

“A TORRENT OF RHETORIC”: CONSTRUCTS OF BLACKNESS AND  
MASCULINITY IN CRITICAL RESPONSES  
TO JAMES BALDWIN’S *ANOTHER COUNTRY*

By

MARLON RACHQUEL MOORE

A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT  
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2004

This document is dedicated to my mother, Quintine Harrison Moore.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ABSTRACT.....	iv
INTRODUCTION .....	1
METHODOLOGY .....	3
ARGUMENT.....	4
Baldwin's Fame.....	8
Critical Responses .....	11
Essays .....	11
Book Reviews.....	24
Conclusion.....	30
WORKS CITED .....	32
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH .....	35

Abstract of Thesis Presented to the Graduate School  
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

“A TORRENT OF RHETORIC”: CONSTRUCTS OF BLACKNESS AND  
MASCULINITY IN CRITICAL RESPONSES TO  
JAMES BALDWIN’S *ANOTHER COUNTRY*

By

Marlon Rachquel Moore

December 2004

Chair: Roger Beebe  
Major Department: English

Since his death in 1987, scholars have endeavored to revive interest in James Baldwin’s contributions to American literature and cultural theory with an additional attempt to redress the damage done to his literary reputation in the 1960s.

This thesis contributes to that enterprise by reexamining the most notorious anti-Baldwin essays of that period and some lesser-known book reviews (American and French) of his great modernist novel *Another Country*—narrowly focusing on what is often referred to as Baldwin’s “era of decline.” It explores social constructions of ‘blackness’ and ‘black writer’ as they reveal themselves in these texts. While acknowledging the homophobic anxiety that has already been exposed in other research, this report traces the racial ideologies embedded in the language of each writer and exposes the relationship of racial essentialism to the decline in Baldwin’s critical reception in America and France.

## INTRODUCTION

In the 1960s at the height of his renown, James Baldwin had two controversial and best-selling works on the market, published within months of each other. One was his third novel and the other a pair of essays bound and sold as a book. The essays were highly acclaimed and honored by numerous social and literary awards. The novel was under fire in parts of America for its debauchery. Critics treated these texts, written by the same hand, both on the topic of racial conflict, as if the levels of talent shown in each were separated by several degrees. Years later, when asked to reflect upon this time in his life, Baldwin said, “the reception of [the novel] was a scandal. I was bewildered... It was banned in all kinds of weird places [and] taken out of the bookshelves... Lord, I would not like to go through that again” (Standley and Pratt 206). ‘That’ was a damaging blow to his fiction career. Much of his work has been canonized in academia, but once his ride was over he would never be celebrated or defamed by mainstream America to that extent again. Subsequently, even though he was prolific in multiple genres throughout most of his lifetime, little attention has been paid to the novels published after the ‘scandal’ of *Another Country*.

Since his death in 1987, scholars have endeavored to revive interest in Baldwin’s contributions to American literature and theory with an additional effort to redress the damage done to his literary reputation in the 1960s. This research contributes to that enterprise by reexamining the most notorious anti-Baldwin essays and some of the lesser-known book reviews (American and French) from what is known as Baldwin’s ‘era of

decline.” While acknowledging the homophobic anxiety that has already been exposed in other research, this report identifies the buried racial essentialism that is the overarching theme which compounds the negative responses to *Another Country*. My ultimate quest in this project is to scrutinize the commotion around the novel that led to its eventual mainstream dismissal. This period is often referred to but not thoroughly explained by Baldwin scholars.

## METHODOLOGY

This project interrogates the partially ignored racial ideologies that emerge in many of the negative critical reviews in the 1960s and 70s. This particular era is significant because, on one hand it represents the crest of the non-violent civil rights struggle and the burgeoning of the Black Power era; and on the other hand because 1962-65 is generally accepted as the end of the love affair liberal Americans were having with Baldwin's work. Because this is an assessment of damaging responses, the positive or neutral critics are unexamined here.

The sources compiled here reflect both ends of the publishing spectrum, from the most anthologized essays to some of the more obscure book reviews. It includes articles from *Time Magazine* and reviews available only in Europe. Although each critique weighs differently in its ability to impact the masses, they are each an important contribution to the political atmosphere we are trying to recapture.

Furthermore, I recognize the complications imposed by postmodernist interrogations of the terms "Negro," "Black" and "African-American" to describe the descendants of imported Africans in America, but within the context of this report—for the purpose of simplification—these terms are used interchangeably. Similarly, "queer" and "homosexual" are both used herein to describe same-sex romantic love, sexual intercourse and any related tendencies.

## ARGUMENT

*In the history of twentieth-century American letters it would be hard to find another figure more simultaneously praised and damned, often by the same critic in the same essay, than James Baldwin. – Lynn Orilla Scott, Witness to the Journey*

In May 1963, James Baldwin graced the cover of *Time* magazine under a banner which reads “Birmingham and Beyond: The Negro’s Push For Equality.” By placing him on the cover *Time* conveys that he is an important person, one who should be recognized and heeded. However by the time the article reaches its conclusion we find that Baldwin’s implied authority has seeped out of the story.

While the article ostensibly chronicles the progress and impediments of the Civil Rights Movement, it also serves to critique the tactics of certain prominent figures. The first half focuses on the riots in Birmingham, Alabama earlier that month: water hoses, boycotts, ‘bombingham,’ sit-ins, and paddy wagons. Public Safety Commissioner ‘Bull’ Connor was villainized to some extent for his abuse of authority and the local press was chided for burying the story. We are told that Martin Luther King, Jr. (described as “the Negroes’ spiritual but sometimes inept leader” (23)), along with attorneys, met with local businessmen to negotiate, among other things, the desegregation of store facilities and the initiation of full occupational inclusion for people of color. “Yet at the same time” the writer tells us, “Negro Leader King could be criticized for using children as shock troops and for inciting the protests even as a new, relatively moderate city administration was about to take over Birmingham” (25). Next, the “chain reaction” to King’s hasty campaign is mapped:

New lunch-counter sit-ins started in Atlanta, Nashville, and Raleigh. The NAACP called for peaceful sympathy demonstrations in 100 cities. Jackie Robinson...said he would go to Birmingham to join the Negro Protest. So did Floyd Patterson. Communism was having a field day. ...Perhaps most baleful of all, the Black Muslim movement within the U.S. Negro community took full recruiting advantage... (25)

That last sentence transitions the focus toward another gathering storm of Negroes—the separatists brewing in the North. “Now Malcolm X, top Eastern torchbearer of the militant movement, could only *sneer* at Martin Luther King’s gospel of nonviolence” (25, emphasis added). The reader is then assured that black nationalists and the likes of Bull Connor do not represent the majority of either race. “There are many other positions, and there is a long gaping valley of confusion and diffusion. It is a great, uncharted space where leaders follow and followers lead, for there is no certainty of plan or purpose there. [But there is hope!] Negro author James Baldwin has illuminated this grey gulf with bolts of intellectual lightning” (25). The writer spends several pages elucidating Baldwin’s philosophies through extensive quotes from *The Fire Next Time*.

Leading up to this part of the article the writer has compared/contrasted the racial ideologies and tactics of differing leaders: King fights for inclusion and fairness through civil disobedience and economic disruption; Malcolm X advocates a fully exclusive Black State through inverted supremacist oratory. But when we get to the discussion of James Baldwin, there is a slight change in the writer’s rhetorical direction. Readers are assured that although he may be as visible as the other spokesmen, Baldwin “is not, by any stretch of the imagination, a Negro leader. He tries no civil rights cases in the courts, preaches from no pulpit, devises no stratagems for sit-ins, Freedom Riders or street marchers” (26).

Upon further reading, we can infer that it is not Baldwin's lack of leadership ability that is considered dubious, but his (lack of perceived) masculinity. King and Malcolm's physiques were not even mentioned, yet Baldwin's appearance and mannerisms are described at length. Presented as "a nervous, slight, almost fragile figure" (26) we might say that he is situated as the un-King. Baldwin has renounced his Pentecostal religion while King is a married Baptist minister and father, whose persona is, paradoxically, chastely virile. According to *Time*, Baldwin is full of vices. Notice the discursive linking (and the coupling of objectivity with the subjective) the writer makes of Baldwin's mannerisms to his ability to reach people: "He is effeminate in manner, drinks considerably, smokes cigarettes in chains, and he *often loses his audience* with overblown arguments" (26, emphasis added).

Nevertheless, the writer offers Baldwin's social critique as a form of enlightenment, a flashing bolt of clarity. Clearly, *Time* believes readers should *follow* Baldwin's thoughts or otherwise immerse themselves in his insights so that they, too, can find their way safely across the 'grey gulf.' Yet the reader might leave this article wondering what Baldwin's role is, since his guidance is considered tenuous. This type of ambivalent discourse typifies the reception of Baldwin in the 1960s, especially in the immediate aftermath (but surely extends beyond) of the publication of his third novel *Another Country*. Often his perceived queerness led to a contaminated view of his abilities.

Fast forward to the present. In a burgeoning revival of academic interest in Baldwin's contributions, scholars have begun to revisit this text. Many decry the homophobia emanating from the negative reviews of *Another Country* as the leading

culprit in the denunciation the book received.<sup>1</sup> So says Lynn Orilla Scott: “it remains very difficult to sort out aesthetic judgments from political [ones] when discussing Baldwin’s reception because they are so deeply interconnected” (10). It is my observation that, while homophobia absolutely serves as impetus in the discursive lynching of Baldwin as novelist (barring *Evidence of Things Not Seen* his essays are unfalteringly praised), scholars have failed to recognize that the noose is tied with a double-knot. Just as the writer in *Time* reveals his ideas of what constitutes a Negro Leader by his dismissal of Baldwin’s effeminate body as leadership material, many critics of *Another Country* expose a weakness in their critical ideology: underlying essentialist notions of what constitutes a Negro and/or Negro Writer often inhibits their critical judgment.

On the surface this concept may not convey its complexity or distinction from what scholars have already acknowledged to some extent. For example in her chapter “Baldwin’s Reception and the Challenge of His Legacy,” Scott recognizes that Baldwin spent time on two crosses: “around the same time [he] was being condemned by white liberals for his black militancy, he was being condemned by black militants for his homosexuality” (12). However, deeper digging reveals that it was never so simply black and white. Whether the reader identified as a black or white, left or right wing, militant or conservative, Baldwin’s authorial identity was constantly being defined in relation to the critics’ preconceived notions of race. What I wish to demonstrate here is that entwined with an overt aversion to homosexuality was the (sometimes) subtle objection to Baldwin’s performance of blackness in art.

---

<sup>1</sup> The most recent roundup of homophobic reviews can be found in “Critical Deviance: Homophobia and the Reception of James Baldwin’s Fiction” by Emmanuel Nelson. *Journal of American Culture* 14, no. 3 (1991): 91-96.

### Baldwin's Fame

Though Baldwin may have been obscure outside of literary circles before 1963, he was far from a struggling artist when the *Time* article was written. His 1949 essay "Everybody's Protest Novel" is widely notorious for the "art vs. protest" debate it motivated among literati. Also, using his Christian fundamentalist family culture as the portal into his narrative space, he emerged as a novelist in 1952 with *Go Tell It on the Mountain*. In highly reductive terms, *Mountain* is a bildungsroman in which a young black boy struggles with his domineering minister father, and his father's obvious preference for the older son. The protagonist also guiltily recognizes his homosexual attraction to another young boy who is also the beloved golden boy of the father's church. Critics generally ignored the subtext and hailed it as a masterpiece of modernist form and style.

His second novel, *Giovanni's Room* (1956), was sensationalized for its homosexual drama, which critiques and deconstructs American myths of masculinity (and femininity to some extent). This novel stands out as Baldwin's overt attempt to write himself out of the box designated for Negro writers. There are no black characters and the story is set in Paris. David, the central character, is an American who visits Paris to 'find himself.' His fiancé Hella travels to Spain to do the same. While apart from his girlfriend, David begins a love affair with the handsome bartender Giovanni. When forced to make a choice David leaves Giovanni, but in his mourning for Giovanni he eventually loses Hella as well. It was a best seller.

*Another Country* was also a favorite among the populace. Commonly described as Baldwin's "most ambitious novel," it is a bit more complicated tale of love and passion. Set in New York City, the characters and their relationships are representative of black

and white; male and female; married and unmarried; homosexual, bisexual, and heterosexual. First there is Rufus, a jazz drummer from Harlem who has become jaded and callous from his experiences with racist society. He is friends with Vivaldo, an Italian-American Brooklynite and struggling writer who spends much time in Harlem's jazz scene; Cass and Richard Silenski: she is a WASP and he an English teacher and novelist; and Eric, an actor from Alabama who has made his home and career in Paris and who is in a relationship with a young French boy, Yves. He is also Rufus' ex-lover. During his heyday in hip circles Rufus meets and moves in with Leona a southern white girl. His disenchantment with his world makes him highly destructive to Leona and ultimately to himself. The emotional and physical beatings he inflicts on her lead to her institutionalization. His shame and internal torment send him into hiding from his old crowd. He wanders the streets of the city dirty and hungry, selling his body to white men in exchange for food. Eventually he jumps to his death from the George Washington Bridge, as did Baldwin's childhood friend on whom Rufus is based. It is around Rufus' death that the others come together and their journey into love and self-reflection begins. When it was published in June 1962 it flew from the shelves.

On the heels of this success came the November 1962, "Letter From a Region in My Mind" in *The New Yorker*, which catapulted him into celebrity among the highbrow liberals. "For this fusion of autobiography, American history and global politics into a document as personal as the blood coursing through his veins, Baldwin received \$6500—and a reputation as the most valuable literary property in the country. Almost overnight, with the *New Yorker's* prestige undoubtedly furnishing some of the booster power, the

piece rocketed into prominence; it was required reading among in-groups, and its author's name became a national byword" (Eckman 169).

In January 1963, that essay was reprinted as "Down at the Cross" along with "My Dungeon Shook: Letter to my Nephew on the One Hundredth Anniversary of the Emancipation." Together they were called *The Fire Next Time* and released into the awaiting hands of those who did not subscribe to the *New Yorker*. It spent forty-one weeks in the top five on the non-fiction bestseller lists and won the George Polk Memorial Award for outstanding magazine reporting. One member of Dell Publishing remembers, "whites loved to hear him blast whites" (Weatherby 236). And blast them he did. The popular demand for his views on racism and integration led to a lecture/debate circuit in the U.S. South and western states. In addition to lectures, he attended television appearances, radio addresses and press interviews. All of these tours focused on the struggle for civil rights by African Americans. Baldwin reasoned it "all happened because I'm a writer, [but] not because people read that much. The country is going through a crisis and I've been thrown up as this kind of public figure because I'm the top 'Negro writer' in the country—whatever that means...but I'm still trying to speak just for me, not for twenty million people" (Standley and Burt 32).

Yet he was asked to represent the African-American perspective at every turn. In 1965, for example, he was invited to England to reach his broader audience. "Baldwin and William F. Buckley, Jr., the witty articulate, conservative editor of the right-wing *National Review*, confronted each other at Cambridge University before more than seven hundred British students crowded into a high-ceilinged debating chamber, with five hundred more in a bar, a library and other college rooms watching over closed-circuit

TV. Baldwin and Buckley, roughly the same age and from extremes of American society, debated the notion, “The American Dream is at the Expense of the American Negro” (Weatherby 311).

During his most famous and prosperous period he traipsed across the country and overseas to propagate the need for America to own up to its crimes against its black citizens. His name and face became almost as synonymous with the struggle for liberation as King’s. This would eventually change. Some writers have suggested that Baldwin’s refusal to closet his sexual orientation is the main reason he was not allowed to speak on the famous March on Washington with the rest of King’s inner circle.

### **Critical Responses**

*Whatever you describe to another person is also a revelation of who you are and who you think you are. You cannot describe anything without betraying your point of view, your aspirations, your fears, your hopes. Everything.* –James Baldwin

### **Essays**

While Baldwin’s fiction career was publicly eclipsed by his fame as an essayist and spokesperson, academic types and literary critics were weighing in on *Country*. “Baldwin has said directly enough that Negroes hate white people,” notes Granville Hicks in one of the first reviews, “[i]t is, however, one thing to say that hatred exists and another to make it palpable, as he so magnificently does...”(*Saturday Review*). In phrases that were more prophetic than he could have known, Hicks expresses how reactions to the themes of interracial sex and homosexual love might distort some people’s view of Baldwin’s artistic endeavor: “He is not only a powerful writer; he has become a skilled craftsman. I hope that, in the controversy the book is bound to arouse, his great gifts as a novelist will not be overlooked” (152). Of course “greatness” is in the eye of the beholder.

What we will find is that Baldwin's skills are often acclaimed in direct proportion to how well he satisfies the critic's expectations. And since Baldwin is a black man who is also homosexual, disapproval of his work is consistently related to notions of race and masculinity. For example, Robert A. Bone exalts *Go Tell It on the Mountain* as Baldwin's very best work and immediately shelves it next to other writers of color. "It ranks with Jean Toomer's *Cane*, Richard Wright's *Native Son*, and Ralph Ellison's *Invisible Man* as a major contribution to American fiction. One senses in [it] a confidence, control, and mastery of style that he has not attained again in the novel form" (31).

After a brief exposition of this great novel and (what he feels is) its not-so-great successor, *Giovanni's Room*, he moves to the work of our focus, which he characterizes as "a failure on the grand scale" (41). "The plot consists of little more than a series of occasions of talk and fornication," Bone explains, "[and] since the latter is a limited vehicle for the expression of complex ideas, talk takes over, and the novel drowns in a torrent of rhetoric" (41). After offering a brilliant (and somewhat cynical) exposition of the novel's philosophical underpinnings, he launches into this searing elitist attack:

What dramatic materials are employed to invest these themes with life? A Greenwich Village setting and a hipster idiom ("Beer dad, then we'll split"). A square thrown in for laughs. A good deal of boozing, and an occasional stick of tea. Some male cheesecake ("He bent down to lift off the scarlet bikini"). Five orgasms (two interracial and two homosexual) or approximately one per eighty pages... Distracted by this nonsense, how can one attend to the serious business of the novel? (42)

What immediately strikes us is his differentiation of normal orgasms from the 'other' types he lists. By doing so, Mr. Bone raises an interesting question here. With all of this preoccupation with the number/types of orgasms, how can he convey the seriousness of the work? I submit that he cannot. Before we decide for sure we should observe that his

main objections so far are the bohemian culture around which the conceptual framework is built and the unapologetic homosexuality. He explains that

For most readers...the difficulty will lie in accepting Eric as a touchstone of reality. Let us consider the overall design. Rufus is portrayed as the victim of a white society that cannot face unpleasant truths. The redemptive role is then assigned to Eric. But few will concede a sense of reality at least in the sexual realm, to one who regards heterosexual love as “a kind of superior calisthenics” (*Country* 336). To most, homosexuality will seem rather an evasion than an affirmation of truth. Ostensibly, the novel summons us to reality. Actually it substitutes for the illusions of white supremacy those of homosexual love. (46)

It must be acknowledged that this critique reeks of heteronormativity, but furthermore it may mislead the reader about the passage it quotes. In this particular episode, Eric is explaining to Vivaldo the differences he experiences sexually with male and female partners. His sexual activity is not limited to men, but his romantic love indeed is. The reason sex with Cass is compared to calisthenics is because, Eric says, “It’s a great challenge, a great test, a great game. But I don’t really feel that –terror—and that anguish and that joy I’ve sometimes felt with—a few men. Not enough of myself is invested.” So he is not saying, as Bone accuses, that *heterosexual love* is inferior, but that for a gay man, heterosexual *sex* leaves him wanting. He is trying to convey *his* sense of reality. For Eric sex with a woman requires an increased focus on the physical because it lacks the emotional connection, therefore perhaps making it a more rigorous performance.

Baldwin knew what Americans generally believed about same-sex relationships, mainly that they were not relationships at all but a series of empty shameful trysts. He replaces that perception with new conceptions of diverse masculine subjectivities. Every novelist is, to some extent, a rhetorician who “finds some of the beliefs on which a full appreciation of his work depends come ready-made, fully accepted by the postulated reader as he comes to the book, and some must be implanted or reinforced” (Booth 177).

The beliefs Baldwin attempts to ‘implant’ pertain to the souls of men beyond the sexual act. His work demonstrates his deep and profound understanding that heterosexual activity is not necessarily symptomatic of a heterosexual identification. Eric is answering questions that Baldwin anticipates from his readers and is speaking a version of truth that many people had not heard at that time.

Nevertheless, the implausibility that a man can only fully commit to love with another man is not a reason Bone gives for deeming this novel unsuccessful: “To understand the failure of ... *Country* we must trace the connection between his sexual rebellion, his religious conceptions and his style,”(48). Here is where Bone’s ideas about masculinity reveal themselves and can be linked to his critical ideology of blackness. In keeping with his reading of this as a ‘negro novel,’ he traces Baldwin’s use of religious imagery and jazz bar settings as representative of the “consecrated and profane” binaries available “from the Negro world” (49). The heart of his critique lies in his description of Baldwin’s artistic performance in this novel as “deliberately shocking” (“blasphemous” even) and therefore juvenile; and indicative of Baldwin’s status as an oppressed minority. Bone posits that Baldwin’s language sometimes “hardens into Garveyism,” which he defines as “emotional and rhetorical excess, and often the extravagant fantasies, to which an embattled minority may resort in promoting its own defense” (47).

As for what makes this rhetorical approach juvenile, we are, inevitably it seems, looped back into a discussion about masculinity. According to Bone, Baldwin’s treatment of controversial themes “exploits the fascination of the forbidden, like a cheap film aimed at the teen-age trade. Indeed, *if the style proclaims the man, we are dealing with an adolescent*: who else gets his kicks from the violation of taboo?” (50). Baldwin’s art is

somehow reflective of his manhood. According to Bone these types of homosexual (and cross-racial) indulgences commonly, but temporarily, distract the young man en route to a well-adjusted sexuality. A mature masculinity necessitates that he recognize this divergence as adolescent rebellion and that he re-direct his energy into women, preferably those within his race.

In his final judgment, Bone finds no redeeming qualities in this narrative and he suggests that Baldwin too needs rehabilitation. This portrayal of masculinity is “symptomatic of a *severe crisis in Baldwin’s life and art...* [since] He has already devoted two novels to his sexual rebellion... The future now depends on his ability to transcend the emotional reflexes of his adolescence” (51). The attempt to create a new vision of society is nothing less than Baldwin’s failure to develop into full manhood—emotionally and artistically.

Sometimes the evidence is not so obvious. In 1964 George E. Kent penned “Baldwin and the Problem of Being,” a thematic survey that draws from his essays and fiction. It is a thoroughly researched article that investigates the underlying existentialist philosophy in Baldwin’s work. He too is very pleased with Baldwin’s earlier works. He expounds upon how *Mountain* “investigates, with warmth and perception, the Negro’s possibility of achieving identity through the discipline of Christianity,” and he finds its style “richly evocative...of Joyce and Faulkner, the rhythms of the old time Negro sermon and the King James Bible (21).

But the joy ends there. In what has become a recurring melody in the majority of the evaluations presented here, Kent sings the praises of Baldwin’s debut novel, but is disturbed by what he considers to be Baldwin’s “preoccupation with sex and love as

instruments in the achievement of full being” (22) in *Giovanni’s Room* and *Country*.

Lamenting that *Mountain’s* successors fail to suspend his disbelief as a reader, he cloaks his inability to identify with the characters in compelling arguments about the “staginess” and “theatricality” of the text. The discussion of *Country* begins with a particularly derogatory force. “To make it a serious novel of first rank,” he declares, “would demand severe cutting and some intensive re-writing” (25). As one writer put it, the same need for editing is true for *War and Peace*, yet it is still considered serious literature.

First Kent requests flawless balance in character development. “One trouble with the scheme” he contends, “is that so few characters exemplify the complexity contended for them. Rufus, Ida, and Eric are the more adequately developed characters. The rest are not projected far enough beyond the level of nice, erring people” (27). One can disagree with this assessment but not truly disprove it, for it is simply a man’s opinion. Plus it is not the goal of this project to argue with the critics. However, Wayne C. Booth does warn against making this demand of authors. “Even among characters of equal moral, intellectual, or aesthetic worth, all authors inevitably take sides. ... But who cares? The novelist who chooses to tell *this* story cannot at the same time tell *that* story. In centering our interest, sympathy, or affection on one character, he inevitably excludes from our interest, sympathy, or affection some other character. Art imitates life in this respect...” (78,79).

Kent denies that the “unconventional” sex is an issue for him. Rather, the problem is that “in neither of these novels does [Baldwin] seem to create fully his fictional worlds and characters” (24). Furthermore “[they] do not root themselves deeply enough to become momentous in fictional terms, *nor do they stand with intensity for elemental*

*forces that we are forced to consider an inescapable part of our lives*" (26). In other words, these emotions and these types of situations do not leap from the page far enough (or at all) to represent universality for Kent. During his trek into their world he never fully surrenders his imagination to the story. It seems then that successful realism requires some familiarity and for Kent certain alien characters remain otherworldly—no matter where you place them on the planet.

We draw this conclusion by scrutinizing his earlier statements. It is interesting that *Mountain*, the story of a pubescent church boy in Harlem, is 'provocative' and reminiscent of certain American iconography. Yet the emotions of love and fear that arise in interracial romance and bisexuality cannot root themselves deeply enough to be considered inescapable elements of every human. In actuality, Kent tells us that neither novel can do so. He posits *Mountain* as a story of 'the *Negro's* possibility' as opposed to *man's*. This distinction is subtle but substantial. Richard Dyer reminds us that the "assumption that white people are *just* people, which is not far off saying that whites are people whereas other colours [sic] are something else, is endemic to white culture (2). Blacks and gays were still marginal characters in mainstream literature in this decade and where they did appear (outside of 'black' texts), they usually did so as caricatures that reinforced the myths of starkly religious darkies. The family in *Mountain* would not be too far of a stretch for the imagination weaned on Faulkner's longsuffering, mournful, black family in *The Sound and the Fury*: "These others were not Compsons. They were black: they endured" (215). Put simply, the subjectivities in *Giovanni's Room* and *Country* may not, for this writer, be *allowed* to root themselves deeply enough to become

three dimensional because they are racialized and othered at the outset. The type of black masculinity represented in *Mountain* is the most common and the most acceptable.

The second layer of his rejection can be peeled away from his commentary on Baldwin's writing style. His choice of descriptive phrases suggests something much more intriguing:

The section concerned with Rufus' death and the attendance of his funeral is excessive reportorial detail, sometimes *theatrical*, sometimes written at the level of the *women's magazine*. And the social criticism is inert, for the most part, a part of the *chatty reflections* of a particular character or long clinical discussions. (26, emphasis mine)

The scene in question marks the beginning of white characters Vivaldo and Cass' confrontation with the world they have been insulated against and the lies they have told themselves about freedom and opportunity. In a taxicab ride, Vivaldo recounts his adolescent sexual violence against black boys, boys he suspects may have grown up to carry hate in their eyes because of people like him. Cass recognizes the ambivalent, fearful face of a new bride as the same one she wore on her wedding day. The reader is then pulled back from the microcosmic scene the cab represents and shown a panoramic view of the Harlem streets. The narrator tells us

It was not hard to imagine that horse carriages had once paraded proudly up this wide avenue and ladies and gentlemen, ribboned, beflowered, brocaded, plumed, had stepped down from their carriages to enter these houses which time and folly had so blasted and darkened...At one time people had cared about these houses—that was the difference; they had been proud to walk on this avenue; it had once been home, whereas now it was prison...Then they turned off the Avenue, west, crawled up a long, gray street. They had to crawl, for the street was choked with unhurrying people and children kept darting out from between the cars which were parked, for the length of the street, on either side. There were people on the stoops, people shouting out of windows, and young men peered indifferently into the slow-moving cab, their faces set ironically and their eyes unreadable. (115)

The point of this scene is that Cass and Vivaldo are beginning to *see* for the first time.

Kent's opinion that this style of writing is excessive is a valid critique, yet it seems that

Baldwin's famously petite physique is being critiqued along with his work. Kent is snubbing Baldwin's queer body as an acceptable male authority—because queerness is perceived as ladylike. His ideas about Baldwin's effeminate persona spill over into his views of the queer characters as only partially realized in the text. It explains his frame of reference when he compares this passage to a women's magazine and describes the dialogue as 'chatty.' In our phallic culture, anything associated with traditionally feminine qualities is considered a negative trait in a man. This writer seems haunted by a lingering vision of Baldwin's effete corpus and it with this anxiety that he describes the writing as "theatrical." Overall, we gather that in Kent's critical ideology, black writers and characters can only represent their race and men's writing style should not lower itself to the wordiness of its feminine counterpart.

There is an additional piece of evidence that may help us to understand why in Kent's summation these novels "reflect a hiatus in [Baldwin's] artistic development" (26). Consider the summary of his essay, in which subtleties are embedded in ambiguous poetics about modernity:

Baldwin...confronts the modern consciousness amidst fluxions more talked about than crystallized, and moving at considerable speed: elements of modern man connoting fragmenting certainties eroded at the base, the succor for which has been sought mainly in the vague horizons of the backward look. *The workings of sex amidst those fluxions are certainly...one major element in the choppy sea of our minds*, in which *definable shapes* seem to *appear for the purpose of disappearing*. To define them artistically would seem to demand extraordinary effort indeed, whether in traditional or experimental terms. ...He has not evolved the artistic form that will fully release and articulate his obviously complex awareness. (27)

In what mode of writing or artistry can the complexity of modern consciousness be fully released? Kent may actually be referring to 'certainties' of masculinity and the 'fluxions' of love and lust between men and races. A 'definable shape' of sexuality would require that David be less tormented in choosing a partner in *Giovanni's Room* and the revolving

partners in *Country* revolve less around the homosexual Eric. Even if he is suggesting that Baldwin create a new form of writing that would better suit these fluxions (and I do not believe he is), this assertion betrays his desire for a more definitive (read: categorical) and easily recognizable sexuality.

When the late 1960s ushered in a new era of rebellion, many began to reject Baldwin's generation as too passive, and some considered their objectives dangerous to African American culture(s). Eventually the Black Power Movement and its Afrocentric counterpart, The Black Arts Movement, became the prevalent rhetoric and aesthetic. The tide began to sway away from the integrationist approach. This new generation represented a blackness that was as separatist and menacing as Malcolm X and the Nation of Islam. Molefi Kete Asante explains it this way: "Despite its successes, the age of [Martin Luther] King was an age of contradictions within the African American community. He saw himself standing between the apathetic and the nationalist. This was *his* principal contradiction. It became impossible for him to stand between the population and [sic]...unless he stood for someone else" (13, original italics). To the nationalist, integration was a euphemism for absorption, and as such, not an answer to America's racial issues. For this generation Baldwin's essays were representative of the waning old school rhetoric. "If Baldwin had once served as a shadow delegate for black America in the congress of culture, his term had expired" (Gates 11).

Eldridge Cleaver's "Notes on a Native Son" is the most notorious attack from the nationalist camp. His reflections model the way Baldwin was at first revered and then rejected by the newer wave in the struggle. More importantly, the rejection is based on a

race-specific rubric that is inextricable from its desire to quell homoerotic representations. At first he

lusted for anything that Baldwin had written. It would have been a gas for me to sit on a pillow beneath the womb of Baldwin's typewriter and catch each newborn page as it entered this world of ours...He placed so much of my own experience, which I thought I had understood, into new perspective...Gradually, however, I began to feel uncomfortable about something in [him]. Then I read *Another Country*, and I knew why my love for Baldwin's vision had become ambivalent. (66)

According to this essay, *Country* was so unsettling for Cleaver that he felt compelled to reevaluate all of Baldwin's work from this new, 'uncomfortable' space. "A rereading of *Nobody Knows My Name* cannot help but convince the most avid of Baldwin's admirers of the hatred for blacks permeating his writings" (67). Even though his argument for Baldwin's apparent self-loathing is fraught with Cleaver's own sexual anxieties, we can still manage to locate Cleaver's three main attacks on Baldwin's cultural authority.

He first castigates Baldwin for his bourgeois values, which positions him as one whose success has come by way of separating himself from his African past:

In this land of dichotomies and disunited opposites, those truly concerned with the resurrection of black Americans have had eternally to deal with black intellectuals who have become their own opposites, taking on all of the behavior patterns of their enemy, vices and virtues, in an effort to aspire to alien standards in all respects. ...[T]he intellectual sycophant does not pretend to be other than he actually is, but hates what he is and seeks to redefine himself in the image of his white idols. He becomes a white man in a black body. A self-willed, automated slave, he becomes the white man's most valuable tool in oppressing other blacks. (70)

'Alien standards' may refer to the literary traditions by which Baldwin has been most influenced: European and Anglo-American. Baldwin rejects the protest novel (most clearly in his essays "Everybody's Protest Novel" and "Many Thousands Gone") and often referred to Henry James as the master craftsman. He also credits Dostoyevsky and Dickens with shaping his ideas about character development (Standley and Pratt 246). An

Afrocentric paradigm, as propagated by Cleaver, requires that one consider African-ness as the center of your consciousness, so to aspire to a European model is to become one's 'own opposite.'

Secondly, Cleaver interrogates Baldwin's ability to realistically represent black culture vis-à-vis his narrative choices. He points out "a decisive quirk in Baldwin's vision... which compelled Baldwin to slander Rufus Scott in *Country...*" (72). What is specifically at stake for Cleaver is black masculinity. Baldwin commits slander by miswriting or misrepresenting a black man as "a pathetic wretch who indulged in the *white man's pastime* of committing suicide" (73). Black masculinity is under siege in Baldwin's hands according to this logic, maliciously cornered and pushed into an unnatural descent into complete hopelessness and bottomless despair. The crime perpetrated against Rufus was in portraying him as too afraid to live.

Furthermore, when we study Cleaver's choice of qualifiers we find his belief that Baldwin's fictional black homosexuals create a cultural oxymoron, by which he "necessarily negates any claim... to an authentic 'black' experience" (Scott 13). Both Baldwin and his texts are bereft of black values. Rufus "let a white bisexual fuck him in the ass, and...took a Southern Jezebel for his woman," all of which combine to create the "epitome of a *black eunuch* who has completely *submitted* to the white man" (73). Rufus is highly sexually active, so by 'eunuch' Cleaver does not imply that Rufus' member has been castrated but that he has relinquished his blackness (represented by domination) through desire for and sex with white bodies. This is "a particularly curious assertion because in the novel, though the homosexual nature of Rufus' relationship with Eric is obvious, there is no indication of the occurrence of the sexual act to which Cleaver

alludes” (Nelson 94). Cleaver assumes that Rufus plays a submissive role in sexual intercourse not only because it is homosexual intercourse but also because he can only imagine black and white interaction in hierarchical terms—with whiteness always in control.

His third argument is that Rufus cannot represent black men because his sexuality is nebulous. He has integrated sexually and emotionally with whiteness. It is a very similar argument to the preceding one, perhaps a subcomponent of it. According to the nationalist logic, racial integration cripples the black man’s sense of self, which is why Baldwin’s quest for love between the races is representative of an identity crisis.

Recalling Baldwin’s comments about the protest novel genre and Wright’s *Invisible Man* in particular, Cleaver positions the writers and their main characters as binaries of blackness and masculinity. Notice his direct address to Baldwin:

As Baldwin has said in *Nobody Knows My Name*, “I think that I know something about the American masculinity which most men of my generation do not know because they have not been menaced by it in the way I have been.” *O.K., Sugar*, isn’t it true that Rufus Scott, the weak, craven-hearted ghost...bears the same relation to Bigger Thomas ...the black rebel of the ghetto and a man, as you yourself bore to the fallen giant, Richard Wright, a rebel and a man? (72, emphasis mine)

The dualism he establishes is in terms of style and message. Baldwin’s message is conveyed through conversations and interior monologues that articulate bitterness and offer love as a path to healing across the racial divide (reveals desire, weakness).

Wright’s novel portrays the dangerous effects of the divide. Bigger becomes a murderer as a result of his fear of the alien whiteness he encounters when he finds himself outside of the ghetto (displays strength). Baldwin’s version of masculinity diametrically opposes Wright’s, not necessarily because it does not resist white supremacy, but because it, like the leaders of the nonviolent movement, spends time explaining the anger and bitterness

to the white counterparts, which gives them a chance to redeem themselves. Cleaver further explicates. “Rufus was a psychological freedom rider, turning the *ultimate cheek*” while Bigger was “a violent, though inept, rebellion against the stifling, murderous, totalitarian white world. There was no trace in [him] of a Martin Luther King-type self-effacing love for his oppressors” (73). It is not enough to portray the pain and suffering that often becomes the violent rage of blackness. In this case Baldwin fails to adequately perform blackness because of his alliances with white culture in life and in his art.

### **Book Reviews**

The first book review we will scrutinize comes from *The Christian Science Monitor*. The writer exhibits a traditionally southern attitude in that his idea of a useful black writer is one who makes his point without “stirring up” the good Negroes. “What is the significance of this obscene and bitter book...?” Roderick Nordell asks his audience (11). One can imagine him waving the book in the air. “In the first place it is written by a man whom many consider the most gifted American Negro Writer, honored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews and by Guggenheim, Ford and other foundations.” A writer of such high visibility and acclaim alarms this critic with “his sordid story of whites and Negroes, Bohemians, homosexuality and miscegenation” (11). He explains that the attention paid to Baldwin “represents an extreme mood of outrage against whatever demeans the black man in America. To the degree that this mood is growing—and there are signs that it is, *particularly among Negro intellectuals*—Mr. Baldwin’s new novel becomes important as a harsh textbook to feelings seldom disclosed... The question is whether [he] is helping the situation or stirring it up...” (11). Nordell warns readers (after fanning their racist flames) that the decadence in *Country* seems “psychologically plausible” until Baldwin “belabors it to a point of nausea and

absurdity” (11). As in the cases above, homophobia is rearing its thorny head here, and Nordell also makes clear that he longs for a particular version of black literature: “And it makes [the reader] wish that Mr. Baldwin would turn his talent now to those *healing gestures* across the barriers of race *that are* surely, in all conscience, *more frequent in actual life* than the examples touchingly present in the brutal context of this book” (11).

Taking a similar approach, Robert Root cautions his presumably Christian audience that Baldwin’s new country is a “wasteland” and “jungle” that no God-fearing intellectual should appreciate. “Take honor. Take loyalty. Take honesty and purity and diligence. Take love. Take all virtue and exclude it from the characters you create and write a novel about America, and you might have something like *Another Country*. Almost certainly you will have ‘another country’ from that familiar to most readers of *The Christian Century*” (1354). It must trouble these writers particularly that Baldwin’s impact will be felt far and wide because Root, too, makes a point of Baldwin’s “repute as a leading Negro writer [who] has been backed by Guggenheim, Saxton and other literary grants” (1354).<sup>2</sup>

Root does take time to dissect the themes and style of the book before referring to the lack of proper Negro-ness he observes, although he does move quickly into that direction. “No religion illumines the wasteland. The myth of the Negro’s religiosity is further undermined by this novel, for none of its characters has any faith...” (1354). As might be expected of a writer who is aware of his religious audience, Root demurs at the rampant sexuality but bristles particularly at the bisexual character at its center: “Eric becomes ‘normal’ long enough to commit adultery with the wife of a novelist friend and

---

<sup>2</sup> I mention this only because the majority of the reviews gathered for this project simply launch into a discussion of the book without assuming that the audience needs to be reminded of the author’s fame.

then sandwiches Vivaldo in fleetingly before going back to his lover, the French boy Yves, whose arrival in New York comprises the limp denouement” (1354). He finds value in the “Negro view of Negro-white relations” but seems most saddened that

[i]f the book is mostly about Life and Sex, it is finally about Race. Here it is especially disappointing. The Negroes’ consciousness of their color poisons all attempts at communications and love. Racism emerges as brutally absurd, a force as irrational as the beating [in the novel] given a little boy by Negro boys who had never before seen him. That Baldwin does not encompass the meaning of race-hate more effectively seems an artistic failure. (1355)

Why would he find the racial component of the story *especially* disappointing? Is it an artistic standard to which he would hold any writer? This case may not be as unambiguous as the others but it is safe to conclude that Root looks to the black artist to convey the complexities of racial prejudice better than any another categorized creative thinker.

As stated earlier, Baldwin was a transatlantic celebrity. He, like many of his American contemporaries, moved to Paris in self-exile the 1940s. Rosa Bobia’s *The Critical Reception of James Baldwin in France*<sup>3</sup> allows us to compare the European reaction with those of the American detractors. She reports that Baldwin’s public participation in the black struggle and his book-length essays *The Fire Next Time* and *Nobody Knows My Name* aroused French critics because his writing became more militant and angrier (read: blacker). “[T]he perception of the contrast in tone from the novel to essay forms the focal point of criticism of many French critics throughout the sixties and seventies. This tone, closer to what had been [Richard] Wright’s, caused for the first time the French critic to identify Baldwin as a ‘Black writer’” (26).

---

<sup>3</sup> Although there is no reason to doubt the integrity of these interpretations, the majority (95% according to Bobia) of the full versions of the French documents quoted in Bobia’s text are inaccessible in the U.S. so the translations examined here cannot be independently verified.

Interestingly, Bobia discovered that while it was usual for Black Francophone writers and critics to respond differently than their white counterparts to African-American literature, not one article on Baldwin by a black person could be traced before the 1960s. She suggests that his work could not capture their attention until he began to meet their standards. “[T]he disparity still existed between the Black and white critics because the Black Francophone critics demanded more emphasis on the socio-political concerns” (23). When they did begin to respond, she reports, his work was met with mixed reviews. Because this project concerns itself with those writers who ultimately rejected the novel, we will not discuss their more positive commentary.

Lucien Guissard postulates that it was not *Country*, but the radical language of the essays and the international media blitz that garnered Baldwin attention outside of literary circles.

What we can establish, is that Truman Capote, Carson McCullers, Jerome David Salinger, William Stryon, John Updike, have an intellectual and limited public in the United States and in France. Moreover, the Black writer James Baldwin, whose essays...have caused a stir on both sides of the ocean, owes his notoriety to the anti-racist struggle. *One ignores that certain of his novels could have been written by a white author.* (26 emphasis mine)

Guissard establishes for us that *Mountain* and *Giovanni's Room* were considered regular American (or unblack?) novels and that the early essays were testimonials to the black experience. So when *Country* was translated into French (published as *Un autre pays* in 1963) critics there also allowed their notions of what should concern the black writer to determine the direction of their reviews. It seems that on both continents Black Literature is anticipated to only reflect Black Themes.

Many would simply frame the work in African-American cultural motifs. Bobia points out that for some writers, “African American music continued to be a reference

point in their discussion of Baldwin's work" (39). Music enthusiast Alain Panel, for example, insists that in *Country*, Baldwin "mobilized all the modern and eternal themes in the name of a liberty, which the bluesmen of Louisiana sought. The very essence of the novel is a sort of gigantic development of a jazz theme" (38). Michel Gresset imbues Rufus with "the immemorial tone of the lamentations of the singers of the blues" (39) while Matthieu Galet emphasizes Negro spirituals but finally dismisses the novel as "laborious" and "predictable" (40).

Apparently, unlike the shock value it held in the United States, interracial and homosexual conjugations were so commonplace as to become banal for some of the French audience. "One has the slight impression of following an algebra solfeggio lesson," Galet laments, "A black man and a white woman; a white woman and white man; a Black woman and a white man; a Black man and a Black woman, etc." (40).

Other critics who found similarities to the novels written by black citizens of France and of the former French colonies express their impatience with the diasporic disposition:

Two kinds of novels [that] repeatedly rehash the same thing irritate the reader. The Algerian with his diplomas who wants to get establish[ed] in France but does not go through with it, and the Black man from the United States with the same diplomas, who wants to get established in the white world and renounces. We have read and reread this story *ad nauseum*; we know the lively and the monotonous moments, the interludes, the steamy chapter, the epilogue. The setting varies...these four hundred pages are only a new plea for integration. (Bobia 40)

As in America, some critics decided that the stylistic differences in Baldwin's fiction and nonfiction could be explained in racial terms. According to Bobia, "Pierre Dommergues is one who "dismiss[es] the novel and dispense[s] with a full review"(39). He minces no words in his essentialist views:

While Baldwin's essays reveal the racial preoccupations of the author, in the novels, there is a disengagement of these passions. The style of the novels is pale, like the novel itself is colorless. The contradiction with Baldwin is that he writes 'white' novels (by their style, and subject) while the essays are 'Black' [—] profoundly committed and written in a flamboyant language. (39)

Baldwin's subjects in his novels, depending on which scholar you ask, are racial healing, self love, finding one's own truth about the intersections of love, race and sexuality, and man's (not to be confused with *mankind's*) search for the self. In his own words, his particular aim in writing *Country* was "to show how a difference in skin color between two lovers could corrupt everything, even the most sincere and intimate feelings" (*Arts* 4). Dommergues does not believe these are the "passions" of black people and his idea of black style can be likened to a verbal zoot suit.

In a similar vein (though not in complete agreement), Auguste Viatte is troubled by the foul language and sexual transgression littered throughout *Country*. It is not that the novel is white, but that the black style is taken to an uncomfortable extreme. "Even in a situation without any relationship with the Black question," he carps, "the morbid scenes [and] the obscenities are in abundance" (41). Viatte and Dommergues fall into that great majority for whom the sphere of blackness is imagined as a space of 'natural' flagrancy and obscenity. Bobia illuminates that "Baldwin's linguistic impropriety would seem to be admissible only if used when writing of racial issues" (41) and it is clear that the standards change—even for the 'black' writer—outside of that space. The notable difference from the American detractors is that neither masculinity nor sexuality becomes a major concern in the French context. Homophobia does not overwhelmingly thwart the attempt to analyze, essentialized notions of race do. This is evidenced in the fact that they mostly disagree on whether Baldwin meets their standards for African-American literature.

## Conclusion

When studied under a microscope, Baldwin's so-called "era of decline" can be better described as the era of critical deviation that Emmanuel Nelson suggests it was. Nelson's article highlights how critics who recoiled from the homosexuality in the novel could not limit their condemnation to the narrative. They would begin by making critical observations about the writing style and thematic content, but would digress into tirades against the integrity of a queer protagonist or the usefulness of rage. My project further reveals that in these discussions about *Another Country*, prevailing constructs of masculinity, sexuality and race were always subtly or overtly in play—not just homophobia. This knowledge creates an interstice in which we can reassess their judgments about Baldwin's artistry and perhaps mitigate the impact their words have had on later scholars.

Ultimately, no matter where a critic stood on the issue of black authenticity, whether blackness was believed compliant or aggressive, Baldwin's performance of it in his life and his life's work often inspired anxiety. No matter how thickly cemented the borders of prescribed masculinity were, Baldwin continually slipped through the cracks and challenged the reader to take up his consciousness and follow him. He continues to challenge us to reconsider what we think we know about people and ourselves. Although negative reviews may have crippled his relationship to mainstream audiences, Baldwin made it clear that he expected nothing less than a raucous reception to his writing. He realized that the work of consciousness-raising is inherently antagonizing for the intended audience. Baldwin put it this way:

...[A]ll societies have battled with that incorrigible disturber of the peace—the artist. [He] is distinguished from all other responsible actors in society—the politicians, legislators, educators, and scientists—by the fact that he is his own test

tube, his own laboratory, working according to very rigorous rules, however unstated these may be, and cannot allow any consideration to supersede his responsibility to reveal all that he can possibly discover concerning the mystery of the human being. The artist cannot and must not take anything for granted but must drive to the heart of every answer and expose the question the answer hides.”  
(*Price of the Ticket* 316)

It is in the spirit of Baldwinian discovery and exposition that we continue our drive toward the question of James Baldwin’s legacy.

## WORKS CITED

- Asante, Molefi Kete. *Afrocentricity*. Trenton: Africa World Press, Inc., 1988.
- Baldwin, James. *Another Country*. New York: Random House Publishing, 1960.
- Baldwin, James. *The Price of the Ticket*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985.
- Bobia, Rosa. *The Critical Reception of James Baldwin in France*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1997.
- Bone, Robert A. "James Baldwin." *The Negro Novel in America*, rev. ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965. Rpt. in Kinnamon 28-51.
- Booth, Wayne. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, 2nd ed. Chicago: The U of Chicago P., 1983.
- Campbell, James. *Talking at the Gates: A Life of James Baldwin*. New York: Penguin Books, 1991.
- Cleaver, Eldridge. "Notes on a Native Son." *Soul On Ice*. New York: Dell Publishing Company, Inc., 1968. 97-111. Rpt. in Kinnamon 66-76.
- Dommergues, Pierre. *Ecrivains americains d'aujourd'hui*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1995. Qtd. in Bobia 39.
- Dyer, Richard. *White*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Eckman, Fern Marja. *The Furious Passage of James Baldwin*. New York: M. Evans & Company, Inc., 1966.
- Faulkner, William. *The Sound and the Fury*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1994, 1929. A Norton Critical Edition, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.
- Galet, Matthieu. "Une sorte de gene." *Arts* 13 (19 January 1965): 5. Qtd in Bobia 40.
- Gates, Henry Louis Jr. *Thirteen Ways of Looking at a Black Man*. New York: Random House, 1997.
- Gresset, Michel. *Nouvel observateur* (31 December 1964): 13. Qtd in Bobia 39.
- Guissard, Lucien. "Aux U.S.A. une nouvelle generation d'ecrivains." *La Croix* (4 December 1964): 5. Qtd. in Bobia 26.

- Hicks, Granville. "Outcasts in a Caldron of Hate." *Saturday Review* 45 (1962): 21. Rpt. in Standley and Burt 149-152.
- "James Baldwin en France, la couleur ne colle pas a ma peau." *Arts* 30 (September 6-October 1964): 4. Qtd in Bobia 39.
- Kent, George E. "Baldwin and the Problem of Being." *CLA Journal* 7.3 (1964): 202-14. Rpt. in Kinnamon 16-27.
- Kinnamon, Keneth, ed. *James Baldwin: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.
- Nelson, Emmanuel. "Critical Deviance: Homophobia and the Reception of James Baldwin's Fiction." *Journal of American Culture* 14.3 (1991): 91-96.
- Nordell, Roderick. "Old and New Novels on Racial Themes." *Christian Science Monitor* (19 July 1962): 11.
- O'Daniel, Therman B., ed. *James Baldwin: A Critical Evaluation*. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1977.
- Penel, Alain. "Une saison en literature." *La Tribune de Geneve* (11 December 1964):13. Qtd. in Bobia 38.
- "Races: Freedom—Now." *Time* 81 (May 17, 1963): 23-27.
- "Review of *Another Country* by James Baldwin." *Libre Belgique* (27 November 1964): 7.
- Root, Robert. "It's a Wasteland" (Review of *Another Country* by James Baldwin). *Christian Century* 79.45 (7 November 1962): 1354-55.
- Scott, Lynn Orilla. *James Baldwin's Later Fiction: Witness to the Journey*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2002.
- Standley, Fred L., and Nancy V. Burt, Eds. *Critical Essays on James Baldwin*. Boston: G.K. Hall and Company, 1988.
- Standley, Fred L., and Louis H. Pratt, Eds. *Conversations with James Baldwin*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1989.
- Sylvander, Carolyn Wedin. *James Baldwin*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Company, 1980.
- Viatt, Auguste. *Livres et lectures* (September 1965): 9.
- Watkins, Mel, "James Baldwin Writing and Talking." *New York Times Book Review* 23 (September 1979): 3.

Weatherby, W.J. *James Baldwin Artist on Fire*. New York: Dell Publishing, 1989.

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Marlon Moore obtained her Bachelor of Arts in English from The University of North Florida in 2001. She is currently pursuing a doctorate in African American Literature at the University of Florida.