My entrée into editorial theory was the direct result of my interest in cultural history and the practical problems of presenting and teaching my work on the Black Arts Movement of the 1960s and 1970s, including selecting, assembling, and contextualizing texts for a Black Arts reader with my coeditors, John Bracey Jr. and Sonia Sanchez, over the last few years. These problems arose as I researched and wrote a history of the origins of Black Arts. One major problem I have often had when I talk about my research, and the Black Arts Movement generally, with colleagues at the University of Massachusetts beyond those in my department, interested scholars who are not Black Arts specialists, students, and potentially interested people outside academia, is that so many of the key texts of the movement are out of print despite a growing body of criticism and literary and cultural history examining the movement. The relative handful of frequently anthologized and cited pieces by a very small number of Black Arts authors often give a distorted or one-sided view of Black Arts. As a result people feel like either they know nothing or they know everything they need to know about this subject—neither of which makes for a productive intellectual dialogue. Until very recently, even much of the best scholarship on African American literature of the 1960s and 1970s seemed to assume that readers somehow knew and basically understood the shape and scope of Black Arts, allowing for more narrowly focused studies, when the difficulty of actually reading a truly representative sample of texts from the movement was great unless one had access to a major research library and the time and energy to essentially put together a sort of makeshift anthology via photocopy, scan, PDF, and so on, or assemble one in one's head. As I will mention again at
the end of this essay, such improvisatory and increasingly legally dubious editing was a necessary and potentially risky task for anyone who wanted to teach the Black Arts Movement for many years.

In addition, certain aspects of the Black Arts Movement cause me to think more deeply about textuality, the material production of texts, and the relation of texts to performance than I might have done otherwise. One of the most perceptive scholars of the Black Arts Movement, Mike Sell, persuasively argues that it was “a textually supported anti-textual movement.” That is to say that Black Arts (and Black Power) significantly came to be understood as a national phenomenon through the circulation of printed texts, including such journals as *Liberator, Freedomways, Negro Digest* (later *Black World*), *Black Dialogue, Soulbook, Black America, Black Theatre*, and the *Journal of Black Poetry*, such anthologies as Amiri Baraka and Larry Neal’s *Black Fire* (1968) and Stephen Henderson’s *Understanding the New Black Poetry* (1972), and the broadsides and books of such black presses as Broadside Press, Third World Press (now the oldest literary black publisher in the United States), Lotus Press, Journal of Black Poetry Press, and Jihad Productions. In fact, one can make the claim that these journals and presses were the most significant and enduring institutions of the Black Arts Movement. Certainly, they make up the most valuable documentary record of the movement now.

At the same time, as Sell notes, there was often a privileging of the oral and of a performance ethos, often linked in poetics and practice with black music. Not only was performance in almost every conceivable public space where black people gathered a major feature of Black Arts poetry, often in hybrid conjunction with other genres and media (especially music, dance, drama, and the visual arts), but poetic (and even critical/theoretical) texts often drew on the resources of African American rhetoric and performance and thematized performance even if those texts were not actually performed. It might be true, as Lorenzo Thomas claims, that the formal arrangement of Black Arts poetry on the page was often a sort of score for performance. However, it was in fact not until some years after its initial publication that Sonia Sanchez read “a/Coltrane/poem” in public— and then only upon request. She recalls that the performance was a success, but that it took some considerable effort to translate aloud the poem’s lineation and spatial arrangement of words designed to recreate a sense of John Coltrane’s chordal explorations on the page. Similarly, though the poet A. B. Spellman’s work was deeply inflected by the performance of such post-bebop jazz musi-
cians as Sonny Rollins, John Coltrane, Ornette Coleman, and Cecil Taylor, Spellman never felt comfortable as a public reader and wrote for the printed page. In short, one aspect of the Black Arts Movement is that it was, in general, extraordinarily concerned with investigating the text (and the presentation of the text to an audience) and its relationship to the outside world, especially language and expressive culture beyond the printed page, seeing that relationship as a sort of process rather than a product suitable for framing. I, in turn, felt obligated to take the text and its presentation and circulation as seriously as did the participants in the movement.

As a result of this concern and the problems I encountered in discussing and teaching the movement, it occurred to me that a Black Arts reader that included key belletristic, critical, and theoretical texts, as well as crucial paratexts, would be a really helpful scholarly and pedagogical tool that would have considerable appeal beyond academia. I have given some thought to the challenges of creating such a reader, and this essay will focus on these challenges. It is my hope that it might in some small way be helpful not only in inspiring other readers and anthologies but also in understanding and teaching the movement.

The challenges to putting together an effective Black Arts reader fall into three basic categories: logistical, contextual, and aesthetic. Obviously, these categories are interrelated and not unique to the Black Arts Movement. Some of the examples that I will cite could easily be moved from one category to another.

The fundamental logistical problem is that a large number of important Black Arts texts (especially the many that only appeared in regionally or locally based journals, newspapers, or small press chapbooks and broadsides) are now hard to find. Others, like most of the work of the Chicago-based poet Amus Mor (whose jazz poetry had an enormous influence on the diction, rhythm, and reading styles of Amiri Baraka, Larry Neal, and other major Black Arts poets), was transmitted primarily orally through readings and other sorts of performances—though it is possible to find various sorts of recordings or transcripts of this material.5 This may seem obvious, but the challenge for an editor is not to take the easy way out and publish the usual subjects from more readily available books and journals, reinforcing our sense of what is “major” and what is “minor” (if one knows that the minor exists at all) without sufficient empirical evidence on which to base that judgment. And, one has to admit, in assembling anthologies this is a challenge that we
often fail to meet. Take the Harlem or New Negro Renaissance, for example. How many anthologies draw on the same handful of books and journals (usually *The Crisis*, *Opportunity*, and *The Messenger*) and ignore significant, but more locally based (and non–New York–based) journals, such as Boston’s *Saturday Evening Quill*? As a result, important writers of the New Negro Renaissance, say, Waring Cuney (along with Langston Hughes and Sterling Brown, an early innovator of the blues poem), many of whose most interesting early poems appeared in the *Quill*, are slighted or misrepresented.

One of the most important (and frustrating to scholars and would-be anthologists) aspects of the Black Arts Movement was its wide regional distribution and diversity. Again, as scholars have increasingly made us aware in recent years, many earlier African American cultural movements had a far wider geographical reach than such descriptors as “Harlem Renaissance” or “Chicago Renaissance” would suggest. But I am not aware of any black art movement—or even any U.S. art movement—that had the same sort of nationwide grassroots distribution as did the Black Arts Movement. There was virtually no city or campus in the United States with any appreciable number of black people where there was not a Black Arts bookstore, theater, community school, writer’s workshop, art gallery, dance company, musicians’ collective, poetry reading series, magazine, or newspaper. Often there would be many of these institutions. The movement even touched many smaller towns. This was brought home to me while I taught at the University of North Florida in Jacksonville. There I had a student in her forties who had been a part of a black theater group in Cross Creek, Florida (the small, unincorporated rural town famed mostly as the setting of Marjorie Rawlings’s *The Yearling*), while she was in high school during the early 1970s. She saw this group as very much part of the black cultural upsurge of that moment. In short, I felt, if it was happening in Cross Creek, it was happening practically everywhere that African Americans lived in appreciable numbers.

While one could trace ideological, aesthetic, and infrastructural continuities and connections between many of these institutions, there were considerable local differences based on regional histories, demographics, cultural traditions, political formations, economics, and even the personalities of leading Black Arts activists. It made a difference, for example, for Black Arts and Black Power founders in the Northeast, that Malcolm X was a regular and surprisingly accessible presence in Harlem. One would miss something vital about the movement, too, if work from
the important New Orleans–based BLKARTSOUTH (and its journal *Nkombo*), which covered a region in which the legacy of Jim Crow (and the mass movement that arose to fight it) deeply inflected Black Arts and notions of African American self-determination, were missing.

I suppose the contextual problem is also obvious and certainly not restricted to the texts of the Black Arts Movement. One of the inherent challenges for putting together anthologies is to figure out how to select and frame material so as not to distort or misrepresent whatever category or classification of literature it seeks to present while keeping the selections to a manageable length. There is never an entirely satisfactory solution to this problem. However, at times the distortions of the material and the movement, formation, or period represented by the material that occur are extremely irritating, though all too common. To take a non–Black Arts example, it has always seemed to me sort of criminal to constantly anthologize as a short poem William Carlos Williams’s “The Red Wheelbarrow” without the rest of section XXII of *Spring and All*—“The Red Wheelbarrow” really is an entirely different thing seen in the explosion of words that characterizes the rest of section XXII. Similarly, a poem like Langston Hughes’s “Harlem” takes on a much different cast when placed within the frame of the rest of the poems of *Montage of a Dream Deferred* where it appeared in 1951 as an untitled part of a long lyric sequence.

Historical framing is absolutely crucial in the case of the Black Arts Movement, especially given the various claims about black “racism” and black nationalism that have emerged frequently throughout the Obama administration—not to mention even longer-standing, and often liberal-left, attacks on “identity politics” that cite Black Arts and Black Power as the beginning of social and cultural decline. When students (and others) read some central Black Arts texts, say, Amiri Baraka’s “Black Art,” they have a tendency to think that these works are crazy—or else they do what too many Black Arts and Black Power activists (and others) do retrospectively—which is try to pound the square peg of Black Arts radicalism into the round hole of today’s sensibilities, to try to smooth out the contradictions and complexities of the movement and the moment. The challenge is not only the profanity, the violent rhetoric, the homophobia, the misogyny, and the anti-Semitism of a number of Black Arts texts (though homophobia, misogyny, and anti-Semitism are not as ubiquitous and unchallenged with the movement as received wisdom often accepts), but also the belief that radical social transformation was
not simply possible but imminent. I find that even my most politically engaged, radical, and/or black nationalist students today do not expect sweeping social change or a liberated African American state any time soon—however much they agree with the political critique of U.S. society contained within Black Arts/Black Power texts.

While editors and readers inevitably read back from their own moment (and, in fact, the significance and even the value of the anthologized period, movement, genre, and so on, are always inextricably linked to the sensibilities and concerns of the moments in which anthologies appear and continue to be read), still the challenge is to frame the texts, to provide the scholarly introductions and apparatus, so as to explain how powerful, often brilliant artists and intellectuals could arrive where they did aesthetically and ideologically while not glossing over the contradictions and even ugly aspects of the movement. What does one make of a poem like Sonia Sanchez’s “TCB,” which seems like an effective poem to me even though it largely consists of the repeated phrase “wite/motha/fucka”\textsuperscript{6}? In other words, the Black Arts Movement was not, in general, a sociopathic cult; neither was it an Upper Westside Democratic Reform Club in New York City—though one can find characterizations now that make it seem like both (and even though the movement did include some reformers and some sociopaths).

One runs into an aesthetic problem here. On one hand, few of us undertake an anthology of literary texts unless we like a large number of the texts on some level—usually a sense of “importance” alone is not enough for us unless we think the text is good. Otherwise, if it were simply a question of cultural importance, as Jane Tompkins pointed out in \textit{Sensational Designs} a quarter of a century ago, \textit{Moby Dick} and many other canonical texts of the “American Renaissance” would have vanished from the earth (which \textit{Moby Dick} more or less did for decades before its critical revival in the twentieth century) or at least been taught far less frequently than \textit{Uncle Tom’s Cabin}, which was vastly more widely circulated, and socially and even culturally more influential than Melville’s novel.\textsuperscript{7} Still, despite the influential and now long-standing efforts of Tompkins and other champions of nineteenth-century sentimental literature to rethink what is “good,” and to remind us how value is connected to race, gender, class, and the politics of a certain moment or series of moments, such as the Cold War, I have not yet encountered any campus where Stowe’s novel is more likely to be taught than Melville’s—and certainly none where many professors are likely to claim that \textit{Uncle Tom’s Cabin} is superior to \textit{Moby Dick}.\textsuperscript{8}
Dick. The point here is that however forewarned and forearmed we are about our possible aesthetic and ideological prejudices and shortcomings, we tend to include work that we think is aesthetically or artistically valuable, for the most part—and did so even before the critical return to “beauty.” For example, one can look at the various anthologies of the Harlem Renaissance and find virtually no work by the Garveyite nationalist poets who published in the pages of *Negro World* despite the fact that they often had more readers than the poets who published in *The Crisis, Opportunity,* and *The Messenger.* Why? Well, in significant part because most of us would consider the work of these Garveyite poets to be stale, trite, old-fashioned, certifiably not modernist—in short, bad. We can also see this at work in African American literary anthologies (excepting *Call and Response: The Riverside Anthology of the African American Literary Tradition*), where, until recently, the selections of the Black Arts Movement have been generally those that most conform to almost a new critical vision of what a good poem or story should be. For instance, if you look at the Sonia Sanchez selections in the *Norton Anthology of African American Literature,* you will find that, for the most part, the editors chose poems that were among the least formally radical in lineation, diction, syntax, and so on. In other words, there is a pronounced tendency to include poems that conform most to our sense of what is aesthetically good, which can skew our sense of an author’s larger corpus and can slight important writers who we don’t feel are very good. To some extent this may not only be a problem of taste but also one relating to the original logistical problems I cited earlier—important writers who have never published with a mainstream commercial or university press, such as Askia Touré or Amus Mor, or who lived outside the main loci of literary and academic production, such as Lorenzo Thomas in Houston, Eugene Redmond in East St. Louis, or Norman Jordan in Cleveland, tend to be under-represented (if represented at all) in most general African American literature anthologies—again, the Riverside (within the limits of space constraints) is largely an exception. Of course, an anthology (and the long-term importance of a literary moment or movement) is hard to sell to publishers, teachers, students, and general readers if you are not able to argue that the bulk of the material contained within it is aesthetically valuable.

Another contextual problem is that the format of most anthologies is not really congenial to the original format of most Black Arts publications. There were a significant number of Black Arts anthologies, such as
Baraka and Neal’s 1968 *Black Fire* and Dudley Randall’s 1971 *The Black Poets*, and individual works by important Black Arts writers, such as Baraka, Nikki Giovanni, and Ishmael Reed, published by so-called mainstream commercial presses. You might call these books that looked like literary books as we now understand them (the mainstreaming of the graphic novel notwithstanding)—basically pages of type with few or no images between two covers. However, as I mentioned before, a tremendous number of Black Arts texts were printed by African American–owned, African American–operated presses, such as Broadside Press, Third World Press, Jihad Publications, Journal of Black Poetry Press, Nkombo Publications, Lotus Press, and so on. Obviously, there is a different feel to this sort of publication.

And beyond the fairly intangible question of feel, there is the far more concrete issue of cover art and often internal illustrations that are far more crucial to the framing of the text than was and is generally the case with large-press publications. Again, this is not a new problem. Even when speaking of large-press publications, it is worth recalling, as Cary Nelson does in *Repression and Recovery*, that there was a time when such cover art and illustrations meant a lot more than they do today. For example, like Nelson, I have always thought the decisions not to include the illustrations of Charles Cullen in the anthology of Countee Cullen’s work, *My Soul’s High Song* (1990), and to omit the drawings of E. Simms Campbell from the version of Sterling Brown’s *Southern Road* contained in *The Collected Poems of Sterling A. Brown* (1980), to be ill-considered.¹⁸ Paul Laurence Dunbar’s books that combine his poetry with the photographs of the Hampton Institute Camera Club, too, have a far different impact than those collections that simply reproduce the verbal texts, such as Joanne Braxton’s *The Collected Poetry of Paul Laurence Dunbar* (1993)—as grateful as I am to Braxton for making it possible to teach Dunbar in an effective way. However, I think that in the case of the Black Arts Movement, such framing was an even more crucial aspect of the reader’s experience in approaching these texts.

This raises the issue of Black Arts aesthetics. Again, as many scholars have noted, one hallmark of the Black Arts Movement was that it was multimedia, multigeneric, and oriented toward performance. One can overstate the oral/performance nature of the movement—there were authors, such as the aforementioned A. B. Spellman, who were much more comfortable with the printed page. And, again, given the geographical dispersion of Black Arts, it would have been almost impossible to imag-
ine it as a national movement without the printed texts of publishers like Broadside Press and Third World Press and of journals like *Black World* and *Journal of Black Poetry* binding it together, however loosely. Still, it is fair to say that the Black Arts Movement, whether one is talking of literature, the visual arts, music, or theater, in general tried to engage a mass audience in public places, streets, housing project courtyards, theaters, bars, community centers, parks, and so on. These performances were often hybrid, multimedia presentations as in, say, performances by Sun Ra and his Arkestra or by the Los Angeles–based Pan Afrikan Peoples Arkestra, which mixed dance, poetry, theater, the visual arts, and music—often simultaneously. There were many records of Black Arts music-literature performances issued—though most are hard to get hold of now. Black Arts texts were often constructed in such a way as to convey this sense of orality and generic hybridity even when, as in the case of Sanchez’s “a/Coltrane/poem,” it might have been some years, if ever, before the poem was actually performed.

Once again, I suppose that this is an old problem. Reading Allen Ginsberg’s “Howl” on the page is much different from hearing a recording of him declaiming in the 1950s while members of the audience shout “Go”—and Ginsberg himself claimed that his inspiration for the long lines of “Howl” was bebop-era jazz soloing. However, again, I think that the Black Arts Movement is distinguished by the depth of centrality of performance as a practice and as a model to its art. After all, the New York poets, such as Frank O’Hara, Barbara Guest, and John Ashbery, did do a considerable number of poetry readings, but even in their cases, they were or are relatively indifferent readers for the most part, and their texts existed primarily for the printed page. The same cannot be said for many Black Arts writers. In fact, if one listens to recordings of Amiri Baraka from different points in his career, one might track his evolution from New American/Beat/New York poet to Black Arts activist from the late 1950s to the mid-1960s by his improvement as a performer of his own work. To my ears at least, Baraka’s reading on a 1959 recording of “Freedom Suite (For Sonny Rollins and Franz Kline)” is relatively tentative; his reading of “Black Art” on the 1965 Jihad Productions album *Sonny’s Time Now* captures his emergence as one of the great performers of poetry in our time.² So, obviously, capturing this crucial performative aspect of the movement presents major problems for the would-be Black Arts anthologist.

What does this mean concretely for the Black Arts anthologist? It
means, again, that the scholarly framing and criteria for making the selections are crucial. One obvious thing is to make sure that a wide range of Black Arts texts, geographically, aesthetically, ideologically, and institutionally, is represented. I say obvious, but again, just because it is obvious doesn’t mean that it always or even often happens. This part is relatively easy. It does require work, time, and a certain amount of judgment based not only on one’s sense of literary value but also on a familiarity with the cultural discussions and debates of the movement. Consulting with living Black Arts veterans, such as Sonia Sanchez, Jayne Cortez, Amiri Baraka, Kalamu ya Salaam, Haki Madhubuti, Woodie King, Barbara Watkins, Askia Touré, Johari Amini, and Marvin X, about what they saw as the key journals and texts, is essential in honing that judgment. And again, one of the crucial challenges is to avoid removing the rough edges of the movement without making it seem like a freak show—or to recall that if it is freaky in the light of today’s political and cultural sensibilities, it made a lot of sense in that era of national liberation and the Cold War national security state.

The question of what sort of scholarly apparatus one creates is key to justifying and understanding the sort of choices one will have to make if one is going to accurately capture the Black Arts Movement and moment. The issue of such scholarly framing and apparatus is fairly simple in theory, if not in practice. What is important is the recognition that strong opinions about the Black Arts Movement and the Black Power Movement are legion, but serious scholarship is still relatively thin, if rapidly growing. That means that, unlike the anthologist of the Harlem Renaissance, the Black Arts anthologist will need to spend much more space defining and framing the movement. In the case of the Black Arts reader that I am coediting with Sonia Sanchez and John Bracey, we have not only included such elements as an introductory overview of the anthology and the movement and a timeline, but also introductions to the different sections of the reader written by Black Arts veterans who were particularly active in the genres covered by the sections. We have also incorporated a number of reminiscences by Black Arts activists giving a sense of the felt experience or everyday texture of, say, Black Arts theater or poetry performance in the 1960s and 1970s. One lasting contribution of these introductions and reminiscences is that they offer an immediate sense of the movement by its veterans who, at the same time, have had some decades to reflect upon and process their experiences. We have also included a section of manifestos, statements of purpose, and vari-
ous sorts of paratexts (often aesthetic and political declarations) that accompanied publications by Broadside Press, Third World Press, and the other presses, newspapers, and journals of the movement.

The system of organizing the selections is a crucial aspect of framing and could be approached variously. One tried-and-true method is to do it generically—essays, poetry, fiction, drama, and so on—which is how we chose to arrange our reader. In fact, this was how such seminal Black Arts era anthologies as *Black Fire* and *Black Voices* were typically organized. Another method would be some sort of chronological order with the notion that this would best display the development of the movement. Another plausible arrangement would be geographical so as to demonstrate the significant regional variation of the movement—and to ensure adequate regional representation (an issue that still provokes Southern Black Arts veterans today). All have their drawbacks. A generic ordering tends to obscure the essentially multigeneric, multimedia hybridity and generic interchange of the movement. Chronological order tends to flatten out or disguise geographical distinction. Geographical organization obscures the genuinely national aspects and interconnections of the movement and makes tracing the evolution of the movement over time more difficult. And what do you do with the many Black Arts figures, such as Jayne Cortez, Tom Dent, Lorenzo Thomas, Askia Touré, John O. Killens, Sonia Sanchez, and Amiri Baraka, who over time play significant roles in two or more regions? As I mentioned before, in the end we followed the generic model—though through our use of the various introductions and reminiscences we tried to get across a sense of the cross-generic, multimedia nature of the movement as well as its historical development.

The most difficult aspect of context bleeds into the question of representing Black Arts poetics and aesthetic practice. One obvious move, which has become a standard of African American literature anthologies (and now other sorts of poetry anthologies) is to include an accompanying CD with example of writers reading their works. In general, these CDs contain simple poetry readings or else illustrative examples of music and folk rhetorical practices on which the writers draw, say, a Scott Joplin rag, a sermon, or Bessie Smith singing “Backwater Blues.” Rarely do you get the sort of music-poetry interface so common in the Black Arts era—with a few exceptions, such as works by Gil Scott-Heron or the Last Poets. Again, it is worth examining whether our sense of genre and medium is more rigid than we might otherwise think. In short, maybe it is a copy-
right problem, but it seems to me that the recording of Baraka performing “Black Art” with Sunny Murray’s jazz group is an essential document for a collection attempting to represent the Black Arts moment.

A more knotty question in terms of producing an anthology that people can actually afford to buy concerns the more visual dimensions of the movement. It is no doubt unrealistic, but it would be wonderful if there could be a CD-ROM accompaniment that included video of say, poets reading with music and dance (say, an Ntozake Shange choreopoem), Sun Ra in concert, theater performances, documentary, and so on. It seems to me that it would not be too difficult to at least have a CD-ROM with PDF files reproducing how the original texts on the page, covers of books, chapbooks, and magazines, and so on, actually looked.

In the end here, what I am talking about is not simply the editing and anthologizing of Black Arts texts but really an approach to teaching them. It is, in fact, basically how most people I know who do teach these texts approach them. In essence, we have cobbled together out of various materials a skeletal version of a Black Arts reader trying to capture its ideological, geographical, and aesthetic diversity. In that sense we have all had to be anthologists if we wanted to teach African American literature and culture of the 1960s and 1970s. We have all had to think deeply about the nature of Black Arts texts and their relationship to other sorts of expressive culture.

One of the things that almost all of us have discovered is that, contrary to what had been the dominant or received wisdom about Black Arts in the academy when I went to graduate school (the early and mid-1990s), the movement was not theoretically averse, but intensely theoretical. Larry Neal did not have to read Jonathan Culler to find out about structuralism—he had already encountered it as a graduate student in folklore at the University of Pennsylvania in the early 1960s. Black cultural and political activists in the early and mid-1960s studied psychoanalytic theory (via Frantz Fanon) and the work of Antonio Gramsci and other Marxist thinkers as well as a range of nationalist and postcolonial/anticolonial theorists in the study groups and workshops that were major incubators of Black Arts. They also created their own homegrown versions of reader response theory, insisting that meaning could not exist independent of an audience and that the audience was an essential feature in creating meaning—hence, one of the reasons for the emphasis on a performance ethos in which artist, work, and audience are intimately bound. While many aesthetic and ideological issues were taken up, none
seemed as pressing as discussing what made a text “Black” and what, in fact, a text was and what it was for. So in the end, my desire to teach the Black Arts Movement (and to write a cultural history of its origins and early development) inevitably led me to attempt to create a usable anthology that takes texts and textuality in a manner as serious and nuanced as did most of the participants in the movement themselves.

Notes

2. Sell, 411–12.
5. For an example of Mor’s poetry and performance style, see (or hear) his reading on the record *Black Spirits* (Black Forum, 1972).

Other critics have echoed Nelson in this regard. George Bornstein, like Nelson, points out that the omission of Weinhold Reiss’s original illustrations in later reprints of Alain Locke’s 1925 *The New Negro* not only weakens the impact of the anthology but substantially changes its ideological cast as an interracial project (George Bornstein, *Material Modernism: The Politics of the Page* [New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001], 150–52).