

In Retrospect. A Conversation with Meyer Fortes.

A. Bujra and K. Prah

QUESTION (PRAH)

Professor Meyer Fortes, you have for a long time been associated with social science, particularly on Africa. We would like to know when and under what circumstances your interest in Africa developed?

ANSWER

Well, you should know that I was born and brought up in South Africa. One of my early interests there, in my student days at the University at Cape Town were questions on race relations. And one of my early, should I call it analytical undertakings, there was into what I thought to be, certain acrimonious elements of injustice in the society. So my knowledge of Africa began with my response to certain conditions in South Africa in my youth. Later I went to London and began my own career by attempting to construct a set of psychological tests of intelligence which would be culturally neutral. But I discovered when I had made these tests that it was impossible to get any tests which were culturally neutral. Therefore, really the whole basis of concern shifted away from tests which at that time seemed to me impossible to be made culturally neutral, to the understanding of the nature of social and cultural phenomenon. This was the original concern which prompted me to go in the direction I subsequently went.

QUESTION (BUJRA)

That was to shift from psychological tests to the study of societies as a whole which means changing from Psychology to Social Anthropology?

ANSWER

That's right; that is what it means.

QUESTION (PRAH)

During these early formative years, as it were, which were the dominant ideas, which were the leading and current ideas, about social science with which you got into contact and became engaged?

ANSWER

Well, that is a very broad question to ask. I was a student at that time at the London School of Economics in the years 1928 to 31/32. It was a place where almost every contemporary theoretical way of looking at human nature and society was represented. The people who were active then were Malinowski; and Morris Ginsberg who was very influential because, although it may not be known, he was a man who believed that ethics were important in social studies and that there is such a thing as the pursuit of the good, that we may not know what it was but it is important. He influenced me too in a sense; that of intellectual honesty. And among the young you can imagine that, that was the period of radical responses to depressing economic conditions, it was the time of unemployment, of hunger marches and so on; clearly, there was enough to agitate the minds of students of the London School of Economics. Seen from the angle of, shall I say, the state of affairs of the working class and especially of course, the urban; problems of urban dwelling. I did some work in the East End of London. This was my first place of special research where I got interested in young delinquents. I delved a lot into criminology in which I argued that these young criminals were not criminals for psychological reasons but criminals partly because of the pressures within the family. This was what first induced me to look at their families; and were partly due to the fact that they (these youths were around the age of 14) were thrown into the great mainstream of public life with tasks of contributing in some ways to household economies at a time when job openings were difficult to come by. These conditions affected my intellectual development. Well as to literature, of course we read all the books. You name them, and we read them. Such was the kind of intellectual formation many of us had at that time. I don't know if that satisfies you.

QUESTION (BUJRA)

Yes, indeed, that gives us some idea of the intellectual background that you were involved in in London when you were studying. But how far do you think that this very eclectic, kind of, this mix of various schools; how far did it affect you in your later study of African societies, and how did it come out in your work?

ANSWER

Well, I think the most important contribution that came from those studies, were the following, let me put it in this way; on the one hand there was the much misunderstood functionalism of Malinowski; the Malinowski school and the Durkheim school. I was also particularly interested in psycho-analysis, and there was also a good deal at that time of what we can in a general sense call Marxist influence. Now I think one important point which is overlooked in all this is that the general trend of that combination was to draw attention away from traditional ethnological concerns with myths and stories and beliefs, and to urge students to begin at the level of producers of modes of livelihood as a basic point of departure, and so for all the functionalist students, if you look at their writings, you find that they begin by attending to questions of mode of livelihood. I am putting it in that general sense. And from modes of livelihood, to questions of how these societies are organised. How do they rule themselves? How do they take decisions about what is right and what is wrong? You see, that sort of thing; so that you should forget all about the metaphysics of functionalism and ask which direction did it push these students, and you contrast this for instance with what was happening at the same time in the 30's with French ethnologists working among the Dogon, where you had people like Griaule explaining out these enormous mythologies, I am not saying they don't exist, I am saying that whereas British anthropologists at that time were saying: How does a family constitute itself? How did it get living from the forest or from what ever it is? How did it fit into a system in which there is law and order? The French at the same time, and I am not being insulting, were dealing with questions of mythology and of ideology in the traditional setting. Now we may have overlooked something, but as you can see, that kind of eclectic combination led us in the direction of, again I am choosing my words carefully; I don't want to use

such words like materialism or determinism; about 50 years ago I was talking in that language; but now I only want to talk in terms of actuality; an actuality like how people get their living.

QUESTION (BUJRA)

It seems that at that time you started studying African societies you and your colleagues like Evans-Pritchard and others were saying that the functionalist school was a reaction to a different previous anthropological school and that it was an advance from the previous school?

ANSWER

Yes.

QUESTION (BUJRA)

But at the same time, unfortunately or fortunately may be for you I don't know; you also did your work in studying African societies under colonialism; under the conditions of colonialism? How far do you think, what kind of role did British social anthropology play in relation to British colonialism in Africa?

ANSWER

Well, in a way this is probably the current preoccupation of many young radicals not only in Africa but also in Europe. They are all writing about colonialism. They make an ism out of it. Once you make an ism out of a historical period of human society, you hypothesize it; you reify it into some form of giant. Now the fact is that, we at that period, were interested in a number of what we considered to be universally human problems; this is the important thing to bear in mind; that we had got down to the view partly as a reaction of my period against the previous period. Well, that is a reaction against the idea that because you could classify human societies at different levels of technology, population, environment, institutions and so on, you could assume that there was an evolutionary sequence which led from the lower savage Australian aborigine at the bottom of the scale to the magnificent Victorian, Christianity, technology, and so. One thing which came out of this was that we began to see things in a totally different way. We studied human societies all over the world as different ways of handling one fundamental human problem such as the problem of marrying, procreating, surviving as a community - a human problem everywhere - that is, how a community survives as a commu-

nity? How did it do it? (2) Of using its environment to the best of its technical skills. So many environments have to be used here, such as physical environment; ecological environment, cultural environment, social environment, all types of environments. (No. 3) was a question of quite a different type, one of, the common humanity which underlies all these things. Well, the only thing which we could say or rather that enabled us to say that there are generally propositions we can make about mankind; regardless of being Australian aborigine or Victorian or Roman or Greek. This was the reaction. From the reaction to the evolutionary idea, to the idea of varieties of human societies and human ways of life which have a common rationality. Now when you come to colonialism, all I can say is that in my own experience, and that of many others, we chose to go to certain areas. I particularly wanted to go to the community where I could find a family system (I was interested in that from my work in London) which was:

- (a) a big contrast to the European system (on the surface),
- (b) which was just sufficiently traditional and authentic; this is the important thing; so that the variable of what in those days we used to speak of as the culture contact could be excluded or kept from it all, and
- (c) where I would be able to make such contrast with the people that I will be able to establish confidence and be accepted by them.
- (d) The other question was where to go in Africa.

The International African Institute which sponsored our activities with International African Student Directors were J. H. Oldham who was a Missionary. No, he was not a Missionary but he was in the Church. One of the leading people was Diederich Westermann, the great German Linguist, Henri Labouret who was a French ex-administrator, etc. We were presided over by Lord Lugard who had retired. The sponsorship of this whole thing was made possible by grants from Rockefeller Foundation. Now we looked at African societies in a wide continental sweep spreading all the way from South Africa to East and West and it just so happened that three of us felt that the least known parts of Africa were

in West Africa; least known in the modern sense. And it just happened that three of us, that is S. F. Nadel, S. Hofstra, the Dutchman, and myself, saw that it would be useful to work in West Africa and the three of us chose three different colonial territories. Nadel went to Nigeria to the Nupe and I went to the Gold Coast partly because by chance I had read Rattray who inspired me and told me a lot; and Hofstra went to Sierra Leone.

I think I must be emphatic in saying that at no time were any obstacles put in the way of my research by the colonial administrators; that I had good relations with them and when they asked me for information I gave it to them. My nearest neighbour was an Agricultural Officer, C. W. Lane, a man who was tremendously liked by the local people; a man who studied there the right cultures which were very important for me; a man who had worked and succeeded in training local people, to adopt certain more efficient manuring methods than they had before. So as far as plain relationship is concerned, I had no initial dealings with them; no initial difficulties with them. Well, a certain amount of difficulty arose later.

QUESTION (PRAH)

You mentioned Rattray?

ANSWER

Yes.

QUESTION (PRAH)

I am sure in the early years when you came to West Africa you were familiar with the works of people like Casely Hayford and Sarbah; what is your reaction or impression of the contribution of some of these previous participants in the study of African societies, specifically in Ghana?

ANSWER

First of all I have to tell you that in the days when I made my contacts with Rattray he at once advised me to read these people straight away. He said: "You must read Sarbah, you must read Casely Hayford's works and all of the other writers: Bowdich, and any of them you can get hold of". I personally think that I am still so inclined that Sarbah was a man of remarkable talent because I think he gave a basic analysis of the particular, the fundamental, the radical structure of Akan society which I found so valuable. Casely Hayford was as quite a different person in that respect but I was interested in his

works. And I had long conversations with Kobina Sekyi about whole problems that were the beginnings of some government issues at that time. With Ofori Atta, again we also had conversations and with J. B. Danquah - these were the people of the last generation - and many others more. And as regards Casely Hayford I think I set him out with more respect for his, should I call it, his imaginative passion than for his contribution to publishing. So this is what I thought at that time. So, from my point of view, Sarbah was a distinguished scholar; Casely Hayford, more of a publicist. That is my evaluation of them.

QUESTION (PRAH)

Since those early years when you came to West Africa a lot has happened and Africa has seen relatively rapid social change; what are your impressions of the essential points and the essential lessons in this broad sweep of time and change which has happened in Africa since you first came here?

ANSWER

You ask me a question which is more suitable for somebody with a grand view of society and humanity than for a mere anthropologist. To me, one of the most remarkable things about Africa, not merely West Africa, but also for the other parts of Africa I know, is the emergence of what I call the intellectual. Now, this may seem odd to you because I know people talk about economic development and political development and so on. But it is a remarkable fact to me; something which was quite different when we look back to the period of the people we have mentioned before; that you now have in Africa, I think all over, the cadre of youngmen, mostly youngmen and women, who are intellectuals in this sense; First, they have international experience; second, they have a body of acquired knowledge which enables them to look at their society in a critical and evaluative way and not merely to, well let me put it this way, to make propaganda. Now, they are technically positioned in different professions which enable them also to see all the problems of their society from the angle of technical and professional requirements that were simply, well, well, I mean, a monopoly of the expatriate, of the colonial government 40 years ago. Now that particular, the emergence of that particular type of, call them what you like, is to me a very remarkable thing more impor-

tant than, for instance, the civil service, the judiciary, than the technician and other levels of persons of that sort. And this is the personal view perhaps of the importance and significance of the intellectual in social life, of his thought, of his knowledge, of criticism, of evaluation.

QUESTION (PRAH)

Professor Meyer Fortes, perhaps you could at this point give us a brief summary of what you consider to be the major contribution of British Anthropology as a whole to the study of human societies in this era?

ANSWER

I think it is a rather challenging question. Remember my beginning. What happened to British anthropology as opposed to the American anthropology, French anthropology, and German anthropology, was a direction of attention to the people on the ground; working, eating, building houses, owning houses, constructing, living in a society. I think it is fair to say that it was the British anthropologists who first made the assertion that indigenous African societies have political order and form of government. It was not the colonialist or colonial contribution to what was going on. This, I think, is something that British Anthropology has done which is of great importance; the recognition that African societies traditionally, not merely because of colonialism, have their own forms, they devised their own forms of government, administration and law; that African societies have the concept of the legal rights and duties of people within their own systems which was comparable in many ways to what you find in other societies.

Now, this I think is an important contribution, that we directed attention on the whole continent, for instance, the fact that you find technical depositories over the whole of the continent attests also as to what some of the British anthropologists were doing. That we declared that, for instance, when we talk about African kinship systems we are not merely talking about a complicated language in which they speak, or some systems of persons of all sorts, but rather we are talking about a system which I think the British Anthropologist will, say is the system of identifying people in terms of their kind from one another in their society; their rights in relation to one another. This seems to me to be number one when we said we looked

at people on the ground starting with their way of living; how they earn their living. Two, that we must regard them honestly as having some rational foundation. However odd they look they must have a rational foundation or they would not survive.

Also, we must look at the constitution of the society, as from the family upwards and upwards as being the constitution which is concerned with how to maintain rights, duties, order and organisation in the society; regardless of the content of the nature of general principles. Number Four, that African societies indigenously, without colonial education, have political systems from which we can learn. Formerly we did not know that they had these systems; even those societies which did not seem to have anything like systems at that time. Finally, (that is one of the most important) that African societies are distinguished by the fact that, in all African societies, there are indigenous, there is an indigenous understanding of law.

Sarbah saw that, and others saw it too. This is our contribution that I value most. I may be wrong though, I belong to this generation but I may be wrong; I am only drawing attention to, for instance, the kind of studies of African traditional political institution which was initiated by my friend Max Gluckman, it had never been done before.

We went on and said what went on in the court. Let us see what actually happened. Let us see the law in action. Remember that Evans-Pritchard whose history you know very well, in his first book on the Nuer dealt with, starts with a description of livelihood and ended by arguing that what others had talked about as kinship is really a political order.

QUESTION (BUJRA)

Professor Fortes, given your very wide experience in studies of African societies in general, but particularly Ghana in West Africa, and given the wide span of years during which you have been looking at this country, what do you think have been the essential elements of social development in Ghana from the time that you went there 40 years ago to the present?

ANSWER

Well, I think you have asked me an extremely difficult question - what are the essential elements of development - well, I must say that every time I come back to Ghana I see emerging in it amongst individuals and groups more of the sense of being Ghanaians, though this may seem to you rudimentary. But from my

point of view when I look back and think in terms of how 40 years ago and even in 1963 when I was here, the concept, the image of the individual himself of being a Ghanaian regardless of which tribal group or area he comes from was still only developing. Now I have been tremendously impressed both by the Ghanaians that are overseas and those here that this sense of being a Ghanaian is becoming a very important and definite one and in this, of course the intellectual is leading the way. But I must have to state also of what I see of the ordinary person in the street, that I talk to. I feel specially honoured in talking to people of my own linguistic group whom I can talk to in their own language, in our own language and I find that, now, the whole idea of being a Ghanaian is expressable and thinkable in their language. This is the first thing I think I would say. The second thing in which I think a change has come, in my time, I think it has been certainly the enormous development of the great cities, Accra, Kumasi, all the cities have become enormously developed and enormously diversified. And it is my impression that as these great urban communities are developing so you are getting in Ghana all the problems that accompany the development of these metropolitan communities elsewhere. I remember when I was here in 1971, a friend of mine, whom I will prefer not to name, said: "You see that we are becoming civilized; because we now have armed robbery in Ghana". But the point I want to mention is that you are beginning to have all the problems of the so-called developed countries and it goes to show that it has to do with the emergence of economic conditions, political and social conditions that conform more and more to the developed society. It is all the same, whether you are capitalist or socialist or whatever you want to call them; they all have the same kinds of problems. My first impression is that there is an anthropological problem of the future and there are a lot of other problems, I think emerging, that there is not really to my understanding, as yet - I may be mistaken; probably; I am hoping to learn something more about it when I go back to Accra. But I think I have this impression that there is not any, I hate the word planning because I don't think you can plan anything human; but this is an attempt of forecast. My opinion is that I have not got the impression that institutions, for that,

are sufficiently developed. That is my impression so far about Ghana. So that on the credit side, I regard every development as a credit or a debit, it is an inevitable thing, but if I were invited to say what is or should be done I myself would say I think you should begin to project your imagination here to realize that you are going in a certain direction as a national state, and this is a national community, and that you should encourage the emergence of institutions in which you can have dialogue and criticism and imagination about what can we do, and how do we work for that future? What is it going to be at a certain time?

QUESTION (PRAH)

Earlier on you made mention of the fact that in your early years the French school of anthropology was already preoccupied to some extent, with theories and ideas on the mythology of pre-capitalist societies. What do you think of the recent contributions of Levi-Strauss to the whole study of myths? Secondly, the French recently, if I may mention a few names which come to mind, Meillassoux, Jean-Phillipe Rey, Coquery-Vidrovitch, Suret-Canale, Terray, Copans, have been coming up with what some have described as a Marxist perspective to the understanding of African societies. What do you think then, to sum up in the same way as you summed the contribution of the British, has then been the contribution of the French school of anthropology to the study of human societies in general and Africa specifically?

ANSWER

Well, it seems your question is one I cannot escape. In the first place let me say this, I think the difference of emphasis between us, British working from the ground upwards and French of my period who studied mythology and ideology was a difference of emphasis and that personally I am willing to believe, apparently, as I do, that the African society, that Africa, has ways of its own, of conceptualizing the cardinal, the state of man, the condition of man, the view of man, cast in the language of mythology which also is the language of our Bible. Also, from my point of view, a mythological way of talking about the same kind of thing. The Chinese have their concept; the Hindus have their concept in the same way cast in a mythology which in many ways looks more complex but fundamentally there are points of contact between all these mythologies. And I think we, British Anthropologists, tended to ignore or neglect them because we were concentrating on the level of people on the ground. So

I am not dismissing the work of the French anthropologists who made us aware, more clearly aware than we had been before, in more detail, that there is that side also of the contribution of the African. You call it pre-capitalist, I call it pre-industrial or whatever you want, or traditional, intellectual life. Never for a moment forget that there was and is in any so-called tribal society a development of significant intellectual life. I mean, I am simply saying that, well, I used to sit down and talk with the Tallensi elders. I was talking to people who were thinking about themselves, thinking about the cosmos, thinking about life in the ways that were available to them; partly mythological. We have already begun understanding that. Now, my approach to Levi-Strauss; I think he has done a great service to the intellectual life of the West and of the world while demonstrating what he called the mythologies of humanity over a whole range of simple societies, are not just crazy imaginings but are phenomena that have form, structure, significance and implications which we can find our way towards by suggesting what I might call basic loss of the organization and the meaning of these things. Above all, I think Levi-Strauss himself made a very important major contribution to this whole business by his propositions that these mythologies are ways of resolving contradictions between the realities of life and death which are human realities and the, could I say, aspirations of mankind, the imagination of possibility by this, in all an invaluable state of affairs. We will like to be immortal if we know we can; we will all like to be well gifted in all sorts of things. How can we resolve this dilemma? And he has suggested: And I think this is an important suggestion; he suggested that this isn't merely something you find in such a place like America but that this constitutes a form to human thinking mechanism which therefore applies to the most exalted types of thinking as well as to the simplest types of thinking. So I think he has done a very important job. Now when we come to the French Marxists like Meillassoux, Terray, Copans and some of the people I know personally whilst I was in London, young people, the position is this; let me tell you quite simply about the question I put to one of them when I had a long discussion with him about it. I think you know, it all comes up to this ques-

tion: Do you mean by rephrasing the available facts, or the available material or the available ideas, this is something new? Or do you make new discoveries? Now, do you think that your Marxist way of presenting the known materials is bringing up new discoveries of which we did not know before? Or is it a restatement? And to this he said frankly that he thought it was a restatement but that there was value in a restatement. I am in favour of restating these things so that our attention is drawn to possibilities. I think to some extent they are definitely wrong about some things and I will give you an example where I think they are definitely wrong. One of the propositions which they have put forward is the notion of what they call the lineage mode of production. But lineage in Africa is never a producing organization. Lineage is an ideological and familial organization. Yes. But production is an activity in permanent evolution like a man and his wife or wives. Lineage may have some times the general regulation of land but even this is not always the case. The state, if we take the Akan system, is the overlord of the land. Lineage holds office. Lineage arranges marriages. But I think there is not a lineage mode of production. I think that is the simplest example; that they have misunderstood the nature of the West African lineages I know. But I must in another way oppose them too; I think they missed out some things. I think one of the things they missed out, for instance (is that when they include everything) you may say they made a long list of everything and they would like us to believe that you can explain the occurrence of institutions always by going back to an economic base. I have one or two points which I am going to argue with them about. I have other points in which I claim that in fact, we in our language, in our own way observed the facts which they are making use of now. Good luck to them. I think there is one problem more and I am sorry that this problem occurs. I think that it is the unnecessary and irrelevant preoccupation with colonialism. Colonialism is as past as the custom of human sacrifice which we know occurred in many parts of West Africa because there are bitter descriptions of them from observers. I mean we know that they occurred in Ashanti, Dahomey; some of us have met and heard much older men who said "I saw that". We know that, that happened.

We know that in England there were public executions in the 17th and 18th centuries. The last public execution was for, I believe, sheep stealing. And in our life time we have had the Hitler holocaust. So there is no use pretending that there is no witness among mankind, black or white, in world history; so there is no use, as it is, harping on colonialism emotionally as the source of all the troubles. Let me tell you one thing I have felt about colonialism: I am going to criticise it like anybody else criticises anything in the past, intellectually. Some three or four years ago I was watching the television when I think, it was Chinua Achebe, who was being interviewed for the BBC by a young man. He was sitting by a window and as I remembered, what happened was that, he was asked a certain question about the Biafran War and so on. This young man was pushing him in the direction of saying something rhetorical about colonialism and Achebe was looking through the window and he turned round and said to the young man something like: "You know if it was not for colonialism I would not be talking to you in the language of Shakespeare. Colonialism opened a window on the world to us". And one point is this, I think that side should be looked at as well as those useful experiences which were unpleasant. Colonialism, which you are criticising for what it was in the colonies was an aspect of things that were going on in the metropolis, too.

QUESTION (PRAH)

It is to be agreed by many people that colonialism had a double edge, as it were. Marx in his writing on the effects of British rule in India indicated that it was historically to be seen as, an impersonal development which on the one hand set in motion the destruction of archaic Asiatic, old Asiatic society, and on the other hand the establishment of Western society in Asia. You have pointed out that one has to be dispassionate in understanding the whole historical mechanism; the origins of man, society, the whole phenomena of colonialism. Well and good. However, in this day and age, there are many people and observers too, like me, who feel that there is a new development in Africa; a new form of colonialism in which some of the old mechanisms and structures, for maintaining the economic, social and cultural relationship established long ago in the colonial period. They are to some extent and in different forms being maintained. What is your reaction to this whole concept of neo-colonialism?

ANSWER

Well, it is obvious to me that you know more about this than I do. And I don't know whether I have observations to make

on that. I think again, I will say something like this: one of the great changes in the world scene in my life time is symbolized in the fact that I can get into my home in Cambridge at six O'clock in the afternoon or even later and that I can be in Accra at six O'clock next morning instead of 16 or 17 days at sea. This is very simple, symbolized in the concord-jet age, you see! The world is becoming much more of what anyone will call one world. Communications, not merely physical communications but the fact that we are having discussions here, sitting here in Lome, the three of us, academics, are having these discussions, is part of what is going on in the world. Now I think one has got to look at neo-colonialism without perhaps putting aside one's passion, without putting aside one's moral partisanship or one's moral allegiances but also with a clear head. I don't know whether it complies with colonialism but whether it complies with it or not, there are certain things that are going on in the world that I don't like. I don't like, for instance, (purely personal reasons) I find it objectionable that Europe is rich and enriching itself because it can draw on the huge labour resources provided by the poorer countries of the Mediterranean and Africa. To me it seems there is something wrong about that. I am not claiming that I follow its economics, that I have got any good basis for it in figures, statistics, all those other things. I am only claiming that I, from my point of view, don't like it. Now, in so far as there are similar things in what used to be the colonial empire, I think they are objectionable, and are to be criticised, to be talked about. Here again, my personal feelings are involved, why I feel that way, for what reasons, heaven knows only why: I still believe that one can help by arguing and talking and persuading and putting in a case. The reason is that to me, a generation is a very small unit of time, just like my own life-time. Perhaps in a generation you will get the next big step which is not going to be attained, I think, by the kind of thing that is going on in Angola now. This is a purely personal view.

QUESTION (BUJRA)

Well, that was a very interesting statement towards the end. Could you slightly elaborate, particularly, in the context of the existence of South Africa and apartheid, and its expansion into Angola?

ANSWER

Remember, it is not only South Africa which is expanding into Angola. I think you will bear with me that the USSR is also putting a lot of weaponry into Angola. It would be really difficult to be too specific on this issue. I don't like it, all I can say is that whoever is there and has not got the right to be there should not be there. I don't think the Russians should be there. I don't think the Cubans should be there. I don't think the South Africans should be there. I think the Angolans should be left to deal with their problems by themselves. The way in the end Kenyatta was able to get the British out of Kenya when he said: "We will deal with our own problems". They did not kill all the white settlers, as you know, and they achieved a way of life. South Africa, I think, is in a very peculiar position and I am afraid that there is a lot of ignorance about it. From my point of view, I think, the fact has to be accepted that the white South Africans have nowhere else to go. They belong to Africa; that is where they are. They belong to Africa as much as an East Asian who came, too, belongs to Africa. As much, I think as you belong to Africa. I am not enquiring about your background but, personally, as much as you do, they belong to Africa. The fact should be faced; that they belong to Africa. In my own lifetime there has been an enormous change, I think, slowly, gradually and even reluctantly but it has happened. Especially, the Africans of South Africa are trying to understand their own destiny. In South Africa I think there has been changes among the whites; fairly reluctantly, of trying to come to terms with the fact that the black people of South Africa are potential members, or already actual members of world civilization. I mean this is not the kind of change of heart which is designated: "Brother, come to me". But the realization that we must not underestimate what already exists in terms of their capacities; their level of skills and so on in Black South Africa.

One of my proudest achievements is that, I was responsible for bringing out of South Africa, a Zulu woman who had seven children, and enabling her to get a Ph.D. in the University of Cambridge. The first Black South African woman to get a higher degree. I feel very proud of that but it has only been possible because she came there with the level of education which enabled her to get a way with it. So you see, my position about South Africa is I really don't know the answer. I entertain the hope,

I still believe that there is room for talking with them gradually, slowly, that they would change. Fundamentally, it must be understood that they cannot be driven out of Africa. I think they would fight to the last stage; fight to die on the land. So I think it is better, to come to terms.