

The Pathetic Plight and the Bleating Voice of Marginalized People in Richard Wright's *The Color Curtain*

P. Nelson Raj, Research Scholar

Dr. S. Azariah Kirubhakaran

Introduction

The 1950s was a time of social disorder not only in the United States, but also worldwide as race relations became an international issue. During this period, the problem of systemic global racism and the associated problem of 'rights' came to the forefront for American blacks and colonized 'colored' people. To win favour with such newly independent nations, during the Cold War, the Soviet Union seized upon the deplorable state of American black-white race relations in order to repudiate the ostensibly 'liberal' ideals underpinning American democracy. (Dudziak 12) As American political elites realized that the country's troubling history of racial discrimination was impeding its foreign policy objectives, they retaliated with their own public relations campaign and strategically advanced significant civil rights legislation ordering the desegregation of schools and public accommodations as well as equal housing rights for American blacks. (Dudziak 49; 106)

During this period, African American writers were in a unique position to observe these events through both the domestic and the international perspectives. The African American author Richard Wright (1908-1960) is a particularly interesting figure to examine with respect to these issues. Drawing upon his own experiences as a native Southerner, as well as a resident of Chicago and New York later in life, Wright's works consistently demonstrate a distinct and penetrating understanding of the necessarily fraught nature of the modern American black male identity. Significantly, Wright's perspective was not only American, but also cosmopolitan as he left the United States permanently in 1947 for France. In Lorraine Hansberry's review of *The Outsider for Freedom* in April 1953, she writes: "... Richard Wright has been away from home for a long time. He has forgotten which of the streets of the Southside lie south of others, an insignificant error, except that it points up how much he has forgotten other things". (Butler 109)

Some critics would later insist that Wright's exile in France blunted his usually sharp focus on American race relations, as demonstrated in the masterpieces *Native Son* (1940) and *Black Boy* (1945); it rather seems that Wright's 'retreat' to Europe afforded him a unique vantage point from which to forge connections between the nature of racism in the U.S. and racism on a global level generally. Paul Gilroy identifies Wright's broadening racial awareness in his study *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. As he observes, "The relationship of 'The Negro'

to western civilization was something that exercised [Richard Wright] greatly, particularly during the last years of his life”. (147)

The Color Curtain can be read as an existentialist text precisely because of its examination of the necessarily fraught positioning of the modern black or colored individual for whom the achievement of an authentic personal identity—free of the marker of ‘color’ and its pernicious effects—are impossible.

Wright’s Exilic Position

Richard Wright’s decision in 1947 to leave the United States permanently for France may be viewed as the culmination of several journeys to find respite from American racism and its insidious effects. After moving continuously within the South during his turbulent childhood, Wright eventually relocated to Chicago in 1927 and later to New York City in 1937. (Jackson 4-7) As he related in 1944: “I had spent a third of my life traveling from the place of my birth to the North just to talk freely, to escape the pressure of fear”. (137) However, as his 1951 essay “I Choose Exile” reveals, these domestic migrations did not provide Wright the freedom he desired. In the essay the author critiques the hypocrisy of the American liberal ideals of freedom and rights by recounting his inability to purchase a house. As was then common for American blacks, though Wright had enough money to purchase the house he desired, he eventually discovered that “the white owner did not want to sell his house to a Negro”. (291) 3. Housing discrimination and racially restrictive covenants were pervasive problems throughout the United States in the 1940s and 1950s. Wright’s experience demonstrates that such discrimination was widespread throughout the United States, even for affluent and prominent African Americans; it was not until 1948 that the Supreme Court ruled in *Shelley v. Kraemer* that racially restrictive covenants were not enforceable. Wright’s critique of American ‘freedom’ continues as he recalls the immense difficulty he experienced in obtaining a passport, which he was ultimately able to get only after “pulling every political string in sight”. (292) 4. Indeed, the fact that Wright experienced difficulty in travelling abroad at this time is not surprising. As Mary Dudziak observes, since the U.S. was in the midst of repairing its international political image at this time, the federal government was particularly vigilant regarding the travel of African Americans, who were likely to smear the U.S. race image abroad. (61) In the early 1950s, Paul Robeson and W.E.B. Du Bois experienced similar obstacles.

When considering the hurdles, he faced in leaving the U.S., Wright sarcastically remarks upon the incongruous ‘welcome’ that he received upon arriving in Paris. Recalling that he was met by a U.S. Embassy official as well as “two sleek cars,” Wright ironically observes, “I found that abroad the United States Government finds it convenient to admit that even Negroes are Americans”. Here the author is profoundly aware of the truth that he only just narrowly ‘escaped’ America, which this meaningless, friendly ‘welcome’ from the U.S. Embassy belies. Indeed, Wright’s arrival in Paris demonstrates the sheer irony of the oppression of African Americans in the United States, for not only was he repressed within his own country, but his attempts to depart it were similarly stifled. As a result, such experiences uniquely qualify the African American man, in this instance Wright himself, to understand and appreciate authentic freedom. (289)

Importantly, France is valued not only for the respite it offers from American racism, but also for the openness and liberal nature of Parisian society specifically. Wright readily observes that Parisians are “a civilized people” who do not make distinctions on the basis of skin color. In contrast to Americans who were “uncivilized” and “insecure,” “it was the love and respect which Frenchmen held toward their own history, culture, and achievements that braced the French to a stance of fairness in racial matters”. (293-293) Thus, when the author decides to purchase a home, in contrast to his experience in the United States, he observes that “not once during my goings and comings did I so much as observe the lift of an eyelid at the color of my skin”. (293) Wright readily lauds the freedom he has encountered in French society: “...I tell you frankly there is more freedom in one square block of Paris than there is in the entire United States of America!” (289) Though overly romantic and sensationalist, Wright’s passionate praise of Parisian society and the freedom it provides him is significant for it explains his decision that “barring war or catastrophe, I intend to remain in exile”. (ibid)

Importantly, rather than dilute his understanding of the African American experience as some later reviewers of Wright’s work suggested, the social and aesthetic freedom of Paris provided the author with a unique, coveted space from which to continue his thoughtful interrogations on race. Indeed, the hybridity of Wright’s new position as both American *and* European—and his consequent knowledge about the respective oppression and freedom within both societies—undoubtedly enriched and broadened his subsequent writing on the subject. In an interview with *Ebony* magazine in July 1953, Wright states:

The break from the U.S. was more than a geographical change. It was a break with my former attitudes as a Negro and a Communist—an attempt to think over and redefine my attitudes and my thinking. I was trying to grapple with the big problem—the problem and meaning of Western civilization as a whole, and the relation of Negroes and other minority groups to it. (qtd. in Gilroy 165)

As noted here, Wright’s exile to Europe resulted in a significant psychic rupture that enabled him to place his previous American-focused writings in a larger, global context in which new meaningful connections could be made. Specifically, Wright alludes to his growing contemplation of the universal predicament of colored minorities vis-à-vis the West. That is, through the author’s newfound distance and freedom from America, he became better equipped to reflect upon phenomena both within and outside of it.

It was precisely this unique position of hybridity that enabled Wright to incisively comprehend the many problems facing the formerly colonized, ‘colored’ nations that attended the Bandung Conference in 1955. Indeed, within *The Color Curtain* one witnesses Wright’s understanding of race expand as he attempts to link the oppression of the American Negro to that of the formerly colonized, ‘colored’ peoples throughout the world. However, despite Wright’s cosmopolitanism that enables him to understand the innate inferiority of the colonized towards the West, he nevertheless conveys a problematic Western mindset throughout the text by suggesting that Westernization is the appropriate solution for these nations to overcome their retarding reliance upon religious and racial thinking. Significantly, through the espousal of such a position, Wright reiterates a message conveyed in his fictional work of the period - the necessarily

overdetermined nature of the colored individual or nation for whom Western ideology is ‘always already’ functioning.

Before leaving for Bandung, Wright engaged in a series of interviews with Westernized Asians whom he thought could teach him “basic Asian attitudes”. (445) However, although Wright observes that he could relate to these Asians on one level, there was nonetheless a profound chasm of experiences and views between them.

Significantly, though Wright perceives that Asians also possess a ‘double consciousness’ like the American Negro which causes similarly inauthentic relations with himself and others, the perspectives of Asians are far more virulent. For Wright, in contrast to the American Negro who fights for his rights *within* a Western context, which is ostensibly yet problematically his ‘home’, 5 Asians have no actual connection to Western culture, which arrived uninvited to colonize their nations and caused deep systemic problems as a result.

As a result of this thorny relationship to the West, it is not at all surprising how Asian countries cling to their own culture and ideas of a pre-colonial past. (487) As Wright comments with dismay, the Asian and African nations at Bandung are problematically constrained by race and religion, which he perceives as restrictive bonds that sadly show no signs of abating. Admittedly Wright’s understanding of Negro black culture is quite tainted by his own views. One could indeed ‘go further back’ than he does to consider slavery and the loss of native African culture. Indeed, this elision further betrays Wright’s staunchly Western perspective.

Thus, a racial consciousness, evoked by the attitudes and practices of the West, had slowly blended with a defensive religious feeling; here, in Bandung, the two had combined into one: *a racial and religious system of identification manifesting itself in an emotional nationalism which was now leaping state boundaries and melting and merging, one into the other.* (emphasis in original; 542)

Since all progress and social change are measured in terms of the degree to which Asian and African countries resemble Western countries, each tiny alternation formed in the traditional and customary habits of the people evoke in them feelings of race consciousness.

Interestingly, despite understanding the culpability of the West in the rise of race and religion as potent social forces in these countries, here Wright nonetheless betrays a problematic Western mindset as he deems these legacies as retardants to these countries’ advancement. For example, he observes that Indonesians are so fearful of being ‘recaptured’ by colonialism that they are unwilling to use Western technology, and accordingly, stymie their own ability to progress. (518) This assessment is indeed ironic as Wright himself seems elsewhere to have understood colonialism’s effects of instigating the rise of religion and race as triumphant markers of a distinguished identity in contradistinction to that of their “white invaders”. (487) Specifically, when comparing the complicated morass of issues, the countries of Asia and Africa bear vis-à-vis the U.S., Wright understandably states that the “Negro Problem” of America has not been brought up at Bandung because it is mere “child’s play”. (574)

“Is this secular, rational base of thought and feeling in the Western world broad and secure enough to warrant the West’s assuming the moral right to interfere *sans* narrow, selfish political motives? My answer is, Yes. And not only do I believe that this is true, but I feel that such a secular and rational basis of thought and feeling, shaky and delicate as yet, exists also in the elite of Asia and Africa! ... [the] two bases of Eastern and Western rationalism must become one! And quickly, or else the tenuous Asian-African secular, rational attitudes will become flooded, drowned in irrational tides of racial and religious passions”. (607)

Wright’s comments, though prophetic for today, are troubling precisely because they reveal the limitations of his cosmopolitan position. Aligning himself with Asian elites like Nehru, Wright finds that colonialism’s sharpening of race and religious ideology has been a profound disservice to Asian and African nations. Yet, despite his understanding of the problematic origin of these ideas, Wright himself adopts a neo-colonialist perspective by advancing the continuing Westernization/modernization as an effective recourse. While Wright qualifies the “West’s moral right to interfere” as an ideal merging of both “Eastern and Western rationalism,” his proposal is nonetheless naïve, for when has Western inference *ever* been without “narrow, selfish political motives”? Through such declarations, Wright certainly betrays the necessarily fraught and potent nature of his Western mindset, which, despite his cosmopolitan location and approach, is demonstrably not easy to escape.

Indeed, though Wright’s exile enabled him to experience what he deemed to be authentic freedom, and to better understand the similarities between the repressed black American man and the repressed postcolonial man generally, one finds Wright’s cosmopolitan perspective in *The Color Curtain* uneven and limited. Certainly, despite his claims in his 1957 nonfictional text, *White Man, Listen!* (647), he had not yet truly become cosmopolitan and “rootless.” Rather, as discussed here, despite his touted cosmopolitan stance, it appears that Wright was only able to escape Western ideology to a certain degree, for though he was able to elude the hegemonic Western construct of race, he did not elude the construct of Westernized progress, a limitation which testifies to the profound difficulty, if not impossibility, of shedding even highly flawed inherited ideological conceptions.

Work Cited

1. Cappetti, Carla. *Sociology of an Existence: Richard Wright and the Chicago School*. The Critical Response to Richard Wright. Ed. by Robert J. Butler. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1995, p. 82-86. Print.
2. Hakutani, Yoshinobu. *Creation of the Self in Richard Wright’s Black Boy*. The Critical Response of Richard Wright. Ed. by Robert J. Butler. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1995. Print.
3. Wallach, Jennifer Jensen. *Richard Wright*. Chicago: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, 2010. Print.
4. Wright, Richard. *The Color Curtain*, New York: Harper Collins Publishers Inc., 1948. Print

5. Wright, Richard. *Black Boy*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers Inc., 1944. Print.

=====
P. Nelson Raj, Research Scholar and Assistant Professor
Bishop Heber College
Trichy
pnelsonraj@gmail.com

Dr. S. Azariah Kirubhakaran
Research Supervisor & Asst Professor
Bishop Heber College
Trichy
sak_bhc@gmail.com