

CHAPTER 6

Philanthropy, Education, and Race Relations in Sub-Saharan Africa



US philanthropic entities decided to get involved in education in sub-Saharan Africa after World War I to promote race relations and US idealism in the region. Generally, Western philanthropic activities in sub-Saharan Africa were shaped by the ideology to advance European and American cultural, political, and economic order. The French official Léon Gambetta's prediction in 1878 (cited by Greely 1984) that European explorations of Africa would pave the way for scientific and philanthropic initiatives on the continent became a reality when, forty years later, philanthropic initiatives moved to a different level in development discourse in sub-Saharan Africa. In the early decades of the twentieth century, the United States found itself isolated politically and economically. US philanthropic entities saw the design of overseas educational schemes as a strategy to allow corporate America to capitalize on developing export markets and raw materials. US philanthropists also saw the need to pacify international racial tensions while developing lucrative African regions. The United States' foreign policy agenda in Africa after World War I was to ensure the United States' significance in the cultural transformation process of black Africans. Education became the "unofficial" social welfare concern rather than a matter of politics or economics (Dunitz 2017). It is insightful to put the US philanthropic initiative of promoting race relations within the context of the post-World War I world. Many blacks in colonial territories of Africa fought alongside Europeans during World War I. The experiences gained by Africans that went to the war widened the horizon of those who took part in these wars as Dr. Oldham of the Phelps Stokes

Commission reported (Phelps Stokes Fund 1932: 76). The political contexts of World War I provided the motivation for US philanthropies to embark on educational initiatives in Africa to engage Africans in a world that was changing and where the old order of things was crumbling. US philanthropy dialogued with British colonial officers and Christian missions and introduced new approaches to education policymaking and practice on the African continent. The Phelps Stokes Fund and Carnegie Corporation (and later the Rockefeller Foundation and in the 1950s, the Ford Foundation and others) stepped in to support education in SSA to push US politics to center stage in the global geopolitical order (Ford Foundation n.d.; Parmer 2012; Phelps Stokes Fund 1932; Sutton 1960). This was not coincidental given the United States' involvement in global affairs after World War I. The US philanthropic entities expanding their purview into British colonial Africa also became part of the United States' agenda to transfer the race relations framework in the Southern United States to Africa (Phelps Stokes Fund 1932).

From the early decades of the twentieth century, US philanthropic foundations became obsessed with studying black communities as part of their broader objective to promote race relations at home and abroad. The popular belief among US philanthropists was that learning about different populations, and ethnic and racial groups was a "republican" and nationalist ideal of promoting "co-operation, self-government and self-reliance" of diverse groups (Dunitz 2017: 49). US philanthropic entities broadened their interests to study the "other" to include supporting initiatives that promoted the education of blacks. Rockefeller supported the General Education Board (GEB), an umbrella foundation created in 1902 to study and support the material needs of black schools and colleges, and the Negro Rural School Fund, which supported the Jeanes schools.

US philanthropic foundations also developed global networks in Africa to support education commissions, research institutions, colonial education bodies, and teacher training institutes. Carnegie Corporation of New York financed the Advisory Committee on Education in the colonies (ACEC) in the 1930s. American philanthropic assistance helped sponsor many African students in the United States and Britain. From its establishment in 1911, the Phelps Stokes Fund, the pacesetter of US philanthropic initiatives in Africa, took keen interests in "studying the Negro" as part of its framework of improving race relations. Thomas Jesse Jones, the educational director of the Fund and architect of the Phelps Stokes Commission education initiatives in SSA believed that studying other populations engenders an understanding of the broader

social unit and how the discrete entities fit together in a multicultural society. He also believed that black people had discrete identities that warrant investigation and analysis (Dunitz 2017). The Carnegie Corporation, Rockefeller Foundation, and the Ford Foundation also saw education as a way to improve race relations in colonial territories and independent nations in the sub-Saharan African region.

In later years, US philanthropic foundations broadened their philanthropic initiatives to promote race relations to include promotion of US values, norms, dominant institutions, and ideologies in SSA to further US interest in the region. The US government and other US entities anticipated that modeling colonial African educational policies on US cultural norms would draw unexploited African regions into an expansionist United States, an empire in all but name. The Carnegie Corporation's educational initiative in SSA influenced many people and national policies of African societies. Edward Berman (1978) portrays the relationship between the Carnegie Corporation, the US government, and the British Colonial Office as a marriage of mutual interest. After many African countries attained independence after 1960, African societies witnessed the transnational policy of borrowing knowledge and learning from the direction of the United States to African societies as US educational policies and school organizations gradually became the policy frameworks in sub-Saharan African educational systems. The European and American philanthropic ideology of the time was based on the distortions regarding the assumed "backwardness" and "primitivity" of African people and their attendant deficit ideologies and imperialism, which global forces clothed in the garb of extending the "common good" to the sub-Saharan African region.

Philanthropy, the US Foreign Policy Agenda, and Race Relations

Beginning in the second decade of the twentieth century, Europeans and Americans embarked on massive philanthropic initiatives to promote education for blacks in Africa as part of their longstanding strategies and efforts to demonstrate their commitment to promoting strong relationships between whites and blacks. This longstanding strategy should be situated within the context of black education in the United States in the late nineteenth century to the end of progressive era and white Americans' resistance to black social mobility until the passage of the Civil Rights Act. The reconstruction project that took place after the US Civil War did not change the white racial ideology for educat-

ing blacks in the Southern United States. The ideology of white racial supremacy was a mindset of even “generous” white Americans after the Civil War. Education of blacks was to make them to be “hewers of wood,” “drawers of water,” and necessary laborers for white industrialists and entrepreneurs. Jim Crow laws, which unofficially enforced legal segregation, operated in all parts of US society until the passage of the Civil Rights Act in 1964. The idea of adapting education to meet the special needs and characteristics of the black race (whether in the United States or Africa) was an ideology that emerged from pseudo-scientific racism and the new ‘imperialism.’ After World War I, US philanthropic entities saw the need to broaden their educational support to include education of black communities on the African continent by transplanting agricultural and industrial education provided to blacks in the US South to Africa (Cameron 1975; R. H. Davis 1980; Hubbard 1975). This kind of international philanthropic initiative in the 1920s was a calculated strategy to shape education policy for “blacks” on the African continent to reflect US global policy and practice (Berman 1978; R. H. Davis 1980). Phelps Stokes’s educational initiatives for blacks in the US South were based on the rubric of white supremacy and “manifest destiny.” White Americans believed they had found in certain forms of education the key to solving the so-called black and white race problem. First was the need to understand the black person. Dr. Thomas Jesse Jones, educational director of the Phelps Stokes Fund, believed that an effective approach to improving race relationships was to study the black person: “Help the Southern White man to study the Negro at first hand, overcome prejudices of an earlier day and help to bring about trained white leadership to cooperate with trained Negro leadership in the solution of the Negro problem” (Phelps Stokes Fund 1932: 14).

Second, white Americans perceived the Hampton-Tuskegee type industrial education to be the solution in the United States and in Africa. In discussing the influence of Americans in African education in the early twentieth century, Ellen Murray (cited in R. H. Davis 1980: 87) pointed out that educated blacks in the United States and Africa saw the common tie that bound them. At the same time, white Americans also came to feel that their experience of the black and white problem in the southern states could provide a solution to a similar problem in Africa. When the question of extending US influence in British colonial territory became an item on the agenda, white educators like Thomas Jesse Jones and others who had worked with Booker T. Washington to push industrial education in the US South believed that the Southern solution was transferable to Africa (R. H. Davis 1980). The events of

World War I encouraged the Phelps Stokes Fund to pursue its ambition of promoting race relations through education in Africa. Once the war ended, Europe and the United States saw a greater need to promote “wise” educational policies for “backward” Africans to prevent interracial friction and prepare native Africans to meet the actual needs of life (Phelps Stokes Fund 1932). The Phelps Stokes Fund stepped in and promoted a low standard of schooling in character development, health and hygiene, agriculture and gardening, industrial skills, knowledge of home economics, and wholesome recreation for the Negro masses in Africa (Healy-Clancy 2014). This kind of education had the purpose of socializing black Africans to know their place in the emerging global society where Europeans and Americans were in control. Education was to be used as the instrument to promote blacks’ perpetual economic and political subordination in a global hierarchical order. Black Africans and blacks in the global community would serve as “the drawers of water and hewers of wood” in the global productive processes. US philanthropic foundations saw the promotion of black education within the framework of “white supremacy” as the most effective way to promote race relations. Europeans and Americans perceived Africans as “backward,” “primitive,” “unintelligent,” and inferior to the white race, and therefore were to be relegated to subordinated statuses. The Phelps Stokes Fund boasted of the nature of socialization the agricultural and industrial education provided to blacks on the other side of the Atlantic.

The awakening interest in recent years of the educated Negro both in the United States and in Africa in his cultural background is a matter of real rejoicing. The socialization of tribal life at its best, Negro art, the “spirituals,” the traditions of worthy leaders in the past—these all deserve the attention they are increasingly receiving. Racial pride, when it does not carry with it unfair attitudes toward other races, is always to be encouraged (Phelps Stokes Fund 1932: 31)

The structure of black education, which aimed to improve race relations, was to ensure that black Africans live side by side with white colonists without competition or vouching for emancipation. Godfrey Brown and Mervyn Hiskett (1975) argue that “adapted education” that the Phelps Stokes Commission proposed was an educational analogue of “indirect rule.” Through education, black Africans would be pawns in the hands of whites. Black Africans would be adapted to the mentality, aptitude, occupation, and traditions of the various peoples, conserving as far as possible all the sound and healthy elements in the fabric of their social structure and adapting them where necessary

to the changed circumstances as they become necessary. Adaptation would enable the black African to navigate the complexity of education within the context of two cultures—that is, the European and African cultures.

Deficit Ideologies, Race Relations, and Education for Black Africans

Missionaries, government officials, and philanthropic entities on both sides of the Atlantic who were concerned with black welfare and black education all believed in providing differentiated education for blacks. The Hampton Institute was founded on the idea that blacks needed “teachers of moral strength as well as mental culture” and the introduction of manual labor as a cure for their poverty. The Hampton Institute, according to Richard Hunt Davis, was “to become a drill ground for the future and to send men and women rather than scholars into the world” (R. H. Davis 1980: 88).

Many of the philanthropic initiatives for educating blacks in the Southern United States during the time was premised on the view that blacks were less intelligent and less capable of undertaking rigorous academic work. Even the black intellectual Booker T. Washington expressed those views as we see in the debate between him and W. E. B. DuBois who argued that blacks were capable and therefore needed education for the “talented tenth” to provide leadership for the black community. Many whites who supported the Booker T. Washington ideology of industrial education for blacks at that time did so because of their belief that education policies should be a way to reproduce the racial status in global geopolitical contexts. The Phelps Stokes Fund’s push for adapted education was to ensure that blacks in the Southern United States would be trained as semi-skilled and semi-literate, while members of a burgeoning working class would be utilized to help industrialize the reconstructed South. The Phelps Stokes Commission for Africa also recommended adapted education to the “backward” and “primitive” peoples around the world on the racist assumptions that black people are inferior genetically; they will continue to be “drawers of water and hewers of wood” (R. H. Davis 1980). The Hampton-Tuskegee type education was to be the model for institutions in Africa to prepare and produce African leaders who would cooperate with philanthropically minded whites. These African leaders would abstain from discussions of political and social problems, since the probing of such topics was not conducive to a spirit of cooperation. Thomas

Jesse Jones bluntly argued that: "What had to be avoided in Africa and in the Southern United States as far as possible was the disease of an educational system like that of India that overstocks the market with clerks, talkers, and writers. Otherwise there would be a recurrence in these areas of the troubles that plagued British authority in India" (R. H. Davis 1980: 87).

The racist and deficit ideology that graced black education in Africa should be viewed within the context of the global eugenics movement and the anti-immigration sentiments of 1921 after World War I and the philanthropic support for the eugenics movement of the era. The Carnegie Corporation and Rockefeller Foundation supported the advancement of the field of eugenics. The Carnegie Corporation based its support for the Phelps Stokes Fund and commission in the United States and Africa in the 1920s on the belief that industrial education was the appropriate education for blacks even with resistance from black intellectuals like W. E. B. DuBois and Carter Woodson. In 1923, the John D. Rockefeller International Education Board provided a grant to the Phelps Stokes Fund to conduct a survey for the British Colonial Office of educational institutions in British West Africa and later in Southern and East Africa (Rosenfield 2014: 75). The report that came out of this grant provided a blueprint for the Carnegie Corporation's educational investment in Eastern and Southern Africa. The Carnegie Corporation also supported education initiatives in SSA to strengthen US influence in cultural transformation in British colonial Africa. Carnegie philanthropic initiatives in Africa aimed at creating conditions unfavorable to the spread of communism. Philanthropic initiatives for education became a tool for waging ideological warfare (Berman 1977).

Philanthropy and Transnational Borrowing of Race Relations

American race relations are complex and complicated in both domestic and foreign policy agendas. US philanthropic foundations' use of education to promote race relations in Africa provides some insights about the complexities of race relations in US domestic and foreign policy agendas. It also helps us understand how US entities exist to promote institutional racism and support white interests. Phelps Stokes Commission membership was a telling point in the supposed agenda of "improving" race relations. The commission included the personality of Thomas Jesse Jones, a British subject with training in the United States and the Director of the Hampton Institute for blacks. The Phelps

Stokes Fund saw Jesse Jones as someone with a deeper knowledge of the black experience. Henry Stanley Hollenbeth, a dentist who was an expert in agriculture and animal husbandry, was recruited to the commission to provide expertise in practical education in agriculture and animal husbandry. The rationale for his recruitment (in accordance with the Phelps Stokes Fund's objective) was to help provide education to meet the social needs of Africans so they would remain in their rural communities as farmers. The British missionary society had their representatives in the persons of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Wilkie Leo Roy from New York. Wilkie Roy was made the secretary of the commission because of his intimate knowledge of Negro education in America. African education architects saw his specialty in industrial education as a gift for the agenda. The commission saw the usefulness to add an African to the group to bring creditability to this "calculated benevolence." The Phelps Stokes Fund recruited for the commission Dr. James Kwegyir Aggrey, a black African from Gold Coast (Ghana) who had a doctorate in theology and was at that time pursuing another doctorate at Columbia University. The Phelps Stokes Fund pointed out that it recruited Kwegyir Aggrey to serve as a member of the commission for his belief in black and white race relations.

Not least among the services rendered to Africa by the Phelps Stokes Commission was the inclusion as a member of the Commission of Dr. J. E. Kwegyir Aggrey, a Native of the Gold Coast. He was animated by a passionate belief in the necessity and value of cooperation between black and white for the good of Africa and possessed a unique gift of interpreting one race to the other. His influence was felt all over Africa. (Phelps Stokes Fund 1932: 81)

The Phelps Stokes Commission crisscrossed West, West Central, and South Africa in their first expedition in 1920–21 followed by visits to East, Central, and South Africa in 1924. In places like South Africa, Phelps Stokes played a pronounced role in shaping Natal policies in bifurcating education for blacks and whites. When the commission toured South Africa in 1920 and 1924, Natal educational official Charles Loram accompanied and offered tremendous support for it (Healy-Clancy 2013).

The objective to improve race relations between blacks and whites in Africa was broadly understood as transplanting US ideas about black education to Africa. The Phelps Stokes Commission influenced the education policies in Belgian and Portuguese colonies in the 1920s into the 1930s (Benson 1936; Phelps Stokes Fund 1932). The idea of improving race relations in sub-Saharan Africa was broadened to in-

clude bringing African educators to the United States. After the expeditions of the Phelps Stokes Commission in Africa, the organization provided travel grants to persons involved in African education to visit the United States. The Carnegie Corporation, in particular, demonstrated support by providing funds for educational exchange for individuals to visit the United States. The Carnegie Corporation's support for education in Africa became part of the grand agenda to promote United States' connections to the world through immigration, foreign languages, and international exchanges that enabled Americans to engage in the world as a motivation that spurred US philanthropic initiatives in sub-Saharan Africa. The Carnegie Corporation points out that: "The grants in support of industrial and community education for blacks in the rural American South in conjunction with the efforts of the General Education Board and the Phelps Stokes Fund laid the groundwork for the major grant programs on this theme in Africa in the late 1920s and 1930s" (Rosenfield 2014: 65).

The Carnegie Corporation's philanthropic initiatives supporting education in SSA initially took center stage in South Africa after World War I. The initiative had the backing of the US government and was part of the grand agenda of the United States to stimulate optimism after the war had weakened progress in Europe. It was during this time when US President Woodrow Wilson promoted an inclusionary and idealist vision of international citizenship based on a partnership of peoples, not merely governments, and provided a persuasive political and cultural context for the initiative (Bell 2000). Between 1929 and 1938, the Carnegie Corporation and the Phelps Stokes Fund collaborated and promoted the Jeanes training initiative, which was part of the organizations' agenda to transplant black education from the Southern United States to Africa. These two philanthropic entities also supported the educational visits of African educators to St. Helena Island in South Carolina to study black education and interracial work in the South.

In the 1950s, the framework of promoting race relations in Africa evolved to include facilitating strong relations between the United States and newly independent African nations, especially as the United States plunged into the Cold War with the Soviet Bloc. The efforts made by United States policymakers to build a strong relationship with the newly independent African countries in the 1950s and early 1960s was intended to demonstrate to the newly independent African nations that the best way to achieve their economic and political aspirations lies in embracing and cooperating with the free world (Parmer 2012). US policymakers saw that it was critical to work with these newly in-

dependent African nations and nudge them toward embracing democracy, free market ideologies, and human capital ideologies to promote human development and human resource needs. US policymakers viewed the United States' influence on African nations as critical and part of the overarching objective of promoting US idealism in Africa. The "secular" missionaries were ready to execute this important philanthropic agenda in Africa. Once again US policymakers enlisted their "secular missionaries" of the era—philanthropic giants—to further this development policy agenda. In 1954, Alan Pifer, president of the Carnegie Corporation, stated that the corporation's interest in Africa was primarily motivated by a desire to strengthen "the Western democratic part of the world" even though most Africans still lived under colonial rule. US policy makers had a strategic interest in Africa in the sense that they wanted the African region to be "free of inimical influences" and friendly to the United States to ensure that African governments' political, economic, and social evolution reflect an image of the United States. They also wanted to guarantee that the United States had access to resources, increased commercial, industrial, and cultural activities and to consolidate its cultural and moral position with respect to Africa (Parmer 2012: 156). Development in Africa, as seen from the accounts here, was to be subordinated to the whims and caprices of the higher strategic goals of the United States and Western powers. Philanthropic entities generally never consulted Africans on the issue of Africa's development initiatives. Inderjeet Parmer (2012: 156) cited an example of a philanthropic conference in 1958 focusing on the development of higher education and related issues in West Africa. The Carnegie Corporation organized the conference, which the Ford Foundation, representatives of the British colonial authorities, US government agencies, and several Africanists from the United States attended. However, the Carnegie Corporation did not invite a single African to this meeting. This is further evidence of the paternalist approaches used by Western forces on Africans when it comes to the education discourse of SSA.

The development ideology of American philanthropic foundations was important in a post-World War II Cold War era where US policymakers took African societies seriously to dissuade them from entering the Soviet Bloc. At the time, Europe itself was under the Marshall Plan, both European and American policymakers saw the great economic significance of the African continent. Africa was rich in all the resources needed for the atomic age. It was also replete with agricultural produce including cocoa, coffee, cotton, and vegetable oils (Parmer 2012). Parmer (2012) points out that with all the abundant

resources, the newly independent African societies needed development that would promote elite top-down modernization. The Christian missionaries and colonial administrators had laid the foundation for new African leadership familiar with the West and who spoke the colonizer's "language" in contrast to the masses. It was in the view of philanthropic entities, notably the Carnegie Corporation and others that future leaders must be educated in the United States to effect the greatest intellectual transformation. Parmer (2012) points out that the acculturation of African elites had political and economic consequences, as these African elites helped expand markets for Western consumer products.

Philanthropy Support, Black Africanist Intellectuals, and Race Relations

The supposed agenda of "improving [the] race relationship" between whites and blacks demonstrated how race and racism shaped philanthropic support for research on blacks and Africans by white and black Africanists (Gershenhorn 2009; Parmer 2012; Vitalis 2015). The racial question regarding the relationship between white and black Africanist intellectuals and their respective access to resources is something worth highlighting. In the 1940s into the 1960s, US philanthropic entities including the Carnegie Corporation and the Rockefeller Foundation made expansive funding available to individuals, universities, and research institutes to embark on research on black African societies. Black scholars sought to capitalize on these developments, which coincidentally was an era of increased interest in Africa among philanthropic foundations and the federal government in the creation of African Studies programs (Gershenhorn 2009; Parmer 2012; Vitalis 2015). Interestingly, black Africanist intellectuals at historically black institutions, such as Howard University, were shut out of these opportunities. Philanthropic entities denied funding to the few black intellectuals including W. E. B. DuBois and Carter Woodson, branding them propagandists. Research projects on blacks during this period received foundation support only when white researchers controlled them (Gershenhorn 2009; Vitalis 2015). Black Africanist scholars witnessed what some of them termed as the "hijacking" of Africa's narratives by white Africanist scholars. The philanthropic entities' treatment of black Africanist scholars caused some rifts in the 1960s politics of African Studies. These inequalities of funding support came to a head when in 1969 at the African Studies Association conference

in Montreal, black scholars led a protest to call for black people to control African Studies. The conflict boiled down to who was supposed to provide the narrative about Africa. The African Heritage Studies Association, which was a caucus carved out of ASA in 1968, raised the issue of who was supposed to interpret African history, white or black scholars. At this conference, black activists asserted that they were not going to permit white scholars to abuse African people. They proclaimed that as people of African descent they would no longer permit “our people” (Africans) to be raped culturally, economically, politically, and intellectually merely to provide European scholars with intellectual status symbols of African artifacts hanging in their living rooms and irrelevant and injurious lectures for their classrooms (Gershenson 2009). Jerry Gershenson points out that black scholars faced enormous obstacles as philanthropic entities had no interest in funding African American scholars (who in the estimation of philanthropic entities could not be relied on) to follow the US State Department’s Cold War line, which aimed to perpetuate European and American imperialist domination in Africa. Philanthropic foundations’ deprived black intellectuals of support for research, which has been a longstanding practice in a “White World Order” (to borrow the words of Robert Vitalis 2015: 106) and part of the ideology of “domination and dependency among the world’s so-called superior and inferior races.” The longstanding strategy used by Western philanthropic entities is to be the trustees and voice of African societies and disenfranchise, marginalize, and disempower African intellectuals and intellectuals of African descent from providing their own narratives about themselves and their societies.

Philanthropy, Race, and Poverty Alleviation

Post-World War II humanistic ideologies that shaped the educational discourse of the 1940s and 1950s influenced the policy agenda of American philanthropic entities working in Africa. These ideologies promoted discourse that linked education and poverty. The popular ideologies about education and occupational mobility in the United States at the time and the rationale to use education to fight poverty and racial inequality, which resulted in the publication of the Coleman Report (1966), influenced the policy agenda of US philanthropic entities and shaped conversations about education policy and practice in sub-Saharan Africa. The education and poverty discourse of the era coincided with the wave of many colonized African nations attaining

political independence. When African nations entered a period of transition in the British colonial dominions, the Carnegie Corporation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Ford Foundation forged partnerships with many of the newly emerging nations to support education and development initiatives with the understanding that there would be a high rate of return to many citizens attending schools in the newly independent African nations.

The economic, political, and social emergence of these [underdeveloped] countries into the modern is one of the most momentous developments of the modern times . . . What all these areas share in common—for some of them are “new nations” in the political sense, others will soon become so, and some are in fact old nations—is that the process of modernization lies ahead for them. In highly telescoped fashion, these emerging nations are striving to create modern economic and political structures in the merest fraction of the time it took the West to do so. Their success will represent the best hope for a peaceful world for all of us; if they fail at that, it will represent failure—and tragedy—for all of us. (Rosenfield 2014: 224)

The US philanthropic entities’ efforts to promote economic development was influenced by the US government and private organizations’ agenda to support human capital development through technical assistance to support the growth and development of newly independent African countries. Technical assistance included the introduction of new technologies to promote modernization (expressed in the form of “liberal capitalism”) as a counter to communism (Parmer 2012; Rosenfield 2014). The Carnegie Corporation, the Ford Foundation, and the Rockefeller Foundation supported human capital in SSA to target higher education where the organizations provided strong support for scholarships for Africans from dominions of British colonial empires to enroll in universities in the United States. The human capital development agenda of the US philanthropic initiatives also included support for national education commissions to establish teacher education programs and institutes of education in some African countries. The Carnegie Corporation supported the Ashby Commission of Nigeria to establish more institutes of education. The Ashby Commission recommended in 1960 that universities be established in each region of Nigeria to promote modernization. The corporation also supported linkages between the Institute of Education of the University of Ghana, the Institute of Education at the University of London, and the Teachers College at Columbia University to organize a professional association to maintain regular contact on issues related to teacher education and curriculum reforms (Rosenfield 2014: 246). The Carnegie Corpo-

ration also supported faculty exchanges between universities in the newly independent African countries and Teachers College.

As several territories in SSA became politically independent in the 1960s, the Carnegie Corporation, the Ford Foundation, and the Rockefeller Foundation collaborated with the US Agency for International Development (USAID) and some US development entities, business investors, and the British Colonial Office to support higher education in countries in SSA in the 1960s. These efforts provided networks of scholars, investors, philanthropists, and policymakers who became influential. Until this time, American philanthropic entities were sometimes caught in the middle between either ceding to the demands of African nationalists for rapid progress through more higher education or preparing a small elite that would be pro-Western in outlook and composition and carry the agendas of Western development entities. It should be noted that Western development entities were skeptical and feared that the growth of an educationally “Westernized urban intelligentsia could stave nationalistic pressure and derail the West’s ultimate agenda, they also envisioned the potential of native elites to succumb to the whims and caprices of Western development entities and perpetuate the Western agenda” (Beshir 1969; Parmer 2012; Seri-Hersch 2017).

Philanthropy and US “Idealism”

US philanthropic entities saw their presence in sub-Saharan Africa as a way to promote US “idealism” in Africa. US philanthropic foundation activities in SSA were based on the principle that nationalism and internationalism could be mutually reinforcing. The liberal developmentalist ideology of the late nineteenth century to the mid-twentieth century embedded the United States’ imperial interests of altruism, evolution, and world progress. For US philanthropic entities, promoting US idealism internationally meant bringing other countries to the consciousness of the United States through the support of schools, universities, libraries, development of key programs to support university staff training, scientific research, and useful publication beyond the United States to include former British dominions and colonies (Effah and Senadza 2008; Weeks 2008). US philanthropic entities made direct grants to support the development of disciplinary studies in African universities and development of African Studies programs at universities in the United States. During the interwar years between the mid-1920s to the 1930s the Rockefeller Foundation developed a special

interest in anthropology and provided support for the development of Social Anthropology. It provided direct grants for operating expenses, research grants, fellowships, and publication assistance to support institutions including the International Institute of African Languages and Culture (IIALC). Donald Fisher points out that the rationale for such interest was to apply scientific methods to social science research to offer knowledge that would make the colonial administration both more efficient and more humane. Social control would be increased, and the problem associated with “culture contact,” which were very much part of the American scene, could be resolved (Fisher 1986).

The US philanthropic entities’ goal of promoting liberal development idealism became obvious in their activities in South Africa in the 1930s and in Ghana and Nigeria in the 1960s. The objective of the Carnegie Corporation’s philanthropic support for education in South Africa included shaping the policy process in South Africa to bring Africa more firmly into the consciousness of the United States and serving as an important antidote to official US policy toward the colonial territories at this time. The liberal development agenda also became the underlying ideology of the Carnegie Corporation’s British Dominion and Colonies Fund for South Africa, which persisted into the 1970s when the international community spoke against the brutalities of apartheid in South Africa even as the United States remained silent about the political situation there. The Carnegie Corporation shifted its strategy during the 1970s so as not to be seen as an agent of US foreign policy (Bell 2000). The liberal development idealism was the basis for the Rockefeller Foundation to develop the African Economic Research Consortium (AERC), which provided grants for many educational activities. The Carnegie Corporation and the Ford Foundation also provided support for education in Africa through the Association of African Universities. In Ghana, US philanthropic foundations collaborated with local institutions to provide platforms for building institutional management and leadership capacities. The Carnegie Corporation supported the Ghana National Council of Teacher Education to help them develop manuals on leadership for newly appointed heads of tertiary educational institutions (Effah and Senadza 2008).

US philanthropic entities also pushed their liberal democratic agenda in the 1950s and 1960s by supporting higher education in newly independent sub-Saharan African societies. The Carnegie Corporation and others saw education as the key to development and therefore focused on developing a system of colleges and universities that would mass-produce men and women qualified to develop Africa (Parmer 2012). The Ford Foundation supported higher education by collab-

orating with US agencies and engaged in active institution-building programs, including economic planning units of the University of Ife, and the behavioral sciences at the University of Ibadan. The foundation spent \$164 million on African development programs between the 1950s and 1974 in the areas of social sciences and a further \$18 million on research and training programs. The Ford Foundation also provided \$25 million for university education in Nigeria of which a third was invested at the University of Ibadan. The Ford Foundation also funded institutes of African Studies in Ghana and Nigeria to promote a national sense of identity in newly independent states (Parmer 2012). While the Rockefeller Foundation took active roles in supporting education in SSA in the 1920s and 1930s, it provided more support for independent sub-Saharan African societies. The foundation contributed a further \$9 million to the University of Ibadan in the 1960s and 1970s while the Carnegie Corporation expended \$10 million on African universities to promote innovations in teacher education (Parmer 2012: 158). Parmer points out that in spite of the supposed “good” will of US philanthropic activities, support for education tended to focus disproportionately on the whites of South Africa and white colonial educators across the rest of the (British) African continent. US philanthropic entities also supported African Studies programs in predominantly white universities in the United States, including Columbia, Yale, Johns Hopkins, Northwestern, UCLA, Harvard, Stanford, Chicago University, Boston University, Indiana University, Wisconsin University, and Michigan University to develop programs on African Studies and pursue research on Africa (Gernshenhorn 2009; Parmer 2012).

In the twenty-first century, US philanthropic entities continue to support higher education in SSA through grants to promote human development (D’Souza 2019; Rockefeller Foundation 2014; Walker 2020). The Carnegie Corporation continues to support knowledge and ideas through support for educational institutions and libraries, promotion of peace, democratic institutions, socioeconomic development, and international engagements. The corporation supports information technologies, women’s advancement in higher education and sciences, and preparing future university faculty. In its fiscal year 2017–18, the Carnegie Corporation made available \$15.8 million to support these courses. The Carnegie Corporation collaborates with the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) to provide grants to support the African Humanities Programs (AHP), which operates in Ghana, Nigeria, South Africa, Tanzania, and Uganda to strengthen humanities and social sciences (D’Souza 2019). In the last decade of the twentieth cen-

ture, the Ford Foundation incorporated peace education, promotion of democratic values, and provision of grants and scholarships for students to promote gender, race, and ethnic justice. The Rockefeller Foundation is also partnering with other entities, including Intel, to close the digital gender gap in Africa.

New Directions of Philanthropic Support

The “Education for All” (EFA) initiative has been a watershed moment for sub-Saharan African nations. While there is a renewed commitment to support universal basic education in the region to promote the “common good” of all people, the cost involved in promoting the EFA initiative continues to put excess strain on the resources of most governments in SSA. Governments in SSA allocate between 11 and 28 percent of their national budgets to education with an average of 18.3 percent and devote 5 percent of the total GDP (about \$1.5 trillion) to public education (The Africa-America Institute 2015; UNESCO-UIS 2011). The higher expenditures on education still represent only a portion of the financial resources needed by the governments in the region to fund education programs that target marginalized groups. International donors provide nearly 6 percent of the education resources in SSA, and individual households contribute about 25 percent of the total national education expenditure on education (The Africa-America Institute 2015). The 2014 Education for All (EFA) Global Monitoring Report points out that continual external support (including philanthropic support) is crucial for comprehensive planning for education and the kind of predictable finance that long-term aid commitment can provide for the region. Within the contexts of the efforts to fulfill the EFA agenda, support received from Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) toward education continues to decline, which means that efforts to promote the global EFA, Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) will be hampered (UNESCO 2018). Education systems in SSA have been expanding rapidly in SSA but governments are struggling to reach their educational development goals. These scenarios show that the international community needs to sustain its support for education to meet its humanitarian commitment in the sub-Saharan African region. Support for education should be viewed within the rubric of economic development, affirming humanistic idealism, and ensuring participatory democratic processes for all, rather than being a political tool to sustain the power asymmetry and marginalization of groups.

Concluding Thoughts

At the outset, US philanthropic entities' promotion of race relations at home and abroad entailed strengthening and perpetuating the existing power asymmetry in the global community. The philanthropic entities in the United States pushed the agenda by supporting and funding research initiatives that focused on Africa after World War II. During the Cold War, philanthropic entities (backed by the US government) saw the necessity to create area studies programs to produce experts to help the United States execute policies that served its global interests. African American scholars sought to capitalize on these developments at this time, which coincidentally was an era of increased interest in Africa among philanthropic foundations and the federal government signaled by the creation of African Studies programs (Gershenhorn 2009; Vitalis 2015). However, African American scholars faced enormous obstacles as philanthropic entities expressed no interest in funding African American scholars (who in the estimation of philanthropic entities, could not be relied on) to follow the US State Department's Cold War line, which intended to perpetuate European and American imperialist domination in Africa. Here we witnessed the use of philanthropy to consolidate institutional racism in grant support. From the late twentieth century into the twenty-first century, the Carnegie Corporation shifted the promotion of race relations in Africa from the earlier paternalistic and racist views to strengthening African scholars to chart their own destiny and write their own histories, their arts, their philosophies, their literature, and their musical and cultural traditions. These stories are not told by the colonizers, but by their own makers, scholars, and thinkers (see D'Souza 2019).

Established US philanthropic foundations have employed market mechanisms to guide their decisions of giving. They are more conscious about the rate of return on investment aiming to enforce competition, weed out the weak, provide close supervision, maintain standards, and embrace output as indicators of success. There is much emphasis on "value for money" (Edwards 2015; Payton and Moody 2008). The new approach to philanthropy in the United States involves a network of business-oriented philanthropic organizations and limited liability companies whose goal is to reform public schools along free market ideologies. The agendas of these philanthropic entities are already making their way to SSA and other parts of the developing world. Bilateral agencies and transnational global governing organizations are embracing the education policy models proposed by these contemporary philanthropies. Education policy transfer continues to be an im-

portant process in these times of economic and cultural globalization where there is much emphasis on technology transfer and sharing of initiatives that promote economic and technological transformation and political cohesiveness.