

**SITES OF CONFLICT
IDENTITY, SEXUALITY & REPRODUCTION**

**EUROPEAN MYTHOLOGICAL IMAGING OF THE
AFRICAN ON THE LONDON STAGE 1908–1939**

AMON SABA SAAKANA
c

Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Drama
Goldsmiths College
University of London, May 1995⁹ 1996

BEST COPY

AVAILABLE

Poor text in the original
thesis.

Some text bound close to
the spine.

SITES OF CONFLICT IDENTITY, SEXUALITY, REPRODUCTION

EUROPEAN MYTHOLOGICAL IMAGING OF THE AFRICAN ON THE LONDON STAGE, 1908–1939

AMON SABA SAAKANA

ABSTRACT

Theatre is now considered to be not just a site of entertainment but one of conflict: conflict of classes, gender and race. In this context the writer looks at several plays written and/or performed between 1908 and 1939 in which the African (i.e., all those descending from an African ancestor despite shade or mixture) has been portrayed on the London stage, in the main, by those of Euro-American descent. These plays featured African people and were set in broad areas of the globe: Africa, the Caribbean, the USA, but they all conformed to a principal idea: that the African is to be represented as a stereotype as, for example, prostitute, seductress, coward, stupid, savage, etc. In looking at these plays the writer examines the orientation of the playwrights (in the context of ideology), interprets the meaning of the language used both in the words of the African and the European (either to each other or to themselves), and showing the historical and theoretical basis for comparisons with the characters and social life at the time. This involves the use of theatrical texts explored through the disciplines of psychoanalysis and cultural studies.

Since the plays were produced during the period of the British empire, with the civil servant class in foreign countries, as well as the position of the African in post-slavery Southern United States and settlement in urban centres, enclaves of previously European and Euro-American settlement, the primary theoretical model used throughout the text is that of colonialism. The thesis proposes that not only was the theatre a site of conflict: the playwrights were themselves part of the social fabric of society and could not but produce a theatre which would be acceptable to their hegemonic patrons and audiences in terms of the working out of popular expectations of what the African was supposed to represent, but the colonial trauma of identity, sexuality and reproduction exacerbated fragile notions of self in foreign lands.

Comparatively, the thesis puts forward the notion that exploitation of racial and sexual difference was not an isolated phenomenon in relation to the African exclusively: European and American society being unequal amongst its citizens, practised a wide range of discrimination. Finally, in contact with other peoples and cultures Euro-Americans continued to express these discriminations through the vehicle of the theatre while perpetuating new ones vis-a-vis the African.

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgement</i>	1
<i>Preface: The Subject, the writer, selection & aims of the study</i>	3
<i>Chapter 1: Introduction</i>	11
Restaging the Centre: Reviewing critical concepts of African representation from the 12th to the 20th centuries	
1. Representing views of the African-Moor in History and in Drama	12
2. The African presence in ancient Spain	14
3. The African-Moor in Spain in the European Dark Ages	15
4. Ancient Egypt & the European Renaissance	21
5. European Ethnocentrism and the stereotype	23
6. Scientific justifications for the stereotype in the 19th century	32
7. The invention of the African stereotype: some explanations	35
8. Models of seeing/Restaging the Centre	42
<i>Chapter 2: Culture & Racism: A Paradigm of Conquest</i>	47
Criticism & Theorists	48
Colonialism & Violence	51
Racism & Colonial Institutions	53
Colonialism & Psycho-religious indoctrination	55
Colonialism & Language	57
Colonialism & Heritage	60
<i>Chapter 3: Political culture & the Stage: some reflections on the meaning and function of the theatre in society</i>	63
‘All songs are ideological’	65
Theatre, architecture & separability	70
Text, context & patronage	73
Ideology & compromise on the left	77

<i>Chapter 4: Colonising the Image: Left/Right strangulation on emerging voices of dissent</i>	81
The Emperor Jones	84
The Hairy Ape	94
Cannibal Carnival	100
Colony	105
Uncle Tom's Children	114
Nigger	119
The Black Ace	127
<i>Chapter 5: The African continental & New World Woman: the Euro-American imagined sexual terror & object</i>	135
Nigger	137
A White Woman	141
Napoleon's Josephine	151
African Shadows	160
Black Ace	169
<i>Chapter 6: Overlordship, the colonial empire cross: the 'Bass' in Africa in Black Dawn</i>	179
<i>Chapter 7: African/Caribbean imaging: models of Eurocentricism or independence?</i>	205
The Black Jacobins	206
At What A Price?	235
<i>Conclusion</i>	247

Appendix 1

List of plays used in the text	253
---------------------------------------	------------

Appendix 2

Framing the social & organisational background to 1939	255
1. Africans & settlement: an overview	255
2. H. Sylvester Williams & the Pan-African Association	257
3. Duse Mohammed Ali – The African Times & Orient Review	259
4. Claude McKay: The outsider in the inside	260
5. West African Students Union	266
6. Dr Ronald Moody & The League of Coloured People	269
7. Pan-Africanism, socialism & the radical wing: C.L.R. James, George Padmore, Ras Makonnen	274
References	283
Bibliography	315

Appendix 3

Extract from The Emperor Jones by E. O'Neill	327
Extract from The Black Jacobins by CLR James	345
Extract from Cannibal Carnival by H. Hodge	366

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Under the supervision of Dr Robert Gordon, I developed this project substantially, from an earlier initiative in 1977. He has been both sympathetic and critical, and helped to raise editorial comments which forced me to restructure my thoughts in several crucial places throughout the thesis. The research and writing of a thesis calls not only for a certain type of discipline but also a great deal of co-operation. Over the final year of writing up this thesis my wife and children have displayed tremendous patience and understanding of the nature of my work. Late nights five days a week, and hours during the weekends, were a lot to put up with. My appreciative thanks go to them and to the few friends who lent their critical comments to the text: Prof. Ken Parker gave critical guidance when this work was in its infancy, Dada Imarogbe who encouraged me and Dr Philip Gobin who made useful comments on the chapter on C.L.R. James. Special thanks go to my friend, Azib Hageri, who made life constantly easier by offering to shop, buy snacks and cook meals for me at times when I was too busy to prepare them for myself. A special thank you to my former student and now friend, Richard Shita-Bey who prodded me to complete the final chapter when I was agonising over an appropriate approach as well as encouraging me to do some revision

when I was in a state of lethargy.

I would also like to thank Cecil Gutzmore, Ismail Mohammed, Winston James, Yvonne Collymore and Sekou Tafari for the loan of books and to Ismail in particular for the unpublished Ph.D. thesis on Al-Ghazali.

Most of this research was done at Senate House, the British Museum, Manuscripts section, Colindale Newspaper Library and occasionally at Goldsmiths Library. A round of thanks to the staff who pointed me in the right direction and showed me kindness and concern when I fumbled.

PREFACE

THE SUBJECT, THE WRITER, SELECTION & AIMS OF THE STUDY

The writer first came to the subject of drama through writing and having some plays produced in the late 1960s/mid 1970's, and learning from the reaction of some members of the British establishment (regardless of how minuscule that power represented in Britain as a whole might have been), that playwriting and play production are simultaneously linked. The writer may believe in the idealism of pursuing a subject without forethought to the end result, i.e., how is it to be produced after it is written? This produces a set of questions and issues which Dollimore prefigured in his configuration for cultural materialist critical approaches: the question of patronage, theatre site, audience, funding, etc. Having realised that there were a set of related issues pertaining to theatre production which depended on the ideological position of the playwright, playwriting became an unpredictable, controversial and complex preoccupation which had to be relinquished if one did not attempt the

almost impossible task of forming a theatre company which also implied the question of funding and thus confronting the criteria laid down by a then (pre-1985) highly selective/prejudicial Arts Council and Greater London Arts Association.

In 1977 a collaboration was forged with John Mapondera, then director of Drum Arts, an African-Caribbean organisation involved in different areas of the arts, which involved "Black" Arts in Britain. This interest was sustained up until 1984 when funding was obtained from the Greater London Council, which has not been superseded to this day as the most innovative and sympathetic organisation not only to the arts in general but also to the specialised ways of seeing which some practitioners of African arts were pursuing. The results of this initial research, collaborated on with Akua Pratt and Ricky Smith, unearthed an avalanche of critical reviews of plays pertaining to Africans which were in existence before the first 1914 war.

In a desire to pursue this research to a more detailed and thoroughly investigative level, this study was initiated in 1988. Having spent over a year at the British Museum's Manuscript Room, from which the majority of the plays under examination in this study came, it was apparent that with two exceptions most of the plays were written by Europeans or Euro-Americans and were set in exotically perceived locations like the Caribbean, Africa, the Southern United States of America, and the Pacific. In all the plays the leading characters were European, and the audience/reader was forced to view the Africans portrayed through the eyes of these characters. No African was ever the centre of his actions except in the plays of Eugene O'Neill, where the principal characters became a vehicle for O'Neill's perception of African personality, behaviour, character, morality, etc. In other words, the central African characters became *objectified* and were never the subject of the playwrights' imaging of them as human persons, existing instead as cardboard mannequins through which

popular stereotypes and racist ideas were worked out.

The arrangement of this study has been designed to elaborate on specific tendencies, issues and subjects which these playwrights have pursued: Africans as lazy, bereft of human culture, savage, highly sexualised men and women (prostitutes, titillating seductresses, pursuer of European men etc). In looking at these plays which chronologically begin in 1908 and terminate in 1939, one becomes aware of the common features of the mentality which produced them. The preoccupation and themes are too linked, too tied to each other over time and space to dismiss as coincidence. There appears to be a monolithic ideological correspondence amongst them all: the effects of colonialism and slavery had given a hegemonic position to these European playwrights regardless of the politically differentiated ideologies they might have professed to hold.

It was necessary therefore to begin with an introduction which spelt out the enormity of the problem confronting the researcher of stereotypes in drama since the vast majority of studies of this nature, with very few exceptions, were conducted by Europeans. However, in spite of the limitation of most critical theorists to include profound analysis of the African subject, and to relinquish the preoccupation with relentlessly quoting tried and failed psychoanalytical explanations for the proliferation of stereotyping of the African, the researcher was bound to utilise critical theorists not specifically involved in drama to illuminate the study of African representation. This involved a wide range of scholars in a variety of disciplines whose handling of the problem of *placing* meaning on the represented African personality allowed for their pertinent inclusion in this specific area of discourse.

This study attempts to focus on the extent to which colonialism as a practice and model has influenced and shaped the response of European playwrights in their perception of the African in different geographical loca-

tions. It also establishes that ideology is not a respecter of colour or nationality: people of the same nationality or "race" can be easily incorporated into a colonising system thus reproducing that system in their thinking and in their writing. In so doing it was necessary to diverge from the norm, despite the penetrating, scientific and professional manner with which some scholars have approached these studies: for example, the use of the word *black* in juxtaposition to the use of the word *European* or its interchangeable corollary, *white*, which nevertheless placed the former at the bottom of a hierarchy, as well as without nationality (thus not a person), completely at variance to that perhaps intended by them. This gave one the impression of putting one foot forward and two backward, for in interrogating representation there is an absolute *necessity to use a language divested of loaded connotations*. For this reason the writer has avoided the use of the word *black* except in cases where it is unavoidably used which comes with quotation marks. The words *black* and *white* as they relate to people have become, in the writer's view, anachronistic and should therefore be set aside altogether, for one inadvertently assigns the "black" to *otherness*.

Chapter one provides an historical overview of the notion of representation from the twelfth century to the twentieth. It attempts to look at European representation of the African from the latter's earliest appearance in Europe as a king to the stereotype of a violent, revengeful, deceitful, and sexual object. This chapter also provides a basis for comparison with the cultural development of Europe and Africa in which the notion of cultural exclusivity is examined in the context of racism and oppression. In chapter two an examination is made of the implications of racism in relation to culture; in this context the writer examines the notion of literary critical discourse in conjunction with the positioning and opportunity of the academic who maintains a dialogue with the mainstream. This chapter also sets out to look at the impact of colonialism in relation to violence, colonial

institutions, psycho-religious indoctrination, language and heritage. In chapter three an examination is made of the ideologies of both playwrights and literary figures who profess to hold *Left* views yet reproduce profound ambivalence on the question of race. This is accomplished by first looking at the site of theatrical production as it moved away from the inns of the collective unit to hierarchical seating arrangements. This chapter also offers an opportunity in examining the production of Left ideologues in relation to theatre practice – in which the reproductive imaging of popular representation, including that of the liberal voice, is performed on the African – which resonate with the ideology of the Right.

Having established several lines of analysis of historical and social contexts for the representation of the African by the European, chapter four offers several plays produced between 1908 and 1939 which deal with the subject of the African as savage. The first are plays by the American Eugene O'Neill, *The Emperor Jones* and *The Hairy Ape* (the latter does not have African characters but uses the metaphor of the working class protagonist to inform the reader of the relationship between the African and the “uncouth” working class on the one hand and the ape on the other). Herbert Hodge, a product of Unity Theatre, had his *Cannibal Carnival* set in the exotic Pacific, which reinforced the image of the Melanesian as savage; Geoffrey Trease’s *Colony*, reflective of the simultaneous liberal and left wing perspective on the question of race and class, is set in the Caribbean where a “revolution” of the workers is forcing the governor to act with “reason” accompanied by force; *Uncle Tom*, adapted from the novel of the same name by Harriett Beecher-Stowe, in its 1925 version reproduces the “heights” of Christian civilisation by imposing the Bible as a source of morality for the African slave. This provides the context for protest and compromise. Edward B. Sheldon’s play, *Nigger*, set in the southern United States, reinforces the equation of bestiality and the

African; Dorothy Brandon's *The Black Ace* can be compared with the theme of Eugene O'Neill's *The Emperor Jones* – the former represents the African as savage who is transformed into a civilised European but ultimately reverts to type. O'Neill's drama touches on this theme intermittently.

Chapter five looks at the European perception and representation of African female sexuality, promiscuity, and of the woman as whore. Throughout the text a comparative method is utilised in detailing representational features of the European woman in the popular imagination. Several of the plays which are looked at in the preceding chapter are also included in this chapter: whereas the political aspects of the plays are examined in chapter four, in this chapter the issue of the relations between male and female colonisers are examined in relation to the African woman. Several new plays are also introduced. Chapter six deals with the concept of overlordship in the context of Africa and a single play, *Black Dawn*, serves as the barometer of this type of perspective. In the context of the play, the role of colonialism as providing the basis for rule and overlordship is closely examined. Here one sees in the trial for the murder by an European male of an African female that even justice, within the jurisdiction of European law in a colonial society, is declared a miscarriage in judging the European because the judge and jury are African.

The final chapter deals with two plays by African Caribbean playwrights, C.L.R. James and Una Marson/Horace D. Vaz in which the perspective of colonialism is shown to affect the vision of the playwrights themselves. The text adheres strictly to the precept that colonialism as a systemic is no respecter of race, thus the African dramatist is as capable of reproducing the prejudices of the European as the European him/herself. Interestingly, however, the African dramatist is capable of rendering the dialogue and aspects of the mentality of the African characters in a far more credible fash-

ion than is the European playwright.

Drama is but one particular area where human beings, subjected to the propaganda and hegemonic position of elite control of the economic means of production and powers of governance, inevitably expresses the complexity of writing in an era where the *beastliness* of the European lower class never became a debatable idea by the upper classes, and its corollary in the African accepted unconditionally. It was important, therefore, in discoursing about representation to write about the social and political conditions under which the dramatist functioned. The dramatist was an "educated" human being and was conversant with Greek and Roman mythology, history, and drama, distorting some of the early Greek writers' ideas to fit the racist canons of the era. Thus in many instances where there was no literary evidence for identifying Greco-Roman notions of beastliness, ugliness, soullessness, etc., early dramatists (including those of the 20th century) randomly connected them with the African. This was not just accidental but a response to the expectations of theatrical conventions, the production unit and the audience. It was these conventions that determined what the dramatists should use and what they should discard, and what point of view they should adopt. Inevitably, however, this left gaps in character and plot developments which were unexplained. It is these gaps which provided clues to the importance of other types of analysis and interpretation-being brought to act on these plays.

Finally, this work fits into the context of re-examining or revising the history of racism which is usually contextualised from the advent of African enslavement in the sixteenth century. The unique contribution of this work to the generalities of representational studies is the location of ethnocentrism as an European phenomenon which is crucial to an understanding of the development of racism in relation to the African experience. In order to understand this better, rather than utilise the short view, i.e., since African

enslavement, the history of inter-European relations involves the utility of the long view, i.e., the beginnings of systematised institutions which legalised perceived “racial,” ethnic or national differences in the city states of Athens, Sparta, Rome and later European political entities. This entailed placing the history of “race” relations in historical perspective in order to demonstrate the nature of the link between European ethnocentrism on the one hand and racism on the other.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION RESTAGING THE CENTRE: REVIEWING CRITICAL CONCEPTS OF AFRICAN REPRESENTATION FROM THE 12TH TO THE 20TH CENTURIES

The study of stereotypes and representation is not a new phenomenon, but it has increasingly become a regular and consistent scholarly endeavour within the realms of cultural studies and critical theory. These studies encompass literary and drama criticism, psychoanalysis and anthropology, sociology and other disciplines. With the scientific and comparative approach of Sander L. Gilman in 1982, the study of stereotypes had taken a new turn. African and British critics like E. Durosimi Jones, J.S. Bratton, Jonathan Dollimore, Stuart Hall, Benita Parry, among others, have all contributed immeasurably to our understanding of the vagaries of cultural discrimination and the social, political, historical and other reasons which underpinned its proliferation. However, cultural studies and critical theory could not have functioned as effectively and as penetratingly without the critical corpus of theories on colonialism established by Frantz Fanon. For this writer, because Fanon was not merely an arm-chair theorist, but a combatant in the field of psychoanalytic practice amongst the victims of colonialism in Algeria (both the French *colon* and the Algerian people), he made a unique and compelling contribution not only to the study

of the human mind but to the operation, effects and future of colonialism as a political model through his intense examination of Algeria.

The location of the first appearance of the African stereotype in both English and European drama has been traced to the twelfth century with the emergence of the Moor, a word of somewhat elusive etymology but which does have a history. Before entering into the discourse on the African stereotype itself, it is useful to locate the historical development of the linguistic background from which representation of the African figure first made its appearance.

1. Representing Views of the African-Moor in History and in Drama

Most critics of representation of the African in drama have located the first appearance of the Moor on the London stage as being the precursor of the later represented African. This assertion can be accepted *a priori* but it does not explain *how* the African-Moor came to be represented in the first place. Critics have spent much time on locating the issues but are rather short on the historical explanations, critical analyses and meanings to be derived from representation as a whole. Some explanations have been offered by drama critics of specific instances of representation of the African-Moor but none has rendered a holistic perspective which located and derived key meanings from it. In order to understand better the meaning applied to the word moor, it is judicious to begin to locate its etymology.

Barthelemy locates the etymology of the word moor in the Greek *maūpos*, 'a proper noun that identifies the inhabitants of ancient Mauretania, the area that now makes up Morocco and Algeria.'¹ He then refers to several etymological dictionaries' definitions in which the word is equated with the colour black, and says, 'the fact [is] that *maūpos* was used as a synonym for black.'² He then links the Greek word with the Latin *maurus* which he says also 'came to mean black.'³ He goes on to say, having quoted an author who says that although the word *maurus* and its derivatives meant dark or black, 'It was, therefore, not possible to mistake a Negro and a Mauretanian,' that this

confusion arose from the author of *Mandeville's Travels* who 'spoke of the Moors as black.'⁴ This illogical form of discourse reduces reason to conjecture. Firstly, no etymological explanation is offered for Mauretania (except in its equation with *maīpos*, already clearly defined as black), and yet the author deduces that the 'Negro' and the Mauretanian are not the same. Before divesting one from the other, he should have paid closer attention to his own deduction regarding the word *maīpos/mauros* and its intrusion into both people and nation. The etymological evidence provided by Snowden on the other hand is too convincing to dismiss easily.

In a scholarly analysis of the historical development of the word moor, Snowden refers to 'Juvenal 5.53, Isidore 14.5.10 "Mauretania vocata a colore populorum; Graeci enim *nigrum μαῦρον* vocant" (Mauretania derives its name from the color of its people, for the Greeks render *nigrum* as *μαῦρον*); *fuscus*, Ausonius *Parentalia* 4.5.3-4. *Maurus* appears at times to have been a poetical equivalent of *Aethiops*..⁵ From all the associations cited by Snowden the word Moor would appear to have been derived from the Greek root, *maīpos*, from which developed the Latin *maurus* and its subsequent descendant and canonised *Moor*. It should be noted here that people of a *black* colour were frequently a part of sixth, fifth and fourth century BC Greece, and numerous ceramic and other icons were made of them. According to Snowden, 'the ancients recognised that these peoples differed in pigmentation and took considerable pains to record observed differences. Ethiopians may have looked alike to Philostratus but not to most Greeks and Romans. Even Philostratus himself described Memnon as not really black because the pure black of his skin showed a trace of ruddiness. When Statius spoke of red Ethiopians, he was perhaps revealing the accuracy of the Roman's knowledge of the Ethiopian type. Negroes of red, copper-colored complexion are known among African tribes.'⁶

This briefly summarises the historical intrusion of the word Moor and its derivations (*moreau*, *morien*, etc.) into the European vocabulary in later years which came to identify the African as a *black* and *tawny* Moor, the latter implying a lighter colour (although some scholars associate this word with

'whiteness'). It is pointless to debate the recognition of people of differing gradations of colour as in black, brown, dark brown, light brown, dark, etc., as there is a preponderance of adjectival descriptions for the various hues of people today called Europeans: the popularisation of the word *mediterranean* simply means permanently sun-tanned in degrees of colour pigmentation; the assignation of all those of darker complexions as inhabitants of southern Spain, Cyprus, Greece, southern Italy, Hungary, etc. The term *moor* indisputably expresses a black origin located in the African presence in sixth-fourth century BC Greece. There are far too many Greek gods who are described as Ethiopian or Egyptian in origin: Athena, Memnon, Andromeda, Cephus, Perseus, etc., were recognised by Greeks in antiquity as having an African-Asian origin and whose complexions were variations of black.⁷

2. The African presence in ancient Spain

In a brief description of the African connection to Spain, Van Sertima, quoting from the Spanish historian, Pedro de Medina, in his *Libro de las Grandezas de Espana*, 1549, dates a devastating drought in Spain to 1050 BC. He draws on the work of the Ibn-I-Khatib Al-Makkary, who describes this drought and supplies some information pertaining to the period. During this period, Africans, banished by an African king, intruded into Spain, founded cities, intermarried and successfully ruled Spain for one hundred and fifty-seven years, at which point they were defeated by Roman invaders.⁸ The next wave of Africans in Spain was that of Pharaoh Taharka, later to be Nubian king of Egypt, but who as general spearheaded an invasion in 700 BC. Van Sertima relies on the authority of Florian de Ocampo's *Cronica General*, published in 1553. Tarharka's name was indigenised in Spanish as Tarraco. These claims are attested to by the parallel finds of Egyptian cartouches in which the names of specific Pharaohs were recorded.⁹ This brief survey reveals the significance attached to the later characterisation of the African-Moor in the developmental stages of the European Middle Ages. However, it was at a later stage that the African-Moor as a conqueror was

introduced to the minds of the European.

3. The African-Moor in Spain in the European Dark Ages

What follows is a brief summary of the meaning of the historical events which took place in Spain from the first landing of the Moor-Arab rescue-support mission which commenced in 710. To establish the context of the Moor-Arab's significance to the resuscitation of Europe, it is fitting to introduce this section with a recognisably colonialist, conservative source, that of Lady Lugard, the journalist wife of Lord Lugard, one of the chief architects and practitioners of colonialism in Africa. She unabashedly states that "To appreciate in any degree the debt which Europe owes to the Arab civilisation of Spain, *we have to remember the condition of barbarous ignorance, sloth, and superstition* in which the Continent was plunged after the break-up of the Roman Empire"¹⁰ (emphasis added).

The scope and meaning of these words have wide ramifications for the discursive structures being rendered here. In detailing the extent to which Moorish Spain contributed to the scholarly revitalisation of Europe, Bey says,

Even as Moorish political and military power began to wane in Andalus, Europeans maintained their interest in Moorish scholarship. Catholic rulers set out to translate Arabic texts. Perhaps the best known European patron of translation was Alfonso X ("the Wise"). Alfonso X supported a "school" of translators at Toledo during the 13th century, and even though we know that the translation of Moorish treatises had been going on at least as early as the 10th century, Toledo became the major centre for translation. Because of Alfonso's great support and financial backing, Toledo became more productive in the 13th century, than other centres of translation throughout Europe, such as Barcelona, Tarazona, Leon, Segovia, Pamplona, Toulouse, Beziers, Narbonne and Marseille.¹¹

This analytical approach unravels part of the complexity in arranging a dialogic structure whereby the dispassionate construction of history would take into consideration the significance of contributions outside the European

orbit, and brings into play the philosophical question which always returns to perplex one: is the abrogation of might the equivalent of right? Bey goes on to scrutinise rarely mentioned historiographies of education in exposing the European debt to the universalising model of non-sectarian, secular education in Christian, superstition-dominated Europe:

Like Montpellier [and Chartres] and Bologna in Italy, Oxford did not originate as a Cathedral school under the regimented supervision of Vatican-sanctioned clerics. Consequently, such European academic institutions were able to adopt Moorish learning without the Church's typically debilitating restrictions. Incidentally, one of the first instructors was a man named Adam de Marisco, whose name translates as Adam "of the Moors" or "of Moorish blood."¹²

The notion that racial chauvinism plays no role in the area of progress, either for the discriminating or the discriminated society, becomes axiomatic in the domain of influences. What is significant is that cultural progress can be created and appropriated by any citizen of the world irrespective of the colour, class, ethnic origin or state he or she occupies. What becomes devastating, however, is the use to which this appropriation is put to obfuscate, distort, or propagate myths concerning the origins of cultural advance. The case, therefore, of a "progressive" Europe, developed in isolation from the rest of the world must be seen, understood and interpreted within the context of its historical origins in xenophobia and ethnocentrism. However, only a brief sketch is offered of the major issues which are relevant to this study.

After the expanded intellectual horizons of Greece and Rome, for nearly a thousand years (fifth century B.C. to fourth century A.D.), the major cities of learning laid in ruins as a result of a combination of the reaction by the church to the acquisition of scientific knowledge and the various north and east European invasions of western Europe. The Huns '...invaded India and terrorized the failing Roman empire...' ¹³; another invasion unleashed the Vandals into Spain, Africa and then into Rome, and in the sixth century 'another tribe of invaders, the Avars. From their base in Hungary they in turn drove other invaders into Italy and the Balkans... Slavs pushed the Greeks

and Illyrians into corners of the Balkan peninsula.’¹⁴ Trevor-Roper claims that the culmination of all this precipitated barbarism in Europe.¹⁵ Tribal barbarism was only one side of the coin, however, because Christianity also played a centrally fanatical role in attempting to stamp its identity on the traditional religions of Europe. Bernal claims, ‘In 390 AD the temple of Serapis [i.e., Osiris (Wsir)] and the adjacent great library of Alexandria were destroyed by a Christian mob; twenty-five years later, the brilliant and beautiful philosopher and mathematician Hypathia was gruesomely murdered in the same city by a gang of monks instigated by St Cyril. These two acts of violence mark the end of Egypto-Paganism and the beginning of the Christian Dark Ages.’¹⁶ In the fourth century, preceding the murder of Hypathia, the Nicene creed came into law under the Roman emperor, Constantine. One of its effects was to banish all rational thinkers from Rome. According to Gibbon, ‘...those who resisted the divine judgement of the synod must prepare themselves for an immediate exile...The impious Arius was banished into the remote provinces...his person and his disciples were branded, by law...his writings were condemned to the flames, and a capital punishment was denounced against those in whose possession they should be found.’¹⁷ During this period, according to Wells, ‘...the practice of medicine was forbidden by the Church, which expected cures to be effected by religious rites performed by the clergy...’¹⁸

It is in this state of barrenness and fear that the Moorish (what is acceptably referred to as the combined forces of Arabs and Africans) presence precipitated a cultural regeneration in Europe. However, although it is popularly believed that the advance in science and philosophy was an homogeneous thrust by the Moors, there is a highly documented history which demonstrates that Arab scholars were subjected to similar punishments and circumscriptions as Christian scholars.¹⁹ What is important, however, is that the sources of European intellectual regeneration came from outside Europe.

The Arabs who were pushing out from Arabia from the time of the Prophet Muhammad in the seventh century, came into contact with Greek writing through the conquest of Persia. Translations were undertaken under the

Abbasid caliphate and Arab knowledge of both the material and immaterial world expanded enormously.²⁰ Between the ninth and tenth centuries there were masses of grammarians, lexicographers and philosophers in Islam.²¹ Wells says, 'At Cordoba [in Spain] in particular there were great numbers of Christian students, and the influence of Arab philosophy coming by way of Spain upon the universities of Paris, Oxford and North Italy and upon Western European thought generally, was very considerable indeed.'²² Lady Lugard makes the comparison with European and Arab knowledge at this stage:

The contrast between Arab civilization and the civilization of Northern Europe of that date is sharply accentuated by the fact that, while the literature of the Arabs was such as to remain for our instruction to this day, Charlemagne, the greatest monarch of the West, could not write.²³

She goes on to list a variety of disciplines that western and northern Europe had no or little knowledge of:

Geber, or Djajar...of whom Roger Bacon speaks at a much later period as the *magister magistrorum* of chemical science, was the first to describe nitric acid...Before him chemistry had no stronger acid than concentrated vinegar...For the composition of gunpowder we get towards the end of the eight century the following prescription: "Pulverise on a marble mortar one pound of sulphur, two of charcoal, and six of saltpetre." Anyone who may have visited the royal gunpowder works at Waltham Abbey will know how little the prescription has altered...Ebn Junis, the astronomer, was the first to apply the pendulum about the year 1000 to the measure of time, and from his abstruse studies in astronomy clocks became a domestic possession...under this Abdurrahman...cotton manufacture was first established in Europe in the year 930...It is worth remembering that glass was not introduced into English domestic architecture until the reign of Queen Elizabeth...²⁴

It must be remembered that the period to which Lady Lugard is referring is from the eight to the twelfth centuries, which does not reflect the extent to which the sciences in antiquity had already made almost all of these discoveries, nor the extent to which "civilization," i.e., acquired through plunder and

conquest, had overtaken and reduced the originators to the anonymity of history. But the Moors laid the foundation for post-Dark Ages Europeans to begin to speculate on the nature of the universe, the spirituality of man, and all the areas of human life which were constantly problematic.

These facts provide a basis for understanding that despite the veracity of history, immense antipathetic representation still flourished in post-Moorish Spain. The question can be legitimately posed as to why? In all conflicts which culminate in war there are exaggerations and distortions, but these serve a purpose: to render the contribution of the defeated side no possibility of enduring in the memory of the population and in the world. The victorious side claims all the accomplishments of the vanquished as a right. In defeating the "enemy," the victor takes his wife, his history, his science and technology, his culture, which all now become integrated into his own and represented as such.

One of the best ways of projecting the inferiorisation of the defeated "enemy" is to fabricate an image of barbarism, cruelty, etc. Irving gives a graphic account of the assignation of cruelty to the Moors, although it was Christians who were perpetrating the crimes:

While the old chroniclers dwell with becoming enthusiasm on this pure and affecting triumph of humanity, they go, in a strain of equal eulogy, to describe a spectacle of a different nature. It so happened that there were found in the city twelve of those renegado Christians, who had deserted to the Moors, and conveyed false intelligence during the siege. A barbarous species of punishment was inflicted upon them, borrowed, it is said, from the Moors, and peculiar to these wars. They were tied to stakes, in a public place, and horsemen exercised their skill in transpiercing them with pointed reeds, hurled at them while careering at full speed, until the miserable victims expired beneath their wounds. Several apostate Moors, also, who, having embraced Christianity, had afterwards relapsed into their early faith, and had taken refuge in Malaga from the vengeance of the Inquisition, were publicly burnt. "These," says an old Jesuit historian, exultingly, "these (sic) were the tilts of reeds; and the illuminations most pleasing for this victorious festival, and for the catholic piety of our sovereigns!"²⁵

The mood of revenge which pious Christians felt in wresting their lands back from the Moors took on proportions of violent indulgence, cruelty and ruthless greed. In so doing they constructed a corpus of stories relating to the savagery of the Moors. Irving, reporting on the thinking of the Jesuit father Pedro Abarca about the Moorish commander, Mulley Abdalla Zagal, said: "...[he] was the most venomous Mahometan in all Morisma," while the Christian chronicler Fray Antonio Agapida says, "Certainly none ever opposed a more heathenish and diabolical obstinacy to the holy inroads of the cross of the sword."²⁶ It is interesting, however, to note the significance of Agapida's words: that because of Zagal's resistance, his refusal to surrender to the power of the Christian sword, he became both a "heathen" and "diabolical." Perhaps this anti-Moor tirade can be explained not simply by the fanaticism of Christian Europe but also because of the unbalanced relations of power between the two contending factions: the governed and the governing. According to Hrbek this perception of Africa was central, 'From the Western European point of view, Africa became identified with the Muslim world as it was from this region that the main incursions and invasions, but also various influences and ideas, were coming...It is thus not surprising that Africa was identified with the arch enemy of Christianity, and its inhabitants, irrespective of their colour, were regarded and treated accordingly' ²⁷(emphasis added). In this type of rationale one sees ascribed to the resisting Moor a variety of characteristics that would brand him a symbol of fanaticism which is paralleled by his represented barbarism and cruelty.

The latter falsehood, proclaimed subsequent to the Moor's defeat, can be contrasted with the level of tolerance and liberty which existed under Moorish governance. It can be inferred that perhaps because of the secularisation of Moorish government (although Islam played a fundamental role in its governance), in contrast to Christian moral and religious practices, the Moor seems to triumph in the pursuit of both the intellect and religious tolerance.

A glance at the volumes of *España Sagrada* shows beyond doubt that the Christian hierarchy, Christian worship, and Christian monasticism,

continued practically without interference for something like two hundred years after the Moslem conquest...²⁸

It appears, therefore, that the Christian Church had a continuous, and so far as can be gathered, a vigorous existence, not only during the Moslem domination in Spain, but also in Morocco for nearly a hundred and fifty years after Islam had lost the whole of Spain except the kingdom of Granada. *This fact alone shows that there can have been little or no persecution, for the sturdiest faith could hardly have survived for five or six hundred years, had any persistent attempt been made to stamp it out.*²⁹

The systematic manner in which the African-Moor became embedded in the psyche of Christian Europe certainly projects a represented figure completely at odds with his historical persona and moral behaviour. It is fitting to end this section with the arch colonialist Lady Lugard who, writing about Abdurrahman, a Moorish king in Spain, refers to him as ‘...the mildest and most enlightened sovereign that ever ruled. His meekness, his generosity, and his love of justice became proverbial.’³⁰ As the Moor became the object of cruel representation and the stereotype of everything that is greedy, violent, rapacious – although immeasurably contributing to the resuscitation of Europe – so too had the ancient Egyptian become a dying fossil in the European imagination until the beginnings of the Renaissance, which the Moor commenced from the eighth century, but which the Egyptian now succeeded to a centrally advantageous level in the late Middle Ages.

4. Ancient Egypt & the European Renaissance

Acknowledged as the single most important feature in post-Christian European history, the Renaissance placed the ancient Egyptian at the centre of origins and foundations of human knowledge. Frances Yates shows that the Italians passion for knowledge led them to abandon the translation of Greek scholars in preference of the translation of the *Corpus Hermeticum*, a text known to have been transmitted by the Egyptian sage, Hermes, to his Greek student Asclepius.³¹ Yates goes on to reveal that Hermes Trismegistus was the ‘...most important figure in the Renaissance...confirming the high

opinion of him which the Christian Father, Lactantius, had expressed, and whom the highest authorities regarded as the source for Plato.’³² Bernal claims that Hermes and other Egyptian divinities were incorporated into the Christian church as patron saints: ‘Neith/Athena was incorporated as St Catherine, Horus/Perseus as St George, and Anubis/Hermes as St Christopher.’³³ Bernal also reveals the euhemerization of Hermes, identified in Islam as ‘...Idris, a sincere prophet who appears in the *Qoran*. In this tradition, too, he was seen as the ‘father of philosophers’ and ‘the one who is thrice endowed with wisdom’. In other Islamic traditions he was seen as three sages, one from before the Flood who lived in Egypt and two from after it; one from Babylon and the other again from Egypt. He was seen as the culture hero who had invented all the arts and sciences, especially astronomy, astrology, medicine and magic.’³⁴

Giordano Bruno, who died at the stake for proclaiming Egypt as containing the paradigm of original religion, characterised the Jews as being ‘the excrement of Egypt’ and claimed that the Greeks were beholden to Egypt, ‘..that grand monarchy of letters and nobility, to be the parent of our fables, metaphors and doctrines.’³⁵ Elsewhere Bernal shows how Isaac Newton, in his quest to find the parallel in his theory of gravitation, needed to get the exact measurement of the circumference of the world, and rejected the explanation of Greek mathematician and astronomer, Erastosthenes, in favour of the original Egyptian cubit.³⁶

It can be inferred that world cultures are continuously being regenerated and revitalised by contributions from the most unlikely sources. Deliberate falsifications about the origins of science and technology, the arts and philosophy will be seen to have been firmly established in the nineteenth century. This is the period in which modern African slavery and rule through force of the gun, created strenuous attempts to deny that the testimony of the ancients was a true record of history.

The pseudo-science which developed to justify the condition of the African would have an enormous impact on the consciousness of Europeans, in all different professional capacities, in their perception and portrayal of Africans.

In order to understand better the historical development of the stereotype in European culture, particularly in relation to the concept of conqueror and conquered (given the history of xenophobia in Europe), it is best to reconstruct a brief overview of how representation was perceived, described and projected in the context of Western Europe.

5. European Ethnocentrism and the Stereotype

There is a popular belief that racism originates in the barbarous commercial activity of African slavery by Europeans in the sixteenth century. This belief has permeated most literature on the subject, although both Sherwin White (1967) and Lorrimer (1978) point to a connection between ethnocentrism and xenophobia as the precursors of racism. Scientific study points to the existence of ethnocentrism and xenophobia as intrinsic features of European society. Slavery, an ancient characteristic and practice, has no connection to racism as a phenomenon. This perspective can be looked at in several ways; the most significant, however, is the inscription of slavery as a legal right within the statute books of Greece and Rome in ancient times. The preoccupation with an historical connection between ethnocentrism and racism is central to the location of racism as a model or social practice which affects the social status of Africans in the modern world.

The contextual framework within which this perspective is developed allows the assertion that ethnic or racial superiority derives from conquest through war; the display of "civilisation" becomes a feature which distinguishes the conqueror from the conquered. Writing on Roman slavery, Higginbotham says

For the whole period during which Rome is historically visible slaves were common. For two centuries from around 200 B.C. when law most developed, the Roman economy was largely based on conquest and slavery.³⁷

Slaves could be of any race or background: other Italian peoples, Greeks, Syrians, Jews, Gauls, Britons, and so on though there were relatively few black Africans.³⁸

...the legal rules on slavery bear no sign of prejudice against racial or

national groups (which is not to say that Rome was free from racism). Just as significant for Roman attitudes is the fact that, by Roman law, any man captured by the enemy became a foreign slave and even lost his Roman citizenship.³⁹

Engels, in reconstructing the passage of Greek society from that of a "gentile order" ("barbarism") to that of "civilisation", notes that collectivism of the tribe had given way to the ascendancy of the family and that the nobility and monarchy were now inheriting unequal wealth. He also notes that "slavery, at first only of prisoners of war but already preparing the way for enslavement of fellow members of the tribe and even of the gens; the old wars between tribe and tribe already degenerating into systematic pillage by land and sea for the acquisition of cattle, slaves and treasure..."⁴⁰ Engels goes on to assert that the increasing class conflict in Athenian society was not that between the nobility and the "common" people, "but of slaves and free men, of protected persons and citizens."⁴¹ Engels proposed that the Athenian state was comprised of 90,000 free men, women and children and 365,000 slaves.⁴² While scholars have never agreed on a figure (see M.I. Finley, ed., 1960), there is nevertheless the suggestion that the conflict in hierarchical Athenian society was primarily due to the position of the slaves. According to Engels, this brought about the demise of Athens.

Aristotle, writing in the fourth century B.C. on the Athenian constitution, says that

All the land was in the hands of a few, and if the poor failed to pay their rents both they and their children were liable to seizure... The harshest and bitterest aspect of the constitution for the masses was the fact of their enslavement...⁴³

Yet, it was the same Aristotle who was responsible for the contradiction of referring to Asians as being predisposed to slavery, although he had already clearly defined the state of the masses, and not the minority, in Athens as being that of slaves.

The races that live in cold regions and those of Europe are full of courage and passion but somewhat lacking in skill and brainpower; for this reason,

while remaining generally independent, they lack political cohesion and the ability to rule others. On the other hand, the Asiatic races have both brains and skill but are lacking in courage and will power; so they have remained both enslaved and subject. The Hellenic race, occupying a mid position geographically, has a measure of both. Hence it has continued to be free, to have the best political institutions and to be capable of ruling others given a single constitution.⁴⁴

Aristotle's self-confidence in propounding on the predisposition of a slavish condition in the Asian could only have occurred in the context of Greece's ascendancy, as a conquering nation-state, during the time of Aristotle's life.

What can be noted from Aristotle's utterance is the readiness to accept that there were intrinsic qualities in both the northern European (passion and courage) and the Asian (brains and skill), cultural features, which transcended his own ethnocentric prejudices. This expresses a response to the acquisition of desirable cultural qualities although maintaining a posture of "racial" difference. This seems to promote the notion that culture was considered to be non-exclusive. As Sherwin-White, writing on the existence of what he terms "racial prejudice" in ancient Greek and Roman societies, says, "The force of such racial feeling as existed was ever being undermined by the non-exclusiveness of cultures. A strong repulsion could not develop when *one of the two peoples concerned was so anxious to adopt the customs of the other*"⁴⁵ (emphasis added).

Gaius Jūlius Caesar, writing in the first century B.C., conceived of the Gauls as being 'extremely superstitious; and so persons suffering from serious diseases, as well as those who are exposed to the perils of battle, offer, or vow to offer, human sacrifices... They believe that the only way of saving a man's life is to propitiate the god's wrath by rendering another life in its place, and they have regular state sacrifices of the same kind.'⁴⁶ Caesar goes on to mock the sacrificial rituals of, for example, the Celts, who built of huge wickerwork images filled with 'living men; they are then set on fire, and the victims burnt to death.'⁴⁷ It is interesting to note that the Romans themselves were known to be a "superstitious" people: prior to their contact with Greek society

Romans were involved in human sacrifice. This was superseded, according to Brian Catchpole, by other forms of sacrifice in which humans were replaced by animals: 'Sacrifice was the major ritual in Roman religion and was, in effect, a bargain between the god and the person or people performing the rite. Usually, a plant or animal held to be sacred to the god was burned or killed on the altar beside the place where the spirit lived.'⁴⁸ Sacrifices were simultaneously strengthened by the belief in placation of the gods through communication:

Apart from the official gods, the soldier worshipped all sorts of demons and spirits. Wherever he happened to be, he would want to come to terms with the *genius loci*, that is, the spirit of the place. Then there was Lares, protector of houses and barrack rooms, and Penates, guardian of the food store. So when the Roman infantryman and the rest of his section pitched their heavy leather tent for the night they would immediately make their peace with the resident spirit of the nearby lake, forest, or hill – and pray that Penates would look after their rations.⁴⁹

In first century Caesarian times, human sacrifices were considered barbaric, although the Romans still made offerings to the gods. The clear link between worshipping nature gods or spirits and the practice of the early Britons was unmistakable. What seemed to have animated Caesar's prejudice was the fact of his relationship to the people of whom he was writing: they still lived in a condition considered barbaric, a condition that Rome itself had previously experienced. Once Rome had synthesised its borrowed knowledge from the Greeks,⁵⁰ Romans felt that they were now "civilised" and could view the culture of others with disdain. In one of his satires, Juvenal says, 'I cannot endure Rome that is full of Greeks.'⁵¹

Cornelius Tacitus was born in the first century A.D. and became a senator and then a governor in the Roman government. His records of his observations of the Germans tell us a great deal about the prevailing notions of race and of ethnic difference. He refers to certain tribes of Germany as often terminating their differences by killing and wounding, and notes that the practice of growing beards springs from the commitment to war. Only on the

death of an enemy can they shave.⁵¹ He notes that the Germans are unpunctual,⁵² that 'When not engaged in warfare they spend a certain amount of time in hunting, but much more in idleness, thinking of nothing else but sleeping and eating,' and that they '...wear the skins of wild animals...' ⁵³ He goes on to say that 'In every home the children go naked and dirty.' ⁵⁴ Tacitus sees the Germans, Britons and French as a structural unit and assigns them to the barbarian stage of human evolution. In a so-called "civilised" society, Rome was infamous for its sport of applauding dogs tearing the flesh of humans until they died. But it was the trappings of buildings, the wearing of clothes, *the position of Rome as an imperialistic and conquering nation which provided the impetus for Tacitus to look so contemptuously on the behaviour of other peoples.*

The contextual structure is being developed which implies that ethnic, racial or national prejudice appears as an increasingly exaggerated phenomenon only on the acquisition of qualities of "civilisation" which now transform a former "barbarian" into a commentator on unbridled ethno-racism. Dialogic structures are simultaneously being grounded on the notion of uncritical prejudice as against educated and scientific discourse on what one appears to be seeing. The difference in the two forms of observation is the degeneration of unreasoned non-comparative approaches into diatribe on one the hand, and that of studied, rational and comparative observations on the other.

If Tacitus' ethnocentrism can be understood because of his birth and position in Roman society, Flavius Arrianus Xenophon, who was born a Greek in the first century A.D., and became an imperial governor in the Roman government, cannot be excused because his position as an outsider should have given him the advantage of looking at the society from an entirely different angle (this notion, however, is in fundamental opposition to the theory of incorporation, introjection, denial and colonialism). His most famous book is the reconstructed history of *The Campaigns of Alexander* which took place in the fourth century B.C. One of the peculiar characteristics of a high-placed functionary in an imperial nation is that the privilege of elitism tends to rub off. If not, in the case of Arrian, Greece's former role as a colonising power

had imbued him with a deep sense of the importance of difference. In this case Arrian was writing of Alexander's campaigns which took place principally in North Africa (Egypt), the Middle East and the East, areas where he came into contact with once powerful cultures. In his dealings with the people from this area, Alexander was keenly aware of the importance of learning from others and of incorporating certain positive attributes into himself and his people. It is this learning disposition to other cultures which strikes the reader as creating a feeling of resentment in not only Alexander's army, but the chronicler himself. Alexander, had he lived today, might have been called an equal opportunity employer at best or a "foreigner lover" at worst; he might also have been called a multiculturalist (he offered sacrifice to the Egyptian god Ammon and sought the advice of the oracle). He incorporated 30,000 Susian troops into his army, all dressed in Macedonian "battle-dress," himself dressed in Median (Persian) clothes and presumably spoke the language as well (his appointed Governor of Persia was resented for speaking the language), conducting marriage ceremonies along Persian lines.⁵⁵

This created consternation among his Macedonian troops, as Arrian records: 'All this was a cause of deep resentment to the Macedonians, who could not but feel that Alexander's whole outlook was *becoming tainted with orientalism*, and that he no longer cared for his own people or his own native ways'⁵⁶ (emphasis added). Arrian, projecting his irrevocable disdain for Alexander's multicultural immersion, associates the cutting off of a court-martialled soldier's nose and ears and his final public execution with the emulation of the 'Eastern extravagance...and the fashion of barbaric kings...' and remarks, 'I have no praise for such conduct...'⁵⁷ Commenting on the accusation, through rumour, that Alexander had destroyed the shrine of the Greek philosopher Asclepius (student of the Egyptian Hermes Trismegistus), he associates the act with that of an "*oriental despot*"⁵⁸ (emphasis added).

Arrian, of course, seemed to have forgotten his own chronicle of Alexander's dressing down of his troops in response to the perennial accusation of abandonment of his own culture. Alexander had recalled the history

of the Macedonians' evolution, of his father Phillip, who found them '...a tribe of impoverished vagabonds, most of you dressed in skins...He gave you cloaks to wear instead of skins; he brought you down from the hills into the plains...He made you city-dwellers; he brought you law; he civilized you.' He continued the harangue about the plunder and rewards they had reaped from his father, Phillip, claiming that he had exceeded what his father had accomplished. He said he had reduced Miletus, that he had given them the wealth of Egypt, Cyrene, Palestine, Syria, and that they were now masters of the gold of Lydia, the treasures of Persia, and the wealth of India.⁵⁹ Arrian separates the plunder of one ethnic group (the Macedonians) from the "barbarianism" of another ("orientals"), so that, from the vantage point of Greece's conquest of the world, Arrian completely ignores the details of how this conquest was accomplished.

Another Greek, Strabo, exhibited similar ethnocentric tendencies against the Iberians and the Celts of northern Europe. Sherwin-White records how Strabo refers to the practice of the Celts of northern Germany who 'still sleep on the ground and eat their meals sitting on mattresses of straw.'⁶⁰ Then Sherwin-White reports that Strabo says of the northern Germans that they 'have a great deal of uncivilized wildness' which he associates with '...the savagery associated with the treatment of prisoners and sacrificial victims – the decapitation of enemies, the preservation of skulls as trophies, human sacrifices of various sorts, and forms of divination 'contrary to our customs'.⁶¹ Strabo, however, believed that the stage of barbarianism was not static: 'The barbarian is beastly, but only by force of circumstances. He is not beastly in himself. His beastliness is the direct consequence of his economic and physical circumstances. These can change, and as they change the beastliness disappears and the barbarian becomes a civilized man, approved by all if he lives in cities. The recurrent formula,' Sherwin-White comments, 'is that peace encourages agriculture, and agriculture leads to civic life.'⁶² Whether this simplistic formula for the acquisition of "civilisation" is accurate can be contrasted with the legal framework within which "civilized" societies such as Greece and Rome functioned, or is it in the concern for human life, and the

constitutional protection of it, that true civilisation can be understood and interpreted?

Writing in the nineteenth century on the foundations of Western law in the Graeco-Roman constitution, Maine examines the law of Warlike Capture, which, he says,

...derives from the assumption that communities are remitted to a state of nature by the outbreak of hostilities, and that, in the artificial natural condition thus produced, the institution of private property falls into abeyance so far as concerns the belligerents...

The idea would occur spontaneously to persons practising the ancient forms of Warfare, when victory dissolved the organisation of the conquering army and dismissed the soldiers to indiscriminate plunder.⁶³

Maine, an apologist for the plunder committed by western nations, excuses it as "spontaneous." There was, however, nothing spontaneous in the act of plunder. It was guaranteed constitutionally, as the objective of conquest: to plunder the cities or states of their riches and to give just rewards to soldiers who participated in such plunder. In late antiquity, when Solon became leader of Athens during the sixth century B.C., he reversed the laws which perpetuated the condition of slaves, and, being subjected to the venom and hostility of the nobility (who had supported his election), he sojourned in Egypt in an attempt to escape them. He wrote an ode which tells of the betrayal felt by the nobility:

They came for plunder, full of rich hopes,
Each of them expecting to find great prosperity,
And expecting me to reveal an iron will behind my velvet speech.
Their talk then was vain; but now they are angry with me,
And all look askance at me as if I were their enemy.⁶⁴

The Greek city-states were founded in and perpetuated on a state of war and plunder. Slavery was a feature of the constitution. Greece was in a state of war for centuries and the constitution of the Four Hundred, for example, refers to the law that 'It should not be permitted to spend Athens' revenues for any purpose other than war...' ⁶⁵ It should not be illogical to view the

development of democratic European political institutions as basing their early and later laws upon some of the features of Graeco-Roman laws. It was the existence of these laws which gave legitimacy to invasion, annexation and imperial control of foreign nations, whereby the material resources of those economies became appendages of the colonising powers.

What is stressed and should be remembered, however, is that the historical development of Europe owed its basic "civilised" features to societies which came before and outside it, the most dominant of these non-Western influences being Ancient Egypt, which, according to James Curl, '...provided some of the most important influences that are *central*, rather than peripheral... Ancient Egyptian religion, art and architecture have profoundly affected Graeco-Roman and Christian civilisations in ways that, to a very great extent, have been *ignored* by historians and commentators: ...some of the *most important* of such influences...trace an extraordinary and persistent thread that leads back to the ancient cultures of the Nile' ⁶⁶(emphasis added).

This brief critical review permitted an interrogation of the internal evidence for the construction of the non-foreign origin/contact in assigning the concept of racism. Slavery was a legal phenomenon in the Greco-Roman world which had no preference for particular nationalities of slaves: whoever fitted the requirement was enslaved and the African was a minority amongst the overall majority of Europeans. Ethnocentrism and xenophobia consequently appear to have been linked to the later phenomenon that we, in the modern context, refer to as racism. The stereotype, the figure of representation, was produced from the internal systemic within European societies. The differences in class position, the zenith of hegemonic dominance, dictated the perpetuation of privilege, overlordship, differentiation. These features were thus gained at the expense of linguistic invention as a rationale for maintaining the dominated in a position of servitude and dependence. It did not take foreign contact with other cultures to precipitate racist practices.

What follows is an attempt to provide the basis for the canonised African as crudely represented stereotype. Contextually, the nineteenth century provides an important chronicle of the pseudo-scientific theories which flourished in

that era and which confirmed that there was no avoidance of the fact that discursive structures were erected from the local or national situation transferred to the foreigner. At all times, there is the internal correspondence of stereotyped people with that of *another* race, usually the African. In our argument, regardless how scurrilous the attack upon the African, there was an inevitable concomitant in the comparative condition of the European oppressed.

6. Scientific justifications for the stereotype in the 19th century

In the attempt to legitimise ideas of science which were being introduced into nineteenth century England, several societies were formed and attempts made to demarcate layman's language from the notion of the scientific. What played the most significant role in delineating this preoccupation with "scientific" objectivity was the new branch of phrenology (brain-power in relation to brain size). Although not specifically designed for racist purposes, it soon degenerated into a racist enterprise.⁶⁷ After the 1840s, the overt implications of phrenology/craniology and other concepts of racist science began to express a perspective of the African as encased in static time: that he was at the stage of human development which the Europeans had passed millennia ago. Many of these ideas were argued around the dichotomy of the monogenesis/polygenesis origin of mankind. What is clear, however, as one commentator observed, is that 'Almost the whole of scientific thought in both America and Europe in the decades before Darwin, accepted race inferiority, irrespective of whether the races sprang from a single original pair or were created separately.'⁶⁸ This observation supports the contention that the ispi-lateral concentration on the *external* forces the dichotomising European mind to abandon the evidence of his *internal* correlates, thus producing contradictory projections and conflicting views. By looking at and examining the writings of a few nineteenth-century scholars and writers, one can not only highlight their contradictions, but establish that their views stemmed from *internal social phenomena*.

Georges Cuvier, the French anatomist, who straddled the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and was known for his racialist theories, was still capable of linking “savage” and “civilized” in the following manner, ‘Savages fight for a forest, and herdsmen for a pasture, and as often as they can, break in upon the cultivators of the earth to rob them of the fruits of their long and painful labours. Even civilized nations, far from being contented with their blessings, pour out each other’s blood for the prerogatives of pride, or the monopoly of trade.’⁶⁹ (This is a precise and clear echo of Strabo except that Cuvier maintains the “civilised” in the domain of the “barbaric.”) He goes on to associate the monkey with the African (Negro) and the Caucasian with beauty, yet he links the Arabs, Jews, Abyssinians (Ethiopians) as branches of the Caucasian race!⁷⁰ (This appears to be a platonic-attributed argument which has no basis in Plato, see chapter 6 for elaboration.) Robert Knox, a medical doctor fallen from grace, exhibits a multifaceted racialism which shows a penchant for maintaining the African in the “primitive” tradition, but simultaneously, he casts aspersions on the Saxons. He says that the Dutch of Southern Africa gave Dutch names to African phenomena, although these phenomena had their original African names. ‘The coloured men the Dutch called boys, and the coloured women they called maids...the (Dutch) go-ahead principle was at work; this, of course, led to the seizure of land, the plunder and massacre, wholesale sometimes, of the simple aborigines...the gun and bayonet became the law...’⁷¹ Knox goes on to see differentiation not only in Africans but in Europeans: ‘...Nature has formed many races of white men whose physical organization and mental disposition differ widely from each other, *so also has she formed the swarthy world...*The old English yeomen and the modern Dorsetshire labourer, the local tenant of Sunderlandshire and the peasantry of Ireland, *are simply bondsmen or slaves; there is no avoiding the phrase..* The fate of the Caffre [i.e., African] race, then, is certain...’⁷² Thus we see that although Knox may have represented a particular tradition of racist thought, he nevertheless presents inescapable evidence to substantiate the view of contradiction and confirmation originating from his own social ambivalence.

The writings of Benjamin Kidd, however, project a deterministic view of race by (1) associating the evolutionary stage of the African with that of the European child, and (2) by claiming that if the European had any right in Africa it was for the purpose of the transmission of civilization.⁷³ Yet, the mere moral supposition of 'if' to the European presence in Africa implies a discomfiture with his own theories, or at the very least suggests doubt on his self-conviction. But Kidd by reason of his class and the prevailing Victorian perceptions of what constituted a gentleman, conforms to the limitations the period imposed on his thinking. As Lorrimer so graphically describes this phenomenon, this sense of the Victorian self not only '...strengthened the English gentleman's sense of his racial superiority, but ultimately the professional and educated classes *founded their assumptions about race upon their conception of themselves as civilized men in an uncivilized world, and as an enlightened intelligentsia in a barbarian England*'⁷⁴ (emphasis added).

Racism must therefore be seen as the complex relation of perceptions of class and status at home and the projection of these dichotomous structures onto relations with peoples external to the society. There is also the complex of a legal framework beyond personal perceptions of class or race; this, from the historical reading of the evolution of European society, can be seen to have been the basis, from remote antiquity to the present time, of constitutional perpetuation of privilege. The effects of racism and of class positions can be read more comprehensively within the complex of mediation of unresolved class conflict at home through the existence of dominated peoples of colour abroad. The following is an attempt to place some meaning and interpretation on the significance of stereotypes in Western culture. This is not to suggest, however, that stereotypes did not and do not exist in other cultures. But there must be societal or political reasons why, in the main, these are never codified and constructed within a legal framework and thus generated through human consciousness.

7. The invention of the African stereotype: some explanations

The first historical appearance of the African-Moor, according to Helen Rusha de Troesch, was in the twelfth century, when he was represented as 'one of three kings in a liturgical play of the nativity.'⁷⁵ She traces this appearance to a manuscript on the continent (i.e., continental Europe) in Latin entitled *Collectanea Flores*: "...Tertius, *fuscus* integra barbatus, Balthazar' (she quotes Karl Young, *The Drama of the Medieval Church*). Another fourteenth century Latin manuscript, for a play performed in Rouen, France, noted '...tres de maiori sede more Regnum induiti.'⁷⁶ Troesch goes on to show that not only was the African-Moor seen temporarily on the stage as king, but he was cast in the permanence of art: 'Among these paintings is the one in the church at Sardino by Luini (1460-1530) which shows one king very black with a black servant. Andre Mantegna's canvas of the same period shows a negro king with a negro attendant leading a camel... In Milan is the Corregio (1494-1534) painting in which the important standing figure is the black king.

'...Dorer's *Adoration of the Magi* (1511) shows one figure with negroid features, no beard, and very curly hair. As in all the woodcuts the color of the face is no different from that of the others...

'Other 15th and 16th century painters in well known centers of other countries, such as Freiburg and Madrid, represent the black king as the youngest and most luxuriously attired.'⁷⁷ She gives several examples. As the African was being canonised in sixteenth century European art, there was also an attempt in the Vatican paintings executed by Bernardo Pintoricchio (c.1454-1513), who was principally responsible for decorating the apartment of the Borgias, to link the lineage of the Pope to Egypt, according to Prof. Curl.⁷⁸

What this unmistakably tells us is that there is no confusion about the first entrance of the African on the European stage and unanimous representation of his incontestable stature: not only was he a king, but he was the basis for catholicism's religious model within the papacy itself. The deterministic, underlying motivations for the belief that the African-Moor was seen as evil have no base in historical fact. Even after the defeat of the Moor, in fourteenth

century Italy and Germany, the Moor was represented as a person of stature and of respect.

There is, however, one powerful motivation for the maligning of the African-Moor at a certain period: as he began to lose his power in the primary cities in Western Europe, particularly Spain, he became the butt of stereotypical ridicule and the absorbent sponge of Christian European hatred. In Spain, Valencia was recaptured in 1238, Cordova in 1239, Seville in 1260,⁸¹ Baza in 1489 and finally Granada in 1491.⁷⁹ Although victorious, the Spanish pursued the Moors relentlessly; '...a policy of ferocious repression and persecution of Islam was inaugurated... Not content with the stamping out of the last flicker of the Hispano-Mauresque tradition, Spain sent an expedition to North Africa in 1505, to make sure that no succour should come from that quarter.'⁸⁰ Christopher Columbus initiated his first voyage across the Atlantic ocean in 1492; he was already a seasoned voyager to West Africa. Spain and Portugal, the two nations which were occupied and controlled by the Moors for centuries, were the first European nations, in the modern epoch, to initiate Amerindian and African slavery. It was at this stage in Europe's history that ethnocentrism achieved a powerful resonance in translating itself into racism: the legal practice of control of other humans on the basis of colour. Serfdom, servitude, and European slavery, although preparing the legal basis for African slavery, paled by comparison with the extent of the destruction that would be unleashed upon a people.

In looking at the changing fate of the African-Moor in European drama, one sees his first appearance as king from the twelfth to the fourteenth centuries, but in the late sixteenth century and at the turn of the seventeenth, one witnesses a transformation in his status from king to a vengeful, bloodthirsty murderer. Writing on Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*, Cowhig asserts that though the author presents 'Aaron as a demon, ... at the end of the play [he] suddenly shatters the illusion of myth by showing Aaron to be a real *person* with common feelings of compassion and fatherly care for his child.'⁸¹ A contrasting view is from Troesch who says, 'In the same year (1594) *Titus Andronicus* presented a vengeful Moor... [Aaron's] rebellion against captivi-

ty, the injustice meted out to him seem comprehensible motives for a desire to get revenge, but the means of gaining it, such as cutting off Lavinia's hands and removing her tongue, makes him *repulsive*. If there was any association in Elizabethan minds between blackness and the devil, its best evidence is in this play where evil seem incarnate.⁸² Tokson, taking his cue from an Elizabethan scholar, E.E. Stoll, quotes him as saying 'that the epithet of "devil" was applied to Aaron "because of his color, not his race, for it was a superstition, not then extinct, that the Devil when he appeared took the form of a Moor.'⁸³ Elsewhere, theorising around Shakespeare's characterisation of Aaron as evil, Tokson claims that 'Aaron (as he contemplates his own evil) himself admits that "Aaron will have his soul black as his face." '⁸⁴

In Cowhig's deductive reasoning she omits the significance of Shakespeare's representation of Aaron as a bloodthirsty, vengeful Moor, capable of the most horrendously violent crimes, and supposes that Aaron's tenderness for his child obliterates his repulsion in the audience's mind. Troesch was manifestly correct in interpreting Shakespeare's representation of Aaron as *repulsive* to the minds of the audience as the most significant quality for his portrayal. Tokson, by comparison, appears to be superficially analysing the assigning and the meaning of Stoll's apologetic position in demarcating Aaron's colour as symbolic of evil from his race as a whole. In post-fourteenth century Britain the Moor predominantly appears as evil, repulsive, revengeful. If Aaron were an isolated example, one could accept, *a priori*, Stoll's statement and Tokson's agreement, but the largely generic, quantitative representation of the African-Moor as evil and bloodthirsty makes it impossible not to identify Aaron with his race. Tokson's second point regarding Aaron's apparent acceptance of his own evil omits the most ponderous example of irresponsibility: *Aaron only confesses his own evil in the hands of an European who represents him*. Neither Aaron nor a member of his race wrote Shakespeare's play, and in the context of European perceptions and representations of the Moor, only Shakespeare himself could make Aaron confess to his predetermined evil. Thus Aaron's preoccupation with brutality and violence could only be a projection of Shakespeare himself; and

Aaron was not an isolated incident within the context of representations of race in several of Shakespeare's plays.

In examining the history of the Moor's presence in Spain and in drama, one directs to the Moor the unalterable hatred that conquerors always evoke in the minds of the conquered. But in the Moor's case, one also noted the extent to which a moribund European society became reinvigorated after the Roman Empire was overrun by a variety of Northern and Eastern Europeans who reduced learning to virtual banishment. It was also shown that the Moor was religiously and morally tolerant to the extent that both Christian churches and Jewish synagogues flourished under Moorish rule and individual liberty was guaranteed. Here it should also be noted that the Moors were not invaders in the period under discussion, but were invited to defend the rightful inheritors of a Spanish kingdom and remained after performing their victorious duties.⁸⁵

The question arises how could a clearly attested history by some of the most prominent and conservative intellectuals in Europe ever have evoked and betrayed feelings of intense antipathy? Dollimore answers the question in terms of the generation of ideology by the dominant society and the construction of a 'history' from its inception to the present period. He also shows that a sectional interest, i.e., the dominant minority, 'universalises' its model for reproduction and standardising.⁸⁶ Gilman offers the explanation that 'Stereotypes arise when self-integration is threatened. They are therefore part of our way of dealing with the instabilities of our perception of the world. This is not to say they are good, only that they are necessary. *We can and must make the distinction between pathological stereotyping and the stereotyping all of us need to do to preserve our illusion of control over the self and the world....* The pathological personality's mental representation of the world supports the need for the line of difference, whereas for the non-pathological individual the stereotype is a momentary coping mechanism, one that can be used and then discarded once anxiety is overcome. *The former is consistently aggressive toward real people and objects to which the stereotypical representations correspond; the latter is able to repress the aggression and deal with people as individuals*'⁸⁷(emphasis added).

In reflecting on the meaning of Dollimore's statement, one immediately understands the nature of most if not of all societies in which the existence of class differentiation and the usurpation of power are for the perpetuation of privilege. This also implies the deliberate falsification of history to serve an avowed end: the separation of peoples along colour and class lines, the incorporation of the conquered into the systemic of the dominating, etc. These are clearly defined materialist perspectives which resonate in any political philosophy and in any geographical domain. Gilman's assertions, however, are anchored in psychology and psychoanalysis and are thus more complex and difficult to agree on fully. In the first instance, whether there is a necessity for stereotypes in order to maintain stability in world-view is arguable. What is here represented is the undetermined nature of not just the human person but the political system in which the being is operating. In this case, materially, anthropologically, it is the constitution of a type of society under which the being exists which is responsible for determining whether or not one needs stereotypes. For example, traditional African societies, in the main, show a complete xenophilic relationship to the stranger (cf. Diop, *The Cultural Unity of Black Africa: The Domains of Matriarchy and of Patriarchy in Classical Antiquity*, 1989). Many European travellers, unfamiliar with the moral bases of traditional African societies, record their surprise at their welcome. On the other hand, in Greco-Roman societies as well as those of Western Europe, the stranger was not only viewed with suspicion but could be subjected to enslavement. Thus the need for stereotypes would fit into societies in which the stranger is recognisably perceived as a threat, both historically and contemporarily.

Following this discursive thread, in spite of the relative position of prosperity under which non-Islamic religions flourished in Spain, there would seem to have been an absence of the European stereotype in the imagination of the Moor-Arab. Gilman thus escapes a materialist perspective in delineating, *a priori*, for the entire universe a paradigm constructed specifically from the European experience. Although it does succinctly and comprehensively explicate and articulate the meaning of stereotyping for the European-

Western individual, by its very universalist mode and appeal, it omits non-Western experiences from its focus.

Following Gilman, Tokson boldly, and perhaps blindly, asserts that 'Why these white writers imagined only certain narrow prescribed courses of behavior for their black characters can probably *never* be fully understood'⁸⁸ (emphasis added). This question perpetuates the mythic dimension of gross (mis)representation of the African as suitable only for psychoanalysis and escapes the responsibility of pursuing discursive threads which lead to a logical, materialist explanation in the realm of history. These attitudes define the enormity of the problem confronting most Europeans and incorporated Africans in assuming a materialist, historicist perspective in the examination and explanation of apparently ill-conceived human behaviour in the representation of the African on the stage.

Michael Pickering, in addressing the problem of stereotypes and their explanation, suggests that '...what was denied in the English identity became objectified in the antithetical black Other: there, in its various types, were clustered many of the features of self which constituted the residua of surplus repression in the ruling culture, and which precisely by that process of symbolic transference became framed and then tamed.. Those non-sublimated, shadowy impulses, wishes and desires that could not be openly made manifest or legitimately accommodated in the culture became lodged in the grotesquely ludicrous or sentimentally pathetic figures of minstrelsy.'⁸⁹

This statement resonates with the psychoanalytic approach although Pickering is considered to be a materialist. In diverting the responsibility of European, in this case, British, actions as being of repressed, unaccommodated feelings in British culture, Pickering, at one stroke, exonerates the entire British ruling class and those incorporated in it. In chapters five and six, Hyam's thesis on British sexuality and empire is reviewed and reveals immorality in the form of British sexual acts in Britain. These immoral acts are then transferred to the empire; so too are the acts of violence on slaves, peasants, servants. Hyam's history is too resonant with details to ever consider the notion of repression as a national preoccupation⁹⁰ (since repression

involves the containing of impulses).

Pickering's arguments appear, therefore, to be apologies for the social order, and writers like him increasingly become morally incapacitated, to act adroitly in the deconstruction of hidden and limited histories. Similarly, the idea that travellers exaggerated stories of what they had seen or purported to have seen having repercussions on the public's psyches cannot always be accepted as a basis for representation.

This argument of misrepresentation by default, by the exaggerations of travellers or travel writers, intellectuals and scientists, misleading both the public and other writers, does not present itself as sound judgement or as a rational proposition. This argument was developed by Phillip Curtin in his book of 1964, and subsequently quoted by several writers on representation including Eldred Jones (1965), Tokson (1982), Barthelemy (1987), among others. Jones, and several others, refer to *Mandeville's Travels* as central in the promotion of misinformation, but of all the fictions contained in the book only those pertaining to the vilification of the African were reproduced. For example, the author reported that the Numidians praised the colour black more than any other and assigned black the colour of angels and to white the devil.⁹¹ If the notion of exaggerations was accepted at face value one can legitimately ask why this specific notion was never propagated in the denial of the projection that black was the colour of evil—the devil? Exaggeration cannot unquestionably be accepted as a *prima facie* explanation for misrepresentation because it involves the notion of selection and omission. The very fact of retaining, reproducing and disseminating certain *selected* items implies a consciousness of choice.

The popular notion of stereotypes as emanating from repressed societies (Tokson), of the necessity of stability of world-view (Gilman), of having no rational explanation except perhaps in psychoanalysis (Pickering), is seen to have been contextualised in a set of precise historical events, prior to which the notion of black=evil/the devil in the apprehension of other Europeans, notably Greeks and Romans and in the sixteenth century by the early Dutch traders, of Africans, is entirely absent. Why, then, do certain qualities sud-

denly come into widespread usage from the fifteenth century without a parallel historical event? It would appear that most cultural theorists, themselves ideologically materialist, terminate their investigations in a cul-de-sac when it comes to explaining rationally the irruption of pejorative adjectives related to the African. As was exemplified above most emphatically by Sherwin-White, stereotypes come into vogue precisely as a result of war and conquest (in the context of the existence of xenophobia). Arrian shows this most forcefully in his *The Campaigns of Alexander*. The victorious conqueror, on vanquishing the cultured, assimilate their science, technology and art while simultaneously viciously satirising, ridiculing and castigating them. The justification of Hitler's destruction of the Jews in Germany parallels the European destruction of not only the Moor-Arab of medieval Europe but also of African civilisations which were still alive and functioning to the end of the nineteenth century.

In approaching a study of this nature it was necessary to appropriate from the most relevant exponents of critical discourse in whatever arena in order to extract from them the tools of investigation, analysis and interpretation irrespective of model or way of seeing.

8. Models of seeing/Restaging the centre

Although cultural studies and drama studies (Troesch, Tokson, Barthelemy) in particular offered detailed insights into the interpretation of plays, most lacked a perspective vigorous enough to facilitate the excavation of the inherited ruins of the historical problems. In this context the works of Cheikh Anta Diop as multidisciplinary, Frantz Fanon as exponent of theories of colonialism, Sander Gilman and Jonathan Dollimore as cultural theorists offered the most incisive and relevant approaches for this critical study. A brief reflection of their thinking is therefore pertinent to their ideological and structural universe, and the diverse approaches to this study which coalesced and stabilised around the subject of the African as colonised.

Cheikh Anta Diop, who worked as a scientist historian/author of several

books pertaining to the racial identity of the ancient Egyptians, fought long and hard to establish a way of seeing which was not wholly dependent upon the European universe. He located the basis of European misrepresentation of the truth of African history in the use of the 'phenotype, that is, the individual or people as that *individual or people is perceived*, which is the dominant factor, as opposed to the genotype'⁹² (emphasis added). All humans share a common heritage but the climatic, geographical location of populations due to gradual migration over millennia account for the differences in physiognomy. These differences are emphasised and differentiated by Europeans and a post-discovery justification is resorted to by misrepresenting the events of history to accord with contemporary realities, i.e., the condition of the African in the modern world. Thus the phenotype, the external appearance of the human, becomes the symbol for difference. Diop, however, was determined to 'rewrite history from a more scientific standpoint, taking into account the Negro-African component which was for a long time preponderant.. Finally, if it is true that only truth is revolutionary, it may be added that only *rapprochement* brought about on a basis of truth can endure.'⁹³

Fanon, in aligning himself as combatant in the Algerian Revolution both as a medical doctor in psychiatry and as an activist, continuously stressed the difference between the war waged by the oppressed and the oppressor. The latter involved the use of biological differences to justify violence, murder and oppressive behaviour, while the former never use these for justification of their war of resistance. 'The struggle of the inferiorized is situated on a markedly more human level. *The perspectives are radically new. In conclusion, universality resides in this decision to recognize and accept the reciprocal relativism of different cultures, once the colonial status is irreversibly excluded*'⁹⁴ (emphasis added). Although Fanon was writing of the revolutionary stage of resistance, he never lived to see the aftermath of the Algerian revolution and the extent to which neo-colonialism has imprinted itself upon the consciousness of the incorporated Arab and African. But his insights emphasise a central difference in the approach to study: the deeper one goes

in examining human history the more humanised one becomes, and the more one is convinced of the fundamental difference of the African struggle to that of the European oppressor. The latter is one of human progress measured in material acquisition at the expense of deep philosophical reflection which should imbue humanity with a morality centred on the survival of the human species rather than the exclusivistic defence of an elite minority.

These insights are fundamental for a rewriting of history for they are all-inclusive. They are neither exclusivistic nor elitist and incorporate all of humanity while striving for the liberation of the African.

Although Gilman has conducted the most serious and far-ranging investigation of stereotypes and established a corresponding comparative approach to the study, relating cultural production to social, medical and political studies – social movements in society – he nevertheless fails to offer structural alternatives but simply insists in his conclusion that ‘We can learn from the study of stereotypes not only why we need stereotypes, but how they function, how we use them to manipulate our world.’⁹⁵ What Gilman’s study does illuminate is that there are often rational explanations for phenomena which most accept as inexplicable. He locates many of the popular figures of stereotypes, not only of the African, and their derivation from particular historical or social events in history. For employing this schematic approach, and for producing with such scope and clarity the context for the stereotype’s survival, Gilman has made a revolutionary contribution to cultural studies.

Jonathan Dollimore/Alan Sinfield, like Diop and Fanon, fall into the area not only of comparative studies but of a materialist approach where represented figures do not appear without explanation, but are named and tagged to particular social and political shifts and currents. Materialism, they write, ‘is opposed to ‘idealism’: it insists that culture does not (cannot) transcend the material forces and relations of production. Culture is not simply a reflection of the economic and political system, but nor can it be independent of it. *Cultural materialism therefore studies the implication of literary texts in history. A play by Shakespeare is related to the contexts of its production (the court, patronage, theatre, education, the church).*’⁹⁶ Such an approach ren-

ders unexplained phenomena as mysticism and subjects human creativity to human causes and effects. There are no abstractions in human behaviour and actions: they are precipitated by human thinking and thus can be subjected to scrutiny, interrogation and interpretation.

In looking at the “school” which provided the critical framework for this study, one also has to possess precise knowledge in order to understand the development of the represented African figure in the imagination of the European in the context of the history of the African presence in Europe and the tracing of a key word (“moor”) which came to signify certain meanings. The following chapter provides a theoretical context for an understanding of the nature of the relationship between the African and the European in the contact of cultures and the relations of power between coloniser and colonised.

Page
numbering as
original

CHAPTER 2

CULTURE & RACISM: A PARADIGM OF CONQUEST

Colonialism and racism have been the historical experience of peoples who have been victimised and oppressed by the imposition of an invading society which sought to impose its will on them, firstly, through violence and conquest and, secondly, through the framework of legality, i.e., the framing of laws and the destruction of the belief and culture systems of the colonised. This chapter seeks to analyse and interpret the methods used in systematically rearranging a hitherto functional society into one of inferiority, a powerful culture into one of dependency and schizophrenia. This fits into an understanding of the wider framework of theoretical epistemologies into which the multifarious dimensions of culture, for example, the image of the African/Caribbean in drama, can take on special meaning. For the concept of imaging falls into relative concepts of value, aesthetics and positioning. As Jackson says, 'Literary conventions are purely conventional, and involve no truth-claims...But it is not true that any literary convention will work at any point in cultural history.'¹ The story does not end there, says Jackson, because '...the conventions governing a dominant art-form are related in a very complex way both to its own past, and that of art in general, and to the intellectual practices and value-systems of the

period of its dominance.²²

In the context of the arguments raised and the discourse entered into here, racism should be considered as a component of culture. Fanon argues this point when he states that 'If culture is the combination of motor and mental behaviour patterns arising from the encounter of man with nature and with his fellow man, it can be said that *racism is indeed a cultural element. There are thus cultures with racism and cultures without racism*'²³ (emphasis added). This therefore provokes an examination of the twin factors of colonialism and racism as creating special conditions, vis-a-vis positioning, in reading and responding to the writings of the colonised and victims of racism by the critical exponents of a racist culture.

Criticism & Theorists

Over the last several years discourse has been renewed on the twin subjects of colonialism and racism and this has precipitated a degree of theorising around these ideas. Whether these theorists have extended any of the original contributions developed by Frantz Fanon can be ascertained by the nature of the criticism responding to perceived colonialist or neo-colonialist positioning by the dominant critical sensibility. What is noticeable about this new set of critics, e.g., Spivak, Said, Bhabha, is that, unlike Fanon who was physically committed to revolutionary activity within an actual colonial territory – Algeria - where his critical sensibility was heightened by revolutionary practice - these critics are professionally and intellectually enmeshed within the dominant colonising societies' university systems and can be thus seen as being subject to cultural and career volatility. This is apparent from the arguments they develop in defence of and influenced by the overwhelming presence of mainstream Eurocentric scholars.

Bhabha criticises the limitation of Derrida's conceptualisation of ethnocentrism as logocentrism identified with what he calls '...presuppositions inseparable from metaphysics' and goes on to reject this notion because it '...cannot lead to the construction or exploration of other discursive sites from which

to investigate the *differential materiality and history of colonial discourse* ⁴ (emphasis added). In the same context of the limitations of the Western scholar in understanding the vagaries of colonialism, Said criticises both Foucault and Williams for this shortcoming: 'I mention these two formidable scholars because in the main I am in almost total sympathy with their genealogical discoveries to which I am inestimably indebted. Yet for both of them *the colonial experience is quite irrelevant* and that *theoretical oversight has become the norm* in all cultural and scientific disciplines except in occasional studies of the history of anthropology'⁵ (emphasis added).

By raising the question of the 'theoretical' oversight of the 'colonial experience,' Said inevitably insinuates himself as one who has corrected this error, and in alluding to the positive anti-colonial 'perspective provided for us in the twentieth century by theoreticians, militants, and insurgent analysts of imperialism like Frantz Fanon, Amílcar Cabral, CLR James, Aimé Césaire, Faiz, Darwish...' ⁶, one receives the distinct view that Said is not just involved in a defence of the Arab world, but takes into view the universal cultures of the oppressed, and specifically people of colour. These announcements, however, do not only lead to misappropriations of his intentions, but also confirm an 'oppositional stance'⁷ which signals but does not deliver the perspective of analytical apotheosis of the announced. Thus Said, in detailing the notion held by Europeans such as the Abbé Le Mascrier in the valorisation of Egypt over the rest of Africa as 'the center of the ancient continent,'⁸ nevertheless reverts to his defence of the '...Orient, in short, [which] existed as a set of values attached, not to its modern realities, but to a series of valorized contacts it had with a distant European past.'⁹ Egypt, which constitutes a North-East geographical sector of Africa, is not defended in terms of its continental significance but in terms of its 'oriental' identity, i.e., its Arab/Muslim ornamentation. It is in this context that there appears to be a fundamental limitation of the 'universalist' anti-colonial announciator who, in defending a national identity, does not embrace the wider geographical area in which the nation exists and blindly follows the route of non-comparative colonial/imperial experiences in which he is supposedly engaged.

Spivak is another critic who is perturbed by the lack of a wider perspective in reading literature by the dominant literary school and says of Eagleton, 'This vexed question of how to operate race-, class-, and gender-analyses together is not even considered...'¹⁰ Spivak also makes a remark concerning her own positioning while participating in a conference with Said which exposes her own preoccupations: 'Apart from a pious remark that the maids upstairs in the guest quarters were women of color and a show of sentiment, involving Thomas Macaulay, when Said and I held the stage for a moment, *the Third World seemed exorbitant to our concerns*. As I reflect upon the cumulative politics of our gathering, that seems to strike the harshest note'¹¹ (emphasis added). Spivak, who defines herself as a feminist-Marxist critic, seems, on the one hand to understand the relationship between the centre and the margin, and on the other suggests alternatives which can be read as 19th century Fabianism: 'The only way I can suggest how the center itself is marginal is by not remaining outside in the margin and pointing my accusing finger at the center. I might do it rather by implicating myself in that center and sensing what politics make it marginal.'¹² This suggestion can be construed as an attempt to reform society from the top down, rather than to suggest alternative routes through which that centre could be challenged, forced into dialogic responsibility and new communication lines constructed.

Parry, in line with the critique of limitations to fundamental differences with colonialism, says of Bhabha:

The other notable absence in theorising colonial discourse is a necessary consequence of analytical strategies which in focusing on the deconstruction of the colonialist text, either *erase the voice of the native or limit native resistance to devices circumventing and interrogating colonial authority*¹³ (emphasis added).

She suggests that both Spivak's and Bhabha's positions have been 'extended to a downgrading of the anti-imperialist texts written by national liberation movements; while the notion of epistemic violence and the occluding of reverse discourses have obliterated the role of the native as historical subject

combatant, possessor of an-other knowledge and producer of alternative traditions.’¹⁴

What Parry does raise to the level of critical signification is the ambivalent and ironic injection of “colonial” discourse in the language of these critics, which is never centralised within their critical criteria. Thus, although “colonial” is a significant springboard in terms of signpost or symbol, other Western, academically authenticated, critical discourses play a more dominant role. Colonial discourse, although a significant critical tool in the language of criticism, has been more present in African and African-descended peoples resident in their native countries (Chinweizu, Ngugi (though in exile), Rohlehr, Gayle, etc.), rather than as expatriates in metropolitan societies.

A cursory examination of the critical theses of anti-colonial critics, both from the inherited mainstream and those who have interrogated and entered it, secreting their critical differences, reveals that the nature of the critical perspective is one of political complexity and ambivalence: on the one hand there is an apparent adoption of radical critiques of dominance, and on the other a clear demonstration of myopia in relation to the subjects of colonial discourse. This critical silence on the alternative traditions, aesthetics, and perspectives of the combatants of colonialism can be construed as representative of the nature of the critics’ volatile and insecure positioning within mainstream Western academic institutions. However, an examination of colonialism itself as the subject of methods of functioning in relation to colonised peoples may suggest alternatives which have historically been encountered and posed within the domain of theory and practice.

Colonialism & Violence

Although in most cases of colonial domination conquest is preceded by trade, barter and general acquisition of knowledge of the territory and the nature of the inhabitants - in terms of the state of resistance - this is soon superseded by physical violence. In his discussion of Fanon’s critique of colonialism as violence, Jinadu says:

Physical violence involves somatic injury inflicted on human beings, the most radical manifestation of which is the killing of an individual. Thus, when Fanon claims that "colonialism...is violence in its natural state," part of his meaning is that colonial rule was usually preceded, inaugurated, and maintained by the use of physical violence. To "pacify" indigenous peoples and force them to accept the new alien order, the colonizer often found it necessary to wage wars against them.¹⁵

Physical violence can be characterised as the highest form of colonialism as conquest. It is the liquidation of oppositional forces and the psychological superiority that this confirms in the minds of the conqueror and inferiority in that of the conquered, which sets the stage for other forms of colonialism. Fanon, in discussing this phenomenon, says, "The feeling of inferiority of the colonised is the correlative to the European's feeling of superiority...It is the racist who creates his inferior." ¹⁶

It is colonial violence, however, which is the precondition for psychological inferiority. In terms of the African continent, years of trading gave way to slavery and to conquest. Cabral discusses this experience in sociopolitical terms:

After the slave trade, armed conquest and colonial wars, there came the complete destruction of the economic and social structure of African society. The next phase was European occupation and ever-increasing European immigration into these territories. *The lands and possessions of the Africans were looted...forced labour, the export of African workers, and total control of the collective and individual life of Africans, either by persuasion or by violence* ¹⁷ (emphasis added).

It can be argued that destruction of internal social organisation is a key to the construction of other forms of organisation. It is only with the demolition of national or internal structural formations that claims can be made by the colonizer for the absence of a history, culture and civilisation. It is this question of violence which assumes varied forms, and somatic injury sometimes manifested itself in forced labour which frequently resulted in death. In 1909, for

example, colonial South Africa signed a contract with the Portuguese colonists for the annual export of 100,000 African labourers to work in the mines, 'where the capitalists use inhuman methods of exploitation in order to maximise profits. Only half of these slaves ever return to Mozambique.'¹⁸ In the construction of railways in most parts of Africa during the 19th and early 20th centuries, forced labour was the normal procedure for recruitment. Both the Belgian Congo and French Equatorial Africa were also prodigiously involved in this form of violence. 'One can hardly build railways with monkeys,' a French journalist wrote in the 1920s, 'so we began to hunt the blacks, using every effort to catch them with lassoes and so on. We then put collars...on them...' 'We must reckon to lose 6-8,000 men', said the Governor General, (sic) or do without the railways.' The number who died was, however, much higher. Today, it is over 17,000.'¹⁹ Another journalist wrote in a French journal in 1929 that he saw disease, starvation, bad hygiene, and death resulting from these factors as well as from exhaustion and overwork. He claims that the mortality rate was 60% and speculated that 18,000 Africans died, 130 per kilometre.²⁰ In colonialism's methodical approach to the recruitment of labour to advance its economic progress, says Sumner, '...the colonial state had to invade and destroy the pre-existing natural economy...' ²¹

Violence, it can be deduced, was the method by which colonialism fulfilled its anticipation of control and subservience in the physical demands for labour. But physical violence was only an individual method and the institutional organisation of the state, the framing of laws, the policies designed to express and exhibit an innate superiority of colonialism's social and cultural paradigms could only be realised through the apparatus and status of legality.

Racism & Colonial Institutions

Although slavery and colonialism played a significant role in the development of racism, they were not the only factors which underpinned the phenomenon. Though Sherwin-White (1967) and Lorrimer (1978) convincingly demonstrated an indelible link between ancient and medieval forms of

European ethnocentrism, it was Diop (1962, 1989) who was able to explicate, scientifically, the social basis for xenophobia, ethnocentrism and racism in Europe. However, we confine ourselves to examples of institutional forms of control in both external (Africa) and internal (Ireland, Wales) societies to demonstrate parallel pursuits of the twin goals of colonialism and racism. If the projection of internal European racism poses a theoretical problematic, one only has to look at the development of craniology/phrenology in 19th century Europe whereby race was conceptualised in terms of nationality and not colour (Curtin, 1964, 1972; Bidliss, 1979).

According to Smith, the process of control is initiated with ‘...the dominant ethnics’ aristocracy setting up *bureaucratic institutions to tie the mass of the population to the state, often aided by protracted warfare*; and it ends by producing a state culture in which the mass of the population participates, albeit unevenly’²² (emphasis added). The final product, however, is established through institutional legalities which carry the veneer of due process. According to Hechter, England imposed its laws on the people of Wales, where, for example, ‘gavel-kind and other traditional customs of the Celtic social organisation’²³ were outlawed. He goes on to show that between 1410 and 1510 the Welsh were barred from owning lands on the border areas with England; if stolen goods were not returned or recovered within a week, the English could retaliate on any Welsh they could seize; the latter were also prohibited from holding municipal offices and from carrying arms, and the English were dissuaded from marrying the Welsh through the withdrawal of citizenship.²⁴ Similar prohibitive measures were also taken against the Irish in the early 18th century, among which were ‘being apprentices to gunsmiths; education abroad; keeping a public school in Ireland; receiving degrees, fellowships, or scholarships at the University of Dublin...acting as grand jurors...Finally, Catholics were forbidden to vote.’²⁵

In Africa, the control and use of land was central to the development of colonialism. This was facilitated by a series of promulgations which ‘alienated,’ i.e., stole, lands from the native population through treaties and laws. ‘Through legislation,’ wrote Sweet, ‘British administrators created new defi-

nitions of acceptable and unacceptable (or criminal) behaviour in regard to land. In so doing, they sometimes *violated the land rights of indigenous populations and backed new policies with penal sanctions* ²⁶ (emphasis added). Sweet gives a terrifying example of colonialism's legal confiscations of land in northern Tanganyika where 30,00 families were forcibly evicted from their land, 'and some of their homes burned down, to permit British occupancy.'²⁷ In 1885, after the division of Africa among European colonialists, Leopold II, King of Belgium, declared that all free land in the Congo was the property of Belgium. A strict translation of the proclamation is, 'The state has the right of absolute and exclusive ownership of all the land and its fruits. Any person gathering any fruits whatsoever will be punished as a thief, and any person buying such fruits, as a purchaser of stolen goods.'²⁸

Thus the legal framework, once warfare succeeded in devastating opposition, becomes the pivot upon which colonial rule is enshrined. But it is important to create the distinction of colonial laws and the maintenance of stability and order. For the latter to sustain the colonial order, it was necessary to foster and promote psycho-religious indoctrination and programming which would create sensitivity and affinity to colonial cultural norms. Harsh legal systems alone did not succeed in the maintenance of stability: the entire educational, religious, cultural and social systems – civilisation – of colonialism were systematically propagated and implanted into the consciousness of the colonised.

Colonialism & Psycho-Religious Indoctrination

The psychological and religious proclivities of human beings are phenomena rooted in the social development of humans themselves, and are to be differentiated from the objective ideological basis of psycho-religious formations. Although in application to an analysis of fascism as ideology, the following has some relevance in understanding the necessity of psycho-religious indoctrination as an intrinsic tool of colonialism.

At the outset, a dictator's views are to be understood solely in terms of the economic basis from which they originated. Thus *the fascist race theory and nationalistic ideology in general have a concrete relation to the imperialistic aims of a ruling class* that is attempting to solve difficulties of an economic nature ²⁹ (emphasis added).

Such an analysis fixes ideology within the context of colonialism as a deliberate, premeditated tool designed for the capitulation, submission and pliability of subjugated nationalities. The historical growth of religion within the context of colonial societies presents no difficulties in understanding the link between cause and effect. Bacon, writing on the goals of Christianity, says, 'It cannot be affirmed, if we speak ingeniously that it was not the *propagation of the Christian faith* that was the...(motive)...of the discovery, entry, and plantation of the new world; *but gold and silver, and temporal profit and glory*' ³⁰ (emphasis added). Writing at the beginning of the seventeenth century about the benefits of Christianity as a means of indoctrinating and pacifying the Amerindians in the Caribbean, Accosta says:

...yet God of his bounty has drawn good from this evil, and has made the subjection of the Indians, a perfect remedy for their salvation. *Christianity without doubt augments and increases, and brings forth daily more fruit among the Indian slaves...* ³¹ (emphasis added).

This attitude was as true for the Spanish as for the French or British. The subjection of peoples and the use of religion as a mechanism for the perpetuation of subjection, through servility and pacification, was undoubtedly an objective of colonialism. This does not exclude the fact of Christianity and the church having an independent, although insignificant part, in the modification of the condition of subjection: Christianity was used both by the state and mercantilists as a weapon of oppression. But religion was not the only weapon. The use of cultural degradation of the colonised and the simultaneous valuing and affirming of colonialist culture precipitated deep psychological anxiety in the minds of the colonised. And the colonised experience of

valuing and status derived, precisely, from his/her degradation.

The colonised is elevated above his jungle status in proportion to his adoption of the mother country's cultural standards. *He becomes whiter as he renounces his blackness, his jungle.* In the French colonial army, and particularly in the Senegalese regiments, the black officers serve first of all as interpreters. They are used to convey the master's orders to their fellows, and they too enjoy a certain position of honour³² (emphasis added).

This question of devaluation was also raised by Memmi who states that '...the colonialist also devotes himself to a systematic devaluation of the colonised.'³³ The mother country, as Fanon has shown, takes on the mantle of paradigm and aesthete, so that every effort is made to compare the colonised with the mother country; and as Memmi continues, in 'Ethical or sociological, aesthetic or geographic...whether explicit and insulting or allusive and discreet (sic), are always in favour of the mother country and the colonialist.'³⁴ Devaluation and sustained attack upon one's culture is designed to induce neurosis. Fanon sees this as a settling '...in the very centre ...of the individual...' and a 'sustained work of clean-up, of expulsion of self, of *rationaly pursued mutilation*'³⁵ (emphasis added).

The policy of cultural degradation can be seen to have had its roots in the colonial policy of psychological subjection of the colonised. And the question of language in the context of these policies is a signally important issue in the contest between colonizer and colonised for superiority or authenticity respectively. In this arena, the very fact of speech, the most immediately distinguishing feature of culture, is subjected to vilification and struggle to authenticate itself through language. This adjustment to the colonizer very often produces visible signs of acculturation, and an examination of this question is in order if one is to understand the later critical responses to the creativity of the colonised.

Colonialism & Language

During the period of African slavery, in order to understand what was being

said, all African languages were forbidden. In their place articulation in the colonising language became the norm. This does not mean, however, that creoles or other means of communication were not developed, but that native language articulation was an interdiction for reasons best understood by the arguments proposed here. The act of subjugation of native language is a phenomenon rooted in colonialism itself, and not confined to a race or a particular nationality. The Act of Union between England and Wales (promulgated by the English ruling class) enforced '*conducting an alien religion in an alien tongue*'³⁶ (emphasis added). The vilification took on the contours of ethnocentrism when, because of their language, '...the mass of the Welsh people are inferior to the English in every branch of practical knowledge and skill'³⁷ (emphasis added). These interdictions on language by the English can be compared with the speculative historical development of both French and English as creole languages, i.e., the emergence of new languages from a history of subjugation and contact.³⁸ It can also be compared to the notion of national identity in England when doubt exists as to the Englishness of the monarchy itself. 'It is characteristic,' Anderson says, 'that there has not been an 'English' dynasty ruling in London since the eleventh century (if then)...'³⁹ Anderson then goes on to show the inconsistency on the emphasis of language as a parameter of cultural homogeneity: 'A William the Conqueror and a George 1, neither of whom could speak English, continue to appear unproblematically as beads in the necklace 'Kings of England'.'⁴⁰

Cultural subjugation through colonial rule is an ancient institution as can be witnessed through the imperial relationship Rome had with several European nations. This is raised by Anderson in his discussion of Latin language hegemony:

Bloch noted that 'Latin was not only the language in which teaching was done, it was the only language taught' ...Febvre and Martin estimate that 77% of the books printed before 1500 were still in Latin (meaning nonetheless that 23 % were already in vernaculars...Somewhat later...Latin ceased to be the language of a pan-European high intelligentsia...*Shakespeare (1564-1616)...composing in the vernacular, was virtually unknown across the Channel...Descartes (1596-1650) and*

Pascal (1623-1662) conducted most of their correspondence in Latin...⁴¹
(emphasis added).

Anderson posits the view that colonialism's function is the subjugation of the native language in preference to that of the conqueror, and that vernaculars were subordinate to the imposed language. What is important, however, is that in spite of prohibitions both the imposed language and the creole or vernacular exist in parallel until superseded by the results of resistance. Cabral, in addressing the problems of culture during the colonial phase, says, 'All Portuguese education disparages the African, his culture and civilisation. African languages are forbidden in schools.'⁴² Fanon, in addressing the valuing and hegemonic position placed upon the colonialist language in Martinique, illustrates its use by Aimé Césaire in an election campaign speech when a woman fainted on hearing his command of the language.⁴³ What this implied is that creole, the native language of the inhabitants, was considered a subaltern/colonised language without the prestige and hegemony of French. Thus an African-Caribbean (black in colour) in his command of the language showed the possibilities to which colonial education could lift the oppressed. Fanon goes on to support this view by saying, 'Historically, it must be understood that the Negro wants to speak French because *it is the key that can open doors* which were still barred to him fifty years ago'⁴⁴ (emphasis added). In a world controlled and ordered by the colonialist it becomes a rational drive to speak in the language of the colonizer, if only to acquire the material benefits and prestigious valuing of that world.

What this argument revealed is that language is vilified and attacked by the colonising and hegemonic positioning of the imposed culture, and that the calculated effect was within the domain of cultural and psychological conditioning. The importance of this reading is based upon the accepted projection that language engages a world-view (with all the historical prejudices and racist content this implies in terms of race), and that to modify or be ambivalent about this raises the question of inferiority. But this also raises doubts about the historical development of the coloniser's cultural apparatus which

is considered to be superior. The question of heritage and of singular notions of cultural development poses a profound picture of human culture as interaction and borrowings for the progress of culture as an entity and as life.

Colonialism & Heritage

The whole concept of hegemony, colonialism and oppression introduces irrefutable evidence which opposes the obvious position of power-control as the arbiter of progress, advancement and superiority. An interrogation of such an unequal relationship – coloniser/colonised - reveals a diffusionist source of human knowledge which reverses popular opinion characterised as the victor is the originator. Although Britain was already the uncontested leader of India between 1757 and 1830, the rulers, coming from a rural environment, did not feel themselves superior to Indian culture. Nandy supplies information which confirms this:

Most Britons in India lived like Indians at home and in the office, wore Indian dress, and observed Indian customs and religious practices. A large number of them married Indian women, offered puja to Indian gods and goddesses, and lived in fear and awe of the magical powers of the Brahmans. The first two governor-generals, renowned for their rapaciousness, were also known for their commitment to things Indian. *Under them, the traditional Indian life style dominated the culture of British Indian politics*⁴⁵ (emphasis added).

What this exposes is the popular view that colonialism was itself a supplanting cultural entity, but it also highlights that cultures with a long established past and civilisation, celebrated and acknowledged in the world as such, do have differential responses from the newly emerging conquering society.

The Greeks, heralded in the modern world as the originators of civilisation, recognised the antecedence of ancient Egyptian civilisation to their own and, according to Smith, after the conquest of Egypt, attempted to perpetuate the

illusion that they were connected to its historical genesis. 'The result,' says Smith, 'was an inventory of the Egyptian state from Menes to the Persian conquest...Whatever Manetho's (the Egyptian commanded by the Greeks to write such a history) personal feelings, this attempt to graft their rule onto an ancient and honoured pedigree was only a limited success from the standpoint of the Ptolemies.. Egyptian sentiment remained strongly suspicious of Greek influence.'⁴⁶ Smith also shows how Nestorian Chaldeans, migrating to the historical geographical land of Assyria, 'congregated and took the name, claiming descent from its ancient and illustrious inhabitants.'⁴⁷

This context of enhancing the conquering society with the artefacts and cultural heritage of the vanquished is particularly apt in relation to Egypt. James Evarts, the US Secretary of State, acquired an obelisk (like England and France before him) from Egypt which was presented to the city of New York, and made incisive remarks on the signifying qualities of such a possession.

These obelisks mark a culmination of the power and glory of Egypt, and every conqueror has seemed to think that the final trophy of Egypt's subjection and the proud pre-eminence of his own nation could be shown only by taking an obelisk - the chief mark of Egyptian pomp and pride - to grace the capital of the conquering nation ⁴⁸ (emphasis added).

The predilection for culture advance and the concomitant belief in historical greatness having a generative effect through contact would seem to underline the need for the conqueror's claiming the conquered material and spiritual inheritance. This reveals that dominance is not the only criteria by which one can measure progress, and that derogation of the conquered appears to mask a more intense admiration on the one hand, and on the other expresses a genuine emotional antipathy based upon cultural envy. However, in relation to the particular historical development of Europe - xenophobia and ethnocentrism appearing to be a centrally differentiating characteristic - the product of colonialism generally generated racist proclivities. What one can observe from the historical example, however, is the dynamic nature of culture: conquered societies have developed forms of resistance which can ter-

minate in reversal. This suggests that victory through warfare is but one temporal phase of the conqueror, and that reconstruction is built upon the existence of a cultural foundation: 'Humans cannot create culture from scratch; they use building blocks already present, combining and recombining them.'⁴⁹

Culture can thus be seen as the material edifice of humans' presence on this planet, and it survives through mechanical, industrial and the most devastating changes of psychological experience.

In pursuit of a wider understanding not only of the notion of cultural differentiation, but of the underpinning forces articulating this thesis, it is important to determine the nature of culture performance, theatre in this instance, within the context of the political and social realities which shaped 20th century British (and by extension, Euro-American) drama. The next chapter thus examines the notion of the mainstream and the discursive subject of alternative theatre, both in terms of politics and style, and brings into focus contending classes as they conceive and execute their roles in the definition and redefinition of theatre practice. It is thus fundamental to an understanding of stereotyping and representation within the context of the dominant culture that some attention should be paid to unravelling the place and role of the stereotype in the psychology of a culture already demonstrated to be not only historically colonising but eurocentric and racist.

CHAPTER 3

POLITICAL CULTURE & THE STAGE: SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE MEANING AND FUNCTION OF THEATRE IN SOCIETY

The Russian Revolution of 1917 is indelibly marked as the turning point not only in response to the ideology of popular Western political praxis but also to the consequences for the theatre itself. This is not to say that ideas about moving theatre away from its idyllic preoccupations with middle class life have not abounded, but that the actual trigger by which middle class intellectuals and writers were activated into delineating a link with a political ideology which encompassed class warfare was placed at the disposal of a large body of people. Historically, although class conflict emerged and dramatised divisions in the economic and cultural sphere, it was only with the emergence of the Bolshevik Revolution that a systematised body of ideas was seriously regarded as regulating the materialist aspects of human life. As a direct result of this historic intervention a new theatricality emerged which placed meaning and emphasis on the realist representations of human life. From the sixteenth century, hitherto, English drama had been preoccupied with the defence of class position, the portrayal of royalty as a perennial subject of signification, and the enlarging of romantic and stereotyped representations of the African as sexual beast, tyrant, murderer, and morally constructed as *differant* in his/her deepest

essence. This modal preoccupation (in relation to the class theme) was largely unchanged until the Russian Revolution.

Although both society and theatre developed in its understanding of the essential perception of different classes because of the socialist interventionist discourse, this rupture was not translated into equalising conceptualisations of what has been pristinely regarded as the *other*. This failure as a result of myopia is not central to this chapter, but raises certain key questions about this omission in the discourse of the left. Before we can begin to interrogate these abnormalities in the body politic of the essential dramatic mode – whether emerging from the right or left – one needs, sketchily, to enhance one's view by widening the focus onto the broader historical range which images the theatre not just as a site of entertainment, but as a centre for generation and dissemination of ideology, and the functional psychological role it fulfilled for theatre audiences.

Only by looking at this problematic in a critical and comprehensive way can one understand the ramifications of the contradictions involved in any fundamental attempt at critiquing and overturning centuries-old (15th – 20th centuries) philosophies and modes of social behaviour. Social behaviour is mediated by environmental influence, and issues such as ethnocentrism/racism, because they are posited in the subconscious and function as social determinants in relations with the *estranger*, go largely unquestioned. Thus by its nature transformation (in the social system) necessarily produces contradictions: the chick's egg is consumed by humans as nutrition, but at this embryonic stage the egg is a living organism feeding on the nutrients provided in its shell; if left alone, it matures into a chick; simultaneously, if there is malformation, this could lead to a process of decay and abortion. This can produce the contradiction of consuming a foetus, i.e., the unborn chick, but the civilised human being would not morally contemplate the consumption of a human foetus without the epithet of insanity being attached to the person. Likewise, although socialist ideology activated the awareness, in a systematised way, of perceiving class, it never equalised the totality of the human condition in the same way, i.e., although conscious of

the commonality of human origins, no practical step was made in harmonising this in the construction of theatre. Thus the exercise of selectivity and elimination enters into the process of transformation, whereby the transforming emerges as a vector of contradictions and ambivalences. The onus is therefore placed on the responsible researcher to ask fundamental questions concerning the relevance, function, role, and funding of theatre, and the actual site within which this activity takes place. Such questions pitch the level of investigation into the realm of both the immateriality and materiality of culture in relation to artifact and production and their intricate and connective relationship to society as a whole.

'All songs are ideological'

According to Samuel, the Fabians played a disproportionate role in the orientation and development of British theatre since the late 1890s.¹ The Fabians founded by Sidney Webb, Graham Wallas, Lord Sydney Olivier, and George Bernard Shaw, were themselves products of the middle and lower middle classes as well as the public school system which perpetuated the notion of social elitism. Both Olivier and Wallas met as undergraduates at Oxford university. Olivier, who was one of driving forces of the Fabians, had an intrinsic belief in the good benefiting from capitalism, 'I have just been reading Hyndman's book *The Historical Basis of Socialism*...He confines himself a good deal to showing the history of the growth of the capitalist system, and its evils. What he does not do justice to, in my opinion, is the *possibilities for good in that system*...which if *moralised*, I am not sure is not economically superior'² (emphasis added). Thus, at the very outset, Olivier defined the limits of his socialism, the extent to which he was prepared to criticise and valorise a system which he felt was not only beneficial to him, but to the rest of the world, especially in those colonies over which Britain ruled. Olivier later became a governor of Jamaica and a liberal spokesman for the suffering poor.

More importantly, the Fabians were committed to social transformation

through their limited interpretation of socialism, and how to achieve this modification in the system, 'The key to this process...lay in the control of the centres of power in society...control of the state...the elite strata of permanent Whitehall bureaucracy and the political parties, would be the instruments which would bring about this revolution from above. *Fabian political strategy was based primarily upon this particular premise*'³ (emphasis added). Yet the Fabians were credited with institutionalising the "discussion" play, and that through Bernard Shaw a more naturalistic 'lifelike' style of presentation...has remained the dominant mode in English acting from that time to now...'⁴ The question still remains of what ideological songs did the Fabians sing and how was this translation effected on the stage? Jon Clark et al declared that '...to see the force of Marxist analysis was not necessarily to adopt it...Hence for some, the survival of art became identified with the preservation and reinforcement of a class-divided, hierarchic society against the menace of egalitarian socialism.'⁵ Here one questions not the integrity of the statement, but its implied postulations beyond the British class context into a universalist mode. Recognition of class war was no recognition of the nature of the commingling, the rupture and join of class on the one hand and race on the other. This fallacious conceptualisation, it can be argued, was responsible for the superficial equalising posture of socialism, claiming to iron out perceived ruffles in social disequilibrium without penetrating the depth of a rooted problem not only in British race relations at home but in the nature of the relations themselves throughout the Empire. But this limitation can be better understood if we scrutinised the "materialism" of marxist/socialist religious zeal and the belief that '...whatever they did was in accord with the truth because their materialist philosophy provided an analysis that was more 'real' than any other system of thought.'⁶ The religious-socialist equation was properly translated if not understood in the minds of its adherents where the ideology did not have to prove itself in *practice* but merely to exist as scientific thought was compelling enough reason for its superiority.

Samuel goes on to list examples of recruits for the Fabians who had been instrumental in their transformation of the London stage. Here he names

Granville Barker whose '...management of the Royal Court Theatre between 1903 and 1907 brought a whole new repertoire on to the English stage...' ⁷ Whatever the merits of Barker's social policies for the middle-class Royal Court, there was no serious attempt to transform the theatre into an arena of conflict/dissent thereby giving voice to meaningful social and class problems in British society. For Samuel himself admits how surprising it was to recognise '...how little [a] direct part theatre played in the cultural practice of the early socialist movement...Then there was the gentrification of the acting profession, a process which, paradoxically, the new and more 'realist' drama, though often proclaimedly anti-bourgeois, served rather to enhance than to subvert, since it excluded popular dramatic forms...' ⁸ These popular dramatic forms would take the form of agit-prop and other forms of propaganda theatre, while simultaneously, remaining strictly within the new development of realism.

After the first major pan-European war ("World War 1"), because of the nature of the Russian bolshevik victory in which a new ideology had replaced tzarism and feudalism, and the concomitant developments in theatre innovation, these socialist ideas slowly spread throughout the world in which class conflict was a dominant mode. Both the United States and Britain, although France and Germany had a longer, more established tradition of realist, socialist drama, integrated these ideas in the late 1920s and 1930s. Bradby and McCormack state that agit-prop theatre epitomised '...sharpening class differences in order to mobilise the working classes in what was presented as a struggle to the death with the bourgeoisie.' ⁹ This death-struggle was certainly absent in British left-wing drama, and instead there were representations of the working class and of race relations in the context of socialist dogma—there is an essential unity amongst the world's working and oppressed class—which was championed by the disaffected middle-class. That significant numbers of workers participated in the wider struggle for democracy in various capacities is incontestable, but that the leadership of cultural politics, and particularly, that of the stage, inevitably came from the ranks within the middle-class. Royalist and double agent, Anthony Blunt,

wrote for *New Left Review*, a journal perceived and championed by the socialist camp as left wing.¹⁰ In delinking from *New Left Review*, Symons states, 'The sort of propaganda printed in *New Left Review* becomes literature only when it is produced by an artist of genius who feels himself to be part of a revolutionary movement. In England no such movement existed...' ¹¹ Symons is here addressing the socialist-realist literature which was published in the journal and not the class occupancy of its militants, but he did mention in passing the 'bourgeois writers of talent who were sympathetic to Communism.'¹² The struggle for identification with the goals of socialism seems to have been the motivating factor in the activities of the middle-class intellectual in the face of the mounting fascism not only of Germany, but at home in Britain. This decisive factor, of combating and driving back fascism, contributed to the limited understanding of a wider frame of reference which not only constrained the British radical movement, but had a deleterious effect upon the apostles of communism themselves.¹³

An analogy can be made here between an apparent abyss separating the middle class intention with realising the working class and race goal: 'Musical incomprehension or aberrant decoding occurs when the code of the sender and receiver are not sufficiently similar. What then happens is that the *receiver attempts to comprehend the musical message in terms of a code he has internalised which is not the code of the emitter*. What is produced is incomprehension or illusory comprehension. Alternatively the listener, unable to decode the musical message might consign the performance or idiom to the category of non-music, 'noise' '¹⁴ (emphasis added). Here the substitution of 'noise' for a fatal incomprehension of the aesthetic and materialist proclivities of the working class and African subjects in general, occluded the possibility of an essential ingredient in the struggle to transcend class/race barriers.

This misapprehension or the collision of symbolic images perplexed the minds of theatre people on the continent like Gémier and Pottecher and their disciple Romain Rolland and subsequently decreased their popularity. Rolland's zeal to portray heroic images for the consumption of the masses led him into excluding a post-mortem examination, as Bradby and McCormack

showed, of '...why the French Revolution failed and what could have been done to save it.'¹⁵ Bradby and McCormack's criticism of Rolland shows that anti-capitalist ideology is not enough to generate a meaningful experience; that theatre practice must involve rigorous interrogation of all issues concerning political and social life rather than manufacturing "heroic" images as a counter to negative images of the working class. While Gémier was later accused of 'currying favour' with politicians and of showing 'in exemplary form the consequences of the doctrine that people's theatre must always be mass theatre,'¹⁶ he never wavered from the goal of establishing a true *people's* theatre.

For British theatre practitioners, this historical precedent was never learnt, thus they were subject to repeating the mistakes made by their predecessors. This flawed thinking may have been derived from the extent to which British theatre had been in the hands of the middle class in which the form and structure of drama took on specific meanings and connotations and which, in the main, confined both the working class and African to comic relief or serious personal vilification. Theatre practitioners were primarily concerned not with the possible aesthetic and spiritual content of a play, but the verifiability of the assailed image of the *estranger*, as well as the fame and fortune to be derived from it. This consideration necessarily involved ignoring the role, function, and meaning of drama. By the 1930s, although the society was in ferment, bedevilled with immense social problems, the middle class could not come to terms with their surroundings, e.g., the presence of post-war African settlers. Nor could they understand the meaning of the rapidly crumbling Victorian world which saw an Empire, and a New World, in which the very foundations of Empire were being attacked in the most fundamental way. These events, along with mounting fascism, generated in the consciences of young middle-class university students the need to respond to and participate in a questioning of their role in society and this was taken up in theatre practice and various forms of political expression.¹⁷

Through an examination of the philosophy and practice of this form of theatre, one may be able to understand the nature of the process – the selection

(i.e., of the script) and the development of drama—given the circumstances and the social importance axiomatic of hierarchisation of class, in a particular social setting.

Theatre, architecture & separability

Before the sixteenth century theatre players ported their own stages. 'They brought with them a few boards and trestles. Joining the boards together and supporting them on trestles, they made an edifice high enough for those upon it to be seen by as many as possible of the crowd witnessing the performance...The places at first greatly favoured for the erection of a stage were the yards belonging to inns all over the country.'¹⁸ In the medieval period of theatre development there was, in the provinces, no separation based upon class affiliation. The very nature of the processes involved in creating a stage excluded the possible erection of class barriers. Theatre was at a comparatively low technical level. Although this took place in the sixteenth century, there was no apparent affectation by the people of the phenomenon of slavery, transported servants, or the consequences of feudalism. Slaves were not part of the English landscape during this period, i.e., they were simply marshalled as servants in the mansions of expatriate slave-plantation owners or the nobility, away from daily contact with the population. Later in that same century, however, William Shakespeare (and others) in the major city of London, from an established ninth century tradition of the African Moor and Arab presence in Spain and Europe, would initiate new tendencies not only in theatrical stagings but in terms of the deliberate construction of Moorish-African-Arab stereotypes (see Eldred Jones, 1965). The theatre, in seeking a permanent site of location, would therefore enfold established traditions of separability which had already characterised Italian and French theatre activity.

The inns, formerly the site of mobile stages, became the focus of permanence, reflected in class organisation (i.e., by the patrons and not the practitioners) based upon seating arrangements,

...the italianate auditorium was [based on]...the social divisiveness of its horseshoe-shaped strata of boxes and galleries. Not only did they divide an audience into layers corresponding to social class, but they also established a division between those who could see the stage and those who could merely admire the rest of the audience. Writing in 1890, André Antoine claimed that in the Comédie Française half the audience could not see all of the stage and a third was unable to hear properly (a fact that can still be verified today).¹⁹

This institution of separability logically followed from the feudal mode where the lords and the aristocracy were set apart from the peasants. This was so in the world of slavery in which great investments were placed, and in ridding the towns of the unemployed and destitute, prestige, privilege and power characterised the new departure: in addition to those of inherited wealth, these conditions also created an opportunity for the transported overseer to lord over the African and Amerindian slave, while liberated peasants or town dwellers became adventurers in Africa, the Americas and the Caribbean, some returning with wealth to purchase a new found status.²⁰ The combined prestige associated with the aristocracy and the feudal lords merged with this new class creating a pattern for the status quo which also expressed itself in the womb of the theatre.

The inns of classless inseparability became subject to class transformations:

The ascending stories of the inn were adapted to the various levels, one above the other, in the auditorium of the playhouse. Allowing the first story of the inn to be the dress circle in the theatre to-day, the second story is represented by the upper circle (sometimes called the upper boxes), and so on. *At the top of the attics where the servants lodged and from whose windows they could view the efforts of the performers in the court yard.* The gallery of the theatre took the place of the attics, and for a long time was reserved for the footmen and attendants of the fops and citizens occupying more favoured places. It was designated the Footman's Gallery, and free admission was allowed these hirelings who attended their masters to the play. Certain prerogatives were assumed by them, and theatrical history tells of riots in the Footman's Gallery when its occupants had fault to find with the management. So troublesome did they become that in 1737

the concession was abolished by Fleetwood, manager of Drury Lane, and the Footman's Gallery, as such, ended, and it became what is virtually the gallery of today²¹ (emphasis added).

The virtual redesigning of the theatre during the eighteenth century to accommodate prestige and power unconsciously advanced the arena of conflict and dissent to emerge and manifest itself. Hitherto, the theatre would become permanently sealed in its class conscious architectural construction, exhibiting separability and containment, and impervious to the several manifestations of political dissent, whether in the form of social reformism, enfranchisement, the Anti-Slavery Movement, the suffragettes, and other forms of political and social protest which continuously characterised the established class traditions in British society. This redesigning of the new theatre space opened up the possibility for a certain type of dominance: the gentrification of the acting profession and thus the permanent preoccupation with suitable plays which extolled rather than explored and examined the deep class interests which divided British society.

The argument is pursued that architecture, taken in general, can be made to express ruptures in society, and that it is only with the intentionality of addressing the issues surrounding uneven distribution and maldevelopment in society, that awareness is sharpened to comprehend partially that architecture can in fact be an extension of the normative values of the dominant classes. Consideration of privilege, of class, imposes itself on the theatre due to the existence, in society, of class divisions. The design involved in the architecture of the theatre thus responded to the importance given to its patrons and the differing power they wielded. In this adjustment to existing reality, the purchasing of the best and later permanent seats, the funding of the building of theatres, the support given to a particular dramatist, suggest the extent to which power played a role in manipulating writing for the theatre, i.e., the process of selection and elimination. And these realities express and extol the virtues of class position, to the extent that today, at the end of the century, the cheapest seats in most commercial theatres are located closest to the ceiling

(the 'attic'), and thus furthest away from the stage. However, with the development of modern engineering, technological innovation has made sound sufficiently available to the cheapest seats in the theatre.

From this understanding of architecture and maintained class position, an argument can be put forward on the nature of the relationship between dramatist and theatre, director and producer, the technical/managerial staff and the audience. How do the actors and parts fit together to produce a theatre of intelligence within the context of selection and omission?

Text, context & patronage

Theatre, like most components of social existence, is a microcosmic mirror-image of society at large, i.e. it functions in a minuscule form in the same way as that of the supranational structure. In a society in which democracy is the political system, spoken and unspoken laws cleave the citizen to the state; likewise in the theatre, the cleavage of the practitioner to the patron expresses the nature and rules which govern the relationship. In most theatrical institutions, theatre is a commercial activity, largely, in the 1930s, unfunded by the state, thus bringing to the fore the proprietors or controllers of the operational space. The owner may not be the operator, and in this case either the operator controls the institution by his/herself or the operator hires a producer who in turn is responsible for both the programme, i.e., the selection of plays, and the hiring of a director who is responsible to him; the producer has the last word. In this context it is imperative that an examination is made of actual examples of how a play may be selected, the nature of the relationship between the dramatist and the controllers of the institution, and the orientation not only of the producer/director but the actors, dramatists, and the media moguls who are in the main central to the success or failure of a play.

In Eugene O'Neill's attempt to replace Charles Gilpin with Paul Robeson as his 'man' in the *Emperor Jones*, Gilpin had a furious argument with O'Neill. This argument, from a reading of O'Neill's letter to a friend, showed what he really felt about Africans, 'I've stood for more from *him* [Gilpin] than from all

the *white* actors I've ever known—simply because he was *colored* ' ²² (emphasis added). In the context of what followed, that he had 'corralled another Negro to do it' (that 'Negro' being Paul Robeson), one can see that O'Neill had only tolerated Gilpin for the duration of their professional relationship simply because he could find a suitable replacement. O'Neill's citing of his tolerance of Gilpin over 'white actors' signifies a consciousness of race based upon valourisation – that he, O'Neill, an Euro-American, in a superior position because of the racial hegemonisation in effect, in the face of institutional and public racism, has endured the African Gilpin's difficulty in order to accommodate him, promotes in the consciousness a dual, paternalistic and schizophrenic personality. The personality could only be schizophrenic because O'Neill wanted African actors to perform in *his* plays which were all saturated with racist exhibitionism (see the following chapter for a fuller exposition), and, more importantly, Gilpin, a self-confessed, race-conscious man, had the audacity to change some of O'Neill's more offensive lines.²³ Although O'Neill admitted that Gilpin was the greater actor, it was O'Neill's racist orientation, his perception of the African that he was determined to convey in an autocratic manner – the fact that a member of the African race who experienced Euro-American society intimately and who was conscious of his own humanity and actively dared protest against O'Neill's misrepresentation and backward racial views, was, in O'Neill's view, tantamount to insubordination.

Interestingly, it was Paul Robeson's thirst for commercial success, driven by his social climbing wife, Essie²⁴ which predisposed him to bite his tongue and swallow his pride. In conforming to the part as stereotype Robeson rehearsed and performed so passionately that he was championed by the Euro-American critics of the dominant media and hailed as the most brilliant of actors. In their response to Robeson's appearance in O'Neill's *All God's Chillun Got Wings*, some critics made the connection between Robeson's passionate and emotional playing and an organic quality peculiar to the African race. Essie, Robeson's wife, contrary to this public view, recorded minutely the extensive rehearsals that she had gone through with Robeson

(apart from that of the production itself) day and night to perfect his part. The readiness with which Robeson empathised with the role displayed his apolitical and absent race consciousness as a result of his (and his wife's) determination for commercial success. Duberman, Robeson's biographer, was acutely aware of this typologising and representation, which he rightly identified as racist: 'In making these distinctions, both Krutch and Nathan [Euro-American critics] saw themselves as champions of the black race, endowing it with attractive *innate* qualities. This "liberal" attitude had its roots in the nineteenth-century view that blacks—like women—were *naturally* endowed with childlike emotionalism and a "superior" capacity for affection, personal loyalty and joy.'²⁵

In this play, like the other race-themes penned by O'Neill, it was the overwhelming vision of middle-class Euro-America which brought it into existence, discovered and exhibited a vision of a 'subaltern' class and race which had no power in the selection process of dramas about itself. O'Neill wrote the play, produced by the Provincetown Players, who in turn were funded by Otto H. Kahn who was variously, a wealthy banker, chief financial adviser to a transportation magnate, and a trustee of Rutgers University when Robeson was a student.²⁶ One writer characterised Kahn's interest in the arts in general and African American art in particular as combining 'noble sentiments with keen market analysis.'²⁷ This all points to a position of weakness in negotiating anything, and more damagingly, in a relationship with capitalist forces which inevitably are wedded to their own political philosophy and practice. Both Robeson's and O'Neill's position could not have been any worse. In O'Neill's case, one conjectures, he was predeterminedly orientated in a particular direction and prospered in a relationship of mutual benefit. Kahn was publicly acclaimed as a liberal sponsor of artists and plays featuring, among others, Africans, while simultaneously benefiting from O'Neill's bias in projecting particularly defined and proscribed roles for those Africans so that the notion of historical imaging remains frozen in the nineteenth century philosophy of the African's innate ignorance and bestiality.

It is interesting to exemplify the role of the Euro-American patron in

American culture. Cruse tells a convincing story of Mabel Dodge, who C. Wright Mills referred to as a stray figure, a patroness of American art mainly of the Greenwich Village sort, i.e., of a perceived bohemian variety. She was introduced to African Americans by Van Vechten and wrote about her experiences of seeing these performers in person:

She related—"didn't betray my feelings"—as she watched the "unrestrained Negroes":

While an appalling Negress danced before us in white stockings and black buttoned boots, the man strummed a banjo and sang an embarrassing song. They both leered and rolled their suggestive eyes and made me feel first hot and then cold, for I had never been so near *this kind of thing* before...(emphasis added).²⁸

Following this response and the perception of the kind of American cultural renaissance that Mabel Dodge envisaged, Cruse said,

Mabel Dodge wanted an American cultural renaissance, but shrank from the implications of a black American renaissance as a socially-necessary, historically-determined, parallel movement. Because of her racially-limited view she could not, or would not, see the black cultural renaissance in its more definable role as a cultural catalyst for the reordering of the disordered and disparate ethnic ingredients of American nationality.²⁹

Following Hechter, the Euro-American relations with its dominated African group can be characterised as colonial (just as the Irish are paradigmised by Hector as an internally colonised group). This colonial domination is not only characterised by the attempted submission of the subject people, but by a relentless campaign to expurgate feelings of worth and value and instead to incorporate them into a predetermined monolithic social behaviour patterning which reinforces the belief in congenital inferiority. This concept was well explored by Frantz Fanon who stated, '...[T]he oppressor comes to be no longer satisfied with the objective non-existence of the dominated nation [person, people] and culture. Every effort is made to induce the colonised to

confess the inferiority of his culture, transformed into *instinctive* behaviour...'³⁰ (emphasis added). With the institutional and private sectors of public life controlled by Euro-Americans, it was almost impossible to imagine that success, which chiefly depended on that world, would be achieved on the terms of the oppressed. The recognition by the African artist of this fact necessarily imposed a limit on his expectations and imbued in him/her a philosophy of gradualism: it would take time to change significantly one's condition. Such accommodationist idealism signalled the acceptance of inferior roles in the main, but simultaneously, fuelled certain sectors of the African American community with a desire to explore areas of their life which would more truthfully express their experience.

In the interim, Euro-America dominated both Broadway and the universities with its own fabricated representations of the African already acknowledged as limited in his power and response, so that the male, patriarchal, dominating spectacle of the Euro-American devising cultural programmes to extend the apathy of both the European and American public, becomes a plausible mode and rationale in an explosively divided society. That O'Neill's plays were actually produced in England tells us of the nature of the identification and resonance between mutually sustaining cultures which shared one motif (apart from critical nuances specific to British media) above all others: entertainment was financially extremely profitable.

Ideology & compromise on the left

In keeping with the traditions of the pre-medieval period, the Group Theatre was founded in 1932 by a host of middle-class aesthetes such as Auden, Benjamin Britten and the ideologue, Rupert Doone. Doone's commitment was to revive the theatre: theatre being 'an art of the body, presented by living people in action; 'it was designed to express 'a life of action and the senses;' and more significantly, Doone wanted to precipitate a permanent body of actors 'working together, and for auditoriums that would command a complete view from every seat by a turn of the head.'³¹ This view was later con-

firmed by Colin Chambers who linked the Group Theatre to 'the European avant-garde...and which called for the theatre to be a social force breaking down the barrier between audience and actor.'³² But a former Group Theatre member, John Allen, a Cambridge university graduate who had first worked with them, having seen the work of the Unity theatre group, soon left, saying, '...this was the commitment that was missing from the Group Theatre.'³³ Chambers, however, in his book on the development of Unity Theatre, refused to ascribe conclusively a class base to Unity apart from its working class ideological activity and commitment, 'It is impossible to define accurately the class composition of Unity and I believe it is fruitless to attempt judgements on its perspective...there is insufficient evidence of the WTM's composition to define it sociologically as proletarian...the core of Unity's early activists were ex-WTM members.'³⁴ In his attempt not to pass judgement on Unity's social class structure, Chambers prevaricates, yet, paradoxically, confirms that it was non-proletarian in composition. This inability to declare a position may be construed as an attempt to invent the existence of successful workers' theatre groups in the face of evidence to the contrary, and especially the role of the middle class and the educated in their role in rallying behind and against the mounting fascism which had overrun Germany and Italy and which was threatening Britain.

Another liberal who played an important role in the development of 'socialist' theatre in Britain was André Van Gysehem who, in his own words, worked with the Embassy Theatre's... 'extremely liberal-minded, unprejudiced manager...Ronald Adams,' through whom Van Gysehem had untrammelled choice of plays, and exercised this right in staging O'Neill's *All God's Chillun Got Wings* which featured Paul Robeson. Van Gysehem confessed that Robeson revealed some insights which 'were never shown in the theatre with any degree of seriousness.' In contrast to the lack of depth in many playwrights, O'Neill, he went on to say, 'went much further.'³⁵ Here it is interesting to contrast Van Gysehem's perception of the relevance of O'Neill's work with the African American theatre historian who felt that O'Neill 'was simply not on familiar ground in his plays of Negro life...The

most notorious theatrical event of 1924 was the Provincetown's production of Eugene O'Neill's *All God's Chillun Got Wings*...Yellow journalism blazed. Headlines, editorials and news stories sought to destroy the work. Fears of racial trouble spread. Nevertheless, the production opened, and at the tense opening-night the audience was ready for anything. The critics disliked the work. *They were many steps behind Negroes, who hated it...He [O'Neill] was, however, talking about interracial marriage, and Negroes were fighting to be free, to eat regularly, live decently and get white feet off their necks*'³⁶ (emphasis added).

Yet with all Van Gysehem's altruistic intentions, he went on to work in South Africa and produced O'Neill's *The Hairy Ape* (for an analysis, see the following chapter), having founded the Bantu People's Theatre there. Paradoxically, Van Gysehem was invited to South Africa to produce a 'pageant commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the first gold field...It was purely and simply an historical pageant about the progress of South Africa from then until the thirties.'³⁷ The political orientation of Van Gysehem seem to have found its metier when producing for the Euro-American theatre because he lists directing pageants celebrating the Chartists Movement and Welsh coalminers, but lent his credibility and talent to pageants in an European dominated society which had won its position by brutally eliminating large sectors of the native population and initiating in a foreign land the ideology of racism and apartheid. The gross comparison with Van Gysehem's role in South Africa, celebrating the capitalist exploitative class, and that of the left wing most particularly of Euro-American plays (excluding his selection of O'Neill's controversial and certainly alienating view of African life), definitely exhibits an incongruity with the ideology of socialism. For Van Gysehem, however, his commitment was supposedly about the 'progress of South Africa,' but that of an European South Africa and not that of the indigenous oppressed.

At the same time, however, this ambivalence was largely symptomatic of the socialist left in the main which, it was demonstrated, were drawn primarily from the middle classes specifically in relation to theatre practice as

opposed to activist, political work in British communities. This confirms a notion that the continued exclusion of a relative, comparative methodology in the apprehension and execution of a value-system which critically appraises theatre on the basis of its ideology springs from the normative value of racism a priori which, on the one hand animates the liberal conscience into action, but on the other, because it moves from the perspective of difference, is incapable of envisioning the merit or irrelevance of a drama which does not and cannot divest itself of feelings of superiority. If socialist ideology cleaved to the notion that class overrides race, that there is a universality of humanity, it is perfunctorily the Euro-American universalism that is applicable – steeped in racial hegemony, separability, and a psychological investment, conscious or unconscious, in maintaining the cultural norms of middle or working class Euro-American life.

In looking at the stage and politics, one is able to illuminate briefly, through socialist discourse itself, the world-view of its critics and practitioners who, in attempting to transcend the historical inheritance of privileged class positions, inadvertently reimpose the inevitability of race – cultural imperialism. Though the Fabians were allegedly avowed socialists they were shown to be staunchly middle-class in their politics and cultural policies. Theatre practitioners themselves were largely drawn from the middle-class university setting, an alienated group from the working-class struggles and inevitably reproducers of racism in their selection and production of texts. The real challenges to racial superiority in the theatre did not emanate in the 1920s and 1930s, rather the African subject continued to be objectified and utilised as a theme only for personal aggrandisement and the elevation of careers.

In the following chapter, an analysis is offered of a variety of plays from differing perspectives which collectively represent the liberal-left and conservative views in the construction of African stereotypes, here represented as central characters.

CHAPTER 4

COLONISING THE IMAGE: LEFT/RIGHT STRANGULATION ON EMERGING VOICES OF DISSENT

The responses to a new environment, to a new people, may well produce feelings of differentiation, but the extent to which differentiation is perceived, synthesised and articulated can determine the nature of a relationship grounded in psychohistory. Not all relationships are naturally symbiotic; some are predetermined by the desire to erect barriers and to extol artificially legitimated canons, to maintain positions of prestige, to enjoy the fruits of separation by power. These are critically and artificially constructed separations—not socially ordained but sites of political and economic power and contests. Johnathan Dollimore¹ recognises this axiom, stating that the theatre is a '...prime location for the representation and legitimation of power.' Dollimore goes on to critique the dominant modes of power legitimation systematised through 'beliefs, practices and institutions' in which 'the representation of sectional interest [passes off] as universal ones.'² It is this passing off as "universal" which is at issue and which this chapter subjects to serious critical interrogation in attempting to comprehend the powerful interests and the psychological

motives which animate both the dramatist and his/her characters in a theatre already located within the context of domination, the status quo, and from the earliest formalities of proscenium-arch theatre, as a site of class and racial conflict.

The site of Euro-American theatre as conflict is not only confined to the class problematic, but to surrealistic impressions of race in which colonial features of domination and the dominated are classically worked out in a catharsis of differentiated expositions, i.e., there is a universalist posturing on the part of playwrights on the matter of race-ideology discourse. The features of "surrealistic impressions" are not, peculiarly, confined to political positions defined in the context of left/right, but, conversely, encompass them. The perception of the right in the context of Euro-America has little meaning within the location of race issues, for the left is sited within a similarity of racial abnormalities, i.e., both the right and the left share the same debilitating and bombastic chauvinism which characterises racial superiority posturing. Arendt, in describing the transcendence of class in the pursuit of imperialistic goals, says, 'Monopolistic concentration and tremendous accumulation of violence at home made the servants active agents in the destruction, until finally totalitarian expansion became a nation-and a people-destroying force.'³ This classical exposition of incorporation and collaboration underlines the nature of the complexity of analysis in locating logical explanations for occupiers of antagonistic classes at home who become participants wedded to the act of supremacist thinking.

In unravelling the mind-set which invents and fashions distorted representations of humanity, the connection is posited between the individual and society, i.e., the dramatist as both environmentally and socially determined and determining, a two-fold carrot-stick bilaterality. This situation is compounded by the nature of the illusion of entertainment. This produces emotional responses which 'may be blindly, pathologically crude, or, at the other extreme, the complexities of performance may offer a unique opportunity for the individual to become aware of stereotyping as a men-

tal activity rather than a reflection of reality...'⁴ The latter alternative is neither correctly put nor empirically validated. The issue which determines the principal thematic tendencies of a play is, in materialist terms, the political perspective of both the dramatist and the director. The site of production is equally a consideration in determining who, why, and what the intentions of the production company are. Thus stereotyped images, in spite of altruistic intentions, cannot conceal the nature of the dramatist/director's mediation of the victims portrayed, nor can they disguise the complexity of the playwright's being, i.e., the state of his consciousness. Ivan Ward clearly understands this problematic when he says,

...I don't want to give the impression that this realm of illusion isn't 'illusory'. It isn't. If you are embedded in a certain symbolic matrix then you are adopting a certain posture and orientation in the world... You *know*, on those 'issues' where your *position* is. You know what side of the fence you are on within the field of racial discourse...— the reduction of racism to a psychology of prejudice — exists not because you are not a racist, but because you have your being within a racist culture.⁵

This serves to introduce the question of stereotypes and consciousness in that any claim for education must necessarily impinge upon the interrogation of the premises upon which this belief lies, and how it has come into being. In looking at some of the plays written and/or performed between 1908 and 1939, the analysis is resting not upon the *claims* of the play, the dramatist, or the reputation of the company (whether left or right wing), but upon a critical understanding of the form or content of the artifact itself. The aesthetics of theatre bring into play the multidirectional orientation of theatre practitioners, whether the dramatist, the director, the players themselves or the institution within which the theatrical activity as entertainment is taking place. Fundamental questions must be contemplated, interrogated, analysed and interpreted: (i) who imaged the artifact, (ii) what is the social environment or the political culture which animated the conception and production of it, (iii) where is the theatrical activity taking place, (iv)

who is it meant for, i.e., who benefits from it, (v) what is the response of the media, as tool of propagation, in the reception and dissemination of the appeal of the work, and finally (vi) how are the objects (i.e., those written of) of the theatrical subject (the writers of) to be located within the context of essentially alien sensibilities?

THE EMPEROR JONES

The dialogue of Mr O'Neill is always instinct with life, and its brutal fibre never offends, because it has in the main, that *essential inevitability which persuades our acceptance* (emphasis added).⁶

...when *Emperor Jones* was booked for the Provincetown Theater, up ran one of the attachés of that place with the script. He did not show O'Neill's play to Robeson; he sat down and read it through to him. At that time Robeson was quite sensitive about the Negro question. It was his first year in New York and the problems he faced made him race conscious. As the play was read Robeson got madder and madder until, when that final line was reached, he wanted to throw the man out of the window. Instead, he just refused the part, much as he needed the money.⁷

The journalistic impression of the *London Sketch* and the report in the *New York Herald Tribune* give a representative contrast between an interpretation of the dramatist's ability to convey a sense of reality and an actual recording of the leading performer of the play. It also expresses the lack of racial sensitivity in an European cognition and perception of what constitutes a drama of *essential inevitability* as against an African's perspective on the *meaning* of the drama to the victims portrayed by an Euro-American.⁸ Paradoxically, what Robeson refused in 1920, he accepted in 1924 (New York) and 1930 (London). In spite of O'Neill's socialisation with Africans, and in particular with the Robeson family,⁹ it can be demonstrated that he was inextricably a reproducer of a racist society. This question of reproduction has to be seen within the context of hegemony: that

social and racial prestige are defended against any semblance of encroachment by the dominated except in the instance of the dominated being prepared to accede to the image/fantasy of the dominating society/individual. The hegemonic fabrication and maintenance of inventive reality is well argued by Ringer, "Thus it can be argued that the dominant group seeks to impress its own brand of *truth*, *virtue*, and *beauty* on the larger society, to monopolise elite positions, and to require adoption of its styles and values by those who wish *to gain acceptance in that society*'¹⁰ (emphasis added). The extrapolation is opaque: that the transposition of the African for the "larger society" (the working classes) can be made; that the condition of dominating/dominated is constant although shifting. The transposition can also be juxtaposed between the urge to be accepted by the dominant society and Robeson, for instance, here a member of the larger, African society.¹¹ The issue under discussion, however, is not Robeson's transition of reversed positions – 1920/1924 – but the hegemonic representation of O'Neill's imagination and its critical reception, as well an examination of the play itself to illustrate the dramatist's own racial perspectives.

The Emperor Jones, because it is set in a sub-tropical, Caribbean island and deals with the transition from slave to emperor, can be compared with the rise of Toussaint L'Ouverture, slave-coachman on the Bréda plantation, who rose to become Commander-in-Chief of the African slave rebellion in Haiti. Here the comparison ends. While James¹² constructs a sensitive, intelligent but highly prejudiced human being, O'Neill invents a character who conforms to the ignorant, violent image of the Euro-American conceptualisation of the African: base speech, slovenly, collaborating with his European counterpart in a reign of tyranny over his "kingdom", yet deeply embedded in superstition, fear and black magic. All of these themes appear in O'Neill's play in addition to the dramatist's own stage directions which leave no doubt in the reader's mind what tradition, and what race/class, he was beholden to.

Towards the end of the play (p.194) the author describes Lem, the

African, as 'a heavy-set, ape-faced old savage of the extreme African type, dressed only in a loin cloth.' Whatever lessons one may have derived from the play, particularly in terms of the motif of the universality of the human condition, that the oppressed not only collaborate in their condition, but aspire to be in the reverse position¹³— themselves in authority, defending their new-found elitist position against the oncoming hordes—is immediately, unobtrusively exposed as the premonition of that bold, racist stereotype enacted to entertain and perhaps to direct group anxieties in order to harness violent predilections (generated through social/racial tensions) in an apparently amusing theatrical activity. Bratton, in theorising on this phenomenon, says, 'On to the transgressive and hostile imperial subject on stage the audience could project all sorts of anti-social characteristics, and these could well be the same evils which were condemned as characterising the working class, and which also presents problems of control in the individual psyche.'¹⁴ In this case, the 'individual psyche' may well be represented by O'Neill himself: it is his imagination, his words which he places into the mouths of the characters, and his stage directions, the distinguishing feature from the drama, which condemn the dramatist to the prison he so barbarically constructs for the African "savage."

The evils, similarly associated with the African, and of the working class that Bratton spoke of, are here associated with the cockney Smithers, representing the collaborative arm of imperialism (cf. Arendt above). In O'Neill's frame of reference, it is not the power-defending elitist colonist who one accuses of atrocities, but the unsympathetically drawn working class object exemplifying devilry and barbarity. Smithers becomes both the object of derision and the subject of and spokesman for colonialism. He accuses an old African woman of "devilment" and then vilifies his partner in crime, Emperor Brutus Jones, out of earshot, of 'Puttin' on airs, the stinkin' nigger!' (p.150). Jones is portrayed precisely as is Smithers — an agent of imperialism—by his constant reference to the other Africans as conforming to the Euro-American stereotype of '...drinkin' rum and talkin' big down in de town' (p.151). This association with alcohol¹⁵ and the dom-

inated is a typical example of representation in which the masses are imbued with an image of sterility, suggesting that the oppressed are incapable of transcending their condition, that, in fact, they are condemned to a cycle of vicious repetition. Jones and Smithers, collaborators and reproducers, are thus cynical vectors of O'Neill's fantasies of the race and class question. O'Neill, familiar with the African American language, is also familiar with the cockney, derived, in the former case from his social liaison with African Americans in the projected belief of his liberalism, and in the latter, one conjectures, by reading fiction.

O'Neill's pursuit of the racist stereotype of the African is carried over in the language he assigns Brutus Jones. Here one witnesses the incredible spectre of a black emperor articulating himself in the so-called crudity of the "imperfect" language of the reproducing dominated. In this propagated image, O'Neill attempts to instill in the audience/reader the caricature and impossibility of associating an uncouth African with civilisation. Jones, with pretensions to the throne, is simultaneously bereft of the accoutrements of civilisation and embraces savagism.

In making Brutus Jones the principal character, O'Neill attempts to vivify the plot of an escaped convict ascending to the throne of a Caribbean island-kingdom, thus legitimising the use of African American speech transferred to a new environment. This represents a rather thin and unrealistic line in plotting, but strengthens O'Neill's hand in simultaneously representing and caricaturing both the African American and the African/Caribbean. Thus the Emperor Jones does not come to life as a creature of contradictions and ambivalence, groping to understanding, but is clay in the hands of his creator who uses this character to voice his vision of African life.

In an interesting scene between Brutus Jones and Smithers, O'Neill attempts to show that the class relationship between the two harbours mutual suspicion, distrust and tension. In the following dialogue, one gets the distinct impression that Brutus Jones' cardboard characterisation is true to the predetermination of the author, in making him unacceptable to the

audience, thus fulfilling the purpose of his vicious characterisation.

Jones: Who dare whistle dat way in my palace? Who dare wake up de Emperor? I'll git de hide flayed off some o' you niggers sho'!

Smithers: It was me whistled to yer. I got news for yer.

Jones: Oh, it's you, Mister Smithers. What news you got to tell me?

Smithers: Don't yer notice nothin' funny to-day?

Jones: Funny! No. I ain't perceived nothin' of de kind!

Smithers: Then yer ain't so foxy as I thought yer was. Where's all your court? The Generals and the Cabinet Ministers and all?

Jones: Where dey most runs to minute I closes my eyes—drinkin' rum and talkin' big down in de town. How come you don't know dat! Ain't you carousing 'em most every day?

Smithers: That's part of the day's work. I got ter—ain't I—in my business?

Jones: Yo' business!

Smithers: Gawd blimey, you was glad enough for me ter take yer in on it when you landed here flat. You didn't 'ave no 'igh and mighty airs in them days!

Jones: Talk polite, white man! Talk polite, you heah me! I'm boss heah now, is you fergetting'?

Smithers: No 'arm meant, old top.

Jones: I accepts yo' apology. No use'n you rakin' up ole times. What I was den is one thing. What I is now's another. You didn't let me in on yo' crooked work out o' no kind feelin's dat time.

I done de dirty work fo' you—and most o' de brain work, too, fo' dat matter—and I was wu'th money to you, dat's de reason.

Smithers: Well, blimey, I give yer a start, didn't I—when no one else would. I wasn't afraid to 'ire yer like the rest was—'count of the story about your breakin' jail back in the States.

Jones: No, you didn't have no s'cuse to look down on me fo' dat. You been in jail you'self more'n once.

Smithers: It's a lie! Garn! Who told yer that fairy tale?

Jones: Dey's some tings I ain't got to be tole. I kin see 'em in folks' eyes. Yes, you sho' give me a start. And it didn't take long from dat time to git dese fool woods' niggers right where I wanted de,. From stowaway to Emperor in two year! Dat's goin' some!

Smithers: And I bet you got yer pile o' money 'id some safe place.

Jones: I sho' has! And it's in a foreign bank where no pusson don't ever git it out but me no matter what come. You didn't s'pose I was holdin' down dis Emperor job for de glory in it, did you? Sho'! De fuss and glory part of it, dat's only to turn de heads o' de low-flung bush niggers dat's here. Dey wants de big circus show for deir money. I give it to 'em an' I gits de money. De long green, dat's me every time! But you ain't got no kick agin me, Smithers. I'se paid you back all you done for me many times. Ain't I pertected you and winked at all de crooked tradin' you been doin' right out in de broad day. Sho' I has—and me makin' laws to stop it at de same time! (pp.151-153.)

In precise and unambiguous terms, O'Neill tailors *his* African to conform to the barbaric, savage, uncivilised African *his* audience needs in order to uphold the belief that the rest of the world, people of colour, are in desperate need of Euro-American civilisation. R. Pearce, in his work on the per-

ilous contact by the indigenous American population with the European, says, 'God had meant..the savage state itself as a sign of Satan's power and savage warfare as a sign of earthly struggle and sin.'¹⁶ To paraphrase this, one can say that O'Neill had ordained the African to be savage therefore one should have no feeling or sympathy for his condition. And in a larger, comparative context, one must not forget that the savagism of Jones can be aligned with that of Smithers, thus demonstrating the maxim that charity begins at home, i.e., it is a recognition of the fundamental anomaly which exists in social, class relations that could allow the elite or class-abandoned working class to see in other ethnic groups the affinities of the condition of the dominated. 'Consciously or unconsciously,' writes Ness Edwards, 'the dramatist has propagated the cultural point of view of a class. In that sense the drama has been propaganda.'¹⁷

O'Neill, therefore, expresses his view of the world in the context of race and class, and undoubtedly, his choice to write on the race question, featuring Africans, can only be interpreted as an opportunistic attempt to benefit from the political upheavals that were traumatising the United States after the first major pan-European war. African Americans who had fought during the war now made their militant claim for equality of opportunity at home. Militant men and women were protesting about their treatment after having fought for the freedom of western Europe.¹⁸ And the embryonic impact of the Marcus Garvey-propelled Harlem Renaissance created the framework for cultural appropriators, both African and European Americans, to descend upon the world of art.¹⁹ It is this social context, with the available space for national attention, which, one conjectures, motivated the mentality of an O'Neill. As will be shown, plays written with Africans in them, whether situated in Africa, the Caribbean or the United States, did not, in the main, have them as leading characters. Their fate was enacted for them; here O'Neill reverses the tradition by placing the African at centre stage, but simply as a more sophisticated caricature and stereotype of the Euro-American imagination. Here the African seals his own fate. The options given him are non-existent, and more importantly,

he is wrapped and paraded in the fantasmogoric clothes of the inventive, crude, imagination of sterility.

The image of savagism is repeatedly demonstrated by O'Neill through Brutus' relationship to his clothes. The symbolic image of the discomfort of the African and clothes, that they are inevitably torn and tattered, reinforces the image of the assailed African character in his pristine nudity, at one with the jungle he inhabits. Thus Jones, slowly and bit by bit, removes his coat and later his spurs, throwing them away.

His uniform is ragged and torn. He looks about him with numbed surprise when he sees the road, his eyes bulging in the bright moonlight. He flops down exhaustedly and pants heavily for a while. Then with sudden anger (author's own stage directions).

Jones: I'm meltin' wid heat! Runnin' an' runnin' an' runnin'!
 Damn dis heah coat! Like a strait jacket! (*He tears off his coat and flings it away from him, revealing himself stripped to the waist.*) Dere! Dat's better! Now I kin breathe! (*Looking down at his feet, the spurs catch his eye.*) And to hell wid dese high-fangled spurs. Dey're what's been a-trippin' me up an' breakin' me neck. (*He unstraps them and flings them away disgustedly.*) Dere! I gits rid o' dem frippery Emperor trappin's an' I travels lighter (pp.175-6).

Then (p.178) he raises his famous question, 'Is you civilized, or is you like dem ign'rent black niggers heah?' O'Neill summarises in this question the circumventing of Jones' character by forcing him to distance himself from his own ethnic group through the potential assimilation of Western civilisation – *only the individual* so the common belief suggests, can be accepted but on the terms of the dominating group. In thus questioning his readiness for civilisation, O'Neill forces his character to accept or reject *himself*. Later, the burden of civilisation is too demanding, because, no matter how hard he tries to adapt, there is a subconscious self utterly betraying him, magnetising him to his *true self*. Thus he also throws away his shoes and

no use no more 'ceptin' to hurt. I'se better off widout dem. (*He unlaces them and pulls them off, holds the wrecks of the shoes in his hands and regards them mournfully.*) You was real, A-one patin' leather, too. Look at you now, Emperor, you'se gittin' mighty low (p.181)!

Simultaneously imaging the jungle as holding terrors for him – wherein harbours the author's images of primitive Africans or chain-gang labourers – they continue to dramatise a link with Jones, his past and his future. By emphasising these connections, O'Neill is telling us in no uncertain terms that Brutus Jones wants to elevate and distance himself both from the popular image of Africans as stereotyped (which he falls victim to) and the accoutrements of savagism (the "tom-tom," the jungle, superstition, human sacrifice). The strategy that confines and mocks the African in a jaundiced vision of the world is propagated and generated by O'Neill's racism.

O'Neill's objectives can be compared to the colonial project: appropriating onto its architects the prestige of a single feudal lord dominant over a vast terrain and people. In this instance, O'Neill neatly wraps up the colonial project by characterising Jones as lord and master of a Caribbean island and investing him and the cockney Smithers with the illusion of power, but it is through this power that they demonstrate joint racism and tyranny. Drawing on Pierre Mille's colonial, fictional work, Maurice Delafosse, the French colonial administrator and ethnologist, says of the typical colonial overlord, 'It is better to be number one in a fly-ridden place than to be second-in-command in Rome.'²⁰ O'Neill not only shows Jones and Smithers as exemplifying this maxim, but he projects the racist concept of both civilisation and savagism in his portrayal of Jones, that 'Left to himself, and without white control and guidance, he [the African] forgets the lessons he has learnt, and slides rapidly back to his original barbarism.'²¹

Not only does Jones slide back to his 'original barbarism', but he is killed through his belief in superstition, thus exemplifying the adage you can only take a donkey to water but you cannot force him to drink. In this play, one sees the powerfully concocted image of an African despot, murderer, sav-

Not only does Jones slide back to his 'original barbarism', but he is killed through his belief in superstition, thus exemplifying the adage you can only take a donkey to water but you cannot force him to drink. In this play, one sees the powerfully concocted image of an African despot, murderer, savage, militating towards civilisation but inevitably reduced to the perceived disposition of his predetermined fate – that of the untamed African ('Nature which has fixed the limits of the white man's mind [i.e., his inexorable position as the dominant species], fixed those also of the black; and no training, no example, can cultivate the lower animal into the higher' ²²).

In this play O'Neill conforms to the structures imposed upon his evaluation in relation to the social context within which his plays escape a balance: most of O'Neill's plays were written for the Provincetown Players – an essentially Euro-American theatre company whose place in American theatre was assured by the support of public grants and business entrepreneurs like Otto Kahn. The media response to O'Neill's plays in the USA, most probably because of the nature of their focus – the issue of racial representation – raised O'Neill's work to the level of icon. Here, it can be clearly argued that O'Neill's work can best be evaluated in the context of the set of questions raised earlier in this chapter. In all of the situations in which the African is represented there is a confirmation of a vast limitation of vision and a monologic structure of misinformation propagated by O'Neill.

The *Emperor Jones* finally epitomises the lack of humane rapport which separates middle-class America from the meaning of racial oppression and social conflict. It dramatises the oppositionality of O'Neill's gravitation towards fame and fortune to African American affirmation of humanity. It constructs a fantasy world of a set of behaviours assigned to the African American Brutus Jones in which he is confirmed by O'Neill in his representation as savage and incapable of assimilating Western civilisation.

This picaresque representation of savagism is also brutally constructed by O'Neill in *The Hairy Ape*. If *Emperor Jones* can be imagined to be the ramblings of an ignorant man, *The Hairy Ape* unravels the spectre of nature repeating evolution in series.

THE HAIRY APE

The Hairy Ape, like a number of O'Neill's plays, was first produced by the Provincetown Players of New York in 1922, and was given a production by the Unnamed Society of Manchester in the same year and presented as a comedy. It was again produced, this time in London in 1928, at the Gate Theatre. Interestingly enough, there are no black characters in this play, but there is the incontrovertible, unmistakable identification of the African with the unsympathetically drawn character of Yank. The first half of the action takes place on board a ship heading for London. Most of the action takes place in the stokers' room. One of the first scenes to interrupt the vision that O'Neill has ephemerally abandoned his preoccupation with the question of savagery=Africanness is in Scene 3 where the delicate heiress, daughter of millionaire parents, here described as a rebel, chaperoned by her protesting aunt, faints at the sight of Yank, dirty and cussing unreservedly in the boiler room, where before striking out in outrage, she screams, 'Take me away! Oh, the filthy beast!'

After she is taken out, one of the stokers, Long, knowing who she really is, refers to her father as 'a bloody Capitalist!' and that they (the workers) are all seen as *monkeys* (p.38). The story is then picked up by Paddy (the Irishman) who says, 'And there she was standing behind us, and the Second [member of the crew] pointing at us like a man you'd hear in a circus would be saying. In this cage is a queerer kind of *baboon* than ever found in *darkest Africy*. We roast them in their own sweat and be damned if you won't hear some of them saying they like it!' (emphasis added, p.38).

There are scenes of continuous savaging of the African in the *Emperor Jones*, and in *The Hairy Ape* there is the inference of human sacrifice which is related to cannibalism, although the symbolism may well be for capitalism itself. What is interesting, however, is the *choice of symbolism*.

Doubtless, the association of monkeys with people in oppressed positions, particularly in a colonial context, exemplifies the colonialist/racist stereotypes that not only describe contact with the African but with others, Europeans, of similar colonised backgrounds. Certainly, the image of the

Irish has been objectified in the context of that nation's colonial relations with England over a five hundred year period. This idea struck Brian Street in making the connection between the black African and the Irish, and he cites the work of L.P. Curtis who shows, 'how many nineteenth-century writers saw the Irish as nearest to the apes...'²³ It is no surprise, therefore, that this idea strikes O'Neill in exactly the same way, in which he equates the working class Euro-American with the African and in the same racist stereotype, as ape. This, however, is a nineteenth century idea in which the concept of race was confined to nationality, i.e., there is a bilateral identification with race and nationality which would later collide and collapse into race as distinct from particular nationalities, while simultaneously and miraculously, distinctions are perpetuated in terms of national identity as being concordant with specific "racial"/national attributes, dispositions, statuses, and ideologies generated by differentiation. This affords the recognition that the much vilified ape, a hominid ancestor, associated with primitivity and stupidity, is genetically linked to the living remnants of that past: the African, the Irish, the Welsh, the Scot, and in times past, the Gauls, the Celts, the early Britons, etc., who were paraded as the lowest echelons of civilisation.²⁴

In Scene 4 there follows an interesting dialogue, one which assures the connection between the represented Euro-American Yank and the African in terms of uncleanliness, i.e., the primitiveness of the ape. What is being considered here is not the fundamental alienation of these thoughts but the causality of their propagation and the responses they may have evoked in the media. Here is a chorus of voices:

Hey, Yank, you forgot to wash...

Yank: Forgot nothin'! To hell with washin'.

It'll stick to you...It'll get under your skin...

Give yer the bleedin' itch, that's wot.

Like a piebold nigger, you mean.

Better wash up, Yank, etc. (emphasis added, pp.34/5)

O'Neill continuously constructs the image of the African-ape connection even in this drama in which the African is physically not dramatised, yet his presence is symbolically expressed in all the dialogue and in the character of Yank. Within the framework of this discourse, one can legitimately raise the question of not only O'Neill's sharpened sense for the racist caricature but for the connection between the outcast, barbarised African and the popular stereotypes in Euro-American culture, for example, the Irish.

Yank is perennially dramatised in juxtaposition to the African: In Scene 6, Yank is in jail for accosting a middle class male, where he learns of a union/political organisation, the I.W.W. Upon release, he visits the place, knocks on the door to have the secretary say, 'What did you knock for? Think we had a *coon* in uniform to open the door?' (emphasis added, p.66). The typology of this response conforms to the belief that social separation was mandatory to retain a sense of separability and superiority: '...the professional and educated classes founded their assumptions about race upon their conception of themselves as *civilised men in an uncivilised world, and as an enlightened intelligentsia in a largely barbarian England*'²⁵ (emphasis added). This last, it can be argued, can be assigned to the status quo maintained in the United States principally along racial lines but also along class lines.

The final scene of O'Neill's racial drama epitomises the identification, if one were not mistaken by the allusions and symbolisms, between the ape and Yank (described above as symbolic of the African). Interpreting Yank as an agitator, the I.W.W. throws him out onto the street where even the police refuse to arrest him, even at his prompting. Exasperated, Yank visits a zoo and discusses his problems with the apes; he then breaks into the cage and attempts to set the ape free. While talking to the ape, the animal attacks him, crushing his back, and throws him in the cage, from where Yank proclaims, '...one and original – Hairy Ape from the wilds de...!..and

falls dead!

In deconstructing the symbolism and meaning of this parable, one is left with the unmistakable image of *identity*, i.e., the problematic of identifying one's self in a complex world. Yank is portrayed as primitive and constant allusions to his being an ape or *coon* (the African) are made, rendering the projected and propagated class/race image incontrovertibly expressive of the image of Yank as affined to that of the African/ape. There is here an obvious resonance with the 19th century pseudo-scientific racism and of the fancifulness of Georges Cuvier in his response to the so-called "Hottentot Venus", 'Her movements had something of brusqueness and capriciousness which recalled those of a monkey. She had a habit of protruding her lips like what I have observed in the Orang-Outang.'²⁶ This connection between hominid ancestor and Yank is constantly present in O'Neill's drama. By associating the ape with humanity, O'Neill is not only constructing an image of a primitive relationship, i.e., a common species ancestry, but conversely, he is also inventing a predetermined and fabricated association with a particular class of person – here the working class Yank who is not only stigmatised for his class origins but also for his connection with the African and consequently the ape. O'Neill, therefore, accomplishes a mammoth achievement in disposing of two types of people – the working class and the African, both unalterably propagated as ignorant and despicable – in one play.

There are other, associated references in O'Neill's play, the most obvious being the genre of minstrelsy in which the send up, the put down, the blatant exaggerations, the overblown character, the ridiculous, the comic, the ignorant are components of an Euro-American recipe for racism. In this context Anna Elfenbein relates the significance of minstrelsy for the crafting of a certain type of character, 'Popular culture made the black "the principal comic figure in the 1890s, replacing the Irishman as the butt of America's jokes," and mob insanity made blacks the scapegoats of lynching and burning rituals.'²⁷ It should be remembered that in the 1920s African Americans were still being publicly lynched in the South, Billy the

Kid died in 1917, i.e., the United States was still a wild West in parts, still unsettled, still largely ungovernable to the extent that the absence of any legislation against racial murder generated the unbridled expression of segregation and violence in public life, and institutional racism.

O'Neill maps the relationship between the working and middle classes, and earns an obvious merit in the voicing of the former's grievances and condition. It is not, however, the middle class daughter of exploitative millionaires who he ridicules, but the working class Yank. There is no association of the ape with the middle class. Michael Pickering, in analysing the phenomenon of minstrelsy in the context of imperialism, succinctly summarises the propagated and surrealistic imaging of the working class/African in the bourgeois imagination:

The trope of 'savagery' served...as a means of placing those regarded as utterly divergent from the bourgeois self-image, the alien abroad or in the homeland, blacks in Africa or New Zealand, costers and colliers in England – and of allowing for a recurrent translocation of images, codes and categories across the social reportage of inner city life...Hence the oft noted...interchangeable terms used for classifying both 'primitive' blacks and 'uncivilised' street folk; and the *centrality of both as objects of repulsion and fascination...*²⁸ (emphasis added).

Both in *The Emperor Jones* and *The Hairy Ape*, we see the centrality of the working class and the African. In the former it is the working class Smithers who becomes the spokesman for imperialism, yet, because of his low status, he is ridiculed and seen to be collaborating with Brutus Jones, the ape-like, escaped convict and murderer turned Emperor; while in the latter play, the working class Yank epitomises the worst in the working class and the African. In both plays the animalistic images of these human beings become an oppressive weapon in dismissing the enormous human effort which drove both the working class and the African in the U.S., Britain and the Caribbean to force social changes in their relationship with the dominating power structure.

It is interesting to note the response of two critics to the play under review, 'He [O'Neill] has a mind centred on the tragedies and horrors of life and a knack for *twisting* things that should arouse *pity* into things that *only invoke repulsion*'²⁹ (emphasis added).

The drama critic on *The New Statesman* wrote scathingly of the staging of O'Neill's play at the Gate Theatre Studio, 'I am afraid I cannot rate the present judgment of those who direct the Gate Theatre Studio very high. It is admittedly difficult to find new plays of merit, but in the interests of the Gate Theatre and of its intelligent and discriminating public, I would advise Mr Peter Godfrey and his fellow directors to give the plays of that *over-rated* dramatist, Mr Eugene O'Neill, a *rest*. Three of his plays have been produced during the past year. *The Hairy Ape* was a tolerable melodrama, good enough to be performed *once* – in view of this American author's reputation and then to be *dropped for ever*'³⁰ (emphasis added).

In O'Neill's inability to evoke emotions of sympathy and understanding, one has a comprehension of the sufferance of the reviewer in looking beyond the plays' dramatic impact in stimulating antagonistic feelings, to that of O'Neill's intentions. His motivations appear to point to considerations separate from the evocation of empathy with the human experience. Because these meanings are absent in either of O'Neill's plays, he thus perpetuates the mythological bourgeois fabrication of the incapacity and inability of the African/working class to transcend their impoverished condition through honest means. In no way does this argument hinge upon the notion of unity of effort between the antagonistic camps of the African/working class, but it pitches a visceral connection: it is through the bourgeois, racist and classist perspective of Eugene O'Neill, that a connection exists, both in physical type, behaviour and preoccupation, which to him warrants attack and vilification.

The modalities and parameters within which O'Neill encapsulates and visualises human relations and their location in race and class terms do not apply only to the American racial complex, but reflect the situation emanating from the imagination of the British dramatist and of the radical the-

atre imagined by the left. *Cannibal Carnival*, shares similar images and race/class assumptions are shared with its American counterpart. The major difference is in the recognition that O'Neill is bourgeois although fashioning plays with themes which can be perceived as socially explosive, while Herbert Hodge, the author of *Cannibal Carnival*, perceives himself to be associated with, and an architect of, the left, while the drama group which mounts his play declares itself devoted to social realism and socialist culture.

CANNIBAL CARNIVAL

After attending a performance of [*Waiting for*] *Lefty* at the Unity Theatre, a London taxi driver, Herbert Hodge, was inspired to write his first play, *Where's That Bomb?*...Hodge followed this short two-act play in 1937 with a less successful full-length 'theatrical cartoon' called *Cannibal Carnival*, and subsequently joined...a number of other Unity members in an ambitious collective theatrical and political experiment...³¹

It is significant that Clark did not characterise Hodge's play as socially conscious or political, but merely described the play as a 'theatrical cartoon.' Although no full length manuscript of this play exists, sections of the play and the narrative were published in a book of 1938,³² and a photocopy of Scenes 4 and 5 is available at the Unity Theatre archives (references to the play are based on these sources), thus enabling the analyst to get an overall understanding of its sequential developments. The play is written in five scenes, and is located within the territory of colonial empire, loaded with imperialists on the one hand, and 'natives' on the other. The ordering and tone of the play unfortunately fall within the tropes of savagism/barbarism, thus removing any possibility that although Hodge's working class background locates him within a certain type of experience—that of discrimination and oppression — it does not exonerate him from feelings of superiority motored, one conjectures, by his genetic connection to a myth-

ically dominant European race.

Basing the action around the Robinson Crusoe syndrome, three shipwrecked Europeans attempt to control and conquer through constitutional illegalities – the rule of law and order, and the neo-colonial strategy of assimilating political collaborators or ventriloquists in a nation of melanesian Africans. The dramatist's precis of the play shows Hodge's own race bias, 'The island is overrun by a lot of *low natives*, in a state of *primitive communism*' (emphasis added, pp.109-110). Here Hodge does not contest the right of conservative scholars like Morgan and socialist (left) thinkers like Engels who continued to utilise racist and pejorative terms for earlier forms of social formations. If *primitive communism* were in existence at an earlier stage of human life then *modern communism* is necessarily superior to what came before. Perhaps this circumscribing may have been due to the association of "primitive" with people of colour as Morgan meant it originally for the Iroquois, for example, an American aboriginal.

Marx and Engels, the founding fathers of socialism, were racists and reactionaries in some aspects of their thinking. Engels, writing of the suffering of 8 million Slavs under the 4 million Magyars, says, 'But in history nothing is achieved without violence and implacable ruthlessness...In short, it turns out these "crimes" of the Germans and Magyars against the said Slavs are among the *best praiseworthy deeds* which our and the Magyar people can boast of in their history'³³ (emphasis added). This is merely to demonstrate that racism is not confined to a particular kind of person who has historically been characterised as conservative or right wing, but that, to paraphrase Fanon, the spectre of racist thinking tars the thoughts and world-view of a racist system regardless of political ideology.

Hodge's play revolves around three capitalists, Bartholomew Bogus, the Bishop of Belgravia, Hungry Joe, an elderly policeman, and Mr Crabbe, a financier. There is a fourth character, Egbert, but he is merely spoken of and only makes a brief appearance, though it is his presence which provides the play's interest and point of conflict and contrast: he represents the workers' consciousness, fighting to change the condition of the working

class in the face of steadfast democratic colonists. The sub-plot revolves around the presence of the masses and how these colonists can appease them without too much expenditure. The capitalists hit upon the idea of a coronation and are to choose from three brothers, Hoko, Moko and Boko who all possess a deformity: deafness, dumbness and daftness. In other words, they are ideal collaborators since they are collectively stupid. Hodge's stereotyping comes in the comparative representation of the three colonists as reasonably clear in their thoughts about their mission, and, contrastingly, the stupid language he puts in the mouths of the collaborators gives the audience the impression that the colonists exude sympathetic clarity (read civilised) while the Africans express a language of childishness. Upon coronation, Boko is made to say, 'Cockadoodle-do! Cockadoodle-do!' while Bumpus cynically comments, 'His majesty is addressing his beloved subjects!' (*ms*, pp.7 - 8). After dethroning Boko, Hoko is made emperor but he too is thrown in jail. At the end of Scene 1, the 'natives' are singing derisive songs about themselves, e.g., 'How cutely comes the clever Crabbe/To this poor savage isle!' (p.110). Here, ignorant natives, in Hodge's view, are allowed to project their inferiority by welcoming the colonists to their nation of savages. Although these lines are written with a sense of the *double entendre* the consistency of the self-deprecating puns assures the reader/audience of unbalanced scales.

In this 'savage' isle the machinations of colonialism are worked out: Western civilisation (according to Hodge) is introduced – 'complete with prostitutes, pawnshops... unemployment...' (pp.110-1). Soon after a "riot" ensues, with the 'natives' fighting for their rights. Egbert is imprisoned. Eventually, an election is held, Egbert is the winner, but the colonists declare it null and void by introducing a new Act, and a state of emergency. Egbert is arrested, tried, found guilty and sentenced to be decapitated. Hungry Joe, the so-called working class policeman, instead of carrying out the decapitation, refuses and declares his class interest and solidarity with the workers. Led by Egbert, the masses burn the courthouse; and in Hodge's words, they '*revert* to their *ancient customs* and put Bogus and

Crabbe in the cook pot...and all ends with a *savage* song and dance...' (emphasis added, p.125).

One sees in this play a talented satirical mind at work, the prismatic encapsulation of the three colonists and their subterfuges in undermining, liquidating and containing the masses, representing a studied understanding of the machinations of colonialism, but Hodge could not help but project, simultaneously, his deep racial bias and the belief that Western civilisation carries with it, in spite of his own testimony to the contrary, a superior cultural legacy. If this legacy isn't accepted, then there has to be a reversion to some barbaric cruelty of the culture from which the colonised emerged historically.

As the play clearly shows, the three Europeans symbolically represent colonialism: Bartholomew Bogus, a bishop, represents the historical role of the church in pacifying the "natives" through the introduction of christianity, as well as physical collaboration in violence when this method fails; Hungry Joe, the policeman, represents the occupying force of colonialism's violent arm—the police, the army; while Mr Crabbe, the financier, represents capitalism itself. After pacification, colonised labour, cheap or enslaved, is forced to work on the plantations or factories of the colonists in order for the latter to amass a fortune. Fittingly, Hodge places a pun on the names assigned to all the leading characters: the Bishop is Bogus since he works for capitalism under the disguise of christian charity and good will; the policeman is the hungry working class who, according to Arendt's definition, collaborates with his own oppressor in overseas dependencies or colonies; and the financier is cleverly named Crabbe, a many legged (multi-aspected) creature who lives in the mud of the seashore or the river banks. In other words, he inhabits a world of filth in order to obtain the highest rewards imaginable: money!

It is difficult to see the reversion of the assignation of barbarism to the natives in a drama in which the British working class assumed a role similar to that of the melanesian African. However, Ridley notes that critics saw the similarity of the working class at home and the 'natives' abroad in

the act of representation, 'The same childish, impulsive emotional character was invariably ascribed to both groups, and the same prejudices about their morals, their appetites, and their smell.'³⁴ In this instance, however, Hodge assigns the 'natives' to a special position of barbarian which conforms to an ideological position in relation to both hegemony and hierarchy, in which the African ends up not only at the bottom of the ladder culturally but 'reverts' to savagism.

A paraphrase can be introduced here to summarise Hodge's savage ending to an otherwise instructive drama: when bayonets were added to guns in 1660, they were utilised selectively in war, 'The Swedes used them only against the Russians, and the Austrians against the Turks; that is, *against enemies on the periphery or outside the system, and so not fully human*'³⁵ (emphasis added). Cannibalism and savagism, as utilised by Hodge, are the demarcating line from civilisation – the English, rapacious, murderous, colonising, is beyond the pale of cannibalism, but the African native, in contradistinction, is not only not fitted for civilisation, but only *he* is capable of such barbarous acts. But the image of the cannibal can be considered appropriate for the use of the bayonet – an instrument used only at close range – in the savaging of the enemy. One component of gunpowder, saltpeter, according to Green, was collected from animal and human excrement.³⁶ Thus the dangers associated with the instruments of death can be characterised as a mass form of cannibalism—the 'native' only cannibalises one person at a time, while the Europeans eat whole peoples, communities, etc. Green shows that cannibalism is portrayed as '...the archetype of everything monstrous and appalling in primitive cultures.'³⁷ The image of savagism is not confined to a particular class privilege, but to every aspect of thinking of race which percolated through British society.

In Hodge's drama, one witnesses the extent to which a socially instructive play devolves into a racist pantomime in spite of the noblest of social and political objectives. There is an inevitability in representation in which, for the purposes of our study, the African is seen not only as incapable of human responses to his condition as oppressed but jettisoned, at the

moment of liberation, into the colonial, xenophobic safety outlet of cannibal and savage. There is no hope for him.

A comparison reveals that there is little to choose between Eugene O'Neill or Hodge: both select the projection of popular notions of the African as savage, reinforced not only by the direction the plays take but in the stage directions supplied by themselves, as formulaic alternative to social responsibility. While Hodge is more conscious of ideological alternatives, in his play, like O'Neill's, the characters revert to a deterministic "type."

In examining the following play, *Colony*, by Geoffrey Trease, one sees the liberal European imagination at work in response, one contextualises, to the social rumblings taking place in the Caribbean in the 1930s.

COLONY

In Barbados...workers demonstrated violently. Some people "stoned cars on the highways while the bolder spirits among the hungry poor" broke into shops and raided "the sweet potato fields...Tate & Lyle, the British multinational, in their drive to open new markets in Jamaica at starvation wages. had a strike on their hands when construction workers downed their tools...The 1937 oil workers strike in Trinidad was one of the most violent seen. Two policemen were killed (one, Sergeant Charlie King, was set alight by a woman), and nine injured, while twelve civilians were killed and fifty wounded.³⁸

Geoffrey Trease's *Colony* was first produced at Unity Theatre in 1939. The reviews ranged from luke warm to laudatory. One critic wrote, '*Colony* has the wit that makes good entertainment and the understatement of *convincing propaganda*, and should certainly be visited by anyone who deplores silliness but admires the competence of the West End success. If this sort of *standard* is maintained Unity has no need to fear the consequences of its forthcoming move to a larger theatre'³⁹ (emphasis added). The reviewer in artificially looking at the play gave no idea that the apparition he described as the conflict of interest between the English Governor

and the union leader was not that of the 'liberal-minded, civil-servant helplessly torn between his duty and his sense of justice.'⁴⁰ No such simple solutions were posed in the play which the critic himself posed in terms of the governor's liberal humanism, but the issue was the struggle of colonialism and the oppressed trying to precipitate a higher and better standard of life.

What is striking about this play, however, is that it purports to represent the socialist, progressive wing in drama, yet it is beholden to a romantic liberalism quite in keeping with Fabianism whose 'revolution' would be very much a top-down affair, a revolution from above: any change in the fundamental political and social structures of British society would only be effected using strictly *legal and constitutional methods*.⁴¹ Again, like all of the plays under review here, it is eurocentrically written from the perspective of the European protagonists: they provide the centre of the action, it is their minds we learn to understand and appreciate, and any semblance of change is animated by the limitations of a liberal-bourgeois political rationalising.

The action takes place in the governor's mansion, and Act 1 opens on the governor's wife entertaining three members of the English elite, two Labour M.Ps., a social science professor and Miss Davis (resident on the island for a number of years), the proverbial representative of moral commitment and social conscience. Their cruiser having developed problems, they have accidentally landed on the island. The governor's wife, Lady Munro, and Miss Davis both typify, to different degrees, a separation from the local population which characterises colonial life. In conversation Miss Davis expresses the mettle of her charity when she represents the school children's need of clothes to Lady Munro. The latter typically dismisses the children as not being interested in education:

Lady M: Sorry! You were saying something about the hospital?

Miss D: No, Lady Munro, the school.

Miss D: We're worried about the attendance. We can take a hundred children now, but the average attendance last week was only fifty-six and a half.

Lady M: And a half?

Miss D: That's the average. You divide by six, you see.

Lady M: Of course! Well, it only confirms what I've always said, Miss Davis. Whatever that man O'Riley says, the negroes don't *want* education (*ms.* p.2).

The conversation swings to the fact that the children's lack of clothes was the principal reason for their absence. Miss D, who is projected as a do-gooder, suddenly expresses her own opinion of their parents, 'The children mustn't suffer because their *fathers are misguided*' (p.3, emphasis added). Thus the children, who suffer in poverty and cannot attend school because of their parents' inability to buy proper clothes, are shown greater Christian understanding although their parents' strike is precisely to make clothes and a better diet affordable. But this logical form of reasoning is entirely lost on both the sarcastic Lady M and the over-zealous Miss D. Both are victims of their circumstances: Miss D intent on doing good in spite of her lack of understanding of the world of the parents, and Lady M in the colonies precisely because she wishes to enjoy a higher standard of living.

Trease exposes the thinking of the Labour M.Ps. in various ways. In this crusading play of political correctness, Trease portrays the loaded language which engulfs the visitors' perception of the African: "backward races" (Labour M.P. Jane). As the governor returns from a meeting with, predictably, the plantation owners, the strike leader, O'Riley, enters with a colleague for discussions with him. The governor's bombastic and heated arguments cause him to introduce a foreign ideology into the argument:

Governor: But you're beginning to. You're pushing this ques-

tion beyond a mere matter of hours and wages. You're preaching red revolution.

Johnson: Oh, no, sir, 't isn't that. It's jest...

O'Riley: Let me speak, brother. Y'r Excellency, we're not preachin' anything jest now. We stand by our demands, no more, an' no less. If the Sugar Trust refuses to grant 'em, well then...

Governor: This gets us nowhere.

O'Riley: *We* can wait.

Governor: No. This has gone beyond you and the Trust. You're upsetting a lot of other men. The dockers are threatening to strike in sympathy.

O'Riley: They have done.

Johnson: That's why the ship went early, jest now. She couldn't load.

O'Riley: The cab-men are with us too – solid. By sundown it'll be a general strike!

Upward: Folly!

Governor: You know what that means? Martial law.

O'Riley: We understand, Excellency. Martial law. Thirty soldiers and two officers.

Governor: I shall arm the police (p.27).

Here Trease convincingly treats the phenomenon of colonialism in a mode confirmed as having universal applications. In failing to get the

upper hand through the ruse of negotiation, rational discussion, the colonialist representative, which the governor unmistakably is, on acknowledging breakdown inevitably reverts to the cessation of all further discussions. Trade unions, however, usually revert to discussions in order to pursue the "democratic" process of exhausting all possible avenues before declaring other alternatives. But, as Trease shows, betrayal⁴² is perpetually lurking as a final, triumphant card: if peaceful negotiations cannot achieve the objective of subversion, then introduce strong arm tactics. With the imminence of a general strike being called, the governor threatens martial law; failing to convince the strike leaders, and seeing the persistence of their conviction, the governor excuses himself and returns with the militia to arrest them.

W. Richard Jacobs, in chronicling the history of protest, organisation, detention and political intrigues against Chief Servant, Uriah Buzz Butler in Trinidad, showed that with the possibility of a serious threat to the economic stability of the country, the colonial government inevitably plays its law and order card by detaining political agitators. Butler was first arrested in June 1937 for 'inciting to violence and breach of the peace,'⁴³ he was released two years later and rearrested by orders of the governor in November 1939.⁴⁴ The Privy Council in Britain freed Butler, stating that his arrest was illegal, but the governor assumed that 'Butler's activities would jeopardise capitalist control of the oil industry...as well as "undermine responsible trade unionism" which was essential for the maintenance of the colonial political system.'⁴⁵ Not satisfied with the imprisonment and later the persistent surveillance of Butler, the governor, acting on behalf of the Crown and the economic interests of Trinidad, denied Butler the right to govern after his victory at the polls in 1950.⁴⁶

The correspondence between the situation of the governor and O'Riley and colleague on the one hand, and the incidence of an historical event on the other, suggests that Trease, in penning this drama, was motivated by the incidents of the 1930s in which political protests, violent confrontations and destruction to the property of entrenched capitalist investments, char-

acterised the will and determination of the militants for better social conditions. And here one sees that Trease shows that when the colonial authorities cannot have verbal victory, cannot convince their opponents through the rational power of the word and position of prestige, they inevitably resort to the power of the law.

Trease, in his ideological commitment to demonstrate that there is a vested class interest between the female Labour M.P. and O'Riley's wife (whom the governor has locked up in his house) which goes beyond race antagonisms, allows the M.P. to free Mrs. O'Riley and pretends that she has fainted. Trease also shows that the Europeans employed on the electrical generating company have come out on strike in sympathy with the local employees (*ms*, p.30). This is thus projected as an incidence of political collaboration based upon class lines, and in prescribing the elements and features of progressive ideological thought, Trease has denied himself the extant knowledge of the meaning of race differentiation both in the Caribbean and in England.⁴⁷ Secondly, any European employed in the colonies is considered well-off because of the differential in the local and expatriate salaries. Because the play is ideologically committed, it denies the reality of the issues under review, because race politics did go hand in glove with race prestige, i.e., in the Caribbean and the colonies, the controllers of power, whether of the legislature or of the economic institutions, were invariably European or European descended with a legacy of inheritances. And it was the governor who was the constitutional head of the colony—it was he who could remove parties and leaders from power; he could change the rules and move the goal posts; he was the final arbiter of "good" management of the state. Prior to 1962, most of the British-dominated Caribbean was under the yoke of colonialism, thus constitutionally dependent upon the King or Queen's representative—the governor—to exercise authority over the local population.

Despite the confrontation between the governor and the symbol of the local revolutionary and resistance, O'Riley, it is not the latter who has precipitated the governor's capitulation. It is not because of the protracted

struggle between the progressive and reactionary tendencies and the possible emergence of compromise and reform on the part of the power-brokers, but because of the conscientised intervention of the M.Ps. and the learned professor of social science, represented here as the voice of reason and rationalism, which at least has the governor promising to concede some, one conjectures, superficial changes. One needs to contrast the words of Trease himself who defines O'Riley as '...at the point where racial instinct ("anti-white") is at war with political reason ("co-operation of all workers, whatever their colour"). In the course of this play, *we witness the ultimate triumph of reason over instinct*' (ms., p.21, emphasis added). What this suggests is that a rational act such as the deliberations, discussions, etc., which go into arranging a strike does not constitute "reason" in Trease's eyes. Because he is committed to an eurocentric political universality—that class interests override all other — Trease ignores the connection between race and class in a context in which the top echelons are combined in one ethnic racial composition while at the other end—those who are oppressed and stigmatised and occupy the lowest position in society—are all of African and/or Asian origin.

It is interesting to compare the merits of this argument with the discourse on the same question between C.L.R. James and Leon Trotsky in 1939 in which James advocated that the 'black' element represented the revolutionary tendency in the USA and that they should be permitted to organise along race lines, i.e., for self-determination. According to the account given by James, Trotsky supported the idea conditionally.⁴⁸ Trease's failure to grasp the elements of his own eurocentrism probably occludes an understanding of the comparative approach suggested by Frantz Fanon, whereby '...universality resides in the decision to recognise and accept the *reciprocal relativism of different cultures once the colonial status is irreversibly excluded*'⁴⁹ (emphasis added).

Trease's drama fails on several levels: not only is his political vision glued to the political sloganeering of the British 1930s, but he removes the one opportunity he had to demonstrate that serious concessions derived from

colonialism are wrested from the power structure, and not cajoled from or bargained for. The governor, luckily the unsuspecting host of English elites, can heed their advice, thus saving the day. But this is the device of colonial writers: they deprive the oppressed of the right to contract out of situations, to utilise their own genius in commanding their battles, to win their own victories, in a word, to assert their own autonomy. In presenting this alternative device, Trease conforms to the stereotype: that only the intervention and collaboration of the superior European can ensure concessions. This is not only anti-historical, but racist: in the assumption of the superiority of European civilisation with the supposed capacity of magnanimity and benevolence.

The play also fails to differentiate the sonic difference between an African American and an African Caribbean language. O'Riley delivers all his lines in the language of African America:

O'Riley: We change nothin'. *See here*; if we jest squat with our arms folded, what can they do? Shootin' us won't't help 'em. Dead man can't cut cane....(p.1-29)

O'Riley: *Why, sir, that's my old woman!*...(p.1-32).

O'Riley: *Sure* conditions. Release all political prisoners, no victimisation, of strikers, union recognition in the sugar industry –...

O'Riley: *Don't get sore, sir*, I didn't want to make you *sore* (p.57).

In the context in which the language is used above, given the period and the status of O'Riley's position, it can be stated that this does not belong to the Caribbean, but to the United States. These American slangs, *sure*, *sore*, *my old woman*, *see here*, did not enter Caribbean speech, amongst a certain official group, during this colonial period. Quite the opposite, the trade unionist utilised big words and a more British form of speaking in order to prove to his opponent that he was educated, intelligent, rational.

Trease also shows us that despite the presence of African Caribbeans in Britain in the 1930s, he was not so ‘universalistic’ as to discover them, or if so only on the peripheral level. But it is on the level of propaganda, that we are all one under the sun (a biological rather than a cultural or historical argument), that his liberalism and perhaps his own paternalism—that he was throwing in his lot with the ‘natives’ (whether they were emotional or not, at least they could be taught through the high standards of British colonialism, in the Fabian sense, to become rational and reasonable) — precludes an intuitive, productive understanding of the complexity of the problem.

This political naivete could well explain the cyclic nature of the dramatist’s vision where, at the end of the play, the butler, having returned from working all night to alleviate the destruction caused by the consequence of the governor’s orders for military ships to fire on the island, and invited by the female M.P. to have a cup of tea, is abruptly interrupted and commanded by the governor’s wife to wash up and prepare the breakfast. When he returns to his tea, she once again interrupts him to instruct him on what to prepare for her husband the governor. The cyclic nature of the colonial ruling power is seen therefore to perpetuate itself over its accommodating local population. In denying the workers the possibility of serious consideration and social amelioration, Trease maintains them in a position of oppression, thus extending the idea that revolt is almost inevitably destined to failure, that the African workers can at best anticipate the social reformism of colonialism. Terry Eagleton’s axiomatic encapsulation of the meaning of individuated selfhood is well lost on this paternalistic, ideologically static melodrama: *‘Nobody can live in perpetual deferment of their sense of selfhood, or free themselves from bondage without a strongly affirmative consciousness of who they are. Without such self-consciousness, one would not even know what one lacked’*⁵⁰ (emphasis added). This lesson was apparently learned neither by Trease nor his generation of political ideologues who were unable to appraise critically their paternalism and race bias before committing themselves to politically pro-

pounding ideas, that when expressed, dramatised enormous contradictions between ideology and practice, philosophy and reality.

In Trease's drama one sees the limits of the liberal, universalist imagination: it cannot move beyond the site of the European at the centre of things. In this way, it shares an aesthetic perspective with O'Neill and Hodge in which the African is central for political propaganda (to echo the *New Statesman's* critic): the inner dictates of the African's expectations, the demands of the historic situation in which he is living are not excavated, his fear for his and his children's future, etc., are all absent from the play. If any of these issues are raised, they are illuminated in terms of individual, paternalistic/maternalistic consciousness of an European, and as set, pre-determined configurations. The character's actions do not elicit sympathy but arouse feelings of indignation because he is not given to negotiating skills or reason. Such cardboard characterisations speak more of determinism than of creativity.

In this context it is worth examining the historical beginnings of a type of paternalism which we have seen in Western drama, the liberal, christian imagination at work in the racist caricature of the good 'negro' as exemplified in *Uncle Tom*.

UNCLE TOM'S CHILDREN

More than any other dramatic or fictional work, Harriet Beecher Stowe's novel, *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, and the countless pantomimic or minstrel-like stage presentations which followed has created the most lasting impression of the African as stereotype in the popular imagination. Africans have resented the safe typologising of uncle Tom as the creature that Euro-Americans tend to believe represents the heart of the bible-loving, all-forgiving, turning-the-other-cheek, docile African. James Baldwin has responded with an acute sense of outrage to give a penetrating interpretation of the meaning of this work for Africans:

Uncle Tom's Cabin is a very bad novel, having in its self-righteous sentimentality...the *ostentatious parading of excessive and spurious emotion, is the mark of dishonesty, the inability to feel; the wet eyes of the sentimentalist betrays his aversion to experience, his fear of life, his arid heart; and it is always, therefore the signal of secret and violent inhumanity, the mask of cruelty* ⁵¹ (emphasis added)...

The insight that this writer brings to an understanding of the popular minstrel icon unlocks an area of discourse and supplies a critique which goes beyond the mask of the work's obvious appeal and analyses the depths of the *intention* of the writer and her creation. This avoids any possibility that the sentimentality of the work might have any serious impact upon the imagination except those for whom tears are an excellent substitute for the ability to do nothing and not to pose the pertinent question, '...what was it, after all, that *moved* her people to such *deeds*?'⁵² The comments here are limited to the performances of an adaptation frequently presented on the London stage in the period under review, in the first third of this century, and not to the question posed above by Baldwin.

In a 1925 version, this time cast in the image of *Uncle Tom's Children* which is described as a play in seven scenes, the author's stage descriptions include 'niggers, children,' etc. And the opening scene has a rendition of a song, presumably to set the tone for the pantomime,

Massa Shelby's a berry good man, Ya! (seven times)
 We do him all the work we can
 Hurrah for Massa Shelby (three times)
 Oh shout you niggers do

The author then has stage directions to the effect of 'niggers laugh.' In the following pages the appeal to the sentimentalist and to the racist takes an interesting turn. George, described as a 'quadroon,' i.e., three-quarters European, is determined to be free; it is ironic that the dramatic imagination has placed this militation for freedom on the one person who most approximates the European, and whose articulation is also closest to the

European.

George, outraged by his condition as slave, asks of Eliza (described by the author as an octoroon, i.e., quadroon mixed with European, i.e., for all purposes, particularly in terms of features, an European), his wife, 'Who gave him [the master] the right to make me a beast of burden?' Their only son, George surmises, will eventually be sold. Eliza, having faith in the master, says, 'No, no, my master is too kind, too good.' But her husband shows her the palm of his hand which contains a red-hot iron brand with the letter H. George, conscious of the status of ex-captives in Canada, bids her goodbye, showing his pistols and his determination to resist capture. 'I shall not be taken. I shall be free or die' (*ms*,p.12).

This scene is followed by Topsy, the cushion for racist caricatures, who flings herself at the master, pleading for him to kiss her. 'You kiss me massa...You gib me blackberry jam or me gib you berry black eye Ya Ya' (*ms*. p.12). 'Kiss me on de red rubber ruby lips' (*ms*. p.15.). With the threat of violence, the master consents. This scene, in terms of the relations of power which strikes one at the core, seems to be conjured up by a mind predisposed to demonstrating that not only is slavery terrible, but the slaves themselves are. In this inverted vision, the slave/captive, and powerless female in an overtly patriarchal, christian society, becomes the instigator for sexual threat or violence. In truth, the master wielded his power in a ruthless and brutal manner in his undisguised desire for the slave women, used punishment, force, the bribe of privilege (lighter work in the house, etc.).⁵³

It is worth noting that the epithet "uncle Tom" is considered by African Americans a grave insult, signifying the willingness to do the master's bidding and to be bereft of self-consciousness or pride. This originated from the assignation of the qualities of the master's obedient servant/slave expressed in Mrs Beecher Stowe's characterisation of Uncle Tom. Here Tom is precisely that, even transferring his own humanity to that of the master, Shelby, who agrees to sell him off, and defending the master's ethical conduct, 'Massa's too good to do dat' (p.20). When Tom is asked what

he'll do when he's taken down to the river where 'dey kill nigger wid hard work and starvation and flogging' (p.21), he calmly answers that he accepts his fate as sacrificial victim.

In portraying Tom as beholden to some higher form of morality, Mrs Stowe also projects his inability to resist his condition, to affirm his own humanity. In denying Tom this right, she associates Tom with an illusory free will which Abraham displayed in the Bible to God in promising to sacrifice his only son. However, where God saves Abraham's son, Tom has no saviour in God. He goes to his new master in a drugged-like state, accepting his condition voluntarily unlike even the struggling lamb. This ignorance which Mrs Stowe assigns to Tom is a morality which, in her mind, places him beyond that of his enslavers. Such a play does not conscientise the slave-master, but strengthens his hand and escalates his contempt for his slave. This "morality" is a burden and maintains the slave as a non-entity, without identity, without consciousness, a blindly obedient slave.

In the final scene Tom is ordered to beat Eliza because she refuses to comply with the master's desire to sleep with her. Tom refuses and is himself flogged mercilessly by the master and then by an African in turn. After Tom has absorbed innumerable painful blows, the new slave master recognises in Tom the virtues of a committed christian and asks him whether he did not see that the Bible says that 'servants, obey your masters.' Tom is made to say that his 'soul is bought and paid for by one that is able to keep it, and you can't harm it' and pledges that he would give his blood to be taken if it would save the master's soul, and forgives the author of his blows.

In this pantomime is the contrast of the represented African woman as she-devil and whore (Topsy), in another the will to seek freedom from tyranny (George), in yet another the exhibition of the christian ethic of a slave (Tom). In Mrs Stowe's romantic imagination, the alternative for George to flee is relinquished by his return to claim his wife through the legacy left him by his former master, Shelby. Thus Shelby is finally exon-

erated from George's doubts of the former's humanity. In the new master's struggle with George over his right to claim his wife, the gun goes off killing him, thus making the slavemaster's "humanity" control and compromise George's possible revolutionary penchant for freedom.

But even in this resolution of the slavery conflict one sees the ritualistic necessity of the 'happy ending' which typified the bourgeois imagination of the nineteenth century. According to Eagleton and Pierce, 'For most of the nineteenth century it would appear to have been almost obligatory to end a novel happily. No matter what strife or tragedies have torn the novel somehow in the last couple of chapters the good are rewarded, the bad justly punished, the divisions healed.'⁵⁴ We might add the bad are justly punished on the stage or in the novel, but rarely in real life, for the divisions are far from healed as the images of the stereotype continue to have resonance and pleasure in the psyche of a craven audience. Any possible arousal of human sympathy is quickly dismissed by the overall picture which encapsulates and contains the African persona.

Through this pantomimic picture, we inevitably see the human element, i.e., the will to be free, but the play iridescently brings to the fore the 'jabbering' of Africans in a language full of comic satire and in which the English language is mutilated in such a way as to ventilate the stupidity of its articulators which in turn gives fright to the stereotype.⁵⁵ In this sentimentalising illustration of human effort, in which the dramatic element of sensationalised plantation life becomes the dominant and engaging tone/site of caricature and disdain, the inevitability of the fate of the represented characters and of the real-life people they attempt to reflect and animate, assures the audience the satisfaction of condescension, laughter, guilt and separability. *Those characters are so stupid they deserve their condition.* Fanon's adept oxygenising of ideas in the context of racism reinforces the necessity of contextualising these actions: 'Racism bloats and disfigures the face of the culture that practises it. Literature, the plastic arts, songs for shopgirls, proverbs, habits, patterns, whether they set out to attack it or vulgarise it, *restore racism*'⁵⁶ (emphasis added). Fanon's observations,

trained on the practices of European culture in which the representation of the African is controlled by the racism of its artists, fittingly describes the general context of the prurient function of a pantomime like *Uncle Tom*.

It is difficult to judge the efficacy of the staging in this pantomime, for the play is determined by certain conventions, namely the reinforcement of African ignorance through song, dance and performance. In this context, the dramatist engages the audience with a combination of sentimentality and stereotyped characters and limited options. In conforming to conventional representation, the play also attempts to create an illusion of morality, but it is a morality not demonstrated through the humanity of resistance, of physical combat, of self-identity, but of *reproduction*, i.e., the characters are encased in the vision of the playwright who reproduces in them the European perception of the meaning of morality which perpetuates their slave condition.

Uncle Tom is a nineteenth century invention which has meaning and relevance for this century and the next, and in keeping with locating the racist icons of the London stage, an examination of Sheldon's *Nigger* leads one to understand better the tradition which leaves no doubt as to the inimical sensibility that has apprehended the African subject as object of derision.

NIGGER

Produced in 1909 at the (Notting Hill) Coronet, Edward B. Sheldon's *Nigger* reflects the free hand of the dramatist as he portrays images of bestiality and of separability and oppression in a land where slavery was abolished less than half a century before. It is also a drama of recognition, i.e., that one comes to terms with one's mixed racial heritage. This drama is located in the southern United States and on a grand plantation with the 'big house,' which epitomises, usually, a connection with slavery. Apart from the racist caricature which appears to be endemic in the writing of most Europeans/Americans, this play has fascination for the reader in the areas of its focus: sexuality and political control of the African population. In this

particular context, one is developing the idea of the liberal as racist; the sexual implications will be addressed in the following chapter.

There are interesting paradoxes expressed in this play. The first appearance of difference is the traditional association of the African as being "shiftless, lazy," etc. Here even the Euro-American character refers to the fact that he '...slaved like a nigger t'make it pay mo!' (*ms.* p.13). One also sees the correspondence in language between the Euro- and African American – even in speech the proximity between the races is close yet the capacity to transcend the race separateness/speech closeness dichotomy is absent. In *Do the Right Thing*, a film by Spike Lee, the protagonist asks his Italian American employer's son, who consistently expresses his deep hatred of Africans, 'Who is your favourite musician, basketball player?' etc. In each answer his favourites were all African Americans. That this contradiction lies at the heart of the core ideological construct implied in racism escapes its purveyors.

It is in this ambience that we can frame the responses of Phil, the focus of this play, who maintains "good" relations with his African plantation workers. His cousin and main rival, Noyes, refers to him as 'Oh, Phil's wonderful with *all* his da'kies...Well, I reckon he thinks treatin' his niggers good brings up the total o' his cotton crop!...(p.5). One understands immediately that any liberalism which is seen to be exhibited by Phil Morrow is undermined by the profit motive. This can be compared with Marx's own views on the necessity for slavery for the progress of Euro-Americans, '...Without slavery, North America, the most progressive nation would be transformed into a patriarchal country. Only wipe North America off the map and you'll get *anarchy, the complete decay of trade and modern civilisation*. But to do away with slavery would be to wipe America off the map'⁵⁷ (emphasis added)...

In this play, Phil is the represented liberal voice, and here, in concordance with Karl Marx, we find equally weighty and racist views on the necessity of slavery (or modern forms of it) for the benefit and prosperity of the European. In this quote Marx is advocating that the pre-European culture

and civilisation which existed in relative stability *will/must* resort to anarchy in the absence of the European. This, of course, is to presume that anarchy was pre-existent in native American social formations.

Phil, whose own ancestry is dubious, condemns race mixing. It is interesting to examine this notion of race-mixing in the context of nationality—in pre-emigration Europe there was a heavy emphasis on national identity; in the USA, this national identity shifted from maintaining its separateness, merging with the acknowledgement of its pan-European ethnicities which, in the face of the native American and African, were separate and different. The separating factor was, of course, not so much the differences in colour and culture, but the *purpose* of emigration: not only the populating and settling of new lands because a large proportion of immigrants were transported servants of the criminalised working class,⁵⁸ victims of an imbalanced judicial process, but also because they were fleeing poverty, malnutrition and disease, and more importantly, in a ruthless pursuit and contest for the appropriation, not sharing, of lands.

Phil, the overlord and sheriff of the town, now runs for the governorship of the state, and is pitted against a rival, Senator Long, who is represented as a more progressive liberal, intending to enfranchise Africans and who is discussed in the opposition camp as hiring and dining with Africans. This news causes Phil no end of rage, 'And while I'm good to my niggahs...I don't think they ought to have the franchise and I won't treat 'em as equals' (p.72). Phil is also shown to harbour extreme antipathy to sexual liaisons, especially of the type between African and European. When the son of his maid confesses that he had raped a white woman, Phil screams with indignation, 'You black beast you —!' The rapist is arrested by Phil's men while the mob converges on the scene, captures and lynches him.

After Phil becomes governor, there is the introduction of African policemen and the disenfranchised registered to vote. The dramatist, however, does not state that all this is due to Phil's doing, but continuously points to Senator Long agitating for the education, enfranchising and hiring of Africans. Phil, however, fumes, 'Intelligent! But theah not! Theah lazy,

black beasts—theah's somethin' wrong with theah brains — all they got is a spinal cord!...The niggah's not a man, he's an animal — he's an African savage — all teeth and claws—it's monkey blood he's got in him' (Act 3, pp.8,9). Phil's rage, like the rage of all racists, is a disguise for his own insecurity and ambivalence. Fanon, writing on the psychological disposition of the coloniser in Algeria in the middle 1950s, characterises the internalisation of the symptoms of "insanity" which drove the French to continue executing orders which were at variance with their "humanity" (which, needless to say, they ignored):

In the course of the first quarter of 1956, cases of insanity among police agents became frequent.

The disturbances that they manifested in the home (threatening to kill their wives, inflicting severe injuries on their children, insomnia, nightmares, continual threats of suicide) and professional misconduct (coming to blows with colleagues, neglect of duty, lack of energy, disrespectful attitudes toward their superiors) often required medical attention...⁵⁹

Phil is thus internalising the contradictions he experiences, exacerbated by the knowledge of the controversy regarding his racial heritage. His attitudes are thus more grossly expressive of the racist because his rage and fury against Africans, internalised and repressed, are also directed at himself, thus he is unable to rationalise his extreme response to the granting of fundamental rights to Africans. Additionally, on a personal and professional level (from his position as master of the plantation in which he hires some 600 Africans) one recognises the image of the liberal. But this liberalism is subsumed by his antipathy to and fear of the racial connections he may have with the vilified African.

Sheldon scores the Victorian triumph by fitting an implausible ending to the drama: by imposing a moral obligation on Phil to recognise and acknowledge his mixed racial heritage, the playwright transforms Phil into a sympathetic character manipulated by the racial tensions and difficulties

of the South. In allowing the audience to see the good side of Phil, Sheldon assumes a moral victory for his drama.

Supported by Senator Long, after several attempts to persuade him, Phil signs the enfranchisement bill although threatened by his cousin with revelation of his past. He confesses his mixed race ancestry to his potential fiancée and, at a lavish dinner party of prominent citizens, announces this fact only to receive hearty cheers and a toast to him.

This cosy Victorian-type resolution of racial conflict, though set in the USA, shows the extent to which popular literature in dramatising the represented figures of caricature through the safety valve of sometimes repressed emotional disturbance, turns it onto characters on the stage who serve as circuit-breakers, absorbing the vituperative, asinine and unbridled expression of racist feelings in achieving a cathartic effect in a simulated fashion. This ending is absolutely unbelievable in view of the extent to which people of mixed heritage have been persecuted and expelled from the dominant European society once they have ceased "passing the colour line".

Levi Coffin exposed the case of a young man of colour who was once a slave and who worked for a conscionable man who, recognising his industriousness and intelligence, entrusted his wife and two daughters to his care while dying. In due course the young man and one of the daughters fell in love and were married, the mother and other daughter consenting unreservedly. 'On the evening of the wedding, the news spread through the city that a negro had married a white woman, and an infuriated mob filled the street in front of the house, and with hoots and yells proceeded to search for the man—*several shades lighter than some of themselves* — who dared to marry a white woman...Not finding him, the mob dragged the bride out of the house and rode her on a rail through the streets, as a demonstration of popular indignation'⁶⁰ (emphasis added). Not satisfied with this victory, the town continued its uproar and vindictiveness until they passed a law on clergymen and magistrates who performed such marriages; additionally, the family was preyed upon, by threats and persuasions, to petition for a

divorce.⁶¹

This story is not an isolated incident, as the tragic life of the mixed race twentieth century literary innovator, Jean Toomer, demonstrates. Toomer was of mixed African and European ancestry, the latter strain dominating his features. In the general response to his 'dark' complexion he claimed to be American. The option, of course, was for him to have claimed southern European ancestry, but Toomer battled with this stigma all his life. In spite of his pronouncements that '*I was an American, neither white nor black, rejecting these divisions, accepting all people as people...In my body were many bloods, some dark blood, all blended in the fire of six or more generations. I was, then, either a new type of man or the very oldest. In any case I was inescapably myself. My body was inescapably my body...*'⁶² he was still to deny his racial heritage when asked by a journal for biographical information, 'I answered to the effect that, as *I was not a Negro, I could not feature myself as one*'⁶³ (emphasis added).

Sheldon thus denies and escapes from the powerful resonances which race identification produced in the psyche of the victim. The mixed race victim denies, is castigated, hounded by mobs, mutilated or lynched, or disbarred from town. The dominant ethnic group thus enforces its code of rules not simply by imposition of law but also by unlawful and illegal means, employing every device to maintain prestige and power. The dramatist thus fails in his facile attempt at maintaining the liberal image of a just and forgiving society. But one can understand Sheldon's superficial resolution if one ignores the subject of race-mixing and postulate, instead, the idea of integration into a hegemonic social system. The end result of the play—Phil's integration into the highest echelons of power—is mediated by Sheldon's perception of the liberal, moral conscience of these high society people in their acceptance of Phil's mixed race ancestry. In another context, this idea was considered an abomination and possibly could result in murder.

If Sheldon were dramatising the reintegration into society of an individual opportunist, then one can frame this action in the context of the value-

system which created such an individual: 'Thus it can be argued that the dominant group seeks to impress its own brand of truth, virtue, and beauty on the larger society, to monopolize elite positions, and to require *adoption of its styles and values by those who wish to gain acceptance in that society*'⁶⁴ (emphasis added). The two acts – that of Phil's mixed-race ancestry and his signing the bill of enfranchisement for African participation in democracy – cannot be seen as committing Phil to the elite's acceptance. Yet Phil valued and desired acceptance more than anything else. The recourse to public admission of his heritage is compounded by his signing the act of enfranchisement. Yet the implausibility of Sheldon's moral ending escapes him completely. Sheldon thus pursues a path which has certainly not precipitated public endearment or embracement by elite classes in environments of admitted racial oppression and separateness.

Phil Morrow's reintegration into southern United States society signals a cyclic return to conventional power despite the much heralded triumph of "progression" over reaction. Comforted by his fiancée's and the elite's acceptance of him, Phil cannot but move to the convention which characterised his entire emotional and psychological development. This inevitable position can be compared with Theodore Parker, liberal Unitarian minister who wrote of the 'ethnologic idiosyncrasy' of the British to 'invade and conquer other lands; his haughty contempt of humbler tribes which leads him to subvert, enslave, kill, and exterminate ...', yet he could not help but confess, 'I look with pride on this Anglo-Saxon people. It has many faults, but I think it is the best specimen of mankind which has great power in the world.'⁶⁵ In other words, Phil, resonatingly portrayed as a racist in his relations with Africans (even the lynching of his prisoner while under his protection), is shown to have a simultaneous capacity for the vituperative and the emancipative. It was, however, revealed in the play that Phil's opportunistic political acts were mediated by the more "radical" presence of Senator Long – it was he who first introduced the issue on several occasions, but by the end of the play not only is Long removed from the action but Phil is promoted as wresting a great moral victory for the

South. Sheldon's drama used the safety valve of representing the African as vile through the mouthpiece of his principal characters, yet remained magnetised to the convention which could not entertain racial integration. True to his ideological and moral position, he could not tolerate the harshness of a plausible ending, thus inventing the acceptance by society of a man, who, upon confession of his identity, would not only have been humiliated but stripped of everything he earned. The fantasy ending, cozy and convenient, ignores the ramifications of the terror and absurdity which lay behind the experience of not only the unquestioned racially amalgamated, i.e., those who successfully merged into the European race, but that of the clearly mixed race. In avoiding such a painful and powerful confrontation, Sheldon escapes the responsibility of unmasking the hypocrisy and racism of Euro-America.

In the psyche of the ambivalent (here expressed by the playwright himself in the options he gives his characters) there are conflicting notions of integration and isolation: the latter implies giving up notions of privilege, status, power, while the former affirms maintenance and continuity of class position and the approbation derived from it. In spite of conflicting psychological directions, Phil Morrow opts for the choice which ensures societal acceptability and respectability. The other part of him—that which is hidden and the source of neurosis (pleasure and resentment)—has always represented the principle of hostility and rejection. By affirming his position of acceptability in southern society, he ensures continuity in a world in which there is enormous emotional and social investment. Like Jean Toomer, Morrow rejects his mixed race ancestry for the acceptance of "white" southern society.

The theme of the prospects of racial amalgamation, dynamically linked to the transformation of the African into an European through medical scientific means, appears to have powerful, evocative links with the fifteenth century preoccupation with contrasting ugliness with beauty, thus symbolically and realistically expressing blackness against whiteness.⁶⁶ This preoccupation took the form of masquing, i.e., projecting blackness through

dress and colouration, and in *The Black Ace* (discussed below) this notion is paraded in an updated version in the form of physical mutilation. Both Sheldon's play and *The Black Ace* are thematically affined in that the man of colour wants to be something other than himself. But we must note that this notion is an expression of the European mind, although it mirrors the effects of colonialism, its consciousness is not motivated by explication and healing but by representation and maintenance of notions of a superior Western civilisation.

THE BLACK ACE

In the final example of racism in early 20th century drama, we look at Dorothy Brandon's *The Black Ace* which was produced at the Queen's Theatre in 1929. In this drama we examine only briefly some of the implications of the author's ventilation of dominant racist characterisations which abound in the play. The preoccupation with particular qualities peculiar to an ethnic group is certainly not new idea. Aristotle was probably the first in European history to propound the idea of the intrinsic virtues of the Greeks as against all others. It was most probably from him, since he was the first to commit this to writing, that later generations of xenophobes, ethnocentrists and racists derived and propounded this concept:

The races that live in cold regions and those of Europe are full of courage and passion but somewhat lacking in skill and brainpower; for this reason, while remaining generally independent, they lack political cohesion and the ability to rule others. On the other hand, the Asiatic races have both brains and skill but are lacking in courage and will power; so they have remained both enslaved and subject. The Hellenic race, occupying a mid position geographically, has a measure of both. Hence it has continued to be free, to have the best political institutions and to be capable of ruling others given a single constitution.⁶⁷

It is important to note that in Aristotle there is no mention of Africans, not

because he did not meet them but because, as a result of the encounter with the Africans of ancient Egypt in particular, he had a completely different view of both them and their civilisation.⁶⁸ And here he says quite plainly that the Europeans of the 'cold' regions lacked brain power and skill. Even the now racially assailed Asian was ranked higher than the "cold" European in mental capacity. This notion was returned to in the 14th century by Ibn Khaldun⁶⁹ who went beyond Aristotle and spoke in ambivalent terms about the African: at once reporting on popular notions of his bestiality and inferiority, and on the other extolling him. This dialogue reached its apex of respectability in pseudo-scientific circles in the 19th century with concepts of eugenics which were originally conceived in relation to plant biology and later transferred to the human species.⁷⁰

In Brandon's early 20th century drama, the prospects of Khaldun's theories and that of the eugenicists become a germinating idea. In Prof. Renard's laboratory in a French penal colony in Africa, he is conducting experiments with a serum derived from *elephants* which carried a disease which turned them, and in turn Asians, white. Prof. Renard then chooses an African to whom he explains the power and danger of his serum:

Prof. Renard: [After explaining that if the serum does not work it will bring death but if it succeeds] ...you will be white...

22: [The African] If I live I will be...

Renard: White!

Bonalie: [Renard's assistant]: White!

22: Wh..(He cannot pronounce the word - shudders) Not possible (p.4)!

Brandon then makes the following authorial remarks, "...a Negro Boy with *blubba* features and wooly hair, but – white as bread" (p.5).

Prof. Renard, satisfied with his experiment, says of his patient, 'He has the lithe and sinewy strength of the panther; the endurance, the vitality of the negro. He has the wit, sagacity, resource and brain power of a European'

(*ms*, p.1). Brandon herself describes him as "tall and European featured, magnificent fellow...Unafraid, defiant as a captive *beast*" (p.12, emphasis added). *He* turns out, in his own words, to be a Freeborn American citizen and a nigger! Damn fine education...college graduate...Yes sir...but a nigger...qualified lawyer – me a nigger!" In his response to the dominant power which has circumscribed his aspirations, he expresses a wish to be "white," which receives a sympathetic hearing from the professor who offers him a serum which can fulfill his dreams. Renard expresses all the usual diatribes of the racist in spite of his ambivalence, for example, 'I think there is something in their [the African's] coward blood, their stupid skulls, something that is not there – to fight to live' (p.5). If one interprets this as meaning the African has no will to live, then the fact of his physical persistence in spite of the cruellest nightmare of slavery, does testify to some ability to understand the need of survival. Needless to say, because Euro-American power resorts both to the constitution, to law, and the systemic of racism institutionally to maintain the African in a position of oppression which reinforces the irrationality of racism as an emotional belief system against logical arguments which illuminate the purpose of propaganda, this crucial point escapes the racist.

When the action is transferred from a French penal colony on the African continent to the southern United States, there is much humour about the African. In response to the judge's remark about appreciation for the African, his recently acquired friend, Randolph Calthorpe says, 'They're unfamiliar.' To which Tony, a friend, replies, 'I *like* having darkies all about.' To which Calthorpe rejoins, 'Gives it a lot of flavour, like currents in a cake' (pp.19-20) and then they continue joking about Africans. The judge's inner feelings about all Africans: 'Blacks, near whites...high yellors...They're just niggers and if they forget...we string 'em up' (p.20) are in contradistinction to his own reserved racism, after a visit by the Ku Klux Klan, when he speculates about these hatreds being imported into America: 'They've called out a crusade against the negroes, Jews and Roman Catholics' (p.34). And these were imported from Russia, Rome,

etc. In assigning hatreds to an imported ideology, the judge is obviously exonerating his conscience and that of the USA's from responsibility. This can be compared to the position of liberal academics like G. Myrdal who ascribed hate groups to abnormal behaviour or to psychically sick people. 'What,' write Ringer and Lawless, 'Myrdal and these scholars failed to realise is that these racial beliefs were more than by-products of white man's baser nature. They were imprinted into the very founding of colonial America and became part of a distinctive legal-normative code that sanctified domination and discrimination of black and later of other racial minorities by the white. The code was legitimated by the writing of the Constitution and later reaffirmed after a brief suspension during the first period of Reconstruction by the Supreme Court as law of the land.'⁷¹ It is no wonder therefore that the judge can go on making racist statements about the African without recognising that he is a vector and victim of duality and self-duplicity, i.e., within the legal framework of the Constitution which defined the African as two-fifths human, he is a social victim of his understanding of the human family. And on the other, as a human being he has the free will to decide for himself his position on racism. This free will is not acted upon independently, thus perpetuating his connection to the racist ideology of which he is a part. By assigning civil action to foreign ideology, the judge confuses himself into believing that African humanity should be satisfied with its condition of oppression.

In ascribing cowardice to the African servants, Brandon seems to be reverting to the old idea of Africans being predisposed to slavery: [In the stage directions, Brandon writes] 'Mammie and Charlie [two African servants] fling themselves at the Colonel's feet. Caesar stands shivering and staring, trying to control himself' (Scene 2, p.57). In the context of ancestral blood, i.e., the power of the blood containing all the qualities of immutable inheritance, Randolph (the former 22), the passing-for-white victim of the serum that transforms blacks into white, is confronted with the choice of being imminently discovered or revealing his true identity. He chooses the latter and there is an immediate reversal to type. Here

Brandon portrays Randolph as a violent man in the context of equalising violence with beastliness – the hidden African in the European's skin, is shown by Brandon to be truly revealed. His words become incoherent and disjointed,

Randolph: Neither black nor white will own me...No one but the Ku Klux Klan claim me... I'm in the world alone... as lonely as the Black Ace on its card (p.28).

Brandon thus reduces the drama to pathos. Randolph, symbol of all Africans, secretly longs to pass the threshold of "blackness" and claim not only a "white" skin but a "white" soul. For this, Brandon characterises him as courting loneliness because there are no compromises along the colour line, no mixed races are entertained. Randolph's exposure as a black man beneath the facade of white skin celebrates the triumph of the conservative and racist elements represented by the Judge and his friends who would rather murder their daughter than see her romantically connected to an African. There are more violent sexual images in this play, but these will be dealt with in the following chapter.

Randolph, upon discovery and reverting to a predetermined type, breaks into a 'Negro' spiritual, "Swing low, sweet chariot," joined by the chorus of African servants (here the author gives stage directions, 'All niggers...'). When he departs the chorus intones 'brother... Brudder!... Brudder!... Brudder!' (last scene, p.32). Randolph, in imposing himself on European society, ironises and caricatures himself by ridiculing and distancing himself from group identity, and becomes, in every manifestation, a socially dying person: by being handed over to the European *Other*, Brandon shows him as reverting to type, thus dying in his culture, identity, and passion. But this appears to be the price he has to pay for this psychologically and physically deracinated mutation.

The pathos continues with the European female doing the decent thing by shooting at the leader of his pursuers (the Klan leader), giving Randolph

time to escape, after which the chorus of voices intone, 'I got wings/You got wings/All God's chilluns got wings.' This seems to parallel (and at the same time recalls Eugene O'Neill's play, *All God's Chilluns Got Wings*) a call and response pattern that 'Negroes' are well known for in their music, for Randolph Calthorpe (the veritable Black Ace), is heard (according to Brandon's directions) 'coughing, gasping, crawling on the rocks...croaks a shout across the water.'

'Ah got wings/You'll hear of me!'

The comparison between Brandon as imitator and O'Neill as prototype is obvious in the portrayals of the violence, cowardice, vile language, the reversion to a vulgar, represented type in which African humanity is characterised and contained. What is even more obvious in both dramatists is the vile and violent language that the African characters are forced to revert to: this encourages and generates the notion that Western civilisation can never be bestowed upon the beastly African, that in the end he will inevitably, unalterably revert to type. Thus the assignation of particular and prescribed uncivilised qualities are permanently encoded in the represented characteristics the African is supposed, at bottom, to possess.

The merits of this play, like all the others under review, are not contested in terms of aesthetic standards, or the value of the narrative, or the construction of the drama, but solely from the perspective of the racist imagination which images reality different from some dispassionate records of history, and we note that as racist as these plays may be, they nevertheless demand a comparative investigation of history. Whether the political orientation of the dramatist is regarded as left, right or liberal, it has been demonstrated, not only from the form and content of the drama itself but from the stage directions and descriptions of the dramatists that they were inescapably racist in their attitudes. What may be suggested as a possible explanation for racist remarks from the dramatists is that the language was normative to the period, but this may well have been reinforced by the

position of the African as slave, as represented icon of lazy, shiftless, uneducated, *beast*. But these are social *constructs*, devised and operated by a system clearly cognisant of its meaning and implications.

Racist stereotyping is therefore only understood from the political function of stereotypes in a society in which prestige and power are vigorously and at times brutally defended against a significant percentage of its population. The site of these constructs lies historically in the populating and settling of other lands; once the operational mechanism receives legitimation through the hegemonic role of the oppressors, it is difficult not to imagine popular notions of roles, functions and place in society of the oppressed as permanently subjected to the unbalanced rules, legalities, and political coercion of the colonists.

In *Emperor Jones*, O'Neill pursues the image of the African ex-convict assuming kingly status in a Caribbean island, clearly evocative of historical Haiti. He assigns qualities of brutality and vindictiveness to the person of Brutus Jones. In his *The Hairy Ape*, Yank becomes the metaphor for the assailed African as savage. In Herbert Hodge's *Cannibal Carnival*, although a presumed socialist drama with clearly portrayed symbolisms of exploitation and colonialism, the essential quality of the African is characterised as content in his original savagery. In *Colony*, Trease, expressive of the liberal imagination, sets out to represent the notion that class struggle transcends and supersedes race, but in the end reinforces the standard of European intellectuals as the mediating hand of reason in precipitating compromised changes in a dependent colony. No attempt was made to document the role of the rebelling colonised as authors of their own social freedom. In all the other plays under scrutiny in this chapter the dominant European view of the African is what becomes central to the portrayal of Africans themselves. Not a single playwright has attempted to centralise the issues surrounding oppression and colonialism within the context of the African character in intelligent discourse. What they have all reverted to are issues central to European feeling and perception of Africa. In this sense, these plays collectively represent a monologic preoccupation with

the generation of clichés and the accepted standards of traditional representation of the African in the fixed condition of savage.

In the following chapter, the specific applicability of an oppressive systemic is juxtaposed in relation to the position and role of colonised female sexuality in the service of racists.

CHAPTER 5

THE AFRICAN CONTINENTAL & NEW WORLD WOMAN: THE EURO-AMERICAN IMAGINED SEXUAL TERROR & OBJECT

The theory here projected, follows that of Lorrimer's¹ – that the excesses of European colonialism abroad do not commence with the conquest of the 'savage', of the 'uncivilised' person of colour, but emanate in the interior of the social fabric which produced such external manifestations. Therefore the position of the African woman vis-a-vis the patriarchal European male can be compared with that of the British woman whose life, at the turn of the century, though supposedly being modified by the demands of the suffragettes, nevertheless unmistakably demonstrates the extent to which her value was perceived as unimportant, existing only to serve the demands of male domination and exploitation. In a survey of three towns in England in which eighty-two females were questioned in relation to job occupancy, two became teachers '(one as a pupil-teacher, one untrained), six clerks or secretaries (one with training), six tailoresses or dressmakers...and two confectioners. Of the rest...all did three jobs: they became domestic servants, shop assistants or factory workers (almost inevitably in textiles).'² Within the context of

male domination and the Christian belief in virtue, Elizabeth Roberts shows that a pregnant girl walking to church to be married was stoned by the women.³ Roberts gives another example of a pregnant girl being horse-whipped by her father for contracting an unmarried pregnancy.⁴ In the former example, the question can be raised of the legitimacy of the notion of male domination when women perpetrated the act of violence against their own gender. The answer lies in the psychoanalytic concept of reproduction: that male domination reproduces in the mentality of the female similar traits of resentment and violence. The object, once submitted to prolonged subjugation and oppression, inevitably reproduces the emotions of oppression.⁵ This can be linked to female excision in the predominantly Muslim world where mothers, consciously aware of the horrors of excision, themselves execute tremendous vigilance in enforcing it on their daughters, despite the objections of some men.⁶

The European adventure in Africa took a similar form, combining the perceived social position of women with the dimension of racial differentiation.⁷ An examination of a group of plays in the following pages centralises the theory and notion of the essentially African female in the context of European patriarchal attitudes to sexuality and race, dramatising the perception of the essential sexuality of the African woman and the complex weight of feelings that her presence generates not only in the European male, but in the European female. Within this examination, the comparative position of the European female at home, already briefly sketched out above, should be held in view in understanding the mentality of the men vis-a-vis their own social context, i.e., as products of a social systemic which normalises such behaviour. Sociologist Calvin Hernton establishes the model of conquest and domination in terms of male sexual rights over women, and in the context of his research, the added phenomenon of European racism in itself enhances power and privilege:

History teaches that women are always included among the spoils of conquest and domination. Everywhere, when the invading tribe or

nation conquers another people, the dominating group invariably takes free liberties with females of the subjugated group. In the case of the white racists and the American Negro, there is something much deeper than mere conquest and subjugation. Sexual paranoia is an inextricable ingredient in that psychiatric terror known as racism. And this fear, this guilt and terror, in various forms, is directed towards and acted out against *both* sexes of the Negro population.⁷

Although Hernton correctly locates the nature of psychological pathology in the behaviour of the Euro-American male via the African American female, the tension should now shift on the nature of the relationship between the European male and female which inevitably unleashes not the dichotomy, but the parallel of oppressive behaviour. Both rape and incest are now considered to be endemic and traditional features of patriarchal societies. Psychological motivation in the act of rape, oppression and violence are not distinguishable on the level of the victim – who experiences it only as pain.

NIGGER

Nigger, written by Edward B. Sheldon, was first produced at the Coronet (now a cinema) in 1909. Although set in the southern United States, it relates to other plays written by Europeans set in Africa, and resembles them in a primary way: the African woman is portrayed as temptress and as victim of the European male's sexual rights as master. The character Jinny ('an ancient quadroon woman, tall gaunt, neatly dressed,' Sheldon's description), presents a problem to Phil's (the plantation owner and sheriff) friends:

Noyes: ...Phil's mighty good to her, ain't he?

Georgie: He adores her – goes down to her cabin and talks to her all the time! I believe she has a grandson who gives her a lot of trouble. Oh, Phil's wonderful with all his da'kies (p.5).

The insinuation that Phil, reputed to have under his employ 600 African Americans in post-Emancipation America, not only has a special relationship with all his African employees, but a peculiarly questionable penchant for the company of Jinny, tells us there is an undertone of darkness lurking beneath the surface. This mystery may be understood in general – and explains the snickering of the men – if Hernton's probing of a contemporary situation (the 1960s) is correct in lifting the lid off this Pandora's box of intrigues: referring to the Euro-American male's boast that his father's African servant held as much power in the home as he ("Why, she was just like one of the family," he declared, gesturing. "In fact, she ruled the house. She told my mother what to do—and, good Lord, I've seen her and my father stand up and argue for hours. And not once did I ever hear my father call her a nigger, or treat her with disrespect in any way..."); Hernton countered that his father must have been intimate with her. "Why, yes," he said, matter of factly. And then, as if he could not stop his tongue, added, "*And when I grew up I had her too*"⁸ (emphasis added). On one level this repressed urge on the son's part to possess the mother figure can be linked to the oedipus complex, but on another, phenomenological level, it crystallises power relations in the execution of possession. If the female were European, the urge, apart from the exceptional circumstance, would have been repressed; but placed in a position where absolute power has the privilege of possession or dispossession, the characterological display of normality in social relations is unhesitatingly manifested, i.e., the Euro-American's normality is power/oppressor while that of the African woman is powerlessness/oppressed.

Jinny, therefore, in the minds of Phil's friends, possesses a privileged position only because she houses some well-preserved family secrets relating to forbidden or chastising sexuality. The revelation was later made that the nature of Noyes' and Phil's dispute related to their grandfathers (both brothers-in-law) who had fought and fell out over an African woman (Noyes: She was a nigger woman (p.8)). This relates concretely to Hernton's previous statement where he claimed that women were conceived as the spoils of

war; in this context, the spoils of slavery. Slavery denoted powerlessness, and although there were levels of resistance, the appearance of mixed-race offspring certainly told the story of the fate of the African woman. Although Adler attempted to explain the phenomenon of violent aggression in males, his exposition lacks a socio-political perspective:

Every form of inner compulsion in normal, and neurotic individuals may be derived from the attempt at a masculine protest. Where it succeeds, it naturally strengthens the masculine tendencies enormously; posits for itself the highest and often unattainable goals; develops a craving for satisfaction and triumph; intensifies all abilities and egotistical drives; increases envy, avarice, and ambition; and brings about an inner restlessness that makes any external compulsion, lack of satisfaction, disparagement, and injury unbearable. Defiance, vengeance, and resentment are its steady accompaniments...⁹

Such forceful drives characterise the neurotic who, like Fanon's French *colons* in Algeria, despite the rapacious, vicious, and tortuous modes of their practices, haunted and perplexed them into insanity. The question of power in its naked and shocking display of corruption, shows that dehumanisation of the object inevitably defines the prison of dehumanisation of the subject. Here, therefore, the double dehumanisation of the woman and the African exposes the fundamental alienation which characterises European colonialism.

Phil and Noyes, contending cousins from an historical antagonism, are also contenders for the affection of an Euro-American woman.

Noyes: ...You nevah told her 'bout me an' that mullata gal, did you?

Phil: That's hardly the thing I would mention to a lady, Cliff.

Phil: ...I've told you if you did that so't o' thing no white woman would touch you with a ten ya'd pole!

Noyes: (Savagely) Gettin' pa'ticular, are they? Well, they didn't seem t'mind back theath when the yallah gals lived under the same roof with 'em.

Phil: They do now, though. All of us mind—or ought to. By God, Cliff, it's a crime—it's demo'alizin' the South! Things have changed since the wah, an' if we want to keep our blood clean, we've got to know that *white's white* an' *black's black*—an' mixin' em's damnation! (p.17.)

Noyes: She did the trick as easy as *I'd kick a niggah downstairs* (p.14, emphasis added). ...You nevah told her 'bout me an' that mulatto gal, did you?

[Noyes taunts Phil about the possibility of his grandfather having children with A black woman.]

Noyes: Haven't discovered any dark relations anywhere about, hav' you, Phil?

Ridley, writing on this phenomenon of mixed relationships in the fiction of European writers, says:

The subconscious fears were again expressed clearly in the universal condemnation which mixed marriage and inter-racial sexual liaison received at the hands of German novelists, both the men and the women. While all the writers condemned such liaisons, the reasons given for the condemnation varied somewhat according to the sex of the author. The women writers insisted on the morally degrading aspects of these relationships and portrayed the African woman as depraved, prey to uncontrolled and insatiable sexual appetite. The encounter of German and African women is always presented as a challenge to European moral standards...¹⁰

Analysed on the conscious, surface level, this explanation may sound appealing and adequate. Subjecting the rationale behind the writer's external outrage, however, introduces the need to examine the spectrum of sub-

conscious drives: motivation, childhood repressions, parental sexual longing, perverse expressions of internalised, uncontrollable psychological disturbance. Such are the considerations apparent in the character portrayals in Sheldon's drama. The possession of a beautiful African woman, subsequently forcing her to leave her child and place of abode by selling her to another part of the South to protect the sexual indiscretions of an European, such is the sub-plot which runs intermittently throughout this play. Both Noyes' and Phil's grandfathers loved and fought over Jinny's sister. The sister bore a child for Phil's grandfather who kept the child (under Jinny's care) but forced the woman to be sold to Mobile, Alabama, in order for him to maintain his property in the European side of the family since he had no heir (Scene 1).

As pointed out in the previous chapter, Phil's self-hatred and racism instantly disappear upon public acknowledgement of his mixed ancestry. Such illusory, romantic inventions characterise and indicate the extent to which rational solutions could not have been contemplated within the framework of the overtly lynching climate of the ante-bellum South. In such a climate, the possession, control and penetration of the African woman, presented in varied forms of sexual threats and dementia, inform the reader of the enormous contradictions which defined and encapsulated her fate. These features are contained in the following play, which also exhibits the status and position of the European female in juxtaposition to the African woman.

A WHITE WOMAN

Written by Edward Conway, *A White Woman* had its first production in 1928. Set in Africa, the play brings to the fore a certain kind of topicality which appeared to be peculiar to the period. Miami, a sensual coloured African woman, is seen walking towards an area peopled by Europeans, and is accosted by Doc who demands to know what she is doing there, while strenuously holding on to her wrist (Scene 1, p.2). Immediately, we

see that Miami is not the cowering type of the European creative imagination, but outspoken and bold. She refers to him as a 'Beast White Man.' At this, Doc threatens to '...tear what little covering you have over you, off your back, and make you walk across the Island, Naked, savvy!' (p.2). Soon after, this same seemingly obstreperous Doc, ruminates to himself, saying, '...it's got to be put a stop to...' yet simultaneously wondering about Miami's beauty. This contradiction, this explosive psychologically divisive force of condemnation and affirmation has its anchor in real life, as we learn from Calvin Hernton: 'The same man told me how he had wanted to kiss a beautiful Negro girl, but that he was repelled and attracted at the same time. He ran away with mixed emotions.'¹¹ Attraction and repulsion are not characteristics of the well-adjusted, rather the quality of these emotions expresses a psychologically malanchored human being. At the base of every symptom or psychological disorder there is a rational explanation. Here Hernton hints at the rationale behind the pathology, 'Because the white man has created such a mammoth sex fantasy out of the Negro, the mere presence of a Negro in white company serves as a sex stimulant to whites...To most white people, the Negro *exhumes* sexuality. The racist is so full of fear, so twisted sexually, that even a young boy like Emmett Till was murdered and mutilated for speaking to a white woman in a department store.'¹² Hernton's clinical accuracy is also reflected and confirmed in Fanon's findings among the French *colons* of Aleria who imaged the Algerian woman in a particular erotic fantasist manner which defined the neurotic.¹³ And Freud, though unaware of the role of racism as a sexual stimulus amongst Europeans, nevertheless examined the concept of *ambivalence* as it relates to abnormal sexual behaviour: 'The predominance in it of *sadism* and the cloacal part played by the *anal zone* give it a quite peculiarly archaic colouring. It is further characterised by the fact that in it the *opposing pairs of instincts* are developed to an approximately equal extent...' (emphasis added).¹⁴

Thus the conflicting emotions of attraction and repulsion which entrap the racist, producing virulent, violent condemnation, express the neurotic

stirrings of sexuality. Such is the conditioning in colonising societies which impel affective emotional growth from childhood that the inevitability of sensual emotions are converted into perversity because they cannot be cultivated to express affection and love, innate feelings in all humans.

Pursuing the fabricated imaging of the African woman as having an unquenchable thirst for European males, Conway has Miami pursue Marlow and swears she was not returning to her people and that '...me like white man' (p.15). Conway then has Miami throw a sexual glance at Gunther, an European who hates all women (after being rebuffed on his wedding day), but hates African women even more so, and follows this with an attempt to kiss him. Gunther then threatens her to '...crush the life out of you,' grabs her by the throat, throws her to the floor and then boasts he's been celibate for three and a half years: 'Do you think I will let you make a wreck of me?...A white woman fooled me once, but a coloured woman will never do the same' (p.16).

Hernton explains the African woman's dependency on the European male on the level of extracting money from him to alleviate her dire social circumstances, as well as revenge in precipitating his "fall" from his ivory tower of race and class discrimination.¹⁵ There is also the private admission by the European that the African woman is capable of releasing him 'better than any white woman but also who can release him from whatever complexes that may be repressing his sexuality.'¹⁶

Contrastingly, there is in English literature the dichotomy of the working class woman depicted as lewd, sensual, immoral and as prostitute. Eagleton & Pierce show the classist perspective of George Eliot portraying the working class female protagonist,

George Eliot shows Hetty to be young and vulnerable and impressionable, but she also shows her to be morally flawed; Hetty's vanity and love of luxury are just the characteristics which Acton saw as contributing to *prostitution*. But in a more manipulative way George Eliot places in Hetty a *meanness of spirit* which restricts the *sympathy* of the reader (emphasis added).¹⁷

The relationship between the attitude, worldview, and prejudice of the playwright Conway and the female novelist George Eliot clearly demonstrates that a shared ideological position is operational. This worldview is grounded in the defence of sexism and racism, in which the patriarchal figure dominates the context and the structure of how we should view women. This restrictive and limiting view operates in a similar way in Conway's portrayal of African women. Thus although Eliot writes of the working class prostitute and Conway of the African woman, they both are seen to be operating through a systematised, ideological way of looking at the world.

Some explication is needed, beyond comparative historical examples, in order to understand better the representation offered by the author of his female African character. Miami is firstly established as a woman of colour, i.e., she is of mixed African/European ancestry and although she is portrayed as a sexual temptress, the audience's supposed tolerance of her in this role of intimacy with several Europeans is precisely represented by Conway to exhibit her as partly European. This latter fact alone tempers her representation as a sexual character on stage. On the other hand, the power of her African strain dominates in her sexual libido, thus simultaneously rendering her as attraction and repulsion. This theatrical device of artificially cementing the audience's identification with her is also utilised to separate her. The audience, presumably, identifies with her European side through her unmistakably portrayed beauty, but this repels and attracts because of her assumed debased African sexuality.

This mixed and confused reaction may also suggest an identification with sado-masochism which is a result of brutal repression of notional emotional, sexual feelings, which, when they express themselves, convert into perversion. The element of violence in either stimulating or hindering sexual expression is also current in the relationship. Freud summarises this aptly:

In ordinary speech the connotation of sadism oscillates between, on

the one hand, cases merely characterised by an active or *violent attitude to the sexual object*, and, on the other hand, cases in which satisfaction is entirely conditional on *the humiliation and maltreatment of the object*. Strictly speaking, it is only this last extreme instance which deserves to be described as *perverse*.¹⁸ (emphasis added).

Miami's aggressiveness towards European men is conveniently framed by Conway to dramatise the fact that the European male is emotionally tempted in an African environment devoid of morality and ethics and Christian European females. Yet, ironically, it is this sexual licence that he had gravitated to in the first place. Here one can read into the subconscious symbols of Christianity in relation to the play: the female as temptress (Eve) and the male as victim (Adam). Christianity is thus the provider of moral restraint and repression, and "pagan" Africa representative of lustfulness, lasciviousness, aberrant sexualness freed of guilt. This is a constant thread that runs through several of the plays under review here: the acceptability of female licentiousness coupled with aggressive repulsion; the polar opposites of the struggle between good and evil, sin and punishment.

Conway rationalises these options by offering a simple solution, that of Christianity itself, to accept that one has sinned but to remain separate from the act of commitment to love and simultaneously to repress violently the symbol of engagement, the pleasure principle, and satiation.

The issue of physical violence against the African woman is further proclaimed in the play. The following scene appears to have been censored by the Lord Chamberlain's office as red lines run through specific areas of the manuscript: despite Gunther's virulent rejection of Miami, the latter embraces him, he strikes her then appeals for her forgiveness, feeling remorseful for having struck a female; she puts her arms around him and they embrace. It is significant, however, that at the moment of capitulation, the Lord Chamberlain's office thought it necessary to excise the scene. Although this is logical within the context of the LC's function which was primarily aimed at swearing and the (mis)use of references to God, it was

also used in relation to maintaining moral standards and racial separability. Thus in this case, the embrace between two consenting people may have been construed as corrupting the morality of adults (the audience). This could only have been so because of the taboo nature of inter-racial expressions of emotion: in order to maintain the illusion of the higher and lower races, it should not be revealed that affection could be shown, and confused affection at that.

More important is the playwright's perception of Miami – she who was rejected and physically abused, feels compelled to overwhelm her adversary with love and affection. Some analysis is needed to explicate Conway's vision. Miami first pursues Marlow, then when this is thwarted, turns her attention to Gunther. The conclusion is obvious that Miami, who is made to confess her love for 'white men,' is intent on capturing any European because, as Conway puts the words in her mouth, '...me like white man.' Thus Miami fulfils the imaginative fiction of the European that the African female would feel no compunction in resorting to any ploy to win over the European male.

This is borne out in Scene Two where Miami is shown to be terminating her relationship with Marlow because he did not fulfil his promise of giving her gold bangles and other gifts. Gunther, removing Marlow from the scene, can then scornfully throw some jewellery to the floor: 'There are the little presents I promised you. I at any rate pay my debt...Scat, *I'll send for you when I want you*' (p.20, emphasis added). Conway enacts his predilection for demonstrating masculine power and control over a female, in this instance, an African woman. This vision of representation has its corollary in Abel Hugo's (brother of the famous Victor) interpretation of female "subservience" in the French rural area of Mayenne:

...women are held there in an inferior position which very often renders their condition very wretched indeed. The wife of a master farmer did not think it right to give orders to the young working men, nor even to her sons when they were no longer children...Thus in every aspect of daily life, women are in a subordinate position; during meals they never

sit down with the men...¹⁹

Martine Segalen, however, disputes this portrayal as more about the 'folklorist's own ideology than...about peasant behaviour...Hugo copied memoirs or questioned local notables whose observations were deeply coloured by ethnocentrism...'²⁰ while elsewhere she writes, 'What the folklorist sees as a sign of hierarchy is only the physical impossibility of the women being able to eat, at the same time as the men, the meal which they also have to cook and serve. In the same way, on everyday occasions, the fact that meals had to be served hot and on time meant that the woman could not eat them until she had fed the workers coming in from the fields.'²¹ Thus what is significant in analysis and interpretation, according to Segalen's model, is the presence of ideology, in this instance, bourgeois ideology which permeates the psychological processes and presents any semblance of truth and balance from emerging. This perspective does suggest, therefore, that it is Conway's fabrication of the character Miami that is seriously in question, given his position as a member of the bourgeoisie and his male view of female personality and sexuality.

Gunther, now befriending a shipwrecked European female, takes her on a stroll around the island and behaves in a perfectly gentlemanly way toward her. When, however, Miami returns to embrace him, he pushes her away, cursing her, 'Get back into the bush you coloured trash, where you belong, I'm through with you' (p.35). Marlow, entering the scene, is offered Miami by Gunther, thrusting her toward him. As she attempts to separate the two from fighting, Gunther slaps her on the face. Hernton explains the brutal behaviour of the European male vis-vis the African woman in terms of slavery, the process of dehumanisation that he unleashed upon her.²² The European woman, shocked by Gunther's violence, later converses with him about the incident:

Woman: I saw you strike a woman.

Gunther: A native woman.

Woman: Nevertheless a woman.

Gunther: Natives must be made to obey me.

Woman: Do you usually strike people to make them obey you?

Gunther: *If it is necessary, yes.*

Woman: Including women?

Gunther: Including women (p.41, emphasis added)...

Woman: I have no respect for a man that strikes a woman.

Gunther: ...you will do well to remember that my word is law,

Woman: And if I choose not to remember that. I suppose you will beat me into submission as you did that native woman (p.42).

Gunther then orders her to help the cockney Knobbs with the cooking and to eat with them instead of in her room. He also commands her to earn her keep like all the others. It is significant that Gunther here takes on the role and mantle of colonialist and patriarch over the female and the cockney, working class Knobbs. This feature of feeling incapable of transcending one's social circumstances, Eagleton and Pierce say, expresses the bourgeois conception of the working class '...trapped by a determinist philosophy, by having no power to transcend or transform these limitations.'²³ This limited vision is thus not confined to the African woman, but to the European female and the working class in the fiction and drama of not only the nineteenth century but well into the twentieth century.

This model of exploitation of the female gender was not simply the workings of the outcast, the pariah, the rejected European unable to compete at home in a highly class structured society, but reflected the philosophy and ideology of patriarchy which embraced males in the highest echelons of European society, as Hugh Trevor-Roper stated, 'Indeed, the tenth century popes have caused some embarrassment to devout historians who have to record that the papal crown was bestowed by or upon the successive lovers

of one accomplished Roman courtesan and the successive descendants of another...and that the gallantries of one of them...deterred the female pilgrim from visiting the tomb of St Peter lest, in the devout act, they should be violated by his successor.'²⁴

The exploitation of the African female is accompanied by a sexual and violent licence which derives its authenticity from the separating, dividing ideology of colonialism itself. Miami's character, it should be emphasised, was imaged and represented by an European male who in turn was writing for a particular audience which had some exotic and perverse expectations of what was to be derived from a play set in Africa.

This question of colonialism and its tendencies in Africa can be clearly borne out by the writings of a late nineteenth century writer. What is important to recognise is that while colonialism abroad gave the British official or adventurer untold sexual opportunity, it also, in some key areas, paralleled the situation in Britain in the nineteenth century. Lecky remarked that no other European country equalled the number of prostitutes in England – a 'hopelessly vicious' situation, he declared.²⁵ Remarked Hyam, 'Commentators from abroad agreed in the 1850s the forms of London prostitution were more shocking to be seen in Europe or America.'²⁶ Perhaps the penchant for paedophilia can be discovered in the fact that the age of consent was twelve up to 1875 and subsequently raised to 13 in the same year.²⁷ Empire thus gave to the sexually frustrated a legitimate means of having fewer restraints placed upon the most secretive sexual desires. Instances of sexual opportunities or sexual exploitation are comprehensively described by Hyam, not only in terms of heterosexuality but most profoundly of homosexuality, supplying names, dates, places, lurid details from the highest British official to the man without rank.

This sexual licence is encapsulated in the laws which controlled the institution of slavery and which were not relinquished in the post-emancipation, colonial setting. 'The stark fact was,' says the libertarian Hyam, 'that a slave-master had absolute rights over his slaves and could appropriate his sexual assets...Even a slave-holder who was a known molester of young

black girls could not be punished...In short, rape was legal while slavery existed.'²⁸

What, then, is the role of Miami in the context of the sexual licence framed above? Miami's character falls into the prevailing approximation of an European South African police superintendent who, in 1903, stated that no more than ten per cent of African girls who migrated to the city in search of work 'escaped ruin' from the seductive demands of 'white men.'²⁹ The potential for rendering Miami a living character on the stage fails miserably in the psychopathological theatrical devices utilised by Conway in representing her in a conventional, stereotypical trope. Nowhere is there an attempt to explore the narrative from her perspective thus enabling the audience to understand the specificities of her social situation. Instead, the conventional device is utilised, with central European male and female characters speaking about her, and contextualising her reactions not as an individual but as a situation, the springboard for discussing ideas of Africans.

In fostering the image of Miami's unexplained lust for gifts in return for various sexual favours, Conway expresses a colonial vision: the colonised are not to be heard if seen; they are to accept their fate because they originate from primitive conditions which still prevail. In other words, these victimised Africans should be happy receiving the gifts of European civilisation: sexual slavery, verbal dressings-down, violent physical attacks.

In framing his theatrical references within the context of the colonising powers, Conway allows for no dialogic structures and turns to the monologic, numbing discourse of the colonist, deaf to his surroundings, in positions of power, prestige and separation.

Thus the reenactment of a patriarchal system should be neither strange nor extraordinary: it issued from historical social formations which are perpetuated in the context of hegemony, power and status positions in which women are to be controlled, raped, subdued, and colonised Africans are to be derided, beaten, abused and discarded. It is Gunther, in the end, who abandons the weeping Miami for the European woman, fleeing back to

Europe with her. These commonalities of racialism, sexism and classism continue to haunt the imagination of the European playwright as he locates his neurotic pathology in Africa, working out his strivings to attain more than his limited social success in his own land. These strivings are rooted in the first moment of historical relations between Africa and Europe, which is framed within definitions of 'black' and 'white.' The following play epitomises these characteristics and gives energy to pervasive notions of 'race.'

And it is in the domain of the African woman as prostitute, as temptress, as the hot-bodied woman, filled with evil and dread, that is the focus in the brief examination which follows of *Napoleon's Josephine*.

NAPOLEON'S JOSEPHINE

Staged at the Adelphi in 1928, Conor O'Riordon's production of *Napoleon's Josephine* centralises the notion of the association of colour with sensuality and prostitution, as well as the prejudices existing in European culture against different nationalities. Here the issue of colour is not overwhelming, but it is nevertheless allowed to reinforce our determination and enhance our perspective of who Josephine is and how she achieved her position as Empress of France (although this is not overtly dealt with at all in the play). The first scene opens with a young maid, Angelique, who enters Napoleon's apartment to unload some informative gossip: that Madame Beaucharnais, the mistress of General Barras (Napoleon's superior) was saved from the guillotine by General Beaucharnais, who also saved a Madame Tallien. She then offers the opinion that Madame Beaucharnais is the worst of the two and that 'She's a black woman from India they say, with an awful temper they say' (p.3). Although no further dialogue develops the notion of the significance of Madame Beaucharnais' colour, it inevitably connotes a certain meaning because she is described as the worst of the two women. Thus an ascription is made to a character's complexion and personality not only on the

level of observation but of signification. Later, intrigued by this information, Napoleon trades verbal slanging with a fellow officer, Bourienne, whom he questions,

Bonaparte: Has Barras a black mistress?...

Bourienne: ...I've heard that she has a touch of the tarbrush...(p.11).

This sensational piece of news has particular meaning for Napoleon, for it conjures up images of sexual exotica. Young, again rationalising the sexual fascination of European men for the African woman says,

For Whites to see themselves as rational, ordered and civilised people, they have to *construct* a notion of *irrationality, disorder and uncivilised behaviour which is then imposed on the object of their stimulus to anxiety*. Elements of the culture which are *repressed* re-emerge in the despised culture. So that where Whites may have fantasies about *total sexual abandonment* whilst living under a yoke of *sexual repression*, that *fantasy is projected onto Blacks* ³⁰emphasis added).

In *Black Velvet*, Cleo is described by the dramatist as a 'voluptuous, sensuous mulatress, 20, house servant,' and it is she who becomes the temptress for the Euro-American southern general and plantation owner's grandson, John; she it is who initiates the sexual flirtation and at the end of Act 2 it is suggested that they make love. Thus even in the act of *desire* the European purports to be a helpless victim, although history has recorded otherwise. The social environment which permitted the African woman to be defenceless also gave legal title to her possession. The rationale is thus an invention to apportion responsibility onto the victim, just as the rapist pleads provocation because the victim was wearing a revealing halter top, see through clothes, too short a dress, or 'pum pum shorts.' Introjection defines such irresponsibility by means of which the person who internalises social oppression becomes energised and powerful by associating with the mores, personality and social behaviour of the colonis-

er. One can understand the condition of powerlessness and this discourse perfectly describes the phenomenon of the colonised utilising the medium of introjection, consciously or unconsciously, to liberate him/herself from the non-being of oppression and colonisation. The coloniser though, in his normative position of power and prestige, is freed of the social conventions which dictate 'civilised' life; the all-powerful, godlike male possesses his victimised African female, projecting brutal, unbounded sexuality onto his lust-object.

It is interesting, however, to note how revealing this idea of ethnocentrism is as a part of European culture. It is not only the sight of the 'dark stranger' which provokes dementia; there are resilient symbols posited in the society itself which set off the notion of difference. A clear link is being established between sexism as a phenomenon in European society and patriarchal qualities of domination and possession. In its attempt to deny domestic cultural pluralism, and that of the female sensibility outside of her limited role as object of desire, the connection is being forged between ethnocentrism/racism and sexism as common features of patriarchal ideology. This extrapolation amplifies examples of the violent imposition of a falsely knit nationhood, and the common artifices of ethnocentrism even by the proclaiming victimised *other*. The discourse examines areas of proclaimed victimisation while simultaneously exhibiting the same attributes of the accused victimiser.

Josephine, on a visit to Napoleon, is met by the concierge who tells her to 'Catch him in it [the bath], the dirty Corsican!' Prior to this scene, Napoleon himself engages in conversation with Bourienne about cleanliness and dirt:

Bonaparte: The republic is not a lady in waiting.

Bourienne: She might be a lady in waiting for you if you could only wash yourself.

Bonaparte: Henry Quarter never washed.

Bourienne: Nobody washed 200 years ago. They scented themselves instead.

Bonaparte: I'd scent myself if I could afford it. Cromwell never washed nor scented (p.8).

Here it is openly stated, from internal evidence, that even 'civilised' Europeans found it beyond the call of duty to clean themselves, thus the ethnocentrism/racism demonstrated by the European to the 'dark stranger' is not uniquely assumed: it is intrinsically a part of the social fabric of European society.

Bonaparte, though a high-ranking officer in the French army is nevertheless an *estranger*, an Italian. Bourienne, French, can only make this jibe at Napoleon because he is a foreigner, but Bonaparte was quick to define the context of Bourienne's remark: if he, Bonaparte, a foreigner, is dirty then so too were Henry Quarter and Cromwell, but this was compounded by the fact they were from "civilised" countries.

Only with this contextual response was Bourienne willing to express attention to the historical development of the notion of cleanliness. The significance of this repartee not only is that it expresses fundamental notions of *otherness*, culture *differance*, amongst Europeans themselves but also the *victimising other*, Napoleon, is given voice to reply, to speak, to defend himself. This is profoundly different from the plays under review in the context of African and European: the African characters are muted, defenceless, and depicted as conforming to an ingrained prototype of the stereotype: *a manufactured text*.

The *otherness* is not confined to the uncivilised, but to nations conventionally considered civilised. Chris Mason, an English school teacher with a Ph.D., in 1991 showed why it was almost impossible for an English national to be accepted on a comparable level to his French equivalent in admission to the French lycée:

You need the Agrégation to teach in a lycée. A relatively gruelling

exam reserved for French nationals, it is roughly MA level and takes the form of a competitive examination...Although I had spent the greater part of my time in France working for state universities, as a foreigner I had no tenure and would remain suspect in the state's eyes until I obtained the golden seal of approval that the Agrégation would bring. I took out dual nationality in anticipation...The classes [taken in preparation] tended to *abound in waffle* (or "discourse", as the French lecturers so *charmingly* call it); the whole thing appears rather *empty* for a frivolous, *empirical* "Anglo-Saxon" mind...A month later, the results were out. I had failed brilliantly...By contrast, a fellow candidate who used the expressions "17.30pm" and "to borrow to" sailed in. But then she *was French*³¹ (all emphases except the last are added).

This lengthy quote shows the similarities in conceptions of prejudice of the several-sided European experience. Significantly, however, though reporting what the writer considers to be the flawed examination system in France, biased against the "foreigner," Mason was nevertheless repeating his own racial bias against the French: *discourse* becomes a *waffle*, probably simply because it requires critical and philosophical formulations not standard in the British school system, and the whole intellectual process becomes *empty* because, as far as he is concerned, he exhibits the English notion of empiricism, empiricism being itself peculiar to the English. This sense of being got at, persecuted, because one is a foreigner is not confined to the British-French antagonism, but can be found in a country amongst its various regional inhabitants, as the following excerpt demonstrates:

United Italy has only a brief history, and its unity in language is younger still...Italian was used in the years after unification, achieved in 1870, to *impose* a national identity on a people who generally *did not feel it*...Cavour introduced Italian as the language of the new parliament and the new state. "Children went to school...and were like immigrants in their own land, taught in a language they did not understand."....According to government statistics, 36 per cent of people said last year they spoke only Italian; the rest were able to speak Italian and a dialect.³²

The restoration project that is now taking place all over Europe in ethnic groups' reclamation of their languages and culture is not a new feature of European civilisation, and in fact goes back very far in time. The following example, written in 1605, confirms German nationalism in its display of ethnocentric pride in the notion that English is itself derived from them: "This English tongue is extracted, as the nations, from the Germans, the most glorious of all now extant in Europe for their morall, and martiall vertues, and preserving the liberty entire, as also for propagating their language by happie victories in France by the Franks, and Burgundians; in this Isle by the English-Saxons; in Italy by the Heruli, West-Goths, Vandals, and Lombards; in Spain by the Suevians and Vandales." ¹³³

What this highlights is that even in "developed" societies where short shrift is given to multi-language countries such as Africa and Asia, languages, now disparagingly referred to as dialects, still persist in spite of colonial imposition. If this data can be accepted as representative of the true ethnic composition of European societies, the inference can be made and the conclusion drawn, that European societies, powered by a long-reigning elitist form of government, have imprisoned their citizens in emotional states whereby ethnocentrism and xenophobia, features of racist societies, ensures development and intermittent explosions (several expulsions of the Jews from Germany during the 19th century, repatriation of Africans during the reign of Queen Elizabeth in the 16th century, ad infinitum). The composition and artificial uniformity of current European languages and culture derive essentially from conquest, domination and imposition. This represents tripartite features of insurance for the survival of diverse, separate and independent ethnic groups demographically and artificially coalesing around unity of a *language*, while languages, cultures, and peoples are ruthlessly suppressed and controlled.

The concierge, even in her lowly, servant position, is capable of characterising a man in a superior position as a 'dirty Corsican!' This feature of the subaltern classes introjecting the *persona* of the ruling classes again reinforces Arendt's formulation of the oppressed classes functioning as

oppressors overseas. In this play, however, taking place on home shores, with the servant (the concierge) powerless to enforce her prejudices, the spectre of racial prejudice is even more palpable. Napoleon himself, already secure in his position as a senior army officer, accepts the challenge of his own representation and calmly goes on to fulfil his colour-derived satisfaction with the "tarbrush" Mrs. Beaucharnais (Josephine, it should be noted here in real life was of mixed African-European ancestry), who, in her obvious beauty shares the same fate as all the other mixed race characters in the acceptability of her amorous adventures.

Racism, therefore, is a phenomenon that has ancient roots partly anchored in the insularity of society (containing unmediated anxieties) and developed over time both in relation to internal acknowledgement of difference and external recognition of genetic separability. According to Anderson, '...on the whole, racism and anti-semitism manifest themselves, not across national boundaries, but within them. In other words, they justify not so much *foreign wars as domestic repression and domination*'³⁴ (emphasis added). It should be contested here, however mildly, that foreign wars were fundamental to the accumulation of wealth and central to the development of racist ideology: how else could it be morally justified except to invent the *savagery* and *barbarity* of the colonised and supremacist fabrication of a noble heritage? Anderson, however, is absolutely correct in his emphasis upon the domestic incubation for the development of racism and anti-semitism.

The racist invectives against Josephine (tainted with the "tarbrush," and familiar with the African sensuality of temptation) are not isolated, as General Barras, intent on seducing her (even though she has left him), attempts to betray Napoleon's secrets to her of his private love letters and names a single woman as a conquest.

Barras: Isn't it ridiculous? A Swiss *Jewess* by birth, a Swede by law, and what a body, what a face, what clothes, what style! But those foreigners are all the same: *Belgians, Corsicans, Swedes, Jews, Blacks, East and West, they're all one family...*(Act 2,

Scene 2, p.13, emphasis added).

Here, as Anderson correctly defined it, is a classic example of the ethnocentrist/racist functioning within the parameters of his domestic borders: everyone is a foreigner, they are lumped together as the ultimate enemy. Yet a young Corsican, Napoleon Bonaparte, became Commander-in-Chief of the French army, a German, Victoria, became Queen of England, a Jew, Benjamin Disraeli became Prime Minister of England, an Austrian (a Slavic country formerly overrun by the racially mixed Huns), Adolph Hitler, became leader and the most strident spokesman for German racism, and a German Jew, de Rothschild, put up the finance to defeat Bonaparte at the Battle of Waterloo in 1815. The contradiction inherent in all these examples of people playing leading roles in countries in which they were foreigners, exemplifies the notion that ethnocentrism/racism has no rational foundation, and is a result of extreme social pathology. Thus ethnocentrism as an *othering* artifice can be linked to the sexual *othering* of the female in the normalising features of a patriarchal systemic.

General Barras, like Napoleon himself, is shown to be so obsessed with Josephine that in order to sleep with her he offers to resign his position which would ensure the opportunity of Napoleon succeeding him. It is this which allows Josephine to accept his offer, though not without the hint of resistance. General Barras achieves his sexual possession of her through bribery. Doubtless, the social position of women in the early nineteenth century, with few legitimate avenues open for social mobility, was a motivating factor in the use of their sexuality to promote their husbands/lovers, thus ensuring prestige and financial rewards derived from it.

Taken together, however, this play represents not only the notion of succeeding in a predominantly patriarchal society, but the assignation of particular qualities associated with the character's blackness: sensuousness, temptress, whorishness (trading sexual favours for personal benefit can be seen as prostitution because it involves no morality, no compunction).

Barras' intoxication with Josephine is matched or perhaps surpassed by

Napoleon's who confesses to her:

Napoleon: ...Other women I have taken to clear my brain. It was my duty to the army. But you, you I have loved with all the passion of which man is capable. When I gave you myself I gave you my all (Act IV, Scene II, p.15).

The most profound difference in this play from the others looked at in this chapter is that the racism against Josephine is not confined to the issue of black-white only, but is contextualised within the wider framework of ethnic chauvinism or xenophobia. Not only are the French biased against the African Josephine but also against fellow Europeans. Secondly, Josephine does not hold a menial position. She is given status although assailed with the characteristics of a sophisticated, urbane prostitute, using her body to elevate her own social position. However, one cannot escape the *persona* which determined the type of character from which Josephine is drawn. She now belongs to the canon of the sensual, African female of a tempting *physical* type who, through the confession of her most successful victim, Napoleon, finally attains the coveted position she longed for.

The drama, on the other hand, conforms to representation and the stereotype as Josephine dies, highlighting Napoleon's deeply conflicting emotions for her: he both loves and despises her. These ambivalent feelings, already examined, underscore that the portrayal of race, especially in the context of sexual relations, tends to illustrate an inability of the dramatist to extend a closed ambience of feeling to enclose one of sympathetic understanding of the force of attraction to difference on the level of the phenotype (external appearance) and is never presented on the level of humanity but of *othering*, *differing*, conceptualisations. The responsibility, however, lies with the dramatist, and the given social circumstances of the period, and the expectations of both the financiers and producers on the one hand, and the audience on the other. These expectations are conventionally illustrated in stereotypical representations which often feed the imagination of an audience already predisposed by social forces to perceive of the

person of colour in a certain circumscribed way.

The following play, *African Shadows*, fixes its central focus on the African woman in which she is both rejecting herself within the framework of her mixed race ancestry, and needing to be accepted by Europeans as one of them.

AFRICAN SHADOWS

K.D. Hewitt, the author of *African Shadows*, describes Anna, an African character in his play, as "quarter caste." Perhaps his vague motivation conformed to Elfenbein's characterisation of her portrayal in 19th century American fiction of '...the octoroon or quadroon... portrayed as a dark, sweet flower with traces of poison on her lips. Unaware ...and innocent of the toxin she bears, she is fated to suffer social ostracism or slavery for the sins of her white father or male relatives...' ³⁵ In this case, Anna does suffer the ostracism of European society transplanted to Africa, as well as the psychological ambivalence and conflicting emotions regarding her colour and her race. On spotting a photograph in her former home (she had left her European husband four years earlier), Dr Leighton, her lover, says:

Doctor: ...Her grandmother wasn't a *Basuto* woman... Yes, she's white. English. The same colour as Bob.

Anna: I can't help my grandmother.

Doctor: Oh, I've nothing against coloured people.

Anna: I'm not. You can't call me coloured.

Doctor: My dear, you're worst of all. You're almost white. The brains of the white man and the vices of the black. Upon my word, I think you're fortunate.

Anna: If you could see under my skin – if you could see into my heart – you wouldn't say that.

Doctor: Very poetically put. There are times when you quite amuse me (p.4).

The racist systemic which has governed the world since its conquest by the European has wreaked psychological havoc in the psyches of the colonised. This is borne out by the story of Helen Corbett, an aboriginal Australian, ' "In different states at that time, there were native laws governing aboriginal people. If you wanted to escape those laws, you applied for citizenship rights which basically made you an honorary white. And the price for that was that you had to completely reject your aboriginal identity. If you were seen to associate with natives from the reserve they took it away from you..."³⁶ This is not an isolated incident, as the reminiscences of Lina Magaia confirms, 'You had to refuse (renounce) your culture. You had to speak Portuguese and make your children speak it. They came and monitored conditions in your home, - examined your furniture to make sure you were sleeping on the right sort of bed and eating off the right sort of table...' ³⁷ The confirmation of immeasurable self-hatred is borne out by a South African "coloured," Joe Marx, who remarked to a reporter, "When I was in prison I used to tell my interrogators: 'You people are going beserk for nothing. My people are bigger racists than you are. You hate me, *my people hate the blacks*' "³⁸ (emphasis added).

Fanon describes this process of deracination in psychological terms as '*... the need to earn the admiration or the love of others will erect a value-making superstructure on my whole vision of the world*' ³⁹ (emphasis added). All emotions are environmentally conditioned, and in regards to characterological make up or psychological orientation, these are dependent upon social affirmation or denial. The latter has an erasing force of its own, propelled by a racist systemic which subjugates or eliminates any vestige of opposition, often terminating in psychic trauma or neurosis. The above examples concretely bear this out. But they also suggest that it is only socially affirmed organisation and struggle which can be successful in

reversing the cyclopean process of the all-embracing social pathology. It should be remembered, as exemplified above, that it was not the individual's choice to accept or reject racial identity, but the superstructure's illegitimately passed laws and social policies which were violently imposed and enforced. In this context, the psychological terror that such lack of options creates in the victim is difficult to describe or to comprehend. The self-inflicting emotional damage which results from such victimisation can only be gauged by the psychic disfigurement obtained from an operationally imposed worldview, which now begins to be practised in and amongst one's own community: texture of hair, gradation of pigmentation, length and size of nose, speech approximating that of the European, prohibitions imposed on one and that one imposes on one's children, such is the cyclic malady which ravages the African. Anna is such a creature. She denies her grandmother, she even denies her race.

Leighton, in conversation with his friend, Beverley, comments on the condition of his health:

Dr Leighton: It's worth my while trying to keep you alive. I'd be a lonely man without some companionship.

Beverley: Ha! What about the local beauties?

Dr Leighton: You know how much they count. A man gets sick of them. Fat black creatures with their broken English love talk. (Mimicing) 'I love you – I love my white man –'

It is interesting to note Leighton's response to Beverley's quip about the local females: in it Leighton attempts to dismiss the African females as uninteresting, overweight and worthless. Yet, paradoxically, he has had an affair with Anna, and his answer implies an intimate familiarity with other African women – which raises the legitimate question of his conducting a sexual relationship without being aroused. Without resorting to a physiological examination of his genital response, it is imperative that his psy-

chological sphere is understood. His ability to have sex does infer an ability to be sexually aroused or no penetration could occur. In other words, Leighton does in fact acknowledge stimulation on the sexual, genital level, but on the conscious level he ideally rejects the energy of his sexual need for African women of whom he envisions himself both as a victim and articulator of propaganda. His capacity to have sex is *denied* on the intellectual plane, thus constructing barriers to affirmed pleasure. He is thus seen as acknowledging his sexual needs but denying the *objects* of his passion. An ensuing monologic diatribe emerges from his ambivalence and he is unable to reconcile pleasure with his sense of identity, i.e., on the conscious, sane level his enjoyment of sexual possession of the African female is denied. Psychoanalytic theory describes this phenomenon in various ways: repression, reaction formation, reversal, etc., and is best described by Anna Freud:

[These represent] methods of defense, for every vicissitude to which the instincts are liable has its origin in some ego activity. Were it not for the intervention of the ego or those *external forces* which the ego represents, every instinct would know only one fate—that of *gratification* ⁴⁰ (emphasis added).

Thus Leighton's inability to reconcile desire and gratification produces a form of neurosis. The neurotic state expresses itself in the obsession with depredate, attacking, humiliating the *other* only because affirmation is rejected by society, in this case represented by the external forces referred to by Anna Freud, which is itself an illustration of pathology.

If this analysis is only partly correct, it does suggest that the problematic of ambivalence comes fully into play in Leighton's mind: objectively African women are to be despised; they are beneath his objective desire, yet subjectively, he is sexually responsive to their bodies. This therefore raises to the level of discourse the question of his hatred. In *Black Velvet* there is a related scene in which John Darr, the General's grandson, comes to meet Patti, his fiancée. She feels passion for him and kisses him, while

John feels 'remorse and shame at having to kiss the girl after his caresses of the negress' (author's notes, Act 3, p.3). In attempting to understand this phenomenon of ambivalence, one can look at Freud's own general analysis and extrapolate from it:

...the second precondition for loving – the condition that the object chosen should be like a prostitute – seems energetically to oppose a derivation from the mother-complex. The adult's conscious thought likes to regard his *mother* as a person of *unimpeachable moral purity*; and there are few ideals which he finds so offensive when they come from others, or feels as so *tormenting* when they spring from his own mind, as one which calls this aspect of his mother in question. This very relation of the sharpest contrast between 'mother' and 'prostitute' will however encourage us to enquire into the history of the development of these two complexes and the unconscious relation between them, since we long ago discovered that what, in the conscious, is found *split into a pair of opposites* often occurs in the unconscious as a unity⁴¹ (emphasis added).

In both cases, Leighton's and John's disgust is obvious after they have had sexual liaisons with African women; thus this brings into question the mother-image of the African certainly not being expressive of the European mother. The African woman can be bought (perhaps cheaply) because her social condition in an urban centre makes her an outcast: she is sought out for menial jobs (as washer-woman, maid, sexual relief). The European mother on the conscious level could not be reduced to this level, thus the African woman takes on the mask of prostitute. But even in this mask, she still threatens because she excites genital responses and since she is represented as uncivilised, on the conscious level she must be rejected and discarded. Yet the sexual urge still remains.

Unfortunately for us, Freud never had the opportunity or perhaps the inclination to investigate the significance of race relations in the domain of sexuality. If we use the mother-focussed image as the point of departure, then certainly the African woman cannot be a surrogate for this image. If, however, we take account of the historical relations between coloniser and

colonised, European and African, and especially the representation of African sexuality in the consciousness of the European, not only is this issue more than mother, but it brings into play fundamental questions regarding the psychological state of the European. The inference, and perhaps conclusion, can be drawn that the fascination of perceived libidinousness represented by the African woman and the opposing attraction of difference, does in fact unite at the level of primal sexuality in the subconscious of the neurotic. Such conflicting emotions, however, point to psychological malaise (or, as Reich would say, symptoms of the emotional plague); and the emotional vehemence expressed by both John and Dr Leighton confirms their ambivalence.

Anna, the putative wife of Bob, despite the attempt by Leighton and Beverley (both males) to keep her away from Bob because of the new woman in his life, the European Mavis, finally confronts him. Here Bob is chokingly shocked by her presence:

Anna: You used to look at me and think how brown I was. And I am only such a little bit brown. Oh Bob, and you so white, so altogether white...You never complained, but I knew. You white men don't understand black magic, black witchcraft, black intuition.

Bob: Black! You're not black.

Anna: Enough black blood to let me read your secrets. I was your woman. You took me for your wife and then you hated me – like hell!

Bob: I treated you decently.

Anna: Decently! Yes, the red-necked Englishman – always decent! A girl like me doesn't want a 'decent man'! I wanted love! and you were just a cold, 'decent' man...(p.50)...

Anna: You failed to love me.

Bob: I couldn't help that. I looked after you –

Anna: As you would look after a dog!...(p.51.). (Bob asks her to go, promising to meet her the following day.)

Anna: And now, if I do not wish to go?

Bob: I ask you to go. If you won't go for asking, I'll tell you to go. Go, or by Heavens, I'll make you.

– If I have any more of your *monkey* tricks, I'll shoot you stone dead. You know I'm not afraid of you.

The dramatist's intentions are clearly to erect a line of demarcation between the audience's sympathy for Bob and that for Anna. Anna is made to initiate the conversation about colour, and by the developments in Bob's dialogue, the inference is made that he was an unwilling victim of Anna's designs: she is the one who talks about 'black magic' and 'black witchcraft,' thus signalling to the audience that she won Bob's marriage through these means. The dramatist is therefore predisposing the audience to sympathy for Bob by painting Anna as evil. But even in this act of solicited sympathy, the dramatist allows Anna to slip out a piece of information which undermines the very picture he does not want his audience to see: 'You took me for wife . And then you hated me –'... So that the picture that is described above, of attraction and repulsion, mother-image and the reality of the African woman, purity and prostitute, all diametrically opposing qualities, meet to form a symbiosis of sexual copulation and emotional separateness. This ambivalence accounts for Bob's continued coldness. The juxtaposition of the European with coldness allows a comparison with Jean Rhys' *Wide Sargasso Sea*, in which the unnamed British male marries the creole woman because she held an inheritance, and although he had possessed her, he felt emotionally compelled to dissociate himself from the love-act. Thus ideological anchoring in the fixed colonial cocoon, the reception to colonial propaganda and the systematic separation imposed through this ideology, allows the coloniser to maintain the image

of his impenetrability, his aloofness.

This aloofness can account for Bob's characterisation of Anna's behaviour as 'monkey tricks,' while threatening her with death. It is only on the point of her dismissal by Bob and her resistance to his plans for her to disappear that he threatens to kill her. The coloniser, the patriarch, cannot conceive of disobedience, and Anna's combative personality, despite the dramatist's own intentions in portraying her as an unsympathetic and evil female, promotes the only weapon which the coloniser understands as unanswerable: death!

Stott, in looking at Rider Haggard's novels, draws the conclusion about the nature of the threat of female sexuality: 'Exploration and appropriation of otherness expresses a male-centred experience, an experience which is full of repressed anxieties about what horrors will be found in the depths of the foreign (female) body. Itself a genre which purports to escape from the female, the adventure fiction places itself in a landscape in which fears of the threatening (sexual) nature of the female can be allowed expression.'⁴² It should be added, however, that the fear of the African female's sexuality is projected as succour, but the effects of colonial propaganda cannot coalesce with the experience of her sexuality. Thus the coloniser's ambivalence promotes his own neurotic condition. Anna, wife, becomes sexual threat, black magical witch, object of irreconcilable, vituperative, emotional bile. The dramatist, unable to allow a dialogic responsibility to open up possibilities of solutions, dispenses with her through death.

The means by which this finality is enacted involves several heated scenes. The primary thrust of the play at this point is to establish Anna's intention on securing Bob for herself. Mavis, the European woman who longs for permanent and legal attachment to Bob, confronts Anna over Bob as Anna unleashes a venomous rejection of Mavis' claims on Bob.

Anna: ...'Those whom God hath joined together let no man put asunder.'

Mavis: The devil can speak scripture to prove his arguments.

Anna: Devil or woman I can tell you to get to hell out of here. Out of my bungalow, out of my home, out of my life. I won't have any damned white woman stealing my man.

Mavis: ...Your skin's not awfully coloured, but your soul is black.

Anna: I will not go.

Mavis: I am mistress here.

Anna: Yes, you are! You are the mistress – and I the wife! Put that in your pipe, and smoke it – slowly (p.97).

Anna's vituperation is forced by Hewitt's perception of her represented qualities of blackness. Anna's later morality in proposing the sharing of their man is cleverly aired by Hewitt in order for her representation as the *other* to be accepted without question; in other words, it is neither *civilised* nor *English*. Anna thus becomes unreasonable in the eyes of the audience who, aware of basic cultural and racial differences, is separated from her actions. The sympathy of the audience thus falls on the predicament both Mavis and Bob find themselves in. Earlier, Beverly explains to Mavis the rationale for sexual licence with the local African. This thus prepares the audience to accept Bob's lack of emotional connection to Anna on a profound level. They, the audience, are made to sympathise with Bob because he did the "decent" thing by marrying Anna, but it is unmistakable that it was the evil designs of Anna's which propelled the victimised Bob to marry her in the first place.

Mavis, a woman of a dubious criminal connection through her mother in England, is, contrastingly, proposed as the woman of virtue and morality. Anna, on the other hand, outcast, evil, other, cannot arouse sympathy or understanding. Thus in revealing the criminal past of Leighton, Anna is shot and killed. This diversion becomes implausible and strained because she had made it known that she had already informed the police, making

her death convenient only to Bob and Mavis. This artificial resolution is also reflected in Rider Haggard's *King Solomon's Mines* where the luscious Foulata who bravely fought on the side of the English against the Africans, and who shared reciprocal love with the European male, Good, is finally disposed of through death.

Anna, decorated in the armoury of witchcraft is easily identified as a source of evil, and is represented as criminal in her intentions and uncivilised in her behaviour – death being the culmination of such actions. Mavis, on the other hand, is outraged by Bob's succumbing to Anna's wiles, and in the confrontation with the latter she is presented as restraining her emotions in the face of a *foreigner*.

The representation of witchcraft as a solely African preoccupation powerfully arms the European with belief in his superiority, and does not acknowledge the extent to which witchcraft was (and still is) a pervasive force in his own society. In this way, the negativity of its projection forces the sympathy of the audience more dramatically onto Bob. He is 'civilised', 'decent', and 'rational', in other words, a reasonable man. It is Anna who is unreasonable and demanding, thus she deserves death.

Unlike *African Shadows* in which the European woman is seen to be utilising the quality of restraint in the face of an adversary, in the following brief examination of an aspect of the *Black Ace*, one concentrates on the notion of introjection by means of which an Euro-American female, in order to enjoy the physicality of sex, vicariously accepts the Euro-American male's notion of masculinity in terms of imposing sexual possession.

BLACK ACE

Like the language and cultural structures described above, in which ethnocentrism appears to be centred in the respective cultures in which it is operational, sexism, likewise, and the brutal affirmation which comes with this particular form of discrimination, is seen as being anchored in the colonising society. The perspective is developed that the *outsider*, the *for-*

eigner, is not an aberrant, incidental irrationality, but a *commomplace*, experiential, *normative feature* of the discriminating, colonising society. The *other* is in fact a generative, ideological, empirical invention wedded to the irresponsibility of collective transference. That is, unlike introjection, it is not derived from the psychology of colonisation or of personal inadequacy (although, on the other hand, it can be considered a feature), but of a male ideological construct in which, in its continued attempt to wield and control power, it unleashes a systematic policy which simultaneously maintains the class system and gendered oppression at home, and colonialism and neo-colonialism abroad. There is also the question of the transformative gendering of societies either matrilineally oriented or with the relatively bilateral features of patriarchy/matriarchy.

The sex discrimination at home and the transformative gendering abroad can both be seen in Dorothy Brandon's *Black Ace* (it can be seen that though the play is authored by a woman, sexual identity does not exclude the ideological, sexist systemic). Miss Lucy, the Colonel and the judge all like Randolph and wish that he would marry Olie. Here Miss Lucy brandishes her male ideological violence in the idea of female possession:

Miss Lucy: *Take her. Never mind what she wants...Make her what you want...Cave man stuff* (emphasis added, p.34).

It is interesting to note that there appear to be censored phrases by the Lord Chamberlain's office marked through in red ink in the course of the following dialogue:

Miss Lucy: ...I prayed that one of them should have the nerve to (rape me!)...I won't be bewailing (my virginity).

In both the bracketed phrases there are red ink lines suggesting cuts. This is not the place to raise the issue of censorship, but one can extrapolate on the psychological meaning of Lucy's dreaded wish-fulfilment: that of

being raped by an African. In both Lucy's statements the advocacy of brutal possession is clear. In the first instance, she urges the assumed European, Randolph, to act out his assumed gender role, that of possession (we can link this to the process of colonisation which invariably involves violent possession); in the second instance, she also advocates self-inflicted violent possession. In psychological terms, the overriding concept of *possession* cannot be extricated from the two examples. One denotes active possession, the other passive possession. The psychological basis for such emotional anchoring can be understood by Adler's references to the male role from infancy:

Very soon the child notices the overtowering role that the father takes; he sets the tone, makes arrangements, directs everything. The child sees how everybody defers to his orders and how the mother constantly refers to him. In every respect man appears to the child as the strong and powerful one. To some children the father appears to be so authoritative that they believe whatever he says must be holy. "Father said so."⁴³

Adler's deduction for figurative authority is derived from the machinations of a patriarchal society where both sexes perceive of the father as an omniscient god, but it is the opposing connotations of the male role model which take on meaning for the sexes. For the male child it is a matter of emulation, for the female it is the recognition that she cannot be like her father; this is physiologically impossible. This then becomes the normative feature of the society in the display of a figure of authority and power, and thus locates the gendered derivation of power bases and command posts.

In Miss Lucy's case, in both instances, where she advocates male power-possession and where she fantasises about passive possession, the location of a sexual identity is central to the portrait of the use of violence. Legman, although writing on the psychological effects of American magazines mutating collective aggression into forms of release, says,

There is still no answer to the question whether this maniacal fixation on violence and death is the *substitute for a forbidden sexuality* or whether it does not rather serve the purpose of channeling, along a line left open by *sexual censorship*, both the child's and the adult's desire for *aggression* against the economic and social structure which, though with their entire consent, *perverts* them⁴⁴ (emphasis added).

Recalling Lucy's statements: she boldly expressed her longing for *forbidden sexual contact* with an element of society which is spurned, i.e., she is sexually censored from genital selection and imagined satisfaction, which directly results from the *social structure* (the patriarchal, capitalistic systemic) which *perverts* her sexual instincts (given that those instincts, to the extent that they are partly socialised, partly physiological, are conditioned by environment). This explains the perceived "aberration" in Lucy's thinking: her aggressiveness is introjected, converted through her own sexual repression and low status, thus taking on the characteristics of assumed male dominance.

Lucy, recognising the importance of her virginity to male generated ideology, offers it in the most blasé and unrepentant manner. Freud offers us some insight into the significance of virginity in a male hegemonising society, "The demand that a girl shall not bring to her marriage with a particular man *any memory of sexual relations* with another is, indeed, nothing other than a logical continuation of the right to *exclusive possession* of a woman, which forms the essence of monogamy..."⁴⁵ (emphasis added). Thus Lucy's fantasies are but converted expressions of her rage *against male dominance*, but such rage is subsumed into identifying with the oppressive male ideology. In this sense, an understanding of sexual possession can be located in the broader, colonial context in which the European colonial imagination, encased in the fictive sexual resonances of the Arab male's "harem," expresses this longing in his literature:

The popular image of slave girls, harems, and concubines nonetheless continued to horrify and titilate Western critics of the Muslim world

throughout the colonial period. An essential part of Gérard de Nerval's "Voyage en Orient" in the mid-nineteenth century, for example, was his marriage to a Druze woman in Lebanon after the relationship with his slave girl in Cairo had failed. Less than a century later, Mersault, the protagonist in Camus's 1939 novel, *The Stranger*, killed an Algerian Arab who refused to make his sister available to the French colonialists. *Possession of Arab women came to serve as a surrogate for and means to the political and military conquest of the Arab world* ⁴⁶(emphasis added).

In all these instances the association with violence and possession becomes clear and obvious. The male coloniser takes possession of the colonised woman who is a slave, a prostitute, or a captive victim, and in no example of any of the plays examined above is there a balanced relationship between the sexes. In each instance, the male is the dominant character, in each instance the female is the dominated personality, subservient, possessed. This further illustrates the psychological portrait of sexual possession as an act of infantile, unexamined sexually perverse violence. Whenever the European woman is represented she is introjected, she becomes herself a coloniser, a violent dreamer, if she differs from this, if she defends the victim, she nevertheless escapes from the colonised geography with the same male who scorned, controlled and possessed her. This limited expression of choice by both male and female European dramatists suggests that it is the acknowledged social, patriarchal systemic which governs public and private life, which distorts human personality, forcing it to conform to its stereotyping and ethnocentrising ideology. This ideology does not recognise race only in terms of the other because it is already, by its practice, *the* other, but it also envisions the female in precisely the same terms: to be controlled, ridiculed, denied her humanity by its aggressive sexual possession of her.

There is an element of mythologising of the Euro-American woman by the chivalrous Euro-American man whereas the mere thought of sexual encounter with the African produces an hysterical response. Because of

Olie's record on race, in which she is portrayed as a progressive, the Colonel, her father, reacts venomously to the possibility of her marrying the African American:

Colonel: I would shoot her - sir - would shoot her...

Judge: I've got the old man-hunting instincts of our father in me! A slave's escaped from his black skin. A nigger's hidden in a white man...*and when I think of what he means to do to my Olie...*' (emphasis added.)

Colonel: *To my daughter!* (p.10.)

This imaging of the African as sexual savage is actually portrayed in *Black Velvet* where Yellow Richmond, a light complexioned African American, is shown to visit his girlfriend, Cleo (described as a 'voluptuous mulatress' by the dramatist), and exhibits brutish and aggressive behaviour; while in the act of foreplay, the author describes him as '...feeling her body savagely' (p.11). The imagined savagery of the African's sexual behaviour is then converted into sexual panic where the imaging of the act produces in the Euro-American male both irrationality and neurosis. This is sometimes described as sexual impotence, the inability to attain or enjoy genital satiation. The "savage" is thus a psychological invention, invested with real emotions and tangibility, to the extent that the imagined sexual cohabiting between the races produces extreme agitation verging on the possibility of murder. As has been exemplified above, these delusory representations have not remained an abstract, psychological invention, but resulted in the castrating, lynching and mutilating of the African American's male body. Fanon, in analysing this phenomenon, says:

Still on the genital level, when a white man *hates* black men, is he not yielding to a feeling of *impotence*? Since his ideal is an *infinite virility*, is there not a phenomenon of *diminution* in relation to the *Negro*, who is viewed as a *penis* symbol? Is the lynching of the Negro not a sexual revenge? We know how much of sexuality there is in all cruelties,

tortures, beatings'⁴⁷ (emphasis added).

The presence of the hallucinating influence of the the African's penis has persistently created an element of terror in European and Euro-American literature and drama ('The *membrum virile*...of the negro is quite large'⁴⁸). It is here employed not only as a dramatic element of discourse, but an expression of inner fears, of deeply embedded secretive inadequacies which result in the absolute violence in thought and action. This mental predisposition to sexual violence, according to Diana Scully, renders rape in the United States as trivia, where it is '...regarded as normal and acceptable under certain conditions.'⁴⁹ One of these conditions may be the question of race, while another may be the consideration of the organisation of society itself which renders rape a normality. On the theoretical plane, one has to link the social policies of nations in relation to sexual politics in order to understand better this phenomenon. In Nazi Germany during the 1930s not only was the sterilisation law proclaimed against the Jew, but it was enshrined as an act of right against *anyone* perceived as being *inferior*.

The German race question consists primarily in the Jewish question. In second place, yet no less important, there is the gypsy question... [But] degenerative effects on the racial body may arise not only from outside, from members of alien races, *but also from inside, through unrestricted procreation of inferior hereditary material*⁵⁰ (emphasis added),

This brings us back to the issue of the European/American's male's sexual preoccupation in the context of its normative value and meaning in a society of legitimating power. In view of the foregoing where discourse renders the implausibility of arguing from a perspective of aberration vis-a-vis the inherent pathology of the society itself, where sexual violence and race violence on the whole become a normality, some conclusions can be drawn from the comparative nature of violence *a priori*, as an established social systemic which encourages rather than discourages violence,

whether of a sexual or physical nature.

In summary, therefore, it can be inferred that ideology is an outgrowth of particular kinds of social organisation which develops into a systemic thereby attaining normality with its own codes and values. Sexual exploitation by the European/American male of the female body cannot be excluded from the patriarchal construct, the negative affirming ideology which permits violence to be an untrammelled expression of social, economic, political and religious repression which has taken on forms of pathology, disorder, irrationality. The European/American dramatists, in focusing on these issues, reveal their conservatism where concepts of race, class and gender become structures of prurience, and the dominant ideology reproduces itself in all human culture under its sphere of control.

This prurience can be seen in a set of representations by the playwrights under discussion. In Sheldon's *Nigger*, inter-racial sexual liaisons can only be entertained illicitly, as Noyes hides his own relationship with an African American woman from his fought over potential fiancée; while Phil, having himself an African American ancestor, distances himself even further from appearing to be a "nigger lover" by resisting social changes on his plantation. In *A White Woman*, despite the liberal conscience of the white woman in her reaction to Miami both as object of violence and of sexual possession, Conway pairs her with Gunther, a patriarchal figure who, in returning to Europe, abandons Miami to her fate. In each play examined above the most striking feature is the limited options placed on all characters, whether male or female. Any hint of racial marriage or durable relationship forces the playwright to invent a way of not confronting this reality and thus escape consequential conclusions which could explain the configurations of the times. In reality, there were successful inter-racial relationships in all societies but these were never portrayed in the drama of colonialism. Such portrayals might have shattered the illusions of power which the European playwright was determined to maintain at all costs.

The following chapter focuses on the generation of a particular type of male-centred ideology which throws some light on cultural reproduction

in the class defeats at home suffered by expatriates in their quest for meaning and status in colonised societies.

Page
numbering as
original

they would not be able get English music hall entertainment, but 'As for the cinemas George says the wild animals of the African desert are getting used to them. There are cinemas everywhere!' (p.2). Lady Katherine finally puts it to Elinor that she would be very happy if she knew she could love and marry one of the boys, '... it would comfort me if I thought that one of them was going to have you as wife' (p.9).

Two concepts spring to mind in analysing the dialogue of Lady Katherine and Elinor: their perception of Africa in the context of progress and modernisation is already shaped by second hand stories, and an element of an arranged potential marriage or pairing off on the part of Lady Katherine who does not leave anything to chance. The act of arranging and laying the foundations for a future partnership between one of her sons and her own adopted daughter already informs us of the class background that this family comes from. Lady Katherine's concern for her sons' happiness is shaped by setting into play forces which she considers compatible with her upbringing and values. In other words, having prepared Elinor, through training and education from youth, with the accoutrements of a desirable and well-mannered wife, Lady Katherine is attempting to ensure that her sons have a wife who is a member of their own class, who shares their social and moral values. This dispels any adventurous spirit that the intending journey to Africa may conjure up in the sense that there is a predictability of value-judgements peculiar to the family and to its class.

Dagnell then describes the brothers thus: 'Harry is dark and lascivious, George fair and manly, but not a prig' (p.9). Harry is equated with the popular image of Africa because of his "darkness" and because he journeys to that continent, while George seeks to remain in England. Although at this stage the associations of 'dark' and 'fair' and their intended meanings are not directly linked to Africa and England, later in the play the author constructs an inescapable picture of precisely what he allows his audience to see of the contrast in both societies. It is interesting at this stage, however, to penetrate deeper into the association of lasciviousness with darkness and manliness with fairness. Barthelemy confronted this same contrast in the dramas of the

Middle Ages and later, and in particular he finds revealing historical precedents for the contrast of beauty and ugliness, evil=blackness (and the associated sexuality concealed in the word black) in Samuel Jonson's drama, *The Masque of Beauty*. He situates Plato's celebration of beauty as virtue over evil as ugly 'clashing with the divine.'¹

There is more complexity to Plato's arguments, and since Barthelemy is but one argument put forward by some scholars as a justification for the association of ugliness and blackness (in all its popular, associated meanings), fairness and virtue/beauty, it is necessary to quote Plato in *The Republic*, in which the spirit of reasoning, rational discussion, is taking place between Socrates and Glaucon:

[Socrates] Surely, then, to him who has an eye to see, there can be no fairer spectacle than that of a man who combines the possession of moral beauty in his soul with outward beauty of form, corresponding and harmonising with the former, because the same pattern enters into both.

[Glaucon] There can be none so fair.

[Socrates] And you will grant that what is fairest is loveliest?

[Glaucon] Undoubtedly it is.

[Socrates] Then the truly musical person will love those who combine most perfectly moral and physical beauty, but will not love any one in whom there is dissonance.

[Glaucon] *No, not if there is any defect in the soul; but if it is only a bodily blemish, he may so bear with it as to be willing to regard it with complacency*² (emphasis added).

Here it is apparent that Plato's "fair" had nothing to do with colour but with the notion of justice and balance. And although Barthelemy extracted Plato's discourse from *The Symposium*, it nevertheless exemplifies the straining of validation of a represented notion in relation to clearly racist dramatic texts. One should, however, be clear to demarcate the political and social conditions of fourth century BC Greece from 16th century Britain especially in the domain of race. This construction of equating ugliness with blackness is not substantiated in Plato or any of the other Greek thinkers at the time. It could not have been because ancient Egypt was a model for Greek society in every sphere of the philosophical and scientific arena.³ The justification for blackness=evil is a social phenomenon particularly resonant in Western Europe after the African/Moor-Arab conquest of Spain and most of the early represented figures of the African took the form of the Moor (see chapter one). The African was absent as a figure of representation in fourth century BC Greece.

Conversely, a play, *St. Augustine or Darkness to Dawn in England*, with text by Cayley Calvert and music by the honourable Mrs. Wilson, performed in 1921, reverses the historically popular notion of blackness=evil and idolatry. In the play a Jewish merchant holds two slaves from England whom he has taken to Rome for sale on the open market. Offered to both St. Augustine (an African) and St. Gregory, they both refuse, vowing to have slavery banned. Urged by St. Gregory to buy the slaves and then set them free, a rich merchant is finally persuaded to do so. Having bought them, he announces, 'Come with me my sweet *barbarians*' (p.5, emphasis added). St Gregory then intones: '...Train the children as Christians, Unice, that when I keep my bargain they shall carry back the truths of Christianity in the hearts to their *heathen land*' (p.5, emphasis added). In Scene two, in France where St Augustine asks the woodsman for directions to England, he replies: 'To Angleland. Well, well. To the land of *darkness and idolatry*, where *they drink mead and sacrifice children to idols*' (emphasis added). Clearly, the popularising of certain types of stereotypical images is most probably a reaction to the final but gradual defeat of the Moor who, once having unparalleled

power and control over significant areas of Spanish, Portuguese and French lands, became the butt of caricature and indignities. This, however, follows the historical line of conquests in which the Romans, overthrowing the Greeks, made the latter into a figure of stereotype; Roman writers portrayed in extremely derogatory terms both the Germans and the British who in turn did the same to each other and later Africans.⁴ The motif of stigmatising the model of civilisation or culture is well argued by Gilman who says, '...paradigm shifts in our mental representations of the world can and do occur. We can move from fearing to glorifying the Other. We can move from loving to hating. *The most negative stereotype always has an overtly positive counterweight.*'⁵

A society which is in the ascendancy may be overtaken by events and, once the elite, become the object of representation. The Mexican, for example, is always shown as a sweaty, greasy, violent man, but his cultural artefacts and historical civilisation are highly valued by the West. The African has been continuously represented as a "noble savage," an oversexualised deviant, uncivilised, etc., yet his art and scripts are held in the most prestigious museums in the Western world. This suggests that the stereotype is assumed to be an outward expression of both envy and anxiety: the represented figure signalling a psychologically fundamental disturbance about its presence. The stereotype both conceals and expresses something about the psychology of its creator.

In pursuing the pseudoplatonic symbolism of dark and fair, Dagnell shows Harry to be boldly impassioned and expressing an irrepressible urge for reciprocal love from Elinor. It is Harry who first proffers the engagement ring to Elinor.

Harry: ...longed for that moment of ecstasy when all else in the world is dead? Longed till your eyes have been covered with a mist. Your brain whirled into a delirium which is almost unbearable. Has red hot blood coursed through your veins – you cannot speak. No sound is audible but the thumping of your heart?

Elinor: I love you! I love you! What else can I say? I love you.
I am yours. Do with me as you will.

Harry: ...I am mad for you! I have waited and now...(p.16)

This expression of rabid passion for confirmed and consummated love is clearly linked to the associated connotation of "dark and lascivious" with which the playwright described Harry. This lustful passion is naturally connected to Africa and Harry personifies the "primitive" passion which the popular imagination associates with Africans. Harry is thus represented as an African emotionally, although his appearance is that of an European. Undoubtedly, there is a strongly linked male orientation to the drama which impinges upon theories of capitalism/Christianity and repression: capitalism gives to the male unbridled sexual opportunity through financial and gendered position, while Christianity represses the libidinal urge which is finally translated and expressed deviantly. Here deviancy is expressed in uncontrolled passion in which bold physical union is powerfully connoted in the dialogue between Harry and Elinor. We note, however, that Elinor conforms to her female status: she tells Harry that she loves him and that he can do with her whatever he fancies. This, of course, as we have shown in the previous chapter, is passivity and conforms to the male perceived norm of violent possession.

Contextually, we can understand this behaviour from Rebecca Stott's definition of the monologic preoccupation with the maleness of imperialist ideology:

Imperialist discourse then, as found in imperialist novels, becomes a man-made discourse, expressing male fantasies, fears, anxieties. It is a discourse that emphasises the importance of male camaraderie and which implicitly warns of the debilitating effects of woman. It is also a discourse that expresses overtly sexual fantasies and fears.⁶

This ideological preoccupation with male dominance can in fact be read as a mythological archetype, deliberately invented in order to contain women,

the indigenous mass, and the 'alien', dark world populations. 'Barthes has suggested that we must become readers of myths in order to reveal their essential function, which is ideological.'⁷ In deconstructing the ideological archetypes of European male domination, a discourse has to emerge in which the critical functions of ideology are analysed and understood. Such a project, in its essential function, must accept that ideology geared to materialist acquisitions is false. The ideological belief that humanity only begins with the European project of 'discovery' is an absolute falsehood in the context of the findings of archaeology, linguistics, genetics, etc., which have cumulatively demonstrated that human culture was initiated by the most remote human ancestor, speculatively placed at 200,000 years ago, whose progeny has merely added another brick, another refinement, another extension, to an already pre-existing foundation of a building, already mathematically and technically supremely constructed.⁸ As Ferguson says, 'Having removed history from the presentation of a person or a *sequence of events*, ideology allows a new and *mythical* history to be established'⁹ (emphasis added).

Harry, the dark brother, suitably migrates to Africa (the 'dark' continent), and does the 'evil' and 'base' thing by indulging in opium (all definitions emanating from the word 'dark'). Not only has he become addicted to opium but he contracts a marriage, both provided by the erotic drug of an African woman, Muma. 'Fair' George, the lawyer, comes to Africa to locate his brother, bearing a letter from Elinor, his fiancée. He is met by a Chinese houseboy whose language evokes the feeling of caricature. This is not to contest the possible realness of the language, but to place the purposive function it serves in the context of the play, namely the stereotype. By locating examples of badly spoken servants, the playwright is shaping the possible response to the separateness and maroonness of the English characters on stage, which facilitates a sympathetic identification between the audience and the European subjects of the play.

Yong (Chinese servant, described by the author as "sympathetic"):

Velly solly Mister Laby not at home.

Yong: Mangoes velly nice. Muchee nice for Tiffin (p.2).

This is followed by a Portuguese who attacks an African servant with a cane and then demonstrates his knowledge of the language by speaking to him in it: "Ho! Camba la laba – Tahee!" (p.2). This, of course, is a non-existent non-sense language, but it is used precisely because the audience is itself ignorant of African languages and is calculated to invoke laughter. Fanon, observing Europeans in close proximity to Africans, notes how they assume a linguistic approach akin to speaking to a child¹⁰; Ngugi, on the other hand, shows the cruel extent to which the European went to extinguish the language of the African and replace it with English¹¹. While Sara Mills, discoursing on the near impossibility of identifying the writer's connection to a text, says '...we are dealing with an illusory textualisation of an illusory construct...'¹², it is irrefutable that writing consists of the mediation of personal or vicarious experiences – whether those experiences are handled expertly or not, good or bad, the writer's imprint on the material inevitably expresses to us not only the narrative but the psychological implications inexplicably associated with the writer him/herself.

The consistent representation of African or non-European characters on the stage in particular ways which are logical to the convention of drama production to an audience not native to the country of the drama's location, inevitably places the author in a position of selecting those notions which are already popular in the country of reception. We cannot divorce the political history of the country and its relations with its colonies from the production of the text. These are not only confirmed by the consistency of impaired characters on the stage but by the implications of the authors' stage directions which leave no doubts as to the identification of the author and the text.

George, the "fair" one who is not a prig (according to Dagnell) is appalled at learning of his brother's drug addiction and later, "marriage" to Muma. Harry confesses that he bought the 'Fullan [sic] woman' from a chief. Outraged, George says, '...as you would buy cattle!...You must have been mad to take a Black Woman for a companion!' (p.12). Harry responds by

asking whether it is such a deadly sin, and George replies, 'It is worse than a deadly sin – it is a deadly crime!' Harry, feeling cornered, confesses that he was '...marooned out here amongst a mass of almost savages – a little better than wild animals!' Harry then responds to George's question about the legality of his marriage, 'I am not such a bloody fool as that! Marry a Black Woman. You must think I am pretty cheap.'

In deconstructing the dialogic confusion which encapsulates the brothers' pathology, it is necessary to see the dramatist's options placed on Harry: he does not defend his relationship with his concubine, but offers excuses for his predicament. He even claims a differentiation between a sexual liaison and that of marriage; the African woman, Muma, was good for sexual intercourse but not for marriage; also the 'almost savages' cannot exclude Muma as she too is African. Thus Harry exhibits a tendency that Hernton earlier described whereby the African woman is represented as a sexual object, the supreme exotic sensualist, with the capacity to cathartise all the neurotic compulsions, in this case ironically, of the 'victimised' European aggressor. Yet Harry, despite his hatred of Africans, was capable of passion for the African Muma. The ambivalence that Freud defined reawakens the notion of sexual expression being rendered in a perverse, loveless manner. Thus the inability to associate sensual feeling with love, or sexual expression with happiness, produces fundamentally conflicting emotions in the pathologically disposed neurotic, in this case Harry. The instinctual erotic desire thus fulfils itself but with hatred and a sense of dread.

In locating the dependency of the playwright on his patron during the 16th century, Barthelemy¹³ shows that sponsors looked for themes of good and evil, virtue and vice, etc., thus forcing the playwright, if he were to continue earning his keep, to maintain rigidly the limits of his imagination to the popularity of particular notions about human quality and worth. Similarly, Dagnell appears to conform to the expectations of the apparatus of 20th century production in which particular themes are dealt with in the context of race relations: the dark/black as evil, lascivious, immoral, linguistically childish, etc. These are certainly present in this drama as well as in the other plays

represented in this text.

Dagnell's drama also raises some important issues surrounding the nature of the European's power over the African female's sexuality. Harry confesses that he had bought Muma off a chief and that he would not be so stupid as to marry a Black woman. The social background to an understanding of this misuse of power is elucidated by Hyam about a T.A. Raikes, Assistant Native Commissioner in southern Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe). Raikes had for himself three African women and also employed a local African to spy out the attractive girls in his district. One was approached but refused, upon which Raikes called her father to order and threatened to arrest him. Afraid of being victimised, the man consented.¹⁴ Hyam gives a more chilling example in Malaya where successive governors maintained harems, one, Hubert Berkeley, '...press-ganging into his harem some girls from the local orphanage, which he raided.'¹⁵ Further evidence is supplied by Frantz Fanon in his work as psychiatrist in Algeria in the 1950s where he observed that the muslim woman's veil was a source of erotic curiosity for the European, particularly in his dreams (but also in reality). 'With an Algerian woman, there is no progressive conquest, no mutual revelation. Straight off, with the *maximum violence, there is possession, rape, near murder*'¹⁶ (emphasis added). Harry's confession of his acquisition of Muma reveals the nature of the *possession: Muma was his slave to do as he willed*. In the hands of the European playwright, the humility of the women in these situations is transformed into verbal violence, exciting and erotic procurer of European men, evil, oversexualised. Harry, now that his secret is in the open, warns Muma not to see George which Muma interprets as George's dislike for her. Harry, confessing his weakness for her, says, 'You have got my body and soul. I can't help it. I have no strength to fight against it' (p.18). Interestingly, this parallels Napoleon's confession to Josephine in *Napoleon's Josephine*. But Harry is not the only victim of Muma's bewitching, overpowering sensuality: she is portrayed as having slept with several Europeans, including a Portuguese who curses himself for becoming her victim. Summarily, therefore, Muma is portrayed as a prostitute, but we are not told if she is remunerated, thus simultaneously, the notion is expounded that she is free and easy, but with Europeans only. The inference, of course, is that

there is prestige attached to the European presence, while the African male, paraded only as a lazy buffoon, does not feature in this loveless "romance."

George, the "fair" one, morally empowered, driven by Christian zeal, returns to confront Harry about the degradation of his life. Harry, reeling from the onslaught, says, 'You with your Christian beliefs pray about the world and mankind. We are all children of God – brothers and sisters...Do you think that a coloured woman has no heart, that it is left to the white woman to own that commodity alone.' Quoting an archival source about the representation of morality pageants of the 16th century in relation to commissions by the Lord Mayor and patrons of the city, it is said that '...occupying a vast portion of the thematic concern [of civic pageants] is the conflict between virtue and vice, the ancient psychomachia between good and evil. Owing a debt to medieval morality drama, almost all pageants contain some sort of reference to the moral struggle, and one need only view the pageants to see the theme in action.'¹⁷ This observation can also be linked to the racial dramas of the early part of this century where the preoccupation of *differance*, extolling the virtues of European moral behaviour over the seductive, tempting sexuality of the African, carries with it a moral tale, an evangelical mission, to judge and condemn those of other cultural persuasions. But the issue of invention of conflict cannot be lost sight of because it centralises the need for validating human and sexual possession and degradation. In the context of Africa, the tension is focussed on the European subject, his/her opinions are projected and, at times, there are counter arguments, but even these serve the intention of the dramatist who weighs the moral power, the conviction of argument, on the side of the virtuous. The injection of themes of dichotomisation, a basis for the morality pageant, is also woven into the drama of race. An essential ingredient of representation is the stasis of dichotomisation: Good vs. Evil, Beauty vs. the Beast, the Civilised vs. the Barbarian. These themes become a monologic preoccupation and pillar in the dramas of race. One, however, understands George's brandishing of Christianity as a weapon of oppositionality in the context of his psychopathology: his rage against Harry is a rage against himself. Although this is never raised to the level of

epistemic drama, one understands George's suppressed jealousy of Harry's winning Elinor from him; perhaps he even resents Harry's way with women, and in attacking Harry and his life-style he is vicariously assuming Harry's *power*. But Dagnell never delves deeply into factors of motivation in the minds of his characters. His commitment to dichotomisation, thus proving his point, *a priori*, about the innate immorality of African life, dare not disturb the equilibrium of his characters and, more importantly, of his audience.

This dichotomisation can also be clearly seen in Muma's representation as temptress, seductress and an inferior being; she is shown to be insecure both in Harry's love for her and in herself, therefore oscillating from one man to the next. In so portraying Muma the audience's sympathy is shifted onto Harry, Elinor, the decent upper class girl who becomes the victim, who was done a bad turn, is thus rendered sympathetic to the audience. In circumscribing the level of Muma's ambience Dagnell's intentionality becomes wedded to the stereotype model in order to contrast and elevate the European.

The plot now hinges on Muma's sexual relationship to Delamo, the Portuguese who is intent on getting rid of Harry, whom he believes did him out of a job, and who now works for him. It is interesting that Harry's enemy is not a fellow Englishman but a Portuguese who has a similar standing to the African and Irish as stereotype. In drama and in fiction, for example, Rider Haggard's *King Solomon's Mines*, the Portuguese is represented as a greedy, violent interloper, not to be trusted. Thus the dichotomising of the European of virtue and the one of vice. In the hands of Dagnell the latter is carved in the figure of Delamo who plots with Muma to kill Harry through drink and dope. Harry, the tortured lover, after having cursed his brother, snatches the pipe from Muma's lips tossing it to the ground, saying 'Thank God I have conquered at last!' At this stage the sentence does not express any clear intentionality of meaning.

In the following scenes there is an interesting dialogue between Delamo and George. Delamo, the Portuguese lover of Muma, says that the 'natives have changed' because they now feel equal to the 'white man' (Act 3, p.7). This, he claims, is due to their now being civilised. George confirms that he has

noticed a change in their attitude—they're now 'insolent.' Delamo continues his conjecture by blaming the missionaries for the change:

'...Their calling these half-witted Natives "Brother!" That this ruin has come about they teach them from a Christian point of view that they have as good a chance of a hereafter as a White Man!...they begin to think that even "Jesus Christ" was a Black man! and that the *twelve Apostles were a family of thick-lipped negroes*...It is not the case of the White Man lifting the Black Woman up to his level—but the Black Woman dragging the White Man down to hers' (emphasis added, p.7).

Dagnell's plot fails in this instance: he allows Delamo to be an overt mouth-piece for colonialism/racism, maintaining privilege in a highly separated society. This does not gell for two reasons: Delamo is Portuguese and obviously working class. Secondly, Delamo is working against Harry by conspiring to kill him with the assistance of Muma. The fact of Delamo's nationality separates him from the English upper class as discrimination was certainly an intra-European practice both at home and abroad. What then is Dagnell's purpose in signalling Delamo, a Portuguese, as a spokesperson for overtly expressed racism? Perhaps this can be explained by normalising the phenomenon of racism: if the English are clearly racist in their behaviour, then it should be consistent with other European nationalities.

What is important however, is the recycling of popular notions of Christianity as a virtuous religious practice which imbued the African with notions of resistance. This can be easily disproved by setting out some historical examples of Christian priests functioning as an arm of colonialism in their role as pacifier. Jaffe, writing on South African history, detailed the extent to which Christianity was used in defence of European conquest: 'The mission-station was the centre of...buffer territories, and used as a British arsenal, fort and recruiting office.'¹⁸ He showed that both the Wesleyans and the London Missionary Society built mission-stations which were subsequently used as

staging posts for wars against native South Africans in 1812, 1816 and 1834; they also spied on recalcitrant chiefs, were active in drafting unlawful treaties with Africans and coerced Africans into the cheap labour force to open up the country for colonisation.¹⁹

Delamo also raged against the 'Black' woman dragging the 'White' man down to her level, but an examination of this vitriolic shows the opposite. The civil servant class were still in Africa in the 1920s, 1930s, right through to the early 1960s. Hyam, in *Empire and Sexuality*, gave too many examples in contestation of the propaganda that the colonised, legally discriminated against, victimised African woman could ever be the activator of moral or sexual corruption. Quoting an anonymous letter-writer to the *Pall Mall Gazette*, the writer said, "The empire was a Moloch, created by men *not of a moral class...*" 'Purity' was to them an invention of Arnold of Rugby...and a sickly plant. At every turn he saw 'the necessity, the universality, and the eternity of *sexual vice assumed as the basis of action and legislation*'. *The result was the creation of a heathen, ribald sensual class of Britons absolutely unbound by convention*'²⁰ (emphasis added). This attests to the fact that the European entered Africa with a morality that was already anchored in 'debauchery' as the anonymous writer put it.

The purpose, then, for Dagnell's airing of these views within the context of the play can be interpreted as being not for enlightenment but for prurience and the perpetuation of an European myth: that Africans are capable of nothing else but sexual immorality. This is perhaps why all the European male characters express their victimisation (sexual and otherwise) to the African woman (sorceress/temptress) although the play itself dramatises the formers' profound racist practices, verbal attacks upon the African in absentia, and a preoccupation with sexuality for which rationalisations are offered.

One of the crucial measurements for the balance of dramatic staging is the use of dialogue between contending parties. Here, the overwhelming number of principal speaking parts fall to European characters: Harry, George, Elinor, Delamo; Muma is almost muted by contrast, and there are no African males except the "houseboy" who is vicariously projected as stupid. This set-

ting conforms to a convention of European colonial drama in which all the characters together represent a monotone, a monolith of opinions all stacked against the African. There are no dissenting voices. Harry's dialogues, seemingly a principled defence of his relationship with Muma is but a concocted rationalisation of self-defence or shield triggered by George's moral outrage.

Here one can rely upon Ferguson, as quoted previously, who refers to the reversing of history, the deliberate fabrication of myths to shield the truth – in this case the naked, unjustified brutality that has historically been meted out against the African woman. Here, the dramatist sustains a picture of Muma's persistent malignancy: she uses drugs to control Harry, she uses sexuality to bewitch and manipulate European men – she is portrayed in such a way that the audience is supposed to react with sympathy to Harry's condition and not to that of the victim. There is a contemporary corollary to this archaic model, that of the film, *Mona Lisa*, according to Young: 'The Black woman is sexualised, objectified and associated with both the *primal* and the inappropriately over-civilised – the latter signified in 'Mona Lisa' through Simone's [the leading mixed-race female] use of stockings, corsets and whips and so on – while being designated the origin of *perverse forms of sexual behaviour*'²¹ (emphasis added). It should be pointed out here that Simone is portrayed as a prostitute and is in the employ of an Euro-British vice ring, thus signifying that although she is represented as sexually deviant, it is the violence characteristic of the vice ring which has solicited and controls her. In other words, Simone, though portrayed as both lesbian and prostitute, requires a thorough understanding in order to deconstruct her portrait as an independent mover when in fact she is the reverse.

Hernton, however, enumerates the historically recorded instances of insane brutality against the African American woman, '...no law was violated when, in 1838, a North Carolina slaveowner admitted that he burnt the left side of a Negro woman's face with a hot iron, which caused her to run away with her two boys, one of whom was as light as the slaveowner. The same slaveowner admitted branding the letter "R" on the cheek of a sixteen-year old Negro girl; he also cropped a piece of her ear, and branded the same letter on the *inside*

of both her legs.'²² Ridley also discusses the '...links between imperialism and violence. On many occasions physical violence is described and relished in situations which involve no threat to whites. Barnavaux, casually beating up an Annamite soldier at the Colonial Exhibition in Paris, does so not because he felt threatened, but in order to prove something about himself. *His violence was an assertion of membership in the colonial elite...Violence here was not the result of white insecurity in the face of the blacks, but stemmed from the whites' insecurity and disorientation in their own community* '²³ (emphasis added). Here the notion can be posited that male violence (sadism), according to Reich, equates with sexual repression (*Sadism originates from ungratified [repressed] orgasmic yearnings*).²⁴

The idea is projected here that sexual exploitation can be construed as violence: moral and anti-humanitarian violence. There are also instances in which Muma becomes the butt of physical violence, the final act precipitating tragic consequences. This can be understood if in all the cases enumerated above violence can be seen to be resorted to as a result of conflicting sexual energy: at once driven by perverse sexual longing and on the other revolted by the discovery of the perpetrator's authentic sexual identity. This pathological sexual identity is nevertheless understood by its perpetrator as releasing him from an immeasurable repression. Freud, Reich, and many other 20th century psychiatrists including Frantz Fanon, have not only linked sexual repression to violence, but have revealed it as a perversity, a pathological disease as a result of societies disfigured by the presence of a social systemic which is grounded in falsehood as its basic *modus operandi*.

It would appear that the drama can be separated into two moral tones: (1) the tone of overlordship, that is, Africa being such a primitive state that the European felt no compunction in releasing unbridled contempt both for the landscape and the people; (2) in the second part there is an attempt to show the possibility of Africans controlling their legal system (which reads as a pseudonym for country) in which the motif of revenge obfuscates the clarity and virtue of legal justice. The theme which binds both episodes together is the pitting of virtue and vice, the fair and the ugly, good and evil. In summary it can be stat-

ed that not only does Dagnell reinterpret the pageant but he extends its fundamental Christian themes in a context of race.

In this drama, and others like it, the European woman is portrayed as virtuous, loyal, moral, but an avid supporter of the social system she meets in Africa (or abroad). In the *White Woman* the leading female protagonist gives a moralistic speech about male violence, but in the end she returns to England with her violator. In *Black Dawn* Elinor possesses the morality of the coloniser, her outrage is motored by the race and class ideology that she shares in common with colonialism. Although Stott claims that in the colonial novel, 'White women also are generally kept out of the plot. That there should be no white women is essential to precepts of the genre: this is Africa where men will be men because there are no women to restrain or encumber them,'²⁵ European women were abundant in the colonial drama, and they were as virulent and as racist as their men. In a 1926 article in a popular British music paper against the continued exhibition of a painting in which the Roman goddess Minerva (lying shattered on the floor) was central to the artist's construction of the symbols of colonialism and of struggle (African musician with saxophone), and the nude dancing form of a female, the editor felt compelled to defend what he considered to be the threat of '...degradation it implies to modern white women...'²⁶ The association of the Jazz player with the freedom of the woman and the rupture of traditional European symbols of purity (Minerva) linked to sexual freedom (the dancing European female) became too powerful an image for the defender of the faith to let slip. The significance of this example is the hysteria surrounding a response to the "threatened" morals of the European female. Elinor, exposed to the immoral and illicit behaviour of African women, is to be saved from it by her higher display of virtue which is meant to salvage Harry from drowning in Africa's vice. The assumption of overlordship by Elinor takes an interesting turn in the context of the African's practice of justice.

Delamo, in his plot to oust Harry, sends disturbing news to George of Harry's addiction. George and Elinor come to confront Harry over the issue and to persuade him to return to England. Before George begins to argue

with Harry, Elinor goes into hiding, Harry removes a jar of opium from a cupboard and a struggle ensues over it until it breaks. Elinor now enters and asks George to leave. Once again she confesses her love and loyalty to Harry by stating that she waited five years for him, then Muma enters having overheard the repartee. She accuses Harry of abandoning her for Elinor and he responds to her roughly asking her to leave.

Muma: Muma live here – her home. You not speak like that when you take Muma to your bed (p.20).

Harry, insulted by Muma's audacity, attacks her with a chair, but she is saved by George who re-enters upon hearing the commotion. George and Elinor then exit. Harry tells Muma he knows what he must do, he must leave her. Muma now taunts him with the fact that other "white" men love her, that she doesn't care and that he could go. Harry, in a jealous rage, shoots her. Rain begins to fall and Dagnell describes this as "The Harmattan!" (which is really the dry season in Africa).

The abject, defenceless position of the African Muma may be read as part of the history and introduction of health laws in the 19th century of sexual control. Gilman, a formidable, erudite and exacting comparative analyst of the historical development of public health laws and the simultaneous circumscription of the represented sexual female, makes an interesting point about the (European) female as Other:

Nietzsche was made the advocate of the *whip in dealing with the woman as Other*. For the late nineteenth century the woman, both in her political demands and in her role as object of sexual control (through the public health laws), had been distanced as a different species, a different form of life. *Close to the jungle beast in her sexuality, she could be tamed only by violence*²⁷ (emphasis added).

Harry's vision of Muma may well have been influenced by a similar perception: that more than the handy invention as beast was an unbounded sex-

uality waiting there to be had. The prestige of overlord which attached itself to the European, particularly those of the upper classes, was ambivalently displayed by Harry. This may well have had to do with the limited characterisation that Dagnell gave him: since the play was predetermined by its assumed moral tone, good and evil, etc. Harry's role, due to the association with the colour dark, can be interpreted as one symbolism that had to contest another, that of the fair=good. Thus Harry's ambivalence can be seen precisely in this context. Dagnell does not show us, as does Hyam in his sociological tract on empire sexuality, that Harry is promiscuous. On the contrary, he is portrayed as steady in his relationship with Muma, but because he is cast as the bad-dark one, Dagnell shows his vice by associating him with drugs. The geographical location of this vice is also out of place, as one usually associates this phenomenon with the East (China, India, Malaya, etc.), thus rendering this connection in a dubious light. Harry's ambivalence both to Africa and Muma can be seen within the trope of love-hate; this quality may well have sprung from his uneasiness with the hypocrisy of English life, but Dagnell does not explore this. Harry's addiction to drugs and to Muma can be seen not only as adventurism but as a feeble and tentative attempt to extricate himself from English life. This is attested by the way he responds to George's Christian moral assumption; he derides his beliefs and accuses him of prejudging Africa and Africans. But because of his consistent ambivalence, his inability to commit himself to a particular position, this presents him as being still emotionally connected to the English hypocrisy that he resents. This reading, of course, does not take into consideration the deterministic path that Dagnell sets out for Harry, rather it attempts to look at subtle hints and shifts in the character and in the dialogue. This allows one to interpret the drama in somewhat different terms as determined by the objective, materialist considerations Dagnell employs for: the British audience at home.

Dagnell falls into the context of the deterministic, the typologicistic, the conventionalistic. *Black Dawn* is sustained by the image of sexuality which motors its other themes: virtue and vice, good and bad which only enter the drama from the basis of sexual representation. Tokson recognises this fun-

damental principle for any play in which the African is featured,

What playwrights would make of the sexual reputation of the black man will require a separate chapter, but suffice it to say here there is *hardly a black character created for the stage whose sexuality is not made an important aspect of his relationship with others*. For whatever reason, blackness and lust went handily, inextricably together, and writers made the most of the link. The literary men...used what was currently and popularly thought of the black man's libido and so *helped to perpetuate and even enlarge these conceptions of his extraordinary sexuality*²⁸ (emphasis added).

Dagnell's drama does not escape this fatality; its *raison d'être* for performance is the cliché of the African's sexuality and since sexuality whether in the form of the Can-Can titillation of Parisian girls, or the "pomography" of the Indian Kama Sutra, or the backstreet prostitution of British cities particularly London, this was the *nirvana* of representation. Although the African man and woman (more particularly the latter) were disproportionately represented, the European woman was also. No playwright was daring enough to allow the African male the hint of sexual encounter with an European female. Thus the African woman was carnalised as object both in the vicarious representation of the European woman's sexuality and the dreaded energy and animal association symbolised by the African woman in the European imagination.

Harry is arrested and put on trial for the killing of Muma. Here the second edifice of Dagnell's determinism, to attach the stigma of revenge to the practice of law and justice in Africa where even though a serious injustice is done against humanity, he pits Elinor's and George's racial or national identity above the very sanctity of the law. Carajee, the African lawyer hired by George and Elinor to defend Harry, in discussing the case with them is the recipient of Elinor's contentious and overlord attitude: '...this woman of your *race* robbed me of all that was dear to me' (Act 3, Scene 3, p.5, emphasis added). Carajee retorts that he thinks of the sufferings of womankind brought about by men's selfishness, even the life of Muma (here it is implied that

though Europeans may think that African lives are worthless, justice is necessary in all cases regardless of class or race). This, however, enrages Elinor:

Elinor: Yes, she was a woman – a woman of a kind. Do you mean to tell me with all your *European Education*, you believe you are justified in avenging her death – for that is what your prosecution is! Yes, you would have been justified had she been a *good* woman – but it has been proved that she was the *vilest of her sex* – she was anybody's *property* – worse than any of the poorest *prostitutes* – for it is their poverty mostly that makes them what they are (p.6, emphasis added).

Such portrayals make the argument for virtue in the European woman sterile, for she actively supports the status quo, and in this case is prepared to countermand the course of justice. She ridicules the law as practised in Africa and questions the veracity of the court in attempting to judge her man. This in its essentialism evokes the American wild West with its wagon trains filled with pious Christians, women actively supporting the men in shooting down the *savage* Indian on land they intended to conquer and settle by any means at their disposal.

Elinor's social understanding of prostitution reverses to a moral argument: remove the social condition of poverty and prostitution disappears. This is essentially a Christian argument. Elinor's emotional attack is potent with irony: Muma's death is considered the cause for Harry's predicament, i.e., if it weren't for Muma's devilish sexuality and witchcraft, Harry would have been free and presumably in England. She thus removes Harry's responsibility for his own actions and for her own lack of responsibility and, more importantly, her passive sexuality. This feeling of privilege as a right is a feature of the overlord syndrome and appears to be peculiar to the English as the practice of inequality is redolent in the English class system; appropriation of priority is claimed by Elinor as a right.

In psychological terms this can be understood from the perspective of transference. Elinor's repressed libido from childhood may have been enforced

through the propaganda of Christian virtue, and in attempting to live up to this idealism she represses the intermittent and perhaps violent flashes of libido which overtake her. The memory of Harry wanting to possess her sexually may have been traumatising in its effect upon his withdrawal to Africa; this passionate memory may have sustained her loyalty and love for him, but it was taken away by the presence of Muma, an African woman, sexually unrepressed, beautiful, sensual and possessing *her* man, her *love*, her *sexuality*. There is no other motive apparent for her virulence and antipathy both to Muma and Africa other than unfulfilled sexual longing and desire: Elinor felt *robbed*. Klein discusses this trait in children in great detail and the analogy to this situation is apparent.²⁹

Fanon also observed this psychological feature in the (French) European vis-a-vis the Algerian woman. He says, 'The European aggressiveness will express itself likewise in contemplation of the Algerian woman's *morality*. Her timidity and her reserve are transformed in accordance with the commonplace laws of conflictual psychology into their opposite, and the Algerian woman becomes hypocritical, perverse, and even a *veritable nymphomaniac*³⁰ (emphasis added). Muma is given by Dagnell the aggressiveness which characterises the European presence as colonialist in Africa and it is directed to her morality in relation to the dynamic value of Christian libidinal repression. The conflict of emotions (ambivalence) functions in relation to an unacknowledged, explosive sexual force within her which internally authenticates her sexual identity, but her own sexual longing for sustained libidinal expression is transferred to the persona of Muma who, in Elinor's confused, repressed world, becomes the realised but feared object of her aggression. She identifies with Muma but cannot accept the identity of Muma's supposed sexual pleasure.

When Carajee informs George and Elinor that the judge is about to summarise to the jury before they consider their verdict, Elinor interjects with an outburst, '*Is it possible that they can understand this case? Are they able to judge where a White Man is on trial for his life?*' Writing of the colonial governor, Sir Anthony Clifford, in an introduction to Claridge's *History of the*

Gold Coast, the writer stated that saddened by the passing of the Asante ("Ashanti") empire, 'few people would question that the Ashanti people of 1915 who devoted the bulk of their energies to peaceful agriculture were *far happier than their "bloodstained ancestors, who spent a goodly portion of their time in ravaging their neighbour's homesteads, taking other people's lives, and enslaving their womenkind and their children."*' The supremacist tone of Elinor's outburst is analogous to Sir Clifford's belief, given that his thinking was fundamentally flawed, that European despotism, colonialism, slavery, military invasions, murder and exile were infinitely better than the perceived African doing it to themselves. Elinor's perception of British justice is perhaps a realisation that justice can be bought if the appellant is rich enough and connected enough to influence the court. Thus when she questions the Africans' ability to judge, it reverses to her conception of what it might have been possible to manipulate given her class background and connection. But even in this, Dagnell was deliberately misleading his audience: Europeans won African lands by murder, cattle killing, deceit, divide and rule policies, invasions, etc. Contemporary to the play's writing, South Africa was an oppressive, apartheid system which had a wholly European judiciary except perhaps in cases where the indigenous African was concerned.

As Carajee bows out to return to the courtroom, George makes an incisively overlord remark, that he can't believe that he (Carajee) 'was educated at one of our Universities...when they get back to their native land...the Viscious [sic] beast returns and governs their nations' (p.16). The privilege attached to the English upper class in a context of administration of justice in a foreign land by foreign people, becomes not an exercise in justice but of foul play. Once educated in a Western university the African is supposed to divest himself of his African cultural realities and cloak himself in the norms of Western psychological affinity. Anything which is not expected of the logical results of assimilation becomes not only a betrayal of the system's thoroughness but a reversion to beastliness, the uncivilised, the barbarian. Benita Perry, writing on the British Raj's relation to colonised India, quotes Calcraft-Kennedy who both opposed humanitarians and left-wingers, 'Our mission is a high and

holy mission. We are here to govern India as delegates of a Christian and civilized power. We are here as representatives of Christ and Caesar to maintain this land against Shiva and Khalifa...*If you agitate you will be punished; if you preach sedition, you will be imprisoned; if you assassinate, you will be hanged; if you rise, you will be shot down*'³¹ (emphasis added). Such high-handed arrogance assumes a God-given right over the lives of others and the concomitant contempt which this supremacist position connotes finds its corollary in George's tyrannical view of African professionals. Once his position as a member of the ruling elite, given to certain privileges and status, does not meet with the anticipated bowing down to lord and master, then everything about the society becomes representative of backwardness, ugliness, the uncivilised, .

The jury returns a verdict of guilty and as they take Harry out, Elinor expresses the idea that money and a word to the English government will free him. *'This Country must listen to what England says,'* she says. *'They dare not refuse'* (emphasis added). Elinor, from the logic of her reasoning, cannot be faulted for thinking this for the history of colonisation has involved the use of economic sanctions, the force of power, threats, invasions, etc., to reverse a popular course of action. Examples abound such as were given of Guyana, Haiti, the USA, Trinidad, etc. Thus the superiority syndrome within which she is enfolded can be understood from the historical role of colonial empires.

It is important, however, to contrast Harry's own response to his crime: never once has he denied that he committed murder and he shows a willingness to accept the punishment for his crime. But it is the fair George and Elinor who protest his victimisation, who adopt a supremacist, contemptuous overlord attitude. Dagnell then shifts the moral weight of the play to escape the consequences of Harry's conviction. Now that the sentence of death is imposed on him, Dagnell has Carajee slip something to Harry who swallows it and dies in the arms of Elinor.

By taking his own life Harry escapes the judgement and thus the justice of the African administration of law. Condemned to die, the "democracy" of the many becomes an inversion of true law: English (true) law would have

set him free. This raises the argument of whether the democratic state is peculiar to the West and the totalitarian state peculiar to the South. Taking Freud's own arguments on the minority's right to rule over the majority one inevitably understands the historical Greek-Western canon that power must always be in the hands of the elite.

*It is just as impossible to do without government of the masses by a minority as it is to dispense with coercion in the work of civilization, for the masses are lazy and unintelligent, they have no love for instinctual renunciation*³² (emphasis added).

Freud's reasoning involves the perpetuation of an elitist minority in the governing of the masses: since "democracy" denotes electoral contests every four or five years; the institutionalisation of the elected minority to political power does not involve any mechanism for the opinions of the electorate in the drafting and consent to new laws, bills and statutes. In this argument, the control of power thus might=right becomes an historical argument from the first founding of city-states in Greece. This notion has been the pillar of Western civilisation and the corner stone of its progress. It is still a primary philosophical perspective, fundamental to governance which perpetuates Greek notions of democracy in modern Western societies. This powerfully evoked idea becomes a fundamental way of looking at the world: in it radiates the centralising notion of justice (although with increasing opposition) which stands between the working class and the upper classes, the citizen and the foreigner, the obstreperously perceived stereotype whether of the local European variety or of the exotic "other." Dagnell thus evades the logic of Harry's death-sentence by removing the execution of the sentence from the colonised. And here stands the luminosity of prognosis: at no future date is the notion of the unchanging world to be actually changed; the powerful will remain powerful to the ends of the earth. Ephemeral victories may be won, but in the end the power-might=just will continue to rule as a God-given right.

Black Dawn contributes meaningfully to the images to be gleaned from the

past, it radiates in an age where the audience was thought to be entirely European, where the thought of oppositionality was as ridiculous as a landing on the moon by men and women. Thus unopposed by the traditional, conventional theatrical production unit, Dagnell felt the unbridled power to conform to the expectations and fabrications peculiar to the era.

The following and final chapter brings into focus the work of two African Caribbean playwrights and attempts to show that racial identity has little to do with ideology or political orientation. But it does show that while their understanding of their characters is thoroughly grounded in reality it may still conform to Eurocentric interpretations.

CHAPTER 7

AFRICAN/CARIBBEAN IMAGING: MODELS OF EUROCENTRISM OR INDEPENDENCE?

In Wilson Harris' contentious attempt to place the 'genius' of Toussaint L'Ouverture not only above the determinism of his chronicler, C.L.R. James, but by implication above the whole of St. Domingo, is the implicit statement that singular genius exists above and beyond the context of socialisation or events. 'Toussaint..emerges not because he fits in where James wants him to stand, but because he escapes the author's self-determination in the end. James seeks to smooth over a number of cracks in building his portrait but each significant flaw he wrestles with begins to make its own independent impact.'¹ The direction that Harris points the reader in is to draw the conclusion that he himself argues against Toussaint's political decision-making and alliances. In fact, Harris reaches for the opposite by arguing that Toussaint was '...groping towards an alternative to conventional statehood, a conception of wider possibilities and relationships which still remains unfulfilled today in the Caribbean.'² By characterising James' portrait of Toussaint in *The Black Jacobins* as deterministic, Harris offers his vision as authenticating a more realisable and perhaps more challenging alternative.

In the context of the theoretical framework developed in this research both Harris and James express the limits of conventional thinking in terms of the

possibilities opened to Toussaint in his attempt to both deliver the Africans of St. Domingo from the brutality of slavery and to form a meaningful relationship with the colonising powers. Harris is both idealistic and incapable of rendering any alternative to the questions he raises, while James' position, though not idealistic, conforms to the proclivities and stasis of European cultural conditioning which will be developed in the analysis offered below.

The Black Jacobins

The Black Jacobins was first published as a book in 1938 and performed as a play in the same year at the Westminster Theatre with Paul Robeson in the lead. Because he is known to the world as a marxist and political theoretician, C.L.R. James is rarely considered as a playwright and novelist. It is interesting, however, to consider Wilson Harris' perception of James as historian in the context of literary icon, influencing the tradition of 'realism' of some Caribbean novelists. The relevance of this statement to *The Black Jacobins* is that the latter does assume its genre from the European tradition of realism and as such it has its place in both Caribbean and European literature.

But beyond this consideration is the positing of certain paradoxical ideologies which contribute to an understanding of both the subject of James' play, Toussaint, and the salient characteristics, by design or accident, which predictably define James himself. The convergence of similarity of character and of background between Toussaint and James is too markedly obvious for coincidence. The two characters are linked by several factors:

- (1) The belief in a morality and dignity which has 18th/19th century Europe as its basis;
- (2) A belief in progress, education, christianity, and integration between the races in which the European colonial model is the basis;
- (3) The belief in a political ideology in which European traditions, of whatever political persuasion, were the basis.

In the course of the analysis which follows, reference will be made to par-

ticular ideological frameworks, e.g., socialism/monarchism, within which both James and Toussaint functioned, as well as parallels in the choices they both made about race, politics and culture.

The New Staesman, in its review of the play, states, "The production as a whole was rough rather than ready, but we doubt if the play, respectable though it is, could ever be impressive. The subject requires a power of imagination which Mr James does not appear to possess." The following analysis offers a different view of the play.

James opens his play with a panoramic view of selected characters who represent the various political or ideological tendencies in the drama. In the opening sequences, James uses African drums and singing as a backdrop to the fierce imposition of the slaver's whip. In this racy kaleidoscope, James summarises his leading protagonists. The Entertainer is a representation of two Europeans whose entertainment is '...when the dancing is over, as a grand finale, we take that old one of mine who has been sick...fill him with gunpowder, and blow him to Kingdom Come!' (p.360). In a sense this can be discerned as a stereotype, but within the context of the drama which later unfolds, it summarises one tendency of brutality. This portrayal is confirmed by historian Korngold: 'Notwithstanding the premeditated destruction of court records in St. Domingo, the list of well-authenticated "extraordinary" punishments is found to include: throwing the slave alive into a flaming furnace; suspending him by arms and legs over a slow fire; burying alive; burying up to the neck and smearing head and face with burnt sugar, to attract flies and other insects; pouring spoonfuls of ants into all the bodily cavities; stuffing into a barrel into which nails had been driven and rolling down a mountainside; ladling burning sugar over the victim's head; forcing him to eat human excrement...' ³ etc.

At the Hotel the yet uncrowned second Emperor of independent Haiti, Henri Christophe, is seen serving drinks to two Europeans and overhears them in conversation:

White Man A: Imagine! Only six deputies for San Domingo! The

States-General in France must be crazy.

White Man B: It was Mirabeau from that black-loving club, "The Friends of the Negro." He had the effrontery to say that if our blacks could not vote, and could be counted in the census, then there were mules and horses in France which could not vote and could be counted in their census.

White Man C: So unfair! Everyone knows that animals are worth more than blacks (p.360).

This allusion to animals and the worth of 'blacks' is not an illusory projection by the author, as Donnan justly stated in relation to the conditions under which Africans were transported to the Caribbean, 'It was like the transportation of black cattle, and where sufficient Negroes were not available cattle were taken on.'⁴ This connection of Africans to animals was a constant feature in Euro-Western literature in earlier centuries and is here used by James to illustrate what may be perceived as a stereotype but is well founded in popular literature, both fiction and in works by historians. Here James' use of it is to situate the extent to which both Africans and Europeans inhabited totally different and antithetical worlds: slave-master/slave. Later this condition of difference would be shown to represent generating forces of atrocities, one pursuing the illusion of superior existence anchored in somatic excesses, the other proactive and imitative in the use of violence (as in the psychological conditions of war).

The final example illustrative of several representative images used by James, is *The Speaker*. It is appropriate that James places a word which characterises articulacy into the mouth of the African slave. To speak, in the African tradition, is to be creative.⁵ The spoken word has an intelligence of its own which in itself generates energy and action. In this context, *The Speaker* represents hope and change:

The Speaker: My brothers, I have been running all night to tell you. The slaves of the French islands of Guadeloupe and Martinique are fighting their masters. The white slaves in France are fighting their masters. You here in Fort Dauphin, you who have toiled in the fields and got no reward except lashes with the whip; the land belongs to you, your blood and your sweat is mixed in the earth. You must join your brothers in revolt, we must fight..(p.361).

The remarkable quality which distinguishes this speech rests within the tradition of Good Speech in which the morally authoritative voice speaks to and on behalf of those similarly committed to resolution of oppressive circumstances. It is the voice of thousands of souls, severely repressed under conditions of slavery; and it is this voice, reproduced by Carruthers from Rainsford, extracted from a speech Dessalines is reported to have made, which links to the materiality of the play itself (if only the act of speech was itself an indication of reality):

You have done nothing if you do not give to the nations a terrible, though just example of the Vengeance that ought to be exercised by a people of...its liberty and zealous of maintaining it...let us begin with the French; let them shudder at approaching our shores, if not on account of the cruelties they have committed, at least by the terrible resolution we are going to make – to devote to death whatsoever native of France should soil with his sacrilegious footstep this territory of liberty.⁶

The veracity of this insight is universally confirmed in the right of humanity to will itself above the limits imposed by fellow humans. This determination to meet death with death is rooted in the spirit of resolve, of the clarity of conviction that the battle waged against the oppressor is guided not only by the hands of God/Goddess but by the direction and will of humanity. This analysis can be contrasted with the vision of Antonio Gramsci, writing from a comparative position of oppression – prison – in which the twin forces of oppression and repression are exercised in the control of oppositionality:

'Men, when they come to feel their strength and to be conscious of their responsibility and their value, will no longer suffer another man to impose his will on them and claim the right to control their actions and thoughts.'⁷ In this observation lies the horizontality of human will and actions: that the human condition, in all geographical locations, is given to oppression, thus the will to combat is resident in all human consciousness. Thus James encapsulates, not only in his choice of levelling humanity to two primary classes, the oppressed and oppressor, but in the process of defining the comparability of the human condition, the motif of universality. However, in asserting a much-needed morality in his view of humanity, James is also reducing the profound difference of social circumstances – the French peasant (who, incidentally, comprises the majority of "foot" soldiers in the battle against the enslaved) and the African captive in San Domingo. James, in delineating his ideological position in his view of the meaning of political action, is clearly describing his marxian/socialist philosophy which conceives of the human condition in a reductive manner – all humanity is related through varying degrees of oppression or wealth. James, because he does not portray the actual social condition of the French peasant in relation to the African slave in the context of the play, at times reduces his kaleidoscopic images to polemic.

Returning to the textual complex of plantation life, James begins to reveal the multi-layered facets of relationships. On the Bréda plantation where Toussaint is employed as a coachman, the master, Monsieur Bullet, in embracing his wife on his return, casts a vulturous eye on the maid, mixed race Marie-Jeanne, who, in retiring to the other end of the room, soon brings the master across to embrace her once his wife has left the room. But James does not allow good manners to reduce his drama to convenience – being influenced by the hegemony of the conservative European convention in the barricading of transracial emotions through unbelievable plotting, e.g., *Black Dawn* in which Muma is murdered to make Frank avoid the consequences of his relationship with her – but actually demonstrates that Madame Bullet is a knowing participant in her husband's lust for their maid. James prefigures LeRoi Jones, whose play, *The Slave*, has a revolutionary leader (African

American), abandoning his violent struggle to talk shop with his ex-wife's husband (both Euro-American), supposedly because of some respect for his mind and the love of his ex-wife. Thus the connection with this play is that the revolutionary hero is seen to be prevaricating on a point of military significance. It is here that Dessalines, who is always portrayed as a crude, uneducated hero, with a good heart but conflicting and violent loyalties, enters to attempt an attack on the master and is saved by Toussaint's intervention, perhaps motivated by moral or ulterior reasons (p.363). Toussaint, the voice of reason or treachery, advises Bullet to flee with his life from the plantation because of the massive revolutionary upheaval engulfing the country. If this incident of Toussaint, disarming Dessalines and sparing the master's life, was symbolic of the course of the play's development, then James has commended to the attention of the audience a simply portrayed example of serious consequences for the liberation of San Domingo.

In returning to James' themes of universality, he embodies in the following scene a cyclic example of the inexorable changes of social circumstances which appear to be standing still:

Marat: All this goddam furniture to be moved. This work is for slaves.

Max: They ain't got no more slaves.

Marat: All right. Not slaves, but fellas to do heavy work. I am a soldier. I am free. What is the use of being free and having to move a piano. Now I am free I have to move the piano.

Max: You used to move the piano for M. Bullet. Now it is for General L'Ouverture.

Marat: The piano is still a piano and as heavy as hell (p.365).

This parable can be read in two particular ways: (1) that humanity only changes leaders and not its condition, (2) that freedom brings with it new, heavy responsibilities. The importance of this scene is that the audience can decide for itself its relevance to its own particular existence. In two successive scenes, however, we see that Toussaint features prominently and in both he either rescues the symbol of oppression or is himself mirrored as an example of the oppressive. In either case, the rapidity with which these images are drawn and developed, informs the imagination of the possibilities of differences of interpretation. The voice of Gramsci, however, does not allow for wavering, and is trained on an example which has universal applications: 'But men, who by their very nature are hypocritical and false, do not say outright: "I wish to conquer in order to destroy", but say instead: "I wish to conquer in order to civilize". And the rest of mankind, who envy the victor, but await their turn to do the same, make a show of believing in it and offer their praises.¹⁸

The problematic of conquering to civilise is a camouflage for the reign of power, and it is also a paradox for those who are genuinely convinced that for the uplifting of humanity even the sacrifice of inflicted suffering is necessary. Toussaint, as painted by James, falls somewhere between the two paradigms. It is Toussaint's wrestling with this dialectical problematic which humanises James' vision of the slave and revolutionary St. Domingo.

In the pursuit of the effects of the revolution on the psyches of the folk, James exemplifies the new, emotionally charged consciousness with visions of grandeur:

Orleans: Yes, I have a new name. I am now the Duke of Orleans.

Mars Plaisir: Good. You are Duke.

Orleans: Duke of Orleans. Orleans.

Mars Plaisir: Orleans. And you... Jacques?

Max: My name is Robespierre. Maximillian Robespierre. Call me Max (p.366).

Ngugi Wa Thiong'o, writing about African writers' preoccupation with the colour of oppression rather than the nature of oppression, makes an incisive analysis which is connected to the subject, 'Except in a few cases, what was being celebrated in the writing was the departure of the whiteman with the implied hope that the incoming blackman by virtue of his blackness would right the wrongs and heal the wounds of centuries of slavery and colonialism. Were there classes in Africa? No! cried the nationalist politician, and the writer seemed to echo him. The writer could not see the class forces born but stunted in a racially demarcated Africa.'⁹ By extrapolation, it could be stated that the leadership of the San Domingo revolution did not impart to the masses a vision of an alternative to slavery and oppression, but a mimetic reproduction of the facade of French civilisation. Thus the conferring of a title synonymous with position and prestige became a symbol of transformation in the psyches of a section of the masses. Thus a preoccupation with revenge, argues Fanon, is in itself an act of incorporation and reproduction, for in seeking revenge the oppressed first imagines the oppressor in his position and seeks to image the fear and terror that were once an intimate experience. Thus '...(t)hat was what he wanted, what he strove for: to make white men adopt a Negro attitude toward him. In this way he was obtaining revenge for the *imago* that had always obsessed him: the frightened, trembling Negro, abased before the white overlord.'¹⁰ The masses, therefore, in the poverty of alternatives offered them, are reduced to the civilisation model in which the outgoing power's culture becomes the standard of aspiration.

Here James' discussion of alternatives is never present in his drama. He massages the effects of slavery, which, though horrific, could never be revenged, and thus neglects the positing of an imaginative construction of what is to replace a systemic of oppression and of adverse philosophy.

In the context of incorporation and reproduction, James quite clearly shows Toussaint as having powerful affinities with the monarchical spirit, which illus-

trates his being out of alignment with the meanings of republicanism in a society which understood the resonances and relevance of the struggle then sweeping the French monarchical system. In keeping with this motif of positive influence from the colonising country, the masses took to singing the revolutionary anthem, *La Marseillaise*, which represented for them an identification of purpose and of a relationship. Sung by Toussaint's soldiers, including his two principal aides, Dessalines and Christophe, Toussaint gives the order for the song to be stopped:

Toussaint: Captain Dessalines, go out and stop that song immediately. Do not sing or hum that song again, either in my presence or alone. We are Africans, and Africans believe in a King. We were slaves and we believe in liberty and equality. But we are not republicans. Do not sing that song again. *La Marseillaise* is the song of enemies. Our ruler is a king, the king of Spain (368).

However, another way of examining this question of Toussaint's monarchical spirit is to place Toussaint in the context of Africa. He is supposed to be the son of a chief, therefore schooled in the sanctimony and protected rights of the African monarchical system, as opposed to the unprotected rights of the peasantry in Europe. Given this background, the view can be offered that Toussaint would have taken a more lenient approach to the monarchy. This conclusion would be acceptable if it were only a single incidence of Toussaint's political views. Taken as a whole, however, Toussaint's deliberate vacillation and prevarication on a number of issues, amount not to coincidence but to a firm indication of his attempt to manipulate and control power for his own means.

In the above scene, Toussaint had formed a relationship with the Spanish who had promised him the emancipation of the African captives if he would side with them against the French and English. When Toussaint hears the news that the French revolutionaries had overthrown the French monarchy and had given definite indications of their intention to abolish slavery,

Toussaint switches his allegiance to the French: 'Marquis, my father was a chief in Africa. Before he was captured and brought here he owned slaves. He told me that some Africans—not all, but some—had known and accepted slavery for hundreds of years. But as soon as they came here and saw only black men from Africa were slaves and because they were black could be nothing else but slaves, one thought became dominant in their minds—freedom!...Look at these people, General. Some of them understand only one French word—*Liberté*. They will join anything, or leave anything, for *Liberté*. That is why I can lead them. But the day that they feel I am not for Liberty, the day they feel I am not telling them everything, I am finished' (p.371).

James places the marxist, universalist approach in his rationalising of the phenomenon of slavery in the context of the St. Domingo situation and that of Africa. However, this comparison should be subjected to rigorous scrutiny. It is a popular notion that all areas of the world underwent the horizontalising of the human experience, i.e., all were subjected to the same mode of social development either simultaneously or at different time stages. This is the "common sense" approach which does not take cognisance of the environmental and geographical differences which influence social formations. In the African context there was no chattel slavery. Society, because it was organised along the lines of strong lineage and familial bonds, had imposed strict laws which regulated social behaviour and which dictated precisely the rights of the individual. In an instance of homicide, two alternatives could be posed: the imposition of compensation or, on the inability to meet this cost, the indenturing of a child, member of the family or relative until the compensation was paid off. 'While all social systems in the world can be analysed in terms of such rights, Africa stands out *par excellence* in the legal precision, the multiplicity of detail, and variation, and the degree of cultural explicitness in the handling of such rights.'¹¹ Because of these rights and absolute reliance upon the family rather than the individual, the captive who is brought to work for a family is momentarily without identity until he/she becomes incorporated into the new family. The captive is not without his/her rights; there are laws which govern the rights to which the captive/servant is

subjected. The captive is not necessarily confined to a low status position when he/she joins the new family. He/she may be an official or a learned person and as such there is particular benefit to the owner. Thus recognition of the human quality of the individual is protected by law and ensured by the concept of lineage identification. Thus even a captive taken in war is subjected to the rule of the laws governing the regulation of his/her life. Consequently, his/her own status is itself determined by the status of the family to which the individual belongs.

In the Western context, therefore, from the time of Greece, Rome, through to the modern period, slavery represented moral and individual degradation and dehumanisation, while in the Southern context "slavery" is a process of rehumanisation, renewal and reincorporation in the context of the family (this is not to say that the captive was treated like any other member of the family; he/she was not, until properly incorporated). To compare Roman laws (considered more humane than Greek), for example, with traditional African laws on the captive/"slave", the demonstration can be made of the opposition of not only legal rules but on the grounds of individual humanity, as Watson shows: 'A Roman captured by the enemy became a foreign slave and lost his Roman citizenship ¹²...[and] who fails to return...is regarded as having died at the moment he was captured.'¹³

James' discussion of the universalising of the human condition is tempered by the application of his marxism. This reduces social processes to a common denominator, namely the European model. James thus puts into the mouth of Toussaint words which demonstrate Toussaint's grasp of the human condition. In other words, Toussaint is divested of the notion that he has claims of specialness as a member of the African race and precisely because of his slave condition. The parallelism which James interjects between the African captive and the European peasant is not logically pursued and thus can be interpreted as an opportunity for his marxian project of universalising the human experience in the context of Europe.

To address the opportunism of Toussaint, it has been demonstrated that when it coincided with his plans, he was a willing ally of the Spanish, and

when his consciousness was touched by the verbal gesture of the French, he switched his allegiance to them. This problematic can only be understood within the context of Toussaint's colonised consciousness. It was the French who had enslaved him, it was their education which delivered him from the gruelling work on the plantation, and according to the play, it was a European woman, the wife of his master, M. Bullet, who had shown him emotional affection; it was the French "civilisation" model that Toussaint aspired to. It was these considerations which permitted Toussaint to renege on his agreement with the Spanish, according to one writer, 'The French had nothing to offer him – neither military aid, nor subsidies, nor supplies. Yet he decided to take the risk.'¹⁴

It is this same opportunism which propelled some of Toussaint's men to adopt a *laissez-faire* attitude to their condition of living as well as to the changes that were taking place around them. This attitude may well have been motivated by the oscillating position of the leadership, at once anti-slavery and pro-slavery, at once militating for freedom and a willing participant in the French colonial project:

1st Servant: Governor Toussaint and our army are fighting the mulattos at Jacmel, and the British, they say, are trying to get the mulattos to join them.

2nd Servant I don't know. I don't care. I am a servant to the American Consul. At the end of the month he pays me my money. That is all I know and that is all I want to know.

1st Servant: He says we are good servants, we work well, and that when he goes to America, he will take us.

2nd Servant: That's what he thinks. In America they have slaves. I'm a free man. I am not a slave any more. I am not going to America or any place where they have slaves. That is all I know.

I know nothing else (p.373).

James constantly allows us to see the relationship between the leaders and the workers; the latter are given a voice which registers their apprehension of the actions taking place around them. When contrasted with the plays analysed in the foregoing chapters, this is a significant development for the author of a play in the 1930s, especially a play dealing with Africans. James' portraiture of this relationship is tense with apprehension: under slavery the plantation captive was aware of his condition precisely, under changes of the revolution the fruits are yet to be harvested. He is not aware of the benefits to his existence except employment by the "white" man. But more than that, James also tempers his peasant/working class characters with an instinctive distrust of the leadership because of the ambivalent positions it may have taken. "Toussaint invited the planters to return and operate their holdings under strict government supervision. Since many planters had died or failed to return, more than two thirds of the land was operated by the State, under the supervision of the military commanders. Abuses crept in. The military commanders waxed rich. They became *négres dorés*. Some, especially Dessalines, drove the laborers excessively."¹⁵ Writing of the middle-class pre-occupation with class conflict, Eagleton and Pierce show that it is '...the firm conviction that class conflict is entrenched in our society that the fears of compromise, betrayal and sell-out spring.'¹⁶ This may not have been the motivation which propelled the St. Domingo leadership to have sold out, but it certainly can be utilised as a guiding concept in understanding the about-turn in their positions: what is significant is that the underclass became pawns in the hands of those making decisions about the future of the nation. It is this class of leaders who profited both from the presence of the European planters and invested strongly in laws which regulated the life of the peasants, forcing them to work equally as hard under civilian (though still military) rule as under slavery.

In defining the levels of European racism, James initiates the argument that, unlike the popular notion that the French were liberal with Africans and could

achieve more under them, he projects the notion that colonial overlords sometimes shifted their tactics from outright oppression to the subtleties of control and power, depending on the situation confronted. This comes out in a dialogue between the American Consul-General, the French general, Hédouville, and the British military general, Maitland. However, it should be noted that the apparent reason for France's liberalism was the recalcitrant fact that France was involved in a losing battle with the San Domingo rebels, and particularly with the stoic and clever leadership. Thus in order to maintain power rather than risk losing it, the French entered into a relationship with the leadership of San Domingo which continued a long tradition of indirect rule in world history, i.e., the nationals wielded power which was ultimately mediated by the relationship with the colonising power.

Lear: ..Generals, I know that Britain and France, your respective countries, are at war. But nevertheless you are both on neutral territory and the three of us have to consult with one another about this fantastic Negro, this Toussaint L'Ouverture – now, God help us, Governor of the Colony.

Maitland: General, was it necessary for the French Government to appoint him Commander-in-Chief of the French Army in San Domingo, but Governor of the Colony? We of the British Services could not possibly think of such a thing.

Hédouville: I know what you mean, and some of us did think that the appointment of a black as Governor was a mistake. But here was the problem: the mulattoes, being half white, educated and privileged, have always felt themselves superior to the blacks. The blacks, being slaves, have always envied the mulattoes and the blacks trust Toussaint. And since the white representatives from San Domingo also urged that Toussaint was loyal to France – we had no choice! With the support of the whites, the mulattoes and

the blacks, Toussaint could control the Colony – for France. However, Toussaint has become too powerful. I've been sent here by the French Government to restrain him. If we could only strengthen the mulattoes, we could maintain a balance (p.374).

In this judgement, James prefigures Frantz Fanon who agreed that a culture is either racist or not racist; there are no degrees to racism. Here again, James' vision is ahead of the era in which he was living. The original insight that James had was certainly explained through his experiences as a liberal in the several political organisations he worked with during the early 1930s and his later conversion to socialism (see Appendix 2).

James' point, not only about European racism, but about the reins of control, can be argued in another context in terms of the nature of colonialism. King Jaja of Opobo, in his search for united and concerted action against the encroaching British monopoly on trade up the Niger, had approached a chief, John Jumbo, for support. Jumbo was intent on rallying to Jaja's cause, but his own son, Oko Jumbo, who was educated in Britain, sought protection from the British consul. 'His example was followed by other educated Bonny youths, who seem to have been influenced by the period of absence overseas.'¹⁷ This 19th century political drama was one of many instances in which colonialism utilised plots, intrigues, divide and rule tactics, to overcome military weakness or numerical strength. Just as Toussaint was later captured and exiled by the French in real life (although not dealt with in James' play), so did the plot thicken for the removal of the irrepressible figure of Jaja from the Nigerian trading scene. Harry Johnson, the racist colonial administrator, short story writer and so-called historian, forged this solution for Jaja's irritating presence, 'the most effectual aid to peace and commerce in the British protectorate of the Oil Rivers would be administered by the *humiliation and banishment of Ja Ja*'¹⁸ (emphasis added). Not satisfied with mere plotting, another British administrator, Hewett, 'had tried to encourage a revolt of the chiefs against Jaja.'¹⁹ The process of the actual exiling of Toussaint can be seen to have had a certain reverberation on the British

employment of this tactic in handling Jaja: Lord Salisbury, one of the few British functionaries who tried to remain impartial towards Jaja, wrote tellingly about the British intentions of peace:

To invite a chief on board your ship, carefully concealing the fact that you have any designs against his person, and then, when he has put himself in your power, to carry him away is hardly legitimate warfare, even if we had a right to go to war. It is called 'deporting' in the papers, but I think that this is a euphemism. In other places it would be called *kidnapping* (emphasis added).²⁰

Toussaint's demise in James' play was precipitated by the plotting and intrigues of Dessalines in collaboration with Christophe and the European and American powers. The parallel with the history of Jaja's example is to dramatise the reality that power-plotting was not a figment of James' imagination, but a practice long established in the history of colonialism. On the historical stage, Toussaint was called to a meeting by a French general and arrested like a common criminal, along with his wife, son, niece, and aide-de-camp, taken on board ship, and imprisoned on the island of St Helena, with insufficient food and clothes, where he finally died of illness brought about by ill treatment.²¹ In this play, James clearly shows the information of Toussaint's movements being passed on to the French. The end is predictable. James omits Toussaint from the play.

Toussaint's vacillation and pro-French attitude alienated the absolute support of Moïse, his adopted nephew. In history and in James' play, Moïse was the revolutionary conscience, the man of the people, who was the single most representative individual of the thrust for independence and reconstruction. It is his stubborn belief in the defence of the revolutionary, realisable ideal which forced him to arrive rationally at decisions which caused his demise, the order for his death by firing squad being given by Toussaint himself. Moïse was highly critical not only of European colonialism and oppression, but of Toussaint and the San Domingo leadership. An extract from his confrontation with Toussaint, Dessalines and Christophe, the leading echelons of

the military hierarchy, exemplifies this tendency:

Moïse: (Having characterised Dessalines and Christophe respectively as the Duke of Turkey and the Count of Marmalade, cynical titles of colonial imitation, he goes on to address the problems of the path to freedom) ...I am against taking anything from the British, either from their general or from their king. *They don't own us. They can't give us anything...* But that we should declare ourselves free from the French; that we should make San Domingo a free and independent country; that I am for. Now, whether you [Toussaint] should become a king – with your Dukes and Counts, or President of the independent Republic of San Domingo, I am not very sure in my own mind. *We will have to ask the people* (emphasis added).

Thus Moïse emphasises his position on the question of the people's militia not only for independence from the European powers but from the possible tyranny of the military leadership of San Domingo. In this context, Moïse represents a revolutionary proclivity reinforced by an exemplary African tradition of Good Speech which is sanctioned by moral authority and the belief in justice. The other leaders, by contrast, represent opportunism and the firm belief in the benefits to be derived from European collaboration which 'advance', not the maximum numbers of people, but the few and the elite. This argument is based around the many examples of Toussaint, paramount leader of the rebels, prevaricating on the issue of independence and freedom. He was also shown to be ruthlessly putting down the rebellion of the peasant masses against the exploitation and overwork under the African leadership.

These actions by Toussaint amount to a veritable confirmation on the premise of his colonial dependency; he moves from the fundamental position of his inferiority, that the European nations and people are greater than he. Even in the concept of God, he dismisses and admonishes the African (him-

self) as having no knowledge of God. What he in fact means is that his belief in catholicism and the acceptance of the Christian God symbolises transformation and civilisation. Thus Toussaint, in his relentless pursuit of worshippers of traditional African religion, confirmed his absolute indoctrination, incorporation and reproduction. In accepting Europe as the cradle of civilisation and progress, he submits his own children to the alienating education which would incorporate a sense of French pride in them and thus separate them from the masses and their environment. Toussaint's vision of progress, therefore, was mirrored in the cultural ideology and anchoring in the European basin, in which measurement was exemplified by the size of buildings, the numbers of converted Christians, those who wore European clothes, and the amount of European education acquired: 'Where are my sons today?' he asks rhetorically. I sent them to France, to be educated... I write to Bonaparte asking him to send me a commissioner, teachers, priests, skilled workmen – and my children... Our people need the help that only France can give. They can't read, they can't write, they have no skills, *no knowledge of God* (emphasis added, p.406). Thus in Toussaint we see not the independence of a cultural or political thinker, but a reproducer of the basest element (colonialism) of Europe.

Here Fanon provides the rationale for this phenomenon:

Having witnessed the *liquidation of its systems of reference*, the collapse of its cultural patterns, the native can only recognize with the occupant that 'God is not on his side'. The oppressor, through the incisive and frightening character of his authority, manages to impose on the native *new ways of seeing*, and in particular a pejorative *judgement* with respect to his *original forms of existing*²² (emphasis added).

The inculcation of cultural imperialism can be understood from the unequal relationship between conqueror and conquered in a variety of ways. Once conquest is completed, the conquered's culture, in all its diverse permutations, is placed under constant attack and ridicule. Since the conqueror commands the highest position in the highly stratified society, the conquered individual,

in the quest to attain either freedom or conformity to the new dispensation, acquiesces to the norms of achievement of the goals of comfort by first accepting the foreign imposition as the only course for progress. Personal favours such as : an extra piece of bread, an extra cup of sugar, consent to marriage, the master not breaking up the family, and providing the services for some literacy, all contribute to the further acceptance of the new order. In Toussaint's case, as dramatised by James, this also involved the personal affections of his master's wife where, in Act II, Scene IV, Toussaint is described by the author in the following manner,

Madame Bullet sitting alone on a bench in the office of the Commander-in-Chief in the central area. Toussaint comes in hurriedly. He kisses her hand and then bends over to embrace her. She turns away.

Mme. Bullet: No, Toussaint, that is over. I have come to say goodbye (p.395).

The intimacy of Toussaint's relationship with the wife of his former master suggests him wanting confirmation of his manhood: only the "civilised" affections of an European woman could confer the humanising qualities necessary for assurance of his arrival in the European world. Where several subterranean motives in the psyche of Toussaint suggest a predisposed difference, an alienation from the mass of the people, simultaneously, there is an inferiority complex about the origins of his cultural beginnings or past. This is suggested in the following dialogue, "A French colony we are and a French Colony we will remain..." (p.381) "No. That is not independence. We do not seek independence. *We are not ready for it. France will be elder brother, guide and mentor*" (emphasis added, p.389). Such tremendous psychological forces of conflict not only drive the individual to success but, more importantly, define the arena and the terms on which such success is measured.

This process has been amply described by E. Franklin Frazier:

Through missionary efforts and other means, colored workers on plantations have often acquired new religious practices and beliefs; under favorable conditions, non-Europeans have been introduced to European education. The extent of this process of acculturation has depended upon the extent to which the plantation became a social institution as opposed to an economic or industrial institution...²³

The process of acculturation was not restricted to learning the language of their masters, certain work habits...The close association between master and slave on the plantation provided the means for the communication of ideas and beliefs, of morals and manners, depending, of course, upon the type of social control.²⁴

In the context of James' clear understanding of the psychology and psyche of his principal character, Toussaint, one can suggest there were obvious parallels, to James' own life. Although James achieved a far greater degree of formal education than Toussaint, he, nevertheless, felt an affinity to Toussaint's dilemma, in his choice of the tools for personal achievement, in his choice of women (at the height of his power, many European women were his partners), etc. Writing on James' own intellectual and personal development, Small says,

There was the aloofness of the grammar-school boy garrisoned by the protection of the school and its Oxbridge-trained masters who could easily, within the walls of the school, teach the old public-school ethic of "playing the game", "respecting the authority of the umpire", and esprit de corps. Education was then even more than now *separated from the social realities*, and the few scholarship winners could hardly represent any real questioning of the applicability of the legend to Trinidad as it existed outside the school. James was further separated by his avid reading and immersion in *British ideology* ²⁵ (emphasis added).

Although James in his writings never once acknowledged the poverty of his family, and in fact gave the impression to his readers that he came from a lower middle-class background, his biographer, Buhle, records James' true social environment:

[The] images of middle-class respectability, given out freely and almost nostalgically in *Beyond the Boundary*, do not do full justice to the difficulty of the family situation. In his earliest memories of the rural village where his father had moved to teach school, James recalled a dwelling of some twenty-five square feet for himself, his elder sister, his younger brother, his parents...The dwelling they took only had two rooms, shared with two young aunts and a grandmother who washed clothes and worked as a seamstress for a living. A thatched cottage roof permitted the rain, it had fleas aplenty. *But they could afford no better*²⁶ (emphasis added).

As regards James' own acculturation, Buhle wrote:

He was, he began to understand, a real if distant descendant of Western culture. Greek literature and Greek culture seemed more compelling than anything he could recognise as African. He had, in spite of his early academic shortcomings, educated himself into a 'member of the British middle class with literary gifts'...²⁷

James' affinity to Toussaint, in his sensitive handling of his subject's contradictions, of his argumentation, of his dilemma and his relationship to the non-European education and culture of the masses, seem to have been motivated by the existence of a similar experience and background. Thus while James' intellectual development is contextualised within Europe, in Toussaint one sees the promotion of African colonisation on behalf of Europe: 'No, Vincent. If this Constitution functions satisfactorily, I intend to take one thousand soldiers, go to Africa and free hundreds of thousands in the black slave trade there and bring them here, to be *free and French*' (emphasis added, p.391); While Toussaint militated for 19th century French capitalism as the model for change, James grasped its perceived opposite in 20th century socialism/marxism as an alternative politico-economic system. Both ideologies addressed the specific social formations of the beginnings of European societies in the democratic-despotism of Greece (see chapter 1).

James' treatment of Toussaint, therefore, in spite of the difficulties the latter experienced with his subordinates, particularly in relation to the revolution-

ary, pro-African ideas of his nephew, Moïse, still renders him as a sympathetic character, one who, through the unfolding of the problematic of choice and progress, the reader begins to have an empathy with because of his intelligence, wit, humanity and overall, his ambition.

Ngugi emphasises the point of colonialism's project of indoctrinating the slave with the 'aesthetic of submission,' a device unique to historical colonialism, in which the subject culture, weakened and almost crushed, incorporates the imposed culture systemic:

Obedience of the oppressed to the oppressor; peace and harmony between the exploited and the exploiter; the slave to love his master and pray that God grant the master long reign over us: these were the ultimate aesthetic goals of colonial culture carefully nurtured by nailed boots, police truncheons and military bayonets and by the personal carrot of a personal heaven for a select few. The end was to school Kenyans in the *aesthetic of submission and blind obedience to authority* in that Christian refrain, *Trust and Obey*²⁸ (emphasis added).

From a reading of Toussaint's own life, and the shared affinities with European life, especially in the realm of the Catholic church in which the dogma against adultery was dominant, Toussaint led a double life: in matters of personal relationships with the opposite sex, particularly European (although before the revolution he was already married to an African). Although James does deal with this issue in a couple of scenes, the relevance of the following information to the subject is obvious. According to one writer,

It is said that two of his white mistresses were a mother and daughter...

He ordered his own nephew to prison for having an open affair with a married woman. His own officers were forced to marry their mistresses. His standards perhaps were double, they were French and they were Catholic. Under the influence of the priests who surrounded him, he forbade divorce. His constant companions were Father Martini, an Italian, and Father Lanthenure who never left his side on his travels throughout the island. He was discretion itself about his private life.²⁹

In the play, Toussaint's paternalistic attitude to the African peasant population may well be due to both the patriarchal inheritance of some African nationalities and its overt form under European Christian rule. It may also be due to the exaggerated sense of himself he acquired under the slave regime, with its nepotistic awarding of rewards to the "well-behaved" and the "well-adjusted", i.e., those willing to accept and to advance in the culture of oppression. Therefore, despite Toussaint's repeated declaration of freedom, it is a freedom that is not defined vis-a-vis the stratification of the population. Gramsci says of those who advocate 'that the choice is not between a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie (as in Hungary) and a dictatorship of the proletariat, but simply between dictatorship and freedom – in our view, such a person corresponds, on the political level, to the charlatan who offers a potion of barley water to someone afflicted with typhus.'³⁰

Not only does Toussaint appear to offer 'barley water' to the adverse conditions of the African masses, but he forces them back to work on the plantation for the very same European oppressor whom they had recently defeated. In a sense, this fear of the masses corresponds to Gramsci's characterisation of the capitalist state as inflicting 'predatory assaults' on the working-class as a war precipitated by 'a glorious agrarian revolution... viz: the introduction of agricultural machinery, expropriation of the peasants and their reduction to the rank of agricultural wage-labourers, without trade union experience and hence more severely exploited and robbed of their wealth of labour power...'³¹ This is particularly identified with Toussaint's notion that work is only accomplished by coercion: his brutal enforcement of the work ethic, however, would appear to have been conditioned by the experience of slavery, that hard work, enforced by the slavemaster and his overseer, could only be achieved through strict application. This was the perspective of the slavemaster, not that of the captive. Psychodynamically, Toussaint's penchant for these cruel forms of control for the sake of 'progress' can well be understood with the comparable situation of some Jewish prisoners under Nazi dictatorship:

Since old prisoners had accepted, or been forced to accept, a *childlike dependency* on the SS, many of them seemed to want to feel that at least some of the people they were accepting as *powerful father images were just and kind*. Therefore, strange as it may seem, they also had positive feelings toward the SS...They insisted that behind a rough exterior *these officers hid feelings of justice and propriety*³² (emphasis added).

The complexity of Toussaint's character is well portrayed by James whose personal life involved serious consideration about some of the problems confronted by Toussaint. These, as have been shown, included problems of perception of one's self in the mirror of the bipolar opposites of slavemaster and slave, the supposed *order* of the imposed European world and the *disorder* of the African world, the might and power of the 'white' and the powerlessness of the 'black', and in these antithetical cultures and images, there is a constant battle being fought for personal, individual authentication. In Toussaint's case, validation was measured by the praises and the subservience he received not only from the people below, but from those on top. For he had reduced grown, powerful men to tears, and had the choice of their best women. Such is the psychology of dependency that a clear line cannot be drawn between illusion and reality, circumstance and pathology. Feelings of profound contradiction contained in the psyche of the colonised are often released in violence, violence against the self, violence against others. Toussaint's rulership exemplified this axiomatically.

In James' Toussaint one sees the residue of an 'aristocratic' leaning, as Toussaint had earlier proclaimed his lineage from that of a chieftom, and in the European context this had a certain resonance of power, prestige and duty. But it was also that of the aristocratic dictator:

For better or worse, aristocratic leadership carried potent associations with *sheer force*, on or off the field of battle. But this was not the whole story. For all its influence and prestige, the profession of arms was only one among several expressions of *aristocratic authority*. In twelfth-century Flanders, Galbert of Bruges had deplored the *excesses of noblemen, but their violence and rapacity seemed to him the characteristic failings of a*

natural ruling class. That rule took two forms: bearing arms (for protecting the poor and the church) and giving counsel to the prince... Whatever, the gap between ideal and reality, 'the giving of counsel' was nevertheless long taken as a prime expression of aristocratic power and responsibility³³ (emphasis added).

Toussaint's self-appointed duty to give counsel both to the rich and the mass of the population in matters of attitude to work, to chastising men in their delinquent attitude to women, etc., are well understood in the context of the cult of the aristocratic. Toussaint, who lived in the midst of a French aristocracy, whether of the monarchy or of the republic, was indelibly imbued with the spirit of unsolicited verbal philanthropy. He was an irrepressible victim of the colonial circumstance: in the control of the reins of power, he was feted and applauded by the Europeans, especially in defence of their property. Each blow against the impoverished San Domingo masses was simultaneously a symbol of impartiality and reasonableness in the eyes of the European elite.

Before Toussaint's departure from the stage of both *The Black Jacobins* and therefore of history, a consideration of his legacy as addressed by James himself in this drama may be a gauge in measuring his success or failure. Throughout the play Dessalines is portrayed by James as both uneducated and cruel to such an extent that one understands the notion that being uneducated is equalled to being uncivilised. However, it can also be theorised that although Toussaint is portrayed as a self-educated, intelligent and witty leader he, nevertheless, expresses, in a far more oblique but dangerous way, a machiavellian tendency, i.e., he appears to be benign but rules through a number of trusted generals and aides who execute and accept the brunt of his policies. Thus, for example, on the historical stage, when he entrusts a chastising assignment against the rebelling mixed race adversary to Dessalines, he can issue the disclaimer to Dessalines, 'I told you to prune the branches not to cut them down!', one inevitably gets the unmistakable message that the orders did come from him, regardless of the degree to which they were carried out.

It is the consistent appearance of intrigue, plots and the tendency to dicta-

torship, i.e., the absolute leader paid obeisance by his underlings and the appointees of state, while the reins of power go unchallenged and executive-ly dispensed by the leader, that Toussaint's legacy can be understood. Just as Toussaint inveigled with the French in his quest for recognition and culture, so Dessalines and Christophe collaborated with them to dispense with Toussaint and later to consolidate power and rule. Here Dessalines and Christophe are engaged in conversation, a plot to oust Toussaint:

Dessalines: ...Give my compliments to General Leclerc. But Christophe, I want you to give him a message. From me.

Christophe: What message?

Dessalines: I am ordering a concentration of all the forces under my command at Grande Riviere. This is for his ears only. The time of concentration will be on Wednesday morning. At 9 o'clock.

Christophe: But on Wednesday morning at 9 o'clock, you are meeting Toussaint at Ennery!

Dessalines: On Wednesday morning at 9 o'clock I will be in personal command of an operation to clear Grande Riviere and its neighbourhood of brigands. You will tell General Leclerc that Toussaint will be at Ennery. That I leave to you, Christophe. By the way, Christophe, Toussaint, on Wednesday morning, will be alone in the pavilion at the end of the garden. As usual, all his men will be at work on the plantation. 9 o'clock exactly. Remember, he is never early and never late (p.409).

But not only did Dessalines plot against Toussaint, he also adopted several of Toussaint's cultural prejudices, particularly the hatred of Voodoo:

Dessalines:...Samedi! (*Dessalines goes to the rear of the room and calls in a stentorian voice.*) Samedi! (*At the sound of his voice the drumming stops abruptly. Samedi comes in looking somewhat guilty.*) Samedi, no more of that drumming. *No Voodoo. Anybody in my detachment who practises Voodoo will be shot on the spot. No Voodoo and none of that drumming* (emphasis added).

Christophe: Why have you stopped the drumming? When Toussaint was Govenor, he gave those instructions, but those days are over.

Dessalines: When it came to governing the country, Toussaint was always right.

Christophe: But General Leclerc and all the French generals say that the people can drum and dance voodoo as they like. Madame Leclerc is absolutely fascinated by the voodoo. As a matter of fact, in the old days, they say, you were a great voodoo dancer yourself, General Dessalines.

Dessalines: After one time is another. For instance, now you are for voodoo and you have always been against it. Always in church worshipping their God, Jesus Christ. You were also stern in putting it down; and if I remember, you would shoot voodoo dancers almost at sight. I heard you say voodoo prevented the population from becoming good citizens and Christians and warning about liberty and equality and the whole set of principles that come from France.

Christophe: Yes, yes. *I was merciless against voodoo in my province. Those were the orders of Toussaint and I believed that voodoo and all that savagery stood in the way of progress, but*

today I am for anything that will satisfy the people (p.408, emphasis added).

The shifting of positions by the leadership is instructive in a central sense: that the pitch was for acceptance by the colonising powers. In proving they were worthy of "civilisation," they rapidly switched positions to accommodate their "civilised" overlords. This is vicariously described by Brathwaite in the following story. In describing the fantastic tale of an ordinary ex-slave, de Bundo, who was born in Barbados, and who claimed his father was a muslim Turk who married his Cherokee Indian mother in London, and being descended from a grandfather – High Priest of Bundo in Africa – from whom he acquired his name and title of Prince, Brathwaite went on to itemise a list of his *bona fides*, including being born in England, attending Eton at the age of seven, graduating from a four year degree course in sixteen months. Brathwaite then explained de Bundo's (né Augustus Frederick Horatio) mettle in impersonations: "This kind of fantasy, skill and cunning were essential if black men were to make any kind of impression within their slave society...Quashee was 'crafty, artful, plausible; not often grateful for small services; but frequently deceitful and over-reaching.' De Bundo was a super-Quashee. It was a way of reacting against the system, a form of devious protest."³⁴ In short, this represents a stereotype protesting against being stereotyped.

This description partly describes the behaviour of the San Domingo leadership, i.e., Toussaint with his over-zealous love of France and his brutal response to Africanisms, the willingness of both Dessalines and Christophe to act out roles of loyalty to Toussaint, the European powers and themselves, until they felt sufficiently comfortable in their ascendancy. In every case, the grotesque aping of European cultural life was fundamental: Dessalines proclaims, 'In France they write plays. But listen, listen. That is San Domingo. We can't write plays about voodoo!' (p.413); 'I am going to be Emperor of Haiti. Emperor, not King. They offered Toussaint to be King and he didn't take it. But nobody is going to offer me anything. I, Dessalines, am going to

be Emperor of Haiti. Napoleon wants to be Emperor of France. I will be Emperor of Haiti. Dessalines, Emperor of Haiti' (p.416).

Like de Bundo, Dessalines was making the final, most impossible attempt at success, at showing the European world, as Baron de Vasty (secretary to the second emperor of Haiti, Christophe), had written, 'Does (our independence) not supply undoubted proof that Africa is capable of civilization?...Africa, we are of opinion, can be civilized only by a conquest, of which the object is civilization (...) To influence men who are buried in profound ignorance, they must be enlightened (...) The Romans themselves owed their civilizations to the Greeks alone, and the Greeks to the Egyptians.'³⁵ Like the Quashee figure and like Toussaint, de Vasty's reaction to the supremacist European mentality, and its vast cultural imperialism, was to proclaim and equate independence with European-perceived merit and virtue. But he also implied, like many other Haitians during the period of the 18th and early 19th centuries, that the French language (and French culture) was to shape the newly conquered Africans in their acquisition of civilisation. Dessalines, likewise, in James' play, is married to a house servant, Marie-Jeanne, who tantalises Dessalines' uneducated appetite with readings of Racine, and Dessalines, on the day of his celebration of his new position as emperor, orders the musicians to play European classical music. It is ironic that James placed this celebration on the day of the announcement of Toussaint's death.

The implication is that as one legend fades away, another takes its place. In *Black Jacobins* we see the extent to which the African is portrayed as both a resistor to and an assimilator of French culture. In James' play, the stereotype takes the form of emulating European culture in its prominent display of art and aesthetics, but it also tellingly illustrates the inevitable development of forces controlled by and responsive to a colonial order. In this sense, James achieves tremendous significance; he was able to do so most convincingly because he was able to draw on his experience as a victim of European political and cultural propaganda. And because he was able to understand fully the personalities of other world revolutions, and the politics of positioning, he

was adroit in illustrating figures in history in which revolution and contradiction were dialectical elements, and which had a symbolic resonance for him, i.e., in the universal sense.

In the following play, *At What A Price*, we examine the extent to which the popular comic stereotype of the African Caribbean can direct and control the perspective that is brought to bear on the dramatic imagination.

At What A Price

Una Marson's two act play, *At What A Price*, was written in collaboration with Horace D. Vaz and was first presented as a reading at the League of Coloured People's annual concert at the Y.W.C.A. in November of 1933, then revised and presented at the Scala Theatre in January of 1934. This era of playwriting can be said to be motivated by the notion that Africans could write relevant and entertaining plays. There was no media response to the play unlike all the others placed under examination here.

The Marson/Vaz combination seem to have written a play that fits easily into the Eurocentric paradigm in which African life, particularly that of the working class, is seen as both exotic and base, with the exception of a dialogue that may be regarded as witty. Its world-view perpetuates several of the oversimplifications in an evaluation of African Caribbean life and continues some of the themes of conventional drama, namely questions of class and its concomitant issues of language, suitable marriage, etc., the elements of class/race conflicts. Here the opening scene sets the tone for this melodrama. A lower middle-class family consisting of James and Mary Maitland, the former a storekeeper in rural Jamaica whose only daughter is the family's moral conscience: she wants to raise the level of both verbal and literate communication amongst the village peasants, to make them clothes without charge, and to instruct them in the art of "civilised" behaviour. Against her efforts in this area, her father has an unreserved, unrelenting hatred of the peasants and their inability to learn or change. On the other hand, the mother tolerates their daughter's piquant personality on the understanding that

she's loved by them.

James: ...love her? Mary, it's just maudlin sentiment. Why don't they show some gratitude? I buy their coffee and pimento and lend them money to start their cultivations, yet when they have saved a few shillings they jump on an infernal bus which is more likely than not to overturn and go to the city to spend it.

The ungrateful creatures! The wretches! And Ruth can't even see that while she plays lady Bountiful my business goes to the devil (p.1).

Although Marson/Vaz made no mention of the colour gradation assigned to the Maitlands, one interprets their social status within the context of the "coloured" class who Henriques suggests, in his formulation of post-emancipation Jamaica, maintains a position of ascendancy:

After emancipation the same lines of distinction were carried over into the new free society. *The black man still remained at the bottom of the social ladder, and the coloured groups still maintained their general superiority to the black, and were themselves treated as inferior by the whites*³⁶ (emphasis added).

Henriques' understanding of the psychological phenomenon of ambivalence within this class is well illustrated in his analysis:

In every colonial society there is both a conscious and unconscious *attitude of ambivalence* towards the ruling group. This is composed of *subservience and imitation* on the one hand, and *hatred and repulsion* on the other...

Where a hybrid population is created through concubinage or marriage the conflict is intensified as it now has a physical basis. The mentality of the hybrid is governed by the fact that he may experience *rejection* from both groups, native and ruler...

The coloured person in the West Indies represents a unique phenomenon in the hybrid world. He is generally almost entirely ignorant of African culture and despises what little he does know as *primitive* and connected

with the *undesirable*, that is the black³⁷ (emphasis added).

Marson/Vaz's portrayal of the psychological ambivalence which characterises the mind of this class does not project it as a debilitating handicap, but their acceptance of this family as the leading protagonists in the play, precisely because of the contrasting picture that is painted of the peasant/working class, confirms the conventionality of the play's format, while the satirical tone, loaded against the working class characters, ensures that the family succeeds on the level of ambition and drive over its satirised objects.

Beckford and Witter, too, share Henriques' view of the extent to which the "coloured" class was simultaneously victimised by colonialism as well as promoted by it, "They , too, were violated by the racist domination of European culture. And they responded in a range of forms of *alienation*, from aping the ways and outlook of the colonial master to outright rejection"³⁸ (emphasis added). In this drama, however, the Maitlands opt for integration and ascendancy.

An important facet of the psychology of the colonised "coloured" class, which characterises ambivalence, is the malanchoring authored by alienation, and an assumed superiority complex validated vis-a-vis the dominating class. In its worse aspect it manifests itself in hatred and thus doing good becomes not a meritorious act but a weakness. In this model, gratitude becomes fundamental to the concept of giving. Miller, in defining the phenomenon of narcissism, allows a picture of the father James to take on particular kinds of meaning:

We cathect an object narcissistically...when we experience it not as the *centre of its own activity but as part of ourselves*. If the object does not behave as *we expect or wish*, we may at times be immeasurably disappointed or *offended*, almost as if an arm ceased to obey us or a function that we take for granted...lets us down. This sudden loss of control may also lead to an *intense narcissistic rage*³⁹ (emphasis added).

The Maitlands can be understood from this reading in that because they have psychologically assumed a position of respectability, due to their social

status (and perhaps because of their colour), they have also demanded the concomitant respect they believe their position ensured. Thus, although throughout the play the relationship between them and the peasant/working class is shown, respect and caution are demonstrated as reserved qualities for themselves; Ruth and her father anticipating perhaps a more grovelling manifestation of gratitude, and certainly a greater acknowledgement of indebtedness. Thus the narcissism of James and Ruth has become an ingrained aspect of colonial disorder: they are never satisfied with the level of subservience of the “lower” classes because they are not satisfied with themselves.

The idealised daughter, Ruth, is soon attended by a peasant woman, and the following dialogue demonstrates that there are two perspectives from which a story is related in a class situation. In one instance the father holds his daughter as a classic do-gooder, but on the other hand even Ruth maintains a class relationship with those she is assumed to help.

Clementia [A peasant woman]: Miss Root, Miss Jemima little gal bring dis fe you ma'am.

Ruth: “Bring dis fe you?” Oh, Clementia, when are you going to learn to speak properly? It seems my sitting up and trying to teach you has only been a waste of *expensive* kerosene oil.

Clementia: Brought dis for you ma'am.

Ruth: Oh go on, you'll never learn (p.4, emphasis added).

Along with an avowed class position also comes the prejudices and biases that go with it. Here an elaboration of the relatedness to class and language has to be contextualised historically both in the Caribbean and in Britain if a psychodynamic interpretation of these characters is to be understood. Dalphinis emphasises the point that a discussion of language should not be isolated from a discussion of the politico-historical context:

Although this seems extra-linguistic, it is of paramount importance in the consideration of African-influenced Patwa in St. Lucia which has traditionally been looked at as the language of the 'inferior' blue-blacks, the 'savages', the dreaded link with the African exported *nég jiné*, and was officially discouraged...⁴⁰

England, which historically resonated with an entrenched class problem, now becomes the site for race/class confrontations in the face of the once colonised migrating to the coloniser's home, and thus creating, or perhaps exacerbating, a condition of difficulty and complexity. But it is the handling of this combined issue that becomes problematic for Dalphinis:

In England, the educational implications of the perpetuation of these Creole languages in the Caribbean-British population is that they and their children are classed immediately as Educationally Subnormal, because their language is after all 'Subnormal English', and their speakers educationally destined for the social history of 'first to be sacked and last to be employed'.⁴¹

The "subnormality" of the peasant's language becomes a source of embarrassment to the "coloured" middle-class because they are, by definition, hybridised; this suggests that however much they may socially distance and superiorise themselves from the African population, the knowledge of their own common ancestors serves as a device for ambivalence. The colonisers, no matter how much they may satirise and ridicule the language of the colonised, can never feel embarrassed because they have no physiological connection with them.

In perpetuating the fantasy of the contentedness of the impoverished mass, James Maitland, commenting on an ungrammatical letter received by Ruth along with a present, confirms his embarrassment and deterministic conceptualisation of the extent of the peasants' lives, "My dear," he says candidly, "they are perfectly content. They lack aspiration and are happier than you or I" (p.4). From another perspective, this statement could have some meaning: in the sense that the masses are not as terrorised or traumatised by their con-

dition of colonisation as the middle classes (this does not, however, preclude affectation by the masses). The middle classes, caught between the route of ascendancy and success on their European side and shame and ridicule on the part of their African genealogy, are trapped in the stasis of options: to identify with the oppressed masses implies stagnation, primitiveness, backwardness and lack of civilisation. The traumatised necessarily cannot examine their political condition dispassionately, and thus, in this case, they are unable to come to terms with the mass of the population.

In between this vision of ambivalence and stasis, i.e., the recurrence of the colonised symbols of entrapment, Marson/Vaz insert the acknowledged outrage of Ruth against the prescribed role of the woman, an act which had resonance even in the most conventional of European plays, e.g., *African Dawn*, so that the isolated incident of the protagonist's conscience does not spare her from the judgement of her reactionary nature. In conversation with Robert, a deeply admiring young man, this element of her politics emerges:

Ruth: If there were no place for you in your Father's office here you would be in the city yourself.

Robert: But I am a man.

Ruth: Don't you dare to be so absolutely Victorian as to tell me the woman's place is in the home. Those words are only used today as a topic for debating Societies (p.7). [Ruth's mother appears to remind her of the lateness of the hour. In departing, Ruth takes his hand and shakes it, but he wants more and she offers him a kiss on the cheek.]

In shaking Robert's hand, Ruth was asserting her independence and individuation, autonomising from conventional modes of relationship in which friendship with a male is necessarily formed in the context of ultimate marriage or liaison. However, as will be demonstrated later, this independence is

selective, i.e., she knows precisely with whom she wants to form this particular association and to whom she wants to give this impression. The authors, by shifting the scene to the office of Ruth's employer, Fitzroy, bring the reader/audience closer into the psyche and the other side of the coloured inferiorised, as well as releasing visions of the comic character of the African Jamaican lower-class. The latter are represented by two salesmen who have come to do business with Fitzroy who, classically, as per the norm of the alienated elite, does not remember their names.

Fitzroy: Oh yes, of course, of course, anytime I get sunburnt I remember you boys.

Septi: Is you him talking, him say you face is sunbun.

Marti: Go on, you own look like when jackass tail drunk. Look here, man, you don't seem to remember you is talking to de managing director of the firm of Messrs...Boils [although not stated on this page, of Boils & Blisters Co.]

Josephine [black woman who works in the office]: But why you boys so fas' eh?

Septi: Go way, is de worse when decent people try to associate wid low class people. You face look like puss pickney... (p.9).

Marti: Good word, you not so hilliterate as I did tink...(p.10).

Septi: ...Goodbye Boss, you is a most hospitious gentleman sah!
(p.12)

This type of dialogue is continued for several pages without any apparent aim except to demonstrate both a use of "dialect" and to satirise the accents

and assumed culture-specific behaviour of the Jamaican poor.

Marti [to Josephine]: Jose, tell me someting, is your breast filled with inspiration towards anyone (p.34)?

Marti: How old you is?

Josephine: Twenty-two.

Septi: Go way, she must hab seen dat on a gate post, she an' me granny go to school de same time.

Marti: etc.

Septi: Of course she old...look at her face, it hard like clothes iron and it have as much lines as de tramway company.

In the history of colonisation, comic language is used to ridicule the colonised or satirise the coloniser. In the context of Marson/Vaz, there is no ultimate plot which renders the use of vernacular language as having relevance to the play. The comic and vernacular use of language is therefore suggested as mere use, to display a penchant and ability to write this type of dialogue; because both the characters and the language have no apparent use, it can be inferred that both Septi and Marti are utilised as comic relief. The names chosen by the authors to represent them, as well as the role they play in the melodrama, indicate strongly that any countervailing balance that may have been restored to the play is undermined and eroded by their stereotypical representation. This is reinforced by the fact that they have no central role in the play, and merely serve as vehicle for Fitzroy, the European-descended employer, who sees them in precisely the same way as Ruth and her father see the peasants in their village. In conforming to these conventional and stereotyped images, the authors continue a cycle of centralising in the persona

of the middle-class the pivotal role of sense, culture, security, acceptability. It should be noted that the play was sponsored by the League of Coloured People (see Appendix 2), an assembly of professionals who, on the whole, intermingled and interacted with the British middle and upper classes both in a social and political context. And being produced in London in 1933, the play was assured of a certain type of audience which would necessarily be embarrassed by the Septi/Marti characters in real life, thus possibly ensuring the efficacy of the represented figures on the stage.

It is interesting, however, to look at the popularity and functionality of this stereotyped representation in the light of the revelations of the African American author, Richard Wright, circling in the upper European echelons of newly post-Independent Ghana, and the relatedness of a normative pun on the apprehension of language by the African working class:

“Say, did I tell you about the half-educated guy who organised a reception for Winston Churchill? Well, Churchill came to this particular colony to make a major address. This African monkey worked day and night to organise the thing, and he was perfect... Everything was just right... Churchill rose to speak and, as he started, a naked African woman ran into the crowd, holding one of her breasts... Churchill paused and the woman ran away. Churchill resumed and the naked woman came running again, holding her breast... This time Churchill ignored the woman and continued speaking... But, when his address was over, Churchill sent for the African who had arranged the meeting.

“ ‘My good man,’ Churchill said, ‘I know that you have a lot of customs here that we don’t know about. But why did that woman run into the meeting hall holding one of her breasts, like that.. ?’

‘The African frowned, surprised. And he said:

“ ‘But don’t you know, sir? That happens every time you make a speech in London, doesn’t it?’

“ ‘Why, man, you’re mad,’ Churchill said, flabbergasted. ‘Never at any meeting in London at which I spoke did a naked woman run into the hall holding onto one of her breasts—’

“ ‘I beg your pardon, sir,’ the African scholar protested, his eyes bright and knowing. ‘I recall reading, sir, that at your last public meeting in London, at which, sir, you spoke. that, as you spoke, a titter ran through the

crowd...⁴²

Interrogation of a drama must be based not only upon the external appearance of the text, but the functionality and meaning of the text in the overall strategies of the intentionalities of the dramatist. If there are no apparently justifiable reasons for the appearance of the stereotype other than ridicule or satire, then the critic must be able to deconstruct the text's meanings and unravel some semblance of interpretation concerning its representations. In Wright's *Ghana*, there is clearly a canonisation of the African stereotype in the vocabulary of the European colonialist/imperialist: instead of confining himself to the working class, the protagonist invents another, more significant stereotype, the intellectual, the scholar, the functionary of precise organisation.

In the Marson/Vaz melodrama, one sees the point and purpose of the serviceability of the Septi/Marti/Clementia stereotype as against the primary distinguishability of the Maitlands – in which the former are portrayed as inhabiting a world of ignorance and backwardness. The Maitlands have the right to rage against the Jamaican poor, the former African slave, in reality, up till then, denied access to the society even in the elementary right to vote. Nowhere does the Marson/Vaz team point to the condition of oppression and exclusion which exists in a colonial society, and one precisely like Jamaica. In denying these revelations to the reader/audience, the play predictably falls into the category of the sensational and the exotic. Further examination of the narrative aspects of the drama will bear out this contention.

Ruth thinks that her boss, Fitzroy, is charming and witty, and when he does find his way to her home, inviting himself in, she feels too flattered and perhaps too overwhelmed to refuse his invitation for a drive. She ends up pregnant and it turns out that he had lied to her by saying that he was free; he was in fact engaged to be married. Her room-mate, Myrtle, forces Fitzroy to agree to marry Ruth by using information concerning a charge of fraud that was brought against him in the past. He agrees to do so. Like most convention-

al plays, the plotting evaporates in the predetermined purpose the play is serving: here it is to dramatise that a woman may not be bound to marriage because of pregnancy and that mutually sustaining, reciprocal love is more significant and desirable. But of far more meaning is the realisation that Ruth, although seriously invested with notions of true love, was primarily concerned, as a member of the lower middle-class, with Fitzroy's conceptualisation of her, her colour, her social standing. "Were I to accept him," she confides in Myrtle, "in time he would only remember that *I, his wife, was not of his set, not of his colour...he would hate me*" (emphasis added, p.39).

For people like Ruth this sexual liaison typified the history of relations between the European slavemaster and the African slave, in which the former won the affections of the women not only by cajoling or bribing but by brute force. Ruth is therefore a testimony of a probable historical encounter between her slave ancestor and the slavemaster. Beckford and Witter state quite clearly, '...[T]he pattern of bourgeois men seducing their female employees – usually African, but East Indian as well – has been carried on by the social and economic descendants of the old plantocracy.'⁴³ This preoccupation with sexual conquest and the force of possession appears to link, according to Kasl, with the relationship between men and war, "There seems to me to be a chilling parallel between the ability of men to detach emotionally from their penises and their sexuality and to detach from the consequences of killing people. Dropping bombs and killing people seemed like one step away from anonymous sex."⁴⁴

But it is the overwhelming evidence of colonialism, the imperial face of oppression, which imposed a new world order: colour, race and class are the parameters which determine sexual and marital unions. Ruth and her parents, conversely, were still unable to fathom the excruciating lesson of this experience: that as victims of racial and class prejudice they were themselves perpetuating the unjust and reprehensible norms of an aberrant, colonial society. This same victimised mentality (one can characterise it as pathological) was extended in Ruth's final choice in soliciting a man who would serve her intentions: the young son of a merchant, Robert, whom she had treated with such

leper-like aloofness, was brought in to marry and save her and the family from shame, loss of standing, and accusations of immorality. This relationship, because the terms were already so clearly delineated by Ruth – she as the imperial dictator of the pace and tone – is succinctly summarised in Kasl's definition of the addicted woman, 'An addicted woman may choose a nice guy as a partner because she can control him. She can take charge without concern that the man will complain when she loses interest in being sexual because he feels it's macho to pressure her.'⁴⁵

This Marson/Vaz drama has the leading protagonist, Ruth, triumph over adversity. Rejected by Fitzroy because of her colour and class, she finds an alternative in a willing surrogate, Robert, who idealises and reverentially loves her. These issues have been dealt with with far greater insight, power and majesty in the work of H.G. de Lisser in his early 20th century novel, *Jane's Career*, and the issue of gradation of colour, class and race was magnificently handled by Roy Heath in his 1970's trilogy of novels on the Armstrong family, *In the Heat of the Day*, *One Generation*, and *Genetha*. Although Marson/Vaz do not handle the issues as clearly or as profoundly as one would have anticipated, they rise above the even more circumscribed and diversionary plotting of the previous plays dealt with in this work in which the African female is usually killed off or her European lover returns to Europe from the colonies. In this sense, Marson/Vaz transcended the racist limits placed upon the avenues opened for the mixed-race female.

CONCLUSION

The results of this study suggest that the history of race relations is but one contribution to the popularisation of particular forms of stereotypes in relation to the African, but it is by no means exclusive, i.e., its prominence in literature does not disguise the fact that in most instances the African merely expresses one form of representation. Other forms have been in existence in British and Euro-Western societies from time immemorial. More than that is the discourse which now hinges on the notion that there is an inevitable interweaving and cross-fertilisation of stereotypical fits between the European and the African: whatever stereotypes evolved in European societies they were merely transferred during the era of the post-Moor-Arab conquest of significant areas of Western Europe and became identified permanently with the African, as some now argue, because of the transatlantic slave trade.

The presence of the African stereotype in Euro-Western drama, portrayed on the London stage between 1908 and 1939, suggests that the stereotype both concealed and revealed particular forms of danger, fear and violence on the part of the creators themselves. The stereotype is the expressed vicarious enemy, the expurgated self which one strives to be (primarily because of its sexual/exotic projections) and simultaneously hates because of societal forms of control and repression. The stereotype, in such loca-

tions, also becomes the key to unlocking the internal contradictions which inhabit the world of the dramatist.

The essence of the plays reviewed here reveals that representation assumes a similar form as that created for the European: the African simply becomes another form of otherness. The peculiar picture presented by these plays is the interweaving of given social and pseudoscientific theories which abounded both in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries with popular notions of sex, the woman, the working class/peasant, etc., and their transference and identity with the African. There is nothing unique in this form of representation because, throughout the development of European drama, these represented figures abounded on the stage. The notion of the sexualised, immoral female can be contrasted with notions of female sexuality and particularly that labelled "prostitute"—the response to free expression of libidinal urges. The woman as deceiver was part of the canon of Western literature and drama from the time Eve first gave Adam the forbidden apple. Since then a peculiar construction ensued which painted the woman in a derogatory manner — if she were not defamed she was desexualised like the Virgin Mary — to be looked at as a saint, never capable of passion or sexual feeling.

These features were shown in some of the plays reviewed, e.g., in *Black Dawn* where Elinor never receives sexual or emotional fulfilment, where she becomes passively possessed. Her antipathy to the African can be read from her repressed or unfulfilled libido: she rages against the African and in particular the African woman, Muma, whose sexuality she envies. In *A White Woman*, the African Miami is represented as a seductress, oscillating between Gunther and Marlow, freely giving herself and accepting abuse. The only European female who defends Miami in a one-to-one confrontation with Gunther—and later abandons her—goes off to Europe with him. Likewise, in *Napoleon's Josephine*, one sees that Josephine is

shown on a path to empress through using her body to promote her men and thus herself. The result in all instances is the representation of the African woman as prostitute, as seductress, as immoral. However, we have seen a comparative approach to this imaging by the European playwright: he was mirroring and transferring his own society's ills to a foreign environment.

In this view, African representation has to be understood as the latest form of already endemic stereotyping present in European popular life. The early Greeks and Romans, later the British, French and Germans, all in their individual quest for perceived empires, razed civilizations to the ground, and incorporated their victims' progress into their own societies, but simultaneously derogated the newly oppressed. European generated African slavery was the last of all the slaveries, having established, a priori, the constitutional construction of slavery in Greece, the constitutional recognition of it in Rome, as well as its legalisation in 15th–19th century Europe. In this view it can be seen and understood, when viewed historically and chronologically, that there is no uniqueness attached to the African being treated in life and drama as a fiendish creature since this creature was already a model in European society, from its own internal systems.

The function of colonialism allows us to understand the nature of fixed systems and the monotonic homogenising of responses. The belief that a person of a different colour or non-European nationality may hold a different perspective is illusory in the context of colonialism. Here the plays of CLR James and Una Marson, although having the benefit of closer proximity to the subject nevertheless expressed facets of colonial representation: James in the way Toussaint's colonial frailties did not make him less a hero and the projection of Toussaint's violent, anti-Voodoo stance as an indicator of him being "civilised;" and Marson by her representation of

working class characters as comic relief. Colonialism has no respect for origins and is responsible for the shaping of attitudes and perspectives in relation to the colonised.

In the arena of British political life, this study has illuminated the colonial model in the plays produced during this period. Geoffrey Trease's *Colony*, although an intrinsic part of the Unity Theatre set-up and its left-wing political stance, confirmed that in the area of race the socialist playwright-thinker is as much capable of racist representation as others elsewhere on the political spectrum. In this drama, where the playwright makes the point that class conditions are universal and thus race is subordinate to economic relations, there is undoubted representation of the principal character by the tight rein the dramatist has over him: his circumscription does not allow any significant dialogic structures to emerge, and the end fixes Trease's liberal options in maintaining the African in a position of servitude. A parallel to this play is that of a Unity working-class hero, Herbert Hodge, whose farce, *Cannibal Carnival*, not only embarrassed Unity but expressed the latter's ambivalence and inaction over images incontrovertibly seen as maintaining the fantasy of the African melanesian as cannibal – the projected natural tendency of the aboriginals of a Pacific island rampaged by European despotic colonialism.

This study has attempted to show that the represented African figure cannot be recognised or understood unless a comparative study is done in relation to the perpetrators' own societies, in this case Europe. By constantly comparing the relevant social, cultural and political histories which underpinned the portrayals by Europeans of themselves and others, a definitive link can be shown to exist between the dramatist, the currents of his/her society and that of the represented. Another significant understanding that this study has shown is that the European female was equally as vitriolic and colonialistic in these dramas as were the men. There is no moral

capacity, no social restraint, no mitigating factor which rendered her acceptance as a European popular icon as lady. And in one case, the female European playwright represented Africans in the same way as did the men, e.g., Dorothy Brandon's *Black Ace*.

In examining these plays, a model was established in order to understand their intentionality and purposibility. This study utilised several lines of investigation: cultural materialism, colonialism and socialism theories, the African-centred perspective as well as the comparative method. Using these various methods of discourse has certainly helped place the plays in their proper historical and socio-political context: they are products of systems of ideology and aesthetics. Once articulated, the system is understood and the plays subjected to deconstruction in the context of their social environment. This has rendered easier the political homogenisation of particular forms of responses which correspond to behaviour predictable in a particular kind of society, e.g., capitalism.

This study has shown that representation and stereotyping serve no further function than to justify existing social, primarily economic, facts around which are constructed the displacement of a perfectly normal people into one servicing an invented image which continued the conditionalities of its role as lord and master. The connotations and meanings which derive from such justifications are the result of the continued defence of a hierarchical position of control, power, prestige, money.

APPENDIX 1

LIST OF PLAYS USED IN THE TEXT

AUTHOR	PLAY	PLACE & DATE OF PRODUCTION
Eugene O'Neill	The Emperor Jones	The Ambassador Theatre, September 10, 1925
Eugene O'Neill	The Hairy Ape	The Gate Theatre, January 26, 1928
Herbert Hodge	Cannibal Carnival	Unity Theatre, 1937
Geoffrey Trease	Colony	Unity Theatre, 1939
E. Elwes	Uncle Tom's Children	1925
Edward B. Sheldon	Nigger	The Coronet, 1909
Dorothy Brandon w/N. Farson	The Black Ace	Queen's Theatre, 1929
Edward Conway	A White Woman	1928
Conor O'Riordon	Napoleon's Josephine	The Adelphi, 1928
K.D. Hewitt	African Shadows	The Q Theatre, September 26, 19
E. Dagnell	Black Dawn	Grand Theatre, 1930
W. Robinson	Black Velvet	1929

M. Edgar	Napoleon's Josephine	The Adelphi Theatre, September 29, 1928
Cayley Calvert	St. Augustine or Dark- ness to Dawn in England	1921
C.L.R. James	Black Jacobins	Westminster Theatre, 1938
Una Marson/ Horace De Vaz	At What A Price?	Central Club Hall, Y.M.C.A., November 23, 1933

APPENDIX 2

FRAMING THE SOCIAL & ORGANISATIONAL BACKGROUND TO 1939

1. Africans & Settlement: An Overview

In order to understand the background of theatre concerned with image-representation of African peoples by Euro-Americans, as well as to understand the particular nature of the insertion of drama by these Africans on the British stage, it is necessary to provide a brief sketch of the settlement patterns and social/political activities of the successive waves of African/Caribbean people in Britain. Since some cultural activity is a product of social intercourse and reaction in a situation of difference, particularly for Africans coming from different geographical places (Africa, the Caribbean, the U.S.A.), with a history of colonization, and with a special shared identity – the sons and daughters of Africa – one should also attend to the notional prevailing images in the host society of these settlers.

In so doing, one has to look at (a) the social/political climate insofar as perceptions of race by the host community is concerned and (b) the responses of Africans both to British perception of themselves and to the programmatic attempts to combat these images and the forms they took. Theoretically, therefore, one has to look at the forms of adaptation of the in-migrating settlers to, and the responses and perceptions of, the British community.

Utilising the definition of Frank Hawkins on the concept of social adaptation as 'the processes whereby a living organism is fitted to its physical and

organic environment,'¹ Carey goes on to say that it is the

change in the norms and behaviour patterns of a group of persons that follows a change in their social environment...which may be expected to affect social life in two major ways...it may alter the internal structural arrangements of the group - its system of leadership and social stratification, the position of its members in relation to each other and to the outsider, etc.; and secondly it may change the arrangements of the group's activities and the specific goals and values of its members.²

It is this question of social adaptation that will be returned to later in the chapter, but it needs to be stated that once the in-migrating settlers accept the notion that they are permanent residents, and not transients, then this notion of social adaptation immediately suggests a number of options. Within this context it should be mentioned that the nineteenth century saw an explosion of racist pseudo-science which can be linked to notions of class and status within British society itself.

Lorrimer, eloquently arguing this point, states:

In an age when Disraeli could speak of two nations and mean a people of one nationality but divided by political power, wealth, social position, and levels of mission applied not only to the rule of white British over subject coloured people, but also to the government of the wealthy over the poor in Britain itself. The nineteenth-century discussion of the racial question rested upon values and assumption moulded by this hierarchical, class-conscious, social order. *The question, 'does a black man equal a white man?' had little meaning in an age when few thought all white men deserved equality*³ (emphasis added).

But it is the development of this pseudo-science, which sometimes ignored the class-stratification at home, which was primarily responsible for the derogative imaging of blacks. As early as 1810, when the science of phrenology⁴ was already in existence, crude representations of imaging by Europeans such as '...a steatopygous Hottentot woman, was kept in a cage and ordered about as if she were a trained animal; after her death she was dissected by a French naturalist and her skeleton and a plaster cast of her body

were put on display at the Musee de l'Homme.⁵

By the end of the 19th century, the population of Africans in Britain was comprised of singers, some students and seamen.⁷ This was bolstered during and after the first war by an increase in the student and seamen, as well as ex-war veterans, population.⁸ In relation to employment, the position of seamen is best characterised by a Nigerian seaman, 'When white man finish you get job. White man never finish.'⁹ Racial discrimination was particularly prominent in the area of employment after the war among seamen, and racial violence flared consistently.¹⁰ Little's reasons for job discrimination against African seamen were given as rooted in the demobbing of war veterans and the competition for jobs, with Britons proclaiming "our own people first."¹¹ This attitude was not confined only to individuals, but to the trade union and members of government.¹²

That racial discrimination was a fact of life was indisputable, that large unemployment contributed not only to racial unrest, but to the general tone of violence, demonstrations, and anti-police tirades and attacks, and the specific rise of the workers movement, cannot be underestimated.¹³ The picture that is painted therefore just after the first war suggests that Britain was experiencing enormous difficulties and the Conservative party was under constant attack, and in addition to the historical characterization of the African as slave and dumb brute, contributed to the worsening condition of the African and of racial discrimination. However, a brief chronological survey of the intellectual and organizational development of Africans suggests that there were oppositional forces constantly at work in responding to racial abuse and attempts to improve the condition of African intellectuals.

2. H. Sylvester Williams & the Pan-African Association

Williams was born in rural Trinidad in 1869, became a teacher while still a teenager, migrated to the U.S.A. and then Canada, where he started a course in law. Leaving Canada, he came to England in 1895 and furthered his studies in law, graduating years later. What needs to be stated at the outset is that

Williams, like the majority of Africans born in the Caribbean, Africa or the U.S.A., shared a passion for the Christian faith and became a member of the Temperance Society in Britain.¹⁴ He was also a member of the Fabian Society and was in touch with the Webbs, George Bernard Shaw and others¹⁵ (of which further discussion is made in chapter 3). This attachment to a certain type of morality, and a conception of civilisation which went with it, would confirm a number of contradictions in Williams' political philosophy - interestingly, not unique to him.

Williams' biographer suggests that it was due to his reaction to an exposition on the conditions of African miners in South Africa by an indigenous South African woman, Mrs Kenloch, which spurred him to form his Pan-African Association in June 1897.¹⁶ But it is probable that Williams' own experience of the condition of the African race (a term used in professional circles during this period) in Trinidad and of the wider problems of the African in the Caribbean and in the U.S.A., had prepared him for ready conversion.¹⁷ Williams convened the first Pan-African Conference in 1900 in which thirty representatives from several countries attended at Westminster Town Hall; among the notables were W.E.B. du Bois, Bishop Alexander Walters, the composer Samuel Coleridge-Taylor and the director of the Fisk Jubilee Singers (who made a great impact on the London stage), J.F. Loudin.¹⁸ The purpose of the conference was broad-based: to solicit assistance in the propagation of the cause of the African race. The Bishop of London sent his well wishes and 'a promise was obtained from Queen Victoria through Joseph Chamberlain not to "overlook the interests and welfare of the native races."¹⁹ The conference also dispatched a petition to Queen Victoria which was explicit in its condemnation of the forced nature of employment and lack of political rights among colonised peoples.²⁰ In 1901 Williams launched *The Pan-African*, a journal which in its first issue exhibited its wide-ranging interests in the condition of the African world-wide.²¹ In 1906 Williams was elected to the Marylebone Borough council on a Labour ticket where, it seemed, his contributions were unrewarding. Williams visited and worked in South Africa as a lawyer, returned to London, then to Trinidad where he died in

1911 at the age of 42.

3. Duse Mohamed Ali - The African Times & Orient Review

Duse Mohamed Ali was born in Egypt in 1867 of Sudanese parents. At the age of nine, his father sent him to study in England where he lived with a French captain by the name of Duse. It was from him he got the name.²² Ali first came to prominence with the publication of a book, *In the Land of the Pharaohs*, for which publicity was received through the formation of his journal, *The African Times and Orient Review*. The journal was a truly pan-African one in content, and seems likely to have been influenced by (as opposed to Peter Fryer's (1984:288) assertion that it was the first journal to be published in Britain by and for black people) Williams' *The Pan-African*. In the first issue, Ali clearly set out the purpose of the journal:

The recent Universal Races Congress...clearly demonstrated that there was ample need for a Pan-Oriental Pan-African journal at the seat of the British Empire which would lay the aims, desires, and intentions of the Black, Brown, and Yellow races - within and without the empire - at the throne of Caesar...

For whereas there is an extensive Aryan-Saxon Press devoted to the interests of the Anglo-Saxon, it is obvious that this vehicle of that information may only be used in a limited and restricted sense in its ventilation of African and Oriental aims. Hence, the truth about African and Oriental conditions is rarely stated with precision and accuracy in the columns of the European press...The voices of millions of Britain's enlightened dark races are never heard...discontent is fermented by reason of systematic injustice and misrepresentation...²³

It is apparent that at the outset of the journal there was an engagement with the racial and political issues of the day, and the Pan-African, Pan-Oriental perspective which Ali spoke of, was reflected in the titles of the first issue: "Hindu Treatment by the Borden Government," "The Race Problems of Hawaii," "The Negro Conference at Tuskegee Institute" (the vocational

school at which Booker T. Washington was principal), "Report of First Universal Races Congress," etc. Ali did not see himself as isolated, nor did any of the early pan-Africanists. Ali kept up the level of information in the journal with graphic photographs of Africans being mob-hanged in the United States,²⁴ along with a chronology of murders suffered by Africans in the U.S. In September 1912, the journal ran an eulogy at the death of British-born Samuel Coleridge-Taylor, and in the Christmas issue of the same year it ran an interview with Harriett Tubman, the anti-slavery freedom-fighter, still alive at over 100 years old. The journal also advertised a lecture bureau offering speakers on Egypt, Morocco, Turkey, Tripoli, Sierra Leone, the Gold Coast (Ghana), Nigeria, etc. And in a later issue, the journal published the first article written by Marcus Garvey in England, entitled "The British West Indies in the Mirror of Civilization. History Making by Colonial Negroes."²⁵ It should be noted here that Ali's journal was based at 158 Fleet Street, the heart of the newspaper industry in Britain.

Ali's journal, with intermittent breaks, functioned until 1918. It must be said, however, despite an obvious predilection for things pan-African, Ali himself was involved in European literary criticism and played the part of Othello.²⁶ He also played a prominent role in the context of politicising the condition of the African, according to Geiss, by supplying information to Labour M.P.s.²⁷ Ali later left England for the U.S. for business interests and also worked with Marcus Garvey on his *Negro World*.²⁸ He left the U.S. in 1931, was refused permission to land on the Gold Coast, and went on to Nigeria²⁹ where he settled until his death in 1944.

4. Claude McKay: The Outsider in the Inside

McKay, unlike the previous pan-Africanists, held an ambition for being a writer since his early years in Jamaica and had lived and worked in the U.S. with the two most powerful Leftwing editors in New York – Max Eastman of *The Liberator*, and the voluble Frank Harris of *Pearson's Magazine*. McKay was also an associate/protege of the British folklorist Walter Jekyll

and had his first collection of poetry published through Jekyll's patronage in his native Jamaica in 1912. McKay's trip to London in 1919 was facilitated by a Mr Gray, an European of dwindling fortunes, who was interested in McKay's poetry.³⁰ McKay also had on him two important letters of introduction, one from Frank Harris to Bernard Shaw (a Fabian), and another from Max Eastman's sister, Crystal, to Robert Smillie, the president of the Miners' Federation.³¹

The importance of McKay to this study is that he functioned primarily as a writer within an essentially European world. This does not mean that he did not experience racial discrimination (as we shall soon see), but that he was simultaneously at ease with the European world as much as he was with the African. McKay's privileged peasant background, with his father's pride, interracial mixing and, more importantly, lack of distinction in treating an European because he was privileged but according only to the law of manners and character,³² conditioned McKay, from childhood, into unhesitating friendship with Europeans on the basis of mutual interests. Thus when he had arrived in London he already had in his possession letters of privilege, and soon came to understand the peculiar nature of Britain's racism, and his own resolve at combatting it.

McKay's childhood was quite unusual for a colonial – before he was fourteen years old he was exposed to his elder brother's free-thinking literature and was without religious indoctrination despite his family's participation in the church.³³ His migration to the U.S. also put him in touch with the Euro-American Leftwing, as well as various pan-Africanists of differing political persuasions. When McKay arrived in England he frequented two clubs, the International Club³⁴ and another, situated in a basement in Drury Lane, was the centre for Africans. McKay was banned from the latter by the manager (an English female) because of his reference to her as 'maternal' in her treatment of Africans³⁵ McKay subsequently spent most of his spare time at the International Club where he was moved by its radicalism, which plunged him into reading Marx.³⁶ This club had its beginnings in the preceding century, founded by radical Germans in 1840, and was the reputed centre for pan-

European radical thought. Marx and Engels had spoken there in the 1840s,³⁷ and during McKay's time it was frequented by Polish, Russian, Italian, Irish and Czech 'nationalists.'³⁸ Here McKay also discusses some of the personalities of the club, Saklatvala, the first Indian (and Communist) M.P. in Britain, William Gallacher, George Lansbury, proprietor of *The Daily Herald*, Sylvia Pankhurst, 'who had deserted the suffragette for the workers' movement.' It was perhaps here where McKay was first introduced to Pankhurst, for he later was employed by her as a reporter and worked throughout his stay for the paper. It is interesting to note that McKay's brief was not about "blacks," but directed to the workers' movement.

McKay first got into print in *The Workers' Dreadnought* in June 1919. Three poems, "The Barrier," "After the Winters," and "The Little Peoples" were reprinted from Eastman's *Liberator*. Two other poems, "A Roman Holliday," and the Frank Harris inspired "If We Must Die" (which became his most popular poem, recited by Winston Churchill over the wireless during the second war) appeared in September of the same year. McKay's first article appeared in January 1920, entitled "Socialism and the Negro," and his entry into the Pankhurst paper was facilitated by Lansbury's rejection of McKay's letter³⁹ to the Editor in response to an article by E.D. Morel, "Black Scourge in Europe – Sexual Horror let loose." McKay's letter, published in *WD*, refers to the fact that the subject was better dealt with in journals like *The Nation*, *The New Statesman*, and *The Edinburgh Review*, which he calls liberal and conservative organs, and went on to say that

During my stay in Europe, I have come in contact with many weak and lascivious persons of both sexes, but I do not argue from my experience that the English race is degenerate...

If the black troops are syphilitic, they have been contaminated by the white world. According to competent white investigators, syphilis is a disease peculiar to white and yellow peoples; where it has been known among the blacks it has been carried thither by the whites.⁴⁰

That Pankhurst's paper was able to carry McKay's letter without censorship tells a great deal about her political integrity and will, for contemporary analo-

gies would be difficult to find without the accusation of reversed racism. In spite of McKay's rebuttal, or perhaps because of it, Morel expanded his article and circulated it as a bestseller pamphlet and free copies were given to delegates to the 1920 Trades Union Congress.⁴¹ This attack on Africans must be contextualised within the general atmosphere of social hardship experienced by the post-war veterans, the massive marches, organised workers' attacks upon the government and employers,⁴² and the ensuing bitterness of the die-hards like Morel who wanted to divert the attention of the workers to their supposed "black" enemy. It should also be borne in mind the peculiar nature of English socialisation given its xenophobic character and ethnocentric bias. Even within the pages of the *WD* an article referred to 'White workers have been used to crush Black workers, and now Black workers seem about to be regarded by Capitalism as the last hope of crushing the International Workers Revolution.'⁴³

This is not the place to discuss these issues in detail, but merely to suggest the complexity of racism as manifesting itself in peculiarly unsuspecting places, thus to acknowledge it as an historical and phenomenological fact. McKay's career as journalist, although not placing him as a writer within the wider context of British literary life, certainly afforded him extensive opportunity to observe, report on and understand British political life. He followed all the major workers' leaders and wrote features, reports, and book reviews of some of the leading radical writers of the 1920s. McKay not only published articles under his own name, but used a pseudonym such as Hugh Hope or the initials of his name.

One of the most interesting of McKay's experiences is the fact that he was not fully aware of Sylvia Pankhurst's involvement with the politbureau of the Russian Communist Party after 1917. When a member of her organisation was arrested by the police, it was revealed that he was a courier between Pankhurst and Lenin, Zinoviev, and members of the polibureau. The police found on him '...notes in cipher, documents of information about the armed forces, the important industrial centers, and Ireland, a manual for officers of the future British Red army and statements about the distribution of money.'⁴⁴

McKay himself cleverly escaped being arrested when the police raided the *WD*'s offices after the publication of a sensitive document about the navy. McKay had secured the original document on his person, after the police had thoroughly ransacked Pankhurst's offices, and was descending when he was questioned by the police:

"And what are you?" the detective asked.

"Nothing, Sir," I said, with a big black grin. Chuckling, he let me pass. (I learned afterward that he was the ace of Scotland Yard.)⁴⁵

McKay's life on *WD* was certainly both colourful and dangerous, and not without serious altercations. Although Pankhurst can be characterised as an 'ultra' leftist in the context of British liberalism, she was certainly cognizant of the limitations imposed on her freedom. When McKay discovered that Lansbury was employing some non-union labour who refused to join the strike at his plant, and wanted to expose the fact, Pankhurst restrained him stating that the paper was indebted to Lansbury for newsprint and a financial debt.⁴⁶ Lansbury, who has been hailed as a progressive, was described by Maisky as '*...deeply religious and drew his inspiration from primitive Christianity... His ideas of struggle...were certainly his own. He did not admit the class principle. Revolution frighetened him. He was a consistent pacifist both in international and in home affairs*'⁴⁷ (emphasis added).

McKay did not circulate only within the circles of the English, but made important social contacts with Africans from the Caribbean and Africa. He did not function as a political organiser, either with the socialist or with the pan-Africanists; that he saw himself as a socialist is without doubt, but that he felt a strong bond with the suffering and circumstances of Africans was indisputable. With this consciousness, he tried to expose the cracks in the armour of British imperialism and what he referred to as the 'congenial' nature of British racism. But McKay was at all times an outsider functioning within the social and political world of both the English left and their liberal counterpart. This last point has been raised by another writer, 'To whatever groups he allied himself, McKay remained always something of an outsider without

deep or lasting commitment.⁴⁸ This judgement is from the organizational perspective, but from personal commitment to a cause and an ideal, McKay was certainly committed all his life. That he gained an immeasurable insight into Britain and made a telling contribution to the elucidation of the African experience and position can be gleaned from readings of his autobiography.

Now that we have considered the orientation and development of some of the leading individual and political figures from the late 1890s to 1920, we turn to further elaboration of the post-war effect upon movement and status of colonial migrants to Britain and the effect they had on the host country and the level of social 'adaptation' that was required of them in order to survive. In this context, we can evaluate the aims and objectives of some student and professional organisations and the politicisation of students in relation to the position of the British government on the colonial question.

One of the earliest post-war organisations was the African Progress Union which was quite a conservative body comprising professional Africans. At its inauguration in January, 1919, several speakers addressed the question of African pride. T.H. Jackson of Nigeria supported the idea of imperialism as having benefits for Africans: 'I am quite prepared to appreciate the function of Imperialism in determining the course of history in the successive stages of the world's existence.'⁴⁹ The question may well have been posed, what determined the world's existence prior to imperialism? Another member, M. Thompson, a lawyer, after extolling the virtues of African pride, said, 'It is not our fault that the Romans did not find it convenient to give us the benefit of their great civilization.'⁵⁰ It is not surprising that this particular brand of contradictory pride and conservativeness could reside in the consciousness of individuals. For it was as colonials they were educated, the requirement of which was to extract all vestige of native culture from them. This was determined by the concept, according to Fanon, of 'It is the racist who creates his inferior.'⁵¹ One can also consider the social atmosphere in the post-war years. Lord Sinha, an Indian, was appointed Under-Secretary of State for India for the 'first time in the British Empire.'⁵² Casely Hayford, the Pan-Africanist,

received the M.B.E in 1919 for his work with the Prince's of Wales Patriotic Fund, and in 1920 he was awarded the O.B.E.⁵³

That education could lead to substantial benefits in the colonial world was obvious. Thus organisations like the African Progress Union would find a place within the context of colonial society – to be proud of being African and, simultaneously, to be prepared to play a subsidiary and unchallenging role in the British Empire.

5. West African Students Union

The West African Students Union was jointly founded in 1925 by Ladipo Solanke and Dr Bankole Bright.⁵⁴ That the energetic force behind its conception was Solanke has not been disputed. Solanke reacted strongly to the representation of Africans as curios at the 1924 Wembley exhibition and sought the assistance of Casely Hayford and other West Africans without any appreciable success.⁵⁵ Before WASU received its home in 1928, loaned for a year, according to Fryer, by Marcus Garvey,⁵⁶ there was discussion as early as 1919 by the Committee for the Welfare of Africans about the purchase of such a home. At a reception held at the Lincolnshire Room, Westminster, on May 22, attended by such colonial luminaries as Sir Hugh Clifford, Lord Henry Cavendish-Bentinck, M.P., Sir Sydney Olivier (Fabian, former Governor of Jamaica, and liberal defender of poor Jamaicans), Sir Victor Buxter and others, the committee's purpose was to consult Africans about what to do in the form of a war memorial. They already had £2,000 in their possession⁵⁷ In 1929 WASU sent Solanke to Nigeria to solicit financial assistance and backing for its building, to be run as a hostel.⁵⁸ Solanke remained until 1932, consequently creating a number of branches along the West African coast: Ghana, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Liberia.⁵⁹ Casely Hayford became the first patron of WASU in 1927, followed by Prempeh 1, the British-imposed exiled King of the Asante (Ashanti) after the former's death in 1931, and in 1935 by actor/activist, Paul Robeson.⁶⁰ On January 1, 1933, WASU moved into its rented premises in Camden Town, and later purchased

its own property in 1938 in the same borough.

At this stage it is important to evaluate the issues as proposed by the two principal players for the hearts and minds of African students, WASU and the Colonial Office. WASU was seen from its inception as a more radical organisation than the previous student bodies, nationally identified, that came before it. Solanke saw WASU as a microcosm and precursor of a federated West African state, ultimately leading to a federated African state. This was radical thinking in 1925. This was translated practically in orientation of WASU's policies; three of its objectives define its political vision: (a) to act as a bureau of information on African history, customs, law and institutions; (b) to present to the world a true picture of African life and philosophy, thereby making a definitely African contribution towards the progress of civilisation; and (c) to foster a spirit of national consciousness and racial pride among its members.⁶¹ These objectives are still relevant to and provide the basis for African cultural and political organisations in 1991 as they were in the mid-1920s. The CO deliberately hastened its desire to establish a rival hostel to that of WASU's in order to circumscribe and limit the effectivity of the latter. The CO set up Aggrey House in 1934 to rival that of WASU's, which, with less money, did not have the facilities that could have been afforded by the CO. The consequence was many abandoned WASU. Ghanaian students all left except one, and WASU felt that African students would be 'influenced in their political thinking and outlook...' which would constitute an undermining of 'Africa struggling to be free from political domination.'⁶²

WASU had wide affiliations to groups and organizations of differing political persuasions. This was characteristic of all African political organisations in London, whether controlled by West Africans or Caribbeans. The reason, ostensibly, was to circulate its ideas and, more importantly, to solicit support for its decolonisation objectives from as wide a spectrum as possible. It had links with organisations such as The National Union of Students, British Centre for Colonial Students, The League of Coloured Peoples, and it had close ties with the Fabian Colonial Bureau and the Labour Party, and 'some left wing organisations such as the League Against Imperialism.'⁶³ The

Labour Party leader, Clement Attlee, spoke at WASU's premises, paying lip service to the 'wrongs of the white races to the races of darker skins. We have always demanded that the freedom which we claim for ourselves should be extended to all men.'⁶⁴ The Labour Party's colonial specialist, Reginald Sorenson, M.P., gave the opening address at a WASU conference in response to the colonial policies of Winston Churchill.⁶⁵ To demonstrate its non-recognition of awards handed out by the colonial administration, WASU wrote in its magazine on one such occasion during the King's birthday celebrations in 1934, 'It is worth remembering that a *decorated donkey is still a donkey, an honoured slave a slave*'⁶⁶ (emphasis added). Although WASU took several stances, and despite its written objectives, it was believed and seen that its membership was not uniform in opinion in expressing a hard political line.⁶⁷ Ladipo Solanke, its Secretary-General, had an unwavering support for Britain over all the other European powers, and characterised Britain's past misdeeds as 'blunders.'⁶⁸ Although Olusanya characterised the perception by some of the duality of choices open to WASU as being cynical, and insisted upon defining its belief as being sincere, i.e., whether there was a colonised mentality or no choice open to WASU – it is obvious that British education of the minority of Africans, despite its violent colonial record, was responsible for the position of the governing body. It was this position, when confronting the option of the better of the worse, that permitted organisations like WASU to support British colonialism. In this sense, despite WASU's persistent involvement with the causes and conditions of the African, it fell short of a holistic view of independence.

In conclusion, it should be mentioned that WASU's political development was empowered by the wide range of political activists who shared its platforms and events which demanded taking a position. This would include George Padmore, C.L.R. James, Kwame Nkrumah, and the unexpected invasion of Ethiopia by the Italian fascists under Mussolini. This was the most politicising event in WASU's history, and although Britain forestalled, along with the League of Nations, on a prompt response, this never hindered WASU proclaiming the leniency of the British colonial system, although

expressing its own political agenda.⁶⁹ But WASU was not the only organisation which held a bi-partisan position in relation to Britain and Africa, and it was not the only one whose vision was clouded by the 'benefits' of colonialism to a minority of African people.

6. Dr Ronald Moody & The League of Coloured Peoples

Ronald Moody was born in Kingston, Jamaica, in 1882 and arrived in London in 1904 to study medicine. His mother, a dark woman, was aware of the liability of black skin in colonial Jamaica for she advised her son to make 'friends with those fairer than himself.'⁷⁰ Moody's father worked on the Panama canal and returned with enough money to open a pharmacy. Moody was sent to a prestigious school in Kingston run by Sir William Morrison, and was then transferred to Woolmer's Free School until 1899. His scholarship was sound, and upon graduation he opened his own school, then was called to Woolmers where he taught for some time. From his very early beginnings Moody was a devout Christian, becoming secretary of the Christian Endeavour Society at the age of nineteen. He also was a preacher at two churches in Kingston.⁷¹ Thus Moody had started his career as an eager christian and as a scholar. It should be remarked here that in the post-Emancipation social circles in the Caribbean, parents perceived of education as being liberation from menial work, and Christianity offered the opportunity to 'fulfill' the moral requirements, as well as status, of any serious person with intentions of becoming a respected citizen in a colonial society.

As early as 1912 in Britain, Moody was elected President of the Young People's Branch of the Colonial Missionary Society (CMS) and in the same year was appointed a member of the Board of Directors.⁷² In 1921 he was elected Chairman of the Board of Directors of the same society (although, as Vaughan points out, he was unable to commit the society to the issue of race),⁷³ and in 1931 he became President of the London Christian Endeavour

Federation.⁷⁴ In 1936 he became President of the Christian Endeavour Union of Great Britain and Ireland,⁷⁵ and in 1937 he was elected a member of the Executive Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society.⁷⁶ This points to a fundamental perspective of life and the influences which came to bear on his conceptualisation of the meaning of 'civilisation' and of 'culture' vis-a-vis his presidency of his own organization, The League of Coloured Peoples. Paradoxically, it is his passionate involvement and belief in the good of Christianity which provided the fuel for his energy, compassion, and broad-mindedness in the struggle for better social conditions under which people of colour worked and lived.⁷⁷

Moody founded The League of Coloured Peoples in 1931. Since Moody had lived in London from 1904, it is without doubt that he would have been familiar with all the student and civic organisations which came into being before and after the first war. He would have known of Duse Mohammed Ali, Sylvester Williams, Casely Hayford, Ladipo Solanke and Claude McKay.⁷⁸ Although Moody's biographer makes no mention of these figures, it is doubtful that with a tradition of organisation and personalities so resonant, that Moody would not have known of them. What is certain is that Moody was an admirer of James E.K. Aggrey (after whom the Colonial Office named the rival hostel and to which Moody belonged as a Trustee),⁷⁹ and flung himself into a number of issues and acted as a mediator between some 'West Indians' and continental Africans over the former's contempt for and arrogance to the latter.⁸⁰ This could only have been so because of the association of the educated 'West Indian' with British culture and civilisation, for there was nothing in the Caribbean that they had created that could have given them this feeling. It is ironic that this question of difference could equally play a role in separating one group of Africans from another when they were both subjected to the same intensity of racial discrimination. Moody's journal, *The Keys*, felt compelled to report on this collision after a meeting was called at Aggrey House to discuss the issue:

...It is in our view impossible to exaggerate the necessity for West Indians

to make an effort to break through the anti-African propaganda with which their educational system is saturated, and to try to re-establish contact with the civilisations in which they have their roots.⁸¹

In spite of this collision, there was undoubtedly many collaborations between committed Africanists from the Caribbean and continental Africans. Moody's organisation had several Africans on its committee, e.g., Stephen Thomas of West Africa was secretary of the League during the 1933-4 period, while his sister, Stella Thomas was the librarian; Alex H. Koi, also of West Africa, was the vice-president, while Lewis Mbanefo of Nigeria (who later became a judge) was on the executive committee.⁸² Moody dealt with this question cleverly, since he himself had suffered from the proverbial disdain for Africans, according to his biographer.

He became conscious of a desire to have as little as possible to do with his own people and what was perhaps worse, he tended to look down on Africans as a species too low in the scale of human development for him to associate with them in any way. He was black indeed, but he resolutely *refused in his own mind to admit that he was an African, or that he was in any way related to Africa*⁸³ (emphasis added).

This notion of difference in spite of genetic connections has been characterised as 'psychological violence':

Its victim is an alienated person, in the strong Maxian sense of man becoming a stranger to himself. To the extent that the brainwashed colonized individual defines himself or herself in terms of the Other, i.e., the White man, he is also not free.⁸⁴

But this is merely a phase in the psychological development of the colonised, and Moody was no different to many educated Africans who fell victim both to propaganda and to the complex of colonial inferiority. That Moody moved steadfastly to deal with this problem publicly and within the structure of his own organisation speaks well for him.

It is interesting to note that each organisation which developed in Britain soon established its mouth-piece, and *The Keys* became such an organ for

Moody: it was campaigning, it was critical not only on social issues but on cultural ones, and it recorded the various developments and events which took place in Britain and different parts of the world. Because of the orientation of Moody himself, there was an indelible stamp on the formation and structure of his organisation. Its policies can be best described as civic, i.e., it was concerned primarily with social injustice and interracial harmony as the name of its journal implied, derived from Aggrey's (Moody's role model) dictum: 'You can play a tune of sorts on the white keys, and you can play a tune of sorts on the black keys, but for harmony you must use both the black and white keys.'⁸⁵

To compound the matter of alienation from one's African ancestry, we can look at the possible effects of C.L.R. James on members of the League when he gave a lecture to them at the Hoddeston conference in March 24 – 26, 1933. *The Keys* reported that James 'began by showing how the black man in the West Indies had been shorn of all African civilization and had been engulfed by Western civilization.'⁸⁶ This would have demonstrated to people who could not differentiate between James' indictment of his own class, and those others who had always been proud culturally and in terms of identity to proclaim their African ancestry. This was one of several conferences and meetings the League regularly held at different locations. Through Moody's Christian connections, members of his organisation were warmly welcomed at Christian Endeavour guest houses, and the journal reported on these events as well as on racial discrimination. In one issue, a report disclosed that the Port of London Authority refused to hire any more African men, while its Union carried out disciplinary actions against men who refused to work with Africans.⁸⁷ The League also held concerts at the Indian hostel where John Payne, the African American singer, performed along with Bruce Wendell, pianist, Rudolph Dunbar, clarinettist, while Stella Thomas and Una Marson, the organiser and compere, gave two recitations each.⁸⁸ In the same issue it was reported that Marson's play, *At What a Price*, was successfully staged at the Y.W.C.A. Central Hall Club, on November 23, 1933.⁸⁹ Moody also held an annual garden party in which members of his organisation and influential

English people attended. The purpose, it seemed, was to keep those who could be called upon, abreast of events which affected people of colour. It is well known that Moody was well connected, that he exchanged letters with the Colonial Office and was familiar with some government officials and prominent members of society.⁹⁰

But the League also played a prominent role in changing public perception of certain events. Two key issues stand out in the League's political development: its involvement with the seamen condition of unemployment (and the notorious Nationality Acts) and on the question of racial discrimination against African commissioned officers. These issues have been dealt with in detail by David Vaughan (1960: 76-9), Little (1972: 85-9), and Ndem (1953: 73-86), and unnecessary to go into here. But the issue, in summary, concerned the large scale firing of African seamen in favour of white British and the consequent hardship that was experienced by the former. This issue spanned both wars: after the first and before the second. On the second issue of the army enlistment discrimination, the matter is effectively summarised by Marinka Sherwood (1985: 1-19). A final issue can be added to the politicisation of the League and that is the question of the Italo-Ethiopian war (see *The Keys*, Vol.2, No.2, Oct-Dec, 1934: 39; Vol.2, No.4, April-June 1935: 70, 84-5, and Vol.3, No.3, Jan-March 1936: 32, 39-40). That these events played a major role in exposing the belief in British justice and fair play are beyond question, but what prevented Moody and the League from moving to a more realistic position in terms of political engagement is his fundamental Christian orientation which expressed the philosophy of exhibiting patience in the face of opposition, virtue in the face of hypocrisy, and the ingrained belief that conscience will pave the way for rapprochement and enlightenment.

Thus, despite the social relationships held with other groups and individuals of differing political views, despite the friendly (and sometimes hostile) atmosphere which prevailed, the League remained a conservative organisation within the Pan-African spectrum (Geiss, 1968: 340), and the organisation came to an end soon after Moody himself expired in 1947.

7. Pan-Africanism, Socialism & the Radical Wing: C.L.R. James, George Padmore, Ras Makonnen

The period of the 1930s provides a paradigm in the articulation and organisational activities of Africans in Britain and marks a turning point in the political and institutional development of both the Caribbean and Africa in a most dramatic way. What needs to be understood is that leaders like Eric Williams, Jomo Kenyatta, Kwame Nkrumah, T.A. Marryshow, all now dead, were politicised and radicalised by their experiences in Britain and the U.S.A. All four were students during this period, and all participated in various degrees in the events of the 1930s. Nkrumah was the first to take leadership of Ghana and gain its independence; Kenyatta became leader of KANU and the first prime minister of Kenya; Williams became the first premier and prime minister of Trinidad and Tobago in the late 1950s/1962 respectively, while T.A. Marryshow also became the political leader and first prime minister of Grenada. This was no accident or coincidence. The fact that Nkrumah and Kenyatta were actively involved in the anti-colonial struggle, that Williams, although actively on the periphery, was pioneering a thesis which revealed the inequities and economic basis of slavery, and that Marryshow was a member of the League of Coloured Peoples, indicate that deconstructing the myth of Britain as invincible, and that there were particular illusions about the British Empire, all crumbled in the highly racist atmosphere and political hypocrisy of the 1930s.⁹¹ In this context, intellectuals like C.L.R. James, George Padmore and Ras Makonnen, who gave up their university courses or did not enter the university at all, in preference for the financially unrewarding tasks of anti-colonial struggle, suggest that there was a definite commitment to precipitate the collapse of colonialism and imperialism in Africa. It is therefore important to understand not only their backgrounds, but the atmosphere and events which led to the political paths they followed.

C.L.R. James was born in Tunapuna, Trinidad, in 1901. He grew up in a family situation with his parents and grandmother, with his aunts close by, and from childhood he had a passion for two things: cricket and learning. His father was a school teacher ('who ducked controversy'⁹²) and his mother a

seamstress. It must be emphasised here that the national curriculum of the entire English-governed Caribbean before and even after independence in 1962 was entirely predicated on the English education system. It should be no surprise therefore that many of the colonial intellectuals were rooted in a sense of belonging to Britain. To give a single example (for the list is long), James here describes his reading and his schooling.

...my *Vanity Fair* and my puritanical view of the world...A British intellectual long before I was ten, already an alien in my own environment among my own people, even my own family...

When I left school I was an educated person, but I had educated myself into a member of the British middle class...⁹³

Although James extolled the virtues of his reading, his education, and the fact that he came from a lower middle-class background, he distanced himself further by saying, 'I visualized my audience as a people who had to be made to understand that *West Indians were a Westernised people*'⁹⁴ (emphasis added). This was a theme that James returned to time and again; in so doing, James was making a case for the integration of Caribbean peoples into British (and by extension, Western) society as a natural and culturally inherited tradition, since the Caribbean was British by colonisation, education and training. Paradoxically, James had made reference to two African-named relatives, a cousin Cudjoe (Kojó,) and an uncle Cuffie (Kofi) at the turn of the century.⁹⁵ This confirms the direct ancestral links that James himself had through his relatives' connection to Africa (Ghana, where these names originate). But James' emphasis upon the westernisation of Caribbeans was an expression of his individual consciousness.

The necessity of examining the political orientation and cultural grounding of African intellectuals is to demonstrate the disparity in the conceptualisation of radical alternatives which were expressed by them, and the actual cultural practice of the people. This would determine the extent to which the intellectual would go in his vision: economic radicalisation (socialism) and cultural conservatism (colonialism), polarities which existed then in the consciousness of the intellectual.⁹⁶

Malcolm Nurse (later known as George Padmore) was born in Arouca in 1902, but regularly visited the same area where James lived, and they knew each other as boys. There were several fundamental differences between James and Padmore and one was Padmore's father did not accommodate British colonialism in Trinidad. As a teacher, Padmore's father, James, was '...more distinguished...' ⁹⁷ than C.L.R. James' own father and was soon appointed to a new position as agricultural instructor to teachers, a post he later resigned due to an assumed title he held for his job. The fact that the objection came from an assumed English professor, did not make nonsense of the latter's influence in the ears of the Board of Education. ⁹⁸ Another difference is that Padmore's grandfather was born a slave and there was revealed discussions about slavery in his house. ⁹⁹ Padmore's father later renounced Christianity to become a muslim. According to James, he may have been influenced by Blyden's book, *Christianity, Islam and the Negro Race*, and that his room was filled with books: 'He had built shelves and they were completely covered with books from the floor to the ceiling...[he] was a man who had some education, because teachers then and middle-class whites had some education. He was a man who had defied the government...and he declared himself a Moslem... I did not understand what that meant...' ¹⁰⁰ After secondary school, Padmore worked for a time on a national newspaper, but disliked the job because of its editor's role as an imperialist. ¹⁰¹ These early events serve to illustrate the political differences between Padmore and James although both were friends from childhood and were equally scholarly, but with evidently different political outlooks.

Padmore left for the the U.S. in 1924 to study medicine. Before taking up his studies at Fisk University, he spent two terms at Colombia University studying sociology. He studied political science after abandoning the idea of medicine, but he also studied botany, international relations, zoology and sociology. While at Fisk he was recognised as an erudite and passionate speaker and took part in many dsiscussions on public platforms on colonialism. Padmore moved to different universitties, but was consistent in his student activities and his articulation of the evils of colonialism. When Sir Esme

Howard, British Ambassador to the U.S., was scheduled to visit Howard University where Padmore was a student, Padmore arranged a demonstration through the International Anti-Imperialist Youth League (for which it was conjectured that he was its secretary). Howard was attacked and the hierarchy at Howard embarrassed.

When a search was made for the culprit who initiated the attack, Padmore's name could not be discovered on the register (for he was registered as Nurse).¹⁰² Padmore's activities seemed always to be on the radical side, but contemporaneous with his political activities, he always seemed to have displayed a deep scholastic interest in his studies, and many members of the academic staff at Howard and Fisk universities testified to his rigor and intellect. Padmore, unsurprisingly, became a member of the Communist Party and had been engaged in journalistic work on a variety of newspapers, from college rag to socialist tabloid. Padmore, to summarise his illustrious and busy activities in the U.S., was a radical who understood the dynamics of the binary concepts of race and class. Thus he would attack the Communist Party over policy and insisted, perhaps somewhat doctrinairely, that the African American could only find liberation in conjunction with the Euro-American working class, a view he would change in the near future.

On the other hand, C.L.R. James worked as a teacher in Trinidad, fraternised with the brown-skin middle-class and the local Europeans, although suffering racial discrimination because of his colour.¹⁰³ He edited a pioneering journal, *Trinidad*, with Alfred Mendes in the late 1920s, of which only two issues were published. The journal can best be described as a 'literary club' idea: writers coming together from the vantage point of their middle-class position, to conceptualise and write of the lives of poor people, and to express critical literary opinions. James' life was also taken up with athletics and cricket for which he wrote in the national papers. Having been invited by Learie Constantine to come to England, James, at 32, sailed out to England where he lived in London for six months before going to stay with the famous cricketer, Constantine and his family. James was introduced to the *Manchester Guardian* at which he began a long career as a cricket corre-

spondent.

It was in Lancashire where he began coming into contact with the Labour Party and discussed politics and other matters with them. But James saw his role as principally that of a writer and published his first book, *The Life of Captain Cipriani*, financed by Constantine, for export to Trinidad and the Caribbean. It had, however, made an impact in England in certain circles and according to one writer ‘...was taken up by Leonard and Virginia Woolf and their circle...’¹⁰⁴ An edited version was published as a pamphlet by The Hogarth Press as *The Case for West Indian Self-Government* in 1933. It is also while still in Lancashire that he had begun preparatory work on his 1938 publication, *The Black Jacobins*, by importing books from France and reading late at night such writers, according to Robert Hill, as Michelet, Aulard, Mathiez, Juarez, and Lefebvre.¹⁰⁵ This marked a radical development in the political consciousness of James, but so far, he was an arm-chair revolutionary, confined primarily to theorising and socialist discourse.¹⁰⁶ A memory from childhood would soon plunge him into another dimension of political activity, radicalism, and organisational grounding and commitment.

But it needs to be stated here that without the entrepreneurial skills of Ras Makonnen many of the activities of the ardent Pan-Africanists of the 1930s and 1940s may not have come to fruition. Makonnen is one of the most important shadows which loom behind the accomplishment of the 1930s and 1940s but who has been, in the main, neglected by scholars and activists alike, primarily due to the fact that apart from his memoirs, he had not produced any writing, theoretical or otherwise, during the heyday of this important era. But that his role as organiser, fund-raiser, and activist was pivotal to the movement is undisputed.

Makonnen was born George T.N. Griffith in Buxton, Guyana in 1899 or 1903, the date is uncertain.¹⁰⁷ His background provides an insight into his later political development. Although he never knew his paternal grandfather, he was reported to have been born in Tigre, Ethiopia, and was taken by a Scots miner to Guyana.¹⁰⁸ In the village of Buxton many of the African descendants owned their own plot of land and a tradition of work co-opera-

tion existed which enabled families to plant, harvest and work together. His maternal grandmother was one of the founders of a village; Makonnen did not state whether it was Buxton itself or a village close to it, but it was clear that she wielded tremendous power in the formation of the village.

...she was part of the proud element which had come into its own after slavery. They were the ones who had made the village laws. They would ring the village bell to summon people to come out and cut the common grass, so as not to have snakes, or to dig the drains. She was a Buxton woman...and it had the strongest traditions of any. On occasions if the women wanted to make some point to government they would actually lie down on the train track.¹⁰⁹

The last reference to protest sounds remarkably similar to the actions of African women in their particular forms of gender organisation in demonstrations against injustices in the society.¹¹⁰ It also has a ring of familiarity in the suffragette movement of the earlier part of this century. Makonnen also had some grand aunts from his father's side, one of whom, Margaret, was a rabel-rouser and rebel. She would exact from anyone owing his father money, through her threatening attitude and loud mouth. His maternal grandmother shared a husband with two or three other women. Makonnen commented that 'nobody cared much about this sort of thing,'¹¹¹ and that it had survived slavery in tact. His father was a gold and diamond miner like his own father. It was perhaps from his father that he inherited his entrepreneurial gifts, for at an early age he and his cousin sought out ways to mine minerals.

While still in Guyana, Makonnen was exposed to Marcus Garvey's *Negro World*, and *The Crisis* which were obtained from the Guyanese scholar, A.A. Thome's bookshop.¹¹² (Comparatively, nowhere in C.L.R. James' writings is there any reference to the reading of Garvey's paper in Trinidad, although there were many branches formed in the country. It should be recalled that James did not leave Trinidad until 1932 – Garvey was already falsely imprisoned in and deported from the U.S. – at which time both Padmore and Makonnen were student activists in the U.S.). Makonnen later travelled to the U.S. from Cuba in the early 1930's with the intention of studying mineralo-

gy at San Saba, Texas, but ended up in Texas working for the YMCA for a number of years and then attended Cornell University between 1932-4, studying agriculture and animal husbandry.¹¹³ During his stay with the YMCA, Makonnen travelled through different states conducting various courses linked with the YMCA. This afforded him a variety of contacts including Ethiopians and other members of the African community. He also met Ethiopian students while a student at Cornell. Makonnen's residence and travels in the U.S., and his very wide circle of contacts, afforded him a working political knowledge of the African American community vis-a-vis the U.S., as well as the relationship of Caribbeans to their African American brothers. When Makonnen finally left the U.S., he had a sophisticated knowledge of world political developments, and a strong affiliation to the cooperative movement which he felt posed the solution to the African economic problem world-wide. He perceived the forms of capitalist development – the stock exchange, competitive labour, individualism and exploitation – as inimical to the social development of the African. These were clearly defined concepts which were integrated within his consciousness and which motivated his work in the Pan-African movement.

Makonnen's contacts at Cornell proved useful in bringing him to Denmark to the Danish Royal Agricultural College in Copenhagen in 1935. He spent about eighteen months in the country, touring the cities and travelling to Sweden and Norway, through contacts at the Norse Student Association, and links with 'radical exiles from Europe...'¹¹⁴ and others on the radical *Politiken*. Makonnen's activist work in relation to the Italian invasion of Ethiopia ultimately led to his expulsion. Denmark's leftwing congregated around the newspaper's offices to protest about the war, and Makonnen's exposure of '...the question of Denmark exporting mustard to Italy, which I felt was being used for the mustard gas employed in the war.'¹¹⁵ Makonnen was woken in the early hours of the morning by the police, taken to the station, and deported the following day.¹¹⁶ Makonnen first came into contact with Paul Robeson on the boat sailing to England. Makonnen initially came into the London Pan-Africanists when he had stopped off in London on his way to Denmark from

the U.S.A. He responded to an announcement about a meeting in Trafalgar Square and had heard the zestful Jomo Kenyatta give a stirring speech: [referring to Sir Samuel Hoare who held ministerial office]

Sir Samuel Hoare...you wonder about him? Well, what else can you expect from a whore? A whore's a whore. He will buy anything, sell anything.¹¹⁷

The Italo-Ethiopian conflict precipitated the most dramatic response by African peoples around the world, and was the mediating catalyst which held leftwingers of a variety of political persuasions together. A summary of the work, political clarity and vision of George Padmore over all the other figures of the 1930s cannot be justly done here. Geiss (1974) affords Padmore the rightful place of precedence over all others, and Hooker (1967) although reserved in his personal judgement, provides the details of Padmore's career. But the point needs to be emphasised that Padmore had all the credentials of a highly experienced political administrator. Not only did he organise conferences and union members, but he was an official representative of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. and attended conferences in Europe, later directing an office with staff and newspaper, from Moscow.¹¹⁸ Here a brief provision of the organisational inter-relationships and political developments is necessary to conclude the period before 1940.

James met Padmore in 1935 having last seen him in 1924. After Italy invaded Ethiopia James formed the International Friends of Ethiopia and acted as chairman, along with J.B. Danquah, Amy Ashwood Garvey (Garvey's first wife), and Ras Makonnen. According to Geiss, Kenyatta, T. Albert Marryshow, Dr Peter Milliard and several others made up the first committee¹¹⁹ (he omitted Makonnen, although James claimed him).¹²⁰ The first act, according to Makonnen, was 'not to be kept away by these imperialists who were pretending to be in sympathy, shedding crocodile tears'¹²¹ when a presentation was made to Emperor Haile Selassie on his first trip to London, seeking help and solidarity from Britain. On his approach, he was presented with a bouquet of flowers by two girls (the daughters of mem-

bers).¹²² The organisation, however, folded rather quickly and was superseded by Padmore's International African Service Bureau (which also published an extremely informative and lively news organ) in 1937. This provided information world-wide, in Africa, the U.S.A. and the Caribbean; and people from Africa constantly contacted Padmore and the IASB for advice, information and introductions.¹²³

A significant pointer to the influences of the ardent Pan-Africanists is that they circulated within differing circles. Padmore's wife, according to his biographer, was a member of the LCP.¹²⁴ Padmore and James wielded some considerable (in terms of information and political alliances) influence, mainly on the Independent Labour Party, writing for their newspapers, and presenting themselves at all available meetings of the left to denounce British colonial rule in Africa, as well as with the Labour Party.¹²⁵ Padmore had resigned from the CP while James was a committed Trotskyist. They held weekly meetings with Fenner Brockway and other leftwing Labour officials which provided the latter with ammunition to confront the government's colonial policies. Padmore was so highly esteemed that he was requested to run for parliament by the Independent Labour Party, but never accepted.¹²

The extent to which political developments increased over the militation for African decolonisation cannot be underestimated. The impact of the injection of a new radicalisation into the British body politic where Africans were concerned is inestimable. This, then, provides the social background onto which ideas of race, class, conception of theatre and political practice on the stage can be gauged and analysed.

REFERENCES

Chapter 1

1. Anthony Gerard Barthelemy, *The Representation of Blacks in English Drama from Shakespeare to Southerne*, 1987, p.8.
- 2.. Ibid.
3. Ibid, p.9.
4. Ibid.
5. Frank M. Snowden, *Blacks in Antiquity*, 1970, p. 259.
6. Ibid, p.3.
7. Ibid, pp.144-153.
8. Ivan Van Sertima, "The moor in Africa and Europe," in Van Sertima, ed., *Golden Age of the Moor*, 1992, p.1.
9. Ibid, p.2.
10. Flora L. Shaw (Lady Lugard), *A Tropical Dependency*, 1905, p.33.
11. José Pimentia Bey, "Moorish Spain: Academic Source and Foundation for the Rise and Success of Western European Universities in the Middle Ages," in Van Sertima, ed., op. cit., p.218.
12. Ibid, p.230.
13. Hugh Trevor-Roper, *The Rise of Christian Europe*, 1966, p.76.
14. Ibid.
15. Ibid, p.133.
16. Martin Bernal, *Black Athena*, 1987, pp.121-122.
17. Edward Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, abridged edition, 1979, p.147.
18. H.G. Wells, *The Outline of History*, 1921, p.336.
19. See, for example, Al-Fatih Qariballah, unpublished PH.D. thesis, *The Influence of Al-Ghazali upon Islamic Jurisprudence and Philosophy*

- with special reference to the period 1100-1400 A.D.*, Edinburgh, 1969, pp.213-219.
20. Ibid, p.211.
 21. H.G. Wells, op. cit., p.335.
 22. Ibid, p.336.
 23. Lady Lugard op. cit., p.47.
 24. Ibid, pp.36-51.
 25. Washington Irving, *The Conquest of Granada*, 1910, p.227.
 26. Ibid, p.234.
 27. I. Hrbek, "Africa in the context of world history," in E. El Fasi, ed., *General History of Africa III, Africa from the Seventh to the Eleventh Century*, 1988, p.19.
 28. Bernhard and Ellen M. Whishaw, *Arabic Spain*, 1912, p.17.
 29. Ibid, p.34.
 30. Lady Lugard, op. cit., p.51.
 31. Frances A. Yates, *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition*, 1964, pp.12-13.
 32. Ibid, p.18.
 33. Martin Bernal, op. cit., p.145.
 34. Ibid, p.146.
 35. Ibid, p.159.
 36. Ibid, p.167.
 37. A. Leon Higginbotham, *Roman Slave Law*, 1987, p.2.
 38. Ibid, p.3.
 39. Ibid.
 40. Frederick Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*, 1972, pp.169-170.
 41. Ibid, pp.180-181.
 42. Ibid, p.181.
 43. Aristotle, *The Athenian Constitution*, 1984, p.43.
 44. Quoted in Martin Bernal, *Black Athena*, 1987, p.202.
 45. A.N. Sherwin-White, *Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome*, 1967, p.60.
 46. Caesar, *The Conquest of Gaul*, 1951, p.33.
 47. Ibid.
 48. Brian Catchpole, *The Clash of Cultures*, 19, p.2.
 49. Sherwin-White, op. cit., p.62.
 50. Ibid, p.71.
 51. Tacitus, *The Agricola and the Germania*, 1948, pp.120, 127-128.
 52. Ibid, pp.110-111.
 53. Ibid, pp.114-115.
 54. Ibid, p.118.
 55. Arrian, *The Campaigns of Alexander*, 1971, p.356.
 56. Ibid, 357.
 57. Ibid, pp.212-213.
 58. Ibid, 372.
 59. Ibid, pp.360-364.
 60. Sherwin-White, op. cit., p.8.
 61. Ibid, p.9.

62. Ibid, p.12.
63. Sir Henry Sumer Maine, *Ancient Law* (U.S.A., 1986), pp.204-206.
64. Aristotle, op. cit., p.52.
65. Ibid, p.74.
66. James Stevens Curl, *Egyptomania, The Egyptian Revival: a Recurring Theme in the History of Taste*, 1994, p.xix.
67. Philip D. Curtin, *The Image of Africa – British Ideas and Action 1780 –1850*, 1964, pp.234-235.
68. John S. Haller, quoted in Michael D. Biddiss, ed., *Images of Race*, 1979, p.17.
69. Georges Cuvier, in Philip D. Curtin, ed., *Imperialism*, 1972, p.7.
70. Ibid, pp.8-9.
71. Robert Knox, in Curtin, *ibid.*, pp.17-18.
72. Ibid, p.21.
73. Benjamin Kidd, in Curtin, *ibid.*, pp.36-37.
74. Douglas A. Lorrimer, *Colour, Class and the Victorians*, 1978, p.161.
75. Helen Rusha de Troesch, *The Negro in English Dramatic Literature and on the Stage and a Bibliography of Plays with Negro characters*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1940, p.1.
76. Ibid.
77. Ibid, pp.3–4. For a more comprehensive overview of the African influence in European art , see *The Image of the Black Man in Western Art*, three volumes, eds., J. Vercoutter, J. Leclant, F. Snowden, Menil Foundation/Harvard University Press, 1976.
78. John G. Jackson, *Introduction to African Civilizations*, 1970, p.187.
79. Washington Irving, op. cit., pp.272, 322.
80. Ibid, p.227.
81. Ruth Cowhig, “Blacks in English Renaissance drama and the role of Shakespeare’s Othello,” in David Dabydeen, ed., *The black presence in English Literature*, 1985, p.7.
82. Troesch, op. cit., p.11.
83. Tokson, op. cit., p.54.
84. Ibid, p.42.
85. Bernhard and Ellen Whishaw, op. cit., pp.36–45:
 ‘The history of the descendants of Witiza, the Gothic king who immediately preceded Roderick, and died shortly before the Moslem invasion in 711, does not seem to have been traced by historians, whether Spanish or foreign. Yet the adventures and fortunes of these princes and their descendants form not only a romantic chapter in the history of Spain, but have an important bearing on the events of the first three centuries of Islam in the Peninsula...(p.36)
 ‘Al-Kuttiyyah says, ‘The last of the Gothic kings of Andaluscia was Witiza, who left three sons named Almand, Romulo, and Artebas. As these children were still of tender age, their mother assumed the regency and governed in their name at Toledo. Nevertheless Roderick, who was the Kaid (general-in-chief) of the armies of the defunct monarch, abandoned the child-princes; then, arrogating to himself supreme authority, he drew into his party the men of war who marched under his banners,

- and came to establish his residence at Cordova..."(p.40)
 'It seems certain that either Witiza's sons, or envoys acting on their behalf, asked the help of the Moslems to recover their inheritance. "Ad-Dhobi and the best Arabian writers" assert this, and it is confirmed not only by Roderick of Toledo and by Lucas of Tuy, for what their authority is worth, but also by the author of the *Chronicon Sebastiani*, who says that they sent envoys to ask for help of the Saracens, and brought them across to Spain in ships, and by the *Chronicon Albedense*' (p.41).
86. Johnathan Dollimore, "Introduction: Shakespeare, cultural materialism and the new historicism," in J. Dollimore and A. Sinfield, *Political Shakespeare: new essays in cultural materialism*, 1985, pp.6–7.
 87. Sander Gilman, op. cit., p.18.
 88. Elliot Tokson, op. cit., p.68.
 89. Michael Pickering, "Mock blacks and racial mockery: the 'nigger' minstrel and British imperialism," in J.S. Bratton et al, *Acts of Supremacy: The British Empire and the Stage, 1790–1930*, 1991, p.195.
 90. See Ronald Hyam, *Empire and Sexuality, The British Experience*, 1990; also Peter Kingsford, *The Hunger Marchers in Britain 1920–1940*, 1982 and Appendix 2 of this study.
 91. Quoted in Eldred D. Jones, *Othello's Countrymen*, 1965, p.7.
 92. Cheikh Anta Diop, "The Origin of the Ancient Egyptians," in Ivan Van Sertima, ed., *Egypt Revisited*, 1991, p.28.
 93. Ibid.
 94. Frantz Fanon, *Toward the African Revolution*, 1970, pp.53–4.
 95. Sander Gilman, op. cit., p.239.
 96. Johnathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, "Foreword: Cultural Materialism," in Dollimore/Sinfield, op. cit., p.viii.

Chapter 2

1. L.A. Jackson, "The Freedom of the Critic and the History of the Text," in Francis Barker et al, eds., *The Politics of Theory*, University of Essex, 1982, p.99.
2. Ibid.
3. Frantz Fanon, *Toward the African Revolution*, Penguin Books, Middlesex, 1970, p.42.
4. Homi K. Bhabha, "Difference, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism," in Barker et al., op. cit., p.196.
5. Benita Parry, quoting Edward Said, in "Problems in Current Theories of Colonial Discourse," in *The Oxford Literary Review*, special issue on Colonialism & other essays, Vol.9, Nos. 1-2, Oxford, 1987, p.58.
6. Edward Said, *Nationalism, Colonialism and Literature: Yeats and Decolonization*, Derry, Filed Day Theatre Company, 1988, p.8.
7. Benita Parry, "Some Provisional Speculations on the Critique of 'Resistance' Literature," unpublished paper, p.2, n.d.
8. Quoted in Edward Said, *Orientalism*, Penguin, London, 1978, p.84.

The quote was taken from Le Mascrier's 1735 book, *Description de L'Egypte*.

9. Ibid, p.85.
10. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *In Other Worlds, Essays in Cultural Politics*, Routledge, London, 1988, p.132.
11. Ibid, p.133.
12. Ibid, p.107.
13. Parry, op. cit., p.34.
14. Ibid.
15. L. Adele Jinadu, *Fanon: In Search of the African Revolution*, Fourth Dimension Publishers, Enugu, 1980, pp.44-45.
16. Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, MacGibbon & Kee, London, 1968, p.93.
17. Amilcar Cabral, *Unity & Struggle*, Heinemann Educational Books, London, 1980, p.17.
18. A.T. Nzula, I.I. Potekhin, A.Z. Zusmanovich, *Forced Labour in Colonial Africa*, London, Zed Press, 1979, p.77.
19. Ibid, p.84.
20. Ibid.
21. Issa G. Shivji, "Semi-Proletarian Labour and the Use of Penal Sanctions in the Labour Law of Colonial Tanganyika (1920-38)," in Colin Sumner, ed., *Crime, Justice and Underdevelopment*, Heinemann, London, 1982, p.40.
22. Anthony Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, London/New York, 1986, p.105.
23. Michael Hechter, *Internal Colonialism, The Celtic fringe in British national development, 1536-1966*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975, p.74.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid, p.77.
26. C. Louise Sweet, "Inventing Crime: British Colonial Land Policy in Tanganyika", in Sumner, op. cit., p.61.
27. Ibid, p.69.
28. Nzula et al, op. cit., pp.61-62.
29. Wilhelm Reich, *The Mass Psychology of Fascism*, Souvenir Press, London, 1972, p.79.
30. Francis Bacon, quoted in Klaus E. Knorr, *British Colonial Theories 1570-1850*, University of Toronto Press/Frank Cass & Co., Toronto/London, 1968, p.31.
31. E.R. Augier, S.C. Gordon, *Sources of West Indian History*, Longmans, 1969 edition, p.89.
32. Fanon, op. cit., pp.18-19.
33. Albert Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonised*, The Orion Press/Beacon Press, Boston, 1967, p.66.
34. Ibid, pp.67-68.
35. Frantz Fanon, *A Dying Colonialism*, Penguin, Middlesex, 1970, p.50.
36. Hechter, op. cit., p.74.
37. Ibid, p.75 (quoting Reginald Coupland, 1954).

38. Loreto Todd, *Pidgins and Creoles*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1981 edition, p.5.
39. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities, Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London/New York, 1983, p.27.
40. Ibid, p.102.
41. Ibid, pp.24-25. Anderson shows how the struggle for a national and ethnic language as the standard-bearer of self-pride was a dominant theme in 18th and 19th century Europe. The Russians, Germans, Finns, Slavs, Ukrainians, among others (including the Baltic states in the USSR today), were recipients of two cultures: that of the people and that of monarchs or conquerors. It was through the persistent expressions of national or ethnic pride that the language of the present European states became a reality. (See his arguments in the work cited, pp.72-73.)
42. Cabral, op. cit., pp.25-26.
43. Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, p.39.
44. Ibid, p.38.
45. Ashis Nandy, *The Intimate Enemy, Loss and recovery of self under colonialism*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 1983, p.5.
46. Anthony Smith, op. cit., p.53.
47. Ibid, p.104
48. Russell Chamberlin, *Loot! The Heritage of Plunder*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1983, p.54.
49. Bruno Nettl, *The Study of Ethnomusicology, Twenty-nine Issues and Concepts*, (quoting Barnett, 1953) Chicago/London, 1983, p.164.

CHAPTER 3

1. Raphael Samuel, "Theatre and socialism in Britain, (1880–1935)", in Samuel, Ewan MacColl, Stuart Cosgrove, *Theatres of the Left*, London, 1985, p.9.
2. Francis Lee, *Fabianism and Colonialism*, London, 1988, p.36.
3. Ibid, p.43. For another view of the Fabians, Susan Craig writes, 'Some of their leading thinkers became Parliamentarians and members of the British Cabinet in the first Labour Governments, and they exerted an influence on colonial questions that was to persist even after the post-war Labour Government fell...Fabian Socialism accommodated to, while claiming to mitigate, the evils of capitalism at home and abroad.' Craig lists Sidney Webb (later Lord Passfield) as Secretary of State for the Colonies, Arthur Creech-Jones was another Secretary of State in 1946, Sir Stafford Cripps, post-war Chancellor of the Exchequer. Susan Craig, "The Germs of an Idea," afterword to Arthur Lewis, *Labour in the West Indies: The Birth of a Workers' Movement*, London, 1977, p.59. Lewis' book was first published by the Fabian Society in 1938, and he was himself a prominent Fabian.

4. Samuel, op. cit.
5. Jon Clark et al, "Foreword," in Jon Clark, Margot Heinemann, David Margolies, Carol Snee, eds., *Culture and Crisis in Britain in the 30s*, London, 1979, p.9.
6. Colin Chambers, *The Story of Unity Theatre*, London, 1989, p.21.
7. Samuel, op. cit
8. Ibid, p.11.
9. David Bradby, John McCormack, *People's Theatre*, London, 1978, p.21.
10. See Anthony Blunt, "Rationalist and Anti-rationalist Art," *New Left Review*, June 1936.
11. Julian Symons, *The Thirties: A Dream Revolved*, London, 1960, p.76.
12. Ibid.
13. Writing of the French experience, Aimé Césaire in a letter of resignation to Maurice Thorez, the chairman of the French Communist Party, said, '...in Europe, in all parties, from the extreme right to the extreme left, is ingrained the habit of doing for us, the habit of thinking for us, in short, the habit of refusing us the right to our own initiative...which is, in the last analysis, the right to a personality.' See Jacques Louis Hymans, *Léopold Sédar Senghor, an intellectual biography*, Edinburgh, 1971, p.209.
 Frantz Fanon who battled for the independence of Algeria first in the capacity of a psychiatrist and then as a writer-activist, wrote bitterly about the inaction of the French left on the Algerian question. According to Irene Gendzier, '...Fanon reminded his readers that the decision of the French government to pursue war in Algeria was accepted by the nation in its entirety; this included liberals and leftists. To increase support for its policies, the French government introduced the cry against terrorism, giving the impression that France was doing no less than struggling against *barbarism* in Algeria. By 1957, if not earlier, the French left was all but silent' (emphasis added). Irene Gendzier, *Frantz Fanon, A Biography*, New York, 1973, p.153.
 For more details concerning the responses by African writers to the racist interpretation of political events in Britain and abroad, see Appendix 2.
14. Vic Gammon, "Problems of Method in the historical study of Popular Music," in *Popular Music Perspectives*, David Horn and Philip Tagg, Göteborg & Exeter, 1982, p.20.
15. Bradby and McCormack, op. cit., p.32.
16. Ibid, p.43.
17. See Jon Clark et al, op. cit.
18. Malcolm Morley, *The Theatre*, London, 1935, pp.14-15.
19. Bradby and McCormack, op. cit., p.15.
20. 'The mere export of violence made the servants into masters without giving them the master's prerogative: the possible creation of something new. Monopolistic concentration and tremendous accumulation of violence at home made the servants active agents in the destruction, until finally totalitarian expansion became a nation- and a people-destroying

- force.' Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, London, 1951/1958, p.138.
- 'The prodigal who returned home empty-handed would have to be content with the common name of "the Mallato just come from Guinea." If however, he returned with his pockets well stuffed with gold, "that very perticular hides all other infirmities, then you have hapes of frinds of all kinds thronging and wateing for your commans. Then your known by the name of 'the African gentleman' at every great man's house...' Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery*, London, 1964, pp.35-36.
21. Malcolm Morley, op. cit., p.20.
 22. Martin Duberman, *Paul Robeson*, London, 1989. p.62.
 23. '...Gilpin had outraged O'Neill by tampering with the script, sometimes substituting "Negro" or "colored man" for O'Neill's frequent use of "nigger."' As Duberman states, it was not the first time that Gilpin altered O'Neill's lines. Ibid, p.61.
 24. Referring to a book party hosted by Eric Waldron, a gifted Guyanese-born short-story writer during the Harlem Renaissance, Essie said that it was a 'beastly bore—some little insignificant talkative Negroes...', ibid, p.74. It is worth noting that Essie Robeson considered the efforts of African Americans as a bore and insignificant. Contrastingly, the company of mainstream Euro-Americans was highly prized and sought out by her.
 25. Ibid, p.65. Later, when Robeson became a professional actor, he was always in a state of financial embarrassment. It was Carl Van Vechten, the author of the controversial novel, *Nigger Heaven*, who wrote to Otto Kahn to secure a loan for Paul Robeson of \$5,000. The agreement was for two years, but Essie, who managed Robeson's money, expended Paul's wages unwisely and put off paying the debt for over five years until Kahn served a writ on Robeson himself. Essie's many letters to Kahn culminated in a long letter which demonstrated how Robeson's \$600 a week wage in London was expended: the renting of a house, assistants, and a limousine, etc. Ibid, p. 596 F.39; pp.119–120. It was a characteristic trait of Kahn to lend money to artists, as Lewis confirms, 'Claude McKay and Hale Woodruff, the young Illinois painter, became White's special wards. Buttonholing wealthy white patrons of the arts and passing the collection plate among Harlem's affluent in order to send Woodruff to Paris for classes at l'Académie Scandinave became routine for White. He also approached the banker Otto Kahn, who, 'without seeing any of Mr Woodruff's work,' agreed to give him two hundred fifty dollars a year for two years of European study.' David Levering Lewis, *When Harlem was in Vogue*, 1989, p.140. Lewis did not say, however, whether Kahn placed a lein on Woodruff's future paintings for the donation.
 26. Ibid, pp.52-3.
 27. David Levering Lewis, op. cit., p.99.
 28. Harold Cruse, *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual*, New York, 1967, p.27.

29. Ibid, p.32.
30. Frantz Fanon, "The reciprocal basis of national cultures and the struggles for liberation," in *Second Congress of Negro Writers and Artists: The Unity of African Cultures*, *Présence Africaine* journal, No.24-25, February-May 1959, pp.89-90.
One can compare this attempt to drain cultural identity from the souls of the colonised to the situation in Australia amongst the aboriginals in relation to the European colonisers. Helen Corbett, speaking of the avalanche of forces working to undermine native culture in the minds of its people, says, 'In different states at that time, there were native laws governing aboriginal people. If you wanted to escape those laws, you applied for citizenship rights which basically made you an *honorary white*. And the price for that was that you had to *completely reject your aboriginal identity*. *If you were seen to associate with natives from the reserve they took it away from you...*' (emphasis added). Laurie Critchley, "Indomitable fighter for black rights," *The Guardian*, London, January 21, 1992, p.16.
31. Symons, op. cit., p.79
32. Colin Chambers, op. cit., pp.50-51.
33. Ibid, p.68.
34. Ibid, p.55 n 21.
35. André Van Gysehem, "British theatre in the Thirties: An Autobiographical Record," in Jon Clark, Margot Heinemann et al, op. cit., pp.209-210.
36. Lofton Mitchel, *Black Drama*, New York, 1967, pp.82-3.
37. Van Gysehem, op. cit., p.216.

CHAPTER 4

1. Johnathan Dollimore, "Introduction: Shakespeare, cultural nationalism and the new historian," in Johnathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, eds., *Political Shakespeare: new essays in cultural materialism*, Manchester, 1985, p.3.
2. Ibid, p.7.
3. Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, London, 1951/1958, p.138.
4. J.S. Bratton, "Introduction," in Bratton, Cave et al, *Acts of Supremacy, The British Empire and the Stage, 1790-1930*, Manchester/New York, 1991, p.3.
5. Ivan Ward, "Introduction" to Joel Kovel, *White Racism, A Psychohistory*, London, 1988, p.xxi.
6. G.F.H., "Paul Robeson's Recital at the Savoy," *The Sketch*, London, September 3, 1930, p.458.
7. N. Stone, in the New York *Herald Tribune*, quoted in Martin

- Duberman, *Paul Robeson*, London, 1989, p.581.
8. African American voices of dissent were voluble: The *Philadelphia Tribune* 'pointed out that images derived from stage and screen helped to form the negative view most whites had of blacks, and called Robeson himself on the carpet for perpetuating the stereotype of the black man as "essentially craven, yielding to discouragement as soon as momentary triumph had passed...becoming a miserable victim to moral breakdown and superstitious fears." ' For this and other reviews by African Americans, see Martin Duberman, *ibid*, p.168, p.588 *n* 51. It is interesting to note that *The Emperor Jones* was first suggested to the Gilpin Players (they took their name from the African American actor, Charles Gilpin, who, incidentally first played the role in 1920) of Cleveland but 'the group could not help feeling that it presented the negro in too inferior a way for them to do wholeheartedly.' See Helen de Rusha Troesch, *The Negro in English Dramatic Literature and on the Stage and a Bibliography of Plays with Negro characters*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Western Reserve University, May 1940, p.173. Troesch also noted that although the play was not seen in Cleveland, 'the Cleveland negroes felt that [Charles] Gilpin had betrayed them by appearing in it, and when he came to Cleveland in the play, they were *openly hostile*' (emphasis added, p.172).
 9. Duberman, *op. cit.*, p.75.
 10. Benjamin Ringer and Elinor R. Lawless, *Race-Ethnicity and Society*, New York/London, 1989, p.30.
 11. Robeson's social origins preclude him from the African middle-class. Awards, grants and working for a living first saw him enter Rutgers and helped maintained him there. Rutgers, in post-World War 1, was an European enclave and Robeson's success in American football and academic study (law) assured him a degree of security from that world. His wife, Eslanda Goode Robeson, details his social world before and after graduation in his professional life, in her biography, *Paul Robeson, Negro*, London, 1930.
 12. Cf. C.L.R. James, *The Black Jacobins*, revised edition, New York, 1963.
 13. It is interesting to compare Robeson's position on his first professional role in *Taboo* in which he accepted the racist lead role because, 'I was broke at the time and it was far better than working in the Post Office for a month or so,' in Duberman, *op. cit.*, p.580 *n* 23. Robeson volubly defended his right to play in and the integrity of O'Neill's plays. He said of *Emperor Jones*, 'To me the most important pre-production development was an opportunity to play "Emperor Jones"... This is undoubtedly one of 'the great plays – a true classic of the drama.' Not content with his aesthetic appreciation of O'Neill, he went on to describe O'Neill as a 'broad, liberal-minded man...He has Negro friends and appreciated them for their true worth. He would be *the last* to cast any slur on the colored people.' Philip S. Foner, ed., *Paul Robeson Speaks, Writings, Speeches, Interviews 1918-1974*, London, 1978, pp. 70-1. See Chapter 3 for a comparison between O'Neill's own

perception of African opinion vis-a-vis Charles Gilpin.

Houston Baker, however, had a different view of O'Neill: '... if only O'Neill had bracketed the psycho-surreal final trappings of his Emperor's world and given us the stunning account of colonialism that remains implicit in his quip at the close of his dramatis personae: "The action of the play takes place on an island in the West Indies, as yet unself-determined by white marines." If any of these moves had been accomplished, then perhaps I might feel at least some of the intimacy and reverence that Trilling suggests.' *Modernism and the Harlem Renaissance*, Chicago, 1989, p.7.

Robeson's naivete can also be evaluated from his acceptance of the lead role in *Sanders of the River*, a film in which he starred as a rural African on the continent, dressed in leopard skin. Robeson later said, 'I didn't realise how seriously people might take the film until I went back to New York. There I was met by a deputation who wanted to know how the hell I had come to play in a film which stood for everything they thought I opposed. That deputation began to make me see things more clearly...After talking to them I did go and see it [the film], and I began to realise what they'd been getting at.' Duberman, op. cit., p.121.

14. J.S. Bratton, op. cit., p.5.
15. 'Filth and drunkenness, too, they [the Irish] have brought with them...And since the poor devil must have one enjoyment, *and society has shut him out of all others*, he betakes himself to the drinking of spirits...he revels in drink to the point of the most *bestial* drunkenness (emphasis added). F. Engels, *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, Moscow/London, 1973, pp.117-118. Here Engels espouses the diatribe of the racist and yet, critically, he assigns the Irish condition to the circumscription forced upon them by English society, but only in passing and in a phrase.
16. R.H. Pearce, *The Savages of America, A Study of the Indian and the Idea of civilisation*, Baltimore, 1953, p.20.
17. Ness Edwards, "The Workers' Theatre (1930)", in Samuel, MacColl, Cosgrove, eds., *Theatre of the Left, 1880-1935*, London, 1985, p.193.
18. See Immanuel Geiss, *The Pan African Movement*, London, 1974, pp.211-2.
19. See Tony Martin, *African Fundamentalism, A Literary and Cultural Anthology of Garvey's Harlem Renaissance*, Massachusetts, 1991. The fact that Euro-Americans dominated the stage in their quest to financially benefit from this cultural reawakening can be gleaned from the fact that no less than 15 plays dealing with 'Negro themes' written by Euro-Americans were produced on Broadway between 1917 and 1930. Five plays by African Americans were produced during the same period. See Harold Cruse, *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual*, New York, 1967, p.35.
20. Quoted in Hugh Ridley, *Images of Imperial Rule*, London, Canberra/New York, 1983, p.126.
21. Charles Mackay, "The Negro and the Negrophilists," in Michael D. Biddis, *Images of Race*, London, 1979, p.104.

22. Ibid.
23. Brian Street, "Reading the novels of empire: race and ideology in the classic 'tale of adventure'," in David Dabydeen, ed., *The Black Presence in English Literature*, Manchester, 1985, p.101.
24. See Sherwin White, *Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome*, Cambridge, 1967.
25. Douglas A. Lorimer, *Colour, Class and the Victorians: English attitudes to the Negro in mid-nineteenth century*, London/New York, 1978, p.161.
26. Quoted in Bernth Lindfors, " 'The Hottentot Venus' and other African attractions in nineteenth-century England," *Australian Drama Studies*, Vol.1, No.2, 1983, p.89.
27. Anna Elfenbein, *Women on the Color Line, Evolving stereotypes and the writings of George Washington Cable, Grace King, Kate Chopin, Virginia*, 1989, p.28.
28. Michael Pickering, "Mock blacks and racial mockery: the 'nigger' minstrel and British imperialism," in Bratton, Cave et al, op. cit., p.213.
29. "The Hairy Ape," *The Stage*, January 26, 1928, p.12
30. J.B.W., "Vienna and New York," *The New Statesman*, London, June 22, 1929, pp.337-8.
- 31.. Jon Clark, "Agitprop and Unity Theatre: Socialist Theatre in the Thirties," in Clark, Heinemann et al, *Culture and Crisis in Britain in the Thirties*, London, 1979, p.232.
32. Herbert Hodge, *Cannibal Carnival*, in E.A. Osborne, ed., *In Red Letters*, London, 1938. It is interesting to note one writer's comments both on Hodge's play and on the controversy within Unity surrounding it, "There were complaints about its attitude to the working class...The ironic tone of *Cannibal Carnival*, mocking even the masses, was not liked by many at Unity..." However, the writer does not say that the working-class here is melanesian African. This perhaps contributed to the difficulty that Hodge had of perceiving the African as part of the larger world working class. See Colin Chambers, *The Story of Unity Theatre*, London, 1989, p.77.

A rather interesting comparison in terms of the conflict of Hodge's socialist views and that on race can be clearly seen in the thinking of Solomon Goldstein, a Jewish East Ender who was 21 when Hodge's play was first produced in 1938. Goldstein is described as 'a committed, methodical, if sometimes ponderous advocate of the faith' [i.e., socialism]. Goldstein's socialist party affiliation was impeccable, yet he was capable of saying in 1991, 'A large number of them [Bangladeshis who are his neighbours] are totally feudal in character and you can't speak to them... It's impossible to *reason* with them. They do not associate in a *friendly way* with *English and Jewish* people and you rarely find them speaking the *truth*' (emphasis added). This clearly illustrates the "universalist" perceptions of a radical in which the world is reduced to that of the English and Jews. There was no acknowledgement of the fact, as the writer showed, that this was 'the kind of tosh uttered against his own people when they first settled the same area in late Victorian

- times.' Andrew Tyler, "Past Master in the Present," *Weekend Guardian*, January 12-13, 1991, p.15.
33. Frederick Engels, "Democratic Pan-Slavism," in *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, Moscow/London, 1977, pp.370/1. Engels also referred to China as '...the rotting semi-civilisation of the oldest state in the world...Chinese nationality, with all its over-bearing prejudice, stupidity, learned ignorance and pedantic barbarism...' See his "Persia and China," in *On Colonialism*, 6th printing, Moscow, 1976, pp.120, 124. Again, on the Irish, Engels writes, 'The southern facile character of the Irishman, his crudity, which place him little above the *savage*, his contempt for all humane enjoyments, in which his *crudeness* makes him incapable of sharing, his *filth* and poverty, all favour *drunkenness*...the pressure of this race has done much to depress the wages and lower the working-class.' *The Condition of the Working-Class in England*, pp.118-9.
 34. Ridley, op. cit., p.139.
 35. Martin Green, *Dreams of Adventure, Deeds of Empire*, London, 1980, p.12.
 36. Ibid, p.13.
 37. Ibid, p.80.
 38. Amon Saba Saakana, *The Colonial Legacy in Caribbean Literature*, London, 1987, p.69.
 39. "Colony," *The New Statesman & Nation*, July 29, 1939, p.177.
 40. Ibid.
 41. Francis Lee, *Fabianism and Colonialism: The Life and Political thought of Lord Sydney Olivier*, London, 1988, p.40.
 42. This idea of betrayal in negotiation between resisters and agents of British imperialism is exemplified in a story told by Ngugi of a mutually agreed meeting between the revolutionary Koitalel and Meinertzhagen: 'Meinertzhagen was a commanding officer of the British forces of occupation. But he is far better known in history as the assassin of Koitalel, the otherwise unconquerable military and political leader of the Nandi people...Having been led to believe that the British wanted to discuss surrender terms and guarantees of safe retreat from Nandi country, Koitalel accepted. Put innocence against brutality and innocence will lose. There could be no finer illustration of this than the encounter between Koitalel and Meinertzhagen. Koitalel stretched an empty hand in greeting. Meinertzhagen stretched out a hidden gun and shot Koitalel in cold blood. The incident is recorded in *Kenya Diaries* as an act of British heroism.' Ngugi, *Detained, A writer's prison diary*, London/Ibadan, 1981, p.34.
 43. W. Richard Jacobs, *Butler versus the King, riots and sedition in 1937*, Port-of-Spain, 1936, p.20.
 44. Ibid, p.25.
 45. Ibid, pp.24-5.
 46. Ibid, pp.180-2. This subterfuge has several correlations in terms of the historical record and the wiles of colonialism: Cheddi Jagan in describing his electoral victory in 1953 in Guyana, says, 'We took our seats feeling very proud of ourselves and all too aware of our constitutional lim-

- itations. We told our supporters that even though we had won the election, we were really Her Majesty's Government's loyal Opposition. In our policy statement, we pointed out that even if we were elected we would be dependent on, and subordinate to the metropolitan power and we had offered only such proposals as could be realised within *the limitation of our colonial position*' (emphasis added). When Jagan's party was declared the winner and governed the country for 133 days, the British government sent war ships and the RAF to invade the country, successfully arresting Jagan and the leaders and suspending the constitution because the party was perceived as undermining the economic interests of Britain and the colonial world. See Cheddi Jagan, *The West on Trial, The Fight for Guyana's Freedom*, Berlin, 1972, pp.118-9, 125, 155-9.
47. See the marked contrast between Trease's ideological naivete and the reality of political practice, 'The Labour Party, to which we appealed for help, not only rebuffed us but *blacklisted* us; it threatened its affiliates with prosecution if they associated with us' (emphasis added). *Ibid*, p.133. 'The British Trades Union Congress criticised us for pursuing a Communist policy and maintaining "contacts behind the Iron Curtain, with the World Federation of Trade Unions rather than the Trades Unions."' *Ibid*, p.135.
 48. C.L.R. James, *At the Rendezvous of Victory*, London, 1984, pp.35 – 43. There is the belief that the account edited and published by James in this book is not true to what took place in 1939. I have not read the original publication.
 49. Frantz Fanon, *Toward the African Revolution*, London, 1970, p.54.
 50. Terry Eagleton, *Nationalism: Irony and Commitment*, Derry, 1988, p.16.
 51. James Baldwin, "Everybody's Protest Novel," in *Notes of A Native Son*, London, 1965, p.10
 52. *Ibid*. From an entirely different source, it is interesting to note that Mrs. Stowe's novel was actually based upon fact interspersed with her own creative imaginative dialogue and more importantly her perspective. For a more dispassionate account of some of the characters that may have appeared in Mrs. Stowe's novel, see Levi Coffin, *Reminiscences of Levi Coffin*, New York, 1968:
 'Eliza Harris, of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" notoriety, the slave woman who crossed the Ohio River, near Ripley, on the drifting ice with her child in her arms, was sheltered under our roof and fed at our table for several days...To elude the pursuers who were following closely on her track, she was sent across to our line of the Underground Railroad.
 'The story of this slave woman, so graphically told by Harriet Beecher Stowe in "Uncle Tom's Cabin," will, no doubt, be remembered by every reader of that deeply interesting book. *The cruelties of slavery depicted in that remarkable work are not overdrawn. The stories are founded on facts that really occurred, real names being wisely withheld, and fictitious names and imaginary conversations often inserted.* From the fact that Eliza Harris was sheltered at our house several days, it was generally

believed among those acquainted with the circumstances that I and my wife were the veritable Simeon and Rachel Halliday, the Quaker couple alluded to in "Uncle Tom's Cabin' (emphasis added, p.147).

53. For a thorough discussion of this question, see Calvin C. Hernton, *Sex and Racism in America*, New York, 1966, pp.89-120.
54. Mary Eagleton and David Pierce, *Attitudes to Class in the English Novel*, London, 1979, p.12.
55. In contrast to the popular stereotype of the African who can only speak in non-Standard English produced for the entertainment industry, see Coffin, op. cit., p.154: 'Sam was conducted to the pulpit by the minister and myself. We made short introductory speeches, then Sam spoke for more than an hour to the attentive and deeply interested audience. *They had not expected to hear good language from a slave who had no educational advantages, and were surprised to find his speech resembling that of a practiced orator* '(emphasis added).
56. Fanon, op. cit., p.47.
57. Karl Marx, *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, Moscow/London, 1982, pp.102-3.
58. See Eric Williams, *Capitalism & Slavery*, London, 1964, pp.10-11. 'In 1683 white servants represented one-sixth of Virginia's population. Two-thirds of the immigrants to Pennsylvania during the eighteenth century were white servants; in four years 25,000 came to Philadelphia alone. It has been estimated that more than a quarter of a million of persons were of this class during the colonial period, and that they probably constituted one-half of all English immigrants...
 'The wave of German immigration developed the "newlander," the labor agent of those days, who traveled up and down the Rhine Valley persuading the feudal peasants to sell their belongings and emigrate to America, receiving a commission for each emigrant..
 'Convicts provided another steady source of white labor...Proposals made in 1664 would have banished to the colonies all vagrants, rogues and idlers, petty thieves, gypsies, and loose persons frequenting unlicensed brothels.'
59. Fanon, op. cit., pp.76-7.
60. Levi Coffin, op. cit., pp.157-8.
61. Ibid, p.58
62. Jean Toomer, *The Wayward and the Seeking*, Darwin T. Turner, ed., Washington D.C., 1982, p.93.
63. Ibid, p.127.
64. Ringer and Lawless, op. cit., p.30.
65. George M. Fredrickson, *The Black Image in the White Mind, the debate on Afro-American Character & Destiny, 1817-1914*, New York, 1971, p.100.
66. This argument is reasonably developed in Anthony Gerard Barthelemy, *Black Face, Maligned Race: The Representation of Blacks in English Drama from Shakespeare to Southerne*, Baton Rouge/London, 1987, p.30.
 Writing about the theme of blackness/whiteness expressed in Ben Johnson's *The Masque of Beauty*, Barthelemy writes:

- Evil and ugliness, now firmly linked, can no longer be distinguished from blackness, nor blackness from them. The now transformed nymphs, by being restored to their former beauty (that is, having been made white), are now not only freed from a mark of ugliness, but more importantly, they are freed from a mark of evil. At the conclusion of the masque, to be black is to be evil, and therefore necessarily to be denied entrance into the Neoplatonic world that appears triumphantly in place where "night was painted" (p.30).
67. Aristotle, *The Athenian Constitution*, Middlesex, 1984, p.43
 68. See Théophile Obenga, *Ancient Egypt & Black Africa: A Student's Handbook for the study of Ancient Egypt in Philosophy, Linguistics & Gender relations*, London/Chicago, 1992, pp.64-6.
 69. Ibn Khaldun, *The Maqaddimah, An Introduction to History*, London, 1967. 'Al-Mas'udi undertook to investigate the reason for the levity, excitability, and emotionalism in Negroes, and attempting to explain it. However, he did no better than to report, on the authority of Galen and Ya'qub b. Ishaq al-Kindi, that the reason is a weakness of their brains which results in a weakness of their intellect. *This is an inconclusive and unproven statement*' (emphasis added, p.64). 'Therefore, the Negro nations are, as a rule, *submissive to slavery*, because (Negroes) have *little that is (essentially) human and possess attributes that are quite similar to those of dumb animals*, as we have stated' (emphasis added, p.117).
 70. All these arguments are contained in John Biddis, op. cit.
 71. Ringer and Lawless, op. cit., pp.69-70.

CHAPTER 5

1. See Douglas Lorrimer, *Colour, Class and the Victorians*, Leicester, 1978, p.15.
2. Elizabeth Roberts, *A Woman's Place, An Oral History of Working-Class Women 1890-1940*, Oxford/New York, 1984, p.53.
3. Ibid, p.78.
4. Ibid, p.79.
5. 'As well as gaining status, the 'higher class' domestic servant acquired aspirations of her own: her children were to be *brought up as similarly as possible to those of the family in which she had served*. Particular attention was paid to table manners, or the arrangement and setting of the table. An element of *social snobbery was clearly visible...*' Ibid, p.54 (emphasis added).
6. See, for example, Asma El Dareer, *Woman, Why Do You Weep*, London, 1982.
7. Calvin Hernton, *Sex and Racism in America*, New York, 1964, pp.110-111.
8. Ibid, p.109.
9. Alfred Adler, *Cooperation between the Sexes: Writings on Women, Love & Marriage, Sexuality & its Disorders*, New York, 1978, p.36.
10. Hugh Ridley, *Images of Imperial Rule*, Kent/New York, 1983, p.75

11. Hernton, op. cit., p.113.
12. Ibid, p.114.
13. 'The act [of rape] assumes a para-neurotic brutality and sadism, even in a normal European.' Frantz Fanon, *A Dying Colonialism*, Middlesex, 1970, p.31.
14. Sigmund Freud, *On Sexuality*, Middlesex, 1977, p.118.
15. Hernton, op. cit., p.129.
16. Ibid, p.130.
17. Mary Eagleton and David Pierce, *Attitudes to Class in the English Novel*, London, 1979, p.57.
18. Sigmund Freud, op. cit., p.71.
19. Martine Segalen, *Love and Power in the Peasant Family*, Oxford, 1983, p.165.
20. Ibid, p.166.
21. Ibid, p.162. It is obvious that to extrapolate from the woman's reluctance to sit at the table may also have been motivated not only by the hotness of the meal, but also by the fact she is serving several people and would be inclined not to be disturbed when eating her own meal. This is precisely what this writer's wife does despite relentless imprecations to sit down. I have also witnessed this in both England and Africa, where the women would serve the invitees first, not necessarily the men, until they had finished, then they would sit at table.
22. Hernton, op. cit., p.125. But this only partly explains it. A more thorough understanding may be suggested by the patriarchal systemic which defined European society over the last two thousand years, coupled with the socio-political developmental processes which included the use of Christianity as a means not only of dissemination of a male hierarchy but a murderous witch-hunt which terminated in the deaths of millions of women. This violence, then, encapsulates an ideological process because it did not respect the European or African female: there is no discrimination in brutality and death.
23. Eagleton and Pierce, op. cit., p.73.
24. Hugh Trevor-Roper, *The Rise of Christian Europe*, London, revised ed., 1966, p.113.
25. Ronald Hyam, *Empire and Sexuality, The British Experience*, Manchester/New York, 1990, p.62.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid.
28. Ibid.
29. Ibid, pp.93-4.
30. Lola Young, op.cit., p.193.
31. Chris Mason, "J'accuse: a witch-hunt in any tongue," *The Guardian* (Education section), August 06, 1991, p.19.
32. Ed Vulliamy, "In Italy, one man's croissant is another's green bean," *The Guardian*, August 10, 1991.
33. Camden, *Remaines Concerning Britain*, quoted in Hugh A. MacDougall, *Racial Myth in English History*, Montreal/New Hamshire/London, 1982, p.46.

34. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities, Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London, 1983, p.136.
35. Ann Shannon Elfenbein, *Women on the Color line: evolving stereotypes of George Washington Cable, Grace King, Kate Chopin*, Virginia, 1989, p.2.
36. Laurie Critchley, "Indomitable fighter for black rights," *The Guardian*, 21 January, 1992, p.16.
37. Amon Saba Saakana, "Lina Magaia: A Biographical Sketch," in Lina Magaia, *Dumba Nengue, Run For Your Life, Peasant Tales of Genocide in Mozambique*, London, 1989, p.109.
38. David Beresford, "The Quandaries of a confused people," *The Guardian*, 5 March, 1993, p.10.
39. Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, London, 1968, p.41.
40. Anna Freud, *The Ego and the Mechanisms of Defence*, London, 1986, p.44.
41. Sigmund Freud, op. cit., p.237.
42. Stott, op. cit., p.88.
43. Alfred Adler, op. cit., p.9. My own wife has related to me how when she was a child she felt her father was capable of anything, that he had the power to make anything happen, that she saw him as larger than life, in other words, as god-like, i.e., powerful.
44. G. Legman, quoted in Frantz Fanon, op. cit., p.147.
45. Freud, op. cit., p.265.
46. Barbara Harlow, Introduction to Malek Alloula, *The Colonial Harem*, London, 1987, p. xv.
47. Fanon, op. cit., p.159.
48. Felix Bryk, *Voodoo -Eros, Ethnological Studies in the Sex-Life of the African Aborigines*, New York, 1964, p.79.
49. Diana Scully, *Understanding Sexual Violence, A Study of Convicted Rapists*, London, 1990, p.53.
50. Gisela Bock, "Equality and difference in National Socialist racism," in Gisela Bock and Susan James, eds., *Beyond Equality & Difference*, London/New York, 1992, p.95.

Chapter 6

1. Gerard Barthemely, *The Representation of Blacks in English Drama from Shakespeare to Southerne*, 1987, p.30:

The world of light and beauty and love expels Night and with her darkness, and here the ban on blackness is total. Yet not only is physical blackness expelled—night and darkness—but clearly what is felt to be the spiritual darkness embodied in Night; even the black messenger Vultur, the warm eastern wind, must depart

before the nymphs alight, and with him goes Boreas, the cold northern wind, because extremes and discord are not possible in this Elysium. Like the initial act of creation that brought forth light and beauty out of Chaos, the masque crushes the forces of darkness and chaos and brings forth an ideal world. Thus when Night is utterly routed and the triumph of beauty complete, songs may be sung of beauty and love, because their opposites, embodied in the blackness of Night, no longer exist. Night has yielded to the light, as blackness has to beauty.

'In *The Masque of Beauty*, Night or blackness is more than an emblem of ugliness; she is undeniably an emblem of evil. And since Night cannot be separated from her blackness, blackness too is an emblem of evil. Triumphant over evil, therefore, is Beauty. As we have seen in Plato's *Symposium*, the contemplation of true beauty brings forth and nourishes "true virtue," and "the ugly clashes with the divine." Evil, therefore, wishes to do battle with beauty as surely it wishes to conquer virtue. Evil and ugliness, now firmly linked, can no longer be distinguished from blackness, nor blackness from them. The now transformed nymphs, by being restored to their former beauty (that is, having been made white), are now not only freed from a mark of ugliness, but more importantly, they are freed from a mark of evil.'

2. *The Republic of Plato*, translated with an analysis and notes by John Llewelyn Davies and David James Vaughan, *Book III*, p.98 (para 402).

3. Théophile Obenga, *Ancient Egypt & Black Africa*, 1992:

'...Egyptian astronomy could 'observe with great exactitude the eclipses of the sun and moon, and calculate them in advance, in order to predict in the greatest detail, and infallibly, these kinds of phenomena' (*Bibliothèque historique*, 1, 50). The astronomer-priests surely taught Thales (who predicted an eclipse of the sun in 585 BC) a method to calculate eclipses. Let us not forget that the most ancient Egyptian astronomical texts date back to the ninth dynasty' [c.2150 BC], p.74;

'In antiquity the Egyptian civil calendar was the only calendar to be based on astronomy; this Egyptian calendar is the very foundation of our present calendar. Callimachus, a poet and grammarian of Alexandria, born in Cyrene (c.310–235 BC), thinks that Thales was the first to make a calendar, and taught sailors to be led by the Great Bear. This scientist from Alexandria simply forgets that Thales received his scientific education in Egypt, where the annual calendar of 365 days had been known as early as 4200 BC, and where the Great Bear, a constellation of the boreal hemisphere, was well and truly identified by the Egyptian, who called it *Meskhetyou*' (p.76).

Martin Bernal, *Black Athena, the Afroasiatic Roots of Greece*, 1987, quoting Isokrates on Pythagoras, Bernal states: 'On a visit to Egypt he (Pythagoras) became a student of the religion of the peor-

- ple, and was the *first* to bring to the Greeks all philosophy', p.106; 'Plato praised Egyptian art and music and argued for their *adoption* in Greece'...If one wanted 'to return to the ancient Athenian institutions *one had to turn to Egypt*', p.107; Aristotle, Bernal says, wrote that 'Egypt was the *cradle of mathematics* because the caste of priests were given great leisure..', p.108 (emphasis added).
4. See Hugh A. MacDougal, *Racial Myth in English History*, 1982: [Inventing the existence of an ancient book which] 'related the actions of British kings "from Brutus, the first king of the Britons, down to Cadwaller"'..[No corroborating evidence having been found] 'one may credit Geoffrey's colorful *History* to a fertile imagination fed by contemporary oral traditions and accounts by earlier scribes like Gildas and Nennius. Geoffrey's motivation in writing his book no doubt was a desire to provide *a heroic epic on the origin and exploits of a people successively subdued by Romans, Saxons, Danes, and Normans*. By portraying the British as a once great people with extensive dominions he could at once *raise their status in the eyes of the Norman overlords* and suggest a precedent to the Norman kings in their imperialistic ambitions. Geoffrey's success can be measured by the gradual acceptance of his account as a great national myth supporting a developing people moving toward nationhood. In locating the origin of British history in ancient Troy Geoffrey was following an accepted tradition. *The dignifying of one's own history by associating its beginnings with an earlier civilization or even with the gods was a practice well known to classical writers*. Rome provided a model ready at hand. Its patriotic writing, *admiring Greek civilization though disliking the Greeks*...The Gallo-Romans as well as the Franks in Gaul drew on tradition of Trojan origins, as, in time, did the Normans' (pp.7-8, emphasis added). Sherwin White, *Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome*, 1967.
 5. Sander L. Gilman, *Difference and Pathology: Stereotypes of Sexuality, Race and Madness*, 1985, p.18.
 6. Rebecca Stott, "The Dark Continent: Africa as Female Body in Haggard's Adventure Fiction," in *Feminist Review*, No.32, Summer 1989, p.70.
 7. Bob Ferguson, "Race and the Media: Some Problems in Teaching," in *Multicultural Education*, Vol.9, No.2, Spring 1981, p.34.
 8. Luigi Cavalli-Sforza, "Genes, Peoples and Languages," in *Scientific American*, Vol.265, No.5, 1991, New York, pp.72-78: 'Our first result supports a conclusion that has emerged from studies of human physical and cultural remains: an African origin of our species. We found that the genetic distances between Africans and non-Africans exceed those found in other intercontinental comparisons. This result is exactly what one would expect if the African separation was the first and oldest in the human family tree.
'The genetic distance between Africans and non-Africans is

roughly twice that between Australians and Asians, and the latter is more than twice that between Europeans and Asians. The corresponding times of separation suggested by paleoanthropology are in similar ratios: 100,000 years for the separation between Africans and Asians, about 50,000 for that between Asians and Australians, and 35,000 to 40,000 years for that between Asians and Europeans' (p.74).

Cf. also Alan G. Thome and Mitford H. Wolpoff, "The Multiregional Evolution of Humans," in *Scientific American*, Vol. 266, No.4, 1992, New York, pp.28-33.

9. Ferguson, op. cit., p.34.
10. Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, 1968, p.31: 'A white man addressing a Negro behaves exactly like an *adult with a child* and starts smirking, whispering, patronizing, cozening. It is not one white man I have watched, but hundreds; and I have not limited my investigation to any one class but, if I may claim an essentially objective position, I have made a point of observing such behavior in physicians, policemen, employers' (emphasis added).
11. Ngugi Wa Thiong'o, "Imperialism of Language. English, a language for the world?" in *Moving the Centre*, 1993, p.33: 'We were often caned or made to carry plaques inscribed with the words '*I am stupid*' or '*I am an ass.*' In some cases, our *mouths were stuffed with pieces of paper picked from the wastepaper basket, which were then passed from one mouth to that of the latest offender. Humiliation in relation to language was the key*' (emphasis added).
12. Sara Mills, *Discourses of Difference: An analysis of women's travel writing and colonialism*, 1991, p.36.
13. Barthelemy, op. cit., p.45.
14. Ronald Hyam, *Empire and Sexuality*, 1990, p.12.
15. Ibid, p.109.
16. Frantz Fanon, *A Dying Colonialism*, 1970, p.31.
17. Barthelemy, op. cit., pp.45-6.
18. Hosea Jaffe, *European Colonial Despotism: A History of Oppression & Resistance in South Africa*, 1994, p.60.
19. Ibid, p.61.
20. Hyam, op. cit., p.91.
21. Lola Young, "A Nasty Piece of Work: A Psychoanalytic Study of Sexual and Racial Difference in 'Mona Lisa', in Johnathan Rutherford, ed., *Identity*, 1990, p.193.
22. Calvin Hernton, *Sex & Racism in America*, 1964, p.125.
23. Hugh Ridley, *Images of Imperial Rule*, 1983, p.141.
24. Wilhelm Reich, *The Invasion of Compulsory Sex-Morality*, 1972, pp.3-4: 'The sexual misery in authoritarian, patriarchal society is a result of its intrinsic sexual negation and suppression which create sexual stasis, which in turn begets *neuroses, perversions, and sexual crime.*'
25. Stott, op. cit., p.71.
26. *The Melody Maker*, Vol.1, No.6, June 1926, p.1.
27. Gilman, op. cit., p.71.

28. Elliot H. Tokson, *The Popular Image of the Black Man in English Drama, 1550–1688*, 1982, p.17.
29. Melanie Klein, *Love, Guilt and Reparation*, 1988, pp.137-8.
30. Fanon, op. cit., p.32.
31. Benita Parry, *Delusions and Discoveries: Studies on India in the British Imagination, 1880–1930*, 1972, p.27.
32. Sigmund Freud, *The Future of an Illusion*, 1943, p.12.

CHAPTER 7

1. Wilson Harris, *Tradition, The Writer & Society*, London, 1967, pp.43-4.
2. Ibid, p. 45.
3. Ralph Korngold, *Citizen Toussaint*, New York, 1965, p.32.
4. See Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery*, London, 1964, p.35.
5. For an excellent discussion of the topic of Good Speech in ancient and traditional Africa, see Jacob Carruthers, *Mdw Ntr: Divine Speech, A Historiographical Reflection of African Deep Thought from the time of the Pharaohs to the 20th Century*, Karnak House, London, 1995.
6. Rainsford, quoted in Jacob Carruthers, *The Irritated Genie*, Chicago, 1985, p.84.
7. Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from Political Writings 1910 –1920*, London, 1977, p.3.
8. Ibid.
9. Ngugi Wa Thiong'o, *Moving the Centre, The Struggle for Cultural Freedoms*, London/Nairobi/New Hamshire, 1993, p.63.
10. Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, London, 1968, p.61.
11. Suzanne Miers/Igor Kopytoff, eds., *Slavery in Africa: Historical and Anthropological Perspectives*, Wisconsin, 1977, p.11.
12. Alan Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, p.3.
13. Ibid, p.21.
14. Korngold, op. cit., p.106.
15. Ibid, p.205.
16. Mary Eagleton, David Pierce, *Attitudes to Class in the English Novel*, London, 1979, p.15.
17. S.J.S. Coockey, *King Jaja of the Niger Delta: His life and Times 1821-1891*, New York, 1974, pp.117/8.
18. Sir Harry Johnson, quoted in ibid, p.119.
19. Ibid, p.122.
20. Ibid, p.127.
21. C.L.R. James, *The Black Jacobins*, New York, 1963, pp. 333/4.
22. Frantz Fanon, *Toward the African revolution*, Middlesex, 1970, p.48.
23. E. Franklin Frazier, *Race and Culture Contacts in the Modern World*, Boston, 1957, p.243.
24. Ibid, p.246.

25. Richard Small, 'The Training of an Intellectual, the Making of a Marxist,' in Paul Buhle, ed., *C.L.R. James, His Life and Work*, London, 1986, pp.53/4.
26. Paul Buhle, *C.L.R. James: The Artist as Revolutionary*, London, 1988, p.17.
27. *Ibid*, p.20.
28. Ngugi, *Detained, A Writer's Prison Diary*, London, 1981, p.41.
29. Wanda Parkinson, *'This Golden African': Toussaint L'Ouverture*, London, 1980, p.88.
30. Gramsci, op. cit., pp.323-4.
31. *Ibid*, p.132. Cf. Sigmund Freud, *The Future of an Illusion*, London, 1943: Freud, although validating the right to elitist governmental rule, also accepted the possibility that a well-educated future generation 'will be ready on its own account to make the sacrifice in labour and in instinctual renunciation that is necessary for its preservation', p.13.
32. Bruno Bettelheim, *The Informed Heart, A study of the psychological consequences of living under extreme fear and terror*, Middlesex, 1986, p.172.
33. John Powis, *Aristocracy*, Oxford and New York, 1984, pp.44-5.
34. Edward Brathwaite, *The Development of Creole Society in Jamaica 1770 - 1820*, Oxford, 1971/8, pp.199-201.
35. Léon-Francois Hoffman, *Essays on Haitian Literature*, Washington D.C., 1984, p.54.
36. Fernando Henriques, *Family and Colour in Jamaica*, Kingston/London, 1976, p.47.
37. *Ibid*, p.52.
38. George Beckford, Michael Witter, *Small Garden... Bitter Weed, Struggle and Change in Jamaica*, London, 1982, p.46.
39. Alice Miller, *The Drama of Being a Child*, London, 1987, p.48.
40. Morgan Dalphinis, *Caribbean and African Languages, Social History, Language, Literature and Education*, 1985, pp.36-7.
41. *Ibid*, p.91.
42. Richard Wright, *Black Power, A Record of Reactions in a Land of Pathos*, New York, 1954, p.323.
43. Beckford and Witter, op. cit., p.45
44. Charlotte Davis Kasl, *Women, Sex and Addiction, A Search for Love and Power*, London, 1990, p.270.
45. *Ibid*, p.273.

APPENDIX 2

1. A.T. Carey, quoting Frank A. Harris (*Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*), in *The Social Adaptation of Coloured Students in London with specific reference to West Africans and West Indians*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1955, p.10.
2. *Ibid*, pp.10-11.
3. Douglas A. Lorrimer, *Colour, Class and the Victorians*, London/New York, 1978, p.15.

4. For a critique of this notion, see Bernhard Kraus, *Human Origin and Development from an African Ancestry*, London, 1990.
5. Bernth Lindfors, "The Hottetot Venus and other African Attractions in nineteenth century England," paper presented at the International Conference on the History of Blacks in England, 1981, p.i.
6. See Philip D. Curtin, *The Image of Africa – British Ideas and Action 1780-1850*, Wisconsin, 1964, for ample discussion of the works of these writers. See also Michael D. Biddiss, ed., *Images of Race*, Leicester, 1979, both for commentary on and reproduction of some of these writers.
7. Kenneth Little, *Negroes in Britain*, London/Boston, 1948, revised edition, 1972, pp.213-214.
8. *Ibid*, p.78, p.214.
9. Michael P. Banton, *Negro Immigrants in a Dockland area*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1954, p.31.
10. *West Africa*, June 21, 1919, p.486, reported on a case of racial violence brought to the Thames Police Court, where the Commissioner of Police was reported to have said that it was 'owing to the action of roughs - white people - who interfered with coloured men, in many cases British subjects.' He continued by saying that if whites would leave blacks alone nothing of this sort would happen. The magistrate said that he was determined to keep the peace in Limehouse, East London. The magazine also reported on "white" violence in Cardiff under the headline, "Cardiff Race Rioters Sentenced," '...ten men were convicted of rioting during the recent race riots at Cardiff, and were sentenced...to...from 20 months to three months.' The magazine also reported the deaths of two Europeans and an Arab. July 26, 1919, p.603. See also Little, *op. cit.*, for further discussion of this theme, pp.80-82.
11. Little, *op. cit.*, p.79. Here the author also discusses the earning power of these seamen during war time and the attraction of the native opposite sex and the consequent resentment this created in white males. It is also interesting to note the author's race bias in characterising the predilection of black seamen being 'in the habit of spending freely what they earned.' Because there is no footnote or reference to this assertion, it can only be logically concluded that the author had inserted his own personal opinion.
12. *Ibid*, p.84, 1f, for the remarks of Commander Kenworthy, M.P. It should be noted that it was economic considerations on the part of the shipowners who sometimes hired African and Asian labour rather than white British who proved considerably more expensive. Little, p.84, 2f. See also the various Aliens Order Acts which provided for the limitation of immigration into Britain, *ibid*, pp.85-89.
An excellent demonstration of the fate of Africans who had fought in the first war can be gleaned from a letter to the editor, published in *West Africa*, October 11, 1919, p.929. Complaining that other nationalities were allowed to march, i.e., Indians, although late, he went on to say: 'There was accommodation for them to the Cameroons and to East Africa when the war was on, but none to bring them to London when

the war was over and the victory won. They were fit to assist in the breaking of Germany, but they were not fit to be in the Victory march. There was no feeling against the coloured races during the war, but no sooner was the armistice signed and the victory sure then feelings against the Africans began to arise, for who can forget the Liverpool treatment, the East London mobbing, the wholesale deportation of coloured men who at the risk of their lives worked for the shipping companies during the war, and last, but not least, the segregation played in the Victory march? We live to learn. Ko buro O!

Victor Allen.

The editor placed a footnote at the end of the letter, saying that transportation would have costed £10,000, but if a million 'it ought to have been done.'

13. An excellent barometer for gauging the temper and social action of the working class and the socialist intellectuals during this period is the Sylvia Pankhurst newspaper, *The Workers' Dreadnought*. On October 23, 1920, under the headline, "Baton Charges in Whitehall," the reporter referred to the police as 'the blue uniformed thugs' and stated that 'the police acted in a provocative manner.. An eyewitness states that many of them (the police) acted as if they were drunk...*they were drunk with a distorted sense of power over a harmless crowd.* They bullied the crowd right and left. The crowd was in no mood to be ridden over rough-shod by these *animals...*' (emphasis added)
In the previous year, under the headline, "Stabbing Negroes in the London Dock Area," the reporter asks, 'Are you afraid that a white woman would prefer a black man to you if you met her on equal terms with him?' May 31, 1919. On June 7, 1919, the paper ran an article under the provocative title, "The Ungrateful Police."
14. J.R. Hooker, *Henry Sylvester Williams, Imperial Pan-Africanist*, London, 1975, pp.21-2.
15. Ibid, p.83.
16. Ibid, p.23.
17. See Hooker's discussion of the background of the Reform Movement in Trinidad, pp.7-15.
18. Geiss, op. cit., pp.182-3.
19. W.E.B. du Bois, "The Pan-African Movement," in George Padmore, ed., *History of the Pan-African Congress*, London, first published 1947, new edition 1963, p.13.
20. Hooker, op. cit., pp.35-6.
21. Geiss, op. cit., p.195.
22. Ibid, pp.221-2.
23. Foreword, *The African Times and Orient Review*, July, 1912, p.iii.
24. Ibid, August, 1912, p.61.
25. Ibid, October 1913, pp.158-160.
26. Geiss, op. cit., p.222.
27. Ibid, p.225
28. Ibid, p.227.

29. Ibid. According to Geiss, Ali was prevented from landing in Ghana by the British colonial government and was thus forced to go to Nigeria instead.
30. Claude McKay, *A Long Way from Home*, London, 1985; first published New York, 1937, p.42.
31. Ibid, pp.60 and 80.
32. See McKay's description of his father refusing to shake the hand of his former European friend because of a perceived error in his character – the theft of church money for which he received isolation and eventually resigned. 'When he was leaving,' wrote McKay, 'he came to my father's house and offered to shake his hands. My father refused. He said the missionary had not acknowledged his error and he did not think his hands were clean just because they were white...' p.37.
33. Ibid, p.12.
34. Wayne Cooper and Robert C. Reinders, "Claude Mc Kay in England, 1920," in John La Rose, ed., *New Beacon Review*, No.1, London, 1968, refer to the International Club as the East Road Socialist Club, p.18, 7f.
35. McKay, op. cit., pp.67-8.
36. Ibid, p.68.
37. See Ivan Maisky, *Journey into the Past*, London, 1962, pp.35-6, for details of the history and political goings on of the club.
38. McKay, op. cit., p.68.
39. According to Cooper and Reinders, Lansbury rejected the letter because of its length and McKay's refusal to edit it. See Cooper and Reinders, op. cit., p.18, 11f. McKay, who details all of the issues in his autobiography referred to above, does not mention this. Further developments, which would indicate Lansbury's political complexion, tend to favour McKay's report.
40. McKay, *The Workers' Dreadnought*, April 24, 1920.
41. Peter Fryer, op. cit., p.317. Fryers' discussion of the Leftwing's possession and exhibition of racism is particularly relevant here.
42. For an informative discussion of the issue of social strife in Britain during the 1920s, see Peter Kingsford, *The Hunger Marchers in Britain 1920 - 1940*, London, 1982, where reference is made to a Liverpool-based neswletter, edited by a clergyman, who advocated 'the right of the hungry to steal food...' p.24.
43. *The Workers' Dreadnought*, June 19, 1920.
44. McKay, op. cit., pp.83-4.
45. Ibid, p.83.
46. McKay, op. cit., p.78.
47. Maisky, op. cit., p.135.
48. Stephen H. Bronz, quoted in Conrad Kent Rivers, "The Soulful Way of Claude McKay," *Black World*, Chicago, 1970, p.41.
49. *West Africa*, January 25, 1919, p.902.
50. *West Africa*, January 18, 1919, p.882.
51. Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, London, 1968, p.93. It is important to discuss the application of Fanon's concept to this situation. Fanon was situating the formation of a once balanced and healthy peo-

ple to that of an inferiorised and subordinated one in a colonial situation. It was not just directed to the educated, although this class characterized this concept classically. Caute, in discussing the trajectory of Gabriel Pellegrin and Blaise Diagne in the Senegalese colonial context, says, 'The mulatto Gabriel Pellegrin, one of the leaders of the anti-French insurrection in 1802, was by 1823 the royalist Government's choice as mayor of St. Louis. A century later, in 1914, the black radical Blaise Diagne was elected to represent his people in the Paris Chamber of Deputies; by 1921 he was defending the French Empire against the criticisms of W.E. Du Bois and the Pan-African Congress; by 1930 he had been delegated by the ultra-conservative Tardieu Government to defend France's record in the matter of forced labour at the International Labour Congress.' David Caute, *Fanon*, London, 1970, p.60. It is clear, however, that Caute's relegation of the concept of class betrayal which is confined to an ancient tradition among Senegalese politicians (p.59) only, is nonsense. History is replete with numerous examples of class betrayal by those seeking power, self-aggrandisement, favour or wealth.

52. *West Africa*, May 24, 1919, p.361.
53. For the two awards, see *West Africa*, June 7, 1919 and May 1, 1920, respectively.
54. G.O. Olusanya, *The West African Students' Union*, Ibadan, 1982, pp.5-6.
55. *Ibid*, p.5
56. Fryer, *op. cit.*, p.325.
57. *West Africa*, May 31, 1919, p.400.
58. It is interesting to note that tension would increase over the years on the question of control of property. The Colonial Office was prepared to finance the establishment of a hostel for African students, but discussions broke down over control. The CO demanded control as well as three times the number of the Trustees provided by WASU must be British and nominated by them. This is where WASU refused and sent Solanke on a fund-raising tour. See Olusanya, *op. cit.*, p.23.
59. For details concerning WASU's history, see Geiss, *op. cit.*, pp.297-304; Fryer, *op. cit.*, pp.324-6; and Olusanya, *op. cit.*
60. Geiss, *op. cit.*, p.298.
61. Olusanya, *op. cit.*, p.10.
62. *Ibid*, p.28.
63. *Ibid*, p.39.
64. *Ibid*, p.52.
65. *Ibid*.
66. *Ibid*, p.39.
67. '...there was no very definite line followed by WASU; many of its members had one foot in the LCP (The League of Coloured Peoples) or in our organization. One explanation for this was that it was an omnibus movement, and was open to anyone from West Africa, or other spheres, who wished to join. And you've got to remember that many of the so-called West African students of that day in London were middle-aged. Often they were men who had served well in the colonial machinery, or

- in some large expatriate company, and now they wanted to take on another job like law. Naturally, as they had been saving up money for many years to get this qualification in the minimum time, they were not disposed to risk their chances by dabbling in politics.' Makonnen, op. cit., p.128.
68. Olusanya, op. cit., p.47.
 69. 'Opinions were at first divided among them concerning the conflict (i.e., Italy vs Ethiopia). One group felt that, as the power with the largest portion of Africa, Britain, in fairness to her subjects, would see to it that justice was done and honour upheld without fear or favour. There were others who reduced the affair to the question of white versus black. This group questioned whether in the event of war breaking out Great Britain would not unhesitatingly sacrifice the black race on the altar of injustice to preserve the superiority of the white race. And yet another group definitely conveyed the idea that Great Britain would conduct herself in such a way as to obtain the greatest benefit out of the situation... 'Members of the union immediately joined in the protest activity in Britain against the violation of Ethiopia's sovereignty. *They could not understand why the Holy See appeared to acquiesce in Mussolini's 'civilising mission.'* In its editorial notes, *Wasu lamented how Italy, the home of Christendom, could attack innocent Ethiopians.*' (emphasis added). S.K.B. Asante, *Pan-African Protest: West Africa and the Italo-Ethiopian Crisis 1934-1941*, London, 1977, p.50.
 70. David A. Vaughan, *Negro Victory, the life story of Dr Harold Moody*, London, 1950, p.12.
 71. Ibid, pp.12-14.
 72. Ibid, p.43.
 73. Ibid, p.46.
 74. Ibid, p.51.
 75. Ibid, p.72.
 76. Ibid, p.84.
 77. 'Moody had from the beginning emphasised the Christian basis of all his work and never failed to make it clear that the Christian faith was the inspiration of all his interests and effort.' Ibid, p.62.
 78. McKay records that he had taken several Africans to the International Club including 'a young West Indian doctor from Dulwich... The minister and the doctor never made a second visit..' This is almost certain to have been Moody as he was practising medicine in Peckham in this period. The fact that he did not return (like the minister) would have been because of the socialist disdain for the concept of God, and he would have been insulted. See McKay, op. cit., p.70.
 79. Geiss, op. cit., p.349; *The Keys*, Vol.1, No.4, April-June, 1934, p.84.
 80. Ibid, pp.349-350.
 81. *The Keys*, Vol.4, No.2, London, 1936, p.16.
 82. Ibid, Vol. 1, No.1, July, 1933.
 83. Vaughan, op. cit., p.21.
 84. L. Adele Jinadu, *Fanon: In Search of the African Revolution*, Enugu, 1980, p.48.

85. Makonnen, *op. cit.*, p.148, 6f.
86. C.L.R. James, *The Keys*, Vol., No.1, July, 1933, p.5.
87. *Ibid*, Vol.1, No.2, October, 1933, p.31.
88. *Ibid*, Vol.1, No.3, January, 1934, p.48.
89. *Ibid*, p.50.
90. See Makonnen, *op. cit.*, p.126; Vaughan, *op. cit.*, pp.69, 86-7, pp.116-7.
91. 'No 'native', however detribalised, could fit socially into All Souls. What, for example, could I say, in the very midst of the Ethiopian War, shortly after the announcement of the infamous Hoare-Laval peace plan, in reply to a question as to whether advanced peoples have any right to assume tutelage over backward peoples?...
 '...the very colonials who formed part of the university generation of the thirties, who saw the rise of Hitler, the rape of Ethiopia, the trampling of Spanish democracy, and who heard the Oxford Union refuse to fight for King and Country...
 'I tried to get my thesis published. No one would buy. Britain's most revolutionary publisher, Warburg, who would publish all of Stalin and Trotsky, told me: 'Mr. Williams, are you trying to tell me that the slave trade and slavery were abolished for economic and not for humanitarian reasons? I would never publish such a book, for it would be contrary to the British tradition.'
 Eric Williams, *Inward Hunger; The Education of a Prime Minister* (London, 1969), pp.45, 52-4.
92. Paul Buhle, *C.L.R. James: The Artist as Revolutionary*, London, 1988, p.23.
93. C.L.R. James, *Beyond A Boundary*, London, 1963, pp.28, 41.
94. *Ibid*, p.121.
95. *Ibid*, pp.19, 21. James' consciousness, grounded in British education and culture, would change in 1971 where he would reverse his belief in the primacy of the West. 'I was about thirty-two years old and for the first time *I began to realise that the African, the black man, had a face of his own*. Up to that time I had believed that the proper face was the Graeco-Roman face. If a black man had that type of face he had a good face, and if he didn't, well, poor fellow, that was his bad luck...
 'Physically he [Paul Robeson] *wasn't Graeco-Roman at all. He was a man with an African face*, nothing Graeco-Roman, and a wonderful person, of great power and great gentleness' (emphasis added).
 C.L.R. James, *At the Rendezvous of Victory*, London, 1984, p.207.
 But James reverted to his previous position in 1983 in his acceptance speech of an honorary doctorate from the University of Hull. The writer was present at the ceremony. His acknowledging that the Greco-Roman world was not everything may have been mediated by his response to the audience he was addressing, in a post-Black Power atmosphere (Ladbroke Grove, 1971).
96. One can compare this statement with the revelation of the Kenyan writer, Ngugi wa Thiong'o, in which he stated that for all his radicalism, he had still been writing in the English language. It was due to a prison warder, while under detention in Kenya, who accused him of writing in

- a foreign language and not being able to communicate with the 'ordinary' people. This was the cataclysm that precipitated Ngugi's engagement with his mother tongue, Gikuyu.
 Ngugi wa Thiong'o, *Detained, A Writer's Prison Diary*, London, 1981, pp.129-130.
97. Buhle, op. cit., p.23.
 98. James, op. cit., p.252.
 99. James R. Hooker, *Black Revolutionary, George Padmore's path from Communism to Pan-Africanism*, London, 1967, p.2.
 100. Ibid. Hooker notes that Padmore's father once rented a room from the British wife of Sylvester Williams: *Henry Sylvester Williams: Imperial Pan-Africanist*, p.118.
 101. Hooker, *Black Revolutionary*, p.3.
 102. Ibid, pp.4-7.
 103. James, op. cit., pp.39-40.
 104. Robert Hill, "In England, 1932-1938," in Paul Buhle, ed., *C.L.R. James: His Life and Work*, Chicago, 1981, p.21.
 105. Ibid, p.22.
 106. 'C.L.R. James today, despite his acknowledged wide range, is known firstly as a political writer and Marxist. Up to the time he left school, there is no sign in him of any political inclinations.' Richard Small, "The training of an intellectual, the making of a Marxist," in Buhle, op. cit., p.16.
 107. Kenneth King, ed., *Ras Makonnen: Pan-Africanism from within*, Nairobi, 1973, p.16, 10f.
 108. '...the reason he ended up in Guyana with this Scotsman was that suddenly the Guyana-Venezuela region was projected as the next mining boom area.' Ibid, p.12.
 109. Ibid, p.8.
 110. For comparison, see Ifi Amadiume, *Afrikan Matriarchal Foundations*, London, 1987.
 111. Makonnen, op. cit., p.8.
 112. Ibid, p.33.
 113. Ibid, p.ix-x.
 114. Makonnen, op. cit., p.111.
 115. Ibid.
 116. Ibid, p.112.
 117. Ibid, p.113.
 118. 'Padmore had been a Communist. He had been a great leader of the Communist movement. When on May Day the Communist armies used to march about Moscow, George would be on the platform with Stalin, Molotov and the rest of them. He lived in the Kremlin. But nevertheless he called them "those people" and it became clear to me afterwards...that he had never been completely swept away by the Stalinist conception of Marxism' (emphasis added). C.L.R. James, op. cit., p.255.
 119. Geiss, op. cit., pp.354-5.
 120. James, op. cit., p.256.

121. Makonnen, *op. cit.*, p.116.
122. *Ibid*, pp.115-6.
123. James, *op. cit.*, p.257.
124. Hooker, *op. cit.*, p.106.
125. Geiss, *op. cit.*, pp.352-3; James, *op. cit.*, p.256.
126. Hooker, *op. cit.*, p.46.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. BOOKS

- A**dler, Alfred, *Cooperation between the Sexes: Writings on Women, Love & Marriage, Sexuality & its Disorders*, Anchor Books, New York, 1978.
- Amadiume, Ifi, *Afrikan Matriarchal Foundations*, Karnak House, London, 1987.
- Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities, Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London/New York, 1983.
- Aristotle, *The Athenian Constitution*, Middlesex, Penguin Books, 1984.
- Arrian, *The Campaigns of Alexander*, Middlesex. Penguin, 1971.
- Arendt, Hannah, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, George Allen & Unwin, London, 1951/1958.
- Asante, S.B., *Pan-African Protest: West Africa and the Italo-Ethiopian Crisis 1934-1941*, London, 1977.
- Augier, E.R., Gordon, S.C., *Sources of West Indian History*, Longmans, London, 1969 edition.
- B**aldwin, James, "Everybody's Protest Novel," in *Notes of A Native Son*, Corgi Books, London, 1965.
- Baker, Houston A., Jr., *Modernism and the Harlem Renaissance*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1987.
- Banton, Michael P. *Negro Immigrants in a Dockland area*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1954.
- Barker, Francis, Peter Hulme, Margaret Iversen, Diana Loxley, eds., *The Politics of Theory, Proceedings of the Essex conference on the Sociology of Literature*, University of Essex, Colchester, 1983.
- Barthelemy, Anthony Gerard, *The Representation of Blacks in English Drama from Shakespeare to Southerne*, Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge/London, 1987.
- Beckford, George, Michael Witter, *Small Garden... Bitter Weed, Struggle and Change in Jamaica*, Zed Press, London, 1982.
- Benjamin, Jessica, *The Bonds of Love, Psychoanalysis, Feminism, and the*

- Problem of Domination*, Pantheon Books, New York, 1988.
- Bernal, Martin, *Black Athena*, Free Association Press, London, 1987.
- Bettelheim, Bruno, *The Informed Heart, A study of the psychological consequences of living under extreme fear and terror*, Penguin Books, Middlesex, 1986.
- Bey, José Pimentia, "Moorish Spain: Academic Source and Foundation for the Rise and Success of Western European Universities in the Middle Ages," in Van Sertima, ed., *Golden Age of the Moor*, Journal of African Civilisations/Transaction Books, New Jersey, 1992.
- Bhabha, Homi K., "Difference, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism;" see Barker et al
- Bhabha, Homi K., ed., *Nation and Narration*, Routledge, London and New York, 1990.
- Biddiss, Michael D., ed., *Images of Race*, The Victorian Library/Leicester University Press, Leicester, 1979.
- Blunt, Anthony, "Rationalist and Anti-rationalist Art," *New Left Review*, June 1936.
- Bock, Gisela, "Equality and difference in National Socialist racism," in Gisela Bock and Susan James, eds., *Beyond Equality & Difference*, Routledge, London/New York, 1992.
- Boime, Albert, *The Art of Exclusion, Representing Blacks in the Nineteenth Century*, Thames & Hudson, London, 1990.
- Bolt, Christine, *Victorians Attitudes to Race*, Routledge & Kegan Paul/University of Toronto Press, London/Toronto, 1971.
- Bowlby, John, *Attachment and Loss: Volume 1, Attachment*, Penguin Books, Middlesex, 1971.
- Brackenbury, Henry, *The Ashanti War*, William Blackwood & Sons, Edinburg and London, 1968 (1874).
- Brady, David and John McCormack, *People's Theatre*, Croom Helm, London, 1938.
- Branson, Noreen, *History of the Communist Party of Great Britain 1927-1941*, Lawrence & Wishart, London, 1985.
- Brathwaite, Edward, *The Development of Creole Society in Jamaica 1770 - 1820*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1971.
- Bratton, J.S., "Introduction," in Bratton, Richard Allen Cave, Brendon Gregory, Heidi J. Holder, Michael Pickering, *Acts of Supremacy, The British Empire and the Stage, 1790-1930*, Manchester University Press, Manchester/New York, 1991.
- Brereton, Bridget, *A History of Modern Trinidad 1783-1962*, Heinemann Educational Books, Kingston, Port-of-Spain, London, 1981.
- Bryk, Felix, *Voodoo-Eros, Ethnological Studies in the Sex-Life of the African Aborigines*, New York, 1964.
- Buhle, Paul, *C.L.R. James: The Artist as Revolutionary*, Verso, London/New York, 1988.
- Buhle, Paul, ed., *C.L.R. James, His Life and Work*, Allison & Busby, London, 1986.
- Butler, Marilyn, *Romantics, Rebels and Reactionaries, English Literature and its Background 1760-1830*, Oxford University Press, New York and

London, 1982.

Cabral, Amilcar, *Unity & Struggle*, Heinemann Educational Books, London, 1980.

Caesar, *The Conquest of Gaul*, translator S.A. Handford, Middlesex, Penguin, 1951.

Carey, A.T., *The Social Adaptation of Coloured Students in London with specific reference to West Africans and West Indians*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1955.

Carruthers, Jacob, *The Irritated Genie*, The Kemet Institute, Chicago, 1985.

Catchpole, Brian, *The Clash of Cultures, Aspects of Culture Conflict from Roman times to the present day*, Heinemann Education Books, London, 1981.

Caute, David, *Fanon*, Fontana/Collins, London, 1970.

Césaire, Aimé, *Discourse on Colonialism*, Monthly Review Press, New York and London, 1972.

Chamberlin, Russell, *Loot! The Heritage of Plunder*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1983.

Chambers, Colin, *The Story of Unity Theatre*, Lawrence & Wishart, London, 1989.

Chinweizu, *The West and the Rest of Us*, Nok Publishers, London/Lagos, 1978.

Clark, Jon, Margot Heinemann, David Margolies and Carole Snee, eds., *Culture and Crisis in Britain in the 30s*, Lawrence & Wishart, London, 1979.

Clark, Jon, "Agitprop and Unity Theatre: Socialist Theatre in the Thirties;" see Clark above.

Clark, Kenneth, *Civilisation*, BBC Books/John Murray, London, 1971.

Coffin, Levi, *The Reminiscences of Levi Coffin*, Arno Press & The New York Times, New York, 1968.

Cole, Hubert, *Christophe: King of Haiti*, Eyre & Spottiswoode, London, 1967.

Cooper, Wayne and Robert C. Reinders, "Claude Mc Kay in England, 1920," in John La Rose, ed., *New Beacon Review*, No.1, London, New Beacon Books, 1968.

Cookey, S.J.S., *King Jaja of the Niger Delta: His Life and Times 1821-1891*, Nok Publishers, New York, 1974.

Cowhig, Ruth, "Blacks in English Renaissance drama and the role of Shakespeare's Othello," in David Dabydeen, ed., *The black presence in English Literature*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1985.

Craig, Susan, "The Germs of an Idea," afterword to Arthur Lewis, *Labour in the West Indies: The Birth of a Workers' Movement*, New Beacon Books, London/Port-of-Spain, 1977.

Cruse, Harold, *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual*, William Morrow & Co., New York, 1967.

Cuppitt, Don, *Crisis of Moral Authority*, SCM Press, London, 1972, 1985.

Curl, James Stevens *Egyptomania, The Egyptian Revival: a Recurring Theme in the History of Taste*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1994.

Curtin, Philip D., *The Image of Africa British Ideas and Action 1780-1850*, The University of Wisconsin Press, Wisconsin, 1964.

Curtin, Philip D., *The Image of Africa – British Ideas and Action 1780–1850*, 1964.

Curtin, Philip D., ed., *Imperialism*, The Macmillan Press, London/Basingstoke, 1972.

Dabydeen, David, ed., *The black presence in English literature*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1985.

Dalphinis, Morgan, *Caribbean and African Languages, Social History, Language, Literature and Education*, Karia Press, London, 1985.

Dash, J. Michael, *Literature and Ideology in Haiti 1915–1961*, The Macmillan Press, London & Basingstoke, 1981.

Dollimore, Johnathan, "Introduction: Shakespeare, cultural materialism and the new historicism," in J. Dollimore and A. Sinfield, *Political Shakespeare: new essays in cultural materialism*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1985.

de Troesch, Helen Rusha, *The Negro in English Dramatic Literature and on the Stage and a Bibliography of Plays with Negro characters*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Western Reserve University, 1940.

du Bois, W.E.B., "The Pan-African Movement," in George Padmore, ed., *History of the Pan-African Congress*, London, first published 1947, new edition 1963.

Diop, Cheikh Anta, "The Origin of the Ancient Egyptians," in Ivan Van Sertima, ed., *Egypt Revisited*, Journal of African Civilisations/Transaction Books, New Jersey, 1991.

Duberman, Martin, *Paul Robeson*, The Bodley Head, London, 1989.

Eagleton, Mary and David Pierce, *Attitudes to Class in the English Novel*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1979.

Eagleton, Terry, *Nationalism: Irony and Commitment*, Field Day, Derry, 1988.

Edwards, Ness, "The Workers' Theatre (1930)", in Samuel, MacColl, Cosgrove, eds., *Theatre of the Left, 1880–1935*, London, 1985.

El Dareer, Asma, *Woman, Why Do You Weep*, Zed Press, London, 1982.

Elfenbein, Anna, *Women on the Color Line, Evolving stereotypes and the writings of George Washington Cable, Grace King, Kate Chopin*, University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville, 1989.

Engels, Frederick *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*, International Publishers, New York, 1972.

Engels, Frederick, *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, Progress Publishers/Lawrence & Wishart, Moscow/London, 1973.

Engels, Frederick, "Democratic Pan-Slavism," in *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, Moscow Publishers/Lawrence & Wishart, Moscow/London, 1977.

Engels, Frederick, "Persia and China," in Engels/Marx, *On Colonialism*, 6th printing, Progress Publishers/Lawrence & Wishart, Moscow/London, 1976.

Fanon, Frantz, *Black Skin, White Masks*, London, MacGibbon & Kee, 1968.

Fanon, Frantz, *Toward the African Revolution*, Middlesex, Penguin, 1970.

Fanon, Frantz, *A Dying Colonialism*, Penguin Books, Middlesex, 1970.

Fieldhouse, D.K., *The Colonial Empires, a Comparative Survey from the Eighteenth Century*, Macmillan, London, 1982.

Foner, Philip S., ed., *Paul Robeson Speaks, Writings, Speeches, Interviews 1918-1974*, London, 1978.

Frazier, E. Franklin, *Race and Culture Contacts in the Modern World*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1957.

Fredrickson, George M., *The Black Image in the White Mind, the debate on Afro-American Character & Destiny, 1817-1914*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, 1971.

Freud, Anna, *The Ego and the Mechanisms of Defence*, The Hogarth Press & The Institute for Psychoanalysis, London, 1986.

Freud, Sigmund, *On Sexuality*, Penguin Books, Middlesex, 1977.

Freud, Sigmund, *The Future of an Illusion*, The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psychoanalysis, London, 1943.

Fuller, Sir Francis, *A Vanished Dynasty Ashanti*, Frank Cass & Co., London, 1968.

Gammon, Vic, "Problems of Method in the historical study of Popular Music," in *Popular Music Perspectives*, David Horn and Philip Tagg, eds., Göteborg & Exeter, 1982.

Gann, L.H. and Peter Duigan, eds., *African Proconsuls: European Governors in Africa*, The Free Press/Hoover Institution, London/California, 1978.

Gann, L.H. and Peter Duigan, eds., *The Rulers of British Africa 1870-1914*, Croom Helm, London, 1978.

Geiss, Immanuel, *The Pan African Movement*, Methuen & Co., London, 1974.

Gendzier, Irene, *Frantz Fanon, A Biography*, Grove Press, New York, 1985.

Gibbon, Edward, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, abridged edition, 1979.

Gilman, Sander L., *Difference and Pathology: Stereotypes of Sexuality, Race and Madness*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca/London, 1985.

Gloversmith, Frank, *The Theory of Reading*, Harvester Press/Barnes & Nobles, Sussex/New Jersey, 1984.

Gloversmith, Frank, ed., *Class, Culture and Social Change, A New View of the 1930s*, The Harvester Press/Humanities Press, Sussex/New Jersey, 1980.

Gramsci, Antonio, *Selections from Political Writings 1910–1920*, Lawrence & Wishart, London, 1977.

Green, Martin, *Dreams of Adventure, Deeds of Empire*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1980.

Gysehem, André Van, "British theatre in the Thirties: An Autobiographical Record," see Jon Clark, Margot Heinemann et al.

Harlow, Barbara, Introduction to Malek Alloula, *The Colonial Harem*, Methuen, New York & London, 1987.

Harris, Wilson, *Tradition, The Writer & Society*, New Beacon Books, London, 1967.

Hechter, Michael, *Internal Colonialism, The Celtic fringe in British national development, 1536-1966*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1975.

Henriques, Fernando, *Family and Colour in Jamaica*, Sangster's Book Stores/Granada Publishing, Kingston/London, 1976.

Hernton, Calvin C., *Sex and Racism in America*, New York, 1966.

Higginbotham, A. Leon, *Roman Slave Law*, 1987.

Hill, Robert, "In England, 1932-1938," in Paul Buhle, ed., *C.L.R. James: His Life and Work*, Chicago, 1981.

Hoffman, Léon-Francois, *Essays on Haitian Literature*, Three Continents Press, Washington D.C., 1984.

Hooker, James R., *Black Revolutionary, George Padmore's path from Communism to Pan-Africanism*, Pall Mall Press, London, 1967.

Hooker, J.R., *Henry Sylvester Williams, Imperial Pan-Africanist*, Rex Collins, London, 1975.

Hrbek, I. "Africa in the context of world history," in E. El Fasi, ed., *General History of Africa III, Africa from the Seventh to the Eleventh Century*, UNESCO/University of California Press/Heinemann, Paris/California/London, 1988.

Hyam, Ronald, *Empire and Sexuality, The British Experience*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, Manchester/New York, 1990.

Hymans, Jacques Louis, *Léopold Sédar Senghor, an intellectual biography*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 1971.

Irving, Washington *The Conquest of Granada*, J.M. Dent, London/Toronto, 1910.

Jackson, John G. *Introduction to African Civilizations*, Citadel Press, New Jersey, 1970.

Jackson, L.A. "The Freedom of the Critic and the History of the Text;" see Francis Barker et al.

Jacobs, W. Richard, *Butler versus the King, riots and sedition in 1937*, Key Caribbean Publications, Port-of-Spain, 1976.

Jagan, Cheddi, *The West on Trial, The Fight for Guyana's Freedom*, Seven Sea Books, Berlin, 1972.

- Jaffe, Hosea, *European Colonial Despotism: A History of Oppression & Resistance in South Africa*, Karnak House, London, 1994.
- James, C.L.R., *The Black Jacobins*, revised edition, Vintage Books, New York, 1963.
- James, C.L.R., *At the Rendezvous of Victory*, Allison & Busby, London, 1984.
- James, C.L.R., *Beyond A Boundary*, Hutchinson & Co., London, 1963.
- James, C.L.R., *The Future in the Present*, Allison & Busby, London, 1977.
- Jinadu, L. Adele, *Fanon: In Search of the African Revolution*, Fourth Dimension Publishers, Enugu, 1980.
- Johnson, Sir Harry H., *The Colonization of Africa*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1913.
- Jones, Eldred, *Othello's Countryman, The African in English Renaissance Drama*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1965.

- K**asl, Charlotte Davis, *Women, Sex and Addiction, A Search for Love and Power*, Cedar, London, 1990.
- Khaldun, Ibn, *The Maqaddimah, An Introduction to History*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1967.
- King, Kenneth, ed., *Ras Makonnen: Pan-Africanism from within*, Oxford University Press, London/Nairobi, 1973.
- Kingsford, Peter, *The Hunger Marchers in Britain 1920-1940*, Lawrence & Wishart, London, 1982.
- Klein, Melanie, *Love, Guilt and Reparation*, Virago, London, 1988.
- Klepp, Susan E. and Billy G. Smith, eds., *The Infortunate, The Voyage and Adventure of William Moraley, an Indentured Servant*, The Pennsylvania State University Press, Penn., 1992.
- Knorr, Klaus E., *British Colonial Theories 1570-1850*, University of Toronto Press/Frank Cass & Co., Toronto/London, 1968.
- Korngold, Ralph, *Citizen Toussaint*, Hill and Wang, New York, 1965.
- Kraus, Bernhard, *Human Origin and Development from an African Ancestry*, Karnak House, London, 1990.

- L**ee, Francis, *Fabianism and Colonialism*, Defiant Books, London, 1988.
- Lewis, David Levering, *When Harlem was in Vogue*, Oxford University Press, New York/Oxford, 1989.
- Little, Kenneth, *Negroes in Britain*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London/Boston, 1948, revised edition, 1972).
- Lorrimer, Douglas A., *Colour, Class and the Victorians*, Leicester University Press/Holmes & Meier Publishers, Leicester/New York, 1978.
- Lugard, Lady (Flora M. Shaw), *A Tropical Dependency, An Outline of the Ancient History of the Western Soudan with an Account of the Modern Settlement of Northern Nigeria*, James Nisbet & Co., London, 1905.

- MacDougall, Hugh A., *Racial Myth in English History*, Harvest House/University Press of New England, Montreal/New Hampshire/London, 1982.
- Mackay, Charles, "The Negro and the Negrophilists," in Michael D. Biddis, *Images of Race*, London, 1979.
- Maine, Sir Henry Sumner, *Ancient Law*, Dorset Press, U.S.A., 1986.
- Maisky, Ivan *Journey into the Past*, Hutchinson, London, 1962.
- Mangan, J.A., ed., *Socialism and British Imperialism*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1990.
- Martin, Tony, *African Fundamentalism, A Literary and Cultural Anthology of Garvey's Harlem Renaissance*, The Majority Press, Massachusetts, 1991.
- McKay, Claude, *A Long Way from Home*, Pluto Press, London, 1985; first published New York, 1937.
- Marx, Karl, *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, Moscow Publishers/Lawrence & Wishart, Moscow/London, 1982.
- Marx/Engels, *On Colonialism*, Lawrence & Wishart, London, 1968 edition (printed in the USSR by Progress Publishers, 1959).
- Memmi, Albert, *The Colonizer and the Colonised*, The Orion Press/Beacon Press, Boston, 1967.
- Miers, Suzanne/Igor Kopytoff, eds., *Slavery in Africa: Historical and Anthropological Perspectives*, University of Wisconsin Press, Wisconsin, 1977.
- Milbury-Steen, Sarah L., *European & African Stereotypes in Twentieth Century Fiction*, MacMillan Press, Basingstoke/London, 1980.
- Miller, Alice, *The Drama of Being a Child*, Virago Press, London, 1987.
- Mills, Sara, *Discourses of Difference: An analysis of women's travel writing and colonialism*, Routledge, London/New York, 1991.
- Mitchel, Loftin, *Black Drama*, Hawthorn Books, New York, 1967.
- Morley, Malcolm, *The Theatre*, Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, London, 1935.
- Nandy, Ashis, *The Intimate Enemy, Loss and recovery of self under colonialism*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 1983.
- Nettl, Bruno, *The Study of Ethnomusicology, Twenty-nine Issues and Concepts*, University of Illinois Press, Chicago/London, 1983.
- Ngugi wa Thiong'o, *Detained, A Writer's Prison Diary*, Heinemann, London, 1981.
- Ngugi, Wa Thiong'o, "Imperialism of Language. English, a language for the world?" in *Moving the Centre*, James Curry, London, 1993.
- Ngugi, Wa Thiong'o, *Barrel of a Pen, Resistance to Repression in Neo-colonial Kenya*, New Beacon Books, London/Port-of-Spain, 1983.
- Nzula, A.T. I.I. Potekhin, A.Z. Zusmanovich, *Forced Labour in Colonial Africa*, London, Zed Press, 1979.

Obenga, Théophile, *Ancient Egypt & Black Africa: A Student's Handbook for the study of Ancient Egypt in Philosophy, Linguistics &*

Gender relations, Kamak House, London/Chicago, 1992.
 Olusanya, G.O., *The West African Students' Union*, Daystar Press, Ibadan, 1982.

- Parkinson, Wanda, *'This Gilden African': Toussaint L'Ouverture*, Quartet Books, London, 1980.
- Parry, Benita, "Some Provisional Speculations on the Critique of 'Resistance' Literature," unpublished paper, n.d.
- Parry, Benita, *Delusions and Discoveries: Studies on India in the British Imagination, 1880-1930*, Allen Lane, London, 1972.
- Patterson, Orlando, *The Sociology of Slavery, An analysis of the origins, development and structure of Negro slave society in Jamaica*, Sangster's Book Stores/Granada Publishing, Kingston/London, 1973.
- Pearce, R.H., *The Savages of America, A Study of the Indian and the Idea of civilisation*, John Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1953.
- Perham, Margery, *Colonial Sequence 1930 to 1949: A chronological commentary upon British Colonial Policy especially in Africa*, Methuen & Co., London, 1967.
- Pickering, Michael, "Mock blacks and racial mockery: the 'nigger' minstrel and British imperialism;" see J.S. Bratton et al.
- Plato, *The Republic of Plato*, translated with an analysis and notes by John Llewelyn Davies and David James Vaughan, Macmillan & Co., London, 1941.
- Powell, J.M., *Mirrors of the New World, Images and Image-makers in the Settlement Process*, Dawson/Archon Books, Kent/Connecticut, 1977.
- Powis, John, *Aristocracy*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford and New York, 1984.

Qariballah, Al-Fatih, *The Influence of Al-Ghazali upon Islamic Jurisprudence and Philosophy with special reference to the period 1100-1400 A.D.*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Edinburgh University, Edinburgh, 1969.

- Reich, Wilhelm, *The Mass Psychology of Fascism*, Souvenir Press, London, 1972.
- Reich, Wilhelm, *The Invasion of Compulsory Sex-Morality*, Condor/Souvenir Press, London, 1972.
- Ridley, Hugh, *Images of Imperial Rule*, Croom Helm/St Martin's, Kent/New York, 1983
- Ringer, Benjamin, and Elinor R. Lawless, *Race-Ethnicity and Society*, Routledge, New York/London, 1989.
- Roberts, Elizabeth, *A Woman's Place, An Oral History of Working-Class Women 1890-1940*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford/New York, 1984.
- Robeson, Eslanda Goode, *Paul Robeson, Negro*, London, 1930.
- Robeson, Paul, *Paul Robeson Speaks, Writings, Speeches, Interviews, 1918-1974*, Philip S. Foner, ed., Quartet Books, London/

- Melbourne/New York, 1978.
- Robinson, Cedric J., *Black Marxism, The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*, Zed Press, London, 1983.
- Rodney, Walter, *A History of the Guyanese Working People, 1881–1905*, Heinemann Educational Books, Kingston, Port-of-Spain, London, 1981.
- Rose, Steven, R.C. Lewontin, Leon J. Kamin, *Not in Our Genes: Biology, Ideology and Human Nature*, Penguin Books, Middlesex, 1994.
- Saakana, Amon Saba, *The Colonial Legacy in Caribbean Literature*, Karnak House, London, 1987.
- Saakana, Amon Saba, "Lina Magaia: A Biographical Sketch," in Lina Magaia, *Dumba Nengue, Run For Your Lifre, Peasant Tales of Genocide in Mozambique*, Karnak House, London, 1989.
- Said, Edward, *Orientalism*, Penguin, London, 1978.
- Said, Edward, *Nationalism, Colonialism and Literature: Yeats and Decolonization*, Derry, Filed Day Theatre Company, 1988.
- Samuel, Raphael, "Theatre and socialism in Britain, (1880–1935)", in Samuel, Ewan MacColl, Stuart Cosgrove, *Theatres of the Left*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1985.
- Scully, Diana, *Understanding Sexual Violence, A Study of Convicted Rapists*, Harper Collins Academic, London, 1990.
- Segalen, Martine, *Love and Power in the Peasant Family*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1983.
- Sertima, Ivan Van, "The Moor in Africa and Europe," in Van Sertima, ed., *Golden Age of the Moor*, Journal of African Civilisations/Transaction Books, New Jersey, 1992.
- Sertima, Ivan Van, ed., *Egypt revisited*, Journal of African Civilisations/Transaction Books, New Jersey, 1989.
- Sertima, Ivan Van, *Great African Thinkers: Cheikh Anta Diop*, Journal of African Civilisations/Transaction Books, New Jersey, 1986.
- Sherwin-White, A.N. *Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- Shivji, Issa G. "Semi-Proletarian Labour and the Use of Penal Sanctions in the Labour Law of Colonial Tanganyika (1920-38)," in Colin Sumner, ed., *Crime, Justice and Underdevelopment*, Heinemann, London, 1982.
- Small, Richard, "The training of an intellectual, the making of a Marxist;" see Buhle.
- Smith, Anthony *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, Basil Blackwell, London/New York, 1986.
- Smith, M.G., *Culture, Race and Class in the Commonwealth Caribbean*, Dept. of Extra-Mural Studies, UWI, Mona, 1984.
- Snowden, Frank M., Jr., *Blacks in Antiquity*, Harvard University Press, Massachusetts/London, 1970.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty, *In Other Worlds, Essays in Cultural Politics*, Routledge, London, 1988.
- Stevens, Anthony, *Archetype, A Natural History of the Self*, Routledge, London, 1990.

Street, Brian, "Reading the novels of empire: race and ideology in the classic 'tale of adventure';" see David Dabydeen.

Suret-Canale, Jean, *French Colonialism in Tropical Africa 1900-1945*, Christopher Hurst & Co., London, 1971.

Sweet, C. Louise, "Inventing Crime: British Colonial Land Policy in Tanganyika", in Colin Sumner, ed., *Crime, Justice and Underdevelopment*, Heinemann, London, 1982.

Symons, Julian, *The Thirties, A Dream Revolved*, The Cresset Press, London, 1960.

Tacitus, *The Agricola and the Germania*, Penguin, Middlesex, 1948.

Tawney, R.H., *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, John Murray, London, 1926/1944.

Todd, Loreto, *Pidgins and Creoles*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1981 edition.

Tokson, Elliot H., *The Popular Image of the Black Man in English Drama, 1550-1688*, G.K. Hall Co., Massachusetts, 1982

Toomer, Jean, *The Wayward and the Seeking*, Darwin T. Turner, ed., Howard University Press, Washington D.C., 1982.

Trevor-Roper, Hugh, *The Rise of Christian Europe*, Thames & Hudson, London, 1966.

Vaughan, David A., *Negro Victory, the life story of Dr Harold Moody*, Independent Publishers, London, 1950.

Vercoutter, J., J. Leclant, F. Snowden, eds., *The Image of the Black Man in Western Art*, three volumes, Menil Foundation/Harvard University Press, 1976.

Ward, Ivan, "Introduction" to Joel Kovel, *White Racism, A Psychohistory*, Free Association Press, London, 1988.

Watson, Alan, *Roman Slave Law*, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London, 1987.

Wells, H.G. *The Outline of History*, Cassell & Co., London/New York, 1921.

Whishaw, Bernhard and Ellen M., *Arabic Spain*, Smith, Elder & Co., London, 1912.

Williams, Eric, *Capitalism and Slavery*, Andre Deutsch, London, 1964.

Williams, Eric, *Inward Hunger, The Education of a Prime Minister*, Andre Deutsch, London, 1969.

Wright, Richard, *Black Power, A Record of Reactions in a Land of Pathos*, Harper Brothers, New York, 1954.

- Yates, Frances A., *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1964.
- Young, Lola, "A Nasty Piece of Work: A Psychoanalytic Study of Sexual and Racial Difference in 'Mona Lisa', in Johnathan Rutherford, ed., *Identity*, Lawrence & Wishart, London, 1990.

II. Newspapers/Journals

- Beresford, David, "The Quandaries of a confused people," *The Guardian*, 5 March, 1993.
- Cavalli-Sforza, Luigi, "Genes, Peoples and Languages," in *Scientific American*, Vol.265, No.5, New York, 1991.
- Critchley, Laurie, "Indomitable fighter for black rights," *The Guardian*, London, January 21, 1992.
- G.F.H., "Paul Robeson's Recital at the Savoy," *The Sketch*, London, September 3, 1930.
- Fanon, Frantz, "The reciprocal basis of national cultures and the struggles for liberation," in *Second Congress of Negro Writers and Artists: The Unity of African Cultures*, Paris, *Présence Africaine* journal, No.24-25, February-May 1959.
- Ferguson, Bob, "Race and the Media: Some Problems in Teaching," in *Multicultural Education*, Vol.9, No.2, London, Spring 1981.
- J.B.W., "Vienna and New York," *The New Statesman*, London, June 22, 1929.
- Lindfors, Bernth, " 'The Hottentot Venus' and other African attractions in nineteenth-century England," *Australian Drama Studies*, Vol.1, No.2, 1983.
- Mason, Chris, "J'accuse: a witch-hunt in any tongue," *The Guardian* (Education section), August 06, 19991.
- Parry, Benita, quoting Edward Said, in "Problems in Current Theories of Colonial Discourse," in *The Oxford Literary Review*, special issue on Colonialism & other essays, Vol.9, Nos. 1-2, Oxford, 1987.
- Rivers, Conrad Kent, "The Soulful Way of Claude McKay," *Black World*, Chicago, 1970.
- Stott, Rebecca, "The Dark Continent: Africa as Female Body in Haggard's Adventure Fiction," in *Feminist Review*, No.32, London, Summer 1989.
- Thome, Alan G. and Mitford H. Wolpoff, "The Multiregional Evolution of Humans," in *Scientific American*, Vol.266, No.4, New York, 1992.
- Tyler, Andrew, "Past Master in the Present," *Weekend Guardian*, London, January 12-13, 1991.
- Vulliamy, Ed, "In Italy, one man's croissant is another's green bean," *The Guardian*, London, August 10, 1991.

THE EMPEROR JONES

by Eugene O'Neill

Characters

BRUTUS JONES, *Emperor.*

HENRY SMITHERS, *A Cockney Trader.*

AN OLD NATIVE WOMAN.

LEM, *A Native Chief.*

SOLDIERS, *Adherents of Lem.*

The Little Formless Fears; Jeff; The Negro Convicts; The Prison Guard; The Planters; The Auctioneer; The Slaves; The Congo Witch-Doctor; The Crocodile God.

The action of the play takes place on an island in the West Indies as yet not self-determined by White Mariners. The form of native government is, for the time being, an Empire.

Scene One

The audience chamber in the palace of the Emperor— a spacious, high-ceilinged room with bare, white-washed walls. The floor is of white tiles. In the rear, to the left of centre, a wide archway giving out on a portico with white pillars. The palace is evidently situated on high ground for beyond the portico nothing can be seen but a vista of distant hills, their summits crowned with thick groves of palm trees. In the right wall, centre, a smaller arched doorway leading to the living quarters of the palace. The room is bare of furniture with the exception of one huge chair made of uncut wood which stands at centre, its back to rear. This is very apparently the Emperor's throne. It is painted a dazzling, eye-smiting scarlet. There is a brilliant orange cushion on the seat and another smaller one is placed on the floor to serve as a foot-stool. Strips of matting, dyed scarlet, lead from the foot of the throne to the two entrances.

It is late afternoon, but the yellow sunlight still blazes beyond the portico and there is an oppressive burden of exhausting heat in the air.

As the curtain rises, a native negro woman

sneaks in cautiously from the entrance on the right. She is very old, dressed in cheap calico, bare-footed, a red bandana handkerchief covering all but a few stray wisps of white hair. A bundle bound in coloured cloth is carried over her shoulder on the end of a stick. She hesitates beside the doorway, peering back as if in extreme dread of being discovered. Then she begins to glide noiselessly, a step at a time, towards the doorway in the rear. At this moment Smithers appears beneath the portico.

Smithers is a tall man, round-shouldered, about forty. His bald head, perched on a long neck with an enormous Adam's apple, looks like an egg. The tropics have tanned his naturally pasty face with its small, sharp features to a sickly yellow, and native rum has painted his pointed nose to a startling red. His little washy-blue eyes are red-rimmed and dart about him like a ferret's. His expression is one of unscrupulous meanness, cowardly and dangerous. He is dressed in a worn riding suit of dirty white drill, puttees, spurs, and wears a white cork helmet. A cartridge belt with an automatic revolver is around his waist. He carries a riding whip in his hand. He sees the woman and stops to watch her suspiciously. Then, making up his mind, he steps quickly on tiptoe into the room. The woman, looking back over her shoulder continually, does not see him until it is too late. When she does Smithers springs forward and grabs her firmly by the shoulder. She struggles to get away, fiercely but silently.

SMITHERS (tightening his grasp—roughly). Easy!

None o' that, me birdie. You can't wriggle out now. I got me 'ooks on yer.

WOMAN (seeing the uselessness of struggling, gives way to frantic terror, and sinks to the ground, embracing his knees supplicatingly). No tell him! No tell him, Mister!

SMITHERS (with great curiosity). Tell 'im? (Then scornfully.) Oh, you mean 'is bloomin' Majesty. What's the game, any 'ow? What are you sneakin' away for? Been stealin' a bit, I s'pose. (He taps her bundle with his riding whip significantly.)

WOMAN (shaking her head vehemently). No, me no steal.

SMITHERS. Bloody liar! But tell me what's up. There's somethin' funny goin' on. I smelled it in the air first thing I got up this mornin'. You blacks are up to some devilment. This palace of 'is is like a bleedin' tomb. Where's all the 'ands? (The woman keeps sullenly silent. Smithers raises his whip threateningly.) Ow, yer won't, won't yer? I'll show yer what's what.

WOMAN (coweringly). I tell, Mister. You no hit. They go—all go. (She makes a sweeping gesture towards the hills in the distance.)

SMITHERS. Run away—to the 'ills?

WOMAN. Yes, Mister. Him Emperor—Great Father. (She touches her forehead to the floor with a quick mechanical jerk.) Him sleep after eat. Then they go—all go. Me old woman. Me left only. Now me go too.

SMITHERS (his astonishment giving way to an immense,

mean satisfaction). Ow! So that's the ticket! Well, I know bloody well wot's in the air—when they runs orf to the 'ills. The tom-tom 'll be thumping out there bloomin' soon. (*With extreme vindictiveness.*) And I'm bloody glad of it, for one! Serve 'im right! Puttin' on airs, the stinkin' nigger! 'Is Majesty! Gawd blimey! I only hopes I'm there when they takes 'im out to shoot 'im. (*Suddenly.*) 'E's still 'ere all right, ain't 'e?

WOMAN. Yes. Him sleep.

SMITHERS. 'E's bound to find out soon as 'e wakes up. 'E's cunnin' enough to know when 'is time's come. (*He goes to the doorway on right and whistles shrilly with his fingers in his mouth. The old woman springs to her feet and runs out of the doorway, rear. Smithers goes after her, reaching for his revolver.*) Stop or I'll shoot! (*Then stooping—indifferently.*) Pop orf then, if yer like, yer black cow. (*He stands in the doorway, looking after her.*)

(Jones enters from the right. He is a tall, powerfully-built, full-blooded negro of middle age. His features are typically negroid, yet there is something decidedly distinctive about his face—an underlying strength of will, a hardy, self-reliant confidence in himself that inspires respect. His eyes are alive with a keen, cunning intelligence. In manner he is shrewd, suspicious, evasive. He wears a light blue uniform coat, sprayed with brass buttons, heavy gold chevrons on his shoulders,

gold braid on the collar, cuffs, etc. His trousers are bright red with a light blue stripe down the side. Patent leather laced boots with brass spurs, and a belt with a long-barrelled, pearl-handled revolver in a holster complete his attire. Yet there is something not altogether ridiculous about his grandeur. He has a way of carrying it off.)

JONES (*not seeing anyone—greatly irritated and blinking sleepily—shouts*). Who dare whistle dat way in my palace? Who dare wake up de Emperor? I'll git de hide flayed off some o' you niggers sho'!

SMITHERS (*showing himself—in a manner half-afraid and half-defiant*). It was me whistled to yer. (*As Jones frowns angrily.*) I got news for yer.

JONES (*putting on his suavest manner, which fails to cover up his contempt for the white man.*) Oh, it's you, Mister Smithers. (*He sits down on his throne with easy dignity.*) What news you got to tell me?

SMITHERS (*coming close to enjoy his discomfiture*). Don't yer notice nothin' funny to-day?

JONES (*coldly*). Funny? No. I ain't perceived nothin' of de kind!

SMITHERS. Then yer ain't so foxy as I thought yer was. Where's all your court? (*Sarcastically.*) The Generals and the Cabinet Ministers and all?

JONES (*imperturbably*). Where dey mostly runs to minute I closes my eyes—drinkin' rum and talkin' big down in de town. (*Sarcastically.*) How come you

don't know dat? Ain't you carousing with 'em most every day?

SMITHERS (*stung, but pretending indifference—with a wink*). That's part of the day's work. I got ter—ain't I—in my business?

JONES (*contemptuously*). Yo' business!

SMITHERS (*imprudently enraged*). Gawd blimey, you was glad enough for me ter take yer in on it when you landed here first. You didn't 'ave no 'igh and mighty airs in them days!

JONES (*his hand going to his revolver like a flash—menacingly*). Talk polite, white man! Talk polite, you heah me! I'm boss heah now, is you fergettin'?

(*The Cockney seems about to challenge this last statement with the facts, but something in the other's eyes holds and cowers him.*)

SMITHERS (*in a cowardly whine*). No 'arm meant, old top.

JONES (*condescendingly*). I accepts yo' apology. (*Lets his hand fall from his revolver.*) No use'n you rakin' up ole times. What I was den is one thing. What I is now 's another. You didn't let me in on yo' crooked work out o' no kind feelin's dat time. I done de dirty work fo' you—and most o' de brain work, too, fo' dat matter—and I was wu'th money to you, dat's de reason.

SMITHERS. Well, blimey, I give yer a start, didn't I—when no one else would. I wasn't afraid to 'ire yer like the rest was—'count of the story about your breakin' jail back in the States.

JONES. No, you didn't have no s'cuse to look down on me fo' dat. You been in jail you'self more'n once.

SMITHERS (*furiously*). It's a lie! (*Then trying to pass it off by an attempt at scorn*). Garn! Who told yer that fairy tale?

JONES. Dey's some tings I ain't got to be tole. I kin see 'em in folk's eyes. (*Then after a pause—meditatively*.) Yes, you sho' give me a start. And it didn't take long from dat time to git dese fool woods' niggers right where I wanted dem. (*With pride*.) From stowaway to Emperor in two years! Dat's goin' some!

SMITHERS (*with curiosity*). And I bet you got yer pile o' money 'id safe some place.

JONES (*with satisfaction*). I sho' has! And it's in a foreign bank where no pusson don't ever git it out but me no matter what come. You didn't s'pose I was holdin' down dis Emperor job for de glory in it, did you? Sho'! De fuss and glory part of it, dat's only to turn de heads o' de low-flung bush niggers dat's here. Dey wants de big circus show for deir money. I gives it to 'em an' I gits de money. (*With a grin*.) De long green, dat's me every time! (*Then rebukingly*.) But you ain't got no kick agin me, Smithers. I'se paid you back all you done for me many times. Ain't I pertected you and winked at all de crooked tradin' you been doin' right out in de broad day. Sho' I has—and me makin' laws to stop it at de same time! (*He chuckles*.)

SMITHERS (*grinning*). But, meanin' no' 'arm, you.

been grabbin' right and left yourself, ain't yer? Look at the taxes you've put on 'em! Blimey! You've squeezed 'em dry!

JONES (*chuckling*). No, dey ain't *all* dry yet. I'se still heah, ain't I?

SMITHERS (*smiling at his secret thought*.) They're dry right now, you'll find out. (*Changing the subject abruptly*.) And as for me breakin' laws, you've broke 'em all yerself just as fast as yer made 'em.

JONES. Ain't I de Emperor? De laws don't go for him. (*Judicially*.) You heah what I tells you, Smithers. Dere's little stealin' like you does, and dere's big stealin' like I does. For de little stealin' dey gits you in jail soon or late. For de big stealin' dey makes you Emperor and puts you in de Hall o' Fame when you croaks. (*Reminiscently*.) If dey's one thing I learns in ten years on de Pullman ca's listenin' to de white quality talk, it's dat same fact. And when I gits a chance to use it I winds up Emperor in two years.

SMITHERS (*unable to repress the genuine admiration of the small fry for the large*.) Yes, yer turned the bleedin' trick, all right. Blimey, I never scen a bloke 'as 'ad the bloomin' luck you 'as.

JONES (*severely*). Luck? What you mean—luck?

SMITHERS. I suppose you'll say as that swank about the silver bullet ain't luck—and that was what first got the fool blacks on yer side the time of the revolution, wasn't it?

JONES (*with a laugh*). Oh, dat silver bullet! Sho'

was luck! But I makes dat luck, you heah? I loads de dice! Yessuh! When dat murderin' nigger ole Lem hired to kill me takes aim ten feet away and his gun misses fire and I shoots him dead, what you heah me say?

SMITHERS. You said yer'd got a charm so's no lead bullet'd kill yer. You was so strong only a silver bullet could kill yer, you told 'em. Blimey, wasn't that swank for yer, and plain, fat-'eaded luck?

JONES (*proudly*). I got brains and I uses 'em quick. Dat ain't luck.

SMITHERS. Yer know they wasn't 'ardly liable to get no silver bullets. And it was luck 'e didn't 'it you that time.

JONES (*laughing*). And dere all dem fool bush niggers was kneelin' down and bumpin' deir heads on de ground like I was a miracle out o' de Bible. Oh Lawd, from dat time on I has dem all eatin' out of my hand. I cracks de whip and dey jumps through.

SMITHERS (*with a sniff*). Yankee bluff done it.

JONES. Ain't a man's talkin' big what makes him big—long as he makes folks believe it? Sho', I talks large when I ain't got nothin' to back it up, but I ain't talkin' wild just de same. I knows I kin fool 'em—I *knows* it—and dat's backin' enough fo' my game. And ain't I got to learn deir lingo and teach some of dem English befo' I kin talk to em? Ain't dat wuk? You ain't never learned any word of it, Smithers in de ten years you been heah, dough you' knows it's money in yo' pocket tradin' wid 'em if you does. But you'se too shiftless to take de trouble.

SMITHERS (*flushing*). Never mind about me. What's this I've 'eard about yer really 'avin' a silver bullet moulded for yourself?

JONES. It's playin' out my bluff. I has de silver bullet moulded and I tells 'em when de time comes I kills myself wid it. I tells 'em dat's 'cause I'm de on'y man in de world big enuff to git me. No use'n deir tryin'. And dey falls down and bumps deir heads. (*He laughs.*) I does dat so's I kin take a walk in peace widout no jealous nigger gunnin' at me from behind de trees.

SMITHERS (*astonished*). Then you 'ad it made—'onest?

JONES. Sho' did. Heah she be. (*He takes out his revolver, breaks it, and takes the bullet out of one chamber.*) Five lead an' dis silver baby at de last. Don't she shine pretty? (*He holds it in his hand, looking at it admiringly, as if strangely fascinated.*)

SMITHERS. Let me see. (*Reaches out his hand for it.*)

JONES (*barsbly*). Keep yo' hands whar dey b'long, white man. (*He replaces it in the chamber and puts the revolver back on his hip.*)

SMITHERS (*snarling*). Gawd blimey! Think I'm a bleedin' thief, you would.

JONES. No, 'tain't dat. I knows you'se scared to steal from me. On'y I ain't 'lowin' nary body to touch dis baby. She's my rabbit's foot.

SMITHERS (*sneering*). A bloomin' charm, wot?

(*Venomously.*) Well, you'll need all the bloody charms you 'as before long, s' 'elp me!

JONES (*judicially*). Oh, I'se good for six months yit 'fore dey gits sick o' my game. Den, when I sees trouble comin', I makes a move.

SMITHERS. Ho! You got it all planned, ain't yer?

JONES. I ain't no fool. I knows dis Emperor's time is sho't. Dat why I make hay when de sun shine. Was you thinkin' I'se aimin' to hold down dis job for life? No, suh! What good is gittin' money if you stays back in dis raggedy country? I wants action when I spends. And when I sees dese niggers gittin' up deir nerve to tu'n me out, and I'se got all de money in sight, I resigns on de spot and gets away quick.

SMITHERS. Where to?

JONES. None o' yo' business.

SMITHERS. Not back to the bloody States, I'll lay my oath.

JONES (*suspiciously*). Why don't I? (*Then with an easy laugh.*) You mean 'count of dat story 'bout me breakin' from jail back dere? Dat's all talk.

SMITHERS (*sceptically*). Ho, yes!

JONES (*sharply*). You ain't 'sinuatin' I'se a liar, is you?

SMITHERS (*hastily*). No, Gawd strike me! I was only thinkin' o' the bloody lies you told the blacks 'ere about killin' white men in the States.

JONES (*angered*). How come dey're lies?

SMITHERS. You'd 'ave been in jail if you 'ad, wouldn't yer then? (*With venom.*) And from what I've 'eard, it ain't 'ealthy for a black to kill a white man in the States. They burns 'em in oil, don't they?

JONES (*with cool deadliness*). You mean lynchin' 'd scare me? Well, I tells you, Smithers, maybe I does kill one white man back dere. Maybe I docs. And maybe I kills another right heah 'fore long if he don't look out.

SMITHERS (*trying to force a laugh*). I was on'y spoofin' yer. Can't yer take a joke? And you was just sayin' you'd never been in jail.

JONES (*in the same tone—slightly boastful*). Maybe I goes to jail dere for gettin' in an argument wid razors ovah a game of dice. Maybe I gits twenty years when dat coloured man die. Maybe I gits in 'nother argument wid de prison guard and de overseer ovah us when we're wukin' de roads. Maybe he hits me wid a whip and I splits his head wid a shovel and runs away and files de chain off my leg and gits away safe. Maybe I does all dat an' maybe I don't. It's a story I tells you so's you knows I'se de kind of man dat if you evah repeats one word of it, I ends yo' stealin' on dis yearth mighty damn quick!

SMITHERS (*terrified*). Think I'd peach on yer? Not me! Ain't I always been yer friend?

JONES (*suddenly relaxing*). Sho' you has—and you better be.

SMITHERS (*recovering his composure—and with it his malice*). And just to show yer I'm yer friend, I'll tell yer that bit o' news I was goin' to.

JONES. Go ahead! Must be bad news from de happy way you look.

SMITHERS (*warningly*). Maybe it's gettin' time for you to resign—with that bloomin' silver bullet, wot? (*He finishes with a mocking grin.*)

JONES (*puzzled*). What's dat you say? Talk plain.

SMITHERS. Ain't noticed any of the guards or servants about the place to-day, I 'aven't.

JONES (*carelessly*). Dey're all out in de garden sleepin' under de trees. When I sleeps, dey sneaks a sleep too, and I pretends I never suspicions it. All I got to do is to ring de bell and dey come flyin', makin' a bluff dey was wukin' all de time.

SMITHERS (*in the same mocking tone*). Ring the bell now an' you'll bloody well see what I mean.

JONES (*startled to alertness, but preserving the same careless tone*). Sho' I rings.

(*He reaches below the throne and pulls out a big common dinner bell which is painted the same vivid scarlet as the throne. He rings this vigorously—then stops to listen. Then he goes to both doors, rings again, and looks out.*)

SMITHERS (*watching him with malicious satisfaction, after a pause—mockingly*). The bloody ship is sinkin' an' the bleedin' rats 'as slung their 'ooks.

JONES (*in a sudden fit of anger flings the bell clattering into a corner*). Low-flung bush niggers! (*Then catching Smithers' eye on him, he controls himself and suddenly bursts into a low chuckling laugh*.) Reckon I overplays my hand dis once! A man can't take de pot on a short-tailed flush all de time. Was I sayin' I'd sit it six months mo'? Well, I'se changed my mind den. I gives in and resigns de job of Emperor right dis minute.

SMITHERS (*with real admiration*). Blimey, but you're a cool bird, and no mistake.

JONES. No use'n fussin'. When I knows de game's up I kisses it good-bye widout no long waits. Dey've all run off to de hills, ain't dey?

SMITHERS. Yes—every bleedin' man jack of 'em.

JONES. Den de revolution is at de door. And de Emperor better git his feet movin' up de trail. (*He starts for the door in rear*.)

SMITHERS. Goin' out to look for your 'orse? Yer won't find any. They steals the 'orses first thing. Mine was gone when I went for 'im this mornin'. That's wot first give me a suspicion of wot was up.

JONES (*alarmed for a second, scratches his head, then philosophically*). Well, den I hoofs it. Feet, do yo' duty! (*He pulls out a gold watch and looks at it*.) Three-thuty. Sundown's at six-thuty or dereabouts. (*Puts his watch back—with cool confidence*.) I got plenty o' time to make it easy.

SMITHERS. Don't be so bloomin' sure of it. They'll be after you 'ot and 'eavy. Ole Lem is at the bottom

160

o' this business an' 'e 'ates you like 'ell. 'E'd rather do for you thap eat 'is dinner, 'e would!

JONES (*scornfully*). Dat fool no-count nigger! Does you think I'se scared o' him? I stands him on his thick head more'n once befo' dis, and I does it again if he comes in my way— (*Fiercely*.) And dis time I leave him a dead nigger fo' sho'!

SMITHERS. You'll 'ave to cut through the big forest—an' these blacks 'ere can sniff and follow a trail in the dark like 'ounds. You'd 'ave to 'ustle to get through that forest in twelve hours even if you knew all the bloomin' paths like a native.

JONES (*with indignant scorn*). Look-a-heah, white man! Does you think I'se a natural bo'n fool? Give me credit fo' havin' some sense, fo' Lawd's sake! Don't you s'pose I'se looked ahead and made sho' of all de chances? I'se gone out in dat big forest, pretendin' to hunt, so many times dat I knows it high an' low like a book. I could go through on dem paths wid my eyes shut. (*With great contempt*.) Think dese ig'nerent bush niggers dat ain't got brains enuff to know deir own names even, can catch Brutus Jones? Huh, I s'pects not! Not on yo' life! Why, man, de white men went after me wid bloodhounds, where I come from an' I jes' laughs at 'em. It's a shame to fool dese black trash around heah, dey're so easy. You watch me, man'. I'll make dem look sick, I will. I'll be 'cross de plain to de edge of de forest by time dark comes. Once in de woods in de night, dey got a fine chance o' findin' dis baby! Dawn to-morrow I'll be out at de oder side and on

JONES (*in a sudden fit of anger flings the bell clattering into a corner*). Low-flung bush niggers! (*Then catching Smithers' eye on him, he controls himself and suddenly bursts into a low chuckling laugh.*) Reckon I overplays my hand dis once! A man can't take de pot on a short-tailed flush all de time. Was I sayin' I'd sit it six months mo'? Well, I'se changed my mind den. I gives in and resigns de job of Emperor right dis minute.

SMITHERS (*with real admiration*). Blimey, but you're a cool bird, and no mistake.

JONES. No use'n fussin'. When I knows de game's up I kisses it good-bye widout no long waits. Dey've all run off to de hills, ain't dey?

SMITHERS. Yes—every bleedin' man jack of 'em.

JONES. Den de revolution is at de door. And de Emperor better git his feet movin' up de trail. (*He starts for the door in rear.*)

SMITHERS. Goin' out to look for your 'orse? Yer won't find any. They steals the 'orses first thing. Mine was gone when I went for 'im this mornin'. That's wot first give me a suspicion of wot was up.

JONES (*alarmed for a second, scratches his head, then philosophically*). Well, den I hoofs it. Feet, do yo' duty! (*He pulls out a gold watch and looks at it.*) Three-thuty. Sundown's at six-thuty or dereabouts. (*Puts his watch back—with cool confidence.*) I got plenty o' time to make it easy.

SMITHERS. Don't be so bloomin' sure of it. They'll be after you 'ot and 'eavy. Ole Lem is at the bottom

o' this business an' 'e 'ates you like 'ell. 'E'd rather do for you than eat 'is dinner, 'e would!

JONES (*scornfully*). Dat fool no-count nigger! Does you think I'se scared o' him? I stands him on his thick head more'n once befo' dis, and I does it again if he comes in my way— (*Fiercely.*) And dis time I leave him a dead nigger fo' sho'!

SMITHERS. You'll 'ave to cut through the big forest—an' these blacks 'ere can sniff and follow a trail in the dark like 'ounds. You'd 'ave to 'ustle to get through that forest in twelve hours even if you knew all the bloomin' paths like a native.

JONES (*with indignant scorn*). Look-a-heah, white man! Does you think I'se a natural bo'n fool? Give me credit fo' havin' some sense, fo' Lawd's sake! Don't you s'pose I'se looked ahead and made sho' of all de chances? I'se gone out in dat big forest, pretendin' to hunt, so many times dat I knows it high an' low like a book. I could go through on dem paths wid my eyes shut. (*With great contempt.*) Think dese ig'nerent bush niggers dat ain't got brains enuff to know deir own names even, can catch Brutus Jones? Huh, I s'pects not! Not on yo' life! Why, man, de white men went after me wid bloodhounds, where I come from an' I jes' laughs at 'em. It's a shame to fool dese black trash around heah, dey're so easy. You watch me, man'. I'll make dem look sick, I will. I'll be 'cross de plain to de edge of de forest by time dark comes. Once in de woods in de night, dey got a fine chance o' findin' dis baby! Dawn to-morrow I'll be out at de oder side and on

de coast whar dat French gunboat is stayin'. She picks me up, take me to the Martinique when she go dar, and dere I is safe wid a mighty big bankroll in my pocket. It's easy as rollin' off a log.

SMITHERS (*maliciously*). But s'posin' somethin' 'appens wrong an' they do nab yer?

JONES (*decisively*). Dey don't—dat's de answer.

SMITHERS. But, just for argyment's sake—what'd you do?

JONES (*frowning*). I'se got five lead bullets in dis gun good enuff fo' common bush niggers—and after dat I got de silver bullet left to cheat 'em out o' gittin' me.

SMITHERS (*jeeringly*). Ho, I was fergettin' that silver bullet. You'll bump yourself orf in style, won't yer? Blimey!

JONES (*gloomily*). You kin bet yo' whole money on one thing, white man. Dis baby plays out his string to de end and when he quits, he quits wid a bang de way he ought. Silver bullet ain't none too good for him when he go, dat's a fac'! (*Then shaking off his nervousness—with a confident laugh.*) Sho'! What is I talkin' about? Ain't come to dat yit and I never will—not wid trash niggers like dese yere. (*Boastfully.*) Silver bullet bring me luck anyway. I kin outguess, outrun, outfight, an' outplay de whole lot o' dem all ovah de board any time o' de day er night! You watch me!

(From the distant hills comes the faint, steady thump of a tom-tom, low and vibrating.

It starts at a rate exactly corresponding to normal pulse beat—72 to the minute—and continues at a gradually accelerating rate from this point uninterruptedly to the very end of the play.)

(Jones starts at the sound. A strange look of apprehension creeps into his face for a moment as he listens. Then he asks, with an attempt to regain his most casual manner). What's dat drum beatin' fo'?

SMITHERS (*with a mean grin*). For you. That means the bleedin' ceremony 'as started. I've 'eard it before and I knows.

JONES. Cer'mony? What cer'mony?

SMITHERS. The blacks is 'oldin' a bloody meetin', 'avin' a war dance, gettin' their courage worked up b'fore they starts after you.

JONES. Let dem! Dey'll sho' need it!

SMITHERS. And they're there 'oldin' their 'eathen religious service—makin' no end of devil spells and charms to 'clp 'em against your silver bullet. (*He guffaws loudly.*) Blimey, but they're balmy as 'ell!

JONES (*a tiny bit awed and shaken in spite of himself*). Huh! Takes more'n dat to scare dis chicken!

SMITHERS (*scenting the other's feeling—maliciously*). Ternight when it's pitch black in the forest, they'll 'ave their pet devils and ghosts 'oundin' after you. You'll find yer bloody 'air 'll be standin' on end before termorrow morning'. (*Seriously.*) It's a bleedin' queer place, that stinkin' forest, even in daylight. Yer don't know what might 'appen in there, it's

like a common nigger! I'se Emperor yit, ain't I? And de Emperor Jones leaves de way he comes, and dat black trash don't dare stop him—not yit, least-ways. (*He stops for a moment in the doorway, listening to the far-off but insistent beat of the tom-tom.*) Listen to dat roll-call, will you? Must be mighty big drum carry dat far. (*Then with a laugh.*) Well, if dey ain't no whole brass band to see me off, I sho' got de drum part of it. So long, white man.

(He puts his hands in his pockets and with studied carelessness, whistling a tune, he saunters out of the doorway and off to left.)

SMITHERS (*looks after him with a puzzled admiration.*) 'E's got 'is bloomin' nerve with 'im, s'elp me! (*Then angrily.*) Ho—the bleedin' nigger—puttin' on 'is bloody airs! I 'opes they nabs 'im an' gives 'im what's what! (*Then putting business before the pleasure of this thought, looking around him with cupidity.*) A bloke ought to find a 'ole lot in this palace that'd go for a bit of cash. Let's take a look, 'Arry, me lad. (*He starts for the doorway on right as*

THE CURTAIN FALLS

Scene Two: Nightfall

The end of the plain where the Great Forest begins. The foreground is sandy, level ground dotted by a few stones and clumps of stunted bushes covering close against the earth to escape the buffeting of the trade wind. In the rear the forest is a wall of darkness dividing the world. Only when the eye becomes accustomed to the gloom can the outlines of separate trunks of the nearest trees be made out, enormous pillars of deeper blackness. A sombre monotone of wind lost in the leaves moans in the air. Yet this sound serves but to intensify the impression of the forest's relentless immobility, to form a background throwing into relief its brooding, implacable silence.

(Jones enters from the left, walking rapidly. He stops as he nears the edge of the forest, looks around him quickly, peering into the dark as if searching for some familiar landmark. Then, apparently satisfied that he is where he ought to be, he throws himself on the ground, dog-tired.)

Well, heah I is. In de nick o' time, too! Little mo' an' it'd be blacker'n de ace of spades heah-abouts.

THE BLACK JACOBINS

By C.L.R. James

a simple movement in the background until the women spin off to stage left. Then five of them move downstage in an open-close movement which is stopped by an attendant houngan—voodoo priest—who enters from upstage and makes a diagonal cross with a bull's tail slashing the stage on either side of his path. The five are herded upstage right as the top rhythm changes to a simple insidious phrase.

(As banner-bearing slaves move across upstage, the chief Houngan with a cross stuck in the mouth of a gourd floats through a curve upstage right and down. He is preceded by the first attendant bowing before him with the bull's tail. He is followed by two attendant houngans carrying voodoo branched candle sticks with lighted candles in them. The first attendant stands, then kneels downstage right with a violent torso movement as the Chief Houngan stands behind him with the cross over his head.

(Two other things have happened while this is going on: Dessalines has returned down left with Mars Plaisir. Dessalines has pushed through the women dancers to stand with hands on hips looking on; a woman—to be known later as Celestine—has entered dancing behind the two candle-bearing attendants. She is followed by the Chief drummer who is executing the top rhythm. Celestine spins into the centre of the stage and there she sees Dessalines. She moves towards him, tempting him to follow her movements. The drummer moves towards them urging them on. Celestine joins forearms with Dessalines and he moves into the dance with her. They then hold hands and do three forehead-to-forehead turns. Breaking this off, both Celestine and Dessalines are dizzy enough to be more susceptible to possession. While Dessalines drifts laterally with his arms out at his sides straight from his shoulders across the stage behind her, Celestine begins trembling with violent jerks of her upper body. She falls to the ground, and begins to roll, still trembling at the knees and shoulders. She rolls up and down stage then stops and trembles violently in one spot as Dessalines drifts down towards her, makes a complete turn with his arms outstretched, raises his left foot, toes pointed downwards, and clenched right fist and shakes them over her body while showing the whites of his eyes. Mars Plaisir places a hand on the drum of the Chief Drummer. Simultaneously, the drums stop, the candles are snuffed out.)

BLACKOUT.

ACT 1 SCENE III — 1798.

During the blackout, the bench of the previous scene is cleared. Then, as the lights return, two servants are seen, one bringing in two chairs, the other with

a chair and an American flag. The flag has thirteen stars in a circle on a blue ground. There are thirteen stripes, seven red and six white.

1ST SERVANT: You heard anything about the battle?

2ND SERVANT: What battle?

1ST SERVANT: Governor Toussaint and our army are fighting the mulattoes at Jacmel, and the British, they say, are trying to get the mulattoes to join them.

2ND SERVANT: I don't know. I don't care. I am a servant to the American Consul. At the end of the month he pays me my money. That is all I know and that is all I want to know.

1ST SERVANT: He says we are good servants, we work well, and that when he goes to America, he will take us.

2ND SERVANT: That's what he thinks. In America they have slaves. I'm a free man. I am not a slave anymore. I am not going to America or any place where they have slaves. That is all I know. I know nothing else.

(Mr. Tobias Lear, the American Consul of San Domingo, enters and looks around the room with approval.)

1ST SERVANT: Can we get anything for you, sir?

LEAR: No. Everything looks satisfactory.

1ST SERVANT: May I get you a drink, sir?

LEAR: No. I am expecting guests. When they arrive. . . *(Voices heard off.)* Ah, if that is General Maitland or General Hédouville, show them in at once. Anybody else, send them away. *(Servants exit. 1st Servant re-enters and announces the visitor.)*

1ST SERVANT: General Hédouville.

LEAR: General, the Representative of the French Government is always welcome on American territory, even though it is in a French colony.

1ST SERVANT: General Maitland. *(He enters.)*

LEAR: General Maitland. I've long wanted to meet the Commander-in-Chief of the British Forces in San Domingo. I am happy, at last, to welcome you to the American Consulate. (He is obviously nervous.) Gentlemen, or perhaps I should say, Generals, I know that Britain and France, your respective countries, are at war. But nevertheless you are both on neutral territory and the three of us have to consult with one another about this fantastic Negro, this Toussaint L'Ouverture—now, God help us, Governor of the Colony. *(He sits centre.)*

MAITLAND: (To Hédouville) General, was it necessary for the French Government to appoint him not only Commander-in-Chief of the French Army in San Domingo, but Governor of the Colony? We of the British Services could not possibly think of such a thing. *(He sits.)*

HEDOUVILLE: I know what you mean, and some of us did think that the appointment of a black as Governor was a mistake. But here was the problem: the mulattoes, being half white, educated and privileged, have always felt themselves superior to the blacks. The blacks, being slaves, have always envied the mulattoes. They have never trusted each other. But both the mulattoes and the blacks trust Toussaint. And since the white representatives from San Domingo also urged that Toussaint was loyal to France—we had no choice! With the support of the whites, the mulattoes and the blacks, Toussaint could control the Colony—for France. However, Toussaint has now become too powerful. I've been sent here by the French Government to restrain him. If we could only strengthen the mulattoes, we could maintain a balance. *(He sits.)*

MAITLAND: Today, that problem is being solved for us. General L'Ouverture I understand, now faces a disastrous military defeat. The mulattoes from all over the island are pouring into Jacmel. He will never take that mulatto stronghold and he will have to retire in disorder. The mulatto Commander at Jacmel, General Pétion, is a mortal enemy of General L'Ouverture, and, if he can, he will not only defeat Toussaint, but destroy his entire army.

HEDOUVILLE: Gentlemen, since General L'Ouverture is Governor appointed by the French Government, my position is anomalous. I have the authority of a representative of the French Government but no actual power at my disposal. I am in the best position to recognise the threat to the present order which General L'Ouverture represents. I also am informed that he faces defeat at Jacmel. . .

(At this moment, a trumpet sounds. The three jump to their feet obviously startled.)

LEAR: But that is impossible. . .

HEDOUVILLE: That is Toussaint's trumpet. *(He rushes to a window and looks outside. He comes back and grabs his hat.)* Yes, it is he. Excuse me, gentlemen.

(He makes unceremoniously for the exit on the other side of the room. There is a heavy knock on the door. Enter Christophe, Dessalines and Moïse, booted and spurred. They have obviously been riding hard. Moïse is applying a handkerchief somewhat carefully to his right eye. Dessalines sits resolutely in the centre chair, puts his foot in the other chair, draws a knife from his boot and begins to peel an orange.)

MAITLAND: Generals, we thought that the Governor had come. It was his trumpet that we heard. What is the news from Jacmel?

DESSALINES: (Peeling orange) It was his trumpet. But whenever he comes to Port-au-Prince he always goes to see old Pierre Baptiste. *(Slices top off the orange.)*

MAITLAND: General Baptiste has rendered, I suppose, a great service to the State?

DESSALINES: He is no general. He is over one hundred years old. *(Sucks orange.)*

MAITLAND: The Governor shows great respect for people of advanced age.

DESSALINES: No question of respect. Old Pierre Baptiste is as strong as you or me. Toussaint goes to see him because when they were slaves together and Toussaint was a boy, old Baptiste gave him lessons, taught him to read and write, taught him some Latin out of a book written by a great soldier.

MOISE: (To Dessalines) His name was Caesar. The book was "Caesar on the War in France".

DESSALINES: I don't know what book it was. Old Pierre Baptiste used to work for some priests. He knew some Latin and he used to teach Toussaint. Now that Toussaint is Governor, and even before, he never comes into Port-au-Prince without first going to see old Pierre. When he has made up his mind to do something he always does it. *(Takes last suck on the orange)* nothing stands in his way. *(Throws orange over his shoulder: it narrowly misses Lear.)*

39
MAITLAND: Most admirable. Obviously the Governor is a man born to govern. But the news. . . (*Moïse meanwhile has been wiping his eye more insistently than before. Maitland notices, turns to him.*) General, you are wounded.

MOISE: I believe I have lost an eye in the service of liberty. Many have lost more for less. Gentlemen, Jacmel has been taken, the army of mulattoes under General Pétion has been completely destroyed. That, I may venture to say, creates an entirely new situation in the country—for us all, I don't know exactly what the Governor has in mind.

CHRISTOPHE: Nobody ever knows.

MOISE: But I believe that when he heard that there was a sort of conference here, he decided to come at once although he would not break his rule of going to see old Pierre.

MAITLAND: Quite, quite. Generals, you are high in the service of the Governor. In fact, of the State of French San Domingo. This victory of yours at Jacmel is not unexpected. Just before you came I was telling Mr. Lear that General L'Ouverture fights no battles which he does not win. He besieges no town which he does not capture. You remember, Mr. Lear, we were talking about that when we heard the trumpet. As a matter of fact, it is in anticipation of just such a result that I came here to talk to the American Consul. Isn't that so, Mr. Consul?

LEAR: Yes, yes.

MAITLAND: And I think that I should tell you gentlemen at once, what we have tentatively arrived at. It is obvious that the Governor and his army are now masters of San Domingo. I am able to inform you that His Majesty King George of England has followed through his Ministers the rise of the slaves of San Domingo. His Majesty has long been of the opinion that if the blacks of San Domingo were to achieve complete mastery of the island, then he would welcome the consolidation of black power in a black state. Governor L'Ouverture can establish himself as King. (*Dessalines takes his foot off the chair.*) He would have around him his army, members of the government. . . he could create an aristocracy, and a nobility. . . and so on and so on. We in England have proved beyond the shadow of a doubt that such stability can only be established by a monarchy, a king and royal family and a nobility. His Majesty, King George the Third of England would welcome as his brother, His Majesty King Toussaint L'Ouverture the First of San Domingo. That, Generals, is essentially what I have to tell you — what

Mr. Lear and I were discussing. I think America will throw its weight in support of this policy.

LEAR: Yes, we have to. The British have military forces and a fleet in this neighbourhood. We have none and we go with them.

DESSALINES: It seems to me. . .

MOISE: I believe, General Maitland, that such a proposition demands that it be considered first by the Governor. In addition, until he comes, we think that we would like to be alone to consider what will completely alter political relations inside and outside of San Domingo. Perhaps you can let us retire to a room.

MAITLAND: A most reasonable request, but there is no need. It would seem to me that Mr. Lear and I should retire and leave you to yourselves, and when the Governor comes, we could return. Mr. Lear, do I express your sentiments?

LEAR: I, I agree.

MAITLAND: Well, Generals, we leave you to your discussion.

(*Maitland, followed by Lear, leaves the room.*)

CHRISTOPHE: Moïse, what do you think?

MOISE: Why do you ask me? You both are Generals of Division, I am only General of Brigade. You are my senior officers.

DESSALINES: Senior officers! Only on the battlefield. In things like this you always know everything.

MOISE: Only the Governor can decide.

DESSALINES: He will decide but I know what I would do. I don't know the English King, but I know the slaves. We are African people. We like a king. We would like to know that the island belongs to us. Toussaint will be as good a king as anybody. I think we ought to take it.

MOISE: Take what?

CHRISTOPHE: Dessalines means what the Englishman is offering us. To establish San Domingo as an independent island free of France, with its own king and its own government.

MOISE: So you mean the British General can give us that?

DESSALINES: Not the British General, he says. The British King.

MOISE: Christophe?

CHRISTOPHE: I don't know. I think there are strong arguments for and strong arguments against.

MOISE: You are waiting to hear what Toussaint says.

CHRISTOPHE: That is the kind of nasty remark you are always making.

MOISE: I am going to tell Toussaint this: We have escaped from the French King. Do we now give ourselves over to the English King?

CHRISTOPHE: He makes an offer. We accept it or we don't. Independence. The Government ours, the army ours, our own king. . .

MOISE: Yes, and our own aristocracy. A San Domingo nobility. In my district there is the town of Marmalade and there is another town of Turkey. It is a pity that Marmalade and Turkey are not in your provinces. You, Dessalines, could be Duke of Turkey—you make enough noise. And you, Christophe, could be Count of Marmalade. All sugar and spice.

DESSALINES: *(Springing at Moïse)* Duke of Turkey! Look here . . . If you weren't wounded, I would put my hands on you. *(Toussaint appears upstage.)* I am no Duke of Marmalade.

MOISE: Not Marmalade, Turkey. Christophe will be. . . *(They both turn on him.)*

TOUSSAINT: Generals, the Commander-in-Chief is here.

(The three Generals freeze.)

CHRISTOPHE: Ah, Ah, General we have a problem.

TOUSSAINT: *(Drily, as he comes forward)* So I see.

(Christophe clears his throat.)

CHRISTOPHE: Governor L'Ouverture, we met here Consul Tobias Lear talking with General Maitland.

TOUSSAINT: I know. Wasn't Hédouville here?

CHRISTOPHE: No sir. General Hédouville was not here when we came. But when General Maitland heard that the army of Pétion has been defeated. . .

DESSALINES: Destroyed.

CHRISTOPHE: When he heard that Pétion's army had been destroyed, he said that we could become independent. The British Government would support a black state. We would have a King and he suggested that you, Governor, should be the first king.

DESSALINES: The King of England would welcome you, Toussaint, as his brother.

MOISE: And don't forget—a black aristocracy, a black nobility, the Duke of Turkey and the Count of Marmalade.

(Dessalines turns away angrily.)

CHRISTOPHE: Governor. General Maitland and the American Consul are in the next room waiting for your reply.

(There is a long silence.)

TOUSSAINT: An offer of independence. To break with France. This is not the first offer, nor will it be the last. In all my military negotiations with General Maitland, he kept on hinting this to me.

DESSALINES: Toussaint, you going to take it? *(A pause. Toussaint does not answer.)* Take it Toussaint. Make yourself king. If you make yourself king, San Domingo will be ours and French, British, nobody will be able to take it from us.

TOUSSAINT: General Christophe, what is your opinion of this offer? For it is only an offer. Everything depends on what we say.

CHRISTOPHE: Well, I think that the offer is very valuable. On the other hand, to take it means that we run certain dangers. I . . . I . . .

MOISE: Christophe, how can you be on both sides at the same time. The Governor has asked you your opinion.

DESSALINES: And what is yours, General Moïse? *(To Toussaint.)* He is against.

(Toussaint looks enquiringly at Moïse.)

MOISE: The Duke of Turkey has everything mixed up. He doesn't know what I am against. He doesn't know what I am for. Governor, I am against taking anything from the British, either from their general or from their king. They don't own us. They can give us nothing. That is what I am against. But that we should declare ourselves free from the French; that we should make San Domingo a free and independent country; that I am for. Now, whether you should become a king—with your Dukes and Counts, or President of the independent Republic of San Domingo, I am not very sure in my own mind. We will have to ask the people. But if we all four of us and the rest, tell the people that we want to finish with the French, and we want to be free and equal; make San Domingo independent, the people will come with us. The army will be entirely on our side and the French will never be able to take their colony back. But—we don't take anything from the British. We don't become independent because the British will help us. We do it because the country belongs to us. We have made it what it is, and we alone can make it what it can be. Nobody else can. That is what I feel. . .

(A silence.)

DESSALINES: Toussaint?

TOUSSAINT: Moïse, let the gentlemen know I am ready.

(Moïse exits and returns immediately with General Maitland and Tobias Lear.)

MAITLAND: Governor Toussaint, we are at your service.

TOUSSAINT: General Maitland, and Mr. Lear, I feel deeply honoured by this generous offer which countries like Britain and the United States have made to us, we who yesterday were slaves. I would like you to express to His Majesty of England through his Ministers, that his offer of alliance

and recognition with a possible King of San Domingo is something that we of San Domingo will never forget. But it will be no surprise to you or to any member of my government that my position today is what it always has been. It is the French Government, the French revolutionary government, which has freed the slaves of San Domingo. No other country in the world has done that or promises to do that. A French colony we are and a French Colony we will remain, unless France attempts to restore slavery. That is the faith by which I live and under that banner I hope to die. That is the message which the people transmit to your government—through me, the Governor of San Domingo, their representative. Gentlemen, I expect we shall again be in contact to discuss the many points which are at issue between us.

(He bows and leaves, followed by his Generals. The lights go off in the big room and after a period they are turned on in the small room to the right and the small room to the left. Maitland is dictating to a secretary under a Union Jack and Toussaint is dictating to Mars Plaisir. They are both saying exactly the same, thing and are making the pauses for the secretaries to write.)

MAITLAND: The British offer. . .

TOUSSAINT: The British offer is designed to create a split between French San Domingo and the French Government.

MAITLAND: . . . is designed to create a split between French San Domingo and the French Government.

TOUSSAINT: However, it must be noted that . . .

MAITLAND: However, it must be noted that this does not mean any support from the British for a free San Domingo.

TOUSSAINT: . . . this does not means any support from the British for a free San Domingo. That would ruin the whole British Colonial system in the Caribbean.

MAITLAND: That would ruin the whole British Colonial system in the Caribbean. A San Domingo at war with France. . .

TOUSSAINT: A San Domingo at war with France they will support only until the peace. Whereupon . . .

MAITLAND: Whereupon the British will either blockade the island and ourselves take it over. . .

501
TOUSSAINT: . . . or they will collaborate with the French towards restoring the old colonial condition. . .

MAITLAND: . . . mulatto discrimination. . .

TOUSSAINT: . . . and negro slavery.

(The secretaries write, Toussaint and General Maitland watching them. When the writing is finished.)

TOUSSAINT: Send this dispatch to the Minister of Foreign Affairs for the Republic of France.

MAITLAND: Send this dispatch to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Great Britain.

TOGETHER: Top secret.

END OF ACT ONE

ACT II SCENE I : 1800

A screen to the side of a bed in a small room where Marie-Jeanne lives. There is a table with a bottle of wine and glasses, as well as a small bookcase. Marie-Jeanne is in a dressing gown. General Hédouville is putting on his coat. He pulls the coat down and adjusts the sleeves. Marie-Jeanne helps to button the front. Then she sits on the bed.

MARIE-JEANNE: I suppose you are going now.

HEDOUVILLE: *(After a pause)* Why do you think so? Even if I had to go, I would like to stay awhile, to talk to you.

MARIE-JEANNE: Why should you want to talk to me?

(Hédouville sits and takes her hand.)

HEDOUVILLE: Because you make me feel more at home in this wild colony than I have since I left Paris.

MARIE-JEANNE: *(Taking her hand away)* Me! Me make you feel at home? I am a mulatto woman. I am nobody. I was a slave. I was the woman of a French planter. Governor Toussaint was a slave on the same estate. He helps

me in any way that he can.

HEDOUVILLE: You have many books here and you teach young children to read. You were a slave. How were you educated?

MARIE-JEANNE: I was the woman of a plantation owner. His wife liked me.

HEDOUVILLE: *(Standing and chuckling)* His wife liked you?

MARIE-JEANNE: *(Standing)* Yes, there were many of us mulatto women in that situation, accepted in the house, one of the house-slaves, but spying on the slaves. His wife liked me, taught me to read, and I used to read the books in the house. She even taught me some music. When the revolution came to the plantation, and she had to go, I took some of the books. *(Walks over to the bookcase.)* I have them here. I read them all the time. I have nothing else to do, and I teach the children of the officials to read. Many of the Generals themselves can't even read, far less write.

(Hédouville gets up and walks over to the bookcase. There are some books on the top. He bends over them and, half to himself, speaks.)

HEDOUVILLE: Molière, Bossuet, Corneille, Racine! *(He flips the pages then turns to look at her.)* You know, I wish we had met under different circumstances.)

MARIE-JEANNE: You mean you wish I was a white woman.

(Hédouville puts the Racine down on the chair, puts a knee on it, takes Marie-Jeanne's hand and speaks very earnestly.)

HEDOUVILLE: No, I don't mean that at all. I wish I had met you in Paris. Things would have been different if I had met you in Paris.

MARIE-JEANNE: *(Taking her hand away again)* You wouldn't have met me in Paris. I would have been a slave. My mistress promised to take me to Paris one day, but I was a slave.

HEDOUVILLE: No! No! No! The moment a slave landed in France he was free. The revolution did not create this. That was French law long before the revolution.

MARIE-JEANNE: General Hédouville, you are saying some wonderful things to me. If you are not in a hurry, as you don't seem to be, perhaps you can tell me some of the things I want to know and which only a man who has lived in Paris can tell me. Can I pour you a drink?

(Marie-Jeanne, without waiting for an answer, moves over to the table and pours wine into two glasses. She returns, handing one to Hédouville.)

HEDOUVILLE: *(Raising his glass)* To my most charming hostess. *(Marie-Jeanne bows gracefully and they drink. Hédouville drains his glass, Marie-Jeanne only sips hers, but pours another glass for him, half of which he drinks at once as she replaces the bottle and returns.)* And now, my dear?

MARIE-JEANNE: I am not educated, *mon Général*, I wish to know what a man like you thinks about San Domingo and our new society with slaves now free. And particularly what you think of us, the mulattoes. What will happen to us, now that the mulatto army of the South is defeated? *(She takes a sip of wine from her glass.)*

HEDOUVILLE: My dear, I occupy a very responsible position in this government, and I shouldn't speak about such things. *(He sips from his glass.)* But, surely you are the kind of person I can talk to. I believe that the mulattoes are in great danger. *(He walks downstage.)*

MARIE-JEANNE: *(Following him)* From the blacks. I knew that. The thing, General Hédouville, is this. We need help. What can we do?

HEDOUVILLE: I can't suggest anything. *(Moving away from her.)* This is a matter from which I must keep very far.

MARIE-JEANNE: *(Following again)* But all of us believe that you came here to assist the mulattoes to take power, so as to prevent Governor L'Ouverture and the ex-slaves from taking over the colony. But our mulatto army is in retreat. Where does your government stand now?

HEDOUVILLE: My dear, you seem to understand a great deal. You understand much more than I gave you credit for. I cannot speak for my Government, but this much I can say. The blacks now have the power, but I believe they are too ignorant and too uncivilised to keep it. At the proper moment the French Government, I believe, I cannot see it doing otherwise, would throw all its weight behind the mulattoes.

MARIE-JEANNE: If this were to come to General Pétion's ears, somehow. . .

HEDOUVILLE: Ah, that I cannot do. But I believe some friend of both the mulattoes and the French Government, could arrange a meeting with General Pétion. I am sure we could come to some understanding. But someone else would have to arrange that, not me. As a matter of fact, this conversation has gone far enough.

(He straightens up and moves over to the table to put down his glass. He takes up his hat. As he is doing this Marie-Jeanne speaks without looking at him.)

MARIE-JEANNE: We have one problem, General, *(She turns to him.)* and that is Toussaint L'Ouverture.

HEDOUVILLE: Toussaint L'Ouverture. Until he is removed there is no freedom for anybody else in San Domingo. Until he is removed we are all his prisoners. My dear Marie-Jeanne, I must leave you now. *(She nods with understanding of what she has to do to facilitate his leaving. She goes to the back entrance, putting down her glass on the way. She disappears briefly and returns with a nod of clearance. Hédouville bows over Marie-Jeanne's hand. I hope to see you soon again, (He kisses her hand.) and not too much politics.*

(As soon as he leaves, Marie-Jeanne, without haste but with decision, sits at the small table and begins to write. While she writes she hums to herself snatches from "Vendetta ti chieggio." She finishes the letter, and calls: Celestine. As if in answer, there is a violent commotion at the door. She is taken by surprise. She rises, and goes to the entrance, tying her gown about her. Dessalines strides in wearing full uniform including hat and sword. He is pushing the maid, Celestine, ahead of him. Celestine cries: Madame.)

DESSALINES: *(to Celestine)* Get out of here. *(Celestine flies out of the room. Dessalines turns to Marie-Jeanne.)* I heard that Frenchman was here.

MARIE-JEANNE: Are you paying me a visit, General Dessalines?

DESSALINES: Was that Frenchman here?

MARIE-JEANNE: If you came here to see him, it is clear he is not here.

DESSALINES: I came to see you. You know that.

MARIE-JEANNE: *(Recovering her composure)* Give me your hat, General. *Dessalines gingerly hands over his hat.)* And your sword. *(Dessalines hands over his sword.)* Sit down, General. *(Dessalines, subdued, sits in the chair*

that Marie-Jeanne indicates. As he sits on the Racine volume, he jumps slightly, takes it and sets it on the floor. Marie-Jeanne has brought her chair from behind the table and they both sit some distance from each other.)
Well, General, I am delighted that you find time to pay me another visit so soon.

DESSALINES: Marie-Jeanne, this Frenchman, this white man, you are always seeing him?

MARIE-JEANNE: He comes to see me. You come too.

DESSALINES: But you know what he comes for.

MARIE-JEANNE: What do you come for?

DESSALINES: Marie, I tell you again, for him you are just another mulatto woman. I want you to marry me. In the church. I am General of Division now, Marie. Fort-au-Prince is my headquarters. I am building a palace there. It will be finished in two months. If you will marry me I will put three hundred men on it and finish in a month. I am Governor of the Province. You will be the wife of the Governor.

MARIE-JEANNE: General Dessalines, I do not want to be the wife of the Governor of a Province.

DESSALINES: *(Standing)* You prefer to be the woman of this Frenchman.

MARIE-JEANNE: I prefer to be what I want to be. You don't own me, General Dessalines. Nobody owns me. Slavery is finished.

DESSALINES: *(Towering over her)* Marie, are you the woman of this man? You were the woman of M. Bullet. You were the woman of the Spanish Marquis. Now you are the woman of General Hédouville. You are the woman of everybody.

MARIE-JEANNE: *(Slipping out from her seat)* Except the woman of General Dessalines.

DESSALINES: *(Following)* What must I do? I don't look at any other woman. I can't. Whenever I want a woman, I think of you. Always. All these women are ready to sleep with General Dessalines and you are ready to sleep with everybody except General Dessalines. Marie, I know I am a savage but I will be everything you want me to be. You only have to tell me. This man, this

French man, he is our enemy. If he gets the chance he and those like him will destroy us.

MARIE-JEANNE: I know that.

DESSALINES: You know that?

MARIE-JEANNE: Yes, I do.

DESSALINES: And yet he comes here to see you all the time.

(Marie-Jeanne goes to the table and picks up the letter she has just written. She rips the envelope open.)

MARIE-JEANNE: This letter is the proof of what I think of General Hédouville. And not only what I think, but what I now know.

DESSALINES: What is the use of showing me a letter. You know I can't read.

MARIE-JEANNE: Yes, I know. *(She calls.)* Celestine! *(Her maid appears cautiously.)* Celestine, I want you to do something for me. Here is a letter. You must read it aloud for General Dessalines. As you know, this is the General. He doesn't know how. . . *(Dessalines glowers a warning.)* . . . he doesn't know how well you can read, Celestine. Show him how quickly you have learnt. *(Marie-Jeanne hands the letter to Celestine. Celestine embarrassed, does not know what to do.)* Read it, child; you know you can.

DESSALINES: Do as you are told, girl.

(Celestine shrinks back. Marie-Jeanne with only one withering glance at Dessalines puts her arm around Celestine and reassures her.)

MARIE-JEANNE: Come, my child, you read for me every day. Read the letter. Begin: "Governor L'Ouverture . . ."

CELESTINE: *(Reading)* Governor L'Ouverture: Your Excellency. This is to inform you that I am now in a position to show the treachery of General Hédouville. Hédouville is ready to intrigue and plot with Pétion and the mulattoes. We can catch him red-handed. I . . .

DESSALINES: That's enough. Go away, you.

301
(Celestine hands over the letter and picks up her skirt for a rapid exit.)

MARIE-JEANNE: Wait. *(Celestine stops. Marie-Jeanne reseals the envelope.)* Here, Celestine, take this to Mars Plaisir. He is waiting to carry it to Governor Toussaint. Hurry!

(Celestine takes the letter from Marie-Jeanne and, obviously very relieved, rushes out of the room.)

DESSALINES: Marie, what can I say? I understand now what I didn't understand before. We will speak again. I have been trying to learn to read but I can't learn. I have to go but . . . Marie, do something for me.

MARIE-JEANNE: What is it?

DESSALINES: I want you to read . . . you remember. The book you read that night at the reception Toussaint gave. I can't forget it. Read it for me and then I will go.

MARIE-JEANNE: You want me to read for you?

DESSALINES: Yes, that is all I want.

(Marie-Jeanne goes over to him and bends low. He is taken aback. But she is merely picking up the Racine volume from the floor. She stands ready to read.)

MARIE-JEANNE: Marie-Jeanne will read for you. . . Jean-Jacques.

(The lights fade.)

ACT II SCENE II — 1800

Toussaint is sitting at a small table. Colonel Vincent, a French Officer, is standing.

TOUSSAINT: Vincent, I have some news for you. I have given General Hédouville notice of dismissal. He must leave by the next boat.

VINCENT: But, sire, he is the representative of the French Government. You cannot dismiss him in that way. The French Government has to recall him.

TOUSSAINT: No. He goes, and he goes at once. He has caused nothing here but disorder, intrigue, disruption of the government and rebellious sentiment in the population. Hédouville has to go. I have placed him under house arrest. *(Vincent is stupefied.)* Sit down, Vincent. Now you have come to talk about the constitution, and if you believe that I sent you away to Spanish San Domingo in order to publish the constitution when you were not here, you are quite right. I did not want you around. You think the constitution is despotic? Constitutions are what they turn out to be.

VINCENT: Sire, whatever the constitution is, what matters is that you have not consulted the First Consul of France. You have had it promulgated officially, you have had it printed and distributed. Which means that for you the matter is settled.

TOUSSAINT: Yes, for me the matter is settled. The constitution swears allegiance to France. For the rest, we govern ourselves.

VINCENT: Yes, General, the constitution swears allegiance to France, but it leaves no room for any French official.

TOUSSAINT: I want a Frenchman to come out and help me govern. But he must recognise the local government. Only a local government can govern. We don't want another Hédouville; we've had enough of them.

VINCENT: But that is independence.

TOUSSAINT: No. That is not independence. We do not seek independence. We are not ready for it. France will be elder brother, guide and mentor. The French Government will send commissioners to speak with me.

VINCENT: *(Standing involuntarily)* But, Sire, I have to remind you that General Bonaparte is not the man to whom one submits a *fait accompli*. Remember, he is First Consul of France.

TOUSSAINT: General Bonaparte is the first man in France and General L'Ouverture is the first man in San Domingo. *(Vincent sits.)*

VINCENT: Sire, you are establishing what amounts to a new dominion.

TOUSSAINT: No, Vincent. What we want is protection. We want to be protected by France. We want to learn from France. France will send capital and administrators to help us develop and educate the country.

VINCENT: What will be the position of the French Government?

TOUSSAINT: The French Government will send commissioners to speak with me.

VINCENT: But the French Government sent Hédouville.

TOUSSAINT: Hédouville came here to govern. No Frenchman can come here to govern. The French Government will send commissioners to speak with me.

VINCENT: This is something entirely new. America has become independent but America is a big country and. . .

TOUSSAINT: You mean that Americans were free men and not slaves. They were white and not black.

VINCENT: General, I did not mean that.

TOUSSAINT: You mean you did not say it.

VINCENT: General, I am speaking in the best interests of you and the ex-slaves of San Domingo. Tell me which of your comrades deserves promotion and rewards for services to the State; I will recommend them. I have very good contacts in France and if, General, you should feel that there has not been sufficient recognition of the services you have rendered, it will. . .

TOUSSAINT: Vincent, you are the best of the white men who have come here from France. But you are a white man, Vincent. You have never been a slave. You have never felt the degradation of being a black slave. This is not a matter of personal rewards for services rendered. I am a General, I am Commander-in-Chief and Governor of San Domingo, but if I make any serious mistakes all that can go—tomorrow. I will be a hunted fugitive and it will be because I am black and an ex-slave.

VINCENT: But General. . .

TOUSSAINT: Don't interrupt me, Vincent. In San Domingo we are an outpost of freed slaves. All around us in the Caribbean black men are slaves. Even in the independent United States, black men are slaves. In South America black men are slaves. Now I have sent millions of francs to the United States. You have heard about this. *(Vincent nods reluctantly.)* But it is not to build a fortune for myself so that if anything goes wrong I

can escape and live like a rich man. No, Vincent. If this Constitution functions satisfactorily, I intend to take one thousand soldiers, go to Africa and free hundreds of thousands in the black slave trade there and bring them here, to be free and French.

VINCENT: General, I have never doubted your devotion to the cause you represent. What I am telling you is that whatever you are doing, and intend to do, you must get the approval of General Bonaparte.

TOUSSAINT: No, Vincent, I have already done what I intended to do. I have sent a copy of the Constitution to General Bonaparte. *(Vincent is shocked.)* And now, Colonel Vincent *(Toussaint used the word "Colonel" and speaks in such a manner that Vincent rises and stands to attention.)* I hereby relieve you of your post as representative of the French Army in the army of San Domingo. I instruct you to go to France. You have a copy of the Constitution with you. *(Vincent places a hand at his breast pocket.)* You are to recommend it personally to the First Consul.

VINCENT: Sire, it may not be too late. Perhaps if I could go to General Bonaparte and tell him that you have withdrawn the Constitution, and are requesting his approval. Will you withdraw it?

TOUSSAINT: San Domingo may as well withdraw itself from these waters and attach itself to France. You have your orders, Colonel Vincent. I can leave the fate of the Constitution in no better hands than yours. Your long and faithful service to us has now reached its climax. You will be under house arrest until you leave. *(Vincent salutes and turns to leave. He stops and turns back.)*

VINCENT: Sire, before I go, allow me to say one more word about General Bonaparte. . .

TOUSSAINT: Colonel Vincent, the interview is now over.

(The light fades on the area on stage right and comes up in the area on stage left. Vincent crosses the stage to the latter area during the cross-fade to the first ten notes of "La Marseillaise" as played on a flute.)

ACT II SCENE III — 1800

The area on stage left represents the First Consul's office in The Tuileries, Paris. General Bonaparte is reading papers with his secretary and an orderly in attendance. There is a guard standing with a bayoneted musket in Colonel

HERBERT HODGE

London taxi-driver who delighted the intellectuals with Where's That Bomb? a satirical play (banned by the Censor, presumably because of harmless coprological material absolutely essential to the play), and Cannibal Carnival, a scene from which is given here.

Hodge has been unemployed agitator, parliamentary candidate, lumberjack, hobo, fireman, journalist and many other things. Has become a very popular broadcaster.

His autobiography is shortly to be published under the title of Hodge Speaking.

CANNIBAL CARNIVAL

by HERBERT HODGE

A THEATRICAL CARTOON

Editor's Note:

Cannibal Carnival was first produced by Unity Theatre Club on June 5, 1937. The following extract is from Scene Five. The author has added an introduction and conclusion for *In Letters of Red*.

THE curtain rises on the beach of one of the Canna-Cary islands, somewhere in the Pacific. The most noticeable features of the landscape are a tall tree and a large rock. On the tree grow French loaves and hot dogs. The rest of the scenery is what you'd expect after seeing the tree. Blue sky makes a back drop for an island paradise.

Three shipwrecked seafarers, the sole survivors, are holding a conference. The first is Bartholomew Bogus, Bishop of Belgravia. He wears a clergyman's collar, bishop's gaiters, and little else. The second, Hungry Joe, is an elderly London policeman with a walrus moustache. Except for a fluttering rag or two, he wears only the symbols of his office: his helmet and boots. He carries a large truncheon. The third, Mr. Crabbe the financier, is tall and lean with the eagle's beak nose of the born buccaneer. Like his companions, he is scantily clad. He has, however, retained the emblems of wealth and respectability; notably his frock coat and leather satchel in which you can hear his money chinking whenever he moves.

The island is overrun by a lot of low natives, living

in a state of primitive communism. The white men decide to civilise it. When the natives come clambering down the tree, the bishop harangues them on the wickedness of gratifying their carnal lusts with loaves and hot dogs, while Crabbe puts a fence round the tree, and Joe sets up the civilised notice: "Private Property—Trespassers Will Be Prosecuted."

Thus the foundations of the new order are laid. The scene closes with the natives, thoroughly awed by the bishop's eloquence and the policeman's truncheon, singing a hymn to Crabbe.

Like this:

How cutely comes the clever Crabbe
To this poor savage isle!
And kindly lets us work for him
To make his little pile!

He puts his fences roundabout
Our sinful savage trees;
And even puts his mark upon
Our savage flies and fleas!

He shows us how we waste our time
For lack of being led,
He gives us pence for making pounds
And crusts for making bread.

Then hail the kindly Mister Crabbe!
Whose money is his might.
We'll toil for him throughout the day,
And praise his name all night!

Before long a thoroughly up-to-date civilisation is in being—complete with prostitutes, pawnshops, dividends,

unemployment, traffic chaos and patent-medicine advertisements. Unemployment leads to wage-cutting; wage-cutting to under-consumption; under-consumption to over-production; and over-production to more unemployment. As the bishop says: "It's positively marvellous! Just like dear old England."

The third scene culminates in a bread riot, during which Joe, the policeman, is knocked down, and Crabbe and Bogus surrounded by angry natives. But Crabbe saves civilisation by ordering the bishop to distribute crusts. Joe arrests Egbert, the native leader, and the curtain falls upon a chorus of "Down with the Reds."

With Egbert locked up, the white men feel safer, but still not altogether safe. The trouble is, decides the bishop, there isn't sufficient glamour surrounding the person of Crabbe. What the natives need, he says, is "a little more romance in their lives; something to take their minds off the sordid affairs of everyday." So he sets up a puppet king and stages a magnificent coronation, with an equally magnificent procession led by Joe upon a hobby horse, and described to the last detail by Crabbe in a megaphone commentary from the big rock.

Unfortunately the procession gets mixed up with an unemployed demonstration, and there is some confusion. Joe, however, charging on his spirited hobby horse, soon clears a path, while the processional jazz-band plays a little louder to cover the sound of cracking skulls.

But the bishop's labour is wasted. The natives jeer

at the king, and finally chase him off, pelting him with rubbish.

Scene five opens on the deserted beach. Pandemonium can be heard off-stage. Bogus and Crabbe enter, breathing heavily and mopping their brows.

CRABBE: That king idea of yours seems to have come unstuck.

BISHOP BOGUS: I fear so, Mr. Crabbe! I fear so! Did Joseph get him away?

CRABBE: Yes. He's put him in the lock-up for the time being. They're howling all round it, but they can't get in.

BOGUS (*shaking his head more in sorrow than in anger*): They're like all savages. No feeling whatever for the Good, and the True, and the Beautiful. All they think about is their bellies. Stuffing! Guzzling! And running after women.

CRABBE: I'd sooner see 'em run after women than run after us. And they will be running after us if we don't look out. We've got to reduce wages again, and we've got to think of something to take their minds off it.

(*He begins to pace up and down deep in thought.*)

BOGUS (*pacing also*): What about a tattoo?

CRABBE: Bunk!

BOGUS: Or a jubilee?

CRABBE: Played out.

BOGUS: A war then. A christian crusade, I mean.

CRABBE: And arm all these savages! Not likely!

We've got no newspapers to work 'em up to a proper patriotism.

BOGUS: Well—what else can we do? A Test Match?

CRABBE: Bah! (*suddenly stopping*) I know! We'll give 'em a vote.

BOGUS (*shocked*): A what?

CRABBE: A vote, my boy. Democracy! The right of every man to choose his own tyrant.

BOGUS: Mr. Crabbe! I absolutely forbid it. Once you admit the right of a man to decide for himself, you undermine the foundations of the Church. Why—we shall be having Nonconformists next. Wesleyans, Methodists, and vulgar persons like that! And who knows, perhaps even Agnostics!

CRABBE: Can't help that, Bish. Let's cut the cant and face the facts. The natives are getting restless. This king business has made things worse instead of better. Whether we like it or not, we shall be forced to restrict production and reduce wages still further to keep our profits up. They outnumber us by a thousand to one. They could wipe us out tomorrow.

BOGUS: But I've taught them to love, honour and obey us. And threatened them with hell fire if they don't.

CRABBE: Bah! What's hell fire to an empty belly?

BOGUS: Well—what's a vote to an empty belly? A man can't make a sandwich of it.

CRABBE: No—but he can comfort himself with it. He can say: I voted for the wrong party last time,

therefore I'm hungry. Next time I'll vote for the right party—and be filled.

BOGUS: And will he?

CRABBE: Will he what?

BOGUS: Be filled.

CRABBE: What's it matter? If he isn't, he'll blame his party. And while he's blaming his party he isn't blaming us.

BOGUS (*pondering it*): I'm afraid I don't understand politics, Mr. Crabbe.

CRABBE: Neither does anyone else. That's the beauty of it. If you and I, for instance, acting for ourselves, reduce wages to an eighth of a loaf, you and I will get the blame for it. There might even be a revolution. You see that, don't you?

BOGUS (*sadly*): I'm afraid it's only too obvious.

CRABBE: Right. But if you and I, the elected representatives of the people, do the same thing, then we can't be blamed, since we are merely carrying out the people's will.

BOGUS: But suppose they elect someone else.

CRABBE: They won't. They can't. There's only the government and the opposition.

BOGUS: But what if the opposition wins?

CRABBE: Then the opposition becomes the government, and the government becomes the opposition: You govern and I oppose—or I govern and you oppose. What's the difference? It's quite simple.

BOGUS: Well . . . say what you like, I think it's a very dangerous experiment. I'd much rather things stayed as they are.

CRABBE: Right! You be Conservative, then. I'll be Liberal. (*Calling.*) Joe! Constable! Sergeant! Commissioner! Lord Chief Justice! Where are you?

JOE (*hurrying in and saluting*): Here, sir.

CRABBE: Put on your wig and declare a new constitution. Votes for all.

JOE (*saluting*): Aye, aye, sir! (*He takes off helmet and dons judge's robes and wig. Then rings handbell.*) Oyez! Oyez! Oyez! (*NATIVES enter. He reads from scroll.*) Take heed all citizens of the Canna-Cary Islands! Whereas it has pleased Us, Our Gracious Majesty, King Hoko, acting through our well-beloved Counsellors, the Right Honourable Mr. Crabbe and His Holiness the Bishop of Belgravia, to declare a new constitution, and proclaim it abroad. And whereas it is enacted that all men are born free and equal, saving only Yids, Dagos and other foreign scum, We, King Hoko, do, on this first day of Our Glorious Reign, graciously grant one whole vote to all persons in Our Kingdom over the age of twenty-one years.

(*Prolonged cheers. JOE rolls up scroll.*)

CRABBE: Government of the People, by the People, for the People! Democracy!

ALL: Democracy!

JOE: As Lord Chief Justice, I hereby declare a general election. On my right stands Mr. Bogus, the Conservative candidate. (*Cheers and boos.*) On my left, Mr. Crabbe, the Liberal candidate. (*Cheers and boos.*) Both are pledged to serve you—with all their hearts,

and with all their minds, and with all their souls!
(*Cheers.*) Whenever they have nothing better to do
they will attend the House of Commons, and there eat,
drink, smoke or sleep, on your behalf. (*Prolonged
cheers.*)

CRABBE (*pushing JOE aside*): Vote for Crabbe and
larger loaves.

(*Cheers and boos. Girl presents him with a bouquet.
He shakes hands with his supporters.*)

BOGUS: Vote for Bogus, and bigger hot dogs!
(*Shakes hands with his supporters.*)

(*BOGUS and CRABBE march up and down, shouting
their election cries. Natives cheer and boo. As
BOGUS and CRABBE pass and repass, they make derisive
urchin gestures at each other, to the delight of natives.*)

JOE (*donning helmet and ringing bell as he goes off*):
This way to the polling booth! This way to the polling
booth.

(*BOGUS's supporters march round him singing,
while he beats time; all making derisive gestures at
CRABBE and his supporters.*)

BOGUS AND CO.:

Vote, vote, vote for Mister Bogus
The Lib'als will ruin you and me.
For Bogus is our man, and we'll have him if
we can,
And we'll chuck old Crabby in the sea.

CRABBE AND CO. (*as CRABBE's supporters march
round him*):

Vote, vote, vote for clever Crabby
The Tories will ruin you and me.
For Crabby is our man, and we'll have him if we can,
And we'll chuck old Bogus in the sea.

(*BOGUS and CRABBE march up and down, shouting
election cries. The following is repeated three or four
times up to JOE's entry.*)

BOGUS: Vote for Bogus and bigger hot dogs!

CRABBE: Vote for Crabbe and larger loaves!

BOGUS (*thumbing nose at CRABBE*): Gertcha! Lousy
Liberal!

CRABBE (*thumbing nose at BOGUS*): Gertcha! Tory
Twister!

(*JOE enters, greatly perturbed.*)

JOE (*to CRABBE*): Oh, sir! Egbert's escaped!

CRABBE: You damned fool! Find him! And when
you do, chain him hand and foot!

JOE (*saluting*): Aye, aye, sir! (*He goes off.*)

BOGUS: Vote for Bogus, and bigger hot dogs!

CRABBE: Vote for Crabbe, and larger loaves! (*as they
meet*) Egbert's escaped! (*Thumbing nose.*) Gertcha!
Tory Twister!

BOGUS: Good God! (*Thumbing nose.*) Gertcha!
Lousy Liberal!

(*Amid cheers and boos, they continue back and forth,
surveyed by EGBERT, the leader of the natives, who has
entered unobserved by them.*)

373

118

CANNIBAL CARNIVAL

CRABBE: Vote for Crabbe, and larger loaves!

BOGUS: Vote for Bogus, and bigger hot dogs.

EGBERT (*jumping up on rock*): Vote for Egbert, and take all! Vote for Egbert, and take all! (*Wild cheering.*)

(CRABBE and BOGUS as they meet stop to hold whispered conference.)

EGBERT: Up the Workers! Vote for Egbert, and take all!

(Some of BOGUS's and CRABBE's supporters cheer EGBERT, and sing while EGBERT conducts.)

EGBERT AND CO:

Vote, vote, vote for Brother Egbert

The Bosses will ruin you and me.

For Egbert is our man and we'll have him if we can,
And we'll chuck all Bosses in the sea.

(BOGUS and CRABBE, dismayed at his success, urge on their supporters to sing again. All three songs are sung simultaneously, while the BISHOP's and CRABBE's supporters march in concentric circles but in opposite directions, EGBERT's supporters, massed at the back, chair EGBERT, and repeat their last line after the BISHOP's and CRABBE's supporters have stopped marching and are standing silently in their respective groups.)

EGBERT AND CO.: . . . And we'll chuck all Bosses in the sea.

374

HERBERT HODGE

119

(Cheers, rattles and terrific hubbub. BOGUS and CRABBE hold whispered conference.)

BOGUS AND CRABBE (*together*): Citizens of the Canary Islands. Confronted by the Red menace, we have decided to sink our petty party politics, and save the country. (*Shaking hands and standing back to back, slowly turning and thumbing noses in all directions.*) Vote for Bogus and Crabbe, the National candidates. Vote National, and save the country! Vote National, and save the country!

EGBERT: Vote Socialist, and save yourselves! Vote Socialist, and save yourselves!

(JOE enters. Sees EGBERT.)

JOE (*to CRABBE*): Shall I arrest him?

CRABBE: Not now. Too dangerous. Wait till we get him alone.

(JOE salutes and goes off.)

BOGUS AND CRABBE: Vote National, and save the country!

EGBERT: Vote Socialist, and save yourselves!

(BOGUS and CRABBE each turn to supporters and conduct National song. During song their supporters go over one by one to EGBERT, so that only two or three are left to sing last line.)

BOGUS AND CRABBE AND CO.:

Vote, vote, vote for Crabbe and Bogus
Young Egbert will ruin you and me.

375

120

CANNIBAL CARNIVAL

For the Nationalists are our men, and we'll put
em in again,
And we'll chuck Young Egbert in the sea.

EGBERT AND CO.:

Vote, vote, vote for Brother Egbert
The Bosses will ruin you and me.
For Egbert is our man, and we'll have him if we can,
And we'll chuck all bosses in the sea.

BOGUS AND CRABBE (*during song, with imploring
gestures*): Vote National! Vote National! etc. etc.

(*EGBERT's supporters wildly cheering. Great excite-
ment. JOE enters.*)

JOE: Silence! Si—lence!!! Silence for the count!
(*Calling off.*) Bring in the ballot-box!

(*Two natives enter, supervised by AMBROSE carrying
palm leaf basket, and abacus, which they set down in
centre. Renewed hubbub.*)

JOE: Silence for the count! Silence for the count!

1ST NATIVE (*counting out papers, while another native
records on abacus*): Bogus and Crabbe, Egbert, Egbert,
Egbert, Bogus and Crabbe, Bogus and Crabbe, Egbert,
Egbert, Egbert, Egbert, Egbert . . .

(*Falls exhausted. 2ND NATIVE takes over. Scene
fades out.*)

2ND NATIVE: . . . Egbert, Egbert, Egbert, Egbert. . . .

(*Scene fades in. 3RD NATIVE is counting.*)

376

HERBERT HODGE

121

3RD NATIVE: (*counting*): Egbert, Egbert, Egbert,
Egbert, Egbert (*turning up and shaking basket*), Egbert is
elected!

NATIVES: Egbert! Egbert! Good old Egbert!

(*Great jubilation.*)

EGBERT: Comrades! I thank you!

(*Greater jubilation.*)

CRABBE: Oh, hell!

BOGUS: I told you so.

CRABBE: Joe! (*Whispers in his ear.*)

EGBERT: The new Socialist Government hereby
enacts that the fence be removed from the tree, and the
bread fruit be made free to all.

(*Pandemonium of delight.*)

CRABBE (*to JOE*): Judge! Do your duty!

JOE (*mounting rock and donning wig*): Silence! The
Supreme Court declares the new Act to be an infringe-
ment of the sacred rights of property, and there-
fore null and void! (*Giving Fascist salute.*) Hail,
Crabbe!

CRABBE (*mounting rock*): The patriots in council
declare Egbert to be a Marxist, a Jew, and a traitor to
his country. Parliament is dissolved! Parliament is
null and void! (*Fascist salute.*) Hail, Crabbe!

BOGUS (*mounting rock*): The Church declares Egbert
to be Antichrist! (*Fascist salute.*) Hail, Crabbe!

JOE (*donning helmet*): The armed forces of the Crown
declare a state of emergency. All civil rights abrogated.

Martial law proclaimed. (*Fascist salute.*) Hail,
Crabbe!

(*Roars of anger from NATIVES. JOE gets behind
EGBERT.*)

EGBERT: Comrades!

(*JOE strikes him with truncheon. He falls. Mean-
while CRABBE is addressing the NATIVES.*)

CRABBE: Peace! Peace! We are your friends! Your
friends, I tell you! We didn't steal your tree. It was
the Jews.

BOGUS: Why are you hungry?

CRABBE: The Jews have eaten the bread.

BOGUS: Why are you thirsty?

CRABBE: The Jews have poisoned the water.

BOGUS: Why are you homeless?

CRABBE: The Jews have stolen the houses.

BOGUS: Who makes rain when we want sun-
shine?

CRABBE: The Jews!

BOGUS: Who makes sunshine when we want rain?

CRABBE: The Jews!

(*Roars of anger from NATIVES.*)

BOGUS: Down with the Jews!

CRABBE: Rout 'em out!

BOGUS: Smoke 'em out!

CRABBE: Burn 'em out!

BOGUS: Beat Jews!

CRABBE: Torture Jews!

BOGUS: Kill Jews! It is a Christian duty to kill!
Kill! Kill! Kill!

NATIVES: Kill the Jews! Kill the Jews! Kill! Kill!
Kill!

(*NATIVES rush about in a frenzy, examining each
other's nose. Masses sway back and forth. Finally all
rush out. The BISHOP, CRABBE and JOE remain
behind: JOE is busy handcuffing EGBERT. NATIVES
can be heard singing: "The Jews! The Jews! We've
got to get rid of the Jews!"*)

BOGUS (*mopping brow*): Phew! That was a near one!
I thought they were going to tear us limb from limb!
Hark at them now! (*Shuddering.*) I'm glad I'm not
a Jew.

CRABBE: Huh! Poor old Jews! The times they've
saved us!

BOGUS: But——

CRABBE: But be damned! It's perfectly simple.
What's the use of telling a man he's starving because of
the economic law? He can't bash the economic law,
so he tries to change the system. But tell him he's
starving because of the Jews—and he's got something
solid and human, and near at hand he can bash to his
heart's content. So off he goes to bash—and leaves the
system alone.

BOGUS: But——

CRABBE: But what?

BOGUS: Well, so far as I've been able to discover
there isn't a Jew on the island.

CRABBE: No?

BOGUS: No.

CRABBE: Oh!

BOGUS: It's going to make things a bit awkward.

CRABBE: Oh! I don't know. When they've tired 'emself out you can tell 'em the Jews have mounted their broomsticks and flown away, like your old witches. People believe anything about Jews. Meanwhile we can settle Egbert. Things'll be easier once he's out of the way. (*Turning to JOE.*) Officer!

JOE (*who has been arguing with EGBERT*): Sir!

CRABBE: Bring Egbert along to the courthouse.

JOE: Aye, aye, sir!

(*BOGUS and CRABBE go off followed by JOE pushing the handcuffed EGBERT before him.*)

(BLACK OUT.)

At the courthouse, Joe serves as prosecutor and judge alternately; Bogus and Crabbe as the jury. Egbert is found guilty of being a Marxist and a Jew, and is sentenced to death. He places his head on the block and Joe raises the chopper for the fatal blow. But Egbert cries: "Up the Workers." This makes it awkward for Joe, who obviously can't bring his chopper down while Egbert keeps shouting "Up." That's psychology, as everybody knows. After some argument, during which Joe offers in vain a varied assortment of suitable last sentiments (free from "up"), Egbert's reiterated slogan makes Joe, as he himself says, "come over all class-conscious." He gives Egbert a cigarette and goes on strike.

The natives, led by Mrs. Egbert, set fire to the courthouse; then revert to their ancient customs and put Bogus and Crabbe in the cook pot (after saying grace as previously instructed by the bishop); and all ends with a savage song and dance, while Joe stirs the stew with his truncheon and leads the choruses: