Section II

Chauvinism, the
"Bwana Syndrome," and
the Third World

Bwana, n . . . used (1) in reference, 'master, owner, possessor'
of slaves, house, plantation or other property, and generally
'great man, dignitary, worthy personage'; (2) in address,
'master . . .'1

Should my Kaffirs receive communion? God forbid that I
should ever allow them.2

Two hundred years of postcolonial history has split the world
into black and white, rich and poor, powerful and powerless.
We are so divided that 20 per cent of us, the White Tribe,
possess 80 per cent of the world's resources and nearly 100
per cent of the world's research. It is this disproportion of re-
sources and the inaction of the Christian and post-Christian
West that has and is contributing more than anything else to
a world of violence and protest.

—P. J. O'Mahony3

Notes

1. Inter-Territorial Language Committee for the East African De-
pendencies. A Standard Swahili-English Dictionary (Oxford University
2. Exclamation of a Portuguese slave-owner, quoted by Plumb, op.
cit., p. 4.
3. From a letter, on behalf of the Catholic Bishop's Commission for
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1. **Item:** NATIVE RACES as both a primary head and subhead (p. 877; Sears, p. 418–19)

   This is thorny on several counts, not least because of the disparity or discrepancy between the boundaries delineated in the scope note¹ and the actual employment of the head by catalogers. In practice, the subhead, particularly, becomes an *ethnological* or *sociological* catch-all, applied to works on the life, habits, and social conditions of “races” within a prescribed land or region, as well, perhaps, as to their relations with the “governing authorities.”² Objections to the phrase itself are manifold:

   (a) “Races” is unquestionably an anachronism, no longer—if ever—sound anthropologically. Coming to the nitty-gritty, it is meant to encompass the “aboriginal” (i.e., originally-resident) *people* in a given area, whether they be a “nation,” or organized tribally, by clan, etc. The overridingly important consideration here is that there may be many such “peoples” in, say, Angola, and they need not be—and often are **not**—much differentiated from one another biologically. If “race” retains any solid contemporary meaning it is biological or taxonomic, not ethnic nor cultural.³ In short, the LC term has been misapplied to what are not racial (i.e., necessarily biological), but rather ethnic or social groups. As an example, the Benga, Combe, Bubi, and Fang of Equatorial (formerly Spanish) Guinea—all distinct ethnically—don’t differ much racially. Yet LC insists on terming these *culturally*-disparate people “races.” They aren’t.⁴

   (b) “Native” is the sort of word employed by a European or American, not an African or Asian. That it connotatively expresses a White supremacist or “bwana” attitude is perhaps nowhere better revealed than in a passage from Ezekiel Mphahlele’s short story “Point of Identity.” Karel, a good-natured “Coloured” mechanic who willingly lives among Black South Africans, but has just been threatened with downward reclassification, exclaims:
Look man . . . de word 'native' doesn't simply mean one's got black blood or African blood. It's a plitical word, man. You's a native because you carry a pass, you can't go to watch-imballer-Parliament. You can't vote, you live in dis location. One can be proud of being an African but not a native.\(^5\)

To cement the point, consider Mr. Fafunwa's remarks:

The word "native" is defined [by the Shorter Oxford English dictionary] as "One born in a place; left in a natural state, untouched by art, unadorned, simple; in modern usage, especially with connotation of non-European origin." In Western journals, magazines and textbooks for primary school children, authors out-do themselves in making the label stick. The word "native" in terms of current usage is synonymous with the African. If no harm is meant by the users of this word, then conscious effort must be made to avoid the use of it by writers and publishers. . . .\(^6\)

(c) It is palpably ludicrous to assign —NATIVE RACES, as a cataloguer now must, to material treating with, as examples, Xhosa and Zulu people in mid–20th century South Africa who may well be identifiable as Xhosa and Zulu (i.e., the "aboriginal"/original inhabitants) but many of whom are no longer folk- or traditionally-organized—in other words, who are modern, urbanized, relatively mobile members of the society. The foolishness only compounds with the realization that these very "native races" will one day, most certainly, become the "governing authorities" themselves, that their presently inferior political station is merely transitory, temporary.

Remedy: (a) Abolish the adjectival "Native" in all its permutations; i.e., NATIVE CLERGY, NATIVE LABOR, NATIVE RACES.

(b) Denote material on "the relations between the governing authorities and the aboriginal inhabitants" by the new head, COLONIZED PEOPLES.

(c) Identify works on the various groups within a prescribed area with the subdivision —PEOPLES (e.g., AFRICA, SOUTH—PEOPLES, which would apply equally to Boers, Britons, Xhosa, Zulu, etc.).\(^7\)

(d) Replace NATIVE CLERGY with LOCAL CLERGY or LOCALLY-RECRUITED CLERGY, and NATIVE LABOR with COLONIES—LABOR AND LABORING CLASSES OR LABOR AND LABORING CLASSES, COLONIAL.\(^8\)
(e) Add the gloss (Biology) to the primary head, Race, and henceforward apply this form solely to works dealing with gross biological differences and categories among humankind.*

Notes (Item 1)

1. "Here are entered works on the relations between the governing authorities and the aboriginal inhabitants of colonial or other areas."
2. LC's own confusion becomes apparent in the specified cross-references:
   × Aborigines
   ×× Ethnology
3. The Meeting of Experts acknowledged that "it would be difficult . . . to dispense entirely with such terms as 'race' or 'tribe,' which are part of current scientific terminology; they should, however, be used correctly." Op. cit., p. 4. The conference further declared, on a more general plane, that "special attention should . . . be paid to the use of terms which have passed into the everyday speech of the colonizing peoples and which, because of their colonialist origin, carry overtones of racial superiority vis-à-vis the one-time colonies. These terms could implant the seeds of racialism in the minds of former colonizing peoples; in any event, they offend the susceptibilities of peoples who were once colonized." The meeting thus recommended "that 'after-effects of colonialism' be eliminated as rapidly as possible." Amen.
6. In Meeting of Experts, p. 25. Emphasis in original. "Librarians" was probably omitted from the last sentence by oversight.
   The "native" cancer, unexpectedly, also appears in the API as NATIVE PEOPLES, op. cit., p. 42, though it was apparently dropped from later issues. Not so unexpectedly, the SSHI uses it, too. Cf., e.g., v. 57, no. 3 (Dec. 1969), p. 81. And Habari, monthly newsletter of the Washington Task Force on African Affairs (P.O. Box 13033, Washington, D.C. 20009), in a regular survey-feature, "Towards a Racist Press," finds the malady
rampant in the U.S. newspapers. The March 1970 issue, for instance, reports that "to read American press coverage of Africa one would think the continent is half populated with dimwits consumed with self-destructive politics. The other half is 'native,' a word usually followed by some erroneous and condescending unfact." Excerpts from the pages of *Time*, *Newsweek*, and the Washington *Star* conclusively prove the point. V. 2, no. 3, p. 5–6.

7. The Meeting of Experts suggested that "the word 'inhabitant' should be used in preference to the word 'native.'" *Op. cit.*, p. 4. While the recommended substitute may not be appropriate to library practice, the complaint regarding the term that we are currently using is worth heeding.

8. For a precedent, cf. *Labor Laws and Legislation, Colonial* (p. 711). To turn once more to South Africa, it is sufficient to employ the usual, unqualified term—*Labor and Laboring Classes* for material dealing with African labor in the postcolonial period, though the subhead in this instance might be made even more precise by adding "African" as an inverted adjective.

9. On "Race" as an essentially biological concept, cf. Sonia Cole, *Races of Man* (London: British Museum, 1965), especially Chapter I, "Definition of Race," p. 9–13, in which the author declares that "Nationality has not necessarily any connection with race, nor has language or culture, though they have been responsible for isolating certain groups and thus indirectly affect gene frequencies. . . . A race, in fact, differs from other races only in the frequency of the genes it possesses. . . ."; Ashley Montagu, ed., *The Concept of Race* (New York: The Free Press; London: Collier-Macmillan Ltd., 1964), a provocative anthology in which the editor himself raises the question "as to whether, with reference to man, it would not be better if the term 'race' were altogether abandoned," p. 12; and van den Berghe, *op. cit.*, who on p. 9–11 critically examines four "definitions" of "race," revealing how actual usage of the term has become impossibly muddled and contradictory.

For LC precedents, cf. *Death (Biology)*, p. 352; *Life (Biology)*, p. 742; *Sex (Biology)*, distinguished from *Sex (Psychology)*, p. 1165; and *Variation (Biology)*, distinguished from *Variation (Music)*, p. 1361.

The glossed head *race* (social science) could be usefully assigned to studies like those by Montagu and van den Berghe, cited above. To achieve even greater accuracy, both should also be catalogued under *race* (biology) and the van den Berghe work further treated under *race relations*. Still another way out of the maze might be to create a composite form, *race* (biologically conceived), which would economically and fairly handle at least the major thrust of the Montagu/van den Berghe volumes.
2. **Item:** DISCOVERY AND EXPLORATION as a subdivision under names of continents and countries (p. 374; Sears, p. 58, 627)\(^1\)

What are such concoctions as AFRICA—DISCOVERY AND EXPLORATION and AMERICA—DISCOVERY AND EXPLORATION if not colossal specimens of ethnocolonialism? Cortez no more “discovered” Mexico for the Aztecs than Livingstone did Victoria Falls for the Leya people, who much earlier had named it “Nsyungu Namutitima.”\(^2\) Unqualified, “—Discovery and exploration” represents an insult to the many peoples and lands which, so it appears in our library catalogues, didn’t really exist until Whites happened to notice them.\(^3\)

**Remedy:** Employ the subhead only with a gloss indicating who did the discovering and exploring, or for whom it was done (e.g., French, European, American, English, Spanish, Portuguese, Chinese).\(^4\)

---

**Notes (Item 2)**

1. Sears apparently uses this subdivision for only “America” and “The West,” otherwise preferring “—Description and travel.” Cf. note on p. 203.


3. In this regard, Joan Marshall adds, the list “reflects, and thereby helps perpetuate, the Western European view that the world was created bit by bit as it was discovered by Western Europeans.” Personal communication, *op. cit.*

4. Joan Marshall, who reports hearing an East African “relate with great humor his view of the Western European view that his country was discovered by Vasco da Gama,” suggests another “remedy”: first, the establishment of a primary head for EUROPE, WESTERN (to match the current EUROPE, EASTERN); second, the introduction under “discovered” areas like AFRICA, EAST of a subdivision, —FIRST KNOWLEDGE OF IN EUROPE, WESTERN; and third, the automatic assignment of a duplicate entry —FIRST KNOWLEDGE OF IN, e.g., AFRICA, EAST under EUROPE, WESTERN (since, as Marshall notes, “while Vasco,” for instance, “was discovering Africa, Africa was discovering him”). *Ibid.*
3. **Items**: FRANCE—COLONIES (p. 511); GREAT BRITAIN—COLONIES (p. 562); U.S.—INSULAR POSSESSIONS (p. 1346); U.S.—TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS (p. 1348; Sears, p. 613)

Under the prime head COLONIES appears this helpful note: "also subdivision Colonies under names of countries, e.g., France—Colonies." The "disinterested" reader, however, who in all innocence turns to the subdivisions under U.S., finds

U.S.—Colonies

See U.S.—Insular possession

U.S.—Territories and possessions

How quaint and self-righteous that the United States does not now (and never did) have "colonies" (an unpleasant word), but only "territories and possessions"! That is, Cubans, Guamanians, Filipinos, Okinawans, Puerto Ricans, Midway, Marianas, Caroline, Marshall, and Virgin Islanders, Hawaiians, Haitians, Samoans, Indians, and Mexicans, unlike their less fortunate brothers and sisters in Africa, Asia, and South America, were spared a "colonial" experience. Except, of course, that they weren't. Which nicely illustrates a transparent double-standard built into the scheme.

**Remedy**: Replace the euphemistic — INSULAR POSSESSIONS and —TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS with the pure, straightforward —COLONIES applied so painlessly to other imperialist powers like France and Great Britain.

**Notes (Item 3)**

1. P. 272.
2. P. 1342. Sears' note under U.S.—TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS (p. 613) is even more candid: "Use this subdivision under U.S. only. For other countries use the subdivision COLONIES."
3. Sir Denis Brogan, limiting his remarks to strictly 19th-century events, frames it this way:

At the end of this ignominious conflict [i.e., the Spanish-American War], the United States had demonstrated to Europe
not only that it had become a serious power with an important navy, but that it had become an imperial power. Cuba was formally ‘freed’; Puerto Rico was annexed as a straight colony; and, across the Pacific, near the shores of China, the United States made itself the heir of Spain by annexing the Philippines. This involved them in a war with the Philippine rebels or patriots, and as the 19th century drew to a close the country of the Declaration of Independence was involved in imposing its authority by force, ‘puoking up its principles,’ as the philosopher William James put it.


African and other beneficiaries of such "socialist" aid, which may include
numberless apothecary jars and hopelessly aged chemical compounds,
might well question the implicit distinction between the two types of "assistance."

4. **Items:** SOCIETY, PRIMITIVE (p. 1195; Sears, p. 551), together with its multiple variations
     (ART, PRIMITIVE; CLOTHING AND DRESS, PRIMITIVE; MUSIC, PRIMITIVE; RELIGION,
     PRIMITIVE; etc.)

   "Primitive" in these inverted heads inaccurately and — according to popular conceptions of the word — slurringly describes various forms and aspects of human life.¹ No self-respecting social scientist is likely to use it. Why then, should librarians? It is heavily overlaid with notions of inferiority, childishness, barbarity, and "state of nature" simplicity, whereas the societies, arts, economic modes, music, and religions it purportedly covers may be extremely complex, ingenious, creative, humane, and — depending on taste and Weltanschauung — admirable.² The term additionally implies, erroneously, a bygone period, although a "primitive" artist, for example, may be a contemporary.

   **Remedy:** (a) Replace the inverted adjective in SOCIETY, PRIMITIVE with "Folk," "Traditional," or — on a structural basis — "Kin-organized."

   (b) Most other inverted forms require special reconstruction; e.g., HUNTING, PRIMITIVE (p. 608) may become HUNTING (ETHNOLOGY), HUNTING IN FOLK SOCIETIES, or HUNTING WITH TRAPS, BOW AND ARROW, ETC., while INDUSTRIES, PRIMITIVE (p. 642) might be changed to INDUSTRIES (ETHNOLOGY); INDUSTRIES, NONMECHANIZED; or INDUSTRIES, HAND.

   (c) If the politico-anthropological distinction between "kin" and "civil" society is accepted, KINGS AND RULERS, PRIMITIVE (p. 703) needs to be dismantled, for the "primitive" element becomes a non sequitur. By definition, most folk- or kin-organized societies are essentially egalitarian and communal. Once "kings" or "rulers" emerge who
govern at least partly by fiat, the society is no longer (in the original ethnological sense) "primitive." Should a heading still be required for material on "primitive" leaders or nominal "rulers," CHIEFS AND HEADMEN IN FOLK SOCIETY, CHIEFS AND HEADMEN (ETHNOLOGY), or CHIEFS AND HEADMEN IN KIN-ORGANIZED SOCIETY may be instituted.

Notes (Item 4)

1. The Meeting of Experts assailed "primitive," as well as "savage," "backward," and "uncivilized," as examples of "contemptuous, unjust or inadequate" phraseology. p. 4.

2. "The Oxford dictionary," notes Fafunwa, "defined the word as 'simple, rude or rough like that of early times: old-fashioned.' Again, this word is often used to stereotype some African art, culture, mores, religion or stage of development. By setting ourselves up as the sole arbiter of who is 'primitive' and who is 'civilized,' and what is 'good' and what is 'bad,' it means that we are playing God and that role can only lead to greater misunderstanding and intolerance among the peoples and nations of the world." Op. cit., p. 26. (Emphasis in original.)

Lest anyone protest that the LC heading-manufacturers never intended the term as ethnocentric or "intolerant," turn to the first column on p. 1137 and notice, about a quarter of the way down:

Savages

See Man, Primitive

The reader hoping to locate entries under such an outmoded, soul-warping head royally deserves to find nothing at all, not even a thoughtful See reference to a not-much-better form.

With particular reference to Africa, Basil Davidson asks two elemental questions: Is its sculpture "primitive"? Is its religion "primitive"? He then quotes William Fagg to the effect that African plastic-forms have assumed a high and influential place among "the world's great art traditions," and to his second query replies that "many African peoples . . . have systems of belief about themselves and the universe that are subtle and developed." Cf. Old Africa Rediscovered (London: Victor Gollancz, 1965), p. 231.

3. Leonard W. Doob affirms that "anthropologists have been seeking euphemisms to replace adjectives such as 'uncivilized,' 'primitive,' and 'savage'; but the ones they prefer—preliterate, non-literate . . . etc.—possess no special advantage." Becoming More Civilized; A Psychological Exploration (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), p. 3. "Non-literate" presupposes literacy as a touchstone of societal differentiation, although "non-
literate" peoples have evolved complex, super-kin sociopolitical organizations that render them unclassifiable as "primitive" or "folk." "Preliterate" posits a series of evolutionary stages, a rigid, immutable progression toward "literacy," that in the case of any specific people simply cannot be demonstrated or known in advance.

The late Ralph Linton, like many other anthropologists, made a necessary distinction between "band-" or "tribe-" organized groups and "civil" societies (i.e., states). "The tribe," he maintains, "is a social entity, while the state . . . is a political entity," characterized chiefly by "a fairly strong central authority with power to coerce [its] members." Cf. "Tribe and State," chapter 14 in his Study of Man (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, first published 1936; copyright renewed 1964), p. 231–52.

As LC precedents for conversion to "Folk" as an alternative, cf. Folk Art, Folk Literature, etc., p. 494–500. Indeed, the July 1964–Dec. 1965 ACS on p. 80 and 125 completely canceled literature, Primitive as a prime head, referring directly to Folk Literature. But this appears to be an isolated instance of de-primitivization. All the sister-forms remain untouched.

5. Item: AFRICA, SOUTH—HISTORY (p. 23)

Obviously inconsonant with both modern scholarship and ordinary intelligence are primary heads and subheads like Native Races; Society, Primitive; Native Labor; and Native Clergy. Surely, as indicated earlier, these can be either abandoned or humanized. Less obvious, perhaps, but equally disturbing, are certain more specific topics. Nosipho Majeké, a South African, in 1952 proclaimed that

When non–Europeans write the full history of the past, they will have to find other names for the so-called Great Trek and 'Kaffir' Wars . . . We shall need a new vocabulary, for language itself has become distorted in the service of herrenvolkism [master-racism]. The very word 'Non-European' is an absurdity, when a man must needs describe himself as the negative of another man.¹

Now, what do we find as subdivisions under AFRICA, SOUTH—HISTORY?:

—KAFIR WARS, 1811–1878
—GREAT TREK, 1836–1840
The list, in short, defines these events entirely from the viewpoint of the rigidly Calvinist and thoroughly racist Boer invaders. It has likewise appropriated wholesale the term “Kafir” (or “Kaffir”), originally an Arabic designation for “unbeliever” or “infidel” which Europeans in South Africa applied—in a connotative sense like “nigger”—to all Bantu peoples in the region, or, more particularly, to the Xhosa and their Nguni-speaking neighbors. Librarians can certainly muster enough imagination to devise more honest and objective forms. Rubbish left over from the days of pith helmets and Gatling guns simply doesn’t belong in a modern library catalogue.

Remedy: (a) As possible alternatives under AFRICA, SOUTH—HISTORY, replace the present second and third subdivisions with:

—XHOSA-BOER WARS, 1811–1878
—BOER MIGRATION, 1836–1840

(b) To eliminate utterly the obnoxious “Kafir” in its remaining forms with respect to both the people it lamely attempts to identify and their language, substitute XHOSA (AFRICAN PEOPLE) and XHOSA LANGUAGE, with cross-references from the variant “Xosa.” Further: replace HYMNS, KAFIR with HYMNS, XHOSA (AFRICAN PEOPLE).

Notes (Item 5)


2. Should this delineation seem excessively harsh, consider that carefully conducted attitude studies in South Africa revealed Afrikaners, compared with other elements of the population, to be “both more anti-African and more authoritarian.” Cf. Tajfel, *op. cit.*, p. 91. The author additionally cites the “religious elements in the hierarchy of human groups built by the Bible-carrying early Boers” as an example of the sort of self-justifying ideology fabricated by social groups “imbued with a fairly definite code of values and morals” who find themselves enjoying advantages over other groups that need to “be explained away in terms which would not conflict with the code.” Hence the Boers’ Bible-based notions of “inherent superiority and inferiority” (p. 95).

conclude “that the Bantu and not the Europeans were the first to come to South Africa. If there is an interloper in South Africa it is the white man.”


4. “kaf-fir or kaf-ir ... I also caf-fer or caf-fre ... a usu cap: a member of a group of southern African Bantu-speaking peoples of Ngoni stock but sometimes cap a South African or Negroid ancestry—usu used disparagingly ...” Webster’s Third, p. 1230. Emphasis added.

W. J. Plumbe, University of Malawi Librarian, in a paper delivered at the mid-1969 Conference of Commonwealth Africa University Librarians in Lusaka, forthrightly stated: “‘Kafir’ is an offensive word that, to say the least of it, cannot be used in the light of present-day or even 1948—knowledge.” Quoted from an unprocessed copy of his “Classification and Cataloguing of Africana.”

The Meeting of Experts also condemned the term as equivalent to “Nigger,” p. 4, while the April 1970 Race Relations News classified it with defamatory labels like “native” and “munt” (v. 32, no. 4), p. 9.

An anonymous contributor to Sechaba succinctly highlights the sociopolitical role and all too frequent outcome of such labels. “It is not,” he writes, “as men that the victims of genocide are attacked. They must first be depersonalized. Men do not enslave other men. They enslave those who they have first deprived of their humanity by labeling them ‘Kaffirs,’ ‘Wogs’—subhumans, fitted by their nature to be slaves. It is not just chance that racism as a social theory came into being with the rise of colonialist, imperial expansion with the clear function of justifying slavery and other forms of exploitation.” Cf. “Brutality and Race,” v. 4, no. 3 (March 1970), p. 7. A later Sechaba issue reports a concrete case of the epithet being used by Johannes burg policemen who allegedly attacked a young Soweto woman, calling her both a “kaffir” and “communist pig.” Cf. “Banned Woman Assaulted,” v. 4, no. 7 (July 1970), p. 24.

5. Indeed, SCAUL (the Standing Committee on African University Libraries) is now undertaking just such a project for Africana; i.e., codifying the names of African peoples and languages into a generally acceptable list which will indicate recommended forms plus variants.

6. To firmly establish that the so-called “Kaffir Wars” were, in fact, a century-long conflict between trekking Boers and militant, cattle-herding Xhosa, cf. chapter 9, “Boer, Bantu, and Briton,” in Donald L. Wiedner’s A History of Africa South of the Sahara (New York: Vintage Books, 1962), especially p. 126.

7. With appalling typicality, the LC list at present does exactly the reverse; i.e., refers from XOSA, which it thereby implicitly recognizes as the correct African terminology, to the Boer-derived KAFIR. Cf. p. 1425. To be fair, there also appears on p. 1425 a primary head for the unglossed XOSA
with an “××” from KAFIRS (AFRICAN PEOPLE), the unmistakable inference being that the Xhosa, among others, are “Kafirs” (i.e., “niggers”).

6. Item: AFRICA, SOUTH—RACE QUESTION
   × Apartheid (p. 23)

The subhead —RACE RELATIONS, discussed above, more appropriately handles material dealing with the interaction between “racial” groups in South Africa and elsewhere. What needs to be stressed at this juncture is that “Apartheid”—the practice, as well as policy or philosophy, of racial separation—is no longer restricted, lamentably, to the South African milieu. It is a theory in its own right, argued and expositored—if not implemented—in many other places (most notably, though not exclusively, Rhodesia).¹

Remedy: “Elevate” APARTHEID to a primary head, with both “sa” and “××” references for AFRICA, SOUTH—RACE RELATIONS; RHODESIA—RACE RELATIONS; RACISM; and SEGREGATION.²

Notes (Item 6)


An apologist minces few words in announcing the general relevance of apartheid to Africa. "The policy," says L. E. Neame, "that is variously described as Differentiation or Segregation or Apartheid simply recognizes that there are different races in the continent; that they are likely to remain different; and that they cannot be merged into a homogeneous people any more than the races in Europe or Asia or America." He later elucidates that "if White Man's Africa is to survive there must be further consolidation and entrenchment. The process must have its centre in the Union [now Republic], which is obviously the stronghold of the White race in the sub-continent. What may be called the White settler areas may wish to be included in the orbit of the Union." *White Man's Africa* (Cape Town: Stewart, 1952), p. 93, 99.


7. **Item:** UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS (p. 1338; Sears, p. 598)

The list editors opted for "Underdeveloped" instead of "Backward." Which merits some applause. But not much. For the chosen term nonetheless qualifies as a species of chauvinistic negativism, emphasizing a distinction between the superior "We" and inferior "They." "It would be permissible," said the UNESCO experts, "to speak of rich, industrialized countries and of poor, still essentially agricultural countries."¹ The LC head is not so lucid.

**Remedy:** Substitute either DEVELOPING AREAS OR THIRD WORLD.²

**Notes (Item 7)**

1. Meeting of Experts, p. 4.
in the May 15, 1970, Library Journal (v. 95, no. 10), Central Michigan University has lately established an interdisciplinary undergraduate program on "Developing Nations" and concurrently issued a guide to its Dag Hammarskjold Collection on Developing Nations. P. 1819. Also, Denmark, one of the most enlightened and highly-respected of Western nations, maintains a Secretariat for Technical Cooperation with Developing Countries within its Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Perhaps predictably, the API selected "Third World" over both "Developing" and "Underdeveloped," though RG unhappily continues in the LC rut.

Since "Backward areas," even as a See reference (p. 103), constitutes an unjustifiable, superiority-laden judgment, it should be permanently removed.

On p. 278 of the 1967 ACS, LC belatedly recognized that the term "developing" can be applied, but steadfastly refused to do it. What appears is:

UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS
  × Developing countries

On page 454 of the 1968 ACS it similarly acknowledged the relevance of "Third World," but merely introduced it, too, as a See reference to UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS.

8. Item: BARBARIAN INVASIONS OF ROME (p. 113)

The impropriety of "Barbarian" is much like that described for "Primitive." The sa roster mentions "Goths," "Huns," "Lombards," and "Vandals," as well as "Migrations of nations." To subsume these peoples or "nations" under "Barbarian" is to judge and damn them, which is hardly the function of a "disinterested" subject-heading scheme.¹

Remedy: Excise "Barbarian" from the head and add, following a comma, the inclusive dates representing the period during which Goths, Lombards, and other peoples invaded Rome. Or, as an alternative, eliminate the head entirely, relying on an appropriate subdivision under ROME—HISTORY, in tandem with MIGRATIONS OF NATIONS, to perform the same task.²
Notes (Item 8)

1. The appellation “Barbarian” would probably seem strange and indefensible to any child who had read Kate Seredy’s White Stag (New York: Viking, 1937). A pity that adults forget so quickly.

2. For an LC precedent, cf.

chine
—History
—Invasions
× Invasions of China


9. **Item:** TRIBE as a descriptive gloss under names of particular groups (e.g., BUBE [AFRICAN TRIBE], p. 163) or an element in primary heads (e.g., IBO TRIBE, p. 616)

A tribe, in popular ‘American,’ suggests a group of primitives, savages, the pre-civilized—who-swing-from-the-trees-in-the-jungle. It is an offensive term....

Mr. Fafunwa states, with understandable rage, that

The word “tribe” is defined [by the Shorter Oxford dictionary] as “A group of persons forming a community and claiming descent from a common ancestor”; it is also defined as “A race of people; now applied especially to a primary aggregate of people in a primitive or barbarious condition under a headman or chief.” It is interesting to note that the word tribe is principally used nowadays to describe African ethnic groups. It used to cover groups in Asia and other non-European communities but since most of the Asian countries became independent between 1947 and 1954, the word gradually disappeared from the textbooks and journals.... How an ethnic group with two or ten million people in East or West Africa, with a parliamentary government, can be described as a tribe and not the Irish, the Scot, the Welsh, the French or the English, still baffles the non-European.
He is wrong, however, in thinking that this willy-nilly application of "tribe" baffles only "non-European." It equally baffles Europeans and North Americans even slightly conversant with anthropological literature who appreciate the enormous complexity—defying easy categorization—of "non-European" societies. To be sure, it is easy and convenient to term the Bube or Ibo a "tribe" without troubling over such niceties as the specifics of their sociopolitical organization, etc. In fact, the Bube had evolved a proto-state on the West African island of Fernando Poo whose further development was stymied only by the advent of English and Spanish colonialists. The Ibo, as every literate person knows, are a numerous people who first pioneered in the creation of federal Nigeria and then formed their own nation/state, Biafra. They are no more "tribes" than the Bavarians or Danes.

Remedy: (a) Since harried catalogers cannot be expected to determine the precise anthropological or political definition for groups like the Bube or Ibo, they may satisfactorily substitute for "tribe" the sufficiently broad and inoffensive term "People"; e.g., BUBE (AFRICAN PEOPLE) and IBO PEOPLE.

(b) As a corollary: Eliminate DETRIBALIZATION as a primary head (p. 364; July 1964–Dec. 1965 ACS, p. 57) since it is highly questionable that the process-term has—or will be—applied exclusively to people who may safely be characterized as "tribal." Two existing heads, CULTURE CONFLICT (p. 341) and URBANIZATION (p. 1356), should do the job for much of this material, while a new form, CULTURE CHANGE (in preference to ACCULTURATION, p. 7, which inaccurately implies a one-way process that is seldom the case), should suitably handle the rest.

Notes (Item 9)

3. Van den Berghe, on p. 3 of the "Introduction" to Africa: Social Problems of Change and Conflict, a collection of readings he edited in 1965 (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co.), writes of the word "tribe" that,
“apart from the invidious connotations of the term . . . (and of its derivatives such as tribal, tribalism, detribalization),” it “has been used in many different senses, and is therefore hopelessly confusing.” Emphasis in original. After noting that “tribe” has become obsolete in French anthropology, he cites “at least six different meanings” ascribed to the word by “English-speaking scholars.” In a later contribution to the same volume, Paul Mercier discourses brilliantly and at length “On the meaning of ‘tribalism’ in Black Africa,” p. 483–501. And elsewhere van den Berghe has reiterated, “I have been especially careful in all my writings to avoid the word ‘tribalism’ altogether because of its highly ethnocentric connotations.” Cf. “Pluralism and Conflict Situations in Africa: A Reply to B. Magubane,” African Social Research, no. 9 (June 1970), p. 686.

4. Cf. the annotations under native population—bubis in Berman, Spanish Guinea, op. cit., p. 288–93. The author, incidentally, admits the use of “Native population” as an error of youth, although the introduction to that 1961 opus describes “native” as “a term largely in disrepute for its ethnocentric and patronizing connotations,” stating that its employment in heads like native policy and native population was intended “denotatively to refer to indigenous peoples.” p. 16.


6. This has been done, either as an afterthought or merely in helter-skelter fashion, for some groups—e.g., Fan (African People), p. 468—which only underscores the wisdom and necessity for applying the principle evenly throughout the scheme. For another bibliographic precedent, cf. the headings bubis (African People), buico (African People), bujeba (African People), etc., in Berman, Spanish Guinea, op. cit., p. 71ff.


10. Item: ACQUISITION OF TERRITORY (p. 8)

A pleasant, if somewhat awkward, euphemism for what in most cases was territorial theft. If the prime head is allowed to stand, the
"sär’s" and "××’s" need to be expanded, in the interest of truth and clarity alike, to better reveal the scope. At present two sär’s appear: "Annexation (International law)" and "Occupancy (International law)." The lone "××" is for "Territory, National."

**Remedy:** Add to both the "sär" and "××" rosters: "Colonies" and "Imperialism."

11. **Item: ANGOLA (p. 53)**

Let us follow the path that today is ours.
With guns, we shall march to build the world we want.

The boundaries of our free land are widening.
Our fields
Our schools
Our hospitals are growing
With each passing day the darkness of oppression
Recedes before the light of our hopes.

The image of our victory rises clear
From our collective labour
It has already the beauty of revolution.

All the land will be ours,
The world will be ours
We are freedom, comrade.

—Marcelino dos Santos

In that this is the first of the still-colonial areas to appear in the list, it may serve as the basis for a general observation. Briefly put: the list makes colonialism in such areas as Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, Namibia, and Zimbabwe appear to be immutable. As now constructed, it locks these lands into a permanent colonial status, even though movements like FRELIMO (Mozambique Liberation Front), COREMO (Mozambique Revolutionary Committee), MPLA (People’s Movement for the Liberation of Angola), and PAIGC (African Independence Party of Guiné and the Cape Verdes) are struggling mightily toward independence, and in the specific instance
of Guinea-Bissau have actually liberated much of the country from alien rule.²

**Remedy:** (a) Introduce a subhead, —NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT, or, under —HISTORY, indicate —WAR FOR NATIONAL LIBERATION, with the appropriate open date³ and—in view of the typical mode of warfare—an “××” for “Guerrillas.”⁴

(b) Establish NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENTS as a new primary form to embrace multi-area studies (e.g., comparative material on the NLF, ZAPU, ANC, etc.), with “××’s” for both “Colonies” and “Guerrillas,” as well as an also note referring to the subhead “National liberation movement” or “War for national liberation” under names of specific colonies and countries.⁵

(c) For once- or still-colonial areas, establish under —HISTORY a further subhead, —COLONIAL PERIOD, with an appropriate commencement date representing the first year of hegemony over the land by the foreign, metropolitan power.⁶ If, as in the case of South West Africa and the Philippines, more than one colonial power has dominated the area, specify the powers in separate glosses; e.g.,

AFRICA, SOUTHWEST

—HISTORY

—COLONIAL PERIOD (GERMAN), 1884–1915

—COLONIAL PERIOD (SOUTH AFRICAN), 1915—

The date should remain open for not-yet-independent countries.

(d) For originally-independent Third World states subsequently occupied or colonized by an alien power, construct an “Occupation” subhead under —HISTORY; e.g.,

ETHIOPIA

—HISTORY

—ITALIAN OCCUPATION, 1936–1941⁸

**Notes (Item 11)**

1. “We Are Freedom,” in Poems from Mozambique, an undated, mimeographed collection of ten verses by FRELIMO guerrillas, p. 3. For an


5. It should be obvious that older rubrics like REVOLUTIONS (p. 1105) and PEASANT UPRISINGS (p. 955) just don't fill the bill.

For details on the liberation struggles in Portuguese-speaking Africa, cf. Whitaker, op. cit., p. 15–35; the press releases and occasional pamphlets issued by the Committee for Freedom in Mozambique, Angola & Guiné (531 Caledonian Road, London, N. 7); K. Shingler’s Portuguese and Colonial Bulletin (10 Fentiman Road, London, S.W. 8); Basil Davidson, "The Liberation Struggle in Angola and 'Portuguese' Guinea," Africa Quarterly, v. 10, no. 1 (April–June 1970), p. 25–31; "Talk with a Guinean Revolutionary," a frank, incisive interview with Mr. Gil Fernandez, Cairo representative of PAIGC, on both the guerrilla war and radical social transformation engineered in Guinea-Bissau by Amilcar Cabral, described by Basil Davidson (ibid., p. 29) as "one of the most remarkable men that Africa has yet produced," in the inaugural, spring 1970 issue of Ufahamu; Journal of the African Activist Association (UCLA), p. 6–21; and the war communiqués, together with other periodicals and pamphlets, published by the movements themselves: FRELIMO (Information Dept., P.O. Box 15274, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania; quarterly letterpress organ: Mozambique Revolution), PAIGC (B. P.

Periodicals issued by ZAPU (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union), ANC (African National Congress of South Africa), and SWAPO (Southwest African Peoples' Organisation) are fully described in Berman's "African Magazines for American libraries," op. cit., p. 1292–93 (SWAPO, however, also issues a bimonthly bulletin, Namibia—Today, from its Dar es Salaam office at P.O. Box 2603). The Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU), another group seeking to free Rhodesia from minority rule, issues a monthly journal, Zimbabwe News, from its Lusaka headquarters (P.O. Box 2331). Material on the long-standing but relatively little-known guerrilla war waged by Anyanya against Arab suzerainty in the Southern Sudan or "Nile State" appears most extensively in The Grass Curtain (Southern Sudan Association, Ltd., Room 19, 29 Ludgate Hill, London, E.C. 4), which began publication in May 1970.


In that SWAPO and its sister liberation movements term the land “Namibia” and are pledged to so designate the country once it attains independence, and since the United Nations General Assembly on 12 June 1968 “proclaimed that South West Africa should henceforth be known as Namibia,” a See reference should be made from “Namibia” to AFRICA, SOUTHWEST. Cf. Yearbook of the United Nations, 1967 (New York: United Nations Office of Public Information, 1968), p. 689. By the same token, “Zimbabwe (territory)” should appear as a temporary “x” under “Rhodesia,” the gloss being necessary to distinguish the contemporary polity from both the ancient city which bore the same name and its actual archaeological site, located some 17 miles southeast of Victoria in Mashonaland. For an authoritative SWAPO statement on the proper nomenclature for Southwest Africa, cf. “Why Namibia” in the Oct.–Dec. Namibia News. More information concerning Bantu-built Zimbabwe, whose monumental stonework dates from the 15th century Monomotapa Empire, may be found in Wiedner, op. cit., p. 97–8; Gertrude Caton-Thompson, The Zimbabwe Culture: Ruins and Reactions (London: Oxford University Press, 1931); and Basil Davidson, Old Africa Rediscovered, op. cit., p. 199–230.


For precedents, cf. entries for the various European states occupied by Nazi Germany during World War II; e.g., DENMARK—HISTORY—GERMAN OCCUPATION, 1940–1945, p. 360.

12. Item: CANNIBALISM

**Ethnology**

**Society, Primitive** (p. 181; Sears, p. 125)

If Ronald M. Berndt is correct in claiming that “authentically substantiated cases of cannibalism are less common in anthropological literature than one might expect,” 1, the referents to “Ethnology” and “Society, Primitive” qualify as gratuitous and misleading.
**Remedy:** Eliminate both "××’s," simultaneously adding an "×" for "Anthropophagy" to placate the tidy-minded.

**Note (Item 12)**

1. “Cannibalism,” in Julius Gould and William L. Kolb, eds., A Dictionary of the Social Sciences (London: Tavistock, 1964), p. 65. Indeed, Berman’s examination of frequent “cannibal” allegations regarding the Fang, the most numerous people of Equatorial Guinea, as well as members of the syncretistic Mbueti Sect, disclosed that no regular nor widespread anthropophagic practice could be established for the Fang in either antiquity or modern times (only occasional “consumption of slain enemies” for purposes of “sympathetic magic”), and that the Mbueti sacrificed animals, rather than humans, at their rites. Cf. the annotations under ANTHROPOPHAGY in Berman, Spanish Guinea, op. cit., together with p. 299–301 and 304–05. Moreover, Stanley M. Garn and Walter D. Block, both of the Center for Human Growth and Development at the University of Michigan, have calculated, on the basis of normal protein requirements, that “less than one man [eaten] per week for a group of 60 would not appear to be nutritionally worthwhile, even as a protein supplement to a cereal or tuber diet with limiting amino acids.” Their conclusion: “While human flesh may serve as an emergency source of both protein and calories, it is doubtful that regular people-eating ever had much nutritional meaning.” Cf. “The Limited Nutritional Value of Cannibalism,” American Anthropologist, v. 72, no. 1 (Feb. 1970), p. 106. In short, while “cannibalism” has mainly occurred among folk peoples, it is in no wise a common nor frequent ingredient of folk or traditional culture. To refer thrill-seekers to the immense ethnological literature for data on anthropophagy is to send them on an essentially wild-goose chase, as well as further propagating the exceedingly tenuous “primitive-cannibal” nexus.

Suhl also pinpoints in the Doctor Dolittle series of children’s books a cannibal/primitive/African syndrome literally at least as old as Shakespeare’s Othello. In The Voyages, “Bumpo Kabbooboo,” Oxford-educated “Crown Prince” of the West African kingdom of “Jolliginki,” when confronted by Polynesia, a garrulous parrot, with the problem of a stowaway sailor “who has been eating up the ship’s store of salt beef,” suggests: “Would it not be good political economy … if we salted the able seaman and ate him instead?” The parrot reminds the African prince that he is no longer at home, adding “those things are not done on white men’s ships.” A smarter parrot than Polynesia would have known that “those things” aren’t done in West African kingdoms either. Op. cit., p. 7.
13. **Items:** CIVILIZATION, ANGLO-SAXON; CIVILIZATION, ARAB; CIVILIZATION, ARYAN; etc. (p. 253–54; Sears, p. 158–59)

In the olden days there was no peace among the black people. There were many wars. People attacked one another without provocation, they killed one another and captured each other’s cattle. . . . Such freedom from fear and want as we enjoy today did not exist; instead, fighting was a daily occurrence. . . . Truly, we who live today ought to thank God that we did not live in those days, but rather live in these days of peace, and of plenty, and of happiness.¹

The reader seeking CIVILIZATION, AFRICAN will look in vain. By the glaring omission of this head it appears that the whole continent has been historyless, a vast cultural desert, whereas in fact “scholars . . . unencumbered by colonial ties” have in recent years discovered that “Africa was not a tabula rasa, but that it had a past, a history which could be reconstructed; that it was a continent which knew empire builders at a time when large areas of Europe stagnated in the Dark Ages; that it knew art and commerce.”² The LC vacuum reflects a common tendency “in the North Atlantic world,” as anthropologist Stanley Diamond puts it, “to stereotype the peoples and cultures of the continent, to regard them as a . . . featureless, backward, and largely passive mass.”³

**Remedy:** Establish at once the primary head, CIVILIZATION, AFRICAN.⁴

---

**Notes (Item 13)**


of Africa's past "is not only possible, but is also useful and even indispensable, to a closer understanding of the general condition of mankind," p. 4–5. Perhaps the most succinct, yet many-faceted, brief for African "civilization" appears as Chapters 10 and 11 of Davidson's *Old Africa Rediscovered*, *op. cit.* "But civilization?" he begins, "isn't that, after all, saying too much?" And then argues conclusively that the appellation fits, on many counts.

3. "Introduction: Africa in the Perspective of Political Anthropology," in Stanley Diamond and Fred G. Burke, eds., *The Transformation of East Africa* (New York/London: Basic Books, 1966), p. 5. This entire chapter should be consulted for information on the dynamics and forms of state building in much of sub-Saharan, precolonial Africa. Probably the most reliable, objective index of "civilization," as Diamond regularly contends, is the emergence of social stratification and civil authority, represented in Africa, as examples, by the several empires of antiquity like Songhay, Benin, Mali, and Monomotapa, and more recent kingdoms or "proto-states" such as Ankole and Dahomey. LC, in fact, admitted this sociopolitical "leap" from folk to civil society (or civilization) when it introduced the subhead, "Kings and Rulers under Africa" (July 1964–Dec. 1965 ACS, p. 5).

The stereotyping persists in portions of Africa itself, as Ezekiel Mphahlele relates from his own experience: "In history, social studies and civics, the black pupil had to be taught to accept as facts the hypotheses that the white man came to South Africa to civilize savage indigenes; that the black man was underdeveloped ... immature ... and could not exercise the vote nor represent his people in Parliament." Cf. "Censorship in South Africa," *Censorship Today*, v. 2, no. 4 (Aug.–Sept. 1969), p. 14. Cf. also the epigraph above, excerpted from school texts fashioned for Black South African children. "The tragedy of Africa," adds Kunene, "the basic problem that confronts us, is that of the contemptuous rejection of the African by the European. So Europe came to Africa and to varying degrees Europeanized Africa, but totally refused to be Africanized by Africa." *Op. cit.*, p. 646.

It should occasion little wonder that a Project Africa study conducted among American secondary school students found that "students see Africa south of the Sahara as a land of 'no history' when the survey of basic knowledge shows that they have virtually no knowledge of the region before the coming of the Europeans. Students simply have never heard of Zimbabwe, Benin, and Ashanti, or of Sonni Ali, Osei Tutu, or Mansa Musa." E. Perry Hicks and Barry K. Beyer, "Images of Africa," *Journal of Negro Education*, v. 39, no. 2 (spring 1970), p. 164. The authors add that "the mis-information that students have about Africa may come primarily from the popular media. Students may never have heard of Africa's Sudanic kingdoms, but they probably have heard of Tarzan, Jungle Jim and King Solomon's mines. If Tarzan lives in the jungle along with his lion and elephant friends and this is all that a student knows about Africa, the student's image of Africa
will certainly not be accurate.” *Ibid.* Further, the surveyors discovered that even in world history courses the continent is usually studied 'from the point of view of European exploration, colonialism, and imperialism. The students see the region and its peoples through the eyes of explorers, missionaries, entrepreneurs, and adventurers. They study it only as an appendage of European history, as an arena in which the destinies of western civilization were enacted. This culture-bound view distorts Africa's past and gives little insight into the present.” *Ibid.*, p. 166. For additional, commonplace faults of imbalance and out-datedness in Africa-related teaching, cf. the full article, p. 158–66. References to the library responsibility for this widespread distortion and misinformation concerning Africa are all the more alarming for their complete absence.

4. The only “new” civilizations acknowledged in LC supplements since the 7th ed. are CIVILIZATION, MYCENAEAN (1968 ACS, p. 87), CIVILIZATION, AEGEAN; CIVILIZATION, BAROQUE; and CIVILIZATION, MINOAN (1969 ACS, p. 42).

14. **Items:** ETHNIC TYPES

   *sa* Caucasian race

   Race

   □□ Race (p. 445)

   ETHNOLOGY

   *sa* Native races

   Race problems

   *also names of races…*

   □ Races of man

   □□ Native races

   (p. 445–46; Sears, p. 242)

Through much of the nineteenth century the concepts of biological race, language, and culture were confused; one was inferred from the other, and reconstruction of human development combined all three aspects. Ethnology was historically oriented from the start and attempted to account for extant races, languages, and cultures in terms of migration, diffusion, and other historical processes.

In the twentieth century, “ethnology” has come to mean the comparative study of documented and contemporary cultures and has largely excluded their bioanthropology, archeology, and linguistics…¹
The LC continues to suffer from and mirror the 19th century confusion. Now that we are 70 years into another century, no one could sensibly charge LC with unseemly haste were it to finally recognize the scientifically-established dichotomy between “race” and “ethnicity.”

**Remedy:**
(a) Eliminate ETHNIC TYPES as a primary head, since its intended meaning is biological, rather than ethnological.
(b) Remove the above-listed “sa,” “x” and “×x” referents under ETHNOLOGY.
(c) As corollaries, excise “Art and race,” “Music and race,” and “Race awareness” as sa’s under ETHNOPSYCHOLOGY (p. 447). Indeed, the first two forms are highly-suspect primary heads, which could be well abandoned or recast as ART AND ETHNICITY and MUSIC AND ETHNICITY.

**Notes (Item 14)**

2. On this point, cf. also van den Berghe, *Race and Racism, op. cit.*, p. 10, where he admits that “the distinction between a racial and an ethnic group is sometimes blurred by several facts,” but maintains that “the distinction between race and ethnicity remains analytically useful.”
3. Sears would also contribute to clarity in this area by canceling the See reference from “Ethnic psychology” to “Race psychology,” p. 241.

15. **Item: PHILIPPINE ISLANDS**

---
HISTORY
---
TO 1521
---
1521–1898
---
INSURRECTION, 1896–1898
---
JAPANESE OCCUPATION, 1942–1945
(p. 970; 1968 ACS, p. 330)

The determining considerations for Western policy were never what the Asians considered to be good for themselves but what
the West judges to be good for Asia. Often this meant, in actual practice, that what is good for the West is good for Asia.
—Salvador P. Lopez

The Yankee imperialism already noted under U.S.—TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS becomes even more evident in LC’s treatment of the Philippines. Except for the cited Japanese incursion during World War II, the supplied headings abysmally fail to indicate that the islands had endured colonialism under two successive foreign powers for no less than 351 years, that American dominion was imposed for a number of less admirable reasons than mere “tutelage,” and that nationalist discontent had arisen during the 19th century, flaring into open revolution at the time of the Spanish-American War. The LC schema reduces the experience of “our little brown brothers” to an inconsequential charade, with only the war-mongering Japanese cast as culprits.

Remedy: Reconstruct the —HISTORY subdivisions as follows:

— TO 1521
— COLONIAL PERIOD (SPANISH), 1521–1898
— REVOLT, 1896–1901
— COLONIAL PERIOD (AMERICAN), 1898–1946
— 1946–

Notes (Item 15)

1. From an address delivered at the opening session of the International Press Institute’s 19th Assembly in Hong Kong on May 18, 1970, quoted in IPI Report, v. 19, no. 2/3 (June/July 1970), p. 19. Mr. Lopez is Chancellor of the University of the Philippines and a former Philippines Foreign Secretary.

"revolution" which erupted in 1896 and only ended with the leader’s capture in 1901. In passing, the authors note regarding Aguinaldo that "there is no indication at any time that he expected less than full autonomy," p. 24. They further admit, on p. 28, the commercial and missionary impulses toward "acceptance of American responsibility for control of the Islands," themes which Julius W. Pratt explores extensively in his *Expansionists of 1898; The Acquisition of Hawaii and the Spanish Islands* (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1959; originally published by Johns Hopkins Press in 1936). Cf. especially Chapters 7 and 8, "The Business Point of View" and "The Imperialism of Righteousness," p. 230–316. Anyone still unsure that American motives (and rationales) vis-à-vis the Philippines significantly differed from those of other colonial powers elsewhere need only digest President McKinley’s account of the answer to his prayers, quoted by Pratt on p. 334–35. The President states, in part, "that we could not leave them to themselves—they were unfit for self-government—and they would soon have anarchy and misrule over there worse than Spain’s was; and . . . that there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all, and to educate the Filipinos, and uplift and civilize and Christianize them, and by God’s grace do the very best we could by them, as our fellow-men for whom Christ also died." Less eminent figures, clerics and businessmen alike, echoed the President’s sentiments with talk of the American duty to uplift the "barbarous" and Anglo-Saxonize mankind.

16. *Items: GREAT AWAKENING* (p. 562);
 *NORTHWEST, OLD* (p. 899);
 *RECONSTRUCTION* (p. 1084; Sears, p. 503);
 *REFUGEES, SOUTHERN* (p. 1089);
 *STATE RIGHTS* (p. 1224; Sears, p. 563);
 *THE WEST* (p. 1401; Sears, p. 627)

*USA all the way.*

—Slogan attached to American flags by construction workers at New York office building site.¹

All these forms appear unglossed. All express a facet of distinctly *American* history or politics which lay foreigners—and perhaps some Americans themselves—cannot reasonably be expected to appreciate.
They therefore represent an all too common ailment, "Americocentrism," as well as being unclear.\(^2\)

**Remedy:** Add glosses for clarification; e.g.,
- GREAT AWAKENING (U.S. RELIGIOUS HISTORY)
- NORTHWEST, OLD (U.S.)
- RECONSTRUCTION (U.S. HISTORY)
- REFUGEES, SOUTHERN (U.S. HISTORY)
- STATE RIGHTS (U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY)
- THE WEST (U.S.)

**Notes (Item 16)**


17. **Items:** LEGENDS; LEGENDS, BUDDHIST;
    LEGENDS, CELTIC [GREEK, etc.];
    LEGENDS, GERMANIC; LEGENDS, JEWISH;
    LEGENDS, ORIENTAL (p. 731)

What's awry here is that, if one halves the world into Occident and Orient (which is done commonly—though brainlessly—enough), the Occident, like Christianity in so many other forms, is assumed to be dominant. As sa's ranging from "Chansons de geste" to "Saints" unequivocally demonstrate, the unqualified head is meant to embrace Western—or, more particularly, European—material. The *other* half of the world's legendary heritage (again, given such a bifurcation) thus occupies a place much-removed from the initial head and distinguished merely by an inverted adjective just as legends derived from Celts and Greeks are. Such handling perpetuates the
Kiplingesque notion that the “Orient” exists only as a kind of exotic, inscrutable adjunct to the Occident, a pagoda-shaped, dragon-decorated, curry-and-soy-sauce-smelling doll house operated for the amusement of wonder-craving Westerners.

Remedy: Admitting the usefulness of inverted forms, the travesty presently made of Oriental civilization can be overcome by instituting a complementary head, LEGENDS, OCCIDENTAL, and reserving the simple form, LEGENDS, for material of genuinely global nature.

Note (Item 17)

1. The same rectification should then be made under ARCHITECTURE (p. 67-8), ART (p. 74-6), etc. LC itself affords precedents for such polaric forms. Cf., for example, CIVILIZATION, OCCIDENTAL (p. 253) and OCCIDENTAL STUDIES (1967 ACS, p. 185).


(1969 ACS, p. 22)

Regardless of pro– or anti–Biafra feelings, the fact remains that such a state did secede from federal Nigeria and managed to endure as an independent entity for some three years. The Confederate States of America did not last much longer, yet they enjoy two full columns of primary and subordinate headings (p. 299). Why, then, is “Biafra” totally buried under “Nigeria” with no primary head representing its actual, if short-lived, existence? Because Black Africans engineered its birth in open defiance of Big Power (not to mention Big Money) wishes? Because its very being wrecked paternalistic Western illusions about how Africans are supposed to behave and indirectly reflected badly on the former imperialists’ border-erecting abilities?

Note (Item 18)

1. For an extra–LC precedent, cf. the May 10, 1970, RG (v. 70, no. 6), p. 43.