

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

The African e-Journals Project has digitized full text of articles of eleven social science and humanities journals. This item is from the digital archive maintained by Michigan State University Library. Find more at:

<http://digital.lib.msu.edu/projects/africanjournals/>

Available through a partnership with



Scroll down to read the article.

PHELPS-STOKESISM AND EDUCATION IN ZIMBABWE*

R.J. CHALLISS

Department of History, University of Zimbabwe

THE MAIN AIM of this article is to consider the impact of certain important external influences on the formulation of educational policy in Zimbabwe, which most historians have tended to overlook, with the result that educational policy in Zimbabwe has not always been informed by reliable historical perspectives.¹

The term 'Phelps-Stokesism' is derived from the name of a fund bequeathed in 1909 an American heiress, Miss Caroline Phelps-Stokes, for the welfare of Blacks in the United States and Africa². In 1912 the Phelps-Stokes Trustees, decided that a sociologist, Dr Thomas Jesse Jones, with the co-operation of the United States Bureau of Education, should undertake extensive studies of educational facilities for Blacks in the United States.³ After the First World War, in co-operation with the Imperial Government and British and American missionary and philanthropic bodies, the Phelps-Stokes Commissions, under the chairmanship of Jones, undertook similar investigations in Africa.⁴ In 1925 the recommendations of the Phelps-Stokes Commissions were officially endorsed by the Imperial Government as the basis of a racially differentiated educational policy in all British colonies.⁵ However, the policy had been officially adopted already in Zimbabwe by 1921 under the regime of the British South Africa Company.⁶

*This is an edited version of a paper delivered to the Conference on Zimbabwe History: Progress and Development, University of Zimbabwe, 1982.

¹See generally, R.J. Challiss, 'Education planning for Zimbabwe: The problem of unreliable historical perspectives', *Zambezia* (1979), VII, 215-41.

²The most thorough historical study of Phelps-Stokesism is by K.J. King, *Pan-Africanism and Education. A Study of Race Philanthropy and Education in the Southern States of America and East Africa* (Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1971); the Phelps-Stokes family had for long interested itself in the welfare of Black Americans, and from 1890 onwards the institution founded by Booker T. Washington at Tuskegee, Alabama, in 1881 received generous endowments from the heiresses Olivia and Caroline Phelps-Stokes, L.R. Harlan, *Booker T. Washington: The Making of a Black Leader* (New York, Oxford Univ. Press, 1972), 196-7.

³King, *Pan-Africanism and Education*, 33.

⁴L.J. Lewis (ed.), *Phelps-Stokes Reports on Education in Africa. Abridged with an Introduction by L.J. Lewis* (London, Oxford Univ. Press, 1962), 1-11; see also, Phelps-Stokes Fund, *Education in Africa: A Study of West, South, and Equatorial Africa by the African Education Commission, under the Auspices of the Phelps-Stokes Fund and Foreign Mission Societies of North America and Europe: Report Prepared by Thomas Jesse Jones, Chairman of the Commission* (New York, Phelps-Stokes Fund, [1922]); and Phelps-Stokes Fund, *Education in East Africa: A Study of East, Central and South Africa by the Second African Education Commission under the Auspices of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, in Co-operation with the International Education Board: Report Prepared by Thomas Jesse Jones, Chairman of the Commission* (New York, Phelps-Stokes Fund, 1925).

⁵King, *Pan-Africanism and Education*, 99; L.J. Lewis, *Education and Political Independence in Africa and Other Essays* (Edinburgh, Thomas Nelson, 1962), 86-7.

⁶R.J. Challiss, 'The Foundation of the Racially Segregated Education System in Southern Rhodesia, 1890-1923, with Special Reference to the Education of Africans' (Salisbury, Univ. of Zimbabwe, D. Phil. thesis, 1982), chs 4, 5, *passim*; *The European Educational System in Southern Rhodesia, 1890-1930* (Salisbury, Univ. of Zimbabwe, Supplement to *Zambezia*, 1982), 101-8.

The racially segregated and differentiated educational policy, which Jones and his associates advocated for adoption in America and Africa alike, was derived from a strategy devised by Booker T. Washington to deal with the rising tide of racial friction that afflicted the United States in the late nineteenth century.⁷ This racial tension arose mainly from White reaction to the emancipation of Blacks after the Civil War and clashes between Black and White workers during the American industrial revolution.⁸ To curb clashes and ameliorate race relations generally Booker Washington advocated a rurally orientated education for Blacks that was very different from conventional Western education. The aim of this racially differentiated education was to encourage Blacks to remain rurally based and thereby avoid clashes with Whites in cities and industrial centres.⁹ The education combined literary with practical vocational training designed to develop self-reliance and self-respect amongst Southern Black communities. By their efforts to improve themselves amongst themselves Blacks would eventually impress Whites to the extent of eliminating prejudices and securing equal rights based upon respect and co-operation between the races.¹⁰

Precedents for the educational scheme devised by Washington are to be found in early nineteenth-century policies on the education and vocational training of children from the lower classes in Europe and the United States, as well as in schemes for subject races in the British Empire, notably the 1847 memorandum by Sir James P. Kay-Shuttleworth, *Practical Suggestions as to Day Schools of Industry, Model Farm Schools and Normal Farm Schools, for the Coloured Races of the British Colonies*.¹¹ More immediately, Washington was inspired by the practically orientated education given at his *alma mater*, the Hampton Institute in Virginia, which had been founded by General S.C. Armstrong in 1869.¹² However, what rendered the work of Washington specially significant lay in the fact that it 'was the first outstanding example of the black man's turning to industrial education of his own accord'.¹³

Booker Washington died in 1915, but his kind of differentiated education lived on mainly because it was favoured by Jones in the influential Phelps-Stokes reports on Black education in America.¹⁴ In his endorsement of the Washington strategy Jones was influenced by a racial theory, which he had imbibed at Columbia University in New York, described as 'consciousness of kind'. The theory was based on Social Darwinistic notions to the effect that it was 'precocious' or 'not natural' for Blacks, who were allegedly on a lower level of civilized evolution compared with Whites, to 'set themselves against the social forces controlling and limiting the development of races'.¹⁵ Jones was careful to exclude this racial theory from his reports.¹⁶ Even so, Jones

⁷A. Conway, *The History of the Negro in the United States* (London, The Historical Association, General Series Pamphlet No. 67, 1968), 18-20.

⁸See generally, Harlan, *Booker T. Washington*; Conway, *The History of the Negro*, 18-20.

⁹Booker T. Washington, *Up from Slavery: An Autobiography* (Boston, Western Islands, reset from the original 1901 Doubleday edition, 1965), 46, 66, 105-6.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, 123, 168.

¹¹See generally, A. E. du Toit, *The Earliest British Document on Education for the Coloured Races* (Pretoria, Univ. of South Africa, Communication 34, 1962); H. D'Souza, 'External influences on the development of educational policy in British tropical Africa from 1923 to 1939', *African Studies Review* (1975), XVIII, ii, 35-43; Harlan, *Booker T. Washington*, 63-5; King, *Pan-Africanism and Education*, 44-8.

¹²King, *Pan-Africanism and Education*, 7.

¹³*Ibid.*, 47.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, 21.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, 23.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, 28.

believed that it was futile to antagonize Whites by strongly criticizing racial oppression. Instead, co-operation between the races should be fostered by focusing attention upon constructive action that diverted attention from contentious issues. Consequently, Jones deliberately minimized criticism of the White South and excluded from his reports consideration of such matters as Civil Rights, Klu-Klux-Klan lynchings and discrimination.¹⁷ In the Phelps-Stokes Reports on Africa Jones adopted a similar tactic by virtually turning a blind eye to racially unjust colonial practices.¹⁸

The man who was mainly responsible for securing Imperial Government approval of Phelps-Stokesism was Dr J.H. Oldham, Secretary of the International Missionary Council.¹⁹ Oldham was greatly impressed by the way Jones managed to secure co-operation between Blacks and Whites in America, as well as between American Government, philanthropic and missionary agencies, and he felt that there was need for similar co-operation in Africa.²⁰ This was particularly so when the war ended and when the idealism of the League of Nations called for more vigorous governmental action on the welfare of subject races, action which until then had been left almost entirely to missionaries.²¹

Influenced as the Imperial Government undoubtedly was by Oldham, additional reasons for its encouragement of the Phelps-Stokes Commissions in Africa included the realization that there was an urgent need for an investigation that might provide a useful guide for the formation of Imperial educational policy, a matter that had suffered prolonged neglect as a result of the war.²² The Phelps-Stokes Commissions also offered a welcome opportunity for Anglo-American missionary and governmental co-operation as well as the promise of financial assistance from philanthropic bodies which supported Phelps-Stokesism, notably the Rockefeller, Carnegie and Jeanes agencies.²³

However, the Phelps-Stokes Commissions in Africa were propagandist rather than objectively investigative in their nature. Indeed, the first Commission embarked for the shores of Africa in August 1920,²⁴ and after 'a rapid tour of West Africa',²⁵ followed by a very brief visit to Salisbury, Jones had already formulated the essential features of the policy that was to be recommended in the reports of 1922 and 1924. This is revealed by a memorandum which Jones sent to the Administrator of Southern Rhodesia,

¹⁷Ibid., 25.

¹⁸Ibid., 137-9.

¹⁹Ibid., 51; L.J. Lewis, *Educational Policy and Practice in British Tropical Areas* (London, Thomas Nelson, 1954), 13.

²⁰King, *Pan-Africanism and Education*, 99.

²¹Ibid.; Lewis, *Educational Policy and Practice*, 9-10.

²²Lewis, *Educational Policy and Practice*, 13.

²³Lewis, *Education and Political Independence*, 79.

²⁴Phelps-Stokes Fund, *Education in Africa*, xvii.

²⁵Lewis, *Educational Policy and Practice*, 16, where it is erroneously stated that the tour took place in 1919.

Drummond Chaplin, in March 1921.²⁶ The policy was based on the premise that African education should be specially 'adapted' to what the Commissioners considered to be African developmental and environmental needs. The Phelps-Stokes Reports are lengthy documents but the policy advocated in them can be briefly summarized under four main headings, which Jones called 'The Four Essentials of Education' for Blacks in Africa, embracing 'the "Simples" of health, home life training, industry (including agriculture) and recreation'.²⁷ A good idea of what 'adaptation' would involve in Southern Rhodesia is provided by the memorandum which Jones sent to Chaplin in March 1921.

With reference first to 'Sanitation and Hygiene', Jones informed Chaplin that these subjects usually received little or no attention in mission schools and so special efforts should be made to ensure that they received an important place in the curriculum of African education.²⁸ Under a second heading, 'Effective use of Environment to Obtain the Essentials of Life', Jones criticized the 'lamentable neglect of this' in the curricula of most mission schools. In this regard Jones was particularly critical of 'higher technical education' in mission schools which simply prepared Africans for the needs of 'the White community', for while such training might be 'desirable it [was] by no means equal to the preparation of workers who [would] go out among the Native Africans and teach them to make better use of the soil and the facilities at hand' in their kraals. Industrial training, therefore, should concentrate mainly on land husbandry of a simple kind and 'simple handicraft' instruction.

Under the heading 'Recreation', Jones referred to American missionary 'experience in the Philippine Islands' as indicative of the way 'communities may be turned away from excessive sex indulgence and other harmful pleasures to recreations that improve the physique, morals and morale'. Consequently, the leisure-time of Africans should be directed towards the development of beneficial cultural pursuits, notably singing and dancing, and participation in vigorous sporting activities. Closely related to these aspects of African education was what Jones had to say about 'Development of Character'. Jones lamented that while this should be the 'first' aim in all

²⁶ National Archives, Zimbabwe, Harare [all documentary citations are to this Archives], LO/1/1/178 [London Office: Board of Directors' Papers: Agenda with Annexures: 6 Jan.-26 May 1921], Dr Thomas Jesse Jones to [the] Admin[istrator of Southern Rhodesia], 31 Mar. 1921. I am grateful to Dr S.B. Stevenson for drawing my attention to this document.

Although Zimbabwe was not 'included in the original... itinerary' of the Phelps-Stokes Commissioners in 1921, Jones and Loram decided to pay a special visit to Salisbury in that year because they had heard that the Government had undertaken work at nearby Domboshawa for the promotion of a policy that was very similar to the one advocated by themselves, *The Rhodesia Herald*, 1 Apr. 1921, Editorial, 'Native Welfare'. However (as it is seen later in this article), Government policy had been subjected to strong criticism from certain leading missionaries and senior officials of the Department of Education by 1921. No evidence has come to light which indicates that Jones and Loram knew of this criticism before their arrival in Salisbury. Even so, it is evident from the memorandum to Chaplin and in press reports that the Commissioners learned of the controversy during their stay in the capital, Challiss, 'The Foundation of the Racially Segregated Educational System', 386-93. Consequently, as the Commissioners were widely regarded as being leading authorities on African education, their public endorsement of Government policy and praise for the work that had been undertaken at Domboshawa must have gone a long way towards undermining missionary and Department of Education opposition to what the Government was doing.

²⁷ King, *Pan-Africanism and Education*, 97.

²⁸ LO/1/1/178, Jones to Chaplin; until otherwise stated all the quotations and information that follow are from this source.

mission schools, it was 'too frequently neglected'. In the development of character Jones stressed that it should involve not merely the teaching of honesty, but the cultivation of those virtues in which the Native peoples are known to be weak. Emotional groups of people are especially in need of the virtues of perseverance, regularity, thoroughness, thrift, cleanliness, order. These virtues should be taught, not so much by verbal exhortation but, by the development of habits through the simple activities of the school and community life.

As for literary education, Jones, under the heading 'Rudiments of Knowledge', observed rather ruefully that in most African schools the teaching of the Three R's was the 'chief object', but he was particularly critical of what he felt was a general failure to relate such instruction to 'the realities of the life of a simple people'. African education, Jones asserted, should be 'as closely related to the life of the people as the circumstances require'. Jones, therefore, deplored a tendency to teach Africans arithmetic of an advanced kind more suited to the solution of problems arising in 'London finances, rather than the simple exchanges of kraal and village'. Jones also lamented the fact that his Commission had rarely come across African pupils who had read Booker Washington's *Up from Slavery*, which he described as 'the wonderful story of the American slave boy . . . who taught his people to live in peace with one another and with the world; to make the largest possible use of their environment'.

Finally, with reference to the 'School and Community', Jones described what he clearly regarded as the most important function of African schools. Jones felt that village schools should be the engines of community development, but lamented the fact that 'this function' was 'almost unknown in many parts of Africa'. Indeed, Jones asserted that the criteria for the evaluation of any African school should be based on the extent to which it exercised 'its influence directly and indirectly on the community in which it is located'. As for teachers, they should be made to 'realize that their influence and responsibility extend beyond the walls of the school room to the health, the work, the recreations and the general well-being of the community'.

Generally speaking, two basic principles of policy advocated by Jones were that *all* Africans should receive an education based on the inculcation of the 'Simples', and that European rule was essential for the promotion of African progress. There was little or no room for independent African initiative and leadership. Jones was of the opinion that

Natives themselves, without guidance, will adopt the superficial elements of European education, religion and life. We could give illustration after illustration of Native groups that have organized educational and religious activities that are unrelated to their own past as well as to their best interests.

Only Europeans knew what was in the 'best interests' of Africans, and so it was essential that Europeans should monitor gradual African progress based on a racially differentiated educational policy which placed 'emphasis' on what Europeans felt was most suitable for a 'primitive people'.

Assisted by Dr Charles T. Loram, who joined the Phelps-Stokes Commissioners after they had completed their West African tour, Jones, from 1921 onwards, personally promoted Phelps-Stokesism in Southern Rhodesia.²⁹

²⁹Challiss, 'The Foundation of the Racially Segregated Education System', chs 4, 5, *passim*.

A South African graduate of Cambridge University, and an inspector of schools in Natal, Loram went to the United States in 1914, where he attended Jones's old university, corresponded with Booker Washington, visited his famous Tuskegee Institute in Alabama, and, like Jones, was impressed by the Black leaders' exposition 'of the conventional wisdom in race relations' in the United States.³⁰ In 1917 Loram published his doctoral dissertation, *The Education of the South African Native*, which established his reputation as an authority on African affairs.³¹ Like Jones, Loram believed in the racial inferiority of Blacks³² but he also felt that Africans should receive special protection in the context of escalating racial tensions in Southern Africa. Consequently, Loram opposed what he called White 'repressionists' who simply wished to utilize Blacks as cheap, unskilled labourers, and he also opposed what he called 'equalists', who felt that Blacks should receive the same education and rights as Whites.³³ Instead, Loram favoured the views of 'segregationists', who believed that Blacks had a right to develop, but 'any such development must be a slow progress, and not . . . entirely upon European lines'.³⁴ Governments, Loram felt, should protect Blacks from exploitation by 'repressionists' and should guide them along the path of gradual progress 'along their own lines'.³⁵

Documentary evidence shows that direct Phelps-Stokesist influences on educational policy in Zimbabwe go back at least as far as 1917, when Loram's book was published, and as far back as the turn of the century with regard to the ideas of Booker Washington.³⁶ However, before examining the Phelps-Stokesist impact on Zimbabwe, it should be noted that the policy, from the very beginning, received strong criticism from certain well-informed observers of African affairs. Although these contemporary critics were unable to prevent the vigorous promotion of Phelps-Stokesism in Africa, in retrospect their fears about the consequences of the policy have in some ways proved to have been prophetic. One of the most eminent of these critics was the distinguished Black American scholar, W.E. Burghardt Du Bois. As early as in 1903, Du Bois expressed the fear that Booker Washington's strategy might result in Black subservience to Whites becoming 'a veritable way of life'.³⁷ Du Bois later criticized Phelps-Stokesism on the grounds that the policy was based on

³⁰For a study of Loram's career, see R. Hunt Davis, 'Charles T. Loram and an American model for African education in South Africa', *African Studies Review* (1976), XIX, ii, 87-99; the quotation only is from Harlan, *Booker T. Washington*, 229.

³¹Challiss, 'Education planning for Zimbabwe: The problem of unreliable historical perspectives', 217.

³²H. Jowitt, 'The Re-Construction of Native Education in Southern Rhodesia' (Univ. of South Africa, unpubl. M.Ed. thesis, 1928), 137-41.

³³C.T. Loram, *The Education of the South African Native* (New York, Longmans, Green, 1917), 18-22.

³⁴*Ibid.*, 23.

³⁵*Ibid.*

³⁶Early in 1918, the Chief Native Commissioner, H.J. Taylor, cited Loram's book as an authority for the formulation of policy on African affairs in Zimbabwe, A/3/18/9 [Admin.'s Office: Correspondence: Native Affairs: 7 Sept. 1917 - 10 June 1920], H.J. Taylor to Secretary [Department of the] Admin., 4 June 1918; in 1925 H.S. Keigwin, whose name was given to Government policy on African education from 1919 onwards recalled that the 'Keigwin Scheme' was 'largely inspired by what [he] had read and heard of the work among Negroes in America, particularly by General Armstrong and Booker Washington', S138 [Native Affairs, Chief Native Commissioner, Correspondence, Numerical Series, 1923-1933], 69 [African Industrial Schools, 1920-1932], H.S. Keigwin to H. Taylor, 24 June 1925; King, *Pan-Africanism and Education*, 48, also mentions that the first Inspector of Schools in Southern Rhodesia, H.E.D. Hammond, had recommended the adoption of the Washington Model in 1905.

³⁷W.E.B. Du Bois, 'Of Mr Booker Washington and others', quoted in King, *Pan-Africanism and Education*, 11.

political rather than educational principles and was likely to institutionalize the repression of Africans in British colonies.³⁸ Norman Leys, author of *Kenya*, the famous exposé of colonial malpractices, agreed with Du Bois.³⁹ Leys was particularly critical of the wordy vagueness and ambiguities that characterized the first Phelps-Stokes report and warned that in Africa the obscurantist is an even greater danger than the exploiter.⁴⁰ Leys felt that Whites should encourage the emergence of a thoroughly well-educated Black leadership and co-operate with such leaders in the promotion of colonial welfare and development.⁴¹ Professor A. Victor Murray, author of the well known study, *The School in the Bush*, also strongly criticized the lack of sound educational principles in Phelps-Stokesism and warned that 'Differentiation without equality means the permanent inferiority of the Black man'.⁴² However, little heed was paid to these critics, for Phelps-Stokesism represented a typically Galbraithian 'conventional wisdom' on race relations in Anglo-American official, missionary and philanthropic circles.⁴³

With reference to the impact of Phelps-Stokesism on Zimbabwe, there are three aspects which evidently require special attention, namely, the initial impact of the policy, its enduring influences, and confusion in the historiography of education in Zimbabwe arising from failures to clearly identify and therefore fully appreciate the importance of Phelps-Stokesist influences. The term 'initial impact' refers to what appear to have been crucially important years between 1919 and 1929 when what can be very loosely described as conventional progress along Western lines of educational development for Blacks in Zimbabwe came to a virtual halt, mainly because of the combined influences of the Phelps-Stokes Commissioners, Jones and Loram, and of the Native Affairs Department. To clearly describe what happened in that decade it is necessary to indulge in considerable simplification of somewhat complex processes.

By the end of the First World War the British South Africa Company Administration, and particularly the Native Affairs Department, conscious of the growing deterioration of race relations in South Africa, became more than ever aware of the danger of African education in Zimbabwe becoming a 'subversive activity' — subversive, that is, to what were considered to be the benefits of peace and stable progress under European colonial rule.⁴⁴ At the same time, it was felt by local and Imperial Government authorities, that there was an urgent need to make the soon to be re-constituted Native Reserves more

³⁸King, *Pan-Africanism and Education*, 144–5.

³⁹*Ibid.*, 130–45.

⁴⁰N. Leys, *Kenya* (London, Hogarth Press, 1924), 393.

⁴¹King, *Pan-Africanism and Education*, 130.

⁴²A. V. Murray, *The School in the Bush: A Critical Study of the Theory and Practice of Native Education in Africa* (London, Longmans, Green, 2nd revised edn, 1938, first published, 1929), 309; for criticism of Phelps-Stokesism, see generally, ch. 13 'America in Africa'.

⁴³J.K. Galbraith, *The Affluent Society* (Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1962, first published 1958), 18, where the tendency is defined as being one that associates 'truth with convenience -- with what most closely accords with self-interest and individual well-being or promises best to avoid awkward effort or unwelcome dislocation of life'.

⁴⁴Challiss, 'The Foundation of the Racially Segregated Education System', ch. 4, *passim*, where a study is made of African education between 1910 and 1923 in the special context of state security.

productive and habitable.⁴⁵ A third important consideration was the need to show that something concrete was being done about Southern Rhodesian African development in order to allay fears about a possible union of the territory with South Africa and also to counter strong criticisms from individuals like John Harris of the Aborigines Protection Society and, closer to home, the missionary Arthur Shearly Cripps.⁴⁶ Fourthly, there was a need to 'forestall a possibly critical situation arising' from a growing tendency amongst White settlers, particularly farmers, 'to seek ways and means of utilising greater numbers of Zimbabwean Africans mainly as cheap [unskilled] labourers'.⁴⁷

To deal with these problems the British South Africa Company Administration, acting in close consultation with the Imperial Government authorities, devised a strategy named after the Native Commissioner charged with its implementation, H.S. Keigwin. The basic intention of the new strategy, represented by what is commonly known as the 'Keigwin Scheme', was to divert progress in African education away from possibly subversive regions of more advanced literary work, into directions that concentrated upon a specially simplified form of industrial training for economic and carefully controlled community development in the Reserves.⁴⁸ For his part in the formulation of the scheme in 1919, Keigwin was greatly inspired by what he had read about differentiated education for Blacks in America,⁴⁹ while the Chief Native Commissioner, H.J. Taylor, had been influenced by what he had read in Loram's recent publication.⁵⁰ Phelps-Stokesism had already begun to exert an influence on educational policy in Zimbabwe, therefore, before Jones and Loram visited the territory in 1921. However, the visit by the two Phelps-Stokesists was of special importance, for the Native Affairs Department was by then in need of authoritative endorsement of the Keigwin Scheme in the face of opposition from certain leading missionaries and also senior officials of the Department of Education.⁵¹

A fundamental issue at stake by 1921 was that the devotion of meagre government and already strained missionary financial and manpower resources to the provision of 'simple' industrial training schemes inevitably resulted in the starvation of resources for progress in literary education, particularly with regard to urgent needs for the expansion of teacher-training facilities and the recruitment of a better quality of teacher by improving salaries and conditions of service.⁵² The Native Affairs Department was fully

⁴⁵ See generally, Southern Rhodesia, *Report of the Native Affairs Committee of Enquiry, 1910-1911* (Sess[ional] Pap[er]s, A.12, 1911); Great Britain, *Southern Rhodesia. Papers Relating to the Southern Rhodesia Native Reserves Commission, 1915 (October, 1917)* [Cmd. 8674] (H.C. 1917-18, xxiii, 135).

⁴⁶ See generally, Great Britain, *Southern Rhodesia, Correspondence with the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society Relating to the Native Reserves in Southern Rhodesia (in Continuation of [Cmd. 8674] February, 1920* [Cmd. 547] 9 (H.C. 1920, xxxiii, 219); J.H. Harris, *The Chartered Millions* (London, The Swarthmore Press, [1920]); T.O. Ranger, *State and Church in Southern Rhodesia 1919 to 1930* (Salisbury, The Central Africa Historical Association, Local Series 4, 1962).

⁴⁷ Challiss, 'The Foundation of the Racially Segregated Education System', 344.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, chs 4, 5, *passim*; see also, Rhodesia Resources Committee, *Native Development (by H.S. Keigwin)* ([Salisbury, The Committee, 1919]); Southern Rhodesia, *Report by H.S. Keigwin, Esquire, Native Commissioner, on the Suggested Industrial Development of Natives* (Sess. Paps. A.7, 1920).

⁴⁹ S138/69, Keigwin to Taylor, 24 June 1925.

⁵⁰ A/3/18/9, Taylor to Secr. Dep. Admin., 4 June 1918.

⁵¹ Challiss, 'The Foundation of the Racially Segregated Education System', ch. 5, *passim*.

⁵² *Ibid.*, chs 3, 4, 5, *passim*.

aware of the implications of the situation but felt that further progress in literary education had to be curbed. By giving relatively advanced education to a few Africans it was feared that a class of allegedly irresponsible agitators would be created who would exercise premature and undesirable political influence amongst the mass of the African populace.⁵³ Only after gradual progress of the mass of Africans had been achieved through concentration upon 'simple' industrial training and community development schemes in Reserves could more advanced literary education be safely contemplated. The Native Affairs Department was also averse to improving African teacher training and conditions of service because the teachers would simply swell numbers in the already very large ranks of single-teacher kraal schools which could not be kept under close European supervision. Moreover, kraal schools gave only literary instruction and were, therefore, considered to be virtually useless for the purpose of promoting separate economic development in Reserves.

Acting in close liaison with the Native Affairs Department, Jones and Loram succeeded in modifying the Keigwin Scheme along Phelps-Stokesist lines and at the same time greatly helped in the campaign to convert missionaries who resisted the new policy.⁵⁴

Of course, Phelps-Stokesist policy and the Keigwin Scheme alike were largely inspired by the Tuskegee model of differentiated education and training for the promotion of separate racial development. Even so, a major practical consideration in the formulation of the Keigwin Scheme had been a desire to stimulate greater productivity in African Reserves. Consequently, the Keigwin Scheme tended to concentrate mainly on the economic rather than the educational aspects of African development. The Phelps-Stokesist contribution, therefore, was to be of special importance with regard to the implementation of the educational aspects of the new strategy devised by the Government in 1919.

Some indication of just how successful the Phelps-Stokesists and the Native Affairs Department were in the promotion of the new strategy devised in 1919 is to be found in the distribution of state aid for industrial as opposed to teacher training at mission schools after 1920. In 1920 the Administration awarded 6 grants towards the salaries of specialists in teacher training, whereas 10 awards went to industrial specialists.⁵⁵ By 1927 there were 22 teacher-training awards, but 67 industrial training awards. In that year, grants for industrial training absorbed £4,623 of the £6,744 expended by the Government on specialist salary grants.⁵⁶ In addition to this there was the expenditure of about £7,000 annually on the Government Industrial Training Schools which were established at Domboshawa and Tjolotjo in 1920 and 1921 respectively.⁵⁷

Two additional consequences of the successful promotion of Phelps-Stokesism in Southern Rhodesia were the appointment of an exponent of the policy who had worked under Loram in Natal, H. Jowitt, as the first Director of Native Education in 1927, and the administrative separation of this department from the authority of the Department of Education.⁵⁸ In the

⁵³Ibid., chs 4, 5, *passim*.

⁵⁴Ibid., ch. 5, *passim*.

⁵⁵Southern Rhodesia, *Report of the Director of Education for the Year 1920* (Sess. Paps, A.9, 1921), 21.

⁵⁶Southern Rhodesia, *Report of the Director of Education for the Year 1927* (Sess. Paps, C.S.R. 23, 1928), H. Jowitt, 'Report of the Director of Native Education', 15.

⁵⁷Chalfiss, 'The Foundation of the Racially Segregated Education System', 268.

⁵⁸Ibid., ch. 5, *passim*.

appointment of Jowitt, the Government conformed with advice given by Jones in 1924, when he stated that the new Director should have 'a belief in the *potentiality* of the natives to receive and use *the type of education*' advocated by the Phelps-Stokes reports.⁵⁹ However, Black Zimbabweans had already displayed, and for long continued to display, strong resentment of and resistance to differentiated education and simplified industrial training. Instead, there was a natural enough desire to obtain the more advanced literary education and the technical and scientific training necessary for modern progress.⁶⁰ Moreover, Black Zimbabweans had revealed from the very beginning of European rule that they could adapt readily to twentieth-century modernization and that, given the encouragement, they were also keen to lead the mass of their people along the same path — facts which Whites were unwilling to frankly recognize. Instead, Whites preferred to believe that it would require centuries of paternalism to wean Blacks from what was considered to be their naturally barbaric state of backwardness.⁶¹

Despite strong Zimbabwean resentment of the 'simple' nature of the racially differentiated education and training advocated by the Phelps-Stokesists, and the well-informed criticisms of contemporaries like Du Bois, Leys and Murray, the policy was to be vigorously implemented by Jowitt until his resignation in 1934.⁶² In subsequent years the policy naturally underwent considerable modification, particularly when steps were taken to introduce secondary and higher educational facilities for Africans in Southern Rhodesia which tended to conform closely with conventional Western institutions.⁶³ Largely vain attempts were also made to provide Zimbabwean Blacks with better opportunities to acquire proficiency in skilled trades of a conventional Western kind instead of a training directed ostensibly towards development 'along their own lines' in Reserves.⁶⁴ Even so, the Phelps-Stokesist emphasis on racially differentiated education and training for separate development in Zimbabwe was never lost sight of entirely and was to be revived to some extent during the U.D.I. period. The scheme for the establishment of F2 Schools, for example, which offered a specially simplified form of rurally orientated, racially discriminatory education and training for Blacks, was

⁵⁹SI38/10 [African Advancement, 1923–1933], Acting Sec., Colonial Sec., to Taylor, 10 June 1924, enclosing 'Memorandum by the Phelps-Stokes Commission', which was very probably written by Jones.

⁶⁰See generally, Challiss, 'The Foundation of the Racially Segregated Education System', esp. ch. 5, where accounts are given of student unrest and disenchantment with the 'simple' nature of the work done at the two Government Schools at Domboshawa and Tjolojo; see also, B. Grimston, *Survey of Native Educational Development, Southern Rhodesia, 1937* (St Albans, privately, 1942), ch. 4, para. 255, for consideration of the prevalence of 'reactionary opinion' with regard to 'controversy over the advisability of using European implements in industrial work' at mission schools.

⁶¹See generally, Rhodesia Resources Committee, *Native Development*, Lord Lugard, 'Education and race relations', *Journal of the African Society* (1933), XXXII, cxxvi, 7.

⁶²F. Parker, *African Development and Education in Southern Rhodesia* (Columbus, Ohio State Univ. Press, Kappa Delta Phi Publications, International Education Monograph 2, 1960), 84–90.

⁶³N. D. Atkinson, *Teaching Rhodesians: A History of Educational Policy in Rhodesia* (London, Longman, 1972), 118–121, 135–207.

⁶⁴See generally, B. Mthobi, *Training for Development: An Inquiry into the Nature and Scope for Technical Training in Rhodesia for African Workers in Industry, with Special Reference to Apprenticeship Training* (Salisbury, The Association of Round Tables in Central Africa in conjunction with the Univ. of Rhodesia, the Centre of Inter-Racial Studies and the Institute of Adult Education, 1978).

directly inspired by esteem for the policy pursued by Jowitt.⁶⁵ Of course, the nature of race relations in Zimbabwe largely accounts for the persistence of Phelps-Stokesist tendencies, particularly during the U.D.I. period. However, it was noted that the Imperial Government gave its official blessing to the policy in 1925 and Phelps-Stokesism, albeit in modified forms, was to remain one of the main inspirations of British colonial education policy for the next fifty years.⁶⁶ External influences on the persistence of Phelps-Stokesist influences in Zimbabwe, therefore, cannot be entirely disregarded by historians.

The enduring influence of Phelps-Stokesism in British colonial educational policy generally can be attributed partly to the work of Jones and Loram in the United States, where they obtained sponsorship from philanthropic bodies for the award of study grants for missionaries and colonial government officials under their tutelage. Loram was to be particularly active in this regard, especially when he was appointed Sterling Professor of Education at Yale University in 1931, a post which he held until his death in 1940.⁶⁸ Similar influence was to be exerted by the Faculty of Education of London University until relatively recent times. Indeed, an academic who played a particularly significant role in this regard was our late Principal, Professor L.J. Lewis, C.M.G. After gaining practical experience as an educationist in Nigeria before the Second World War, Lewis was appointed as a lecturer in the Institute of Education of London University in 1944 and as Professor of Education with Special Reference to Education in Tropical Areas in 1959. The Professor held this post until 1973 when he was appointed Professor Emeritus of London University.⁶⁹

Lewis has written a number of books on British colonial educational policy and practice, in all of which Phelps-Stokesism is highly commended. Certainly, there are aspects of Phelps-Stokesism that, as he put it, 'still offer sound guidance about planning educational development'.⁷⁰ Much in the memorandum which Jones sent to Chaplin in 1921, for instance, was obviously commendable educationally, notably with regard to the need to adapt formal education to the special socio-economic needs of pupils, the aim to link education more closely with community development and, as Jones went on to mention in the memorandum, the need to foster closer co-operation and co-ordination amongst all engaged in making provision for formal education. On the other hand, relatively little investigation into what actually constituted African socio-economic needs was undertaken by the Phelps-Stokesists, who tended to base their recommendations largely upon preconceived ideas and prejudices about African backwardness, racial inferiority and what Europeans, rather than Africans, considered to be worthy of special attention in African schools. These weaknesses of Phelps-Stokesism, which were comprehensively identified by contemporary critics of the policy like Du Bois, Leys and Murray, are almost entirely overlooked in the books by Professor Lewis.

⁶⁵M.G. Mills, *Junior Secondary and Secondary F(2) Schools in Rhodesia* (Salisbury, Univ. of Rhodesia, Faculty of Education, 1974), 69.

⁶⁶Lewis, *Education and Political Independence*, 55, 85-6.

⁶⁷King, *Pan-Africanism and Education*, 177-254.

⁶⁸Davis, 'Charles T. Loram and an American model', 90; R.D. Heyman, 'C.T. Loram: A South African liberal in race relations', *The International Journal of African Historical Studies* (1972), V, 41-50.

⁶⁹*Who's Who 1981* (London, Adam and Charles Black, 1981), 1544.

⁷⁰Lewis, *Education and Political Independence*, 55.

In his historical assessments of Phelps-Stokesism Lewis never refers to the well-informed critics of the policy. Even so, he does criticize the typically Phelps-Stokesist denigration of what was known as the 'mission educated native', one who had received plenty of literary instruction but little or no practical training.⁷¹ For instance, while the Professor felt that there might have been 'an element of truth' in allegations that 'missionary education produced people who became political agitators, possessing no roots nor respect for local traditions, beliefs or environment, out of touch with the mass of the people, ridiculously sensitive to racial and social discrimination, real or fancied, [and] ready to create and respond to unrest',⁷² he felt that such criticism was often based on 'a superficial acquaintance with the people who had received a modicum of education' and failed to recognize that mission schools had helped to produce 'an excellent cadre of local assistants for State and Church' and 'a number of outstanding individuals'.⁷³ Indeed, Lewis was personally acquainted with one of these individuals, Dr Henry Carr, the Nigerian inspector of schools and member of the legislature.⁷⁴ However, it is evident that Lewis was not entirely in accord with views expressed by Leys on the need to encourage Africans in their quest for advanced education. Instead, Lewis suggests that there was 'a timeliness about the step forward taken by Britain to provide for higher education in Africa' shortly after the Second World War, for with 'regard to social and economic conditions . . . World War II apart, an earlier effort would have been premature and a later one could have been tragic'.⁷⁵ This opinion indicates that Lewis's attitude conforms most closely with one displayed by Dr Oldham, who had done so much to promote Phelps-Stokesism before the Second World War.

The attitude of Oldham after the Second World War represented what can be characterized as a modification or evolution of Phelps-Stokesism in the context of 'globular political changes'.⁷⁶ When it became clear after the war that decolonization in Africa was imminent, it was equally evident that leadership in politically independent Africa was most likely to be provided by the very class of 'educated' Africans who had been denigrated by Phelps-Stokesists in the 1920s. Therefore, while Oldham still revered the memory of 'Dr. Thomas Jesse Jones, who made so notable a contribution a generation ago to thought about African education', he nevertheless advocated somewhat different tactics in the 1950s by supporting the cause of the Capricorn Africa Society.⁷⁷ The aim of the Society was to create in Africa 'an inter-racial, integrated society in which differences of race and colour [would] cease to have any significance'.⁷⁸ The Society was founded in Harare in 1949 'by a group of people . . . of different races, who believed that a policy for Africa must come from within Africa itself'.⁷⁹ Educational schemes and close co-

⁷¹Lewis, *Educational Policy and Practice*, 12, quoting from Lord Lugard, 'Education in Tropical Africa', *The Edinburgh Review* (July 1925), C.

⁷²L.J. Lewis, *Society, Schools and Progress in Nigeria* (Oxford, Pergamon Press, 1965), 30.

⁷³Lewis, *Educational Policy and Practice*, 12-13.

⁷⁴L.J. Lewis, personal communication, 11 June 1981.

⁷⁵Lewis, *Education and Political Independence*, 92.

⁷⁶Of course, when the counsels of Phelps-Stokesists like Oldham and Lord Lugard were eventually replaced by those of individuals like Margery Perham and Julian Huxley, British colonial educational policy evolved along more progressive lines. Even so 'globular - political rather than strictly educational considerations tended to remain a major element in the formulation of policy', H. D'Souza, 'External influences on the development of educational policy in British tropical Africa from 1923 to 1939', 46.

⁷⁷J.H. Oldham, *New Hope in Africa* (London, Longmans, Green, 1955), 48.

⁷⁸*Ibid.*, 13.

⁷⁹*Ibid.*, 14.

operation between Whites and 'educated' Blacks figured largely in the strategies of the Society.⁸⁰ Although Lewis did not join the Capricorn Africa Society,⁸¹ his views would appear to have been consonant with many of those expressed by Oldham, when he propagated the aims of the Society in 1955 in his publication, *New Hope in Africa*.

To some extent the historical assessment of Phelps-Stokesism by Lewis appears to be almost deliberately neglectful of important issues raised by contemporary critics of the policy. For instance, reference is made to *The School in the Bush* by Murray, but not to the perceptive criticisms by Murray of some of the educationally unsound principles that informed Phelps-Stokesism.⁸² Consequently, no attempt is made by Lewis to consider the implications of the warning by Murray that 'Differentiation without equality means the permanent inferiority of the Black man'. Lewis simply asserts that Phelps-Stokesism and the Imperial educational policy that it so largely informed marked 'a crucial step forward for education in the then British colonial dependencies'⁸³ and that 'enlightened statesmanship' allowed for the development of African 'educational facilities by their best lights'.⁸⁴ Any failures of British colonial educational policy stemmed largely, Lewis claims, from inadequate finance and a consequent inability to implement schemes with sufficient thoroughness.⁸⁵ While 'all that might be desired' had not been achieved, Lewis feels that there was 'little to be ashamed of'.⁸⁶ If only historians 'in the best objective traditions of historical research and presentation'⁸⁷ could fill gaps of knowledge about what the British had achieved in the sphere of colonial education then 'hostile' criticism 'based on inadequate information coloured by prejudice' would be largely silenced.⁸⁸ What Lewis laments is that criticism of British colonial educational policy is largely 'emotional in origin rather than based on a knowledge of facts about what has been done or about what remains to be done'.⁸⁹ Too much 'opinion on education in Africa', Lewis feels, has been 'emotionally conditioned'.⁹⁰ However, as King and other analysts of Phelps-Stokesism have shown, the policy was inspired as much by reactionary notions about racially and socially differentiated educational policies that go back to the early nineteenth century as by altruistic desires to take 'a crucial step forward'.⁹¹ By disregarding issues

⁸⁰The Capricorn Africa Society acquired 'the reputation of being dangerously radical and wildly idealistic' and therefore achieved relatively little as a political pressure group amongst European settlers in Zimbabwe', I.R. Hancock, 'Sane and pragmatic liberalism: The Action Group in Bulawayo, 1955-1965', *Rhodesian History* (1976), VII, 75, fn. 34. However, the Society was able to secure funds for the establishment of Ranche House College in Harare, mainly for purposes of non-racial adult education. Under the Principal, Mr Ken Mew, D.F.C., who retired in 1982, the College also played a 'secret' political role during the U.D.I. period by making arrangements for meetings between Black and White leaders, *The Herald* (18 Aug. 1982), 11.

⁸¹Lewis, personal communication, 11 June 1981.

⁸²Lewis, *Society, Schools and Progress in Nigeria*, 29-30.

⁸³Lewis, *Education and Political Independence*, 79.

⁸⁴*Ibid.*, 65.

⁸⁵Lewis, *Educational Policy and Practice*, 16-17.

⁸⁶*Ibid.*, 4.

⁸⁷M. Read, *Education and Social Change in Tropical Areas* (London, Thomas Nelson, 1955), 25, quoted by Lewis in *Education and Political Independence*, 82.

⁸⁸Lewis, *Educational Policy and Practice*, 4; and *Education and Political Independence*, 85.

⁸⁹Lewis, *Educational and Political Independence*, vii.

⁹⁰*Ibid.*; in much the same way as Jones denigrated Blacks for being an 'emotional' race, so does Lewis denigrate their 'strong political aspirations' as being 'largely emotional', Lewis, *Educational Policy and Practice*, 111.

⁹¹King, *Pan-Africanism and Education*, 137-9.

raised by the critics of Phelps-Stokesism, Lewis deals with his subject in much the same way as the Phelps-Stokesists themselves tended to do, namely as propagandists rather than as investigators inspired by 'the best objective traditions' of scholarship.⁹²

The views of Lewis have been considered at some length in this paper because they seem to indicate the persistence of what has been characterized as 'the conventional wisdom in race relations' of the Anglo-American establishment that was mentioned earlier. Of equal significance is the special relationship between the Faculty of Education of London University, where the Professor has for long exercised considerable authority, and the education faculties of universities in former British colonies like that of the University of Zimbabwe.⁹³ It is hard to say how far the somewhat uncritically favourable esteem for Phelps-Stokesism propagated by Professor Lewis has influenced histories of education in Zimbabwe, notably those by Professor Franklin Parker, an American academic who held a research post at the University of Zimbabwe,⁹⁴ and Professors R.C. Bone and N.D. Atkinson, long-serving members of the Faculty of Education of the University of Zimbabwe. However, consideration of these histories reveals a great deal of conformity with assessments of Phelps-Stokesism made by Lewis, even when the relationships between Phelps-Stokesism and educational policy in Zimbabwe have not always been clearly identified in these histories. There are also certain errors and omissions in these histories that tend to render their accounts of the impact of Phelps-Stokesism in Zimbabwe somewhat misleading and confused.

An important omission from the accounts by all three of the historians just mentioned is the failure to refer to Phelps-Stokesist influences exerted in Southern Rhodesia before the advent of Responsible Government in 1923. By overlooking the inspiration and support of Jones and Loram that can be traced back to at least 1917, the impression given by the three historians is that the formulation of Government policy was almost entirely the result of internal events, indeed, the result of ideas propagated by Keigwin alone. Parker, for instance, somewhat simplistically accounts for policy changes by stating that 'In 1918, H.S. Keigwin, a Native Commissioner, interested the Government in developing village industries'.⁹⁵ Atkinson simply mentions in a footnote that Keigwin was appointed as the first Director of Native Development in 1920,⁹⁶ by which time, he states in the main text, Keigwin had 'begun to turn his thoughts towards schemes for a more direct intervention by Government in the field of African education'.⁹⁷ Moreover, Atkinson suggests that little was achieved under the Keigwin Scheme before British South Africa Company

⁹² King, *Pan-Africanism and Education*, 45; Harlan, *Booker T. Washington*, 63-4; D'Souza, 'External influences on the development of educational policy', 37-8.

⁹³ Lewis, *Education and Political Independence*, 15-47.

⁹⁴ Professor Parker was a research scholar at the University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland when he undertook his investigations. M. Gelfand, *A Non-Racial Island of Learning: A History of the University College of Rhodesia from Its Inception to 1966* (Gwelo, Mambo Press, 1978), 136.

⁹⁵ Parker, *African Development and Education in Southern Rhodesia*, 76.

⁹⁶ Atkinson, *Teaching Rhodesians*, 110, fn. 73; it is erroneously stated in this footnote that in 1921 Keigwin was appointed Director of Native Education, a post 'on the establishment of the Department of Native Affairs and did not carry any responsibilities to the Education Department'. In fact Keigwin and his chief assistant, G.A. Taylor, were appointed as additional inspectors of schools in 1922 'under a special arrangement by which their reports should be rendered to the heads of both [the Native and Education] Departments', Southern Rhodesia, *Report of the Director of Education for the Year 1922* (Sess. Paps, A.13, 1923), 23.

⁹⁷ Atkinson, *Teaching Rhodesians*, 97.

rule had ended and when 'it was at last possible to embark on ambitious schemes for forward planning in almost every aspect of life in Southern Rhodesia'.⁹⁸ Certainly, the Native Affairs Department achieved less than it hoped for by 1923. Even so, particularly with regard to the propagation of Phelps-Stokesism amongst missionaries and the diversion of state aid and other resources into industrial rather than teacher training some very significant steps had been taken by 1923.⁹⁹

While it is acknowledged by the three professors that after the advent of Responsible Government, at any rate, the Phelps-Stokes Commissions exerted an influence in Southern Rhodesia, little or no attempt is made by them to clearly identify and assess the nature and extent of this influence. For instance, no mention is made of the fact that Jowitt was a protégé of the Phelps-Stokesist Loram and probably owed his appointment as the first Director of Native Education to recommendations made by Loram and Jones. Moreover, Atkinson gives the very misleading impression that the Phelps-Stokesist influence was not felt at all before 1923 by stating rather vaguely that 'at about the same time [as the advent of Responsible Government], a commission under the auspices of the Phelps-Stokes Fund of New York arrived to enquire into the state of native education in central Africa'.¹⁰⁰

In addition to errors and omissions in the accounts by the three professors, they make assessments of the impact of what they do not always clearly identify as being Phelps-Stokesist influences which are very similar to some of those made by Lewis with regard to the impact of Phelps-Stokesism generally in British colonial Africa. The three professors, therefore, tend to be in agreement with Lewis to the effect that 'Phelps Stokesism heralded a crucial step forward' in the development of the formal education of Africans. Bone, for instance, evidently assumes, like Lewis, that the Phelps-Stokesists were eminently well-qualified educationists intent upon the development of African education by its 'best lights'. Consequently, Bone accepts without question criticisms made in the Phelps-Stokes reports to the effect that the Department of Education and missionaries were culpable of prolonged neglect and incompetence with regard to teacher training and gives the impression that it was only when Jowitt became Director of Native Development in 1929 that teacher training began at last to receive proper attention.¹⁰¹ What Bone overlooks is that despite adverse circumstances, certain missionaries, with considerable encouragement from the Department of Education, managed to make remarkable progress in the establishment of teacher-training institutions, particularly when the war ended and until 1921.¹⁰² Subsequently, Phelps-Stokesist influences themselves tended to greatly hinder further progress. Parker concedes that 'a few' missionaries had for many years been critical of the fact that in teacher training, at least, industrial work was done at the expense of academic education.¹⁰³ Even so, Parker concludes that 'Keigwin's and Jowitt's policy of "adaptation to environment"' was eminently sound,¹⁰⁴ indeed, was a policy

⁹⁸Ibid., 103.

⁹⁹Challiss, 'The Foundation of the Racially Segregated Education System', chs 4, 5, *passim*.

¹⁰⁰Atkinson, *Teaching Rhodesians*, 103.

¹⁰¹R.C. Bone, *African Education in Rhodesia: The Period to 1927* (Salisbury, Univ. College of Rhodesia, Faculty of Education Occasional Paper 9, 1970), 26-36.

¹⁰²Challiss, 'The Foundation of the Racially Segregated Education System', ch. 3, *passim*.

¹⁰³Parker, *African Development and Education in Southern Rhodesia*, 74.

¹⁰⁴F. Parker, 'African Community Development and education in Southern Rhodesia, 1920-1935', *International Review of Missions* (1962), LI, 346.

that had undoubtedly been conceived by 'men of wisdom'.¹⁰⁵ Atkinson is rather more guarded about the 'wisdom' of what was conceived by 'Keigwin and Jowitt'; he feels that for 'an underdeveloped community' there was 'some justification, both on educational and sociological grounds' for the Keigwin Scheme and what he does not always clearly identify as being Phelps-Stokesist modifications.¹⁰⁶ Nevertheless, Atkinson does point out that 'almost unavoidably' the new policy 'tended to retard the development of facilities for secondary and higher education and ensured that Africans could not generally equal the standards achieved by Europeans'.¹⁰⁷

Of course, the most important consideration, arising from the assessments made by the three professors and a more critical assessment based on further research and in the light of relatively recent studies of Phelps-Stokesism, is that there appear to be three distinct general interpretations of the significance of the impact of Phelps-Stokesism in Zimbabwe. Parker, in his pioneering studies undertaken mainly in the 1960s, makes an interpretation that conforms very closely with contemporary views expressed by Professor Lewis. Therefore, with reference to what were in essence the Phelps-Stokesist policies undertaken by Keigwin and Jowitt, Parker asserts that 'Had the policy of making Africans efficiently secure in their environment been intelligently supported, it might substantially have improved the present generation's ability to work out multi-racial problems'.¹⁰⁸ Atkinson, writing some ten years later, remains vague about what actually represented Phelps-Stokesist influences, but makes somewhat different observations from the one propounded by Parker. Atkinson states that 'persistence [after the 1920s] with segregated arrangements was not without some justification, both on sociological and educational grounds', for 'African education presented special problems in its own right, calling for separate machinery for planning and development'. However, Atkinson also asserts that there was an equally important need 'to develop a co-ordinated education policy for the country as a whole' and he feels that governments after the 1920s persisted too long with 'two distinct systems of education . . . along separate lines of development'.¹⁰⁹

I would agree with Parker that what were in fact Phelps-Stokesist economic and community development schemes received inadequate financial assistance under successive governments, for there was hardly much point in rurally orientated training schemes unless they were backed up by capital investment in rural development. I naturally agree, too, with Atkinson that 'a co-ordinated education policy' was overlooked for too long. However, I cannot agree with the view that the implementation of what I would prefer to call Phelps-Stokesism was as wise a policy as the four professors tend to suggest. The attempt to set the clock back, as it were, by trying to suppress African aspirations to modernize and revive enthusiasm for separate tribal development was a tall order by 1920. After the First World War growing numbers of Zimbabwean Africans were beginning to seek racially integrated rather than separate development. But, as another supporter of the Capricorn Africa Society, Sir Laurens van der Post, put it

Having taken away their way of life we then made it impossible for them to acquire any other. Having supplanted their law by ours we then gave

¹⁰⁵Ibid., 347.

¹⁰⁶Atkinson, *Teaching Rhodesians*, 200.

¹⁰⁷Ibid., 201.

¹⁰⁸Parker, 'African Community Development and education', 335.

¹⁰⁹Atkinson, *Teaching Rhodesians*, 200-2.

them no right to live as our law demanded but rather forced them to drift suspended in dark acceptance of a state of non-being.¹¹⁰

When White settlement began in the 1890s there might have been a case for an 'intelligently supported' Phelps-Stokesist policy, but by the 1920s it would appear that the time had come for what Atkinson refers to as 'a co-ordinated education policy'. By stressing alleged African backwardness at this stage, Phelps-Stokesism inevitably aggravated Black discontent with colonialism. Moreover, stress on 'simple' industrial training, which receives little or no attention in the historical assessments of the four professors, contributed to our present manpower and development problems.

¹¹⁰L. van der Post, *The Dark Eye in Africa* (London, The Hogarth Press, 1955), 48.