



*Graduate Student Essay*

## On the Uses of History by Scholars of the African Diaspora

Kyrie Mason, MA

[kyriemasn@gmail.com](mailto:kyriemasn@gmail.com)

Department of History

North Carolina Central University

### *Abstract*

This article explores the relationship between “public history” and scholars of African descent. In this reflection, “public history” is defined as a broad philosophy of history, which is oriented towards a general public -whether real or imagined - as principle research object, methodological center and/or primary audience. While the question of the composition of this public is relevant, it is the orientation towards a generalized public, outside the bounds of a formal academy, which is of utmost importance to public history as a philosophical orientation. In this vein, this article argues that, whether explicitly intentioned or not, scholars of African descent throughout the 20th century were often dependent on maintaining close ties with a general public, in a way that many scholars racialized as white or of European descent were not. In doing so, it examines this complex relationship in brief, by focusing on a few sets of case studies: the work of Afro-American historians of the early 20th century such as Anna J. Cooper, Horace Mann Bond, and Carter G. Woodson; the methodologies of Caribbean scholars Walter Rodney, Sylvia Wynter and Michel-Rolph Trouillot in the mid 20th; and the hopes and concerns around archives and accessibility, expressed by South African academics such as Premesh Lalu, through the late 20th century into

---

*Siyabonana: The Journal of Africana Studies*, Volume 1, Number 2, Summer 2023

Copyright © The Author(s) 2023

the 2000s. The article concludes by contending that, despite the vast range of approaches used by these various academics, their projects, and institutions - in a manner reminiscent of the Afro-pessimists - the position of the historian of African descent has been, and continues to be, constricted by the legacies of colonial structures of power and racial interpolation.

*Keywords*

Public History, Historical production, Meta history

## Introduction

Public History has been theoretically cleaved away from History, and this article will not go into in-depth theorizing on this point.<sup>1</sup> Instead, this article is an attempt to examine the relationship between public history and historians of the African diaspora. For this reflection, Public History is functionally defined by its orientation towards a public in its approach to methodology, subject matter, or audience and this public sits outside of the purview of the academy of professional historians. Whether this public is itself real or imaginary, contingent, or essential, is up for debate; however, it can be further generalized that this public is envisioned as different from a mass composed either entirely or majorly of other professional historians. To the public historian, the connection between the historian and *a* public is the primary relationship.

With this in mind: What is public history's relationship to historians of the African diaspora? The assertion of this article is that most historians of the African diaspora have historically had a necessarily close alignment to the theories, methods, or aims of public history, both as historians and historical objects - this being so even prior to the contemporary establishment of Public History as a field in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. When talking about "historians of the African diaspora," we are talking mainly about those historians of African descent, either from the continent or the diaspora writ large as well as, to some extent, those historians which have taken up the study of the African diaspora as a concept. Thus, this does not always exclude those outside of the racial

category of “Black,” a point which we will address later. For now, it suffices to say many historians of the African diaspora (in both senses) have often either been closely tied or explicitly beholden to a public within their lifetimes, or else have been utilized as a public figure in later historical analysis of their person or work. There are very real tensions and shortcomings inherent to such a schema which, on one hand, is meant to be generous enough to include historians from incredibly broad, though sometimes egregiously different backgrounds, whilst on the other, projecting them through rather narrow conceptual generalizations so as to compare them to one another against an overarching philosophy of history. It is difficult business, and many of the questions, assumptions, and criticisms wrought from this difficulty are not tangential, but crucial to further understanding the relationships between the academy, historians, and the public, and, more interestingly, the relationship between ideas and human reality. In this vein, the assertions of this essay are not meant to definitively gloss over the nuances and intricacies of either its figures, theories, and claims - rather, its generalizations and schema are meant to simply describe a set of historical relationships and apprehend their similarities for further analysis.

There is a huge difference between historians like Bethwell Ogot and Harold Wolpe. Though both are African - Ogot hails from Kenya, while Wolpe comes from South Africa - the legacy of colonialism frames these two very differently. Ogot is racialized as Black, while Wolpe as white; Ogot is recognized as ethnically Luo, whilst Wolpe, descended from a Jewish, Eastern European family. In this respect, the two take points across the wide gulf dug by colonialism’s dependence on structures of oppressive hierarchy, whether its racial, cultural, or otherwise. It is, however, these repressive structures which, consequently, build some of the widest bridges between academics such as Ogot and Wolpe, as these African historians are forced to deal with the erasures, absences, and alienation caused by the violence of the colonial state. It is the contention of this essay that historians, when dealing with this colonial apparatus, have developed approaches to history which fall within the realm of public history. Some have taken up the task of filling in those absences by devoting study to those left out and forgotten by colonialism; others have sought to use historical projects to ground forms of anti-colonial activism; still more have simply oriented their work for the consumption of the masses as opposed to those in power or highly professional fields.

Again, as previously mentioned, this is a highly generalized summary of a state of affairs which is, nonetheless, at play for those across the African diaspora. To elaborate on this and break down some of the nuances of this interplay, we will examine the work and careers of a handful of historians in three parts across diffuse places and times: early 20th century African American historians Anna J. Cooper, Horace Mann Bond, and Carter G. Woodson will be examined in terms of their subject matter and scholarly aspirations; mid-20th century Caribbean scholars Walter Rodney, Sylvia Wynter and Michel-Rolph Trouillot will be discussed in terms of the blend of their methodology, activism, and advocacy; lastly, the discussions had by historians about the use of the archive in post-Apartheid South Africa in the late 1990s into the 2000s will be used to explore the development of the relationship between historical production, professional historians, the public, and legacies of the colonial apparatus.

## Part One: African Americans and the Negro Question

The life of Anna Julia Cooper is worthy of extensive monographic study and the continued work of scholars to this effect speaks to the significance of Cooper's life and career as an academic figure<sup>2</sup>. As an archetype of the Public Historian, Anna Julia Cooper prefigures, in practice, many of the themes and ideas which we will trace through the other figures of our case studies. Born enslaved in 1858 in Raleigh, North Carolina, Cooper began her academic career shortly after the end of the Civil War, attending Saint Augustine Normal School; it was this event which, as a historical figure, would set the definitive trend of Anna Julia Cooper's life as she went on to later receive her BA and MA from Oberlin College, and eventually her PhD from the Sorbonne in 1925. Despite the condition of totalitarian chattel slavery in the US and the legacy of such a condition as found in the increasingly repressive Reconstruction era, Anna Julia Cooper was not only able to receive an education as a Black person, but a particularly elite education as a Black woman.<sup>3</sup>

While Anna Julia Cooper's life is unique, when analyzed as a historical object, the many lines which she crosses make her archetypal of a public historian and scholar of the African diaspora.<sup>4</sup> What is most interesting for our purposes is the usage and subject matter of Cooper's academic career. Anna Julia Cooper worked as an educator and advocated extensively for the education of the recently emancipated Black American community, especially Black women, whose education in particular,

Cooper cited as essential to the uplift of the community.<sup>5</sup> As best put by Cooper herself in her seminal work, *A Voice from the South*, “Now the fundamental agency under God in the regeneration, the re-training of the race, as well as the ground work and starting point of its progress upward, must be the black woman.”<sup>6</sup>

To Cooper, it is the acknowledgement of the absence and erasure of Black women from both the academic profession and socio-political realm in general, which serves as her impetus to write *A Voice of the South*, as an attempt to fill those spaces.<sup>7</sup> Cooper does not, however, leave her attempted balm at simply the polemical aspect of the book, but also its method, as she regularly attempts to cite the lived experience of “everyday” Black women as source material. Furthermore, this book is meant partially as an extensive advocacy for the education of historically excluded people, which further engenders it towards a public audience rather than a purely academic one.<sup>8</sup> In brief, Anna Julia Cooper, despite the rarity and heights of her education, devoted much - if not all - of herself as an academic, not to anything professionally confined, but to the public sphere, where her work acknowledged the historical exclusion of Black women.

Later historians Horace Mann Bond and Carter G. Woodson take up similar projects, blending their intellectual pursuits, professional aspirations, and personal interests with a sense of responsibility and relationship to a larger community. Horace Mann Bond took a similar career pathway as Cooper, working and publishing work as a historian, though also acting as an educational advocate who would eventually work as a collegiate administrator. As E. George Payne puts plainly in the introduction of Bond’s first book, *The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order*, “Too little importance has been attached to the status and contribution of the minority cultural groups to American life and civilization. Particularly is this neglect evident in the case of the Negro.”<sup>9</sup> Taking up Cooper’s familiar line, Bond pronounces that the proper education of the Black person is fundamental to the health of the “new social order,” which was arising in the United States through and after Reconstruction. In Bond’s case, though his work shallowly advocates for an increase only in Black *men’s* education as the engine of community uplift,<sup>10</sup> Bond’s project, as both historian and educator, center the Black community as a public to be studied, spoken with, and advocated for, as opposed to the hard barriers set between many white professional historians of the time, and the mass of laypersons with which they had little relationship.<sup>11</sup>

Similarly, Carter G. Woodson also devoted much of his career to the importance of education for the betterment of the public, specifically the Black community. In particular, Woodson was famously an advocate for the utilization of history, as both a public access epistemology, and as a subject to be populated, not simply by a narrow historiography, but by an extensive scope, which incorporated the entirety of the African diaspora, and the pre-colonial histories of its various peoples. Woodson was certainly a public historian in the vein of subject matter, method, and intention, as his work took very seriously, not only the existence of the African diaspora, but also the methodology and framework of its study and usages as a socio-political tool. Further, despite Woodson's advocacy of education, he is also famously critical of the confines of academy and its white supremacist tendencies as embodied by the United States' educational structure;<sup>12</sup> indeed, Woodson, in the early passages of his seminal *Mis-Education of the Negro*, is intensely opposed to blurring or overlooking the histories of the pre-colonial and colonially-racialized identities of Black people in the United States. He therefore saw the integrationist tendencies of some Black academics during his time as ultimately reductionist and complicit in white supremacy.<sup>13</sup>

What are some conclusions we can draw from an analysis of Cooper, Bond, and Woodson? For one, we can highlight the great regularity by which these three scholars took up their professional careers as extensions of their communal responsibilities and politics. Specifically, it is the relationship between their intentions as educators, scholars, and activists and their rather explicit desire to utilize these ends towards some concept of "racial uplift." This is a quality that they all share, one in which most educated Black Americans of the late 19th into the early 20th century, would hold. However, we can expand this shallow stereotype by expanding upon the nuances of this particular trio, especially pertaining to the very real distinctions in how they apprehend their public approach. Cooper, for instance, is insistent on the importance of the education of women, particularly in a classically liberal manner. Opposite of this, of course, is the bent towards Black men held by Bond in his work, as well as his rather sociologic and statistically based historical method, which stands opposed to both Cooper's and, to some extent, Woodson's, style. This method is interesting to our analysis in that while all three scholars take a Black public as their primary interest in terms of subject and audience (in a way of thinking), Bond is the most detached methodologically; he tends towards the dense, mechanical style, in

which he was trained, at the University of Chicago. Carter G. Woodson's subject matter and framework was centered in an African American historical perspective, and both an African diasporic and pre-colonial lens. Woodson's approach, therefore, also stands in stark contrast to the more regional interests of Cooper. Anna Julia Cooper did attend the first Pan-African Conference held in England circa 1900, though she does not prioritize an African diasporic lens in her work, to the same extent as Woodson; he utilizes the concept of the African diaspora for the purposes of Black American social uplift and politics. Despite these differences, Cooper, Bond, and Woodson, are closely aligned with a public at large; in their case, that public comprised mainly Black Americans, to whom they felt a very real responsibility.

## Part Two: The Atlantic World and the Activist Academic

The opportunity of education and academia often morphed into an explicit platform of activism and advocacy. The strictures imposed on colonized subjects by European powers, often lead to grave, widespread forms of violence, which resulted, in part, to mass cultural gaps and literal omissions from the written record. However, the imposition of these strictures, held within it, the seeds for its own undoing.<sup>14</sup> Throughout the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, particularly through the 1960s into the 1990s, academics of marginalized backgrounds, and colonial peripheries, turned their training towards themselves and their own community; in doing so, many broadened their critiques of colonialism and knowledge production, centering both within their own lived conditions and contributions.<sup>15</sup>

The tragic life of Walter Rodney sits as the paradigmatic convergence of the public historian of the African diaspora and the activist-academic, particularly in his activity in the politically vociferous late 1960s and 70s. As poignantly articulated in his first book, *The Groundings with my Brothers*, Rodney was acutely aware of the totalitarian nature of colonial racialism and the mechanisms of repressive power, which hinged on such classificatory systems<sup>16</sup>. To Rodney, however, the intentional obfuscation of colonial subjects' history and historical cultures - really the systematic destruction of these cultures into something reductive like merely "Black"<sup>17</sup> - is not a moment of panic or arrested mourning; but instead an opportunity for international organization and action in lively opposition against colonialism and its legacy. Rodney is famous for his Pan-Africanist politics, as well as the very regular activism throughout

the Caribbean, East Africa, and elsewhere. Distinct about Rodney's activism from, say, Black American scholars of the early 20th century, such as the aforementioned Anna Julia Cooper or Horace Mann Bond, is his intense criticism of the highly educated in the African diasporic petty bourgeoisie, and an equally intentional alignment with the working class.<sup>18</sup> As he states boldly in *Groundings*, "the black academic *must* attach himself to the activity of the black masses."<sup>19</sup> Rodney formulated the communal pursuits of the academic as imperative, the ideal Black scholar working always for the greater good of their community, with the entire endeavor of a Black scholar's work as public, whether one intends it or not.<sup>20</sup>

On the other hand of the spectrum, while different but not terribly unrelated, is interdisciplinary academic Sylvia Wynter. As opposed to the working-class pronouncements of Walter Rodney, Wynter is in many respects a model of the elite, petty-bourgeois academic, whom he admonishes for narrowness. Wynter is, however, by no means a narrow academic, and despite the theoretic bent of her writing, the subject matter of her work follows a similar trend to Rodney, in that it attempts to be explicit in its activism. Similarly, Wynter writes and philosophizes with a keen self-awareness of her position as an object interpellated as several identities, be it woman; Black; Caribbean; academic; or otherwise. Her self-awareness and activist intent, often and necessarily, brought her into parley with at least a conceptual general public, if not the flesh-and-blood masses of Rodney's audience. Works such as Wynter's "Novel and History, Plot and Plantation," make use of a fusion of popular culture, history from below, and critical theory in order to better illuminate the tensions inherent in otherwise reified modern structures. Wynter's form of analysis and deconstruction, while, in some instances, not directly concerned with speaking on behalf of a particular group or mass of people, is still relationally dependent on the lived experience of people brutalized by colonial and postcolonial structures. As made explicit in her polemical letter, "No Humans Involved," a study of those suffering from colonial legacies has the potential to open new avenues of liberatory politics and ways of being.<sup>21</sup> Indeed, while the form may, at times, be less direct than other academics or historians who make a greater plea towards the pragmatic, the work of Wynter is nonetheless still very much engaged with a public at large.<sup>22</sup>

The work of Michel-Rolph Trouillot exists, in some senses, as a bridge between the direct line of Walter Rodney and the theoretics of Sylvia Wynter. Trouillot works specifically as a public historian, and his work *Silencing the Past* is a classic within the



field. *Silencing the Past* is explicit in its intention to explore “the many ways in which the production of historical narratives involves the uneven contribution of competing groups and individuals who have unequal access to the means for such production.”<sup>23</sup> The bridge between Rodney and Wynter’s approaches is the way Trouillot seeks to acknowledge those masses and figures who have been ignored by conventional historical narratives. Trouillot’s work is therefore a cross between Rodney’s admonition for the Black intellectual to align themselves with the masses, whilst taking up a philosophically intense method, reminiscent of Wynter. Throughout the work, Trouillot is meticulous in pointing out the absences, which are both created by, and in many cases, necessary to, the creation of historical work, as perpetuated by the state and professionals complicit with the status quo. In this way, Trouillot sees history as a tool of power in its explicit sense, that is, in its service to empire (the specific case of this book). History is also a tool of power in its implicit cases, such as in the examination and identification of “silences” or absences in the record, as well as in the co-option of these absences for the purposes of resistance. The particular forms of history practiced by those trained in the European tradition, still predispose itself to certain pitfalls. As Trouillot says clearly, “None of us today can be true to Afro-American slavery—whether for or against it—as we can be true to ongoing practices of discrimination. Similarly, individuals in the Old World or in Latin America today cannot be true or false to a colonialism they did not live.”<sup>24</sup> Indeed, though Trouillot is sympathetic to the condition of the victims of colonial oppression, he is nonetheless intensely interested in the pragmatic relationship between history, postcolonial activism, and public betterment.<sup>25</sup> Despite his extensive problematizing of this relationship, Trouillot seemingly advocates for action above and over the arrested development of one concerned with historical - or, for that matter, generally academic - authenticity of facts and intention.<sup>26</sup>

In relation to one another, the particular methods and theoretical intimations of these three scholars highlight, somewhat problematically, some of the nuances of historians of the African diaspora, in relation to the profession itself. Despite the rather trite observation that many scholars who descended from the African diaspora, often study and work on behalf of the diaspora (or, at the least, some conception of “Blackness” or Black people),<sup>27</sup> it is the intensity of Walter Rodney’s alignment with laypersons and “the masses,” indeed the very way in which he claims an academic *must* have a relationship with other people, that calls into question the relationship

between historians and the public. As outlined by Michel-Rolph Trouillot's work *Silencing the Past*, historians invariably always work in a mode which engenders certain exclusions; in the context of histories produced by colonial states, these exclusions were also paired with violence against those who were excluded. Trouillot's work makes explicit that the exclusionary nature of historical production is a process inherent to all historians, despite their intentions, whether they are working in an archive or taking oral histories. Anachronistically, Rodney affirms this reading of historical production in his work as a Pan-African nationalist activist-academic.<sup>28</sup> The work of Sylvia Wynter, in some ways, seeks to negate this position as it attempts to deconstruct such constraints as historical identities and categories. Despite such a problematic relationship, the work of Rodney, Wynter and Trouillot, is still, *prima facie* centered around nuclei of Blackness, Black people, colonial subjects and their histories. Further, those nuclei of interests tie Rodney, Wynter, and Trouillot strongly to their respective communities, and the condition of the African diaspora as a whole, in a way that their white contemporaries often were not. This is the condition of scholars of the African diaspora as a whole, which many academics racialized as white are not subject to, as their work is not interpellated within the context of their historized region and identity; concerned with the betterment of any public; and thus, even less likely to be interpellated into the context of a larger group. Thus, it is the paradox of this racial interpellation, of which Rodney, Wynter, and Trouillot are very aware of, which binds them to their respective communities.<sup>29</sup> Still, in their self-awareness and in their different ways, they use their work to advocate for these communities, highlight the fecund intellectual possibilities engendered by perspectives born of these communities, and at the same time, deconstruct such strictures. Indeed, while one may be as philosophically dense, and poetical as Wynter or Trouillot when working within the purview of Black people - really of all those who have suffered the violence and silencing of colonial histories - one is, as *Silencing the Past* so expertly presents, necessarily interlinked with a public because no strong distinction of another demographic yet exists in the racialized, postcolonial world.

### Part Three: Who uses the Archive in the Post-Colony?

This conception of the relationship between a public and historians of the African diaspora does not, however, end simply with those racialized as Black persons. Many people of the post-colonial world face a similar situation in varying degrees and are

subject to the nuances of violence and repression enacted by colonial and post-colonial structures. Africa's historical position as "the dark continent" within popular culture, or the archetypal other,<sup>30</sup> subjects academics who are of African descent and/or other academics, who engage with Africa intellectually, to the cultural and material legacies of these conceptions. Cultural, in the sense of overcoming Eurocentric tendencies latent to certain academic frameworks, methodologies, or subjects; material, in the sense that many artifacts produced by those indigenous to Africa were either stolen, destroyed, or repurposed by European colonization. Europeans also intentionally excluded African people from historical projects. This situation is not applied equally. For instance, scholars of the African diaspora who are racialized as white, while dealing with the same dearth of material or textual sources from African or African diasporic subjects, still benefit from their whiteness in white supremacist structures. Scholars working from within the old colonial powers often have the means to access expensive or explicitly gatekept materials, while those outside of the colonial center – those of the former colonies – are often *still* outside.

The discourse around digitizing archives and historical texts in South Africa, following the end of apartheid in the 1990s, speaks to the legacies of this colonial exclusion. The extensive writing of South African historian Premesh Lalu on his concerns with digitization efforts in the late 1990s and 2000s, speaks explicitly to the unequal distribution of knowledge power and its post-colonial effects. In miniature, Lalu problematizes the archives as site of historical production and the continued usage of digital technologies as tools of post-colonialism in "The Virtual Stampede for Africa." Lalu says, "Apartheid affirmed the idea that the archive was not merely a storehouse of documents but an apparatus placed in the service of racial subjection."<sup>31</sup> Thus, he maintains that the archive and its technologies must be scrutinized closely in the post-Apartheid context if such racially oppressive practices are not to be repeated; further, Lalu seems outright to fall on the line that this scrutiny is warranted, as the archive and the competing global forces pushing for its digitization, recreate the exclusionary patterns of the colonial context.<sup>32</sup> Lalu finds it, instead, imperative to reconfigure the archives for optimal usage by the public of South Africa as opposed to former colonial powers.<sup>33</sup> While the arguments of Lalu and his interlocutors are extensive, and deserving of long-form historical analysis, in brief this situation is used to illustrate the relation of the African historian to the public outside of the strict confines of race and Blackness. Lalu, who is of South Asian descent, still identifies as

a South African and aligns himself with the struggles of post-colonial Africa. Lalu's case illustrates further the latent ties found between the public and historians of the broadly African context, as opposed to confining such a relationship exclusively to Black historians.<sup>34</sup>

## Conclusion

While it is a reductive state of affairs to confine one's work in terms of their identity or historical context, as aptly highlighted by Trouillot, "the realization that historical production is itself historical is the only way out of the false dilemmas posed by positivist empiricism and extreme formalism."<sup>35</sup> Hayden White puts the situation this way, when he says that some scholars "have interpreted the burden of the historian as a moral charge to free men from the burden of history," an interpretation which, in the context of the African diaspora, takes on added urgency.<sup>36</sup> The burden of history, becomes also the burden of the historian, as scholars of the African diaspora are caught in a position wherein they often *must* be public historians *and* objects for the public. Many of these historians explicitly affirmed their responsibility to contribute to the betterment of their particular diasporic community or the community as an international body. However, these scholars are often given the identity of public historians due to being so closely intertwined with marginalized people; it is impossible to disentangle these scholars and their work from their public, and the constructive context of that public.<sup>37</sup>

As we learn from Trouillot, historical scholarship, as we know it now, is a particular mode of production, a mode based on real and theoretical imbalances of power and access. To Francois Laruelle, the imbalance of power in western knowledge production resides just as much in its theoretical claims, as its material structure (i.e., the academy, the archive, etc.). As Laruelle says, "philosophy is the capital within thought, the capital-form of our general relations to the World"<sup>38</sup> and as such, similar to capital as described in its economic form by Soren Mau; capital reproduces itself and its necessary power imbalance via "paradoxical circularity."<sup>39</sup> This is the other side of the burden of history, as described by White.

This complex - the burden of history' and the scholars of the African diaspora found within it - begs certain questions: Is it possible for scholars of African descent not to be scholars of their community? Is such a possibility even ideal, given the

continuing effect of hegemonic repression built upon history and historical institutions of power and knowledge production? Is it worthwhile to pursue a type of productive metahistory - a “science” of history in the vein of Francois Laruelle’s non-philosophy as a “science” of philosophy - or does such a pursuit only enable further disenfranchisement? I find myself in agreement with Mau when he writes, “contrary to what many intellectuals may be led...to believe, the role of theory...is bound to be very limited.”<sup>40</sup> Such a politics, we saw, explicitly aligns with a figure like Walter Rodney, yet this is not to imply that theory/philosophy/history is worthless, as neither Mau nor Rodney do. This is instead to insist that these forms of knowledge production are useful. One must have a clear knowledge of their limitations, with an eye to, whenever possible, application in practice and a rewriting of the boundaries of history and historical production, in view of a Wynter-esque new humanism.<sup>41</sup> In this way, we not only accept the “moral charge” to free *all* of us from the continuing burdens of history, but we take steps in disentangling our forebearers from the complex of racialized, historical interpellation this enacts.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> Works such as Thomas Cauvin's *Public History: A Textbook for Practice*; Jennifer Koslow's *Public History: An Introduction from Theory to Practice* and Michael Frisch's *A Shared Authority: Essays on the Craft and Meaning of Oral and Public History* give a more thorough account of the theory and history of public history as a method and field.

<sup>2</sup> The work of Vivian M. May, LaRese C. Hubbard, and Shirley Turner-Moody stand out in particular.

<sup>3</sup> Evans, Y. Stephanie. *Black Women in the Ivory Tower, 1850-1954: An Intellectual History*. (University of Florida Press, 2008).

<sup>4</sup> Moody-Turner, Shirley. "Gendering Africana Studies: Insights from Anna Julia Cooper." *African American Review* 43, no.1 (2009): 1-11. <https://www-jstor-org.ezproxy.nccu.edu/stable/27802557>.

<sup>5</sup> Cooke, Paul Phillips. "Anna J. Cooper: Educator and Humanitarian." *Negro History Bulletin* 45, no. 1 (1982): 5-7. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44176949>.

<sup>6</sup> Cooper, Anna J. *A Voice from the South*. (New York: Negro Universities Press, 1969), 26.

<sup>7</sup> Cooper, *A Voice from the South*, 13.

<sup>8</sup> Cooper, *A Voice from the South*, 35-38.

<sup>9</sup> Bond, Horace Mann. *The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order*. (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1934) xiii.

<sup>10</sup> Bond, *The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order*, 6-13.

<sup>11</sup> Bond, Horace Mann. "Lectures on education." WB Fowle and N. Capen, 1855.

<sup>12</sup> Woodson, Carter Godwin. *The Mis-Education of the Negro*. (New York: Tribeca Books, 2011), 5-8.

<sup>13</sup> Woodson, *The Mis-Education of the Negro*, 8, 12-13.

<sup>14</sup> Wynter, Sylvia. "Ethno, or Sociopoetics?" (1976); "The Ceremony Must be Found: After Humanism" *boundary2* Vol. 13, no. 1 (1984). Derrida, Jacques "Structure, Sign and Play" (1966/1970). Harris, Robert L. "Coming of Age: The Transformation of Afro-American Historiography." *The Journal of Negro History* vol. 67, no. 2 (1982).

---

<sup>15</sup> Wynter, Sylvia. “The Ceremony Found: Towards the Autopoietic Turn/Overturn, its Autonomy of Human Agency and Extraterritoriality of (Self-)Cognition” (2015). Harris, “Coming of Age.”

<sup>16</sup> Rodney, Walter. *The Groundings with My Brothers*. (Chicago: Research Associates School Time Publications, 2001), 16-20.

<sup>17</sup> Rodney, *The Groundings with My Brothers*, 36-35.

<sup>18</sup> Rodney, Walter. “Aspects of the International Class Struggle in Africa, the Caribbean and America.” in *Pan-Africanism: The Struggle against Imperialism and Neo-Colonialism; Documents of the 6. Pan-African Congress* edited by Campbell Horace, 18-42. Toronto: Afro-Carib Publ.1975

<sup>19</sup> Rodney, *The Groundings with My Brothers*, 63.

<sup>20</sup> Rodney, *The Groundings with My Brothers*, 62-67.

<sup>21</sup> Wynter, Sylvia. “No Humans Involved.” *Forum N.H.I: Knowledge for the 21st Century* 1, no 1 (1994), 14-15.

<sup>22</sup> Wynter, “The Ceremony Must be Found”; “The Ceremony Found.”

<sup>23</sup> Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. (Boston: Beacon Press, 2015), Preface.

<sup>24</sup> Trouillot, *Silencing the Past*, 150.

<sup>25</sup> Trouillot, *Silencing the Past*, 143-151.

<sup>26</sup> Trouillot, *Silencing the Past*, 152-153.

<sup>27</sup> Platt, Spencer C. and Hilton, Adriel. “Why So Much Blackness? Race in the Dissertation Topics and Research of Black Male Doctoral Students.” *Spectrum: A Journal on Black Men* 5, no. 2 (2017): 23-44. Dellums, Robert. “The Responsibility of Black Politics.” *The Black Scholar* 10, no. 5 (1979): 38-44.

<sup>28</sup> Rodney, Walter. “Aspects of the International Class Struggle in Africa, the Caribbean and America.” in *Pan-Africanism: The Struggle against Imperialism and Neo-Colonialism; Documents of the 6. Pan-African Congress* edited by Campbell Horace, 18-42. Toronto: Afro-Carib Publ.1975.

<sup>29</sup> Holloway, Jonathan Scott. “The Black Intellectual and the ‘Crisis Canon’ in the Twentieth Century.” *The Black Scholar* 31, no. 1 (2001). This essay by Holloway builds to a similar claim.

---

<sup>30</sup> Meisenhelder, Tom. “African Bodies: ‘Othering’ the African in Precolonial Europe.” *Race, Gender & Class* 10, no. 3 (2003): 100–113. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41675090>.

<sup>31</sup> Lalu, Premesh. “The Virtual Stampede for Africa: Digitisation, Postcoloniality and Archives of the Liberation Struggles in Southern Africa.” *Innovation* 34, no. 1 (2006), 29.

<sup>32</sup> Lalu, “The Virtual Stampede for Africa,” 34-42.

<sup>33</sup> Lalu, “The Virtual Stampede for Africa,” 30-32.

<sup>34</sup> See “Digitization, History, and the Making of a Postcolonial Archive of Southern African Liberation Struggles: The Aluka Project.” *Africa Today* 52, no. 2 (2005): 55–77 for further details.

<sup>35</sup> Trouillot, *Silencing the Past*, 145.

<sup>36</sup> White, Hayden. “The Burden of History” *History and Theory* vol. 55, no 2 (1966). Here, White is referring to European intellectuals Hegel, Balzac and Tocqueville, a set of scholars not known for their allegiance to people of African descent.

<sup>37</sup> Holloway, “The Black Intellectual and the ‘Crisis Canon’ in the Twentieth Century.”

<sup>38</sup> Laruelle, François. *En tant qu’un: la non-philosophie expliquée aux philosophes* (Paris: Aubier, 1991), 79-115. Trans. By Jeremy R. Smith. While Laruelle here uses the term “philosophie”, within his usage of the term I find it acceptable to include the disciplines of the humanities at large within it. His usage here is similar to Wynter’s usage of *Studia Humanitas*, implying both the epistemic structure, the epistemes which grow from said structure and the subsequent outgrowth of specialization and professionalization within this structure.

<sup>39</sup> Mau, Soren. *Mute Compulsion: A Marxist Theory of the Economic Power of Capital* (New York: Verso, 2023), 321-323.

<sup>40</sup> Mau, *Mute Compulsion*, 324.

<sup>41</sup> Wynter, “The Ceremony Must be Found.”