



Title of Paper: **Strangeness and Subversion at the Shaftesbury: *In Dahomey* in London in 1903**

Author: Holly Gale Millette

Affiliation: University of Southampton

Section: Articles

Date of Publication: September, 2014

Issue: 2.3

Abstract:

Moving away from the identity politics inherent in revisionist biographies of ex-enlaved African Americans abroad, I would like to refocus the vehicle and situation of the Black performance collective that presented *In Dahomey* abroad. In this, I will refer to the show's reception rather than deconstruct elements of its script, its songs, or its dancing. I am attempting to recover indigenous narratives of struggle, resistance, and capitulation that drove the company which toured the United Kingdom from the 26th of December 1903 to the 4th of June 1904. For the purposes of this discussion, my thoughts will centre on this account on the 23rd of October 1903, by the drama correspondent for the *Times*.

The resultant impression left on our mind was one of strangeness, the strangeness of the “coloured” race blended with the strangeness of certain American things...we can remember nothing quite so strange as *In Dahomey*. Probably [the] sole design was to show us the African unenslaved, the African in his native majesty, by way of contrast to the Americanized African of the subsequent scenes. Their spectacle is just a little painful – painful and strange.¹

Keywords: *In Dahomey*, Performance, Theatre, Subversion, Race, Fin de Siècle, Radicalisms, DuBois, Fanon.

Author Bio:

Holly Gale is a Cultural Geographer and Performance Historiographer with expertise and interest in mapping urban spaces and places of: radical identity; transgression and protest; mobile cultures and diaspora; race and gender in cultural formations; and hybrid of material and visual cultures. Her current writing and research encompass post-humanist discourse, biography/autobiography, heritage and social histories, and identities of protest and subversion. She is currently employed by the University of Southampton as a Senior Teaching Fellow.

Author email: H.Millette@soton.ac.uk



The Victorian

I would like to begin with what this is not. It is not, strictly speaking, a revisionist biography of previously enslaved African Americans performing in Britain. Moving away from the identity politics inherent in such accounts, I would like to unpick and then refocus the vehicle and situation of the Black performance collective that presented *In Dahomey* – the first American Musical with an all black cast and production crew to perform in Great Britain. In this, I will refer to the reception of *In Dahomey* rather deconstruct elements of its script, its songs, or its dancing. I am attempting to recover indigenous narratives of struggle, resistance, capitulation and revolution that drove the company which toured the United Kingdom from the 26th of December, 1903 to the 4th of June 1904 after a successful run of its show at the Shaftesbury Theatre in London from the 16th of May 1903.

For the purposes of this discussion, my thoughts will centre on this account on the 23rd of October 1903, by the drama correspondent for the *Times*.

The resultant impression left on our mind was one of strangeness, the strangeness of the “coloured” race blended with the strangeness of certain American things...we can remember nothing quite so strange as *In Dahomey*. Probably [the] sole design was to show us the African unenslaved, the African in his native majesty, by way of contrast to the Americanized African of the subsequent scenes. Their spectacle is just a little painful – painful and strange.ⁱⁱ

Dahomey was a French colony, released from colonial rule by that Empire at the very turn of the new century; it is now the Republic of Benin. The play *In Dahomey* was the most economically and critically successful of all the black theatricals at the Fin de Siècle even though it was anchored by notions of the ‘Uplift’ of a race, subversion of imperialistic display, and the repatriation of an African Kingdom by a pair of ex-enslaved African Americansⁱⁱⁱ. The pair in question was the



The Victorian

comedy duo of George Walker and Bert Williams both of whom had begun their careers in late-century black minstrelsy and as performers at the Mid-Winter Exposition in Golden Gate Park, California as “real savages” in the African Dahomeyan village exhibit^{iv}. They were not a success in the exhibition trade, and it could be well understood that their brief foray in this highly exploitative mobile environment produced pain, depression and disgrace for the pair^v. Walker poignantly remarked that “nothing seemed more absurd than to see a colored man making himself ridiculous in order to portray himself”^{vi} and this served, in part, as a catalyst for them to form a Collective of performance artists that would strive to locate and portray the “native” (Walker’s words^{vii}) black performer. *In Dahomey* was an early attempt to do precisely this and it is telling that Walker chose words that plainly borrowed from the taxonomy of exhibitions of that period. The play’s skeletal plot recounted a quest mounted by two detectives – The dandified Rareback Pinkerton (Walker) and his bumbling sidekick, Shylock Homestead (Williams) – to return a family heirloom to its proper owner. The allusions and allegories embedded in these names are extant, and I will not unpack all of them here. However, I should like to point out that these private ‘eyes’ could be seen both as the Fanonian “I” in “I am black”; “I am human”, which I will refer to in a moment, and the search for the black African “I” in the various guises and locations in which it may have become dislocated and hidden.

This quest would see the pair journey from the elite black circles of Boston, to the home of Cicero Lightfoot the ‘The President of a Colonization Society’ in Florida, and finally to Africa and the swamps of Dahomey. Along the way, they would meet a



The Victorian

variety of African Americans who, like them, were obsessed with social climbing and negotiation. Each new character was an opportunity for a musical interlude, or ‘turn’, and some of these characters became attached to the pair as entourage. The musical’s final scene was a lavish pantomime transformation act featuring a chorus of supernumeraries who embedded themselves in a riotous display of ‘exotic’ local verdant scenery, mud swamps, and grinning skulls. By this I mean they covered themselves with leaves, flowers and mud to appear *as* the jungle. Although devoid of much of the first parts of the pantomime, the closing transformation scene was clearly in evidence here. Nonplussed audiences watched as ‘two idealized lovers in frog costumes floated down the stream in a canoe’ singing a duet of “My Lady Frog” while choristers languished foliage-like in the background. In essence, ‘the cast of *In Dahomey* became *Dahomey* on stage’.^{viii} Into this scene of their very origin, came the two corrupted western versions of the African American man transformed into King of Dahomey (Walker) and Jester (Williams) – note that it was the black-faced Williams landed this part. With that, the carnivalesque atmosphere closed abruptly in the swamp; curtain down, lights up, and as the *St. James Gazette* explained, the “wildly inconsequential abruptness of the way in which there was suddenly no more of “*In Dahomey*” at about 11 p.m. on Saturday had to be seen to be believed.”^{ix} Neither the nostalgically rendered Africa of yore or the newly administrated Africa of the 1881 Berlin accord, which saw that continent parcelled out to its various colonizers for them to manage, was on view at the Shaftesbury. Instead, what was there was the physiognomy of Africa embodied – literally – in the transported; repatriated bodies of the previously enslaved. Eric Ledell Smith^x recounts that on its



The Victorian

premier in London its conductor and composer William Marion Cook – sensing a crisis in the pit – waved the orchestra on into an abrupt rendition of “God Save the King” to signal the play’s end to its bewildered audience. Thus, the British national anthem came to delimit the most ambiguous and radically unsettling elements of the first African American musical in the West End. Like the complexities of the characters names, this panicked insertion of Empire was riddled with spiralling complexities. What is intriguing, however, is that at a time when pantomimes in London had reached an apotheosis and in the context of narratives of Empire in which the majority of these pantomimes were set, this one production – while maintaining the form of a pantomime to a slight degree (one might be tempted to presume as a sop) – it belied the contextual relationship between the pantomime and its audience. Indeed, it subverted it so strongly that the only significant reference to Empire had to be inserted as a signal that the play had ended.

To the British, the show seemed to be based on a transposed plantation formula, with set dance pieces and novel musicality that expressed authentic ‘negrotude’, and a pantomime transformation extravaganza bolted onto the end - but it’s plot was cloaked in mystery. Reviewers had never seen anything like it before. “What it is about”, mused the Daily Mail, “we are unable, even with the assistance of a printed ‘argument’ to fully understand”^{xi} and other papers followed suit. This was neither a play about Africa, nor was it using Africa for dramatic purposes. It was a play about grappling for a place within which to imagine, and piece together, fractured post-enslaved, Black American identities and it did so, as Daphne Brooks put it, by “yoking broad strokes of romantic whimsy with black political intent and activist



The Victorian

vision”^{xii}. This process, I argue, was made all the more revolutionary for its being played out in full view of the colonial Big Other. Given this and considering the linguistics of *The Times*’ review at the start of this piece, the repetition of the word ‘strange’ seems a bit more understandable.

The discomfort and subversion this popular entertainment brought to both British audiences and the touring artists performing to them, was a two-way cathartic dance of resistance. In this, the stage was very much a mediated cultural contact zone with a thick veneer of double-consciousness weaved into its theatrical ‘third wall’. *In Dahomey* provided a set of visually familiar narratives in which the audience expectancy was to gawk at colonised territory, but the fancy dress, the repatriation, the ‘uplifted’ identities of the black men and women on stage, all combined to unnerve them. It was ‘strange’, unfamiliar and challenging – something the company did not anticipate, but probably welcomed with a more than just a touch of Schadenfreude. My thoughts are that this unease was related to the rhetoric: “Do white people have – not just a legitimate position – but *any* holistic position within the social fabric of colonisation?” Franz Fanon in his seminal *White Skins, Black Masks*^{xiii} answers this with a definitive: “No”. What is radical is that the *In Dahomey* Company performed this answer live, from the stage at the Shaftesbury theatre, fifty years prior to Fanon’s writing. Fanon unfortunately died too young to continue much of his important thoughts, but what he did write achieved an epistemological break from the modernist formulation of man by radically re-thinking what humanism was constituted as and why we could no longer do without it. In Martinique, where Fanon was raised, double-consciousness turned on a void, a lack that threatened to devour



The Victorian

the child-Fanon from the outside in. The Black boy self that Fanon pondered wore the White Mask of the double-consciousness experience that Dubois spoke of as ‘the veil’ in *The Souls of Black Folk*^{xiv}. Du bois’ precise statement, which would come to define this circumstance of double-consciousness, was:

One ever feels a two-ness – an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder.^{xv}

But whites, Fanon would come to see, also wear a white mask in the colonial relationship where the utility of the black individual dehumanises the white; devouring him from the inside out. The troubling aspect of *In Dahomey* – its strangeness – was that the cast performed this double-consciousness, its void, and the ideological pantomime of the masks so subversively as to avoid detection. There was not a single white face on stage, in the wings, in the orchestra or in the one hundred-strong company. To be pedantic, the only part a white man had to play in the creation and performance of the production was that a few had painted its scenery. In amongst the cakewalking, the slapstick comedy of the bumbling Williams, and the obtuse pantomime at the shows end, was the denial that white people had any holistic position in the social fabric of colonisation at all.

What is interesting to me in this example was that colonised peoples redouble on themselves in these performances to become tourists themselves in the very land of their own colonizers, receiving payment for performing their ‘authentic’ rejoinder of imperial discourse. “Indeed,” as Cooks identified “the dualism of colonial relationships implies a colonial subjectivity and a colonized objectivity that somehow exists in “pure” form, untainted by travel and cultural exchange.”^{xvi} This dualism is



The Victorian

implicit in the cast's sojourn; that travel – their travel – “implies the imperialism of the traditional ethnographic relationship of travel to distant lands that defines colonial relationships for exploitation by the mother country.”^{xvii} Tourism – their tourism – is tainted with the discourse of imperialism and colonial administration and with the juxtaposition of Nation and Empire, and these serve to clarify their boundaries of belonging. As Simon Gikandi notes, “the trope of travel generates narratives that are acutely concerned with self-realization in the spaces of the other.”^{xviii}

The black man is an ancient symbol represented in religious myth as fallen and then accursed as was Ham who was cast Black by his father, Noah, for bringing lasciviousness aboard the Ark. Following the etymology of the folk-myth, Ham is the son who does not merely engage in sexual congress out of a duty to procreate – he enjoys it. The sons of Ham^{xix} represent the Colonial's repressed desires to enjoy and to have fun: Ham does if for fun, he likes to sing, he likes to dance; he enjoys life. And the *Times* was quick to make this connection:

In ‘epileptic’ dancing these coloured people are, as was to be expected, quite unrivalled. But in repose, and in their ball dresses, they give one an even stranger sensation than when they are dancing.^{xx}

This legacy of Ham sat in opposition to the Collective's desire for resistance. Caryl Phillips fictionalises what this dilemma might have wrought in George Walker's internal monologue:

Is the colored performer to be forever condemned to pleasing a white audience with farce, and then attempting to conquer these same people with music and dance? Is the colored American performer to be nothing more than an exuberant, childish fool named Aunt Jemima, Uncle Rufus, or simply Plantation Darky, who must be neither unique nor individual? Can the colored American ever be free to entertain beyond the evidence of his dark skin? Can the colored man be himself in twentieth-century America?^{xxi}



I suggest Philips is grappling here with reconstructed biographical struggles similar to Fanon's autobiographical ones, and that both draw directly (and intentionally) from Dubois in doing so:

What, after all, am I? Am I an American or am I a Negro? Can I be both? Or is it my duty to cease to be a Negro as soon as possible and be an American? If I strive as a Negro, am I not perpetuating the very cleft that threatens and separates Black and White America? Is it not my only possible practical aim the subduction of all that is Negro in me to the American? Does my black blood place upon me any more obligation to assert my nationality than German, or Irish or Italian blood would?^{xxii}

Fanon experienced similar expectations, disappointments and resistance as the *In Dahomey* Collective did as tourists on their arrival in London. The confidence Fanon had in Martinique, was that the “I” in his inward mantra “I am human”; “I am black” would be uplifted and honoured once he reached Paris, if only because he wore his ‘white mask’ so well. Fanon, to his disappointment would come to find that this “I” would, in fact, become obliterated once in Paris. That the hope that they – the colonized and colonizer – could co-exist as identities was obliterated because the black man comes not only to signify a lack or the subject of its otherment, but worse: he comes to signify inhumanity as a whole by tracing the epistemological continuance of: 1) the black man signifies his own lack and void; 2) the black man signifies his subject in the Big Other and conversely the Big Other's lack and void; 3) consequentially, the black man signifies the inhumanity of all men. The *In Dahomey* company would become aware of similar disappointment in London. After, opening night they were forced to tamper with the script in order to signpost its plot via an epigram and when calls came for the insertion of ‘cakewalking’ – an appropriated and



The Victorian

extremely convoluted subversive plantation dance – into the show (the show arrived in London without a cakewalk or a walk around) they capitulated. Also, in September of 1903, they became embroiled in a colour line debate that had sprung up on the back of their presence at the Shaftesbury. Public houses in that area notice a marked increase in black British clientele. Reports emerged of a publican who had begun to refuse people of colour from his establishment:

The public house in question ... has for some time been frequented by a number of undesirable nigger loafers, who have been attracted to the neighbourhood by the presence of the coloured company now appearing at the Shaftesbury Theatre. Their presence is particularly obnoxious to the members of that company. “They have been getting more rowdy every day,” said the manager of the house, “fighting and using bad language, until I have been obliged to refuse them.”^{xxiii}

There followed some rationale from selected publicans, dissent from one who commented that he would break the colour line and “serve anybody, no matter whether their colour is green or blue, so long as they behave themselves and pay for what they have”, he lodging of a complaint at Marlborough Street magistrates court by “a gentleman of culture and refinement...at present in this country studying our sociological conditions, a subject on which he is an authority.”^{xxiv} The gentleman in question was W.E.B. Du Bois, who was in London in 1903, but would remain anonymous throughout. Du Bois like the Williams and Walker Collective, it can be imagined, was deeply disappointed to find expectations of equality dishonoured.

Fanon is important here for many reasons, but I use him to focus on three aspects. Firstly, I believe Fanon, and then Sylvia Winter, more adequately flesh out (this pun is intentional) the predicament of the dark-skinned colonial at the Fin de Siècle and rightly radicalise and compliment Du Boisian double-consciousness.



The Victorian

Secondly, I believe this thinking explains the drive to resist the performers' socially encoded blackness and I believe it both radicalises and compliments Du Bois' attitudes and opinions regard Uplift. The ideology of 'racial uplift' and the 'uplift' movement gave voice to the desire by the black intelligentsia to uplift the spirit – which I conceptualise here as a social revolutionary stance – and profile of Black Americans and the Black American 'sociogeny'^{xxv} in the creation of a new black nationalism. Uplift and its supporters illustrated the deep class divide among blacks and black communities at the turn of the century. These were rooted in the distinctions emerging between high and lowbrow cultures in the Black community of the same sort that had resonance in white communities. And thirdly, I find Fanon, and the thinkers that followed him, to be insightful critics of the Pan African movement begun by Du Bois and utilised by the *In Dahomey* Company as the plays major plot device.

Thinkers such as Fanon are too often conceptualised as multi-cultural post-modern add-on's whereas some (Drucilla Cornell, e.g.) would argue^{xxvi} that he (Fanon) was actually the catalyst for much French post-structural thought. Fanon, and later Sylvia Wynter^{xxvii}, begin from the unalterable premise that the colonial situation is one of systematic de-humanisation. Fanon acknowledges the double-bind inherent in the colonial situation: that it is ever a situation, on both sides, of systematic de-humanisation. Furthermore, he posits that the damage to the intelligence and cognitive dissonance of the wretched^{xxviii} is historical; it cannot – after colonialisation and exploitation survive intact. It is damaged. This is a position that Spivak^{xxix} and others have acknowledged. For Fanon that 'I am Black' and 'I am I; I am human' draws first



The Victorian

from Hegel in his regard for the self-consciousness of his own negritude, but it then denies Hegel's picture of the epistemological movement from one subject to another in the Master/Slave dialectic because, Fanon argues, the phrenology of that epistemograph is presented and then negated in its very presentation – it negates itself in announcing itself. White and Black relations in colonialism are relations that defy relation because, Fanon insists, any presumed relationship between the two has no ethical humanist structure. Foucault, following Fanon, stressed that we are social encoded creatures and that culturally produced symbolic schemas are hard-wired through our brains which, in turn, sends signals of aversion and fear at the sight of an ingrained socialised experience that is programmed as aversion or, contrarily, desire. Further, as we are binaries who represent both the socially encoded subject *and* the liminal other, the only way these binaries can be resolved is in death. This means that all or any symbolic schema possesses a liminal other; it is common to all social engagement. What is most feared and harboured in every binary consciousness is chaos and death, or what Butler^{xxx} refers to as the anxiety of Lacan's *joissance* at the extreme end, where the illogical fear of the black man as killer and rapist emerges. The black other is not just representing aversion and desire, but representative of chaos and death. In the colonial encounter and, specifically, in the material that *In Dahomey* is working with, what needs repression, what has to be kept at bay and controlled, is the blackened other. Here the black man was not only what audiences had an aversion to and yet desire for, but was a subject who's very blackness ate their whiteness up; he problematised their whiteness. Cornell West would recount tales from his own experience about these socialisations. One that emphasised not just the



The Victorian

extreme fear of the binary but the negotiations the black man would go through to avoid these, was his admission that on approaching a white female crossing a street, he would hum Mozart to signal that he was a ‘safe’ black man whose sophisticated cultural signifiers would negotiate that assumed fear of the binary hard-wired into the white woman. I relate this story to the contested lack and then addition of the epigraph and the Cakewalk in *In Dahomey* which, I will argue, was a reluctant display of a popular culture signifier that marked the company as ‘safe’ and ‘popular’ rather than violent and ‘strange’.

Fanon clarifies the lineage of Du Boisian ‘Uplift’ as relative to social revolution and the Collectivist Movement – something that Rosa Luxemburg was writing about at the time of the In Dahomey tour – her “Marixist Theory and the Proletariat” was published in 1903 and her first reflections on the General Strike were published in 1905. What Luxemburg underscored in her writings on the General Strike was that justified self-interest, is no interest whatsoever. That to tie your flag to the mast of fixed ideals and never waiver from the singular vocabulary of the revolutionary cultural claims of the proletariat is to work against the larger revolution of the social and that, ultimately, these self-interested motives will diminish that struggle, overall. In a more extensive writing I would argue that the exodus of slaves from the South in a diasporic shift to the North at the end of the nineteenth century in the wake of Reconstruction could and should be seen as a General Strike of Black bodies within the United States. What I do argue here is that Du Bois appealed to the talented tenth of that diaspora to lead their brethren in the Uplift of their race. Uplift’ as a term and a movement was anchored by what Du Bois termed the ‘talented tenth’



The Victorian

of his race – that class of educated and talented blacks who opposed, as he did, Booker T. Washington’s position that by passive laborious submission the black man would slowly earn respect and capital gain. These talented of the tenth percentile, by not submitting to that inferior place and by headlining their talents would instead ‘lift up’ their citizenry within psychologically and via a hierarchy of motivational leadership.^{xxxii}

It is probable that when Du Bois attended the University of Berlin, he engaged with Luxemburg and her thoughts on social revolution. A careful reading of his *Souls of Black Folk* reveals that he is less concerned with producing a proletariat intellectual out of his brethren, than he is with producing a subaltern intellectual out of them. His revolutionary thought was that African Americans would reconstruct their own narrative with a new voice that had not yet been allowed to speak yet represented the reality of their identity formation. This would be more authentic to his people and would draw their ingrained socialised experience – what Glissant calls sociogeny^{xxxii} – into the struggle. Foucault’s description of resistance applies neatly to the complex networks of both double-consciousness and the tripartite marginal identities that the Williams and Walker collective embodied:

Points of resistance are present everywhere in the power network. Hence, there is no single locus of great refusal, no soul of revolt, source of all rebellions, or pure law of the revolutionary. Instead there is a plurality of resistances...[M]ore often one is dealing with mobile and transitory points of resistance, producing cleavages in a society that shifts about, fracturing unities and effecting regroupings, furrowing across individuals themselves... marking off irreducible regions in them, in their bodies and in their minds.^{xxxiii}

This would give rise to a more authentic revolution. Authentic revolution brings the social into existence. It means that you do not have an objective truth outside of



The Victorian

subjective reason. Class-consciousness does not emerge when you ‘learn your position’ but when you enact it or experience it and can then verbalise it.^{xxxiv} It is from here you can implement an epistemological performance and change something from the point of knowing it. *This* was the real performative event taking place on stage at the Shaftesbury and in the work of the *In Dahomey* Collective: the epistemological performance of resistance that made its audience uncomfortable because it hinted at something revolutionary. Ardent would take the idea of social revolution further by (echoing Hegel) saying that humans on the two sides of the dialectic can only encounter each other in violence and destruction^{xxxv}. Therefore, the black revolutionary struggle must be a violent encounter; a complete obliteration of what obliterated the black social in the first place. Freedom involves a violent struggle. But how ‘violent’ was *In Dahomey*? If it was violent it was certainly only epistemologically so.

Overwhelmingly, they were insinuating that a return to (or of) the land might just be necessary to recoup the “I” in “I am black”; “I am human”. Not just because a need exists to return land that was stolen – but because without land, there can be no humanity and no productive means for economic existence. The right to reclaim land, said Mgobo Moore^{xxxvi}, is inseparable from the right to be human or the right to life. When you move the concept of being human in the Kantian sense from an epistemological to a practical philosophy, it allows for the revolutionary, it de-centers and it permits resistance. You cannot think “human” outside the revolutionary struggle because the human has never been truly allowed to exist. There is no ‘relationality between the Colonised and the Coloniser. Relationality, as Glissant



The Victorian

coined it, is the way we relate to each other in a socio-symbolic schema. Slavery, for Glissant, was the tearing down of relationality and the *In DaHomey* company, it could be argued, formed their own relationality out of what remained after slavery. Caryl Phillips certainly does this in his well-research fictionalised account of the Williams and Walker relationship.^{xxxvii} Cornel West considers^{xxxviii} that the whole of Harlem did this. But in performing these ideas of repatriation on stage at the Shaftesbury, Caliban was presenting himself to a sea of Prospero's as human^{xxxix}. And the audience found this strange.

My thoughts are that, in no small way, the *InDahomey* Collective behaved in similar ways to contemporaneous worker collectives and communes and acted out their own revolution on the stage at the Shaftesbury with their performances. I think there is a relationship to be drawn between these politicised citizens of Harlem's Renaissance and communist collectives. Their struggle; their revolution was truly a socialist one where diverse interests were approached by individuals fighting singular battles for the good of the whole. Their epistemological and actual performances of resistance, Uplift of their race, and the Pan African ideal of repatriation could be seen as an epigram of a 'new ethnicity' of the type Hall speculates on as having a third position, "one which locates itself *inside* a continuous struggle and politics around black representation, but which then is able to open up a continuous critical discourse about themes, about the forms of representation, the subjects of representation, above all, the regimes of representation."^{xl} Often the riddle of an epigram could operate as or signal an *epitaph* and my suggestion here is that, as cultural texts, the *In Dahomey* Collective and the Harlem Renaissance might be viewed as epigrams to the Black



The Victorian

Power movement that would occur later in the century. This epigram and the movement's epitaph might be borrowed from the bourgeois critique of all revolutions: that they are all, in some way failures; and from Žižek's reduction of Samuel Beckett^{xli} in speaking of Communism: Try, Try again, Fail again, Fail better.

ⁱ "The Strangeness of *In Dahomey*" from "The Drama" in *The London Times*, 23 October 1903.

ⁱⁱ "The Strangeness of *In Dahomey*" from "The Drama" in *The London Times*, 23 October 1903.

ⁱⁱⁱ I am referring here to both the 'Uplift of the Negro Race', as Du Bois heralded it, and Pan-Africanism reticent at the turn of the 20th century, not the black nationalism of the mid-century. For critical discussions of these see: Johnson, James Weldon. *Black Manhattan*. Alfred A. Knopf: New York, 1930; Bracey, John H., *Black Nationalism in America*. Bobbs-Merrill Company: New York, 1970; Geiss, Imanuel. *The Pan-African Movement: A History of Pan-Africanism in America, Europe and Africa*. Africana Publishing: New York, 1971, translated from the original, *Panafrikanismus. Zur Geschichte der Dekolonisation*. Frankfurt am Main: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1968.

^{iv} Walker, George and Bert Williams. *Variety*, 14 December 1907.

^v Caryl Phillips presumes as much, drawing from comments made by Walker, in his fictionalized account of their rise to fame. Phillips, Caryl. *Dancing in the Dark*. London: Secker and Warburg, 2005. Henceforth, Phillips, *Dancing*.

^{vi} Green, Jeffrey P. "In Dahomey in London in 1903" in *The Black Perspective in Music*, Vol. 11, No. 1, Spring 1983, pp. 22 – 40.

^{vii} Ibid.

^{viii} Brooks, Daphne. "Alien/Nation" in *Bodies in Dissent: Spectacular Performances of Race and Freedom, 1850 - 1910*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, p. 208. (Henceforth, Brooks, *Bodies in Dissent*)

^{ix} "The Drama" in *The St. James Gazette*, 19 May 1903.

^x Smith, Eric Ledell *Bert Williams: A Biography of the Pioneer Black Comedian*. London: McFarland, 1992, p. 69.

^{xi} *The Daily Mail*, 18 May 1903.

^{xii} Brooks, *Bodies in Dissent*, p. 210.

^{xiii} Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks* (1952) Charles Lamm Markmann (trans.) London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1968.

^{xiv} DuBois, W.E.B. (William Edward Burghart) *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903) London: Archibald Constable & Co., 1905, p. 5.

^{xv} Ibid, 3.

^{xvi} Cooks, Leda and Elizabeth Fullon. "The (In)visible Whiteness of Being: Stories of Selves in Sojourn" in *Intercultural Alliances: Critical Transformations*, Vol. 20, International Intercultural Communications Annual, London: Sage, 2002: 137 – 165,



141; See also, James Clifford, “Travelling Cultures” in *Cultural Studies*, (Laurence Grossberg et.al., eds.) New York: Routledge, 1992, 96 – 116.

^{xvii} Ibid.

^{xviii} Girkandi, Simon. *Maps of Englishness: Writing Identity in the Culture of Colonialism*. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996, p. 8.

^{xix} It bears notation that before their success in the States and abroad with *In Dahomey*, the William’s and Walker Collective had produced *The Sons of Ham* in 1900, which approached this myth in the same subversive manner that *In Dahomey* approached repatriation.

^{xx} *The Times*. 23 October 1903.

^{xxi} Phillips, *Dancing*, p. 100.

^{xxii} W.E.B. Du Bois, *Writings*, (Nathan Huggins, ed.) New York: Library of America, 1986, p. 821.

^{xxiii} *Weekly Dispatch*, 13 September 1903.

^{xxiv} *Westminster Gazette*, 09 September 1903.

^{xxv} Sociogeny is a term borrowed from Glissant and which he comprises to refer to the whole of society operating in a particular hegemony that is differentiated from Bourdieu’s habitus in its power structure. Glissant, Edouard. *Caribbean Discourse, Selected Essays*. (J. Michael Dash, trans. and introduction) Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1989.

^{xxvi} Cornell reminds us that because Fanon postulated, in 1952, that the social symbolic order was an episteme, but one that is fully encoded in racial discourse. In this sense Foucault could be argued to have been led by Fanon, long before the glut of French thinkers were really up and writing. Cornell, Drucilla. *Moral Images of Freedom: a future for Critical Theory*. Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield, 2008. She refers to Paget in this. Paget, Henry. *Caliban’s Reason, Introducing Afro-Caribbean Philosophy*. New York: Routledge, 2000, see esp. “The African Philosophical Heritage”, 21 – 46 and “Caribbean Marxisms: After the Neoliberal and Linguistic Turns”, 221 – 246.

^{xxvii} Wynter, Sylvia. “The Ceremony Must be Found: After Humanism” in *Boundary 2*, Vol. 12/13 On Humanism and the University 1: The Discourse of Humanism in two parts, Vol. 12, No. 3, Spring and Vol. 13, No. 1 Autumn, 1984, pp. 19 - 70. See also: Paget, Henry, *The Future of the Post-colonial Subject: Sylvia Wynter and Wilson Harris*. ASNEL conference paper at the “Bridges across chasms towards a transcultural future in Caribbean literature” conference in Aachen, Germany and Liege, Belgium, May 2000, pp. 27-38; and Henry, Paget. “Sylvia Wynter: Poststructuralism and Postcolonial Thought” in *Caliban’s Reason, Introducing Afro-Caribbean Philosophy*. New York: Routledge, 2000, pp. 117 – 143.

^{xxviii} I am referring here to: Fanon, Frantz, *Wretched of this Earth*, (1954) London: MacGibbon and Kee, [n.d.], but he carries on this argument in: Fanon, Frantz. “Unity and Effective Solidarity Are the Conditions for African Liberation” in *Toward the African Revolution, Political Essays* (Haakon Chevalier, trans.) New York: Grove Press. 1964 and Fanon, Frantz. “This is the Voice of Algeria” in *A Dying Colonialism*. New York: Grove Press, 1965.



The Victorian

^{xxix} Spivak, Gayatri C., et. al. “The Ethical Affirmation of Human Rights: Gayatri Spivak’s Intervention.” in (P. Chaterjee, et. al. eds.) *Can the Subaltern Speak: Reflections on the History of an Idea*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2009, pp. 100 – 116. Drawing on her original: Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. “Can the Subaltern Speak?” in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, ed., Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (London: Macmillan, 1988): 271 – 313, and see also: Spivak, Gayatri. Response in *Interventions: international journal of postcolonial studies*. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's "Critique of postcolonial reason: toward a history of the vanishing present ", New York: 2000, 2002, pp. 205-211.

^{xxx} Prevalent through much of her work, but see esp.: Butler, Judith. *Antigone’s Claim: Kinship between Life and Death*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.

^{xxxi} Patricia Hill Collins, “Like One of the Family: Race, Ethnicity and the Paradox of US National Identity” in *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24:1, January, 2001, pp. 3 – 28.

^{xxxii} See: D. Marriot. *Inventions of Resistance: Sylvia Wynter, Frantz Fanon, Sociogeny, and “the Damned”* in *CR: The New Centennial Review*, Vol. 11, No. 3, 2011, pp. 45 – 90

^{xxxiii} Foucault, Michel, *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction* (Robert Hurley, trans.) Vol. 1, New York: Vintage, 1990, pp. 95 – 96.

^{xxxiv} Lukács, George. *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist dialectics*. (Rodney Livingstone, trans.) London: Merlin Press, 1971.

^{xxxv} Ardent, Hannah. *Thinking in dark times : Hannah Arendt on ethics and politics*. (Roger Berkowitz, Jeffrey Katz, and Thomas Keenan, eds.), New York : Fordham University Press, 2010.

^{xxxvi} Mgobo Moore, as interviewed on *NPR* (National Public Radio)’s “South Africans Struggle to Reclaim ‘Promised Land’” 07 July 2010.

^{xxxvii} Phillips, *Dancing*.

^{xxxviii} This is an often recounted anecdote used by West to emphasis his philosophy on race and pragmatism in the United States. See, for example: Cynthia Willett, “Laughing to keep from Crying: Cornel West, Pragmatism, and Progressive Comedy” in *Irony in the Age of Empire: Comic Perspectives in the age of Democracy and Freedom*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008.

^{xxxix} I am referencing Paget here: Paget, Henry. “Pan-Africanism and Philosophy: Race, Class and Development” in *Caliban’s Reason, Introducing Afro-Caribbean Philosophy*. New York: Routledge, 2000, pp. 197 – 220.

^{xl} Hall, Stuart, “New Ethnicities” in *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, eds. David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen New York: Routledge, 1996, 448, emphasis, in the original.

^{xli} The full quote is: “All of old. Nothing else ever. Ever tried. Ever failed. No matter. Try again. Fail again. Fail better.” Samuel Beckett, *Worstward Ho!*, 1983, which, in itself, was a prose response to Thomas Dekker and Charles Kingsley’s, *Westward Ho! On a sociable; or, The adventures of two Socialist brothers in the track of the setting sun*. *By the Guard*. London: Iliffe & Sone, 1883. Žižek, Slavoj. “Multiculturalism, or, the Cultural Logic of Multinational Capitalism”, *New Left Review*, 225, Sept./Oct. 1997, pp. 28 – 51.