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Abstract

Six years after assuming the presidency of a newly independent Senegal, Leopold Sédar Senghor, with the support of UNESCO, convened the First World Festival of Negro Arts and Culture in Dakar held from April 1-24, 1966. The Dakar Festival was Senghor's attempt to highlight the development of his country and “his” philosophy, Négritude. Margaret Danner, a Afro-North American poet from Chicago and attendee of the Festival referred to him as “a modern African artist, as host; / a word sculpturer (sic), strong enough to amass / the vast amount of exaltation needed to tow his followers through / the Senegalese sands, toward their modern rivers and figures of gold.” For Danner and many other Black cultural workers in North America, the prospects of attending an international festival on the African continent intimated that cultural unity among Africans and Afro-descendants was rife with possibility. What is more, for a brief historical juncture, Senghor and his affiliates were able to posit Négritude as a viable philosophical model in which to realize this unity. However, upon critical reflection, a number of the Black cultural workers who initially championed the Dakar Festival came to express consternation at the behind the scenes machinations which severely weakened the “lovely dream” of “Pan-Africa.”
Following Senegal’s independence from France in 1960, the poet-statesman Leopold Sédar Senghor became the county’s first African president. He subsequently established Négritude and “African socialism” as the cultural, political, and economic ideologies of his government.¹ Six years after assuming the presidency of Senegal, Senghor, with the support of UNESCO, convened the First World Festival of Negro Arts and Culture in Dakar held from April 1-24, 1966. The Dakar Festival was Senghor’s attempt to highlight the development of his country and “his” philosophy, Négritude, by bringing together people of African descent from around the globe. Margaret Danner, a Afro-North American poet from Chicago and attendee of the Festival referred to him as “a modern African artist, as host; / a word sculpturer (sic), strong enough to amass / the vast amount of exaltation needed to tow his followers through / the Senegalese sands, toward their modern rivers and figures of gold.”² For Danner and many other Black cultural workers in North America and elsewhere, the prospects of attending an international festival on the African continent intimated that cultural unity among Africans and Afro-descendants was rife with possibility. What is more, for a brief historical juncture, Senghor and his affiliates were able to posit Négritude as a viable philosophical model in which to realize this Pan African unity.³

Brent Hayes Edwards’ The Practice of Diaspora (2003) documents the post-World War I international linkages between Africans and Afro-descendants in the Franco-phone Caribbean, Paris, and North America, which resulted in the formation of the Négritude movement. He suggests that Paris served as “a special sort of vibrant, cosmopolitan space for interaction … boundary crossing, conversations, and collaborations.”⁴ It was within this cosmopolitan space that Pan African connections were established between partisans of the New Negro Renaissance from the United States and francophone speakers from Africa and the Caribbean. Much of the impetus behind the Négritude movement can be found in the early publications of Aimé Césaire, Léopold Senghor, and Leon Damas in L’Étudiant noir (1934) and later Présence Africaine (1947), as well as the literary expression of Langston Hughes in North America and Nicolás Guillén in Cuba. However, equally essential to the formulation of the movement was the cultural and political work of Paulette and Jane Nardal, two Martinican women residing in France during the 1920s. In fact, T. Denean Sharpley-Whiting’s (2002) important study on the Nardal sisters and Suzanne Césaire, the wife of Aimé Césaire, documents the genealogy of Afro-Caribbean women creative intellectuals in the articulation of Négritudist and Pan African cultural politics.⁵ Moreover, Sharpley-Whiting and Edwards each point out that in addition to translating Alain Locke’s The New Negro (1925) into French, the Nardal sisters also wrote numerous essays exploring the complex interaction between race, place, and gender experienced by Afro-descendant women in France. According to Edwards, Jane Nardal initially asserted the centrality of Black women in constructing and codifying racial consciousness, which ultimately resulted in Négritude:
Until the Colonial Exposition, the coloured women living alone in the metropolis have certainly been less favoured than coloured men who are content with a certain easy success. Long before the latter, they have felt the need of a racial solidarity that would not be merely material. They were thus aroused to race consciousness. The feeling of uprooting which they experienced…was the starting point of their evolution. 

Later Paulette Nardal would suggest that Jane “was the first ‘promoter of this movement of ideas, so broadly exploited later,’ and that Senghor and Césaire ‘took up the ideas tossed out by us and expressed them with more flash and brio…[W]e were but women, real pioneers—let’s say that we blazed the trail for them.”

Even though the Nardal sisters were genealogical foremothers of Négritude, Aimé Césaire did not codify the term until 1939, in his poem “Cahier d’un retour au pays natal” (“Notebook of a Return to The Native Land”). Originally, the French word “Negre” had the same connotation as the English pejorative “n*gger,” however, Césaire succeeded in transforming it into a “positive” signifier of Francophone Afro-Diasporic identity:

my Négritude is not a stone, its deafness dashed against
the clamor of the day
my Négritude is not an opaque spot of dead water/ on the dead eye of the earth
my Négritude is neither a tower nor a cathedral
it plunges into the red flesh of the soil
it plunges into the ardent fresh of the sky
it pierces opaque prostration with its upright patience.

In this stanza, Césaire establishes that Négritude cannot be reduced to static objects, such as stones, dead water, a tower nor a cathedral, but instead it is an active, living subject that plunges, pierces and has patience. Robin D.G. Kelley (1999) asserts that Césaire’s Discourse on Colonialism (1953) is an attempt by the poet-activist to synthesize his variants of Négritude, Marxism, and Surrealism into a “poetics of anti-colonialism.” Césaire would later build upon his socio-historical rendering of the ideology: “Negritude is not a philosophy. / Negritude is not a metaphysics. / Negritude is not a pretentious conception of the universe. / It is a way of living a history within history.” Nick Nesbitt (2003) argues “Césaire’s original conception sees the specificity and unity of black existence as a historically developing phenomenon that arose through the highly contingent events of the African slave trade and New World plantation system.” However, he notes that Senghor, who intellectually supplanted Césaire as the primary exponent of Négritude, posited an “essentialist interpretation” that “argues for an unchanging core or essence to black existence.”
Senghor, Césaire, Damas and other members of the Société Africaine du Culture engaged many of their ideas on Négritude at two international Black writers’ conferences in Paris (1956) and Rome (1959). In addition to the African delegates: Alioune Diop, Cheikh-Anta Diop, Leopold Senghor, Paul Hazoume, Thomas Ekollo, E.L Lasebikan, and Jacques Rabemananjara, numerous writers from the United States and the Caribbean were also in attendance, such as Richard Wright, Césaire, George Lamming, Horace Mann Bond, Jacques Alexis, John Davis, William Thomas Fontaine, Jean Prince-Mars, James Baldwin, James W. Ivy, Chester Himes, Mercer Cook and Frantz Fanon. Even though Négritudists and other cultural nationalist tendencies dominated the writers’ congresses, a handful of African and Afro-descendant Marxists and left nationalists posed ideological challenges at the proceedings. Speeches like Fanon’s “Racism and Culture” in 1956 and “Reciprocal Bases of National Culture and the Fight for Freedom” in 1959; Wright’s “Tradition and Industrialization” in 1956; and Alexis’s “On the Marvelous Realism of the Haitians,” in 1956 each highlighted the shortcomings of Négritude and cultural nationalism. Even the “preamble” of the Second Congress of Negro Writers and Artists expressed that “political independence and economic liberation are the essential conditions for the cultural advance of the underdeveloped countries in general and the Negro-African countries in particular.”

One of the most vocal critiques of Senghor’s interpretation of Négritude came from Afro-North American writer Richard Wright. Although Négritude was the dominant philosophy driving the two congresses, in “Négritude, Afrocentricism, and Black Atlanticism,” Adeleke Adeeko explores the differences in the conceptualization of “African culture” that ensued between Senghor and Wright. Adeeko suggests that Senghor intended Négritude to be a “black meta-hermeneutics” and “existential ontology,” which asserts that the black person is a being with open senses, with no intermediary between subject and object, himself at one the subject and object…Stimulated, he responds to the call and abandons himself, going from subject to object from me to Thee on the vibrations of the Other: he is not assimilated: he assimilates himself with the other, which is the best road to knowledge.

Senghor also sought to dispel the notion that his articulation of Négritude somehow proposed that Blacks were without reason. Conversely, he argued,

the Negro is not devoid of reason, as I am supposed to have said. But his reason is not discursive: it is synthetic. It is not antagonistic: it is sympathetic. It is another form of knowledge. The Negro reason does not impoverish things, it does not mold them into rigid patterns by eliminating roots and the sap: it flows in the arteries of things, it weds all their contours to dwell at the living heart of the real. While reason is analytic through utilization: Negro reason is intuitive through participation.
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In responding to Senghor’s “black ontology,” Wright criticized what he viewed as the irrationality of holding onto African spirituality and tradition, which he viewed as being in opposition to “progress” and the Enlightenment. Despite having already repudiated his ties to the Communist Party, Wright’s rejoinder is very much an historical materialist reading of race; for instance, he pondered: “Can a way be found to merge the rational areas and rational personnel of Europe with those of Asia and Africa? How can the curtains of race, color, religion, and tradition—all of which hamper man’s mastery of his environment—be collectively rolled back by free men of the West and non-West?” He also felt that Senghor’s postulation about an “African Negro culture” was inherently essentialist:

I wonder where do I, an American Negro, conditioned by the harsh industrial, abstract force of the Western world that has used stern, political prejudices against the society (which [Senghor] has so brilliantly elucidated)—where do I stand in relation to that culture? If I were of another colour or another race, I could say, ‘All this is very exotic, but it is not directly related to me”, and I could let it go at that. I can not. The modern world has cast us both in the same mould. I am black and he is black; I am an American and he is French, and so, there you are. And yet there is a schism in our relationship, not political but profoundly human…Is it possible for me to find a working and organic relationship with [the culture]? I don’t condemn it. I am questioning and asking: Might not the vivid and beautiful culture that Senghor has described not been—I speak carefully, choosing my words with the utmost caution, speaking to my colleagues, hoping that you will understand my intensions—might not that beautiful culture have been a fifth column a corps of saboteurs and spies of Europe?

It is clear that Wright is restating the Du Boisian notion of “double consciousness” in this passage: the difficulty of being of African descent and American. However, where Du Bois’ “two-ness” derived from the strife of being a Black American, Wright is questioning how he relates to Senghor’s meta-African culture unbounded by history and geography. Moreover, he goes further to suggest that the “beautiful culture that Senghor has described” may have aided in the subjugation of Africa by Europe. For Wright, any articulation of Pan African culture must recognize the historical and spatial diversity of Black people caused by enslavement, colonialism and imperialism. In addition, he was not opposed to adapting values and knowledge from the West to further develop Afro-Diasporic cultural identity.

Despite this and other ideological challenges, by the early 1960s, Senghor had become the primary exponent of Négritude. In doing so, he tended to emphasize the cultural aspects of African subjectivity at the expense of political and economic considerations. This was evident in both the methods in which Senghor led Senegal, as well as in the marginal “support” he gave to liberation struggles on the African continent and elsewhere.
Moreover, the privileging of culture was particularly apparent at the Festival in Dakar. One account of the event actually described it as a chance for Africans to disregard “the trials and tribulations of nation-building to rejoice for a while in their unique and rich cultural achievements.”\textsuperscript{20} Here, it is important to realize that the joint sponsorship of the Senegalese government, SAC, and UNESCO, as well as the “select” participation of African and Afro-descendant entertainers, had a delimiting effect on the articulation of radical Pan Africanism and the burgeoning international Black Arts movement.\textsuperscript{21}

Although Richard Wright and many other Black radicals remained relatively silent about the Dakar Festival, Hoyt Fuller and his \textit{Negro Digest} would become one of the main supporters of the event in North America. In fact, he published numerous “calls” in the journal with the hopes of mobilizing Afro-North American participation. In the August 1965 issue of \textit{Negro Digest}, Fuller printed the prospectus of the Association for the World Festival of Negro Arts, describing the four objectives of the event:

\begin{itemize}
\item To advance international and interracial understanding;
\item To permit Negro artists throughout the world to return periodically to the sources of their art;
\item To make known the contributions of what President Senghor has termed “Négritude”; a Negro’s pride in his race and a recognition of the Negro’s unique creative ability based on his African heritage;
\item To make it possible for Negro artists to meet and demonstrate their talents to publishers, impresarios, film producers and other members of the international art world, who can provide them with the necessary outlets.\textsuperscript{22}
\end{itemize}

While each of these objectives was important, nowhere did the prospectus discuss politics or African liberation as they related to cultural development. What makes the lack of emphasis around political struggle and anti-colonialism even more problematic is the fact that four months prior to the Festival, the Organization of Solidarity of the Peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America (OSPAAL), also known as the Tri-Continental Solidarity Conference occurred in Cuba, strengthening the non-aligned and anti-imperialist-oriented Third World movement.\textsuperscript{23} Moreover, in February of 1966, one of the leaders of continental Pan Africanism, Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, was overthrown in a military coup by Western-backed forces.\textsuperscript{24}

It is not completely surprising that Senghor remained mute about Ghana because even before the neo-colonialist ousting of Nkrumah, the Senegalese and Ghanaian leaders had divergent ideas about the best path to African unity. As early as 1961, a serious fracture had occurred within the continental Pan African movement with the Casablanca-Monrovia split.
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The former group (Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Morocco, Egypt, and Algeria) advocated armed struggle, anti-imperialism, and variations of Marxism-Leninism to liberate Africa and create a Pan African continent, while the latter group—originally the known as the Brazzaville group—(Congo-Brazzaville, Senegal, Côte d’Ivoire, Cameroon, Madagascar, Benin, Chad, Niger, Burkina Faso, Central African Republic, The Gabon, Libya; and later adding the Congo (Kinshasa), Ethiopia, Liberia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Togo, and Tunisia) maintained a gradualist approach to decolonization. What is more, the left-leaning Casablanca group accused the more conservative Monrovia group of accommodating neo-colonialism by maintaining economic ties to Western countries. With the exception of Ghana, all the other Casablanca members represented Muslim states and Egypt, Morocco, and Algeria were Arab countries, which further complicated matters.25 This split had serious repercussions for the general Pan African movement that was somewhat diffused at the founding of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in 1963. Nonetheless, at the time of the Dakar Festival in 1966, ideological and tactical differences remained acrimonious.26

Seeking to circumvent the conflict, organizers of the Festival did not want to engage political issues, focusing solely on cultural expression. The Festival Association established the event’s exhibitions and performances around visual art, literature, film, dance, plays, and music, as well as a colloquium on the function of Negro Art. Conveying the impression that the Festival was little more than an African Cultural Olympiad, however, the organizers offered prizes to the best work of art in each category. The Festival Association also sought to highlight the “cosmopolitan” aspects of Dakar by labeling it the “crossroads that links Europe, America and the whole of Africa.” Ironically, while the aims of the Festival were to build unity among African and Afro-descendant performers by illustrating the cultural developments of newly independent nations, much of the impetus behind the event became legitimizing Africa in the eyes of their former European colonial regimes.27

Upon being elected as the president of the Festival Association, Alioune Diop, a Senegalese writer and co-founder of Présence Africaine along with Senghor, limited participation at the Festival to nation-states. Thus, there was no representation of African liberation movements, the Afro-North American delegation had to get approval from the U.S. State Department to attend, and the Festival Association denied exiled Afro-Brazilian writer Abdias do Nascimento entrance into the event because he was not a member of the “official” Brazilian delegation. Later that year, Nascimento responded to his exclusion with an “Open Letter to the First World Festival of Negro Arts,” which chastised the Festival Association for allowing white Brazilians to represent Afro-Brazilian culture at the event.28 In an equally ironic move, although the vice-president of the North American Committee was John A. Davis of the American Society of African Culture, the president of the delegation was a Euro-American woman named H. Alwynn Innes-Brown.
As head of the American National Theater and Academy and a consultant to the Bureau of Education and Cultural Affairs of the State Department, she served as a gatekeeper between prospective participants and the U.S. government. Though Richard Pritchard, a Black classically trained musician and other Afro-North American artists protested AMSAC and the State Department’s imposition of Innes-Brown on the North American Committee, Senghor and Diop supported the U.S. government’s decisions.

Despite the fact that the U.S. government was initially reluctant to endorse an event that championed Négritude, a concept some officials perceived as “separatist,” the U.S. State Department gave the North American Committee $150,000 for travel expenses believing that the Festival could improve the “Cold War” image of the United States in Africa. In addition, Adlai Stevens, U.S. Ambassador to the UN and President Lyndon B. Johnson’s wife were named “honorary” members of the committee, insuring that the government had direct influence over who would “represent” Afro-North America. Only a handful of elite and “safe” Black American politicos and entertainers served on the committee, such as Ralph Bunche, Mercer Cook, Alvin Ailey, Marian Anderson, Fred O’Neal, Leontyne Price, Sidney Poitier, Hale Woodruff, Ossie Davis, Duke Ellington, Langston Hughes, Arthur Mitchell, and William Warfield. It should come at no surprise therefore that the North American Committee deemed few of the younger generation of Black writers and artists aligned with the burgeoning Black Arts/Power movements appropriate to represent Afro-North Americans in Senegal.

Not allowing the apparent cooptation of the North American Committee by the State Department to deter him, Hoyt Fuller continued to publicize the Dakar Festival hoping to encourage Black Americans to attend the event of their own accord. In “Festival Time in Dakar,” from the April 1966 issue of Negro Digest, Fuller reiterated many of the aims and objectives of the Festival printed in the earlier article. He also spoke approvingly of Senghor, believing that the event signified a moment of real Pan African solidarity and possibility. “Like most serious African leaders,” Fuller wrote, “President Senghor is concerned with Africa’s achievement of genuine power and consequence in the world, and he feels that the edifice of African power and consequence must be build on a base of cultural security” (68). He went on to quote Senghor who claimed that the Festival marked the emergence of an “era of cultural independence” for Africa (69). However, culture was over-determined by Senghor and members of the Festival Association and they muted any real deliberation of political struggle. In the context of neo-colonialism and imperialism, moreover, cultural “independence” was acceptable, as long as Western economic expropriation of Senegal’s and other African countries’ natural resources persisted.
Prior to assuming the editorship of Negro Digest in 1961, Fuller had spent considerable time traveling between Guinea and Senegal, which gave him intimate knowledge of West Africa. In contrast to his more cynical portrayals of Senegal in Journey to Africa (1971), though, at the time of the Dakar Festival, he highlighted what he perceived as the “positive” aspects of the city. Depicting the downtown area of Dakar as “French-flavored” and still heavily populated by French citizens, he claimed that although most Senegalese could not afford to live there, the city was relatively free from racial segregation. Fuller ironically asserted that the French colonial regime was “less racist than the British,” so Europeans in Dakar constructed their settlement “villas” adjacent to “African huts” (78). These statements illustrate the highly questionable nature of “independence” experienced by the masses of Senegalese, where the French still economically and physically controlled their capital city over five years after the “end” of overt colonial rule. Furthermore, the country’s “Minister of Finance” remained a French bureaucrat, meaning the former colonialists controlled the most basic considerations of economic development (78). As the Festival commenced, these contradictions would be made apparent to many Afro-North Americans who traveled from the United States.33

AMSAC charted a plane that took over one hundred artists, writers, and intellectuals to Dakar for the 25-day Festival. Some of the major artists who performed at the event were jazz legend Duke Ellington, poets Langston Hughes and Margaret Danner, novelist Rosa Guy, vocalist Marian Anderson, gospel singer Marion Williams, dancer-choreographers Katherine Dunham and Alvin Ailey, visual artist Hale Woodruff, actor Fred O’Neal, Leonard De Paur and his choir, and classical pianist Armenta Adams (other performers originally scheduled to attend were Louis Armstrong, Ella Fitzgerald, and Mahalia Jackson). The Festival also awarded the Grand Prize for poetry by a person of African descent written in English to Robert Hayden, for his volume of poems A Ballad of Remembrance (1962). Ironically, at the same time that he was receiving accolades for his poetic verse in Dakar, Hayden was at the First Fisk Writers Conference refuting the notion that he was a “Negro poet.” Further demonstrating his contempt for racial solidarity, he admonished those assembled at Fisk, “Let’s quit saying we’re black writers writing to black folks—it has been given importance it should not have.”34

None of the official events sanctioned by the Festival Association nor the North American Committee featured the performances or voices of artists affiliated with the New Jazz, Rhythm & Blues, or Black Arts movements. The sole representative of the nascent Black Arts movement recognized for his work at the Festival was Amiri Baraka (then LeRoi Jones). He received second prize in the drama competition for his semi-autobiographical play The Slave (1962), written three years prior to his move uptown with the founding of BARTS.35 Only a handful of progressive creative intellectuals associated with the “new” Black Consciousness movements in North America were even able to attend the Festival and other events throughout Dakar, such as Jamaican poet-novelist Lindsay Barrett, Hoyt Fuller, poets Sarah Webster Fabio and Keorapetse Kgositsile. Upon return to the United States, many of these individuals would detail the undesirable machinations of the event and how little in the way of actual Pan African solidarity took place.
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By far, the performances, art exhibitions, and prize ceremonies were the major emphases of the Festival. Nonetheless, UNESCO and SAC also organized a philosophical and theoretical component with the eight-day Colloquium on Negro Art. It consisted of scholarly papers and presentations concerning “African Traditions,” “The Meeting of Negro Art with the West,” and “The Problems of Modern African Art.” Allegedly organized to discursively illustrate the “function and meaning of African Negro art in the life of the people and for the people,” the conference mainly revolved around defending Négritude. Even though this was one of the initial objectives for the Festival, few dissenting voices were heard over the span of the colloquium. In contrast, the two earlier writers’ conferences convened in Paris and Rome by Présence Africaine featured papers by a number of creative intellectuals who challenged Senghor on the utility and tenability of Négritude, from Richard Wright, Frantz Fanon, and James Baldwin, to Jacques Alexis and René Depestre.36

Even the Nigerian playwright Wole Soyinka, who was widely recognized for his comments that “The tiger knows that it is a tiger, but it does not go about prattling about its tigertude,” steered clear of open criticism in his presentation “Modern Negro-African Theatre.” Although the New York Times, one of the few North American media outlets to cover the Festival, ran an article proclaiming, “Debate on ‘Négritude ’ Splits Festival in Dakar,” the only vocal opposition to the orthodoxy of the concept was choreographer Katherine Dunham, who questioned the need to apply any “labels” to her work. Therefore, as President of the Republic of Senegal and de facto “king” of the First World Festival of Negro Arts and Culture, Senghor ensured that Négritude would dominate the theoretical itinerary of the conference.37

The Colloquium commenced with his presentation of “The Defense and Illustration of Négritude,” republished in the September 1966 issue of Negro Digest. Throughout much of his paper, Senghor attempted to challenge critics of the concept, especially those who defined it as little more than “racism in reverse,” by suggesting that it was actually an “elaboration of a new humanism which this time will include the totality of humanity on the planet Earth.” This would be a point that Senghor had made numerous times previously, beginning in the 1950s, which moved away from his earlier postulations that Négritude illustrated the innate racial differences between “Europeans”—whom he claimed were primarily rationalist and “Negro” Africans—whom he claimed were mainly intuitive.38 Now, Senghor was convinced that Négritude constituted an essential element of the “civilization of the universal,” and without it, there could be no claims to human universality. He suggested that this mythic “new humanism” would emerge through “complementarily...dialogue and interchange, not of opposition or racial hatred.”39
One major distinction that Senghor continued to make between Europeans and Africans was that though the former had finally begun to acknowledge the contributions of African art and culture to human civilization, they did so through defining it, while Africans, by and large, “preferred to live it.” Applying a cultural nationalist reading of human existence, Senghor also contended that it was from the realm of culture, and by extension, art, that economic and social development sprang. Referring to art in terms of “the production of material goods and spiritual goods,” he asserted:

When I speak of Négritude, I am referring to a civilization where art is at once technique and vision, handicrafts and prophecy; where art expresses, in the words of Ogotemmeli: “the identity of material gestures and spiritual forces.”

Unfortunately, nowhere in his speech did Senghor reference the effects that colonialism, imperialism, or capitalism had on the manifestation of contemporary African art and culture. To believe that the years of colonial rule would somehow be wiped away, simply by returning to pre-colonial cultural practices was highly ahistorical and impolitic. What made his paper even more problematic was the fact that by attempting to construct a “universal humanism” that did not take into account the continued economic and political exploitation of Africa by Europe and the United States (both countries ironically possessing large quantities of the African art showcased at the Festival) aided by corrupt African elites allied with the West, Senghor could only posit dialogue as the remedy to the unrelenting socio-cultural imbalances.

A paper presented by the venerable Afro-North American poet Langston Hughes drew parallels between Négritude and the concept of Soul coming into vogue among Black Americans at the time. His speech titled, “Black Writers in a Troubled World” declared that the core ingredient of both concepts has “roots deep in the beauty of black people.” Hughes delineated Soul as

the essence of Negro folk art redistilled—particularly the old music and its flavor, the ancient basic beat out of Africa, the folk rhymes and Ashanti stories—all expressed in contemporary ways so emotionally colored with the old that it gives a distinctly Negro flavor to today’s music, painting, and writing.

Although many younger participants of the Black Arts movement would agree with Hughes’ articulation of Soul, his definition, as Senghor’s Négritude, clarified little in the relationship of culture to political economy or anti-imperialism. Moreover, Hughes had choice words for the “new” generation of Afro-North American cultural workers. Engaging the turmoil occurring in the United States between the civil rights and emergent Black nationalist movements, he described the new militant writers, epitomized by Amiri Baraka, as “America’s prophets of doom, black ravens cawing over carrion.”
He also questioned the tactics by which they condemned the racism and decadence of the United States government, suggesting that they stooped to “shocking white readers with bad language rather than with bad facts.” Interestingly enough, a year prior to the Festival, Hughes made many of these claims in a review of Baraka’s plays The Toilet and The Slave published in The New York Post. In that review he suggested,

I gather that contemporary Negro playwrights do not like anybody any more – neither their stage characters, their audiences, their mothers, nor themselves. For poetry in theater, some of them substitute bad language, obscenities of the foulest sort, and basic filth which seemingly is intended to evoke the sickest of reactions in an audience.

Pronouncing the generational rift between he and Baraka, Hughes belittled the younger writer by referring to him as the “white-haired black boy of American poetry,” who if was able to control his use of profanities could possibly become “America’s new Eugene O’Neill” (emphasis mine). It is ironic, however, that Hughes would make this assertion considering Baraka’s essay “The Revolutionary Black Theatre” following his staging of The Dutchman in 1964, which called for the destruction of white Western aesthetic ideologies, and more importantly “THE DESTRUCTION OF AMERICA.”

In Hughes’ speech before the Festival Colloquium, he accepted the importance of young artists first developing their own voices and satisfying their own aesthetic tastes, harkening back to his 1926 manifesto, “The Negro and the Racial Mountain.” Then again, he posited that considerations of publication and reception were equally vital. Historically complicating this, Hughes explained, was the dilemma of which audience to write for: white audiences, black audiences or both. However, in “The Revolutionary Black Theatre,” Baraka had already asserted that the primary impetus for the cultural production was to further the cause of Black liberation, this “conflict” was relatively a non-issue. But for Hughes, and those who championed Négritude, making protests to white authorities and proving the humanity of Blacks to white audiences were major predilections of their cultural imagination.

According to the mainstream North American press that attended the First World Festival of Negro Arts and Culture it was a success. However, the few radical Black cultural workers in attendance thought otherwise. Over the next two years, South African poet-in-exile, Keorapetse Kgotsitsile would remain one of the most vocal critics of the Festival, Senegal, and Négritude. His essay on the Festival in the Liberator, “I Have Had Enough!” from July 1966, exposes the layers of hypocrisy he experienced while in Dakar. Even though he believed there was nothing wrong with holding grand fêtes on the African continent, going as far to laud the performances and exhibitions, Kgotsitsile found the overall objectives of the Festival to be a sham.
His essay decried the absence of relevant and “contemporary” Afro-North American artists, such as James Brown, at the event, as well as the complete “omission of Nkrumah’s ideas in any serious discussion on the dangers of neo-colonialism.” Pointing out the other major contradiction of the Festival, Kgositsile observed that the Senegalese government erected a fence around the Dakar slums, preventing the masses from attending. Thus, the vast majority of those who did attend the performances and exhibitions were Europeans, which meant that “Black culture was being ‘made illustrious’ to and for a white patronage.”

For Kgositsile, the Festival was a poor attempt by Senghor and other “Westernized” Africans to dialogue with the “racist maniacs” who dominated the world. As a countermeasure, he argued,

Let the contemporary Black artist with a conscience take upon himself the responsibility of making his art as potent a weapon as any in the fight against Western inhumanity. I am not preaching anything like a romantic return to a mystical or even questionable glorious African past.

Kgositsile makes an important point here. He recognizes the responsibility and potential utility of art in liberation struggles while not succumbing to essentialist notions of an idyllic pre-colonial Africa that was often posited by Négritudists and other cultural nationalists. Rather, he asserts that the main objective of combat must be in deconstructing the “power of the Western maniac.” Summing up his overall position, Kgositsile concluded by paraphrasing an extended piece of dialogue by Lindsay Barrett. It suggests that a person who is starving “understands only satisfaction: ‘I’m hungry,’ he’ll say, battered spear in his hand. ‘But you have a glorious past.’ ‘Fuck the past. My son died of malnutrition.’ ‘But you have rhythm.’ ‘When is this independence nonsense going to stop? We have had enough!’ Beware. It will be millions of unpretentious ex-natives and ex-negroes ready to slit God’s own throat.”

Kgositsile’s surreal experiences at the Festival were soon translated into poetic criticism. Though his poem “Bleached Callouses, Africa, 1966,” published in the winter 1967 issue of Black Dialogue, does not specifically mention Senegal, the Festival, nor Négritude, he nevertheless makes allusions to “Bleached” French-speaking Africans: “I sit under the sea / And watch your perverted breath / Teetering before the glare of this motion / Parlez what?” He also refers to the baobab tree throughout the poem, which has mythical significance in Senegalese national culture. However, Kgositsile finds some irony in this, considering the tendency of many Senegalese elites to identify with France, a point he would make at the Black Arts Convention held in Detroit in August 1966. “Don’t you know don’t you know / Even the roots of the dead baobab / Tree remain in the soil?” In contrast to the Westernized African intelligentsia that looked to Europe for its inspiration, the baobab tree represented rootedness and connectivity to the history and land of the African continent.
He then alludes directly to Négritude and the Festival: “Where then where / Is the flesh of the rhythm / You preach. Your touch / Is blue-eyed rubber-stamped / FOR MASTER’S AMUSEMENT.” Here, Kgositsile is referring to Négritudists who spoke of the graceful rhythm “innate” to Africans; however, since they primarily performed for the pleasure of Europeans this had little substance or sustenance for the liberation of the African masses.54

Hoyt Fuller also publicly expressed his disillusionment with the Festival. His criticisms, however, were directed more at the North American Committee than Négritude or Senghor. Nonetheless, Fuller did assert that Senghor had some influence in who would assume the chairpersonship of the North American Committee. Much of the June 1966 issue of Negro Digest scrutinizes the Festival, specifically lambasting the organization of the Committee and its leadership. In the Perspectives section of the journal, which often served as Fuller’s personal editorial page, he wrote “Mrs. Innes-Brown and the Festival,” challenging both the chairperson’s connections to the U.S. State Department and the fact that a European-American led the Committee.55 He expounds upon these ideas in the article “Festival Postscripts: Assessment and Questions,” which begins with a troubling anecdote highlighting the racial politics of the North American Committee:

One hopes that the story is apocryphal. The way it goes, the prime movers of the American Committee for the First World Festival of Negro Arts were considering which group of musicians to invite to Dakar as exemplars of jazz music in America. Benny Goodman and his sidemen were mentioned but it was remembered that the State Department already had sent them on such a tour. Then Woody Herman and his orchestra were suggested, and the idea was received with much enthusiasm. But then, someone asked the number of Negroes in Mr. Herman’s current Herd…

As it turned out, Duke Ellington and his orchestra were chosen as the musicians to carry the message of jazz music to Dakar, but the above story—whether apocryphal or true—tells much about the orientation of the American Committee.56

In addition to the State Department imposing Innes-Brown as head of the Committee, Fuller’s description of the “deliberations” over which jazz group should represent Afro-North Americans in Dakar only compounds the discrepancies that he and Kgositsile emphasized about the Festival. What is more, Fuller also questions why the Committee chose Armenta Adams, Martina Arroyo, and Leonard De Paur to symbolize Black American cultural expression, suggesting, “There is nothing particularly ‘Negro’ about a pianist playing Bach preludes and a soprano singing Verdi arias.” While Marion Williams and her Gospel Singers were good illustrations of Afro-North American cultural performativity, the Festival Association scheduled their concert at the Cathedral of Dakar. However, Fuller notes that since Senegal was an overwhelmingly Muslim country and the populace did not feel welcome in Catholic churches, the majority of the audience was white.57
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He reserved his most scathing words for the issue’s Editorial, though. Returning to the irony of having a Euro-American serve as chairperson, Fuller suggests that members of the *Negro Digest* editorial staff were adamantly against any non-Afro-descendant leading the North American Committee from the outset. However, he asserts that most elite Blacks (particularly the leaders of AMSAC) associated with the Committee claimed there were no “Negroes” who had the connections or economic resources that Innes-Brown did. Fuller found this line of reasoning to be preposterous, arguing that if there were indeed no Afro-North Americans who could have undertook the leadership of the Committee, then “the Black Revolution is a mockery and a myth.” The whole idea behind fighting for freedom, he contended, was so that Black Americans could determine for themselves how to exist in this society and the world. Unfortunately, Fuller explains, for too many members of the Black bourgeoisie the struggles of the 1960s came down to becoming more acceptable in the eyes of white Americans:

Must everything be done ALWAYS the way white people do it? What’s wrong with starting out by admitting that there are no Negro millionaires who can undertake the whole burden of chairing a Festival committee and then going on from there to do what is necessary? What’s wrong with going directly to the black masses, explaining to them what the project is and what the problems are, inviting them to identify with the program and to help make it a success? What’s wrong with that?\(^{58}\)

Even though he did not make the claim of CIA co-option in 1966, five years later Fuller would assert in *Journey to Africa*, his politico-biography of Guinea and Senegal, that while at the Festival in Dakar he learned firsthand of the insidious relationship between AMSAC and the CIA.\(^ {59}\) Why he did not mention this in his earlier pieces is unclear. One reason may have been that it was not until 1967 that allegations of the CIA bankrolling AMSAC’s endeavors in Africa had become common knowledge. It is evident that the U.S. State Department’s overt support and the CIA’s covert involvement in organizing Afro-North American participation at the First World Festival of Negro Arts and Culture momentarily undermined the prospects for Pan African liberation and unity.\(^ {60}\)

Despite the U.S. government’s intervention and Senghor’s questionable alliances, Fuller, Kgositsile, and other Pan African activists in North America nonetheless remained vocal advocates of Afro-descendant and African solidarity. For Kgositsile, the imperative of Pan Africanism continued to predetermine his work, even though he identified internal contradictions in the movement,

Pan Africanism or African Unity seems today, in 1967, to be more removed from our reach than it was in 1957. Why? I suggest that our lack of a clear understanding of our contradictions led to this. We relied upon the influence of external forces for our unity. Black people suffered under white oppression, and it was an opposition to white oppression that we based our unity.”\(^ {61}\)
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Similarly, by continuing to publish poems, essays, and editorials on Pan Africanism in *Negro Digest*, later renamed *Black World*, Fuller kept this potentiality in the consciousness of his readers. For instance, in the September 1966 issue alone, he printed three pieces with Pan African subject matter: Margaret Danner’s “The Missing Missionaries,” Sarudzai’s “Pan-Africa,” and Julius Thompson’s “Sonnet.” Though the content of the latter two poems contemplate the prospects of African unity, the authors ironically employ the archaic and Eurocentric form of the Shakespearean sonnet. Notwithstanding, for Sarudzai, which was the pseudonym of a female militant cultural worker in the Zimbabwe African People’s Union, she articulates frustration with the continued contradictions of colonialism, neo-colonialism, and imperialism ensuring that “mighty Africa stands still, apart.” At the same time, she envisioned the “lovely dream” of “Pan-Africa” as the ultimate hope for the liberation of the continent and people.62 Throughout the latter half of the 1960s, this “lovely dream” remained just that, a dream, even though the groundwork for an anti-imperialist Pan African movement was beginning to emerge in revolutionary Algeria, which would have a profound effect on the trajectories of the Black Arts/Power movements into the 1970s.
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Fuller, *Journey to Africa* (Chicago: Third World Press, 1971): He continues, “One of these days, the full, awful story of the American secret service’s role in the First World Festival of Negro Arts at Dakar in 1966 will be told, stripping of honor certain esteemed Black Americans who lent their prestige to the effort to hold to the barest minimum the political impact of that unprecedented event. As it was, the American Society of African Culture’s relationship with the CIA was revealed following the Festival, throwing into full relief the role of AMSAC and its white ‘friends’ in planning American participation in the Festival. It was a sorry affair,” p. 92. Fuller went on to assert that after continually implying that there had been a conspiracy to limit Afro-North American participation at the Festival, “an agent of the American Government (and of the CIA?) finally let his red hair down. Yes, he told me, with a sneer that expressed all his racist feelings, we are keeping Black radicals away from the Africans, and we will succeed. There’s a damned good chance that we’ll have the French back in control here after a few years!” p. 93.
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