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This study examines the World War II correspondence published by the Baltimore Afro-American, concentrating principally on Ollie Stewart. We argue these wartime dispatches constitute a style of social action and narrative journalism best understood through the lens of feuilletonism. These works featured the correspondent as the reader’s “tour guide” of the war, wandering about and reporting what he saw and heard from black troops of their wartime experiences. Within the context of the Double V campaign, this body of work provided evidence for the Afro’s argument that blacks were loyal and heroic citizens who deserved equal rights in the postwar world. Published alongside provocatively worded articles on racial and civil unrest in the United States, these works provided an undemanding style of reading that depicted soldiers as fulfilling—and exceeding—the expectations of a country dependent on their support to win the war.

By 1945, when the *Afro-American* published a book-length compilation of its World War II reporting, the Baltimore newspaper had sent seven black correspondents overseas to cover the experiences of black soldiers. The first of these was Ollie Stewart, who covered Rommel’s retreat from North Africa in 1942 and the invasions of Sicily and Normandy in 1944. Stewart and the six other correspondents sponsored by the *Afro-American* are evidence of the growth of the paper’s circulation, profitability, and influence during the 1930s and 1940s—unprecedented growth, given that the *Afro* sent no
correspondents abroad during World War I. Launched on the foundation of a church newspaper in 1892, the paper went national during the 1930s, publishing two Baltimore editions, a national edition that many Pullman porters carried on trains to faraway cities, and several local editions, including the Philadelphia Afro-American, the Washington Afro-American, the Newark Afro-American, and the Richmond Afro-American and Planet. The Afro continued to expand its reach during the war years, when circulation increased 124 percent and gross income grew from over $430,000 to $1.1 million.

Such growth was true of the black press in general. Circulation rose from 1.3 million in 1940 to 2.1 million in 1947, with the majority of that number accounted for by just four papers: the Pittsburgh Courier (277,900), the Afro-American (235,600), the Chicago Defender (193,900), and the New York Amsterdam News (105,300). Yet despite the reach and influence of these papers, there has been relatively little scholarship on African American World War II correspondents.

This essay draws on the pages of the Afro and the book-length compilation of its World War II reporting, This Is Our War, to describe the work of the Afro’s overseas war dispatches. Ollie Stewart’s papers, a meager collection at Howard University, were also consulted. Though we concentrate on Stewart, we argue this body of work constitutes a style of social action and narrative journalism best understood through the lens of early feuilletonism. Exemplified in the United States by the New Yorker’s “Talk of the Town” column, feuilletonism has been called “an unruly genre of writing,” one that “would offer a slice of urban culture: a collage of everything that has occurred in the area and that deserved mention, however passing.” Similarly, the Afro’s war reporting offered a jumble of events, observations, and stories collected by each correspondent. Across this body of work, however, there are constants: a concern with how “our soldiers are faring overseas, what they’re thinking and, as far as censorship allows, what the places are like where they are staying,” along with the publication of long lists of the black soldiers encountered abroad and their greetings to loved ones back home. Furthermore, these works exhibit many of the themes that have been identified as markers of narrative journalism. Correspondents endeavored to produce a “journalism of everyday life.” Through the use of first-person subjectivity and a conversational tone, these works functioned to “narrow the distance between subjectivity and the object.” In the desire to defeat a common enemy, these works symbolically aligned writer, subject, and audience as allies with a white Other who discarded racist practices abroad while working side-by-side, often for the first time, with blacks. This rhetorical effect is heightened by the social context framing these works: the black press’s “Double V” campaign to
FEUILLETONISM

fight both the enemy abroad and racism at home.

This essay not only contributes to the little-studied subject of the black press, but also advances John J. Pauly’s call to clarify literary journalism’s role in civic life and Nancy Roberts’s invitation to scrutinize overlooked sources. We begin first by outlining a brief history of feuilletonism before describing the work of the Afro’s overseas correspondents, ending with a discussion of the context of their work.

FEUILLETONISM AS NARRATIVE REPORTAGE

The stories reprinted in This Is Our War create a fragmented portrait, a fact noted in the introduction by editor and publisher Carl Murphy. “In reprinting these war-time dispatches no effort is made to tell a connected story,” Murphy wrote. “This book represents a series of pictures of what war correspondents met in their travels and interpretations of the reactions of GI Joe to new environments.” This mix and the centrality of the subjective reporter are defining characteristics of feuilletonism, a chatty, opinionated, and impressionistic journalistic genre common in European countries. Since 1800, when the editors of the French Journal des Debats invented the term feuilleton (“a leaf,” referring to supplements in which such writings initially appeared), feuilletonists have been a journalistic force. Early feuilletonists “wandered about the city and relayed what they saw and heard in the street,” becoming the reader’s “expert tour guide and a friendly companion.”

The role of feuilletons on the Continent has been so fundamental that opinionated writing, instead of newsgathering aimed at objectivity, gave rise to the impression that much of the European press consisted of views papers, as opposed to America’s newspapers. In Saint Petersburg and Moscow, for example, scholars have traced feuilletonism’s influence on both public opinion and literature. There the form became immensely popular during the 1860s, when improvements in technology and an easing of censorship facilitated a dramatic expansion of the press. Replacing the heavier editorials and reviews published in previous journals, the “accessible” and “undemanding” feuilleton functioned as a subjective first-person guidebook to popular urban culture:

The writer of the feuilleton presented himself as a man on the street and simulated easy conversation with the reader about common concerns. Often written in the first person, the feuilleton featured intimate details of the author’s life. The familiarity of colloquial style and the emphasis on material of local interest made feuilletonistic speech easy to consume. The writer rambled between diverse issues of the day as a flaneur might meander through a variety of metropolitan locales. Purporting to inform city dwellers about the life of different municipal districts, the feuilletonist offered stories and accounts of local rumor and gossip.
Arguably, the genre reached the height of its influence during the turbulent and culturally exciting period in Germany from World War I to Hitler’s ascension to power in 1934.23 One feuilletonist with a lasting impact was the Austrian-born Joseph Roth, whose 1920s and early 1930s writings for the Berliner Zeitung, Berliner Börsen-Courier, and Frankfurter Zeitung are prized for their insights and literary qualities.24 Roth’s novels also became popular, particularly Radetzky March and The Wandering Jews.25

By contrast, aside from the New Yorker’s Talk of the Town, the U.S. popular press has not fostered a mainstream feuilletonist tradition.26 Arguably, certain narrative journalists and columnists—an American invention—could be regarded as coming close to the early feuilletonists. Hutchins Hapgood described his work at the New York Commercial Advertiser as “something like the feuilleton.”27 But as a well-known member of New York City’s Bohemian community, Hapgood’s connection to the form is perhaps more indicative of the influence of urban European culture on American bohemianism than of the influence of feuilletonism on US journalism.28 A more important influence was likely the black press itself, long the only outlet for black literary talent and intellectual thought, and an unabashed agent of advocacy and protest.29 The tradition nurtured the feuilletonist style Ollie Stewart developed in prewar reporting trips for the Afro, a style that would later characterize his work along war fronts.

**Ollie Stewart’s Prewar Reporting**

As the United States entered World War II, Washington faced a thorny problem: how to win support for the war effort among African Americans on the home front. It was a hard sell. Blacks were no less patriotic than whites, but many resented government regulations that restricted the numbers of black soldiers who could enlist and limited their participation to mostly supply, mess, and maintenance duties, underscoring their second-class status in the segregated armed forces. Yet, unless the black population’s loyalty could be secured, the possibility loomed that African Americans might sympathize with Japan, or so the government feared.

The dilemma was not new. More than two decades earlier, in World War I, the federal authorities had similarly viewed African Americans as a disgruntled group that the enemy could exploit. Officials saw any criticism of the prevailing “separate-but-equal” regime as suspicious and dangerous, particularly if it was expressed in the black press.

During World War I, federal authorities had the black press under close surveillance.30 J. Edgar Hoover, at the time a young G-man,31 played a key role in these efforts. By the time the United States lurched toward World
War II, he had risen to the top of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, where he again aggressively tried to gauge the dangers posed by the black press. As early as 1940, one of Hoover’s targets was the Afro-American Company of Baltimore. Its papers’ tone was set by the editor and publisher, Carl Murphy, a Harvard graduate who received his PhD in German philology and had studied at the famed University of Jena, where the philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel and the poet and philosopher Friedrich Schiller once taught.

At the Afro, as the papers were commonly and collectively known, Murphy favored a mix of serious headlines and titillating stories about gruesome killings, divorces, and salacious exposés about love triangles involving clergy-men and doctors. As war clouds gathered in 1940, Murphy came up with an idea that further increased the popularity of the various editions of the Afro and gained national prominence: he assigned a writer, Ollie Stewart, to tour armed forces camps that trained blacks. Stewart, who had been the paper’s sportswriter, filed a series of twenty-three articles over the course of a year, describing segregated conditions and interviewing soldiers, naming them and their hometowns. Stewart saw the training of what became the first “Red Tails” of the Tuskegee Airmen. He saw a desert camp in Arizona and a number of bases from the Deep South to the Canadian border. All were strictly segregated. If he encountered black officers at all, they were likely to be chap-lains. The New York Public Library deemed his reporting so exceptional that it included Ollie Stewart in its 1942 honor roll of race relations.

Hoover monitored the Afro with concern. He didn’t like Stewart’s stories or the headlines that editors in Baltimore put on them, such as “White Faces Making Lee Soldiers Sick.” Indeed, the headline was both incendiary and a stretch, since Stewart, in complaining about the absence of black officers in the segregated units, wrote:

The truth of the matter is, these white officers at Camp Lee don’t understand their men at all. They mean well—but they just don’t know. They live in a different world, and it is my honest opinion that they will never get as fine response and results from their units as colored officers would.

In general, Afro headlines tended to be catchier than the stories themselves. “Georgia Whites Would Prefer Axis Victory to Racial Equality in the United States,” declared one. It was based on this Ollie Stewart lede:

FORT BENNING, GA.—On the train to Columbus I heard a white in the smoker say: “I’d rather lose this goddam war than see these black sons of b------ get out of their place. Wearing an officer’s uniform has already got some of ’em thinking they are as good as a white man.”
Equally provocative was “Here’s Stewart’s Riot Prediction/Powder Keg at Two Army Camps”:

I was here on a Saturday night, not long after pay day. I was to return on a bus, operated by a civilian driver. Colored soldiers entering the bus were not entering fast enough to suit the white driver.

Said the driver: “Come on, step up there, shines!”

This was repeated at least three times until one soldier, coming up the steps remonstrated, “These men are no shines. They are soldiers!”

The driver reached down beside the seat and came up with a short-handled ax. He laid it in his lap and sat there. The soldiers were standing up in the bus. Nobody spoke. Trouble was so imminent you could smell it. And why hell didn’t break loose is more than I’ll ever understand.40

Ollie Stewart was born May 18, 1906, in Louisiana, the son of a pastor who was the dean of Coleman College, a Baptist institution created in 1890 to educate the children of freed slaves. After the death of his father in 1929, Stewart went to live with an uncle, a dentist in East Orange, NJ, but he returned to Louisiana for high school and college.

This middle-class background gave Stewart ambitions that others may not have had, and he grabbed opportunities to realize them. He was in his early thirties in 1939 when he scored coups that thrust him to the front ranks of rising black journalists: he sold two articles to the *Reader’s Digest*, then at the peak of its popularity. “A Negro Looks at the South” produced controversy because of his optimistic long-term assessment.41 “Harlem God in His Heaven” became much talked about because it was about Father Divine, the charismatic Harlem spiritual leader whose message was “Accentuate the Positive, Eliminate the Negative,” which the white songwriter Johnny Mercer later turned into an early crossover hit that appealed to listeners regardless of race.42

Flush with cash from his *Reader’s Digest* articles, Stewart talked Murphy into sending him to Brazil. He voyaged through the Caribbean for twelve days on the way out and spent another two weeks on a ship coming back. Everywhere he stopped, he wrote about his impressions of racial conditions. He also included other items of interest to readers. In the Dominican Republic, he wrote about eager youngsters hoping to catch the eye of US baseball recruiters; in Trinidad about how hot the temperature was. However, it is the series of Brazil articles, based on his twenty-six days in that country, that best demonstrates the kind of journalist Ollie Stewart was and would be in World War II. Stewart was not really a reporter in the mainstream tradition; rather,
he was a feuilletonist. In his *Afro* coverage, he used feuilletonist techniques by mixing presumably factual observations—often from unidentified locals—to buttress his impressions. His journalistic forte was writing, not newsgathering. As a feuilletonist in Brazil, Stewart often gave short shrift to sourceable facts and instead quoted unnamed persons he met, including taxi drivers or waiters. He made sweeping statements about race relations on the basis of what he saw. In one long front-page article, “Brazilian Tragedy Is Short Hair,” he analyzed race relations through hair:

*RIO DE JANEIRO, BRAZIL—*If it isn’t a sin against the Holy Ghost, it is at least the height of bad judgment to be born black.

That is the conclusion I have come to after getting acquainted with Rio—one of the most beautiful places in the world, and the city I have tried harder to like than any place I’ve been.

Brazil has a hell of a color line. And it seems to be drawn according to the kind of hair you’ve got. The Portuguese and Indians come pretty dark sometimes, but they have straight hair. So they go anywhere and do anything. The mulatto, mixed African and Indian, or Portuguese and African, has long curly hair. So he too gets by.

But the plain colored man with short hair catches the devil!

Oh, they are very nice about giving colored people the runaround. All smiles and we’re-all-brothers-you-can-depend-on that—but you find yourself outside looking in, just the same, if you ain’t got that hair.

In an article headlined “Brazil 100 Years Behind the United States,” he wrote about what he perceived as social class immobility:

Opportunity doesn’t come akinning here as it does in the States. Poor boys in Sao Paulo don’t work their way through college, study law, become president of a college or marry the boss’s daughter. If you start out in life here by selling bananas or lottery tickets, you usually end up doing the same thing. . . . This applies to Portuguese, Indian and African. You play the cards dealt you. There is no second deal.

The *Afro* published letters praising Stewart’s articles from readers who found them exotic. But James W. Ivy, a cultural anthropologist who later became editor of the *Crisis*, criticized Stewart as a “wide-eyed countryboy from Louisiana” who lacked the background and language to interpret Brazil’s racial and caste complexities. None of this worried Murphy, the *Afro* editor. People were talking—and buying the paper. And Stewart’s impressions had a lasting impact; his conclusions continued to be cited as authentic observations, partially because so few American blacks had seen Brazil.
Just as he had in Brazil, Stewart reported what he heard as he surveyed the situation of black troops at US encampments. If he made any effort to seek official comment, he made no mention of it. In a story headlined “Draft Has Already Hit Dixie, Ollie Stewart Finds,” he wrote:

In Louisiana, I heard stories of colored men already conscripted, already feeding and taking care of mules, already hustled into camps and taught how to cook and make beds—so that they will be good orderlies.

“But,” [I] objected to my informant, “the conscription bill has not yet been passed, and may not be passed until January—or at least until after the election.”

“Don’t need to pass no bill, if the white folks decide to come after you,” the man replied. “And if’n I was you, I wouldn’t be talking about elections and things. That’s white folks’ business—and somebody might hear you. Better button up your lips.”

Stewart was not the only one who challenged prevailing mainstream ideas. Soon after Pearl Harbor, in December 1941, the Afro’s unnamed “Inquiring Reporter” printed comments from five Richmond residents about the possibility that Japan might win the war. “The colored races as a whole would benefit,” William A. Pride, a printer, was quoted as saying. “This would be the first step in the darker races coming back into their own.” A salesman, James R. Orrange [sic], said: “If Japan should win the war, the colored people would have a greater advance. Today under white America’s rule, we do not have much opportunity to show our worth.”

Hoover hit the roof. He had collected a stack of provocative remarks from the Afro—including Ollie Stewart’s stories—and asked the Justice Department whether they were prosecutable for sedition. The answer was no. But Wendell Berge, head of the Justice Department’s criminal division, encouraged an investigation of the Afro’s ownership as well as the “character and pertinent activities” of its editors to see if they were linked with “hostile or subversive sources.” Hoover was not the only one who was fearful. After Pearl Harbor, President Franklin D. Roosevelt proposed the imposition of a voluntary censorship of black papers as the first step toward instituting official censorship. His administration also mulled over censoring all newspapers, white and black. Gradually, the Roosevelt administration’s thinking evolved. The censorship idea soon was shelved and the cooperation of newspapers catering to all races secured through persuasion. Even as the FBI director wanted to act against the Afro and other black papers, wider considerations about winning over the African American community trumped his concerns.

An early turning point in this evolution may have come at a two-day
conference sponsored by the War Department that began the day after the attack on Pearl Harbor. Nearly 20 key figures in African American journalism traveled to Washington, DC, where they were told by Colonel E. R. Householder, of the adjutant general’s office, that any relaxation of segregation was a nonstarter. “The army is not a sociological laboratory,” he declared.

Ollie Stewart was one of two Afro representatives at the conference. Within months of the meeting, he convinced Murphy to seek accreditation for the Afro. Surprisingly, authorities, after considering the application for six months, approved Stewart despite such indiscretions as urging, tongue-in-cheek, that readers reject President Roosevelt’s 1940 reelection and vote for Communists instead. Stewart also overcame another serious hang-up: at one point officials investigating his background confused him with a bank robber of the same name. But when Stewart finally shipped to Europe in 1942, he became the Afro’s first war correspondent and a journalistic novelty to be promoted on its pages.

Ollie Stewart and the Afro Go to War

Some 30 accredited war correspondents represented the black press on fronts from Europe to the Pacific, Alaska, China-Burma-India, the Mediterranean, North Africa, and Italy. The Afro sent seven overseas. But as the paper’s first, Stewart was treated as a celebrity. Instead of waiting to send him by troop ship at government expense with the “next colored contingent,” the company acquired bragging rights by paying $656 to fly him on a Pan American Airways Clipper to Europe. “The same trip before the war would have cost $359,” readers were told. A picture showed the writer in an army trench coat and an officer’s cap, since correspondents enjoyed the equivalent rank of major. He held a briefcase; a green armband marked with “C” identified him as a correspondent. In an article accompanying the picture, not a single detail was spared, from the number of inoculations he received to the cost of each piece of clothing in his wardrobe.

After Stewart arrived in wartime England in September 1942, he continued his feuilletonist style, writing as if he were sending letters home. In one of his maiden reports, he related how he woke up to a rat in his London hotel room eating his bar of chocolate until Stewart got up and ate it himself; the rat remained. He also described life in the warring country in terms that his readers living back in the States could readily relate to:

In America you get big, bulky Sunday papers. Here you get eight pages. In America you buy all the clothes you can pay for. Here you hoard coupons until you must have a shirt. In Baltimore you can have bacon and eggs every morning, with butter and plenty of sugar. Here you wait for a month for your egg, and wonder how to prepare it when you get it.
On the night of November 9, 1942, shortly after the first Allied landings in North Africa had been announced, he was included in a star-studded group of correspondents headed for Morocco in a convoy of ships. A. J. Liebling described the departure in the *New Yorker*:

> Our party . . . left London late in the evening from a spur railroad station used only for troop movements, in an atmosphere thick with fog and mystery. It included Ernie Pyle, of Scripps-Howard, Bill Lang of *Time*, *Life*, etc., Red Mueller of *Newsweek*, Gault MacGowan of the New York *Sun*, Ollie Stewart of the Baltimore *Afro-American*, and Sergeant, now First Lieutenant, Bob Neville, whom I had known when he was on the *Herald Tribune* and *PM* and who was now going to Africa as a correspondent of the army magazine, *Yank*. I recognized a kindred spirit in Ollie the moment I saw him. “Where do you hope we land at?” he asked me. “Someplace where resistance has ceased,” I told him. That established a perfect rapport.63

Since these correspondents traveled on a British merchant ship that had been converted into military use, none of the US segregation rules were in force. Ernie Pyle wrote:

> We were officially assigned together, and we stuck together throughout the trip. Ollie Stewart was a Negro, the only American Negro correspondent then accredited to the European theater. He was well-educated, conducted himself well, and had traveled quite a bit in foreign countries. We all grew to like him very much on the trip. He lived in one of the two cabins with us, ate with us, played handball on the deck with officers, everybody was friendly to him, and there was no “problem.”64

Once the group landed in Morocco, the correspondents went where the action was. Because the War Department barred blacks from combat, Stewart was constantly on the lookout for black supply, maintenance, and engineering units. To his editors he explained: “Finding colored units, or any unit, while under fire, is almost impossible. Nobody gives away such vital information, not even to correspondents—so when I do find colored boys in the forward areas, it is usually by accident.”65

Soon after arriving in Morocco, Stewart found himself bivouacked in the La Mamounia hotel, a former palace within the gates of the old imperial city of Marrakesh. A waiter there tipped him to the presence of a mysterious woman “just like you,” a black American. He wasted no time in knocking on her door and found Josephine Baker, the Paris nightlife icon who had been widely reported as having died.66 Stewart may have been the first to interview Baker during her convalescence from a serious operation. “There has been a slight exaggeration,” Baker told Stewart, “with a gay smile and a French accent. ‘I am much too busy to die.’”67
His first experience reporting live combat came soon after along the Tunisian front: “This is a story I have wanted to write since I left America . . . now that I have seen our lads in action on the Tunisian front, I am both proud and humble,” Stewart wrote. “I am proud because they covered themselves with glory as well as with mud—and humble because I cannot tell the story as it should be told.” Stewart described traveling many miles to reach the front and then putting cloth in his ears to watch the exchange of gunfire. He reported that officers told him of the “marvelous job” black artillerymen performed, and described trying to find the regiments the next day only to discover they had already evacuated. In the absence of interviews with soldiers, Stewart wrote of the equality of all troops under fire:

I must emphasize that every unit near the front is a combat unit. All our quartermasters, engineers and truck drivers are subject to encounters with the enemy day and night, and all are prepared to fight their way out of a crack.

You can be sure that every man in Tunisia whose name I write in stories is really helping push the Germans out of North Africa.

Unshaven and looking like bearded Arabs, living in caves, dirty and tough as leather, our boys are helping every time the Allies gain mileage in this push, which we all hope will last in this theatre of operations.

Everything that Stewart wrote had to be passed by military censors. While he occasionally mailed material that was not time-sensitive, he cabled most of his articles, a somewhat costly proposition that may have stunted his style because it required economy in expression. In writing, he used cablinese, merging words, taking shortcuts. Instead of shot down, he would write downshot. “Downshot is one word and saves money; but if not understood on other end can cause confusion,” he explained to his editors in Baltimore. “In the future I will cut out or transpose all words that will effect a saving—and you have to pad the messages. Put in ‘s,’ ‘the’ and such; watch for words like uncan, meaning can’t; unpassed meaning passed up, etc.”

From North Africa, Stewart followed invading troops to Sicily, then Rome. He was an eyewitness to the Allied landing at Normandy in 1945 and the push through the countryside. Stewart wrote that everywhere he went he was told about the heroics black troops had performed, from field artillery and barrage balloon operators to the first black officers managing motor transport companies. Regarding these officers, a colonel told Stewart: “They’re on trial . . . to prove what they can do as compared to white officers. I don’t think mixing the officers is a good thing. Either all white or all colored.” In a parenthetical aside, Stewart expressed regret on the subject:
(Apology to readers, if any: If I keep mentioning colors and races in this and other articles, I’m sorry. But everywhere I go it pops up. I’m sick of the subject, and wish I never heard of it again, but the army functions on racial lines.

(Officers talk race, not ability; the men discuss it all the time—so a correspondent has to include it, no matter how distasteful the subject may be.)

Stewart’s own skin color attracted attention in Brussels, where Belgians were relieved to learn he was American, not African, and wanted to discuss relations with the Congo. In London, Stewart was pleased that the city did not show “even a hint of the color prejudice that some people have said exists. All classes seem united for victory. The spirit of true democracy fills the air and the streets are colorful with uniforms of united nations.” Yet, he encountered racism from time to time in his interactions with American troops, and described one such moment during his first haircut in London: “A friend with hair like mine sent me to his barber, a Greek; and as soon as I sat down a Texas drawl came in and took the seat next to mine,” Stewart wrote. “One look and the drawl, in an American uniform, started to get up and leave. It stayed, however, and nobody understood the byplay but us two.”

In 1943, at the conclusion of his first year abroad as a war correspondent, Stewart was optimistic that American racial divides were being erased by “common danger, the common foe and hardships of battle.” Stewart wrote about his hopefulness at length:

There are no color lines in foxholes or when a landing barge is being shelled; when an air field is strafed or when a convoy is dive bombed. I have seen colored and white who glared at each other before a bombing get quite chummy after death whistled by in big hunks of shrapnel.

Opinion here is growing stronger that the American army cannot fight two wars at the same time—one against the axis and the other between its own white and colored soldiers.

Many lives will be lost before the final victory is achieved, but already our men are looking ahead toward their part in the post-war world. While statesmen study maps in anticipation of global control, these boys lie on the ground and swat flies and sweat on docks to make this control possible, and all they want to know is will they be allowed to enjoy what they have fought for?

The war was the peak of Stewart’s career. Returning to the United States, he found racial conditions intolerable. He settled in Paris, trying to eke out a living by freelancing. But over the next decade, as the focus of racial politics
shifted from the war to desegregation in the United States, he found himself in a wrong place at a wrong time. Young Ollie Stewarts among the new generation of black journalists were covering desegregation, some of them able to hit the big time by working for prominent white newspapers, radio stations, and television, which was emerging as a major media outlet. Stewart struggled on. Perhaps because of pride, he insisted on staying in Paris, barely able to make a living. His 1968 income was $425. In ill health, he ended up doing occasional pieces for whomever paid, including the pulp magazines *Argosy* and *True*. He died in Atlanta, Georgia, in 1977.

While Stewart is today largely forgotten, his coverage of the war—combined with that of the correspondents who followed him—stands today as an example of feuilletonism as social action.

**Feuilletonism as Social Action**

Stewart was the first of the *Afro*’s seven war correspondents. With some variation, each correspondent who followed continued to provide a mix of war news similar to Stewart’s mix. These correspondents included Art Carter, who traveled to Italy in 1943 and reported the heroics of the Tuskegee airmen of the Ninety-ninth Fighter Squadron after pilots returned to base “like football players bursting into a dining room after a triumph in the season’s classic.” Max Johnson reported the invasion of southern France in 1944, while Vincent Tubbs and Francis Yancey covered General Douglas MacArthur’s campaigns in the southwest Pacific in 1943 and 1944. Tubbs was perhaps the most “literary” of the reporters to succeed Stewart, demonstrating a gift for depicting mundane, yet poignant moments pregnant with detail. Herbert Frisby traveled to the far north during two summer trips in 1943 and 1944, reaching the Aleutians and the Arctic Circle in Alaska, and writing lengthy travelogues describing the Eskimo people and customs he encountered on his way to visit black armed forces. Finally, Elizabeth Phillips, Carl Murphy’s daughter, became the first African American female war correspondent when she traveled to London in 1944. Though her plans to travel to the European theater were canceled after she was hospitalized with neuralgia, she reported from her hospital bed the names of black soldiers she met and her experiences adjusting to air raids and counting English pounds.

This body of work, like the correspondence featured generally in the black press, was principally concerned with highlighting black soldiers’ contributions to the war effort on behalf of a country that denied them civil rights. This coverage included war dispatches, exposés of racial injustice, and long lists of names of soldiers encountered abroad, since “editors knew that names made news.” Personal experiences and narratives were a substantial part of
this work throughout the black press. Like the Afro, the Norfolk Journal and Guide printed personal journalism and human-interest stories alongside war updates. Yet scholars have characterized such narratives as second-tier reporting. Frank Bolden, writing for the Negro Newspaper Publishers Association, was said to have produced mostly “soft” stories because of strict censorship. Herbert Frisby’s Alaskan travelogues have been described similarly: “[W]ith almost no real ‘news’ to report, Frisby sent back folksy features, sometimes padding them out with lists of black soldiers he had encountered along the way.” And another reason human-interest stories dominated: black soldiers did not engage in combat until the last stages of the war.

However, Stewart’s prewar reporting suggests that his narrative war correspondence was a stylistic choice, not one forced upon him by censorship or lack of news. That Carl Murphy refused to release Stewart to become a general correspondent for the Associated Negro Press also suggests that this was an intentional stylistic choice for the paper. But if so, what function might such narrative have served?

It has been said that narrative journalism is more than just a literary canon; it is social discourse as well. After studying the work of the Afro’s correspondents, we believe these reports served a strategic function, and we propose understanding them as something akin to early feuilletonism—with a purpose. As in Russia and France during the previous century, this personal form of journalism appeared in a newspaper that, in the tradition of the black press, was committed to an advocacy that “interpreted events from a black viewpoint and were far less committed to ‘objectivity’ than the white papers claimed to be.” These dispatches were also published during a time of immense growth for the Afro, when the newspaper could boast of both increased circulation and influence. Stewart’s work featured the correspondent as the reader’s “tour guide” of the war, wandering about and reporting what was seen and heard. Also, much of the time, this was not a coherent or chronological account of the war’s major campaigns. Though at times filled with news, this was also a fragmented mix of the correspondents’ personal experiences and observations, and a record of people encountered. As such, these works provided compelling reading that featured both the routine experiences and the heroic deeds of black soldiers abroad.

But we suspect this example of World War II feuilletonism also functioned on another level, given the FBI investigations of the Afro. Though the Justice Department refused Hoover’s 1942 request to prosecute the Afro for sedition, the FBI director continued to demand extensive investigation of the paper throughout the war. Meanwhile, the Afro continued to publish incendiary accounts of racial unrest. For instance, when a brief account by Ol-
lie Stewart of Tuskegee fliers dropping bombs on Italy appeared on the front page of the *Afro*’s June 26, 1943, edition, it was surrounded by stories describing race riots in Detroit and Texas. Declared one lede: “A week end of terror, worse than anything visited upon the Jews by Nazi fanatics at the height of their pogroms, was experienced by the colored population of this swollen war industry town last week.” The side-by-side appearance of such stories with Stewart’s feuilletonist dispatches fulfilled the *Afro*’s “Double V” mission—to encourage readers to support victory against shared enemies abroad and victory over racial injustice at home.101

The Double V campaign was launched first in the pages of the *Pittsburgh Courier* in February 1942, and then in the *Chicago Defender* and the *Afro*. For three months, the *Afro* ran an image of a flag (for loyalty) on one side of its masthead and a closed fist (for unity) on the other before explaining their meanings to readers: “[P]atriotism can function effectively only if all citizens, like all fingers of the hand, work together as partners.” This was a homage to Booker T. Washington’s attempt at compromise and conciliation between North and South, black and white. In an 1895 speech in Atlanta, Georgia, Washington stated, “In all things that are purely social we can be as separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress.” Critics of this approach included W. E. B. Du Bois, who wrote that Washington’s accommodationist approach was viewed as one of “an old attitude of adjustment and submission” that had resulted in a loss of political power, civil rights, and opportunities for higher education. The *Afro*’s reference to all citizens as members of the same hand could be interpreted as a call to unity—a homage to Washington, but one that embraced a more active civil rights agenda. This was a fine distinction the *Afro* had carved out during much of the contentious debate between Washington and Du Bois in the early years of the twentieth century.

Just two months after the *Afro* published its explanation of its fist and flag imagery, Ollie Stewart departed for London. In the context of the Double V campaign, Stewart’s dispatches may have leavened criticism—from both blacks and whites—who saw the paper as too militant. Reproaches of the black press’s militancy came from prominent blacks such as Warren H. Brown, director of Negro relations for the Council for Democracy, and Southern white and nationally known journalists Mark Ethridge and Virginius Dabney, as well as Westbrook Pegler. Such critics opined that black newspapers were “stirring up interracial hate” and would encourage violence among extremists. Even the *Courier* toned down its Double V campaign dramatically in late 1942, just months after it was introduced, likely because it did not want to endanger the wartime gains made by middle-class blacks in the armed forc-
es and defense industries. The Courier replaced Double V agitation with positive news stories and photo layouts that frequently took up a full page. Similarly, increased cooperation with the military led to an “endless stream” of positive coverage, especially in the pages of the Afro, since it had sent so many correspondents overseas. (Of the national black newspapers, only the Pittsburgh Courier sent as many reporters to the fronts.) Thus, while the Afro’s war correspondence not only fulfilled the mission of the Double V campaign by highlighting servicemen’s contributions to the war effort, it also demonstrated the paper’s own loyalty and patriotism—and its willingness to provide a positive response when its demands were met.

**Narrative Journalism and Civic Life**

What role does literary journalism play in civic life? This question was posed by John J. Pauly in his keynote address at the 2011 meeting of the International Association for Literary Journalism Studies. In examining the weaknesses of literary journalism as compared to conventional news forms, Pauly noted that literary work is often seen as a “needlessly wordy version of the feature writing and depth reporting that the best reporters already do,” and that such work may “over-theorize the individual and under-theorize the group.” Pauly asked: “Is it possible for literary journalism to describe a social field, in which individuals are not the entire focus but moments in a larger social process?”

We think this body of war correspondence provides one example. The context of this work implies that this instance of narrative journalism was deployed strategically. When considered in context, this body of work exemplifies the collaborative use of both literary journalism and domestic news and exposés to give “voice to the drama of civic life.” Murphy used Stewart’s narratives alongside provocative domestic stories not only to demonstrate the legitimacy of the paper’s civil rights claims, but also the paper’s loyalty and patriotism to the war effort. This feuilletonist style provided a counterbalance to critics who protested the Afro’s militant insistence on racial injustice and discrimination. And, in showing that “there are no color lines in foxholes,” Stewart’s narrative symbolically united writer, subject, and audience as allies with a white Other who discarded racist practices abroad while working side-by-side, often for the first time, with blacks. This rhetorical effect was heightened by the social context of the Double V campaign and domestic criticism of the black press, underlining the Afro’s argument that its readers were not only loyal citizens, but heroic as well, and deserving of equal rights in a postwar world.
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