The Chairman, Professor Leland Goodrich, opened the meeting by introducing the speaker for the evening, Dr. Z. K. Matthews, remarking that he was free to talk of anything he wished to, whether strictly in line with the announced topic or not.

Dr. Matthews began by saying that when he saw that he was expected to speak on an African "concept of peace" he felt like not coming and sending an apology to the members -- he had never considered precisely what the term "peace" meant to various Africans before. It might well prove interesting though to examine what its meanings were in African languages where the term appears. In the Basuto tongue, for example, the word means "co-existence" - a living together without friction. One famous native chief was an exponent of the idea to a high degree. As soon as an enemy was defeated he then set him up again with no thought of reparations. In another tongue, peace means "ready to forgive" and embodies the concept of people living in harmony with one another. The concept might be worked out in time on this basis -- there are others working on primitive man as a philosopher, however.

It seems important at the present time to consider peace in a different sense and to see the relation between Africa and world peace. Frequent and varied contacts with Africans show how they consider the concept of world peace. There has been considerable propaganda in Africa making use of the term. There have been invitations to "peace" rallies. There has been much discussion of it.

In talk about peace in the western world, it seems that consideration of what the African thinks, of what he is apt to do, of what his reactions are to the idea are often overlooked. Africa has a strategic place in the world today. Supplies and war materials are obtained there; various kinds of bases are being built. Strategic railways and supply dumps are being planned and built. The Cape route to the East is even more important now that difficulties are being encountered with the Suez. There is fear that Africa might fall to the Russians. There's a great deal of interest in Africa as a place and in its potentialities - but not in the hopes of the people or of their place in the world.

They will be an important factor though in the maintenance of peace and in the prevention of war for several reasons. First, because of the number of people involved. Their exact number is unknown since vital statistics have been badly kept under administering powers, but it is estimated at about one hundred eighty to two hundred millions. Secondly, we know that tensions are developing on that continent which may have an important effect on peace. It is the last large area subject to colonialism, and in particular, the rise of new nations in the East has stimulated national consciousness in Africa and has caused problems for the colonial powers.

An African, if asked, will generally say that "there is no peace in Africa". There is war there all the time -- the continent is "out of world peace". In every territory there is constant warfare between the indigenous peoples and the constituted authorities. The people feel that they are in the struggle for peace all the time. It is difficult to get even temporary peace. A variety of factors leads to this sense of constant war.

1.   There are so few areas on the continent where the people determine their own destinies. There are only four independent areas and it is doubtful if they have full independence. Liberia, for example, is thought by many to be only a colony of the United States or perhaps of American capital. Abyssinia is felt to be

under the thumb of Great Britain. Egyptians don't believe that they are fully sovereign while English troops remain there. Even in the Union of South Africa part of the ruling population doesn't feel that it is fully independent while in the Commonwealth. Most Africans then don't feel that they have the right to determine their own destinies.

There exists, it is true, a cogent argument that many of these peoples are not in a position to be independent. It is brought constantly to their attention that they lack knowledge of modern government and that it would not be safe to stand alone, since, if they were not under their present rulers, others would move in and dominate. These positions are not necessarily accepted by the people, however, largely because in many areas they can see that there is no preparation being made to help them to guide themselves. In many territories, there is no opportunity even for small-scale training in managing their own affairs. It is like a parent who never gives a child a chance to try something for itself. The African peoples are not children, it must be remembered -- they had their own political institutions before they were conquered, many of which were worthy of respect. The dual problems of foreign rule and lack of preparation for self-government result in constant friction.

2. There is great tension due to this clash of political institutions but also due to cultural conflicts as well. There is, for example, a big problem of language in Africa -- there exist a huge number of tongues. Many belong to larger families but their languages are usually unintelligible to each other. In asking for self-government, the Africans themselves are divided by this barrier. In the Union of South Africa, there are four main African languages spoken by the eight and a half millions of Africans. It is difficult, as a consequence, for leaders to arouse a sense of unity. An effective leader must be a linguist and be able to address a meeting in any of the tongues. The language difficulty thus causes friction between a government and its people and among the people themselves. Of course this happens between white and white too. There are significant tensions between the English and the Dutch -- the English don't like to learn Dutch, feeling that the reverse should be the case, and this is increasingly a sore point. This barrier stands everywhere in the way of harmonious relations.

3. There is further a tremendous problem of ignorance and a need for education throughout the continent. Governments have paid too little attention to this problem. They have been concerned only with law and order, and have left education far too much in the hands of the churches. The churches have built up the systems but they all have a certain character. Since it is cheaper, and since the churches have little money, a literary type of education has developed with little or no emphasis on technology which is badly needed.

It is very important for better understanding between governments and their people that educational scope be broadened. Many worth-while governmental schemes have fallen down due to a lack of understanding of what is meant. Soil erosion, for example, is a very basic problem but attempts to deal with it have often been unfruitful because too little educational work has been done among the people. Some territories do have literacy programs today and governments are beginning to see the need for raising the level of education.

4. Economic development has much to do with the serious problem of social disintegration in Africa. The exploitation of natural resources and the consequent need for the use of native labor has led to the break-up of old social patterns and to the spectacle of "men moving in all directions". Industrialists have been

combing native reservations for laborers who are then herded into compounds and completely separated from their families. The breaking up of family life has led to further tensions and greatly increased problems of crime, especially among juveniles, and of illegitimacy, prostitution and increase of venereal disease. The industrialist wants the African worker but not his family. There is no wholesome social life of which the family is the especial foundation.

5. The health problem is also connected with the withdrawal of large numbers of men from the tribal areas. It has seriously affected food production for one thing and has led to an increase in malnutrition and in preventable diseases.

In the industrial compounds, it has become obvious that the physique of the new workers has deteriorated over the years and the new employees often have to be fed and built up for a period before they are really ready for work. The people are becoming poorer and poorer despite the industrialization. There has been an effect both on health and on the African's outlook on life.

6. There is additionally a big problem of land hunger. Much of the land is now government land and is given as concessions to industry and to settlers. The shortage of land is a big factor in native discontent as can be seen in the Kenya disturbances which are a result of this land hunger.

There has been a great deal of political agitation all over Africa. With the spread of education and of the mobility of the people, ideas are spread and exchanged faster. There is a greater questioning of events in Africa and nationalisms are rising.

Governments are dealing with the problems in different ways. Each has a "policy" for the territories under its administration however. England, for example, claims that it will grant self-government and has made a start in West Africa. There are some movements in East Africa too and there is some representation being given to Africans in the proposed Central African federation. There are thus attempts to deal with some of the problems but the people don't feel that these proposals are coming fast enough and are suspicious of their ultimate fulfillment. The rise of political organizations like the Kenya African Union and various national conferences are all part of the increasing demand for more rapid progress to self-government.

What will the peoples do in the event of a third World War? In World War I, the African people responded enthusiastically to calls to the service of the colonial governments. They fought "for king and country". They were not so enthusiastic in World War II however -- in some territories, recruiting didn't go well at all. Why, the people asked, should they take part in wars when they were not really a part of the countries which were fighting. They had no country to be loyal to.

In the future, an even greater apathy will exist. If asked to "fight for democracy", the Africans will answer that they should be given a little at home first. Communism has not yet been successful in Africa despite the existence of parties there, but may well be. Those who do not wish to see this happen might well take an interest in the removal of those factors leading to uneasiness.

It was surprising, for example, that Eisenhower's inaugural had no word about Africa in it at all. This was unwise -- the message was eagerly read all over Africa. People there are wondering what line will be taken. So far, the industrialists and Wall Street seem more interested in the continent than does Washington.

The African people are apprehensive of the part Washington will play in African events. Africa will have to play a bigger part in American policy in the future. After all, intervention may be needed there. Wisdom and intelligence are called for.

It is true that the United States is in a difficult position. Its NATO Allies are those who are largely responsible for these very tensions but the U. S. has also said that it is interested in "enslaved" peoples. The Africans are looking on with hope and with fear as to what will happen.

A member opened the general discussion by referring to the speaker's comments with regard to the strategic interests of the United States in Africa and its raw materials and said that he himself had worked with government plans. It is true that strong pressures exist to open new sources of supply, etc., but it seems wrong to come in directly merely to grab. Our program must convince the Africans that their welfare comes first -- all other things will come from the decent relationship to be established between the United States and the Africans.

The speaker remarked that several related things would get rid of the fear and suspicion in the African mind. For example, a broad educational program should be encouraged. The administering governments feel that they don't have enough money for such programs -- perhaps the United States might assist in this field.

The member who had previously spoken continued by saying that the question of education focused attention on another dilemma. The United States must work through the metropolitan areas. The colonial offices of these powers have been informed that the United States would help with education but in each instance we have been told that such aid was not at all needed. How can we get over this hurdle?

The speaker replied that these colonial governments give this excuse due to their wounded pride. The need for educational improvement exists though -- they can't cope with the problem. In every territory, the major burden is on the churches. African demand for education, however, has been so great, even without a compulsory system, that the churches have been overwhelmed. Perhaps the United States could aid the missions.

A member suggested that at present there was no way to do that and asked what the effect of a change of American legislation would mean. Another member interposed that the colonial powers would protest that this meant moving too rapidly but the first member noted that that was always their line. He asked again how valuable this kind of an approach might be -- that is, the planning for an over-all area -- an improvement of roads, railways, etc., rather than the planning for a single project like a mine.

The speaker replied that any broadening, especially for the benefit of the country rather than for that of the administering power would be welcomed. In education, aid could be given for institutions of higher learning. None of the countries has enough money for good colleges. They say they are willing to lay the foundations and provide for secondary education later, etc. Experience seems to show though that the establishment of a college greatly stimulates a whole educational system. The U. S. has done work in the Far East, in China and elsewhere. American foundations might now turn to Africa. Then too, some might be impressed by the idea that the more institutions that exist in Africa, the less the people will come out.

One member agreed that Ford might better set up a college there than to bring Africans here or send Americans there. Ford seems to have discovered Africa. Another then asked what had happened to the Stettinius plans for Africa, and the speaker answered that the program was still going on though it was in different hands and was receiving little publicity. Another member noted too that a UNESCO special fund had been planned for fundamental education centers and that two had been set up in Mexico and Africa. The fund was short on cash, however -- perhaps the United States could go through this approach even if it didn't want to increase its share of UNESCO's budget.

A member next asked whether, in the tribal mind, the concept "peace" was regarded as a normal or abnormal situation. The speaker replied that peace was normal in the view of tribal societies. Where individuals have quarrels, it is regarded as a bad thing for the dispute to remain unsettled. It is felt to produce bad effects on the relatives of those involved and even on the group.

Of course some tribes like the Zulus are more warlike than others though this is usually due to their having had a warlike leader in the fairly recent past. Peace is a normal tradition, however.

The same member asked whether methods for peaceful settlement of disputes existed and whether war outside of Africa was regarded as normal, as revolting, etc. The speaker answered that, on the first point, the tribes generally had negotiators who acted in disputes between tribes but that the subject had not been specifically studied. On the second, he said that in general white people were regarded as very quarrelsome. The Africans ask why the whites can't have peace at home when they insist on it elsewhere.

A member commented that once a colonial power entered a country, its primary need was for law and order. If they worked only on native welfare, they would only be tossed out when the job was done. The speaker objected that law and order were already well established -- it is time for the governments to do other things. In many countries, departments are now being changed from "Native Affairs" which meant only law and order to "National Development". Further, law and order would be improved by a higher standard of living as between white and black too.

A member next asked whether there wasn't a real danger that the introduction of educational systems from Europe or America into the tribal situation might prove disintegrative too. Attempts by Europeans or Americans to go into different cultures and introduce normative processes might prove bad. It is very difficult to get Americans or Europeans in tune to the local culture so that they would be non-destructive of what is already there. It is also true that those taken out of the tribe and schooled elsewhere are often no better as teachers at home than outsiders. They often absorb a different culture elsewhere and don't even want to go back.

The speaker agreed that it was hard to introduce educational programs with intelligence. It has often been done badly -- frequently by those who insisted on proceeding as if African cultures had been wiped out and a new start was needed. Much progress has been made though in this direction and a precise copy of the West is no longer desired in the educational system.

It is true that in the past, especially under the missions, people were taken out of their environment and schooled away from their homes. This old approach is on the decline -- schools today are being set up in the midst of the

villages and rural education is being developed. Education should be related to the life of the community and the modern school differs from the old. The more use of Africans, the better!

A member than turned to the subject of literacy and inquired whether written native languages existed or whether it was necessary for the Africans to learn a foreign tongue. The speaker replied that written languages were being developed and that it was not necessary to learn English first, for example. Another member said however that it was a common experience that where a native population learned reading and writing for only two or three years in school, the people could barely read and write. Their design of life doesn't require literacy since they see no papers or books and the learning is unusable as there is no follow-up. Literacy is important only in an environment where it is needed daily. The speaker added that though this might have been true in the past, the situation was rapidly changing in Africa. The ability to read and write was used widely. Letters were sent and newspapers printed in many tribal languages. The modern means of rapid transportation had changed many things.

A member continued by asking whether education shouldn't concentrate on agriculture. After all, the African spends much time in agriculture which stands in great need of improvement on that continent. Education, as in India, might concern itself with an improved agriculture rather than purely with literacy which may not even be necessary for teaching agricultural methods. The speaker remarked that literacy was regarded mainly as a tool. Without being literate, the African would remain dependent on others whatever else he learned. Give a man a tool and let him improve himself by use of it. Agricultural education is certainly needed -- but the other is too.

A member next asked whether the fact that there had been no breakdown of social life in North Africa was due to the circumstance that the North was Islamic and the rest pagan and, further, whether the type of artificial community tried by the Belgians in Africa where families were brought together in a settlement but without a tribal community were successful. The speaker answered that the breakdown of social life was not due to religion but to the concentration of economic life on certain spheres such as mining which required the bringing of large numbers of workers from their homes to the point where work was to be done. Only men were moved and families were thus broken up. There would be no breakdown if development took place where the families are as in agricultural development. Migration is possible and desirable but by family, not by person. Although he had not seen the Belgian experiment, it might be a solution -- such communities would not remain artificial for long.

Another member queried whether tribal traditions could "migrate". In North Africa, Islam was largely the same everywhere. Could a tribesman carry his religion with him? The speaker felt that he could and that the undermining of social life was due only to the absence of family life and to the constant moving back and forth of the workers. Villages consisting solely of women and children or of men are unhealthy for all.

A member asked too whether it wasn't a tribal custom as well as the demands of the industrialists that caused the men to go off alone -- that is, the requirement that a young man earn enough money to buy a wife. The speaker denied that this was so, saying that marriage statistics showed that this was not the motivation. For one thing, migrant laborers didn't earn enough to come back and buy a wife. They marry without the payment. The payment is largely a fiction in the anthropology books and not in the lives of the people.

A member next inquired as to what the impact of the economic systems of the West had been and what principles should now be followed to obtain African cooperation. Will Africa be lost if the old policies are followed? Is there any creative thinking in the West? Should investment income be limited, etc.? The speaker answered that in the old method of economic development, stress was on what would be taken out of Africa for the benefit of other areas. The change must be to what can be done for the area itself. Both Africa and the rest of the world can be benefitted simultaneously under the concept of the dual mandate which takes account of both the needs of the people and the needs of the outside world. Stress has been on the latter until now and a change is in order. Thus far, there does not seem to be much thinking except along the old pattern.

Another member noted that it has been said that the only solution is to give Africans control over their own affairs. That problem of course varies. Two of the questions suggested are: 1) Chiefly with regard to West Central Africa, to what extent is political development stunted by fragmentization and division among diverse colonial powers? and 2) How can self-government be worked out where a white minority exists?

The speaker replied that unification of the split territories was definitely indicated and that, in principle, he agreed with the federation of central African territories. Federation must start within the territories of the metropolitan power but those powers can and should coöperate even now for the wider benefit of Africa. Some joint work is now being started in medical research, soil erosion, etc.

The difficulties of self-government are not insuperable. The problem of the whites differs by area, of course. In some, there is a large, settled population. In others there is none. It is possible to work for equal rights even in South Africa. Self-government there is argued for on a basis of apartheid which has the support of the Dutch Reformed Church. Many want a united South Africa with black and white on equal terms but the present rulers believe this "would not be to the whites' advantage".

In other territories, the problem is serious though less acute. Who is to get self-government and in what proportion, remain unanswered.

A member then asked whether South Africa was planning a white empire in Africa and also whether Trust Territories should be incorporated in territories to which they are adjacent. On the first point, the speaker believed that there was no danger of South Africa consolidating a white empire. It would be satisfied by incorporating South West Africa and the small adjacent territories. The upper territories must ultimately come together though there is a danger of the type of thing which is going on in South Africa. The white population is probably overwhelmingly too small however.

On the second point, the Trust Territories should be amalgamated. A separate trust regime is not sufficiently advantageous to keep them from this natural consolidation.

A member next remarked that, in the long run, the principle of absolute separation of peoples in a country breaks down. Wisdom says that nature should be permitted to take its course. Work should be done for political equality -- separation has never succeeded.

- 8 -

Another member asked whether trusteeship had real advantages and the speaker answered that it did. Through it, the attention of world opinion can be directed to the territories and the administering powers are really very sensitive to world opinion. Another asked what the basis for the Dutch Reformed Church's stand on apartheid was and the speaker replied that the theory was ostensibly based on theology -- the will of God is that the people should be separate -- but the real reason is simply that apartheid pays. It is a form of special pleading, supported by their university professors too. If it should cease to pay, it will lose its support.

To a last question on the influence of the Ghandian movement on apartheid, the speaker responded that the Africans were attempting to conduct a passive resistance, supported by the Indians and by some elements of the white population. It was the only policy possible however, since they were unarmed and would be slaughtered for active resistance. There were however some elements which were also convinced followers of Ghandi too.

Members present: Dillenberger, Finkelstein, Goodrich, Graff, Hazard, Lerner, Lissitzyn, Mackie, Matthews, Orchard, Staines, Tannenbaum, Taubenfeld, Van Wagenen, Vickrey, Wengler. Professor Iversen attended as a guest.