At Home in the World

For the Winter 2019 Carnegie Reporter, we set out four questions — near and far — to explore the ripple effects of the Corporation’s long-standing work in cultivating knowledge in the service of peace and democracy.

We range widely. From Africa and postglobalism to The Hague and quantum theory, in this issue we offer a discussion that reflects the symbiotic relationship between knowledge and peace — and between Carnegie Corporation of New York and the larger world.

As Corporation president Vartan Gregorian writes in his letter, “Andrew Carnegie formed Carnegie Corporation of New York because he understood that peacemaking and knowledge are interdependent.” That vision continues to guide the work of the Corporation today: investing in research, scholarship, and knowledge — the precursors and prerequisites for peace.

For our cover story, we turn to a lesser-known but critical corner of African scholarship, namely the researchers and academics who will write Africa’s history and teach the next generations of policymakers and leaders on the continent. Writer and art critic Anna O’Sousa explores the Corporation’s support of African humanities scholars.

Many may not know that Andrew Carnegie was a key figure in the history of international law and justice. Despite relentless ridicule, Carnegie worked tirelessly for world peace, arguing that systems — including world courts — be set in place to resolve conflicts without resorting to bloodshed. Both the Permanent Court of Arbitration and the International Court of Justice (the principal judicial arm of the United Nations, commonly known as the World Court) are housed in the Peace Palace in The Hague, built with Carnegie’s financial support and opened in 1913.

Architectural writer Fred A. Bernstein explores the connection between Carnegie’s vision for peace and democracy and the “often fraught” architectural competition from which his magnificent Temple of Peace was born.

Closer to home, LaVerne Srinivasan, head of the Corporation’s Education program, and education author Jeff Archer review how lessons learned from past decades of school-reform efforts inform the Corporation’s current thinking on American education. A lot has changed in 35 years since the modern school-reform movement was born. And famed “technosociologist” Zeynap Tufekci gives America’s voting system the once-over. The verdict? We’ve got work to do.

Finally, our periodic issue would be incomplete without a nod to the fourth dimension: don’t miss the essay on quantum technology by Stephen Del Rosso, program director for the Corporation’s support of research, scholarship, and knowledge — the precursors and prerequisites for peace.

As we head to our offices in New York City, sitting on a couch after our conversations with two well-travelled citizens of the world, philosopher Kwame Anthony Appiah and Financial Times editor Lionel Barber, as interviewed by Scott Malcomson, global journalist and author. They are panoramic in their discounts, the free movement of people, the complex forces driving nationalism both at home and around the world, and much more.

Julia Weede
Chief Communications and Digital Strategies Officer; Carnegie Corporation of New York

FROM THE PRESIDENT

Carnegie Corporation of New York is a philanthropic foundation created by Andrew Carnegie in 1913 to promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding among the people of the United States. Subsequently, the charter was amended to permit the use of funds for the “promotion of international harmony and understanding among the peoples of the world.” Hence, the mission of the Carnegie Corporation is to be a hub of ideas and a beacon for dialogue about the work of the Corporation.

Our grant-making stems from foundational research, a legacy of just how unready we are. Fear without reason, fear without knowledge, fear that can be exploited. The quantum revolution rolls on, warns Stephen Del Rosso, with Carnegie’s financial support and opened in 1913. The greatest controversy? The competition to design Andrew Carnegie’s Temple of Peace was won by a Dutch architect.

The verdict? We’ve got work to do.

Many may not know that Andrew Carnegie was a key figure in the history of international law and justice. Despite relentless ridicule, Carnegie worked tirelessly for world peace, arguing that systems — including world courts — be set in place to resolve conflicts without resorting to bloodshed. Both the Permanent Court of Arbitration and the International Court of Justice (the principal judicial arm of the United Nations, commonly known as the World Court) are housed in the Peace Palace in The Hague, built with Carnegie’s financial support and opened in 1913.

Architectural writer Fred A. Bernstein explores the connection between Carnegie’s vision for peace and democracy and the “often fraught” architectural competition from which his magnificent Temple of Peace was born.

The African Aesthetic

Visual activism in Africa: The New Storytellers

Scholars and practitioners of the arts all across the continent are transforming the ways their histories, past and present, are being told.

Visual artists are creating texts to express the complex forces driving nationalism both at home and around the world, and much more.

Julia Weede
Chief Communications and Digital Strategies Officer; Carnegie Corporation of New York
Andrew Carnegie’s peace project was ambitious, audacious, visionary. The work was — is — difficult, often stymied, never-ending. But what is the alternative?

When Andrew Carnegie agreed to fund the construction of the Peace Palace at The Hague in the Netherlands, he was, as usual, building for the long haul. The Hague was no ordinary location. As Carnegie knew very well, the city was strongly linked to the history of international law. Settling in The Hague in 1799, the Dutch scholar, jurist, and diplomat Hugo Grotius (1583–1645) would go a long way to define the legal frameworks and foundations for peaceful cooperation between nations. Grotius had to battle a great deal of resistance in his quest. And centuries later, so did Andrew Carnegie, whose passionate commitment to ending war was considered unrealistic if not downright dangerous. “Refusal to arbitrate,” he boldly asserted, “makes war, even for a good cause, unholy.” Neither man surrendered. Today, the great edifice of international law stands as a tribute to the visionary labors of each man. Like the magnificent Peace Palace, it is built to last. But the work of peace advanced all the same, strengthened by a growing conviction that, at heart, human beings were bound by natural law, which derives its authority from two fundamental human needs: self-preservation and community. His theories were severely tested by the Thirty Years’ War (1618–48), but finally helped to pave the way for the Peace of Westphalia, which ended the war, restoring peace between the Catholic and Protestant powers. But Grotius’s ideas were not codified into a functioning international system, and, over the course of the centuries that followed, religious conflicts gave way to wars sparked by nationalism and authoritarianism.

Even as the 20th century was dawning, with its seemingly limitless potential, war remained an uncomfortably realistic possibility. That was simply unacceptable to Andrew Carnegie, who believed that a better world was not only possible, but necessary. He believed in the call that President Lincoln issued in a now famous address at Cooper Union in New York City, on February 27, 1865: “Let us have faith that right makes might. And in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it.” As his biographer David Nasaw has written, Carnegie became a “fool for peace.” Carnegie understood his duty.

“Right makes might” is a dramatic phrase, but there was nothing “foolish” about the seriousness of Carnegie’s purpose. He admired Grotius, and believed it was possible to strengthen the foundation of international law. By establishing a network of legal instruments and institutions, the nations of the world could reduce the inevitability of war and establish peaceful ways to adjudicate their various disputes and claims.

Unfortunately, at the dawn of the 20th century most of the world showed little interest in preventing armed conflict. President Theodore Roosevelt considered Carnegie naive, and even called some of his ideas “twisted.” But Roosevelt failed to grasp how much thought Carnegie had put into the project of peace, or how stubborn he could be. As history would prove, it was even more naïve to think that civilization could survive the kinds of wars that were coming. In fact, Carnegie’s vision of the future was more realistic than Roosevelt’s. Although Roosevelt had done important work toward peace earlier in his career, earning the Nobel Peace Prize in 1906 for helping to end the Russo-Japanese War, his strident rhetoric was a contributing factor to the rise in tensions as he pursued his quixotic political goals in the aftermath of his presidency.

In those same years, armaments continued to multiply and tensions grew between sprawling empires. With confidence, vision, and a vast fortune, Carnegie began to transform his dream into a reality, built from bricks and mortar. In 1903 Carnegie agreed to donate the $1.5 million ($43 million today, adjusted for inflation) needed for construction of the Peace Palace, which would serve as home to the Permanent Court of Arbitration, as well as housing a library of international law. At last, the edifice of international law would be grounded in an actual edifice.

With the cornerstone laid in the summer of 1907 midway through the Second International Peace Conference, the Palace opened to the public, with much fanfare, six years later. The Palace soon housed other international bodies, including the Permanent Court of International Justice, the official court of the League of Nations. In the words of American diplomat Andrew Dickson White, the friend who helped convince Carnegie to invest in the initial venture, the Peace Palace would serve as a “temple of peace where the doors are open, in contrast to the Janus-temple, in times of peace and closed in cases of war.”

Even as the 20th century was dawning, with its seemingly limitless potential, war remained an uncomfortably realistic possibility. That was simply unacceptable to Andrew Carnegie, who believed that a better world was not only possible, but necessary.
It is easy to lose faith in an age where peace still seems like an evanescent dream. Still, we should not underesti-
mate the achievement of seven decades of relative peace in Europe since 1945. Armed conflict in Western Europe
has been largely unthinkable. For that, we have many
people to thank, including of course two who helped lay
the foundation: Hugo Grotius and Andrew Carnegie.
In the hundred years since the christening of the Peace
Palace, peace has spread in much of the world, due in
no small part to the hard work of such "tools for peace."
International agreements are not perfect, but, in general,
they work. Trust can exist between nations. The Marshall
Plan channeled $13 billion (nearly $100 billion in 2018
dollars) in economic and technical aid to 16 European
countries, in a spirit of generosity that Carnegie would
certainly have recognized. Since its creation in 1993, the
European Union (EU) has brought about unprecedented
stability for most of its member nations, largely because
economies have been intertwined and systems are set in
place to resolve conflicts without resorting to bloodshed.

Yet, as the poet W. H. Auden reminds us in "The Cave of
Making."

More than ever
life-out there is goody, miraculous, loveable,
but we shan’t, not since Stalin and Hitler,
trust ourselves ever again: we know that, subjectively,
all is possible.

All is possible indeed, in a world that is increasingly
indefinite to the structures Carnegie left to posterity. But
knowing the scale of depravity and horror to which we can
sink, is it not also imperative to work toward and trust in
the potential, whenever we strengthen the edifice or
simply walk away from it?

Carnegie knew the answer. Seeking to prevent deadly
conflict is both idealistic and realistic. The danger of
nuclear weapons has not receded, while the threat posed
by biological and chemical weapons has increased. In
such a world we have no choice but to try to build better
structures, beginning with bridges of trust, finding long-
term common interests that transcend political and ethnic
divisions. It is only through building these bridges that
reason will ultimately prevail.

Just as the bricklayers were erecting the Peace Palace,
Carnegie was constructing the institutional edifices that
represent some of his most enduring legacies. In addi-
tion to his work in The Hague, Carnegie established and
endowed four U.S.-based foundations dedicated to the
cause of peace, including the Carnegie Endowment for
International Peace (CEIP), working with partners to
sponsor the reconstruction of various cultural landmarks
in Europe destroyed in World War I.

Carnegie put his final “structure” in place in 1913, endow-
ing the philanthropic Carnegie Corporation of New York;
with an astonishing $135 million (nearly $3.6 billion in
2018 dollars) — at that time the largest permanent phil-
thropic trust ever recorded. The Corporation’s mission is
clear: “To promote the advancement and diffusion of
knowledge and understanding.” And it has always
remained true to that mission. For more than a century,
we have been proud to continue the work of Andrew
Carnegie.

The Corporation’s work in peace and diplomacy has
embraced initiatives connected to the Balkans, Russia,
North Korea, and Kashmir, as well as efforts to resolve
all kinds of international conflicts. Since the 1920s the
Corporation has also been active in Africa, operating
under the belief that education is the key to providing
leaders for the continent and its institutions, including
the development of a new generation of African peacebuild-
ing scholars and practitioners. In Carnegie’s view, it was
the responsibility of the wealthy nations of the world to
establish a network of legal instruments and institutions
to codify man’s natural impulse toward war — and thus
enable the new century to be free from the scourge of war.

Throughout its history, one constant theme in the
Corporation’s grantmaking has been the need to integrate
deep knowledge and scholarship of the highest quality
into the development of policies and programs aimed at
advancing global peace and security. In August 2018 we
mark the centennial of Andrew Carnegie’s death, and in
concert with that occasion, the Carnegie family of insti-
tutions is organizing a series of programs, under the title
Forging the Future, to celebrate Carnegie’s philanthropic
legacy of “doing real and permanent good in this world,”
while addressing the many national and international
challenges that lie ahead.

As part of Forging the Future, the Corporation joined
with the Netherlands-based Carnegie Foundation—Peace
Palace and its partners for three days in September 2018,
convening the Carnegie PeaceBuilding Conversations, an
international conference in The Hague that connected
different people from various backgrounds and generations
around conflict-related themes. Some 300 participants — govern-
ment officials; public and community figures and leaders;
activists directly involved in conflicts; experts from civil
society, science, politics, business, and philanthropy;
and students and teachers working in conflict resolution —
heard from a number of our grantees, sister institutions,
and partners worldwide, focusing on ways to deal with the
causes, not just the symptoms, of our greatest challenges,
including advancing world peace.
In furtherance of this pacific and hopeful world view, we were proud to support the Carnegie PeaceBuilding Conversations. When treaties and compromise are disparaged, from the South China Sea to the Rio Grande, it becomes all the more important to defend the mission embodied by the Peace Palace. For what is the alternative? Without international law and justice, the world is at risk of reverting to an anarchic, Hobbesian state of nature — a permanent state of “war of all against all.” Carnegie had a deep faith in the utility of due process for managing relations among the great powers, but he also believed in providing face-saving alternatives for smaller powers buffeted by forces beyond their control. Carnegie’s Enlightenment–inspired commitment to reason remains an affirming antidote to the darker trends in our troubled world. The conference built on Carnegie’s peacemaking legacy while underscoring the relevance of his belief in the ability of states to find solutions through cooperation, dialogue, negotiation, and understanding.

In such an iconic setting as The Hague, comparisons between the present moment and the years when Carnegie supported the construction of the Peace Palace were hard to avoid. His was a time of unbridled nationalism, and for him a central challenge was creating a framework in which powerful countries could resolve their conflicting claims. As one conference participant pointed out, while we are witnessing a resurgence of nationalism across the globe, it is a nationalism based largely on nostalgia, far removed from the conquering spirit of the early 1900s. Citizens of many countries compare their current status unfavorably to a romanticized earlier era. Compounding this view, a common theme of the PeaceBuilding Conversations was the fragility of human communities, not only in the countries of the world. A variety of factors conspire to create this fragility: the increased mobility of people, capital, ideas, and weapons, abetted by the spread of new and disruptive technologies; the complexity and interconnectedness of global challenges; and the ongoing deficiencies of governance at multiple levels. In this context, the rules-based “liberal international order” — which some have argued was never as liberal, international, or orderly as was claimed, but which nevertheless has helped avert war by the major powers — appears to be breaking down, with no clear replacement in sight. Given the internal weaknesses of many societies, the task of building a new international order seems especially daunting when the bricks themselves are crumbling.

But despite the apprehension provoked by these developments, a spirit of Carnegian optimism prevailed at the Peace Palace. Many in attendance would have rallied to Carnegie’s own words, delivered in a 1905 address to the young participants, in particular, reminded those gathered in The Hague that, while there was much work to be done to repair the world and build sustainable peace, there are many talented people committed to the task — a sentiment echoed by peace activists and officials alike.

It can be easy to doubt idealism and hope in the face of a world that at the moment does not seem to value either. But becoming a “fool for peace” does not mean acting foolishly. It means standing up for reason, self-control, and the hard work of international understanding. It means affirming the value of justice, reciprocity, and the rule of law. It means affirming our solidarity as fellow inhabitants of a small planet in a vast universe. It is essential that we reject cynicism and despair. Andrew Carnegie formed Carnegie Corporation of New York because he understood that peacemaking and knowledge are interdependent. He understood that genuine enlightenment — steeped in history and constantly enriched by current and changing events — provides a sturdy foundation for building understanding between societies, cultures, religious beliefs, and political systems. Understanding can be a bridge to peace and, ultimately, is powerful enough to help man triumph over war — in Rousseau’s words, “the foulest fiend ever vomited forth from the mouth of Hell.” But Andrew Carnegie was an optimist. A realistic optimist, but an optimist nonetheless. As he instructed his “young constituents” at St. Andrews that day in 1905:

You are busily preparing to play your parts in the drama of life, resolved, I trust, to oppose and attack what is evil, to defend and strengthen what is good, and, if possible, to leave your part of the world a little better than you found it.

Vartan Gregorian
President, Carnegie Corporation of New York

More Than Matter
The marble floor of the great entrance hall in the Peace Palace were designed by the distinguished Dutch architect, designer, and typographer Hendrik Wijdeveld (1885–1932), the influential avant-garde architectural journal, Wijdeveld said of the Peace Palace that it was “an expression of a spiritual desire.” The Latin motto “Sol Justitiae Illustra Nos” (The Light of Justice Shines Upon Us), the thematic heart of Wijdeveld’s elegant design, is only partly visible in this photograph, taken on September 24, 2018, the opening day of the Carnegie PeaceBuilding Conversations. PHOTO: © CARNEGIE FOUNDATION – PEACE PALACE
Why has identity politics become a major theme of our time? What happened to globalization? And has the West simply lost the plot?

To illuminate these and a few other questions, we turned to three people who have examined similar issues throughout their careers.

From In My Father’s House (1992) to The Lies That Bind: Rethinking Identity (2018), Kwame Anthony Appiah has been thinking and writing about identity politics in Africa (his paternal home), Europe (his maternal home), and the U.S. (his home by marriage and long residence) for three decades.

Lionel Barber has been a student of modern history — Germany’s in particular — since his undergraduate days at Cambridge. His work as a journalist took him across Europe and the United States; since 2005 he has been editor of the Financial Times.

The discussion was moderated by former Carnegie Corporation of New York media fellow Scott Malcolmson, who has reported on nationalism and empire around the world since the mid-1980s (as well as serving in government).

The conversation took place at the Corporation’s headquarters in New York. What follows is an edited transcript.
M A L C O M S O N: Was Brexit an instance of identity politics?

L I O N E L B A R B E R: It certainly wasn’t about economics, because any serious discussion of economics would have ended in a different result.

M A L C O M S O N: Do you think that the economic arguments made on behalf of Brexit were of great importance to the people voting for Brexit, leaving aside the quality of the arguments themselves?

B A R B E R: I think that the so-called Remainers, led by the then-prime minister, David Cameron, made the fatal mistake of assuming that they could win the referendum through a rational argument, and they misunderstood emotion and identity politics. The idea that you could have several identities — you could be English, British, and European — was never addressed.

K W A M E A N T H O N Y A P P A H: There was always this thing that a lot of Britishness has always been defined against the continent. The English, the Irish, the Scots, and the Welsh have that in common.

B A R B E R: Part of what was going on here had to do with the rise of Englishness, which hadn’t been a very important political identity in the British Isles.

M A L C O M S O N: And there weren’t any political parties that openly, or even covertly, at least since the Second World War, tried to fuel that sense of Englishness or of British nationality. It was not part of what political parties did.

A P P A H: No, and one has to remember that in the immediate postwar period, the emotionally conservative position, in the small-C conservative sense, had to do with Empire. It had to do with Britishness and being connected with a wide world of English-speaking peoples, especially the white Commonwealth, but the Commonwealth more generally. That notion of Englishness was a notion of Britishness. One of the things about Englishness — I have an English mother — is that it’s not something you theorize or talk about very much. It’s a given.

Within the European Union, however, England is an entity. It’s viewed as distinct from Scotland because the Union has all these regional policies, and so England became differentiated from the other parts of the British Isles because European thinking is that there are regions as well as countries.

B A R B E R: The country itself has become more fragmented. The Scottish independence movement also accentuated or triggered a greater sense of awareness of English identity.

A P P A H: Yes. A lot of the counties in the U.S. that voted for Donald Trump, presumably endorsing his anti-immigrant attitudes, are counties with almost no immigrants at all. So those voters never met people of the sort they were supposed to be worried about. And London may be the center of England, as well as Britain, but the English countryside is central to the image of Englishness.

B A R B E R: Yes, a “green and pleasant land.”

A P P A H: Yes, green and pleasant. William Blake’s Jerusalem, all that stuff. If you think of those places going away, or being filled with Poles or Muslims or something, you think, “We really are losing something.” It’s the sense in England that there is a real England and that it’s under threat. Well, those spaces will change. After all, they are not as they were when Blake was writing, so they’ve always been changing. The small towns in Gloucestershire and Oxfordshire were made rich by the wool trade in the Middle Ages, which depended connections into France and into the Muslim world. They’ve always been affected by the world, but they didn’t have a lot of people from the world showing up in their town or in the village. Nor did anyone propose that there should be a mosque in Tetbury or even in a big place like Stroud.

M A L C O M S O N: In Hungary there were many decades of experiencing government from Moscow replaced after only a heartbeat of independence with government from Brussels. People who had been associated with the idea that control over who does and who doesn’t get to live in Hungary is not going to be in Hungarians’ hands, and the government went to great lengths to make this association as tight as possible: it’s going to be in Brussels’ hands. So some Hungarians’ emotional reactions to the Soviet Union are similar to their reactions to the European Union.

B A R B E R: That sense that “We’re not in control of our borders” is important. All these unknown people are coming, not just from Central and Eastern Europe, but also from North Africa and the Middle East. This is about security and the fears about that, as well as identity. The other side of the coin, which I think is not irrelevant, is another economic argument: that the best people are leaving the country, they’re going to the West, and the country is being diminished.

A P P A H: Another thing populist nationalism draws on is that sense that the task of the party or the leader is to raise up us again in the eyes of the world. Not being in control of your own policies and territories is associated with important respect. This resentment of historical loss is so very much behind the responses of Muslim radicals around the world. Something is shared between Hungarian nationalism and Islam, the sense that “We’ve been put down in the world and our task is to bring ourselves back up, but internal enemies are going to get in the way.” So the idea becomes that we have to purify the nation or purify Islam in order to do this big project — to bring the U.S. or Hungary or wherever back into a place of honor in the world.

The Establishment

M A L C O M S O N: In 2016 I did a very informal sampling of what we might call establishment opinion, and it was that Brexit wouldn’t happen, and Trump would never become president. So was that a failure to see the strength of identity politics or was it a failure to understand globalization, from the point of view of people not in the establishment? Or are those the same thing?

B A R B E R: At its most basic, it was the views of people who were not prepared to make the effort to travel outside London. For the FT’s coverage of Brexit, one of my colleagues had a great idea: bring back five foreign correspondents and send them to the corners of the country. To a man and woman, they all came back saying: It’s going to be Brexit. And most of us didn’t believe it, which is pretty shocking.

M A L C O M S O N: That is certainly cause for some reflection.

B A R B E R: We were out of touch. We also failed to grasp an essential truth about globalization, which is its emotional effect.

We were out of touch. We also failed to grasp an essential truth about globalization, which is its emotional effect.

— Lionel Barber
attends a UKIP (United Kingdom Independence Party) pro-Brexit event in Birmingham, England, May 2016. an anti-immigrant fence on its border with Serbia, July 2015 (“Jesus is also an immigrant”); counterprotestors greet a demonstration against Islamophobia, 12

Signs of the Times

a message of hope, which was not true of the deeply flawed

America Great Again,” and he was in his own way offering

offering a positive, very clear message, which was “Make

immigration is such a powerful weapon being used by

politicians, by Trump, by the Leave voters in the Brexit

campaign. The media just went rational and missed these
emotional points. I definitely missed Brexit. I think also

that politics could occupy itself with other

things, like identity. I think some identity politics is

necessary globalization that would take care of economic

issues on its own, so that politics could occupy itself with other

things, like identity. I think some identity politics is

one of the reasons you can’t be

against globalization — in the very same period, massive

amounts of people have been taken out of poverty around the

world.

MALCOMSON: Within the U.S., yes; but not within China, for example.

APPAH: Yes, and that’s one of the reasons why globalization

in terms. In the Clinton campaign, for example, globalization

about globalization or you talked about it in positive

terms. In the Clinton campaign, for example, globalization

was the default position. It was assumed there was a ratio-

nal globalization that would take care of economic issues

on its own, so that politics could occupy itself with other

things, like identity. I think some identity politics is

a reaction against a kind of power grab by globalization,

as well as by...

APPAH: The people who profit most from it. Well, I agree.

But I don’t think it’s the right response. A better way of doing it

would involve some fine tuning, saying let’s have a

design that goes far beyond where it first appeared in the globalization
debate.

MALCOMSON: I was recently looking at trends in foreign
direct investment in the 1960s and ’70s. After 1958, as

currencies became convertible between the United States

and Europe, the U.S. invested steadily in Europe, still in

some ways recovering from the war. The U.K. also invested

on the Continent. By the early 1970s, two-thirds or more

of global ODI — overseas direct investment — was within

the Euro-American sphere, and there was a huge amount of
transfer. It seemed more like building companies across

the Atlantic that would naturally share technology because

there was no point in not doing so. As with China until

recently.

BARBER: Well, you can’t draw a comparison between the
two, in my view, because first of all, China’s internal

market is on a different scale. And secondly, we are now
talking about serious technological advancement. What the

Chinese are doing now, and the way they’re thinking about

artificial intelligence, bears no comparison to American

investment into machine tool companies in the 1960s,
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BARBER: Well, you can’t draw a comparison between the
two, in my view, because first of all, China’s internal

market is on a different scale. And secondly, we are now
talking about serious technological advancement. What the

Chinese are doing now, and the way they’re thinking about

artificial intelligence, bears no comparison to American

investment into machine tool companies in the 1960s,

transfers in the 1960s and ’70s. After 1958, as
currencies became convertible between the United States and Europe, the U.S. invested steadily in Europe, still in some ways recovering from the war. The U.K. also invested on the Continent. By the early 1970s, two-thirds or more of global ODI — overseas direct investment — was within the Euro-American sphere, and there was a huge amount of technology transfer from the U.S. — and to some extent from the U.K. — to the Continent. The West was in a virtuous circle of investing in itself in a sort of mini-glocalization, with relatively free technology transfer. That was no doubt partly because it didn’t seem like technology transfer. It seemed more like building companies across the Atlantic that would naturally share technology because there was no point in not doing so. As with China until recently.

BARBER: Well, you can’t draw a comparison between the two, in my view, because first of all, China’s internal market is on a different scale. And secondly, we are now talking about serious technological advancement. What the Chinese are doing now, and the way they’re thinking about artificial intelligence, bears no comparison to American investment into machine tool companies in the 1960s, or that kind of thing. I just think that when you look at China, where it has come from, the speed of its growth and technological advancement and its ambitions — they may not be stating it explicitly, but this country wants to be Number One.

The China Price

BARBER: It may hurt some to say this, but there is a kernel of truth in what President Trump is saying about the way globalization has worked. If you look at the trade relationship between China and the U.S., there’s no question that this has not been a level playing field. People forget that America and the other Western countries consistently decided to give China an extra margin for maneuvering in 2001, when it joined the World Trade Organization, by treating it as a developing country. China likes to emphasize at times that it still has tens of millions of people living in poverty in the countryside. But the other side of China is highly competitive in traditional manufacturing industries.

Now, the interesting thing, and I think it’s relatively new, is a change of mind in the American boardroom. They see a threat from China in technology, in the way China wants to become number one in artificial intelligence. Corporate America is concerned about Chinese competition, so they do want to reset the rules of the game. They don’t support tariffs but they see as help support a tougher stance in dealing with China. That is why economic nationalism goes far beyond where it first appeared in the globalization debate.

MALCOMSON: Within the U.S., yes; but not within China, for example.

APPAH: Yes, and that’s one of the reasons why globalization — in the very same period, massive amounts of people have been taken out of poverty around the world.

MALCOMSON: That’s such a good example of an argument that makes a lot of sense to us and people we know, but what you see in the stressed parts of Europe and the United States is: “Yes, but.”

Malcolmson: Within the U.S., yes; but not within China, for example.

APPAH: Yes, and that’s one of the reasons why you can’t be against globalization — in the very same period, massive amounts of people have been taken out of poverty around the world.

MALCOMSON: Within the U.S., yes; but not within China, for example.

APPAH: Yes, and that’s one of the reasons why globalization — in the very same period, massive amounts of people have been taken out of poverty around the world.

MALCOMSON: That’s such a good example of an argument that makes a lot of sense to us and people we know, but what you see in the stressed parts of Europe and the United States is: “Yes, but.”

Economic nationalism is a response. Whether it’s a creative or even an intelligent response is another set of questions. But two-plus years ago, you either didn’t talk about globalization or you talked about it in positive terms. In the Clinton campaign, for example, globalization was the default position. It was assumed there was a rational globalization that would take care of economic issues on its own, so that politics could occupy itself with other things, like identity. I think some identity politics is a reaction against a kind of power grab by globalization, as well as by...

APPAH: The people who profit most from it. Well, I agree. But I don’t think it’s the right response. A better way of doing it would involve some fine tuning, saying let’s have a basic structure of international trade that’s relatively open, but let’s agree that there are winners and losers in every market system. Then we need to think, nation by nation, about securing the interests of the people who lose in our countries, and to think about arranging the system to minimize the number of such people.
Societies are very complicated. Things work for reasons that are very hard to figure out, and stopping them from working as they are because you think you can do something better is usually a mistake. It’s usually the case that even if you can get to something better, it turns out to be much harder than you thought.

— Kwame Anthony Appiah
Picture this: the state of electoral infrastructure in the United States. What comes to mind? Perhaps dispiriting photos of election officials during the historic 2000 Florida recount, squinting at chads on punch-card ballots and debating whether they were hanging, dimpled, indented, or possibly even pregnant with voter intention. But maybe that’s not even the lowest point.

The worst electoral failing? Perhaps it’s the terribly designed “butterfly ballot” in Palm Beach County from that same election. The ballot’s confusing layout made it difficult to tell whether one was voting for Reform Party candidate Pat Buchanan or Democratic candidate Al Gore. Almost 20,000 votes were spoiled because many voters punched the hole for both candidates. Buchanan also gained thousands of overvotes because many Gore voters likely punched the wrong hole.

Out of almost six million votes cast in Florida under these contentious conditions, George W. Bush was certified as 537 votes ahead — and was thus awarded all of Florida’s electoral votes and, with them, the presidency. Suddenly,

While the totality of the National Academy of Sciences report on voting technology is sobering, a country with the resources and technical expertise of the United States can make great progress, and quickly, if it garners sufficient political will and resources.

By Zeynep Tufekci
the not-so-healthy state of U.S. election infrastructure leapfrogged into the news. Consequently, in 2012, the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) was signed into law with overwhelming bipartisan support, and billions of dollars were allocated toward its goals. It looked like the machinery of elections was finally being taken seriously. Hopefully the system would be fixed—or, at least, greatly improved.

Eighteen years after the chaos of dimpled chads, a new report from the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (NAS), Securing the Vote: Protecting American Democracy, documents in exacting detail the still-insecure, still-troubled state of electoral infrastructure in the United States. The 156-page report conjures up an even more unfortunate image than those of hanging chads: a virtual “404 error” page, symbolizing the lack of available methods and implementations to reach an American voter’s record. The paper’s authors, who have found that voter fraud remains a vanishingly rare occurrence in the United States. Unfortunately, while many of the vulnerabilities and inequities outlined in the NAS report remain unaddressed, direct attacks on voting machines and systematic procedures in place for meaningful audits to guard against tampering at all stages of the electoral process—from pollbooks/voting to tallying/certification—have been used to push through stricter voter-ID laws and other legislation.

There is one electoral infrastructure–related issue that has gotten widespread attention: voter fraud, allegations of which have been repeated at the highest levels of government. Yet multiple investigations have found that voter fraud remains a vanishingly rare occurrence in the United States. Unfortunately, while many of the vulnerabilities and inequities outlined in the NAS report remain unaddressed, direct attacks on voting machines and systematic procedures in place for meaningful audits to guard against tampering at all stages of the electoral process—from pollbooks/voting to tallying/certification—have been used to push through stricter voter-ID laws and other implementations that in effect can restrict the right to vote.

For example, shortly after the report was released, it was revealed that the state of Georgia has invoked the “exact match” law, which requires that voter registration applications perfectly match information on file with the state’s department of motor vehicles or the Social Security Administration. (In November 2018 a federal judge subse- quently overturned the law.) Direct attacks on voting machines and systematic procedures in place for meaningful audits to guard against tampering at all stages of the electoral process—from pollbooks/voting to tallying/certification—have been used to push through stricter voter-ID laws and other implementations that in effect can restrict the right to vote.

“This is a critical time for our country,” said Committee on the Future of Voting cochair and Columbia University president Lee C. Bollinger. “As a nation, we need to take collective action to strengthen our voting systems and safeguard our democracy. In addition, the nation’s leaders need to speak candidly and apologetically about threats to election systems. The American people must have confidence that their leaders place the larger interests of democracy above all else.”

The small number of voting-machine manufacturers underscores one of the more ambivalent aspects in our system: the lack of competition in the market for the nation. As the NAS report states, the United States is almost alone among nations in having “no centralized, nationwide election authorities” and “no per-capita or state-wide support,” which “would mean that one company could potentially disrupt a small number of electorally critical states—or disrupt a small number of electorally critical states— or disrupt a small number of electorally critical states.”

Elderly people and students without driver’s licenses are also more likely to be prevented from voting by strict voter-ID laws, as are Native Americans, many of whom do not have standard residential addresses, living on reserva- tions without named and numbered roads. Compared to the middle class, poor Americans as well as young people tend to move frequently, increasing the likelihood of being purged from the rolls because their current address does not match voter registration records.

About the NAS Report

Securing the Vote: Protecting American Democracy, a report from the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine [NAS], was released on September 6, 2018. Supported by Carnegie Corporation of New York and the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the report identifies steps to secure Americans’ votes, emphasizing the need for coordinated preparedness at the federal, state, and local levels.

“Securing the Vote is a comprehensive, clear-eyed report that provides a robust foundation for understanding the vulnerabilities and risks to our democratic system, and outlines steps that can be taken to make our elections more secure,” said Carnegie Corporation President and CEO Roger McNamee.
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The NAS report lists several incidents of breaches of voter secured. is far from ideal. Many jurisdictions use a mix of electronic databases to ensure their security. But the current system of each state. Ideally, the EAC and DHS would create The integrity of pollbooks falls squarely under the jurisdiction. Unfortunately, electronic pollbooks are not standardized, outdated paper pollbook. But even if she's allowed to cast a provisional ballot, the process can involve long lines and higher fees. Hacked or stolen voter information, as the report notes, can also be used to fraudulently request absentee vote mail-in ballots. Security protocols for absentee ballot request lists can result in a voter being inconvenienced (e.g., being forced to vote via provisional ballot), or, worse, she can be turned away at the polls, completely barred from voting.

The NAS report also addresses the human side of the electoral infrastructure, pointing out that many jurisdictions have a hard time hiring an adequate number of poll workers. Training them properly is difficult because the job is seasonal, the pay is low, and the hours are long. Truly underway, elections are fraught with nervousness and cyber intrusion. A blockchain can also be manipulated through collusion by multiple actors or stakeholders (those who can add items to the blockchain). In fact, these concerns apply to any digital scheme, malware and hacking are threats that we are simply not able to fully guard against using current technologies in connected systems.

Advanced software technologies allowing high levels of integrity and security are one thing, but in the end requiring local political legitimacy and verification processes that are relatively transparent to ordinary people. For example, with systems like optical-scan ballots, which are counted by computer but subject to risk-limiting audits (RLAs), it's at least electronically auditable. The Voluntary Voting Systems Guidelines (VVSG), advanced under HAVA by the EAC and the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), can provide direction. Forty-eight states rely on the VVSG to certify voting equipment, using the guidelines as a basis for their own standards, while some states utilize an EAC-certified test lab to do their testing. These are prounounced.

Given the current realities of the U.S. electoral system, the report accordingly recommends that, for the foreseeable future, electronic pollbooks be used in tandem with paper

Internet Voting, Blockchain Voting

Two questions come up often: whether Internet voting is feasible, and whether newer ledger technologies like blockchain or end-to-end verified voting can help prevent voter fraud while also providing voter verification. The NAS report notes that no Internet-based voting scheme can come close to providing the kind of assurances needed. For one thing, all Internet-based schemes are vulnerable to DDoS attacks. Any web-based system can be attacked this way, regardless of its underlying security. More importantly, the threat of malware and cyber intrusion simply cannot be eliminated using current technologies, making Internet-based voting systems infeasible.

Furthermore, blockchain — a system of decentralized ledgers that creates append-only logs (meaning a data base can only grow and not be altered backward) — is not suitable because elections, as the report describes, are "inherently centralized." Election administrators make many of the decisions about ballots, eligible voters, and more. These actions need to be verifiable, and a blockchain system would require software verification, which, one again, brings up the threat of cyber intrusion. A blockchain can also be manipulated through collusion by multiple actors or stakeholders (those who can add items to the blockchain). In fact, these concerns apply to any digital scheme: malware and hacking are threats that we are simply not able to fully guard against using current technologies in connected systems.

Dear States: You’re on Your Own

Why hasn’t HAVA funding, totaling billions of dollars at the act’s inception plus substantial funds allocated subsequently, more progress tackling the issues with voting in America — or even solved the problem?

In fact, some real improvements came out of HAVA. For one, the dreaded punch-card voting machines were phased out, replaced with electronic voting machines providing increased access to voting for people with disabilities — one of HAVA’s goals. A positive change, but this obviously is not enough, and the lack of progress on a broader scale is tied up with other aspects of politics in the United States.

The truth is that state and precinct officials can find themselves overwhelmed by the range of technical options — more than willing, but unable, to implement the required digital security. The Voluntary Voting Systems Guidelines (VVSG), advanced under HAVA by the EAC and the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), can provide direction. Forty-eight states rely on the VVSG to certify voting equipment, using the guidelines as a basis for their own standards, while some states utilize an EAC-certified test lab to do their testing. These are pronounced.

States.

Given the current realities of the U.S. electoral system, the report accordingly recommends that, for the foreseeable future, electronic pollbooks be used in tandem with paper ones.

Paper vs. Digital

The potential hacking of voting machines receives a lot of attention, as it should, but the process of voting has many other moving parts in the United States. With the exception of North Dakota, voters must register to vote proactively (several states do now offer same-day registration on Election Day). The fact is that voter information is held by states with varying degrees of security, meaning that secret voting data can use data from the voting rolls or excessive purging of registration lists can result in a voter being inconvenienced (e.g., being forced to vote via provisional ballot), or, worse, she can be turned away at the polls, completely barred from voting.

The NAS report also addresses the human side of the electoral infrastructure, pointing out that many jurisdictions have a hard time hiring an adequate number of poll workers. Training them properly is difficult because the job is seasonal, the pay is low, and the hours are long. Truly underway, elections are fraught with nervousness and cyber intrusion. A blockchain can also be manipulated through collusion by multiple actors or stakeholders (those who can add items to the blockchain). In fact, these concerns apply to any digital scheme, malware and hacking are threats that we are simply not able to fully guard against using current technologies in connected systems.

Advanced software technologies allowing high levels of integrity and security are one thing, but in the end requiring local political legitimacy and verification processes that are relatively transparent to ordinary people. For example, with systems like optical-scan ballots, which are counted by computer but subject to risk-limiting audits (RLAs), it’s at least electronically auditable. The Voluntary Voting Systems Guidelines (VVSG), advanced under HAVA by the EAC and the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), can provide direction. Forty-eight states rely on the VVSG to certify voting equipment, using the guidelines as a basis for their own standards, while some states utilize an EAC-certified test lab to do their testing. These are pronounced.

States.
two-thirds of counties in the United States use either optical-scan ballots or paper ballots, both of which provide the potential basis for sensible next steps for election integrity, at least in terms of tallying votes. I use the word potential because, as the NAS report makes clear, the possibility of meaningful audits is important — a possibility denied by electronic machines with no paper trail. But in and of itself a paper trail isn’t enough without a procedure in place for system-wide audits.

Given all the risks outlined, it is more important than ever that trustworthy and systematic audit processes are in place and functioning, to assure voters that their votes are counted as cast — especially now that optical-scan ballots are increasingly stored as digital snapshots. This means that optical-scan ballots are counted by computers, which means that they can be hacked and election outcomes distorted. And, as history has shown, without oversight even human counting is prone to many types of fraud and mistakes.

What would meaningful audits look like in the United States? The important point here is that it’s not enough for us to hope that everything will work as planned, or even that the experts believe that everything probably did work out as planned. Voters need verifiable assurances that their votes would be counted correctly. In 2018, after half of all Americans had a great deal of confidence that their electronic-only systems with paper-based voting technologies such as optical-scan ballots. Virginia has replaced its insecure voting machines with paper ballots, and other states are considering making such a move. All of this is a good start, but much more needs to be done. The NAS report provides a clear look at the vulnerabilities, along with a concrete list of suggestions that would go a long way toward securing elections in the United States. At a minimum, RLAs should be put in place as quickly as possible and local election authorities should allocate more resources to grapple with potential Election Day problems, including using backup paper copies for poll-books and beefing up the training of poll workers so they are prepared for all contingencies.

Looking Forward

In September 2018 President Trump signed an executive order outlining a review and sanction process for any foreign party caught meddling in U.S. elections. As the NAS report documents, U.S. intelligence agencies, as well as other independent investigations, have demonstrated that substantial foreign meddling occurred in the 2016 election, including misinformation campaigns and hacking. However, as important as it is to prevent foreign meddling in the public sphere, U.S. electoral infrastructure should be designed to be secure from any interference, whether foreign or domestic.

After years of warnings from academics and security researchers, a number of states have been making progress on their own. Some have begun replacing their electronic-only systems with paper-based voting systems. But how did we get here? Why is it that one of the most technically advanced nations in the world is experiencing such an acute crisis in the tallying of votes? The answer is not simple — nor does it have a simple solution. However, at this moment, when faith and trust in our democratic system is in jeopardy, it is crucial that we understand the history of voting technology in this country. It is only then that we can begin to understand how the problem can be fixed.
The counting of votes is organized around two potentially competing priorities or values: accuracy and timeliness. Accuracy requires that the final vote tally reflect the correct aggregate of votes cast by eligible voters. However, a city or county could spend months and months counting and recounting its votes under a system that valued only accuracy. Nevertheless, governance requires the smooth transition of power, which explains the pressure to count ballots quickly — that is, the value of timeliness. The faster an initial tally can be completed, the more confidence the community will have that an election was not muddied with. With both considerations — accuracy and timeliness — are important. It is the tension between the two that drives the conversation around voting technology and voting reforms.

Joseph P. Harris’s seminal _Administration in the United States_ (1934) provides a survey of earlier vote tabulation systems. Lever voting machines were used throughout the country for much of the 20th century. These hulking machines provided voters with a confidential way to cast ballots, accounting in large part for their popularity. However, they were very challenging to operate, and a wayward jolt could reset — erroneously — the vote tabulation system. Beginning in the 1960s and ’70s, lever machines started to give way to paper-based systems like punch-card voting machines (the vote is “punched” out of the paper ballot) and optical-scan machines (voters fill in the oval connected to the candidate of their choice).

The debate around voting technology rose to national prominence after the 2000 presidential contest between George W. Bush and Al Gore and the subsequent Florida recount. Who can forget the images of election officials holding up paper punch-card ballots to a magnifying glass for a recount. Who can forget the hanging chads, dimpled chads, and sawed-off chads? Who can forget that Boston and Miami were counting votes for president in the wee hours of the morning? Who can forget the images of George W. Bush and Al Gore and the subsequent Florida recount. Who can forget the hanging chads, dimpled chads, and sawed-off chads? Who can forget that Boston and Miami were counting votes for president in the wee hours of the morning?

The debate around voting technology rose to national prominence after the 2000 presidential contest between George W. Bush and Al Gore and the subsequent Florida recount. Who can forget the images of election officials holding up paper punch-card ballots to a magnifying glass for a recount. Who can forget the hanging chads, dimpled chads, and sawed-off chads? Who can forget that Boston and Miami were counting votes for president in the wee hours of the morning? Who can forget the hanging chads, dimpled chads, and sawed-off chads? Who can forget that Boston and Miami were counting votes for president in the wee hours of the morning?

In 2002 Congress passed the Help America Vote Act (HAVA), which allocated $380 million in federal grant dollars, and the vast majority of states have used those funds, and established best practices. All states have accepted the voluntary standards for voting systems, distributed HAVA funds, and established best practices.

The debate around voting technology rose to national prominence after the 2000 presidential contest between George W. Bush and Al Gore and the subsequent Florida recount. Who can forget the images of election officials holding up paper punch-card ballots to a magnifying glass for a recount. Who can forget the hanging chads, dimpled chads, and sawed-off chads? Who can forget that Boston and Miami were counting votes for president in the wee hours of the morning?

The next steps in improving voting technology policies rest with election officials, state-level election boards, and voters. The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), which developed and approved voluntary standards for voting systems, distributed HAVA funds, and established best practices.

The next steps in improving voting technology policies rest with election officials, state-level election boards, and voters. The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), which developed and approved voluntary standards for voting systems, distributed HAVA funds, and established best practices.

Department of Homeland Security has worked with the FBI and the chief election officials in all 50 states to identify and close gaps in security. In March 2018 Congress appropriated $300 million dollars for grants to the states to help fortify their election infrastructures, with an additional $300 million to combat Russian cyberattacks. Many experts and nonprofit organizations have worked to educate election officials and the public on better ways to secure their election systems. All states have accepted the federal grants, and the vast majority of states have begun to use those funds. One way that states can utilize grant funding to increase security is to purchase voting systems that allow for audits and recounts.

While much attention has recently been paid to how technology has introduced vulnerabilities into our elections process, there are numerous examples of the ways that it has also improved the voting experience for millions of Americans. HAVA stipulated that voters with disabilities must be able to vote privately and independently. “The recent emergence of ‘ballot-marking devices’ allows voters who are blind or have other disabilities to navigate a ballot using audio and tactile interfaces. Since 2002, 56 states plus the District of Columbia have moved toward a system of online voter registration, with many of those states allowing voters to check and update their registration via a single online portal rather than having to undertake a series of cumbersome trips to the county courthouse. But it’s the new technology of electronic pollbooks that offers the greatest potential to ease the voting process — providing directions to the right polling places, updating registrations on the spot, and even accommodating same-day registrations. Election officials have also started to employ wait-time measurement tools via websites and mobile apps to show voters when lines are shortest at a particular voting location. The key to improving the voting process is straightforward: expand accessibility while also prioritizing security.

The next steps in improving voting technology policies rest with election officials, state-level election boards, and voters. The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), which developed and approved voluntary standards for voting systems, distributed HAVA funds, and established best practices.

With the advent of the new law and the promise of new funding, more states made the move to electronic voting machines. These systems were developed by private-sector companies and were already in use in some jurisdictions, but large-scale purchases had been infrequent because of inadequate funding. That changed with HAVA. Jurisdictions used the new funds to purchase new equipment, but whether that equipment complied with election law was not entirely clear. At the same time, questions were emerging about paperless electronic voting equipment and whether it could be relied upon in a recount or audit. Some advocates of verified voting, inspired in part by then–Congressman Rush Holt (D-NJ), pushed for voter-verifiable paper audit trails (VVPATs), which are produced at the same time that an electronic vote is cast. Given that many jurisdictions had just purchased electronic voting machines with HAVA funds, there was some reluctance on the part of states of having to “go back to paper.” Efforts to pass Rep. Holt’s bill at the federal level failed, but his work to promote a paper backstop would have a lasting impact.

While many jurisdictions continued to purchase new paperless voting machines, efforts at the state level to promote optical-scan ballots or voter-verifiable paper records have gradually gained traction over the last decade, with a number of states passing laws requiring paper ballots. Many jurisdictions (with some notable exceptions) have adopted paper-based voting systems for most processes. For example, only five states (Delaware, Georgia, Louisiana, New Jersey, and South Carolina) did not produce a paper record associated with each individual vote cast in the 2018 midterm elections. Given these trends, the relatively small community of voting systems vendors has also adjusted its approach, and today there are almost no options to purchase paperless voting systems. (A steadier stream of funding could help establish a voting system “replacement cycle,” reducing the market’s reliance on the one-time purchases of machines and allowing vendors to focus more on research and development, while also lowering the cost per system.)

Enter the 2016 presidential election. While it is clear that there were foreign attempts to provoke and promote misinformation connected to the political campaign itself, there were also attempts to interfere with our voter registration and tabulation systems. Thankfully, much work has already been done to respond to these threats.

Many jurisdictions (with some notable exceptions) have adopted paper-based voting systems for most processes.
AFRICAN HISTORY, WRITTEN IN AFRICA

The African Humanities Program has built a vast community of engaged scholars — creating opportunities for intellectual exchange across the continent

By Aruna D’Souza

Site-Specific Doung Anwar Jahangeer, a Mauritian-born artist based in South Africa, was included in Ruth Simbao’s groundbreaking Making Way exhibition, showcasing artists from the Global South tackling questions of mobility. Part of Jahangeer’s project involved a performance, The Other Side with the Matebese Family (2012), which featured a special reddish-brown soil traditionally used by the Zulu people for self-adornment and protection from the sun. In the back of the 1820 Settlers Monument in Grahamstown, South Africa, the gazetteer, says Jahangeer, “welcomes this history into the present” — instead of taking down a monument to white colonialism, the artist modifies the sculpture to spark conversations about often-unquestioned aspects of the past. An art historian at Rhodes University whose research ranges widely from performance theory and the geopolitics of knowledge to “Western-driven theories of diaspora and globalization,” Simbao was a 2010 African Humanities Program fellow. (Images by Doung Anwar Jahangeer, Ruth Simbao)
The fellowships from the African Humanities Program, in 2011-2012, to Ama Tumusiime, an artist and senior lecturer in the Department of Visual Communication, Design and Multimedia at Makerere University in Kampala, Uganda, to do many things: take a year off from teaching to pursue her research on humanistic scholarship — in Tanzania, South Africa, Uganda. and institutions of higher education in Africa, and looking toward the future of the humanities on the continent.

Why the Humanities?

In the wake of decolonization across the African continent in the mid-20th century, political leaders of newly independent nations saw education as one of their most urgent priorities. How do you build the infrastructure and gain the knowledge — whether in medicine, science, engineering, economics, or a host of other scientific and technical fields — to improve the lives of their citizens? And, equally important, how do you attract a new, postcolonial generation of scholars — of its histories, its arts, its philosophies and literatures, its musical and cultural traditions — not only through the eyes of its colonizers, but by its own makers, scholars, and thinkers?

The answer to these questions involved investing heavily in higher education. Among countries in sub-Saharan Africa, between 10 percent and 25 percent of all government spending went toward education in the post-independence era, with up to a quarter of this amount dedicated to colleges and universities; even 50 years later, in African countries an average of 16 percent of all government spending goes to education, more than the U.S. (13 percent) and France (10 percent) of their nation’s gross domestic product. According to the United Nations in 1970s and 1980s, which many refer to as a “golden age” for higher education among African nations. But challenges emerged in the decades since — a combination of economic shocks, changes in government (including the rise of military-backed and authoritarian regimes), and debt crises leading to interventions by the World Bank and the IMF — that have taken their toll on tertiary education in Africa. A number of countries on the continent. Recent years have witnessed a movement “to build education, training and innovative ecosystems that have local relevance, global competitiveness and mutual recognition to enable us to equip the African citizenry with the necessary knowledge and skills needed to build the Africa we want,” said Sarah Agbor, chief executive officer of the African University. Speaking at a pan-African conference on education held in Niamey in April 2018, Agbor stressed, “Quality education is imperative to Africa. We have to attract this vision, generate home-grown solutions to African challenges, and participate fully in, and influence the global knowledge economy.”

However, this recommitment to higher education across a number of African nations has tended — as it has in the U.S. in recent years — to focus a vast proportion of research into networks of scholars, they deepen the role of the humanities in Africa while expanding AHP’s influence and effects. Now in its tenth year, the AHP is taking stock of its considerable achievements in supporting scholars and institutions of higher education in Africa, and looking toward the future of the humanities on the continent.
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Reinvigorating the Humanities

The African Humanities Program is one of a number of initiatives focused on shoring up humanities education in the face of such challenges. It emphasizes support for individual researchers in the hopes of strengthening and revitalizing institutions and scholarly networks. This has partly to do with its history, coming on the heels of similar ACLS initiatives in Central and Eastern Europe, according to Andrzej W. Tymowski, director of international programs at the American Council of Learned Societies. “The AHP emerged in the wake of another Carnegie-sponsored program, which was focused on the former Soviet Union. The broad purpose of both was similar — to support individuals in the humanities so that they could continue to build the scholarly infrastructure in their home countries.”

The choice to focus on individual researchers is especially crucial within the context of the region. Among the many challenges faced by the humanities in African tertiary education, the stresses placed on the shoulders of university lecturers and professors are near the top of the list. This is in part due to sheer demographic realities — as the population increases and as governments expand access to primary and secondary education, more and more students are pursuing degrees. In fact, university enrollment across all sub-Saharan African countries has grown from 181,000 in 1975 to approximately 8.8 million in 2016, while the number of higher education institutions grew from 170 in 1990 to more than 1,590 in 2014, according to UNESCO’s Institute for Statistics and the World Bank, respectively.

Many politicians and policymakers would like to see more students take STEM and other fields seen as relating directly to development goals in order to train a homegrown citizenry to confront economic, environmental, health-care, and other immediate concerns. But elementary and secondary training in STEM subjects is often lacking, and at the university level these courses of study are expensive to offer, making few seats available. As a consequence, many students end up taking humanities courses instead. This means bigger classes, more demands on lecturers, and less time for mentoring graduate students toward their PhDs, which in turn results in fewer and fewer qualified teachers completing their degrees and entering the academic pipeline, and even less time for research. Salaries for university lecturers are poor, research funding is hard to come by, and working conditions in general are challenging — prompting some of the most qualified researchers and thinkers to move abroad to better-resourced institutions, and others to risk professional stagnation by staying close to home. Financial constraints make traveling to international conferences in one’s field difficult, and the relative parochialism of the academic communities in the Global North means that few scholars outside Africa have access to, or cite the work of, their African peers, leading to intellectual isolation on both sides.

The result is startling: while Africa is home to 13.5 percent of the world’s population, it accounts for less than one percent of its scholarly output in the humanities, despite producing some of the world’s great public intellectuals and demonstrating — throughout the continent — a deep commitment to higher education.

Enriching the Scholarly Experience in Africa

Supporting humanities scholars in multiple ways, the AHP

• offers predoctoral and postdoctoral fellowships to individual scholars, allowing academics at different stages of their careers to take time away from teaching and administrative duties in order to complete their dissertations or the manuscripts of their first books
• works with the U.S. African Studies Association to sponsor scholars from the continent to travel to annual conferences, where they are able to present their work to an international audience and make connections with peers
• sponsors intensive manuscript development workshops and publishes a book series, helping select fellows get their scholarly contributions out in front of a global readership
• sponsors international regional meetings and colloquia, enabling scholars in Africa to develop networks for mentoring and intellectual exchange
• gives scholars the opportunity to do a residency outside of their home country at one of a number of residency centers in the five AHP countries as well as at the West African Research Center in Senegal, giving them the opportunity to focus on research and writing outside of the demands of day-to-day life and to meet peers and senior colleagues abroad

Moreover, although perhaps less easily measured, the support offered by the African Humanities Program allows ambitious scholars to imagine a professional life in Africa,
Both junior and senior scholars are able to travel within professorships. Thanks to the predoctoral fellowships, we have seen several tangible effects. “First, of course, it provides opportunities in myriad ways. Bertram Mapunda, who has been a core member of the African Humanities Program, created in partnership with the Association of African Universities, has long been involved in working to strengthen a number of universities in selected sub-Saharan countries. But the Corporation has also focused on more individual efforts, for example, the 1960s and 1970s, a period in the foundation’s history described by Patricia L. Rosenfeld in her book A World of Giving: Carnegie Corporation of New York — A Century of International Philanthropy as one of “energetic internationalism.” This involvement ramped up in the 1950s and 1960s, in concert with the rapid decolonization of many African nations. The Corporation worked with leaders of the newly independent states, while encouraging other donors and U.S. policymakers to pay attention to the region.”

“Along with the Ford and Rockefeller foundations,” notes Rosenfeld, “Carnegie Corporation recognized that you could not impose a particular worldview on newly developed and newly independent nations. They wanted to strengthen those nations so that they could participate actively in the world.”

In FY 2017–18, nearly 40 percent of the $356 million Carnegie Corporation of New York gave away was directed toward international activities, $55.8 million to African programs specifically. The Africa grantsmaking focuses on two broad areas: extending access to knowledge and ideas (including through the support of educational institutions and libraries), and the promotion of peace, democratic institutions, socioeconomic development, and international engagement.

“Starting in the 1920s, when there were not a lot of external donors in the African region, Carnegie Corporation’s grantsmaking was based on its mission, its programmatic interests, opportunities it identified through travel from site visits, and its experience in the United States,” says Rosenfeld. From the 1950s onwards, as more foundations and agencies began to support activities in the region, Carnegie Corporation focused on working with colleagues in African countries to identify under-addressed grantsmaking opportunities — areas where limited resources could make a significant difference. This meant, for example, a shift in the 1990s from broad-based funding of African universities to a more strategic focus on human capital within those institutions.

Turning Seaweed into Subsistence

Carnegie Corporation of New York has long been involved in working to strengthen a number of universities in selected sub-Saharan countries. But the Corporation has also focused on more individual efforts, for example, the 1960s and 1970s, a period in the foundation’s history described by Patricia L. Rosenfeld in her book A World of Giving: Carnegie Corporation of New York — A Century of International Philanthropy as one of “energetic internationalism.” This involvement ramped up in the 1950s and 1960s, in concert with the rapid decolonization of many African nations. The Corporation worked with leaders of the newly independent states, while encouraging other donors and U.S. policymakers to pay attention to the region.

When Andrew Carnegie established Carnegie Corporation of New York in 1911, the foundation focused on giving money to organizations in the United States. But the philanthropy quickly expanded its program to include the British dominions and colonies in Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the Caribbean, Asia, and Africa. The corporation’s notes that thanks to a history of colonization, many African universities tended to be oriented toward Europe and America, drawing their curricula, exams, external examiners, and other structures and traditions from outside the continent.

The impact of the African Humanities Program, including the communities it has generated, is already visible in myriad ways. Bertram Mapunda, who has been a core advisor to the AHP since the third year of the program, sees several tangible effects. “First, of course, it provides opportunities in myriad ways. Bertram Mapunda, who has been a core member of the African Humanities Program, created in partnership with the Association of African Universities, has long been involved in working to strengthen a number of universities in selected sub-Saharan countries. But the Corporation has also focused on more individual efforts, for example, the 1960s and 1970s, a period in the foundation’s history described by Patricia L. Rosenfeld in her book A World of Giving: Carnegie Corporation of New York — A Century of International Philanthropy as one of “energetic internationalism.” This involvement ramped up in the 1950s and 1960s, in concert with the rapid decolonization of many African nations. The Corporation worked with leaders of the newly independent states, while encouraging other donors and U.S. policymakers to pay attention to the region.”

“Along with the Ford and Rockefeller foundations,” notes Rosenfeld, “Carnegie Corporation recognized that you could not impose a particular worldview on newly developed and newly independent nations. They wanted to strengthen those nations so that they could participate actively in the world.”

In FY 2017–18, nearly 40 percent of the $356 million Carnegie Corporation of New York gave away was directed toward international activities, $55.8 million to African programs specifically. The Africa grantsmaking focuses on two broad areas: extending access to knowledge and ideas (including through the support of educational institutions and libraries), and the promotion of peace, democratic institutions, socioeconomic development, and international engagement.

“Starting in the 1920s, when there were not a lot of external donors in the African region, Carnegie Corporation’s grantsmaking was based on its mission, its programmatic interests, opportunities it identified through travel from site visits, and its experience in the United States,” says Rosenfeld. From the 1950s onwards, as more foundations and agencies began to support activities in the region, Carnegie Corporation focused on working with colleagues in African countries to identify under-addressed grantsmaking opportunities — areas where limited resources could make a significant difference. This meant, for example, a shift in the 1990s from broad-based funding of African universities to a more strategic focus on human capital within those institutions.
"Because the humanities study the natural human propensity to tell stories, it is easy to see why the humanities are crucial for understanding African cultures. The goal of the African Humanities Program is to encourage and enable Africans to tell their stories in as many ways and to as many audiences as possible."

— Andrzej W. Tymowski, American Council of Learned Societies

**Globalizing Knowledge**

One of the ways the African Humanities Program (AHP) is tackling this problem is by making excellent research from the continent available to a global academic readership, thanks to its African Humanities Series. Launched in 2014, the series was initially established by Sandra Barnes of the University of Pennsylvania and Kwesi Yankah, minister of higher education in Ghana. It has since developed under the guidance of Fred Hendricks, the Nigerian novel, notions of democracy in Africa, and Ghanaian boxing.

Making such studies available to a worldwide audience is crucial, notes philosopher Kwame Anthony Appiah, author of Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers (2006) and, most recently, The Lies That Bind: Rethinking Identity (2018). “In the humanities, more than in the natural sciences, African scholars have access to important material that is difficult to get access to except through them. Of course an African physicist must keep an eye on what’s going on in the European nuclear reactor or MIT. And if researchers in the South African observatory, but the details of physics don’t depend on where you are. But in the humanities, the details do depend on where you are. It’s a waste not to take advantage of that. We can’t do it right if we don’t have these voices as part of our understanding of the humanities. It’s not just politically correct to do so — it’s intellectually correct.”

One of these goals is to provide a platform for researchers in Africa to publish their work abroad, that does little to support the work of our peers in Africa.

Submissions are solicited from fellows of the AHP, and cover African histories, literatures, languages, and cultures. The series aims to publish work of the highest quality, foregrounding the best research being done by these emerging scholars.

Titles in the series include Gender Terrains in African Cinema by Dominica Diop, Makerere University, Uganda; What the Forest Told Me: Yoruba Hunter, Culture and Narrative Performance by Ayo Adeduntan, University of Ibadan, Nigeria; Nation, Power and Dissidence in Third Generation Nigerian Poetry in English by Saleem Badat, Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Nigeria; The Anglophone Literary–Linguistic Continuum: English and Indigenous Languages in African Literary Discourse by Michael Aduhinile, University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania; and Parading Respectability: The Cultural and Moral Aesthetics of the Christmas Bands Movement in the Western Cape, South Africa by Sylvia Bruinders, University of Cape Town, South Africa. In 2019 the series will continue with new titles on African intellectual history, the Nigerian novel, notions of democracy in Africa, and Ghanaian boxing.

AHP fellows, Art POWA (“Producing Our Words in Africa”) is a writing program advisors are enthusiastically passing along their expertise to their PhD students and peers in many ways. They’re organizing professional development workshops at their home institutions; they’re guiding next-generation and new-generation academics in grant writing and manuscript development; and they’re holding writing retreats. Such initiatives, often begun at the major research universities in the continent, are sometimes replicated at smaller institutions, expanding the reach and impact of the larger schools.

At Makerere University in Uganda, Angelo Kakande, chair of the Department of Industrial Art and Applied Design and a former AHP fellow, began conducting writing workshops for his students and colleagues. "When I returned from a manuscript development workshop in Dar es Salaam [Tanzania], I wanted to test out how someone else had done it in 22 weeks. I got the opportunity to introduce what I learned there to the doctoral students at the art school."

"There were students who had been writing their proposals for five or six years," notes Dr. Kizito Maria Kasule, dean of the school. "Since Dr. Kakande introduced this platform, we have been able, during the previous two or three years, to have about seven students who have successfully defended their PhD proposals or their doctoral theses. So I requested that he coordinate the PhD seminar."

Such efforts have resulted in a sharp uptick in published research. "The academic staff and students have published over 23 papers" since the workshops began, says Kasule. Furthermore, according to Dr. Henry Alimaatwe, principal at the College of Engineering, Design, Art and Technology at Makerere University, "Most of the faculty who have taken part in the manuscript development workshops have been promoted to the rank of senior lecturer" thanks to their increased scholarly output.

"In many ways and to as many audiences as possible.”

The Mellon Foundation’s work in Africa research initiative and comprising a significant number of former AHP fellows, Art POWA (“Producing Our Words in Africa”) is a writing and publishing network that aims to support African-based scholars whose work focuses on the visual arts. Contextual researchers are often separated by vast geographical distances, with few opportunities to convene in person. The Mellon-funded program allows them to participate in publishing workshops, share publications, and discover new opportunities to create connections with other engaged thinkers. CREDIT: ART POWA. PHOTO: KYANNA BROWN.

**African-Focused and Sustainable**

Funding for the African Humanities Program was to end in 2018. But at its December board meeting, Carnegie Corporation of New York approved an additional center- nary grant to ACLS to support the work of the AHP for a further three years, allowing its African partners to usher the program into its next phase of existence. "The goal now is to build on the network and mentoring successes of the AHP, so that in the near term it can become not only Africa-focused but also African-directed. The legacy of Carnegie funding would be, we hope, an autonomous and self-sustaining African Humanities Program," says ACLS’s Andrzej W. Tymowski.

"This means deploying the tremendous capital that has been accumulated by the program so far. The active community of AHP scholars can build bridges across the continent to catalyze intellectual exchanges," Tymowski continues. "Because the humanities study the natural human propensity to tell stories, it is easy to see why the humanities are crucial for understanding African cultures. The goal of the African Humanities Program is to encourage and enable Africans to tell their stories in as many ways and to as many audiences as possible."

The goal of centering the priorities of their African partners and achieving sustainability is also at the heart of another major funding initiative on the continent — The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation’s International Higher Education and Strategic Projects (IHESP) program, created in 2014 and headed by Saleem Badat. While the African Humanities Program offers fellowships to individual scholars, the Mellon Foundation’s work in the region focuses on supporting universities and other institutions — in South Africa (where Mellon has been working for 30 years), plus institutions in Uganda, Ghana, Egypt, Lebanon, and Senegal. "So what exactly do we
support?” asks Badat. “We support their priorities in the arts, humanities, and interpretive social sciences.”

This support may be in the form of research, faculty and graduate development initiatives at each individual university, collaborations with other institutions in their countries, and transnational collaborations with other institutions, located mainly in the Global South. It also includes building scholarly infrastructure, which could encompass the establishment of archives, digitization, library development, and the creation of graduate programs. (Physical infrastructure is not a priority for IHESSP, although the foundation has supported increasing internet bandwidth, a crucial prerequisite for scholarly research and one that is often lacking.)

Badat emphasizes that the work the Mellon Foundation does in supporting institutions in Africa is done with an eye to — and in conversation with — other agencies working in the field, including the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, the Ford Foundation, The Kresge Foundation, the Canadian International Development Research Centre, and Carnegie Corporation of New York. “We talk to each other about our grantmaking and experiences. We know each other. We know that we don’t need to put resources into certain areas because our colleagues at other agencies are doing that, so we can focus our attention where it makes sense to us and our mission. We meet regularly with Carnegie around the issues of questions of who we are supporting, and what issues are important. We share information and ideas, because we have a common commitment to helping build institutions in Africa and the Middle East.”

Badat was, after democracy in 1994, the first head of the policy advisory body to the South African minister of higher education, and served as vice chancellor of Rhodes University in South Africa before taking up his current role at the Mellon Foundation. He is pragmatic about what it means to promote, defend, and advance the arts and humanities — the mission of the Mellon Foundation — in the context of African nations: “Because of the particular history of Africa, and of countries shaped by colonialism and neocolonialism and by unequal economic relationships and trade, these societies have major challenges in addressing the legacies of colonialism and apartheid, inequality and poverty, and of creating and ensuring a better life for their citizens and their people. In that context, governments by and large devote much of their scarce resources to economic and social development, and to the STEM areas. So even when, on occasion, there is a recognition that the arts, humanities, and social sciences are important and not just for narrow developmental or instrumental purposes, the budgets simply are not adequate to sustain and support those areas.”

At the same time, Badat insists, sustainability is an issue: “A key challenge that the Mellon Foundation and anyone else working in this context has to contend with is how to provide support wisely, but also how to help leverage other support from states, the corporate sector, and other sources. Sustaining universities and the arts and humanities — which is the Mellon Foundation’s interest — cannot just be a philanthropic commitment. It has to be a larger commitment. So our grantmaking is constantly looking at how we may engage with universities and simultaneously engage with the state and other potential partners, and how we can build partnerships, so that ultimately we make progress both via Mellon support and the internal resources in each of these countries that can be galvanized and leveraged to support the arts and humanities.

“Any progressive funder has to constantly think about how you sustain initiatives, how you ensure that important programs and projects are institutionalized,” Badat continues. “Not to see themselves as the key and all-knowing actor. That kind of modesty is important if you wish to be a genuine development partner.”

Bertram Mapunda agrees that sustainability must be baked into the grantmaking — and for him, the three-year transition period that Carnegie Corporation is funding is a model: “It is important because it offers an opportunity for humanities scholars in Africa as well as their collaborators across the globe to ensure that the gains accrued over the past 10 years are not only sustainably maintained but multiplied.” He continues, “We need to turn the AHP into a full-funded Africa-based program, and to do that we need to make clear to the public, to our governments, and to private and public funders (both inside and outside of Africa) of its considerable achievements so that they will take over support. And we need to continue to develop the network of AHP alumni (both fellows and mentors) so that they become a united block that can then expand outwards, bringing others into the fold so that there is a real strength in numbers among humanities researchers across the continent.”

Several of the most ambitious foundation collaborations ever undertaken, the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa (PHEA) was the brainchild of the presidents of four prestigious American foundations at the turn of the 21st century, including Carnegie Corporation of New York’s Vartan Gregorian. As Fabrice Jaumont writes in his 2016 study of the initiative, the PHEA sought to support the “indispensable contribution of higher education to social and economic development” in Africa and accelerate the “processes of comprehensive modernization and strengthening of universities in selected countries.”

Spearheaded by the Ford Foundation, The Rockefeller Foundation, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, and Carnegie Corporation of New York (and later, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, The Kresge Foundation, and The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation), the endeavor emerged amid a new global push for development in Africa. Through coordinated investment in higher education, the PHEA sought nothing less than to, as Jaumont puts it, “unlock the talents of the continent for the well-being of its people and those beyond its borders.”

Carnegie’s Gregorian, who wrote the foreword to Jaumont’s study, cites the late Kofi Annan, former secretary-general of the United Nations, as “the primary source of inspiration” for the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa. The initiative, Gregorian stresses, “should not be considered an end, but a beginning and, we hope, an inspiration to those in the philanthropy, education, and development fields.”

Foundations have long played a central role in the development and sustenance of the social sector. Today, when federal funding for both education and international development take hold, philanthropic institutions, where the political will exists, may seek to partner in an effort of solidarity to fill potential funding gaps. The PHEA stands as a timely case study worthy of consultation.
How can we use Andrew Carnegie’s legacy today to strengthen the case for democracy and peace, as well as the values and institutions that uphold those ideals?

By David Nasaw
The Carnegie Peace-Building Conversations, a three-day program presented by Carnegie institutions worldwide and their partners, was held at the Peace Palace in The Hague in September 2018. Among the event’s roster of speakers, David Nasaw, the biographer of Andrew Carnegie and Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. Distinguished Professor of History at the CUNY Graduate Center, examined the great Scott’s legacy both historically and in terms of more recent developments. Here follow Professor Nasaw’s prepared remarks.

September 24, 2018 | The Hague, Netherlands

We are here today because that little man believed in evolution, in reason, in humanity.

We are here today because that little man had a big voice and the money to make himself heard and be taken account of.

We are here today to celebrate, learn from, and carry on the legacy of a child of the Scottish Enlightenment; a man of the 19th century, the century of light and progress; an optimist, a visionary, an advocate of peace activists ignored or ridiculed as utopians, cranks, dreamers — that little man dedicated himself and a good part of his fortune, his welfare, his health, and his reputation to campaigning for peace.

We are here today to celebrate, learn from, and carry on the legacy of a child of the Scottish Enlightenment; a man of the 19th century, the century of light and progress; an optimist, a visionary, an advocate of peace activists ignored or ridiculed as utopians, cranks, dreamers — that little man dedicated himself and a good part of his fortune, his welfare, his health, and his reputation to campaigning for peace.

Andrew Carnegie had learned from Herbert Spencer of the 19th century, the century of light and progress; an optimist, a visionary, an advocate of peace activists ignored or ridiculed as utopians, cranks, dreamers — that little man dedicated himself and a good part of his fortune, his welfare, his health, and his reputation to campaigning for peace. The early 19th-century peace movement did not end well — it was a victim of the Crimean War, of disagreements about what constituted good and bad conflicts, just and unjust wars, and of unresolved and perhaps unsolvable questions about whether the citizens of enslaved nations in Europe, like the Italians, had the right to fight for their freedom. This organized peace movement did not die — it instead entered on a new phase, one led by international lawyers and statesmen who argued that after centuries of warfare, peace would have to be built, step by step, through the creation of a body of international law and arbitration treaties that called for the peaceful resolution of disputes.

Peace, disarmament, and arbitration activists like Andrew Carnegie had, by the last quarter of the 19th century, come to believe that their cause was not only just, but achievable. They pointed, with pride and hope, to 1872 and the peacefully arbitrated resolution of the “Alabama Case,” which had pitted Great Britain against the United States over the American demand for compensation for the damage caused by British-built confederate warships, and to 1879, when the Americans and the British peaceably settled another dispute over the boundary line between Venezuela and British Guiana. “Truly,” Carnegie wrote Prime Minister Gladstone, arbitration as a substitute for war “seems to me the noblest question of our time.” The Americans and the British would set the example which the rest of the world would soon follow.

The scaffolding for a new, civilized world order was already in place — here, at The Hague, where a Permanent Court of Arbitration had been established at the international conference in 1899, called by Czar Nicholas II, and attended by the representatives of 27 nations. The promise of peace through arbitration at The Hague was affirmed when, in December 1902, President Theodore Roosevelt persuaded Britain, Germany, Italy, and Venezuela to submit their dispute over Venezuela’s refusal to arbitration, “and Theodore Roosevelt bounded into the list of those who will forever be hailed as supreme benefactors of man.” In a “New Year Greeting” published in the New York Tribune, Carnegie declared that Roosevelt, in “breathing life into the Hague tribunal, the permanent high court of humanity, for the peaceful settlement of international disputes,” had moved humanity a step closer toward the “continued banishment of the earth’s most revolting spectacle — human war — the killing of man by man.”... The complete banishment of war draws near. Its death wound dates from the day that President Roosevelt, in “breathing life into the Hague tribunal, the permanent high court of humanity, for the peaceful settlement of international disputes,” had moved humanity a step closer toward the “continued banishment of the earth’s most revolting spectacle — human war — the killing of man by man.”... The complete banishment of war draws near. Its death wound dates from the day that President Roosevelt, in “breathing life into the Hague tribunal, the permanent high court of humanity, for the peaceful settlement of international disputes,” had moved humanity a step closer toward the “continued banishment of the earth’s most revolting spectacle — human war — the killing of man by man.”... The complete banishment of war draws near. Its death wound dates from the day that President Roosevelt, in “breathing life into the Hague tribunal, the permanent high court of humanity, for the peaceful settlement of international disputes,” had moved humanity a step closer toward the “continued banishment of the earth’s most revolting spectacle — human war — the killing of man by man.”...

To celebrate the dawn of this new era, Carnegie, in April 1905, committed $1.5 million (about $43 million today) for the erection of a Peace Palace to house the Permanent Court of Arbitration and a library. Mankind was now set on the path to peace — and progress along it appeared inexorable. In October 1904, U.S. Secretary of State Hay issued a call for a second peace conference at The Hague. In June 1905, Japan and Russia ended hostilities and agreed to negotiate peace terms, with President Roosevelt as arbitrator, in Portsmouth, New Hampshire. Carnegie, buoyed by events, stepped up his personal and now full-time campaign for peace. In October 1905, in his second rectorial address at St. Andrews, he delivered an overly long treatise — how anyone sat through it is beyond me — on the history of peace activism, on the folly, the madness, the inhumanity of war, and the need to eliminate it from the face of the earth through “Peaceful Arbitration.” He urged his hearers, university students, to resist the clarion call to arms. There was no glory to be had by putting on a uniform and killing one’s fellow men. “We sometimes hear, in defense of war, that glory to be had by putting on a uniform and killing one’s fellow men. “We sometimes hear, in defense of war, that
“Although we no longer eat our fellow-men nor torture prisoners, nor sack cities killing their inhabitants, we still kill each other in war like barbarians. Only wild beasts are excusable for doing that in this, the twentieth century of the Christian era, for the crime of war is inhuman, since it decides in favor of the right, but always of the strong. The nation is criminal which refuses arbitration.”

— Andrew Carnegie, letter to the trustees of the Carnegie Peace Fund (which would become the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace), December 14, 1910

it develops the manly virtue of courage. This means only physical courage, which some animals and the lower order of savage men possess in the highest degree. According to this idea, the more man resembles the bulldog the higher he is developed as man.” It was to educate the public to the true meaning of courage, of heroism, that Carnegie had the year before created his Hero Funds. He was prouder of his Hero Fund than of any of his other endowments. “It grew out of his intense conviction,” his friend and one of the original commissioners Frederich Lynch insisted, “that it took just as much heroism to save life as it did to take it, whereas the man who took it got most of the recognition.”

“Most of the monuments in the world,” Carnegie had discovered, to his distaste, were “to somebody who has killed a lot of men. That is not heroism. His Hero Fund would call attention to, recognize, and reward the true heroes of the world.

With every utterance, Carnegie made new enemies and enflamed old ones. Teddy Roosevelt, whom Carnegie regarded as his partner in peace, was near apoplectic at the Scotman’s dismissal of the manly military virtues, at Carnegie’s delight that fewer and fewer young men appeared to be volunteering for military service, and his call on university men to resist putting on uniforms and defending their nations. In November 1906 he wrote Whitelaw Reid that he had tried hard to like Carnegie but it is pretty difficult. There is no type of man for whom I feel a more contemptuous abhorrence than for the one who makes a God of mere money-making and at the same time is always yelling out that kind of utterly stupid condemnation of war which in almost every case springs from a combination of defective physical courage, of unnaturally shrinking from pain and effort, and of hopeless idealism... It is as nusious folly to denounce war as it is to denounce business per se. Unrighteous war is a hideous evil, but I am not at all sure that it is worse evil than business unrighteousness.

Carnegie was undeterred by the criticisms, by the caricatures, by the insults to his manhood. What worried him was that, while mankind appeared to be progressing toward peace, there were fearful signs of war on the horizon. The British and the Germans were engaged in an escalating battle to build bigger and bigger dreadnoughts, with other nations now entering the fray. Though Carnegie Steel was making a fortune outfitting new battleships with steel armor, Carnegie insisted that armor was for defensive, not offensive, purposes. And, to his partners’ dismay, he campaigned for an end to this arms race.

Carnegie hoped and expected that the subject of disarmament would be discussed at the Second International Peace Conference in The Hague, which, after postem- nents, was scheduled to meet in June 1907, or at a disarmament conference in London, which he actively proposed and promoted. In the meantime, in preparation for the Hague conference, he took an active, oversized role in funding, organizing, and convening a massive and massively publicized meeting of the National Arbitration and Peace Congress at Carnegie Hall in April 1907.

The meeting was a triumph — but it was only a meeting, an exhortation, and a prayer. The real work of peace was to be accomplished at The Hague that summer. Carnegie was not content to leave the business of peacemaking to the delegates. In early June 1907 he attended Kaiser Wilhelm II’s annual regatta at Kiel in northern Germany, hoping that he would be able to arrange a personal meeting and a personal connection to the kaiser. He did not get much of a chance to do so — the kaiser was more interested in his yachts than in talking peace to the strange little Quoican Scotman about arbitration and The Hague.

From Kiel, Carnegie and his wife, Louise, boarded a special railroad car provided him by the kaiser, which, with the German government’s cooperation, arranged for his passage through to The Hague. He arrived — as a private citizen — while the conference was in process and spent the next few days as cheerleader and publicist. The second Hague conference, he would continue to meet through the fall, long after Carnegie had departed. The fact that little was accom- plished on naval disarmament, compulsory arbitration, a League of Peace, or the organization of an international police force neither deterred nor discouraged Carnegie. More nations had participated in 1907 than in 1899 and the conference had adjourned with a resolution to meet again, though no date was set for a third conference. (A date was eventually set: 1915, but by then it was far too late for peace. There would be no third peace conference at The Hague.)

Despite the failures of the second Hague conference, Carnegie remained confident that no to London to meet with the leaders of the British government to secure their approval. This grandest of schemes was derailed, temporarily, when on the eve of Roosevelt’s arrival in Berlin, Edward VII of Britain died, and all future diplomatic activity ground to a halt. But even had the king (who happened to be...
the Kaiser’s uncle) lived, Carnegie’s grand scheme was destined for failure. Roosevelt had no intention of doing his bidding.

“Carnegie... had been asking me to try to get the Emperor committed to universal arbitration and disarmament,” Roosevelt wrote his friend George Tevlyan in Britain. “Carnegie’s purposes as regards international peace are good, after a fashion, and not a little absurd.” Roosevelt refused to present the Kaiser with Carnegie’s “absurd” peace proposals. He indirectly raised the possibility of Germany’s slowing the naval arms race with Britain, but indicated he would not be disturbed if there were no movement towards disarmament. Roosevelt assured the Kaiser that he was “a practical man and in no sense a peace-at-any-price man.” Roosevelt not only failed to secure the agreement of the Kaiser to intervene on behalf of King Edward VII’s death and the hubbub over succession and the coronation of a new monarch, he glibly postponed and then canceled his meetings with the leaders of the ruling Liberal Party in Britain.

Carnegie’s plans had fallen flat — there would be no arbitration treaty, no disarmament conference in London, no League of Peace in The Hague. But he did not give up hope. Instead he shifted his focus from Europe to Washington, where he intervened, under the leadership of President Taft, to secure passage of a meaningful, near compulsory bilateral treaty of arbitration between the U.S. and Britain, a proposal which treaties would be negotiated with France, Germany, Russia, Italy, and Japan, culminating in the creation of a functioning League of Peace.

To help Taft get his proposal through the Senate, Carnegie organized — and donated $10 million dollars to establish — his “peace trust,” the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (CEIP). He named Elihu Root, former secretary of war and state and now senator from New York, as its first president. His letter to his trustee made clear that Carnegie, though he no longer exerted our fellow-men or torture prisoners, or sack cities killing their inhabitants, we still kill each other in war like barbarians. Only wild beasts are excusable for doing that in this, the twentieth century of the Christian era, for the crime of war is inherent, since it decides not in favor of the right, but in the Senate’s explicit approval. Teddy Roosevelt, now on the warpath against his successor, declared, in no uncertain terms, that the nation that pledged to arbitrate its differences would end up dishonored and impotent, like the man who, when his wife was assassinated, took the ruffian to court instead of attacking him on the spot. Carnegie wanted to fight back against Roosevelt and treaty opponents by launching a publicity campaign organized and funded by his new Endowment, but Elihu Root refused to do so. Carnegie did not argue — as a matter of principle, he did not overrule the men he had chosen to run his various philanthropic endeavors. Instead he took $10,000 of his own money to pay for clergymen to travel to Washington and lobby their senators. Again, his efforts came up short and Taft’s arbitration treaty bill was eviscerated by amendments.

Carnegie blamed Taft’s lack of political skills for the defeat, refusing to recognize the frightening insularity of America’s leaders. He had never paid much attention to public opinion, believing that he had the money and the skill to educate the public to his thinking. It was a fatal, terrible mistake to build peace from the top down, as Carnegie had attempted to do, without simultaneously working from the bottom up. His trust in the American public and in politicians — his optimism that they too were reasonable men and women — was falsely placed. There was work to be done — then and now — in the United States. He did not do it, but we must. As I wrote the final draft of this sketch, the front page of the New York Times carried an article, bylined The Hague: “On War Crimes, U.S. Sides with Detractors, Not Allies.”

The Hague conference had failed, Roosevelt’s mission for peace had ended in failure, and the treaties of arbitration which Taft had attempted to push through Congress had been destroyed by Congress. The arms race in Europe continued apace.

And still, the “Star-Spangled Scotman,” as he proudly called himself, refused to give up. In February 1914, bowing to Elihu Root’s wish to keep the Endowment out of political controversies, Carnegie endowed a second agency, the Church Peace Union (known today as the Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs) with $2 million, no less, with the understanding that it would take a more active role than the Endowment could. With the leaders of the new organization, an ecumenical group of churchmen, all peace activists, he planned an international conference to be held in Germany in August.

And then, the unthinkable. Carnegie, as had been his wont for decades, spent the summer of 1914 in Scotland, when, as he had predicted, the spark he had spent the last 20 years trying to extinguish took flame, and America was plunged into the conflict. The police of nations, the empires of Europe committed to violence to settle a local dispute between Austria and Serbia. His first task was to rescue the Church Peace Union delegates from Britain and the United States who had been trapped in Germany when war was declared. That accomplished, he returned to the United States and went immediately to Washington, where he implored President Wilson and the American government to do what it could to bring about some sort of peace agreement. He failed, the war ground on, the killing accelerated.

Carnegie celebrated his 70th birthday in November 1914. In December he predicted that if a League of Peace were not established at the end of the war now raging, the vanquished would rise up again to renew the cycle of bloodshed. In March 1915 he was asked in an interview with the New York Times if he had “lost faith in the peace impulse which centers at The Hague.”

“Certainly not. I verify believe that in this war exists the most impressive, perhaps the only argument which could induce humanity to abate forever the curse of military preparation and the inevitably resultant woe of conflict... This war stagers the imagination... I do not underestimate its horror, but I hope, and I believe that this very horrible, barbaric excess will so revolt human nature against all who, of the kind that the reaction will be great enough to carry us into the realms of reason. And the realms of reason are the realms of peace.”

This was to be his last interview.

He retreated into silence, stopped writing, seeing visitors, speaking, corresponding; his live topped few papers. His friends were distraught, as, of course, was Louise, his wife, who did not recognize the once verbal, active little man who could not stop talking. They were convinced he had suffered some sort of a nervous break-down, brought about by his failure to do anything to stop the Great War. The Supreme optimist had in the end been defeated by the reality of man’s inhumanity to man. Wilson had ceased to communicate with the world around him.

On November 10, 1918, the day before the armistice was signed ending World War I, he took up pen again to write a last letter to Woodrow Wilson. “Now that the world war seems practically at an end I cannot refrain from sending you my heartfelt congratulations upon the great step you have had in bringing about its successful conclusion. The Palace of Peace at the Hague would, I think, be the fitting place for passionate discussion regarding the destiny of the conquered nations, and I hope your influence may be exerted in that direction.”

Wilson’s response was generous. “I know your heart must rejoice at the dawn of peace after these terrible years of struggle, for I know how long and earnestly you have worked for and desired such conditions as I pray God it may now be possible for us to establish.” While Wilson did not know where the peace talks would be held (they would end up at Versailles, not The Hague), he was sure that Carnegie would “be present in spirit.”

And Woodrow Wilson may have been right.

We are here today because Andrew Carnegie remains with us in spirit. He was a man of the 19th century who hoped for the better in the 20th century, who would not be satisfied until the two decades into the 21st. Might we not take something away from Andrew Carnegie’s crusade for peace, failed though it was. Let us put our nation’s grand Palace of Peace, and look back across the desolate dark century that has passed, the world wars, the genocides, the killing fields. Without forgetting the horrors of our own war, let us commit our hearts and minds to build a lasting peace, let us remember, celebrate, and build upon this little man’s dreams. Let us renew, with him, our commitment to work towards a future when reason and human-kind take the final step forward on the path from barbarism to civilization.
The architectural competition to design a temple of peace for the entire world

By Fred A. Bernstein
The magnificent Peace Palace in The Hague, Netherlands, built and endowed by Andrew Carnegie, serves as testament to the American philanthropist’s unshakable belief that for the progress of mankind, the tide had turned at last, and that “even the smallest further step taken in any peace-ful direction would soon lead to successive steps afterward.”

ig philanthropic initiatives on peace and security have become few and far between, according to a recent article in the Nation, ruefully titled “You Never Give Me Your Money.” Carnegie Corporation of New York’s Stephen Del Rosso told the Nation in a 1905 speech to the students at the University of St. Andrews in Scotland: “A tribunal is now at hand to judge wisely and deliver righteous judgment between nations.”

In 1913 Carnegie spoke at the dedication of the Peace Palace, the structure designed as the permanent home for the Court of Arbitration. Financed by Carnegie, it “became the physical manifestation of his desire to bring about world peace, the same desire that fuels the Corporation’s work today,” says Del Rosso, program director for international programs. The Palace now accommodates not only the arbitration court and its programs build on Andrew Carnegie’s efforts to banish war, which he called “the earth’s most revolting spectacle.”

Perhaps Andrew Carnegie’s most tangible such effort was the building of a home in The Hague for the Permanent Court of Arbitration, an intergovernmental organization created in 1899. “At last there is no excuse for war,” Carnegie said of the court in a 1905 speech to the students at the University of St. Andrews in Scotland. “A tribunal is now at hand to judge wisely and deliver righteous judgment between nations.”

To ensure that the building would be as lofty as its mission, planners held an architectural competition — a tradition dating back at least to 1429, when Filippo Brunelleschi was selected to design the dome of the famed Cathedral of Florence in Florence. By the 20th century, architectural competitions had become de rigueur for significant public projects. The Peace Palace competition presaged several better-known contests: in 1949, Nero Saarinen’s design for the Gateway Arch, on the St. Louis waterfront, was chosen from among 172 entries (including one submitted by his father, Eliel Saarinen). And in 1957, Jørn Utzon, a young Danish architect, triumphed in a competition to design the Sydney Opera House, known for its iconic, sail-like roofs. Tellingly, the Florence cathedral, the Gateway Arch, and the Sydney Opera House are among the world’s most recognizable structures.

Because the court had no home of its own, in 1900 Russian diplomat Frieder de Martens traveled to Berlin to enlist the aid of the U.S. Secretary of International Court of Justice (the principal judicial arm of the United Nations, commonly known as the World Court), as well as an international law academy and a research library holding the world’s largest collection of materials on international peace and justice. He asked the Carnegie Corporation to build a permanent home for the Permanent Court of Arbitration, an intergovernmental organization created in 1899. “At last there is no excuse for war,” Carnegie said of the court in a 1905 speech to the students at the University of St. Andrews in Scotland. “A tribunal is now at hand to judge wisely and deliver righteous judgment between nations.”

In 1913 Carnegie spoke at the dedication of the Peace Palace, the structure designed as the permanent home for the Court of Arbitration. Financed by Carnegie, it “became the physical manifestation of his desire to bring about world peace, the same desire that fuels the Corporation’s work today,” says Del Rosso, program director for international programs. The Palace now accommodates not only the arbitration court and its programs build on Andrew Carnegie’s efforts to banish war, which he called “the earth’s most revolting spectacle.”

Perhaps Andrew Carnegie’s most tangible such effort was the building of a home in The Hague for the Permanent Court of Arbitration, an intergovernmental organization created in 1899. “At last there is no excuse for war,” Carnegie said of the court in a 1905 speech to the students at the University of St. Andrews in Scotland. “A tribunal is now at hand to judge wisely and deliver righteous judgment between nations.”

To ensure that the building would be as lofty as its mission, planners held an architectural competition — a tradition dating back at least to 1429, when Filippo Brunelleschi was selected to design the dome of the famed Cathedral of Florence in Florence. By the 20th century, architectural competitions had become de rigueur for significant public projects. The Peace Palace competition presaged several better-known contests: in 1949, Nero Saarinen’s design for the Gateway Arch, on the St. Louis waterfront, was chosen from among 172 entries (including one submitted by his father, Eliel Saarinen). And in 1957, Jørn Utzon, a young Danish architect, triumphed in a competition to design the Sydney Opera House, known for its iconic, sail-like roofs. Tellingly, the Florence cathedral, the Gateway Arch, and the Sydney Opera House are among the world’s most recognizable structures.

Because the court had no home of its own, in 1900 Russian diplomat Frieder de Martens traveled to Berlin to enlist the aid of the U.S. Secretary of International Court of Justice (the principal judicial arm of the United Nations, commonly known as the World Court), as well as an international law academy and a research library holding the world’s largest collection of materials on international peace and justice. He asked the Carnegie Corporation to build a permanent home for the Permanent Court of Arbitration, an intergovernmental organization created in 1899. “At last there is no excuse for war,” Carnegie said of the court in a 1905 speech to the students at the University of St. Andrews in Scotland. “A tribunal is now at hand to judge wisely and deliver righteous judgment between nations.”

In 1913 Carnegie spoke at the dedication of the Peace Palace, the structure designed as the permanent home for the Court of Arbitration. Financed by Carnegie, it “became the physical manifestation of his desire to bring about world peace, the same desire that fuels the Corporation’s work today,” says Del Rosso, program director for international programs. The Peace Palace was only the first of many commissions for Rosse, who enjoys the distinction of being the first Dutchman to win an Oscar — for his art direction of the 1950’s “King of Jazz.” And on a personal “note” he met his future wife, Sophia Luyt, at the Peace Palace, where she was an assistant to Thomas Mawson.

Eventually, the Carnegie Foundation Board decided on a competition that was both open and closed. It would be international — as befits an organization dedicated to world unity — but limited to entrants nominated by the 26 countries that took part in the 1899 Hague Convention. (The single exception was the nomination of American architects, which was left to Carnegie himself; he chose Peabody & Starns of Boston and Carrère & Hastings of New York.) The Foundation board, besieged by requests from foreign architects and their professional associations that the competition be open to anyone, eventually relented, although only the invited firms were paid a stipend for participating.

Another issue in architecture competitions is whether to solicit fully developed designs or more conceptual sketches. The former approach, requiring hundreds of hours of work, might discourage all but the best-funded practitioners. The latter, a so-called ideas competition, may result in the choice of an exciting scheme by an architect who then turns out to have little practical experience.

In this case, the board set the bar very high: the “Peace Palace for the Architectural Plan of the Peace Palace for the Use of the Permanent Court of Arbitration with a Library,” distributed worldwide on August 15, 1905, informed architects that they had seven months to produce plans, elevations, sections, and perspectives for a finished structure meeting hundreds of precise requirements. The process proved overwhelming, and, as the deadline approached, the participating archi-tects were granted an extra month. More than 200 entries arrived by the (revised) deadline, October 15, 1906. The six jurors (chosen by the Carnegie Foundation board) included the president-elect of the

The first thing the organizers of an architectural contest must decide is whether to allow all architects, or only a preselected group, to enter an open call may bring a flood of submissions, but few from established architects (who are likely to be deterred by the low odds of winning). Conversely, an “invited competition” would exclude lesser-known architects who might have the most original ideas. In the case of the Peace Palace, an additional question arose: Should the competition be limited to Dutch architects, as the Royal Institute of Dutch Architects demanded at the time, or should it be open to architects of any nationality, the view — not insignificantly — of Andrew Carnegie himself?

Eventually, the Carnegie Foundation Board decided on a competition that was both open and closed. It would be international — as befits an organization dedicated to world unity — but limited to entrants nominated by the 26 countries that took part in the 1899 Hague Convention. (The single exception was the nomination of American architects, which was left to Carnegie himself; he chose Peabody & Starns of Boston and Carrère & Hastings of New York.) The Foundation board, besieged by requests from foreign architects and their professional associations that the competition be open to anyone, eventually relented, although only the invited firms were paid a stipend for participating.

Another issue in architecture competitions is whether to solicit fully developed designs or more conceptual sketches. The former approach, requiring hundreds of hours of work, might discourage all but the best-funded practitioners. The latter, a so-called ideas competition, may result in the choice of an exciting scheme by an architect who then turns out to have little practical experience.

In this case, the board set the bar very high: the “Peace Palace for the Architectural Plan of the Peace Palace for the Use of the Permanent Court of Arbitration with a Library,” distributed worldwide on August 15, 1905, informed architects that they had seven months to produce plans, elevations, sections, and perspectives for a finished structure meeting hundreds of precise requirements. The process proved overwhelming, and, as the deadline approached, the participating archi-tects were granted an extra month. More than 200 entries arrived by the (revised) deadline, October 15, 1906. The six jurors (chosen by the Carnegie Foundation board) included the president-elect of the
Altogether, the entries comprised more than 3,000 drawings — so many it was hard to find a place to hang them, until Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands offered the walls of her Kneuterdijk Palace. There, in May, after reviewing the proposals privately, the jurors convened to pick a winner. They began by naming their favorite projects. Forty-four plans received at least one nod, and thus qualified for further discussion. The field was eventually narrowed to 16. Several jurors were unsatisfied with the pool of entries and suggested, to no avail, that the contest be reopened.

The jury took a final vote on May 11. In first place was Cordonnier’s scheme for separate courthouse and library buildings connected by a corridor, with four large corner towers, all in a richly decorated, neo-Renaissance mien. The jury, in a written statement, praised the design for “following the local traditions of XVI Century architecture.” But Eyffinger succinctly notes that this was not the case. “Cordonnier’s design,” he writes, “was in no way linked to Dutch tradition.”

“Why on earth the 16th-century style?” one critic asked mockingly. “Is it because Holland was engaged in war (with Spain) most of that period?” (In 1897, shortly after announcing the winning entry, board members traveled to Dunkirk, France, to see that architect’s town hall. That building so closely resembled Cordonnier’s Peace Palace design that, in Eyffinger’s words, the board members might have felt “downright cheated by the plagiarism.”)

Moreover, Cordonnier, busy at his office in Lille, had little regular visits. The board persuaded him to collaborate to Dunkirk, France, to see that architect’s town hall. That building so closely resembled Cordonnier’s Peace Palace design that, in Eyffinger’s words, the board members might have felt “downright cheated by the plagiarism.”

Moreover, Cordonnier, busy at his office in Lille, had little interest in relocating to The Hague, or even in making the contest. The building now a 234-foot square surrounding a courtyard of 102 by 132 feet, was exactly a creative genius.” The building, now a 234-foot square surrounding a courtyard of 102 by 132 feet, was not universally beloved in its time. Reviewing the finished creation of the Peace Palace. But then, in a manner of speaking, he almost destroyed it: the urn (together with its base) weighs an incredible 3,200 kilograms; the builder had to reinforce the concrete floor before it could be installed. Gold embellishments include the double-headed eagle insignia of the Romanovs. PHOTO: © CARNEGIE FOUNDATION – PEACE PALACE.

The huge jasper vase in the entrance chamber to the small courtroom was a gift from Czar Nicholas II, whose initiative led to the creation of the Peace Palace. But then, in a manner of speaking, he almost destroyed it: the urn (together with its base) weighs an incredible 3,200 kilograms; the builder had to reinforce the concrete floor before it could be installed. Gold embellishments include the double-headed eagle insignia of the Romanovs. PHOTO: © CARNEGIE FOUNDATION – PEACE PALACE.
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This handsome watercolor rendering is part of the submission that won Louis-Marie Cordonnier the Peace Palace commission. But sticking
With Andrew Carnegie's budget meant eliminating many of the flourishes of the original design. Cordonnier's four corner towers were reduced to two — the
highest of which was adorned with a clock donated by Switzerland — and the ornamentation was simplified considerably by the project’s “executive archi-
tect,” Johan van der Steur. PHOTO: © CARNEGIE FOUNDATION – PEACE PALACE

EVEN with the simplified design, the board had to ask
Carnegie for additional funds — which led to his belated
discovery that a brick-and-mortar library was to be a
major part of the building. (When he initially offered
to provide the funds for a library at the Peace Palace,
Carnegie explained, he had meant a collection of books,
not a library structure.) “I am positively wounded…. To
speak of ‘The Library and Court of Arbitration’ is as if a
bereaved husband were to ask plans for a sacred shrine
to ‘my nephew and my dear wife,'” Carnegie wrote in
a letter to David Jayne Hill, the U.S. minister in The
Hague. However, through an exchange of letters and some
personal diplomacy, matters were eventually smoothed
over.

Meanwhile, work proceeded in the van der Steur offices.
The Peace Palace’s cornerstone was laid on July 30, 1907,
during the Second International Peace Conference, which
was held, like the first conference (1899), in The Hague.
This symbolic act preceded the actual groundbreaking
by months, and splendid gifts soon began pouring in
from around the world. The Russian czar sent an ornate
and very grand vase — so heavy that the floor below it
needed reinforcement. America’s offering was perhaps
less impressive, although today the marble figure of Peace
Through Justice is given pride of place at the top of the
great staircase in the main entry hall, greeting visitors to
the Palace in her own way. As Efftinger, the Dutch histo-
rian, explains wryly:

America’s official gift was the marble statue repre-
senting Peace Through Justice, as it was named. After
WWI, with President Wilson furious at the profit-
able neutrality of the Dutch during the war, the U.S.
Congress did not vote in favor of a gift to the Peace
Palace, and the statue (by Andrew O’Connor, and not
produced until 1924) will initially have been meant
for different purposes altogether. The marble lady of
peace wears a wedding ring and has hands like show-
els. Perhaps the records of O’Connor’s life will tell you
more of the provenance of the statue!

The result is an edifice rich in allegorical detail and meta-
phorical allusion. Here’s de Boer, the guidebook author,
Describing just a bit of the decor of the Great Hall
of Justice, the nobly proportioned and beautifully appointed
room in which the International Court of Justice sits in
session:

Remarkable for this room are its four stained-glass
windows, which are a present of Great Britain. They
were painted by Douglas Strachan and represent the
development of mankind from its primitive days
to the period when war as a means of international
politics will have been banished. The painting by
Albert Bernard is a gift from France. It represents a
young woman separating two horsemen to prevent
their fighting, while the men standing on the rocks are
trying to settle their dispute by arbitration.

A grand opening was scheduled for August 1913, a
month during which peace conferences were held throughout
The Hague. As Efftinger writes in The Peace Palace, “All in all,
It looked very much as if the whole universe of pacifism
had gravitated to The Hague — indeed, the atmosphere
was that of a joyful world reunion.” The high point came
on August 28, as hundreds of dignitaries turned out for
the inauguration of the Peace Palace. Old world met new,
with Andrew Carnegie bowing deeply to the Dutch queen.
However, as Efftinger observes, to the Dutch public that
day, it was Andrew Carnegie who was visiting royalty,
likening his ride to the Peace Palace to a Fifth Avenue
ticker-tape parade. Carnegie was profoundly moved by the
taking his turn at the lectern that day, Carnegie predicted
that the end of war was “as certain to come, and come
soon, as day follows night.”

Tragically, Carnegie’s certainty did not become a reality.
Exactly 11 months to the day after the opening of the Peace
Palace, World War I — “the war to end all wars” — erupted
when Austria-Hungary declared war on Serbia. All seemed
hopeless.

And yet …

The Peace Palace endures, and the seemingly never-ending
work of the world’s peacebuilders continues.

In late September 2018, at the Peace Palace, Carnegie
PeaceBuilding Conversations connected leading stakehold-
ers from various backgrounds and generations, including
underrepresented players and those directly affected
by conflict and war. Presented by Carnegie institutions
worldwide and their partners, the three-day program was
designed to generate unexpected insights and routes for
progress in promoting world peace.

At the closing event, held in the Great Hall of Justice, the
winners of two notable peace prizes were announced and
their extraordinary achievements celebrated. Youth-led
organization BoqArt received the first Youth Carnegie
Peace Prize for its “Letters of Reconciliation” project,
which creates a dialogue between disconnected groups
in Colombia, addressing the challenges of promoting youth
participation in peace transition processes. For Leonardo
Párraga, BoqArt executive director, the prize is “a direct
demonstration of the power that the youth have to trans-
form conflict and build sustainable peace.”

War correspondent Rudi Vranckx, winner of the 2018
Carnegie Wateler Peace Prize, has for more than three
decades put his life on the line to give voice to people
caught in some of the most dangerous conflict areas in
the world. “Every word has consequences,” Vranckx reminded
the audience. “Every silence does too. Silence is not an
option.”

Again, old world met new. Next-generation peacebuilders
are ready. Dr. Bernard R. Bot, chairman of the Carnegie
Foundation—Peace Palace, forcefully invoked Andrew
Carnegie, who made both the Peace Palace and the
Carnegie Foundation tangible realities. “In all his ideas,
he was dominated by an intense belief in the future, in
progress, in education, and in a future without war. His
spirit as well as his faith in the ability of individuals to
better themselves, and thus the world, is a beacon of light for future generations to follow.”

Carnegie Wateler Peace Prize winners Rudi Vranckx
(left) and Leonardo Párraga. PHOTO: © CARNEGIE FOUNDATION – PEACE PALACE
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NOW, DON’T BE SPOOKED!

The quantum revolution rolls on, and philanthropy is falling behind

By Stephen Del Rosso
Quantum discovery could create superpowerful satellites, cameras, and sensors and interlink their data with historical information and on-the-ground observers in real time for battlefield use. It could crack encrypted data almost instantly and create far better encryption methods. It could also, in the wrong hands, undermine our democracy by flooding our information systems with "fake news" to mislead and control a population.

As I noted previously, investments are pouring in on the technology side—from tech behemoths like Microsoft, Google, and IBM; from major universities; from federal agencies, including NASA and the National Security Agency; from public- and private-sector players, most prominently in China, but also in Australia, Canada, Europe, and elsewhere. The Department of Energy's 2019 budget proposal allocates $565 million to quantum investigation, citing the "emerging urgency of building U.S. competency and competitiveness" in the field. All these public and private players are clamoring to develop a fully functional quantum computer, and in the process, they are finding all kinds of new quantum angles to explore.

Still, despite the huge implications of all this curious activity, the public scarcely knows the field exists beyond vague and often hyperbolic references in popular culture. Foundations are no further along.

Modest Support at Best
As quantum technology evolves at unprecedented speed, philanthropy lags in fostering appreciation for its impact and its potential for both good and ill. Much useful research needs to be done, but social scientists have not generated many projects on this theme. If anyone should be helping scholars and analysts make sense of all this for the rest of the population, it's us.

But foundations are just not playing their part. The most recent survey of the 65-member Peace and Security Funders Group showed $7 million in annual grantmaking on nuclear issues and tens of millions more on a host of other security challenges, from peacebuilding to counterterrorism. Quantum study did not even merit a category. Carnegie's own support for this work remains modest, an attempt to maintain momentum in hopes that others will join in.

There is encouraging news from the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation, which last month announced a $65 million investment over six years for research in "quantum materials" — an important but esoteric subfield that explores ways in which quantum properties can be applied to new technologies — on top of nearly $800 million it had already committed.
A heartwarming documentary that shows how, in America, a UNITED COMMUNITY can conquer tragedy and hate

AMERICAN BEAT
Cops and Refugees Join Forces in Boise

This award-winning film weaves together three stories that rise above the divisive politics of immigration: the groundbreaking efforts of Boise police officers to integrate and mentor refugees; the determination of a former Iraqi translator for the U.S. military who is putting down roots in a new country with his family and dreaming of becoming a police officer; and a portrait of Boise itself, coming together to welcome refugees from war-ravaged parts of the world. “It’s hard to effect cultural change,” as Boise police officer Randy Arthur puts it, “but it can be done and it’s got to start somewhere. It might as well start with us.” Watch the film at: AmericanBeatDocumentary.org

soon, if ever. That’s because, unlike classical physics, there is nothing in the observable world that can duplicate quantum behavior. Objects at the subatomic level have no definite state before they are measured; it’s something that confounded even Einstein.

So, a key remaining challenge is how to design a theoretically rigorous and empirically driven research agenda for quantum issues, despite their essentially impenetrable nature. How can a grant proposal be written to persuade a foundation that the implications of this fuzzy phenomenon warrant study and support, given the myriad other security challenges facing the world?

The latest developments in new quantum technologies suggest a rich and consequential research agenda that awaits further investigation and investment. Beyond studies that probe the implications of quantum applications, quantum perspectives — with their counterintuitive reality and recognition of entanglement across time and space — can loosen rigid modes of thinking and help us make sense of the burgeoning international peace and security agenda. Phenomena such as terrorism and populism demonstrate that events in one country can affect those in another. These quantum-like characteristics don’t fit traditional models.

Philanthropy is in an ideal position to support research that applies new, quantum-informed ways of thinking to this agenda. At the same time, it can help explore whether social science can anticipate and suggest responses to a world in which quantum-fueled technologies begin to outpace governmental and even human control. We ignore these questions, and fail to answer them, at our peril.

Despite my initial failure to win converts to this view, I continue to believe that my fellow grantmakers will one day share my zeal and find other entry points into the mysteries of quantum. I will remain an evangelist for this cause, even if that requires a leap of faith on my part — quantum or otherwise.

Scholars and practitioners of the arts all across the continent are transforming the ways their histories, past and present, are told.

Africa is a continent of 54 nation states, more than 1,500 languages, and roughly 3,000 ethnic groups, making it the most diverse and culturally rich place on earth. It is impossible to speak of it as a singularity. This is why many scholars on the continent refer not to African art, but to the arts of Africa when speaking of the visual and material cultures produced across a vast range of eras, spaces, and traditions.

While much writing on the arts of Africa is produced outside of the continent, especially in the U.S. — *African Arts*, the most important journal in the field, is published by UCLA with MIT Press, for example — there is a growing network of Africa-based scholars who are working to develop an African-centric approach to understanding the arts produced there, both historical and contemporary.

For some, this means challenging and transforming long-entrenched art historical curricula in the academy. Others are delving deep into histories of gender, race, inequality, colonial power, material culture, sociopolitical economy, and more to deepen their own artwork. And yet others are developing and supporting new generations of scholars who will join in the efforts to rewrite the history of the arts in Africa — in Africa itself.

Here are some of those researchers, scholars, and artists, all alumni of the African Humanities Program (AHP), a partnership of the American Council of Learned Societies and Carnegie Corporation of New York that, since 2008, has been working to reinvigorate the humanities in Africa through fellowship competitions and related activities. These thinkers and makers are telling new stories about some of the myriad cultural forms, past and present, that are shaping — and reshaping — the lived experience of contemporary Africa. Art POWA, the recently established network of Africa-based scholars whose work focuses on the visual arts, put the message right in their name: Producing Our Words in Africa.
Eyitayo Tolulope Ijisakin
Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria
2015 and 2018 African Humanities Program Fellow

A Nigerian artist and art historian offers the first comprehensive study of printmaking in his country

I benefited from two fellowships from the AHP (one predoctoral fellowship, the other postdoctoral): an AHP Manuscript Development Workshop in Ghana and an AHP residency at the International Institute for the Advanced Study of Cultures, Institutions, and Economic Enterprises at the University of Ghana in Accra. I am presently using my postdoctoral fellowship to rework my PhD dissertation into a book on the evolution and development of printmaking in Nigeria, with a view to extending the frontiers of knowledge on art history in my country. As a printmaker myself, this knowledge also deepens my own work in the medium, and allows me to place my practice in a larger context.

Compared to sculpture and painting traditions, printmaking practices in Nigeria have been grossly neglected, with very little available literature to draw on — a few exhibition catalogues, scanty newspaper reviews, and autobiographical sketches here and there. No single text exists to tell the story of how printmaking evolved in the country, to note the landmark events, to identify printmakers and their techniques, and to assess their significant contributions to the development of contemporary art praxis in Nigeria.

Collecting data for my study was almost overwhelming. Literature was scarce, and I had to track down individual printmakers all across the country — in the end, I identified 220 practitioners! Many of these … well, I met and interviewed some of them one-on-one — at the Harmattan Workshop (a meeting point for visual artists from across Nigeria and abroad). I met others in their homes or studios, or I spoke with them by phone. My work argues that Nigerian printmaking artists — appropriating cultural heritage, aesthetics, and sociopolitical thoughts from their environment — are defining new perspectives of national identity.

Eyitayo Tolulope Ijisakin’s ongoing study of the history of Nigerian printmaking was born of and continues to shape his own work as an artist. His collagraph print African Bride (2007) incorporates a complex symbolic and coloristic language to represent Yoruba conceptions of the role women are expected to play in marriage. (courtesy of the artist)
A South African artist and researcher uses colonial photographs to highlight the deep history of South Africa’s ethnic divisions

Often when one presents oneself as an African artist, the question of ethnic background arises — are you a Zulu artist or a Xhosa artist? But we live in such a complex time, and ethnic identities are complicated and fluid — they don’t necessarily define you. My creative research focuses on the representation of ethnic identities in colonial photographs and in museums. My work is a response to the ways in which ethnic divisions in South Africa were constructed under colonialism through British Indirect Rule, and later through Apartheid policies established to create Bantustans (homelands) that separated races and ethnic groups.

The colonial photographs I used in the Self-Portrait Project series were presented as scientific evidence, documenting different ‘tribes’ of the Zulu people or Xhosa people and so on. They are often labeled with the titles of the ethnic group that’s being represented or they have classification numbers. Many of them were made in photographic studios, with people posed in front of painted backdrops. These so-called documentary photographs are actually fictitious works, rooted in the colonial imagination — fantastic fictions of the colonial archives that were presented as truth.

During that research, I was also interested in how museums are organized. I focused specifically on a museum in Grahamstown, where I used to live, that was divided into two sections — it had a Xhosa side and a British settler side. On the British side, objects were associated with specific names. But on the Xhosa side, things were only identified by ethnicity — ‘Xhosa beaded skirt,’ for example. By locking people into ethnic categories, museums tend to reduce complex sociopolitical identities into these static, ethnic identities. In the museum, we cease to be human. How is it possible to subvert and rewrite the political implications of these photographs, which are part of our history and our collective memory? Of what use are they to contemporary politics? Of what use are the tools of memory if they serve a denigrating history?

Even though it is my body depicted in these works, rather than being explorations of the self, the project explores the representation of African women. Colonial photography is the documentation of violation and the terror of dispossession. Reenacting these scenes brought me closer to this terror. For me, the past is living memory — this work is a way of coming to terms with the persistence of the same repressive structures.
A Nigerian art historian changes the narrative by writing about women artists

When I was deciding on my dissertation, someone said to me, ‘You are a woman, and most women artists in Nigeria have not been researched at all. Who will do that? Who will change that narrative if not other women?’ And so I decided to write on two artists, Nnenna Okore and Lucy Azubuike. What interested me was that they had diverse themes in their art — while Okore was interested in repurposing waste into valuable works of art, Azubuike was using photography to talk about female degradation and other subjects. But at the same time, there was a connection between their practices: I see their works as forms of visual activism.

Okore uses discarded materials like jute, paper, plastic, and fired clay to create works that talk about consumerism. And there is another dimension, too, because these materials degenerate over time, so the artwork goes through a process that is sort of like the life of a person: it’s created, it ages, and eventually it ‘dies.’ In that sense, the work reflects an African concept of ancestral existence, which connects the past with the present, and the living with the dead.

In fact, some of Okore’s works use the concept of the ancestral emissary or messenger — an entity that links the ancestors and communicates between the dead and the living in many African cultures. My writing on Okore tries to connect the materials she uses with these traditional notions. Usually these ideas are the purview of men in Nigeria — it’s men who create, produce, and practice these roles. But now, she’s able to claim this aesthetic in her art, and create her own vision of it. Art gives her the opportunity to delve into a space she wouldn’t normally be able to enter in everyday African life.
A visual historian trains his eye on contemporary wedding practices in Nigeria

I studied aso ebi textiles — fabrics that are distributed by brides to wedding guests, and used to make outfits for the event — in western and southeastern Nigeria. The idea behind this long-standing practice is that by dressing in matching textiles, your guests are defining themselves as part of your community. In return, the bride gives gifts to those wearing the special clothing. Aso ebi is the name for the fabric, but it’s also a practice in which people dress in similar uniforms and then attend social ceremonies, such as weddings, parties, and funerals. It’s one of the ways in which Nigerian society constructs and reconstructs things like friendship.

I wasn’t just looking at the textiles themselves — I was thinking about the political and visual economies that surround them, too.

Over the past 20 years, new ways of using aso ebi have emerged. The altruistic intention of the original transaction, where textiles were given freely to family members, has been complicated by commercialization. Brides now sell the fabric to wedding guests, even those she doesn’t know well. It’s become a sign of social status — the number of people that attend a wedding in aso ebi tells you how successful the wedding has been. But this has also caused friction among friends, instead of creating feelings of inclusion and belonging. The use of aso ebi plays into the visual hype of contemporary Nigerian society, and a culture of conspicuous consumption. I’m interested in how the intersection of aso ebi, popular photography, and fashion magazines have actually transformed the local visual cultural landscape in Lagos and other parts of Nigeria.

When it comes to art history, the first question you need to ask is, ‘What do we really need to study when it comes to material culture or visual history?’ Art history should not revolve only around paintings, sculpture, graphic arts, and so on — a limited range of objects. It should embrace the political and economic and social networks that circulate around things, too. You can’t study objects in a vacuum. Art history should go much, much deeper than the way it is often studied — when I teach my students, I go beyond that to teach them what they need to know to understand their own world.
Art history is taught in Africa largely from Eurocentric points of view, with an emphasis on anthropological methods rather than art historical ones — a legacy of colonialism. My work focuses on creating a new curriculum for the study of African art, one that is situated within the larger discourse of global art historical studies, but that looks at African art from a genuinely African point of view.

For our students, many of whom arrive at university with no understanding of the history of art, it is necessary to start with what is known and to then move on to the unknown. Our art history curriculum starts with the question of geography, and how it determines the art that arises in a place — both in terms of, say, the kinds of materials available to an artist (the types of wood or stone they might choose), as well as economic, political, linguistic, and other factors.

When it comes to contemporary art, much of what is recognized in international exhibitions and biennials as ‘African art’ (or even ‘Nigerian art’) is work that fits into certain frameworks that make it legible to non-Africans. Because the West still largely orchestrated the tempo and character of art in postcolonial Africa, many artists here continued to adopt Western, modernist ideas of the grotesque, the naïve, or the primitive in their work. But if colonialism brought abstraction and modernism to African colonies, it also brought realist and naturalist art — a fact that is often overlooked. Abayomi Barber, for example, one of Nigeria’s foremost artists and the founder of an influential art school in the country, was committed to depicting African subject matter, but rejected primitivism in favor of pictorial naturalism and a focus on technical excellence.

For me, the goal of creating an African approach to the history of art is both to get students to understand their own place — their history — and to get them to understand how they are situated in a global context. I’m interested in the idea of critical citizenship — understanding what it is to be Nigerian, for example, but knowing that you exist in a larger context.
Embracing what she calls “strategic southerness,” a South African art historian rethinks the study of the arts of Africa

My AHP fellowship project was about representations of Africa-China relations in the visual arts, which was still a fairly new theme for many artists at the time. That led me to curate an exhibition in 2012 called Making Way, which included art being produced in China and South Africa that connected the ideas of movement and crossing borders. The exhibition challenged simplistic valorization of fast-paced movement and celebratory approaches to globalization that tend to ignore its underbelly and negative aspects. I focused on artists who represented slower and often painful ways of moving — such as walking, crawling, and scraping their bodies along the ground.

Drawing from this research, I am now thinking about ways we can reframe the study of Africa and its epistemologies within the Global South. Collaborating with various Africa-based scholars, I am asking how we can rewrite art history on the African continent in a way that embraces ‘strategic southerness.’

What are other ways of looking at the arts of Africa — not ‘African art,’ which is a largely European and American-produced category? How do our Africa-based art histories reflect what the Kenyan writer Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o refers to as a ‘quest for relevance’?

I was recently invited to be part of the consortium that publishes African Arts, an influential journal based at the UCLA African Studies Center and published by MIT Press, and in 2017 I came on board as the Rhodes University editor. I edit one issue a year of the journal, and I decided to make it my goal to include as many Africa-based authors as possible. (Up until that point only about 12 percent of the journal’s contributors were based on the African continent, and only 1.5 percent were based in Africa outside of South Africa.) To achieve this, I founded the Art POWA network that offers publishing workshops that are similar to the AHP manuscript development workshops. I managed to obtain funding from the Mellon Foundation to run this program, and in the first issue I edited, the vast majority of the authors are indeed Africa-based.
Before 2003 I was creating images that were not different from the mass-circulated images which subtly — but purposely — reinforced the silence and subordination of women in Uganda. My images tapped into the narrative of what an ideal woman should be in a patriarchal order. Clearly, I contradicted the position of woman enshrined in the 1995 Uganda Constitution, which was hailed for having given voice to women.

But laws, however progressive, are not enough to build a woman’s capacity to challenge deep-seated stereotypes that are circulated through art. The right education and research are very essential to nurture the kind of woman who can unmask layers of control perpetuated through traditions.

After 2003 I pursued graduate studies at the University of the Witwatersrand and the University of South Africa in Pretoria. I gained the knowledge I needed to interrogate the issues of gender in art, and to make paintings that would advocate for women’s advancement. My themes and symbolism changed.

This is the context in which in 2016 I mounted Another Place, Another Time: Million-Dollar Masterpieces from Uganda and America, 2003–2016, an exhibition showcasing work I made during my sojourn in the U.S. as a Fulbright Scholar the previous year. This was the first time a painting would be sold at that price in Uganda. In 2016 I also presented the million-dollar painting titled Another Place, Another Time in Uganda. This canvas took me 13 years to complete. My goal was two-pronged: first, to raise funds, and second, to achieve my dream of supporting girls’ education in Kabale, the district where I grew up.

My work has now taken me into the realm of thinking about empowering other marginalized communities — the deaf and other people with disabilities, the elderly, and so on. I am finding ways to use the power of art to empower people.
Spring 2018 marked the 35th anniversary of the landmark report from the U.S. Department of Education, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. The study was an urgent call to action lamenting the “rising tide of mediocrity” in American schools, and it helped launch the modern school reform movement. As has tended to happen every five years or so, this milestone prompted renewed criticism of the significant gap between the report’s aspirations for a “Learning Society” and the current state of American education. Such critiques serve an important purpose: we need honest assessments of the extent to which our efforts as a nation have fallen short of our commitments.

Any agenda for meeting those commitments, however, must be informed by a present-day perspective. The nation has changed tremendously since the early 1980s, when U.S. Secretary of Education Terrel Bell appointed the panel of experts who went on to produce arguably the most cited document in the field. The U.S. population in 1983 was far more homogeneous than it is today. The biggest concerns at the time were the Cold War and economic competition from Japan, especially its auto industry. Social media was decades away, and widespread applications of artificial intelligence were only just beginning.

Meanwhile, in the decades since *A Nation at Risk* we have learned a great deal about how to teach all students to ever-higher standards. Thanks to advances in cognitive psychology, we know more than we ever have about effective learning activities and techniques, student motivation, and what makes an environment conducive to learning. We have new school designs with a track record of preparing at-risk youngsters for success in college and beyond. And, while we have yet to achieve such successes at scale, recent work in educational reform has greatly clarified the problems that still need to be solved.

The current portrait of America’s students is one of great complexity. Within the past few years, the country’s school-age population has become, for the first time, majority nonwhite. A record number of Americans are foreign born. More young people are economically disadvantaged than at any time in recent history. A majority of students in public schools now qualify for free or reduced-price lunches under federal guidelines, a commonly used indicator of family poverty. The diversity of languages, life experiences, and needs among today’s students is unprecedented.

**Education in Complex Times**

Lessons learned from decades of school reform have led the Corporation to clarify a new set of strategies to better align its philanthropic efforts.

*by LaVerne Srinivasan and Jeff Archer*

Crisis Counseling

Released in April 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education’s report, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, warned ominously of “a rising tide of mediocrity” in American schooling.
At the same time, the level and quality of education required for success are at all-time highs. Since the 1990s the overall number of jobs in the United States has grown by 35 million, but in that time the number of jobs that require only a high school diploma fell by 7 million. This gap in economic prospects, between those with and those without a postsecondary education, has only increased in the years since the Great Recession of 2007–10.

There is little debate as to what is driving this divergence. Automation and outsourcing have dealt a blow to once decent-paying occupations involving routine activities (e.g., manufacturing and administrative support). Meanwhile, many of the jobs that entail nonroutine activities fall into two categories: low-skill, low-paying jobs such as goods and service work; and high-skill, high-paying jobs in technical and professional fields that require a postsecondary education and advanced training. With regard to the development of robots and artificial intelligence, we can envision a not-too-distant future in which many nonroutine jobs will have either been eliminated or will involve working with sophisticated new technologies.

The upshot is that all of today’s students will need more than the traditional foundational literacies in reading, writing, and mathematics. Everyone will need to be able to think critically, assess and make use of new information, work effectively in teams, and use reasoning to formulate and evaluate various and often competing solutions to novel problems. When adaptability is the coin of the realm, and everyone will need to be able to work effectively in teams, and use reasoning to formulate and evaluate various and often competing solutions to novel problems.

Meanwhile, the field of education has generally embraced the idea that all students need more than just the fundamentals. The most significant sign of this has been the adoption of the Common Core State Standards. Compared with earlier K–12 standards, the Common Core presents a more rigorous and comprehensive approach to the education of all students. Many educators have expressed concern that the Common Core will result in lower standards, and more students will be likely to score below the proficiency level.

Any dispassionate appraisal of our progress in meeting the nation’s educational challenges would be mixed at best. Results from the most recent National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), regarded as the nation’s report card, prompted lamentations of a “lost decade of education.” For the country as a whole, fourth-grade results were only marginally better. Meanwhile, large achievement gaps remain the same in 2017 as in 2007; eighth-grade results were only slightly better. Meanwhile, large achievement gaps remain the same in 2017 as in 2007; eighth-grade results were only slightly better. Meanwhile, large achievement gaps remain the same in 2017 as in 2007; eighth-grade results were only slightly better. Meanwhile, large achievement gaps remain among racial groups.

Other recent data show that we also have a long way to go at the postsecondary level. While we have seen some significant gains in both high school completion and college enrollment, great disparities persist among racial groups when it comes to college completion.

On a more positive note, we have seen significant growth in the number of pathways available to students as they prepare for and progress through college. Nontraditional college students are becoming the new norm: around 40 percent are 25 or older, and more than one-third are enrolled part time.

Postsecondary education is accommodating a wider array of circumstances.

Meanwhile, the field of education has generally embraced the idea that all students need more than just the fundamentals. The most significant sign of this has been the adoption of the Common Core State Standards. Compared with earlier K–12 standards, the Common Core presents a more rigorous and comprehensive approach to the education of all students.

Another 25 states have adopted their own standards based on the framework for science education around which NGSS was developed. Perhaps one of the biggest findings to emerge in recent years is that these new standards require new and unfamiliar methods of teaching—the kinds of techniques and approaches that few teachers have much experience with. For example, working with early learners in developing the ability to construct a well-supported argument takes a special skill set, as does helping students understand complex concepts, such as why a smaller number results when multiplying a larger number by a fraction.

Fortunately, major developments in the science of learning over the past two decades have offered a new and unprecedented window into how children acquire the kinds of knowledge and skills needed for college and career readiness. We know that students draw extensively on their prior understanding to construct new mental models as they devise new ones. This puts a high premium on a teacher’s ability to surface, and then gently redirect, students’ reasoning processes. It also means cultivating a classroom climate that encourages risk-taking—by teachers and students alike.

Unfortunately, we as a nation have not adequately prepared for the challenges posed by these new expectations. This has prompted pushback against Common Core, as teachers objected to being required to take on something very new and very difficult—and without guidance. Parents saw that educators were stressed, especially since teachers were being additionally subjected to new evaluation systems—while all coming to grips with the new standards. Furthermore, families felt left out of the loop about the transition that was underway.

Carnegie Corporation of New York has thought hard about these developments and their implications. The lessons learned in recent decades of school reform have led us to clarify a set of strategies to better align the Corporation’s philanthropic efforts.

One of the key lessons is that these new standards require new and unfamiliar methods of teaching—the kinds of techniques and approaches that few teachers have much experience with. For example, working with early learners in developing the ability to construct a well-supported argument takes a special skill set, as does helping students understand complex concepts, such as why a smaller number results when multiplying a larger number by a fraction.

Fortunately, major developments in the science of learning over the past two decades have offered a new and unprecedented window into how children acquire the kinds of knowledge and skills needed for college and career readiness. We know that students draw extensively on their prior understanding to construct new mental models as they devise new ones. This puts a high premium on a teacher’s ability to surface, and then gently redirect, students’ reasoning processes. It also means cultivating a classroom climate that encourages risk-taking—by teachers and students alike.

Unfortunately, we as a nation have not adequately prepared for the challenges posed by these new expectations. This has prompted pushback against Common Core, as teachers objected to being required to take on something very new and very difficult—and without guidance. Parents saw that educators were stressed, especially since teachers were being additionally subjected to new evaluation systems—while all coming to grips with the new standards. Furthermore, families felt left out of the loop about the transition that was underway.

Carnegie Corporation of New York has thought hard about these developments and their implications. The lessons learned in recent decades of school reform have led us to clarify a set of strategies to better align the Corporation’s philanthropic efforts.

Central to these strategies is the goal of building the capacity of educators, parents, and other stakeholders to provide all students with the experiences needed to become successful lifelong learners. To accomplish this, we have identified three shifts in the field that the Corporation will promote:

- A broader learner orientation. We must better attune to the learning needs of educators and other stakeholders, including students. We also must promote a more expansive view of learner objectives—one that includes social-emotional qualities as well as academic mastery.
- More coherent efforts within systems that learn and adapt. Reforms have too often been pursued as a series of isolated initiatives, developed without truly understanding the needs of the people involved. The field needs greater capacity to effect change through more integrated approaches.
- A more engaged and informed public. Nothing can doom an agenda for social change like an alienated constituency. The goals and strategies of educational improvement must be owned by more than just those who work within the system.

Finally, we must commit to a sustained focus on equity. A society as diverse as ours cannot thrive without the full participation of every individual from every background.
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The nation’s leading philanthropies are banding together to ensure a fair and accurate 2020 Census

by Joanne Omang

Before a few months ago, Arturo Vargas’s worries about the 2020 Census mostly involved ways to help Latinos get online to fill out their forms. The U.S. Census Bureau is moving online for much of this decade’s required count of America’s population, and Vargas thinks Latino American participation could suffer, especially in lower-income areas.

“They use cell phones rather than desks or tablets mostly, and it’s hard to do the forms on those,” says Vargas, chief executive officer of the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO) Educational Fund, which promotes Latino engagement in civic life. NALEO is one of nearly 100 nonprofit, business, and campaigning organizations funded since 2015 by a group of 75 donors known collectively as the Funders Census Initiative, in hopes of ensuring a fair and accurate 2020 count.

But time is limited, and census problems have proliferated, culminating in increased tensions between the members of the census initiative and census authorities.

Rather than offering reassurance, the U.S. Commerce Department announced in March 2018 that it would add a question to the census form asking all U.S. residents whether they are U.S. citizens. Commerce Secretary Wilbur Ross claimed it would be useful in enforcing protections for minority voters. Some civil rights groups and other census experts disagree, saying the Census Bureau’s American Community Survey already provides adequate data.

Vargas and many census donors were outraged by the citizenship question. “It means we’re back to trying to get people to respond at all,” he says. Millions of immigrants, documented and undocumented, are already leery of any government attention and are now more likely to avoid the census, going uncounted as a result. More than 750 grantmaking executives agreed and recently signed a letter asking the Commerce Department to reconsider. (On January 13, 2019, a federal judge in New York ordered the Trump administration to stop its plans to include the citizenship question in the 2020 Census, a ruling that is expected to be appealed ultimately to the U.S. Supreme Court.)

Adding the citizenship question in this climate of fear and distrust will have a disproportionate impact on hard-to-count communities” of minorities and rural residents, the letter states. “We urge you to … instead focus on making sure everyone in the U.S. is counted once, only once, and in the right place.

Over the past three years, the collaborative funders have awarded grants totaling $352 million toward that goal, arguing that an accurate count of every woman, man, and child living in the United States is crucial. That is because the results affect nearly every area of American life. Knowing who lives where determines how some $780 billion in federal funds gets distributed to states and localities for education, health care, transportation, and infrastructure, among other things. It also helps better enforce civil rights and housing laws, as well as expand the reach of services such as child welfare, school lunch, and disability programs.

The count also provides useful data to businesses deciding where to locate and how to attract customers and workers. Congress uses it in its determination of the number and boundaries of congressional electoral districts, while state and local lawmakers use it to define school districts, voting precincts, and their own domains. Adults or children who don’t get counted get shortchanged in these types of decisions.

“What’s at risk is political power and resources for our community — for any community — for an entire decade,” says Vargas. “There’s no alternative but to be counted.”

In the 2010 Census, blacks were undercounted by over 2 percent and Hispanics by 1 percent, while nearly 5 percent of Native Americans on reservations were missed, according to the Census Bureau. Nearly 5 percent of all children under age 5 were not counted — one in every 20 kids — evidently because many people wrongly assumed that the census only counts adults. Meanwhile, white residents were overcounted by about 1 percent, apparently because of second homes or college residencies.

The Census Bureau recognizes these problems and has promised to work on fixing them. However, Congress, which usually steps up its decade-long census funding in years seven and eight, left FY 2017 and 2018 budgets all but flat — half the level budgeted in the previous decade. An extra $1 billion is slated for FY 2019, but it’s not enough: two of three critical “dress rehearsals” have already had to be canceled for lack of adequate funding. And during all of this, the Census Bureau has had no permanent director. (Nominated for the position by President Trump in July 2018, Steven Dillingham, formerly director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, was confirmed director of the Census Bureau in January 2019.)

“We understood early that Congress was not going to fund the 2020 Census adequately,” says Geri Mannion, director of the Carnegie and Bauman were among 15 major philanthropies that began work in 2015 on an action plan to bring in donors and set up the collaborative, using tool kits, fact sheets, networking webinars, and technical assistance.

They warned that the Census Bureau was far behind in the research and education campaigns needed to fix its problems and to remind people of what’s at stake. A chief concern is how information in the new online forms will be kept secure and confidential, especially in light of recent hacking campaigns to spread disinformation in other areas. Funding lags have meant that new computer programs and systems haven’t been extensively tested, raising the prospect of major crashes such as those that plagued the rollout of the Affordable Care Act.

How will the bureau reach the millions of residents with limited or no English fluency? Or rural and low-income people who lack Internet access? In 2010 the bureau hired 845,000 people to go door to door, many of whom were

“The census is a constitutional requirement, but government doesn’t always have the resources to do everything it should. Philanthropy can step in to fill some of the gaps — like supporting advocacy to make sure census forms are accessible and that there is adequate funding. We can also educate our colleagues and the public about why the census is so important, so that there is adequate public and private support to ensure that ‘Get Out the Count’ is successful in 2020, especially in hard-to-count communities and areas of the country with limited resources.”

— Geri Mannion, Program Director, U.S. Democracy Program, Carnegie Corporation of New York
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A new program aims to hack America’s culture of apathy toward nukes

by Karen Theroux

Most people in the U.S., most of the time, don’t think or talk about nuclear weapons,” says Alex Wellerstein, assistant professor of science and technology studies at Stevens Institute of Technology in New Jersey. “Except when there’s a period of crisis, and then people become extremely anxious. Then they want to talk about them a lot.” Wellerstein, a historian of science, is a principal investigator for Reinventing Civil Defense, a Carnegie-supported project at Stevens Institute that aims to restore a broad cultural understanding of nuclear risk. Kristyn Karl, also a principal investigator on the project, is an assistant professor of political science at Stevens with a background in political psychology. Both have given the issue much thought.

Wellerstein expounds on the problem: “After the Cold War, many people took away that [the nuclear threat] was something of the past, which we no longer have to worry about. We stopped talking about it as a culture, and now there is very little education about nuclear issues, from the early grades through college. Contrast that with how hard it would be to come out of elementary school without learning about germ theory or earthquakes or hurricanes. Nuclear risk is not part of the conversation, and therefore it’s not part of their world.”

But nuclear danger is still very much part of the world: approximately 15,000 nuclear weapons and 1.8 million metric tons of weapons-grade nuclear material still exist. Any type of nuclear event, intentional or otherwise, would dramatically change the world. Without daily awareness of this risk, an entire generation of Americans has lost track of the fact that we all still live in a world of nuclear threat.

“The nature of nuclear risk has changed,” says Carl Robichaud, program officer with Carnegie Corporation’s International Peace and Security program. “Most people think the risk is gone, or they might think only about North Korea. But the new dimension is nuclear terrorism. The prevailing mentality among the general population today is characterized by an array of misconceptions. A common sentiment tends to be: “Why worry? When they drop the big one, it’s the end of the world.” But this attitude and accompanying existential dread stem from Cold War thinking more than present-day reality. At the other extreme, young people tend to believe that the world’s nuclear weapons have been eliminated, so they’ve got nothing to worry about. Regardless of one’s stance, what the public needs to know, and the reason the Stevens Institute program exists, is that while there are serious nuclear risks, there are also effective survival strategies.

“As awful as the experience was for people who received the false alert, the incident was a useful natural experiment. We learned how unprepared we are,” Robichaud says. “Hundreds of thousands of people were panicked and legal permanent residents with useful language skills. But in 2020 only 280,000 enumerators are slated to participate — and they must all be U.S. citizens.

The collaborative’s grantees are doing innovative work, Bass says. At the CUNY Graduate Center, Steven Romalewski has created an interactive map of hard-to-count census tracts that will allow advocates to target attention and resources. Andrew Reamer at George Washington University has identified the federal programs that rely on census data in their formulas for optimal fund distribution, allowing users to more clearly see what’s at stake for various programs in their areas.

Several grantees are doing opinion research to craft outreach campaigns encouraging census participation, for testing and use this autumn. Others are mobilizing several grantees are doing opinion research to craft stake for various programs in their areas.

Several grantees are doing opinion research to craft outreach campaigns encouraging census participation, for testing and use this autumn. Others are mobilizing

Facing the Nuclear Truth

A new program aims to hack America’s culture of apathy toward nukes
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Wellerstein expounds on the problem: “After the Cold War, many people took away that [the nuclear threat] was something of the past, which we no longer have to worry about. We stopped talking about it as a culture, and now there is very little education about nuclear issues, from the early grades through college. Contrast that with how hard it would be to come out of elementary school without learning about germ theory or earthquakes or hurricanes. Nuclear risk is not part of the conversation, and therefore it’s not part of their world.”

But nuclear danger is still very much part of the world: approximately 15,000 nuclear weapons and 1.8 million metric tons of weapons-grade nuclear material still exist. Any type of nuclear event, intentional or otherwise, would dramatically change the world. Without daily awareness of this risk, an entire generation of Americans has lost track of the fact that we all still live in a world of nuclear threat.

“The nature of nuclear risk has changed,” says Carl Robichaud, program officer with Carnegie Corporation’s International Peace and Security program. “Most people think the risk is gone, or they might think only about North Korea. But the new dimension is nuclear terrorism. The prevailing mentality among the general population today is characterized by an array of misconceptions. A common sentiment tends to be: “Why worry? When they drop the big one, it’s the end of the world.” But this attitude and accompanying existential dread stem from Cold War thinking more than present-day reality. At the other extreme, young people tend to believe that the world’s nuclear weapons have been eliminated, so they’ve got nothing to worry about. Regardless of one’s stance, what the public needs to know, and the reason the Stevens Institute program exists, is that while there are serious nuclear risks, there are also effective survival strategies.

“As awful as the experience was for people who received the false alert, the incident was a useful natural experiment. We learned how unprepared we are,” Robichaud says. “Hundreds of thousands of people were panicked and
didn’t know what to believe or what to do.” In contrast, during the Cold War, Federal Civil Defense Administration drills trained the public in nuclear response tactics (“duck and cover”) — though we later learned how ineffective those measures would actually have been. “The fact is that you can take measures in the face of an attack to make survival much more likely,” he says. Many of the steps recommended in other emergency situations offer good guidance, Robichaud stresses. Instead of trying to escape, go inside and stay there until more information is available about the incident, including the direction in which the radiation is moving — whether it’s a nuclear detonation or a nuclear accident.

So what is the best way to inform the public of the potential dangers and hard facts without causing alarm? And to whom should messaging be directed? “We’re most interested in targeting young adults — millennials, high school and college age,” Wellerstein says. “This group is extremely interested in political issues but has low nuclear salience. They’re quite interested when it comes up, but haven’t had exposure yet.”

One thing is clear: new communication strategies are essential for young digital natives. Impactful media messaging that makes the nuclear risk personal is a primary focus of the Stevens program. Comic books, podcasts, and plays, as well as multipractice media products such as apps, video games, graphic novels, and virtual reality, are all being tested. And researchers remain mindful that millennials typically find civic engagement — volunteerism, activism, and civic use of social media — more relevant than traditional political activity.

Several seed projects chosen for initial funding are now in the pipeline, and the Stevens team is assessing results before deciding where to allocate further investment. Robichaud says that this approach “allows trying out lots of things at low cost to find out which ones are working. People from different disciplines are looking at the problem from different angles. This is true of some of our most successful projects.”

The first of the program’s three communications workshops was held in June 2018 at the Brookhaven National Laboratory on Long Island in New York, and brought together a range of participants: academics, scientists, emergency-management workers, artists, writers, and game developers. Enthusiasm was high as groups discussed how to mobilize and move beyond timeworn government publications. The goal was to reinvent old-school civil defense messaging, which kept nukes in the public consciousness but disseminated misleading information, ultimately serving as fodder for satire. Wellerstein describes the workshop as an “odd group to bring together, but it worked. Everyone got something out of it. They formed connections and kept communicating.”

Conveying accurate information would do more than improve emergency response. The Stevens program also aims to affect policy — to use nuclear preparation to change the conversation. When no one outside of expert and activist circles is listening, there’s little practical action or public support for policy efforts. In the long run, this creates a lower likelihood of motivating the next generation of arms-control practitioners. But with the nation’s recent change in administration and resulting tough talk regarding nukes, the need for effective, nonpartisan communication about nuclear risk has never been greater. The program leaders view this as an opportunity: nuclear anxiety, for better or worse, is back again. But with the right strategy, it might produce some much-needed political action — and perhaps less panic.

“The fact is that you can take measures in the face of an attack to make survival much more likely.”

— Carl Robichaud, Program Officer, International Peace and Security, Carnegie Corporation of New York

Duck and Cover

Schoolchildren in Topeka, Kansas, practice survival methods during a civil defense test in December 1960. As sirens wailed, thousands of students left their desks that day and took shelter in school hallways. 
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Harnessing the Power of the Diaspora

Born under apartheid in a small hamlet in South Africa, today Dr. Kokila Lakhoo is an internationally renowned pediatric surgeon

by Karen Theroux

ow did Kokila Lakhoo, a woman of color who grew up under apartheid, become one of the first female pediatric surgeons in Africa?

Born in South Africa, Lakhoo is now a consultant pediatric surgeon at the Children’s Hospital in Oxford and the University of Oxford in the U.K. In addition to newborn surgery, her interests include global health, neonatal surgery, and the University of Oxford in the U.K. In addition to the editor of several textbooks, has contributed to more prenatal counseling, and pediatric tumor surgery. She is today Dr. Kokila Lakhoo is an internationally renowned pediatric surgeon, achieving international recognition, and giving back to the continent’s next generation of physicians.

“I grew up in a tiny hamlet in South Africa,” says Lakhoo. “I lived with my extended family, and my grandmother was a self-taught health worker. She dealt with childbirth, sprains, and minor wounds.” In apartheid, there was no facility for people of color in remote areas to receive medical care, she says. “I saw her work, and I got interested in the joy and appreciation of the people that she looked after.”

Under apartheid, there were also no schools in small towns like hers for nonwhite children past the age of nine. Lakhoo was forced to leave her family and move to Pretoria alone to continue her schooling. “My family had no money,” she explains, “but they cared about education.” Though difficult, the experience of leaving home by herself at such an early age made her “very independent,” she says.

Later, when Lakhoo decided to pursue a medical degree, she found that her choices were limited to black medical schools. After that, she found that “black hospitals were run by black doctors, who all had gone abroad to get training,” she explains. “They had studied in countries where there was sympathy toward working against apartheid.” Even after completing her medical education, Lakhoo was given low status and little guidance. She was sent to Baragwanath Hospital in Soweto for further training, but also made the effort to attend monthly state-of-the-art lectures at the University of the Witwatersrand — a 70-kilometer trip. She was forced to sit in the back of the lecture hall. “Surgery was for white males,” she says. “We were invisible.”

To ensure that she received world-class training, Lakhoo left for a yearlong fellowship in London, at the Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children. When she returned to Johannesburg, however, “it was a really rough time in South Africa,” she says. “Some of my colleagues were murdered or hijacked — some in the hospital.” By that time, Lakhoo was pregnant, and she learned that Oxford was looking for someone with her experience. So, for the sake of her family’s safety, she immigrated to England — and thus became part of the African academic diaspora.

The term “brain drain” is often used to describe the loss of highly trained individuals from less-developed regions, such as Africa, who relocate to economically advanced countries. Although these successful graduates have left their universities behind, many maintain strong connections with them and feel strongly motivated to give back. And with support from such organizations as Carnegie Corporation of New York, Lakhoo and other alumni from African institutions are bridging gaps in important ways.

“It’s ‘brain circulation’ as opposed to ‘brain drain,’” says Claudia Frittelli, Carnegie Corporation of New York program officer for Higher Education and Research in Africa. “Lakhoo is able to do so much because of her international experience. But today, instead of leaving their home countries, highly-skilled graduates can have contacts all over the world. They can stay in Africa because of their networks with leaders in their field.”

Higher-education enrollment in sub-Saharan Africa has grown nearly fivefold in the past several decades, and today South African universities function as training hubs for academics throughout the continent. At the same time, graduate school enrollment in South Africa has more than doubled, and the country’s universities no longer have enough staff with doctorates to train this new generation. But diaspora programs supported by the Corporation are helping in key areas: graduate supervision and training, use of laboratories and equipment, and access to research funding and collaboration, to name a few.

Support for Kokila Lakhoo’s work came via the University of the Witwatersrand (“Wits”) Health Sciences Research Office (HSRO). Established in 2010, and funded in part by Carnegie Corporation of New York since 2014, the Carnegie-Wits Alumni Diaspora Programme stimulates research collaboration among leading health sciences alumni working in academic institutions abroad and their counterparts at Wits. So far, the program has developed exchange partnerships with universities in England, Australia, New Zealand, and the United States.

“In most cases, visiting alums do much more than come back for one trip,” notes Frittelli. Long-term linkages formed at Wits have led to the coauthoring of articles and manuscripts, the acceptance of joint abstracts at conferences, joint grant proposals, guest lecturer visits and seminars, access to laboratories for testing purposes, and more. One growing partnership with U.S.-based Wits alumni Roy Zent, vice chair for clinical affairs at Vanderbilt University’s Department of Medicine, has supported visits to Wits by Vanderbilt students, researchers, and faculty, as well as reciprocal visits to Vanderbilt by Wits personnel, collaborations in various medical fields, and even support for a medical bioinformatics system at Wits.

The Wits diaspora story started in South Africa, but it doesn’t end there. When a baby girl living near Oxford, England, developed a disfiguring facial birthmark that grew into her eye socket and threatened her sight, Lakhoo, by this time practicing in Oxford, saved the child’s eyesight and restored her perfect appearance. But a baby in Kilgoma, Tanzania, far from the capital, born with a life-threatening tumor can be saved too, thanks to Lakhoo’s efforts in leading the development of pediatric surgery services throughout the country, which previously did not have a single pediatric surgeon.

“One of my children were out of the house, I could do global work,” Lakhoo says. For the past 16 years she has spent her vacations training surgeons from all regions of Tanzania. The above scenarios illustrate more than the accomplishments of one woman; they demonstrate the immense global potential of African diaspora networks.

“Kokila Lakhoo serves as one example of a scholar giving back to another whole country and saving multiple lives every day,” Frittelli says. In South Africa in 2018, in an especially gratifying example of giving back, Lakhoo delivered a state-of-the-art lecture at Wits titled “Pediatric Surgery, Then and Now” — in the same auditorium in which she had previously been made to sit in the back.

With support from such organizations as Carnegie Corporation of New York, Kokila Lakhoo and other alumni from African institutions are bridging gaps in important ways.
Dictatorland: The Men Who Stole Africa
Paul Kenyon
Head of Zeus. 432 pp. 2018.

Power Trip
A BBC correspondent’s new survey of seven African despot’s makes the case that the continent suffers from a resource curse. He tells his tale vividly, but even despotism deserves a more nuanced, comprehensive, and above all contextual approach.

by Aaron Stanley

Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.” Or so Lord Acton’s much-invoked truism goes. We have only too many examples of manipulation and corruption from world leaders, but what do we actually know about why some leaders gravitate toward moral depravity as they seek to retain power while others willingly relinquish their reigns?

It would be easier to identify examples of where despotism is happening than where it is not, and Africa offers much low-hanging fruit. Since the wave of independence from European colonial powers concluded in the 1970s, most African countries have experienced some combination of authoritarianism, one-party rule, military coups, and leaders who held office for more than 15 years. At the same time, human development across the continent has stagnated.

Insert Paul Kenyon’s new book, Dictatorland: The Men Who Stole Africa. Elegantly written and entertaining, the book provides historical vignettes of the rise and some-times fall of seven African strongmen. The book is organized according to the natural resources Kenyon credits for each despot’s wealth. Zimbabwe and Democratic Republic of Congo, aka Zaire, fall under “Gold and Diamonds.” Libya, Nigeria, and Equatorial Guinea are connected to “Oil.” Côte d’Ivoire and Eritrea are outliers: Côte d’Ivoire is linked to the nonnative cocoa plant, and Eritrea is associated not with any natural resource but with “Modern Slavery.”

The storytelling is engaging, but why did Kenyon write this book, and what’s his point? We learn some political history of despotic rule in countries we may not have been familiar with previously, but a general conclusion is lacking. Kenyon’s depictions suggest he may be making a circuitous argument for the “resource curse,” the theory of an inverse relationship between a country’s natural resource riches and economic growth and democracy. British economist Richard M. Auty posited in the early 1990s that if you have a lot of oil or mineral wealth, you will usually not have development, but corruption and poverty instead. Kenyon’s vignettes make it hard to argue against the theory. However, critiques of the resource curse have found its theoretical and empirical framework lacking. One criticism is that it cherry-picks its examples. Norway and its oil wealth, for instance, do not fit the model. Dictatorland can also be accused of such cherry-picking.

Zimbabwe is highlighted in the book, but its neighbor Botswana is one of the largest diamond exporters in the
The storytelling is engaging, but why did Kenyon write this book, and what’s his point?

The news caused nationwide consternation, and with reason. When internalized, lead can erode the brain’s gray matter, impair cognitive ability, affect emotions and impulse control, elevate risks of early dementia, and more. Yet for 18 months, state and local officials had insisted that the water was safe and that the community drink it, bathe with it, and feed it to their infant children. So the community did.

Flint’s water source had been switched in April 2013 from Lake Huron to the cheaper Flint River, an austerity measure expressly designed to reduce government spending. Although local activists, scientists, and Flint residents immediately expressed concerns about the inferior water quality, state and city officials assured the community that the new water met federal safe-drinking water standards. In reality, the inadequately treated water was corroding the city’s lead pipes, causing lead to leach into the tap water. It was not until September 2015 — when Dr. Mona Hanna-Attisha and her team of scientists publicized alarming data revealing heightened lead levels in children’s blood — that the public had irrefutable evidence that the switch had in fact triggered a major health crisis.

In What the Eyes Don’t See: A Story of Crisis, Resistance, and Hope in an American City, Hanna-Attisha offers an impassioned account of her efforts to alert the public that — unequivocally — the tap water was endangering the Flint community, especially its youngest children. An associate professor of pediatrics and human development at Michigan State University, she is also the founder and director of the Michigan State University and Hurley Children’s Hospital Pediatric Public Health Initiative, a model program to mitigate the impact of the Flint water crisis. According to Hanna-Attisha, even the slightest possibility of lead in the drinking water should have been cause for alarm and government action. Brain scans show that exposure to lead in children critically affects brain development. Lead-poisoned children are far more likely to struggle or fail in school, compared with their unaffected peers, and they may even be more prone to violent criminal activity as adults. In a city such as Flint, where toxic stresses such as poverty, malnutrition, and inadequate access to health care already affect children’s development, the added threat of lead poisoning was devastating.

Yet in spite of scrupulous analysis by Hanna-Attisha’s team and the urgency of their findings, state officials made numerous attempts to undermine the study’s methodology. With vivid detail, Hanna-Attisha recounts the
Hanna-Attisha’s prescription for the water crisis goes beyond ensuring clean water — beyond measures like the restoration of Flint’s previous water source, or such stopgap remedies like bottled water and filters, or even the replacement of all of Flint’s lead pipes.

Flint’s situation falls outside the scope of Carnegie Corporation of New York’s typical grantmaking. However, in 2016 the Corporation teamed with other philanthropic institutions to provide immediate relief to the city through a collaborative funding initiative that funded independent water testing, supported the health needs of Flint families, fortified early education programs for children ages six and under, promoted civic engagement and local decision-making, and more. Investments in these sorts of interventions are designed to build a community’s resilience and its capacity to overcome environmental stress. As the effects of lead poisoning in Flint residents continue to be observed, long-term collaborative efforts such as these will continue to be essential.

At a time when many cities across the country struggle to secure access to clean water and basic services, What the Eyes Don’t See offers a powerful and engaging account of the Flint water crisis from the perspective of a medical professional who serves that community on a daily basis. Hanna-Attisha does not speak directly to the longstanding dedication of local activists in Flint advocating for clean water, but in every chapter she captures the distress and frustration that local public health and community advocates felt as they grappled with a government that not only refused to address the crisis, but also refused to recognize its very existence.

The problem of lead in water is far from over. This past September, Detroit Public Schools shut off drinking water at all of its 106 schools after finding elevated levels of lead in the water. Many Flint families are also still unable to use their tap water for cooking and bathing. What the Eyes Don’t See is a story of triumph by a resilient city that will — one hopes — only grow stronger, but foremost, it is an important primer on a public health crisis that must never be allowed to happen again.
Growing up as a first-generation American, I was lucky to receive an excellent public school education, with peers as diverse as my hometown of Los Angeles. School was my joy, just as it was my stepping stone, and it’s with this sort of pride that I decided to teach in a Newark public school through Teach for America in 2015. Introducing pristinely uniformed ninth graders to Toni Morrison for the first time, I remember my heart beating with urgency as if it were a siren coming from a fire truck on Central Avenue. Each day I was confronted by what Eve L. Ewing calls “moments of intense focus and commitment where trying to help someone understand seems like the most important thing in the world.”

Ewing’s Ghosts in the Schoolyard is a hybrid book — equal parts 20th-century American history, education sociology, and personal memoir. The author, a sociologist of education at the University of Chicago’s School of Social Service Administration and an acclaimed poet, looks at the 2013 closures of 50 Chicago public schools (the largest mass closure of public schools ever in an American city) from the perspectives of the students and families who were most affected. She connects these developments to the housing, legal, and education policies that are inextricably intertwined with the ugly realities of racial and socioeconomic politics.

Bronzeville, a historic neighborhood on the South Side of Chicago and a final destination for many black Americans during the Great Migration from the Southern states, is where Ewing grounds her narrative. A former resident of the neighborhood and Chicago Public Schools teacher, Ewing gracefully channels the struggles of the community’s students, educators, and parents who fight valiantly to keep their schools open despite local politicians’ efforts to enact large-scale “reform.” These efforts beg the question that frames much of the book: If the schools are so terrible, why do people fight for them so adamantly?

In 2012 the Chicago Board of Education announced its intention to close Walter H. Dyett High School, a Bronzeville stalwart since its founding in 1931. Ewing takes us to press conferences held by Chicago Public School officials making the case for why Dyett should be shut down. But through the eyes of its students and parents, we see how attempts by local officials to close Dyett look like attempts to “get black history to go away.”

Schools aren’t merely the sum total of their test scores and attendance levels; they’re spaces that facilitate an understanding of a shared past and culture. Or as Ewing puts it, a school is “a place of care, a home, a site of history.” By looking at decades of racist housing policies and opaque school board processes that consistently under-resource schools in black communities, the author exposes the structural inequalities that can undergird our public education system and make any objective evaluation of individual schools quite challenging.

Ewing gracefully channels the struggles of the community’s students, educators, and parents who fight valiantly to keep their schools open despite local politicians’ efforts to enact large-scale “reform.”

By looking at the multiple roles schools perform in a community, Ewing explains why these families wage such fierce battles to keep them open, just as the depth of their resistance — for example, a month-long hunger strike — debunks a common myth about low-income and minority families being disinterested in their children’s education. In fact, the commitment of these families contrasts with the bureaucratic indifference of the public education system that marginalizes them.

However, one tension I confronted in Ewing’s work comes from my own experience as a classroom teacher: What should be done with schools that fail to adequately educate their students according to commonly accepted standards? Ewing herself acknowledges this tension when she writes that her “purpose in this book is not to say that school closures should never happen.” Paradoxically, the undeniable power of Ewing’s book is that she steers clear of offering blanket solutions. Rather, she underscores the importance of understanding how power and politics intersect in our communities, validating the experiences of all families and nurturing our young people in environments that preserve their cultural legacy.
The Peace Palace in The Hague hosted the first edition of the Carnegie PeaceBuilding Conversations, which in late September 2018 brought together more than 300 professionals from government, business, NGOs, philanthropic organizations, and knowledge institutions, as well as representatives of Carnegie institutions worldwide, to generate fresh perspectives on peacebuilding and conflict resolution. In view of the increasing urgency and interconnectedness of situations involving conflicts and peace, new ideas — and especially the voices of new generations — are much needed. That was a signal theme of the three-day gathering: the importance of involving young people in the process of envisioning and working toward creative solutions to a more peaceful and equitable world.

As Mayor Pauline Krikke of The Hague observed at the opening reception, on September 24:

The challenges of the 21st century demand 21st-century solutions, which means working together in network organizations, using the latest technology and sharing all the available data and knowledge. It also means listening more than ever before to what young people have to say on these matters. Because in the end it’s all about tomorrow’s world. The world that they will shape. . . . Would Andrew Carnegie have even dreamed that 100 years later young people would be keeping his ideals alive? He lived in the age of silent movies and the hand-operated telegraph, while we live in the age of Netflix and WhatsApp. But our goal is precisely the same: Bringing Peace Together.

Peacebuilder Leonardo Párraga, BogotArt executive director, holding the citation for the inaugural Youth Carnegie Peace Prize, awarded for the organization’s Letters of Reconciliation project. PHOTO: © CARNEGIE FOUNDATION – PEACE PALACE
A Celebration of Heroes in Pittsburgh: 10,001 and Counting

The Carnegie Hero Fund Commission, Carnegie Museums of Pittsburgh, Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, and Carnegie Mellon University — the four Pittsburgh-based Carnegie institutions — came together on June 12 in the Steel City to mark a special milestone in the history of civilian acts of heroism. A special luncheon was held at the Allegheny HYP Club in downtown Pittsburgh to honor Vickie Tillman and Jimmy Rhodes, respectively the 10,000th and 10,001st Carnegie Heroes. Later that evening, representatives of the Carnegie institutions convened at the Carnegie Music Hall for a gala event, helmed by NPR host Scott Simon. After acknowledging Tillman and Rhodes for their acts of bravery, Eric P. Zahren, Carnegie Hero Fund Commission president and secretary, unveiled the Carnegie Heroes Roll of Honor.

Throughout the 114 years since the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission was established, more than 10,000 Carnegie Medals have indeed been awarded and many millions have been disbursed in one-time grants, scholarship aid, death benefits, and continuing assistance. But most importantly, the Fund keeps the heroes’ stories alive, ensuring that their acts of personal bravery will ripple across generations.

Education Writers’ Conference Tackles Thorny Issues

The Education Writers Association held its 71st national seminar at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles from May 19 to 21. This multiday conference is the country’s largest gathering of journalists covering education and provides participants with hands-on sessions for covering the topic from early childhood through graduate school.

The theme of this year’s seminar was “Room for All? Diversity in Education & the Media.” Several panels focused on helping journalists understand how today’s shifting demographics and cultural dynamics impact both the classroom and newsroom, with an eye toward helping attendees cover issues ranging from immigration and integration to free speech, gender identity, and mounting political polarization.

Students took center stage at a panel discussion about school shootings. High-school students David Hogg and Emma Gonzalez of Parkland, Florida, Alex King of Chicago, and Jackson Mittleman of Newtown, Connecticut, joined Education Week reporter Evie Blad for a wide-ranging conversation about guns, violence, school safety, and student activism.

President Gregorian Welcomes New Americans at JFK Library

On July 18, 200 people from more than 50 countries of origin gathered at the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum in Boston to share one unforgettable moment: they stood side by side, holding small American flags, to become naturalized United States citizens. Vartan Gregorian, the Iranian-born Armenian American president of Carnegie Corporation of New York, delivered the keynote, which was adapted and published by the Boston Globe.

Gregorian urged the new citizens to help America do better. “As citizens of this country we can — and we must — participate in the work of our democracy. That means undertaking a myriad of small actions, most of which do not take place on Election Day. Read, learn, listen to others, help your neighbors, speak out against injustice, and vote! Study our nation’s glorious past as well as its trials, tribulations, and tragedies. By doing so, you fulfill your rights and obligations as citizens.”

Carnegie Corporation of New York supports immigrant integration and civic engagement through its portfolio of philanthropic grants dedicated to democracy.
Adam Ambrogi is the director of the Elections Program at the Democracy Fund, a Jeffersonian foundation working to ensure that our political system is able to withstand new challenges and deliver on its promise to the American people. He previously served as chief counsel to the Senate Rules Committee.

A former writer and editor at Education Week, Jeff Archer is president of Knowledge Design Partners LLC, a communications and knowledge-management consulting firm with a focus on K-12 education research and innovation. Through KDP he supports educational nonprofits, academic organizations, and businesses in sharing the lessons learned from their work to improve teaching and student learning. This includes working with the Education program at Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Fred A. Bernheim studied architecture (at Princeton University) and law (at NYU) and writes about both subjects. He has contributed more than 450 articles, many on architecture, to the New York Times, and is a regular contributor to such magazines as Architectural Record and Architectural Dwell. He has also published journals like the New York University Review of Law and Social Change. In 2008 Bernheim won the Oskar奖, bestowed annually by the New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architects for excellence in architecture writing.

A British illustrator primarily creating conceptual work for newspapers, magazines, and advertising, Mitch Blunt has enjoyed providing illustrations for a diverse range of clients, including Bloomberg Businessweek, HarperCollins, Zephyr, Foreign Policy, the Atlantic, the New York Times, Wired, and more. mitchblunt.com

A transplant from Toronto, Marcos Chin has been living and working in New York City as an illustrator for over 15 years. An instructor at the School of Visual Arts, he has created illustrations for companies such as Google, Target, HBO, Starbucks, and the New York Times. marcoschin.com

Stephen Del Rosso is director of the International Peace and Security program at Carnegie Corporation of New York. Prior to joining the Corporation, he was a development professional at a New York City–based nonprofit organization empowering immigrant integration, voting rights protection, and voter engagement. Prior to joining the Corporation, Jung was a development professional at Finn Church Aid, where he managed peacebuilding and other activities aimed at engaging parents and communities, improving teaching and leadership for learning, advancing innovative learning environment designs, providing K-12 pathways to college and career success, and fostering integrative approaches to innovation and learning in the field of education.

A program analyst with Carnegie Corporation of New York’s Peace and Security program, Aaron Stanley focuses on peacefulbuilding in Africa, Asian security, and the Bridging the Gap portfolio. He came to the Corporation from P bla Church Aid, where he managed peacebuilding programs in Somalia. Stanley is a Ph.D. student in political science at the City University of New York. He holds an M.S. in violence, conflict, and development from the School of Oriental and American Studies, University of London, and a B.A. from Boston University.

A member of the inaugural class of Andrew Carnegie Fellows in 2009, Zeynep Tufekci is an associate professor at the University of North Carolina and an opinion writer at the New York Times. Her research revolves around the intersection between technology and society. Published by Yale University Press in 2017, Tufekci’s first book, Twitter and Tear Gas: The Power and Fragility of Networked Protest, examines how digital connectivity has transformed the public sphere, social movements, and politics. She is currently working on a book on the impact of artificial intelligence on society. @zeynep | technosociology.org

On the Cover: In blue works like Evening Beauty (2017), Nnenna Okore transforms largely recycled materials (in this case chewed cloth, jute string, lace, and wire) into ritual objects and spiritual totems. Her work explores themes of the female body, social justice, and the role of visual art in the public sphere. In 2018, Okore was identified as one of the most influential living artists. However, on the Cover, the work ‘Morning Beauty’ (2017), by Nnenna Okore. Ed Ruscha, A Book about Los Angeles: 1964–67, revised ed. or the New York Times. Architectural Record.
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