the changing profession

Race in Africa: Four Epigraphs and a Commentary

HARRY GARUBA

"Look, a Negro!" It was an external stimulus that flicked over me as I passed by. I made a tight smile.

"Look, a Negro!" It was true. It amused me.

"Look, a Negro!" The circle was drawing a bit tighter. I made no secret of my amusement.

"Mama, see the Negro! I am frightened!" Frightened! Frightened! Now they were beginning to be afraid of me. I made up my mind to laugh myself to tears, but laughter had become impossible.

—Frantz Fanon, "The Fact of Blackness" (111–12)

The racialization of the Tutsi/Hutu was not simply an intellectual construct, one which later and more enlightened generations of intellectuals could deconstruct and discard at will. More to the point, racialization was also an institutional construct. Racial ideology was embedded in institutions, which in turn undergirded privilege and reproduced racial ideology. It was this political-institutional fact that intellectuals alone would not be able to alter. Rather, it would take a political-social movement to be dismantled.

—Mahmood Mamdani, *When Victims Become Killers* (87)

Far back as one may go into the past, from the northern Sudanese to the southern Bantu, the African has always and everywhere presented a concept of the world which is diametrically opposed to the traditional philosophy of Europe.

—Leopold Sedar Senghor, "Negritude: A Humanism of the Twentieth Century" (30)

Sango's history is not the history of primal becoming but of racial origin, which is historically dated.

—Wole Soyinka, *Myth, Literature and the African World* (9)

HARRY GARUBA is associate professor at the Centre for African Studies and the English Department of the University of Cape Town. He has published many articles in the field of African and postcolonial literatures, including "Explorations in Animist Materialism: Notes on Reading/Writing African Literature, Culture, and Society" and "Mapping the Land/Body/Subject: Colonial and Postcolonial Geographies in African Narrative." He is working on a manuscript on the "peculiar" nature of African literary textuality, examining this against the background of the dominant paradigms and practices that shaped the emergence of modern African literature in English as an object of intellectual inquiry.

THESE FOUR EPIGRAPHS GIVE A SENSE OF THE DIVERSITY OF USAGES OF THE CATEGORY OF RACE IN AFRICA AND THE DISCOURSES AND PRACTICES that coalesce around these usages. I use the textual fragments to open up questions about race in Africa, to explore the various discursive economies in which race is articulated and circulates, and the regis-

© 2008 BY THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2008.123.5.1640 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ters and vocabularies in which responses to it have been conducted. The approach adopted is therefore metonymic: each fragment represents a larger body of texts and practices that broadly constitute a discourse defined by a set of shared characteristics. My purpose is not to discuss exhaustively these characteristics but rather to draw rough distinctions among the conditions that govern their articulation and circulation. In this way I can indicate the network of social, historical, and discursive relations in which the idea of race functions.

Fanon's classic formulation of the process of black subject formation and the racialization of subjectivity as a consequence of the white gaze is so well known it requires no gloss. However, while highlighting the trauma of the subject's entry into blackness, Fanon asserts that "[a]s long as the black man is *among his own*, he will have no occasion, except in minor internal conflicts, to experience his being through others" (109; emphasis added). The confidence that underlies his claim that the black man among his own will have no occasion to experience his being through others comes from a global conception of race in which a homogeneous blackness exists in opposition to a dominant whiteness. What Fanon discounts in elaborating on the fact of blackness is the consequent fact that once the category of race as produced by modernity was discursively set in motion, it clearly had other reproductive effects: it was coarticulated with, translated to, and mapped on local conditions to produce newer racial distinctions validated by whatever evidence or proof came to hand.

In the second epigraph, Mahmood Mamdani attempts to show how race was produced as a political identity, complete with the reproduction of a racial ideology, and embedded through various institutional arrangements in a local context to serve the interests of the colonial masters. Fanon and Mamdani thus speak to the subject of race using two different registers; they draw on two different vocabularies. This difference needs some explaining, as it shows that invocations of race in discourse are often highly unstable and dispersed, even while ostensibly pointing to the same referent.

The example of the racialization of Tutsi and Hutu identities has a dynamic that is different from but related to the global production of blackness that Fanon's statement represents. The former, I would argue, represents an instance where the category of race is mapped on local economic and political arrangements, on conflicts or contestations of power between groups that claim different social and cultural identities. This usage of race in Africa, one that was largely confined to a discredited racial science and to the racial typologies of colonial anthropology, has emerged again and is beginning to gain currency in serious academic research and writing. Recently, there has been a spate of books and essays dealing with Darfur and other racial conflicts in the Sudan, chattel slavery and the legacies of race and slavery in West Africa and the east coast of Africa, Arab–black African relations, and so on, in which the discourse of race and racism appears with a disquieting degree of prominence.[1] One such essay admits that "local terms to describe racial and social status cannot easily be translated into Western racial or racialist concepts as the French did. Yet, this is what the [colonizing] French did" (Lecocq 46). It is fairly clear that these kinds of inappropriate translations of local terms of differentiation among social groups as markers of status were made by colonial officials and their handmaiden anthropologists in various parts of Africa in the colonial era, but it is unclear how race as it appears in the conjunction "racial and social status" can properly be said to belong to precolonial local conceptions of nobility, skin color, slavery, social status, and social hierarchy. It is possible that not only colonial anthropologists and administrators were trapped in the discourse of race but also that the language and vocabulary available to

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2008.123.5.1640 Published online by Cambridge University Press

us as academics for describing and categorizing difference at this postcolonial moment are so completely racialized that we cannot hope to operate outside them—especially when certain observable physical or phenotypical characteristics (that may or may not be transposed into local social classifications) are involved in the marking of this difference. In many recent essays, race is repeatedly used to describe precolonial, premodern forms of local social discrimination that are obviously different from Fanon's classical evocation.

I therefore make a distinction between these two ways of deploying race in Africa: global blackness, in the Fanonian sense, is race as produced by modernity; the Tutsi-Hutu conflict is an example of race as translated and mapped on locality. It should be obvious that I am unconvinced that *race* is the appropriate or exact term to describe these premodern, precolonial social constructions of difference among social, cultural, or ethnic groups in Africa. I do not deny that the premodern usage has a long history. Its pedigree began even before the age of discovery and the racial classifications of the philosophers and writers of the Enlightenment. Distinctions have been made among Arabs, Moors, Ethiopians, blacks, Negroes, and so on at various times in history, and the presence of antiblack sentiments in various classical Greek and Roman texts and Arab, Islamic, Jewish, and Christian texts that predate the modern period cannot be disputed. In Africa itself, people have always had their own local ways of distinguishing themselves from other groups with which they were in contact. So it is disingenuous to claim that such translations date only from colonial conquest.

But these premodern, precolonial instances of group self-identification and prejudice were not racial distinctions in the modern sense, for three basic reasons that define race as a category of modernity. First, they were more fluid and flexible than what *race* connotes today. Second, they were not concerned with constructing a homogeneous self against which a different other could be placed as a binary opposite. Third, they were not embedded in a machinery of knowledge production that defined ways of knowing, ways of seeing and apprehending social reality and the world, and ways of conceiving the self and subjectivity. Michel Foucault's description of the modern regime of power as simultaneously totalizing and individualizing helps us focus on the distinction that I am attempting to make here.[2] Unlike previous uses of race, which may be reduced to the social level of group self-identification, definition, or even prejudice, which may or may not be deployed and institutionalized as a form of social organization, race as produced by modernity is about the making of the world and the making of individual subjects in the world. It involves the disciplinary and normalizing technologies of modern power, which seek to discipline not only the world and the individual subjects in it but also the production of knowledge about that world and its subjects.

Mamdani provides us with a description of the different historical phases in the formation of Hutu and Tutsi identity up to the point of its racialization under colonialism. It deserves to be quoted at some length:

> Hutu and Tutsi changed identities as did the organization of power within the Rwandan state. At this point, we can clearly identify at least three different periods in this history. . . . In the *first phase,* during the founding period of the state of Rwanda sometime in the fifteenth century, Tutsi was more likely an ethnic identity. Hutu, we have seen, was never an ethnic identity; it was rather constructed as a trans-ethnic identity of subjects. Hutu was a political construction, a political umbrella under which were assembled different subjugated groups. In other words, those stigmatized as Hutu only became Hutu with their subjugation to the Rwandan state. In the *second phase*, Tutsi was recast as an identity of power. Given the ennoblement through intermarriage of prosperous

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2008.123.5.1640 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> individuals from among the subjugated population, Tutsi also became a transethnic identity. It is in this phase that Hutu was constructed as a subject identity alongside Tutsi as an identity of power. The *third phase* came with the colonial period, when both Hutu and Tutsi were racialized, Tutsi as a nonindigenous identity [subordinate to colonial power] . . . and Hutu as an indigenous identity of (nativized) subjects. . . . The big change was that from being at the top of the *local* hierarchy in the precolonial period, the Tutsis found themselves occupying the bottom rung of a hierarchy of *alien* races in the colonial period. (101–02)

However inappropriate it is to racialize these identities and recast them by drawing on the terms of the Hamitic hypothesis (indigenous vs. alien, Hutus vs. Hamites), note that local terms of social classification and social organization were mistranslated, corralled into a new discourse and mapped onto the local space in ways that would have grave consequences. The history that Mamdani narrates of the movement from the older order of social classification to the new racial order of things can be said to represent, with a few modifications of details, most if not all instances where a modern Western discourse of race is mapped onto local social categorizations of difference. His narrative thus effectively identifies the point at which race as produced by modernity discursively captures premodern forms and reworks them into a new discourse. The difference between both orders may also be made to stand in for the distinction I draw between premodern modes of racial categorization and more modern notions of race and the capture of the former by the latter.

There are any number of ways of exploring the question of race in Africa. One may focus on premodern and precolonial racial classifications and elaborate on their local meanings as similar to or different from modern racial classifications. One may trace their trajectory through the discursive distortions of modernity and colonialism in Africa to their legacies in the contemporary postcolonial moment. One may pay attention to the global elaboration of the idea of race and the ways in which blackness and Africa have been central to the consolidation of that idea as an organizing category of modernity. I choose instead to explore the various usages of race as produced by modernity in Africa, the discursive economies of their production and circulation, and the responses to these discourses. For the interested reader there are many works that focus on the relation between the idea of race and the formation of these discourses, practices, and institutions: V. Y. Mudimbe on the "invention of Africa" as part European discourse, Emmanuel Eze on race and reason, David Theo Goldberg on the racialization of society, the state and modes of belonging, citizenship, and subjectivity. Summarizing the thrust of his *Racist Culture* (1993), Goldberg writes:

> I argued that starting in the sixteenth century racial thinking and racial articulation became increasingly normalized and naturalized throughout modern European societies and their spheres of influence. Race was rendered integral to the emergence, proliferations, and reproduction of world systems. The increasingly sophisticated elaboration of liberalism from the late seventeenth century played a central role in this process of normalizing and naturalizing racial dynamics and racial exclusions. As modernity's definitive doctrine of self and society, of morality and politics, liberalism served to make possible discursively, to legitimate ideologically, and to rationalize politico-economically prevailing sets of racially ordered conditions and racist exclusions. (*Racial State* 4–5)

In *The Racial State*, he draws more "connections between race and homogeneity, the state and racial exclusion, with how they manifest conceptually, theoretically, and materially." This more recent book "is about racial states, as a set of projects and practices, social

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2008.123.5.1640 Published online by Cambridge University Press

conditions and institutions, states of being and affairs, rules and principles, statements and imperatives. Inevitably, then, it is about the racist expression of states, state-directed racial exclusions, and so about *racist states*" (5).

Goldberg's colorful discussion of how racial thinking permeated modern European society, interpellated individual subjects, and structured the making of modern institutions and world systems is the story of race as produced by modernity told as a series of interwoven practices, projects, rules, and principles that have come to define the world conceptually, theoretically, and materially.

Since much rigorous research has been done on the pervasiveness of race in modernity, I turn to African responses to the global deployment of race. I premise my remarks on an understanding of the difference between race as produced by modernity and other premodern uses of the term, and I am concerned only with the usage of race expressed in the epigraph by Fanon that began this essay.

Black and Not-Black Subjects: Comparative Racialization of Social Spaces

In February 2008, a video produced by white students of the University of the Free State in South Africa and published by a local newspaper set off a storm of condemnation locally and internationally. Made in September 2007, the video showed three male white students feeding elderly female black staff members food the students had urinated on (or pretended to urinate on, as they later claimed). Because of the atmosphere of camaraderie and fun that the students faked, these black women who worked as cleaning staff members in the Reitz residence of the university did not realize they were being made to participate in a racist ritual of degradation, which involved playing a mock game of rugby, engaging in a beer-drinking competition, eating food on their knees, and so on. The voice commentary that links these taped events shows that the video was made to protest the decision of the university authorities to integrate student residences.

Through this incident at the University of the Free State we can create a frame for thinking about the question of race in Africa. This frame is necessary for two reasons. First, the success of the concerted assault in the academy on essentializations of race has ensured that at every mention of race, everyone from the indifferent graduate student to the glib talk-show host is able to say, without reflection, that race is a social construct. Once a new intellectual understanding of race in the natural and human sciences, this response has become a cliché that inhibits thinking about the various ways in which race is articulated historically and in the contemporary moment. The notion implies that belief in the natural, biological essence of race is a thing of the past and that therefore manifestations of racism are also. Our fathers and mothers believed in and practiced racism out of ignorance of the scientific facts, but now we know better, and never again should we allow race to take center stage in our social and intellectual lives. Thomas Holt reminds us:

> The idea that race is socially constructed implies that it can and must be constructed differently in different historical moments and in different social contexts. And one of the implications of taking seriously this historicity of race—that there are historically specific "racisms" and not one singular ahistorical racism—is the analytic necessity of exploring how racial phenomena articulate with other social phenomena. (21)

The tendency toward singularity and homogenization is particularly strong in both popular descriptions and intellectual analysis of Africa and African polities. Large as Africa is as a continent and unwieldy as the subject of race in Africa is, the expression "race in Africa" seems to make sense: its intelligibility rests on its homogenizing gesture, invoking a long history of blackness (both real and

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2008.123.5.1640 Published online by Cambridge University Press

intellectual) constructed in terms of racial otherness and positioned in binary relation to a whiteness that is figured as the universal norm. To deal with the question of race in Africa, therefore, requires that we guard against the glib dismissal of race as a social construct, on the one hand, and this monolithic singularity and the homogenizing impulse in invocations of Africa, on the other. We should rather think of *race* and *Africa* as signs located at the unstable juncture of a complex semantic and semiotic universe fed by multiple and complicated discursive histories. The frame that I propose registers this complexity and multiplicity, and it provides access to the diversity of the continent and the understandings and articulations of race at various times and various places.

The University of the Free State video is evidence of racism at the level of the everyday life of social relationships. Less dramatic than racial murder, it is no less indicative of the persistence of racism in the lived experience of people in South Africa. This experience runs the spectrum from outright denigration to barely concealed acts of discrimination to subtle insults or patronizing remarks. It is familiar to most people who live in the West. But this everyday racism is hardly experienced in a large number of African countries, especially where there was no settler colonialism and black people may live their whole life without encountering more than a handful of whites. People in these countries—Nigeria would be a good example—are therefore not black subjects in the conventionally understood sense of black subjectivity, because they have neither experienced nor been formed in the Fanonian mirror of the white gaze. Everyday interaction between black and white does not exist; if it exists at a negligible level, it does not feed into an immediately felt history of racial oppression. These African countries are not racialized as South Africa is; they do not really have cause to elevate racism in social life into an issue of public, national concern. The University of the Free State video and the conditions of possibility that enable its making are directly related to the intense racialization of the social space of daily life in South Africa. In this regard, most South Africans may be said to be black subjects in that primary, Fanonian sense, whereas most Nigerians are not.

If we use a scale of comparative racialization of social space and position South Africa at one end of the scale and Nigeria at the other, we will find that in highly racialized societies attention to race clusters around a set of issues that are quite different from those in less racialized societies. In highly racialized societies or, to use Stuart Hall's expression, societies structured on racial domination, the manner in which race is enunciated and contested centers on its role in enabling or inhibiting the performance of everyday life. In the highly racialized societies of Africa, the issues that command the greatest public attention are similar to those that dominate racial discourse in the West: they have to do with the struggle to deracialize the social space of everyday life and the public institutions of state and society. Affirmative-action-style proposals and policies that focus on getting the racial numbers right, and proposals and policies of a more multiculturalist orientation that focus on recognition and respect, are predominant. The presence of black bodies in public positions and places matters.

In societies at the other end of this continuum, racialization does not happen at the physical, visual level that Fanon recounts; it occurs at the level of discourse, at the point when the subject enters into the discourse of modernity. In a memorable passage, the Nigerian author Chinua Achebe recounts this experience.

> I went to a good school modelled on British public schools. I read a lot of English books there. . . .
>
> *I did not see myself as African to begin with.* I took sides with the white men against the savages. In other words I went through my

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2008.123.5.1640 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> first level of schooling thinking I was of the party of the white man in his hair-raising adventures and narrow escapes. . . .
>
> But a time came when I reached the appropriate age and realized that these writers had pulled a fast one on me! I was not on Marlowe's boat steaming up the Congo in *Heart of Darkness.* I was one of those strange beings jumping up and down on the river bank, making horrid faces. Or, if I insisted on the boat-ride, then I had to settle perhaps for that "improved specimen," as Conrad sarcastically calls him, more absurd than a dog in a pair of breeches trying to make out the witchcraft behind the ship's water-gauge.
>
> That was when I said no, and realized that stories are not innocent; that they can be used to put you in the wrong crowd, in the party of the man who has come to dispossess you. ("African Literature" 7; emphasis added)

The young Chinua becomes racialized only at the point when he recognizes in this tale the group to which he truly belongs. He realizes that in terms of his representation in the text, he has been conscripted as a racial other into the discourse of race as produced by modernity.[3] Unlike Fanon, who becomes a black subject after the experience of the physical gaze of whiteness, Achebe enters into blackness only under a purely discursive gaze.

For Africans from societies like the Nigerian one, in which Achebe grew up, the experience of racialization occurs at this level. Their responses to race therefore tend to focus less on the presence of physical bodies in public spaces—to continue with the image—and more on the creation of a discursive mass to counter their sense of absence from or negation in the discourse of race and modernity, where they discovered their blackness. Achebe captures the essence of this response in an interview with Charles H. Rowell:

> Rowell: Did your education at the University of Ibadan direct you in any way towards a career in creative writing? I guess what I'm ultimately asking is how did you come to write?
>
> Achebe: . . . I think it's simply encountering myself in literature and becoming aware that that's not me, you see. A number of texts helped; one of them was Joyce Cary's *Mister Johnson,* and I suppose one of them was Conrad's *Heart of Darkness.* (183)

Achebe creates counterdiscourses with the goal of reversing or transforming the epistemic foundations of racialized modernity.

These distinctions represent broad generalizations by which I hope to give a sense of the many ways in which Africans enter into a racialized consciousness and subjectivity, depending on geographic location and the attendant histories of their encounter with colonialism and modernity.

Essentializing Responses, Historicizing Responses

Having examined discursive and everyday racism, I turn to new theories about institutional racism and demography. While policies of racial transformation and equity in South Africa have largely focused on numbers, some scholars have tried to move beyond counting to dwell on what has been called institutional culture. Even when numbers that reflect the racial demographics of a country are finally made right, there is a central, intangible core to the founding and functioning of institutions that is not changed simply by changing the color of the personnel. Achieving racial representation requires a change in the culture of an institution. Institutional culture, according to John Higgins, has become a keyword in debates on racial transforming in South Africa.

Institutional culture may be taken as a bridge between the concern with representative bodies that characterizes highly racialized societies and the quest for discursive deconstruction, which is more prominent in the less racialized countries. My third and fourth epigraphs serve as points of departure here:

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2008.123.5.1640 Published online by Cambridge University Press

both deal with the paradigms and practices that characterize the discursive economies of race. They question the universal normativity ascribed to European epistemologies and paradigms; they point to the basic ethnocentrism of those epistemologies and paradigms. If the goal of racialized modernity was to create a homogeneous self and a singular normativity and set them in opposition to pathologized others, responses to race in Africa have undermined that singularity by affirming the validity of other norms, other ways of being in, experiencing, and narrating the world. Most of the truly exciting intellectual work being done in this regard has uncovered the central role that race and racialization play in the formation of the paradigms, methodologies, and practices of disciplinary knowledge production, from anthropology, sociology, and psychology to literature, history, and all the other humanities and social sciences.[4] To borrow Dipesh Chakrabarty's apt phrase, intellectual work on race in Africa in recent times has "provincialized Europe."

In my third epigraph, Senghor propounds an African normativity "which is diametrically opposed to the traditional philosophy of Europe" by affirming a racial culture that links the diverse peoples of Africa from the "northern Sudanese to the southern Bantu" ("Negritude" 30). Negritude, the name coined by his colleague Aime Cesaire to describe this African culture and civilization, traded in a series of binary oppositions. Negritude took over the dichotomizing framework of earlier theories of racial differences and imbued the negative stereotypes of blackness with positive images. In accepting and explaining the significance of this difference, Senghor writes, "'I think therefore I am,' wrote Descartes, the European *par excellence*. The African might say, 'I smell, I dance the *Other*'" ("African Apprehension" 32). He also writes, "The African is one of those worms created on the Third day . . . a pure sensory field. Subjectively, at the end of his antennae, he discovers the *Other*" (30). Emotion and intuition, which were said to be characteristic of the black race and seen as the devalued pair in a chain of contrasts with reason and logic, were now qualities to be affirmed and celebrated. In its glorification of all things black, negritude did not really seek to reverse the racial order of things; rather it sought a revaluation of the hierarchy of value ascribed to racial traits. The finer details of negritude's ideological orientation need not be discussed here. Negritude took Africa and the entire black race as the subject of its discourse, and its approach was essentialist and homogenizing.

It is this approach to race that makes the fourth epigraph a text of interest. Taken from Wole Soyinka's *Myth, Literature and the African World*, it performs the double maneuver of being essentializing and historicizing at the same time. While negritude focuses on the black race in general, Soyinka is concerned with the Yoruba, an ethnic group or nationality in South Western Nigeria that also inhabits Benin Republic and Togo in West Africa, Cuba, and Haiti. Speaking of Sango, a deity of the Yoruba who was once a king in real life but was deified after his death, Soyinka claims this myth is of racial origin. It is unclear what discourse of race he is claiming in this statement. Positioned between ethnicity, nation, and culture, on the one hand, and race in the Fanonian sense, on the other, it straddles the usages of the first two epigraphs. The ambivalence and ambiguity that come from this combination of essentialization and historicization seem to me one of the important legacies of race and responses to race in Africa.

Notes

This essay is based on research supported by the National Research Foundation, South Africa. In addition, I thank my colleagues at the University of Cape Town, Brenda Cooper, Zimitri Erasmus, John Higgins, and Crain Soudien, who

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2008.123.5.1640 Published online by Cambridge University Press

either drew my attention to material I would otherwise not have been aware of or provided me with some crucial texts.

1. See, for example, de Waal and Flint; de Bruijn and Pelckmans; Benjamin; M'Bow.

2. Foucault argues in several of his works that the truly distinctive thing about modern power is that it is simultaneously totalizing and individualizing. For example, he says, "But I'll like to underline the fact that the state's power . . . is both an individualizing and a totalizing form of power . . . a tricky combination in the same political structures of individualizing techniques and totalizing procedures" ("Subject" 332). He reiterates the point: "I think the main characteristic of our political rationality is the fact that this integration of the individuals in a community or in a totality results from a constant correlation between an increasing individualization and the reinforcement of totality" ("Political Technology" 161–62).

3. I owe the word *conscripts* to Talal Asad, who uses it to describe the manner in which colonial subjects are inserted into modernity.

4. Among the many examples of these kinds of works, see the essays collected in Bates, Mudimbe, and O'Barr. See also Magubane; Pierre.

Works Cited

Achebe, Chinua. "African Literature as Celebration." *Chinua Achebe: A Celebration.* Ed. Kirsten Holst Petersen and Anna Rutherford. Oxford: Heinemann, 1991. 1–10.

———. "An Interview with Chinua Achebe." By Charles H. Rowell. 1989. *Conversations with Chinua Achebe*. Ed. Bernth Lindfors. Jackson: U of Mississippi P, 1997. 165–84.

Asad, Talal. "Conscripts of Western Civilization." *Civilization in Crisis: Anthropological Perspectives*. Ed. Christine Ward Gailey. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 1992. 333–51. Vol. 1 of *Dialectical Anthropology: Essays in Honor of Stanley Diamond*.

Bates, Robert H., V. Y. Mudimbe, and Jean O'Barr, eds. *Africa and the Disciplines.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1993.

Benjamin, Jesse. "Legacies of Race and Racism at the Coast of East Africa: Historiography and the Suppression of Subaltern Epistemology." *ACAS Bulletin* 72 (2005–06): 19–27.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2000.

de Bruijn, Mirjam, and Lotte Pelckmans. "Facing Dilemmas: Former Fulbe Slaves in Modern Mali." *Canadian Journal of African Studies* 39.1 (2005): 69–95.

de Waal, Alex, and Julie Flint. *Darfur: Short History of a Long War.* London: Zed, 2006.

Eze, Emmanuel, ed. *Race and the Enlightenment: A Reader.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1997.

Fanon, Frantz. "The Fact of Blackness." *Black Skins, White Masks*. London: Pluto, 1986. 109–40.

Foucault, Michel. "The Political Technology of Individuals." *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault.* Ed. Luther H. Martin, Huck Gutman, and Patrick H. Hutton. London: Tavistock, 1988. 145–62.

———. "The Subject and Power." *Power: Essential Works of Foucault, 1954–1984*. Vol. 3. Ed. James D. Faubion. Trans. Robert Hurley et al. New York: New, 2000. 326–48.

Goldberg, David Theo. *The Racial State*. Malden: Blackwell, 2002.

———. *Racist Culture: Philosophy and the Politics of Meaning.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.

Hall, Stuart. "Race, Articulation, and Societies Structured in Dominance." *Black British Cultural Studies: A Reader.* Ed. Houston A. Baker, Jr., Manthia Diawara, and Ruth H. Lindeborg. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996. 16–60.

Higgins, John. "Institutional Culture as Keyword." *Review of Higher Education in South Africa: Selected Themes*. Pretoria: Council for Higher Educ., 2007. 97–122.

Holt, Thomas C. *The Problem of Race in the Twenty-First Century.* Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2002.

Lecocq, Baz. "The Bellah Question: Slave Emancipation, Race, and Social Categories in Late Twentieth-Century Northern Mali." *Canadian Journal of African Studies* 39.1 (2005): 42–68.

Magubane, Zine. "African Sociology: A Critical Journey from Pluralism to Postcolonialism." *Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Encounters*. Ed. Paul Tiyambe Zeleza. Dakar: CODESRA, 2006. 62–74. Vol. 1 of *The Study of Africa*.

Mamdani, Mahmood. *When Victims Become Killers: Colonialism, Nativism, and the Genocide in Rwanda.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 2001.

M'Bow, Babacar. "From Yoke to Yoke: Race and Racism in Africa." *ACAS Bulletin* 72 (2005–06): 9–12.

Mudimbe, V. Y. *The Invention of Africa: Gnosis, Philosophy, and the Order of Knowledge.* Bloomington: U of Indiana P, 1988.

Pierre, Jemina. "Anthropology and the Race of/for Africa." *Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Encounters.* Ed. Paul Tiyambe Zeleza. Dakar: CODESRA, 2006. 39–61. Vol. 1 of *The Study of Africa*.

Senghor, Leopold Sedar. "The African Apprehension of Reality." *Prose and Poetry.* Ed. and trans. John Reed and Clive Wake. London: Oxford UP, 1965. 29–35.

———. "Negritude: A Humanism of the Twentieth Century." *Colonial Discourse and Post-colonial Theory: A Reader.* Ed. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993. 27–33.

Soyinka, Wole. *Myth, Literature and the African World.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1976.

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2008.123.5.1640 Published online by Cambridge University Press