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"With humility but with pride I shall offer one small life... for whatever it is worth, to fulfill the prophecy that all men [sic] are created equal" ("An American Credo," 24), wrote Pauli Murray in 1945. For the next four decades, she offered her life in the service of human liberation as a civil rights and feminist activist, educator, lawyer, writer, and Episcopal priest.

BACKGROUND

Born on November 20, 1910, Murray grew up in Durham, North Carolina, in the care of her maternal grandparents, after she was effectively orphaned at the age of 3 by the death of her mother and her father's inability to care for his six children. She was descended from both slave and slave owner. Her grandfather was the son of a half-Irish mulatto slave who had been given his freedom; her grandmother was the daughter of a part-Cherokee slave and the white man who had raped her.

Murray attended Hunter College in New York City, where she majored in English and planned to become a writer. Graduating in 1933 during the Depression, she was able to secure employment under the Works Progress Administration (WPA), teaching in its Remedial Reading Project and Workers' Education Project. Her experience on public assistance was the impetus for the development of a lifelong friendship with ELEANOR ROOSEVELT. In 1938 Murray wrote a letter to the editor of the New York Herald Tribune, describing the experience of applying for public assistance, and sent a copy to Roosevelt, initiating a correspondence between them. The two met for the first time in 1940, when Murray, as executive secretary of the annual National Sharecroppers Week, an observance designed to focus attention on the plight of sharecroppers in the South, arranged for Roosevelt to be a banquet speaker. For the next
twenty-two years, until Roosevelt’s death, the two women corresponded and met regularly, and Murray served as “a central figure in Mrs. Roosevelt’s conscience on race” (PM:xii).

Although always painfully aware of the divisiveness of race in U.S. society, Murray did not become professionally involved in the civil rights movement until two incidents in 1940. The first occurred when she and a friend were jailed for several days in Virginia for asking to move closer to the front of a Greyhound bus after her friend became ill riding over the wheels in the back.

The second incident involved the case of Odell Waller, a black sharecropper convicted and sentenced to death by an all-white jury in Virginia for killing his white landlord in self-defense in a dispute over their jointly owned wheat crop. Murray worked for the Workers’ Defense League (WDL), raising funds and enlisting public support for Waller’s appeal. In the spring of 1940, she spoke throughout the country with his foster mother, Annie Waller, usually to local chapters of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, or the WDL: “Mrs. Waller would tell her personal story . . . and I would follow with a factual presentation of conditions among sharecroppers” (PM:168). Despite their efforts, each stage of the court battle ended in disappointment, and Waller was executed.

That experience prompted Murray to enroll in Howard University’s Law School “with the single-minded intention of destroying Jim Crow” (PM:182). At Howard, she was instrumental in developing the strategy of nonviolent civil action that students used to desegregate restaurants in Washington, D.C., in 1943 and 1944. She described their first demonstration:

As each group arrived, three entered the cafeteria while the fourth remained outside as an “observer.” Inside, we took our trays to the steam table and as soon as we were refused service carried our empty trays to a vacant seat at one of the tables, took out magazines, books of poetry or textbooks, notebooks and pencils, and assumed an attitude of concentrated study. Strict silence was maintained. Minutes later the next group arrived and repeated the process. Outside, the observers began to form a picket line. (PM:207)

The strategy proved successful: within 48 hours, the owner began to serve black customers. But the effects on the students were even greater: “We were jubilant. . . . We had proved that intelligent, imaginative action could bring positive results” (PM:208).

Murray’s contributions to civil rights while at Howard assumed yet another form. For her senior thesis, she examined the Supreme Court’s civil rights decisions in the late nineteenth century and challenged the separate-but-equal formula that had been the cornerstone of the legal justification for segregation since 1896—“a radical approach that few legal scholars considered viable in 1944” (PM:221). Later, she discovered that her professor and other NAACP lawyers had used her paper in preparing their arguments for the successful 1954 Supreme Court challenge, Brown v. Board of Education.

Following completion of a master’s degree at the University of California School of Law at Berkeley in 1945, Murray returned to New York City, where she opened a law office. She was able to support her practice largely through a two-year research project on racial segregation in various states that she was asked to undertake for the Women’s Division of the Methodist church. At the time, no single source presented a comprehensive view of racial laws throughout the country. The result was States’ Laws on Race and Color (1950), which Thurgood Marshall called “the bible during the final stages of the legal attack upon the ‘separate but equal’ doctrine” (PM:289).

Although Murray had trained herself as a speaker, both through her political organizing work and her teaching, she had not abandoned her dream of being a writer. She came to see that she could use writing as a way to contribute to political struggle and education while at the same time exploring issues concerning her own personal identity. Her first book, Proud Shoes: The Story of an American Family, published in 1956, was a history of the struggles of her family and of how her ancestry, particularly her maternal grandparents, had shaped her into a rebel against racial injustice.

In 1959 a black man named Mack Parker was lynched in Poplarville, Mississippi; although his murderers were known, they were never indicted. Parker’s murder was the impetus for Murray’s decision to leave the United States: “Each of us reaches a point where we can’t take it any more. I reached it with Poplarville. My depression was so deep I had to get away” (Miller and Swift, 1980:64). She contracted to serve as a senior lecturer in constitutional and administrative law at the University of Ghana Law School in Accra, West Africa. She believed that she never would return to the United States, but the sixteen months she spent in Africa clarified her life’s purpose for her and she knew she had to return: “I could not evade the compelling conviction that my own task was not to expound democratic values to Africans, but to realize those values in American life” (Miller and Swift, 1980:64). Prior to her departure for the United States, in collaboration with Leslie Rubin, also a lecturer at the Law School, she produced The Constitution and Government of Ghana (1961), intended for use as a convenient reference for teachers, students, lawyers, judges, and government officials.

Murray earned a doctor of juridical science degree from Yale Law School in 1965. Because teaching jobs at law schools were not readily available to women of any race at the time, she supported herself for the next year by writing another monograph, Human Rights U.S.A.: 1948–1966 (1967), for the Women’s Division of the Methodist church. In the monograph, she traced the historical roots of human rights in the United States and laid out the contributions the President’s Committee on Civil Rights, the Supreme Court, and the civil rights movement had made to the protection of human rights.

During the same period, she co-authored with Mary O. Eastwood “Jane Crow and the Law: Sex Discrimination and Title VII,” which was published in the George Washington Law Review. Murray and Eastwood set forth ways in which
the Fifth and the Fourteenth amendments and the sex provisions of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 could be interpreted to accord women equality of rights. Published at a time when few legal materials existed on discrimination against women, the article was widely cited.

In the 1960s Murray’s activities began to reflect the double burden of discrimination of race and sex that she had always faced. She served on the Civil and Political Rights Committee of President John Kennedy’s Commission on the Status of Women in 1962–1963. She also served on the national board of directors of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) from 1965 to 1973, a time when the ACLU developed into an effective advocate for women’s rights through constitutional litigation.

In June 1966 Betty Friedan and Murray were among fifteen women who met to discuss the possibility of forming an independent national civil rights organization for women comparable to the NAACP. Murray was elected to the temporary coordinating committee to develop the framework for such an organization. At an organizing conference in Washington, D.C., in October 1966, she was among the thirty-two women who set up the permanent organization of the National Organization for Women (NOW).

Murray accepted an administrative position at Benedict College in Columbia, South Carolina, in 1967, where her responsibilities were to develop educational plans and programs that would help close the educational gap between black and white college students. She resigned at the end of the school year and returned to New York City, “...convinced that my talents lay in having direct contact with young minds in classroom situations, and that I was misplaced in a purely technical, administrative job” (PM:379).

In the summer of 1968, Murray participated in the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in Uppsala, Sweden, a kind of United Nations of Christianity, with almost every Protestant denomination represented. She was involved in the work of the subcommittee charged “to work on priorities and details of the Council’s effort to contribute in the post-Uppsala period to the elimination of white racism from European civilization and from those societies influenced by it” (PM:380). For Murray, “Uppsala turned out to be one of those peak experiences, for she had never before seen people of such diverse origins and backgrounds attempting to surmount differences...to find common ground in relating the teachings of the Christian faith to world problems” (PM:381).

On her return to the United States, Murray joined the faculty of Brandeis University in Boston, with responsibilities for teaching in the American Civilization program and developing programs in Afro-American Studies and pre-law. At Brandeis, she found herself in conflict with a younger generation of civil rights activists: “From the moment I arrived on campus, I was thrown into fundamental philosophical and moral conflict with the advocates of a black ideology as alien to my nature and as difficult for me to accept as white ethnocentrism” (PM:392).
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The differences between her perspective and that of the younger activists did not allow her to contribute as she had hoped to the new phase of the civil rights movement: “Far from providing leadership in a new and constructive phase of civil rights, I found myself in a head-on collision with those whom I most wanted to serve” (PM:393). The publication in 1970 of Murray’s book of poetry, *Dark Testament and Other Poems*, pointed eloquently to those differences; it detailed her vision of human liberation and her philosophy on how it is best obtained.

Murray’s treatment by the younger radicals because of her sex also highlighted for her the pervasive sexism not only in mainstream society but also in the civil rights movement: “I began to see that much of my barely disguised hostility toward the Black Revolution was in reality my feminist resentment of the crude sexism I perceived in many of the male leaders of that movement” (PM:416). Her growing recognition of sexism extended to the Episcopal church, in which she always had been active: “Why cannot women and men, boys and girls...” she wondered, “participate equally in every phase of Church activity?” (PM:371). The result was a crisis of faith: “I had been taught all my life to revere the church and its teachings; now I could only condemn the church as sinful when it denied me the right to participate as fully and freely in the worship of God as my brethren” (PM:370).

Using her skills as a lawyer and teacher, Murray joined others in crafting appeals to bishops, priests, and the laity, advocating the full participation of women in the church, including their ordination as priests. Their responses were so disappointing that she left the church for a year. The death of a close friend brought her back to the church and to an awareness of her desire for ordination: “I had been called upon to be with a devout Christian whom I loved in the crisis of death and to minister in ways I associated only with the ordained clergy. As I reflected upon these experiences, the thought of ordination became unavoidable” (PM:426). She resigned her tenured position at Brandeis to enter General Theological Seminary in New York City in 1973, completing a master of divinity degree in 1976. She was ordained a deacon in the Episcopal church in 1976.

Murray completed her theological studies at the height of the controversy over the ordination of women in the Episcopal church. In defiance of tradition and church law that admitted only men to the priesthood, eleven women were “irregularly” ordained priests in Philadelphia on July 29, 1974; she was in the audience. After much turmoil, the Episcopal leadership voted in 1976 to authorize the ordination of women to the priesthood beginning on January 1, 1977. The six-month waiting period required of all deacons before ordination expired for Murray in December 1976, and she was ordained as the church’s first black woman priest on January 8, 1577. She served a “floating parish” from her apartment, first in Alexandria, Virginia, and then in Baltimore, Maryland, directing her ministry primarily to women and the aged. For her, the ministerial
role was a reconciliation of the varied and sometimes contradictory dimensions of her identity and her life:

All the strands of my life had come together. . . . Now I was empowered to minister the sacrament of One in whom there is no north or south, no black or white, no male or female—only the spirit of love and reconciliation drawing us all toward the goal of human wholeness. (PM:435)

Murray died in July 1985, while working on the final revisions of her autobiography. Originally entitled Song in a Weary Throat: An American Pilgrimage; when published in 1987, it was reprinted in 1989 as Pauli Murray: The Autobiography of a Black Activist, Feminist, Lawyer, Priest, and Poet. The book details her victories and failures in the civil rights and feminist movements as well as the spiritual awakening that led to her ordination in the Episcopal church.

MURRAY’S RHETORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

Murray’s aim in her speeches, articles, poems, autobiographies, and sermons was the achievement of human liberation for all people. For her, human liberation meant a society that would provide and maintain “those conditions for personal growth and creativity which will permit individuals of whatever origin or circumstance to reach their full potential” (“The Future of Black Women,” 1976:1). In such a society, all humans would be “entitled to equal opportunity to fulfill their individual and unique potential” (“Statement of Dr. Pauli Murray,” 1970:329).

The audiences Murray generally addressed during her rhetorical career were already committed to the achievement of the goal of human liberation but were often divided on how to achieve that goal or on which group’s liberation should have priority. In their quest for liberation, her audiences often particularized their struggles for liberation, advocating the superiority of particular tools for the struggle or competing “with one another in defining a particular form of oppression as the ‘source of all evil,’ and thus losing sight of the goal of universal liberation and salvation” (“Black Theology and Feminist Theology,” 8). Her rhetorical purpose throughout her life was to unite activists divided among themselves, urging them to recognize the different—but equally valuable—places they all occupied in the struggle for human liberation. She sought to encourage audience members to build alliances, to work together as partners, and to support one another’s agendas.

Early in her work on behalf of civil rights, Murray faced audiences who were divided on the question of whether the fight for individual rights should be subordinated to the world war then being fought against fascism. Some believed that “the Negro, the coal miner, all the underprivileged in our midst should wait for justice until we had defeated the Nazis” (“Negroes Are Fed Up,” 1943:274). She represented a different point of view:
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[It] is a deep instinct, the most precious of all human instincts—the determination to be free. Suppress it and you suppress the heart of America. For the Negro today is the symbol of all our own yearnings, of our equally faltering and disorganized groping toward democracy and human brotherhood. (“Negroes Are Fed Up,” 274)

A similar source of division that surfaced later was the tension between black men and women in the competing black and feminist movements. Murray found herself “calling for a broad, inclusive expression of feminism at a time when many prominent Negro women felt impelled to subordinate their claims as women to . . . ‘restoration of the Black male to his lost manhood’” (“PM:416). She traced the split between black women and men to the male-oriented Black Power movement: “[T]he main thrust of black militancy is a bid of black males to share power with white males in a continuing patriarchal society in which both black and white females are relegated to a secondary status” (“The Liberation of Black Women,” 1970:92). As a result, black women who insisted on women’s rights were “made to feel disloyal to racial interests” (“The Liberation of Black Women,” 96).

The same kind of tension existed between black and white women in Murray’s audiences. The revolted women’s movement led predominantly by white middle- or upper-class women was seen as not incorporating the aspirations of poor and minority women in its struggle: “Instead of the solidarity we envisioned, one finds severe tensions and misunderstandings existing between Black women and white women which stand as barriers to the full development of the women’s movement as a genuinely liberating and humanizing force in our society” (“Three Steps from Power,” 1983:3).

Differences in strategic choices also divided audience members from each other and sometimes from Murray herself. Many of these differences were generational: “Fundamental differences of outlook, strategy and style separate today’s militants from yesterday’s. To find a trustworthy bridge across this gulf is our present challenge” (“Response of Pauli Murray,” 1970:1).

Older activists, including Murray, advocated the use of conciliation, love, and nonviolence rather than violence and hate: “Almost from birth I had been conditioned by religious training to believe that love was more powerful than hate . . . a vigorous love which resisted injustice without stooping to the level of hating the oppressor” (PM:391). The response of many younger activists to such a commitment to nonviolence, however, was that such “methods had failed and must be abandoned” (Hiatt, 1988:73) and that only the use of violence could achieve the desired liberation.

Older and younger activists also differed in the relationship of their preferred strategies to the mainstream. Older activists employed strategies designed to integrate blacks into the mainstream, while younger ones employed strategies to maximize black power. As Murray explained: “Emphasis shifted from interracial cooperation to self-determination and a strong identification with the rising African nations and other nonwhite third world peoples” (PM:395). She and
other activists like her had lived and worked in an interracial context and had developed strategies for use in that context: "When my brothers try to draw a circle to exclude me, I shall draw a larger circle to include them. Where they speak out for the privileges of a puny group, I shall shout for the rights of all mankind" ("An American Credo," 24). In contrast, other activists sought "to give priority to blackness above all else" ("Response of Pauli Murray," 2). They felt that "older activists had been 'coopted,' ""were 'too trusting of white people,'" and were not "'black enough'" (Hiatt, 1988:73).

Even the appropriate label for African Americans became a source of division. In the face of calls by younger activists for renaming Negroes "blacks," Murray and others argued for the old label: "We affirmed our human dignity through raising the term 'Negro' from lower case to upper case and making it further distinctive through both personal and collective accomplishments" ("Response of Pauli Murray," 1). She objected to "black" because it "inaccurately described the physical identity of millions of Negro Americans, or people of color, whose characteristics varied from blond Caucasian [sic] types to almost pure-black African types"; "emphasized a black-white polarization that the term 'Negro' did not convey"; and "conveyed the status of a thing and not a person" through the absence of capitalization (PM:403-404). She continued to use the term Negro into the 1980s, clinging to it "as an acceptable (and dignified) identification" ("I Know," 1981:C14).

To motivate her audiences to work together to achieve human liberation—to unify her divided audiences—Murray chose to focus her rhetoric on the process of struggling for human liberation. Rather than emphasizing the current state of oppression or the desired state of liberation, her rhetoric stressed movement toward goals and the future. She spoke of her audiences' "heroic struggle" and of "collective advancement" ("Response of Pauli Murray," 2) in their efforts "to enter the doors of opportunity" and portrayed them as making "spectacular strides," "moving steadily" along the "path to the future" ("The Future of Black Women," 6–8, 16).

Murray's choice of focus on the process of struggling may have seemed peculiar, given that the means or process of change constituted a major source of disagreement among members of her audiences, but she transformed the division into unity through the ways she chose to describe the struggle. Her focus on the history of the struggle and individuals' roles in the struggle enabled audience members to unite with each other and to identify with her.

In her rhetoric, Murray featured "the continuity of our tradition" ("Response of Pauli Murray," 1) of struggle—a history audience members shared with each other. We "should bear in mind," she asserted, "that each generation from 1619 to the present has contributed its share of effort and leadership" to the struggle ("Continuity, Commitment and Competence," 4–5). In an essay on the liberation of black women, Murray suggested a similar ground for unifying black and white women: "The parallels between racism and sexism have been distinctive features of American society, and the movements to eliminate these two evils have often been allied and sometimes had interchangeable leadership" ("The Liberation of Black Women," 94).

An awareness of the history of the struggle was important not only because of its function as a means of identification, but also because it allowed participants to discover resources that could be used in the current effort and that would have an "ennobling effect . . . upon our lives" ("Response of Pauli Murray," 1). "We are only now beginning fully to appreciate the strength of our heritage and the pride we can take in this valiant struggle of our ancestors" ("Individual Commitment to Professional Excellence," 1967:5), Murray suggested. Only through an awareness of history was the movement able to maintain "a sense of continuity and perspective, passing on the best traditions of each generation of fighters to the next," continually renewing and enriching itself ("The Women's Revolution," 1971:1).

A second dimension of the struggle on which Murray focused was the individual's potential to effect change. When she discussed strategies, they were not collective but individual ones. In developing these strategies, her focus was on the personal characteristics that would serve as tools in the struggle for liberation.

Murray saw three personal characteristics as primary. Creativity was one such characteristic; individuals involved in the struggle must "reach down and bring up the unknown, untapped creative resources within each of us, which are always available to us in solving problems if we are willing to make the effort to release this energy" ("Individual Commitment," 12). She also urged audience members to develop commitment, "a voluntary choice, a gift of yourself." "Only when you are committed do you have the courage to make difficult choices and stand by them" ("Continuity, Commitment and Competence," 1971:8), she suggested.

Murray also required competence of activists, defined as "both the quality and the range of performance" ("Continuity, Commitment and Competence," 10). She believed in "the principle that the level of development of any group or any society is ultimately determined by the performance of individuals"; thus, she urged her audience to "take individual responsibility for high standards of performance at many levels" ("Individual Commitment," 3). "I am duty bound not to settle for mediocrity but to reach to the outer boundaries of my potential," she believed. "I must not excuse myself for those deficiencies which I have the power to correct" ("Individual Commitment," 17). She asked, in fact, that the participants in the struggle do more than meet high standards; she urged them to meet standards "higher than those of the forces which still seek to hamper our progress" ("Individual Commitment," 18).

Although Murray herself was evidence that those who are creative, committed, and competent and employ these qualities in their efforts make significant contributions to the struggle, she did not emphasize herself as a model; her speeches and essays are markedly diffident and modest in tone. Rarely did she tell a story about herself or her accomplishments, and when she did, she usually
prefaced the story with an apology: "If you will also forgive a personal reference," she stated at the beginning of a narrative in which she told how she applied to fill the vacancy of Justice Hugo Black from the Supreme Court when he resigned in 1971 ("The Women's Revolution," 6). An emphasis on her life would have pointed to divisions between her choices and those of other activists in the selection of strategies for the struggle.

Instead of using herself and her own achievements as a model for the qualities she urged her audiences to develop, Murray told of the contributions of others to the struggle through application of their personal qualities. In one speech, she cited Harriet Tubman, Sojourner Truth (see entry in companion volume), Ida B. Wells-Barnett (see entry in companion volume), Mary McLeod Bethune, MARY CHURCH TERRELL, Rosa Parks, Daisy Bates, Gloria Richardson, and Coretta Scott King as women whose application of the qualities she advocated enabled them to make major contributions to the struggle for human liberation ("The Liberation of Black Women," 90). In others, she cited Claire Collins Harvey, national president of Church Women United, and Marian Wright Edelman, then director of the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, now head of the Children's Defense Fund ("Continuity, Commitment and Competence," 12-13), as well as her third grade teacher, Martha Hester Williams, and her high school Latin teacher, Mary Lee Fisher ("Individual Commitment," 12-13). These ordinary people, she suggested, contributed to the creation of a new future by demonstrating creativity, commitment, and competence in their personal and professional lives.

CONCLUSION

Murray's primary focus in her rhetoric was on the actual journey from oppression to human liberation. Her recognition of the disunity that characterized her audiences led her to focus on the history of the struggle in which they all shared and in which they all could take pride. She also encouraged individuals to develop the personal qualities necessary to make their most effective contributions to the struggle, however they defined them.

Both dimensions of the struggle Pauli Murray featured goaded audiences to action. As she described a history of individuals who took action wherever they were, in whatever circumstances confronted them, relying on their personal resources, she allowed her audiences no excuses for inaction. Their individual actions, joined into a diverse but mutually supportive struggle, were needed to accomplish the dream of human liberation.
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