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Abstract

In the immediate aftermath of World War I, later historian and journalist Rayford W. Logan, became interested in the international plight of black people and joined the Pan-African Congress movement of W.E.B. Du Bois in the 1920s. As a Pan-Africanist, Logan was critical of European colonialism in Africa and the West Indies through the Mandate System established in the Treaty of Versailles by the Allied victors of World War I. His subsequent career interest as a historian and professor of history was in part focused on the failure of the Western powers through the League of Nations to improve conditions in their respective colonial territories and to prepare blacks for eventual self-government. Although a World War I veteran, Logan was an astute critic of U.S. foreign policy and inequality in the U.S. military. This was coupled with his subsequent rise within the ranks of the Pan-African movement although much lesser known than his contemporaries such as Du Bois, Marcus Garvey and Cyril Briggs.

Logan’s involvement in the early Pan-African Congresses between 1921 and 1927 perpetuated his development into a Pan-Africanist thinker. He wrote dozens of scholarly articles about colonialism in Africa and the West Indies for nearly twenty years between the two world wars. After becoming the chairman for the Committee for the Participation of Negroes in National Defense Programs [CPNNDP] for the Pittsburgh Courier in 1940, he began to advocate for the full inclusion of blacks in the defense industries and combat units in World War II. At the end of the war, Logan was commissioned by the Courier to cover the founding conferences of the United Nations. In this capacity, Logan’s vast background as a World War I veteran, a Pan-Africanist, a historian, a civil-rights activist and a professor of history prepared him to critique the Charter established by the UN and its impact on the future of Africa and the African Diaspora.
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The African diaspora is a triadic relationship linking a dispersed group of people to the homeland, Africa, and to their host or adopted countries. Diasporas develop and reinforce images and ideas about themselves and their original homelands, as well as affect the economies, politics, and social dynamics of both the homeland and the host country. Diasporas are therefore significant factors in national and international relations.

–Joseph Harris, *The African Diaspora*

This investigation covers Logan’s involvement and development as a Pan-Africanist during the formative years between 1921 and 1927 from his perspective, which he recorded in his personal diaries, an un-published draft of an autobiography, public speeches, and his analysis of the *Treaty of Versailles*. Other relevant secondary sources are included for context.

Rayford Whittingham Logan’s evolution into one of the most formidable and yet lesser known of the 20th Century Pan-Africanist began in earnest when he met W.E.B. Du Bois in Paris, France in 1921 at age twenty-four. At the time Du Bois was for black America arguably the most learned man of the era. Having graduated with a liberal arts education from Fisk University in 1888, Du Bois went on to graduate with honors from Harvard University in 1890 with a degree in philosophy. After Harvard, Du Bois studied sociology and economics in the early 1890s at the University of Heidelberg in Germany before returning to the U.S. to finish his doctorate in history from Harvard in 1896. Du Bois already showed interest in Africa with a doctoral dissertation on the trans-Atlantic slave trade. In addition to being well educated and having traveled Europe it was Du Bois in 1903 who prophesized with poetic clarity that “The problem of the 20th century is the problem of the color line, the relation of the darker to the lighter races of men in Asia and Africa, in America and the islands of the sea.”

Rayford Logan was thirty years Du Bois’ junior and he too was well educated considering his liberal arts education from the renowned M Street High School in Washington, D.C. and he finished valedictorian from the prestigious William’s College in 1917 giving the commencement address. At twenty-four, Logan was also a war veteran that had lived in Paris and traveled Europe for two years giving him valuable experiences about European and world culture. Although Logan was budding into a cosmopolitan thinker himself he was not yet actively engaged in any movement or struggle outside fighting military racism as a second lieutenant in the U.S. army. As revealed later in his life he did make observations about race and race culture, normally ending in a negative assessment of the racist attitudes of white Americans traveling abroad.
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Logan’s evolution as a Pan-Africanist involved his assessment of world politics and movements from the end of the 19th century through World War I. To be sure, both Du Bois and Logan were not only professionally trained historians but serious students of current events and modern world history. In fact, Du Bois had recognized as early as 1915 in a provocative essay entitled, “The African Roots of War,” that the entire conflict of World War I lay in which European power would dominate and control African [and Asian] land and resources. Logan believed that when Germany sought to expand its empire and sent the battleship Panther to the coast of Morocco in 1911, this was a precursor to Du Bois’ thesis that the industrialized European powers would fight over Africa. Du Bois had also given his valedictorian address on Otto Von Bismarch the German chancellor most responsible for the unification of Germany in the late 19th century. After the Berlin Conference of 1885 it seemed that Africa increasingly received the attention of the major European powers for economic and political reasons that were very clear by the end of the century. Du Bois deplored European imperialism in Africa and wrote forcefully:

The methods by which this continent has been stolen have been contemptible and dishonest beyond expression. Lying treaties, rivers of rum, murder, assassination, rape, and torture have marked the progress of Englishmen, German, Frenchmen, and Belgium on the Dark Continent. The world has been able to endure the horrible tale by deliberately stopping its ears while the deviltry went on.

He continued by using modern historical events to strengthen his argument,

consider a moment the desperate flames of war that have shot up in Africa in the last quarter of a century: France and England at Fashoda, Italy at Adua, Italy and Turkey at Tripoli, England and Portugal at Delagoa Bay, England, Germany and the Dutch in South Africa, France and Spain in Morocco, Germany and France at Agadir, and the world at Algecirus.

And although Britain and France controlled the lion’s share of colonial possessions in Africa, after the Berlin Conference of 1884-85, they both took heed of the potential German threat along Africa’s north coast. According to one authority, “Many Germans demanded a colonial empire simply because other great powers had colonial empires reinforced by the simple dogma give Germany colonies and the Germans will be as prosperous as the English.” In addition, Du Bois argued that the economic aspects of the current world war could serve as the basis for future conflicts between the European powers. Even the United States was not exempt from this process as the U.S. marine corps by the end of World War I sang, “From the halls of Montezuma to the shores of Tripoli…” encompassing Central America and North Africa in their previous military record over the centuries.
Considering Germany’s demand of its pre-World War I colonies at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 and with Italy invading Ethiopia in 1935, there was merit to Du Bois’ thesis that Africa would be the basis of future wars including possibly world war. This background is significant. In 1921, Jesse Faucet, Logan’s former French teacher at M Street High School and then editor of *Crisis Magazine*, wrote to Logan in Paris to meet Du Bois. This contact would forever change Logan’s evolving views of race and the possibilities for Africa in the future world.

Logan’s development as a Pan-African thinker, therefore, began with the activism and scholarship of Du Bois within this broad international context. As a disgruntled World War I veteran, one could argue that Logan saw an opportunity to strike back at racism through an organized and intellectual medium. After graduating from Williams College, Logan enlisted in the 1st Separate Battalion, District of Columbia National Guard in 1917. He served as a second Lieutenant and the unit became part of the 93rd Infantry Division that saw combat. Continuous racism from fellow white American soldiers embittered Logan who remained in France for five years after being discharged in 1919.

A full twenty years before he became a journalist for the *Pittsburgh Courier* in the 1940s, Logan already had firm views of the European encroachment in Africa. His initial orientation began officially with the Pan-African Congress of 1921. At the time, Paris was the location for the Peace Conference between the Allied powers that won the war and the Central powers that lost the war. The *Treaty of Versailles* that officially ended World War I also began the terms of the peace process, especially effecting Germany’s African colonies and the former territories of the Ottoman Empire which became the Middle East. Logan witnessed this process and as Du Bois’ protégé became a Pan-Africanist that used his talents to fight on behalf of Africa.

The efforts by black intellectuals outside Africa to organize on behalf of African peoples on the continent had a tragically recent history. According to Clarence Contee,

The agitation had started as far back as 1897, when a group of educated and prosperous concerned Africans living in England had formed an organization called ‘The African Association.’ . . . a series of events had caused alarm about the rule of the British over the Africans; these events included the number of Africans killed in the Matabele and Bechuanaland Wars; the continued existence of slaves and slave trading in Pemba and Zanzibar; the compound system in use in the mining areas of South Africa; the uprising of Africans in Sierra Leone; and the havoc wrought by a hurricane and sugar crisis to inhabitants of the British West Indies. Africans were rejecting the authority of their masters.
At the same time, Marcus Garvey’s United Negro Improvement Association (UNIA) was well established in Harlem, New York City attracting a large following, particularly from the working class segments of black America. Garvey’s UNIA, however, was markedly different that Du Bois’ Congresses. Garvey was asking a different set of questions about the solution to the problems that Africans were facing, perhaps more grandiose. Garvey queried,

Where is the black man’s government? Where is his king and kingdom? Where is his president, his country, and his ambassador, his army, his navy, his men of big affairs? I could not find them, and then I declared ‘I will help make them’.10

Though Marcus Garvey was a Pan-Africanist, Logan viewed him as a demagogue and did not agree with his ideas, especially his glorification of all things black, his well-known belief in black separatism nor his plan for a mass exodus to build a so-called black empire in Africa.11

Logan’s first important contact with organized Pan-Africanism began with the Pan-African Congresses of 1919, 1921, 1923, and 1927. This experience of Logan’s participation as a translator, organizer and lecturer at the latter three consecutive congresses began the process of his orientation to the international plight of the black struggle. Logan learned a great deal from the first hand experiences of African and West Indian leaders who spoke about the political, economic and social conditions in their respective locations. Though Logan had read about Africa and the West Indies, it was the Pan-African Congress movement at the behest of W.E.B. Du Bois that ultimately shaped his career as a scholar, activist and journalist.

**Pan-African Congresses, 1921-1927**

Besides Logan’s extensive research about the mandate system and European colonialism, the major factor in his political development was the Pan-African Congresses. The Pan-African Congresses (PAC) were an organized intellectual response of black leaders from the United States, Europe, the West Indies and Africa to influence the Allied Powers on behalf of Africa and the diaspora at the Paris Peace Conference of 1919.12 With no invitation to black leaders to speak at the peace conference, it was clear that the decision to control African land and resources was being made without the consent of the Africans through a structure called the mandate system. With no standing armies or weapons the fight against European hegemony in Africa, activism came in the form of investigations, public criticism and organizational protest. By the 1970s, Logan’s analysis of the Pan-African movement was unique because only he and a small handful of eyewitnesses were still alive to explain what actually happened in terms of the mood, temperament, and meaning of the congresses within a historical context.
Pan-Africanism meant different things to different people usually reflecting the vantage point and orientation of the individual using the term. In this study Pan-Africanism will be used the way that Logan defined the term. To Logan Pan-Africanism meant “self-government or independence of African nations south of the Sahara.” To this basic premise he would add the extension of rights to all persons of African descent throughout the African Diaspora. Logan was particularly impressed with Du Bois’ *Address to the Nations of the World* which was an essay he wrote on behalf of Africa produced at the Pan African Conference in London, England in 1900:

Du Bois made a plea for the inclusion of Negroes in all parts of the world in the great brotherhood of mankind urging self-government or independence for at least some Africans hence in my judgment; this *Address to the Nations of the World* includes the first modern published exposition of my definition of Pan-Africanism. 

Therefore, Logan’s evolving definition of Pan-Africanism was based on his belief in the eventual freedom of Africa from European control but also on the immediate circumstance of whether Africans could govern themselves based on modern world standards of the industrialized West. The exact origin of the term is difficult to pin-point historically unless one adopts a narrow definition such as Logan’s. To be sure, there has always been general and specific African resistance to European hegemony for centuries. What is clear is that by the end of World War I the term Pan-Africanism had been in use sporadically for at least a quarter century but was not in common vogue for a key reason. Professor Clarence Contee points out that if anyone was going to bring about the revival of the Pan-African idea it almost had to be W.E.B. Du Bois. He writes:

In a real sense, Du Bois had to be the one of the early Pan-Africanist to restore the vibrant heartbeat of the movement; new leaders were not yet ready. Death had claimed the lives of Henry Sylvester Williams (1911), and Dr. Edward Wilmot Blyden the leading Pan-Negroes of the nineteenth century (1912); in 1915 Bishop Henry McNeal Turner, Booker T. Washington and Benito Sylvain died. Also, later Bishop James Johnson a Nigerian nationalist and Bishop Alexander Walters, Black Afro-American President of the Pan-African Association of 1900 died; so did Reverend Majola Agbedi, another Nigerian nationalist and a person who knew Du Bois.
Contee makes the important observation that for the 1919 Congress, Du Bois felt the First World War provided an opportune time to politicize the plight of Africans throughout the world. In the aftermath of the war the idealism of democracy would hopefully benefit activist like Du Bois, who believed in the democratic process. Hence, Contee says, “Du Bois felt that conferences and discussions were legitimate vehicles to effect social, economic, and political changes in the oppressive conditions of the African and the Afro-American. Perhaps the “power-brokers and decision makers” at the Paris Peace Conference would listen to ideas that could benefit the Africa and the African Diaspora. Du Bois advocated for the formation of “a Central African state composed of the former German colonies and the Belgian Congo such a state was what Africans wanted and [was] in the best interest of world civilization. From the vantage point of this study, the Pan-African Congress of 1919, which Logan did not attend, was significant for its intentions if not its limited results. According to the January 1919 issue of the NAACP’s magazine, *The Crisis*, Du Bois had traveled to France with a three-fold mission: to collect first hand material for a history of American blacks in the recent world war, to serve as special representative of the *Crisis* at the actual peace conference, and to ‘bear all pressure possible on the delegates at the peace table in the interest of the black people of the world by calling a Pan-African Congress’. Although Du Bois was not permitted to attend the peace conference, he did collect data concerning black soldiers who fought in the war and as reported in the April issue of the *Crisis* “the congress had met, [established] an executive committee, and maintained a hotel in Paris with regular hours.\(^1\)

**Logan and the Second Pan-African Congress (1921)**

Logan was still in the army when the first Pan-African Congress took place in 1919. However, it was this background that provided the structure and momentum of the subsequent congresses in which he played an important role. In fact, the details of the second, third and fourth congresses in which Logan participated are necessary to situate his evolving views based on his exposure to the key issues and topics discussed. Also important are the leaders from African and West Indian territories which Logan met allowing him to see the broader implications of what became a worldwide movement to uplift African peoples.

The second Pan-African Congress took place in the late summer going into the early fall of 1921 with an August and September session in London and Brussels and a September session in Paris, France where Logan became involved. The London session met on the 27\(^{th}\) of August at Central Hall in the shadow of Westminster Abbey. There were representatives from such places as South Africa, the Gold Coast (Ghana), Sierra Leone, Lagos, Nigeria, Liberia, Grenada, Martinique, and the United States. Each delegation had a particular set of problems. For instance, the West African’s main concern was the problem of no political power and segregation while East and South Africans could not vote, had been denied the “best portions of the land,” and faced the problem of East Indian influx. A Grenadian delegate, Mr. Marryshow, pointed out that “actions not words were needed,” while a Nigerian delegate, Mr. Augusto, stressed that the congress should “accomplish something very concrete, such as the financial development of independent Liberia.”\(^1\)
At the Belgium session, following London, Fauset observed a marked conservatism by the Congolese delegate Paul Panda who did not criticize Belgium. The well-known brutal atrocities committed by the Belgians against the Congolese through forced labor to produce sugar cane, coffee, and palm oil were not spoken of by Panda but not without reason. The stronghold that Belgium had on the Congo was immense and there was an intense feeling of awe when the Congresses convened at the Palais Mondial. In Belgian museums Fauset observed such artifacts as furs, gold, copper, mahogany wood and elephant tusk which indicated the vast wealth acquired by King Leopold from Central Africa. Perhaps Panda knew that the Belgians were not going to give up this fortune and therefore chose not to criticize Belgium for fear of a brutal response on the native population still living in the territory. When the congress met it became evident to Fauset that Belgium’s economic interests were so centered in the Congo that the government watched the congress with a careful eye. There were Belgium officials that attended each meeting of the congress and some even addressed the delegates formally. One Spanish official at the Brussels meeting even spoke about the problems of race mixing. But, Faucet found it most interesting that:

For three days we listened to pleasant generalities without a word or criticism of colonial government, without a murmur of complaint of black Africa, without a suggestion that this was an international congress called to define and make intelligible the greatest set of wrongs against human beings that the modern world has known.

There were also very few black people that lived in Brussels as compared to London, which made the meeting even more conspicuous. When Fauset suggested to Panda that perhaps some colored teachers might be induced to visit the Congo Panda quickly replied, “No, the Belgian authorities would never permit that because the colored Americans are too ‘malins’ (clever).” The Belgian authorities were very much concerned with the NAACP who some thought were paid by Bolsheviks. According to the Belgian newspaper Neptune,

The association [NAACP] has already organized propaganda in the lower Congo, and we must not be astonished if some day it causes grave difficulties in the Negro village of Kansasha, composed of all the ne’er-do wells of various tribes of the colony aside from some hundreds of laborers.

The “grave difficulties” as voiced in the above Belgium newspaper in 1921 was a continuation of fear over black leaders meeting to discuss problems throughout the African world. Previously, the 1919 congress nearly did not take place except that Blaise Daigne the representative from French West Africa showed loyalty to French Premier Georges Clemenceau, who used Senegalese troops to fight in the late war.
Logan learned this background when Du Bois asked Logan to serve as secretary and interpreter of the 1921 Paris session of the Congress, which met at the Societe des Ingenieurs Civil 19 Rue Blanch. Logan accepted Du Bois’ invitation to serve as he had been well prepared to translate French and English based on his training at M. Street High School with Faucet and his military career in France during the recent war.

Logan was not only a translator but a mediator between the French and English speaking factions when the meeting convened in Paris. Had it not been for Logan’s diplomacy and mediation skills it is very possible that the Second Pan-African Congress would have fallen apart over a very critical issue. When Du Bois’ resolutions were read in English proposing a return of African land to the community, Daigne, who spoke as poor English, as Du Bois spoke French, only recognized the word “commune”. To Daigne commune meant Communism, which meant an overthrow of the current French republic. Logan pointed out that the word commune to Frenchmen also meant the revolutionary ‘commune’ that took over the French government in Paris after the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-1871 still within memory. With Bolshevism on the rise in Russia, the black French leader could not agree with any resolutions that sounded too radical or could be interpreted as threatening to French control of French North and West Africa. At the urging of William Stuart Nelson, a colleague and friend, Logan sought to mollify the tempers of both men through crafty paraphrasing. “By translating only a bit of the acerbic remarks to each other,” Logan later wrote, “I obtained an agreement between the two or what Daigne viewed as a temporary compromise.”23 The congress moved forward with its agenda and Daigne became the presiding officer. As if to set the record straight, lest Du Bois’ radicalism dominate the congress, Daigne exclaimed unequivocally, “I’m a Frenchman first and a Negro afterward!”24

Daigne’s allegiance to France above the interest of Africans in the diaspora seems to have hinted at an eventual rift between the objectives and the ultimate direction of the congresses, particularly between the Francophone versus Anglophone Africans. According to Logan’s recollection, Du Bois saw an opportunity for the colonial possessions that Germany lost during the war in Southwest Africa, to be returned to the native Africans to whom the land originally belonged before the Berlin Conference of 1885. However noble Du Bois’ intentions, the return of African land to the native African population was something Daigne thought would upset the French government.

Even after Logan’s timely mediation between Daigne and Du Bois, the former “leapt to his feet in his role as presiding officer and jammed through a set of resolutions that the American and English Negroes only partially grasped.”25 The implication was that Logan thought the resolutions of which there is no comprehensive record, was of a conservative nature and more closely aligned with the wishes of the French to maintain control of African land. Logan believed this allegiance of the French speaking Negroes was because at the time France was the only country in the world that had conferred national citizenship upon natives in Africa; moreover France allowed Blaise Daigne to sit in the French Chamber of Deputies he also served as Chairman of the Committee on Colonial Affairs.
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By the time the Congress delegation reached war-torn Paris’ Salle des Ingenieurs building the agenda was once again underway. Faucet remarked,

On that platform was, I suppose the intellectual efflorescence of the Negro race. To American eyes and, according to the papers, to many others, Dr. Du Bois loomed first, for he had first envisaged this movement and many of us knew how gigantically he had toiled. Then there was M. Bellgarde, the Haitian minister to France and Haitian delegate to the assembly of the League of Nations. Beside him sat the grave and dignified delegate from the Liga Africana of Lisbon, Portugal, and on the other side the presiding officer, M. Daigne and his colleague, M. Candace, French Deputy from Guadeloupe. A little to one side sat the American Rayford Logan assistant secretary of the Pan-African Congresses at Paris and our interpreter. His translations, made offhand without a moment’s preparation, were a remarkable exhibition.  

The great challenge of this leadership was how to address the broad range of concerns affecting the Black world. Each delegate came from a different place geographically; their political, social, and even economic views were divergent although there were some obvious common denominators. It became clear that each group had a different relationship with their respective colonial power. These differences manifested themselves as the meetings proceeded. As Americans, Faucet, Du Bois, and Logan “were somewhat puzzled as the floor was repeatedly given to Blacks from French colonies who dwelt on the glory of France and the honor of being Frenchman.” Logan remembered the report that the Africans at the Brussels session were uncritical of their mistreatment in the Belgian Congo. There appeared to be a clear ideological split between what each of these various groups of African people actually wanted to accomplish by the end of the Congress.

The Africans from the French colonies identified with the metropolis and felt part and parcel of the French Empire much more closely than the Black delegation from the United States and Haiti felt for their homelands. They wanted improved conditions for Africans but not at the expense of upsetting the colonial powers. Faucet reported, “Messieurs Daigne and Candace of Guadeloupe gave us fine oratory and magnificent gestures, but platitudes, while Du Bois, E. Franklin Frazier, Walter White of the United States, Dr. Jackson, a young fiery Jamaican, and M. Dantes Bellgarde of Haiti, gave ‘facts and food for thought.’”
One reason for the frankness of the delegates reporting on conditions in their respective countries at the Paris session was the difference in the audience compared with mostly white Brussels. Faucet recalls that the Paris population contained a larger number of Blacks who had suffered and therefore could relate to Du Bois’ straightforward resolutions. At the conference the mostly Black audience felt that “here at last was the fearless voice of long stifled desires of their hearts, at last comprehension, here was the translation of hitherto unsyllabled unuttered prayers.” Logan remembers the Paris session as the most largely attended though most delegates were from non-African countries. While serving as Deputy Secretary and translator, Logan saw Blaise Daigne, resign as President of the Pan-African Association and Gratien Candace, a delegate from French speaking Guadeloupe became president.

The Pan African Association was a panel of the key leaders from the French and English speaking delegation namely Du Bois, Logan, Blaise Diagne and Gratien Candace. Since the Congress met every other year the Pan-African Association kept in contact with one another and planned the location and agenda for the subsequent meetings. This Association began to slowly drift apart after the 1923 Pan-African Congress. Logan felt that part of the reason for the deterioration of the Congresses was Blaise Daigne. Daigne in Logan’s estimation was a self-made man from Senegal, tall, blue-black in skin color and married to a white French woman. He was both conservative and shrewd but saw the possibilities of the Congresses as an opportunity to “make steps toward eventual self-government,” slowly. This conservative leadership on the part of Daigne, however, was in direct contrast to the other great leader of French speaking Blacks, Dantes Bellgarde of Haiti. Bellgard was the Haitian minister to France and in Logan’s estimation he was “polished, elegant, modest and one of the most able men he ever met.” Bellgarde evidently saw the possibility of Negroes coming together under the Pan-African Congresses to help Blacks in the Caribbean as well. Certainly, all participants from the Pan-African world, although differing in their respective opinions of what could be done, at least learned much more intimately of each others’ plight.

Despite the difficulties of the various delegates agreeing on one agenda, Faucet believed the results of the 1919 and 1921 Congresses were progressive. First, it was clear that the Pan-African Congresses were a permanent organization. Though there was always the language barrier (at least two languages had to be spoken) and a limit to free speech on the part of the African delegations on their respective colonial situations there was a better knowledge of the overall plight of Africans from a more global perspective. Each African group knew more about the plight of the others. Secondly, Faucet felt that “organization on our part arrests the attention of the world.” In other words, the European and American press took note of the Congresses and gave them world-wide publicity showing the important relationship between organization and influence, even if modest. The third accomplishment of the Congress was “the realization that there is an immensity of work ahead of us.”
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To Logan the second Pan-African Congress of 1921 was by far the most successful of the four held between 1919 and 1927 because of the large number of delegates and the quality of the resolutions that were passed. Of the approximately one-hundred and ten delegates in attendance forty-one were from Africa, thirty-five from the U.S., twenty-four were Africans living in Europe and seven were from the West Indies. The strategy of the Congress was similar to the previous one’s which strove to influence the newly formed League of Nations by first sending Du Bois to Geneva to interview officials at the Permanent Mandates Commission on African affairs. Faucet stated that a thousand resolutions and petitions were being presented at the Geneva Convention by delegates of many nations. Log remembered “There was a petition which was published as an official document of the League urging eventual self-government in Africa and the appointment to the Permanent Mandates Commission of a man of Negro decent properly fitted in training and character as soon as a vacancy occurs.” This appointment would have been instrumental because that individual would be in direct contact with those who were making decisions about Germany’s lost territory. Also, the International Bureau of Labor was included in the petition to address the “shameless exploitation of Negro labor in all the colonial territories.” The petition of the Second Pan-African Congress was presented through the very able Haitian M. Dantes Bellgarde. Logan learned from Bellgarde himself that a man named M. Rappard director of the Mandates section of the League “promised him to work for his appointment.”

While Bellgarde attempted to gain an appointment at Geneva, Du Bois made his presence known. On September 13, 1921, Du Bois spoke to a group called the English Club of Geneva to “convey some idea of what the Black world was thinking, feeling, and doing in regards to the Negro problem.” This was important because Du Bois had no direct voice into the Geneva convention himself so he had to persuade and convince sympathetic white men who did have access. Du Bois also met with Rene’ Claparede an executive member of the International Society for the Protection of the Natives and William Rappard head of the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations.

Both of these men endorsed the proposal to at least appoint a Negro man to the Mandates Commission in charge of native affairs. The United States interestingly enough did not have a delegate at the League of Nations (and never did join) and so there was no ear or voice to listen and speak on behalf of African people throughout the world. Bellgarde finally was given a chance to speak at the debate on the mandates commission with apparent success but this assessment is hazy at best, because Logan spoke with Bellgarde who told him that despite vacancies and Rappard’s promise there wasn’t a person of Negro decent appointed to it.
Results of Paris Session

Regardless of the varying interpretations of the successes and failures of the Pan-African Congress of 1921 countries like England, France and Belgium—all colonial powers—that took notice of Black intellectuals and leaders organized on behalf of African peoples. A few newspapers articles illustrate the point. One historian wrote concerning the reaction of Europeans to this 1921 congress saying,

It was a mixed one. The fact that so many Black men of consequence from remote corners of the globe were exchanging ideas on disabilities imposed by white arrogance and intolerance not surprisingly aroused suspicion of a revolution and fear of Black domination. As Walter White related, there were secret agents of the British Colonial Office at the London sessions and the same surveillance was encountered in Belgium and France.\textsuperscript{41}

The historian also notes that an English newspaper the \textit{Manchester Dispatch} commented that the white people did not naturally look forward with joyful emotions to the day when a prolific Black race would rise to power but the time may come when we shall have to submit ourselves to the tender mercies of our dusky conquerors.\textsuperscript{42} He goes on to record another reaction in the \textit{Public Opinion} that,

No white man could have attended the conference and retained his smug complacency; the days of the super race were numbered; the theory of the permanent and necessary inferiority of the Negro seemed then to be untrue from a practical, as it had always been from a Christian standpoint.\textsuperscript{43}

According to \textit{The Daily Graphic}, another English newspaper,

The delegates [of the Pan-African Congress] were so earnest both the men and women, so absolutely convinced of the justice of their cause, their right to a citizen’s franchise, to representation in the world’s counsels [League of Nations] to everything, in fact, that civilized humanity offers to the sons regardless of race, color or creed.\textsuperscript{44}
The British were not the only ones concerned about the meaning of the Pan-African Congresses. The French were also very much aware of what the congresses meant. The *Humanite* of Paris recorded the views of some who felt that “the black and mulatto intelligentsia proved by its very existence that the Black race was not inherently inferior. How could Europeans consider inferior to white men these orators with their clear thought and their ready words?” Perhaps the last word on the Second Pan-African Congress should be the manifestos that Logan helped to translate. Again the Congress addressed their request to the League of Nations:

1. That an International Bureau of Labor set aside to deal particularly and in detail with the conditions and needs of native Negro labors especially in Africa and in the Islands of the Sea,

2. That the spirit of the modern world moves toward self-government as the ultimate aim of all men and nations and that consequently the mandated people have the right to have a Negro appointed a member of the Mandates Commission,

3. The League of Nations has vast moral powers of world public opinion to take a firm stand on the absolute equality of the races and form an International Institute for the study of the Negro Problem and for the Evolution and Protection of the Negro Race.

Logan’s observation about the decline in the movement was more evident by the time the Third Pan-African Congress convened in 1923. With Daigne’s allegiance to France and Candace’s “marriage and close personal and financial relations with high banking and industrial circles,” the Congresses seemed doomed. In Logan’s opinion Candace, at one time the president of the Pan-African Association, was in fact, corrupted. Logan wrote, “It was reported at the meeting of the Pan-African Association that Candace received financial support for his re-election in Guadeloupe from the then famous mystery man of Europe, Basil Zaharoff.” Logan admits not being able to verify the absolute truth of this statement. He clearly remembered that Candace rarely attended the meetings of the Pan-African Association held in an office at Avenue Du Maine. In Daigne’s case he withdrew support after a French newspaper *Intransiegn* published an article accusing Du Bois of being a disciple of Marcus Garvey which frightened the French government. It was known that Garvey wanted all Whites out of Africa which he felt should be governed by Africans. Though the rumor about Du Bois being Garvey’s disciple was, of course, untrue, the French delegation was not as supportive of the movement after this false report.
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Another problem that inhibited the Congresses was dwindling financial contributions. The North American delegation headed by Du Bois had been the main financier of the First and Second Congresses but by 1923 the NAACP, the main source of the revenue, had to decrease its expenditures.50 Most of the expenses in terms of living quarters, food, and travel accommodations for Logan came out of his own limited resources. Logan remembered “The NAACP, moreover, finding its resources dwindling after the high mark of enthusiasm during and immediately after the war, had to reduce its expenditures. I never received a salary.”51

Third Pan-African Congress: London, England

Although by 1923, the organization, purpose and goals of the Pan-African Congresses had been well established, there was a considerable decline in both enthusiasm and participation as compared to the previous two congresses.52 Nevertheless, the third Pan-African Congress convened in London on November 7th, and 8th with delegates from thirteen countries on the African continent, the West Indies, and the U.S. In both locations Logan helped to lead discussions following the programs.53 The London meeting took place at Denison House which was an old headquarters of England’s Anti-Slavery Society. The chief speakers were Harold Laski of the London School of Economics, Ida Gibbs Hunt, the wife of a U.S. Consul at St. Etienne, France, who spoke on the topic, “The Colonial Races and the League of Nations,” Kamba Simango who spoke about Portuguese East Africa, Bishop Vernon of the African Methodist Episcopal Church and Chief Amoah III of the Gold Coast.54

Though the third Congress was not as well attended as the second, the resolutions which it produced, were as demanding as in previous Congresses. They were as follows:

1. Voice in government,
2. The right to the land and its resources,
3. Trial by jury,
4. Free elementary education-industrial, and higher training,
5. The development of Africa for the benefit of the Africans and not merely for the profit of Europeans,
6. The abolition of the slave trade and the liquor traffic,
7. World disarmament and the abolition of war,
8. Finally, the organization of commerce and industry so as to make the main objects of capital and labor the welfare of the many and not the enriching of the few.55
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These demands for basic human as well as economic development of African land and resources applied to all of colonial Africa although each colonial situation was unique. Logan’s exposure to the consistency of the demands proved instrumental by 1923. It was the London and Lisbon sessions where in addition to being the translator between the English and French speaking delegates Logan was directly involved in the shaping and planning of the sessions. All of the resolutions were vital to the development of Africa and the diaspora but the particular demands such as natives having a voice in government, a free education and the right to the land would be ideas that Logan would later articulate as a mature polemicist over twenty years later following World War II. Analysis of the specific demands asked for in various locations of the African and African Diaspora reveal an interesting pattern. In the British West Indies and West Africa the demand was for “civilized subjects to have home rule and responsible government without discrimination as to race and color.”56 In Nigeria and Uganda, under British rule as well, the demands included “the development of Native law, industry, education, and eventual economic independence.”57 In the French controlled territories in West Africa the demands were similar but with a slightly different emphasis. French speaking Africans wanted the citizenship rights of voting, representation in the French Parliament, by Senegalese and West Indian delegates. The demands from Kenya, Rhodesia, and South Africa were equally straightforward. South Africa, for example, demanded “a recognition of their right to a voice in their own government and the abolition of the pretension of a white minority to dominate a Black majority and even to prevent their appeal to the world.”58

The congress recognized that there had been no decisive change in the Belgian Congo from a regime of profit making and exploitation to an attempt to build modern civilization among human beings for their own good will.

The three Black republics: Ethiopia, Liberia, and Haiti, all were affected by European colonialism. The Congress stated that these nations, which in a sense proved that Africans could rule themselves, needed “not only political integrity but also their emancipation from the grip of economic monopoly and usury at the hands of the money masters of the world.”59 Though the European powers did not have the overt control and physical presence in these independent nations as they did in the rest of colonial Africa, the raw materials of these independent nations were controlled by Europeans and in the case of Liberia, the U.S. businessmen who invested heavily and made huge profits. The Pan-African Congress made demands on behalf of Black people in the U.S. such as recognition of full citizenship rights in spite of color, the cessation of lynching, mob-rule, and caste distinctions, had always been goals of the NAACP. This organization contributed most of the financial support for the Black American delegates first three Congresses, had even put forth the Dyer-Anti Lynch Bill in 1921 which would have allowed the federal government to intervene in states where mob-rule and the lynching of Blacks went virtually un-checked.
Though the bill was defeated in the House the NAACP’s campaign to popularize the fact that over thirty-four hundred Negroes had been lynched from post Reconstruction to 1922 was now being published in the resolution for an international audience. The intention was that the various white nations would take heed to the thoughts and aspirations of their colonial subjects. Rayford Logan’s name along with Ida Gibbs Hunt and Du Bois was signed at the bottom of the Third Pan-African Congress’s resolution.

The Lisbon session of the third Pan-African Congress took place on December 1st and 2nd, 1923. More noticeable was the strong presence of Portuguese speaking blacks whose organization Liga Africana, was led by their president Jose’ do Magalhaes who represented Sao Tome’ in the Portuguese chamber of deputies. Logan did his best to set up the meeting at the request of Du Bois and felt the Lisbon session was poorly attended although he gives no exact numbers. He did record that there were fewer Portuguese Blacks in Lisbon as compared to Paris or London and the few that lived there did not speak Portuguese very well. Having discussed and debated the major issues that by 1923 had become standard objectives the end of the meeting still found the French Negro delegation once again at odds with the motives and objectives of the congress. Du Bois, for one, felt the major problem was that the black French leadership “thought of themselves as Frenchman first and Negroes second,” as that the leadership was “hanging back for self-interest or political reason despite the fact that in Paris the black French masses showed a keen desire to cooperate.” Whether or not this analysis was completely correct the congresses, normally held every other year, did not meet in 1925 because of these internal conflicts and lack of financial resources from the NAACP which turned to the local issue of lynching in the United States.

Fourth Pan-African Congress: New York City

The fourth and final Pan-African Congress of the 1920s did not take place until 1927 and was unique in that it was the first congress held in the Western Hemisphere and it was chiefly organized by black American women. The New York Age reported that the Congress was scheduled to meet between August 21st through the 24th, 1927 in New York City and that women of the Circle for Peace and Foreign Relations were working to receive such notables as Dantes Bellgarde of Haiti, Georges Normail Sylvain the son of a Haitian patriot, and Chief Amoah III of the Gold Coast representing British West Africa. It is interesting that women from a large number of other cities were also “arousing interest in the Congresses” all over the country.

The long list of organizers were all women including an E.D. Canady of Oregon, Maybell Baylor of Milwaukee, Percy Bond of Washington, D.C., Violet Johnson of Summit, New Jersey, and Nadine Lottie Cooper of Orange, New Jersey and other women under the leadership of A.W. Hunton who is said to have raised $3000. Without these women’s fund raising activities in their various locations the meeting would not have taken place as scheduled.
As finances had previously hindered the progress of the movement in previous years The New York Age recorded the name of Nadine Wright as the first individual to send a check for $100 to the Pan-African Congress headquarters at Grace Congregational Church on 308 W. 139th Street in New York City.

When the congress convened at the church headquarters on Saturday, August 20th, the discussion and presentations centered on the race problem in the African Diaspora. Some of the presentations were delivered at other Black churches throughout Harlem including St. Marks Methodist Episcopal Church, Abyssinia Baptist Church, and the 135th Street Branch Library. Each speaker was apparently prepared to deliver an address based on their place of origin or familiarity with their own local condition. Bellgarde, the Haitian delegate, was “cordially received” on the 16th and gave the viewpoint of the black condition in Europe, the West Indies, and America. Chief Amoah III was said to have “authoritative knowledge of the condition [of Blacks] in the English, French, and Portuguese colonies in Africa.” T. Augustus Toote from the Bahamas arrived to represent his region and Rayford Logan arrived as “secretary and interpreter.”

Though Logan remembered speaking at the congress there is no written record of the topic or text of his speech though he did continue in his role as organizer and interpreter for the French speaking delegations. Nonetheless, other notables were Ms. A. W. Dickerson of the International Council of Women of the Darker Races, Eugene Kinkly Jones of the National Urban League, and Charles Johnson who wrote for the NUL’s magazine Opportunity. In addition to James Weldon Johnson and William Pickens of the NAACP, a Swedish born Professor of Anthropology from Columbia University named Melville Herskovitz addressed a session with the topic, “African and American Negroes.” In total, there were 208 delegates representing the U.S. and ten foreign countries including Liberia, Sierra Leone, the Gold Coast, Nigeria, Haiti, the Danish Virgin Islands, the Bahamas, Barbados, the Belgian Congo, Portugal, and South America.

The topics were varied but all within the framework of the Pan-African Congress’ traditional demands for complete equality for all African peoples regardless of location. Helen Curtis is reported to have spoken on the topic “African Missions,” Addie W. Dickerson on “The Colored Women and Missions,” while Charles H. Wesley of Howard University along with Professor Hertzkovitz both chose the topic, “The Dispersed Children of Africa.” The goals of the Fourth Pan-African Congress were consistent with the previous three which shows constancy in the movement as opposed to redundancy hinted at by writers who question the growth of the Pan-African Congress movement. Namely, they demanded a voice in their own government, the right to the land and its natural resources, education for all children, the development of Africa for Africans and not merely for profits for Europeans, the treatment of civilized men as civilized regardless of birth, race, of color, the reorganization of commerce and industry so as to make the main object of capital and labor for welfare of the many rather than the enriching of the few.
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It is interesting to note that the Fourth Pan-African Congress was originally scheduled to meet in the West Indies or in Tunis, North Africa in 1925. While finances and internal problems between the French and English speaking blacks were in evidence another hindrance to the meeting was revealed. When the French authorities of Tunisia got news of the conference they very politely but firmly told Du Bois that the congress could be held in Marseilles or any French city but *not in any colony or protectorate of France in Africa* [emphasis mine].

It was becoming increasingly clear that the metropolitan powers, especially France, Portugal, and Belgium, were fearful that the Pan-African congress movement could potentially spell disaster for their ability to maintain control of their colonial possessions. Loss of colonies meant loss of profits in commodities such as ivory, gold, diamonds, cocoa, sugar and many other items that came from African land.

**Results of the Pan-African Congresses 1921-1927**

What were the results of the four Pan-African Congresses from 1919-1927 of which Logan played a role? Clearly, there are many answers to this question both on and off the mark. One scholar considered an authority of Pan-Africanism is Professor Immanuel Geiss of Hamburg, West Germany. Writing about the results of the Fourth Congress Geiss states, “the most important result of the Fourth Pan-African Congress was perhaps simply that it took place at all” but saves himself from almost total error by also stating that “[the members] had established a certain tradition with the passing of time.” This tradition is exactly the point of the long term significance of the movement. C.L.R. James states the case more clearly in his masterful study of the Haitian Revolution which the present writer thinks Geiss has missed totally. James states that

> Great men make history, but only such history as it is possible for them to make. The freedom of achievement is limited by the necessities of their environment. To portray the limits of those necessities and the realization complete or partial of all possibilities, that is the true business of the historian.

Professor Geiss seems to interpret the worth of the four Pan-African Congresses based on an objective reality that could not and did not exist because the conditions were not yet conducive. Great social revolutions and upheavals are normally preceded by an ideology that has taken years to ferment and develop over the passage of time. A classic example would be the abolitionist’s movement in the United States in the 1830s which preceded the Civil War by thirty years. When the conditions were right, the Union forces smashed the South to preserve the union and the idea that slavery should be abolished and the Black slave set free came to fruition by 1865. It would be preposterous to evaluate the meaning and significance of the abolitionist crusade as “slight or meager” because they could not persuade southern slave masters or the white South to end slavery thirty years earlier.
That would be a misreading and a total misinterpretation of history and even place into question the value of the historian which in part is to make connections between people and events based on a reasonable evaluation of the available primary sources. C.L.R. James demonstrates this so well in his connection between the French Revolution’s cry of “liberty, equality, and fraternity” to the organization of one half million slaves under Toussaint in San Domingo into a formidable fighting force that eventually gained independence.

Professor Francis Broderick makes the same error when he writes, “Du Bois’ Pan-Africanism only touched a handful of people—literate people who cared, affluent people who bought books, dedicated people who made the fight against racial inequality an important aspect to their lives.” This statement is only partially true because it does not give the full weight to what the Pan-African Congresses did in the long run. Closer to the truth is Professor Manning Marable’s statement that,


Logan’s own analysis of the results of the Pan-African Congress were stated in a speech entitled, “The Historical Aspects of Pan-Africanism, 1900-1945” delivered at the Third Annual Conference of the American Society of African Culture in 1960. Logan begins, “In the history of ideas it is frequently difficult to determine origins, changes, continuity, discontinuity and revival and influence.” Difficult though it may have been, Logan, the historian later in life, traced the broad history of Pan-Africanism and its impact on the world. The timing and success of Pan-Africanism, as an idea, and as an organized body of men and women of African descent, was of the utmost importance to Logan, at this time a seasoned historian at the age of sixty-three. Some of the most important events in world history, World War I and World War II, which Logan called “acts of supreme folly on the part of the superior races,” are his main examples. Logan states, “without these two wars “it is unlikely that in 1945 Pan-Africanism would have laid the foundation that made possible its mighty leap forward.” It is equally true that the more forthright demands of George Padmore, Kwame Nkrumah, Nnamdi Azikwe and the other African nationalist by 1945 was only possible because of the Pan-African Congresses of the 1920s even with their “limited or meager immediate results.” He further reviewed the goals of the Pan-African Congress movement as an opportunity to reveal “fascinating reciprocal relationships between ideas and events, men and events.” The aims of the Pan-African movement were basically threefold,
1. to bring people of African descent throughout the world into closer touch with each other,
2. to establish more friendly relations between the Caucasian and African races and
3. to start a movement looking forward to the securing of all African races living in civilized countries their full rights and to promote their business interest.76

Persons of African descent did come into closer contact with other Africans from the English, French, and Portuguese speaking world throughout the Congresses. The Africans that participated learned about the worldwide context of the struggle for human rights and freedom. The second aim of friendly relations with Whites is more difficult to gauge but as long as African land was controlled by Europeans and the U.S. still practiced racial segregation and discrimination the relationship did not improve much. Many African nations viewed Whites as colonizers who took over their land making it virtually impossible to establish friendly relations. During the 1920s the third aim of securing full rights of all African people in their respective lands was not realized but at least the idea of eventual African independence began a process which was accelerated by the advent of World War II and eventually realized.

Logan also recognized that Du Bois was mainly responsible for taking H. Sylvester Williams’ idea of Pan-African unity and transforming it to mean self-government and independence for Africans.77 It was Du Bois in almost Garveyite fashion that advocated the grandiose idea for the Congo region in central Africa to become a great black state in world affairs and he demanded respect for the integrity of Abyssinia, Liberia, and Haiti. To Logan, as Du Bois was developing and refining the Pan-African idea at the Race Congress in London, England in July 1911, an important yet little known event took place. “The German [battle] cruiser Panther arrived at Agadir, Morocco in July 1911 on the western coast of Africa! This event caused Lloyd George, an English official, to “warn Germany not to re-arrange the map of Africa without consulting England.”78 Logan goes on further to state that the bickering between the European powers over African lands, by a strange twist of fate, aided the cause of Pan-Africanism that Du Bois had been developing since 1900. His premise is based on the fact that as European nations fought over Africa in World War I and later in World War II, the drain in finances in the billions, as well as resources and men made it virtually impossible for them to hold onto their colonial possessions. Logan summed up by stating,

my major conclusion that these gravediggers aided Pan-Africanism is, of course, not original. It is related to the well-known thesis of Samuel Flagg Bemis that Europe’s distress is America’s gain with the sale of Louisiana by Napoleon Bonaparte to the United States is a classic example.79
In Logan’s estimation the Pan-African Congresses between 1919 and 1927 could not ask for immediate independence. Logan states, “The proposal for self-government or independence was pre-mature since the colonial powers were not prepared to grant it and since the concept of inherent inferiority of the Negro still prevailed.” So then, the African colonies under European control were difficult to manage and the belief that Negroes were not ready for independence flew in the face of the basic goals and objectives of the resolutions passed at the early Pan-African Congresses. Woodrow Wilson, the architect of the Mandates System, did not himself believe in Black equality with White Americans nor that Africans were ready for independence. The Mandate System therefore reflected the views of the imperialist Whites who created it—Wilson and Jan Smuts.

Logan concluded regretfully that “the Pan-African Congresses after World War I had failed to achieve the ultimate aim of self-government or independence of Black Africa” the only point echoed by Professor Geiss’ above essay. Ironically, Logan was not totally against the Mandates System in Africa nor European ideas about government citing the influence of “great libertarian principles” on many future African nationalist. Perhaps Logan felt that the Africans under colonialism would learn these “great theories.” World War I and World War II, to Logan, “created the failure of the colonial powers to make colonialism palatable which drove a few nationalist to demand the abolition of colonialism itself.

Though European colonialism died a slow death the seeds of its eventual collapse in the 1950s can no doubt be traced to the early Pan-African Congresses which laid the foundation out of which future Congresses would demand outright independence. So careful a student of Pan-Africanism as Walter Rodney would write,

It was imperialism that was giving us permission to hold a Pan-African Congress. Under those circumstances, the gains could be limited. One could play off some of the contradictions between the imperialist themselves such as the contradiction between the British and French and the Germans at the end of World War I. This observation that Logan connected with the downfall of colonialism that benefited the Pan-African movement was the destruction of the “purity of white womanhood myth.” When the Senegalese troops in the war were accused of invading the German brothels, Logan recalled that really these Africans were snatched up by white women. This is consistent with Logan’s theory that the context of the Pan-African movement should be viewed side by side with World War I and World War II. Black people fought in both of these wars and through all the death and destruction the White world could never look at Black people in just the same light as they had before.
It is clear that what the Pan-African Congresses could not demand in the 1920s it most certainly could demand in the 1950s as a direct result of the foundation laid by the earlier congresses. The idea that Africa should be governed by the Africans, that the economic resources belong to the indigenous people of the land, that Black people are an equal member to the human family and have the right to self-determination are ideas that did not start in 1945. The African independence explosion of the 1950s is an extension of the unfinished Pan-African Congresses movement of the 1920s that provided both the framework, the blueprint and the idea that Africans were not only ready for independence but had the right to self-determination wherever they lived.

The formative years of the great scholar and activist Rayford Logan are a fascinating study in the forces that mold and shape men into what they become. In Logan’s case, he was born into a dignified Black community in Washington, D.C., where manners and grace were as much a part of daily life as church and school. His education at the prestigious Williams College and his stern resolve to become something great in life catapulted Logan into a role as an activist and organizer on behalf of his race. While living abroad in Europe Logan became more acutely aware of the international dynamics of racism and prejudice as a result of European imperialism and colonialism. Logan’s participation in the Pan-African Congresses of 1921, 1923, and 1927 was his first brush with organized protest in adult life and greatly impacted the type of scholar he became at and his razor sharp political analysis. It was all of the above factors that caused Logan to be a Pan-Africanist, a scholar of colonialism in Africa and later a polemicist writing for the *Pittsburgh Courier* after World War II. This was the necessary preparation for Logan’s way of fighting against an international system of racism that classified Black people throughout the African Diaspora as inferior.


3 Apparently Logan was not only a Paris contact for famous Americans such as W.E.B. Du Bois but another soon to be famous black American poet named, Langston Hughes, who he helped get a job. See Langston Hughes, *The Big Sea: An Autobiography by Langston Hughes* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1993), 164-65.


6 Ibid., The locations listed by Du Bois were all conflict areas between the European colonizing powers directly inside or near continental Africa: Fashoda in the Egyptian Sudan, Adua in North Africa, Turkey in the Middle East bordered the Mediterranean Sea, Black Sea and Aegeatic; Tripoli lie in Lybya, North Africa bordering the Mediterranean, Delagoa Bay was in Southeastern Mozambique, Agadir was in Southwest Morocco in North Africa and Algecirus was a port city in southern Spain opposite the rock of Gibraltar in North Africa.


The Pan-African Congress of 1919 is not a focus in this study beyond the establishment of the Congresses themselves. For details regarding the 1919 congress see Du Bois’ first-hand account in the April edition of *Crisis magazine* 1919 or Clarence Contee’s article cited in the above footnotes.
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