

**Soviet Supersystems and American Frontiers:
African Art Histories Amidst the Cold War**

Kate Cowcher

(accepted for publication in *Art Bulletin*, due 2019)

In the early 1970s Oxford Africanist historian Anthony Kirk-Greene was surprised in a bookshop in Nigeria. Amidst local publications and student texts, he found Soviet Union-published books written in the West African language Hausa. Alongside political novels and dictionaries, there was a biography of Lenin, which Kirk-Greene wryly noted had added the word *subbotnik* to the Hausa-Russian dictionary. Kirk-Greene was alerted to the relative ignorance of the Western academy to the “sizeable phenomenon of Hausa literature published in the USSR”ⁱ If Soviet involvement in Nigeria had registered in the West (notably its support for the government in the Nigerian Civil War), Kirk-Greene highlighted “a quieter consolidation of the Soviet presence...in the sphere of Hausa studies” had occurred under the radar.ⁱⁱ In truth, Africanist scholars in the East and the West were cognizant of the growth of academic interest in the continent across the First and Second worlds from the 1950s onwards.ⁱⁱⁱ If the specifics of such interest (say, Russian-Hausa literature) had limited circulation in a geopolitical climate not suited to collegial exchange, both blocs knew that at the dawn of the age of colonial liberation knowledge of Africa had become distinctly hot property.

How did this Cold War appetite for knowledge about Africa specifically impact the development of research into art and visual culture on the continent? How did discourse in the East converge with or differ from that of the West on the subject of art from Africa? How did geopolitics and ideological demands affect methodological approaches to visual material? Historiographic surveys of African art studies remain relatively few. In 1989 the Journal of the African Studies Association, *African Studies Review*, published two large, seminal surveys

documenting the evolving study of art from Africa from the parallel, and sometimes overlapping disciplinary paradigms of anthropology and art history. In the first essay, “African Visual Arts from a Social Perspective,” Paula Ben-Amos traced the various “conceptual models” – the functionalist approach, the structural-symbolic approach and the historical-particularist approach – that scholars had utilized over the course of the twentieth century to analyze the social significance of art in Africa. Organizing her study around the development of these models, whose origins were found in European sociology and anthropology, Ben-Amos surveyed the work of a large range of mostly American or America-based scholars. Whilst acknowledging the breadth of scholarship, and the new directions that younger Africanist academics were pursuing, Ben Amos used both the introduction and the conclusion of her essay to express concern that a persistent adherence to these three conceptual models had contributed to the pervasive view that African societies were “small in scale, highly integrated, and slow to change.”^{iv} She ended her study by calling upon scholars to pursue new paradigms, ones that were “more emic, more integrative, and more comparative” in order to counter the dominance of Western epistemological frameworks.^v

Monni Adams’ response to Ben-Amos was “African Visual Arts from an Art Historical Perspective” and it remains one of the most comprehensive surveys of Africanist art history in the West. Here, Adams traced the genealogy of African art historical research in the United States from its “dual heritage” in anthropology and museum studies, through its various concerns in the 1970s and 80s, from style and iconography to function and symbolism.^{vi} Whilst she crucially identified the intellectual trajectories of the first (1950s/60s) and second (1970s/80s) generation of Africanist art historians, Adams, like Ben-Amos, did not explicitly consider the social and political context of this work. In focusing on rigorous documentation of the content of

broad swathes of scholarship, both of these seminal studies avoided extensive analysis of the institutional contexts in which it had flourished. Although briefly noting the concurrence of decolonization in sub-Saharan Africa and the Civil Rights' movement in the US, as well as the impact of Erwin Panofsky on post-war American art history, Adams did not interrogate why the specifically *art historical* study of Africa—one with concerns for iconography, style, aesthetics and history rather than just ethnography or functionalism—had become institutionalized in the United States to a much larger extent than in Europe, where anthropology remained the authoritative discipline.

Adams did not, for example, specifically explore the impact of the politically expedient growth of Area Studies or the involvement of many American second-generation Africanist art historians in such “intercultural” programs as the Peace Corps, founded in 1961. The Autumn 2017 issue of *African Arts*, and Robin Poynor’s article “Ancestors and Elders: Personal Reflections of an Africanist Art Historian” in particular, goes some way to redressing this by highlighting the importance of Title VI funding, allocated through the 1958 National Defense of Education Act, to the generation of interdisciplinary centers of humanistic, Africanist study. However Poynor is keen to stress that, despite the implications of benefiting from programs broadly implemented to increase America’s influence in the then-Third World, Africanist art historians were not “merely agents of hegemonic American imperialism.”^{vii} Poynor is right to reject a reductive historiography that presents the development of Africanist art history in the US as merely an arm of soft power politics, yet a closer interrogation of the beneficiaries of the “Cold War framework” is needed, and consideration should be given, in particular, to the impact of various Cold War-era programs not only on the notable growth of Africanist art history in the US, but on the very methodological approaches that it fostered.

By taking a step out of the US, and considering the Cold War from a more global perspective, we can glean insights that put the America's notable academic endeavors into important perspective. Neither Adams nor Poyner considered, for example, that whilst American scholars Douglas Fraser, Robert Farris Thompson and Roy Sieber were forging new art historical approaches in the US, Soviet writers such as Vil' Borisovich Mirimanov and Dmitri Olderogge were also pursuing new histories of creative culture in Africa. They, like their American counterparts, were the beneficiaries of a certain political climate. In the US and the USSR academic appetites burgeoned in parallel, sometimes challenging but often working alongside existent anthropological interests. Fieldwork opportunities, broader African Studies' agendas and relative foreign policies were frequently divergent, factors that critically shaped approaches to African art from either side. Nonetheless art historical scholarship on African visual culture boomed in the era of geopolitical hostility, and grew specifically within the ideologically competitive climate of colonial independence.

In reference to Africa the term "Cold War" too often connotes strategic battles for influence, in which African states and statesmen are pawns on a board.^{viii} Odd Arne Westad has provided a pathway out of this framework by detailing the negotiations that "Third World" leaders undertook with the superpowers and the choices they made between the two "hegemonic models of development on offer."^{ix} In his insistence on a "Global Cold War" Westad uncovers African agency previously missing from the discourse. Clapperton Chakanetsa Mavhunga goes further, clarifying that "Cold War" referred specifically to how Americans, via George Orwell, described the period. Mavhunga shows that the Soviets did not use the term, seeing the period as a battle between "the world's progressive forces" and imperialism.^x Terminological differences, of course, reflected ideological ones, and each inflected their respective views of Africa. From

the Soviet perspective, it was peopled by brothers in arms who needed assistance in expelling imperialism. For America, it was a continent calling for freedom, from communism as much as colonialism. Mavhunga further critiques the view of Africa as passive. He posits “mutual weaponization” whereby if the superpowers used the Third World as puppets, so too the Global South used the purveyors of a Cold War as “weaponries...to achieve their [own] objectives.”^{xi}

A concern for seeing the Cold War as a messier period of negotiated positions framed from the top (or the North) down by the rhetoric of ideological extremes is key. After a cursory overview of pre-Cold War studies, the article provides a survey of Soviet scholarship, then American studies of African art. It utilizes the bifurcated framework, whilst seeking to draw attention to its inconsistencies. Whilst both sides used combative language against the other’s intellectual agendas, there were globally shared interests amongst new scholars of African art, from an appreciation of aesthetic sensibilities to accounting for ancient cultural histories on the continent. Forums for exchange existed, such as the 1967 International Congress of Africanists attended by Soviet and American scholars, held in Dakar, Senegal. Like Kirk-Greene’s discovery of Soviet research on Nigerian bookshelves, its location demonstrated that Africa was not just subject of study, but also site for intellectual exchange between academics presumed separated by the Iron Curtain.

Beyond Description and Praise

At the end of the Second World War, African art study remained largely rooted in Europe. As Adams’ identified, it was the preserve of two camps—the anthropological establishment, and museum and gallery professionals—which although not entirely mutually exclusive had different ways of approaching and analyzing objects of African art. The anthropology camp, most of

whom conducted embedded fieldwork on the continent, consisted of academics such as France's Marcel Griaule, whose *Masques Dogon* (1938) had revolutionized understandings of Dogon masquerade through its extensive accounts of mythology, social ritual and performance, and Belgium's Frans Olbrechts and P.J. Vandenhoute, who undertook important research on Kongo sculpture and art from the Ivory Coast respectively. To suggest that European anthropological approaches were staid ethnography would be misleading. Olbrechts, for example, had organized an exhibition of Kongo art in Antwerp in 1937, which challenged the typically ethnographic manner in which African art was exhibited. He insisted upon arranging objects according to style, rather than by ethnicity. He went on to publish *Plastiek van Kongo* in 1946, which expanded on his innovative method of "morphological analysis."^{xii} Olbrechts had written in 1943 about the need to study the specifics of cultural context in order to understand African art. He believed that the persistent lack of cooperation between ethnographers and art historians ensured that studies of African art remained deficient.^{xiii}

The museum and gallery world had been enamored with art from the African continent since the early twentieth century when artists in Paris had first "discovered" African sculpture and integrated its so-called "primitive" forms into the avant-garde. Carl Einstein's *Negerplastik* (1915), contemporaneous with wider European exaltation of African art, partially anticipated Olbrechts in its assertion of formal appreciation over ethnographic categorization. As Z.S. Strother has noted, in its use of juxtaposed photographic images that facilitated formal comparisons, *Negerplastik* consciously departed from the to-scale, clustered photographs of ethnographic museum publications that invited a more typical "scientific" analyses. It was, Strother asserts, in its assembling of a "doctored and highly selective" corpus of object photographs that *Negerplastik* "conjured 'African Art' into being as a corpus that had literally

never existed before.”^{xiv} However, Einstein’s analysis remained at the level of formal observation with the exception of generalized statements about the religious function of African sculpture, which fell short of the contextual analysis that Olbrechts later called for. In 1921, Einstein published *Afrikanische Plastik*, a text with a notably more historical approach to African art (an approach that Strother posits may have been motivated by reviews of *Negerplastik* that criticized its lack of historicizing). The later text explicitly hoped to inaugurate “specialized research” into histories of art from Africa, an aspiration that seemed to affront contemporaneous primitivizing appetites for decontextualized African forms.^{xv} In the 1950s, however, gallerists like Ladislav Segy, who moved from Europe to New York in 1938, were still thanking the “Cubist revolution” for inaugurating an appreciation of “one of the great artistic heritages of the world.”^{xvi} In the 1960s William Fagg, who would become the leading British voice in African art studies from his position as curator of the African collection at the British Museum, sought to facilitate understanding of African sculpture by examining it “in relation to...European concepts of art.”^{xvii} Fagg would make significant contributions to histories of the art of Benin, but he persisted in writing about African art within European art historical parameters and in speaking in increasingly archaic terms of “tribal” art and of “tribes” as discrete cultural entities.^{xviii} On the eve of the Cold War primitivist adulation lingered, with the European art historical academy showing little interest in forging new ways to critique and understand African art, either on its own or in collaboration with anthropology.

One important exception was “L’art nègre,” the special edition of pan-African quarterly, *Présence Africaine*, published in Paris in 1951. Here Fagg’s history of Nigerian art appeared alongside writing by Marcel Griaule, Henri Lavachery, Georges Balandier, Jean Paul Sartre and Jacques Howlett in a volume that insisted upon moving past romantic appreciations. As

Lavachery wrote, it was imperative to consider how European expertise could help colonized Africans to rediscover their artistic heritage as a reflection of their new belief in themselves.^{xix}

As *Présence Africaine*'s Senegalese founder, Alioune Diop, wrote in his introduction to the 1966 expanded version of these papers, it was no longer sufficient to simply “describe or exalt.”^{xx} The study of African art in Europe, Diop asserted, must be attuned to the shifting social and political needs of the African continent, notably that of decolonization.

Diop's introduction was an optimistic call to the European academic establishment to pursue art historical scholarship in support of the urgent and sensitive political processes of colonial disengagement, processes that once colonizing European nations were undertaking with varying degrees of unwillingness. Whilst the writers in “L'art nègre” presumed, as most progressive intellectuals did, the inevitability of imminently liberated African nations, European states were still debating the subject and statuses of their empires; there was no unilateral acceptance of independence. Charles de Gaulle's immediate withdrawal from Guinea—civil servants, paperwork, light bulbs and all—when Sékou Touré led his country to vote against joining the French Community (a supposedly equitable network of France and her former colonies) in 1958 was emblematic of a European arrogance that could not fathom a truly independent Africa.^{xxi} In a political context that was at best ambivalent and, at worst, hostile to actively supporting the processes of decolonization, where could a scholarly study of African creative cultures fit in the European academy? If the smattering of articles published on the subject of art in the Royal Africa Society journal, *African Affairs*, between 1949 and 1970 are any indication, Diop's clarion call went largely unheard within the UK's community of academic Africanists.^{xxii} In fact, it was not until 1971, twenty years after the first appearance of “L'art nègre,” that the University of London would permit art historical doctoral research in African art.

Then Ruth Phillips, studying under Guy Atkins at the School of Oriental and African Studies, sought to undertake an art historical PhD on Mende art. She was sent to the Courtauld Institute of Art, the arbiter of academic art history in the UK, to justify how fieldwork in Sierre Leone could yield art historical research.^{xxiii} A board consisting of Alan Bowness, John Golding, John Shearman and Sir Anthony Blunt approved her case, but Britain already appeared far behind the US, where Roy Sieber had completed his African art history dissertation in 1957.^{xxiv}

Whilst in Europe disciplinary anxieties (or ambivalence) over where African art studies belonged persisted, in the US and, indeed, the USSR space was opening in more interdisciplinary climates, led by what University of Michigan History Professor Robert B. Hall called “Area Studies.”^{xxv} The politicizing of African art studies that *Présence Africaine* had initiated took on new meaning as the dawn of colonial independence collided with the age of ideological extremes. Although Adams’ asserts that sub-Saharan African art studies in the US remained in the difficult, often marginal position of not really “[satisfying] the demands of either” art history or anthropology, from the 1960s onwards Africa as a regional focus unquestionably gained a foothold in American art history that was not replicated in Western Europe. Although art history as a discipline did not exist in the Soviet academy, African art rose quickly on intellectual agendas. Speaking to largely American audiences at the 1962 African Studies Association meeting, Ivan Potekhin, head of the recently founded Africa Institute (*Institut Afriki*) in Moscow proudly cited Dmitri Olderogge’s work on Benin bronzes and his text “West African Art,” as well as Y. Lebedev’s “The Art of Tropical Africa” and other forthcoming work. Potekhin lamented that art scholarship was scant but promised improvement. “Our people want to learn about the history and culture of the African nations,” he stated, “...they demand much of us.”^{xxvi}

Polycentric Supersystems and the “War Against Imperialism”

In 1958 W.E.B. DuBois encouraged Nikita Khrushchev to establish an “institute for the study of Africa.” During his visit to Moscow and Leningrad DuBois conversed with the Soviet Premier, and suggested that the best means for the Soviet Union to assist in the “socialist development” of African nations was to undertake “scientific study” of the continent, and to “make the results of [such] studies available to the African people.”^{xxvii} It seemed that Khrushchev heeded DuBois advice. It was in line with a renewed Soviet interest in the African continent, in the wake of Ghana’s liberation from colonial rule in 1957 and the emergence of Third World solidarity at Bandung in 1955.^{xxviii} In 1959 Khrushchev announced the creation of the Africa Institute, an interdisciplinary compliment to the older Institute of Ethnography in Leningrad. This commitment to research was matched by the creation of opportunities for Africans to visit the USSR. The establishment in 1960 of the People’s Friendship University, subsequently named after assassinated Congo leader Patrice Lumumba, offered education for Third World youth, along with an extensive program of student grants.^{xxix}

A part of the USSR’s broader political aspirations to engage the continent, the Africa Institute was charged with the “extensive study of the urgent scientific problems”—its social, political and economic development of Africa in the wake of the long struggle against colonial oppression and the new fight for national liberation.^{xxx} This the USSR had long seen itself a champion of, following Lenin’s 1919 declaration that imperialism was the “highest stage of capitalism.” Anti-imperial zeal had driven Soviet studies of Africa since the late 1920s when party delegates had resolved, in the interests of the Comintern, to reach out to colonized sub-Saharan Africa, and encourage the development of communist parties there.^{xxxi} Hungarian professor Endre Sik was tasked with shaping a “Marxist science of black Africa” to compliment

political objectives.^{xxxii} Sik's efforts influenced Soviet African Studies for several decades, which remained focused on denouncing colonialism, a noble goal yet one that often neglected realities in favor of ideological agendas.^{xxxiii} By the 1960s the anti-imperialist rhetoric was shifting away from just criticizing Europe; the 1961 "Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union" emphasized that "US imperialism [was] the chief bulwark of modern colonialism."^{xxxiv} The denouncement of colonialism, old and new, remained an important strand of African Studies, which was refocusing energies on research deemed constructive of socialist sympathies in Africa.

A "scientific" history of African art was a key part of this renewed endeavor. As a 1966 Africa Institute publication asserted, it was the job of Africanists to recognize that culture "reflects the complex structure of modern African society and plays an important part in building up the future of Africa." It was incumbent upon Africanists to "make known the African contribution to civilization."^{xxxv} As Potekhin insisted, there was a long history of Russian interest in African artistic and literary culture.^{xxxvi} The Institute of Ethnography had housed a collection of African art since the late nineteenth century and as early as 1900 Boris Tuarev had published *Ethiopian Manuscripts in St. Petersburg (Efiopskie rukopisi v S. Peterburge)*.^{xxxvii} The pre-1950s, Comintern-driven academic environment, however, had not prioritized research into African art, preferring instead to focus on history, economics and politics.^{xxxviii}

And yet, it was in Russian that one of the earliest texts discussing African art as *art*, not simply as material culture or ethnographic specimen, had been published. In 1919 the People's Commissariat for Enlightenment posthumously published *Iskusstvo Negrov (Negro Art)* by Latvian writer Voldemars Matvejs, who published under the name Vladimir Markov.^{xxxix} Promoted by Levkiy Zheverzheev and Vladimir Mayakovsky, *Iskusstvo Negrov* was published

with a cover design by avant-garde artist Nathan Altman.^{xi} Markov had spent 1912-13 travelling through Europe viewing African art collections from Russia to England. In each place he photographed objects to illustrate his text, which he prepared in 1914. Markov's writing, contemporaneous with Carl Einstein, insisted that Africa was "rich both in a historical and artistic sense."^{xli}

Markov's text, notably similar to Einstein's, was an early attempt to systematically define "Negro" aesthetics via formal analysis of museum holdings. His observations were distilled into three conclusions. Firstly he saw the "language" of African art as "the play of masses." This referred to liberation from naturalistic representation; the human form consisted of a series of "arbitrary" and "autonomous" masses, some geometric, corresponding to relevant bodily features. Plays with proportions and weights was something Markov found "striking in its originality."^{xlii} Secondly, Markov was struck by the expressive nature of African sculpture, considering the use of "plastic symbolism"—the arbitrary invocation of an eye, for example, by any object or marks—as a particularly African talent.^{xliii} Markov believed that ethnographers who would seek information on the specific visual languages of plastic symbolism employed in African art "would understand that the Negroes are a profoundly thoughtful people."^{xliv} His final observation acknowledged the multifarious techniques used in the production of African sculpture and the variety of materials employed; Markov emphasized the range of skills required to produce the objects he encountered.

Although acknowledging his considerable debt to Leo Frobenius, Markov sought to understand "negro art" differently. He saw Frobenius' as focused on tracing foreign influences on African art, notably the Etruscans, and positioned his own interest in pursuit of "indigenous" or "inherently African" qualities.^{xlv} As Jeremy Howard's translations of *Iskusstvo Negrov* reveal,

Markov acknowledged that Africa boasted rich arts that included Christian manuscripts and cave painting, alongside the sculptural forms more familiar to European audiences.^{xlvi} Arguing that the former were complex enough to warrant their own separate study, he stated at the outset that objects from West and Central Africa were the focus of his study. Beyond highlighting continental diversity, Markov was also insistent that the reader acknowledge historical development: the Benin “Olokun” head provided evidence that bronze work has been undertaken on the continent for centuries, for example. Whilst Markov’s terminology echoed some primitivist adulation *du jour*, his praise of African creativity and his insistence on its complex history was markedly unique; in its close attention to formal qualities alongside historical details, it strained to make the case that the arts of Africa (and their creators) were neither inferior, nor were they beholden to European standards of beauty. Romantic though his language may appear, it was nonetheless infused with respect for what he considered to be a “serious, independent art with its [own] strict laws and traditions.”^{xlvii} In the wake of the Bolshevik Revolution, in a country that saw a fraternal linkage between itself and oppressed Africa, Markov’s scholarship would take on a renewed significance.

In 1969 Dmitri Olderogge, leading the African Department at the Institute of Ethnography, felt compelled to reintroduce his readers to Markov whose first text had fallen into obscurity. Introducing his catalogue of African art from the Institute of Ethnography, Leningrad, Olderogge highlighted that Markov’s text had been published when “the young Soviet Republic was going through its most difficult years of foreign intervention and civil war.”^{xlviii} Thus, unlike Einstein, he had remained unknown to the Western specialists who went on to shape the study of African art. For Olderogge, who did not always tow the Soviet Africanist line, it was

important for his readers to note that it was in Russian that one of the first texts to treat African art as “independent, rich and varied” appeared.^{xlix}

For Russian scholars, Markov had resurfaced three years earlier in 1966 when a final essay attributed to him was published in the journal *Narody Azii I Afriki (Peoples of Asia and Africa)*. It had been written in Markov’s name by his longtime companion, Varvara Bubnova, who had developed it from its original format as a conference paper from 1920, based upon Markov’s notes.^l Entitled “On ‘The Principle of Weightiness’ in African Sculpture,” the text expounded upon Markov’s analysis of three-dimensional forms from Africa, with a particular focus on their uses of weight and mass as a sophisticated mode of formal abstraction. As Z.S. Strother, Irēna Bužinska and Jeremy Howard highlight, it is notable that Bubnova published this article, with its emphasis on the complexity of African sculptural forms, not in an art historical journal, but in one closely associated with the project of “international friendship” that saw the Soviet Union assert fraternity with the decolonizing nations of the non-aligned world.^{li} Markov’s attention to details had a new political significance.

Markov’s call to study African art’s “strict laws and traditions” was heeded in the Khrushchev era as scholars sought to categorize and chronologically order. Led by art critics and anthropologists such as Olderogge and Vil’ Borisovich Mirimanov, Soviet studies were often concerned with denouncing the notion that African art was “primitive,” praising its functional qualities and, most importantly, establishing long evolutionary narratives of aesthetic development. The 1960s witnessed a significant growth in Soviet writings about art from Africa. Texts in Russian included Mirimanov’s slim volume *Istkusstvo Afriki* (1964, Fig. 1), jointly written with Galina Chernova, which was one of the first Russian publications to stress the significance of the earliest rock and graphic art as an *ur*text for histories of African culture.^{lii}

Mirimanov, in particular, would go on to analyze African art as integral part of a cultural superstructure anchored by an ever-changing political-economic base. In 1966, Chernova insisted that Soviet scholarship was, in fact, more rigorous than the “bourgeois ethnography” practiced in the West, which used “culture” more loosely to refer to “an entire way of life.”^{liii} More significantly still, the Marxist base-superstructure approach allowed Soviet scholars to appreciate contemporary art found in Africa’s growing cities as important manifestations of the continent’s newest stage of economic and political development.

The 1966 *Essays on African Culture* illustrates Soviet priorities. Published in French and English, it was designed for audiences outside the Soviet Union. In 1962 Potekhin argued that, if published only in Russian, Soviet research would not be read by the international Africanist community that it so often took issue with.^{liv} The volume included essays on Ethiopian architecture, Nigerian literature and the tensions between “tradition” and “modernity.” E.A. Veselkin’s essay unpacked Ghanaian premier Kwame Nkrumah’s concept of the “African Personality” as more “substantial” than Negritude, which he characterized as being too nostalgic for lost greatness. Holding the “African Personality” up as progressive, Veselkin also contrasted it with Fagg’s insistent definition of African art as “tribal,” criticizing the pursuit of “tribal” art as culturally isolating. Veselkin, preempting Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger’s “invented tradition,” asserted that the defense of tribalism was what European colonialists had pursued to divide and rule.^{lv} Further, Veselkin added, those who seek to preserve “traditional institutions in their pristine state...[play] right into the hands of neocolonialism.” The “development of national cultures” was an important part of “all-round material development”; the USSR’s multi-nationalism exemplified the “forward” moving cultural development that Africa should strive for.

Flaws in Western writings about African art were the focus of Chernova's contribution, which confronted Ralph Linton's introduction to Eliot Elisofon's *The Sculpture of Africa* (1959). Chernova first took issue with the term "primitive" (Linton's title was "Primitive Art"), which she argued "bourgeois scientists" used to describe the art of so-called "uncivilised" peoples," regardless of the time under discussion.^{lvi} She acknowledged Linton's wrestling with the term, and yet criticized his subsequent decision to use "non-European" as equally problematic. This shift lumped artists from Africa, Australia, the Americas and Asia together, Chernova argued, in opposition to European peoples; "it simply [puts] up a wall whose name is "civilization" to divide them."^{lvii}

Although she credited Linton with opposing racist theories that equated "non-European" art with that of children or schizophrenics, she argued that his failure to historicize "non-European" art led him to wrongly characterize its differences in relation to European art. These included arguing that non-Europeans were unconcerned with aesthetics and with "rationalizing" their art and materials, that portraiture was rare and that abstraction was rife. African art was not, Chernova asserted, abstracted "from real life" but rather "stylized" in relation to a lived reality. Such "stylization," Chernova insisted, was however neither stable nor solely "African." "[African] art...like any other," she insisted, "changes with the changes in the artist's ideology and perception of the world, which, in their turn, are determined by concrete historical conditions."^{lviii}

Linton served as straw man for Chernova's more general critiques of "bourgeois" Western clichés about Africa, yet her essay highlighted the emphasis placed by Soviet scholars on *histories* of African art. Twenty years before Johannes Fabian would criticize (Western) anthropologists for relegating their studied "Other" to a timeless "ethnographic present,"

Chernova accused Linton of exactly that. Unlike Fabian, she did so based upon her commitment to understanding African art within Marxist historical parameters that characterized the continent as ever progressing.

V.B. Mirimanov was the foremost proponent of this approach. His contribution to the 1966 volume argued for a dramatically long history of art that connected Saharan rock art with the masks and sculptures gathered in European collections. “L’Occident, patrie du grand art rupestre?” was one of Mirimanov’s first attempts at charting continuities in African production. He would further argue the case for charting “traditional stylistic continuities” and writing of a “continuous development of African art” in an article in the 1971 edited volume *Problems of Cultural Development (Construction) in Independent African Countries*, which was reviewed very favorably by J.B. Osaga Odak in the Nairobi-published *East Africa Journal*.^{lix} The very appearance of Odak’s review, of course, demonstrated that such texts, although obscure in the West, were distributed and read by scholars across the African continent.

Mirimanov’s scholarship found its fullest expression in his 1986 tome *The Art of Tropical Africa: Typology, System, Evolution (Iskusstvo Tropsičeskoj Afriki: Tipologija, Sistematika, Ėvoljucija)*, a book that Emilia Ilieva argues marked the “apex” of Soviet African art study.^{lx} Here, he sought to pinpoint the “synchronic” and “diachronic” aspects of African art and to define its “common general laws of artistic development.”^{lxi} Part One, focusing on “synchronic” analysis, began with the continent’s earliest art and centers of its production, from the Sahara to southern Africa. This section examined morphological characteristics, dividing the continent into four large regions—West Sudan, the coast of Guinea, the Congo basin and East Africa—within which a bevy of different “artistic schools” was noted. The “clan or tribal stage”

was characterized as a historical moment in the histories of these schools, and responsible for the development of certain social structures.

The second part of Mirimanov's book was dedicated to "diachronic" research, with data arranged in rough chronological order, albeit one that is "interrupted by lacunae."^{lxii} As Mirimanov noted a strict chronology would be impossible. He sought a "stratigraphy of certain layers" to best appreciate African art's diachronic development. He developed a four-stage scheme that detailed the Primitive Communal Era, Era of Class Formation, Early Class Societies and the Contemporary Era.^{lxiii} Within each stage Mirimanov identified the characteristics of artistic evolution. In rock art the development of the plastic ideogram marked progressions from image to sign.^{lxiv} Sculpture's evolution was traced relative to "quantitative deformation" (diachronic; formal changes over time) and "qualitative deformation" (synchronic; spatial factors such as relationships between different schools).^{lxv} The establishment of courtly societies led to the creation of an artisan class and the professionalization of African art, which was bound to shifting governance structures. Art from Africa, Mirimanov insisted could not be studied only "at the level of the local artistic schools, but as an entire system or, to be more precise, supersystem." This "supersystem," Mirimanov argued was both "polycentric...consisting of many hierarchically organised mutually interacting systems (art centers)" and "multilevel, since it combines unequally developed systems and subsystems (schools of art, styles, substyles)."^{lxvi}

Whilst Mirimanov's text included extensive analysis of various arts, from Nok sculpture to Dogon masks, it is his formalization of an ever-evolving "supersystem" that best characterizes the grand aspirations of Soviet histories of African art. In 1983 Anatoly Gromyko laid out a similar four-stage system to answer the "acute problem" of "present-day African art," namely "continuity." Gromyko went one step further, accusing Western colleagues of actively seeking to

prove African “intellectual and artistic inferiority.”^{lxvii} In a twist of logic, he suggested that in focusing on micro “local field studies” rather than the macro “historical” picture, as the Soviets were, Western scholars were doing a great disservice to Africa. Tellingly, Soviet African studies did not often, unlike its American counterpart, involve embedded fieldwork. Certainly some Africanists, notably Potekhin and Olderogge, did research on the continent, but a greater premium was placed upon the writing of grand art *history*. Masks, figures and other works in Western museums were studied as historical objects, whose primary stage of utility had passed with the arrival of new social and political systems.

Soviet scholars lauded Africa’s post-colonial urban arts, including painting, photography and sculpture seen on the streets and in the art academies of cities such as Accra, Nairobi and Lagos.^{lxviii} These arts, some of which William Fagg had dismissed as “an extension of European art by a kind of voluntary cultural colonialism,” emblemized for Soviet scholars cultural advance in sync with a “transitional” political phase.^{lxix} Gromyko even claimed that “new, progressive African art on the basis of realistic traditions...[could solve] the entire set of tasks connected with independent socio-economic, political and cultural development.”^{lxx} Although marking a new era, Mirimanov stressed that contemporary arts were part of the historical continuity of African art.^{lxxi} His reasoning differed from thinking in the West, which in the 1960s saw modern and contemporary arts as a break from traditions that had been destroyed by colonial rule.^{lxxii} In the Soviet teleological narrative, hybrid art that combined modern practices from outside Africa with local traditions were a necessary and positive product of a turbulent stage.

Unsurprisingly, the Soviet Union was not just active in praising such practices; it was instrumental in forging them. From the late 1950s, “realistic traditions” in painting and sculpture, including lengthy life-drawing classes, were taught to many African artists who gained

scholarships to schools such as Moscow’s Surikov Academy (Fig. 2).^{lxxiii} Ethiopian artist Bekele Mekonnen was one of the last of the Cold War generation to receive an education in the USSR, arriving for study in the late 1980s. Whilst his predecessors—students in the 1960s and 1970s—remembered fondly their time in the Moscow and Leningrad, Bekele arrived in the later *perestroika* period when attitudes towards African students were shifting away from the rhetoric of “international friendship” and towards less savory, nativist feelings that students of color did not belong.^{lxxiv} Bekele recalls overhearing professors mocking his and other African students’ abilities, a memory that is markedly different from his fellow Ethiopians, who in the 1970s had gained accolades such as the “Red Star MA” degree from the Surikov and Leningrad Academies.^{lxxv} Despite this souring of relations in the latter years, the impact of Soviet art education on the development of modern and contemporary art in Africa is significant. The encouragement of realism as a “useful” aesthetic mode (albeit not one that was rigidly defined) cannot, however, simply be reduced to a tale of the Soviets imposing “socialist realism.” Rather this emphasis on realism, understood in Gromyko’s terms broadly as art that both depicted and was engaged with current realities, was motivated by the faith that such representation was best suited to this era of rapid urban economic and social development.

Communist Fears and Fieldwork Frontiers

The Cold War’s impact on African art study in America is less immediately apparent; leaders in the field were not, unlike some of their Soviet colleagues, inclined to cite national political agendas as motivating factors for their research. Many of the field’s pioneering scholars actively protested American interventions in the name of ideology, specifically the Vietnam War. If Soviet studies of African art were conceived as an integral part of the official “war against

imperialism,” the development of African art history in America was a less deliberate product of Cold War era shifts in academic agendas and foreign policies. Although such research was not explicitly motivated by a desire to support American interests, it was inspired by and made possible through programs established in the name of national political agendas, from National Defense Education Act (1958) Title VI funding to frontiers of intercultural exchange offered by the Peace Corps. Africa’s entry into American art history occurred not because of that discipline’s greater inclusivity, but in the midst of an opening up to Africa as an essential terrain for research, concomitant with the rationale that this terrain had become the “greatest open field of maneuver.”^{lxxvi} The first interdisciplinary African Studies program was founded at Northwestern University in 1948 by anthropologist Melville Herskovits, using a grant from the Carnegie Foundation. A student of Franz Boas, Herskovits was fascinated by African artistic culture, and was committed to studying it within its specific social and historical context. In 1926, he revealed a precocious intolerance for haughty art world speak that waxed lyrical about the formal qualities of African sculpture whilst offering no insights into the purpose or origin of the object. Herskovits was so irritated by Paul Guillaume and Thomas Munro’s publication *Primitive Negro Sculpture* (1926) that he wrote several scathing reviews of it in different publications. In *Social Forces* journal he excoriated Guillaume and Munro’s formalist descriptions as “a smothering mass of verbiage,” whilst in *The Arts* he criticized their insistence on evaluating art “*in vacuo*, so to speak” and their “Ivory Tower” detachment.^{lxxvii} He ended the latter review by insisting that “the comprehension of African cultures...is a *sine qua non* to the appreciation of African art.” This was a position that Herskovits only became more committed to after he undertook his first fieldwork trips in the late 1920s. Fieldwork would become a critical component of American African Studies under his guidance and, as the recollections of one

former student, Jean Cordwell, attest, Herskovits maintained a close supervisory correspondence with those he sent into the “field.” Cordwell recalls receiving responses from Evanston to her fieldwork notes insisting that she wasn’t asking the right question or that she “just [wasn’t] getting in deep enough!”^{lxxviii} Herskovits deeply personal commitment to fieldwork would find fulfillment in his teaching, and later the African Studies program at Northwestern, which attracted students such as William Bascom, James Fernandez, Simon Ottenberg and Warren d’Azevedo who would each pursue groundbreaking studies in the historic and contemporary arts of Africa.

In the Cold War’s earliest years, however, American interest in African art was most extensively taken up by a constituency who shared with Soviet scholars a desire to elevate respect for African culture and to denounce imperialism: African American academics and cultural leaders. Since the Harlem Renaissance, African American intellectuals had been celebrating African art. Alain Locke’s 1925 essay “The Legacy of Ancestral Arts,” had argued that the European “discovery” of African art unearthed a “classical” tradition from which to draw inspiration.^{lxxix} In the era of colonial liberation and with the stirrings of the Civil Rights’ struggle, the powerful appeal of this art resurfaced in the poetry of African American writers like Margaret Danner. In her 1960 collection *Impressions of African Art Forms*, she insisted that African art must be “uncaged from the safe captivity of the Exhibition area, the sociologists notebooks, and the journals of aestheticians and historians.”^{lxxx} In the poem “An American Coach of Aesthetics” Danner wryly dressed down a white academic of African art whose “speech is plain but sweet Ph.D delight.” Here, Danner characterized her appreciation of Africa’s “bubbling aesthetic principles” as more intense than his cool academic detachment, highlighting that her

understanding was heightened given that her context was “this melting pot. Here in America, here in Detroit.”^{lxxxix}

At Howard University, one of America’s historic African American colleges, from the 1930s classes onwards African art were taught by artists and scholars such as Lois Jones and James Porter, who in 1953 favorably reviewed the *Présence Africaine*’s call for African art study to serve political needs.^{lxxxii} In 1950, Porter brought Nigerian artist Ben Enwonwu to Howard, facilitating an unprecedented exhibition of contemporary African art.^{lxxxiii} Porter went on to published on African art’s value as source of cultural pride for African Americans. Following Herskovits’ groundbreaking study *The Myth of the Negro Past* (1941), which had insisted on the need to study the vestiges of African heritage in African-American culture as a means of denouncing the assumption that “the Negro is a man without a past Porter traced the “transcultural affinities” between African art and its Diaspora in volumes such as *Africa from the Point of View of American Negro Scholars* (1958) and *Pan-Africanism Reconsidered* (1962). Both of these were published by the American Society of African Culture (AMSAC). AMSAC, founded in 1957 following the First International Congress of Negro Writers and Artists in Paris, was the American partner of the French Société Africaine de Culture (SAC) headed by Alioune Diop. It arranged conferences and lectures promoting discussion of African art. In 1965 it established *African Forum*, a journal publishing articles on African and African Diaspora culture and politics.

These endeavors claimed to be above the burgeoning ideological struggles of the age, seeing the emancipation of both Africans and African Americans as a higher goal. As Diop wrote to his “AMSAC brothers” in the introduction to *Africa from the Point of View of American Negro Scholars*, “we have no part in the East-West conflict.”^{lxxxiv} Yet, as Hugh Wilford has

shown, AMSAC was not all it seemed. By the late 1960s it was hounded by accusations of CIA funding, accusations stirred by the lavishness of its New York accommodations and its steamrolling of Nigeria's SAC in 1961, when it set up its own office in Lagos.^{lxxxv} AMSAC's sponsorship of major showcases such as First World Festival of Negro Arts in Dakar in 1966, characterized by *Ebony* magazine as "[illustrating] the genius, the culture and the glory of Africa," suddenly seemed shady.^{lxxxvi} As Pearl Robinson argues, the State Department had stressed that alongside Africa being the "greatest open field of maneuver" in the era of "worldwide competition," discrimination against the Africa American population posed a public relations threat, particularly in view of the USSR's denouncement of colonial oppression.^{lxxxvii} In a curious twist, "non-aligned" African American scholars were drawn into the Cold War through an organization purportedly funded to promote a more positive view of race relations in the U.S., via the promotion of African arts.^{lxxxviii} The leading organization for the promotion of contemporary African art in the United States in the 1940s, 50s and 60s was the Harmon Foundation, a philanthropic organization founded in the 1925 by William E. Harmon for "the advancement of opportunities for members of the black race."^{lxxxix} Throughout the 1920s and 30s, the Harmon Foundation had provided awards and other patronage to African American artists. In the age of decolonization, under the leadership of Mary Beattie Brady and Evelyn Brown, it had turned its attention to the African continent, offering scholarships and exhibitions in the US to over 300 artists between 1947 and 1968. These efforts were underpinned by a belief in the importance of an "intercultural exchange flow" and of art's role in fostering peace and understanding, a mission that was highly resonant with the cultural agenda of America's Cold War. John C. Walter has argued, however, that, despite this resonance, there is no evidence that

NOT TO BE REPRODUCED OR CIRCULATED WITHOUT PERMISSION FROM THE AUTHOR

the Foundation was a directly financed tool of the State Department (in the manner of AMSAC, perhaps).^{xc}

As well as bringing leading contemporary African artists, such as Gerard Sekoto, Skunder Boghossian and Ibrahim El Salahi to the US, the Harmon Foundation made a major contribution to histories of African art when it published texts on contemporary art in the 1960s. Its second publication, the work of Evelyn Brown, was *Africa's Contemporary Art and Artists* (1966). This was a landmark survey of hundreds of artists from across the continent. In its depth and diversity, the text was a direct affront to the antiquated European anxieties that modernist art in Africa was either derivative of European forms, or made at the expense of lost traditions. In its commitment to utilize its programs to “make friends” with those who were “coming forward into freedom and self-determination,” the Harmon Foundation proved itself to be both a useful cultural actor in the Cold War theater, but also, more important, a trusted and important ally for contemporary African artists.

Contemporaneous with resurgent African American interest in African art, and the Harmon Foundation's efforts to promote contemporary practices was the founding of the African Studies Association (ASA) with Herskovits as its first President and the passing of the first Africa-focused dissertation in the field of art history in the US: Roy Sieber's “African Tribal Sculpture,” which he, in overly self-deprecating fashion, later proclaimed to be a “lousy survey”!^{xcii} Much debate has occurred about the impact of Cold War policy agendas on the development of African Studies in the United States, suffice to say that it is hard to deny that it was significant.^{xciii} At the time, those leading the interdisciplinary field's academic institutionalization were cognizant of the political stakes; William Martin and Michael West have exposed Herskovits' assurance to CIA director Allen Dulles in 1958 that the ASA “would be happy to aid [the CIA] in any way it

can.”^{xciii} President John F. Kennedy telegraphed his support to the ASA’s 1962 meeting, at which Potekhin presented Soviet research. As well as emphasizing the “common ties” and “mutual concerns” of the US and Africa, Kennedy praised the ASA for “illuminating” the continent and for helping America communicate with it.^{xciv} By 1962, African Studies programs had been established in a number of American colleges, supported first through such initiatives as the Ford Foundation Foreign Area Fellowship Program and, after 1958, by the National Defense Education Act, passed in response to the launch of Sputnik. In 1960 a Joint Committee on African Studies (JCAS) was formed. As Robinson highlights, much of this funding and support went to major research universities; thus, African American colleges that had pioneered African arts research largely missed out.

In interviews with Sieber and Robert Farris Thompson, two pioneers of African art history in the US, for the 25th anniversary edition of *African Arts* magazine neither directly credited the boom in African Studies as responsible for their choice of career. Both attributed their turn and approach to African art to new classes on non-western art, to reading anthropology and to broader shifts in the field of art history—in short, to an atmosphere of indisciplinary that befit the age. Sieber attributed his interest in the “intellectual depth” of an object to studying under both Meyer Schapiro, in classes at the New School, and William Heckscher, a student of Panofsky at the University of Iowa as well to reading anthropologists Frobenius and Herskovits.^{xcv} Thompson, whose “Afro-Atlantic” interests were sparked by boogie-woogie, rumba and mambo, cited George Kubler and his course on Mesoamerican civilization.^{xcvi} Sieber and Thompson’s early careers, however, were shaped by increased opportunities to study Africa that the late 1950s and early 1960s bore: upon completion of his dissertation, Sieber took a Ford Foundation grant to travel to the continent. He went on to pioneer the program in Africanist art

history at Indiana University, which, as a major recipient of Title VI funding, became a leading center for African humanities research in the “Area Studies” mold.

That Sieber and Thompson, along with fellow pioneer Douglas Fraser, chose art history as their field over anthropology is important, however, for it indicated two things: a belief that art history could include non-western cultures and, more importantly, an interest in expanding existing African art studies to include art historical concerns for style, aesthetics and connoisseurship. As Henry Drewal has highlighted, the 1960s were a period of research and methodological pluralization in which “multiple perspectives” were brought together.^{xcvii} Pearl Robinson corroborates; from the mid-fifties anthropological hegemony in the field gave way to a “flux in the disciplinary mix,” true, it appeared, of art studies as much as other areas.^{xcviii} The JCAS sponsored conferences mapping the state of the field, as well as future research frontiers. One of these was the 1965 “The Traditional Artist in African Societies” in which both Sieber and Thompson participated alongside many eminent Herskovits-educated scholars, Bascom, Fernandez and d’Azevedo. As d’Azevedo recalled in 1989, the conference, a watershed in putting African art studies on the broader African Studies agenda, was motivated by an “urgent sense” that new approaches were both “necessary [and] imminent.”^{xcix}

If Soviet scholars were drawing all known African arts into a large, teleological, polycentric supersystem, American Africanists were throwing the field open. Yet for all the professions of interdisciplinarity, many of the “new approaches” were articulated via art history’s familiar languages. At the 1968 Hampton Institute conference on “Traditional African Art,” Richard A. Long insisted that only by defining “scientifically established catalogues” of African art would the “denigrating myth of anonymous tradition-bound artists” dissipate. Long compared the state of African art studies to the study of “Flemish or Italian Primitives a hundred

years ago.”^c Art history’s traditional emphasis on individual “genius” and the discreet object was believed an important counterpoint to generalized ethnographies of African art. As Sieber put it, “in anthropology you are making a point which the object illustrates, and therefore...any object will do if it is of the right class, category or whatever. In art history, one deals with the object as a primary focus...whatever you deal with must be used to explain that object.”^{ci} Implicit in Long’s assertion was the idea that “scientific” studies of non-Western culture would enable participation in the traditional art historical canon; questions remained as to whether African art had to constitute itself within accepted art historical molds, or whether it would force the discipline into new modalities.

If the first generation wrestled with disciplinary terms and methodologies that befitted a post-war shifting interdisciplinary environment, many of the second generation, educated in the late 1960s and 1970s, were alumni of a different, but related, Cold War cultural initiative: the Peace Corps. As Sieber said of his students, Christopher Roy and Anita Glaze, who joined him in the early 1970s, their Peace Corps experience had directly led to their finding “their niche for research.”^{cii} Founded in 1961, the Peace Corps, a volunteering program that took American youth on two year placements to Africa and other parts of the then “Third World,” was designed to enable these young ambassadors to “serve their country in the cause of world peace and understanding and simultaneously assist other nations towards their legitimate goals of freedom and understanding.”^{ciii} Both Kennedy and Sargent Shriver, the driving force behind its foundation, insisted that the program was not motivated by ideological ends, but rather sought to address north-south social and economic divisions far greater than Cold War political divisions.^{civ} It attracted those seeking to avoid active combat in the name of the Cold War; during the Vietnam War it offered a partial alternative to military service by way of a draft deferment.^{cv}

Furthermore, a 1961 Public Affairs Press publication about expectations and opportunities for the Peace Corps insisted that whilst in the field, volunteers were free to express opinions divergent from official foreign policy.^{cv} As African art scholar and former Peace Corps volunteer Thomas Seligman recalled, however, they would not tolerate active protest against the American government as occurred at various embassies in the wake of the covert bombing of Cambodia in 1969-70.^{cvi}

Elizabeth Cobbs-Hoffman insists that the Peace Corps was born out of concerns about newly decolonized nations' relationship to a growing Soviet sphere of influence.^{cviii} It was not the first youth volunteering program; the British Voluntary Service Overseas (VSO) was established in 1958, first seeking high school graduates to send to Africa and Indonesia.^{cix} From France to Canada, other countries followed suit but the American endeavor was unparalleled in scale and in funding. "The Peace Corps," Cobbs-Hoffman argues, "was bankrolled by a wealthy government as an expression of its foreign policy."^{cx} In contrast to the USSR, which invited thousands of young Africans into its borders for education and training, America sent thousands of its youth to Africa to teach, build, aid and support.^{cx} This army of young ambassadors for peace, it was hoped, would go a long way to countering the damaging stereotype of the "ugly American," as depicted in the infamous 1958 novel of the same name.^{cxii}

Both Christopher Steiner and Christraud Geary allude to the immediate and significant impact of the Peace Corps on markets for and collections of African art.^{cxiii} Peace Corps alumni corroborate their assertions in memories of bringing objects back from the field as souvenirs of long-term placements. As Gary Collins, now a professor of Physics at Washington State University recalls, besides art there was little else for volunteers to spend their money on; his personal Peace Corps-era collection includes a bronze Senufo mask, purchased from an artisan in

Korhogo, Ivory Coast in 1967 (Fig. 3).^{cxiv} Collins remembers Hausa traders visiting Peace Corps volunteers once a month with new objects to sell and his photographs of field offices in Togo in the late 1960s show the walls decorated, for example, with Dahomeyan wall hangings (Fig. 4). The quality and “authenticity” of works brought back to the US by volunteers has been debated, but there is little doubt that the influx of American youngsters brought many new opportunities for traders of African arts and crafts, and boosted American interest in such.^{cxv}

The Peace Corps also significantly impacted America’s post-war leadership in African art studies. Alongside Roy and Glazer, many of the current leaders in the field cut their Africanist teeth as volunteers before pursuing graduate work. Just as funding was being made more widely available for African Studies’-related graduate fieldwork, the Peace Corps was pricking the research interests of those already in the field. Living in both urban and rural communities for prolonged periods offered unprecedented opportunities to see and experience art and architecture. Some art-inclined (and principally university-educated) youngsters even pre-empted their graduate work during their service. When Roy began his doctoral work with Sieber in 1972, he immediately spotted an error in a book by Fagg. Fagg claimed that the Mossi people of central Burkina Faso no longer made art because they had converted to Islam. Having spent two years in Burkina Faso with the Peace Corps, Roy knew that this was incorrect and traced Fagg’s source to the then director of Ouagadougou’s Art Museum, Toumani Triande; president of the Muslim brotherhood and, Roy claimed, “one of the most corrupt people” he ever met.^{cxvi} Correcting this error motivated Roy, who wrote his Ph.D. on Mossi masks and became a leading expert in West African art.^{cxvii}

Roy’s experiential, and initially unintentional, acquisition of knowledge about Mossi art was emblematic of the manner in which the Peace Corps shaped African art study in the US.

Contrasting with anthropological field expeditions in which research objectives were defined and methodologies in place before departure, Peace Corps volunteers were dispatched to Third World destinations with broader training in local languages and cultural history, and a faith in liberal international development. Notably, Roy Sieber was one of those recruited to assist with the training of young Peace Corps volunteers; Rosalyn Adele Walker recalls encountering him in 1965 on the campus of Hampton Institute, where he was offering a series of lectures on African art.^{cxviii} Although Harris Wofford stated in 1966 that the Peace Corps functioned as a “university in dispersion,” offering unique learning opportunities for American youth, *what* they specifically learned was left open.^{cxix} Thomas Seligman, who volunteered in Liberia in the late 1960s and went on to become an authority on Tuareg arts and a leading museum professional, recalls that officials didn’t care what volunteers worked on, as long as it seemed “useful.” He worked at Liberia’s Cuttington College looking after and developing its collection of African art, his previous education in art and art history providing a basis in connoisseurship essential for identifying quality goods brought by traders.^{cxx} The open-ended nature of Peace Corps’ methods and objectives enabled those with an interest in art an opportunity to engage in unrestricted, exploratory fashion, and gain skills for which there was no set training program.

Unsurprisingly, therefore, former Peace Corps volunteers were responsible for pioneering innovative approaches to African art research. Drewal was a Peace Corps teacher in Nigeria in 1965, went to on to complete an interdisciplinary PhD at Columbia University Teachers’ College, and ultimately became a professor of Art History and African-American studies at University of Madison-Wisconsin. In his research he has emphasized “sensory” engagement. Unlike traditional anthropological methodologies, which he believes “historically emphasize observation,” Drewal has called upon researchers to be “sensorially engaged participants.” He

states that, although he was not aware of it at the time, it was during his Peace Corps service when he apprenticed to a Yoruba artist that he realized that only by learning to carve himself could he understand Yoruba style and aesthetics.^{cxxi}

Unlike their predecessors, the second generation of scholars was less hung up on making African art fit art historical models, often challenging art history to accept new frontiers. Suzanne Preston Blier wrote in 2001 that before departing for Peace Corps service in 1969 she “packed away [her] Western art history books (along with the magnifying glass I had used in the Panofskyan iconographic analysis of that era).”^{cxxii} Her service in Benin provided the grounds for a prolific career as an art and architectural historian of Africa, and as a scholar who pushed for new methodological tools. Twenty years after she left for West Africa as a volunteer she used her field experiences to critique Panofskian art history. Unraveling its exacting methodology, Blier argued that the study of African art demanded a more flexible approach to defining “meaning,” one that took into account wider social and political contexts, the influence of users or “geomancers” on an object’s purpose and the importance of “experiential” research.^{cxxiii} Blier’s doctoral research in Batammaliba architecture relied heavily on amassing many interviews and interpreting terminology, and demonstrated a complex semiotic relationship between language and the built environment. Recognizing signs was not sufficient; the specifics of location and context should foster an understanding of shifting indexicality.^{cxxiv}

Accompanying innovative attitudes to fieldwork was an emphasis on African languages; Blier, Drewal, Roy and others relied heavily upon specific local language terminologies for research. Although Thompson had demonstrated in the 1960s the need for a close attention to language in his exposition of Yoruba aesthetic sensibilities, the Peace Corps generation were alumni of a program that put a premium on language skills in order to strive for “two-way

communication;” a notion that motivated their research.^{cxxv} The “new frontiers” for American youth that the Peace Corps purportedly offered proved to be important frontiers of knowledge and methodological questioning for the study of African art in the United States on a scale that was not replicated elsewhere.

Beyond the Fall of the Wall

The parallel models of Africanist art history developed on either side of the Iron Curtain, each shaped by the political agendas of the Cold War’s leading protagonists, certainly impacted African scholars of African art. Some, such as Babatunde Lawal, a scholar of Nigerian art who traveled to Indiana to study with Roy Sieber, found opportunities to pursue doctoral work in the US. At the same time, as evidenced by Kenyan academic J.B. Osaga Odak’s appreciation of Mirimanov’s work, Soviet texts circulated on the continent, distributed through various cultural programs that ensured both academic and popular texts reached African readers. Yet, further research is needed to explore the impact of Cold War academic agendas on the development of art historical inquiry on the continent. How did the influx of young Americans impact African academics? How did the arrival of “cultural consultants” from North Korea and Cuba who visited socialist-oriented countries shape academic programs? How did sojourns to the Soviet Union inform African scholars’ and artists’ approaches to histories of African culture?

Certainly, European anthropologists and gallerists had set precedents for innovative research into African culture in the early twentieth century, but it was in the climate of geopolitical rivalry that a bevy of new approaches and attitudes emerged in earnest. The rival Soviet and American concerns for post-colonial Africa shaped their respective “African Studies” research agenda and approach. For the former, liberated Africa was to be firmly brought into a

Marxist narrative of teleological development. For the latter, America was to insert itself into Africa's narrative of development, whilst "safeguarding" her newfound freedom. Soviet African art studies were noticeably concerned with determining large historical systems for understanding African Art as continuous development; this seemingly stodgy endeavor, ironically, enabling an interest in contemporary, particularly urban, art unmatched internationally in its enthusiasm. American studies of African art were a less intentional product of the era, emerging through a growing appetite for knowledge about the liberating continent. Thus demands for new approaches were inextricably linked to the various government initiatives that institutionalized "African Studies" in a notably American way. The impact of the Peace Corps on economic circuits for, as well as studies of, African art still demands further investigation.

The legacy of Cold War academic configurations lingers in various ways. In Russia, whilst major collections of African art remain, particularly in St. Petersburg, African art study has not commanded the same sense of urgency that it did prior to 1989. Further, Russian attitudes to Africa have undergone serious turmoil; the fall of the Soviet Union ushered in a period of nativism that left Africans, or African-descended Russians, in a precarious position.^{cxxvii} Films such as Mauritanian director Abderrahamane Sissako's short *Octobre* (1993), following the disintegrating relationship between an African student and a young Russian woman against the backdrop of late *perestroika* Moscow, evoked some of the deeper racial tensions and contradictions that emerged at the end of the era of socialist "international friendship."

In America, the legacy of Cold War-era investments, debates and programs is more tangible. Field research precedents that were enshrined by second generation American Africanists have proved a continuous source of debate. The storm around Fred Lamp's 1999

essay and its concern for younger generations' approach to African research is emblematic of continuing methodological anxieties.^{cxxviii} Another persistent debate pertains to the problematic categorical binary of “traditional” and “modern/contemporary” African art; the binary that was absent in the Soviet Union and that the Peace Corps' generation confronted through embedded experience.^{cxxix} Such debates testify to a vibrant, if rarely harmonious, intellectual community that is unmatched in its institutional acceptance: despite the clarion call for research coming from France, since the 1950s professors of art history pursuing research in Africa have been found predominantly in universities on the opposite side of the Atlantic. With regard to the rest of the West, it would be fair to assert that, after 1945, America stole the field of African art history.

Yet, whilst the institutionalization of African art studies has certainly been greatest in the US, the broader global impact of Soviet African art studies, specifically on the African continent, is yet to be fully accounted for. In 2014 Ethiopian artist and teacher Eshetu Tiruneh was busy preparing a large art history textbook in Amharic for young Ethiopian artists.^{cxxx} As a former student of the Surikov Academy of Art in Moscow, Eshetu had not studied art history through the American writings of Sieber, Thompson and Fraser but through the approaches of Potekhin, Mirimanov and their colleagues. On his desk at the Enlightenment Art Academy in Addis Ababa, besides drafts of his textbook, was a well-thumbed copy of Mirimanov's 1967 text *Afrika: Isskustvo*, in Russian. Whilst they may have been forgotten in dominant Western Africanist discourse, Soviet polycentric supersystems endure as sources for Africans of the Cold War generation engaged in writing their own histories of art.

ⁱ A.H.M. Greene, “*Kamus na Hausa--Rashanci* by D. A. Olderogge; *Lenin: takaitaccen tarihin rayuwarsa* by Ado Gwadabe; *Seryoja* by Vera Panova, Ado Gwadabe; *Talifi a kan malam na*

farko by Cingiz Aitmatov, Ado Gwadabe; *Tsuntsu mai farin kwibi* by J. A. Tafida; *Masu kaga labarai* by N. Nosov, J. A. Tafida; *Labarai don yara* by L. N. Tolstoi, J. A. Tafida,” *Africa: Journal of the International Africa Institute* 41, no. 4 (Oct., 1971): 348-350.

ⁱⁱ *Ibid.*, 349.

ⁱⁱⁱ In the late 1950s and early 1960s, as African Studies was emerging as an interdisciplinary field, a number of bibliographic and survey papers were produced in the West and in the Soviet Union detailing the others’ respective research efforts. Examples include: Central Asian Research Centre, *Soviet Writing on Africa, 1959-61; an Annotated Bibliography*, (Oxford: Distributed for the Royal Institute of International Affairs by the Oxford University Press, 1963), Mary Holdsworth, “African Studies in the USSR,” *African Studies Bulletin* 5, no. 1, (March 1962): 9-13, David Morison, “African Studies in the Soviet Union,” *Russian Review* 22, no. 3, (July, 1963): 301-314, Ram Desai, “The Explosion of African Studies in the Soviet Union,” *African Studies Bulletin* 11, no. 3, (December, 1968): 248-258. One particular Soviet volume purported to expose the “imperialism” of Anglo-American African Studies: I.I. Potekhin (ed.), *Anglo-Amerikanskaia Etnografiia Na Sluzhbe Imperializma [Anglo-American Ethnography in the Service of Imperialism]*, (Moscow: Academy of the Sciences of the USSR, 1951). Finally, Russian-African-American scholar Lily Golden wrote a warm review of Soviet African Studies for African-American periodical, *Freedomways*: Lily Golden, “African Studies in the Soviet Union,” *Freedomways: A Quarterly Review of the Freedom Movement* 10, no. 2, (Second Quarter), 1970: 146-156.

^{iv} Paul Ben-Amos, “African Arts from a Social Perspective,” *African Studies Review*, 32, no. 2, (Sep. 1989): 3.

^v *Ibid.*, 39.

^{vi} Monni Adams, “African Visual Arts from an Art Historical Perspective,” *African Studies Review* 32, no. 2, (Sep. 1989): 55-103.

^{vii} Robin Poynor, “Ancestors and Elders: Personal Reflections of an Africanist Art Historian,” *African Arts* 50, no. 3 (Autumn 2017): 8-21.

^{viii} The depiction of the continent as a playground for “proxy” wars continues to dominate popular and textbook narratives of the Cold War. For example Africa is described as the stage for the “geopolitical chess match between the United States and the USSR” in James Arnold and Roberta Weiner (ed.), *Cold War: The Essential Reference Guide* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2012), 6.

^{ix} Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 92.

^x Clapperton Chakanetsa Mavhunga, “A Plundering Tiger with Its Deadly Cubs? The USSR and China as Weapons in the Engineering of “Zimbabwean Nation,” 1945-2009” in *Empire and Technopolitics in the Global Cold War*, ed. Gabrielle Hecht, (Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2011), 232.

^{xi} *Ibid.*, 233-4.

^{xii} For a discussion of the so-called “Belgian method” of form and context see Sam Vangheluwe, *The Artist Himself in African Art Studies: Jan Vandenhoute's Investigation of the Dan sculptor in Côte d'Ivoire*, (Ghent: Academia Press, 2001), 10-14.

^{xiii} His sentiments were echoed in a 1948 catalogue for the Belgian Government Information Center in New York, which argued that ethnology and aesthetics did make a “happy marriage.” Leon Kochnitsky, *Negro Art in the Belgian Congo* (New York: Belgian Government Information Center, 1958), 1-2.

^{xiv} Z.S. Strother, "Looking for Africa in Carl Einstein's *Negerplastik*," *African Arts*, Winter 2013, 46, no. 4, 8-9.

^{xv} *Ibid.* 14

^{xvi} Ladislav Segy, *African Sculpture Speaks* (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1958), 1.

^{xvii} William Fagg and Margaret Plass, *African Sculpture: An Anthology* (London: Studio Vista Limited, 1964), 5.

^{xviii} For example, William Fagg, *Tribes and Forms in African Art*, (New York: Tudor Publishing Co., 1965)

^{xix} Reprinted as Henri Lavachery, "L'art des Noirs d'Afrique et son destin," in *L'Art Negre*, Nouvelle edition (Paris: Présence Africaine, 1966), 45-67.

^{xx} Alioune Diop, "L'artiste n'est pas seul au monde," in *L'Art Negre*, 11.

^{xxi} Paul Nugent, *Africa Since Independence: A Comparative History*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014), 48-9.

^{xxii} One revealing example is Dr. L.R.C. Haward's bizarre and generalizing study of the drawing abilities of "the African" that led the author to conclude (in 1960) that "African art may possess depths of meaning which have been previously overlooked." Haward goes on to suggest that the results of his "psychological" study "[give] a new insight into the mentality of a people who are gaining a new stature in international affairs, and with whom we must one day forge new social links on equal terms." Literature scholar Gerald Moore offered a more insightful survey of leading contemporary practitioners, including Yemi Bisiri, Vincent Kofi and Demos Nwoko, but the opening sentence of his essay is also revealing: "Sooner or later I shall have to come to terms with that phrase which obtrudes in my title—'the new Africa'." He goes on to clarify that he is not uncomfortable with the idea of an independent Africa, but rather with the concept of "new"

because “all societies of old.” Moore’s wistfulness, however, is revealing of a broader anxiety amongst Western Africanists about a “new” Africa losing sight of its traditions in its pursuit of modernity, and from a British writer discussing art in former British colonies, the assertion pointed to an awkwardness in a moment of radical change. Both the “one day” in Haward closing remarks and the “sooner or later” in Moore’s opening sentence are at odds with Diop’s sense of urgency. See L.R.C. Haward, “African Art: A Psychological Study,” *African Affairs*, 59, No. 357, (Oct. 1960): 324-327 and Gerald Moore, “The Arts in the New Africa,” *African Affairs*, 66, No. 263, (Apr. 1967): 140-148.

^{xxiii} Ruth B. Philips, ““Can You Go out without Your Head?” Fieldwork as Transformative Experience,” *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics*, no. 39 (Spring 2001): 62-3.

^{xxiv} Roy Sieber, *African Tribal Sculpture* (Ph.D. diss., University of Iowa. 1957).

^{xxv} See Robert Hall, *Area Studies: With Special Reference to their Implications for Research in the Social Sciences* (New York: Committee on World Area Research Program, Social Science Research Council, 1948).

^{xxvi} “Plenary Session: Friday Morning, October 13: African Studies in the Soviet Union,” *African Studies Bulletin*, 5, no. 4, Report of the Fifth Annual Meeting of the African Studies Association (Dec., 1962): 36.

^{xxvii} W.E.B. DuBois ideas were also delivered in a speech at the First All-Africa People’s Congress in Accra, Ghana in December 1958, and later formalized in the essay “The Scientific Study of Africa” (1960). Reprinted in W.E.B. DuBois, *Against Racism: Unpublished Essays, Papers and Addresses, 1887-1961*, ed. Herbert Aptheker, (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1988), 317-318. See also Gerald Horne, *Black and Red: W.E.B. DuBois*

and the Afro-American Response to the Cold War, 1944-1963 (Albany: State University of New York, 1986), 322.

^{xxviii} See Irina Filatova, “Anti-Colonialism in Soviet African Studies (1920s-1960)” in *The Study of Africa, Volume 2: Global and Transnational Engagements*, ed. Paul Tiyambe Zeleza, (Dakar: Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa, 2007), 203-234.

^{xxix} Maxim Matusевич has written extensively on the presence of African students in the Soviet Union. See, in particular, Maxim Matusевич, “An Exotic Subversive: Africa, Africans, and the Soviet Everyday,” *Race and Class* 49, no. 4, (April 2008): 57-81.

^{xxx} Institute of Ethnography announcement in the journal of the USSR Academy of Sciences *Vestnik Akademii Nauk S.S.S.R.M.*, no. 12, 1959, reproduced in Seymour M. Rosen, *Studies in Comparative Education: Soviet Training Programs for Africa*, US Department of Health, Education and Welfare, (Washington: US Government Printing Office, 1963), 5.

^{xxxi} Maxim Matusевич, *No Easy Row for a Russian Hoe: Ideology and Pragmatism in Nigerian-Soviet Relations, 1960-1991*, (Trenton: Africa World Press, 2003), 30-2.

^{xxxii} *Ibid.*, 32. Also see Colin Darch and Gary Littlejohn, “Endre Sik and the Development of African Studies in the USSR: A Study Agenda from 1929,” *History in Africa* 10, (1983), 79-108.

^{xxxiii} See Filatova, “Anti-Colonialism,” 217.

^{xxxiv} *Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Adopted by the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U., October 31st 1961* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1961), 44.

^{xxxv} M.A. Korostovtsev (ed.), L.M. Ozerova, B.P. Birukov, S.E. Vitman (trans.), *Essays on African Culture / Essais d’Histoire de la Culture Africaine* (Moscow: Nauka Publishing House, Central Department of Oriental Literature), 3.

^{xxxvi} He did so to counter the claim that all Soviet interests in Africa were “political.” See “Plenary Session,” 37.

^{xxxvii} Boris Turaev, *Efiopskie Rukopisi v S. Peterburge* (St. Petersburg: 1900).

^{xxxviii} For details and discussion of such texts, see Filatova, “Anti-Colonialism.”

^{xxxix} In 2009, Jeremy Howard translated a section of Markov’s text, making it accessible for the English-speaking audiences for the first time. Vladimir Markov (Voldemars Matvejs), “Negro Art,” trans. Jeremy Howard, *Art in Translation* 1, Issue 1: 77-117.

^{xl} Solomon Volkov describes how this book was published despite major shortages and deprivation in the city of St. Petersburg. See Solomon Volkov, *St. Petersburg: A Cultural History* (New York: Free Press Paperbacks, 1995), 281-2.

^{xli} Markov / Howard “Negro Art,” 84.

^{xlii} *Ibid.*, 108.

^{xliii} Yves Alain Bois notes that Markov’s understanding of “metaphoric displacement” was at the heart of Cubism. Yves Alain Bois, *Painting as Model*, (Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1990), 82-83.

^{xliv} Markov / Howard, “Negro Art,” 110.

^{xlv} *Ibid.*, 108.

^{xlvi} “Vladimir Markov (V.I. Matvey) *Iskusstvo Negrov*, with a Memoir by Varvara Bubnova and Foreword by Levkiy Zheverzheev.” Translated by Jeremy Howard. Annotated by Z.S. Strother and Jeremy Howard in *Vladimir Markov and Russian Primitivism: A Charter for the Avant-Garde*, Jeremy Howard, Irēna Bužinska and Z.S. Strother, (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2015), 217-251.

^{xlvii} Markov / Howard, “Negro Art,” 115.

^{xlviii} Dmitri Olderogge, *The Art of Africa: Negro Art from the Institute of Ethnography, Leningrad*. (London: Paul Hamlyn, 1969), 9.

^{xlix} Olderogge had participated in the volume that Potekhin edited in 1951 that accused Anglo-American Africanists of imperialism (see note iii). He later confessed shame to participating in this volume, and was known for engaging Western scholarship, even when his colleagues spurned it. See Peter Skalnik, “Social Anthropology: Smuggling ‘Biased’ Knowledge around the World” in *De Palerme À Penang: Un Itinéraire en Anthropologie Politique*, ed. Francois Ruegg, Christian Giordano, Andrea Boscoboinik, (Munster: LIT Verlag, 2001), 351-364. See also Dmitri M. Bondarenko and Vladimir A. Popov, “Dmitri Olderogge and his place in the history of Russian African anthropology. Review Article: Kochakova, Natalia B. (ed.). 2002. *Ethnologica Africana. In memory of Dmitri Alexeyevich Olderogge* (in Russia, with English summaries). Moscow: Muravei. 384 pp. No price given. ISBN: 5 89737 129 6.” *Social Anthropology*, 13, no. 2 (2005): 215-220.

^l “Vladimir Markov (V.I. Matvey), On the ‘Principle of Weightiness’ in African Sculpture.” Translated by Jeremy Howard. Annotated by Jeremy Howard and Z.S. Strother. With a note on authorship by Z.S. Strother and Irēna Bužinska, in *Markov and Russian Primitivism*, 5

^{li} Z.S. Strother, Irēna Bužinska and Jeremy Howard, “Introduction to Matvejs, Markov and ‘Primitivism’” in *Markov and Russian Primitivism*, 253-269.

^{lii} See V. B. Mirimanov and G. A. Chernova, *Iskusstvo Afriki*, (Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1964).

^{liii} Galina Chernova, “The Evolution of R. Linton’s Views on African Art,” in Korostovtsev (ed.), *Essays*, 165.

^{liv} “Plenary Session,” 36

^{lv} E.A. Veselkin, “The African Personality,” in Korostovtsev (ed.), *Essays*, 83.

^{lvi} Chernova in Korostovtsev (ed.), *Essays*, 164.

^{lvii} *Ibid.*, 165.

^{lviii} *Ibid.*, 168.

^{lix} J.B. Osaga Odak, "Book review: *Problems of Cultural Development (Construction) in Independent African Countries*, Moscow: Nauka Publishers, Central Department for Oriental Literatures, 1971 (in Russian). 231 pp. Price 1 rouble 8 kopek." *East African Journal*, 9, no. 6, (June 1972): 32-35.

^{lx} See Emilia A. Ilieva, "Africa in Slavonic scholarship: the case of African art and African literature," in *Africa in World Affairs: Challenges to the Humanities*, ed. Edward Wamala, Aaron Mushengyenzi, Susan Kiguli and Ahmed Kaggwa, (Kampala: Makerere University, 2004), 207-214. It is notable that the only English language bibliographic reference to Borisovich's work, and Soviet African art history in general, comes from a conference held in Kenya in March 1997.

^{lxi} Alex Miller (trans.) "Summary: African Art. Typology. System. Evolution." in V.B. Mirimanov, *Iskusstvo Tropskoeskoj Afriki: Tipologija, Sistematika, Ėvoljucija*, (Moscow: Moskva Iskusstvo, 1986), 288.

^{lxii} *Ibid.*, 291

^{lxiii} See Miramanov's table detailing these stages. *Ibid.*, 294.

^{lxiv} *Ibid.*, 295.

^{lxv} "Deformation" does not denote distortion but merely "stylization." *Ibid.*, 295-6.

^{lxvi} *Ibid.*, 296.

^{lxvii} Anatoly A. Gromyko, "The Traditional Art of Tropical Africa," *Narody Asii I Afriki (Peoples of Asia and Africa)*, no. 3, 1983. Reprinted in *Africa in Soviet Studies: Annual 1985*, USSR

Academy of Sciences Institute of African Studies, (Moscow: Nauka Publishers, Central Department of Oriental Literatures, 1985), 131.

^{lxviii} In 1987, for example, Mirimanov apparently presented a paper “The Formation of Urban Artistic Culture in the Countries of Sub-Saharan Africa” at the Moscow Conference on the Study of Cultural Features in Developing States. It is mentioned in A.G. Cheremin and N.N. Zarubina, “The International Conference: Cultural Progress in the Developing Countries,” *Narodii Asii I Afriki*, no. 3, May-June 1987, pp. 124-131. English summary of the latter in *JPRS Report, Soviet Union Peoples of Asia & Africa No 3, May-June 1987*, (Arlington: Joint Publications Research Service, 1987), last accessed September 14 2017, <http://www.dtic.mil/docs/citations/ADA371449>.

^{lxix} Fagg and Plass, “African Sculpture,” 6.

^{lxx} Gromyko, “Traditional Art,” 120.

^{lxxi} Mirimanov particularly praises contemporary artists who utilize traditional elements in innovative ways, arguing that to wish to restore “lost” traditions is a futile and regressive endeavor. See Mirimanov, *Iskusstvo Tropičeskoj Afriki*, 297.

^{lxxii} For example, see Ulli Beier, *Contemporary Art in Africa*, (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968), 15.

^{lxxiii} Personal correspondence with Bekele Mekonnen, former director of the School of Fine Arts, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia, June 20 2009.

^{lxxiv} Bekele’s experiences resonate with some of those detailed in Maxim Matusевич, “Probing the Limits of Internationalism: African Students Confront Soviet Ritual,” *Anthropology of East Europe Review* 27, no. 2, (Fall, 2009): 19-39.

^{lxxv} For more information see Kate Cowcher, “From Pushkin to Perestroika: Art and the Search for an Ethiopian October,” in *Red Africa: Affective Communities and the Cold War*, ed. Mark Nash, (London: Black Dog Publishing, 2016), 53-67.

^{lxxvi} A quotation from the 1962 State Department’s *Guidelines for Policy and Operations in Africa* in Pearl T. Robinson, “Area Studies in Search of Africa” in *The Study of Africa, Volume 2*, ed. Zeleza, 235-276.

^{lxxvii} See Melville J. Herskovits, “Negro Art: African and American,” *Social Forces*, 5, no. 2 (Dec. 1926): 291-298 and Melville J. Herskovits, “African Art from an Ivory Tower,” *The Arts*, 4, Oct. 1926: 241-243, accessed 20 April 2018.

<https://www.africanstudies.northwestern.edu/docs/publications-research/working-papers/cordwell-2011.pdf>

^{lxxviii} Jean Cordwell, “Melville Herskovits and the Visual Arts,” *Program of African Studies Working Paper, Northwestern University*, No. 20: 19

^{lxxix} Alain Locke, “The Legacy of Ancestral Arts” in Alain Locke, ed., *The New Negro: Voices from the Harlem Renaissance* (New York: Albert & Charles Boni, Inc, 1925), 254-270.

^{lxxx} Emilie A. Newcomb, “Introduction” in Margaret Danner, *Impressions of African Art Forms in the Poetry of Margaret Danner*, (Michigan: Broadside Press, 1960), n.p.

^{lxxxi} *Ibid.*, n.p.

^{lxxxii} James A. Porter, “Review: *African Art / L’Art Negre* by Presence Africaine; *African Sculpture Speaks* by Ladislav Segy.” *The Journal of Negro Education* 22, no. 1, (Winter, 1953): 46-50.

^{lxxxiii} Julie L. McGee, *David C. Driskell: Artist And Scholar* (San Francisco: Pomegranate, 2006), 31-2.

^{lxxxiv} Alioune Diop, "Introduction" in *Africa from the Point of View of American Negro Scholars*, American Society for African Culture, (Dijon: Presence Africaine, 1958), xii.

^{lxxxv} See Hugh Wilford. *Mighty Wurlitzer: How the CIA Played America*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008), 230-257.

^{lxxxvi} Hoyt W. Fuller, "World Festival of Negro Arts: Senegal Fete Illustrates Philosophy of 'Negritude,'" *Ebony*, July, 1966: 9-99, 102.

^{lxxxvii} Robinson, "Area Studies in search of Africa," 252

^{lxxxviii} AMSAC organized such events as "Negro Culture in Africa and the Americas" which offered opportunities for Africans to enjoy music and art by African Americans. See Wilford, *Mighty Wurlitzer*, 210-215.

^{lxxxix} John C. Walter, "The Harmon Foundation and the Sponsorship of Contemporary African Artists, 1947-67," *Contours: A Journal of the African diaspora* (Champaign, IL) 1, no. 2, fall 2003.

^{xc} Ibid.

^{xci} Doran H. Ross and Roy Sieber, "Interview with Roy Sieber," *African Arts* 25, no. 4, 100th Issue (Oct., 1992): 36.

^{xcii} Jane Guyer made the case in 1996 that African Studies had a much longer pedigree than simply Cold War expediency. See Jane I. Guyer, *African Studies in the United States: A Perspective* (Atlanta: African Studies Association Press, 1996). The Cold War-dominated narrative of African Studies' development in the United States also fails to take into account the historic African American research conducted in the earlier twentieth century. See William G. Martin and Michael O. West, "The Ascent, Triumph and Disintegration of the Africanist Enterprise, USA" in *Out of One, Many Africas: Reconstructing the Study and Meaning of Africa*,

ed. William G. Martin and Michael O. West, (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1999), 85-122. See Robinson, "Area Studies in search of Africa," for discussion of how the Cold War impacted, and disenfranchised African American scholars.

^{xciii} Martin and Michael, "Africanist Enterprise," 91-2.

^{xciv} John F. Kennedy, "Telegraph from President John F. Kennedy to the President of the African Studies Association, October 12, 1962," *African Studies Bulletin* 5, no. 4, Report of the Fifth Annual Meeting of the African Studies Association (Dec., 1962): 1.

^{xcv} Ross and Sieber, "Interview," 39.

^{xcvi} Donald J. Cosentino and Robert Farris Thompson, "Interview with Robert Farris Thompson," *African Arts* 25, no. 4, 100th Issue (Oct., 1992), 55.

^{xcvii} Henry John Drewal, "Signs of Time, Shapes of Thought: The Contribution of Art History and Visual Culture to Historical Methods in Africa" in *Writing African History*, ed. John Edward Philips, (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2005), 336.

^{xcviii} Robinson, "Africa," 253.

^{xcix} d'Azevedo notes that the 1961 ASA meeting included just one panel on "Art, Literature and Music" out of seventeen other panels, largely focused on politics and engineering. Warren d'Azevedo, "Preface to the Midland Edition" in *The Traditional Artist in African Societies*, ed. Warren d'Azevedo, First Midland Book Edition, (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1989), xvi.

^c Richard A Long quoted in Ezio Bassani, "Kongo Nail Fetishes from the Chiloango River Area," *African Arts* 10, no. 3, (Apr., 1977): 36.

^{ci} Ross and Sieber, "Interview," 39.

^{cii} *Ibid.*, 46.

^{ciii} “Remarks of the President on the signing of the Peace Corps Bill (H.R. 7500),” Office of the White House Press Secretary, 22 September 1961, accessed September 15 2017,

<https://www.jfklibrary.org/Asset-Viewer/Archives/JFKPOF-035-045.aspx>

^{civ} Shriver insisted that the world was “no longer divided into just two armed camps: Soviet Communism and the West” but into other north-south divisions of inequality. See Sargent Shriver, *The Point of the Lance*, (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc. 1964), 8.

^{cv} See Elizabeth Cobbs-Hoffman, *All You Need is Love: The Peace Corps and the Spirit of the 1960s* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), 205-206.

^{cvi} Maurice L. Albertson, Andrew E. Rice and Pauline E. Birky, *New Frontiers for American Youth: Perspective on the Peace Corps*, (Washington: Public Affair Press, 1961), 81.

^{cvii} Interview with Thomas K. Seligman, San Francisco, September 12, 2012.

^{cviii} Cobbs-Hoffman, “All You Need is Love,” 89-120.

^{cix} *Ibid.*, 80

^{cx} *Ibid.*, 97.

^{cxii} One notable exception to this model, detailed by Cobbs-Hoffman, occurred in 1963 when Nkrumah invited Russian as well as American volunteers to Ghana. Peace Corps staff were concerned, and kept a close eye on Russian volunteering efforts. The latter were hampered by a lack of English language skills and the Americans proved more popular in the field. The Russians were pulled out in 1966. See Cobbs-Hoffman, “All You Need is Love,” 162-3.

^{cxiii} When *The Ugly American* was first published in 1958 it immediately caused a stir. In January 1959 a group including the Senator John. F. Kennedy, Senator Clair Eagle, Bishop James A. Pike and Morris L. Ernst sent a copy to every member of the US Senate. William J. Lederer and Eugene Burdick, *The Ugly American*, (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1958).

^{cxiii} See Christopher Steiner, *African Art in Transit*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 7; Christraud M. Geary, “On Collectors, Exhibitions, and Photographs of African Art: The Teel Collection in Historical Perspective” in *Art of the Senses: African Masterpieces from the Teel Collection*, ed. Suzanne Preston Blier, (Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 2004), 36.

^{cxiv} Personal correspondence with Gary Collins, March 20, 2011.

^{cxv} Naturally many of the volunteers did not have skills in connoisseurship to differentiate between fine, historic works and more recent market-bound replicas. Many brought home works that might be considered “tourist art,” although several did bring important objects back the US. Christraud Geary has done considerable research in this area.

^{cxvi} Personal communication with Christopher Roy, September 22, 2012.

^{cxvii} Christopher D. Roy, *Mossi Masks and Crests*, (Ph.D. Thesis: University of Indiana, 1979).

^{cxviii} Rosalyn Adele Walker, “Remembering Roy Sieber (1923-2001),” *African Arts* 50, 3 (Autumn 2017): 22-29

^{cxix} Harris Wofford, “The Future of the Peace Corps,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 365, The Peace Corps (May, 1966), 129.

^{cxx} Interview with Thomas K. Seligman, September 20, 2012.

^{cxxi} For more on Drewal’s concept of “sensiotics” see Henry Drewal, “Senses in Understandings of Art), *African Arts* 38, no. 2 (2005): 1, 4, 6, 88 + 96.

^{cxxii} Suzanne Preston Blier, “Autobiography and art history: The imperative of peripheral vision,” *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics*, no. 39, (Spring 2001): 26

^{cxxiii} Suzanne Preston Blier, “Words about Words about Icons: Iconology and the Study of African Art,” *Art Journal* 47, no. 2, (Summer, 1988): 75-87.

^{cxxiv} Suzanne Preston Blier, *The Architecture of the Tamberma (Togo)*, (Ph.D. Thesis: Columbia University, 1981). This thesis was the basis for Blier's book, Suzanne Preston Blier, *The Anatomy of Architecture: Ontology and Metaphor in Batammaliba Architectural Expression* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987).

^{cxxv} Details on language training for Peace Corps' volunteers are given in Albertson, Rice and Birky, "New Frontiers," 81-3. See also, John L. Landgraf, "Aspects of Anthropology and Language Study in the Peace Corps," *The Modern Language Journal* 47, no. 7, (November, 1963): 305.

^{cxxvii} See 9 Charles Quist-Adade, "The African Russians: Children of the Cold War" in *Africa in Russia, Russia in Africa: Three Centuries of Encounter*, ed. Maxim Matusevich, (Trenton, : African World Press, Inc. 2007), 154–173.

^{cxxviii} Fred Lamp, "Africa Centered," *African Arts* 32, no. 1, Special Issue: Authorship in African Art, Part 2 (Spring, 1999): pp. 1, 4, 6, 8-10. See also "Replies to Fred Lamp," *African Arts* 32, no. 2, (Summer, 1999): pp. 9-10, 85-87.

^{cxxix} For other examples of these debates see Clive Kellner, "Notes from Down South: Towards Defining Contemporary African Practice" in *Africa Remix: Contemporary Art of a Continent*, ed. Simon Njami and Lucy Duran, (London: Hayward Gallery, 2005), 22-25; Salah Hassan, "African Modernism: Beyond Alternative Modernities Discourse," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 109, no. 3. (Summer, 2010): 451-473; Mary (Polly) Nooter Roberts, "Tradition Is Always Now: African Arts and the Curatorial Turn," *African Arts* 45, no. 1, (Spring, 2012): 1, 4-7.

^{cxxx} Observations made during fieldwork in Addis Ababa (2013-14).