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Abstract

This thesis examines the infrastructure behind the academic discipline of African History. By looking at government reports, a selection of reflective essays and memoirs written by key historians, and the key pre-colonial sources that have driven select studies, my thesis explains how African History emerged in British and U.S. universities. Key factors include the English colonisation of Sierra Leone in 1787, the affiliation of Fourah Bay College with the University of Durham in 1876, and the creation of universities in 1948 in Nigeria, Sudan, Uganda and Ghana. In Britain, the importance of African territories resulted in a series of influential reports that shifted missionary controlled education on the African continent to colonial government control. After 1945 a series of pivotal government reports established the impetus and funding for the academic institutionalisation of African History in the United Kingdom. The influence of an English academic recognition of African History provided a transnational current of ideas that flowed between Africa and the United Kingdom, and from there to the United States. With the advent of the Cold War the United States recognised the importance of developing Area Studies programmes, including African Studies, and during the 1960s and 1970s became world leaders in the field. Crucial to this development was the role of pioneering historians who travelled to Africa to teach and research, and who then returned to train a new generation of Africanists. Africanist scholars, recognising the importance of African agency, expanded the shape of the discipline through investigation of oral sources and re-examination of extant pre-1800 European written records. ‘Charter historians’ established university programmes that would produce scholars with the necessary skills required to sustain the new discipline. The infrastructure that under-girded and positioned African History in the mainstream of academia is analysed in-depth, and is, as such, the central theme of this thesis.
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INTRODUCTION

The year 2007 marked a milestone in the history of Africa. Two hundred years had passed since the abolition of the slave trade by the British Parliament. This year also occasioned the fiftieth anniversary of the independence of Ghana, the first African state to be granted independence by the British. Between 1957 and 2007, Africans have witnessed the independence of all former European colonies, including the end of Apartheid and the beginnings of democracy in South Africa in 1994. Today, in 2008, African History is an accepted scholarly discipline in Britain and the United States. The journey of African History’s development to formal academic acceptance marks a fundamental shift in attitude from an Africa with no past to an Africa with a rich history. It was the concerted effort of charter historians who opened up the search for pre-colonial sources, both written and oral, that challenged the entrenched view of many historical professionals, such as the Professor of Modern History at Oxford University, Hugh Trevor-Roper, who as late as 1963 claimed that pre-colonial Black Africa had no history.1

Before the late 1940s there was no written history of Africa in the Western academic tradition that considered the African perspective of events. Neither was there a general history of the whole African continent published before the 1950s. Several prominent English-trained academics and a few notable American scholars joined a growing number of Africanists to create the new discipline of African History, which grew rapidly in the late 1940s and 1950s.2 By the late 1950s, British academics stood out as the leaders in African historical research. The year 1960 was pivotal in the recognition of African History, as it was the year that the English academics John Fage and Roland Oliver launched the Journal of African History in association with Cambridge University Press. The Journal of African History was the first history journal to embrace a multidisciplinary approach to the African historical past, and included articles by archaeologists, anthropologists and linguists, as well as by historians. In the same year, 1960, the United Nations (UN) made a formal acknowledgement that all colonised people had the right to independence. The UN’s Declaration on Granting Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples stated that ‘all peoples’ have the right to self-determination.3 Significantly, the creation of the
Journal of African History occurred as the UN recognised African rights to self determination.

Several emeritus scholars who helped develop African History have reflected upon key moments during the past fifty years of the discipline’s growth. Some, like John Fage, have listed important moments like the establishment of British African Universities in 1948. Roland Oliver and Jan Vansina believed that the 1953 and 1957 conferences on African History and Archaeology, held at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), marked the recognition of African History as an academic subject. Philip Curtin also recognised the publication of the Journal of African History in 1960 as a landmark in the discipline’s creation. Yet, few acknowledged the background to these events, preferring to write of their ‘golden years’ when the field began to thrive. Their comments led me to search for various government reports on education, where indeed I found a wealth of information. I discovered that source material for pre-colonial Africa was mentioned by academics, but little elaboration was made by them on how these impacted on the development of the discipline. Memoirs, government reports and reflective essays shaped the direction of my study towards the role of infrastructure in establishing African History.

In addition to memoirs, there are also references to academic infrastructure within many historiographical essays on African History, but they are considerably limited in scope. That said, they do offer pointers towards the role that infrastructure played in the formation of the discipline. For example, John McCracken wrote a reflective essay on the development of the discipline in 1993, acknowledging that the expansion of British Higher Education related to the subsequent emergence of African History at British Universities. McCracken provided an overview of the state of African Studies in British universities since the 1950s. In order to examine the infrastructure behind the discipline of African History, I have broadened the search beyond the historiography of African History to the historiography on educational development in Africa, Britain and the United States.

As with the overview approach taken by McCracken, studies on the development of African History generally focus on key texts, historians and contextual events, and tend to follow a chronological format rather than a thematic approach. A major part of these ‘standard’ historiographical essays is a review of the literature of African History. It is also common for historiographical essays to focus on the development of the
discipline relative to specific geographical areas. For example, the *Oxford History of the British Empire* (hereafter *OHBE*) dedicates volume five to historiography and includes several chapters that relate to the development of African History in the United Kingdom. These chapters focus on how the discipline favoured certain areas within British Africa and reflected the regionalism preferred by historians. *OHBE, vol. V* offers a good overview of British academic attention towards the African past and contains examples of standard historiographical essays on African History. However, there is no detailed evidence provided on how these histories and historians impacted upon the development of the discipline, a theme that I intend to explore in this thesis.

A standard approach to writing about the development of African History found in *OHBE, vol. V* is A. D. Roberts’ chapter ‘The British Empire in Tropical Africa: A Review of the Literature to the 1960s’. Roberts’ chapter contains contextual information and descriptions of the major developments in writing on Africa. The work is authoritative, detailing events and theoretical shifts as a teleological narrative. Roberts’ own background, which incidentally was given little attention in *OHBE, vol. V*, is relevant to the infrastructure and growth of the discipline. Roberts trained in African History under one of the most influential historians of the discipline, Jan Vansina, at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Subsequently, Roberts was an integral figure in teaching at important institutions, and he published significant works that reflected the training he received. After completing his Ph.D. in 1966 he became one of the first American historians to work at the new University College of Dar es Salaam in Tanzania. He then moved to the School of Oriental and African Studies at the University of London, becoming Professor of the History of Africa and now Emeritus Professor. Roberts was also the editor of the *Cambridge History of Africa Volume Seven* and the former editor of the *Journal of African History* between 1974 and 1990. My thesis will explore the background of key African historians, such as Roberts, to shed light on the contribution they made to the establishment of African History.

A model for this Master of Arts thesis on the infrastructure of African History is Lewis Hanke’s reflective essay on the development of Latin-American History in the United States. Hanke’s ‘The Development of Latin-American Studies in the United States, 1939-1945’ looked beyond the role of historians to the infrastructure supporting the academic discipline. His essay, written in 1947 during the initial development of the discipline, devotes a considerable amount of space describing how the academic
infrastructure supporting the discipline was created. According to Hanke, the development of Latin American Studies in the United States during the Second World War resulted from the combined efforts of state and private organisations, such as the Rockefeller Foundation.\textsuperscript{10} Government and private foundations drove the direction of academic study into different fields of enquiry, resulting in an interdisciplinary approach, the growth of Inter-American conferences and the establishment of University courses in Latin American Studies. Furthermore, Hanke noted that the development of the discipline was linked to the expansion of research and the creation of new publications, including bibliographies of existing sources and the expansion of libraries in the field. His approach is a major departure from the approach of the standard historiographical essay available for African History.

Like Hanke, my thesis will detail the development of an academic discipline—in this case, African History. My thesis will be both thematic and chronological, and will show how over a broad time period the links between infrastructure, sources and historians drove the development of the discipline. I am concerned with the crucial moments that impacted upon African History’s position in British and American universities. While I focus on the growth of African History in English and American institutions, written by historians trained within English and American university systems, it must be acknowledged that Africans have recorded their own past in numerous ways. Also, many non-English speaking peoples—such as the French, Portuguese and Spanish—have had considerable relationships with Africa over time. This thesis limits itself to the English-speaking historical tradition where the modern discipline of African History developed. This in turn has contributed to my decision to focus generally, but not exclusively, on the presentation of history for the areas of West Africa that relate directly to the English colonial past.

Chapter One examines the infrastructure of British West African colonies that impacted on the development of the discipline. The aim of this chapter is to illustrate that the development of academic African History was linked to the continued English presence in Africa, from the foundation of the English Colony at Sierra Leone in 1787, to the beginning of university courses at Fourah Bay College, Sierra Leone in 1876, and then to the decision by the Elliot and Asquith committees to develop British African Universities in 1948.\textsuperscript{11} I examine the development from missionary education to government education, focusing on several crucial reports between 1911 and 1945. Importantly, this chapter will illustrate that governmental contributions to educational
development led to the creation of British universities in Africa that directly impacted on the creation of African History as a discipline during the late 1940s. This has been acknowledged in passing, but never considered as pivotal to the creation of African History.

Chapter Two will discuss how, alongside the growth of British-African education in Africa, there was continuous expansion of education in African Studies in the United Kingdom driven by British strategic interests. I will demonstrate how government funding intersected with pedagogical initiatives to place Africa, by the 1960s, in the mainstream of British higher education. I spotlight three important government reports between 1947 and 1963 concerning education. In addition, I focus on the pioneering historians who during this period played a key role in the development of African History.

Chapter Three examines the development of African History as a discipline in the United States. Like the growth of the discipline in the United Kingdom, African History as an academic subject in the United States advanced through a perceived national need, which resulted in an injection of funds to energise the study of Africa. African History, as a separate discipline in the United States, owes its existence to the infrastructural support given to the creation of academic departments, and perhaps, more importantly, to the historians who staffed them. While the contribution of key historians runs as a theme throughout all four chapters of this thesis, this chapter focuses on the role of Philip Curtin and Jan Vansina in developing African History at the University of Wisconsin. Key historians, like Curtin and Vansina, taught African history throughout the 1950s and 1960s, laying the foundation of the discipline. Among the many contributions of the first generation of trained African historians was an emphasis on a critical evaluation of extant source material.

The final chapter of this thesis investigates the contribution of sources to the discipline. One of the most important aspects of African History’s development was the recognition that Africa had a pre-colonial past. I look into how the availability of sources and their limitations impacted on the presentation of pre-colonial African History, ca.1450-1800. This chapter examines closely how source material often drove the way historians studied pre-colonial African history by investigating how the discipline relies on a few written European sources and African oral testimonies. I also spotlight two important port regions of pre-colonial West Africa, Sierra Leone and
New Calabar (Nigeria), and explore how historians have marshalled written and oral sources to present the pre-1800 history of these regions.

This thesis, then, examines the development of African History as an academic discipline in British and American universities in the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s. I show how this growth emerged from the creation of the British colony in Sierra Leone in 1787 to the expansion of missionary activity there. As colonial territories expanded in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, British government officials, aware of Africa’s increased strategic importance, took over the educational endeavours begun by missionary teachers. After the Second World War, governmental and private funding promoted the development of African Studies in British and U.S. universities. Historians participated in the expansion and development of the discipline by researching source material, writing histories and building programmes to train students. These factors combined to form a solid foundational infrastructure for African History, the theme of this thesis.
Notes to Introduction


2 Throughout this thesis I have adopted the following convention, ‘African History’ refers to the academic discipline, whereas ‘African history’ refers to the history of Africa and its peoples.


7 All subsequent references to University of Wisconsin refer to the Madison campus.


9 Lewis Hanke, ‘The Development of Latin-American Studies in the United States, 1939-1945’, *The Americas*, Vol. 4, No. 1, July, 1947, pp. 32-64. Both Latin America and Africa have a similar contextual past which involved large independent civilisations, subsequent conquest and were subject to slavery and colonisation and eventual post-colonial independence. The growth and direction of Latin American Studies was driven by the developments of U.S. scholars while African History was largely driven by British scholars. Prior to the Second World War Latin American Studies was limited in approach by U.S. historians who held a condescending approach to the regions history in much the same way that British historians viewed Africa as void of history. After the Second World War this steadily changed into a more unbiased historical view.

10 Hanke, ‘The Development of Latin-American Studies in the United States, 1939-1945’, p. 32. Hanke notes that the interest of scholars in the area since 1900 had a role to play in the expansion of Latin American Studies.

11 Senegambia was the first English colony in Africa established in 1765, but it was abandoned in 1783. Sierra Leone became the first permanent English colony to be established in Africa.
Reflecting on the development of African History in 1971, John Fage, then Professor of African History at the Centre of West African Studies, University of Birmingham, stated:

The modern period in the writing of West African history begins...with the development of the history departments in the new universities established in West Africa itself from 1948 onwards, and with the more or less contemporaneous development of the serious study of African history in universities elsewhere, first perhaps in Britain and the USA.¹

Fage acknowledges that the creation of the discipline of African History is inexorably linked to the establishment of British universities in Africa. Fage is considered by many in the field to be one of the founding fathers of the discipline and one of the most influential historians of Africa in the United Kingdom.² Like Fage, Roland Oliver is considered by Africanists to be one of the founders of the discipline.³ Oliver had the distinction of holding the first lectureship in African History in Britain at the School of Oriental and African Studies, London in 1948, the same year Fage names as the beginning of the modern period of West African History. Both the development of African universities in British colonies and the appointment of the first lecturer in African history in a British University are seminal moments in the development of African History as an academic discipline in the Western world.

John Fage, by linking the start of African History as a discipline with the establishment of universities in Africa in 1948, indicated a connection between the growth of formal Western education in Africa, the creation of British universities in Africa and the growth of the field of African History. This chapter builds upon Fage’s statement by showing that the birth of the modern discipline of African History had its origins in the development of an educational infrastructure in Africa that emerged as a result of British strategic interests in trade and security. This growth occurred through the changing political relationship between England and its African colonies between 1787 and 1948.

First I will illustrate how the initial educational developments made in Sierra Leone became a blueprint for British education across all of British West Africa until
the late 1940s. I will then outline the development of the key concepts of ‘trusteeship’ and ‘adaptation’ that were embraced in educational policy, and examine the major British colonial government reports on education which occurred after the First World War and again after the Second World War that resulted in the creation of British African Universities in 1948.

Sierra Leone: The beginnings of an educational tradition
The development of education in British Africa started in Sierra Leone with the Portuguese in the fifteenth century. The English continued the Portuguese tradition of Christian education in Sierra Leone and at Fourah Bay established a continued presence on the peninsula leading to its eventual colonisation in the eighteenth century. Missionary activity was an integral component of this continuity and the actions of English evangelicals laid a foundation of Christian education in the colony of Sierra Leone that set the pattern of formal education for all of British Africa. Sierra Leone was the first place in British West Africa to have a missionary training centre, an English secondary school and an English university affiliated college. Africans educated at Sierra Leone went on to become leaders throughout Africa. In Sierra Leone, an infrastructure had been set in place for the integration of missionary education with formal government education and the provision for African higher education in the humanities.

Sierra Leone was one of the most visited regions of West Africa by Europeans after the fifteenth century. Colonisation by the English in 1787 guaranteed Sierra Leone as a crucial base for all future British expansion in West Africa. The Portuguese were the first Europeans to establish trading settlements along the Upper Guinea Coast from Senegal to Sierra Leone during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The Portuguese were replaced by the Spanish during the second half of the seventeenth century. The English, while dominating trade in the area after 1650 and establishing a succession of forts, remained sporadic visitors to the area until the last decades of the eighteenth century. The Portuguese and Spanish established Catholic missions, imparting their faith and traditions to the surrounding peoples, beginning a slow process of religious conversion. According to Paul Hair, the influence of Spanish Catholicism ‘lasted almost until the beginnings of Protestant missions in the 1790s’.

Hair argues that despite the lack of constant English settlement and the lack of English missionary
attempts before 1787, the English did frequent Sierra Leone often enough to lay foundations for later colonial settlement.8

Between 1787 and 1793 British evangelicals and abolitionists established a colony in Sierra Leone for freed slaves, both from England with its recent abolitionist laws, and ex-servicemen from the War of Independence in America. The colony faltered, and in 1792 was reinforced by a second wave of colonists, black Loyalists from Nova Scotia, under the control of the Sierra Leone Company.9 The colonists continued the tradition of religious education started by the Portuguese missionaries in the fifteenth century. Bible instruction and sermons were made available to the ex-slaves from 1792 and was viewed an essential part of the civilising mission of the colony. In contrast to the local Africans, the bulk of the settlers who were of African descent spoke a form of English, had English names and attended Christian services.10 The founders of the colony hoped that the settlement would serve as a base to expand Christianity into Africa and develop trade. Integral to both of these ideals was education. The benefit of European education for trade purposes had long been acknowledged by the local rulers who had been sending their children to Europe since the middle of the eighteenth century.11 Sierra Leone offered the local rulers an alternative to sending their children to Europe for education. There was such a large demand for education in the colony that it outstripped the availability of teachers.12

A more focused and deliberate attempt was made between 1795 and 1804 to expand missionary activity in Sierra Leone. This expansion was related to the foundation of the Missionary Society at London in 1795 whose aim was to expand Christian missions to foreign peoples.13 In 1797 the London Missionary Society sent several missionaries to Sierra Leone in an effort to extend Christianity beyond the confines of the colony to the indigenous Africans.14 The success of the Missionary Society’s preachers was limited amongst the Sula and the Fula peoples, and by 1799 they had stopped sending missionaries. The activities of the Missionary Society in Sierra Leone were replaced by the Church Missionary Society (CMS), founded in 1799. The CMS was associated with the Clapham sect, the original founders of the colony, with many of its members prominent in both organisations.15 The first CMS missionaries went to Sierra Leone in 1804, beginning a long and influential association with Sierra Leone.

The abolition of the slave trade by the British Parliament in 1807 had dramatic effects for educational growth in the colony of Sierra Leone. From 1807 Sierra Leone
became a drop-off point for slaves rescued by the British navy from slave trading ships. These slaves, known as ‘recaptives’, bolstered the population of the colony. In 1808 the Crown took control of Sierra Leone from the Sierra Leone Company. With the government reluctant to become deeply involved in the affairs of the colony the CMS expanded its role in Freetown and became the de facto British government in Sierra Leone. Throughout the nineteenth century the CMS continued its emphasis on the expansion of education for Africans in both the English language and the Protestant faith. Alongside the establishment of facilities for the education of Africans, Freetown became an important place where European missionaries could learn about Africans and study their languages before heading inland to spread the word of God. In 1827 The CMS recognised that they needed to expand facilities to teach the growing number of ‘recaptives’, and founded Fourah Bay College to train missionary teachers. Fourah Bay College was the first English African College specifically designed to train missionary teachers and marks an important step in the process of European educational development in Africa. Missionary education was so important in Sierra Leone that by 1841, thirty-three years after Sierra Leone had become a British Crown colony, no established governmental pattern of education existed in Sierra Leone: out of the forty two schools only fourteen were government schools, the rest being Church Missionary Society or Wesleyan.

The CMS continued to dominate the development of educational facilities in Sierra Leone throughout the latter part of the nineteenth century. In 1845 the CMS extended educational facilities in Sierra Leone with the opening of the first West African secondary grammar school, and in 1876 Fourah Bay College, in association with the University of Durham, became Africa’s first institution offering English university courses. Both these institutions were missionary operated and funded, and in the case of Fourah Bay College the decision to offer university level education in arts subjects was the CMS’s reaction to pressure from educated Africans. The CMS introduced arts subjects at university level to Fourah Bay College to allay the fear that the government might create an African University run along purely secular educational lines, like that suggested by Edward Wilmot Blyden. Blyden was one of the first educated Africans to advocate the teaching of African subjects at Fourah Bay College. Blyden had gained the support of the British administrator of Sierra Leone, J. Pope Hennessy, and advocated the teaching of ‘African languages, songs and oral tradition, and a form of Christianity adapted to the African people’. His pressure did not create...
the secular educational institution that he had hoped for; instead Fourah Bay College remained the extension of existing missionary education with the inclusion of secular subjects. There was, however, some concession as Fourah Bay College created programmes for the study of African languages in West Africa. These courses were not designed to expand the education of Africans but to instruct missionaries so they could spread Christianity through vernacular languages.

The development of missionary education in Sierra Leone, particularly that of higher education at Fourah Bay College, influenced all later British educational policy in West Africa.27 Eminent African historian Emmanuel Ayankanmi Ayandele notes that the high quality of graduates produced at the Church Missionary Society’s grammar school and the affiliation of Fourah Bay with the University of Durham were crucial moments in the development of African intellectual progress in Western education.28 It was at the educational institutions of Sierra Leone that prominent African intellectuals and leaders received their education.29 Some of the most important graduates were Samuel Ajayi Crowther, James Beale Horton, Nathaniel S. King, Sir Samuel Lewis, Christian F. Cole, James Johnson, Isaac Oluwole, Henry Johnson, Henry Rawlinson Carr, Joseph Ephraim Casely-Hayford, Herbert Samuel Heelas Macaulay, and Kenneth Onwuka Dike.30 Dike is considered today by Africanists as one of the founding fathers of African History, receiving an education at Fourah Bay College in the 1940s.31 In Sierra Leone the foundation of Western education in Africa was created, and an infrastructure developed that would spread education throughout British Africa, ultimately leading to the creation of African History as an academic subject.

The developments of a governmental policy for British Africa, 1880-1918

In 1884, eight years after university courses began at Fourah Bay College in Sierra Leone, members of fifteen European states met at the Berlin Conference and decided to partition the African continent. The 1880s mark the point at which Africa began to be gradually placed under the control of colonial powers, culminating in the dominance of Africa by Europeans by the end of the First World War in 1918.32 During the ‘Scramble for Africa’, the British extended their territories and became a dominant power in the African continent. In 1882 the British occupied Egypt, followed by Sudan, Nigeria, Kenya and Uganda in the 1890s.33 By the end of the Great War the British had gained
over one million square kilometres of the African continent, extending its pre-1880s land a thousand fold. After the First World War German territories in Africa were divided between Belgium, Great Britain and France. The British obtained one third of Togoland and part of the Cameroons bordering Nigeria. The most sizeable British acquisition was the German territory of Tanganyika in East Africa.34

As the English expanded their African territories, a gradual transformation from missionary education to formal education took place. Until the end of the First World War in 1918, university education in British Africa remained the domain of the missionary-controlled Fourah Bay College. Along with the increase in British colonial control over areas of Africa there came an increased feeling of responsibility for the education of Africans in the Colonial Office. The Colonial government and the existing missionary organisations combined to address responsibility for education not only in Sierra Leone but across the larger and more populated areas of its governance, such as Nigeria and the Gold Coast.

The development of Colonial policy towards education in African territories embraced two related concepts in the beginning of the twentieth century. The first concept was that of ‘trusteeship’, which was conceived in the Imperial mindset as the moral responsibility of the more ‘civilised’ colonial power to administer governance to African peoples. ‘Trusteeship’ implied that the advancement of African people was to be guided by the Colonial Office through colonial educational policies that wed African demands for improvement and English educational standards and curriculum.35 The second key concept developed was ‘adaptation’, which was the altering of the British educational curriculum to the African situation. Thus, ‘trusteeship’ found its outward expression in the policy of ‘adaptation’, which formed the basis of the educational strategy adopted by the Colonial Office and missionary organisations in Africa.

A clear example of the concepts of ‘trusteeship’ and ‘adaptation’ can be seen in the first decades of the twentieth century when British administrators turned their attention to educating the citizens of the expanding British Empire. In 1907 the Ministry of Education in London held a series of groundbreaking meetings on the development of education in the British Empire. The outcome of these meetings was the decision to hold, in 1911, the first Imperial Conference on education in London. The Report of the Imperial Education Conference, 1911 emphasised the need to simplify the English language in order to spread literacy amongst colonial peoples. Along with an emphasis on literacy the report contained a paper on the education of Africans in Sierra Leone,
Sierra Leone, with its long tradition of established educational facilities for Africans, offered Honter and the members of the Imperial Conference an excellent example of the state of education in an African colony. Honter described the nature of the predominantly missionary education delivered to the descendents of recaptured slaves, or Creoles as they were known, who formed the bulk of the population in the colony centred on Freetown. Importantly, Honter also looked beyond Freetown to the larger area of Sierra Leone known as the Protectorate, inhabited by indigenous Africans. Honter noted that there was a discrepancy between the education delivered by missionary societies in Freetown and in the Protectorate. In Freetown the Creoles had received a European based education for over a hundred years, while the Africans of the Protectorate were the recipients of what can be best described as conversional education, which emphasised practical agricultural training. Honter believed that European education in Sierra Leone had proceeded along two divergent paths, which had separated rather than integrated the indigenous African inhabitants from the Creoles. The Creoles and the Africans who lived in Freetown had formed an educated elite, many having received an academic education at institutions like Fourah Bay College. This group had become disjointed from the rest of the mainly indigenous populace of the Protectorate who saw little value in British education, preferring their traditional educational methods.

For Honter the solution to the discrepancy in education was to adapt the education in both territories. Honter recommended that education for the indigenous Africans of the Protectorate should be a modified form of British education that stressed the development of practical skills rather than the higher literary knowledge taught at Freetown. In Honter’s view:

> education must begin with something of commercial value. Some time in the future, education might be valued for its own sake, but the first step has to be in the direction of returns in money or kind. It appears to me that this is the only way in which education can be successfully introduced.

Honer’s report reflects an early concept of both ‘adaptation’ and ‘trusteeship’, and it also makes clear that by 1911 the pressure exerted for higher education in African
territories during the 1870s had suffered a dramatic setback. Honter suggested that the Colony and Protectorate should share the same system of education tailored to suit the masses. The emphasis of the policy of ‘adaptation’ on the development of practical skills, such as English literacy and agriculture, clearly indicate that British administrators were concerned with the growth of an education system that would benefit the commercial machinery of Empire. Higher education like that offered at Fourah Bay College, while acknowledged as important in the long term development of the colonies, was not seen as a pressing need by the British colonial administration. ‘Trusteeship’ in essence entailed a measure of steady control over the pace of educational change.

Between the 1880s and the end of the First World War, the need to administer British African colonies led officials to acknowledge that educational expansion in Africa was inevitable. In order to control this expansion the concepts of ‘trusteeship’ and ‘adaptation’ emerged, which would ultimately form the genesis of later governmental policy for African education. These two concepts would evolve in the imperial mindset to recognise the importance of African higher education and play a fundamental role in the decision to create universities in Africa and the expansion of African studies in the United Kingdom.

The establishment of formal education in British African colonies, 1918-1925
In the aftermath of the First World War and the 1918 Peace Settlement the advancement of British educational policy for Africa increased dramatically. As a result of the War, British African possessions increased and so did the contribution of the African colonies to the war effort. The commitment of African resources and personnel to the war effort strengthened the commitment in Britain to develop education in the colonies. While the British government acknowledged the need for an overall educational policy for colonial territories in Africa, the direction that education would develop in Africa was again guided by the underlying concepts of ‘trusteeship’ and ‘adaptation’ and the practical involvement of missionary groups, in particular the effort of Dr. Joseph Houldsworth Oldham, the Secretary of the Conference of Protestant Missionary Societies in Great Britain.
Oldham was a trusted advisor of the British government on religious matters during the 1920s and 1930s. He had a lifelong interest in the educational development of Africans and perceived ‘[t]he need for broader missionary perspectives and closer cooperation between missions and state if African interests were to be served in the modern world’. Through Oldham, the promotion of education in Africa was greatly expanded by the British government. In the early 1920s Oldham organised two missionary enquiries into African education known as the Phelps-Stokes Commissions. The Phelps-Stokes Commissions recommended that the educational policy adopted in the British Territory of South Africa be introduced to Tropical Africa. South Africa had introduced the reforms suggested by E. B. Sargent, the Educational Adviser to the British High Commissioner to South Africa. Sargent’s reforms were a classic example of ‘adaptation’, as outlined previously in Houter’s report of 1911, and stressed that Africans should primarily be taught literacy and industrial skills rather than higher education. Oldham supported the findings of the Phelps-Stokes Commissions, and with the backing of already established African missionary organisations he was able to influence the direction of government educational policy. In 1923 Oldham organised the Derby Day Meeting between members of the government, industry and missionary organisations. The outcome of this meeting was the creation of the Colonial Advisory Committee (CAC), whose role was to frame educational policy in Africa. Oldham maintained a strong influence over the three groups involved in the CAC; the Government, industry and missionary organisations, until his resignation in 1934. He was able to ensure that missionary organisations retained the largest influence over educational developments in Africa.

Missionary pressure exerted through the unofficial Phelps-Stokes Commissions’ findings and the personal influence of Oldham resulted in the drafting, with Sir Frederick Lugard, of the 1925 publication of the Colonial Advisory Committee, *Education Policy in British Tropical Africa* (Cmd. 2374). The policy of ‘adaptation’ found official expression in the 1925 report:

*Education should be adapted to the mentality, aptitudes, occupations and traditions of the various peoples, conserving as far as possible all sound and healthy elements in the fabric of their social life; adapting them where necessary to changed circumstances and progressive ideas, as an agent of natural growth and evolution...Education thus defined will narrow the hiatus between the educated class and the rest of the community whether chiefs or peasantry. As a part of the general policy for the advancement of the people every department*
of government concerned with their welfare or vocational teaching—including especially departments of Health, Public Works, Railways, Agriculture—must co-operate closely in the educational policy.

The report, issued as a government white paper, acknowledged that British educational policy had hitherto been largely devoid of an overall plan and that missionary education had been the bulwark of education for Africans. Significantly, the British government did not take over missionary education but moved to control the administration of education and cooperate with existing mission schools to enact the policy of ‘adaptation’. Provision for higher education was also made in the report but its emphasis was downplayed as the priority was explicitly for mass education. Colonial administrators saw education as a way to increase the contribution of the colonial territories towards the development of Empire and to raise the indigenous population towards civilisation. The 1925 Report, while reflecting the recommendations of the earlier 1911 Report, was a more important step towards combining African education with government strategic needs.

According to Professor Thomas Walter Wallbank, the British colonial office policy on education during the 1920s contained three fundamental assumptions. The first was the concept of ‘trusteeship’: the ‘responsibility to utilize all those agencies, of which education is perhaps chief, which contribute towards raising the African in the scale of civilization. This is an altruistic conception of the obligation which a colonial power owes to her native wards’. Wallbank’s second point ‘is that education has a vital connection with industry, trade, and markets... Thus the whole economic structure of a colony advances with the progress of education’. The third and most important point was that while the British were committed to increasing African participation in governmental policy, education was used to ‘retard the creation of a vociferous, yet numerically insignificant, intelligentsia divorced from the great mass of their own inarticulate people, yet demanding impossible political concessions’. Wallbank, significantly, highlights the important relationships at work in the colonial education policy, which married education with commercial interest in an attempt to safeguard British Imperial interests. The colonial educational policy in Africa during the 1920s saw the development of an infrastructure that instituted the policy of ‘adaptation’ into African territories and had the effect of restricting higher education in Africa to a trickle, emphasising mass education and practical skills, particularly that of agriculture over higher education.
The intersection of Imperial responsibility and commercial interest can be seen in the dependence of educational expansion in British tropical African colonies during the 1920s on economic growth. During the late nineteenth century the British government had declined to support the funding of higher education ‘from the conviction that limitations of finance and educational progress made it inexpedient’. However, as economic growth developed in colonial territories during the 1920s so did schemes for the expansion of education. With the combined support of missionary organisations and sufficient funding from local administration, educational facilities could be expanded, laying the basis for later higher educational development. For example, the increase in revenue led directly to the colonial commitment to expand education on the Gold Coast by creating The Prince of Wales College, known as Achimota College (opened in 1927), in Accra. As Wallbank wrote:

It was th[e] development in cacao culture which increased the government's revenues and made possible the financing of an ambitious educational program of which Achimota was a part. Cacao, and cacao alone, explains why educational expenditure could be increased from £54,000 in 1919 to £289,000 in 1930.

The Gold Coast was the largest producer of cacao in West Africa and at one stage produced over seventy five percent of the world’s cacao.

Achimota College is an example of the institutionalisation of the 1925 white paper and Honter’s observations on British colonial policy towards African education in the 1920s. Achimota College was developed after the First World War by the governor of the Gold Coast, Sir Frederick Gordon Guggisberg, who was influenced by the findings of the Phelps-Stokes Commissions. Guggisberg constructed a Secondary School, which he envisioned would eventually offer technical courses and teacher training, which would be a stepping stone towards an African university. Construction of Achimota College began in 1924, and while a few courses were taught from this time, the College did not officially open until 1927, and began offering higher education courses in 1929. The creation of Achimota College reflected the comments of the 1925 white paper, which stated that ‘rapid development of our African Dependencies on the material and economic side demands and warrants a corresponding advance in the expenditure on education’. The concept of ‘adaptation’ stressed in the 1925 white paper also found solid implementation at Achimota College as courses contained a mandatory component of agricultural training:
It must not be thought that Achimota's curriculum is “academic.” As the main economic basis for the colony is agriculture, specifically cacao, this subject is given special attention. It is a compulsory subject for all secondary students, both girls and boys, and also for those enrolled in the Teacher Training Department. Furthermore, the religious and moral instruction of African students was given high priority at Achimota College, also reflecting the values of the 1925 white paper. Along with the increased economic revenue, the Colonial government had become aware of a growing responsibility towards its African wards.

Between 1918 and the 1925 white paper, missionaries and colonial administrators developed the provision for educational facilities in Africa. While the 1925 white paper limited the advancement of higher education in Africa along the lines of that available for English students in the United Kingdom, it did reflect the growing commitment shown by Colonial administrators towards advancement of African education. This commitment was encouraged by recognition of the strategic need to advance colonised peoples in economically developing territories. During the 1920s the British colonial administration and missionary societies had become partners in developing a formal policy for African education, which would deliver Christian education to important British territories, under the auspices of ‘trusteeship’ and ‘adaptation’. The creation of Achimota College in 1924 reflects the advancement of such a policy for educational expansion.

The educational transition to African universities, 1929-1948
During the build up to the Second World War the British colonial government increased its attention on the development of education in British African territories. By the end of the Second World War the provision for higher education in these territories had been officially recognised as essential for Africans and for the strategic interests of Britain. Between 1929 and 1948, provision for the expansion of educational facilities was made possible through the recommendation of three reports on colonial development: the 1929/30 First interim report of the Colonial Development Advisory Committee (Cmd. 3540); the 1939/40 Statement of policy on Colonial development and welfare (Cmd. 6175); and the 1945/46 Despatch dated 12th November, 1945, from the Secretary of State for the Colonies to Colonial Government (Cmd. 6713). These three reports provide an example of the strategic value that Britain placed upon its foreign colonies.
during a period of growing German rivalry in Africa. The 1929/30 *First interim report of the Colonial Development Advisory Committee* (Cmd. 3540) made the initial step towards funding improvements in colonial infrastructure. The report recommended that a sum of £1 million a year be made available for developmental purposes in British colonies. However, this amount was largely insufficient for the demands of all of the British overseas territories. The next major report on colonial development, *Statement of policy on Colonial development and welfare* (Cmd. 6175), occurred after the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939. The report made provision for the expansion of the 1929 Colonial development report increasing the allowance for development from £1 million to £5 million each year for a maximum of ten years. While the writers of the report acknowledged that the rate of progress in implementing its recommendations would necessarily slow down as a result of the war, the fact that any increase at all during a time of war was suggested outlines the strategic importance that the British Government placed on the Colonies.

The largest commitment to funding development in African territories came only months after the end of the Second World War, in the form of the 1945/46 *Despatch dated 12th November, 1945, from the Secretary of State for the Colonies to Colonial Government* (Cmd. 6713). This report made provision for a dramatic increase in funding from the 1929 development and welfare report. In 1929 the provision for development was £1 million per year. In 1939/40 this increased to £5 million per year for a period of ten years, but after the 1945/46 report it increased to £17,500,000 per year and the period was extended for another five years. The provision for an increase in funding for Colonial territories at a time when the British economy was weakened from six years of war, indicates the strategic importance that Britain had placed in her overseas territories. The 1945/46 report states:

> This increase in the total sum to be provided and the lengthening of the period of such assistance by a further five years mark an important turning point in the development of Colonial productive resources and the improvement of human well-being. It comes at a time when a gradual easing of war-time shortages of materials, equipment and skilled technical scientific personal may be hoped for. There are great possibilities in the years that lie ahead for raising the standards of health, education and social welfare, and general well-being of Colonial peoples if these expanded services are based upon improved economic efficiency and increased production. The primary requisite still is an improvement of the economic position in the Colonial Dependencies, the utilisation of their natural resources.
to the greatest extent possible and the widening of opportunity for human enterprise and endeavour. The increase in funding for colonial development shown in the Colonial Office reports of the 1930s and 1940s signalled the transition from missionary dominated education towards a greater governmental role in African education. The reports on Colonial development had a direct impact on both the pace and the importance associated with the development of African territories. It was, however, a series of educational reports that were conducted throughout this period that put in place the manner in which colonial education would be developed and where higher educational facilities would be established.

Alongside the reports recommending the development of overseas colonies in the 1930s and 1940s, fear of German expansion also forced Britain to re-examine its framework for higher education in African territories. There were six reports into education conducted between 1933 and 1945: the Currie Report of 1933; the De La Warr Report of 1937; The Channon Memorandum, 1940; the Channon Report 1943; the Elliot Report 1945; and the Asquith Report 1945. Both the 1933 Currie and 1940-43 Channon Reports recommended an immediate expansion of higher education in African territories. However, the Colonial Office largely ignored these detailed reports, for two reasons. The first stumbling block was the reluctance of the British Colonial Governors to commit to the development of higher educational facilities in their territories. The second obstacle was the Second World War, which diverted attention away from the development of education facilities towards the more pressing concerns of the War effort, inadvertently supporting the lack of enthusiasm shown by the Colonial Governors towards educational development. With the end of hostilities in 1945, both the local governors and the Colonial government acknowledged that British Africa was on a path towards self-rule, and only through partnership in education could British and African interests be mutually served.

The two most important reports for the expansion of higher education in British African territories were the Elliot and the Asquith reports, which were both published at the end of the War in 1945. These two reports marked the fullest recognition of the policy of ‘trusteeship’ expressed in the 1940, Colonial Development and Welfare Report. The Elliot and Asquith Reports represented a dramatic change from the 1920s educational policy of ‘adaptation’ favoured by the government and then dominant missionary educational institutions, which stressed practical subjects and a curb on
higher education. By 1945 the concept of ‘trusteeship’ embraced the crucial acknowledgement that it was not only the moral duty of the colonial government to improve the education, health and economy of African societies, but also their duty to prepare African peoples for eventual self-governance. As the Asquith Report states:

His Majesty’s Government has entered upon a programme of social and economic development for the colonies which is not merely the outcome of a desire to fulfil our moral obligations as trustees of the welfare of Colonial peoples, but is also designed to lead to the exercise of self government by them. In the stage preparatory to self government universities have an important part to play; indeed they may be said to be indispensable.

With the emphasis placed on the essential development of higher education by the Elliot and Asquith Reports the concept of ‘adaptation’, which stressed a curriculum of practical subjects, was joined by the provision for the creation of universities offering higher education.

The Elliot and Asquith Reports formed the basis for the British government’s expansion of higher education in British Africa after 1945. Both Reports were presented in June 1945, and the Elliot Report shared two members with the Asquith Report. The Elliot Report looked specifically at the development of higher education in West Africa and recommended the extension of existing facilities at Sierra Leone, Ghana and Nigeria. The Asquith Report examined the development of higher education across all British colonies and recommended the additional establishment of university colleges in Sudan and Uganda. These five colonies represented the most important British interests in Africa after the Second World War.

The Asquith Report was accepted as the overall plan for the development of universities in British colonial territories, and when combined with the Elliot Report’s specific plans for the development of higher education in West Africa provided the blueprint for the development of African universities. The Asquith Report recommended the creation of an Inter-University Council to facilitate the establishment and administration of the future University Colleges. The Inter-University Council met for the first time on 8 March 1946, and after a series of meetings the members of the committee in November 1947 approved the creation of the university colleges in Africa and the implementation of the recommendations of the Asquith Report. The Asquith Report had become the outline for the exportation of British universities to overseas colonies. By 1948 five University colleges were established in British Africa. Four were affiliated with the University of London: the University College Gold Coast (Ghana);
University College Ibadan (Nigeria); University of Khartoum (Sudan); and the University of Makerere (Uganda). The fifth university college, Fourah Bay College (Sierra Leone), remained affiliated with the University of Durham as it had been since 1876.82

The development of African History as a discipline owes its existence to the implementation of the Asquith Report in 1945. With the Colonial Office approval to create university colleges in Africa and expand higher education, the Report put into place the creation of an infrastructure that would lead directly to the formation of African History as an academic tradition. Two important recommendations contained within the Asquith Report contributed directly to the development of African History. The first recommendation was the insistence on the encouragement of British academics to staff the new institutions.83 The second was that staff, in accordance with the nature of the British academic tradition, must be able to undertake original research.84 The Asquith Report had put in place an infrastructure that supported the research and adaptation of courses such as history to be tailored to the local area.85 This insistence on original research by academic staff opened the way for recruited British scholars to play a fundamental role in local research, ultimately opening up the field of African History. The change was not immediate, and not until the 1960s would African History become accepted as an academic discipline in its own right.86 However, the new ‘Asquith’ colleges as they were known, staffed by British academics, led ultimately to the creation of the discipline of African History.87 African History began developing away from Imperial History as the African past became acknowledged and academically legitimised.

The formal creation of four British sponsored African universities in 1948 to supplement Fourah Bay College in Sierra Leone led to the establishment of an educational infrastructure in Africa. From 1787 to 1948 a shift occurred from sporadic informal education to institutionalised formal university education in Africa. Missionary control gradually gave way to an increased involvement by the British government as Africa gained strategic importance through the First and Second World Wars. The Colonial Office expanded upon the earlier work of missionary societies, and produced a series of educational reports that over the years matured into the policy of ‘trusteeship’ and ‘adaptation’ expressed in the Elliot and Asquith Reports of 1945. Underlying the
creation of these educational reports was the British desire to retain strategic and commercial influence after African colonies gained independence. These reports led directly to the expansion of higher education in Africa and an ideology that stressed the adaptation of curriculum that included the research of peoples and places previously considered void of history. By 1948 there was an educational infrastructure within British African territories that set the path for the development of the discipline of African History that exists today. It was from the new university colleges of Africa, located in the most important areas of British Africa, that African History was born, and it was in the hands of the predominantly English trained academics that African History was researched and written. In Chapter Two I examine how the need for higher education in Africa generated an awareness of the need for scholars to be trained formally in African History.
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CHAPTER TWO
THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ACADEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE FOR AFRICAN HISTORY IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

Chapter Two examines academic African History in England from 1787 to 1963, using British government reports as evidence of change and growth. During these two centuries the growth of higher education in Africa and the expansion of interest in African History in Britain became inexorably linked. Importantly, this chapter will explain how educational and political advances put in place an infrastructure that contributed to the creation of the modern discipline of African History. In doing so I illustrate that the requirement for study of Africa and its people was the result of a strategic need, which resulted in the emergence of teaching positions in institutions in British African colonies and British universities in England. I first look at the growth of academic African History in the United Kingdom after the establishment of the British colony at Sierra Leone in West Africa in 1787 until the government’s 1947 publication known as the Scarbrough Report.¹ I then spotlight how the Scarbrough Report contributed to the discipline’s development. The first ten years after the Scarbrough Report was a key period of academic infrastructural development. Two major reports emerged, the Hayter Report and the Robbins Report, which finally established African History within academic institutions in the United Kingdom.²

The transition to academic African History in Britain: From 1787 to the recommendations of the Scarbrough Report in 1947

In Great Britain formal university courses on Africa and its people were limited before the late 1940s. Nevertheless, educated Britons learned some information about Africa and its people from the published works of travellers and explorers as well as newspapers and exhibitions. The First World War and the Second World War also increased public attention on Africa and increased the numbers of English people who travelled to the continent. Along with an increased awareness of Africa followed an increased need for cultural and geographical information about the region and its peoples. Early travellers to the region also needed to develop basic African language skills, and during the periods of war this became a necessity.
The forebears of African History departments in the United Kingdom were private societies formed by intellectuals and wealthy businessmen in the eighteenth century. One such society was the Association for Promoting the Discovery of the Interior Parts of Africa, more commonly known as the African Association, which was founded in 1788 by a group of wealthy individuals, including Sir Joseph Banks. The primary function of societies like the African Association was to fund exploration and the gathering of knowledge on foreign territories. The African Association funded the pioneering explorations of Mungo Park along the Niger, Frederick Hornemann’s trip to Fezzan, John Lewis Burckhardt’s journey through Egypt and Nubia, and the artist Henry Salt’s exploration of Ethiopia and Egypt. The information gained by these adventurers was published and exhibited, and represented some of the earliest popular accounts of Africa and its peoples. The African Association merged with the Geographic Society in 1831 and the society gained its Royal Charter in 1859. The Royal Geographic Society’s main function was to scientifically record and map the globe, and thus its information served a strategic importance to the commercial and military expansion of Empire.

The most important private organisation to promote the study of Africa from a cultural perspective was the African Society, founded in 1901 in posthumous recognition of the pioneering work on West Africa produced by Mary Kingsley. The African Society gained a Royal Charter in 1935, becoming the Royal African Society. It is interesting to note that this society was financed from donations by two educated Africans, Mr. R. B. Blaize and Dr. E. W. Blyden. This was the same Edward Blyden who had argued vigorously for the creation of a West African University in the late nineteenth century. Blyden became the first vice-president of the African Society. As such, the society had since its inception been concerned with the promotion of knowledge and the education of both British and African peoples.

The strategic importance of education both for Africans and Europeans was acknowledged in a speech made by Frederic Shelford at the Society’s inaugural meeting in 1901. Shelford, introduced to the meeting as ‘the largest employer of labour in West Africa’, pointed out the importance of Africa in terms of the size of population, the number of natural resources available for home industry, and the value of marketing goods back to the Africans themselves. Furthermore, Shelford made an important connection:
Why is it that for hundreds of years West Africa has been regarded as the darkest spot of Darkest Africa? Why is it that for scores of years our merchants have lived on the edge of the sea and have bought from the natives only such palm oil, kernels, rubber and other products as they chose and have sold to the natives such European goods as the natives have happened to hear of and to require? Why have the natives not produced more? Why have they not bought more from us? Why in fact has not the trade between this country and those Colonies been greater? Why has our knowledge of these Colonies been chiefly derived from the wars we have waged against them? Why did we have to fight the Ashantis again and again till 1896? Why did we have to punish the Benins in 1897? Why did the Mendis rise in 1898? Why did we have to fight the Ashantis again in 1900? Is not the answer to all these questions to be summed up in one word—“Ignorance”.

From this, Shelford argued that the only way to alleviate ignorance and improve the opportunities for development was to educate the West Africans as well as the English. Shelford had realised in 1901, forty-seven years before the first chair of African History was appointed in the United Kingdom, that along with the development of education for Africans there was also a strategic need for the British to be educated about Africa. Shelford’s comments share a remarkable similarity to the later comments made in government reports promoting the study of Africa in Britain after 1945.

The African Society promoted the dissemination of knowledge about African peoples in Britain through the establishment of its pioneering publication the Journal of the African Association. The importance of this journal was summed up in the 1951 fiftieth jubilee edition that noted that since its creation in 1901 until the 1920s ‘there was no other Society or Journal devoted mainly to the investigation of African life and customs’. Along with the publication of the Journal of the African Association, the contribution of the African Society to the development of formal African studies took practical shape in the contribution of one of its most promising staff members, Alice Werner, to the newly formed School of Oriental Studies (SOS) at the University of London in 1916. Alice Werner became a lecturer in Swahili at the School and was joined by her sister Mary. The two Werner sisters were responsible for teaching African languages until their retirement in the 1930s.

The creation of the SOS tacitly acknowledged the importance of the study of Oriental and African languages to the administration of the Colonial Empire. Some provision for the study of Oriental languages and literature had been available in Britain at Oxford and Cambridge since the seventeenth century, but there was no single centre
that focused specifically on languages or taught introductory language courses for diplomats and government officials in London. The University of London decided to meet the need for such an institution, and in 1905 the university council recommended that a school be set up within the University of London to expressly teach Oriental languages. In 1908, a committee of inquiry approved the recommendation for the formation of a separate constituent college within the University of London. After a decision was made to situate the new school at Finsbury Circus in London, the process went on hold until 1912 when Parliament passed an act to create the SOS. In 1914 funding was approved, but with the outbreak of the First World War the creation of the institution was delayed. Sir Philip Hartog, the main proponent for the creation of the school, promoted the usefulness of the institution in the War effort, and in 1916 SOS received its Royal Charter, finally opening in February 1917. The school’s location in London related directly to its role in training diplomats and government officials for foreign posts, central to the post-1918 expansion of British territory in Africa.

During the 1930s SOS focused on the practical teaching of foreign languages. Officials recognised that training also should be given in Literature, History, Religion and Customs of foreign peoples, but those fields remained limited at the school during this decade. In 1932 the School was reorganised into eight departments. There were six for the study of languages and cultures, one for Oriental history and Law, and one for phonetics and linguistics. The regional departments were: Ancient India and Iran; Modern India and Ceylon; South East Asia and the Islands; the Far East; the Near East; and Africa. The regions and languages studied at SOS in the 1930s reflected areas of British government and business interest. In recognition of the growing importance of British territories in Africa and with the help of a Rockefeller Foundation Grant, SOS gradually built up an African studies department between 1932 and 1937 with a staff of six specialists in African languages. In 1938 it changed its title to the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS).

With the outbreak of the Second World War, the need for foreign language skills increased dramatically. Initially the British Government was reluctant to fully utilise the University to train military personnel, but by 1943 SOAS was recognized as the primary institution in United Kingdom for Oriental and African languages. Over one thousand members of the armed services were trained at SOAS between 1943 and 1945. By the end of the War the School had proven itself an invaluable institution and had made a strong case for increased government funding to meet the changing requirements of the
Post-War period. Cyril Henry Phillips, who became a lecturer at SOAS in 1936, Professor in Oriental History and head of the History Department from 1946 to 1980, and who also served as Director of SOAS between 1957 and 1976, pointed out the context in which the proposal for increased government support was met:

> The movement of world affairs, the ebb and flow of British fortunes, favoured the proposal, and the great changes brought about by the war in Asia and Africa, and the implications of the wartime alliance with Russia had made it urgently necessary to make a fresh appraisal of Britain’s relation to these areas.\(^{20}\)

The British Government received SOAS’s proposal favourably, and Mr Anthony Eden, Secretary Of State for Foreign Affairs, authorised the establishment of a commission under the chairmanship of Lord Scarbrough to examine the current state of Oriental and African studies in the United Kingdom and to provide recommendations for their improvement.\(^{21}\) The Commission began work in 1945 and presented its findings to the Government in April 1946. *The Report of the Interdepartmental Commission of Enquiry on Oriental, Slavonic, East European and African Studies*, or the Scarbrough Report as it was known, was subsequently published in 1947.

**The Scarbrough Report**

The Scarbrough Report was a milestone in the development of the future discipline of African History, more for what it identified as the way forward in the fields of Oriental, Slavonic, East European and African Studies, than for what it practically achieved. The most important accomplishment made by the authors of the Scarbrough Report was the recognition that the study of the people and regions of Asia, the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and the Colonial Empire, were fundamentally important for British security and economic growth. As Chapter Three, ‘The National Importance of These Studies’, of the Scarbrough Report states:

> a nation which does not possess a sound foundation of scholarship is ill-equipped to deal with world affairs, for scholarship is the source from which a knowledge of other countries and an interest in their ways of living is spread among the people. At a time when great efforts are being undertaken to make co-operation between the nations the basis of world peace and future prosperity this foundation of scholarship has an importance which cannot be disregarded without injury to the national and to international and to imperial interest.\(^{22}\)
By identifying the need for future academic enquiry into foreign peoples, the Scarbrough Report single-handedly created the foundation for the subsequent development of African History in British Universities.

The Scarbrough Report acknowledged that non-linguistic African Studies was almost non-existent in the United Kingdom. It recommended the ‘building up of an academic tradition comparable in quality and in continuity with those of the major humanities and sciences’ and suggested that facilities for linguistic and non-linguistic study of Africa should be developed with urgency across the United Kingdom. To create an academic tradition in Oriental, Slavonic, East European and African Studies required new students and academics who would become specialists in these fields of study. Without the expansion of departments, new students and trained specialists, no expansion of knowledge in these new subjects could be undertaken. The Report recommended twenty studentships in African Languages and thirty studentships in non-linguistic African Studies for young students who might be trained to hold junior academic posts. In addition, the Scarbrough Report made provision for grants to expand the staffing of university departments and centres of study: ‘On a very rough estimate, the additional annual expenditure which the Universities as a whole would need to incur might be of the order of £225,000 at the end of five years, and a further £225,000 at the end of ten years’.

The Scarbrough Report recognised the importance of expanding the largest English institution, the SOAS, into a world leader in Asian, African, Slavonic and East European studies. While expansion at SOAS included the provision for non-linguistic study this was secondary to the continuation of its role as the dominant institution where African languages could be studied in the United Kingdom. The importance placed on language study by the authors of the Scarbrough Report and SOAS can be seen in the provisions made for future staff levels at SOAS. The Director of SOAS submitted a proposal to the Scarbrough Commission to expand staffing levels for African Studies from 1944/45 to 1960. These recommendations specify a remarkable increase in staff numbers considering that at the time there were only six staff in the African studies department. The Scarbrough Report accepted the proposed increase at SOAS from six staff to forty-eight over sixteen years, and recommended that they ‘be accepted in their entirety’. With provision made for only two lecturers in Anthropology and two Lecturers in African History and Law during the sixteen year period, it is clear that African language was considered paramount at SOAS (see Table 1).
Table 1. Proposed Staff Requirements for the School of Oriental and African Studies, from 1944/45 to 1960.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professors (two of Bantu and two of West African languages)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readers in Swahili, Bantu languages, Hausa, and West African Languages</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers in individual languages</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readers or Senior Lecturers in Anthropology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers in African History and Law</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve of lecturers (to allow for field research)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Assistants</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Staff</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In addition, the Report recommended that non-linguistic studies on Africa, or as it was labelled in the report ‘Colonial Studies’, should be developed in the Universities of London, Oxford and Cambridge. The authors also hoped to foster an interest in African studies at ‘[t]wo other universities, one in Scotland and one in the north of England’. The Institute of Colonial Studies at Oxford University was encouraged under the leadership of Margery Perham, a noted historian of Colonial Africa and Reader in Colonial Administration, to ‘direct attention to the problems of the Colonial Empire’. Likewise, Cambridge University was encouraged to expand studies on African subjects and build upon the expertise of Professor E. A. Walker, who was the current holder of the Vere Harmsworth Professorship of Imperial and Naval History at Cambridge University and was well known for his interest in Africa. The institutions at Oxford and Cambridge were encouraged to build upon their existing strengths in Colonial Studies, particularly that of Anthropology, which was at the time considered essential for those who sought careers in Africa.

The milestone Scarbrough Report of 1947 marks one of the most important developments in the creation of the discipline of African History. This report acknowledged that Africa and its peoples were a valid area of concern worthy of academic study in universities of the United Kingdom. Without this government recognition, African Studies and the discipline of African History would not have been
funded and most likely would not have been established as a permanent subject within British institutions of higher learning in the next decade.

The development of African History in the United Kingdom, 1947-1957
Between 1947 and 1957 the growth in academic infrastructure promoted by the Scarbrough Report, albeit modest, guaranteed the future development of African History in the United Kingdom. While the Scarbrough Report intended to ‘increase the development of non-linguistic subjects, which had been hitherto neglected’, the actual institutional increases of the Scarbrough Commission’s recommendations were limited. In 1952, after only five years, the University Grants Committee stopped the provision of specific grants for Oriental, Slavonic, East European and African Studies put in place by the Commission. From 1952 onwards African Studies departments had to compete with other more established subjects for their share of funding. The reduction of earmarked grants hindered the implementation of the Scarbrough Report’s recommendations with the majority of the funding during the 1950s going to SOAS.

By 1960 SOAS had twenty staff, with less than a dozen African specialists and, as John Fage remarked, ‘was to all intents and purposes no more than a department of African languages’. Yet despite Fage’s claim, the impact of the Scarbrough Report to African studies during the late 1940s and 1950s was considerably greater than the funding of an African language department at SOAS.

The Scarbrough Report promoted interest in Africa and prompted the growth of academic inquiry in the late 1940s and throughout the 1950s. These years were so crucial to the full emergence of the discipline that Jan Vansina, one of the foremost Africanist scholars, claimed in his 1994 autobiography that African History had achieved academic acceptance marked by the independence of Ghana in 1957. Vansina noted that in order to reach academic credibility the discipline had to achieve three key objectives: ‘A sufficient number of historians of Africa had to be recruited, an African history curriculum had to be set up, and it had to be shown that valid and usable sources were available for practitioners to write “indigenous history”’. In order to recruit historians, academic posts had to be created and a pioneering generation of African historians had to step up to recognise the potential of an Africanist history. The first generation of English scholars who wrote about Africa, like John Fage, Roland Oliver and John Blake, were not trained Africanists. That is, they
were not trained to present African History from an African perspective. For example, during the 1930s Blake trained in Imperial History as a pupil of Arthur Newton, the Rhodes Professor of Imperial History at Oxford. A decade earlier, Newton, the then Professor of Imperial History in the University of London, made the remarkable statement that Africa had ‘no history before the coming of the Europeans’. Thus, in the first half of the twentieth century, the first English academics writing on Africa, like Blake, worked within an educational framework steeped in an imperialist view that considered Africa as an integral part of the story of European nations, not as a continent with innumerable histories of its own. As a result, throughout the 1930s and early 1940s, publications on Africa were primarily the story of European enterprise in Africa. Yet scholars like Blake had realised by the late 1940s that a process of change was in motion, and had acknowledged that the time had come to write a history of Africa from an African perspective, albeit at this stage primarily reconstructed from European records.

In 1948 Roland Oliver was appointed as the first lecturer in the Tribal History of East Africa at the School of Oriental and African Studies in London. This key appointment reflected the landmark shift in perspective that had occurred in recognising that Africa had its own history. This lectureship was made possible by the provision of funding generated by the Scarbrough Report. Oliver’s appointment was immediately followed by his field research in East Africa between 1949 and 1950, after which he concluded that Ugandan history could be studied several centuries before the arrival of Europeans, a fact that hitherto had not been considered possible in academic circles. During his fieldwork Oliver learned the importance of interdisciplinary cooperation, and on his arrival back in England he presented oral traditions as legitimate historical sources. Oliver’s appointment in 1948 was followed in the same year by the development of African university institutions, administered by SOAS. John Fage’s appointment in 1949 as a lecturer in history at the University College of the Gold Coast, formally Achimota College, was the result of funding called for by the Scarbrough Report and the relationship of SOAS to African institutions. While in Africa, Fage, like Oliver, had realised that there was a rich local African history waiting to be researched and revealed, and alongside several prominent social anthropologists began to champion the introduction of African history courses.

The two pioneering fathers of the discipline, Roland Oliver and John Fage, played a pivotal role in establishing the burgeoning subject of African History. Both
Oliver and Fage acknowledged the need for cooperation between historians, archaeologists and anthropologists. Throughout 1951 and 1952 Fage and Oliver met and conceived the First Conference on African History and Archaeology, which was held in 1953 at SOAS. The conference brought together academics from a wide range of disciplines and was subsequently described by Oliver in his 1997 autobiography as having put African History on the map. This was the first ever international conference designed to bring history teachers from all of the African university colleges together alongside international scholars. It’s central topic of discussion was the urgent task of advancing pre-European African history. Discussion centred on how oral traditions, archaeological remains and written records might be used to reconstruct the African past. Historians at the conference realised that the minimal written evidence available from largely pre-literate West-African societies meant that to uncover the pre-colonial past alternative evidence had to be garnered. To counter the claims of sceptics within the academy, historians of Africa had to prove, as Vansina claimed, that there were enough accurate sources to present indigenous history, and importantly that this history existed for pre-colonial Africa. The success of this conference can be measured by the fact that Fage subsequently implemented African history courses at the University of the Gold Coast between 1953 and 1954.

While the 1953 conference had opened the way for academic interdisciplinary cooperation, the 1957 conference set about making the future direction of African History a reality. The proceedings for the 1953 and 1957 conferences were each subsequently published. Both of these reveal that the focal point of these seminars were centred around the methodological problems confronting historians and archaeologists. The 1957 conference held at SOAS, like its pioneering 1953 predecessor, was fundamentally important for emphasizing that the future of African History as a subject of study relied on combining various types of source material. The 1957 conference urged the immediate need to train historians ‘for fieldwork in Africa in concert with archaeologists and anthropologists’. According to Vansina, who attended the 1957 conference, oral tradition was discussed at length in the proceedings and singled out as an important area for continued attention. Vansina considered the two groundbreaking conferences in the 1950s on African History and Archaeology as evidence of the acceptance of African History’s legitimacy as an academic subject. Both Vansina and Fage, writing in the 1990s, reflected on how historians of tropical Africa doubled between 1953 and 1957, with thirty-three papers submitted in the first
conference and seventy in the second.\textsuperscript{61} However, aside from conferences, there was
still no real forum for the academic sharing of multidisciplinary information.

Between 1948 and 1957 attempts at the integration of a multidisciplinary history
of Africa had been undertaken by specific university departments in the United
Kingdom and Africa. At SOAS, Roland Oliver’s role was to ‘address the much wider
question of how African history could be developed into a regular subject of study, not
only in London but also in the emerging university colleges in tropical Africa that were
preparing their students for London University degrees’.\textsuperscript{62} Integral to the development
of the emerging discipline was the need to supervise postgraduate students who would
ultimately go on to teach African history from an Africanist perspective. The difficulty
in training students in African subjects in the United Kingdom was that they were
constrained by limited funding. Furthermore, in a three-year postgraduate course
students could not develop adequate African language skills.\textsuperscript{63} In his 1997
autobiography Oliver claimed that the ultimate result of this was that postgraduate
students were restricted to writing African history from European records.\textsuperscript{64}

Evidence of the dependence on European sources can be seen in the details of
postgraduate theses produced and the research undertaken in African subjects. James
Coleman investigated the current state of Africanist research in 1959 within the United
Kingdom, and concluded that the discipline had progressed along a multidisciplinary
path combining anthropology, sociology and history.\textsuperscript{65} Coleman noted that ‘51 of the 72
Ph.D. dissertations completed in British universities during the period 1950-1956’ and
‘79 of the 107 current research projects’ on African subjects were in anthropology,
sociology and history.\textsuperscript{66} However, the pattern of this growth shows that while African
academics who studied history were on the increase, by 1957 anthropology, not history,
dominated the field work in Africa and retained the largest number of Ph.D. students.\textsuperscript{67}
Between 1950 and 1956 the number of Ph.D. students in anthropology was three times
greater than those in history. In sum, the number of postgraduate students studying
African topics in the United Kingdom during this period were: forty studying
anthropology; eleven in history; six for political science and law; five for linguistics;
five in economics; and five in geography.

It is particularly striking that, despite the growth of postgraduate interest in
African subjects between 1948 and 1957, few students produced theses that considered
an African perspective of events for pre-colonial Africa ca.1450-1800. Of the sixty-six
students who completed an M.A. or Ph.D. thesis on African subjects up until and
including 1957, only thirteen can be considered as pre-1800 histories. Of these, only ten theses were on subjects directly about African peoples removed from European contact: one for Tanganyika in Central Africa; one for Ethiopia; and eight for Egypt. Furthermore, all of the theses related to ancient and medieval history prior to 1450. During the first ten years of the development of the discipline, then, postgraduate attention was mainly directed at African histories that could be researched from written records held in European archives.

One striking exception to scholars’ continued reliance on written European records was the British trained Nigerian academic Kenneth Onwuka Dike, who received his Ph.D. from the University of London in 1950. Much has been written in retrospect about the importance of Dike’s thesis ‘Trade and Politics in the Niger Delta, 1830-1879’, published in 1956. Dike’s work reflected the growing assertion in the 1950s that African history could be presented in its own right. Ajayi, writing about Dike, claimed he:

was the first to get [oral evidence] accepted as part of a scholarly work for a doctorate, and it was not easy then to get a supervisor or the relevant University Committee to agree to it. That is why his resultant work *Trade and Politics in the Niger Delta* marks and important milestone in the evolution of historiography not only in Africa, but also generally.

While not exclusively a work which utilised oral sources, Dike did incorporate traditional histories throughout his first chapter, ‘The Pattern of West African Trade and Politics, 1481-1830 and his second chapter, ‘The Delta and its People’. In doing so Dike promoted the case that African oral evidence could be examined alongside that of European written material. The success of Dike’s revolutionary approach can be seen in the fact that he championed the introduction of African history courses at the University College of Ibadan (Nigeria). Until 1956, the University of London had only permitted the University College of Ibadan to teach the history of Europeans in Africa.

The acceptance of African History was achieved by 1957 through the crucial acknowledgment by scholars in the value of an interdisciplinary approach towards the reconstruction of the African past. Revealing the pre-colonial past was the key factor required for historians to present an Africanist history, and the lack of pre-colonial sources necessitated interdisciplinary skills. Historians, particularly those teaching in African universities, were beginning to turn their attention to pre-colonial history, a point reinforced by the success of the 1953 and 1957 conferences on African History.
and Archaeology at SOAS. It was due to the pioneering work done between the two conferences that teams of academics from different disciplines were able to work together on similar projects. One such project was the ‘Scheme for the Study of Benin History and Culture’, launched in 1956 under the direction of Kenneth Dike. Since completing his Ph.D. dissertation, Dike had returned to Nigeria and joined the History Department of the University College, Ibadan. After working at the West African Institute for Social and Economic Research between 1952 and 1954 he returned to the university and in 1956 was awarded a Professorship and the chair of the History Department.  

Dike’s Benin project sought to integrate the findings of various interdisciplinary fields in order to recreate the history of Benin, an African kingdom which flourished from the tenth century until conquered by the British in the late-nineteenth century. However, while there were interesting points made, the ultimate goal of an integrated picture of Benin’s history was not achieved. Robert July, looking back on the Benin project in 1987, wrote that:

[m]uch information and experience was gained, particularly with the complexities of a multidimensional project. Written records of European origin, local oral traditions, the sociology of contemporary Benin, and the material remains of the past were all studied in detail and with profit. Difficulties arose, however, in relating information from different sources to form a coherent integrated picture of the past. No single person appeared capable of absorbing such diverse materials to produce one synthetic whole.

According to July, the major stumbling block to interdisciplinary cooperation was the complexity involved in understanding other disciplines’ methodologies and to satisfactorily express both. Despite the best intentions of academics to grasp the complexities of other disciplinary methods it was clear that by the late 1950s the intended interdisciplinary cooperation on the Benin project was not successfully achieved. For example, Alan Ryder, who worked on Dike’s Benin Scheme, went on to write *Benin and the Europeans, 1485-1897* in 1969, a work that failed to use an interdisciplinary approach and relied predominantly on archival records.

The failure of interdisciplinary cooperation was especially true in the presentation of pre-colonial African history, an essential area of study for the emerging discipline. The recovery and presentation of pre-colonial African history was required to prove that Africans had a history of their own before the arrival of Europeans. The difficulty in presenting a total picture of history for any area of pre-colonial Africa during the 1950s
was directly attributable to the lack of comprehensive evidence available in any one particular type of source. The reconstruction of the African past, according to Roland Oliver, was not related to the scarcity of sources, rather, African historians would need training in numerous languages. One would need to read:

- English, French, Arabic, Portuguese, Dutch, German, Italian, Afrikaans, Amharic, Greek Latin and Ancient Egyptian, [Spanish] to name only the most important. The unwritten lore of pre-colonial times has to be recovered from peoples speaking some six or seven hundred languages. The archaeological approach, beginning with man’s origins and before, continuing right up to the eve of the colonial period, requires as many skills as the historical.77

With the historian of Africa requiring competency in European languages, the appropriate African languages, and an understanding of archaeological methods, it is little wonder that the majority of historians during the 1950s reconstructed African history mainly from the European archival record.78

It is also understandable that the colonial period dominated publications on Africa during the 1950s. While historians were being trained in new approaches the more plentiful written records of the colonial period offered instantaneous sources. Where adequate written materials existed there was little cross-disciplinary work required to reconstruct an account of past events. It was the lack of written African sources that created difficulty in the training of historians in a new type of African History, and ultimately the problematic nature of source material would influence the presentation of the African past.

During the period from 1948 to 1957, anthropologists, archaeologists, linguists and historians wrote and researched Africa within their own given fields, met to discuss their findings at conferences, and published their ideas in journals. Despite relatively few numbers of Africanist historical theses during the 1950s that covered the pre-colonial period of African history, dramatic growth had been achieved in the recognition that multidisciplinary cooperation was required in the subject. In the case of most postgraduates their theses concerned the better known regions such as North Africa, the coastal regions of West Africa and South Africa, where there was considerable European contact, and usually focused on the late-nineteenth century. In hindsight, the 1950s can be seen as a transitional point in the development of the discipline, and while Vansina’s claim that that the discipline had come into academic acceptance by 1957 is valid, the discipline had not yet resolved its interdisciplinary methodological dilemma. According to Vansina in his 1994 autobiography, by 1960
none of the various interdisciplinary schemes were successful in creating a multidisciplinary reconstruction of the past.  

However, the decision at the 1957 conference to create the *Journal of African History* and its subsequent publication since 1960 went in some way to rectifying the need for a cross-disciplinary approach. The *Journal of African History* provided a forum for historians and specialists in the field. The success of the 1953 and the 1957 conferences and the growth in the numbers of African historians led directly to the Rockefeller Fund’s decision to financially assist the creation of the *Journal of African History* with John Fage and Roland Oliver as its founding editors. The foundation of the journal was described by Philip Curtin, a well-known pioneering American historian of Africa, as ‘the coming-of-age’ of African History. What made the *Journal of African History* so important was that it was the first journal dedicated to publishing multidisciplinary articles on the history of Africa and its people, focusing on an Africanist perspective. Terrance Ranger, a respected Africanist historian, paid tribute to the foundation of the *Journal of African History* at the 1974 University of Edinburgh conference ‘African Studies since 1945’, where he noted that the journal championed the now accepted multidisciplinary approach to the African past.

While the *Journal of African History* enabled publication in one place of multidisciplinary investigation into African history, its role remained more as a forum for knowledge than a tool of interdisciplinary training. The journal’s strength lies solely in its ability to present African history to a wide readership. To Jan Vansina, writing in 1995, the attempts to integrate oral and archaeological evidence into the historical discipline of African History have still not been satisfactorily achieved, and despite the valiant efforts of the *Journal of African History*, African History and archaeology remained divided largely due to the difficulty of integrating the findings into a meaningful historical account. One example of an attempt to share disciplinary findings in the *Journal of African History* can be seen in the constant revisions to radiocarbon dating in pre-colonial Africa. Between 1960 and 2002 the journal published twenty-four articles on radiocarbon dating, each updating artifactual evidence. This dating provides some useful information for reconstructing the chronological framework for African civilisations, but due to its non-absolute nature, exact dating is difficult and thus is problematic for use by historians. The problem of interdisciplinary cooperation is that it requires considerable cross-training between fields that are often incompatible.
Between 1947 and 1957 historians attempted a new interdisciplinary approach to reconstructing the African past. The discipline aimed to consider an African perspective from a multitude of sources, something unthinkable before the Second World War. With the 1957 conference on African History and Archaeology the discipline of African History had achieved a sense of legitimacy. Courses and methodologies were being established that would culminate in a massive growth in the study of African History in the 1960s. African History was on the threshold of what historian Terrance Ranger considered to be the ‘Golden Age’ of African History.85

The Hayter and Robbins Reports, 1961-1963

While African History established itself throughout the 1950s, two official government reports guaranteed the infrastructural support required for the fledgling discipline in the 1960s. The first of these was published in 1961 by the University Grants Committee, Report of the Sub-Committee on Oriental, Slavonic, East European and African Studies, known as the Hayter Report. The authors of the report acknowledged the fundamental contribution of the Scarbrough Report to all subsequent developments in African Studies in the United Kingdom, yet, at the same time, the Report noted that political changes rather than the recommendations of the Scarbrough Commission had increased the study of Africa in British institutions.86 The Hayter Report outlined that between 1947 and 1961 there had been considerable improvement in non–linguistic African Studies but that the level of improvement was still insufficient and did ‘not reflect the comparative importance demographically, politically or economically of these areas’.87 The Report acknowledged that there was a strategic importance in the development of African Studies and noted that the authors of the Scarbrough Report had been justified in their recommendations for the immediate increase in Oriental, Slavonic, East European and African Studies.88 The Hayter Report was published at a time when decolonisation had resulted in creating ‘seven newly independent territories, four in Asia and three in Africa, and more on the verge of independence’.89 The authors of the Hayter Report saw that the need for African Studies in English universities was as great in 1961 as it had been in 1947.90

The Hayter Report fostered the growth of a solid infrastructure for the expansion of African Studies and importantly the development of African History as a discipline
throughout the 1960s. John Fage gives a good overview of the important recommendations of the Hayter Report:

A further dose of Scarbrough-type medicine was urgently needed to expand the total quantity of university research into these areas, 'to increase the number of students outside the language departments who come into contact with the ideas, history and problems of the non-western world', and 'to achieve a better balance between linguistic and non-linguistic studies and between classical and modern studies'. To this end it was recommended that over the ten years 1962-71 earmarking should be resumed to create 125 new posts in the history, geography, economics, law, anthropology or other non-language aspects of the non-western world, or for posts in such fields which would be held jointly with language departments; to fund ten postgraduate studentships a year; and to support teaching and research relevant to the non-western world with adequate library resources and travel funds.\(^91\)

The Hayter Report also recommended the setting up of ‘Area Studies Centres’, which resulted in the establishment of the Centre of West African Studies at the University of Birmingham (CWAS) and the Centre of African Studies at the University of Edinburgh in 1963.\(^92\) The formation of Area Studies Centres was influenced by a visit to the United States by members of the Hayter Commission.\(^93\) The intention behind the creation of these centres was that academics of different disciplines would gather to share sources and develop a well-rounded approach to the peoples and regions being studied. Fage states that, ‘after Hayter had reported, it was interesting to notice that SOAS put alongside its departmental structure a framework of area studies centres, headed by chairmen drawn in rotation from the various disciplinary departments—albeit not from their heads’.\(^94\) According to Fage, the Hayter Report also led to the creation of the independent African Studies Association of the United Kingdom by Roland Oliver and Antony Allott in 1963.\(^95\)

In 1963 the British government, via the Robbins Report, further strengthened the infrastructure supporting African Studies. The 1963 Report of the Committee appointed by the Prime Minister under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins, 1961-63 (Higher Education) (Cmd. 2154) prompted a large growth in higher education and an increase in staff.\(^96\) The Robbins Report conducted a review of the entire higher education system in the United Kingdom and recommended that student numbers be increased from 216,000 in 1962/63 to 560,000 in 1980/81.\(^97\) The Committee was not far off the mark: by 1981 there were 533,000 students in higher education in the United Kingdom.\(^98\) In order to cope with the planned increase in students, the Report recommended an increase in
staffing to maintain, and if possible increase, the ratio of teachers to students.  

According to Fage, ‘[b]y the 1960s, especially perhaps with the implementation of the Robbins Report after 1963, substantial numbers of British academics with experience in Africa were finding their way onto the teaching and research staffs of the UK universities’.  

Table 2 contains a list of academics who worked in African universities who went on to hold major academic posts. For the most part this table is concerned with universities in the United Kingdom and English scholars. The exceptions are Andrew Roberts, Graham Irwin, John Omer-Cooper, Ivor Wilks and Jack Lander. Roberts, an American, spent his entire career after Dar Es Salaam teaching at SOAS, and Graham Irwin, an Australian educated in Britain, was John Fage’s successor in Ghana before heading the African Studies department at Columbia University. Omer-Cooper, a South African who shifted to New Zealand to escape an attempt on his life, was the former head of the history department at the University of Zambia. He effectively established African History as a subject in New Zealand at Otago University. Wilks, a pioneer of African oral history, taught for over two decades at Northwestern University in Chicago, and Landers, an English medieval historian, was a prominent historian in Africa before going to Canada. Like Landers, not all of the people in the table went on to teach African History. For example, Patrick Collinson was an ecclesiastical historian of England and Jack Scarisbrook was an English medievalist. Robert Gavin and Eric Stokes produced some African history, but Gavin predominantly worked on English and Irish history and Stokes became a major historian of India at Cambridge. Roger Anstey and Richard Gray were former students of Roland Oliver and Andrew Roberts a past student of Jan Vansina. Importantly all of these historians were serving in Africa between 1950 and 1970, the crucial years of the discipline’s development.

The expansion of the supporting infrastructure of higher education driven by the Robbins Report helped to bring historians who had trained in Africa into history departments across the United Kingdom. These new lecturers carried their expertise on Africa, as Fage recollected, not only into African departments but also into ‘straightforward disciplinary departments’, such as History. As Fage stated in 1989, ‘I can think of nine historians who had held expatriate posts in the African colleges who subsequently held UK chairs of Modern History; this compares with six who have held UK chairs of African or Imperial History’. Importantly these historians brought with them from service in Africa a developed sense that Africa had a rich historical past.
Table 2. Historians who have held senior positions after service in African Universities.

### Chairs of Modern History in the UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historian</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roger Anstey</td>
<td>1952-59, Ibadan, Nigeria</td>
<td>1968-79, University of Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hair</td>
<td>1953-65, Khartoum &amp; Ibadan</td>
<td>1965-90, [Chair 1979] Liverpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence Ranger</td>
<td>1957-63, Rhodesia 1963-69, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania</td>
<td>1965-84, Royal Holloway College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Scarisbrick</td>
<td>1950s-60s, Ghana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Posts in Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historian</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jack Lander</td>
<td>1950s-60s, Ghana</td>
<td>1960s-1986, University of Western Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Omer-Cooper</td>
<td>1950s-60s, Ibadan 1966-73, Zambia</td>
<td>1974-1997, Otago, New Zealand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Posts in UK Polytechnics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historian</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Furley</td>
<td>1957-60s, Makerere</td>
<td>1970s-current, Coventry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Gavin</td>
<td>1960s-70s, Ibadan</td>
<td>1980s-90s, Ulster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chairs of African or Imperial History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historian</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Fage</td>
<td>1949-59, Ghana</td>
<td>1959-63 SOAS 1963-84, Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Gray</td>
<td>1959-61, Khartoum</td>
<td>1961-89, SOAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Roberts</td>
<td>1960s-70s, Dar es Salaam</td>
<td>1970s-90s, SOAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Stokes</td>
<td>1950s-60s, Rhodesia</td>
<td>1963-81, Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Irwin</td>
<td>1959-65, Ghana</td>
<td>1974-83, Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivor Wilks</td>
<td>1953-66, Ghana</td>
<td>1971-93, Northwestern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

before the arrival of Europeans and the essential need to produce African History that recognized an African point of view. Through the assistance of the Hayter and Robbins Reports, these British academics in Africa returned to expand the teaching of African History to the succeeding generation of Africanist historians.

The achievements of Roland Oliver and John Fage were recognised in 1963 with both men being promoted to full Professor, Oliver receiving the first established Chair of African History at SOAS in London and Fage receiving a personal Chair in African History and the Directorship of CWAS in Birmingham. CWAS, under the directorship of John Fage, would develop to be one of the top three African Studies centres in the English-speaking world, alongside SOAS under Roland Oliver in London, and the University of Wisconsin, under Philip Curtin and Jan Vansina. Roland Oliver and John Fage, as benefactors of government support, duly expanded the new field of African History at SOAS and CWAS. In a large part, the success of the discipline’s growth in the United Kingdom is attributable to them, particularly as they influenced the next generation of graduate students in the discipline of African History.

In the 1980s, special editions of the *Journal of African History* paid tribute to Oliver’s and Fage’s efforts in building the discipline of African History. Michael Crowder noted that under Oliver’s direction at SOAS many graduates were trained who would go on to:

- staff history departments in the new African universities, or to set up African history programmes in American universities. By the time Roland retired in 1986, he had supervised forty-two theses on a wide variety of aspects of sub-Saharan African history, with a particular concentration on Eastern Africa. Perhaps most striking of all was that a quarter of these theses were primarily based on oral tradition rather than documentary sources. It is a testimony to the high standards on which he insisted that twenty-six out of these forty-two theses have been published. And even when he retired he took with him to his home in Frilsham the supervision of a last thesis, concerned with the early twentieth-century history of Namibia. Among those students he has supervised have been a large number of Africans, some of whom, like Adu Boahen, were to establish their own graduate schools.

John Fage was also paid tribute to in a special edition of the *Journal of African History* in 1986. The invited authors, his former students, noted his enormous contribution as a teacher and tireless promoter of African History. Douglas Rimmer, Fage’s eventual successor as Director at CWAS, pointed out that Fage, in his role as Director of CWAS for over twenty years, ‘appeared always to give priority to teaching, whether it was the
supervision of his research students or the course introducing the history of the African continent which he taught for nearly 20 years to first-year undergraduates. By his retirement in 1984, Fage had supervised twenty doctoral students, the most prominent of whom were: Robin Law (Professor of History, University of Stirling); Robin Cohen (Professor of Sociology, Warwick University); Finn Fuglestad (Professor of History, Oslo University); and Adam Jones (Professor of History, University of Leipzig).

By 1963, African History as a discipline was institutionalised as an accepted part of the academic curriculum in the United Kingdom and Africa, supported by an elaborate educational infrastructure. The Hayter and Robbins Reports recognized the recommendations of the Scarbrough Report and provided a solid foundation for the budding discipline. With the provision of funding and the experience of working in Africa, English academics spread African History throughout the United Kingdom. The fact that many of the scholars who taught in Africa went on to hold senior academic posts is directly attributable to their success in developing the discipline and the infrastructural support received from the Hayter and Robbins reports.

Reflecting on the genesis of the discipline in 1989, well after his retirement, John Fage believed that the Scarbrough Report of 1947 and the creation of African universities in 1948 were seminal moments in the discipline. Indeed, the academic infrastructure developed in Britain in parallel to the growth of African higher education, as discussed in chapter one. Together, these two events guaranteed the establishment of African History as an academic subject in British universities in Africa and the United Kingdom. The creation of the modern discipline of African History in the United Kingdom was the outcome of a continuous pattern of educational development supported by the growth of an infrastructure promoted at first by missionaries, private institutions and then established formally by a succession of government reports. The growth of SOAS in the 1940s and 1950s, established in Britain a solid foundation from which all subsequent developments in African Studies could take place. While the 1947 Scarbrough Report was pivotal in establishing the future direction of African Studies and promoting government support for the expansion of educational facilities, the Hayter Report in 1961 continued the direction of the Scarbrough Commission and helped to promote facilities for the study of Africa, such as CWAS. The Hayter Report, like the Scarbrough Report, was a product of the gradual process of decolonisation and
essential for establishing a platform for African Studies in the United Kingdom. In 1963 the Robbins Report, in turn, strengthened higher education and increased the funding of university departments. The Robbins Report enabled the appointment of prominent African historians to positions in the United Kingdom who would subsequently drive the development of the discipline of African History through the establishment of programmes and graduate training.
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CHAPTER THREE
AFRICAN HISTORY IN THE UNITED STATES

African History as part of the academic curriculum in U.S. universities progressed from the developments in the United Kingdom and British African territories after the end of the Second World War.\(^1\) While U.S. links with Africa, in both a missionary and an educational context, had existed since the end of the nineteenth century, these links did not develop into the creation of African History in the same way that it had in England.\(^2\) More importantly, the historical links between Africa and the United States were formed through the trans-Atlantic slave trade, which forcibly transported an estimated 305,000 Africans to the United States from the 1620s to the 1850s.\(^3\) The institution of slavery was so integral to the United States that twelve Presidents were slave owners before slavery’s abolition in 1865. The descendents of these slaves form a major part of the population of the United States and thus the connection between Africa and America is more obvious than that between the United Kingdom and Africa. However, the United States was less direct in transferring the growing awareness for an African perspective in higher education than the British, who controlled substantial African territories between the 1780s and the 1960s.

Interest in African Studies in the United States had been active since the late nineteenth century, but it remained largely of interest to African-Americans, who, for the most part, were not part of the mainstream academic community. The most notable African-American scholar, W. E. B. Du Bois, published *The Negro* in 1915, a work that studied ancient African kingdoms in the same manner as early European civilizations.\(^4\) Thus, Du Bois had foreshadowed the later developments of Africanists in the 1950s and 1960s in acknowledging that Africans had a history that was not inferior to European history. In his 1999 presidential address to the American Historical Association, Africanist scholar Joseph Miller recalled that academic courses in African history were taught by one of Du Bois’ former students, the African American scholar Leo Hansberry. Miller noted that Hansberry:

introduced the first academic courses in African history at Howard University in the early 1920s, [and] capitalized on its nationalist spirit to justify Africans' political accountability. [T]hese pioneering historians of Africa overwhelmed the regional historical traditions of the colonial era and adapted basic progressive assumptions to
African purposes, demonstrating political centralization and expansion in political scale in Africa of European proportions. Despite the pioneer efforts of Du Bois and Hansberry, the acceptance of African History as a discipline did not take hold in U.S. universities until after the Second World War—after the mainstream academic community had ‘come on-board’.

In this chapter I chart the development of African History in the mainstream academic community in the United States from 1946 to 1970. The rapid shift towards decolonization after the Second World War increased U.S. academic interest in Africa, and by the late 1960s U.S. universities expanded African History courses to be at the forefront of the discipline. The focal point of this chapter is to extend the concept of infrastructure to include the essential role historians played in creating the discipline. I will examine the overall development of African History as an academic subject in the United States, focusing on the acceptance of a strategic national need for and subsequent funding of African Studies programs. I will also look at how African History was expanded through the contribution of individual historians who developed university departments, producing an influential generation of postgraduates. I will focus on the University of Wisconsin as an example of how African History was developed by historians in the United States.

**From Area Studies to African Studies, 1946-1970**

African Studies owes its existence in the mainstream U.S. academic community to the importance placed on Area Studies programmes after the Second World War. Between 1946 and 1970 African Studies developed rapidly, illustrating the importance that the study of Africa was given by its financial benefactors. Why were African Studies so important to the United States? The answer lies in the strategic need recognised by the government, private societies and academics for linguistic and cultural understanding between Americans and Africans. This understanding was prompted by the growth of trade between the two regions during the Second World War, the impact of decolonisation that had removed African regions from traditional spheres of European interest, and the urgent security needs perceived by the potential association of these newly created states with the communist Soviet Union.

The background to the funding of Area Studies lies in the acknowledgement by the U.S. Government that higher education was paramount to the interests of the nation.
In 1946 the U.S. President Harry S. Truman appointed a commission to consider higher education in the United States, and the findings were published in a six-volume report, \textit{Higher Education For Democracy, A Report of the President’s Commission on Higher Education}, in 1947.\textsuperscript{7} According to John Dale Russell, writing in 1949:

\begin{quote}
The Commission's report stresses the fact that the present is a time of crisis. “In a real sense the future of our civilization depends on the direction education takes, not just in the distant future, but in the days immediately ahead”. Three principal goals for higher education are given top priority: “They are to bring to all the people of the Nation: Education for a fuller realization of democracy in every phase of living. Education directly and explicitly for international understanding and cooperation. Education for the application of creative imagination and trained intelligence to the solution of social problems and to the administration of public affairs”. These objectives, it will be noted, lie within the general field of the humanities and the social sciences.\textsuperscript{8}
\end{quote}

The Report emphasised the need for an educated public, recommending that the number of people receiving higher education double from 2 million in 1947/48 to 4.6 million by 1960.\textsuperscript{9} At the time of this report African Studies was virtually non-existent in the mainstream academy, but the need to understand foreign peoples was a stated educational priority.

In May 1949 the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) published \textit{Area Studies, with Special Reference to their Implications for Research in the Social Sciences}, a report that identified the need for area studies.\textsuperscript{10} The Report highlighted that pre-war Area Studies had focused on Latin American Studies and Far East Studies, but the Second World War had placed urgency on the demand for specialised knowledge about new regions and peoples—those hitherto outside the focus of U.S. scholarly attention. By 1949, the Report authors noted, there had been little interest shown ‘in any part of Europe (other than Russia) and there is even less in such major world areas as the Near East, Africa, the Indian World, or Southeast Asia’.\textsuperscript{11} Area Studies was seen as essential to the welfare of U.S. citizens: ‘the scholarship of this country was found wanting when put to the test of war—wanting in precise knowledge of different areas and their peoples, and wanting in the accumulation of materials which would have made sound research or analysis possible’.\textsuperscript{12} Furthermore, the Report argued that ‘[n]ational welfare in the post-war period more than ever before requires a citizenry well informed as to other peoples, and the creation of a vast body of knowledge about them’.\textsuperscript{13} The SSRC Report contended that it was the responsibility of universities, academics,
libraries and museums to fill gaps in knowledge about areas of the world such as Africa.  

The Report also stressed the importance of developing interdisciplinary scholarships for young academics to encourage them to consider particular peoples and cultures from their own perspectives. The SSRC aimed to promote peaceful relations with foreign nations and so prevent the possibility of a future war. In the event of another war, there would be a body of expert knowledge on regions and peoples. The SSRC Report concluded that centres for Area Studies needed to be supported at universities across the United States and funding given to allow for the expansion of facilities for undergraduate and graduate training.

While funding bodies did not explicitly target African Studies in the late 1940s, the shift towards Area Studies led to a reconsideration of the importance of Africa to the United States in the decade that followed. In 1963 Vernon McKay published *Africa In World Politics*, outlining the development of ties between Africa and the United States from the Second World War to the 1960s. McKay was clearly an influential authority. In 1963 he was Professor of African Studies and the Director of the Programme of African Studies at Johns Hopkins University; Research Associate, Foreign Policy Association; Deputy Director of the Office of Dependent Area Affairs, United States Department of State; Member of the United States Delegations to the United Nations General Assembly, Trusteeship Council and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self Governing Territories; Consultant to the Carnegie Corporation and Ford Foundation; and past President of the African Studies Association. His career illustrates how a first generation Africanist scholar held numerous positions in governmental and charitable organisations.

McKay believed that the growth in African Studies developed as a consequence of American reliance on African trade during World War Two, the rapid decolonisation of African territories, a rise in humanitarian missions and the fear of Soviet influence. American interaction with African was to serve economic, military and intellectual needs. U.S. financial aid to Africa for the sixteen year period between 1946 and 1961 totalled $1,800,000,000—clearly considerable importance had been placed on American–African relations. To put this figure into perspective, McKay notes that until 1953 American aid to Africa was so small that it does not register in the Government records. Then in 1953 Congress authorised 40 million dollars in financial aid to
Africa, then, had grown in importance each year during the Cold War, and had become central to U.S. interests.

Gwendolen M. Carter, the distinguished historian of Africa and president of the African Studies Association between 1958 and 1959, wrote in 1976 that the creation of African Studies departments in the United States was directly attributable to the provision of funding by private and government organisations. For Carter, the beginning of African Studies in the United States as we know it today, occurred in 1948 when Northwestern University offered the first African Studies curriculum, which combined courses from several specialities into one coherent programme. Northwestern University was only able to offer a full programme in African Studies because of funding provided by the privately run Carnegie Corporation in New York.

The creation of Northwestern’s African Studies programme in 1948 was followed by rapid expansion of African Studies programmes across the United States over the next decade, all of which were directly attributable to some form of government or private funding. For example, courses and programmes in African Studies were funded by the Ford Foundation at Boston University and Stanford University in 1953 (although at Stanford studies were primarily in Economic, Agricultural and Food research until 1962/3), Howard University and Harvard University in 1954, and the University of California in 1957. The Ford Foundation also provided funds for research fellowships in African Studies. Similarly, the Carnegie foundation supported fellowships for the study of Africa, gave funds to Stanford University along with the Ford Foundation, and gave financial support to African Studies at Duke University in 1955. The Ford Foundation alone gave US$5 million towards the expansion of African Studies programmes between 1952 and 1960. In 1957, in keeping with the rapid expansion of African Studies, the African Studies Association (ASA) was founded in New York with Professor Melville J. Herskovits, the director of the African Studies department at Northwestern University, as its first President. Like the establishment of African Studies in U.S. universities, this association was funded by the Carnegie Corporation and the Ford Foundation.

In 1958 the ASA launched the *African Studies Bulletin* as a means of keeping its members informed about academic developments. The first issue of the *African Studies Bulletin* listed the following ten universities offering African Studies programmes: Boston University; University of California at Los Angeles; Duke University (Commonwealth Studies Centre); Duquesne University; Hartford Seminary Foundation;
Johns Hopkins University (School of Advanced International Studies); Northwestern University; Roosevelt University; Stanford University (Food Research Institute); and Yale University. By 1964 the *African Studies Bulletin* was able to list twenty-two programmes.29

The doubling of African Studies programmes in six years can be in part attributed to the addition of government funding for education, which aimed to combat the fear of Soviet superiority in education.30 In 1958 the United States Government passed the *National Defence Education Act P.L. 85-864* (NDEA).31 This Act, while concentrating on the urgent need to establish language training centres, also made provision for area studies in general and the commitment to financial support for building African Studies programmes.32 The impact of the Act was immediate: it led to the funding and development of African languages and area programmes in African Studies at eight centres by 1965.33 Title IV of the Act, ‘National Defence Fellowships’ aimed to increase the number of college teachers and expand the number of Ph.D. programmes and students through financial assistance to existing and new programmes. Importantly for the field of African Studies, Title IV ‘placed no restrictions on the fields of study that could qualify for funding, and it did not require institutional matching funds’.34 Thus, through a combination of private and government initiatives, African Studies increased significantly. As Philip Curtin noted in 1971, the growth in membership of the African Studies Association increased from about twenty Africanists in 1950, to about two hundred by 1960, and then to eighteen hundred by 1970.35

Despite the expansion of African Studies from 1948 to 1960, African History remained within African Area Studies departments, and until the 1960s these Area Studies programmes paid little attention to an African perspective. African Studies in the United States consisted mainly of Anthropology and non-historical Social Science departments, which had for some time dominated African Studies. Gwendolen Carter and Philip Curtin noted that in the 1950s African History as a discipline lagged behind African Anthropology, both in numbers of academics and in considering an African perspective.36 Developments in the 1960s proved key. Writing in 1967 Leonard M. Thompson stated that in the 1950s:

American students were encouraged to study African history with grants from the federal government and from foundations. In this respect the Ford-supported Foreign Area Fellowship Program has performed a seminal role. Its first grants for the study of sub-Saharan Africa were made as early as 1954, when the Gold Coast was still
moving toward independence. In the next four years only seven awards were made to historians, but after that the allocations were increased and by 1966 forty-one Americans and Canadians had been awarded Foreign Area Fellowships for historical study in sub-Saharan Africa (out of a total of 243 fellowships in all disciplines).\textsuperscript{37}

In 1971 Curtin published a disciplinary profile of academics who were members of the African Studies Association in the United States. Curtin noted that the largest increase in numbers of discipline-based scholars between 1960 and 1970 occurred in history, advancing from thirteen to twenty percent (see Table 3).\textsuperscript{38} Anthropology, the

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{lcc}
\textbf{Discipline} & \textbf{1960} & \textbf{1970} \\
\hline
Anthropology & 28.6\% & 15.5\% \\
Political Science & 23.0 & 21.5 \\
History & 12.7 & 19.6 \\
Geography & 10.3 & 5.8 \\
Economics & 9.4 & 8.0 \\
Sociology & 7.5 & 4.6 \\
Language, Linguistics, and Literature & 2.8 & 8.1 \\
Art, Philosophy, Music, and Religion & 1.4 & 2.9 \\
Psychology & 0.9 & 0.9 \\
Education & 0.5 & 3.5 \\
Law & 0.5 & 1.7 \\
Demography & 0.0 & 0.3 \\
\textit{Other} & 2.3 & 7.6 \\
\hline
100.0 & 100.0 &
\end{tabular}
\caption{Discipline Profile of African Studies, 1960-1970.}
\end{table}


leading discipline in African Studies in 1960, had been overtaken by History, reflecting the increased personal interest of scholars and increased financial aid the discipline received in this decade. Political Science was particularly strong during the 1960s and 1970s, bolstered by interest in new African nations and by Soviet action in African regions, such as the Congo and Angola.
In the late 1940s and 1950s Area Studies programs had expanded and acknowledged the need for academic attention towards Africa. In turn this resulted in the establishment of African History as an academic subject in African Studies courses by the end of the 1960s. African Studies developed between 1948 and 1970 as a result of the strategic need perceived by American academics and funding bodies for Area Studies. Now I will concentrate on the development of one African Studies programme, that at the University of Wisconsin, and the pivotal role played by academics in creating an environment to study African History from an African perspective.

**Philip Curtin, Jan Vansina and African History at the University of Wisconsin**

As African Studies began to expand in the United States throughout the 1950s and 1960s, the University of Wisconsin made a crucial decision in 1961 to add an African Studies Programme, which remarkably for its time focused on History rather than Anthropology. This programme had come into being largely because of the actions of one its staff members, the historian Philip Curtin. Curtin had joined the Wisconsin faculty in 1956 to replace the British Empire historian Paul Knaplund, and was hired primarily for his expertise in Imperial History and interest in Latin America. In 1955 Curtin travelled to Africa to research his book *The Image of Africa: British Ideas and Action, 1780-1850*, published in 1964. This trip began Curtin’s lifelong academic relationship with Africa, a relationship that would lead him to create an African History programme at the University of Wisconsin.

Following his trip to Africa, Curtin made several crucial decisions that accelerated the development of the African Studies programme. In 1957 he invited John Fage, then teaching in Ghana, as a visiting Professor to take the Knaplund lectures at Wisconsin. Curtin noted in his autobiography that this decision was made by him in order to ‘introduce graduate training in African History’ at the university. Fage taught a British Empire in Africa course for a semester and joined Curtin in his regular seminars, which had by then become seminars in African history. Curtin described Fage’s presence at Wisconsin as ‘historic’, noting that this was ‘the first seminar in an American university designed to train doctoral candidates in African history’. Curtin organised the publication of Fage’s lectures by the University of Wisconsin Press, a work released in 1959 as *Ghana: A Historical Interpretation*. In 1957, Curtin also
attended the Second African History and Archaeology conference at SOAS in London, hosted by Fage and Oliver. Attendance at this conference introduced Curtin to the work of young Africanists including Jan Vansina. With Curtin’s decision to extend his book *Image of Africa* to two volumes, he regularly travelled from Wisconsin to the United Kingdom, and obtained funding from the Ford Foundation and the University of Wisconsin to return to Africa for research in 1958/59.\(^{44}\)

Curtin considered moving to one of the three American African Studies centres at the time, Northwestern University, Boston University or the University of California, but Fred Harvey Harrington, vice president at the University of Wisconsin, offered Curtin a chance to develop his own programme.\(^{45}\) Under Curtin’s leadership the University of Wisconsin developed the Comparative Tropical History programme, which studied Africa, tropical America and South Asia. African Studies, though, was the centrepiece. As Curtin recollected, by 1959/60 the University of Wisconsin ‘was becoming known as a place that placed special emphasis on African history’.\(^{46}\) Indeed, in 1960 the University of Wisconsin had ten doctoral candidates in African History.\(^{47}\) The crowning glory of Curtin’s administrative achievement in establishing African History at Wisconsin was the appointment of the young Belgium historian and anthropologist Jan Vansina in 1960, which was followed by the formal creation of a dedicated African Studies programme in 1961.\(^{48}\) Roland Oliver noted in his autobiography published in 1997, that during his lecturing visit to the University of Wisconsin in 1962, the programme was ‘already a flourishing school of African history that was setting standards of training that were perhaps unique in the world’.\(^{49}\)

Jan Vansina is one of the most well-known and respected historians of Africa. Vansina’s reputation rests largely on the fact that he pioneered the use of oral testimonies using methods of both history and anthropology. Prior to completing his doctorate, Vansina had completed his Masters degree in medieval history at the University of Leuven in Belgium and postgraduate training in anthropology at University College, London.\(^{50}\) In December 1952 Vansina was posted to Africa as an anthropologist for the Belgium Institute for Research in Central Africa (IRSAC), and between 1953 and 1956 he conducted fieldwork in the Belgium Congo amongst the Kuba people.\(^{51}\) During his African research Vansina concluded that oral traditions were legitimate sources for the reconstruction of the past and that his work was in fact historical not anthropological or ethnographical. In 1956 Vansina was accepted as a Ph.D. candidate by the University of Leuven. The submission of his Ph.D. was
revolutionary and extremely controversial, only enacted by the University of Leuven in 1957 after considerable debate about its validity as a work of history rather than ethno-history or anthropology. Vansina himself later acknowledged the role of his supervisor Jozef-Maria De Smet in supporting him ‘because he, a medievalist, had to convince the “establishment” in 1956 that both oral data and the history of a Central African realm were indeed history, and not anthropology, or perhaps folklore. Without him there would not have been a thesis nor a degree in the department of history’. Vansina focused mainly on oral sources at a time when historians studying Africa relied on written evidence.

The confirmation of Vansina’s Ph.D. dissertation, ‘The Historical Value of Oral Tradition: Application to Kuba History’, enabled Vansina to continue his fieldwork collecting oral testimonies. After the completion of his doctorate Vansina again returned to fieldwork in Africa between 1957 and 1960, finding time in-between research to attend the Second Conference on History and Archaeology in Africa held in July 1957 at SOAS in London. At this conference Vansina contributed to the debate on collecting and using oral sources. During 1957 and 1958 Vansina hosted both Roland Oliver and Philip Curtin during their research trips to Africa. Between 1958 and 1960 Vansina continued researching oral traditions for IRSAC and taught some courses at the University of Lovanium in the Belgium Congo, which served both the territories of the Congo and Ruanda-Urundi, until political upheavals forced him to flee Africa and return to Belgium in 1960. With no fixed employment prospects Curtin convinced Vansina to accept an assistant professorship at the University of Wisconsin in 1960.

While at Wisconsin, Vansina produced the seminal work on oral methodology for historians, *Oral Tradition: A Study in Historical Methodology*, first published in French in 1961 as *De La Tradition Orale: Essai de Méthode Historique*. This work, based partly on his Ph.D. thesis research and fieldwork, sought to provide ‘a general discussion on the special nature of oral traditions as a source of information about the past’ and ‘apply the methods of historical criticism to these sources’. Vansina claimed that historians can only:

arrive at some approximation to the ultimate historical truth. He does this by using calculations of probability, by interpreting the facts and by evaluating them in an attempt to recreate for himself the circumstances which existed at certain given moments of the past. And here the historian using oral traditions finds himself on exactly the same level as historians using any other kind of historical source material. No doubt he will arrive at a lower degree of probability
than would otherwise be attained, but that does not rule out the fact
that what he is doing is valid, and that it is history.60
Oral history was now accepted by Africanists, with Vansina revising his 1965 book in
1985 published as Oral Tradition as History.61 A striking feature of Vansina’s work,
evident throughout his publications, is the critical appraisal of methods and sources, and
in particular a keen awareness of the limitations of both.

In 1961, along with the publication of Oral Tradition, Vansina attended the
Fourth International African Seminar at the University of Dakar in Senegal. This
conference was the first of a series of International African Institute conferences to
focus on the emerging role of history as a subject with relevance for Africa, and was
attended by many important historians and anthropologists.62 The seminar centred on
three problems facing the historian of Africa. The first focused on the techniques of the
historian: oral tradition, archaeology, ethnography, and linguistics. The second
considered the role of the historian in relating the African past to the present. The third
explored particular aspects of historical representation within sub-fields such as
economics, regions and state systems.63 The seminar and subsequent publication of
papers focused participants’ attention on pre-colonial Africa and on areas where written
documentation were scarce.64 Importantly, Vansina’s participation in this conference
and his earlier publications drew academic attention towards the general acceptance of
oral sources and Vansina’s own expertise.65 By 1963 Vansina had been promoted to full
Professor at Wisconsin, a year before the publication of this conference proceedings,
and by 1965 headed a separate African History Programme at the University of
Wisconsin.66

Between 1961 and 1965 Vansina’s publishing record was phenomenal. Alongside numerous journal articles he had produced five books by the end of 1964,
four sole-authored and one co-edited.67 In 1966 Vansina published his most famous
work utilising oral sources to portray African pre-colonial societies, Kingdoms of the
Savanna.68 Here Vansina was able to convincingcly reconstruct aspects of pre-colonial
history for regions of Central Africa that had been largely ignored by European
historians because of a lack of written sources, and thus strengthened the use of oral
traditions as valid tools for historical reconstruction. Kingdoms of the Savanna won the
prestigious 1967 African Studies Association Melville J. Herskovits prize for
outstanding scholarly work of Africa and firmly established Vansina as one of the most
important historians of Africa.69
After recruiting Vansina to Wisconsin, Curtin set about developing the University of Wisconsin’s area studies programmes and his own research agenda. In 1963, to complement the African Studies programme, Curtin instituted the Department of African Languages and Literature, which to this day remains the only one of its kind in the United States.⁷⁰ Thus, the University of Wisconsin had complemented and strengthened the African Studies Programme by expanding the natural links between language study and area study. This was followed by the creation in 1965 of a separate African History Programme under Vansina, with Curtin leading the Comparative Tropical History Programme. Curtin now shifted focus from his 1964 *Image of Africa* to examine the slave trade. In 1967 he published *Africa Remembered: Narratives by West Africans from the Era of the Slave Trade*, and in 1969 he produced *The Atlantic Slave Trade: A Census*.⁷¹

*The Atlantic Slave Trade: A Census* attempted a systematic analysis of the scale and geographic distribution of the slave trade. Never before had an academic conducted a comprehensive investigation on the volume of the trade from the mid-1400s to the mid-1800s. According to Eugene D. Genovese, the premier historian of American slavery, Curtin’s findings, while focusing primarily on the numbers of enslaved Africans, challenged the existing knowledge and assumptions of the academy. In Genovese’s words:

> The United States received only five per cent of all Africans in the trans-Atlantic trade; yet in 1950 it contained more than thirty per cent of all those of African descent in the Western Hemisphere. What happens, then, to the common assumption that Southern slavery was so much more rigorous and brutal than Caribbean or South American? Reproduction being a major index of treatment, something is seriously wrong.⁷²

While Genovese pondered new questions linking African and American history, Curtin developed his findings in a work on pre-colonial Senegambia.

In 1975 Curtin published *Economic Change in Pre-Colonial Africa: Senegambia in the Era of the Slave Trade*. John Hargreaves revealed in his review of Curtin’s work the connection between *The Atlantic Slave Trade* and *Economic Change in Pre-Colonial Africa*:

> When Philip Curtin's monumental *The Atlantic Slave Trade: A Census*… produced new quantitative estimates of the magnitude of the Atlantic slave trade, their importance clearly lay not in some magic in the numbers themselves (for nobody was more careful than Curtin to emphasize that these were liable to substantial margins of
error), but in the possibilities which they offered for proceeding to real historical accounts of the impact of the growth of this terrible trade upon the economic and social development of African societies. In this major new work Curtin undertakes this task for Senegambia, perhaps that region of West Africa for which we have the best and most varied sources of historical evidence over the last five centuries.  

Curtin’s work on Senegambia, covering the period 1450-1850, integrated oral sources with archival sources to illustrate that Africa was not isolated or removed from the wider Atlantic world economy. In doing so, Curtin extended his earlier quantitative work on the slave trade to show that Africans themselves were active economic participants rather than passive actors in early modern history.

Curtin’s pioneering integration of African history, the slave trade and world history, while obvious today, was not so clear at the time. The revolutionary idea that through studying the slave trade African history could be revealed as part of global history challenged the previously held academic belief of the early twentieth century that Africa was void of history. Curtin demonstrated to the academy that Africans had agency in their own past, and his arguments ultimately reflected his own view that African history was part of a larger global history best seen through a comparative lens, in his case primarily through cross-cultural trade.

Not only did Curtin and Vansina advance African History but they passed their knowledge and enthusiasm on to the next generation of Africanists. Combined, they supervised sixty-two doctoral graduates in the African History programme at the University of Wisconsin. The contribution of these two men was acknowledged by their colleagues and former students in festschriffts, Africans in Bondage: Studies in Slavery and the Slave Trade: Essays in Honor of Philip D. Curtin on the Occasion of the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of African Studies at the University of Wisconsin, published in 1986, and Paths Toward the Past: African Historical Essays in Honour of Jan Vansina, published in 1994. Both tributes acknowledge the role of Curtin and Vansina in breaking new ground in the approach to African History and in the manner in which each enthusiastically supported the development of graduate students. In Paths Toward the Past the editors, Vansina’s past students, note that ‘Jan’s audacious, inventive spirit has been infectious for his students. Many of us feel that he trusted us to tackle problems that we would never have dared to attempt without his trust…The profession cannot but grow in appreciation of what he has contributed.’
A clear example of the evidence of Curtin’s and Vansina’s impact on the discipline can be seen in the Ph.D. graduates produced at the University of Wisconsin. Wisconsin, under Curtin’s lead, required that every Ph.D. graduate must conduct fieldwork in Africa and be able to speak and read two foreign languages, one of which must be African. The result of this requirement, according to Oliver, was that:

the best Wisconsin doctoral graduates were the best trained entrants to the profession from the 1960s on. Not many were Africans, and not many of the others worked for any considerable time in African Universities, but their collective contribution to research in African history and to the establishment of the subject in the major universities of North America was to be pre-eminent.

The importance placed on African language skills and fieldwork were quite different from SOAS, which never made a mandatory requirement for African fieldwork to be a part of its doctoral programme.

The following table of Ph.D. graduates during the years 1963 to 1996 at Wisconsin clearly illustrates the importance of Curtin and Vansina as supervisors and also illustrates that the majority went on to receive employment as academics (see Table 4). What is also striking about the names included in this list is that many of them are, as Oliver pointed out in 1997, recognised today as the leading scholars of their field. Oliver again emphasised this point in his review of the festschrift for Vansina, noting:


Joseph Miller, like Curtin, had the honour of being elected president of the American Historical Association, which in itself reflected African History’s ranking as an academic subject. This Association’s importance can be gauged by the fact that its past presidents have included U.S. Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson. Like Vansina, Curtin produced some outstanding scholars—Paul Lovejoy and Patrick Manning to name a select few. Certainly all of the graduates from the University of Wisconsin who went on to pursue academic careers have contributed in turn to the development of the discipline of African History, and all are indebted to the pioneering efforts of Vansina and Curtin.
Table 4. University of Wisconsin African History Programme Ph.Ds, 1963-1996.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADVISOR</th>
<th>ACADEMIC POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>John William Curtin</td>
<td>SUNY-Stony Brook (emeritus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Julian Witherell Curtin</td>
<td>Library of Congress (retired)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>E.J. Alagga Vansina</td>
<td>Port Harcourt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Roberts Vansina</td>
<td>SOAS (emeritus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Rowe Curtin</td>
<td>Northwestern (emeritus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Raymond Kent Curtin</td>
<td>Berkeley (emeritus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Bruce Fetter Vansina</td>
<td>Wisconsin-Milwaukee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Forbes Munro Vansina</td>
<td>Glasgow (emeritus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>William Brown Curtin</td>
<td>Wisconsin (deceased)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Coifman Vansina</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Davidson Vansina</td>
<td>Aberystwith (deceased)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R. Hunt Davis Curtin</td>
<td>Florida (emeritus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ross Dunn Curtin</td>
<td>San Diego State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrick Manning Curtin</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leo Spitzer Curtin</td>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Allen Isaacman Vansina</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Fred Berg Curtin</td>
<td>Colgate (emeritus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Corry Curtin</td>
<td>Wisconsin (retired) (admin)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myron Echenberg Curtin</td>
<td>McGill (emeritus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hassan Mohamed Vansina</td>
<td>Khartoum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Babatunde Agiri Vansina</td>
<td>Norfork</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Brown Curtin</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Jean Hay Curtin</td>
<td>Boston (emeritus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allen Howard Curtin</td>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Miller Vansina</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lucy Quimby Vansina</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Tlou Vansina</td>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Works Curtin</td>
<td>Missouri (emeritus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Iris Berger Vansina</td>
<td>SUNY-Albany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lee Cassanelli Feierman</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeffrey Fadiman Vansina</td>
<td>San Jose State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Henige Vansina</td>
<td>Wisconsin (library)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Hubbard Curtin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Irwin Curtin</td>
<td>Stanford (admin) (retired)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Lauer Vansina</td>
<td>Michigan State (library)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Lovejoy Curtin</td>
<td>York (emeritus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Stephen Baier Curtin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Johnson Curtin</td>
<td>Minnesota (admin)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claire Robertson Feierman</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philip Shea Vansina</td>
<td>Bayero, Nigeria (deceased)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Spear Feierman</td>
<td>Wisconsin (emeritus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shirin Walji Feierman</td>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Adell Patton Brown</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kings Phiri Feierman</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Sigwalt Vansina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Randall Packard Feierman</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Sandgren Feierman</td>
<td>Concordia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976 (cont.)</td>
<td>Robert Schecter</td>
<td>Vansina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Shick</td>
<td>Vansina</td>
<td>Wisconsin (deceased)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Henry Bucher</td>
<td>Vansina</td>
<td>Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dennis Cordell</td>
<td>Vansina</td>
<td>Southern Methodist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Koffsky</td>
<td>Feierman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monica Schuler</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Wayne State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Robert Harms</td>
<td>Vansina</td>
<td>Yale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>John Berntsen</td>
<td>Feierman</td>
<td>State Dept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Newbury</td>
<td>Vansina</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Jeffrey Peires</td>
<td>Feierman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Ismail Abdalla</td>
<td>Feierman</td>
<td>William &amp; Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Musambachime</td>
<td>Vansina</td>
<td>Zambian Ambassador to UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kingsley Ogedengbe</td>
<td>Vansina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Bakonzi Agayo</td>
<td>Vansina</td>
<td>Zaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marc Dawson</td>
<td>Feierman</td>
<td>Western New England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janet Ewald</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Duke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>David Anthony</td>
<td>Feierman</td>
<td>UC-Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Carol Dickerman</td>
<td>Feierman</td>
<td>Michigan (admin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bryant Shaw</td>
<td>Vansina</td>
<td>USAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>J.S. Mohlamme</td>
<td>Vansina</td>
<td>VISTA, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Keletso Atkins</td>
<td>Feierman</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Eldridge</td>
<td>Vansina</td>
<td>MSU (emeritus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Grabler</td>
<td>Vansina</td>
<td>Los Angeles CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Giblin</td>
<td>Feierman</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Joyce Kirk</td>
<td>Feierman</td>
<td>Wisconsin-Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Schmidt</td>
<td>Feierman</td>
<td>Loyola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Lynda Day</td>
<td>Feierman</td>
<td>CUNY-Brooklyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathon Glassman</td>
<td>Feierman</td>
<td>Northwestern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tharcisse Nsabimana</td>
<td>Vansina</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Kenneth Curtis</td>
<td>Vansina</td>
<td>California State-Long Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renee Tantala</td>
<td>Feierman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Michele Wagner</td>
<td>Vansina</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Nancy Rose Hunt</td>
<td>Vansina</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pier Larson</td>
<td>Vansina</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Landau</td>
<td>Vansina</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Tefetso Mphethe</td>
<td>Vansina</td>
<td>Lesotho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joe Lunn</td>
<td>Vansina</td>
<td>Michigan-Flynt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Carolyn K Adenaika</td>
<td>Vansina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Bierworth</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Murray State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>David Leaver</td>
<td>Vansina</td>
<td>Georgia Southwestern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Cathy Skidmore-Hess</td>
<td>Vansina</td>
<td>Georgia Southern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The influence of Vansina and Curtin on their students can be seen by looking at the academic careers of two of their most prominent students, Paul Lovejoy and David Henige. Lovejoy, who completed his Ph.D. under Curtin in 1973, has made a career...
studying Africa, the slave trade and its international dimensions. Henige, who also completed his Ph.D. in 1973, was inspired by Vansina’s interest in methodological issues, particularly those pertaining to oral testimony. These two scholars, stimulated by their supervisors, have both been in turn influential in the development of African History. The careers of both of these men are evidence of the importance of their postgraduate training.

Professor Paul E. Lovejoy currently holds the Canada Research Chair in African Diaspora History, and is a Research Professor in the Department of History at York University, Toronto, and the Department of History, University of Hull, Wilberforce Institute for the study of Slavery and Emancipation. He is also a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, and the Director of the Harriet Tubman Resource Centre on the African Diaspora at York University. The Canada Research Chairs’ Program is part of a national strategy by the government of Canada to make it one of the top countries for research and development. In 2000 the Government created a permanently funded programme to develop research professorships. Lovejoy, as one of the recipients, was appointed Canada Research Chair on the African Diaspora, which had funding totalling $2.5 million (Canadian dollars) between 1997 and 2002.82

One of Lovejoy’s most important works, Transformations in Slavery: A History of Slavery in Africa, first published in 1983 and updated in 2000 with information from the W. E. B. Du Bois Centre database of slave trade voyages, reflects the inspiration of his mentor Philip Curtin. Martin Klein, also a noted Africanist historian of the slave trade, regards Lovejoy’s second edition to still be ‘the indispensable summary of the history of slavery within Africa’.83 Lovejoy’s study examines how slavery developed within indigenous societies and was influenced by international trade, and it is not confined to the trans-Atlantic slave trade but also discusses the impact of slavery on the social, economic, and political development within Africa.84 Lovejoy has continued to focus on slaving and the slave trade throughout his career and he is currently investigating the slave trade in the Bight of Biafra, working on a book on the history of slavery in the interior of Nigeria. This work in progress looks at how slavery in the interior relates to the forced migration of enslaved people to the Americas. Along with the publication of five books, fourteen chapters in edited volumes and numerous articles, most of which focus on slavery and the slave trade, Lovejoy has supervised over a dozen Ph.D. dissertations on African history.85 Through publications and the
training of students Lovejoy has continued the work of Curtin in developing African History.

In comparison to Lovejoy, David Henige, a former student of Vansina, contributed to the development of African History through a more structural role. Henige currently works as Bibliographer for African Studies and Anthropology at the University of Wisconsin. According to Henige his decision to study African history was an easy choice given that in the 1960s, ‘the field was a tabula rasa, where one could make an impression and also (not insignificantly) get funding’. The choice to apply to the University of Wisconsin was simple: at the time it had ‘by far the strongest African history program, with Jan Vansina and Philip D. Curtin, and later others’. He completed his doctorate in African history from the University of Wisconsin in 1973, after conducting fieldwork in Ghana among the Fante, focusing on the chronology of oral traditions. After a brief stint as a lecturer at the CWAS in the United Kingdom he returned to the University of Wisconsin in 1974, and became the Africana bibliographer for the university, completing a postgraduate Library studies qualification in 1978. Henige was influential in helping to establish the Africana collection at the university into a world class resource for African Studies.

In 1974 Henige founded the journal *History in Africa: A Journal of Method.* This journal, published annually by the African Studies Association:

- focuses on historiographical and methodological concerns and publishes textual analysis and criticism, historiographical essays, bibliographical essays, archival reports and articles on the role of theory and non-historical data in historical investigation.

These topics reflected Henige’s academic interest in historical methods. Henige has remained the journal’s editor since 1974, and has published several books, primarily of historical methods and criticism and over one hundred and seventy journal articles. Henige’s work was influenced by the critical approach taken by his supervisor in evaluating oral sources and methods. His Ph.D. dissertation, published in 1974 as *The Chronology of Oral Tradition: Quest for a Chimera,* was considered by Andrew Roberts to be the ‘first major theoretical study of oral tradition as historical evidence since Jan Vansina's *De la tradition orale* (1961)’. In it Henige discusses the value and limitations of oral traditions in establishing a chronology for societies. His work clearly shows Vansina’s influence in oral methodology and in the critical evaluation of the methodology and sources. To this Henige added *Oral Historiography* (1982), where he
provided discussion on the historical use of oral sources. In this volume Henige also noted the stimulation and influence of Jan Vansina on his work.\footnote{91}

As the editor of History in Africa, head of the Africana collection, and the author of several books, David Henige has for over thirty years been a tireless promoter of African history. Historian Adam Jones, a former student of John Fage, considers Henige to be one of the people who most influenced him after the completion of his doctorate.\footnote{92} Jones, an historian who focuses on pre-colonial Africa, has conducted considerable analysis of early European texts. Henige in his role as editor of History in Africa has promoted the inclusion of numerous articles on the analysis and discussion of written, pre-colonial African sources. Henige’s concern for the thorough investigation of evidence illustrates the importance of the limited sources for Africa between 1450 and 1800. The impact of sources, and in particular the few written ‘golden texts’ of African History, is discussed in the following chapter.

African History developed as a discipline in the United States from a perceived strategic need to understand Africa and its peoples. Lacking the colonial presence in Africa of the British, Americans nevertheless took to the study of Africa in the post World War Two years with vigour. An infrastructure was funded by both the government and private institutions like the Carnegie Corporation and the Ford Foundation. These organisations identified African Studies as of national importance. The University of Wisconsin took the lead role in developing the rich new field of African History, led by two pioneers, Jan Vansina and Philip Curtin. Under the influence of these two men Wisconsin produced sixty-two doctoral students between 1960 and 1996, half of whom became prominent historians of Africa. Curtin, Vansina and the University of Wisconsin established the academic infrastructure needed to produce ongoing graduates who would help advance the practice of African History. David Henige and Paul Lovejoy are two of these academics to graduate from the African History programme at the University of Wisconsin and are a tribute to the pioneering efforts of Curtin and Vansina.
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CHAPTER FOUR

SOURCES AND HISTORIOGRAPHY:
CHARTING THE PRE-COLONIAL AFRICAN PAST, 1450-1800

In 1949, John Blake addressed the Royal Historical Society on ‘The Study of African History’. Blake, at the cusp of the new era for African History, made two important recommendations for the future direction of academic enquiry in this field. First, scholars were encouraged to study African History from an African point of view. Second, in order to achieve a new direction for African historical study, a thorough investigation of existing sources and the discovery of new ones was essential to the future development of the discipline. Importantly, Blake believed that the major written sources for the African past had already been located. Blake acknowledged that although written sources required further analysis, supplementing these with information gained through the disciplines of archaeology, philology and anthropology would greatly expand knowledge of the African past.

When Blake made his speech he was well aware that there was a lack of written material for the first two centuries of European contact with West Africa. ca.1454-1578. In the decade before Blake presented his speech to the Royal Historical Society he had written and published European Beginnings in West Africa 1454-1578. Blake’s 1937 work was the published version of his Master of Arts thesis. European Beginnings in West Africa discussed Iberian rivalry during the first century of Portuguese activity in West Africa. The book was written from European records, primarily those of the Portuguese, and did not include any African sources. Blake followed this early publication with a two-volume work in 1942, Europeans in West Africa 1450-1560: Documents to illustrate the nature and scope of Portuguese enterprise in West Africa, the abortive attempt of Castilians to create an empire there, and the early English voyages to Barbary and Guinea. Blake and his publisher the Hakluyt Society aimed to present Africa’s primary source accounts by the early explorers and travellers to an English reading audience. In volume one Blake published, edited and translated Portuguese and Spanish primary source documents. Volume two contained the publication of all known source material for the English voyages to Guinea and Barbary.
Blake’s 1949 call for in-depth analysis of written sources and the integration of African History with other disciplines highlighted the limited source material available for the pre-colonial African past. The intense focus of historians on the classics of pre-colonial West African history reflects an acknowledgement that some sources for the pre-1800 period are considerably more useful than others. Writing in 1971, John Fage singled out Pieter de De Marees, Pereira, Bosman and Dapper as examples of pivotal European sources for the reconstruction of Africanist pre-colonial history. This chapter will investigate how sources ca.1450-1800 have contributed to the development of pre-colonial West African History in the English-speaking world after Blake’s 1949 speech by looking at several case studies. I firstly will investigate the contribution of written European sources for pre-colonial history in West Africa and discuss how a selection of these ‘golden texts’ have influenced the development of the academic discipline of African History. I will then spotlight pre-colonial histories for the port regions of Sierra Leone and New Calabar (Nigeria), ca.1450-1800. We will see how the availability of extant source material has shaped historical studies of these two African Atlantic locations. I will also examine whether or not pre-colonial African History was able to develop along Blake’s earlier 1949 recommendations, namely that the discipline of African History would need to integrate the restricted number of written sources with multi-disciplinary evidence in order to present an Africanist view of history.

Golden Texts and the presentation of pre-colonial West African history

A limited number of written European sources have contributed to the development of the discipline of African History and the Africanist depiction of pre-colonial West Africa between ca.1450 and 1800. Indeed academic African History could not exist without the contribution of ‘golden texts’, which enable the reconstruction of an Africanist history for pre-colonial African peoples. ‘Golden texts’ form a crucial element of Africanist history, providing a framework around which oral histories and anthropological research can be better understood. One particular factor of ‘golden texts’ is that they are time and place specific; there is not a series of written historical sources for any region of West Africa covering that region diachronically throughout the pre-colonial period. The major difference in historical reconstructions of pre-colonial regions relate to the type and availability of source material. Many regions also share the same written sources, due in part to the limited number of sources available. I
chose two criteria to define a pre-colonial text as a ‘golden text’. First, it must represent one of only a small number of available sources. Second, it must contain valuable historical information.

The academic history of pre-colonial West Africa rests upon a small number of written European sources for the period ca.1450-1800. Scholars, while constantly looking for new written sources within the archives, acknowledge, as Blake pointed out in 1948, that most of the important sources of pre-colonial West Africa are already known to historians.\textsuperscript{10} John Fage, in his compendium of pre-colonial sources, noted that there were 411 published sources in European languages available for West Africa between ca.1450 to 1800. Table 5 shows the number of sources broken into fifty-year periods. It is based on Fage’s figures, and does not include shipping and trade accounts, government reports or collections of minor accounts.\textsuperscript{11} The sources sometimes only briefly touch on a particular location, as in the example of Father Barreira, who lived in Sierra Leone from 1606 to 1609. Conversely, some of the sources cover multiple locations. The table makes it clear that there are few written accounts for the period ca.1450-1800 available for the historical reconstruction of pre-colonial West Africa, an

\begin{table}
\centering
\caption{Original Sources for Pre-colonial Western Africa Published in European Languages, ca.1450-1800.}
\begin{tabular}{l l}
\hline
Years & Number of sources \\
\hline
c.1450 to 1500 & 6 \\
1501-1550 & 20 \\
1551-1600 & 48 \\
1601-1650 & 56 \\
1651-1700 & 86 \\
1701-1750 & 66 \\
1751-1800 & 129 \\
Total & 411 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}


\textit{Note:} The first entry is amended from ‘Sources Prior to the Sixteenth Century’, pp. 1-6, to condense the period ca.1450-1500.
area of considerable size and diversity. Furthermore it is apparent from the fifty-year breakdown that sources become more prevalent in the second half of the period.

In order to verify the importance of ‘golden texts’ I conducted a survey of articles published in the *Journal of African History*. I catalogued the names of every source listed in John Fage’s guide and searched all of the publications of the *Journal of African History* between 1960 and 2002 inclusive. I then recorded the number of articles that contained references to these sources, limiting my list to those ‘golden texts’ cited by twenty or more scholarly articles. The most numerous cited sources are those of Bosman, Dapper and Periera (see Table 6). De Marees, while not listed, is included within the works of Dapper and Barbot, who both reproduced sections of De Marees. Thus, all of the sources identified by Fage as crucial in 1971 received the most numerous references in the *Journal of African History* articles up until the end of 2002.

Pereira, Bosman and Dapper (who includes De Marees), are essential sources to reconstruct pre-1700 African history. Duarte Pacheco Pereira was Portuguese and spent his entire life in the service of the crown of Portugal. He lived between 1450 and 1530, and wrote *Esmeraldo de situ Orbis* in the years 1505-08. Pereira’s writings were about his own experiences and those of other Portuguese travellers and covered numerous African Atlantic settlements from Morocco to South Africa. Two of the foremost Africanist historians to write on Pereira, John Fage and Paul Hair, note that the *Esmeraldo de situ Orbis* is more of a navigational guide, or ‘rutter’, than a work that sets out to detail the people and places of the African coast. Yet both authors acknowledge that Periera’s work contains crucial historical information for the late fifteenth century. As Hair asserts, the value of Periera’s information on Guinea, other than the purely navigational, is therefore original, hence most valuable, particularly when it deals with the coasts east of Sierra Leone, since these were not reached in the earlier accounts of Zurara, Gomes, Cadamosto, and Fernandes. For Hair, the *Esmeraldo de situ Orbis* forms one of a series of pivotal ‘golden texts’ for the regions of Sierra Leone and the Upper Guinea coast. Fage also considers Periera’s material to be a vital text. According to Fage, Pereira’s work was the ‘first comprehensive account of the Upper Guinea coasts to have survived’ and ‘the only comprehensive account of the Lower Guinea coast available until that by Pieter de Marees in 1602’ nearly a century later. There are fewer sources for Lower Guinea than Upper Guinea until the seventeenth century because fewer Europeans travelled there.
Table 6. Published sources before 1801 for pre-colonial West Africa in articles in the *Journal of African History* between 1960 and 2002 inclusive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-colonial Source</th>
<th>No. of Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA’ DA MOSTO, Alvise da: 1455, first published 1507, <em>Viagens de Luis de Cadamosto e de Pedro de Sintra</em>, first English translation abridged 1745, full 1937.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACHECO PEREIRA, Duarte: 1506, <em>Esmeraldo de situ Orbis</em>, first published 1892, first English translation 1937.</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERNANDES ALEMÃO, Valentim: 1506, <em>Description de la Côte Occidentale d’Afrique</em>, first published in two parts, 1856 and 1857, no English translation.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAPPER, Olfert: Collection first published in 1668, <em>Naukeurige beschrijvinge der Afrikaenschegewesten van Egypten, Barbaryen, Lybien, Biledulgerid, Negroslant, Guinea, Ethiopiën, Abyssinie...,</em> first English translation 1670.</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da MONTECUCCOLo, Giovanni Antonio Cavazzi: 1668-1671, <em>Istorica Descrizione de’ tre regni Congo, Matamba ed Angola</em>, first published 1687, no English translation. John K. Thornton is working on translating the original manuscripts, which were written in Africa and found in 1969.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBOT, Jean (or John): 1678, <em>A Description of the Coasts of North and South Guinea</em>, published in English 1732</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORRIS, Robert: 1772, <em>A short account of the African slave trade</em>, published 1788 and was included in <em>Memoirs of the reign of Bossa Ahâdeo, King of Dahomy, an inland country of Guiney</em>, published in English in 1789.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Given the fact that there are few sources for Lower Guinea it is no surprise that Periera’s information is essential for any historical reconstruction. For example, consider the academic debate on the relationship between Benin and Ife, two pre-
colonial southern Nigeria cities in the fifteenth and sixteenth century. The debate centres on the authenticity of local tradition that claims that the ruling dynasty of Benin was related by ancestry to Oduhua, the ancestral founder of Ife.  The significance of this concerns the historical makeup and social interaction between African states within the region, and has important consequences for understanding the pre-colonial history of southern Nigeria. Some twenty years after the debate had begun, John K. Thornton explained in his 1988 article ‘Traditions, Documents, and the Ife-Benin Relationship’ that academic difference of opinion surrounding the history of the region was driven by interpretation of source material. Thornton states that:

the debate about the Ife-Benin relationship has been a standoff that matched information acquired through written documentation against archaeological, traditional and art history evidence, and its resolution would make a contribution to clarifying issues in using each of these sources.

As Thornton suggests, there are considerable multi-disciplinary sources available for the region—artistic, archaeological, written and traditional histories—yet these sources are small in comparison to many other areas of West Africa. Thornton sought to ‘re-examine the question primarily from textual evidence, and to propose some new documentary evidence which [could] shed light on the issue’. The central problem lay in the fact that traditional evidence was adaptive and had changed over time, unlike the early written accounts. Thus, the original documentary evidence contained in Pereira’s *Esmeraldo de situ Orbis* that had started the line of academic enquiry, remained the essential basis from which all other sources could be interpreted. While additional sources were added by Thornton and other academics throughout the ongoing debate, Pereira remained the central starting point for all subsequent historical reconstruction.

Another example of the relevance of Pereira’s ‘golden text’ to the history of Lower Guinea is its contribution to the history of the Yoruba Kingdom of Ijebu in Nigeria. Robin Law, writing in 1986, drew attention to the fact that much of the early historical information on Ijebu that had been repeated in later European documents had derived from the 1614 account of the Portuguese author Manuel de Figuerido, who in turn had taken his information from Pereira. As a consequence, the seventeenth-century texts had failed to record the change from ivory to cloth as a primary trade item, a transformation that occurred before the beginning of the seventeenth century. Law pointed out that sixteenth to eighteenth-century writers repeated information derived from Pereira, and hence relied on navigational information from ca.1505-07 at the
latest. As in the case of the Ife/Benin debate, the lack of extant pre-1800 sources requires historians to cite Pereira’s predominantly navigational text in studies on pre-colonial Ijebu.\(^{27}\)

Unlike Pereira, Dapper never went to Africa but wrote his work based on travellers’ accounts in Africa. Olfert Dapper’s text is one of the ‘golden texts’ for pre-colonial West African History. Dapper published his work in Amsterdam in 1668, which was translated in 1670 into English by John Ogilby and published as *Africa: Being Accurate Description of the Regions of Ægypt, Barbary, Lybia, and Billendulgerid, the Land of Negroes, Guinee, Æthiopia, and the Abyssines, with all the Adjacent Islands, either in the Mediterranean, Atlantick, Southern, or Oriental Sea, Belonging Thereunto*.\(^{28}\) Fage noted ‘Dapper’s work is the major seventeenth-century synthetic account of Africa’.\(^{29}\) Dapper cited most of his sources within the text and many of the published sources are extant, which makes his work of considerable value to historians today.\(^{30}\) However, some of Dapper’s important sources are lost, such as the unpublished account by the Dutch merchant Samuel Blomert.\(^{31}\)

Adam Jones, another scholar who investigated Dapper’s text, also noted that Dapper offered material for Africa that could not be found in any other source.\(^{32}\) The first was the ‘Kquoja account’, which discussed North-Western Liberia and Sierra Leone. The Kquoja account contained extensive historical information on the local peoples, making it a rare document.\(^{33}\) The second was the unpublished material Dapper used to write on Loango in what is now Southern Gabon. While containing original information, Dapper’s Loango description also included information from other published European accounts.\(^{34}\) Jones identified several areas of Dapper’s text that could be considered primary material because the sources cited by Dapper are not extant. Robin Law noted that Dapper’s account follows on from Perieira’s to be one of most important sources for the Ijebu during the seventeenth century.\(^{35}\) The value of Dapper’s text, like that of Periera’s, lies in the fact that it contains information for pre-colonial Africa that does not exist anywhere else and as such can be considered one of the ‘golden texts’ for pre-colonial African history.

Whereas Dapper never went to Africa, William Bosman’s publication, *Naauwkeurige beschrying*, published in Utrecht in 1704, was based on first hand experience. Bosman’s book is the most cited European text for pre-colonial Africa in the *Journal of African History* from 1960 to 2002.\(^{36}\) Bosman’s book became one of the
most popular travel accounts of the time. Bosman was sixteen when he first arrived on the Guinea coast in 1688, and by 1698 he had become the Chief Merchant for the Dutch West India Company. Bosman’s long residence on the African Coast and his intimate knowledge of the region has contributed to the value of his work as a primary source. While scholars have noted the bias of some of his opinions, particularly concerning the Komenda Wars between the Dutch West Indies Company and the African Kingdom of Equafo on the Gold Coast (1694-1700), Bosman’s work remains an invaluable first hand account of the region. Bosman’s publication, in twenty-two letters, devoted considerable space to describing the peoples and geography of the region. For example, one letter describes the interior states of the Gold Coast, and eight discuss the people, vegetation and animals of the Gold and Slave Coasts. Bosman’s work is regionally specific. Bosman also included chapters by the travellers to Africa, David Van Nyendael and John Snoek. Out of the 493 pages of text, 322 pages relate to the Gold Coast, 100 to the Slave Coast, forty-six to the Ivory Coast (written by David Van Nyendael), and twenty-five for the Grain Coast (written by John Snoek). These sections are extremely valuable to an Africanist historian, making Bosman’s text one of the most important ‘golden texts’ for pre-1800 Africa.

The fact that there remain few ‘golden texts’ of early modern African history, such as those by Pereira, Dapper and Bosman, has led historians since the 1950s towards a greater focus on textual analysis. The limited number of written pre-colonial sources covering ca.1450-1800 can be seen in John Fage’s guide to pre-colonial sources. There are often no oral sources that can be reliably used for the pre-colonial period. Some English historians like Blake acknowledged early in the development of the discipline that the few written sources available needed to be reproduced for academics in order for them to be used to present Africanist history. While the process of translation and editing from an Africanist perspective began in the 1950s and expanded after the launch of the Journal of African History, Adam Jones points out that little early attention was placed on the critical analysis of the texts. For example, the fourth English translation of William Bosman’s account into English in 1967 still contained errors because of its reliance on an earlier incorrect translation. As can be imagined, the effect of such errors when there were so few sources has had a marked impact on the quality of pre-colonial West African histories produced.
Analysing the historical accuracy of ‘Golden Texts’

Between the 1960s and the end of the 1980s, a gradual acceptance of the importance of analysing what few written sources existed in European languages for pre-colonial West Africa took place in the discipline of African History. The creation of the journal *History in Africa: A Journal of Method* in 1974, edited by David Henige, responded to the need for a forum to analyse and discuss sources of African history. Henige stated the journal’s agenda in the first volume:

*History in Africa* proposes to concentrate on these areas of the metier of historical enquiry as they have evolved and as they continue to evolve. This emphasis will be manifested in several related ways. *History in Africa* will include articles on source criticism and evaluation and the nature of history and historical thought, surveys of the historiography of themes and events, archival and bibliographic reports, review essays of methodological works, and studies of historical problems which are comparative in focus or approach.

For Henige and the editorial advisory board, which included prominent historians such as Vansina, Curtin, Fage, Joseph Miller, Paul Hair, Robin Law, Douglas Jones, the Portuguese Admiral Avelino Teixeira da Mota (whose primary interest was in the investigation of pre-1800 texts), Albert Van Dantzig, Bruce Metzger, Michael Twaddle and Adiele Afigbo (the first doctoral student to graduate from the University of Ibadan), the importance of examining the veracity of sources was a fundamental task of the journal.

From the launch of *History in Africa* in 1974 academics realised that no new texts would be likely to be discovered for pre-1800 Africa and began to scrutinise the ‘golden texts’. Albert Van Dantzig clearly illustrated the need for this work when he published nine articles from 1974 to 1984 in *History in Africa*, updating the English version of Bosman from the Dutch version. Dantzig proved that the original 1705 English edition of Bosman was written specifically for an English audience and contained biases for this audience, not to mention numerous translation errors that carried through to the 1967 republication.

In 1978/79 John Fage began work on *A Guide to Original Sources for Precolonial Western Africa Published in European Languages: For the Most Part in Book Form*, published in 1987. Fage’s work comprehensively identified the published primary-source monographs for pre-colonial Africa. The guide was driven by an acknowledgement that historians needed access to a resource that identified all written
source material for Africa. This book, like the groundbreaking conference held a year before its publication, ‘European sources for Sub-Saharan Africa before 1900: Use and Abuse’, marked a significant moment in the discipline’s development. This conference, the first of its kind to focus on the role and problems of using written European sources for pre-colonial Sub-Saharan Africa, acknowledged that the time had come for African historians to take stock of the discipline, and conduct an investigation into its written source material.  

Anthony Kirk-Greene, one of the founding English historians of African History and editor of The Emergence of African History at British Universities, noted that the 1986 conference and subsequent publication made two important points:

[O]ne, that for all the substance in the numerous publications and theses written on the history of Sub-Saharan Africa since 1960 the discussion of sources has received a far lower priority than it deserves; and two, while recognizing that all forms of historical source and methodology must be used in studying the history of Africa, no scholar can afford to ignore the fundamental, often primary, and sometimes pre- eminent role of European-language material in that study.

The conference confirmed the view of earlier scholars like Blake in the late 1940s and Hair in the 1960s, who both realised that the limited amount of source material had to be made available and critically examined. Hair noted at the symposium that ‘[i]t is precisely because the sources for the Black African past are so limited that the African historian of today has a peculiarly strong obligation to use those sources in the most careful, intelligent and critical way’. Hair pointed out that majority of contemporary texts for pre-colonial Africa had not been edited.

In 1987 Adam Jones, one of Fage’s former students, also published a book which focused on sources, Raw, Medium, Well-Done: A Critical Review of Editorial and Quasi-Editorial Work on Pre-1885 European Sources for Sub-Saharan Africa, 1960-1986. Jones’ book was driven by the findings of the 1986 conference, which established that historians had an urgent need for a guide to the quality and subject matter of academic edited editions of written European sources for pre-colonial Sub-Saharan Africa. This book, along with Fage’s, formed essential tools for the historian of pre-colonial Africa. While not a substitute for critical editions of pre-colonial European texts, the information contained in these two publications enabled historians to begin to locate and evaluate sources for specific histories of Sub-Saharan Africa.
Since Jones’s publication in 1987, the most important editorial work to have been completed on pre-colonial West African history has been Paul Hair, Adam Jones and Robin Law’s edited *Barbot on Guinea: The Writings of Jean Barbot on West Africa, 1678-1712*, published as two volumes in 1992. According to Paul Hair, Barbot’s text ‘has probably been cited more frequently by twentieth-century writers on precolonial Guinea and on the Atlantic slave trade than any other printed source’. Barbot’s importance as a source was also identified by Fage: ‘Jean Barbot was the author of one of three contemporary sources [the other two are Bosman and Dapper] which almost every historian of West Africa between 1650 and about 1750 must take account of (and which most of them quote!)’. Because of Barbot’s significance, his work was considered by the editors as ‘the starting point for the critical study of many other pre-1700 Guinea sources’. The immense task of editing Barbot’s work, which appeared as two versions, one in French and an enlarged English edition, took Hair, Jones and Law twenty years to complete.

The analysis of Barbot by Hair, Jones and Law identified just how important this editorial task was for the sources of pre-colonial West Africa. The editors of Barbot noted that he only spent some sixty days in total on African soil, taking part in two French slaving voyages to Guinea between 1678/79 and 1681/82. Yet, Barbot is one of the most cited sources for Guinea and the Atlantic slave trade. Hair, Jones and Law examined and identified large sections of Barbot that were derived in some cases wholly and in others partially from other writers. For example, many of the passages in Barbot were found to be from the work of Olfert Dapper, who in fact cribbed his work from earlier sources, many now lost, and Willem Bosman, who had first hand experience of the Guinea coast. Nonetheless, much of Barbot’s text was original, and through his work written and oral sources survive. The resulting two volumes totalled over 1,000 pages with extensive notation, and has become the definitive scholarly account of Barbot, contributing to the more accurate understanding of African Atlantic history ca.1700.

The history of pre-colonial West Africa rests largely on few ‘golden texts’. Historians, recognising the importance of ‘golden texts’, turned their attention to the critical analysis of these texts during the 1970s and 1980s, aided by the creation of the journal *History in Africa* in 1974. Of the three ‘golden texts’ listed by Fage, Barbot, and to a lesser extent Bosman, have received critical analysis, but Dapper’s *Naukeurige*
beschrijvinge has not received the same investigation. The job of critically annotating these texts can take, as in the case of the Barbot volumes, three scholars twenty years. Nevertheless, historians acknowledge today that any history produced for pre-1800 West Africa is predominantly based on written European sources and must adhere to high standards of scrutiny, a factor not so prevalent during the early development of the discipline in the 1960s.

Source material and the histories of Sierra Leone and New Calabar, 1450-1800

The early histories of the port community at New Calabar and the port estuary community of Sierra Leone provide an example of how extant source material shapes scholarly writings. Both of these areas were thriving port regions of pre-colonial Africa. By looking at the publications of several prominent scholars I will show how different source material has been used for the two regions in academic publications since Jan Vansina’s so-called date of African History’s coming of age, 1957. In doing so I will show the relationship between source material and the history produced.

Europeans first landed on the peninsula of Sierra Leone between 1460 and 1461, forty years before reaching New Calabar. Between the arrival of the first Portuguese in 1460 and the founding of the crown colony in 1787, increasing numbers of Europeans visited Sierra Leone. Sierra Leone, only a three-week sail from southwest Europe, attracted Europeans who wanted to purchase gold, camwood, slaves and ‘elephants teeth’ (ivory). By value, slaves dominated Sierra Leone’s export trade from 1650 to 1808, the year of British slave trade abolition. Data collected for the period 1676 to 1808, the peak years of the slave trade, show that Sierra Leone was the third largest port of embarkation of slaves on the Upper Guinea Coast. Europeans also anchored off Sierra Leone en route south. Vessels of all sizes could anchor in the large deep water port and re-supply with fresh water and provisions—particularly rice. Even some large British East India ships provisioned at Sierra Leone.

The trading state of the Elem Kalabari, referred to by Europeans as New Calabar, was situated on the River Real in the eastern Niger Delta, in what became known as the Bight of Biafra. The first written record of New Calabar comes from Pachecho Pereira in his Esmeraldo de situ orbis (ca.1505-1508). Once over the sand bars, the waters at New Calabar and nearby Bonny were ‘eleven miles broad, very deep, and navigable by
ships of any tonnage'. New Calabar, the village, located some twenty miles from the Atlantic, became an important area of European and African contact in the second half of the seventeenth century. Though Kalabari merchants first sold mostly ivory, slave-trading became the dominant export business by the 1680s and 1690s. New Calabar was the principal slave trading port of the Bight of Biafra until 1700. New Calabar’s ascendancy in the slave trade dwindled after the mid-eighteenth century when the rival delta states of Bonny and Old Calabar surpassed New Calabar’s importance. Despite its decline, New Calabar remained a port of call throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as trade gradually shifted from slaves to palm oil.

Visitors to New Calabar, unlike those at Sierra Leone, did not stay for extended periods. There were no European forts or factories at New Calabar to provide residences for travellers. The Kalabari maintained a purely commercial relationship with Europeans, not allowing them to set up permanent bases. When compared with Sierra Leone, New Calabar had a shorter period of concerted European interest, which in turn resulted in fewer European visitors than Sierra Leone. In contrast, many of the explorers, merchants, slavers, naval personnel, colonists and missionaries who stopped at Sierra Leone recorded their experiences, making Sierra Leone one of the most documented regions in West Africa. The works of Pereira, Dapper and Barbot contain considerably more information of Sierra Leone than they do for New Calabar. In addition to these three accounts, there are many other excellent sources that provide a greater picture of the pre-colonial history of Sierra Leone than those available for New Calabar. In 1507, for example, Valentim Fernandes published an account of the region based in part on the experiences of one of the earliest Europeans to live in Sierra Leone, Alvaro Velho do Barreiro, who had spent eight years there. No comparable account exists of a European living for any period in New Calabar. Nor is there a comparable account for New Calabar like that of Father Barreira, a Portuguese Jesuit, who lived in Sierra Leone during the early-seventeenth century. Like Alvaro Velho do Barreiro, Father Barreira is today considered as one of the key sources of the region. Importantly no written account by an African exists for either region before 1800.

Compared to Sierra Leone, New Calabar also lacks a comprehensive written European record ca.1450-1800. Gwilym Iwan Jones’ The Trading States of the Oil Rivers: A Study of Political Development in Eastern Nigeria (1963) contrasts the histories of New Calabar and Bonny. Both in this work and in a later article in 1965,
Jones notes that only three written works contain relevant written material for pre-1850 New Calabar. These works are:

- the *Esmeraldo de Situ Orbis* by Pachecho Pereira, which refers to the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth century;
- the *Description of Africa* by Olfert Dapper, which refers to the middle of the seventeenth century; and
- the *Description of the Coasts of North and South Guinea* by John Barbot, printed in the eighteenth century, but referring to the end of the seventeenth.\(^72\)

Importantly, these three traders’ descriptions, or commercial handbooks, do not give historians comprehensive histories of the eastern Bight of Biafra. Jones also points out that the ‘native traditions’, learned through oral evidence, only become valid as a source after the beginning of the eighteenth century, when recollected history can be corroborated with information in the accounts of Captain John Adams and Captain Hugh Crow from the 1790s.\(^73\) Even recently discovered information on the trade with New Calabar by the Dutch, who were prominent traders during the mid-seventeenth century, does not add much to Pereira, Dapper, and Barbot.\(^74\) Though New Calabar was an important trading port between 1650 and 1800, it is surprising that few written accounts for this period survive. Out of the 411 pre-1800 sources listed by Fage, only three written sources for pre-colonial New Calabar are the basis for most of its academic history.\(^75\)

The lack of written source material for New Calabar has shaped how scholars approached its study. With an abundance of written material Sierra Leone’s pre-colonial history could be largely reconstructed from written European sources. The minimal written accounts for New Calabar, however, resulted in a reliance on oral evidence.\(^76\) As a consequence, all of the published histories of pre-colonial New Calabar have not been produced by historians but by anthropologists. G. I. Jones completed a history degree, but became actively involved in field research among the people of the eastern Niger Delta during colonial service in Nigeria. Upon his return to England, Jones became a lecturer in the Department of Social Anthropology at Cambridge University. In 1962 he became a Fellow of Jesus College, retiring in 1971.\(^77\) Robin Horton, who has lived in Africa since the 1960s, trained in philosophy and anthropology and was Professor of Anthropology at the University of Ife, Nigeria, and Professor of Philosophy and Religious Studies at the University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria.\(^78\) Neither Jones nor Horton were trained African historians. Instead the pair worked as anthropologists, conducting fieldwork and collecting oral evidence to supplement scattered information
from the minimal written material. While oral history was accepted by the first generation of African Historians as a viable source there was also an acknowledgement of its limitations. As G. I. Jones noted in 1963: ‘Neither class [oral or written sources] is capable of standing by itself; they have to be taken together and used to correct, check, and amplify each other’.79 The problem of using oral history for the pre-colonial period was clearly summarised by Pair Hair when reflecting on thirty years of the discipline from 1964 to 1994. Hair stated that:

oral traditions…have an inbuilt “horizon” of recollection which falls far short of the arrival of the Europeans five centuries ago. Ethnographic, cultural, and linguistic evidence, systematized in recent times, can be extrapolated backwards to earlier times, but this can only be done, with any security, when trends over time have been identified from earlier hard evidence.80

Thus oral history is a problematic source for the pre-colonial period, ensuring that written European sources remain vital forms of evidence for pre-colonial West Africa.

The availability of sources has resulted in striking differences in the number of publications on pre-colonial New Calabar and Sierra Leone. The single most obvious point of difference is that there is no single book dedicated to the history of New Calabar. In contrast, Sierra Leone has over twelve single volume histories, the most important of which are Peter Kup’s A History of Sierra Leone, 1400-1787 (1961), 212 pages, and Christopher Fyfe’s A History of Sierra Leone (1962), 773 pages.81 Sierra Leone also has two single volume bibliographies, one online web-bibliography and two article length bibliographies, which include primary and secondary sources for its history.82 The region has also been the subject of six different academic journals.83 Indeed, Sierra Leone is one of the most comprehensively studied regions of West Africa.

By contrast, there are just two prominent historical works that cover the history of New Calabar during the pre-colonial period, G. I. Jones’, The Trading States of the Oil Rivers, and Robin Horton’s, ‘From Fishing Village to City-State: A Social History of New Calabar’ (1969), in Mary Douglas and Phyllis M. Kaberry (eds.), Man in Africa: Essays in Honour of the Late Professor Daryll Forde.84 Both works rely on oral testimony, as the only informative written account for New Calabar during the seventeenth century is Barbot. Jones and Horton, in fact, tell readers that their works contain many speculative conclusions.85 Horton, the most published English scholar on New Calabar, directed the majority of his academic career to studying the religious and
philosophical aspects of the Kalabari people, writing anthropological rather than historical works. He believes that Jones’ history of New Calabar, though published in 1963, ‘cannot be substantially improved upon’. To date, some forty years after they were written, the works by Jones and Horton remain the standard references for pre-colonial New Calabar.

The written sources for Sierra Leone are so rich that it sustained the academic careers of three English historians, Christopher Fyfe, Peter Kup and Paul Hair. Quantitatively, Fyfe, Kup and Hair have published the most written work on Sierra Leone. All three historians published works on Sierra Leone during Ranger’s so called ‘golden period’ of African History between 1960 and 1980. In the 1960s both Fyfe and Kup published single volume histories of Sierra Leone, Kup’s *History of Sierra Leone 1400-1787* (1961) and Fyfe’s *History of Sierra Leone* (1962). In contrast, Paul Hair, who wrote on Sierra Leone from the early 1950s until his death in 2002, did not publish a single volume history of Sierra Leone. Hair, however, is considered the most published historian on Sierra Leone having an extensive article list, several chapters in edited publications and an edited collection of his out of print writings.

Like Jones and Horton who wrote on New Calabar, Fyfe, Kup and Hair were not trained Africanist historians before they began working on Sierra Leone. All three had spent time working in Sierra Leone. Christopher Fyfe was a school teacher in Germany before becoming a Government archivist in Sierra Leone from 1950 to 1962. Fyfe had a history degree but never applied for or completed a Ph.D., nor did he ever teach African history at an African University. Nonetheless, he became lecturer in African history at the University of Edinburgh in the newly founded Centre of African Studies in 1962 and Reader in 1964. Peter Kup held the Chair of History at the University of Sierra Leone between 1963 and 1965 having completed his Ph.D. in Tudor history. Paul Hair graduated with a history degree from Cambridge in 1949 and a Ph.D. from Oxford in 1955 on ‘The Social History of British Coalminers 1800-1845’. Between 1952 and 1965 he worked at Ibadan University in Nigeria, the University of Sierra Leone and as Senior Lecturer in History at the University of Khartoum in the Sudan. In 1965, Hair became a lecturer in African history in the History Department at the University of Liverpool, and from 1979 until his retirement in 1990, he held a Chair in Modern History.

Christopher Fyfe, Peter Kup and Paul Hair deployed varying sources to present their histories of pre-colonial Sierra Leone. Fyfe’s *History of Sierra Leone* predominantly studies the colony of Sierra Leone, 1787-1909. The fact that there are
no other comparable single volume histories for any other sub-Saharan region reveals both the importance of Sierra Leone and the large number of sources available. Despite clearly knowing the most important source material for Sierra Leone from the fifteenth century to the twentieth century, Fyfe choose to write his encyclopaedic work on the history of the colony from the late-eighteenth century to the beginning of the twentieth century. Fyfe limited his study to the period he knew best. As government archivist, he was familiar with colonial documents, and was best placed to write a comprehensive history of the colony. Furthermore, when Fyfe began his project, oral history was very much in its infancy. Fyfe did not conduct any oral research, although he cited other scholars’ work on African oral traditions and linguistics. Importantly, Fyfe demonstrates that in the last half of the eighteenth century the written material on Sierra Leone had increased dramatically, particularly after colonisation in 1787. Though a colony-focused study, Fyfe’s work included considerable information on the local African peoples described by frequent European visitors. To date Fyfe’s History of Sierra Leone remains an authoritative text.

Peter Kup’s History of Sierra Leone (1961), covering the period 1400-1787, should along with Fyfe’s publication, provide the reader with a comprehensive history of Sierra Leone, ca.1400-1909. Unlike Fyfe’s publication, Africanist scholars received Kup’s book poorly, citing his misuse of sources. Kup relied on the already well known written European sources for the region and provided a good basic history of Europeans on the coast. However, he did not add any new sources of information to his history, and he failed to integrate accurately written evidence with that from archaeological or oral testimonies. When he attempted to incorporate seventeenth-century oral testimony to reconstruct the mid-sixteenth century Mani invasion of Sierra Leone, for instance, he was criticised by Douglas Jones, a noted historian of Ghana and a proponent of oral history. Jones wrote: ‘Dr. Kup does not seem to have used any work of his own on oral tradition and does not appear best at handling this kind of material’, and he criticised one attempt as ‘insubstantial fancy’. Another critical reviewer, Paul Hair, commented that one of Kup’s sources, Father Balthasar Berriera, had not been correct in his assertion of the Mani invasion. In a separate review, Christopher Fyfe highlighted the major failing in Kup’s study: Kup failed to adequately engage with the advances in African History that had been made in the field during the 1950s. Despite the misgivings voiced by these Africanist scholars, Kup’s book demonstrates that during
the 1960s there were sufficient sources to attempt a single volume history of Sierra Leone for the period 1400-1787.

Paul Hair is the most influential historian to have written about pre-colonial Sierra Leone. Hair published articles on the Sierra Leone region from the mid-1950s through to 2002.\textsuperscript{103} Compared to Peter Kup and Christopher Fyfe, Paul Hair’s publications are the most Africanist. Like Kup and Fyfe, Hair did not actively seek out and pursue the use of oral traditions. This is a major difference between the published history of Sierra Leone and New Calabar. Hair, while having undertaken field research in Africa alongside anthropologists, linguists and Africans, decided that there were sufficient pre-1700 European written materials covering Sierra Leone and the neighbouring coasts of Western Guinea to occupy his research career in African History.\textsuperscript{104} Hair worked extensively translating and editing European documents concerning West Africa.\textsuperscript{105} For example, he studied the linguistic references contained throughout European documents diachronically over the Guinea coast region in an attempt to chart the course of pre-colonial migration patterns.\textsuperscript{106} In doing so he reconstructed one of the most thorough ethno-linguistic pictures available for pre-colonial West African peoples. Hair’s work has been evaluated by specialists in the field, and is still considered essential historical information today, a fact borne out by the publication of Hair’s collected articles in 1997.\textsuperscript{107} Paul Hair’s work is a testament to the value of written European evidence to the reconstruction of African pre-colonial history and has greatly expanded the academic understanding of Sierra Leone’s pre-colonial past.

In the presentation of pre-1800 histories of New Calabar and Sierra Leone written after the acceptance of African History as an academic discipline, source material directly contributed to the amount and quality of these studies. To write the pre-1800 history of New Calabar, scholars relied on oral histories and acknowledged the limitations of myths, legends and stories. The reliance on oral testimonies contributed to the history of New Calabar being written by anthropologists and not by professional historians. Where significant written accounts were available, little oral source material was used as seen in the history of Sierra Leone. As a consequence, Sierra Leone had a more detailed history published that has sustained the academic careers of three historians. Despite methodological advances in oral history and the importance of archaeology, a handful of ‘golden texts’ represent the most important sources for pre-1800 West African
history. One of the most important developments of the discipline is the way sources have shaped both the presentation of histories and the careers of academics. Particular to the development of the discipline, Africanists learned to demonstrate the limitations in all pre-colonial sources, written or oral.
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Hair, Afro European Contacts in Guinea, pp. 10-11. For a list of editions of Valentim Fernandes see Fage, A Guide to Original Sources for Precolonial Western Africa Published in European Languages, p. 8.

Father Barreira worked in Sierra Leone from 1606 to 1609. His work has been published in the volumes of Fernao Guerreiro, Relaçam anual das cousas que fizeram os Padres da Companhia de Jesus nas partes da Padres dalndi Oriental en emalguas outras...Tirado tudo das Cartas dos mesmos Padres....Lisbon: Pedro Crasbeek, 1603-11, reprinted by A. Viegas three volumes, Coimbra: Imp. da Universidade, 1930-42. See also the contemporary translation in French by Pierre du Jarric, Histoire des choses les plus mémorables tant ez Indes Orientales, que autres pais de la descouverte des Portugais...et principalement de ce que les Religieux de la Compagnie de Jésus y ont fait.... Bordeaux: S. Millanges, 1608-14. See also the important work by A. Brasio, Monumenta Missionaria Africana, Africa Occidental, 2nd ser., 4, Lisbon: Agência Geral do Ultramar: Academia Portuguesa de História, 1968, which is a collection of Portuguese documents. Paul Hair has translated some of Barreira’s work into English, for a list see P.E.H. Hair, ‘Jesuit Documents on the Guinea of Cape Verde and the Cape Verde Islands, 1585-1617 in English Translation’, History in Africa, Vol. 16, 1989, pp. 375-381. See a list of various translations and editions available in P.E.H. Hair, ‘A Bibliographic Guide to Sierra Leone 1450-1650’, Sierra Leone Studies, No. 10, 1958, pp. 62-72.


Adam Jones (trans. and ed.), West Africa in the Mid-Seventeenth Century, An Anonymous Dutch Manuscript, Atlanta, Georgia: African Studies Association Press, 1995. See pp. 6-7 for a discussion on New Calabar information contained in the manuscript.

In comparison, Fage lists forty seven sources for the rivers of Guinea and Sierra Leone. Fage, A Guide to Original Sources for Precolonial Western Africa Published in European Languages, p. 191. This figure is derived from Fage’s ‘Geographical Guide to Entries’. Interestingly there are twenty entries for the Bight of Biafra of which New Calabar is a part, but only three of these relate to New Calabar.

The descriptions of who the oral evidence was obtained from is rather poor in Jones and Horton’s works. The assumption was that the sources were well documented in the authors own field notes.


Professor Ruth Finnegan, provided some biographical details on Horton by email on 30 May 2008. Finnegan wrote, ‘I’m a little vague now on the details but know that Robin Horton did an undergraduate degree in what was known as ‘PPP’ (Philosophy, Psychology and [I think] Physiology—it was the first two which specially interested him) at the University of Oxford sometime in the 1950s, then anthropology at UCL (University College London)—I’m not sure
what his official connection was there, i.e. whether he did formal courses and a post-graduate degree etc but know he did spend some time there, and always had a particular rapport with Mary Douglas. He did fieldwork among the Kalabari in Nigeria, and spent most of his subsequent life at one or other Nigerian University from sometime in the 1960s (he was certainly at the University of either Ibadan or Ife (in Ibadan) in early 1965 and had already at that point been there some time).


Hair, ‘The Early Sources on Guinea’, p. 87.


Gwilym Iwan Jones, *The Trading States of the Oil Rivers: A Study of Political Development in Eastern Nigeria, London*: Oxford University Press, 1963, Robin Horton, ‘From Fishing Village to City-State: A Social History of New Calabar’, pp. 37-58 in Mary Douglas and Phyllis M. Kaberry (eds.), *Man in Africa: Essays in Honour of the Late Professor Daryll Forde*, London: Tavistock, 1969. New Calabar is not completely void of history. For example most of the works by Robin Horton throughout his extensive career focus on New Calabar, but these tend to be more anthropological rather than historical and focus on case studies particularly that of Kalabari religion. There are quite a few works which include New Calabar but these do not give any comprehensive history of the region and most of these do not give a history of the region before ca.1800. A good case in point is the work of Dike, *Trade and Politics in the Niger Delta, 1830-1885*. Dike mentions New Calabar in the pre-colonial period but only briefly and not as a full history and quickly moves on to his intended focus of trade between 1830-1885. This book is the closest to a dedicated book on New Calabar but it is very specific and not a general history but a social anthropological study. For a discussion on religious practices see Robin Horton, *The Gods as Guests: An Aspect of Kalabari Religious Life*, Third in the series of special Nigeria Magazine publications, Lagos: Nigeria Magazine, 1960. See also David Northrup, *Trade Without Rulers: Pre-Colonial Economic Development in South-Eastern Nigeria*, Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon Press, 1978. Northrup’s book contains a reasonable amount of information on New Calabar, but does not introduce any new historical information than
offered by Jones and Horton. Northrup uses them as sources and also relies on the same sources primary sources for New Calabar.


87 Robin Horton, ‘From Fishing Village to City-State: A Social History of New Calabar’, p. 37. See also footnote 7, p. 58. According to Horton writing in 1969, Jones did not ‘have the opportunity to do fieldwork in the Kalabari villages’ and therefore some of his work was based on information gathered from neighbouring communities.

88 After publication of his book Fyfe obtained a post teaching African History without a Ph.D. Kup who worked in Sierra Leone went on to work in Canada teaching African History. Hair had the longest publishing career with over fifty years of work on the region. He taught at the University of Ibadan and the University of Khartoum between 1953 and 1965, and then at the University of Liverpool between 1965-90.

89 Kup’s A History of Sierra Leone 1400-1787, published in 1961, coincided with the independence of Sierra Leone from the United Kingdom. These are not the only works produced by Fyfe and Kup. While I have selected these three historians there are quite a few other English trained historians who have written about Sierra Leone since 1957. For example, there was Walter Rodney a West Indian who completed his Ph.D. in 1966 at SOAS. His dissertation was published in 1970 as A History of the Upper Guinea Coast, 1545-1800, Oxford, U.K., Oxford University Press, 1970. Rodney was killed in a bomb explosion while running for office in elections in Guyana in 1980. John Hargreaves completed an M.A. at the University of Manchester in 1948, ‘Anglo-French Relations 1904-06’. He became an assistant lecturer at the University of Manchester in 1949 and then a senior history lecturer at Fourah Bay College, University of Sierra Leone between 1952 and 1954. In 1954 he became lecturer at the University of Aberdeen, and chairman of the Aberdeen University African Studies Group from its creation in 1966 until his retirement in 1983. Michael Crowder (1934-1988) was not a trained historian. After war time service in Nigeria he gained a 1st class honours degree in Politics, Philosophy and Economics at Oxford University in 1957. Crowder became the first Editor of Nigeria Magazine, 1959-1962, and Secretary at the Institute of African Studies at the University of Ibadan. Crowder became a lecturer in African History at the University of California in 1964-1965 and Director of the Institute of African Studies at the University of Sierra Leone between 1965 and 1967. Between 1968 and 1978 he was Research Professor and Director of the Institute of African Studies at the University of Ife, Nigeria, and in 1971 became Professor of History at the Ahmadu Bello University acting as the Director of its Centre for Nigerian Cultural Studies, for the period1972-1975. From 1975 to 1978 he was Research Professor in History at the Centre for Cultural Studies at the University of Lagos. In 1979 he took up the post as editor of the British magazine History Today and remained Consultant Editor up to his death in 1988. Between 1981 and 1982 he was the Visiting Fellow at the Centre for International Studies at the London School of Economics and Professor of History at the University of Botswana, 1982-85. From 1985 until his death he was also the Joint Editor of the Journal of African History. In 1986 Crowder became the Visiting Professor in Black Studies at Amherst College, Massachusetts and an Honorary Professorial Fellow and General Editor of the British Documents on the End of Empire Project at the Institute of Commonwealth Studies (ICS). For a fuller account see, Aim 25, Archives in London and the M25 area, Institute of Commonwealth Studies, ‘Crowder, Michael (1934-1988)’, http://www.aim25.ac.uk/cgi-bin/search2?coll_id=4931&inst_id=16, last accessed 13 May 2008. Adam Jones completed his Ph.D., ‘A History of the Galinhas Country, Sierra Leone, ca.1650-1890’ at the Centre of West
African Studies, University of Birmingham in 1979. Before that Jones was a teacher of history, literature and English in Sierra Leone between 1973 and 1975. Jones has also completed thirty months of field research in Sierra Leone over the years 1973-75, 1977-78, 1980 and 1984. Most of Jones’s professional career involved teaching in Germany where he became a Lecturer and Heisenberg Fellow between 1989 and 94. Since 1995 he has held the post of Professor of History and Culture in Africa at the University of Leipzig. See, University of Leipzig, ‘Employees, Dr. Adam Jones, Professor of History and Culture in Africa’, http://translate.google.co.nz/translate?hl=en&sl=de&u=http://www.uni-leipzig.de/~afrika/&sa=X&oi=translate&resnum=1&ct=result&prev=/search?q=Institut%25C3%25BCr%25C3%25BCf%2BAfrikanistik%26hl%3Den%26sa%3DG, last accessed 13 May 2008.

90 David Henige, Adam Jones, Robin Law, Bruce Mouser, Konrad Tuchscherer, Selena Winsnes, ‘P.E.H. Hair, 1926-2001’, History in Africa, Vol. 29, 2002, pp. 1-13. See Bruce Mouser, p. 8, ‘I first met Paul in 1981 when I was attending a Sierra Leone Symposium hosted by University of Birmingham. By that date Hair was already acknowledged the most published historian of Sierra Leone, with more articles than perhaps even he could easily recollect’.


92 A.P. Kup, ‘An account of the returned exiles of 1553-8 in England and Scotland’, Ph.D., St Andrews, 1952. Information kindly supplied by David Henige, email 21 May 2008. I have been unsuccessful in locating more biographical details for Kup.


94 The first eighty seven pages of the six hundred and twenty of text cover the period from the fifteenth century to the beginning of the nineteenth century. There is little reference to the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. By page four Fyfe begins to discuss the eighteenth century and by page seventeen Fyfe is already describing the boarding of the colony expedition ships in January 1787. It is worth noting that by the end of the text Fyfe has only moved from 1787 on page seventeen to 1909 by page six hundred and twenty. Clearly Fyfe’s book is a study of incredible depth on the colony.

95 I have investigated Fyfe’ footnotes and bibliography it is clear that he was well aware of the most important sources, such as those listed by Hair in, ‘Ethnolinguistic Continuity on the Guinea Coast’, The Journal of African History, Vol. 8, No. 2, 1967, pp. 247-268. see p. 249, footnote 8. Hair lists the following pre-1800 authors. D. Gomes, Cadamosto, Duarte Pacheco Pereira, V. Fernandes, A. Alvares d’Almada, F. De Lemos Coelho. Coelho was not used by Fyfe possibly because because the English translation did not appear until 1985. See English translation: P.E.H. Hair (trans. and ed.), Francisco de Lemos Coelho, Description of the Coast of Guinea (1684), Liverpool, U.K.: Dept. of History, University of Liverpool, 1985. Gomes does not appear in Fyfe’s book, but reference to Blake’s Europeans in West Africa, 1450-1560, shows that he was certainly aware of the source. Pereira does appear in Fyfe, but Cadamosto is in Fyfe’s bibliography. Fyfe was also aware of Father Barreira’s records translated into French by Du Jarric. Fernandes appears in Fyfe and included in Fernandes work was information from Alvaro Velho who lived in Sierra Leone for eight years. Alvares appears in Fyfe. Fyfe’s references leave the reader in no doubt that he was clearly aware of the most important sources.

Schön and S.A. Crowther, *Journals*, London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge 1842, S.W. Koelle, *Outlines of a Grammar of the Veï Language*, London: Church Missionary House, 1849; *Polyglotta Africana*, London: Church Missionary House, 1854. It should also be noted that no archaeological work was used by any of the authors mentioned in this section.

According to Adam Jones, writing in 1985, ‘[a]s far as Sierra Leone is concerned, no work specifically devoted to the nature of oral tradition has been published, despite several valuable publications on the oral literature of the Limba and Mende’. Adam Jones, ‘Some Reflections on the Oral Traditions of the Galinhas Country, Sierra Leone’, *History in Africa*, Vol. 12, 1985, pp. 151-165, see p. 151.

Written records also increased after the abolition of the slave trade in 1807, the transformation to a Crown colony in 1808, and the settlement of recaptives.

Christopher Fyfe, ‘Reviewed work: A History of Sierra Leone, 1400-1787 by Peter Kup’, *The Journal of African History*, Vol. 2, No. 2, 1961, pp. 327-328, see p. 328. Fyfe is most scathing: ‘How is a reviewer to treat such a book? To criticize it seriously is like falling into the sort of embarrassing, spoilsport pedantry one would show in explaining to a happy child that her tinsel star is not pure gold, nor her stick a magic wand’. J.D. Hargreaves, ‘Reviewed work: A History of Sierra Leone 1400-1787 by A.P. Kup’, *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 77, No. 305, October, 1962, pp. 786-787. John Hargreaves was more polite than Fyfe in his condemnation of Kup’s book, but he too notes that *A History of Sierra Leone 1400-1787* is not an accurate book on Sierra Leone or its people.


Migratory patterns are one of the greatest riddles of the pre-colonial African past. See the works by Hair; ‘Ethnolinguistic continuity on the Guinea coast’, pp. 247-68; ‘An ethnolinguistic inventory of the Upper Guinea coast before 1700’, *African Language Review* 6, 1967, pp. 32-70; ‘An ethnolinguistic inventory of the Lower Guinea coast before 1700, pp. 47-73; ‘An

CONCLUSION

My thesis investigated how an academic infrastructure was developed to create the discipline of African History. This development had its antecedents in the need for the British to gain knowledge of African peoples between 1787 and 1945. This knowledge was required for trade, missionary activity, the act of colonisation and security. After the Second World War, with moves towards decolonisation, the need for African Studies increased in importance. With the creation of British African universities in 1948, African History in the United Kingdom was still very much in its formative stage. By the 1960s African History was a burgeoning field of study, both in the United Kingdom and in centres for the study of Africa that were emerging in the United States. With the recognition by pioneering Africanists that African history could be portrayed from an African perspective, the discipline gained legitimacy. This validation relied on the work of scholars who located and examined pre-colonial written sources and established African oral testimonies as valid historical evidence. Throughout the chapters of this thesis I examined and explained how infrastructural factors contributed to create, shape and present what we now know as the academic discipline of African History.

Chapter One discussed how the growth of education in British African colonies had its foundation in the colonisation of Sierra Leone in 1787. From Sierra Leone, missionary organisations extended control over British education in Africa, culminating in the establishment of university courses in affiliation with the University of Durham at the missionary-controlled Fourah Bay College in 1876. Missionaries laid the foundation for the concepts of ‘trusteeship’ and ‘adaptation’ between 1880 and the end of the First World War in 1918. In the inter-war years, missionary education partnered with government education, but gradually gave way to government control as African colonies increased in importance to the British Empire. Between 1929 and 1948 the British government put in place a formal education policy for Africa. A series of government reports between 1911 and 1945 demonstrated the British commitment to developing higher education in its African territories. The subsequent creation of universities in Africa, in Nigeria, Sudan, Ghana and Uganda not only introduced higher education but embraced a local research requirement for academic staff. By 1948, a
pivotal moment for the discipline of African History had been reached, as formal acknowledgment was given to the study of regions previously considered as having no histories.

Chapter Two explained how in the United Kingdom an academic infrastructure developed alongside education in British African colonies, establishing the discipline of African History by the end of the 1950s. The early foundations of the discipline were laid by the writings of travellers to Africa and the efforts of private organisations. The School of Oriental Studies, University of London, evolved from these origins, opening in 1917 and in 1938 being renamed the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS). Until the end of the Second World War, African courses at SOAS focused on African languages for government officials and military personnel. Non-linguistic African Studies received its authorisation at SOAS from the recommendation of the Scarbrough Report (1947), with Roland Oliver appointed lecturer in African Tribal History in 1948. The same year, four new British universities opened in Africa. The Scarbrough Report formalised the official government position that recommended the expansion of African Studies in the United Kingdom and the creation of academic departments. In the mid-1950s a group of pioneering historians developed the subject by organising conferences, staffing academic departments and creating scholarly publications, such as the *Journal of African History*. Government reports in the 1960s confirmed these developments, making African History a permanent subject in the academic curriculum in Britain.

Chapter Three demonstrated how African Studies in the United States followed from the disciplinary developments in Africa and England. African History in the United States did not emerge as the result of the U.S. Civil Rights movement, nor did it develop as an attempt to understand the connection between Africa and African descendents living in the United States as result of the Atlantic slave trade. The discipline developed in the United States as a consequence of a national need to understand a growing economic and strategic relationship between Africa and the United States. This association grew from trade during World War Two and a growing fear of Russian influence in Africa during the Cold War. The development of African Studies programmes was supported at U.S. universities by government and private funding. These university programmes were developed by key historians, who not only expanded the subject’s boundaries, but influenced the following generations of
Africanists. Thus, along with government and private foundational support, historians themselves played a role in developing the discipline’s infrastructure.

Chapter Four shifted focus from government reports and the establishment of university departments in African History to examine how sources have impacted on the discipline’s development. In the 1950s and 1960s historians began writing the history of Africa, and began closely examining existing source material. By looking at pre-1800 West African history this chapter demonstrated that to write African history for the period ca.1450-1800 historians must rely on a few extant written European sources or ‘golden texts’. The importance of these highly-cited texts forced historians to re-examine them, which in the case of Barbot’s *Description of the Coasts of North and South Guinea* (1678-1712), took three historians twenty years of work. The limited number of written sources also prompted historians to use oral testimonies, a traditional method of recording the past in many African societies. The pioneering works of Jan Vansina illustrated that oral testimonies were difficult to verify and required considerable analysis. In order to mine all extant sources, historians were required to learn European and African languages and to interpret oral sources. The extent to which historians had been successful was illustrated by the case study of histories produced for Sierra Leone and New Calabar. With an adequate amount of written material, the history for pre-1800 Sierra Leone relied almost exclusively on European written records. In contrast, New Calabar, with minimal written records, incorporated oral testimony to fill out the few ‘golden texts’. The comparatively rich pre-1800 written material for Sierra Leone sustained the careers of three historians, Peter Kup, Christopher Fyfe and Paul Hair, enabling a greater number of comprehensive histories to be published than those produced for New Calabar.

In 2008, SOAS, CWAS, and the University of Wisconsin are still the most important centres of African History in Britain and the United States, although the focus of study within the subject has changed. Pre-1800 African history has declined as a topic of study, being replaced by interest in Africa in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. For example, nine of the last ten African Studies Association Herskovits awards have been for works that focus predominantly on African subjects during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.\(^1\) The one exception was the 2005 award for Emeritus Professor Jan Vansina’s *How Societies Are Born: Governance in West Central Africa Before 1600* (2004).\(^2\)
The shift away from writing about the pre-1800 period in African History also can be seen in the number of articles referencing the discipline’s ‘golden texts’ (See Table A1, Appendix A). An examination of the number of articles in the Journal of African History, which cite the major ‘golden texts’ referenced in chapter four, Table 6, reveals that between 1960 and 1999 there has been a reduction in their usage by historians. Between 1960 and 1989 the use of ‘golden texts’ remained relatively even, averaging eighty-six articles per decade. The decade 1990-1999, however, showed a major reduction, with less than fifty percent of the previous decade’s usage, recording only thirty-six articles. The change of focus relates to several factors, the first being the availability of primary source material.

It is clear that African historians who examine the pre-1800 period must rely on comparatively few sources. In 1977 John Blake published a second edition of his 1937 book, European Beginnings in West Africa 1454-1578, adding a preface and re-titling it West Africa: Quest for God and Gold 1454-1578. The change in title reflects a shift from Imperial History to African History and acknowledges the importance of written accounts by missionaries and traders. In the preface of his 1977 publication, Blake noted that while many new sources had been discovered in the archives of European nations, particularly those of the Portuguese, in the forty years since his first edition no new source had significantly changed pre-colonial African history. Today in 2008, with no new written sources likely to be found, the few scholars who still study pre-1800 Africa have turned to in-depth textual analysis of existing ‘golden texts’. The African Studies Association instituted a prize for editing primary source texts in 1990, renaming it the Paul Hair Prize after Hair’s death in 2001. This prize recognises both the importance of editing and analysing primary texts and Hair’s prominence in this field. Interestingly, the prize does not reward the discovery of new pre-1800 sources.

The difficulty in obtaining oral sources for pre-1800 African history has also resulted in a shift of academic attention away from pre-colonial studies. Historians of nineteenth and twentieth-century African history generally have more reliable oral testimonies due to their closer proximity to the past. One obstacle for British and American historians is the difficulty to collect reliable oral data for the distant pre-colonial African past. One recent study of pre-colonial Africa, which relied on oral data, was Robert Baum’s Shrines of the Slave Trade: Diola Religion and Society in
Precolonial Senegambia (1999). In reviewing Baum’s important study, Africanist Martin Klein noted that:

[i]t took Robert Baum 25 years of research, eight visits and 900 interviews before he felt he could write the history of shrines in the Diola community of Esalulu (population 15,000).4

With the length of time required to investigate pre-colonial oral sources and difficulty of access to many African societies, it is little wonder that pre-1800 African history is less prominent as an academic subject today compared to when the pioneering generation lived and worked in Africa.

Another contributing factor to the change of focus in African History is the diminishing historical connection between universities in Britain and the United States with African universities. British academics no longer staff the new independent universities in Africa. As a result of independence and political changes, foreign academics are often no longer able to spend long periods in Africa conducting fieldwork necessary for research into the distant past. Africans at local universities are now positioned to investigate their own histories. The present dynamic situation in Africa has drawn African and non-African academics, as well as government officials, to investigate the more recent past for answers to political instability. A study of recent developments in African universities would add to the findings of this thesis.

The contribution of historians, government and private educational funding created institutions where would-be Africanists can venture into a rich and dynamic history. That students of African history today can study several languages, including an African language, can learn linguistic, anthropological and archaeological methods, and at the same time be trained to analyse written and oral information, is the result of long-term infrastructural developments as well as the lasting legacy of those ‘charter historians’ who pioneered the discipline of African History in the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s.
Notes to Conclusion


2 Vanisina, *How Societies Are Born*.


## APPENDIX


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BARBOT, Jean (or John)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOSMAN, Willm (or Willim)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA’ DA MOSTO, Alvise da</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAVAZZI da MONTECUCCOLO, G.A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALZEL, Archibald</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAPPER, Olfert</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERNANDES ALEMÃO, Valentim</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABAT, Jean-Baptiste</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORRIS, Robert</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACHECO PEREIRA, Duarte</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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