, love, and adventure that characterized the 1930s pulp genre; as used by Schuyler, however, the stories formulate a coherent allegory of African resistance to white domination" (270). In this way they indirectly dismiss the idea that the melodramatic mode may be a result of hasty writing. In fact, they also find melodramatic elements in *Black No More*, above all in the shift from satire to "a mean-spirited orgy of revenge" at the end of the novel with its concomitant abrupt stylistic turn. The shift itself, the lynching of two white racists who are mistaken for blacks, they interpret as a case of structural irony. Thus, whereas the ironic style is aban-

doned toward the end of the novel, the ironies of plotting, according to this reading, still remain within the confines of the text.

Gruesser, in contrast, finds irony on the discourse level of the *Black Empire* serials. He justifies this by drawing analogies to *Black No More* (which, in the light of what I have just pointed out, seem rather questionable) and to certain political comments from Schuyler's autobiography of 1966 (*Black and Conservative*; Gruesser 683), which denounce some of the issues that Dr. Belsidus advocates, as well by quoting the author's most well-known comment in a letter to P.L. Prattis of the *Pittsburg Courier*:

> "I have been greatly amused by the public enthusiasm for 'The Black Internationale,' which is hokum and hack work of the purest vein. I deliberately set out to crowd as much race chauvinism and sheer improbability into it as my fertile imagination could conjure. The result vindicates my low opinion of the human race." (Gruesser 260)

In Gruesser's opinion, these extratextual arguments then suggest

> the possibility that Schuyler, instead of creating a utopia in the *Black Empire* serials, wrote an anti-utopia reminiscent of *Black No More* to once again expose the dangers of race chauvinism. If this is the case, then for Schuyler the irony of the *Black Empire* novels and the public response to them may have been that the empire Belsidus creates is just as fascistic and repressive as the colonial governments he ousts. (Gruesser: 683)[4]

Whereas, as we have seen, the reference to Belsidus's totalitarian tendencies is definitely correct, Gruesser's insistence on an ironic discourse seems problematic. It demands the "straight" reading of Schuyler's denunciation of his own text, which would immediately provoke the question why he wrote a sequel to it. From his rather odd attitude towards his (almost exclusively black) readers, it appears that he would have been equally frustrated, if they had read it as a piece of ironic fantasy. For it seems that on some level he identified with Belsidus,[5] and this is why the argument in favor of an ironic reading does not convince me. Irony, at least in the "simple," traditional meaning intended in this discussion, demands a moral stance at least on one level of the text, and it is exactly that which is missing in the *Black Empire* serials. On the one hand, the abundance of cruelty and violence ordered and

---

[4] About the distinction between utopia, anti-utopia, and dystopia, see Reilly 107, 109 (about *Black No More*); Kumar 380-422.

[5] Especially with Belsidus's adaptation of Du Bois's concept of the "Talented Tenth," his hatred of Italy because of its invasion of Ethiopia, and perhaps also his self-assurance.

committed by Belsidus make any of his appeals to racial tolerance and love appear hypocritical; on the other, the responses of Slater, the narrator and Belsidus's secretary, are so ambivalent as to make one doubt his journalistic discrimination. Paradoxically, therefore, certain rather ineffective incidents of situational irony serve to undermine the possibility of an ironic discourse.

Moreover, not only are the irony signals too weak, not only is the happy ending of the plot incompatible with the anti-utopian tendencies that Gruesser attributes to the text, but – what is much more consequential – the ironic and the dystopian readings would be mutually dependent and would thus appear artificially imposed, especially because of the absence of a moral norm among the leading characters as well as the lack of the story's foundation in reality. If we ignore the charge of hasty writing, we will probably have to assume that the author was so overwhelmed by the demands of his revenge fantasy that he was forced to abandon the creative control necessary for successful ironic writing. In that case one might even speculate that here the absence of irony is the decisive factor that turns satire into melodrama.

Hill and Rasmussen have gone to great lengths to point out intertextual references and thus to show how Schuyler's newspaper serials are embedded in the mainstream of 1930s novels and movies of the pulp- and science fiction variety. They ignore *Brave New World*, which might have offered a few interesting points of comparison. But they also ignore a book that was written less than 50 years earlier and that represented a similar departure from the possibility of satire, Mark Twain's *A Connecticut Yankee at King Arthur's Court*. Looking backward rather than forward, Twain's dystopia nevertheless displays similar interests and approaches to a different culture, such as the return to the country of one's origins, the utilization of the latest scientific achievements and the deployment of progressive technology, especially in the military realm, the education and "civilizing" of the inhabitants of the old country, the protagonists' method of persuasion by showmanship, etc. There is no space for a detailed comparative analysis. One aspect, however, should be singled out, and that is the closure of the two stories.

Twain's English version of the Civil War[6] finds its complement in Schuyler's "war of liberation" – both end in havoc and ghastly massacre. Yet, whereas Belsidus and his African American elite finish by celebrating their victory and everlasting peace, Hank Morgan and his followers are literally trapped in their own victory: "We had conquered; in turn we were conquered" (*A Connecticut Yankee* 406). Twain's elaborate framing and filtering of Hank's account makes use of another, a "romantic" form of irony and in

---

[6] Cf. Justin Kaplan's "Introduction" to the Penguin Edition 18-19.

this way renders the defeat more palatable to an audience who expected (and thought it received) a comic tale. A violent scene in a *Black Empire* serial, on the other hand, is a practical joke turned into bitter reality and then celebrated as a success. Paradoxically, Schuyler's directness jeopardizes credibility even in the realm of fiction. The use of gratuitous violence, it appears, is only convincing in a literary text if it is shown to be self-defeating. If it is shown to be successful, it is the author who defeats himself, as is evident from Schuyler's loathing of readers who believed his tale. Twain shows that the Americanization of England ends in disaster. Schuyler's pseudonymous author, instead of trying to Africanize America, describes the successful Americanization of Africa. In the light of Schuyler's rejection of the Harlem Renaissance, this makes perfect sense. In the light of his own creative engagement with a bitter reality, it suggests that he has already begun selling out to an American imperialist ideology that defeats the political goals of African America.

Works Cited

Bone, Robert A. *The Negro Novel in America.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958; rev. 1965.

Clarke, John Henrik, ed. *Marcus Garvey and the Vision of Africa.* New York: Random House, 1974.

Clemens, Samuel L. (Mark Twain). *A Connecticut Yankee at King Arthur's Court.* 1889. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971.

Gates, Henry Louis, Jr. "A Fragmented Man: George Schuyler and the Claims of Race." *New York Times Book Review* (20. Sept. 1992): 32.

Gruesser, John C. "George S. Schuyler, Samuel I. Brooks, and Max Disher." *African American Review* 27,4 (Winter 1993): 679-686.

Kumar, Krishan. *Utopia and Anti-Untopia in Modern Times.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1987.

Peplow, Michael W. *George S. Schuyler.* Boston: Twayne, 1980.

Petesch, Donald A. *A Spy in the Enemy's Country: The Emergence of Modern Black Literature.* Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1989.

Rayson, Ann. "George Schuyler: Paradox among 'Assimilationist' Writers." *Black American Literature Forum* 12 (1978): 102-106.

Reilly, John M. "The Black Anti-Utopia." *Black American Literature Forum* 12 (1978): 107-109.

Schuyler, George S. "The Negro-Art Hokum." *The Nation* 122 (June 16, 1926): 662-663.

———. *Black No More: Being an Account of the Strange and Wonderful Workings of Science in the Land of the Free, A.D. 1933-1940.* New York: Macaulay, 1931; Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1989.

———. *Slaves Today: A Story of Liberia.* New York: Brewer, Warren, and Putnam, 1931; New York: AMS Press, 1969.

———. *Black and Conservative.* New Rochelle: Arlington, 1966.

———. *Black Empire.* Ed. Robert A. Hill and R. Kent Rasmussen. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1991.