

## United States Relations with South Africa: The Realm of Ideas

Y. G-M. Lulat

**NOTE:** This reading comprises Chapter 14 (“The Realm of Ideas: Cognitive Relations”) of a book titled *United States Relations with South Africa: A Critical Overview from the Colonial Period to the Present* by Y.G-M. Lulat (New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing Group, 2008). For more on the book click here: <http://bit.ly/sabook>

### Chapter Contents

#### IDEATIONAL RELATIONS/... 404

“Tuskegeeism” and the Education of Black South Africans

*The Phelps-Stokes African Education Commission (PSAEC)*  
*Charles T. Loram*

Black Power and Black Consciousness

Black Liberation Theology

Nonviolent Civil Disobedience

Musical Influences: borrowing, blending, and transmutation

*Minstrelsy and Jubilee Songs*

*Jazz*

*Television*

#### COMPARATIVE ANALYTICAL “RELATIONS”/... 418

Apartheid versus Jim Crow

Colonization: Little Big Horn and Isandlwana

Affirmative Action

White Racialized Violence

Environmental History

#### NOTES/... 423

## The Realm of Ideas: Cognitive Relations

As we end this part of the book on political and other relations, we must now to bring to the fore an aspect of U.S. relations with South Africa that has been lurking around as one of the subtexts of this work—one that will be clearly present, for example, when we undertake our forays into Ethiopianism and Garveyism in South Africa in the next chapter (which should be read in conjunction with this chapter). Specifically, these forays will provide us with a window on a significant aspect of U.S. African American relations with black South Africa: the cross-fertilization of ideas that would come to play an important part in the development of the antiapartheid struggle in South Africa and in the United States (and which would also, in turn, influence the U.S. civil rights movement, as will be indicated below). However, one can go even further: In considering these transatlantic diasporic connections between Afro-South Africans and U.S. African Americans, we will be presented, albeit subtextually, with an even broader topic: an area of relations between the United States and South Africa that is not usually highlighted as a special or distinct *category* of research under the general topic of “U.S. relations with South Africa”; this is the subtopic that comprises “intellectual relations.” We will now devote this chapter to this subtopic.

To start with, what does one mean by “intellectual relations”? To explain: given the similarities in some of the determinative elements of the historical experiences of both countries, it is not surprising that along the way a range of people (represented by philosophers, scholars, theologians, educators, activists, etc.) have found a rich terrain of ideas to explore, mine, and emulate in an area of U.S. relations with South Africa that we may label, for want of a better term, as “cognitive relations”—namely intangible relations based on *ideas* (giving rise to a subset of cognitive relations that we can term *ideational relations*), and those based on comparative theoretical *analysis* (producing a subset of relations we may call *comparative analytical “relations”*).

### IDEATIONAL RELATIONS

It is to be expected that with such tangible relations as those based on trade, investment, foreign policy, exchange of visitors, and the like, connecting two societies over a long period of time (spanning centuries) there is bound to be an interchange of *ideas* emerging out of the particular historical circumstances of each society of such significance as to have *some* determinative influence on the historical trajectory of either societies involved—depending upon the direction and intensity of the flow of the ideas in question. Not surprisingly, South Africa and the United States from this perspective have not been exceptions. For our present purposes, there are at least five examples that stand out for consideration and which are subsumed under these headings: “Tuskegeeism,” black power, black liberation theology, nonviolent civil disobedience, and musical influences. First, however, a cau-

tionary note: the transfer of ideas (sometimes referred to as “cultural imperialism” when nations of unequal power, as in this instance, are involved) always takes one or both of two principal forms, informal and formal but whichever form it takes it does not necessarily mean that the transfer is always wholesale or that it is always successful, whatever the intentions of the agents involved (activists, experts, academics, researchers, think tanks, foundations, government officials, etc.), even when the transfer is the object of a planned endeavor.<sup>1</sup>

### “Tuskegeeism” and the Education of Black South Africans

We can begin this discussion of “Tuskegeeism” (constituting the aims, approaches, and practice characteristic of the Hampton/Tuskegee educational model—see below—and of which Booker T. Washington was among its chief proponents) in South Africa, by pointing out here, that Tuskegeeism was also emblematic of the Euro-South African equivalent of the black South African fascination with black America. That is, just as black South Africans came to look at a part of United States for inspiration in their struggles for dignity and freedom from white racist oppression, Euro-South Africans also came to see a part of United States as a source for ideas and insights on how to construct a whiteness-inspired racial state. (The process, in fact, had begun, as we saw at the beginning of this work, with the U.S. War of Independence where some among the Cape burghers sought inspiration from that struggle for their own desire for autonomy.) In other words, for good or ill, the United States became a beacon of hope and ideas for both whites and blacks in South Africa, but for entirely opposite reasons, from very early on.

While all formal educational systems in all societies are also agencies of social control—in some societies more explicitly than in others—in the case of juridically subjugated groups this aspect of education will receive an even greater and more explicit emphasis from the ruling group.<sup>2</sup> A case in point is the education of blacks in both the United States and South Africa around the turn of the twentieth-century.<sup>3</sup> Once it was accepted by the State that access to education could no longer be denied to blacks (after Emancipation in the United States, and after the formation of the Union in South Africa) then the issue that immediately arose was how best to *adapt* the existing educational system for whites to the needs of this new clientele. Now, whereas the term “adapt” (and adaptation) occurs fairly frequently in the literature on black education generally, it is very important to distinguish between the two senses of the word in which it occurs historically (for one was far from benign compared to the other). In one sense it was used neutrally to mean the same as that defined by any dictionary, which in relation to education referred to the modification of some features of a transplanted education system (pedagogy, texts, language of instruction, and so on) to suit the specific circumstances of the recipient of the transplantation on purely legitimate pedagogic grounds. In another sense, which is of particular relevance here, its use implied that the system was to be adapted to suit, on one hand, the mental capabilities of an entire people—judged to be an intellectually inferior people (namely blacks and other colonized peoples)—and on the other, the subservient political and economic status of the same people relative to their white masters. In other words, adaptation meant subpar educational provision of white education to blacks and others on both racist and political grounds. The study by Reilly (1995) provides a good example of what this meant at the policy-level in Anglophone Africa where he traces the linkages in the first decades of the twentieth-century among the racist ideas of three contemporaries, the Euro-American Thomas Jesse Jones, J. H. Oldham (a British missionary official with great influence on matters of colonial education in British government and missionary circles) and Charles T. Loram (a white South African educator and one time government official who we have already met), which were the basis of educational policy for blacks in the U.S. South and in British colonial Africa in the early part of the twentieth-century. Reilly explores in his study how the social Darwinist beliefs of these three came to influence educational provision for Africans in the British colonial Africa generally and in South Africa specifically. That is, all three were firm believers in the Hampton/Tuskegee (H/T) model of education where the primary objective was to increase the productive value of black labor through vocational education, but at the same time deny them access to academic education available to whites so as to keep them subservient to white overlordship (constituting the same recurring theme that has marked the entire history of black/white relations in the post-1492 era: racism as the handmaiden of capitalism and white privilege).

The H/T model, as King (1971) who did a seminal study on the subject explains, rested on what was once euphemistically called “industrial education.” The ideological underpinnings of this form of education is summarized by him as the “disavowal of all political ambition on the part of the Negroes, and a readiness to stay in the South as a steady labor supply” (p. 8). Among the clearest statements of what this model meant, however, is to be found in a massive two-volume study of the status of African American education that was done by Thomas Jesse Jones for the Phelps-Stokes Fund and which was published by the U.S. government’s Bureau of Education division of the Department of the Interior a year after its completion in 1916 (US-BE 1969 [1916]). In that study Jones laid out, though not in so many words, the problem: unenlightened whites (especially in the U.S. south) did not seem to see any value in the education of African Americans; on the other hand African Americans hungered for education, but of the type (literary academic education) unsuited to their political and economic circumstances—namely, against the backdrop of a rural agrarian economy in which most African Americans were mired as cheap labor, one that was shorn of their civil rights in the context of a rapidly evolving Jim-Crow-driven neofascist political order. (Though that is not exactly how he described these circumstances). A policy for African American education needed to address two problems: that whites needed to be persuaded to see the value of educational provision for African Americans, and the latter needed to be persuaded in the value of an education (industrial education) that did not encourage them to challenge their political and economic subordination.

For our present purposes, it will suffice to concentrate on two primary agents who possibly had the most potential to influence policy in South Africa—from among all the agencies involved in the transfer of ideas (but by no means fully implemented, as will be indicated shortly) associated with the H/T model—one was the Phelps-Stokes African Education Commission (PSAEC) sponsored by the Phelps-Stokes Fund and headed by Thomas Jesse Jones, and the other was Charles T. Loram.

*The Phelps-Stokes African Education Commission (PSAEC).* This body was established in 1919 at the request of the American Baptist Missionary Society by the Phelps-Stokes Fund to study and make recommendations on the education of Africans in British colonial Africa (including South Africa). Interestingly, the Fund was set up by the granddaughter of Daniel Lindley (mentioned earlier), Caroline Phelps Stokes, in 1911. In her will, she had specified that the income from the endowment that was the fund was to be expended for a number of social welfare purposes as well as “for the education of Negroes, both in Africa and the United States... through industrial schools” (from US-BE 1969 [1916]: Vol. 1, p. xi). The Phelps family, says Hull (1990: 155–56) was closely linked to the transnational, Phelps-Dodge Corporation. The PSAEC was led by one Jesse Jones (a white educator who had in 1914 completed an extensive study of the education of U.S. African Americans) and he chose James E. Kwegyir Aggrey to be his co-director on the Commission. Loram was also included in the Commission that went to east and Southern Africa in 1924.<sup>4</sup> Both Jones and Aggrey were strongly influenced by the prevalent ideas of how best to educate U.S. African Americans; chiefly ideas propounded by people such as Booker T. Washington and Samuel Chapman Armstrong (whose ideas were influential in the planning of curricula at the Hampton Institute) that emphasized practical (vocational) education rather than general academic education and which came to be known as the Tuskegee/Hampton model.<sup>5</sup>

*Charles T. Loram.* To begin with it should be stressed that Loram was the more well-known of a group of (mainly white) South Africans who studied at Columbia University’s Teachers College (thanks in part to the assistance provided by the Rockefeller Foundation), during the period 1914–1951 who Fleisch (1995) has helped to identify as “The Teachers College Club: South Africa” and who were instrumental in helping to transfer to South Africa not only ideas related to the education of black South Africans, but a whole panoply of ethos and methodologies associated with, on one hand, social science research and, on the other, the belief that the practitioners of this research were the best qualified to advise society on matters of social policy—thereby, ensuring, in his words “that the United States had an enduring influence on the formation of a racially segregated South African education state (sic), the relationship between civil society and the state, and the authorization of ‘expert’ control” (p. vii).<sup>6</sup>

By all accounts, Loram, from the perspective of his South African contemporaries, had an illustrious career as an educator. He not only received his Ph.D. from Teachers College, Columbia University (after studying at University of Cambridge, and before then at the University of Cape Town)

in 1916—the first South African to do so—but in 1931 he was appointed as the Sterling Professor of Education at Yale University. (A couple of years later he would become the chairperson of the Department of Culture Contacts and Race Relations.) And as already indicated, he was not only a member of the PSAEC from 1921-1924 but he was also the South African representative of both the Phelps-Stokes Fund and the CCNY. At the same time, Loram was among those who were instrumental in getting the CCNY to sponsor the Poor White Study. It is not these achievements per se, however, that are of interest here but his views on the education of black South Africans, specifically his belief in the efficacy of the H/T model and which he tried to implement. While at Columbia he had made a study-tour of Tuskegee and other similar institutions in the U.S. South and he was impressed enough with the H/T model to produce a Ph.D. dissertation (titled *The Education of the South African Native*) that advanced the thesis that the missionaries had gotten it all wrong in their “policy” toward the education of black South Africans, which he argued was evidenced by the high rate of inefficiency of mission institutions (in terms of graduate rates, and the like).<sup>7</sup> Moreover, he strongly insisted the missionary policy was, in any case, unsuited to the political-economic circumstances of South Africa:

If we agree that the object of education is to enable the coming generation to adjust themselves to the society in which they will live, we must admit that the few pupils who survive the elementary curriculum in Native schools are not adequately prepared for their future lives. In South Africa the ruling European has decided that the spheres of work of the two races shall be widely different for the present at any rate. . . . [A]ny system of instruction which failed to take into account that patent fact, and which gave the natives a literary bookish education, as the present system does, when the work which the natives will be required to do will be, for the most part, industrial and agricultural, would be doing the Native more harm than good. [Therefore T]he Education given at the present [should] not have the effect of causing the Native to despise manual labor and to incline to the clerical occupations, which the European has decided shall be reserved for those of his own race. (Loram 1917: 127)

However, Loram also laid the blame for the “irrelevant” education that blacks were receiving in mission schools at the door of the “Natives” arguing that the “disinclination of the Natives themselves for manual and industrial education in school,” was the result in part of the fact that “The native is naturally indolent, and his ideal of life is one of ease. Circumstances have made him the hewer of wood and the drawer of water for the white man. The white man does not work with his hands. He is a ‘gentleman.’ The native believes that it is education which has made the white man what he is. When he goes to school any attempt to make him do manual work is regarded as a subtle attempt on the white man’s part to prevent him from reaching his ideal” (p. 160).<sup>8</sup> Loram concluded his dissertation with observations on his visit to Tuskegee and Hampton, institutions that he greatly admired, commenting “Lofty ideals, devotion to duty, and the spirit of religion we have in our South African missionaries in abundance. It remains to inculcate among our Native students the ideals of social service, and to frame our courses of study, untrammelled by tradition and outside authority, on the present needs of the South African Natives” (p. 312).

In his effort to popularize these ideas Loram was helped by circumstance, for in the period prior to his graduate studies he had joined the Natal Education Department (in 1906) which later opened the door to his appointment as the Chief Inspector of Native Education in Natal Province in 1918, just two years after getting his Ph.D. (he held the post until 1921). Now, although Loram did manage to introduce some modifications to the curriculum of black schools (as well as bringing a modicum of order to the education “system” sufficient to even impress the PSAEC) he was unable to effect a wholesale change to the system in line with what he advocated—both the missionaries and their charges saw to that.

In other words, simply because he and those who shared his views (which included some Afro-South Africans who had studied in the United States) were greatly enamored with the H/T model does not mean that this model, as Fleisch (1995) has demonstrated, was able to exert hegemonic status over missionary educational policy. Thanks to the long history of missionary control over education of Afro-South Africans, coupled with the desires of the Afro-South Africans themselves, the general tendency in the development of African education would be a slow but steady movement toward convergence with white education (from the perspective of broad parameters). Both the missionaries and the Afro-South Africans never gave up faith in the potential for black assimilation into white society by means of education, illusory though this goal was in practice. Efforts to undermine the “liberal” or “academic” oriented education were therefore resisted and, by and large,

quite successfully. Consider, for example, the path that was pursued by the first university college for Afro-South Africans, the University College of Fort Hare. Despite the example of the much celebrated Lovedale Mission Station located nearby (with its industrial education approach to schooling), and even though the new college's head, Alexander Kerr, had visited the Tuskegee Institute (and not to mention Loram's membership of the college's governing council), the H/T influence was not a major presence in the curricular mission of the college.<sup>9</sup> Kerr in fact observed that by the time of his visit in 1922, both Hampton and Tuskegee were, in response to "other times, other needs" moving away from the model of education they had pioneered toward a more conventional type of higher education (Kerr 1968: 99). Kerr would further comment on this matter:

Missionaries have been blamed for giving him [the African] an education which is merely bookish, but when they teach him such arts as building and carpentry, they find that their protégés are debarred from employment by the only persons with capital enough for undertaking contracts requiring their services. As long as such a condition of affairs prevails the education of the African is bound to have a bookish bias, and his field of employment to lie amongst the professions: ministers, teachers, doctors, lawyers, civil servants, journalist" (p. 130).

By the time the apartheid state took over control of black education following the enactment of the *Bantu Education Act* of 1953 (which was informed by the recommendations of the 1949 *Report of the Commission on Native Education in South Africa*—commonly known as *The Eiselen Commission Report*, after its Chairman Dr. W. W. M. Eiselen—released in 1951) the notion of "adapted education," as a practical nation-wide policy, was essentially dead concludes Fleisch (1995). Segregated education, the chief thrust of the Act, did not have to necessarily imply industrial education (even if the quality of education provided to blacks would be inferior to that of whites). To put the matter differently, in examining the influence of the PSAEC and people such as Loram, one must distinguish between intentions and outcomes. On the other hand, other ideas about education in the United States did have considerable influence on the course of South Africa's educational development, they included "IQ testing, the comprehensive high school, vocational guidance and various pedagogic innovations" (Fleisch, p. 277).

### Black Power and Black Consciousness

Accompanying the struggles of the African diaspora in United States for human and civil rights—as whites, under the aegis of a recurring pattern of virulent dialectically intertwined capitalist and racist imperatives that had shaped U.S. history from the moment the first European settlers set foot in the North American ecumene, dramatically propelled the United States away from the intent of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments (brilliantly summarized by Nieman 1991) following the Civil War—were a number of ideological approaches, the *influences* of which would find their way through several agencies across the Atlantic to black South Africa and help to shape the character of black nationalism in that country in its democratic struggles to demolish the institutional manifestations of the ideological hegemony of whiteness.<sup>10</sup> As we have seen, these influences were expressed through the "Ethiopianism" of the AME and the "Tuskegeeism" of Booker T. Washington during the period leading up to the First World War, and the Garveyism of UNIA in the interwar period—but against the backdrop of a broader but indeterminate "existential" influences of a *seemingly* successful black America (in the eyes of Afro-South Africans), represented, for instance, by such cultural agencies as the McAdoo Jubilee Singers and the like.

We now turn to yet another major influence to come out of the cauldron of the black/white struggle in the United States and it would arrive in the postwar period, specifically in the 1970s, in the form of the Black Power Movement but which in the South African context would be expressed as the Black Consciousness Movement (BCM). The chief architect of this movement would be Steve Biko. Through the organizational vehicles of the black South African Students Organization (SASO) and later the Black People's Convention (BPC), he helped to develop the ideology of Black Consciousness by eclectically borrowing from a variety of both domestic and foreign intellectual sources, including the PAC and such widely influential revolutionary writers and thinkers as the Guinean revolutionary leader Amilcar Cabral, Caribbean psychologist Frantz Fanon; the Brazilian educator Paulo Freire; U.S. African American nationalist Malcolm X; a number of luminaries of the U.S. Black Power movement, notably the Black Panthers (in the persons of Bobby Seale and Huey P. Newton), Eldridge Cleaver, Kwame Ture (Stokely Carmichael); and the U.S. black liberation theolo-

gist James Cone—against the backdrop of rapid urbanization of Afro-South Africans, the seemingly intensifying apartheid oppression in the face of rising expectations of the young, and such consciousness-raising events as the independence of Mozambique in 1974 and the defeat of the SAAG expeditionary force in Angola in 1976. Without a doubt, however, among the *overseas-derived* influences it is the influence of the U.S. Black Power movement that would hold pride of place because it was closest to the homegrown black consciousness ideology of, for example, Anton Lembede of the ANC Youth League and PAC's Robert Sobukwe—albeit from another era (late 1940s to early 1960s)—in the birth and evolution of BCM.

Although there is a general tendency to place the birth of the U.S. Black Power movement within the narrative of the civil rights movement—by pointing to the June 17, 1966 speech by Kwame Ture in Greenwood, Mississippi in which he called for black power as the ideological and strategic basis for the civil rights struggle—it is necessary to be reminded that the Black Power movement, whether its advocates admitted it or not, was heir to the radicalism of at least two sources: that of Bishop Henry McNeal Turner and, of course, Marcus Garvey (both of whom advocated the overthrow of the hegemony of whiteness at the intellectual level and at the political and economic level self-direction and self-reliance. In explicitly rejecting the pacifism of Martin Luther King, Jr. and others, the Black Power movement introduced, initially perhaps inadvertently, the issue of class in the struggle for civil rights: expressed through its disillusionment with the leadership of the U.S. African American petite bourgeoisie who it felt was incapable of comprehending the insidious nature of whiteness that while patently obvious in the case of the Jim Crowism of the white southerner was also, however, integral to northern white liberalism even if not so readily apparent. Kwame Ture and his colleagues among other things sought to expose the unwillingness of Northern white liberalism to shed its residual adherence to the ideology of whiteness (a problem that continues to plague it to the present day)—even as it hypocritically railed against the racism of Jim Crow South—symptomatic of which was its failure to work toward the amelioration (let alone elimination) of the severe racially-determined oppression of blacks living in the *de facto* segregated ghettos of Northern cities (marked by conditions ranging from poverty and unemployment to inadequate and poor quality of schooling, and from overcrowded rat-infested run-down housing to police brutality).<sup>11</sup>

From the perspective of BCM, the crucial element in the Black Power ideology that would inform their movement was the necessity to grapple with the hegemony of the ideology of whiteness at both psycho-cognitive levels and at the political level. As Murray (1987: 222–23) explains: “The imaginative and original contribution of Black Consciousness revolved around its steadfast refusal to accept the received notion that *apartheid* ideology and South African liberalism were somehow ideological opposites.” He continues, “The pioneering Black Consciousness visionaries doubted the willingness of white liberals to renounce the system that guaranteed their accumulated privileges. Black Consciousness adherents reasoned that liberalism as a doctrine was incapable either of unambiguously confronting the question of racial/national oppression or addressing the uniqueness of the South African black experience.” Starting from this premise, fundamental to the Black Consciousness ideology, *as it would eventually come to evolve over the years*, would be five main concepts: (1) in the struggle for freedom, what blacks had to do first and foremost was to break the chains of the racist intellectual hegemony of whiteness by freeing themselves in the mind: that is to rid themselves of psychological oppression foisted on them through centuries of white racist propaganda that at its core preached the false doctrine of inherent white superiority over black peoples; (2) the term “black” was not a racial or ethnic term, but a political one; that is all victims of oppression regardless of their color or ethnicity could be categorized as “black.” (3) That, with rare exception, white liberals could not be trusted. While their opposition to apartheid was perhaps genuine at the ideological level, the fact that they were materially benefiting from the system left them too compromised to work, in practice, for the genuine dismantling of the system on the basis of universal suffrage. (4) That racism in South Africa was inextricably bound up with capitalism and therefore attacking racism also required attacking capitalism itself. In other words the oppression of the black man was a function of the dialectical relationship between capitalism and racism in which one fed on the other. (5) While it was essential that blacks unite in their struggle against racist/capitalist oppression it was equally essential that the call for black unity not lose sight of the fact that there were some within the black community, the petite bourgeoisie, who stood to gain from corroboration with SAAG. In other words, the struggle against racist/capitalist oppression also required paying attention to the dif-

ferent class interests within the black community itself. Not all blacks could be trusted because (as aspiring capitalists) they were not all necessarily against capitalist oppression even if they were against racist oppression. Ultimately it was class and not race that determined a person's political and ideological proclivities. (This fifth concept would take considerable time to evolve and would not fully become part of Black Consciousness thinking until the late 1970s.)

Without any question, BCM emerged as a powerful force in galvanizing the young, who had never known any other kind of political arrangement in South Africa besides apartheid, to overthrow the weight of apartheid-driven socialization that attempted to inculcate a world view of the inevitability and naturalness of the whiteness-based South African racial state. In other words, BCM became a potent force for cultivating political consciousness among the young. This was all the more critical for the antiapartheid struggle within South Africa given, at this point in time, the relative absence of any credible presence—thanks to the hitherto seemingly almost invincible might of the apartheid security apparatus—of the old guard movements, such as the ANC, the CPSA, and the PAC. While these organizations were taken by surprise and perhaps even alarmed at their total lack of control over the spontaneous rebellions that would mark the second “decade of antiapartheid rebellion,” in the end they benefitted from the BCM handsomely: the thousands of young who escaped the ensuing apartheid crackdown in the 1970s by going abroad, especially following the Soweto Uprising, joined the ranks of these hitherto relatively moribund organizations. At the same time, those who remained within the country soon discovered that from the perspective of long-term political strategy of overthrowing the apartheid state (in contrast to episodic confrontations with it, no matter how dramatic), organizations like the ANC had more to offer—especially after the ANC *readopted* a parallel strategy of nonviolent civil disobedience through mass mobilization in the aftermath of the Soweto Uprising.<sup>12</sup>

### Black Liberation Theology

It should, perhaps, not be surprising that in the face of the historical collusion in the United States between the white Christian churches and the racist order on one hand, and the emergence of the Black Power movement on the other, there would emerge a strand among the black clergy (many associated with the white churches) a “radical” line of thought on what Christianity meant under conditions of racist oppression in the mid-1960s, even as the civil rights movement was savoring its legislative victories, as expressed by, for example, the *Civil Rights Act* of 1964 and the *Voting Rights Act* of 1965. Distinct from the more accommodationist-oriented black clergy (represented by, for example, people such as Martin Luther King, Jr. and the organization of which he was among the leading figures, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference), that while supportive of the struggle for civil rights for blacks—and as a consequence were willing to build alliances with the white liberal groups, religious or otherwise—the radicals would insist on completely rethinking the role of the Christian church in the existing whiteness-determined racial order. The outcome would be the birth of “Black Liberation Theology.”<sup>13</sup> Taking their cue from the emerging Black Power movement and working in the “prophetic” tradition, the new theology sought to ask questions such as, in the words of Hopkins (2006):

What did it mean to be black and Christian? Where was God and Jesus Christ in the urban rebellions [of the “long hot summer”]? Was the black church simply serving an Uncle Tom, other-worldly role; or was it aiding in black control of the community and black people’s destiny? Could blacks continue to uphold the theology of integrationism and liberalism—a theology where all power remained in the hands of white people? When stripped of its “whiteness,” what did Christianity say to black Americans? Could black identity, culture, history, and language become authentic sources for the doing of theology? What did a blue-eyed, blond-haired, “hippie-looking” Jesus have to do with Black Power and black liberation? (p. 85)

The organizational embodiment of the founding of Black Liberation Theology would be the formal establishment, on the basis of an initially ad hoc group of like-minded radical clergy that had come together in 1966, of the National Committee of Negro Churchmen (“Negro” would be shortly replaced by “Black”—hence, NCBC) in the fall of 1968, with Gayraud Wilmore as its first chairperson. A year later, with the publication of *Black Theology and Black Power* by a relatively unknown black theologian James H. Cone (1969), Black Liberation Theology would receive its theoretical exposition and justification. Arguing that at the core of the message of Christ, as exemplified by his life, as well as the Biblical exodus of the Israelites out of Egypt to escape Pharaohic bond-



age, was the liberation of the poor and the oppressed—and in this sense, symbolically, Christ was not white but black—the task of Black Liberation Theology was to restore to Christianity its essence: the liberation of humanity from all Satanic evils (which includes racist oppression), so that it may enter “God’s Kingdom.” In other words, to the proponents of Black Liberation Theology a Christianity that sought to justify oppression in the name of God was not Christianity, but a heresy.

Similarly, there arose in South Africa too, on the back of the Black Consciousness Movement (BCM), and with inspiration from the work of NCBC, a South African version of “black liberation theology.”<sup>14</sup> Among the chief proponents of it was the Colored Reverend Allan A. Boesak of the Dutch Reformed Mission Church, who beginning in the mid-1970s began to articulate a distinct theology that would come to see relevance in the message of the BCM. Beginning with an uncompromising critique of the NGK inspired theological basis of apartheid, he would assert (like his counterparts in the United States) that the fundamental message of the Scripture, that is the “Word of God” upon which the Reformed Churches place great emphasis, was liberation in its totality—one that includes liberating Christianity itself from such ideological perversions as apartheid. In his words: “Apartheid is more than an ideology, more than something that has been thought up to form the content of a particular political policy. Apartheid is also pseudo-gospel. It was born in the church.... The struggle against apartheid... is, therefore, more than merely a struggle against an evil ideology. It is more than a struggle for the liberation and wholeness of people, white as well as black, in South Africa. It is also finally a struggle for the integrity of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.” Commenting specifically on the matter of the “black” content of this theology, Boesak would add further: “Black Theology is a theology of liberation. By that we mean the following. Black Theology believes that liberation is not only ‘part of’ the gospel, ‘consistent with’ the gospel; it is the content and framework of the gospel of Jesus Christ” (from Hopkins 2006: 98–99).

Although the South African version had echoes in it of the U.S. version—especially given that the NCBC people made an effort to reach out to both the South Africans and others in the rest of the continent by means of conferences and the like (as well as through the medium that we may fruitfully label as the “osmosis of ideas” that publications and travel make possible)—one ought to caution that, like the BCM itself, it was not a carbon-copy of the U.S. version.<sup>15</sup> It differed both in the emphasis placed on the Scripture, as well as on the redemptive potential of whites (in other words, from the perspective of the latter, it was more inclusive and less “nationalistic”). Boesak fully accepted the possibility of reconciliation between blacks and whites, but among the defining characteristics of this reconciliation had to be, on one hand, the acceptance by blacks of their blackness (that is, they must shed the incubus of inferiority placed on their humanity by the ideology of whiteness—as called for by the BCM), and on the other, a genuine repentance on the part of whites (“I speak of those white Christians who have understood their own white guilt in the oppression of black people as corporate responsibility, who have genuinely repented and have been genuinely converted”—from Hopkins, p. 101.) In other words, BLT is also a theology for the liberation of whites. As Hopkins puts it: “In analyzing the black poor’s particularity, black theology expresses solidarity with the liberation of the world’s poor. In the liberation of the universal poor, the rich oppressor simultaneously attains liberation. Without black victims to oppress, the white ‘victimizer’ would also enjoy the fruits of Jubilee” (p. 108). One ought to also add here that Boesak defined oppression to go beyond simply the issue of racism, to also include class, and therefore he warned, quite presciently as it has turned out, of the oppression of blacks by blacks (in collusion with whites)—that is, the rich versus the poor or the black bourgeoisie versus the black poor masses, in the coming apartheid-free South Africa. (It may be noted that this line of reasoning, on the connections between race and capitalism, receives generally less emphasis in the U.S. version of BLT).<sup>16</sup>

### Nonviolent Civil Disobedience

It is most strange indeed that, with the exception of a few works, the large corpus of biographies and scholarly writings on Mahatma Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi provides only a cursory nod at the formatively most important period of Gandhi’s personal *and* intellectual life, the two decades or so (from 1893 to 1914) that Gandhi spent in South Africa *as an adult*. (Whiffs of essentialism?).<sup>17</sup> Yet, as Brown (1996) and Parel (1996), for example, show, without the South African experience there would have been no “Gandhi” as we have come to know him. He may have been the father of

modern India, but he was also, in a sense, the son of a modern (black) South Africa.<sup>18</sup> It is not simply that South Africa is where he first tried out his nonviolent approach to civil disobedience for purposes of effecting political change, or that it was the birthplace of this strategy in the form that he came to conceive it (as *satyagraha*—involving both political and “spiritual” dialectically-connected goals), or that it is where he published his seminal work, *Hind Swaraj*, on the basis of his South African experiences (which provided both the historical and intellectual contexts for it), but above all, as an adopted son of (black) South Africa, specifically the free South African Indian community, South Africa provided him with the status of the “big fish in a small pond.” Whereas, had he remained in India he would have been merely one among millions of fishes in the sea (a nonentity to all intents and purposes, for there was nothing in his early life that pointed to eventual greatness as a “philosopher-activist”). To explain: given his lower middle-class Hindu status, coupled with his shy personality and self-effacing character, had he remained in India after returning from England he is unlikely to have had the opportunity to grow in both self-confidence and character—something that the act of leadership tends to *dialectically* engender—nor would it have been possible for him to undertake the social “experiments” (given the constraints of tradition and custom) that would be the basis of the evolution of his *satyagraha*. (It is most unlikely that he would have been able to establish a “Tolstoy Farm” or a “Phoenix Settlement” if he had remained in India.<sup>19</sup>) In other words, it is in South Africa that he came to both personal and intellectual maturity, without which he would neither have come to assume the leadership of the struggle for the independence of India from British colonial rule, nor would he have produced the philosophical contributions that have become the patrimony of all who espouse nonviolence change across the planet, or who seek truly meaningful ways of contributing to public life.

If one were to insist on a single seminal event in South Africa that would propel Gandhi onto the Gandhian trajectory of philosopher-activist, then it would have to be the train journey from Durban to Pretoria shortly following his arrival in the country in 1893 when he was unceremoniously forced off the first-class compartment of the train (because it was reserved exclusively for whites, even though he possessed a first-class ticket) at the Pietermaritzburg station. It is as a result of this incident, that he first began to entertain the idea of fighting the system that made this racist humiliation possible. Now, in one of those intriguing coincidences of history, this racially-inspired public humiliation would find its echo in a similar humiliation many decades later, and thousands of miles away across the ocean, in another country, in United States, and it too would help launch the career of a man and a movement of considerable import for essentially the same reasons: to overthrow a system that made such racial humiliation possible (and who, most sadly, would share the same mind-numbing ironic fate that befell Gandhi: death at the hands of an assassin). Reference here is of course to the much, and deservedly, celebrated rise of the nonviolent civil rights movement in the United States in the latter half of the 1950s led by Martin Luther King, Jr. (MLK) following the refusal by Gloria Parks to forcibly give up her seat on a bus in deference to white passengers—a compromise protocol established, ironically, as a result of another bus boycott organized by U.S. African Americans in 1953 in Baton Rouge, Louisiana—and the subsequent launch of a year-long bus boycott (1955–1956) in which Reverend King would come to play a prominent role.

In South Africa the final culmination of the nonviolent civil disobedience strategy that Gandhi had first articulated and nurtured there over a period of 21 years (1893–1914) was the *Defiance Campaign* of 1952 undertaken jointly by the African National Congress, the South African Indian Congress, and others. Yet, the Defiance Campaign as a strategy of nonviolence civil disobedience was a failure in terms of achieving freedom from racial oppression (leaving in its wake the adoption of an alternative strategy by the protagonists: that of revolutionary violence). In contrast, in United States, the nonviolent civil disobedience strategy adopted by MLK led eventually to the successes embodied by two of the major pieces of legislation in the history of the United States over the preceding century: the *Civil Rights Act* of 1964 and the *Voting Rights Act* of 1965 that would forever alter the course of black-white relations in United States. However, our concern here is not the relative successes and failures of the strategy that has come to be so closely associated with Gandhi, but rather the mediatory role of South Africa as an ideational crucible for the genesis, blending, modification, flowering, and propagation of an important idea behind *satyagraha*, nonviolent civil disobedience, that involved the work of three men but who never met in person: U.S. Euro-American philosopher Henry David Thoreau (1817–1862), Gandhi (1869–1948), and MLK (1929–1968)—the printed

word being the principal link.<sup>20</sup> While some may, perhaps, dismiss out of hand the ideational connections that are being drawn here (and to complicate matters one may also add into the mix the Russian writer and philosopher Leo Tolstoy, with whom Gandhi was in touch) between these three men as somewhat tenuous—though one should be reminded here that in the realm of evolving philosophies, strategies, and the like it is a fool’s errand to attempt to quantify the impact of ideas and insights sourced, whether consciously (as in this case) or unconsciously, from elsewhere—the point being made is that in tracing the well-known transatlantic journey of Gandhi’s influence, not only did South Africa play a pivotal role but that in addition that journey, at least part of it, had its roots in the United States. To put the matter differently: just as MLK gave credit to the *influence* of Gandhi’s ideas in the development of his own nonviolent approach to the struggle for civil rights,<sup>21</sup> so too did Gandhi give credit to the influence of Thoreau in the evolution (though not genesis) of his (Gandhi’s) own approach to nonviolent civil disobedience as a foundation stone of satyagraha.<sup>22</sup> There were, therefore, two transatlantic ideational crossings: from the United States to South Africa and from there back to United States.<sup>23</sup> (An analogy drawn from material earlier in this chapter: African music—generically understood—crosses the Atlantic to become eventually part of the evolution of jazz in United States and then from there it crosses back to become part of the evolution of South African urban music.) Moreover, in these crossings the subtextual suggestion here is not one of serendipity, but deliberate agency born out of the reality of a shared historical experience: the struggle to remake a society corrupted and brutalized by the forces of whiteness-inspired racial oppression.

### Musical Influences: borrowing, blending, and transmutation

It would not be an exaggeration to state that South Africans of all colors have had a love affair with U.S.-derived mass entertainment and culture that is of long-standing, whatever else their opinions have been of the United States as a nation-state.<sup>24</sup> One of the earliest forms of mass entertainment to arrive in South Africa from the United States was music, initially in the form of minstrelsy—to be replaced later by other musical forms as they were developed within United States, such as ragtime, jazz, rock ’n’ roll, and so forth.<sup>25</sup> (And later of course would come other cultural forms, such as cinema.) Given that the development of *homegrown* music in United States has depended on the overwhelming contribution, for historical reasons, of U.S. African Americans more than any other group, it is the various forms of this music that would be exported to all corners of the world. In the case of South Africa, following Manuel (1988: 106) one can adduce three principal reasons for the popularity of U.S. African-American-inspired music there: (a) Southern African music tends to be less polyrhythmic and more vocally based compared to music elsewhere in Africa; consequently it has a closer musical affinity to rhythmically less complicated styles of U.S. African American music. In other words, Afro-South Africans, sometimes consciously but mostly subconsciously, were able to discern and relate to the “Africanness” of U.S. African American music from the perspective of musical structure. (b) Whites in South Africa, as in United States, in spite of (or because of) their racism, were not averse to U.S. African American music for their own reasons.<sup>26</sup> (c) Afro-South Africans were emotionally drawn to U.S. African Americans because of their (legitimate) perception that they shared the same enemy: the hegemony of the ideology of whiteness—even if its political and economic expressions were not always identical to those in United States.<sup>27</sup> At the same time, the *content* of the music (especially in the case of spirituals) had a deep resonance for them given their own whiteness-inspired trials and tribulations; as the newspaper *Ilanga Lase Natal*, for example, observed: “there breathes hope and faith in the ultimate justice and brotherhood of man. The cadences of sorrow invariably turn to joy, and the message is ever manifest that... every man will be free” (from Ballantine 1991a: 132).

Under the circumstances, for Afro-South Africans especially, their affinity for U.S. African American musical genre would come to be of such ubiquity and durability that it would palpably influence the development of their own musical forms and styles. That is, against the backdrop of the perception of both a racial and cultural identity with U.S. African Americans (regardless of whether it was misplaced or not), Afro-South Africans took the multistage journey of fascination, imitation, borrowing, blending, and transmutation in the cultural realm generally, and in the musical one specifically, with great alacrity.

*Minstrelsy and Jubilee Songs.* South Africa's first mass exposure to U.S.-derived music, arguably, occurred through the agency of a U.S. African American minstrel troupe the Virginia Jubilee Singers (also known as the Minstrel, Vaudeville and Concert Company) under the direction of its founder Orpheus Myron McAdoo, singer and impresario.<sup>28</sup> Although some English whites in South Africa already had some familiarity with blackface minstrelsy, and the highly successful New York-based white troupe the Christy Minstrels had performed in South Africa in 1862, it is the McAdoo Singers (as the troupe is also known) that firmly put minstrelsy, with its various constituent musical styles, on the South African mass entertainment map.<sup>29</sup> As for Afro-South Africans, except perhaps for the few who had gone to study in the United States, they probably had never encountered it before; yet the countryside performance tour that included both the countryside and the city by the singers (who arrived in South Africa in June 1890 and would end up spending altogether a total of some five years in the country (1890–1892, and 1895–1898) would leave a lasting impression on them. The sentiment was best captured by one Josiah Semouse of Kimberley, a future member of the Afro-South African troupe known as the South African Choir, which, taking the cue from the McAdoo Singers, would embark upon their own overseas tour (from 1891 to 1894) that would also take them to the United States:

“Gentleman, I do not find the words to describe the way in which these people sang. Unless I am mistaken, I can say that they sang like angels singing Hosanna in heaven. All the people on the diamond fields agree that they sing better than anybody else, white or black. . . . Today they have their own schools, primary, secondary, and high schools, and also universities. They are run by them without the help of the whites. They have magistrates, judges, lawyers, bishops. . . . When will the day come when the African people will be like the Americans? When will they stop being slaves and become nations with their own government?” (From Erlmann 1994: 168)

In the same vein, compare also the review by the Zulu newspaper *Imvo Zabantsundu* (founded and run by John Tengo Jabavu) in its October 16, 1890 issue, which observed inter alia:

The vocabulary of praise has been exhausted by the press of this country in the eulogy of the performances of the world-famed Concert Company of the Jubilee Singers. To such an extent has this been the case that it would tax the ingenuity of an ordinary writer to add to the rich encomiums. . . . It would strongly savor of presumption for a Native African of this part to venture a critique on his brethren from America, who are now visiting this quarter of their fatherland, and whose position, socially, is being deservedly pointed at on all hands as one that Native[s] here should strive to attain. . . . As Africans, we are, of course, proud of the achievements of those of our race. Their visit will do their countrymen no end of good. Already it has suggested reflections to many who who, without such a demonstration, would have remained skeptical as to the possibility, not to say probability, of the Natives of this country being raised to anything above remaining as perpetual hewers of wood and drawers of water. (From the review reproduced in Wright 1976: 323)

The review then ends with this interesting comment: “We need not say that we wish them a successful trip through the land, a trip which must be fruitful of reflections to them as their appearance in it has been to the descendants of those who escaped transportation to America.” Clearly, to the Afro-South Africans the country-wide tour of several years duration altogether by the McAdoo Singers not only built the foundations for the emotionally warm view that most of them would generally develop of their diasporic brethren from North America—laying the groundwork for the arrival of other influences (e.g. the Ethiopianism of the AME, and Garveyism)—vestiges of which have lasted up to the present, but it was also symbolic of resistance to the hegemony of whiteness.<sup>30</sup> As Erlmann (1991: 60) explains: “It is the role of defense against white exclusivism and racism that accounts for the early impact of [African American] music and minstrelsy together with a variety of other forms of musical comedy and black humor on the evolution of black popular music in South Africa. . . .” In other words, the positive reception that the McAdoo Singers received from Afro-South Africans was not simply a function of their musical prowess, but what they also represented to Afro-South Africans: an alternative identity that did not correspond to the racist “less-than-human” identity that whiteness constantly sought to impose on them through the racially-determined triple forces of armed violence, economic super-exploitation, and whiteness-inspired Christian proselytization; that is, an identity that affirmed nothing less than their full humanity and dignity.<sup>31</sup> Unbeknownst to the McAdoo Singers then, their music was not simply a form of entertainment but it also represented a consciousness-raising idiom for Afro-South Africans.<sup>32</sup> (See also a discussion in an analogous vein by Ballantine [1991b] who considers the political significance of jazz and vaudeville in South Africa in the period 1920s through 1940s.)

Though, it should also be noted that from their side the McAdoo Singers did not necessarily perceive the Afro-South Africans in the same light (as fellow equals), given that they were accorded a slightly higher status by the Euro-South Africans than that granted to Afro-South Africans. This is not to say that the troupe was unaware of the burden of racially-inspired disabilities that Afro-South Africans had to carry, as this quote from a letter by McAdoo to his mentor (none other than Hampton Institute's General Samuel Chapman Armstrong) makes clear:

Everyone seemed captivated with the singing; never heard such singing in all their lives, and they said, "and just to think that back people should do it." The latter remark will give you some idea of a feeling of prejudice; well so it is. There is no country in the world where prejudice is so strong as here in Africa. The native to-day is treated as badly as ever the slave was treated in Georgia. Here in Africa the native laws are most unjust; such as any Christian people would be ashamed of. Do you credit a law in a civilized community compelling every man of dark skin, even though he is a citizen of another country, to be in his house by 9 o'clock at night, or he is arrested? Before I could go into parts of Africa, I had to get out a passport and a special letter from the Governors and Presidents of the Transvaal and [the] Orange Free State, or we would have all been arrested. (From the letter reproduced in Wright 1976: 322)

From the specific perspective of music, the McAdoo Singers (as well as others) also unwittingly laid the basis for the infusion of U.S. African American musical idioms into the music of Afro-South Africans to give rise to new forms in the cultural melting pot of the urban areas as they learned to negotiate their geographic, ethnic *and* emerging class boundaries under the duress of both the demands of their material circumstances as voluntary and involuntary proto-urbanites and urbanites and the circumstances of the always violence-prone hegemony of white racism as it matured over a number of decades into the system that came to be called apartheid.<sup>33</sup> The process began with Afro-South Africans establishing their own minstrel troupes, such as Brave Natalian Coons, Western Minstrels, and the Kafir Christy Minstrels of Durban to give a few examples. (The last was apparently good enough to merit this backhanded praise from the local white paper: "a troupe of eight genuine natives, bones and all, complete who really get through their songs very well" [from Erlmann 1991: 32].) In fact, minstrelsy in its heyday would achieve sufficient popularity to even become a regular fare—notwithstanding the racially derogatory symbolism of burned cork faces and bone playing—of student concerts and theatrical performances at missionary-run Afro-South African schools.

However, beyond imitation, in years to come, successive generations of black South Africans would take this idiom and creatively transform it to produce new black "rural-urban" musical forms, such as *isikhunzi* (from "coons"—referring to the so-called "coon songs" that were part of minstrel shows<sup>34</sup>); *imusic* (which was based in part on the jubilee musical idiom); and the wildly popular *isicathamiya* (which too was based on the jubilee musical idiom).<sup>35</sup> *Isicathamiya*, which by the late 1920s had established its distinct identity, had roots in isikhunzi as well as rural-urban-based ragtime-infused *ukureka* style of Zulu *ingoma* dance and songs. Its popularity was, in part, a function of the easy accessibility of this music by the masses (specifically the Zulu migrant workers), from the perspective of performance. In locations and compounds, on weekends, isicathamiya choral groups would meet and hold competitions, providing an opportunity for communal celebration of song and dance in a world momentarily sealed off from the harsh, exploitative, and regimented world outside created under the aegis of the racist hegemony of whiteness (as South African industrialization moved apace). These competitions also provided, of course, opportunities for the emergence and participation of new talent. Decades later, the world was given a taste of this genre of music through the *Graceland* project of U.S. musician Paul Simon who collaborated with a number of high profile Afro-South African musicians to produce the Grammy-award-winning album (released in 1986 and re-released in 2004 with additional tracks), as well as undertaking a neo-philanthropic world concert tour—despite the ongoing cultural boycott of apartheid South Africa.<sup>36</sup> Among the Afro-South African participants in this "world music" project was the well-known and indefatigable singer Miriam Makeba,<sup>37</sup> jazz musician Hugh Masekela, and Joseph Shabalala's isicathamiya choir Lady Smith Black Mambazo.

**Jazz.** As minstrelsy waned into the oblivion of cultural history in United States by around the First World War as a result of the advent of cinema, coupled with a number of socio-political developments that need not detain us here, a new U.S. African American musical form would come to the fore that we can subsume under the general term "jazz" (but which itself was a product of an amalgam of other U.S. African American musical forms, such as "blues" and "ragtime"). Here again, South Africans of all colors would take to it like ducks to water, but most especially Afro-South Af-

ricans.<sup>38</sup> Consider, for example, Ohlange Institute's talented organist and pianist Reuben T. Caluza who came to specialize in ragtime (or *iRagtime* as Afro-South Africans called it)—including the production by Caluza of ragtime-inspired original compositions—which he learned to perform on the basis of secondary sources such as sheet music, phonograph records, and the like.<sup>39</sup> Caluza helped to popularize ragtime among Afro-South Africans of all classes in the 1920s by means of countrywide tours of the very popular Ohlange Choir, founded by John L. Dube as a fund-raising vehicle for his Institute (echoes of the Fisk Jubilee Singers), the leadership of which passed into his hands shortly after he joined Ohlange as a staff member in 1915. In time, with the development of the phonograph recording industry, he would also have the opportunity to record his compositions which would become popular enough to even come to the approving attention of W. E. B. Du Bois's *The Crisis*.<sup>40</sup>

Jazz, as the form is conventionally understood, made its entry in South Africa in the 1920s on the heels of a waning interest in ragtime in the form of the jazz big-band tradition.<sup>41</sup> According to Ballantine (1991a) the agency by which big-band jazz would become all the rage among Afro-South Africans was the “Concert and Dance,” an entertainment institution that was the answer to the racially-inspired night curfews, inadequate transport, pass-law-determined attenuation of freedom of movement, and other similar disabilities that greatly crimped the development of black nightlife. By means of this indoor entertainment, held in a variety of venues in black residential areas, it not only permitted Afro-South Africans to let off steam but to also exercise their passion for music and dance from across the Atlantic—in this case big-band jazz *symbiotically* coupled with vaudeville performances.<sup>42</sup> Such Afro-South African vaudeville troupes as De Pitch Black Follies, Midnight Follies, Bantu Review Follies, Kimberley Amateur Entertainers, and Africans' Own Entertainers, working in tandem with jazz bands (e.g. Merry Blackbirds Orchestra, Jazz Maniacs, and Rhythm Kings Band), and drawing upon an existing tradition of brass bands (echoes of New Orleans)—first introduced by British and German missionaries (for the glory of God of course), but whose formation was also supported by the mining enterprises as a vehicle for social control in the compounds—popularized this genre across all ethnic groups and classes among Afro-South Africans. As for the vehicle of transmission of this music from across the Atlantic? It was, as in the case of ragtime, multifaceted but also included motion pictures. As Ballantine (1991a: 131) observes, “[d]espite controls and strict censorship, the movies had an impact which it is difficult to overestimate. For jazz and vaudeville artists, films were an apparently infinite source of things to be emulated or developed: ideas, melodies, songs, routines, dance steps, styles of presentation, ways of dressing, ways of playing; and of course they also provided ways of estimating local achievement.” How good were these jazz bands? Here is an assessment as recalled by one of the participants of the time period in the course of discussing the impact of cinema: “Oh my God, these fellows were very, very able, very, very able! When this picture of Glen Miller came out, where the band played ‘Chattanooga-Choo-Choo,’ we were right on top of the mountain at that time. Right on top! When that music came out, we played it.... So when the crowds would hear that, after the picture had been shown, oh, they would go mad, mad, mad, mad, mad, mad!” (p. 131). Not content with simply emulation, out of this idiom Afro-South African musicians, in time, produced a genre called *marabi*, which Ballantine states was neo-traditional secular social music, popular mainly in the shebeens and at “weekend-long slumyard parties,” comprising a fusion of jazz and locally-derived but cross-racial-sourced dance music that “was also primarily a keyboard, banjo or guitar style [music] based on a cyclic harmonic pattern, much as the blues was....” He further explains, “the basic *marabi* cycle, however, may be said to have stretched over four measures, with one measure for each of the following chords: I–IV–I 6/4–V” (p. 135).<sup>43</sup> Given its association with illicit drinking and other less-than-desirable behaviors, *marabi* died a natural death but out of it emerged, in the late 1940s, a hugely popular musical form called *mbaqanga* which, however, had two variations: a live-performance version and later a recording-studio version (early 1960s). Given its antecedents, which includes *kwela*—a pennywhistle style that evokes the swing of jazz—*mbaqanga* has been rightly labeled as “South African jazz” (though internationally it is considered part of the genre known as Afro-pop). The foremost group that came to be associated with this form was undoubtedly Mahlathini and the Mahotella Queens.<sup>44</sup>

As big-band jazz gave way to such other styles as swing, boogie-woogie, bebop, cool, and free in the United States, based primarily on smaller four- to six-person bands, from around the mid-1930s onwards (that is shortly following the termination of Prohibition), South Africans also quickly took

to these new styles. Through the agency of such black-oriented media as *Drum*, and the cultural vibrancy of the black township of Sophiatown (before its cruel destruction in 1955 by the apartheid state under the segregationist 1950 *Group Areas Act*)—which in the minds of many of its residents came to be nothing less than a South African version of Harlem—and building on what had gone before (in terms of U.S. African American musical imports) Afro-South Africans, more than any other group, made this “modern” jazz their own.<sup>45</sup>

When Mike Zwerin and his band was sent by the USIA to tour Africa, as part of a cultural goodwill gesture, one of the countries the band visited was South Africa.<sup>46</sup> After playing the second of the two scheduled sessions at the YMCA in Soweto with a number of Afro-South African musicians, one of them told Zwerin’s band: “Send us the big shots. Send us Art Blakey and Elvin Jones. We know them. We have their records. We will pay them ourselves. We are paid slave wages by this [s\*\*t] government but we will find the money somehow.... When I heard you guys the first night, I didn’t dream we would play together. But you have given us inspiration. Its great to play with Americans. When Americans play jazz, it’s the real thing. Now we want to form a group. I don’t think you should boycott us” (Zwerin 1985: 128).

Given the popularity of jazz in South Africa at one time, it is not surprising that it would produce its own jazz musicians of world-class caliber—names include Abdullah Ibrahim, Hugh Masekela, Chris McGregor (and his Brotherhood of Breath band), Dudu Pakwana, and Harry Miller. In United States one of the names most familiar to jazz fans is Abdullah Ibrahim and it is not without reason. This “brother from South Africa,” says Nicholson (1990: 293-34), produces compositions that “evoke the space and timelessness of the African continent; his languid, unhurried melodies over a lilting ‘Capetown beat’ a series of lyrical polemic mediations.”<sup>47</sup> His music linked together the musicscapes of such U.S. jazz greats as Duke Ellington and Charlie Parker with that of black urban South Africa to produce a South African style of jazz that came to be called African bebop.

All in all, then, the stamp of U.S.-derived music, most especially that of U.S. African American provenance, on the development of South African music (especially that of Afro-South Africans) is not only of long-standing, but as Cockrell (1987) points out, some of the genres (as in the case of spirituals and jazz, for example) have not only been retained in their original forms but have become part of the South African musical repertory *and* continue to be performed to this day. Hence, notwithstanding the cultural hegemony of Britain in nineteenth-century South Africa, he observes, musical influences from United States were powerful enough to palpably challenge this hegemony, forever altering the course of musical development in South Africa.

Of course, it was not only U.S.-derived music that held South Africans, black and white, in thrall. Other forms of culture would also be subjected to the juggernaut of U.S. cultural influences against the backdrop of fascination (or even obsession) with U.S. culture by South Africans—most especially Afro-South Africans.<sup>48</sup> One has in mind here, for example, literature, cinema, fashion, theater, and (years later, as will be indicated in a moment) television. Discussing the case of the celebrated black township of Sophiatown to which we have already alluded, to take one example, Nixon (1994: 12) reminds us that “[a]s the apartheid regime refined its scheme for racial labeling, American clothes and records spoke with the fine arrogance of other styles of being. Giant finned cars became voguish, as did movie slang, Woodrow hats, Florsheim shoes, and clothes labeled Palm Beach, Palm Dale, and Magregor; Dorothy Dandridge, Sidney Poitier, Humphey Bogart, James Cagney and Richard Widmark all became idols.”<sup>49</sup>

**Television.** In discussing U.S. cultural influences in South Africa, one would be greatly remiss in not mentioning an unusual influence to which Nixon (1994) draws our attention: the case of television, but initially not in the sense one would logically expect. For a country that had no difficulty in importing the latest cultural technology as soon as it became available in the United States (or elsewhere for that matter), television came very late to South Africa: in 1976, by which time it had become a commonplace medium in most parts of the world (some 130 countries had it by then). The principal obstacle to the adoption of this U.S. invention was not technological or economic but ideological. The architects of apartheid, such as Prime Minister Hendrik Verwoerd and his cabinet minister responsible for communication services (Dr. Albert Hertzog), not only likened television to poison gas and the atom bomb—that is a destroyer of civilization itself! with its potential, in their minds, to smuggle in “liberal individualism, racial mixing, communism, imperialism, monopoly capitalism, commercialism, and the cosmopolitanism of English South Africans and the Jewish and

[Afro-Asian] diasporas,” to quote Nixon, pp. 59–60—but they saw it as a Trojan horse for U.S. cultural influences of the type that were least desired: most especially the idea of a multicultural democracy. SAAG was, above all, fearful of TV’s potential to influence the black population, not only filling their heads with the possibility of an alternative political future but making them dangerously restless by introducing them to a consumerist capitalist culture that did not fit in with apartheid’s definition of the economic place of the black man: at the bottom of the economic system as nothing more than hewers of wood and drawers of water. If one added to these fears the super-irrational fear of racial miscegenation, the outcome was predictable, absolutely no access to television by the populace if SAAG could help it.<sup>50</sup>

Ironically of course, SAAG’s fears were not entirely unfounded. While the insurgent potential of foreign-derived visual media for ideologies and cultures of totalitarian-type societies (or even nontotalitarian societies) is notoriously difficult to map with certitude, its existence is probably a fact. At least one study (Krabill 2002) argues that in the case of South Africa, the adoption of TV in 1976 (SAAG, with the diminution of the power of the hardliners, had relented by turning some of the previous arguments on their head: e.g., the absence of TV not only made South Africa appear civilizationally backward, unnecessarily, in the eyes of the world but it had the potential to serve as a powerful propaganda tool for apartheid) in time helped to undermine apartheid ideology among whites by, on one hand, heightening feelings of isolation from the international community—e.g., the hurt of seeing South Africa’s exclusion from the Olympic Games and World Cup soccer matches even as they savored the TV coverage of such events—and on the other, undermining their essentialist concepts of the “other.” In other words, television helped to enlarge the palate of identities available to Euro-South Africans, including access to ones that were inimical to the preservation of apartheid (at least in its most extreme forms): for example, a less racist view of blacks and a desire to be part of the wider international community. In a nutshell, Krabill argues that the introduction of television in South Africa proved to be ideologically subversive, even though it was government controlled, because it helped, via programs such as the U.S.-derived TV program the *Cosby Show* (featuring Bill Cosby) to “liberalize” the Euro-South African mind in matters of race relations.<sup>51</sup> That is, the possibility that blacks and whites could occupy the same political space harmoniously that television helped to engender in the white mind was the ideological grease that over time helped, *among other factors*, to turn the wheels of social change toward the dismantling of apartheid set in motion by the revolutionary struggles of black South Africans and their small group of white allies. (This is not to suggest by any means that television helped to destroy the concept of whiteness, but rather that it weakened it sufficiently to permit the white mind to entertain the possibility of alternative political futures. By way of comparison, it is quite possible that an analogous role was played by television, among other factors of course, in the case of the demise of communism in Eastern Europe where visual access to Western consumerist capitalism meant that it became increasingly impossible to keep them [the populace] down on the farm.)

### COMPARATIVE ANALYTICAL “RELATIONS”

One of the subtexts running through this work has been the illuminative potential of undertaking comparisons between the United States and South Africa. At the beginning of this chapter we identified it as constituting one half of the twin dimensions of what we have labeled as “cognitive relations.” A brief foray into that other half (referred to as comparative analytical “relations”) is the purpose of this section.

In any situation where there is a significant basis for comparison of historical experiences, scholars will emerge who will want to explore research topics using the comparative method—employing the experiences of each as a means to further theoretical analysis and understanding of both societies (or of one or the other). Yes, of course, comparative historical studies by their very nature are a daunting and in fact a foolhardy business.<sup>52</sup> The likelihood of coming up with erroneous conclusions, given the inherent complexity of the task, is almost axiomatic. Still, where feasible, they can yield quite useful insights. For, comparative studies permit one to set up “analytical laboratories” where variables can be manipulated while others are held constant (to the extent data permits of course) in order to test hypotheses. Moreover, in this particular instance (the United States and South Africa) historians have had no choice in the matter: the publics of the two countries have forced the



historians' hand by, as we have already seen in this work, voting with their feet. To explain; as Campbell (1997: 91–92) has astutely pointed out, comparative studies of the U.S.-South Africa experiences where a host of topics—“slavery, segregation, sharecropping, racial ideology, black politics, the relationship of state and capital, the frontier experience, even the historical profession itself”—have come under comparative purview owes considerably to this fact: “[T]he USA-South Africa comparison matters to historians because it has mattered so profoundly to the people about whom we write.” That is, he observes, “[w]hatever the intrinsic comparability of the two societies, there is no question that generations of [U.S.] Americans and South Africans, black and white alike, have found the comparison compelling, finding in one another’s experience new perspectives on their own societies, new ways of understanding and addressing their distinct historical predicaments.”<sup>53</sup> Therefore, he concludes, “when we seek to compare South Africa and the United States we do not begin with two discrete sites, but with complexly interrelated societies, bound together by a myriad of direct and imaginative exchanges.”<sup>54</sup>

Under the circumstances, it is not surprising that over the past several decades, comparing the experiences of United States and South Africa has become a sort of a mini-cottage industry, spawning even its own journal.<sup>55</sup> While the page-space constraint simply does not make it possible to cover all the topics that have received such a comparative treatment (much less provide a critical evaluation) we can at least come up with a small sample, beginning with the topic that has generated, for legitimate reasons, probably the most ink: the origins of the racial order that in one society came to be known as apartheid and in the other Jim Crow.

### Apartheid versus Jim Crow

Without wishing to begrudge Fredrickson’s generally accepted position as the premier scholar of studies in this particular area of comparative studies, one would be remiss by not beginning this section by pointing out a relevant work that we have already come across, but which long predated Fredrickson—even if its *raison d’être* was one that, in reflecting the spirit of its times (racism masquerading as liberalism), we would find deeply troubling today: Evans (1915). It will be recalled that Evans, a Euro-South African, undertook a sociological study around the turn of the preceding century that sought to understand the U.S. South in light of the concerns of his day—the future of black-white political relations in South Africa (an issue usually cast by whites in their typical whiteness-inspired essentialist thinking as the “native question”)—where on the basis of his research, which included a field trip to the United States, he found much, by way of “do’s and don’ts.” The work, which was received with much acclaim by the white South African media (as excerpts of their reviews reprinted in the book’s front matter suggests), framed its problem thusly:

The keen intellect and tender conscience of the Twentieth Century both imperatively demand that the illogical and an unethical attitude in which the races face each other in the Southern States and in South Africa shall be changed for one that we can justify, and with which the black man shall be satisfied. Our question is one phase of the greater problem of race and color which touches all the European nations, and nearly every backward race and tribe throughout the wide world. The problem of the Twentieth Century is the problem of the color line (p. v).<sup>56</sup>

Evans’s primary conclusion (as we have already indicated) is that, after considering a range of topics—slavery, land, Reconstruction, the achievements of U.S. African Americans, the U.S. African American church, education, transportation, the justice system, and so on—black-white relations in South Africa would be harmonious only on the basis of racial segregation where the white man would rule, but with patronizing compassion.

Programmatic advice, of course, is not the intent of Fredrickson’s work (unless one rummages in the subtext to possibly come up with this: the racial orders represented by apartheid and Jim Crow as the very antithesis of democracy require an explanation). Published in 1981, and resting on an unquestionably masterful use of the comparative method, it essentially sought to prove that apartheid (like Jim Crow) could be best understood as the culmination of a long history of caste-inspired black-white political/economic relations dating back almost to the founding days of the country as a European settler colony in which ideology (in direct opposition to materialist explanations) loomed large. One may also note here that perhaps in response to criticism that this study had paid inadequate attention to blacks, a decade and a half or so later he came out with a work that sought to compare ideologies of black liberation in the United States and South Africa (Fredrickson 1995).

While Fredrickson is by no means the first to subtextually advance the view that race is a socially constructed category (see van den Berghe below), his work had the merit of helping to flesh out what this really meant in practice historically in the cases of the United States and South Africa.

Quite coincidentally, roughly around the time of the publication of Fredrickson (1981), several other works appeared covering more or less the same subject matter; notably Greenberg (1981), Lamar and Thompson (1981), and Cell (1982).<sup>57</sup> Greenberg's fairly lengthy study, guided by a certain degree of theoretical eclecticism but still informed in an overarching sense by Marxian political economy, advances the thesis that racial segregation in South Africa and the U.S. South (uses Alabama as a case study, but also brings in insights from Northern Ireland and Israel) was a direct result of the intensification of capitalist development—in other words, modernization, as its proponents would have it, does not always lead to democracy—where both the white capitalist class, comprising businessmen and farmers, and the white working class had *complementary* class interests in ensuring that the black working class remained subservient to both, economically and politically. Though not explicitly programmatic, he does state that “the book could not avoid asking how developing societies free themselves from race domination.” He goes on to say that his book “is not a political tract or handbook, but there are lessons here for those who despise racism and those who live with its burdens from day-to-day.” That is “[b]oth groups in the end must understand the consequences of growth and the opportunities and obstacles that it creates” (p. xi). One should mention, as he himself acknowledges, that his study (like that of Fredrickson's) is a “top down” study concentrating primarily on the dominant racial group (whites), and offers this justification for it: “They [blacks] are an integral part of the story and, indeed, the point of it. But they are not the entire story and, in certain periods, perhaps not the principal forces shaping social relations and making for political change and conflict” (p. x).

Lamar and Thompson is an anthology which is built around a particular concept of the settler frontier: so long as the *contending* societies (an inherent characteristic of the frontier involving competition for resources between the interlopers and the aboriginal peoples) have yet to establish mastery over the other, everything, in terms of political and other relations between the two societies, is fluid. However, once control has been established by one over the other than not only do they cease to exist as separate societies but become one in which a “new structural situation” is created where “[s]ubsequent relationships are relations of ethnicity and class within a single society, not frontier relationships between different societies” (p. 10). Employing this close-ended temporally-specific concept of the frontier (it is “open” when political hegemony is not yet established, it “closes” when it is—marked, in other words, by the fact that the Natural Law of Prior Claim, to use another concept, ceases to have any legitimacy among the interlopers) the contributors in this work examine the experiences of United States and South Africa on the frontier from a number of perspectives, including economics and the advent of capitalism, society and the advent of Christianity, and of course politics.

Cell's basic thesis is that segregation should be viewed (in contrast to Fredrickson) as a sharp disjuncture between the past and present where it is a particular response to changes wrought by urbanization, modern capitalist development, and the like. Consequently, the time period he is most explicitly concerned with is the period 1890 to 1925; that is a time of massive economically-rooted upheavals in both the United States and South Africa. Segregation, therefore, is not simply white supremacy, but a sub-specie of it—that is, in his parlance, constituting “the highest stage of white supremacy.” For him, segregation was a deliberately engineered mechanism for achieving white unity by sacrificing the interests of blacks where the objective interests of the white working class (which of course coincided with the objective interests of the black working class) was transposed with subjective interests, specifically whiteness-inspired racial segregation. One can paraphrase Cell's thesis without doing injustice to it, thusly: whereas the capitalist class exploited and oppressed both the white and black working classes, the self-interested insistence on white unity as more important than class distinctions by the white capitalist class, had the desired effect of rendering the white working class blind to its exploitation and oppression. In other words, racial segregation helped to obliterate class distinctions within the white polity to the benefit of the capitalist class. The ideologues who masterminded this project he argues were not racist extremists, but “well-educated and comparatively moderate men” (compare here Evans mentioned above). Quite clearly, Cell thesis has much affinity with Greenberg's, though this is not to suggest that one is a replication of the other. Cell,

unlike Greenberg, places a greater emphasis on the role of ideology—it allows class conflict within the white polity to remain sufficiently manageable as to prevent the polity from breaking apart—and he also (unlike both Fredrickson and Greenberg) does not shy away from looking at the subordinate half of the black-white equation.

One should point out that prior to this crop of studies, there was one other similar study that had preceded them by more than a decade, which ought to be mentioned here: that of van den Berghe (1967) which also had the merit of expanding its geographical palate to include Brazil and Mexico.<sup>58</sup> His basic thesis was not too dissimilar from Cell's and Greenberg's: modernization implied a move from *paternalistic* race relations to *competitive* race relations (his theoretical approach is based on these two ideal typologies) where the advent of modern capitalist development in turn precipitated a competitive struggle for jobs and other resources between whites and blacks. In other words, greater economic development implied greater racial intolerance where whites sought to exploit their historically-rooted caste-based privileges in a rapidly changing socio-economic order. Naming neofascism as "herrenvolk democracy" he argued that it ought not to be viewed as an aberration, but a logical outcome of the development of modern capitalist democracy. The fact that racism continues to inform the political economic order in the United States to this day (that is almost a century and a half since emancipation) is perhaps testimony to the general cogency of the studies by all three. In fact, if we may consider globalization in its current manifestation (of domination by technofinancialism) as a further move toward intensification of capitalist relations of production, then globalization is not likely to lead to enlightenment, as its proponents argue subtextually, but to even greater racialized conflict among the working classes (of which the current jingoistic anti-immigrant hysteria in both the United States and South Africa, for example, is but a symptom).

None of the above studies places an emphasis on the special role of the modern State. That apparent weakness is addressed by a wide-ranging and highly informed study by Anthony Marx (1998) that compares the United States, South Africa, and Brazil. His basic argument, which is a slight variation on Cell's really, is that where (as in the cases of the United States and South Africa) ethnic conflict *within the dominant racial group* may threaten the stability of the political order, most especially nation-building—without which capitalist development is greatly undermined—then the State may move in to establish order by scapegoating the subordinate racial group as a device for establishing unity within the dominant group.

### Colonization: Little Big Horn and Isandlwana

The colonization by white settlers of the remaining U.S. First American lands to the west in the nineteenth century was a process that was identical in many respects to the European colonial projects in southern Africa—so much so that it even had a counterpart to the Battle of Little Bighorn (Custer's Last Stand, where George Armstrong Custer's 7th Cavalry met defeat in 1876 at the hands of the Sioux on the Little Bighorn River), the Battle of Isandlwana where in January 1879 the Zulus defeated the 24th Regiment of the British army. In both battles, as Floca (1974) observes, the same elements were present: the insatiable desire to steal another people's homeland; the racist hubris of the Anglo/American armies who thought spear and arrow-wielding "savages" would fall easy prey to trained soldiers with cannons and Henry-Martini rifles; grave tactical errors on the part of the Anglo/American commanders; and of course the eventual total defeat, at a later date, of both the Zulus and the Sioux, "not from any display of military genius, but from an overwhelming superiority of firepower that men carrying spears and bows could not match" (1984: 32).<sup>59</sup>

### Affirmative Action

Any society that has been burdened by a history of centuries of discrimination based on race, class, gender and the like the transition toward democracy will always be accompanied by, sooner or later, the logical and correct demand among the victims of this discrimination that measures be adopted to ameliorate the debilitating burden of history that continue to encumber their lives. Such measures have come to be generally known as affirmative action. In both United States and South Africa affirmative action aimed at restoring some semblance of political and economic justice (especially in the areas of political representation, education, and employment) for reasons of historically determined racial and gender discrimination have been attempted—albeit not without considerable resis-

tance from the dominant and/or historically privileged groups (primarily whites and white males). A number of comparative studies that examine affirmative action in both these countries have emerged in recent years, they include: Abdelrahman (1999), Diamond (1999), Hamilton, Huntley, Alexander, Guimarães, and James (2001); Hassim (2000), Higginbotham (1999), Khalfani (2006), Langston (1997), and Michelman (2004). See also the highly illuminative study of the concept of “color-blindness” by Ansell (2006) who shows how at one time this concept served as a powerful tool for cracking open the door of white privilege but today, in the hands of the right wing, has metamorphosed into a tool for shoring up white privilege.

### White Racialized Violence

One of the abiding motifs of black-white relations throughout much of South African and U.S. history (up to the present day) has been racialized violence, considered either in its institutional (structural) form or corporeal (physical) form. Concentrating specifically on the corporeal form, the norm in both academic and popular literature (most of it white of course) has been to portray this violence as essentially the handiwork of blacks as expressed by the term “riot.” By means of a comparative study of four such popularly known “riots”—the 1898 Wilmington Race Riot in North Carolina, the 1976 Soweto Uprising, the 1992 Los Angeles Rebellion, and the 1994 Mmabatho Election Riots in the Bophuthatswana homeland (also known as “Battle of Bop”)—McKoy (2001), in a seminal work that draws upon both literary and visual discourse, as well as primary source materials, shows that in reality such racialized violence does not represent blacks rioting but on the contrary constitutes nothing less than whites rioting.<sup>60</sup> She demonstrates that, from time to time, the perception by whites of a threat to white hegemony (actual or fictive) from blacks has been met with white corporeal violence in the form of “racialized riots” facilitated by what she calls “white racialized ululation,” which she defines thusly:

White racialized ululation... is a ritualized process of vocalizing a response to threats to white supremacist order, of a hyperbolic intensification of the emotions that these threats evoke.... [It] is a call to action, rather than a response to the rioting black bodies that usually fill the scene, making white riot invisible. In the context of social violence, racialized ululation finds its outlet through a variety of cultural reproductions: in newspapers, on television, in documentaries, on film, on talk radio, through the entire spectrum of popular discourse.... Plainly, it calls forth white riot that in turn elicits linguistic and violent responses from the disempowered community that become the race riots that the white supremacist mirror reflects. (pp. 24–25)<sup>61</sup>

### Environmental History

As Beinart and Coates (1995) remind us, unlike any other organism, human beings occupy a unique position on the planet: they exist apart from nature and they are part of nature. The study of this phenomenon from a historical perspective has come to be called environmental history. While the name of this subdiscipline of history may be new, the fact is that environmental history has been the subject of study (albeit in various guises) for centuries. However, the fact that there is now a belated upsurge in interest even among the lay public, against the backdrop of concern for environmental destruction by means of greenhouse gases, in environmental issues (of which the “green” movement, in its generic sense, is emblematic) has the potential to bring this subdiscipline out of the shadows of specialist history. Working toward this end, Beinart and Coates have produced an introductory but seminal work on the subject by going a step further: injecting a comparative dimension by comparing the experiences of United States and South Africa. In their work they point not only to the presence of a rich history in both countries of interest among sections of the enlightened in the environmental impact of human activities following settler-colonization, but they provide a quite insightful comparative overview of projects and programs at mitigating, albeit not always successful, the destructive consequences of the effort of both colonial-settlers and capital to “tame nature”: ranging from conservation of forests and trees to control of hunting to best practices for agricultural activities (soil conservation) on to the development of wildlife sanctuaries. At the same time, their section on race, inequality and the environment draws attention to the highly political character of the current movement for environmental preservation (labeled “environmentalism”). If one can summarize the findings of their wide-ranging exemplary effort to produce a comparative environmental history of two countries that are at once similar and dissimilar, then it is this:

The expansion of Europe and the communities this established in southern Africa and North America inaugurated far-reaching sequences of change in the ecology of the colonized continents. The capitalist systems that came to dictate human relations with nature were often geared to the gobbling of resources for maximum short-term profit, a veritable *raubwirtschaft* (predatory economy)... Yet within [this] transformative tendenc[y] resided capacities for containment. The propensities of capitalism have proved unpredictable and can in certain cases work to the benefit of its former victims (p. 109).

## NOTES

1. For an interesting exegesis on the informal transfer of ideas see Chapter 10 of Said (1983) titled “Traveling Theory.”
2. The literature dealing with education as an agency of “social control” (which we may define here as the maintenance of social order effected through the ideological hegemony of the ruling class in a society characterized by unequal power relations at almost all levels, economy, polity, etc.) is vast indeed; however these two anthologies considered together will be more than adequate in providing a quick purchase on the key issues involved: Halsey, Lauder, Brown, and Wells (1997); and Karabel and Halsey (1977).
3. For sources on this section on black education, in addition to those that will be mentioned, see also Campbell (1995), Davis (1978) and Jacobs (1982)—especially the chapters by Manning Marable and Carol A. Page.
4. He also became the official representative of the Phelps-Stokes Fund in South Africa in the same year.
5. There is a profoundly sad irony in the origins of this model given that a U.S. African American was so highly instrumental in its genesis. The Tuskegee Institute (to be also-called Tuskegee College, and today continues on as Tuskegee University) began its life as a teacher training college in a place from which it took its name; it was established in 1881 by the state of Alabama. The Euro-American trustees of the college appointed Booker T. Washington to head the new institution upon advice from his mentor Samuel Chapman Armstrong—the Euro-American brigadier general who had been in charge of U.S. African American troops during the U.S. Civil War and who, with philanthropic help, had founded in 1868 Tuskegee’s precursor, Hampton Institute, to train recently emancipated U.S. African Americans in the industrial arts. Taking Armstrong’s educational philosophy (known as the Hampton idea) of combining training in practical vocational skills with Christian morality, a strong work ethic, and a deep sense of gratitude toward and humility before one’s (white) benefactors, Washington developed it further almost to the level of a religion. Faced with the reality of an unrelenting, brutal and ever-spiraling terrorism unleashed on U.S. African Americans by Euro-Americans under the aegis of the neofascist Jim Crow laws that came to govern the South in the post-Reconstruction era—among the hallmarks of which were the routinely gruesome murders (lynching) every year of innocent blacks by the score all over the South, as well as anyone else who dared to oppose these laws, by white mobs dressed in their Sunday best (so as to obliterate the recently won civil and human rights of blacks in the service, at the core, of that age-old problem of Southern agropitalists, access to a plentiful supply of cheap labor)—Washington took to heart the Hampton idea and publicized it with even greater fervor by politicizing it. 5 Arguing that the road to the recapture of civil rights by U.S. African Americans did not lie in political agitation but exemplary hard work and Christian morality, Washington would immortalize himself by that oftquoted line in a speech he delivered on the occasion of the Cotton States and International Exposition in Atlanta in 1895 (to which he had been invited to speak by its Euro-American organizers), that came to be known as the “Atlanta Compromise”:

To those of the white race who look to the incoming of those of foreign birth and strange tongue and habits for the prosperity of the South, were I permitted I would repeat what I say to my own race, “Cast down your bucket where you are.” Cast it down among the 8,000,000 Negroes whose habits you know... [For]...you can be sure in the future, as in the past, that you and your families will be surrounded by the most patient, faithful, law-abiding, and unresentful people that the world has seen... In all things that are purely social we can be as separate as the fingers, yet one has the hand in all things essential in mutual progress. (Washington 1985 [1895]: 151–52)

Earlier in the same speech Washington had told his mainly Euro-American audience that because of ignorance and inexperience, blacks had been in error, following emancipation, in pursuing the very top instead of beginning at the bottom: “that a seat in Congress or the State Legislature was more sought than real estate or industrial skill; that the political convention or stump speaking had more attractions than starting a dairy farm or truck garden” (p. 150). In a nutshell, Washington’s approach can best summarized by that oftquoted Dickensian version of an ancient prayer:

Oh, let us love our occupations,  
Bless the squire and his relations,  
Live upon our daily rations,  
And always know our proper stations.

It is not clear, however, whether Washington sincerely believed in what he preached as he went around the country; or, like a politician, he was merely grandstanding and telling his (usually Euro-American audience) what they wanted to hear (surely, a man as astute as Washington must have known that the economic salvation of U.S. African Americans he was championing was dialectically intertwined with their political salvation; that is, in the contradictory world of a capitalist racist democracy, one was not possible without the other). What is clear, however, is that against the backdrop of Jim Crow, the Euro-American establishment liked what they heard; they would reward him accordingly with gifts to

“his” Institute—as well as personally to himself, materially and otherwise (he was, for example, among those who received a private pension from Andrew Carnegie). To put the matter differently: his—perhaps understandable—pragmatic response to Jim Crow terror was fortified by the dialectic between the growth of Tuskegee, together with his personal stature, and his advocacy of “Uncle Tommery” (a process that some have labeled the “Tuskegee Machine”). In other words, then, until the civil rights movement came into being in the late 1950s Tuskegee became the educational beacon of the hat in hand “yes massa!” Uncle Tom strategy of grappling with the always potentially volatile black/white race-relations in the United States, and in white settler Africa. Little wonder then that patronizing white liberals like Thomas Jesse Jones and Charles T. Loram (who mistook their paternalistic subterranean racism, like so many white liberals of today, for wholesome liberalism—recall that neither had ever publicly championed opposition to Jim Crow or apartheid), together with those blacks like Aggrey who aspired to fill Washington’s (Uncle Tom) shoes, became ardent advocates of the H/T model and philosophy. Yes, of course, there was a touch of hypocrisy in all this; for none of the fervent advocates of industrial education would have risen to the commanding heights of the world of black education (which had given them the opportunity to prescribe industrial education for others) on a diet of that same education; on the contrary, they had received (and/or self-taught) the same liberal classical education that they did not wish others to have! It goes without saying that even in its day, the H/T model was not received with equanimity by everyone; it drew considerable criticism from some sections of the black community on both sides of the Atlantic. In the United States, men such as W. E. B. Du Bois saw the model for what it was—an attempt to create an obedient conservative black underclass unwilling to challenge the Jim Crow status quo. Writing some decades after the founding of Tuskegee, he would comment:

The system of learning which bases itself upon the actual condition of certain classes and groups of human beings is tempted to suppress a minor premise of fatal menace. It proposes that the knowledge given and the methods pursued in such institutions of learning shall be for the definite object of perpetuating present conditions or of leaving their amelioration in the hands of and at the initiative of other forces and other folk. This was the great criticism that those of us who fought for higher education of Negroes thirty years ago brought against the industrial school (Du Bois 1996: 417).

Not surprisingly, the recommendations that the PSAEC came up with for the education of Africans in Southern Africa, drew considerable criticism from people such as W. E. B. Du Bois, Marcus Garvey, and the U.S. African American historian, Carter Woodson. They accused the PSAEC of advocating education designed to “create an obedient, docile, fundamentally conservative black underclass” (Hull 1990: 159).

6. For more on this subject see also Bell (2000) and Miller (1993). The “Club” included, besides Loram, according to Fleisch, Reuben Caluzo, P. A. W. Cook, Abe Desmore, Wouter de Vos Malan, E. G. Malherbe, and John Marquard among many others (numbering about eighty altogether who studied at the Teachers College during the period 1914–1948).

7. According to Campbell (1995), Loram’s views were shaped initially (that is before he left for the United States), in part, by the ideas of one Maurice Evans, a member of the Natal Native Affairs Commission and who also had the opportunity to visit the United States—including visiting Hampton and Tuskegee and participating in the 1912 International Conference on the Negro held at Tuskegee. Evans’ stock in trade, it appears, was to draw “lessons” for South Africa from the experiences of the Southern United States in handling black-white relations. For example, in a work well received by the white English-dominated South African media of the time, published in 1915, that grew out of his travels in the United States, in its concluding chapter—beginning with the comment that “South African readers, who for the most part will be practical men of affairs, will ask what definite and specific lessons of value to us in South Africa I learned from my visit to the Southern States”—he had this to say *inter alia*:

- (1) That the gift of self-government to a people unfitted for it may not be a boon but a bane, and we cannot in South Africa solve the native question by simply giving the franchise to the Native, and telling him to protect himself.
- (6) It is clearly shown that the Negro is not fitted for city life. His home life should be in the country...
- (7) The races are so different that to reduce antagonism and give each its full opportunity for race development, a conscious and reasoned attempt at race separation should be made.
- (8) Such separate communities should be under white guidance, assisted by the more advanced of the black race...
- (9) Religion and morals should be given a high place in any educational system. The emotional side of the native mind should not be suppressed but guided...
- (10) The great sin of the white man against the black lay not in slavery, nor in economic exploitation, but in the debauchment of the race by illicit sexual intercourse.... At all costs we must preserve racial purity. (Evans 1915: 280–81; numbering in the original)

In the effort to achieve these objectives, education, especially in the form of the H/T model, had, of course, an important role to play (see chapters 12 and 13 in his book where he waxes lyrical on the merits of the H/T model).

8. Loram must have modified some of these views by the time the CCNY, a decade or so later, inaugurated the circulating library project for blacks (The Carnegie Non-European Library) because, as we noted, he was an enthusiastic supporter of that project as the CCNY’s “person on the spot,” so to speak.

9. Lovedale was among the most successful of the missionary enterprises in South Africa serving Afro-South Africans: established in 1841 in the Eastern Cape, by early 1900s this United Free Church of Scotland Mission station (Presbyterian) had grown into an extensive educational, theological, and vocational complex—complete with a primary school; a middle school; a teacher-training school; a vocational arts department that trained students in carpentry, wagon-making, shoe-making, printing, dress-making, etc.; a hospital with a nursing school; a printing press; an extensive

farm; and a thriving church. However, as Vinson (2001) reminds us, Lovedale initially began as a typical British liberal missionary educational institution that saw the possibility of black assimilation through a classical Christian-oriented education. But as the basket of mercantilist determined ideas that are sometimes put together as “Cape liberalism” receded into the background as a result of a number of conjunctural factors, including the discovery of precious minerals and the concomitant development of the mining sector with its voracious appetite for cheap black labor, the popularity of Social Darwinist thought among whites waxed correspondingly (see Trapido 1980); one outcome of which was the institution’s turn toward the H/T model—especially after 1870 when James Stewart, an out-and-out Social Darwinist, became principal of the institution. An instance of his views would surface in 1884 during a lecture to protesting students: “Starting but as yesterday in the race of nations, do you soberly believe that in the two generations of the very imperfect civilization you have enjoyed and partially accepted, you can have overtaken those other nations who began that race two thousand years ago, and have been running hard in it for a thousand years at least?” (from Davis 1979: 29). In 1903 he had an opportunity to visit Tuskegee and he came away from the visit even more convinced that the education of Africans was best developed along the lines of the H/T model. One may also add here that his successor, James Henderson, who took over as principal in 1906 fully shared Stewart’s views.

10. It is important to stress the word “influence.” Although upon even a brief reflection it should be quite clear, the point bears repeating: It is rare that ideas are always imported wholesale from another source separated by either time or geography or both. This certainly was true in the case of the BCM.

11. Limiting our attention to the rise of the Black Power movement on the heels of the Ture speech, the other elements that helped to develop it into a “movement” (albeit not as determinate as the civil rights movement itself) were the radical thoughts of el-Hajj Malik El-Shabazz (Malcolm X), the emergence of the “Black is Beautiful” campaign, and the formation of the Black Panther Party. While the number of works on the Black Power movement and its architects would fill a range of library shelves, these should provide an ample entry point into the literature: Carmichael (2003), Carmichael and Hamilton (1967), Cleaver (1968), Foner (2002), Joseph (2006), Malcolm X (1973, 1989), and Seale (1970).

12. For more on BCM, and its place in the history of antiapartheid struggle in South Africa, the following considered together should suffice: Barrel (1992), Cobbett and Cohen (1988), Diseko (1992), Fredrickson (1995), Gerhart (1978), Lodge (1983), and Marx (1992).

13. Strictly speaking, the periodization of the history of Black Liberation Theology, should include consideration of Garveyism as a legitimate precursor of this ideology. Recall that Garveyism embodied a Christianized version of black liberation.

14. See Walshe (1991) on why liberation theology found a ready reception in South Africa.

15. The first conference to bring U.S. African American and black South African theologians in direct discussions took place at the Union Theological Seminary in New York City in December 1986.

16. For more on Black Liberation Theology, including its transatlantic influences, see Cone (1969), Hopkins (1989), and Wilmore and Cone (1993).

17. More recent biographies are beginning to acknowledge the importance of South Africa to Gandhi’s life work; see, for example, Chadha (1997), and Wolpert (2001). A worthy read that focuses exclusively on the “South African” Gandhi, besides Brown and Prosezky (1996), is Bhana and Vahed (2005). For primary source material on the evolving but critical phase of Gandhi’s nonviolent civil disobedience campaign see Volume 8, which covers the period January–August 1908, of *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi* (published in 1962 by the Government of India).

18. It is ironic, that until recently, the one “biography” that did go to considerable length in correcting this scholarly imbalance, was not even a real biography in a scholarly sense. Reference here is to, of course, the Oscar-winning docudrama by Richard Attenborough, *Gandhi* (released in 1982), and in which Ben Kingsley gave a memorably rousing performance as Gandhi.

19. See Bhana and Vahed (2005) on the importance of Tolstoy Farm to Gandhi’s evolving concept of satyagraha. Incidentally, it was not without reason that the farm, where Gandhi spent some four years, was named after the great Russian writer Leo Tolstoy (see below).

20. MLK’s access to Gandhi’s ideas came through several avenues, including: connections with U.S. African Americans theologian Howard Thurman, who as a missionary abroad had had the opportunity to meet and exchange ideas with Gandhi, and labor leader A. Philip Randolph who tried to incorporate the spirit of Gandhi’s approach in his civil rights work; U.S. Euro-American Reverend Glenn E. Smiley who was an admirer of Gandhi’s ideas; reading Gandhi’s writings; and visiting Gandhi’s family in India in 1959. See Fredrickson (1995) for more on both Gandhi’s work in South Africa and the transatlantic migration of his ideas to the United States. MLK’s trip to India is covered by Jackson (2007). For King’s own pronouncements on the relevance of Gandhi’s ideas to the civil rights struggle there is, unquestionably, no better resource than to mine the multivolume *The Papers of Martin Luther King, Jr.* produced by the Martin Luther King, Jr. Project at Stanford University under the direction of historian Clayborne Carson. (So far six volumes have been published, covering the period 1951 to 1963. A visit to the project’s website ([www.stanford.edu/group/King](http://www.stanford.edu/group/King)) also permits identification of relevant documents through a search engine.) See also, Fredrickson (1995), Hendrick and Hendrick (2005), Nojeim (2004), and Wolpert (2001)—plus of course MLK’s own description of his (MLK’s) intellectual journey toward nonviolent civil disobedience: King (1966 [1960]).

21. For example, the organization that MLK helped to found to spearhead the emerging civil rights struggle in the U.S. South in 1957, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, among its earliest pronouncements included, what appeared to be, in Fredrickson’s words, “an unqualified celebration of Gandhism,” framed thusly: “The basic tenets of Hebraic-Christian tradition coupled with the Gandhian conception of satyagraha—truth force—is at the heart of SCLC’s philosophy” (from Fredrickson 1995: 258).

22. Gandhi explained his debt to Thoreau in these terms: “The statement that I had derived my idea of Civil Disobedience from the writings of Thoreau is wrong. The resistance to authority in South Africa was well advanced before I got the essay of Thoreau on ‘Civil Disobedience....’ Nonviolence was always an integral part of our struggle” (from Chadha 1997: 137). Yet, at the same time, without contradiction, he would also write to the British biographer of Thoreau, Henry S. Salt, in response to his question if Gandhi had ever heard of Thoreau: “My first introduction to Thoreau’s writings was, I think, in 1907, or later, when I was in the thick of the passive resistance struggle. A friend sent me the essay on ‘Civil Disobedience. It left a deep impression upon me.... The essay seemed to be so convincing and truthful that I felt the need of knowing more of Thoreau, and I came across your *Life of him, his ‘Walden,’* and other shorter essays, all of which I read with great pleasure and equal profit” (Salt 1954: 147). For more on the Thoreau-Gandhi ideational connection see also Ezekiel (1972) and Hendrick and Hendrick (2005). Thoreau’s essay is available in many anthologies, including Mayer (1966), from pp. 140 to 159. In the anthology, the editor has juxtaposed it against Leo Tolstoy’s “Letter to a Non-commissioned Officer,” and “Letter to a Hindu” (pp. 160–76), both of which are also recommended. Note: Thoreau’s essay should be read in conjunction with the insightful analytical commentary by Rosenwald (2000).

23. Some would argue, with justification, that the crossings were triangular: from India to United States (since Thoreau was probably also influenced to some extent by ideas derived from Hindu philosophy as contained in the *Bhagavad Gita* and the *Upanishads*, texts he was familiar with—see Bhatia 1972, for example, on this), and then from the United States to South Africa, and back again.

24. As Ballantine (1991a: 122) has put it, for Afro-South Africans especially, “[w]here [U.S.] culture fascinated, black [U.S.] culture infatuated.” What is more, this is not just a thing of the past. Writing about the present, South African Ian Glenn (2008: 69) observes:

While in terms of high culture and sports we may still have anglophile tendencies, with Afrikaners casting an occasional covetous glance at France or Holland, our popular culture... is strongly American. Look around you at Coke and KFC, Levi’s and Nike, or the latest technological or intellectual fashions. The favorite show of white Afrikaners in the last days of apartheid was the *Cosby Show*. Oprah is a South African icon, too, and a steady stream of African-American actors star in movies made in South Africa. Black and white South Africans see affinities between the situation in South Africa and in the United States, and draw on it as example—good and bad.

Note: This particular section (on musical influences) is dedicated to one of my mentors James G. Pappas and it draws considerably from Ansell (2004), Ballantine (1991a), Cockrell (1987), Erlmann (1991, 1999), Seroff (1990), and Wright (1976) in addition to other sources mentioned in this section. Although not discussed here because of the constraint of page-space, the reader may also want to look at Hamm (1985) who explores the arrival of rock ‘n’ roll in South Africa in the mid-1950s and its initial embrace by, primarily, white teenagers (to the characteristic chagrin of their parents who castigated it as “primitive music”—read black music, which in a sense it was in terms of one of its branch roots, rhythm and blues). Paradoxically, blacks did not take to this music as fervently as did the whites and, in fact, they began to turn away from it even as it was becoming an obsession among the latter—perceiving it, rightly or wrongly (among other factors) as “white” music, or even as a bastardized version of black music. Moreover, at the time of rock ‘n’ roll’s entry in South Africa the music of such U.S. African American rock ‘n’ rollers as Little Richard, Fats Domino, Chuck Berry, the Platters and so on, was not easily accessible to blacks (or whites) because of the modality of music distribution specific to South Africa (see Hamm).

25. For the purposes of this work, musical *form* should be understood as a subcategory of musical *genre* (while musical *style* is the subcategory of form). For example, jazz is a musical form that belongs to the genre of U.S. African American music, while bebop is a style of jazz.

26. They probably saw in U.S. African American music, depending upon the musical form in question, either a reassuring confirmation of their own racist stereotypical imagery of blacks or the usual promise of licentious hedonism that exoticism tends to allow. About the latter: despite the overt racism of whites toward blacks throughout history up to the present, whites have never been able to completely ignore black culture. In fact, on the contrary, in the vein of Eve eating the forbidden apple whites have often fallen prey to their racist-inspired stereotypes of black culture as sinfully but deliciously exotic—meaning, in their minds, as thoroughly imbued with fun-loving, pleasurable oversexed, and the devil-may-care values and attitudes—and proceeded to partake of this “forbidden” culture. Notice that there are four processes at work here: overcoming racist inspired material hurdles to access to black culture; conjuring up a furively desired stereotypical black culture that resides only in the repressed and “civilized” staid white mind; the inability to see that the essentialist binary of the self and the other is nothing more than reification of reality, especially in a cultural domain such as music; and through the “exoticizing” process refusing to acknowledge the humanity of the “exoticized.” From this perspective, then, exoticism, clearly, is a fundamentally racist project—even if it can simultaneously function as one more weapon in the arsenal of accumulation employed by Western corporate capital, immaterial of which era is under consideration: colonialism, or imperialism, or globalization (About the latter, see Erlmann 1999 and Taylor 2007, for example.) In the specific case of blackface minstrelsy, it goes without saying that because it was primarily for white consumption the basic themes in the shows all revolved around poking fun at black people. Hence, the added bonus here was that the performances reassuringly confirmed white negative stereotypes of black people as lazy good for nothings. Consider this comment by the *Cape Argus* in reference to the South African tour by the Christy Minstrels:

[T]he fame of the distinguished party who have earned so wide a celebrity as portrayers of Negro character had preceded their arrival in Africa. Besides, the character of the entertainment is eminently suited to the tastes of the people here. ... Moreover, so essentially true to life—especially African life—in many of its phrases, are the



“sketches” of these clever impersonators of Negro character, they could scarcely fail to please. (From Erlmann 1991: 31)

27. Consider, for instance, the rights of U.S. African Americans (even though not generally respected during the Jim Crow era) as full citizens was enshrined in the U.S. Constitution. For Afro-South Africans, this was, to put it most mildly, hardly the case.

28. McAdoo, who was born of enslaved U.S. African Americans in Greensborough, North Carolina, in 1858, was a graduate of Hampton Institute (in Hampton, Virginia), the college for U.S. African Americans set up in 1868 to provide “industrial education” by General Samuel Chapman Armstrong, where he had studied from about 1872–1876. Following graduation he spent a few years teaching at the Institute, during which time he also became an active member of the well-known Hampton Male Quartette, before deciding to taking up music professionally by joining in December 1885 a reconstituted choral group from Fisk University—a college for formerly enslaved African Americans opened in 1866 on the immediate conclusion of the Civil War in Nashville, Tennessee—known as the Fisk Jubilee Singers. The group had been established in October 1871 (under the leadership of their music teacher George L. White) as a fund-raising venture for the financially-strapped university. By the time he joined the group it had already achieved considerable fame and popularity, albeit with a different membership—even garnering an invitation to perform at the White House (then occupied by Ulysses S. Grant). It had also undertaken overseas tours, beginning with a trip to England in 1873–1874, which by all accounts were a success. In fact, the money the choral group helped to generate for the university proved to be critical to its establishment and expansion. At the time when McAdoo joined the Fisk Singers, now under the leadership of one of its own (Frederick Loudin), it was on its way to a world-tour. After returning home in April 1890, McAdoo immediately set about to form his own troupe (having parted company with Loudin some months earlier), recruiting his brother Eugene among others, and in May he was again on the road, boldly embarking on a tour of England. Running into problems there shortly upon arrival, he instead set his sights for South Africa, a decision that the troupe would not regret. From the perspective of music, one must distinguish, as Erlmann (1991) points out, between the musical repertoire of white troupes, such as the Christy Minstrels, and that of the black troupes represented by the McAdoo Singers: whereas the repertoire of the former comprised mostly songs based on white stereotypes of blacks (e.g., “Jim Crow,” “Zip Coon,” and “Jim Along Josey”), that of the latter was much more varied, including, besides glees, ballads and classical songs, black religious-oriented spiritual “jubilee” songs (e.g., “Steal Away Jesus,” “The Gospel Train,” “Swing Low, Sweet Chariot,” and “Go Down Moses”). Jubilee songs were first popularized by the Fisk Jubilee Singers—a contribution of immense importance in the development of the national repertoire of the music of United States. (Incidentally, the name “Jubilee Singers” is now a registered trademark of Fisk University. For more on the Fisk Jubilee Singers see Graham [2001] and Ward [2000].)

29. Blackface minstrelsy had its origins in the entertainment shows that enslaved talented U.S. African American musicians on the plantations of the U.S. South were forced to put on for the plantation owners. Through accident or design these shows involved both comedy and music and the basic theme was the ups and downs of plantation life itself. Minstrelsy was based on a similar format, but in its initial stages involved only white performers (appropriately adorned with blackened hands and faces)—names that are associated prominently with this proto-blackface minstrelsy are George Washington Dixon (who achieved fame through his portrayal of the “Zip Coon” character, a staple of minstrelsy) and Thomas “Daddy” Rice (the creator of the solo “Jump, Jim Crow” act that popularized the *Jim Crow* song both nationally and internationally). The first prototypical blackface minstrel show, it is said, was performed by the Virginia Minstrels at the Bowery Amphitheater on February 6, 1843 in New York where the owners felt that the tribulations of plantation slave life would make wonderful entertainment for whites. Later, U.S. African Americans themselves began to participate in minstrel shows; the first U.S. African American minstrel troupe it appears was formed in 1855. The shows involved vocal, instrumental, dance, and theatrical performances laced with stereotypical humor (at the expense of U.S. African Americans), and in time would grow from a four-person troupe to elaborate stage productions with up to sixty-member orchestras in its heyday (from roughly 1840 to 1880). For more on blackface minstrelsy see Bean, Hatch, and McNamara (1996); Cockrell (1997); Dennison (1982); Mahar (1999); and Rehin (1975).

30. The troupe was also invited to perform at the missionary-run Lovedale Institute (an educational institution for Afro-South Africans modeled after Tuskegee); here is an excerpt from a description of that experience by one of the members of the troupe, Eugene McAdoo (Myron’s brother): “The many nice buildings, the boys in the work-shops, the girls at their different labors, made me imagine that I was at Hampton. . . . The girls and boys came in much the same way as do the students here [at Hampton] There were nearly five hundred of them. . . . We sang for them for nearly a couple of hours, and then they favored us with some of their songs, which we thoroughly enjoyed, for their voices were indeed good” (from his letter reproduced in Wright 1976: 326).

31. Of course, most Afro-South Africans were unaware that blacks in the United States were steadily being pushed into the abyss of Jim Crowism (especially in the U.S. South) to suffer almost the same kind of segregationist racial burdens as those imposed on themselves. The mechanism involved would be the cumulative consequences of, on one hand, the anti-civil rights rulings by the U.S. Supreme Court that gutted the spirit and intent of the *Thirteenth*, *Fourteenth* and *Fifteenth Amendments* in cases such as *The Slaughter-House Cases* (83 U.S. 36 [1873]), *United States v. Cruikshank* (92 U.S. 542 [1876]), and *The Civil Rights Cases* (109 U.S. 1 [1883]), and on the other, such events as the recapture by 1877 of all southern states by white racists, the so-called Bourbon Redeemers (Democrats), by means of nothing less than widespread terrorist violence and election fraud, and in the same year the conclusion of the *Compromise of 1877* that gave the presidency to Republican Rutherford B. Hayes in exchange for a complete withdrawal of federal troops from the South—thereby leaving blacks and their allies to the tender mercies of arch racists.

32. Though, in one sense, this was highly ironic considering that minstrelsy as a genre was a white invention foundationally based on demeaning stereotypes of U.S. African Americans—no matter that U.S. African American minstrel

troupes also arose to popularize this genre further. But then, it is not the music per se, that is of concern here, but the performers (in terms of what they represented to Afro-South Africans).

33. In employing the term “urban” one must be cautioned against the danger of reification: in cultural terms the rural/urban dichotomy did not really exist in the South Africa of that period; rather, we should see it as a fluid continuum in which the evolving black culture was at once rural *and* urban. From this perspective, the development of new musical forms was an outcome of a dialectical process where both the rural and the urban lent idioms to the other. In other words: In South Africa the rural musical “tradition” was not hermetically sealed off from foreign (e.g. U.S.) musical influences which made their entry point initially through the urban cultural environment. Similarly, one must also be careful about how class is analyzed in relation to the development of musical genres among Afro-South Africans; as Ballantine (1991a: 121), for example, points out, “although one can discern the existence both of different class tendencies and different musical genres, the relationship between economic classes and musical genre is not straightforward: competing classes might support the same genre, or one class might identify with different, apparently, contradictory, genres.”

34. Coon songs were comic songs based on stereotypes of the speech of U.S. African Americans (who were disparagingly referred to as “coons”). The popularity of this genre in the United States would reach a sufficient magnitude (from around 1880s to 1910s—thanks to the infusion of the ragtime idiom), to entice even U.S. African American composers to lend their hand at enlarging its repertoire (see Dennison 1982 and Dorman 1988).

35. The hyphenated “rural-urban” speaks to the fluid nature of the rural-urban “frontier” in the South Africa of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, both in geographic terms as well as in mental terms. The new musical forms that emerged in part on the basis of transatlantic borrowings, blendings, and transformations were neither entirely rural-based nor urban-based, but rather occupied a new geographic and mental zone: the rural-urban frontier. Note too that it was a frontier that, from the perspective of music, also transcended class boundaries. (See, for example, the discussion by Erlmann 1991.)

36. See Meintjes (1990) and Erlmann (1994) for an interesting analysis of the *Graceland* project which, it should be noted, was not without controversy. Meintjes sees the project as not simply a musical project but as a “political” (though not necessarily antiapartheid) project as well, while Erlmann argues that the project should be seen as nothing more than an expression of global capital’s efforts to manufacture difference as an economic end in itself (accumulation). From a different perspective, one can also posit the *Graceland* project as symbolic of the unwitting “taintedness” of culture by the Other (which of course renders mythical notions of cultural purity much beloved by peddlers of essentialism) made possible by the development of technology on one hand and cross-cultural contacts on the other, regardless of the modality of that contact (colonialism, imperialism, globalization, etc.)—as exemplified by this journey of musical influences through the tripartite agency of borrowing, blending, and transformation taking place over a period of several centuries: African musical antecedents → U.S. African American musics → Afro-South African musics → U.S. modern popular music (the arrows represent influences).

37. A word or two about this remarkable singer and political activist whose work is symbolic of the fusion between U.S. African American and Afro-South African musics, and who was the first to introduce to the world abroad this distinctly U.S.-influenced Afro-South African music, would not go amiss here. Miriam Makeba rose to international fame as a singer after she came to the attention of the Jamaican singer, activist, and actor Harry Belafonte in 1959 who, sensing her extensive musical talent, volunteered to be her mentor and sponsor in the United States. Within a short time she would earn enough acclaim to even receive an invitation to sing at President John F. Kennedy’s birthday celebration. As her singing career progressed she also simultaneously became drawn into antiapartheid politics—beginning with her appearance in the antiapartheid docudrama *Come Back, Africa* produced by the independent U.S. filmmaker Lionel Rogosin and first screened at the international film festival in Venice, Italy in 1959—drawing the ire of SAAG who a year later retaliated by preventing her from attending her mother’s funeral and banning her from ever returning to South Africa by revoking her passport, thereby placing her in permanent exile (until of course the dissolution of apartheid). (Characteristically, in 1963 SAAG also banned sales of her records in South Africa; they would not be unbanned until 1988.) As an antiapartheid activist, she also appeared more than once before the United Nations to give evidence (first, in 1963)—and the award to her of the Dag Hammarskjöld Peace Prize in 1986 marked a well-deserved recognition of her contributions in this area of her life’s work. After having spent almost three decades in exile, Makeba returned to South Africa in 1990 to much public adoration. Her first concert in the country went beyond her wildest expectations and served as a springboard for a world tour, complete with a successful album, *Eyes on Tomorrow*, released in 1991. In 1995 Makeba was invited to perform at the Vatican Christmas concert, and a few years later, by now in her late sixties and dubbed by her fans as “Mama Africa,” she released another well-received album, the Grammy-nominated *Homeland* (2000). In 2005 she embarked on a fourteen-month farewell world tour, performing in all the countries that she had visited during her professional career.

Makeba was born on March 4, 1932 in the black township of Prospect near Johannesburg to a family where mom worked as a domestic help but who also ran on the side a shebeen to supplement the family income. Against the backdrop of a music-loving family background, Zenzile Miriam Makeba, like many other Afro-South Africans who became nationally and/or internationally known musicians and singers, received at an early age exposure to African American music (in this case jazz—principally through radio and phonograph records). Combining this influence with traditional African music, and beginning as an amateur while in high school, her work would eventually mature to an eclectic form of what is now known as Afrobeat jazz; helped along the way, initially, by her membership of such highly successful Afro-South African musical groups as the jazz band Manhattan Brothers (in 1954), the Skylarks (in 1958), and her role as the lead singer in the 1959 jazz-inspired South African musical *King Kong* (which in format echoed U.S. Broadway musicals and was based on the sadly disastrous life of the Afro-South African heavyweight boxing champion Ezekiel

“King Kong” Dhlamini), together with collaborative work with Belafonte—which would also lead to the release in 1965 of the popular Grammy-award winning album *An Evening with Belafonte/Makeba*. Perhaps the song that first helped establish her name was “Pata Pata” that she originally sang while with the Manhattan Brothers (also released as a single in 1967); in later years her other signature songs would include the Xhosa wedding song “The Click Song,” and the Zulu lion-hunting song “Wimoweh.” (Note: this last song began its life as “Mbube” (meaning lion) sung by the wildly popular Afro-South African vocal group the Evening Birds, led by Solomon Linda, in the early 1940s in a style then known as *ingoma ebusuku* that combined traditional Zulu vocal music with U.S.-derived musical influences and which would later evolve to become a style that is known today as *mbube*, named after the title of the original song—both styles, incidentally, are among the antecedents of *isicalhamiya*.) The song was then adapted by the New York city-based Euro-American folk music quartet The Weavers as “Wimoweh” and later by The Tokens, another Euro-American New York city-based vocal group, as “The Lion Sleeps Tonight.”) An interesting phase of Makeba’s life was her marriage to Kwame Ture (Stokely Carmichael) in 1968 that not only earned her an instant pariah status in the U.S. music industry, but would also include such other consciousness-raising life events as moving to live in Sekou Toure’s Guinea and meetings with Fidel Castro and other similar revolutionary personages. (She separated from Ture in 1973 and they divorced a few years later in 1978.) Among other men she was married to briefly was Afro-Asian South African ballad singer and composer Sonny Pillay (in 1959) and Hugh Masekela (from 1964–1966). For more on Makeba see her autobiographies (1988, 2004).

38. Because jazz would come to have such an important influence in the development of Afro-South African urban music, a word or two on this history of this music. To begin with, the term jazz has its origins in the vernacular of the U.S. African American working class. Its first apparent public usage was in the Chicago Herald newspaper in the May 6th, 1916 issue where the word was first spelt jass (with quotation marks). Later it was transformed to the word jazs and then a year or so later to its current form (jazz). Jazz soon began to be used by musicians as a descriptive verbal signal to members in the band (as in the phrase “jazz-it”) telling them to increase the level of sound and tempo of the music. At one time the term also had a sexual connotation (as in “he jassed her”) which helps to explain, in part, why jazz initially had an unsavory reputation. The first recorded use of the term “jazz” as we understand it today was in 1902, at least that is what a New Orleans musician of the day going by the professional name of Jelly Roll Morton (real name: Joseph Ferdinand la Menthe [1885–1941]) would claim. He would assert that it is he who first used the term by applying it to his style of music to distinguish it from other contemporary musical styles, most especially the popular U.S. African American musical form of the day called ragtime (see below), thereby insisting that he was the original inventor of jazz. While many have hotly contested this claim, Sales (1984) suggests that an examination of Morton’s published musical work (coupled with other sources of information) lends credence to his claim but only in that he was the first to have, in Sales words, “injected crucial elements into ragtime that nudged it further along the road to jazz.” It would appear then that jazz, which was an essentially urban creation (but with rural folk roots as will be indicated in a moment), first surfaced in the entrepôt of New Orleans, Louisiana—though this apparent original home of the music should be not be construed to mean that various simpler versions were not being played elsewhere in the South—as a result of fortuitous circumstances (which need not detain us here), especially among the city’s black residents. Besides Morton, the other name that frequently appears in the literature on the origins of jazz in New Orleans is Charles Buddy Bolden (1868–1931). Bolden, an enterprising individual who owned a barber’s shop and published a scandal sheet (called the Cricket), was also an accomplished cornetist. In the 1890s he formed his own 5–7 person dance band, the Bolden Ragtime Band, that began to innovate with ragtime. In fact to this day, Bolden’s original proto-jazz band repertory continues to serve as the model for all jazz band repertories: one, and later, two cornets; guitar; bass violin; one or two clarinets; valve trombone alternating with slide trombone; and drums. (Morton added the piano.)

Now, in indicating that jazz first emerged in New Orleans it does not imply, it should be cautioned, that the music simply emerged out of nowhere. Like all forms of music everywhere jazz was a product of a combination of serendipitous and deliberate musical influences, both contemporary and historical. In fact, the roots of jazz lay in the various ethnic forms of African rhythmic music brought over from Africa in the seventeenth century by enslaved Africans. Thousands of miles away from the rich sounds of their homeland, the enslaved Africans made music from the various implements and tools they had at their disposal. They also brought with them an oral tradition which emphasized vocal sounds over instrumental sounds. As Blassingame (1979: 22) points out “Group participation, improvisation, call and response, rhythmic complexity, and percussions are constant in traditional African music. Often hand clapping or stamping of the feet supply the percussion accompaniment to songs.” He further notes: “Perhaps the most distinctive feature of traditional African music is its rhythmic complexity. In this area the African is far superior to the European. While European music is based characteristically on one rhythm, African tunes often contain three or more patterns. (See also Schuller [1968], and Jones [1959] for more on this point.) The antecedents of jazz, therefore, are to be found in the earliest musical forms performed by enslaved Africans in the rural south: work songs (including field hollers and chants), folk ballads, and church music. Work songs and folk ballads were songs sung roughly during the period up to Emancipation by the enslaved Africans on plantations. Church music or “gospel music” was an outgrowth of the effort by plantation owners to use Christianity for the pacification of the enslaved Africans where the converts improvised a new form of music around the melodies and rhythms of the hymns. The emergence of gospel music was crucial to the development of not only jazz, but even rock, as Werner (1989: 38), for example, points out: “Gospel music has given much of today’s rock music its very foundations. The elements found in gospel music can be found in all the components of rock, from the basic beat, structured upon the even eighth note pattern as the pulse, to the shouts and the drama exhibited by performers, including the dance steps which seem to be a derivative of the dances performed to the slaves’ gospel songs.”

A particularly important device that the Africans on the plantation retained from their West African musical heritage was the use of a clear and forceful musical ground beat (made by percussion instruments or even simply handclaps or foot stomping) running evenly, relentlessly and independently throughout their musical performance. This is a beat of the type that is common to military marching music in the European musical tradition, but not normally found in other European musical forms. (Incidentally, the beat in these other forms emerges out of the music itself.) On the foundations of this unceasing ground-beat, the Africans then piled up simulated counterhythms of their musical heritage achieved by changing the rhythm in a melody in accordance with improvised time durations. Out of this simple traditional U.S. African American folk music, some of which, even as late as 1863, could be described in very basic terms, such as jug, tub, spasm and washboard band music—that is terms that pointed to the essence of the music as unadorned and melodically simple, and relying for obvious reasons on homemade instruments such as jugs, kettles, wooden boxes, string instruments (simple guitars, violins, banjos and fiddles made from wooden boxes), bells, whistles, kitchen utensils (spoons, forks, washboards, etc.) and other assorted domestic instruments—grew four principal musical forms that formed the precursors of jazz (besides gospel music): plantation music (blackface minstrelsy—a corruption of the traditional U.S. African American rural folk music by whites), spirituals (jubilee songs), blues and ragtime.

Blues grew out of the rural southern U.S. African American folk tradition (in which, as noted earlier, the African oral musical style plays a dominant role). In its early form the music represented the cry of the downtrodden and the oppressed; hence the music had an aura of melancholy and despair. The rural to urban migration of the formerly enslaved following Emancipation ensured that blues would have an impact on other forms of music as well, including the development of jazz. In fact, by 1910 blues as a formal term had firmly become part of the U.S. musical lexicon. Further, during the next two decades the music would spread from the Mississippi delta region, east to New Orleans and north to the urban settings of Chicago and New York, producing cross-fertilizations between blues and other forms that would become quite popular. Among the more well-known blues singers were Alberta Hunter, Ma Rainey, Clara Smith, Maggie Jones and Bessie Smith. (Incidentally, blues would, in time, influence even white rock musicians. For example songs such as the following are all rooted in the blues: “Can’t Buy Me Love” by the Beatles; “Hound Dog” by Elvis Presley; “Rock Around the Clock” by Bill Haley and the Comets; “Born Too Late” by Cream; and “Love in Vain” by the Rolling Stones.

Around 1895, one of the cross-fertilizations began to acquire a distinct shape in and around New Orleans. As the city’s Creole population and the new migrants from the countryside began to interact (mainly under the duress of the evolving Jim Crowism) they emerged with a style of music that was counterbalanced to the rhythms of each group producing a form of proto-jazz; it came to be called ragtime. The term denotes the ragged aspect of the counterbalancing where harmonies and rhythms from the black musical tradition (slave chants, minstrel tunes, jug music, gospel music, “coon songs,” plantation music, spirituals, blues, etc.) were counterpoised against those from Creolized European musical tradition (especially that represented by German and Italian marching band music, and to a lesser degree classical piano concert music), producing a sound that, on initial hearings, appeared thoroughly alien, but still fascinating, to the European musical ear. While primarily a piano music played by such illustrious musicians as Scott Joplin, James Scott, Eubie Blake, and Fats Waller, it was also played by small bands such as those led by Buddy Bolden, Bunk Johnson, Fletcher Henderson and Louis Armstrong. Initially, the emergence of ragtime on the national musical scene was greeted with considerable opposition from the white bourgeois and some of the U.S. African American petit bourgeois classes. They felt that the music was simply too decadent and morally corrupting. The following passage (quoted in Feather [1961]) from an editorial in the magazine *Musical Courier* published in 1899 is illustrative: “A wave of vulgar, of filthy and suggestive music has inundated the land. Nothing but ragtime prevails. No seaside resort this summer has been without its ragtime orchestra, its weekly cakewalk [an U.S. African American dance form]. Worse yet, the fashionable idol folk of Newport have been the worst offenders. . . . [C]akewalk is nothing but an African danse du ventre [belly dance], a milder edition of African orgies, and the music is degenerate music.” Despite such denunciations, in time ragtime became very popular, reaching its apogee around 1910-1915, both in the United States and abroad (including South Africa).

From about 1915 onwards as the popularity of ragtime waned, yet another style emerged from it: “New Orleans style” jazz, which would grow out of the hot music of people such as Buddy Bolden and Jelly Roll Morton. This new style, like ragtime (and minstrelsy before it), soon spread rapidly to other parts of the country, so much so that by the 1920s not only would it become integrated into the musical culture of the white majority, but it would also lend its name to that decade (the 1920s would come to be known as the “jazz age”). Among the major names that would surface in disseminating New Orleans jazz were such U.S. African Americans musicians as Louis “Satchmo” Armstrong, Earl “Fatha” Hines, Fats Waller, King Oliver, Fletcher Henderson, and Duke Ellington. With the “nationalization” of this new style other innovating musicians created, in time, various substyles of this music; among the more prominent of these were swing, boogie-woogie, bebop, cool, free, fusion and more recently world jazz.

Against the backdrop of the foregoing pedigree, what then were the distinguishing characteristics that separated jazz from other musical forms as it evolved? One can identify at least seven (albeit at varying levels of practical implementation depending upon style and circumstance) that were salient which in combination gave it a specific identity: (1) *Improvisation*. The musician was allowed to create or make up sounds as he/she saw fit within the confines of a melody (or even in the absence of a melody) on the basis of these practices: the music was usually unrehearsed; it was not usually memorized or written down (notated) beforehand (except in the case, usually, of the large jazz bands (big band jazz) where written arrangements were the norm—though note that even in their case solo performances were often improvised); the music was usually composed while it was being performed; and it was spontaneous. About the last: This spontaneity that improvisation permitted was the most crucial element of this music. As a consequence, the aesthetics of this particular music were the reverse of the aesthetics of, for example, European orchestral music. As Gioia (1988:

55), for example, explains: “An aesthetics of jazz would almost be a type of nonaesthetics. Aesthetics, in principle if not in practice, focuses our attention on those attributes of a work of art which reveal the craftsmanship and careful planning of the artist. Thus the terminology of aesthetic philosophy—words such as form, symmetry, balance—emphasizes the methodical element in artistic creation. But the improviser was anything but methodical; hence these terms have only the most tangential applicability to the area of jazz. ... For this reason the virtues we search for in other art forms—premeditated design, balance between form and content, an overall symmetry—are largely absent in jazz.” In other words, jazz was a type of music that was best appreciated by not looking at it in isolation from the artist, the musician, but rather appreciating it in direct relation to the artist himself/herself. (2) *Syncopation*. In jazz differing rhythms coexisted together, giving it a “syncopation” character at irregular and often spontaneous intervals. Tempo and time could shift at any point or could work in unison differing only in conception. This method of creating counterpoint rhythms had its roots in the improvisational rhythms of African percussion instruments (e.g. drums, cymbals, vibraharp, and marimba) where the musicians played the instruments in such a way that they created polyrhythms and counterbalances producing a sound that to the European ear sometimes appeared to have a cacophonous flavor. (3) *Blue Notes*. Because jazz came from a vocal frame of reference the transition from low note to high note or from sharp to flat was constantly driven by the ability to ‘slide’ from one note to another rather than by steps characterized by integral jumps as scored on a standard page of sheet music. These notes were then bent, turned, inverted and reshaped according to the manner the musician chose to play, leading to the production of what was sometimes referred to as “blue notes.” This approach represented a musical compromise between the demands of African traditional music and the North American (European) musical background of U.S. African Americans. (4) *Swing*. Jazz was played within the context of a musical style called “swing” comprising five basic characteristics: the presence of a constant tempo; the production of a “group sound” where all members of a band performed in a synchronized manner; the permeation of performances by exceptional buoyancy and gaiety of a type not common in performances of European classical orchestral music (hence, both players and members of the audience felt that they were involved in a joyous celebration of the ongoing creation of music); and the constant presence of alternating tension and relaxation in music lines as the motion of these lines rose and fell alternately. (5) *Jamming*. Because jazz was both improvisational and individualistic, each musician could well come out with a unique set of notes during the course of an actual performance that he/she may never have played before. In other words, each time a jazz band performed both the players and the audience were likely to be treated to something ‘new.’ The format within which this process occurred could be likened to a jam session (in fact at times it was actually be a real jam session). Within this format, however, there were a number of unwritten rules, of which two were critical: First, a band member was not to monopolize the solo sequences at the expense of others, nor was he/she to attempt to garner audience attention at the expense of others by being ‘pushy.’ Second, audiences were encouraged to become participants in the performance by making approving noises of encouragement, or by stamping their feet, or by simply clapping their hands in applause. In a successful jazz performance, therefore, the interaction between the players themselves (especially between the soloist and the rhythm section) and between the band as a whole and the audience was one of “call-and-response” (reminiscent of the call-and-response of drums in Africa when communicating between villages, or the call-and-response between the preacher and his congregation in a “sanctified” church)—but underlined by respect and encouragement where all played a part in the ongoing “ceremony” of making music. (6) *Informality*. Jazz was not dependent upon a written or memorized set composition or arrangement. In fact, given that the written notation was alien to black culture, be it in Africa or the United States, an important distinguishing characteristic separating black music from white music, at a general level, had been the fact that white music had traditionally depended on the accurate reproduction of a set composition. This is by no means to suggest that all jazz produced by blacks was produced on the fly, but rather most of it was. Very little of it was to be found in written scores. It must be remembered that because of white racism U.S. African Americans were not permitted access to music schools until well after much of their music had become part of U.S. culture as a whole. To some degree, then, the individual freedom of style that was so much part of jazz was an outcome of the absence of the rigid formalism characteristic of traditional white music, especially orchestral music. (The general exception, as already noted big band jazz where written arrangements were a necessity because of the large ensemble of players involved.) (7) *Instruments*. The instruments used in jazz performances consisted of specific standardized type and numbers. In general, but not always, the instruments of choice for the rhythm section comprised: the string bass or the electric bass guitar; the drum set (consisting usually of a snare drum, a large and a small tom-tom drum, a bass drum, a ride cymbal, a crash cymbal, and a high-hat (or sock) cymbal); the piano; and wind instruments (chiefly trumpet, cornet, clarinet, flute, and the different types of saxophones).

In providing this sketchy overview of the history and characteristics of jazz, several points ought to be kept in mind. (1) Although the impression may be gained from the foregoing that the development of jazz was an all male affair, it is far from the truth. To be sure, the music has traditionally been male-dominated but that does not imply that women have had no part to play in its development. Without the contribution of jazz vocalists such as Billie Holiday, Bessie Smith, Ella Fitzgerald, and the late Sarah Vaughan, jazz would not be jazz. (2) Given the enforced marginal status of blacks throughout U.S. history, the development of jazz and other popular forms of black music that eventually achieved some degree of acceptability by the white-dominated music industry has been marked by, to varying degrees, black musicians sacrificing their authenticity on the altar of economic survival in a white-dominated capitalist society on one hand, and on the other, their exploitation (e.g. by means of unfair contracts—relative to those of white musicians) by the music industry. (3) Because jazz was born in the United States, it must also be emphasized that the contribution of whites to its development is undeniable. The relationship between whites and jazz has not always been one of “exploitation”—that is, whites benefitting at the expense of blacks through appropriation and the like. (In an essay review DeVeaux [1996: 394] summarizes the core of this matter when he frames it with this question: “Does the paradigm of black authenticity leave any role for white musicians other than as imitators or exploiters, or any role for

the mass white audience other than as philistines and voyeurs?”) This much is incontrovertible: A number of individual white jazz musicians and personalities, as Sudhalter (1999) has shown in his extensive work, have played very constructive roles in the development of jazz. Names that come to mind include Bix Beiderbecke, Jack Teagarden, Stan Getz, Benny Goodman, Bill Evans, Gil Evans and John Hammond. The last was not a musician at all, but a wealthy jazz patron. Sales (1984:103) describes his role thus:

His seemingly endless fount of money, time, and energy was funneled into the careers of countless musicians both great and obscure who he found jobs for, put through school, got out of jail and hock, hospitalized, dried out, recorded, buried, loaned money to with no hope of repayment; of writers he found publishers for; magazines he underwrote; racial and activists groups he subsidized and guided; historic concerts and benefits he produced. The recording sessions he organized and supervised include a who's who of jazz, blues, gospel and even rock. His discoveries and protégés included Count Basie, Billie Holiday, Teddy Wilson, Lester Young, the boogie-woogie pianists whose revival he sparked almost single-handedly, Charlie Christian, Big Joe Turner, Aretha Franklin, George Benson, Bob Dylan, and Bruce Springsteen.

However, there is an even more fundamental point being argued here: the development of jazz, as with all other forms of “black” music and “white” music in United States, cannot be completely extricated from the historical matrix of the tortured relationship between blacks and whites. Each group has had a hand in the development of the musics of the other, sometimes consciously, but more often unconsciously. Jazz (as well as its antecedent forms, blues, spirituals, etc.) is as much “black” music as it is also “white” music—though not necessarily in equal proportions (on this score one must part company with Sudhalter, for the primacy of the African roots of the music is simply incontestable). By the same token, there is no such thing as an authentic U.S. “white” music, for blacks have also played an important role (often unwittingly) in the development of U.S. “white” music—regardless of musical form. Radano (2003) makes a similar point when he states that: “black music’s emergence is inextricably linked to a racial logic, one in which blackness defines a distinctiveness or ‘difference’ that has been historically negotiated within a relationship between African- and Euro-Americans. That is, the qualities that define black music grow out of a cultural ground that is more common than many realize...” Yet, despite this fact, he also points out, there has been (and continues to be) a vested interest on both sides to deny this historical reality: “black music, as the defining expression of race, has been shaped and reshaped within a peculiar interracial [musical] conversation whose participants simultaneously deny that the conversation has ever taken place” (p. xiii). (See also McMichael [1998] who explores the insurgent role of jazz in undermining whiteness.) (4) While jazz may have been born in the United States, very early on (thanks to the invention and universalization of the phonograph and the radio) it became international in scope, not only in terms of simply “performance” but also “production” as each geographic domain (including South Africa) borrowed, gave, and lent to the other various strands of the idiom—as it replaced minstrelsy and ragtime. For more on jazz and its history, besides the sources already mentioned above, see also Blesh (1956), Blassingame (1973), Gioia (1997), Kaufman and Guckin (1979), Kernfield (1988), Radano (2003), Werner (1989), and Southern (1997). For a visual documentary history of what is primarily swing-era jazz (and even that somewhat less than satisfactory) see the nineteen-hour ten-episode PBS (Public Broadcasting Service) film by Ken Burns simply titled *Jazz* released in 2001.

39. Later, however, Caluza would have the good fortune to acquaint himself firsthand with the music of the premier U.S. African American ragtime composer Scott Joplin, as well as other ragtime composers, while studying for a B.S. degree on a Phelps-Stokes Fund scholarship in United States at McAdoo’s *alma mater*, the Hampton Institute, beginning in 1930. Incidentally, after graduating from Hampton, in 1934, he enrolled the following year at Columbia University on a Carnegie Corporation scholarship for an M. A. degree, which he completed in 1936. Upon returning to South Africa he joined the School of Music as its head at the college founded by the American Zulu Mission at Azimtote on the outskirts of Durban, Adams College (the *alma mater* of people such as John L. Dube, Albert Luthuli, Albertina Luthuli, Z. K. Matthews, Govan Mbeki, Mangosuthu Buthelezi, and still in existence). Interestingly, during his time at the college among his many interests was the revival of spirituals and minstrel music, which he felt retained the essence of African American folk music—even if burdened with the baggage of the imagery of white stereotypes of blacks. (For more on Caluza and his contribution to the development of Afro-South African music see Coplan [2008] and Erlmann [1991].)

40. Invented by the legendary inventor-entrepreneur Thomas Alva Edison in 1877 in the United States, the phonograph was already fast becoming by the late 1920s a common household accoutrement in South African homes among both blacks and whites. Its influence as a conduit of U.S.-derived music cannot be, to put it mildly, overstated. As the internationally known Afro-South African trumpeter Hugh Masekela once told an interviewer (albeit referring to a slightly later period):

Everybody in those days had gramophones. South Africa has always been a country of record collectors. When I was young, I heard everything Count Basie, Duke Ellington, The Mills Brothers, Louis Armstrong, Frank Sinatra, Benny Goodman, Glen Miller, Tommy Dorsey, The Ink Spots, Cab Calloway. Oh man, I heard all of them. What with the industrialized nature of South Africa, and the gold rush, people came from all over the world with their wares. So even though we were nothing but a cheap labor pool, we were exposed to what was going on all over the world. The most attractive thing to us was American popular music. (From the interview by Philip van Vleck in the February 2003 issue of *Metro Magazine*, titled “African Roots Define Time, Masekela’s Latest Album.”)

41. One ought to note here that from a musical perspective, respect for U.S.-derived music across the planet revolves primarily around only one form: jazz. No other musical form that the U.S. has exported to the rest of the world can even remotely come close to the respect that jazz commands. (For a quick overview of the international impact of jazz, Atkins (2003) is a worthy read). This point has not been lost on U.S. jazz musicians. As Dexter Gordon, the highly

talented tenor saxophonist who spent over a decade working in Europe, while explaining why they were able to play to a full house when in Athens even though the audience were not jazz fans, told veteran observer of the jazz scene, W. Royal Stokes (1991:179): “You know, jazz is the only original American art form and its so strange that everybody in the world knows that except the citizens of the United States of America. Isn’t that incongruous? I mean, it’s unbelievable! When you go out of the country, that’s the thing they dig about America, is jazz. They’re not too concerned about a Ford or a Chrysler or something. I mean, this is what America is known for all over the world.” In support of Gordon’s point: when Mercer Ellington, son of Duke Ellington was looking for a place to house his father’s priceless collection of tapes, interviews, musical scores, recordings, etc., it was the Danish Radio that came to his assistance and volunteered to not only serve as a custodian of this ‘archive’ but to also to process the tapes and transfer them onto new tape material so that the sound was preserved cleanly. It was only later, when it became clear how important a part of U.S. cultural history this archive was, that in 1988 a U.S. institution stepped forward to house it: the Smithsonian Institution in Washington.

42. Vaudeville was a variety show of seventeenth-century French provenance (though its roots went back to the sixteenth century) that spread across Europe and then across the Atlantic; it would become hugely popular by around the turn of the twentieth-century in the United States. It was not entirely dissimilar to the minstrel shows in terms of structure; besides songs and dances, it included skits, comedic performances, and acrobatics.

43. Shebeens were backroom places (usually operated by women—“shebeen queens”) where the local version of moonshine was illicitly sold; that is, outside the confines of the law that sought to protect the highly lucrative monopoly over liquor sales in the black townships held by the white authorities. In other words, they were an Afro-South African version of speakeasies.

44. Formed in the early 1960s, over the years the group underwent many personnel changes. Today, a smaller version of the group, following the death of Mahlathini (Simon Mahlathini Nkabinde) in 1999, continues as simply the Mahotella Queens (comprising Hilda Tloubatla, Nobesuthu Mbadu, and Mildred Mangxola).

45. See Nixon (1994) on the insurgent role of Sophiatown from the perspective of U.S. imported black culture. Also of interest here is Hannerz (1994), who provides a broader view of the role of Sophiatown in South African sociocultural history.

46. At the time of Zwerin’s visit (he does not indicate dates) the U.N.-sponsored cultural boycott of apartheid South Africa was in force. Responding to criticism from antiapartheid forces, Zwerin (1985: 123) explained his decision to ignore it: “I was aware of the U.N.-sponsored cultural boycott but, checking around, I was told that because we would be sponsored by the U.S. government not a local promoter, and because we would be a racially integrated group [two blacks, two whites] playing for racially-integrated audiences, we should be exempt. Later in the tour, in Lesotho, we ran into Hugh Masekela, one of South Africa’s most famous musical émigrés, and an old friend from New York. He confirmed it (I have it on tape).” Elsewhere in his book, in response to an angry question posed by a friend, Claude Verses, “Would you have gone to play in Nazi Germany?” Zwerin states: “Good question. It stumped me for a while, but it depends who I would have played with and for. I would have gone with other Jews to play in stalags, concentration camps and ghettos. Sad Afrika [sic] is the closest system we have to Nazi Germany. Not to say they are unique in political repression or racial discrimination. But it is the only system today built on racial discrimination; it is the system. And, as in Nazi Germany, prosperity is based on what amounts to slave labor” (p. 127). Incidentally, the two black musicians were told that while in South Africa they would be officially considered as “honorary white.” To which Oliver Johnson, one of the musicians laughingly responded: “I’ve been a nigger in Oakland and New York and Paris all my life. I have to go to Joburg to be white” (p. 126)?

47. Born in 1934 in Cape Town as Adolphe Johannes Brand, a Colored, he learned piano from his mother (who was a pianist in the local African Methodist Episcopal church) and when he started playing jazz he acquired the professional name of “Dollar Brand”—given to him by U.S. African American sailors frequenting the bars where he played while on their recreational stopover in Cape Town. He converted to Islam in 1968 whereupon he changed his professional name to Abdullah Ibrahim. Explaining the origins of his interest in jazz he told Stokes (1991: 192): “The African Methodist Episcopal churches are a very, very strong influence. . . . I mean, it is a very, very large community in South Africa and that’s how I was exposed to spirituals, African American spirituals, and then, through records, to the music, which at that time was like Basie, Louis Jordan, Erskine Hawkins, and the boogie-woogie pianists Albert Ammons, Meade Lux Lewis, and Pete Johnson.” It is while in exile in United States (which began in 1976 shortly after the Soweto Uprising) that his music began to really acquire its distinctiveness and international prominence. However, the true beginnings of his international fame can be traced to a serendipitous meeting with Duke Ellington and Billy Strayhorn in Paris where on February 23, 1963 a recording session with them (together with his jazz singer partner and future spouse, also a Colored, Sathima Bea Benjamin—a talented person in her own right whose early upbringing included self-willed exposure to such great African American female jazz singers as Doris Day, Ella Fitzgerald, and Billie Holiday through the medium of the radio) led to the release of an LP (long play) recording titled *Duke Ellington Presents the Dollar Brand Trio*. See Lucia (2002) for an intriguing analysis of his work during the U.S. exile period that locates the wellspring of his creativity in the terrain of nostalgia, both personal and political. Ibrahim continues to perform to this day, though his work has taken a somewhat different direction: orchestral music. For a look at Benjamin’s work see Muller (2001) who also comes to a similar conclusion about the sources of her (Benjamin’s) creativity, namely: “an individual and collective need to perform for political liberation,” where “jazz performance became the vehicle for invoking a sense of home for Abdullah and a spirit of love and community for Sathima” (p. 135), but always set within the context of a musical language that was at once U.S. African American and South African in origin.

48. It is also important to point out that this influence was not always just one way. As one would logically expect, the dominant can never be completely immune from the reverse cultural traffic flowing from the dominated—even if it

may be attenuated in magnitude. In almost all cultural areas (music, literature, cinema) and even in the realm of politics, South African influences (especially those emanating from black South African sources) have found their way to U.S. shores—as Nixon (1994), for example, has ably documented.

49. Here, as already mentioned, an important medium for the popularization of U.S. African-American culture among Afro-South Africans was the white-owned but black readership oriented magazine called *African Drum* (founded in 1951). Because it was losing money, within less than a year the name was changed to simply *Drum* as it was restructured under the editorship of Anthony Sampson, an English expatriate, and with the assistance of a team of reporters who were all not only Afro-South Africans but also thoroughly cosmopolitan in outlook—shamelessly pandering to the nascent Afro-South African petite bourgeoisie. In other words, *Drum* soon became the equivalent of *Ebony* (magazine of U.S. African American petite bourgeoisie) in style and role, though not necessarily in tone, for this class. Unable to find sufficient exemplars of the “modern” urban Afro-South African culture, the magazine relied heavily (by means of reviews, articles, pictures, etc.) on U.S. African American culture together with a Hollywood-derived cultural style of urban bravado as a resource base. Needless to say, by its very existence (though not in intent of course) *Drum* became a cultural vehicle for challenging apartheid whose architects were not only against the urbanization of Afro-South Africans but who saw them as they had always seen them, little more than a factor of production—to cite the oftquoted pronouncement by one of them, Henrik F. Verwoerd (at the time the so-called Minister of Native Affairs) in the whites-only South African Parliament on September 17, 1953: “The Natives will be taught from childhood to realize that equality with [whites] is not for them.... There is no place for [them] above the level of certain forms of labor” (from Nixon, p. 31). (For more about the magazine see also Sampson [1983].)

50. Consider this scenario (with its multiple angled racialized fears) painted by Hertzog during a parliamentary debate on the question of allowing television broadcasts in South Africa: “It is afternoon and the [black servant] is in the living room cleaning the carpet. Someone has left television set on. The [servant] looks up at the screen, sees a chorus line of white girls in scanty costumes. Suddenly, seized by lust, he runs upstairs and rapes the madam” (from Krabill 2002: 44).

51. The *Cosby Show* proved, ironically, to be a great hit—“[b]lack entertainment figures like Bill Cosby were not only visible but even *beloved* by White South Africa,” states Krabill, p. 5 [emphasis added]—among Euro-South Africans with its portrayal of nonthreatening but yet “civilized darkies.”

52. One ought to note here that comparative studies generally fall into, with some simplification, two main methodological categories, the “parallel study” that places side by side case studies in the service of prior theoretical propositions (e.g. Fredrickson [1981] and McKoy [2001]), and, for want of a better term, the “integrative study” that dynamically moves back and forth between case studies in order to illuminate matters of concern to the comparativist (e.g. Greenberg [1980] and Nixon [1994]). (See the seminal essay on this subject by Skocpol and Somers [1980].) While the generally accepted view is that a true comparative study is the latter kind one should be wary of self-righteous academic hubris. Both methodological approaches are useful, depending upon one’s purpose. (An allied issue here is the perennial [though perhaps legitimate] concern with the pitfalls of comparison; see, for example, Cooper’s [1984] essay review of Fredrickson [1981], as well as Barnard [2005], and Campbell [2000].)

53. Similarly, Cuthbertson (1999: 104) observes:

The U.S.-South African comparison offers “such a dense web of interconnections and ‘intrinsic’ comparisons” that one is amazed by the salience each of these societies has in the political and cultural life of the other. This goes back to the 1870s when South African newspapers carried reports on developments in the American South. Liberal segregationists in both countries compared notes in the early 20th century and the “American model” became a reference point for black and white.

54. Incidentally, his own article (the source of these quotes) is a comparative study of the movement for industrial education as it played out in both countries.

55. It’s called *Sajundi: The Journal of South African and American Studies*. “The Editorial Board believes,” the journal, explaining its purpose, states, “that analyzing the two countries in an international, transnational, and/or comparative context enhances our perspective on each, individually.” The journal’s website also maintains a live bibliographic database of U.S.-South African comparative studies.

56. Obviously he is quoting W. E. B. Du Bois here, but he does not indicate this.

57. For a more recent related work see the anthology by Hamilton, Huntley, Alexander, Guimaraes, and Wilmot (2001) which also, interestingly, introduces into the comparative equation Brazil. The introductory chapter is by Fredrickson and in itself it is a worthy read, especially since it is the only chapter that is truly comparative in terms of its methodology. To explain, while a number of interesting topics are covered in the anthology (whiteness, sexism, racism, affirmative action, democracy, and so on) the comparison is achieved mainly through the structure of the anthology; that is, by juxtaposition of contributions where the burden of comparison is placed on the reader.

58. A second edition of the work was published in 1978.

59. See also Gump (1994) for a book-length study of this topic. The motion picture *Zulu Dawn* gives one an idea of what transpired at the *Battle of Isandlwana*.

60. Interestingly, more than a hundred years after the event, in 2000, the North Carolina legislature voted to establish the Wilmington Race Riot Commission to investigate and report on the 1898 “riot.” The final report, which was issued on May 31, 2006 makes sobering reading, and it is available on the Internet at the website of the North Carolina Office of Archives and History ([www.ah.dcr.state.nc.us](http://www.ah.dcr.state.nc.us)).

61. For a thoughtful critique of McKoy, especially in its methodology, see Barnard (2005).