THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Final Report

THE FORMULATION OF BRITISH COLONIAL EDUCATION POLICY, 1923-1948

F. James Clatworthy

ORA Project 07498

under contract with:

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
CONTRACT NO. OE-6-10-050, PROJECT S-366
WASHINGTON, D. C.

administered through:

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION ANN ARBOR

August 1970

In Memory Of

Dr. Joseph H. Oldham

1874 - 1969

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is initially indebted to the Chairman of his Committee, Dr. Claude A. Eggertsen, without whose intellectual stimulation this study would not have been conceived, nor without whose monumental patience, encouragement, and support this study would not have been completed.

The author also wishes to acknowledge his sincere gratitude to the staff at Edinburgh House, Sir Christopher Cox, Mr. W.E.F. Ward, Dr. Margaret Read, Dr. Philipa Esdaile, Dame Margery Perham, and the Bishop of London for their generous assistance and kindest hospitality.

The author further wishes to thank Mrs. L. M. Clatworthy, 'Little Hardy,' Charlton, London, and his parents Mr. and Mrs. Frank Clatworthy, 'Saltash,' Deerfield Beach, Florida, for their moral and financial support. Parents, like wives, have the tenacity of faith that often makes all the difference.

Finally, the author wishes to reaffirm his deepest gratitude to his wife, whose spirit, encouragement, and assistance were a continual source of inspiration during the entire study. And to his daughter for her helpful understanding, a pledge to make up lost time together.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

The general assumption that education plays an important role in the development process for emergent nations, or the continuing advancement of post industrial societies, has led to an effort to increase the efficiency and impact of educational planning. This study attempts to aid in that endeavor through an historical analysis of British colonial education policy as formulated by the Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies. This official government committee had a continuous responsibility for cross-cultural educational planning for over thirty-seven years, but the span of this study covers the first twenty-five years from 1923 to 1948.

The study examines the hypothesis that the policy formulated by the Advisory Committee reflected a continuous attempt to orient education in the colonies to meet the local needs for human resource development. The study also examines to a subordinate degree the process of policy formulation and the various pressures and influences that were exerted by individuals who served on the Committee, as well as outside pressures.

The methodology utilized a technique of open-ended interviews to increase the available primary historical data which was limited to less than half a dozen documents which were made public by the Colonial Office. The interviews led to a large amount of primary source material, including a set of Advisory Committee minutes which were not available through the Colonial Office.

The study substantiates the hypothesis that the policy advocated by the Advisory Committee reflected a continuous attempt to orient colonial education

to meet the local needs for human resource development. The opportunity to examine policy over time allowed an analysis of the value guidelines of policy and disclosed that British colonial education policy was formulated with humanistic community development as its major value guidelines. British colonial education policy was primarily a heuristic policy in that it established value objectives as guides for practice rather than specifying the formula to reach those objectives. Variety in practice was encouraged as long as the values of local policy were consistent with values of the Colonial Office. However, the Committee had no direct authority to intervene when the Colonial Office policy and local colonial practices were out of phase even though such was so frequently the case.

The process of policy formation disclosed the role of key individuals as effective leverage points in the continuum of policy development. A knowledge of personal contributions to the committee process of policy formulation afforded an opportunity to examine both the spirit and letter of British colonial education policy.

The study does not attempt to compare policy with practice. The Committee was fully aware that policy and practice were not always in agreement. The Committee did not have executive power and could only affect what it considered deviations from policy through indirect means which were only partially successful. The actual educational practice in most colonies was far from the policy advocated, a discrepancy not only due to economic and political factors but also to a conflict of values at both the local and Imperial level.

An additional contribution of the study is derived from an examination of policy formation over an extended period of time. The data seem to indicate

that policy could be viewed, in part, from the position of axiological synecology. The value objectives in any one vertical policy area like education, economics, or social services, could be coordinated with the value objectives in other areas so that the entire span of human activity might be coordinated through general value principles that have synecological application. Further study might be given to the axiological character of policy and its influence within the broad perspective of the interaction of communities and their environment (synecology).

I

A STUDY OF POLICY

Education will continue to play a key role in the development of human resources, especially for the emergent nations or Third World countries. Even in countries of long established cultural and economic traditions, the need for the continual development of human resources places pressures on the educational institutions which could result in either a new release of energy directed at social change or revolution, depending on responses by the institutions.

How human resources are developed through the educational system depends on the formulation of an educational policy which attempts to expand and maximize the capacities of that system. The formulation of educational policy by a government, however, is inexorably a political judgment which is the product of many forces, but one which does influence development.

The need for research in the area of educational policy formulation has been suggested by several sources. The International Institute for Educational Planning, for example, met during the summer of 1964 to discuss research needs in educational planning. One of their recommendations was that studies should be made of the, "administration and implementation of education planning."[1] This would involve studies of countries with educational planning experience to examine their procedures and institutional framework for the formulation of educational policy. The need for research in the area of educational policy

[1] Guy Benveniste, "Major Research Needs in Educational Planning" (mimeographed), Bellagio, Italy: I.I.E.P., 1964, p. 28.

formulation was also suggested by Gordon C. Ruscoe in Dysfunctionality in Jamaican Education,[2] and implied by E. Christian Anderson in "The Development of Government Policy for Education in Sierra Leone, 1882 to 1961."[3] In both of these studies it was apparent that evaluations or discussions of educational policy in former British colonial territories cannot be completely meaningful without an understanding of the objectives of British colonial education policy, or the nature of its formulation and implementation.

Great Britain and her colonial empire offer a good case study for the formulation of educational policy. Great Britain pioneered in the field of cross-cultural educational planning on an official level, and established an Advisory Committee to advise the Secretary of State for the Colonies on educational matters for all, or individual colonies. It was not the province of this body, nor did it so operate, to direct the educational activities in the colonial states. Its documents contain ample references to the failure of colonial authorities to carry out the recommendations of the Committee.

This study offers an historical analysis of the formulation of British colonial education policy. It focuses on the institutional framework created to formulate policy, and investigates the various pressures which affected Britain's colonial education policy. It examines the hypothesis that the educational policies recommended by the Colonial Office Advisory Committee on

---

[2] Gordon C. Ruscoe, Dysfunctionality in Jamaican Education (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan School of Education, 1963), p. 121.

[3] E. Christian Anderson, "The Development of Government Policy for Education in Sierra Leone, 1882 to 1961" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1964), p. 235.

Education reflected a continuous attempt to orient education policy in the colonies to local needs for human resource development. The study further provides a limited analysis of the functional relationship between the administrative structure of the Advisory Committee and the various personalities who interacted with the committee in the process of policy formulation. Although reactions of colonies to statements of recommended practices were treated as a part of policy formulation, it is not the purpose of this inquiry to compare Committee policy with local practice. However, an examination of several studies of practices reveals a great discrepancy between recommendation and performance.[4]

For the purpose of this study, "British colonial education policy" is defined as that policy which was formulated by the Advisory Committee on Education. It does not include the educational policy formulated in the various colonies. "Colonial" refers to the geographic areas whose educational policy came under review by the British Colonial Office. This excludes the Dominions and India, but also the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, North Borneo, and Serawak. It includes areas such as Palestine, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, and Swaziland while these territories were administered through other offices, but their educational problems were considered by the Advisory Committee.[5]

---

[4]Studies on educational practice in former British colonies can be found in The University of Michigan Comparative Education Dissertation Series: Gordon C. Ruscoe, Dysfunctionality in Jamaican Education, 1963 (no. 1); Erma F. Muckenhirn, Secondary Education and Girls in Western Nigeria, 1966 (no. 9); George E. F. Urch, The Africanization of Curriculum in Kenya, 1968 (no. 12); E. Christian Anderson and Earl D. Baker, Educational Development in Sierra Leone, 1969 (no. 15); Louis F. Dolan, Transition from Colonialism to Self-Reliance in Tanzanian Education, 1970 (no. 16).

[5]The Dominions Office (later Commonwealth Office) administered these areas, but the Colonial Office was responsible for communications regarding the social services.

For the purpose of this study, educational needs will be defined as the educational objectives and/or institutions which were considered essential for the educational development of a given colony. The people who considered them essential and the definition of educational development requires further delineation.

While the evaluation of educational needs was a function of the Advisory Committee, other channels also expressed what were considered to be "educational needs." These channels consisted of colonial officials, missionary representatives, native councils, European settlers, and business interests within a given colony. It thus became a function of the Advisory Committee to assess the educational needs envisioned by the various intra-colonial interests, consider these in light of other educational experiences and the committee's ideas on educational needs, and then arrive at a statement which attempted to establish the guidelines for transforming educational needs into policy.

"Educational development" will be defined as the physical expansion of the educational system. The consideration of "educational development" can thus be seen in the same light as "educational needs." The Advisory Committee acted as a debate forum for ideas on educational development and within its given authority attempted to formulate policy which would advance the stage of educational development within a given colony.

Obviously the Advisory Committee made judgments on what it considered "educational needs" and "educational development." However, it is not within the scope of this study to make an evaluation of the Advisory Committee's judgments, but rather to analyze as objectively as possible the relationship

between what was considered an educational need and what ultimately became educational policy.

The administrative structure of the colonial empire required that the Sovereign appoint a Governor who represented the Sovereign in a particular territory. The executive powers of the Crown were thus vested in the Governor. It was because of this individual relationship, Crown-Governor, that the development of the colonial empire has been described by an inter-war Secretary of State as, "an autochthonous evolution."[6] The autochthonous nature of the colonial empire would seem to negate any apparent influence that the Colonial Office might have had in establishing policy for a given colony, or the colonies as a whole. However, in practice this was not the case. The Crown acted on the advice of Ministers and as such the Secretary of State for the Colonies had the power of influencing both the appointment of Governors as well as their dismissal. The Secretary of State, however, was dependent on information from the colony in making judgments and this information formally passed through the Governor. Further, the Secretary of State as a government minister was responsible to Parliament. Thus a delicate system of balances were in operation which made the Secretary of State and the Governor the chief executives in the administrative structure of the colonial empire.

In educational matters the Secretary of State was advised by the Advisory Committee on Education, and since he relied on their opinion, expert or otherwise, the advice they rendered in effect became the advice of the Secretary of

---

[6] W. A. Ormsby-Gore in F. H. Melland, ed., Lord Hailey's African Survey (London: Macmillan, 1939), p. 17.

State and as such the policy of the Colonial Office. A Governor was not required by any written law to follow the advice of the Colonial Office; however, by a heritage of tradition, and perhaps more realistically a desire for self-advancement, a Governor would cooperate as fully as possible in carrying out the Secretary of State's advice on educational matters. If there were peculiar local conditions which prevented a Governor from complying, the problem was usually relayed back to the Secretary of State who in turn passed it on to the Advisory Committee for further study. Adjustments could always be made in general policy statements to fit the unusual local situation. Behind what appears to be these simple channels of communication and authority lay the bureaucratic structure of the Colonial Office civil service. It was this structure and its counterpart in the colonies that manipulated the day-to-day functions of the administrative machine. Its channels of communication and authority were fairly well defined, yet the "labyrinth effect" could be detrimental to formulating policies or making quick decisions.

There are few works which deal directly with the Advisory Committee on Education. The most recent is a study by L. J. Lewis, Educational Policy and Practice in British Tropical Areas (1954). His study, however, is primarily a digest of Advisory Committee policy statements and does not provide an analysis of the formulation of the colonial education policy. The lack of source material accounts for the restriction since he used only the major Colonial Office documents which were available to the public up to 1953. The other work, Education in the Colonial Empire (1939), by Arthur Mayhew, which deals with the Advisory Committee is more a personal account of one individual's

view of British educational policy. However, the fact that Mr. Mayhew was a Joint-Secretary of the Advisory Committee makes the book valuable for a study on the formulation of policy since it does discuss what one member of the Advisory Committee felt were the basic educational needs of the colonial peoples.

Other books which deal indirectly with the Advisory Committee on Education, but which have been useful in many ways are Margaret Read's, Education and Social Change in Tropical Areas; W. E. F. Ward's, Educating Young Nations and Fraser of Trinity and Achimota; and Lord Lugard's, The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa.

Works by Africans offer some interesting and often conflicting views on the British colonial heritage, and in particular the British educational policies. Nigerian Education, edited by Dr. Okechukwu Ikejiani, represents a strong anti-British sentiment. The first chapter, written by P. Uduarho Okeke, discusses the educational background of Nigeria and concludes that the British rulers did not want to educate Africans for positions which provided jobs for themselves and that the British knew that if they intensified the education of Nigerians they would hasten the end of occupation.[7] In a more reasoned view, Davidson Nicol suggested that the British could have done more, but what was done was done well. Nicol believes that Africans would not necessarily have done much better had they been in the place of the British.[8] This view gains

---

[7] Okechukwu Ikejiani, ed., Nigerian Education (Praeger: New York, 1965), p. 4.

[8] Davidson Nicol, Africa—A Subjective View (Ghana University Press: London, 1964) p. 52.

strong support if the development of Liberian education is compared with any of the British African colonies.

Some periodicals have contributed useful information for studying the Advisory Committee on Education. Foremost is Oversea Education which was created by the Advisory Committee as a vehicle for spreading educational ideas and experiments throughout the colonies. The Journal of the Royal African Society; the journal of the International Institute of African Languages and Culture, Africa; and the International Review of Missions were also beneficial for articles dealing with policy statements or problems the Advisory Committee was in the process of evaluating.

Government sources include the reports of officials who made tours of various colonial areas, as well as government commissions of inquiry on various topics. The public reports of the Advisory Committee together with the Minutes of the Committee provide a record of the major policy statements on education and are basic to this study. Parliamentary debates offer another source, although limited for reasons which will be developed later, of the pressures which affected colonial education policy.

Great Britain was not alone among nations in having faced the responsibility for providing education for colonial peoples. France, Belgium, the United States, and others have shared similar responsibilities. Great Britain's response, however, was unique and, in part, is the reason for the significance of this study. The British response to colonial obligations of trusteeship in the area of education was the creation of the Advisory Committee in 1923.

The work which this Committee undertook represents 37 years of educational planning and was a unique experience in the field of educational development for underdeveloped countries. As Professor Claude A. Eggertsen stated in 1960, "America is spending vast sums and utilizing the talents of thousands of Americans in an attempt to help the world through education, while those of us responsible for furnishing guidelines for this effort on the basis of historical and contemporary experiences have failed to supply the needed help."[9]

It is for this reason that an historical study of the formulation of British colonial education policy will be most significant. There is a great deal to be learned about the role of education in a developing economy, but historical investigations of past attempts at educational planning may be helpful in acquiring needed objectivity as well as providing a useful framework upon which educational theory and practice can be added.

This study provides an historical analysis of the formulation of British colonial policy from 1923 to 1948. The study further provides a limited analysis of the functional relationship between the administrative structure of the Advisory Committee and the various personalities who interacted with the Committee in the process of policy formulation. It examines the hypothesis that the educational policies recommended by the Colonial Office Advisory Committee on Education during the first twenty-five years of its operation reflected a continuous attempt to orient education policy in the colonies to local needs for human resource development.

---

[9]Professor Claude A. Eggertsen, "English Education and the Cultures of East and West," Studies in Comparative Education: Education in England (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education Pamphlet OE-14061, 1961), p. 51.

The analysis of the creation of the Advisory Committee examines the basic pressures which brought the British government to recognize the need for creating a colonial education policy. The analysis also discovers the personalities who were primarily responsible for transforming ideas about education into policy. As the Advisory Committee becomes a reality, the focus of the study follows the administrative development of the Committee to inquire into how individual pressures affected the secretariat function of the Committee, and to determine how the recognition of educational needs was filtered through the institutional structure of the Committee.

With a background of the administrative developments of the Advisory Committee, the study then examines the formulation of education policy in three stages. The first consists of policy formulated as a foundation for further educational development. The second comprises a period when the policy became evaluative in order to prepare for further expansion of the educational policy. The third consists of the formulation of policy which would ultimately see most of the colonies through to independence and Commonwealth status. As a conclusion, the role of the Advisory Committee is discussed in terms of the Committee formulating policy to meet the varying needs of the colonies through values that were to be guides for the practice of education in the colonies.

II

THE TRANSFORMATION OF IDEAS INTO POLICY

The formulation of formal educational policy by the British Colonial Office began in 1923 with the creation of the Advisory Committee on Native Education in British Tropical Africa. While this committee was given wider geographic reference, enlarged, and renamed the Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies in 1929, the essential function of the Committee remained the same. It was to advise the Secretary of State on any matters of education and to assist him, "in advancing the progress of education in those Colonies and Protectorates."[1]

An examination of the origin of the Committee was helpful for delineating the pressures on educational policy formulation and the personalities responsible for influential decisions.[2] A knowledge of the pressures and personalities assists one in the examination of educational policy by focusing on the channels of communication through which educational needs were recognized and transformed into policy.

---

[1] Letter from Secretary of State for the Colonies to the Governors, December 27, 1923, in Advisory Committee on Native Education in Tropical Africa (London: H.M.S.O., 1929), p. 296.

[2] The government version contained in the Colonial Office memorandum on the Advisory Committee, African Pamphlets, Vol. II, No. 47, Colonial Office Library, places the initiative with the Colonial Office. R. Oliver's account in The Missionary Factor in East Africa (London: Longmans, 1952), pp. 264-271, places the initiative with Ormsby-Gore. Dame Margery Perham's treatment in Lugard: The Years of Authority (London: Collins, 1960), pp. 657-660, implies Lugard's importance in the creation of the committee. G.K.A. Bell's version in Randall Davidson (London: Oxford University Press, 1935), pp. 1230-1234, implies that the creation of the Advisory Committee was an outcome of the East African crisis.

The Committee had two origins: one lay in the institutional structure of the Colonial Office; the other in the interest and effort of Dr. J. H. Oldham.[3] The institutional origins of the Committee can be found in the creation of advisory committees within the Colonial Office administration. In 1905 the Colonial Survey Committee was established to advise on survey problems and was composed of outside experts as well as government officials. In 1909 the Advisory Medical and Sanitary Committee for Tropical Africa was formed along similar lines, including a Secretariat provided by the Colonial Office.

In 1921, however, a slightly different method was tried with the creation of an adviser on business matters.[4] This single adviser working without pay proved an unsatisfactory arrangement and was dropped in 1923. Thus, when the Colonial Office created the Advisory Committee on Education in 1923, it had some administrative experience upon which to draw, and fashioned the new committee in the image of the 1905 and 1909 Advisory Committees with outside experts who gave their service voluntarily and a secretariat supplied by the Colonial Office.

The key personality behind the Colonial Office influence upon the creation of the Advisory Committee was the Hon. William G. A. Ormsby-Gore, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies. If it had not been for Ormsby-Gore's genuine interest in education and his position of influence within the Colonial

---

[3] Joseph Houldsworth Oldham, C.B.E., M.A.: b. October 20, 1874 - d. May 16, 1969; graduate of Trinity College, Oxford; Secretary of the International Missionary Council, 1921-1938; Administrative Director of the International Institute of African Languages and Culture, 1931-1938; Member of the A.C.E.C., 1923-1936; Editor of the Christian Newsletter, 1939-1945; Senior Officer of the Christian Frontier Council, 1942-1947.

[4] Sir James Stevenson who had been with John Walker and Sons, the distillers.

Office, the Committee would probably never have been created.[5] Ormsby-Gore's interest in education and his influence within the Colonial Office were alone insufficient to bring about the creation of the Advisory Committee; however, his capacity to know when and where to influence policy decisions within the Colonial Office was a major asset in initiating a Colonial education policy.

Ormsby-Gore knew of the Phelps-Stokes Commission which had visited Africa from September, 1920 to June, 1921, and agreed with the view that education was an important aspect of political, economic, and social development.[6] He also knew that if Great Britain were to live up to her responsibilities of trusteeship she would have to provide among other things, greater educational development in the colonies.[7] Ormsby-Gore's work load and position as Parliamentary Under-Secretary prevented him from making specific proposals on the problems of education, but when an outside influence offered to initiate proposals, Ormsby-Gore assisted as much as possible.

The origin of the Advisory Committee stems from a dynamic synthesizer, a genius at influential action, and one of Britain's most unrecognized public servants—Dr. J. H. Oldham. Oldham has been characterized by others who knew him as "a Christian saint" and a "busy-body of genius,"[8] and "sincere, selfless, thoughtful,...and gentle."[9]

---

[5]Interview with J. H. Oldham, February 10, 1965.

[6]Sir F. D. Lugard, The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa (London: William Blackwood and Sons, Ltd., 1921), p. 459.

[7]Great Britain, Parliamentary Debates (Commons), Vol. 162 (1923), p. 1139.

[8]Sir Ralph Furse, Aucuparius (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), p. 124.

[9]Perham, Lugard, op. cit., p. 659. And by Ronald E. Wraith, in Guggisberg (London: Oxford University Press, 1967), as "the arch-intriguer for good," p. 146.

Oldham's concern for African education stems from his close association with Dr. Thomas Jesse Jones, Educational Director of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, and Oldham's position as Secretary of the International Missionary Council. Oldham met Jones during the summer of 1919 when Jones was in England, and was greatly impressed with Jones's knowledge of American Negro education and his "great fund of common sense."[10] Oldham and Jones remained in close contact from that time on, and in fact, it was through Oldham that part of the British West African colonies, as well as representatives of a British missionary society, Reverend and Mrs. Arthur Wilkie, were included in the first Phelps-Stokes Fund study of African education in 1920-21.[11] It was the published results of this first educational survey of Africa, Education in Africa, which clearly laid out the need for educational development in Africa, and specifically emphasized missionary and government cooperation in the field of education.[12]

Oldham's responsibility as a result of the Lake Mohonk, New York, meeting of the International Missionary Council in October, 1921, was to pursue further the investigations, urged on him by the Conference at Crans (1920), of the position of Christian Education in the mission field, especially in relation to the

---

[10] Interview with Dr. J. H. Oldham, April 28, 1965.

[11] J.H.O. to Reverend A. W. Wilkie, March 5 and March 22, 1920. Oldham Papers, International Missionary Council Archives (I.M.C.), Edinburgh House, London; by kind permission of Dr. J. H. Oldham. All further references to personal correspondence to or from J. H. Oldham will be found in the Oldham Papers unless otherwise stated, and will be cited as J.H.O.

[12] Dr. Thomas Jesse Jones, Education in Africa (New York: Phelps-Stokes Fund, 1922), pp. 92-96.

rapid extension of state systems of education.[13] This investigation originated with Oldham's own concern for the development of education in Africa, and with his knowledge and association with Dr. Jones and the work that the Phelps-Stokes Fund was undertaking. In a letter to the Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, Reverend C. H. Patton in April, 1920, Oldham stated that the question of the future of Christian schools demanded immediate attention.[14]

Oldham thought it essential that the missionary societies have a common policy, and in order to achieve this he suggested to Patton that he would bring the whole question before the international missionary meeting to be held at Crans in the end of June.[15] Oldham's efforts succeeded at Crans which in turn led to the even stronger position given to him at the Lake Mohonk Conference. Thus, it was Oldham who started the missionary societies thinking about a general unification of their educational goals and objectives with a view of cooperation with government, rather than competition.

Oldham was familiar with the writings of Professor Paul Monroe and used them as a wedge to persuade missionaries of the need for a unified policy with regard to education. Professor Monroe insisted that the development of an effective governmental system of education was essential, but that missionary educational efforts should be allowed the greatest possible freedom, "provided

---

[13] Minutes of International Missionary Council, October 1-6, 1921, Lake Mohonk, New York.

[14] J.H.O. to Reverend Patton, April 4, 1920.

[15] Ibid.

they come up to the minimal essentials of a positive, legitimate character to be required of all schools and enforced in government schools as well as those of a private character."[16] Oldham agreed, for he realized the missionary societies would never have the financial resources to compete with government in building schools; therefore, if the missions could not compete in quantity they should concentrate on quality.

Oldham thought the missionary societies should aim at the establishment of model schools and unify their efforts. He suggested that the loss through the closing of any particular institution which was doing some good work would be obvious, but emphasized that only a very powerful imagination could picture the gain which would result from a consolidated effort.[17] Oldham, however, could see that before the missions could hope to concentrate their efforts, there would have to be a policy on the part of the Imperial government with which the missions could cooperate.

With the backing of the International Missionary Council meetings at Lake Mohonk, New York, in 1921, and Canterbury, England, in 1922, Oldham was placed in a position which necessitated action to bring about greater cooperation between government and missionary societies. After the missionary conference at Canterbury, Oldham left for an extended trip to India, returning to England in March of 1923. By this time the Phelps-Stoke Fund report, Education in Africa,

---

[16] Paul Monroe, "The Place of Mission Education in a National Educational System," unpublished article sent to J. H. Oldham, April, 1922.

[17] J. H. Oldham, "Notes on Christian Education," unpublished material dated 1922. The chronology of the material in the Oldham Papers suggests it was used for the I.M.C. meeting at Canterbury, England, July 27-30, 1922.

had made some impact, and as an Imperial Education Conference had been announced for the summer of 1923, Oldham felt it was time to make some suggestions to the government for creating a colonial education policy.

Turning to a close friend for advice and consultation, Oldham had occasion to speak with Sir Michael Sadler, England's notable educational adviser, during the evening of March 8, 1923. Their discussion touched upon several topics that evening because Oldham had more than one problem facing him at the time.[18] Apparently, Oldham was able to approach Sir Michael with the idea of trying to get the government to initiate a colonial education policy with which the missionary societies could cooperate. Sir Michael was not enthusiastic about the idea and undoubtedly had strong reservations as to how government officials might interpret oldham's intentions, for on the following day Oldham wrote Sir Michael:

> I have not the smallest desire to secure anything for missionary schools except in so far as they can serve the educational good of Africa. But I believe their future to be important, first because many of the best African administrators, like Sir Frederick Lugard, are convinced that education, to be of use to the African, must be on a religous basis, and secondly because, as we have seen in India, private effort allows room for initiative, experiment and development of special types.[19]

To initiate government action, Oldham was faced with two alternatives. He could take the matter before the Imperial Education Conference scheduled for the summer of 1923, although Oldham foresaw that it would be a body composed almost exclusively of officials, all of whom might well take the official point of

---

[18] Native conditions and land settlement in East Africa were other problems.

[19] J.H.O. to Sir Michael Sadler, March 9, 1923.

view.[20] The other alternative was to take the matter to the Colonial Office. Oldham felt that the Colonial Office would provide an occasion for having the question considered.[21] Sadler apparently acquiesced with Oldham's analysis of how to approach the government, although Sadler's trip to Canada prevented practical communication on the problem. Sadler managed to write Oldham from Toronto, saying, "As always it was a memorable thing to meet you when we were in London. You say a lot without saying it. I have chewed the cud since."[22]

Feeling that he had more chance of success in approaching the Colonial Office, Oldham wrote to the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, the Right Honourable William G. A. Ormsby-Gore, asking for the opportunity of an informal talk on the subject of African education. Oldham carefully explained his purpose in this manner:

> I am anxious that the missionary societies should not work at cross purposes with the Government but cooperate to the utmost extent possible. On our side this means a considerable education of the missionary body. On the other hand effective cooperation requires a definite policy on the part of Government with which we can cooperate.[23]

Ormsby-Gore's reply was immediate, and set Thursday, March 22, 1923, at 11:30 a.m. as the appropriate time for their discussion. Oldham's problem as to the most effective course of action was solved at the meeting.

---

[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Sir Michael Sadler to J.H.O., April 3, 1923.

[23] J.H.O to Ormsby-Gore, March 13, 1923.

The only evidence of the nature of the discussion between Oldham and Ormsby-Gore is contained in a letter Oldham wrote to Dr. Thomas Jesse Jones, Educational Director of the Phelps-Stokes Fund. The day after his meeting with Ormsby-Gore, Oldham sent Jones a cable asking him to come to England in early May rather than June, when Jones had planned to attend the Imperial Education Conference. To explain the urgent request, Oldham summarized his discussions with Ormsby-Gore which had made it clear that policy would be made at the Governor's Conference, not the Imperial Education Conference.

> I had an interview to-day with Mr. Ormsby-Gore, the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, and discussed with him some of the larger questions relating to the future of native education in the British Colonies of Africa. He informs me that the three Governors from West Africa are all arriving early in May and that they will certainly confer together quite early after their arrival in regard to educational policy. The Governor of Kenya Colony is also coming over about the same time. Major Ormsby-Gore proposed that I should be called into conference with them and has asked me to prepare a memorandum on the subject. The commercial interests will also be consulted.
>
> You will realise that it is in these preliminary discussions that policies actually take shape. Supposing at one or more round-table conferences the Governors of the three West African Colonies form certain ideas which are mutually agreed upon and which, in consultation with us, they believe to be acceptable to the missionary societies, those are the ideas that will go through and the discussions at the Imperial Education Conference will have no effect upon them.[24]

Oldham had been skeptical of the Imperial Education Conference as a way of initiating policy, for the meetings were occasions for talk, but not for action. Thus, the March 22 meeting with Ormsby-Gore gave Oldham the opportunity he was seeking. First, he had found a receptive ear at the Colonial

---

[24] J.H.O to Dr. T. J. Jones, March 23, 1923.

Office to the problems of education. Second, he was given an inside track on policy formulation and shown how his ideas might have a chance of producing results. With Ormsby-Gore at work in the Colonial Office and Oldham in consultation with his wide range of contacts outside, success seemed probable. The course of action would involve the Colonial Office, not the Imperial Education Conference.[25]

Oldham had successfully laid the groundwork for the creation of a Colonial education policy by discussion with Ormsby-Gore; however, a difficult task remained in the preparation for the forthcoming Governors' Conference. Oldham realized that a carefully prepared memorandum which received the governors' support would be the necessary document to initiate executive action by the Colonial Secretary, but he was also enough of a diplomat to know that in order to insure support he would have to work well in advance of the Conference. Oldham's experience with affecting policy since his involvement with the Edinburgh Conference of 1910[26] would prove helpful in the creation of a formal Colonial Office education policy.

In the preparation of the memorandum, "Educational Policy in Africa," Oldham consulted a number of individuals both for the purpose of examining the

---

[25] Oldham did meet with Major W. Maclean, Secretary of the Advisory Committee on the Imperial Education Conference at the Board of Education on March 28, 1923. At this meeting he was informed that for admission approval he would have to write a Mr. Batterbee. Oldham complied with this request and was informed on June 6, 1923, that the I.M.C. could send one representative, but only when the subject of Native Education was under discussion. How ironic that he should be notified on the very day he would achieve success at the Colonial Office.

[26] See Hogg's Ecumenical Foundations (New York: Harper and Bros., 1952), pp. 105-130, for Oldham's key role in the Edinburgh Conference of 1910.

accuracy of some of his statements, as well as uncovering objections to certain ideas before they could damage the whole approach. Oldham sent out drafts of the memorandum as early as April 12, and by the end of April had sent out copies to a dozen individuals as well as members of the Education Committee of the Conference of British Missionary Societies.[27] The Education Committee was scheduled to meet on May 4, 1923, but the day before Oldham received the first letter in opposition to his proposal. It came from the Church Missionary Society's representative on the Education Committee, Reverend G. T. Manley, who expressed his inability to grasp the "inwardness" of the memorandum, and felt that the statement, "A policy of partnership involves consultation," would lead to government interference.[28] Oldham, unable to convince Reverend Manley before the Education Committee meeting, apparently had sufficient support at the meeting to obtain approval of the memorandum.

After the meeting, Oldham wrote to Garfield Williams, Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, in hopes that he could convince Reverend Manley that the proposal for a Colonial education policy which would involve cooperation with the missionary societies would not lead to government interference, rather, "the whole object of the present move is the precise opposite."[29] From the missionary viewpoint, the suggestions embodied in Oldham's memorandum would secure their educational efforts in Africa and prevent an anti-missionary governor or

---

[27] Oldham was Chairman of the Education Committee and had to have its approval before sending the memorandum to Ormsby-Gore. The task was not altogether easy.

[28] Reverend G. T. Manley to J.H.O., May 3, 1923.

[29] J.H.O. to Dr. Garfield Williams, May 4, 1923.

education officials from excluding schools supported by religious organizations from participating in the education of Africans. The motives behind this move might be highly suspect by advocates of secular education; however, Dr. Oldham's intentions were not to secure a vested interest for missionary education, but to propose a policy which would best fit the needs of Africans in relation to their resources in the decade of the 1920's. For a closer look at what Oldham intended, an examination of his memorandum is essential.

The memorandum, "Educational Policy in Africa," which was submitted on behalf of the Education Committee of the British Conference of Missionary Societies, had six major sections plus an appendix consisting of five statements supporting the importance of religion in African education. Section One, "The Present Position," takes up a statement made by Ormsby-Gore during the debate in Parliament on Empire Trade on April 10, 1923. Speaking on administration in the African Crown Colonies, Ormsby-Gore said, "the first duty is to give the native a chance to advance in the scale of civilization and in moral and material prosperity."[30]

Oldham suggested that if effect were to be given to Ormsby-Gore's statement, greater resources would have to be used for education than the missionary societies could provide. Oldham then showed that in some colonies (Uganda and Nyasaland) education was completely in missionary hands while even in Sierra Leone only slightly better than one-tenth of native education took place in government schools.

---

[30] Memorandum on Educational Policy in Africa, International Missionary Council Archives, Box E 18. Hereafter cited as Memorandum on Policy (1923).

Section Two explained the "Importance of Co-operation." Since the job was so large and the resources limited there was only one solution, "the co-operation of all concerned."[31] This meant government, missionary societies, the European settler community, and the natives themselves. Africans who read this section might be skeptical of the wording and suggest the essence of capitalist-colonist exploitation. This is not what Oldham intended. His concern is expressed in Section Three, "Goal of Educational Policy." Oldham was interested only in, "the improvement of the life of the masses of the people."[32] He believed that the recommendations of the Phelps-Stokes Commission Report, Education in Africa, were the best way to meet the needs of Africans. Attention should be given to the third paragraph of the memorandum as it attempts to clarify the view that education should be related to the needs of the community and not purely an academic exercise with no relation to the development of the local community:

> This emphasis on the practical side of education has nothing whatever to do with the view which favours industrial education for the natives as a means of keeping them in an inferior and subordinate position. Through fear of this, efforts to give education a more practical turn are likely to meet with opposition from the native side, until it is understood that what is proposed is sincerely advocated as the most effective means of enabling the community as a whole to make real progress, as has been recognized by the most distinguished Negro educators and leaders of the Negro race in the United States, and that the making of education more practical is in harmony with the most progressive educational thought and policy in the West.[33]

---

[31] Ibid., p. 1.

[32] Ibid., p. 2.

[33] Ibid.

Recent African criticism of British educational efforts suggests that the British ignored the demands of educated Africans, or the writings of W. E. B. Du Bois, and blindly followed the Booker T. Washington school of thought which placed emphasis on training in the skilled trades and encouragement in industry and common labor.[34] In point of fact, Dr. Du Bois did not reject Washington's ideas, but felt that room should also be made in the educational structure for the "talented tenth," so that Negro leadership could be enlarged.[35] Oldham certainly recognized the need for both types of education and was constantly exerting pressure on missionary societies, and later the government, to provide more facilities for the "talented tenth."

"A Policy of Partnership" which Oldham describes in Section Four would be the basic essential, "to ensure the consistent carrying out of what ever broad lines of policy the Imperial government might after consideration determine to be best suited to meet the educational needs of Africa."[36] The policy would also give the missionary societies the assurance that their position or opportunities in African education would not be reduced, "except after the fullest deliberation."[37]

---

[34] Godfrey Brown, "British Educational Policy in West and Central Africa," The Journal of Modern African Studies, Vol. II, No. 3 (November, 1964), pp. 365-377.

[35] W.E.B. Du Bois, Dusk of Dawn (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1940), p. 70.

[36] Memorandum on Policy (1923), op. cit., p. 3.

[37] Ibid.

The deliberation would take place on "Advisory Boards" which was the heading for Section Five of the memorandum. The outcome was a direct result of partnership in education. If the British government were to recognize partnership, which it would almost have to do because of the practice at home, as well as the policy established in India with the famous Dispatch of 1854, they would also have to provide for consultation. There was nothing new or unusual in Advisory Boards as they already existed in Natal, the Gold Coast, Nigeria, Uganda, and Kenya. Sir Frederick Lugard in his famous work on colonial administration, The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa, strongly advocated boards of education which would represent school managers, influential members of the community representing both Native and European, and tribal chiefs.[38]

Oldham's point, however, was that Advisory Boards should not only be used by colonies which did not have them, but that the Colonial Office should create an Advisory Committee on Education to oversee the educational work in the colonies and devote itself to the larger aspects of education in the form of educational guidelines, research, and the collection and dissemination of information for the benefit of all the colonies. The Advisory Committee would not only supplement the work of the various advisory boards in the colonies, but also provide for effective consultation and cooperation between Government and private agencies. If the need for cooperation and consultation, research, and communication of education ideas were insufficient reason for establishing an Advisory Committee at the Colonial Office, then Oldham suggested an even greater

---

[38] Ibid.

reason, one which was basic to the whole relationship between Great Britain and her Colonies, the development of human resources:

> In the administration of our large African Empire considerable provision has been made for the scientific study of the best means of developing its material resources. Very little has yet been done to devote serious thought to the best means of developing its human resources and the advancement of the peoples for whom we claim to act as trustee. The mind of the nineteenth century was predominantly occupied with development of material resources. The present century is happily witnessing an increasing recognition of the importance of the human factor in the life of mankind. The appointment of such a committee as is suggested would be an important step in a direction in which progress must be made.[39]

The concluding section of Oldham's memorandum, Section Six, "The Missionary Contribution," gave the government assurance that the missionary societies recognized the need for better trained personnel and that they would endeavor to send out men and women with, "the highest educational qualifications."[40] As an example of good faith Oldham mentioned the Education Commission (Phelps-Stokes) which recently visited Africa under missionary auspices in an effort, "of bringing their educational work up to the highest standards of modern and progressive educational theory and practice."[41] Oldham foresaw that only by Government and Missions working together could the best results be achieved, and only by their mutual development of policy could their individual achievements be focused on the common goal of developing the human resources of the British African colonies.

---

[39] Ibid., p. 4.

[40] Ibid.

[41] Ibid.

The Appendix to the memorandum is composed of five testimonies to the importance of religion in African education. One of the testimonies, the East African Protectorate Report, sets the general tone and reasoning for the nature of the whole Appendix:

> The native requires something more than an abstract moral code in place of his primitive moral law and a definite religious belief is necessary if he is to become an honest and respectable member of society.[42]

The manner in which British colonial administrators, and it should be added, most church officials working in the colonies, viewed the needs of Africans is pertinent, and the justification for their opinions interesting. The opinions on the need for a moral code expressed by Sir Frederick Lugard and others were highly indicative of the thinking of the majority of British officials and can be taken as representative of the statements being expressed in the 1920's concerning the role of religious education as a form of character training:

> Experience in India, China, and Africa seems to demonstrate that purely secular education (including moral instruction) divorced from religious sanctions, produced, among races not habituated to the ethics of a monothesistic religion, a class which lacks reverence and respect, whether for parents, social superiors, employers or Government. To inculcate this discipline and to overcome the natural proclivities of the African boy requires every influence which can be brought to bear, and there is no doubt that no influence can be stronger with youth—perhaps especially in Africa—than that of religion.[43]

Although some of the statements in the memorandum are clearly racist in tone and intent, it should be remembered that the overall memorandum represents a unique synthesis of tradition, progress, and gentle persuasion. This was

---

[42] Ibid., p. 5.

[43] Ibid.

Oldham's genius, his ability to blend areas of mutual agreement into a well ordered statement designed to unify government and church, governors and missionaries, and point them all toward a common goal of assisting and allowing the African to develop himself and his society. Oldham was already far in advance of the economic advisers to the Colonial Office; he realized the value of human resource development and its correlation with economic development.

Oldham's final task after writing the memorandum and having it approved by the Education Committee of the Conference of British Missionary Societies was the careful preparation for the Governors' Conference scheduled for June 6, 1923. Confident that the Education Committee of the Conference of British Missionary Societies meeting would approve his memorandum, Oldham wrote the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Randall Davidson, and included a copy of his memorandum. Oldham wanted the Archbishop to realize that the future of Christian education in the African continent depended upon action being taken at the proper time—the Governors' Conference in June.[44] Oldham made it clear that there were many practical difficulties to overcome, and in this regard the Archbishop's advice would be helpful. He also pointed out that he had already spoken with Sir Hugh Clifford, Governor of Nigeria, and Sir Frederick Lugard and that they were in agreement with the memorandum's position on religious education and the need for a Colonial Office policy.

Oldham received a favorable reply from Dr. Davidson and lunched with him on May 9. Dr. Davidson agreed to speak with the Colonial Secretary, the Duke of Devonshire, as well as the President of the Board of Education, the Right

---

[44] J.H.O. to Archbishop of Canterbury, May 3, 1923.

Honourable E. F. L. Wood.[45] With the Archbishop's strong support, Oldham's chances of success steadily increased. One last effort was needed—discussion with the African governors who would attend the June 6 Conference.

The one man in England who could arrange for Oldham to meet various African governors was Oldham's close friend, Sir Frederick Lugard. Lugard had received a copy of Oldham's memorandum and was in complete agreement with its recommendations. Oldham spent the weekend of May 12-13 with Lugard at his home in Surrey. It was during these informal weekends that Oldham and Lugard would plan strategies, discuss problems, and on this occasion did both while they entertained the Governor of the Gold Coast, Sir Gordon Guggisberg. The weekend gave Oldham and Lugard the opportunity of explaining the implications of the memorandum which would be discussed at the Governors' Conference in June. The weekend proved another success for Oldham's memorandum as witnessed by Oldham's comments to Dr. A. A. David, Bishop of Ipswich and former Headmaster of Rugby, that "Guggisberg is entirely with us."[46]

By the middle of May, Oldham had secured the approval of nearly all the important people who would be taking part in the Governors' Conference. Working through Ormsby-Gore, Oldham had suggested that Dr. David, Dr. T. Jesse Jones, and Lugard be invited to the Governors' Conference. He also mentioned the Archbishop's interest in the Conference and was instrumental in having an invitation sent to the Archbishop as well.[47] Of the governors who would be attending the

---

[45] J.H.O. to Archbishop of Canterbury, May 11, 1923.

[46] J.H.O. to Bishop of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich, May 14, 1923.

[47] J.H.O. to Ormsby-Gore, May 29, 1923.

Conference Oldham had already secured Sir Hugh Clifford's approval, as well as Sir Gordon Guggisberg's. It would seem that enough preparation had been made to secure the acceptance of the memorandum, but Oldham wanted to be sure. Accordingly, Oldham arranged for a luncheon on May 17, and brought together as many of the people who would be attending the Conference as possible. At this meeting, Oldham brought together Dr. David, Sir Gordon Guggisberg, and the Governor of Sierra Leone, A. R. Slater, whom Oldham had met before, but who was introduced to Oldham's memorandum for the first time. Oldham also invited Dr. T. Jesse Jones and Dr. Anson Phelps-Stokes, Secretary of Yale University, who had only just arrived from America.

The luncheon proved successful as it allowed all the individuals to discuss freely some of the key points in Oldham's memorandum, and it provided an occasion for the various participants of the Governors' Conference to meet one another before the Conference. Oldham preferred personal contact whenever possible for establishing rapport and for clearly communicating ideas. Keeping Lugard informed of his progress by letter, Oldham mentioned the success of the luncheon, "Guggisberg and Slater are as keen as can be," and asked that if Lugard was seeing Sir Robert Coryndon, Governor of Kenya, perhaps he could speak to him about the memorandum to be presented at the Governor's Conference.[48]

The preparations for the Conference were complete. Oldham had met with nearly all the governors who would attend, and had the support of the outside interests who would also attend the Conference. The only individuals whom Oldham

---

[48] J.H.O. to Lugard, May 18, 1923, Lugard Archives, with kind permission of Dame Margery Perham.

did not reach directly, or even indirectly, were Sir George Smith, Governor of Nyasaland, and Mr. A. C. Hollis, Colonial Secretary of Tanganyika, and the Colonial Office officials from the permanent civil service staff.

An unexpected result from discussions with the governors was their enthusiasm for the creation of an Advisory Committee suggested in the memorandum. Oldham discovered Sir Gordon Guggisberg so enthusiastic for his proposal for an Advisory Committee that Guggisberg was "taking up the matter as if it were his own."[49] This led Guggisberg to suggest to Oldham that a draft Constitution of the Advisory Committee be drawn up and presented at the Governors' Conference.[50] Accordingly, Oldham drew up what he considered some of the essential points for the Advisory Committee and had Slater and Guggisberg meet at his office on June 4 to prepare a final draft.

Oldham also wanted to consult Lugard on the Constitution of the proposed Advisory Committee, so he arranged a working luncheon with Lugard on May 25. He also invited Dr. T. Jesse Jones and Dr. Anson Phelps-Stokes so that they could meet Lugard. Oldham had a secondary motive for the luncheon. Since the Advisory Committee was almost assured of being approved, Oldham thought it essential that the Executive-Secretary of the Committee be as knowledgeable about African education as possible and have some international reputation as well. Oldham was considering the idea of asking Dr. T. Jesse Jones to become

---

[49] J.H.O. to Reverend J. N. Ogilvie, Secretary of the Foreign Mission Committee, Church of Scotland, May 23, 1923. The Foreign Mission Committee had also approved Oldham's memorandum in a meeting held in Edinburgh on May 7, 1923.

[50] J.H.O. to A. R. Slater, May 22, 1923.

Secretary, if and when the Advisory Committee was approved, but he wanted Lugard to talk with Jones first. There were some obvious obstacles in Jones's appointment as Executive-Secretary of the Advisory Committee on Education since he was an American citizen. However, Lugard was not overly impressed with Jones,[51] and Oldham began looking in other directions. The matter of a permanent Executive-Secretary for the Advisory Committee would have to be settled at a later date.

The Governors' Conference on Derby Day, June 6, 1923, proved a complete success for Oldham's memorandum and his careful preparations. As Oldham expected, there was some opposition from the permanent Colonial Office officials, but the Governors in attendance remained enthusiastic for the proposals.[52] The Colonial Secretary's decision was therefore assured with the further support of Dr. T. Jesse Jones, Sir Frederick Lugard, Dr. A. A. David (who had become Bishop of Liverpool), Ormsby-Gore, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, whose presence for part of the meeting was notification that the Church not only endorsed Oldham's memorandum, but considered its acceptance essential.[53]

It was agreed at the June 6 Conference that the Advisory Committee on Education would be created, but the recommendation that the Colonial Office announce a policy of partnership with private educational agencies was deferred for consideration by the Advisory Committee. Oldham, Lugard, and the governors were in

---

[51] Lugard to J.H.O., June 1, 1923, Lugard Archives.

[52] The Governors were: Sir Hugh Clifford, Nigeria; Sir Robert Coryndon, Kenya; Sir F. G. Guggisberg, Gold Coast; Mr. A. R. Slater, Sierra Leone; and Sir Goerge Smith, Nyasaland.

[53] J.H.O. to Archbishop of Canterbury, June 6, 1923. Dr. Davidson's presence for part of the meeting was not officially recorded.

agreement with the idea that the new Advisory Committee should formulate a policy statement on the relations between government and private educational agencies.

Oldham's opinion was that the missionary societies would be much more likely to get the kind of declaration they wanted from the Advisory Committee on Education than from the Colonial Office.[54] Once a policy of partnership was established, the important point, which was also accepted by the governors, was consultation at the local level. However, Oldham foresaw that with the creation of the Advisory Committee, those people who were most concerned for African education would be in an advantageous position to apply the necessary pressure to bring about the proper educational conditions in the Colonies.[55]

---

[54] J.H.O. to Reverend W. Meston, June 7, 1923.

[55] Ibid.

III

ADMINISTRATIVE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

The development of a colonial education policy was the responsibility of the Advisory Committee created as a result of the Governors' Conference on June 6, 1923. The Committee's official title, The Advisory Committee on Native Education in British Tropical Africa was extended in 1929 to include areas outside of Africa as well as education of all races. Charged with the responsibility of advising the Secretary of State on matters of native education its duties were more in the nature of reporting.

A second responsibility of assisting the Secretary in, "advancing the progress of education," in British Tropical Africa gave the Advisory Committee a carte blanche for developing the educational guidelines for an area of over two and a half million square miles with a native population of forty million.[1] The responsibility was unique among Colonial powers during the 1920's, and placed the burden directly on a selected group of individuals.

The formulation of educational policy could be strengthened or weakened by decisions that were made in the embryonic stages of the Advisory Committee's administrative development, and later by decisions which would affect its administrative structure and in turn influence its efficacy in carrying out its assigned responsibility.

---

[1] Great Britain, Colonial Office, Educational Policy in British Tropical Africa Cmd. 2374 (London: H.M.S.O., 1925), pp. 2-3. Hereafter cited as 1925 Policy.

The success of the Advisory Committee, in part, depended upon an imaginative, energetic, and influential Executive Secretary who was capable of directing the committee in matters of general policy as well as in performing the various administrative and public relation functions required. The concern about filling the position had come up before the Governors' Conference,[2] but a major obstacle to overcome was the Secretary's salary. It was arranged through the governors and the Colonial Office that the finances of the Advisory Committee on Education would be met by contributions from the various colonial governments, and paid out of a fund to be administered by the Crown Agents for the Colonies.

At the June 6 Conference, the Colonial Office officials seemed to think that five hundred pounds was an adequate salary for the Executive Secretary, but Oldham knew that the Committee would never be able to have the kind of Secretary he had hoped for at this salary. The question was not settled at the June 6 Conference; but two days later, on invitation from the Colonial Secretary, the Duke of Devonshire, Oldham attended another meeting at the Colonial Office. He sat through the whole morning session without saying a word. Finally, the Colonial Secretary asked Oldham to say a few words on education in the colonies. As it was nearly one o'clock and the whole morning session had been spent discussing education Oldham thought there would not be any further point to his prolonging the meeting. The Colonial Secretary asked for just five minutes. Oldham talked for more than five minutes on the salary

---

[2] See pp. 31-32.

allocation for the Executive Secretary of the Advisory Committee, and in his opinion, it was the most important five minutes he could ever have given to African education. Instead of five hundred pounds, it was agreed that fifteen hundred pounds should be the salary of the Executive Secretary of the Advisory Committee on Education which would certainly be more in line with the quality of person that Oldham, Ormsby-Gore, and Lugard wanted.[3]

The June 8 meeting cleared the way for securing an Executive Secretary of high caliber to guide the Advisory Committee. The negotiations for selecting an Executive Secretary were, at first, almost completely in Oldham's hands; as the choices for Secretary fell through the matter was taken up by the Colonial Office.[4] Oldham was worried for fear that the Colonial Office would insist on a pensioner taking the job, and in Oldham's estimation, "We might as well bury the Advisory Committee unless we can get the right man as secretary."[5]

Oldham had a clear conception of the qualities he wanted in a person for Executive Secretary of the Advisory Committee. Not only should the Executive Secretary have experience with African education and be reasonably knowledge-

---

[3]The whole account is based on personal interviews (recorded) with J.H.O., February 10 and April 28, 1965. The total budget would be two thousand pounds with salary at fifteen hundred pounds and travel and miscellaneous expense at five hundred pounds.

[4]Oldham first wanted Dr. T. Jesse Jones (his American citizenship and duties with the Phelps-Stokes Fund prevented his accepting); then Sir Michael Sadler (his appointment as Master of Bailol College, Oxford, precluded his even being asked by Oldham); and C. T. Loram, Native Affairs Comm. in South Africa (pension and salary prevented his acceptance).

[5]J.H.O. to Sir M. Sadler, November 7, 1923.

able on the subject, but he must also possess the ability to facilitate the transfer of ideas from scholars and theorists to practitioners working in the field so that theory became practice.

> The Secretary should have a certain sympathy, receptivity and elasticity of mind, which will enable him on the one hand to draw out and turn to account the best in men like yourself (Sadler) and others both on the Advisory Committee and outside of it; on the other hand to 'get across,' as Americans say, this contribution to the very varied types of people who in one way and another control education in the colonies.[6]

The matter had become critical by November of 1923 because Oldham had arranged with the Phelps-Stokes Fund that the Executive Secretary of the Advisory Committee should travel with the East African Commission which was scheduled to leave in January, 1924. The matter finally came to a head in a meeting at the Colonial Office on November 6 when the name of Hanns Vischer was mentioned by the Colonial Office staff.[7] Oldham did not know Vischer personally, but his experience as Director of Education in Northern Nigeria, his fluency in several languages (German, French, Arabic, and Hausa), and the favorable impression he had created with the permanent officials in the Colonial Office, indicated that he would make a suitable Secretary for the Advisory Committee on Education.

The only other alternative was H. S. Scott then working in the Transvaal, but the problems of hiring Scott were similar to C. T. Loram, and delays in appointing the Executive Secretary of the Advisory Committee would postpone the forthcoming Phelps-Stokes Commission to East Africa, as the Commission

---

[6] J.H.O. to Sir M. Sadler, June 15, 1923.

[7] J.H.O. to Sir M. Sadler, November 7, 1923.

would not go to Africa unless the Advisory Committee cooperated by sending their permanent Secretary.[8]

Oldham preferred Scott to Vischer, but since Vischer was immediately available and, therefore, the Phelps-Stokes Commission to East Africa could go through, Oldham favored Vischer's appointment as Secretary of the Advisory Committee on Education.[9] Oldham immediately invited Vischer to spend the evening of November 7 at his home in Chipstead for the purpose of talking about the possibilities of the Advisory Committee on Education, and as a result felt satisfied that Vischer could handle the job of Secretary.[10] Vischer, in return, thanked Oldham for his clarification of the position of Executive Secretary of the Advisory Committee and the image of what the Advisory Committee could accomplish with regard to African education. It was clear Oldham had begun a skillful program of indoctrination as Vischer's comment indicates the nature of Oldham's influence:

> "I am very glad I had this opportunity of hearing your views before I discussed the matter at the Colonial Office, where I do not think that the far reaching possibilities of the Advisory Committee are yet understood."[11]

There was one snag in Vischer's appointment, however, and that was Lugard's reluctance to approve. Vischer had gone back to Switzerland and Oldham sent him a telegram and a letter informing him of the situation as it

---

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid.

[10] J.H.O. to Bishop of Liverpool, November 7, 1923.

[11] Hanns Vischer to J.H.O., November 9, 1923.

stood—all in favor with Lugard in doubt. Vischer wrote Oldham immediately saying, "I am very glad to know how things stand, but I am sorry to hear that Lugard questions my appointment."[12] Oldham had Lugard stop by his office for a discussion on Vischer's appointment, and convinced Lugard that a compromise would have to be made in obtaining the best man for the job in order that the greater work of the Advisory Committee could go forward.[13]

Lugard's consent to Vischer's appointment cleared the way for the appointment to be made, but more important was the fact that it gave Vischer enough time to visit the United States, meet with Dr. Jones, and see Hampton and Tuskegee in action before going out to East Africa with the Phelps-Stokes Commission. This was probably Oldham's main point in convincing Lugard that they would have to settle for Vischer as Executive Secretary of the Advisory Committee. Oldham immediately wrote Vischer informing him that Lugard approved his appointment, and suggested that plans be made for Vischer's trip to America.[14] Oldham wrote Dr. Jones informing him of the final arrangements, and added his positive evaluation of Vischer.

> I believe we have got a good man in Vischer—he may prove to be very good. He is keen, open-minded, has the right spirit and I should imagine gets on well with people—that is his record. He probably has a good deal to learn about education. Much depends on how far he will go in that respect.[15]

---

[12] Hanns Vischer to J. H. O., November 15, 1923.

[13] J.H.O. to Dr. T. Jesse Jones, November 15, 1923.

[14] J.H.O. to Hanns Vischer, November 15, 1923 and J.H.O. to Dr. T. J. Jones, November 15, 1923.

[15] J.H.O. to Dr. T. J. Jones, November 15, 1923.

No sooner was the matter of Secretary of the Advisory Committee settled than another problem arose—the Chairmanship of the Advisory Committee on Education. During the drafting of the Advisory Committee Constitution, Oldham, Slater, and Guggisberg decided that Ormsby-Gore, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, would be Chairman of the Advisory Committee. At the time it was obvious and logical since Ormsby-Gore was singularly influential in moving the Colonial Office to accept the idea of an Advisory Committee on Education and he was in full agreement with Oldham, Lugard, Sadler, and others on the great need of developing the human resources in the African colonies.

What was overlooked at the time, however, was Ormsby-Gore's vulnerability to changes of government. In the General Elections of November, 1923, the Labor Party won 49 new seats, the Liberal Party 38, and correspondingly the Conservative Party lost 87 seats. This gave the Labor-Liberal block control of the House, and it would only be a matter of time before the Baldwin government would bring a new Parliamentary Under-Secretary, and perhaps this individual, unlike Ormsby-Gore, would not be sympathetic to the cause of African education.

The matter was even more crucial since the Advisory Committee might not have an opportunity to meet before the new government took office, as no one knew when the test vote in Parliament would take place. In point of fact, the Advisory Committee was not officially appointed by the middle of November, 1923. Ormsby-Gore had mentioned in the Colonial Office Estimates debate in the House of Commons in July that a permanent Committee had been formed, "for

the purpose of exploring the most helpful type of education for Africans for life in Africa."[16] The Committee, however, had not been appointed officially, and a change in government could preclude the Committee's official adoption. As soon as Major Hanns Vischer accepted his appointment as Executive Secretary the full Advisory Committee was officially appointed on November 24.[17] The appointment of the Advisory Committee would then have to be officially communicated to the African Governors who had consented to its formation and financial support. This all took some time, but was finally concluded on December 27, 1923.[18]

The instability of the Baldwin government had apparently troubled Lugard, so much so that he wrote to Oldham suggesting that Oldham circulate a letter among the Advisory Committee members to ask Ormsby-Gore to retain the Chairmanship of the Advisory Committee in his personal capacity and not ex-officio as Parliamentary Under-Secretary. Oldham's reaction to Lugard's suggestion was emphatic. Although he did not reply directly to Lugard he wrote Vischer and related the contents of Lugard's letter and then commented, "I shall, however, do nothing of the sort. The matter can quite well wait until the Committee meets."[19] Although Oldham was as concerned as Lugard about the future of the Advisory Committee under a change in government, he was also

---

[16] Great Britain, Parliamentary Debates (Commons), Vol. 167, pp. 498-499.

[17] 1925 Policy, op. cit., p. 2.

[18] Great Britain, Colonial Office, Advisory Committee on Native Education in Tropical Africa (London: H.M.S.O., 1929), pp. 296-297.

[19] J.H.O. to Hanns Vischer, December 27, 1923.

aware that if the Parliamentary Under-Secretary was not Chairman of the Advisory Committee, then whomever was chairman might not have the full support of the government. This would not expedite the work of the Committee, nor the cause of African education for which it was formed.

In his thoroughness, Oldham wrote to Sir Michael Sadler, Dr. David, and Vischer concerning the matter of the Chairmanship of the Advisory Committee and the view that more could be gained by having the Parliamentary Under-Secretary ex-officio Chairman of the Committee. Armed with the support of Vischer, Dr. David (Bishop of Liverpool), and Sadler, Oldham talked with Ormsby-Gore and found his ideas to be sympathetic to his own. With a majority of the Committee behind him Oldham wrote to Lugard just two days before the first official meeting of the Advisory Committee and agreed with Lugard that Ormsby-Gore should be retained as a member of the Advisory Committee but not as Chairman.[20]

Oldham went on to explain that when, or if, the Government changed it would be essential, according to Ormsby-Gore, that the new Parliamentary Under-Secretary be a member of the Committee, and if a member, he must be Chairman. Oldham explained that both Sadler and Dr. David concurred with Ormsby-Gore's analysis, and, incidentally, Oldham's. As much as Lugard might have disliked the idea of the Parliamentary Under-Secretary as ex-officio Chairman of the Advisory Committee, there was little he could do about the matter just two days before the meeting.

---

[20] J.H.O. to F. D. Lugard, January 7, 1924.

Oldham had engineered another important development in the Administrative structure of the Advisory Committee by safeguarding the political effectiveness of the Committee through incorporating the Chairmanship of the Committee in the office of the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies. It was extremely important to Oldham that the Committee get off to a good start which included having a good Secretary and a cohesive structure which would give the Committee some political weight through the Chairmanship of the Advisory Committee. Oldham's gamble that a novice Parliamentary Under-Secretary could be educated to the objectives of the Advisory Committee on Education proved correct when the first Labour government in British history took office on January 24, 1924, and Lord Arnold became the Parliamentary Under-Secretary. Oldham lost no time in arranging to talk with Lord Arnold about the Advisory Committee, and for the remainder of the Labour government's brief stay in office, from January 24 to November 23, 1924, Oldham would receive Lord Arnold's full cooperation on matters concerning the Advisory Committee on Education.[21]

The Conservative Party's return to office in November, 1924, brought Ormsby-Gore back to the Colonial Office as Parliamentary Under-Secretary and Chairman of the Committee. His second tenure as Chairman would prove to be the longest in the history of the Advisory Committee, from November 7, 1924, to June 8, 1929. Ormsby-Gore was later to become the Secretary of State for the Colonies for two years in the middle of the thirties under Baldwin and

---

[21] J.H.O. to Lord Arnold, February 8, 1924.

Chamberlain.[22] The Committee would once again face the task of educating a new Parliamentary Under-Secretary during the second Labour Government in 1929; however, it would be under more secure conditions as far as the institutional life of the Advisory Committee was concerned.[23]

Oldham's influence in guiding the administrative development of the Advisory Committee was due, in large part, to his effort in the creation of the Committee and a desire to see that anything in which he had a hand prospered and succeeded. From the Governor's Conference in May, 1923, Oldham had acted as unofficial Secretary of the Committee.[24] Following Vischer's appointment as Executive Secretary, Oldham would continue to act as unofficial Secretary due first to Vischer's trip to America and then his participation with the Phelps-Stokes East African Commission.

Oldham had hoped to talk Ormsby-Gore into taking over as Secretary in Vischer's absence since Ormsby-Gore would no longer be Chairman of the Committee when the Labour Government took office, but this move proved unsuccessful.[25] Oldham was forced, therefore, to remain as unofficial Secretary during Vischer's absence with the Phelps-Stokes East African Commission, and even following Vischer's return, Oldham found himself in the position of

---

[22] May 29, 1936, to May 15, 1938.

[23] This would be Mr. Lunn who was Lord Passfield's first Parliamentary Under-Secretary from June 8, 1929, through November, 1929. He was succeeded by Dr. Drummond-Shields in December, 1929.

[24] J.H.O. to Lugard, June 23, 1923.

[25] J.H.O. to Lugard, January 7, 1924.

occasionally having to direct Vischer's activities and point him in directions that Oldham felt the Advisory Committee ought to be heading.[26]

The administrative development of the Advisory Committee was strengthened by the decision to add women to the Committee for the purpose of dealing with female native education and for a wider representation of educational views and opinions. It is indicative of Oldham's interest in the Committee that the matter should have involved him directly.

Following a dinner of the African Society in March, 1925, Oldham was asked by Miss Gray, Headmistress of St. Paul's School for Girls, why there were no women on the Advisory Committee and urged that at least one be appointed.[27] Oldham agreed that a woman should be appointed to the Committee and suggested Miss Gray write Ormsby-Gore. Oldham then followed this up by contacting Ormsby-Gore and Sadler, and supported Miss Gray's request. Oldham asked Sadler if he agreed with the request to push the proposal in the Advisory Committee meeting on April 9 for the simple reason that, "Your opinion will carry more weight than that of anyone else."[28]

Miss Gray's request proposed two alternatives which were discussed at the Advisory Committee meeting on April 9. One alternative was to form a separate committee of women to deal with female native education, while the other suggested that a woman member be appointed to the Advisory Committee.

---

[26]The correspondence between Oldham and Vischer clearly indicates the paramount influence that Oldham had in directing some of Vischer's major activities. Also J.H.O. to Hanns Vischer, July 30, 1924; March 5, 1925; June 26, 1925; June 28, 1927.

[27]J.H.O. to Sir Michael Sadler, March 30, 1925.

[28]Ibid.

Ormsby-Gore was opposed to a separate Committee and suggested that the Committee accept the alternative of adding a woman to the Advisory Committee.[29] The Committee agreed, and Sadler's recommendation of Miss S. A. Burstall, past Headmistress of the Manchester High School for Girls, was accepted; she attended her first meeting on May 21, 1925.[30]

It had originally been Sadler's intention to appoint two women to the Committee; however, Oldham wanted to appoint one to start with and if it worked out a second could be added.[31] Oldham's main concern was that the woman appointed be someone who had great influence in educational circles, if possible as near a female equivalent to Sir Michael Sadler. The success of the decision to add women to the Advisory Committee would be justified by the fact that they assisted the Colonial Office in the recruitment of women teachers for African service, as well as the fact that notable women such as Dr. Philipa Esdaile, Margery Perham, and Dr. Margaret Read, who served on the Advisory Committee, furthered the advancement of colonial education and promoted the work of the Advisory Committee.

The administrative development of the Advisory Committee reached a critical stage in the fall of 1927 when the Colonial Office considered the

---

[29] A.C.N.E.B.T.A. Minutes, 13th meeting, April 9, 1925. The Advisory Committee on Native Education in British Tropical Africa was the official designation of the Advisory Committee on Education until 1929. Hereafter the Committee Minutes will be cited as A.C.N.E.B.T.A.

[30] A.C.N.E.B.T.A. 15th meeting, May 21, 1925.

[31] M. Sadler to J.H.O., March 31, 1925, and J.H.O. to M.S. April 1, 1925. Miss A.W. Whitelaw was added to the Committee a year later and attended from July 9, 1926.

extension of the Advisory Committee's responsibility for advising on African native education to include European (white) education in the African Colonies, as well as education in the non-African colonies. The justification for the expansion of the Advisory Committee depended upon the clarification of the overall Colonial Office policy by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Rt. Hon. L.C.M.S. Amery, during the Imperial Conference of 1926, followed by the Colonial Office Conference in 1927. As a result of these two meetings the Colonial Office recommended that the work of the Advisory Committee ought to be expanded to include non-African colonies that wished an educational advisory service.

The work of the Advisory Committee was well known through the publication of its first major policy statement, Educational Policy in British Tropical Africa (Cmd. 2374, 1925), and some of the personalities were held in high esteem by certain British officials in the colonial areas. Hence, those colonial governors outside of Africa who desired to have access to the Advisory Committee had asked that its responsibility be expanded in keeping with the overall colonial policy which was now incorporated into one word, "Trusteeship."[32]

Another factor to be considered was the economic condition in the colonies. The middle to late twenties were prosperous years for most of the colonies in that there was a demand for the raw materials they could produce for export. The colonies were in no way affluent, but their finances could absorb

---

[32]Kenneth Robinson, The Dilemmas of Trusteeship (London: Oxford University Press, 1965), pp. 18-19 and 71.

the cost of several hundred pounds to support the Advisory Committee.[33] If a colonial government thought the cost prohibitive it need not support the Advisory Committee, but then, of course, it would forfeit the use of the Committee's services. From the emphasis the Colonial Office had placed on the expansion of the Advisory Committee it would be reasonable to assume that many Governors were in favor of expanding the Advisory Committee's responsibility to include non-African colonies.

The first meeting of the Advisory Committee after the Colonial Governors' Conference in July, 1927, dealt with the expansion of the Advisory Committee. In precedent setting meetings, the Advisory Committee held two sessions on September 14 to discuss the problems of an expanded Advisory Committee.[34]

In his opening remarks to the Committee, Ormsby-Gore stated that the Committee would have to decide on the course to be taken in expanding the Advisory Committee. The Committee had two alternatives. It could decide on selecting an "Organizing Secretary" who would become a permanent adviser to the Colonial Secretary, with Vischer and another man working under the permanent adviser, or it could recommend a Joint-Secretariat with Vischer and another man, acting as a team and possibly a third man in a staff position to edit a Bulletin and handle correspondence. It was Ormsby-Gore's opinion that

---

[33] The Advisory Committee's expenses were handled by the Crown Agents for the Colonies and since the members served gratis the only expense was the Secretary's salary (£1,500/yr.) plus travel expenses for the Secretary, and those members of the Committee that were traveling for Committee business. The Colonial Office provided materials and space for the Committee meetings and the Secretary's office. The total budget of the Committee was approximately two thousand pounds.

[34] A.C.N.E.B.T.A., 38th Meeting, September 14, 1927.

the latter was preferable and this was supported by Oldham, Currie and Lugard.[35]

Sir Gordon Guggisberg who had attended the meeting questioned the Joint-Secretary idea, but Ormsby-Gore reassured him that with careful selection the two men would work out well, and that the team approach would be capable of carrying the ball in the event of staff changes in the Colonial Office due to Parliamentary elections. The meeting concluded with the concensus that a Circular would go out to the Colonial Governors to ascertain their interest to participate in the Advisory Committee's work, and that the Joint-Secretariat should be the goal of the Colonial Office in selecting personnel.

Oldham was quick to respond to the situation and immediately wrote Sir Michael Sadler who had been unable to attend the September 14 meeting. Oldham explained how he had been invited to attend the Colonial Office Conference of Governors during the summer to express his views on enlarging the Committee's responsibility. It was Oldham's view that Vischer lacked some of the essential qualities that were needed for a successful committee, and that if the Committee were to take on added work or even continue successfully after Ormsby-Gore left the Colonial Office then it was imperative that the right person be selected.

> We must have someone among the officers of the committee who has the ability to absorb the special points of view and types of experience represented among its members, and to blend these in a statement which so nearly expressed the truth as to command their assent, and to convince Governors and Directors of Education that the policy of the Committee is right, and to give an effective answer to any objection that

---

[35] Ibid.

they may be inclined to raise. Much of this work has up till now been done by Ormsby-Gore.[36]

To find an individual with the abilities that Oldham had in mind would be difficult, but it would be impossible unless the Colonial Office allocated a higher salary to the Secretary's position and gave the Committee a reasonable budget. The budget problem had been settled at the Colonial Governors' Conference when in a period of less than ten minutes the old budget of two thousand pounds was raised to six thousand pounds.[37]

Oldham explained to Sadler that he had Ormsby-Gore's agreement that before any appointments were made those Committee members with wide knowledge of the educational world would be consulted. Oldham wanted to convince Sadler of the necessity for a strong Joint-Secretariat for the Advisory Committee. Oldham was not completely dissatisfied with Vischer for Vischer was gifted with a personality that always embraced people and could get on well in almost any group. Vischer's fluency with languages was extremely useful in a public relations sense, and he was persona grata with the Colonial office.

However, in Oldham's opinion, Vischer's weakness was his disdain for memoranda and written reports. If the Committee were to function properly, it would have to utilize the experience and expertise of its members and the only way to draw out the Committee was to produce a memorandum on a vital subject and have the Committee react to it. This would then have to be

---

[36] J.H.O. to Sir Michael Sadler, September 15, 1927.

[37] Ibid.

followed by a revised memorandum that absorbed all the various contributions and presented them with conviction while at the same time injecting ideas of the individuals at the frontiers of research and experimentation so as to keep the Committee up to date with what was most alive and creative in the educational sphere.

Oldham realized the importance of the administrative changes that were in the offering, and acted swiftly to solidify his position that a Joint-Secretariat would be preferable to a permanent Advisor position, and that the Committee should have an opportunity to advise on the selection of the new administrative personnel. Oldham's analysis was that Sir Michael Sadler and Professor T. Percy Nunn, Principal of the London Day Training College, would be key advisors to the Colonial Office in the selection of the new Secretaries.

Oldham contacted Nunn concerning the new appointments since Nunn was unable to stay for the full Advisory Committee meeting. In a letter to Nunn, Oldham disclosed the fact that he had talked with Ormsby-Gore after the meeting and discovered the Colonial Office had already contacted Dr. Winstedt, Director of Education in the Malay States, and had approached him with the offer of serving as Secretary for an expanded Advisory Committee.[38] Oldham further ascertained that Ormsby-Gore was also favorable to Arthur Mayhew as a possible appointment. Oldham's choice was Mayhew, but due to the Colonial Office's solicitation of Dr. Winstedt it developed that if Mayhew were appointed it would have to be in the position of third man in a supportive

---

[38] J.H.O. to Professor T. P. Nunn, September 15, 1927.

staff position as editor of an educational bulletin,[39] but nevertheless in a position to do the kind of work Oldham felt the successful continuation of the Advisory Committee would require.

Oldham had known that Arthur Mayhew desired a Colonial Office appointment since August as Mayhew had written Oldham to inform him that he had applied for the position of Director of Education in Kenya and had used Oldham's name as a personal reference.[40] After the September 14 Committee meeting and talks with Ormsby-Gore, Oldham wrote to Mayhew to inform him that his name was now under consideration for a new position with the Advisory Committee, and that under no circumstances should Mayhew turn down such an appointment if it were offered, "without having a talk with me about it first."[41] True to Oldham's style of personal meetings to explain important developments, Oldham met with Arthur Mayhew to brief him on the new position to which Oldham hoped Mayhew would be appointed. Once Oldham had convinced Mayhew that the new position was more important at the present time than the Director of

---

[39]The idea of an Educational Bulletin had been raised by Sir Michael Sadler at the 33rd Meeting of the Advisory Committee (March 17, 1927). He drew attention to the Bulletin of Educational Matters published quarterly by the Nigerian Education Department, and suggested that the Advisory Committee should publish a digest of its Minutes and circulate it widely.

[40]A. Mayhew to J.H.O., August 13, 1927.

[41]J.H.O. to A. Mayhew, September 27, 1927.

Education in Kenya, he met with Ormsby-Gore and Major Ralph Furse.[42] Oldham wanted to find out exactly what the Colonial Office was planning with regards to the new position for the expanded version of the Advisory Committee. With knowledge gained from Ormsby-Gore and Furse, Oldham wrote Arthur Mayhew and informed him that the Colonial Office would consider Mayhew for the new position with the Advisory Committee and would find someone else for Director of Education in Kenya.[43]

The selection of an additional Executive Secretary for the Advisory Committee was delayed for almost a year by the Colonial Office until favorable replies to the Circular on the Expansion of the Advisory Committee were received from colonial governors. Eventually all the obstacles were overcome and Arthur Mayhew was appointed Joint-Executive Secretary of the Advisory Committee on Education with responsibility for the non-African areas and editorship of a bulletin which the Advisory Committee would publish through the Colonial Office.[44] Upon completion of the appointment for Joint-Executive Secretary for the Advisory Committee, the plans for the official expansion of the Committee moved swiftly. A memorandum was circulated to all members of

---

[42] Major Furse was Asst. Private Secretary to the Colonial Secretary and had complete responsibility for recruitment of Colonial Office staff. Recruitment of Colonial Office staff was technically under the "patronage" umbrella until after the Fisher Commission recommendations were accepted and a Personnel Division was created in 1930. Major (later Sir Ralph) Furse continued in charge of recruitment and training, a witness to the objectivity and high standards he used in selection, until his retirement in 1948. See Sir Charles Jeffries, The Colonial Office (London: Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1956), pp. 138-139.

[43] J.H.O. to A. Mayhew, October 5, 1927.

[44] A.C.N.E.B.T.A., 45th Meeting, September, 1928.

the Committee asking them if they would serve on the new Committee. All of the members accepted the new appointments and two members were added for the first meeting of the expanded Advisory Committee which took place on January 10, 1929.[45]

The administrative organization of the expanded Advisory Committee was now in the hands of two men with distinctly different talents, but the combination gave the Advisory Committee both an effective public relations representative and an efficient executive who could produce written memoranda to keep the Committee using the able talent at its disposal.

The reorganization of the Committee and the installation of Mayhew as Joint-Executive Secretary along with Hanns Vischer came none too soon. Six months after the first meeting of the newly expanded Advisory Committee the second Conservative Government of Stanley Baldwin came to an end with his resignation on June 4, 1929. The second Labour Government of J. Ramsay MacDonald came into office on June 5 and brought with it a change of personnel in the Colonial Office. The new Colonial Secretary was Lord Passfield (Sidney Webb) and his Parliamentary Under-Secretary was William Lunn, M. P. for Rothwell, Yorkshire, since December, 1918.

The new Parliamentary Under-Secretary meant a new Chairman for the Advisory Committee and the loss of William G. A. Ormsby-Gore who had served as

---

[45] A.C.E.C. Minutes, January 10, 1929. The two new members were Mr. Will Spens (later Sir Will), Master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; and Sir George Maxwell, retired Colonial Secretary for the Federated Malay States. The expanded Advisory Committee was named the Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies since it now had responsibility for areas outside of Africa. The minutes from 1929 to 1948 will hereafter be cited as A.C.E.C.

Chairman for nearly the entire period of the Committee's operation from January, 1924 to June of 1929.[46] This change brought up the old question of whether the Chairman of the Advisory Committee should be the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies. Oldham, who would soon be leaving for a conference in America and thus unable to attend the first meeting with the new Chairman, was quick to react and asked Ormsby-Gore to clarify his ideas on the matter. Ormsby-Gore was in favor of Oldham's suggestion to work with the new Chairman rather than change the structure since the procedure had worked in the past with Lord Arnold.[47] Oldham, therefore, wrote Sir James Currie, Director of the Empire Cotton Growing Corporation, and a charter member of the Advisory Committee, and informed Currie of Ormsby-Gore's views as well as the fact that after a few months the Committee could recommend that Ormsby-Gore become a regular member.[48]

Any fears about the working relationship between the new Chairman, Mr. Lunn, and the Advisory Committee were put to rest at the sixth meeting of the Advisory Committee when Mr. Lunn officiated as Chairman. In his opening remarks to the committee, Mr. Lunn informed the members that he considered the committee's function to be important and that he hoped the discussion would be candid and good results would follow.[49]

---

[46] The brief exception was Lord Arnold's service from January 24 to November 7, 1924. Ormsby-Gore was later to become Lord Harlech (4th Baron).

[47] See pp. 42-43.

[48] J.H.O. to Sir James Currie, June 11, 1929.

[49] A.C.E.C., 6th Meeting, June 20, 1929.

The transition from Conservative to Labour Government had no effect on the attitudes of the permanent Colonial Office staff with regard to the continuation of the Advisory Committee. Acceptance of the Advisory Committee by the permanent Colonial Office staff was in direct proportion to the Committee's longevity. By 1929, the Advisory Committee on Education had only five years of operation behind it, but at least there was sufficient moral support from colonial governors to prevent immediate dissolution. There was a possibility, however, that the Committee could be terminated and it hinged on the financial prosperity of the colonies.

The financial support for the Secretariat was derived from contributions by colonial governments who used the service of the Advisory Committee. This arrangment was consistent with the financial support for other Colonial Office consultative services. In lean years when revenues declined due to fluctuations in foreign commodity markets the colonial governments, under pressures to maintain balanced budgets, found it necessary to cut their expenditures and sever relationships with the Advisory Committees in Whitehall.

The declines in colonial revenues began almost immediately after the American stock market crash in October, 1929. There was an appropriate delayed budget response to the worsening international economic situation, and by the summer of 1931, the Colonial Office believed that a decrease in colonial contributions for support of the Advisory Committee might necessitate the elimination of one of the Joint-Executive Secretaries. It would be customary if such action were required to keep the man with the longest tenure. The prospect of losing Arthur Mayhew prompted Oldham to write Ormsby-Gore

because, in Oldham's opinion, the successful continuation of the Advisory Committee depended on Mayhew.[50] Oldham wanted Ormsby-Gore to talk with Mr. J. H. Thomas who had taken over as Colonial Secretary on August 26.

Ormsby-Gore's reply to Oldham's letter indicated the major influence behind the removal of at least one of the Joint-Secretaries of the Advisory Committee was connected with the attitudes of the permanent Colonial Office staff who were not in favor of their ad hoc colleagues and had attempted, "an internal drive to get rid of all the advisory committees, the advisers (who are not members of the Home Civil Service Trade Union!), Secretaries, etc."[51] Ormsby-Gore recommended that Oldham have a talk with Malcolm MacDonald, the Prime Minister's son, since Ormsby-Gore had heard that he would become J. H. Thomas' Parliamentary Under-Secretary and Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Education. As it turned out, Ormsby-Gore's information was incorrect as the new Parliamentary Under-Secretary was Sir Robert Hamilton, Liberal M.P. for Orkney and Shetland since 1922.[52]

Oldham received some assurance that both Mayhew and Vischer would be retained as Joint-Executive Secretaries at least for another year in hopes that the financial picture would brighten for 1932. Instead, 1932 represented the economic ebb for Great Britain with the value of her exports declining

---

[50] J.H.O. to Ormsby-Gore, August 31, 1931

[51] Ormsby-Gore to J.H.O., September 1, 1931.

[52] Sir Robert Hamilton retired as Chief Justice of British East Africa and President of H.M. Court of Appeals for Eastern Africa in 1920. He had held the position since 1905 with Colonial experience dating from 1893.

from 729 million pounds in 1929 to 365 million pounds in 1932.[53] The decline in economic activity was also reflected in the colonies so that with indications of a steady decline of economic activity the colonial budgets for 1933 were cut to basic essentials, but even then many balanced budgets had become deficits due to larger revenue declines for 1932.

It was evident to the Colonial Office by June, 1933, that the anticipated improvement in the colonial financial structure was not forthcoming. Once again the reaction of the Colonial Office staff was to recommend cuts in the finances for the Advisory Committees and thus eliminate some of the non-Civil Service staff which had grown rapidly since the early 1920's.

Arthur Mayhew's interest in the finances of the Advisory Committee was paramount since reductions in the Committee budget would immediately effect his position as Joint-Executive Secretary. Furthermore, Mayhew was aware that Oldham would be having Dr. F. P. Keppel, President of the Carnegie Corporation down to his home in Chipstead during Keppel's visit to Great Britain, and that the occasion would be an excellent opportunity for Oldham to discuss the present and future work of the Advisory Committee on Education should its finances be reduced. Mayhew would have had several occasions to mention the idea of Oldham discussing the possibility of Carnegie Corporation support for the Advisory Committee with Keppel.

As soon as Oldham was aware that changes might be made in the Advisory Committee's secretariat due to finances, he was quick to respond. Oldham

---

[53] R. S. Sayers, A History of Economic Change in England, 1880-1939 (London: Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 54.

asked that Mayhew draft a brief note on the scope and functions of the Advisory Committee on Education so that in his discussions with Dr. Keppel, Oldham would represent the Colonial Office view rather than what might be taken as his personal view of the Committee. Mayhew complied and cautioned Oldham to make it quite clear that there was no official action being made by the Colonial Office. It appeared that the original idea was Mayhew's in that he states, "I would like to make it quite clear that, in suggesting the possibility of your drawing Dr. Keppel's attention to the Committee, I am not acting under any instructions from the Colonial Office.[54]

Oldham's discussions with the President of the Carnegie Corporation produced at least a glimmer of hope that the Carnegie Corporation might be willing to support the activities of the Advisory Committee on Education. In his usually thorough manner, Oldham set to work to insure Arthur Mayhew's continuance with the Committee by convincing the Colonial Office to accept financial support from the Carnegie Corporation. Oldham wrote Lord Plymouth,[55] Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies and acting Chairman of the Advisory Committee's budget, and asked whether it might be desirable to approach the Carnegie Corporation for funds to support the Committee.[56]

The meeting was arranged and Oldham was told that budget reductions would be made by asking Vischer and Mayhew to accept salary cuts, and that if the colonial financial situation failed to improve during the year that

---

[54] Arthur Mayhew to J.H.O., June 8, 1933.

[55] Rt. Hon. Ivor Miles Windsor-Clive (15th Baron of Windsor).

[56] J.H.O. to Rt. Hon. Lord Plymouth, July 3, 1933.

further reductions would be necessary for 1934. The Colonial Office was reluctant to initiate any direct request, but would assist Oldham in any effort he wished to undertake to solicit Carnegie funds for the support of the Advisory Committee on Education.

Oldham wrote a six-page letter to Dr. Keppel, President of the Carnegie Corporation, explaining developments since their personal conversation in June, and asked for a grant of a thousand pounds ($5,000) a year for the next three to five years to support the work of the Advisory Committee on Education.[57] The Carnegie Corporation accepted Oldham's request and Oldham, in turn, immediately sent Dr. Keppel's letter to Lord Plymouth and asked that the Colonial Office take up the correspondence.[58] The financial support of a thousand pounds a year would continue from 1933 through 1939.[59] The grant enabled the Advisory Committee to weather the financial depression of the thirties, strengthen its own institutional security by longevity and continue its work of developing educational policy for colonial areas.

---

[57] J.H.O. to Dr. F. P. Keppel, August 4, 1933. With kind permission of both Dr. Oldham and the Carnegie Corporation, the letter is in the Carnegie Corporation Archives in New York.

[58] J.H.O. to Lord Plymouth, October 25, 1933.

[59] The Carnegie Corporation support for the Advisory Committee on Education totaled $30,000 over the six-year period. In the Report of the President, 1934 (New York: Carnegie Corporation) p. 57, the grant is listed as "Inquiries on Educational and Cultural Interests of British Colonies."

The overall financial support from the Carnegie Corporation for various projects in the British Colonies from 1923 to 1943 (the term of Dr. Keppel's Presidency) amounted to nearly two million dollars ($1,995,080.00). See Reports of the President, 1924 through 1943 (New York: Carnegie Corporation).

The last major change in the structure of the Advisory Committee came in 1939 with the creation of an educational adviser to the Colonial Secretary. This was necessitated almost entirely by the termination of the Carnegie Corporation grant in December, 1939, which made it financially impossible to continue the Advisory Committee on Education under a joint-secretariat.

There was another influence, however, which had its origin in a Royal Institute of International Affairs project funded by two grants from the Carnegie Corporation for a total of $110,000, and culminating in the famous African Survey by Lord Hailey.[60] The Committee invited Lord Hailey to attend their meeting in May, 1939, and devoted the entire meeting to the discussion of "Education in the African Dependencies."[61] During the discussion Lord Hailey agreed with a statement that only in the field of education had a definite policy been laid down by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Lord Hailey approved of the policy, but he also emphasized that no definite steps were taken to see that it was carried out, and from his survey there was a good deal of variation in methods and quality of education from colony to colony. Lord Hailey suggested that the educational policy in the various dependencies be coordinated through the appointment of an educational adviser who could tour Africa on behalf of the Secretary of State for the Colonies.[62]

---

[60] Report of the President, 1934, (New York: Carnegie Corporation), p. 56, and Report of the President, 1937, p. 31.

[61] A.C.E.C., 94th Meeting, May 18, 1939.

[62] Ibid.

The Committee voiced no disagreement with Lord Hailey's suggestion of an educational adviser to the Secretary of State, and Reverend Dougall[63] along with Mr. Clauson[64] both made statements supporting the suggestion of an educational adviser. There was no formal recommendation, but the meeting proved seminal with regard to the future development of the Committee.

In September, following the outbreak of the European phase of World War II, the Advisory Committee was informed by its Chairman, Lord Dufferin, that the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Rt. Hon. Malcolm MacDonald (son of the late Ramsay MacDonald), desired to continue all social work in the Colonies during the war, and that the Committee would continue to meet, in one form or another, until, "happier times arrived."[65] The Colonial Secretary's forthright and bold decision to continue the services of the Advisory Committee through the war, regardless of its duration, meant that the Colonial Office staff would have to act quickly to secure administrative leadership for the Committee if it was to carry on its functions in 1940.

The day before the 98th Meeting of the Advisory Committee, Reverend Dougall met with Mr. A. J. Daive, Assistant Under-Secretary of State for the

---

[63] J.W.C. Dougall, D.D., was the Secretary to the Phelps-Stokes Commission to East Africa, 1924, and thereafter the first Principal of the Jeanes School in Kenya. He became Secretary of the Church of Scotland Foreign Mission Committee and succeeded Dr. Oldham on the Advisory Committee in January, 1937.

[64] Mr. Clauson was made head of a newly created Social Services Department within the Colonial Office in April, 1939, and appointed to the Advisory Committee as of the 94th Meeting.

[65] A.C.E.C., 97th Meeting, September 21, 1939. This meeting also proved historic from an administrational point of view with the first African to be appointed Deputy Director of Education in the Gold Coast—Mr. A. V. Tettey. Unfortunately, Mr. Tettey died two years after his appointment (December, 1941).

Colonies, to discuss continuity in the Secretariat of the Advisory Committee on Education. Dougall was told that Vischer's and Mayhew's term of appointment had been renewed, but that there was not enough money available in the Advisory Committee's account with the Crown Agents for the Colonies to continue with two Executive-Secretaries.

The matter was more than financial. The Secretary of State, Rt. Hon. Malcolm MacDonald, desired the appointment of an Adviser and wanted to see a younger man installed.[66] When Dougall was asked if he knew of any suitable men for the Adviser's post, he replied, "I had heard of Cox as a likely appointment.[67] Dougall, however, had hopes of Mr. Christopher Cox (later Sir Christopher) accepting a post at Achimota, but Davies, who did not know Cox, thought he would not want to take up a post in Africa after just returning to England from the Sudan.[68] Dougall stressed that the missionary organizations had every reason to believe that Cox would be as sympathetic as the others (Vischer and Mayhew), but had hoped that Cox could gain some experience with East or West Africa.

Dougall also learned that the Colonial Office had plans to use Vischer as a kind of tutor and friend to African students in London, and that Mayhew would be given a post in one of the Colonial Office's new Social Service Departments. Mayhew would also be available to sit on the Advisory Committee

---

[66] "Report of Interview with Mr. Daive at the Colonial Office October 18, 1939," by J.W.C.D. (J.W.C. Dougall). I.M.C. Archives, London.

[67] Ibid.

[68] Mr. Cox had been Principal of Gordon College and Director of Education in the Sudan.

and its Sub-Committees.[69] Dougall's concern for continuity seems to have been partially satisfied. As he stated in his Report, "I welcomed this (the placements of Vischer and Mayhew) as going some way to meet the case."[70]

The Colonial Office finalized the apointment of an Educational Adviser with startling speed and exemplary efficiency. In November, 1939, only a month after Dougall's discussions with the Colonial Office, the announcement was made at the Advisory Committee meeting that Mr. Christopher Cox had been appointed Educational Adviser to the Secretary of State for the Colonies.[71] Lord Dufferin, the chairman of the Committee, also informed the members that it was quite possible that an Assistant Adviser would also be appointed at a future date.[72] Lord Dufferin also made known to the Committee that Mr. Mayhew and Major Vischer would be terminating their services with the Committee and assuming new duties in the Colonial Office. The Committee responded to Lord Dufferin's announcement by passing a resolution so as to place on record its great appreciation for services the Joint Executive Secretaries had rendered in their years with the Committee, and expressed the hope that both Mayhew and Vischer would be able to rejoin the Committee as members.[73]

---

[69] "Report of Interview with Mr. Daive," op. cit.

[70] Ibid.

[71] A.C.E.C., 99th Meeting, November 16, 1939.

[72] This came to pass with the appointment of W.E.F. Ward in October, 1945, at the 137th Meeting of the Advisory Committee after a succession of temporary Assistant Advisers—five in all.

[73] Arthur Mayhew did rejoin the Advisory Committee at the 132nd Meeting, March 15, 1945, and no doubt Sir Hanns Vischer would have also rejoined the Committee except for his untimely death on February 19, 1945.

The Advisory Committee had moved into a new period after fifteen years, but the important point in consideration of administrative developments was that it moved, rather than remain stagnant and cease to exist. With heavy financial burdens placed upon every colony, as well as the Colonial Office, it would have been an easy and somewhat justifiable task to eliminate the Advisory Committee had it not been for the visionary leadership of such men as Malcolm MacDonald, William G. A. Orsmby-Gore, Dr. J. H. Oldham, Lord Lugard, Lord Hailey, Hanns Vischer, and Arthur Mayhew. All of these men were in close communication and shared a singular commitment that regardless of finances or world events, the work of advancing the progress of education in the British colonies must continue; therefore, the Advisory Committee on Education continued.

The administrative structure of the Advisory Committee was completed at the 100th meeting of the Committee on January 18, 1940, when Mr. Cox began his service as Educational Adviser to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. From that date, the structure of the Advisory Committee remained essentially the same until the Committee's termination in June, 1961.[74]

A synopsis of the overall development of the Advisory Committee's administrative structure highlights the efforts required to perpetuate the Committee and its work, and the eventual accomodation by the permanent Colonial Office staff to the need for an Advisory Committee on Education with the

---

[74] The Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies met for the last time on June 8, 1961. It was the 242nd meeting of the revised Advisory Committee, or the 289th meeting of the Advisory Committee begun in 1924. The function of advising on educational development was to be taken over by the Department of Technical Co-operation.

appointment of an Education Adviser to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The stark necessity of finding financial resources to support the Advisory Committee or abandon it altogether due to the lack of Carnegie Corporation funds forced the Secretary of State to decide between education as an investment and education as an expense. To Malcolm MacDonald, well counseled by Ormsby-Gore, Oldham, Lugard, Hailey, Maynew, Vischer and others, goes the credit of making the crucial decision. And to those who counseled him goes the credit for the vision and wisdom during the twenties and thirties to grasp what today is a more generally accepted premise that education is an investment in human resources. The idea has not been totally accepted even today; yet for the British in their pre-Keynesian economic frame of mind, it was daring and well within the minority opinion.

The long struggle to insist that education in the colonies should be considered an investment rather than an expense had begun to pay off in terms of changing some official attitudes and Colonial Office financial commitments, but the battle was far from won. By 1940 the financial suport of the Advisory Committee on Education by the Colonial Office had inched the office closer toward the acceptance of education as an investment, but it would take the pressure for political independence from the colonies to transform inches into yards.

It is a truism that policy is a function of administration since decisions cannot be made without decision makers who in turn comprise, in a collective way, the administration. The continuing administrative structure of the Advisory Committee on Education was essential to the continuation of

policy-making with regard to colonial education. If the administrative function of the Advisory Committee had ceased, the formulation of educational policy guidelines for the colonies would have ceased. The clock probably would have turned back to the pre-1924 era with education tumbled into the separate worlds of soul saving and elitism; both divorced from the concept of education as an investment in human resources.

The challenge of formulating educational policy guidelines for the colonies fell squarely upon the Advisory Committee on Education. Their response to the challenge, the conflicts they encountered, and the policies recommended between 1923 and 1948, receive the central focus of this study in the following chapters.

IV

THE FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATIONAL POLICY

The genesis of an education policy for British Tropical Africa began with the decision to have the Governors' Conference of 1923 consider a memorandum on "Educational Policy in Africa." The result was the creation of an Advisory Committee on Native Education in British Tropical Africa.

The responsibility of the Advisory Committee to both advise and assist the Secretary of State for the Colonies in the advancement of education created a dual role for the committee. The advising function resulted in formal statements on educational policy which the Secretary of State for the Colonies could accept and circulate to the colonies; thereby making the statements official policy. To assist the Secretary of State for the Colonies in advancing the progress of colonial education was interpreted to mean that the Advisory Committee would deal with educational problems as they developed. The latter function created an indirect influence on educational policy in that the Advisory Committee could influence policy by selecting alternatives that came closest to its interpretation of policy, or else recommend formal policy statements to the Colonial Secretary of State in light of its own investigations into educational problems in the colonies.

The guidelines for the Advisory Committee seemed clear enough—to advise and assist the Secretary of State for the Colonies; yet within that defined and limited function there was an important responsibility, the exercise of which could affect future generations of people living within the British

Colonial empire. There was also room for bold initiative which would provide flexibility within a structure and adaptability within a system being imposed from outside.

At its first meeting on Wednesday, January 9, 1924, the Advisory Committee began to explore the dimensions of the responsibility it had assumed. Ormsby-Gore offered his interpretation of the Committee's role in dealing with the impact of western civilization upon the peoples of Africa. The object of the Committee, according to Ormsby-Gore, "was to avoid a repetition of the mistakes made in India and see that Africa benefited from the fruits of experience from all over the world. If a sounder system of education developed it would be less productive of causes of legitimate discontent."[1]

Ormsby-Gore, as Chairman of the Committee, also outlined two major problem areas that the Committee would probably face due to the increased demand of education in the British African colonies. The first problem was financing native education since governments were beginning to take part in the education of Africans. Sir James Currie, who had not been associated with the formation of the committee but would soon become a close friend of Dr. Oldham, suggested that the Committee recommend as a matter of general principle the policy used by Lord Cromer in the Sudan, that when any considerable proposal for economic development was approved, a certain proportion of the funds available should be earmarked as a contribution to native education, in order to preserve the balance between the material and intellectual progress of the natives.[2]

---

[1] Minutes of the Advisory Committee on Native Education in British Tropical Africa, 1st Meeting, January 9, 1924. Hereafter cited as A.C.N.E.B.T.A.

[2] Ibid.

Sir Herbert Read, Assistant Under-Secretary of State at the Colonial Office, responded on behalf of the permanent Colonial Office officials that although Currie's suggestion might be possible in theory, it was not possible in practice to induce a colonial government to carry out the principle to the same extent as in the Sudan. Sir Frederick Lugard took issue with Read's implication that colonial autochthony would preclude Imperial degree by citing the example of Lever Brothers who had been required by the government of the Belgian Congo to provide for the maintenance of two medical officers and two schools in return for taking up concessions in that territory. The matter was temporarily dropped, but it would be discussed again in the Second Advisory Committee meeting.

The second problem that Ormsby-Gore discussed was the matter of the "relation of Governments to Missionary Societies." In point of fact, the origin of the Advisory Committee on Education developed as a response to the basic question of what would be the relation between government and missionary societies in the field of education. Ormsby-Gore's view was an expression of more than a majority of the committee when he stated, "any attempt at native education which took no account of religion would be doomed to failure."[3] Again it was Sir James Currie who questioned this general assumption and mentioned the Mohammedan religion and its schools in Northern Nigeria and East Africa. It was clear to Ormsby-Gore that the Committee, at least for the time being, was not in a position to deal with general policy, nor was it his intention that it do so. Ormsby-Gore succinctly ended the discussion on religion by making the

[3] Ibid.

point that the Committee's practice, apart from any contributions made by individual members, should be devoted to the consideration of problems as they arose.[4]

Contingency planning could be deadly, but so could lengthy discussions of general policy when no action could be taken. Ormsby-Gore's responsibility was to set an overall view of what major problems the Committee would face and at the same time discuss situations that would require some action. The first task was the instructions for the Committee Executive-Secretary, Hanns Vischer, who would shortly depart for Africa with the Second Phelps-Stokes Commission. The Committee agreed that Vischer would collect educational reports from the various governments and summarize the points of interest for the Committee. The Committee further agreed that Vischer would ask the various Directors of Education to use a common format to make their yearly reports and would use a questionnaire drafted by Lugard to solicit information on the current status and problems of education in the various British African colonies.[5]

The Committee had the opportunity of hearing a brief account by Mr. Vischer of his visit to the United States on behalf of the Phelps-Stokes Fund and to meet with Dr. Thomas Jesse Jones concerning the Second Phelps-Stokes Commission to East Africa. Sir James Currie desired the Commission to include the Sudan

[4] Ibid.

[5] Lugard desired to have the questionnaire mailed to all Directors of Education, but Oldham felt that it would be an unnecessary burden of paperwork and would give the Committee a bad image. Oldham's view prevailed.

in their itinerary, but Dr. Jones explained that it would be impossible to include the Sudan in what was already an overcrowded itinerary.[6]

From the first meeting, the leadership nucleus of the Committee composed of Ormsby-Gore, Oldham, Lugard, and Sadler, was in agreement on how the Committee should function as well as what should be discussed. The first meeting was successful from their view; it brought the Committee together, introduced Mr. Vischer, the Executive-Secretary of the Committee; and gave Dr. Jones and Rev. Dougall an opportunity to meet the Advisory Committee and explain the objectives of the Second Phelps-Stokes Commission which would survey education in East Africa. Vischer would also visit Bechuanaland, Basutoland and Swaziland.

The Advisory Committee on Education was launched on the uncharted seas of cross-cultural planning for education. The Committee regarded its first step as cautious, but sound. The Committee would gather as much firsthand information as possible before recommending policy. In the interim, the Committee would act on specific problems as they developed.

Ormsby-Gore had already established that the Committee would deal with matters as they arose, especially during the tour of the Second Phelps-Stokes Commission. However, there was one educational project that had developed prior to the inception of the Advisory Committee—an educational complex at Achimota in the Gold Coast (now Ghana). Sir Gordon Guggisberg, Governor of the Gold Coast, had shown Oldham a draft copy of the report of his special committee on the new university college at Achimota. The Gold Coast was in the fortunate financial position to have a budget surplus and a Governor who

---

[6] A.C.N.E.B.T.A., 1st Meeting, op. cit. Reverend Dougall was also at the meeting and would go with the Second Phelps-Stokes Commission as Secretary.

advocated educational development. The recommendations of the Governor's Committee called for the creation of a school and college at Achimota. It thus became the task of the Advisory Committee to help secure the best man for the post of Principal at Achimota College. Oldham saw the selection of the Principal at Achimota as a matter of equal importance to the selection of the Secretary for the Advisory Committee.[7] However, the full potential of Achimota was not realized by Oldham until his talks with James E. K. Aggrey and Alex Fraser and their agreement to work together at Achimota.[8]

The Advisory Committee, informally under Oldham's direction during Vischer's tour with the Second Phelps-Stokes Commission, met in March to consider Achimota and discuss a report on education in Tanganyika. The main item on the agenda was Achimota, but the report on education in Tanganyika highlighted the serious lack of education facilities in Africa and the dilemma of policy versus action.

Sir James Currie immediately raised the question of finance which was central to educational development in tropical Africa. Currie was strongly in favor of a Colonial Office policy that would allocate a portion of money spent for development for application to the educational needs of the native population. Currie was quite insistent that the material needs should not outstrip the intellectual.[9]

---

[7] J.H.O. to Sir Michael Sadler, June 15, 1923.

[8] J.H.O. to Hanns Vischer, January 14, 1924.

[9] A.C.N.E.B.T.A., 2nd Meeting, March 13, 1924.

Ormsby-Gore agreed that financing was difficult, but his view was that the initial cost of capital expenditures in all areas limited the amount available for education, and of course the amount available for education would then be subject to the same condition insofar as the amount of money that could be spent on teaching staff as opposed to buildings. Ormsby-Gore's view was interesting in light of future Colonial Office attempts to assist with capital expenditures. The Colonial Development Act of 1929 was an attempt to deal with the problem that Ormsby-Gore discussed, although it was extremely limited in its scope.[10]

Another aspect of the financial dilemma that irritated the officials in the Colonial Office was Currie's insistence that what was done in the Sudan under Lord Cromer ought to be done in the other colonies. The Sudan was not a part of the Colonial Office sphere of influence, but came under the Foreign Office. However, a more important tradition in the Colonial Office would prevail—colonial autochthony. Governors were considered captains of their ship. If an individual Governor wished to adopt the Cromer system he was free to do so, but the Colonial Office would not impose the system across the board on all the colonial Governors.[11] Oldham's view touched the heart of the matter.

---

[10]The 1929 Development Act was limited to agriculture and industry, and was pushed through Parliament on the assumption it would stimulate commerce and industry in Great Britain. The only benefit to education would have been through trade or industrial schools connected with various development projects, but this was not seen as development since education was considered a social cost, an expense not an investment.

[11]The autochthonous position was true of the Foreign Office as well. What Lord Cromer did in the Sudan did not apply to his successor. Sir Herbert Read, Assistant Under-Secretary of State at the Colonial Office, used the word "induce" in the first meeting when Currie brought up the proportional investment scheme used in the Sudan. The Colonial Office would suggest, but Governors would have to accept, and that was a different matter considering the internal pressures Governors had to face.

Colonial Governors would have to be educated to the potential economic worth of educational investment, but in the meantime the Advisory Committee should consider the financial reality that Governors faced—limited revenues and almost unlimited possibilities for expenditures.

Oldham suggested that the Committee deal with educational problems in light of the funds available; therefore, he suggested that a system of traveling teachers within a particular colony would maximize a teacher's advantage with a minimum of expenditure.[12] The suggestion was based on the principle of the Jeanes Teachers in America's rural south.[13] It was Oldham's view that what could be done in the way of educational development would have to be done with money available; however, he hoped that changes in the financial resources available for education could be improved.

In a letter to Reverend Forgan of the United Church of Scotland, Oldham explained how Ormsby-Gore had taken up Sir James Currie's suggestion of earmarking a portion of the funds to be spent for development projects for education and was pressing the matter with the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Thomas. Oldham explained that since influential men were pushing the idea it had some chance of success. Oldham concluded his remarks by the comment, "It is within the bounds of possibility that instead of the paltry sums at present being expended on

---

[12] A.C.N.E.B.T.A., 2nd Meeting, March 13, 1924.

[13] The Jeanes Teachers originated with the establishment of the Negro Rural School Fund in 1907 which provided for supervising teachers who would travel through the rural areas and assist teachers in one-room schools or help develop a school program where one was needed.

on education there may soon be, in some colonies, the expenditure of half a million pounds, as indeed is happening in the Gold Coast at present.[14]

Oldham's optimism on the improved financial picture for education in all the colonies was short-lived. The Colonial Office considered the suggestions of Ormsby-Gore, Currie and others, but the matter continued as a question for each Governor to decide, and as such a perpetual conflict for the Advisory Committee's policy. The idea emerged several times during the Committee's life, but was finally outflanked by the passage of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act of 1940. The brilliance of the idea was tarnished by a conservative Treasury Department ambuscade.

The role that the Advisory Committee played in the development of Achimota was an excellent example of how indirect policy could work. First, and foremost, was the selection of a Principal to take responsibility for developing the school. The selection was extremely important if there was to be some consensus on the general philosophy behind Achimota. Second, there would have to be a clear perception of Achimota's purpose and whether that purpose could serve the Advisory Committee in executing its responsibility to the Colonial Office and individual colonies. It was Oldham's interest in what Achimota could mean and do for the Gold Coast, and Africa as a whole, that finally culminated in the selection of Mr. Alex Fraser and Mr. James Emman Kwegyir Aggrey to head the staff at Achimota.[15]

---

[14] J.H.O. to Reverend Forgan, April 9, 1924.

[15] J.H.O. to Hanns Vischer, January 14, 1924. Also W.E.F. Ward, Fraser of Trinity and Achimota (Accra: Ghana University Press, 1965), pp. 168-170.

The value of Achimota to the Advisory Committee centered in the experimental work it could do, especially with Mr. Aggrey on the staff. The school could be experimental without Aggrey, but the fact that he was black and of Gold Coast origin gave him excellent leverage in voicing African needs to the British and interpreting British intentions to the Africans. It was clear to Oldham that Mr. Aggrey was, "the biggest asset we have got in regard to our African Empire."[16]

Oldham's views of Achimota were optimistic, "It is the one place in the continent of Africa where the funds are available for a first-rate educational experiment and the carrying out of such an experiment seems likely to contribute more than anything else to sound educational development."[17]

The Advisory Committee met to discuss Achimota at their second meeting in March. The opportunity of meeting with Mr. Fraser and discussing his views of Achimota's potential would highlight some of the conflicts inherent in the formulation of policy, as well as clarify the unique role that Achimota could perform for the Advisory Committee. Achimota was discussed by the Committee before Mr. Fraser was asked in for questions. Sir James Currie raised the question of the relationship of the Principal of Achimota College and the Director of Education in the Gold Coast. Currie preferred that the two posts be combined, but this suggestion met with strong opposition from Oldham. The key, in Oldham's opinion, now that money was available, was to insure that there

---

[16] J.H.O. to Sir Michael Sadler, February 21, 1924.

[17] Ibid.

was, "a brain to direct the application of that money."[18] Oldham viewed the innovative and experimental role that Achimota could perform under an able Headmaster as far more important to the Gold Coast in the long run than the administrative function of the Director of Education. After all, it was the educational complex at Achimota that was to receive approximately five-hundred thousand pounds, not the Department of Education.[19]

The relationship of the government financed Achimota School to the Department of Education was important, but the Committee agreed that the matter would have to be discussed with the Governor of the Gold Coast at a future meeting.[20] Mr. Fraser was then given an opportunity to meet with the Committee and the first question asked was his view of the relation between the Principal of the College and the Director of Education. Fraser drew from his experience in Ceylon and suggested that the Director and Principal should not work at cross purposes, and to facilitate the arrangement the Principal should have a seat in the Council of the Education Department and the Director of Education should be on the governing body of the College.[21]

---

[18] A.C.N.E.B.T.A., 2nd Meeting, op. cit.

[19] At standard exchange, it was about two and a quarter million dollars in 1925. The operating budget was $810,000.

[20] Oldham was displeased with this part of the meeting. His feeling was that the meeting was nearly a failure because the Committee could not really gain ground by talking with itself. He was also concerned over the possible waining of enthusiasm of the members of the Committee. Mr. Alex Fraser's presence seemed to add a necessary spark which saved the meeting as far as Oldham was concerned. J.H.O to Hanns Vischer, March 14, 1924.

[21] A.C.N.E.B.T.A., 2nd Meeting, op. cit.

Mr. Fraser was also asked his views on denominational teaching due to his Church Missionary Society background and the fact that the College was a government school. Mr. Fraser stated that, "His principal had been not to teach anything which could not be put into practice."[22] Fraser was of the opinion that no strong school spirit could be developed unless there was a religious base. Those students who did not want religious instruction would have a form of instruction based on the lives of great men. Fraser's idea of religion was not authoritatively denominational. He preferred the Protestant Christian position, but considered any religous instruction beneficial so long as it was "constructive and not destructive."[23] Fraser was a deeply religous man, but like his brother-in-law, Dr. J. H. Oldham, he was an ecumenical Christian, not a hard line denominationalist. Fraser and Oldham agreed that the effectiveness of the Christian message for Africans lay in its ability to create brotherhood, cooperation and a social sense of Harambee, the Swahili term for pulling together.

Fraser was also questioned on the comprehensive structure of the Achimota scheme, in particular the elementary section of the school. Fraser's perception was that in order to develop a nucleus, the school would have to begin with kindergarten level and work up. The Teacher Training College would begin its program the same time as the elementary program.[24] Fraser was opposed to

---

[22] Ibid.

[23] Ibid.

[24] The School began taking students in January, 1928.

beginning the educational program at the secondary level with instruction in English; rather he desired to begin at both ends of the educational ladder and as facilities and staff increased, expand the ladder from the bottom up.

Following the second meeting of the Advisory Committee, Sir James Currie had occasion to talk more extensively with Mr. Fraser. The discussion developed an interesting conflict in the dimension of power that was available to the Advisory Committee, as well as some insights into the personal dynamics of the Committee itself. Currie's absence from the third meeting of the Advisory Committee and discussion with Fraser prompted him to circulate a memo to the Committee which suggested that missionary schools should be brought under government control and their graduates limited by the economic demand for their services.[25]

Lugard responded to Currie's memo with a memo of his own in which he clarified the parameters of the Advisory Committee's real power. First of all, the Committee was not to interfere with the local colonial administration, nor the functions of the Governor and his advisers. Second, the Committee had not touched on the problems of general application because it was considered advisable to defer them until Mr. Vischer returned from the Phelps-Stokes Commission to East Africa.[26] Thirdly, the matter of limiting school graduates to the economic demand for them as suggested in Sir James Currie's memo was a failure to see that the only limitations on school graduates were the financial resources

---

[25] A.C.N.E.B.T.A., 3rd Meeting, April 30, 1924, Appendix A.

[26] Ibid., Appendix B.

available to produce school graduates. The demand for school graduates was almost limitless with the multitude of problems facing the African colonies.

Lugard's opinion was that the real need of Africa was for well-trained teachers. But was this only Lugard's opinion, or was the idea shared by others? A note on Sir James Currie's memo in Oldham's handwriting rejects Currie's idea of limiting the output of school graduates to the demand for them with a emphatic "NO," and added, "You can't insist demand for educ. Can only limit grant."[27] There is no documented evidence to show that Oldham asked Lugard to respond to Currie's memo, but Oldham had not hesitated to use Lugard's great influence to push his own ideas, or oil the gears for his own humanist projects.[28]

As Oldham was acting as unofficial Secretary of the Committee during Mr. Vischer's temporary absence, his paramount desire was to increase the effectiveness of the Committee by avoiding clashes with colonial Governors, or antagonizing any of the elements which made up the orchestra of colonial education.[29]

---

[27] "Note by Sir James Currie on Matters Arising From Recent Minutes and On an Interview with Mr. Fraser at Colonial Office," O.P., International Missionary Council Archives, London.

[28] The Lugard Archives are ample evidence of the many instances of Lugard's action upon Oldham's suggestion. Also Oldham to Lugard, May 19, 1923; July 17, 1924; October 3, 1924; October 8, 1924; February 25, 1925; March 14, 1927; and in relation to the East African question of Native interest (taped interview with J.H.O. on April 28, 1965).

[29] Currie had made a comment in the 2nd Advisory Committee meeting that Directors of Education should be invited to attend Advisory Committee meetings. Sir Gordon Guggisberg responded, "As Governor, however, I should be decidedly adverse to the Advisory Committee making a rule of receiving Directors of Education without my request. I think it is obvious that this would give rise to certain difficulties." See Appendix, Minutes of the A.C.N.E.B.T.A., 3rd Meeting.

As a conductor Oldham was to play an important role in the manipulation of the "art of the possible." What could be accomplished was more important than what might be accomplished, especially when the latter could result in no gains at all because of personal antagonisms or alienations of one sort or another. The key to the success of the Advisory Committee in Oldham's mind was to get off to a positive start with a sound policy statement, a feeling of cooperation between the various components of colonial education, and a sense of interest, movement, and momentum that would create a dynamism of attention for the British African colonies and their people.[30]

The main task which faced the Advisory Committee was the formulation of a policy statement that could be circulated to the African colonies. Hanns Vischer returned from the Phelps-Stokes Commission in July, 1924, and the process of formulating an official policy statement began, although the formulation of policy had begun with the genesis of the Advisory Committee and continued in an indirect manner with the interaction of the members of the Committee. During its two meetings in July, the Advisory Committee discussed the recommendations for an educational system in Uganda. These meetings allowed for personal interaction of the Committee members with Mr. Vischer, and for some comments on his reactions to the preliminary findings of the Second Phelps-Stokes Commission. The discussion was an indication of the process through which the Advisory Committee was influenced into accepting a mass education approach.

---

[30] J.H.O. to H. Vischer, April 10, 1924.

After two full meetings, the Committee agreed that the educational structure in Uganda should provide for both elementary and higher education by upgrading "bush schools" and developing Makerere College. Sir Michael Sadler expressed a central concern of the Committee in dealing with African educational policy.

> Our failure in India was due to the fact that we only did Higher Education. We should not under value Western Civilization but we should make Africans proud of their own civilization as well.[31]

The Advisory Committee did not meet during August and September. It resumed regular meetings in October and heard a proposal by Lugard that the Committee consider a procedure whereby important matters that were to be considered by the Committee might first be discussed in a memorandum which would be circulated to all the members. Each member was to make notes on the draft and return it to the Committee Secretary who could then compile a draft which showed those areas where opinion was in conflict. This would give each member an opportunity to evaluate various views and when the Committee met, those areas where disagreement continued could be modified or deleted so as to achieve a general consensus of the Committee.[32] Oldham suggested that the Committee consider using the procedure outlined by Lugard in dealing with the main task of developing guidelines for educational policy, as well as other topics like the upgrading of the educational service, and the usefulness of vernacular in African education.[33]

---

[31] A.C.N.E.B.T.A., 5th Meeting, July 30, 1924.

[32] A.C.N.E.B.T.A., 6th Meeting, October 6, 1924.

[33] Ibid.

The official record with regard to the formulation of policy is somewhat distorted. The real policy making was going on behind the scenes, and not at the Advisory Committee meetings. In September, Vischer and Oldham had corresponded over the July meetings and it was clear that Vischer was working closely with Oldham. Late in September Vischer wrote to thank Oldham for his assistance in a matter dealing with the format of the forthcoming Phelps-Stokes Commission Report on East Africa and ended with the confirmation, "see you at your office on Thursday (September 25th) at 3 p.m."[34]

The specific nature of the meeting is not known but at least some time was probably devoted to the development of the Committee's first policy statement. Oldham was concerned with the development of a sound policy statement as well as the procedural mechanics for the development of the best policy statement the Committee could create. Apparently, Oldham knew that Lugard was drafting a statement for the Committee to consider for on October 3, Oldham received a copy of the memorandum on policy that Lugard had drafted. Oldham responded immediately with a letter to Lugard to suggest that copies of the memorandum be sent to Committee members to distribute the initiative.[35] Oldham suggested that it would be wise to send copies of the memorandum to Dr. Jones and Mr. Fraser for their comments since they were at the heart of African education.

The initial draft of the policy statement was before the Committee members before the Committee officially commissioned Lugard to draft the statement. The

---

[34]Hanns Vischer to J.H.O., September 23, 1924.

[35]J.H.O. to Sir F. D. Lugard, October 3, 1924.

procedure adopted at the official Advisory Committee meeting on October 6 was also ex post facto. It is understandable that what was in fact taking place had to be made official in the sense of the Minutes of the Advisory Committee. The initiative for formulating educational policy came from Oldham and Lugard and the function of the Committee was to serve as an elaborator or testor for the ideas put before it. As further indication of the care with which the official record was established, Oldham wrote Vischer following the Committee meeting to give him the verbatim wording of how the Minutes should read with regard to Lugard's procedural suggestions and his own suggestions on the subjects the Committee ought to explore.[36]

Oldham returned the first draft of the memorandum on education policy to Lugard shortly after the Advisory Committee meeting with ample comments and suggestions for revision. Oldham suggested that Lugard expand the section of his memo on the Advisory Boards of Education which Lugard had suggested should be established in each colony. Oldham wanted the paragraph expanded because he thought it might be a mistake to put too much power into the hands of the Director of Education if he were made Chairman of the Board as Lugard had originally suggested.[37] Oldham preferred more flexibility for the individual colonies and to leave the matter open by not stating specifically how the Board should be organized.

---

[36] J.H.O. to Hanns Vischer, October 6, 1924.

[37] J.H.O. to Sir F. D. Lugard, October 8, 1924.

Oldham further wanted Lugard to strengthen the section of the policy memorandum dealing with education being adapted to native life. Oldham wanted Lugard to stress the fact that the main purpose of education in Africa was to give the African communities the leaders they would need to serve and advance the whole community; of equal importance was the goal that the individual not be separated by his education from his own people.[38] Oldham's final suggestion to Lugard was to include a sentence that would make it perfectly clear that although the Advisory Committee was concerned with the formulation of education in Africa, it was also aware of the responsibility for advanced education and would recommend Africans have opportunities for further education as funds allowed.[39]

Oldham not only had a great deal to say about policy; he was also concerned about procedure. Oldham suggested to Lugard that copies of the memorandum be circulated outside of the Committee, and in particular to Dr. T. Jesse Jones, Educational Director of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, and to Mr. Fraser, Principal of Achimota College. Oldham wished to consult with Dr. Jones and Mr. Fraser because of their experience and insights which he felt would benefit the Committee in formulating its policy statement. Oldham further pressured Lugard with the idea that, once the Committee had a policy statement it felt was ready to be sent to the Secretary of State, that an intermediate step should be followed whereby the various Directors of Education in the African colonies should

---

[38] Ibid.

[39] Ibid.

be sent the memorandum so the Committee could consider their comments before finally issuing the memorandum.

Oldham's reasons for initiating this step which would probably delay the appearance of the policy statement were, first, to give the various Directors of Education in Africa a chance to comment and suggest ideas. Another reason was Oldham's desire to have the local governments and Directors of Education involved and thinking about what the Advisory Committee was doing, and hopefully be more responsive to the ideas and "advice" that the Advisory Committee would be issuing as a policy statement.[40] At the same time Oldham suggested to Lugard that the memorandum on policy should be sent to the Directors of Education, he was also writing Hanns Vischer, Executive-Secretary of the Committee, to suggest that the intermediate step of sending the draft memorandum to key personnel in Africa be done before the memorandum went to the Secretary of State for the Colonies.[41] Oldham desired to have as many people as possible connected with colonial education involved, at least indirectly, in the formulation of the policy that they would have to carry out. The process, in Oldham's mind, was one of educating the educators to see the glaring discrepancies between what Africa needed and what education was offering.[42]

[40] Ibid.

[41] J.H.O. to Hanns Vischer, October 8, 1924

[42] To this end Oldham organized a Conference on African Missions that was held in September, 1924, for the purpose of discussing the Phelps-Stokes Commission Reports and the direction in which the missions would take in regard to education. As Oldham wrote Vischer, "It will be an exceptional opportunity of helping to swing the missionary societies into line with a sound educational policy." (J.H.O. to H. Vischer, April 29, 1924) It was from this Conference that the International Institute of African Languages and Cultures was born, and which later became the International African Institute under the direction of Lord Lugard and later Lord Hailey.

The formulation of the first policy statement by the Advisory Committee began with Lugard's memorandum and was circulated among the members of the Committee. The Advisory Committee did not discuss the policy memorandum formally at their meetings, but no doubt the members did have an opportunity to exchange views and opinions in an informal manner before and after their official meeting.

The memorandum began to take final form late in February, 1925. By this time Dr. T. J. Jones' and Mr. Fraser's views had been incorporated into Lugard's revised draft, and Sir Michael Sadler and Sir James Currie had given their approval as well. However, Oldham was not entirely satisfied with the memorandum and suggested that Lugard make four changes.

First, Oldham thought it was unnecessary to mention that the creation of the Advisory Committee had been in response to the Conference of British Missionary Societies. Second, the paragraph on religion and character training in which Lugard had mentioned the danger to constituted authority of Christian teaching on equality and brotherhood seemed unnecessary and would probably receive hostile criticism. Oldham suggested a wording that emphasized the necessity of religious and moral instruction being accorded equal standing with secular subjects, and that moral instruction and secular subjects both be related to the conditions of life and the daily experience of the students.

Oldham's third suggestion was to omit any statement as to how religion should be taught. In some instances, like Achimota, where conditions were right, the suggestions might be acceptable, but in other instances they would only antagonize and distract from the real value of the policy memorandum.

Oldham's final suggestion was to eliminate the paragraph on the organization of the school system which was too detailed in relation to the conditions. Oldham wanted to emphasize that the local conditions would vary, but that when a colony or district had completed its education structure it would have opportunities for elementary, secondary, technical, university, and adult education.[43]

Oldham was not convinced that Lugard would incorporate his suggestions into the final draft of the memorandum on policy so he wrote Sir Michael Sadler. Oldham wanted Sadler's support and suggested that if Lugard was resistent to Oldham's suggested changes the matter would have to be fought before the Committee.[44]

Ten days before the Advisory Committee's official meeting in March, Sadler and Vischer met to go over the final draft of Lugard's memorandum on policy. The task was apparently made simpler by Oldham's letter to Sadler which included the four suggestions Oldham had made to Lugard, and which Sadler and Vischer apparently supported for they found their way into the final memorandum.[45]

The final draft of the memorandum on policy was presented at the Twelfth Meeting of the Advisory Committee on March 10, 1925. The memorandum was unanimously adopted and the Committee agreed that it should be sent to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Amery, with the recommendation it be printed and issued as a Parliamentary Paper. The Committee's suggestion was carried out

---

[43] J.H.O. to Lugard, February 25, 1925.

[44] J.H.O. to Sadler, February 26, 1925.

[45] Sir Michael Sadler to J.H.O., February 27, 1925.

and the memorandum on educational policy became Education Policy in British Tropical Africa, Cmd. 2374, on March 26, 1925.

To give the publication some publicity and prevent the document from simply gathering dust in the Parliament Library, the Advisory Committee decided at its April meeting to have a question put to the Colonial Secretary in the House of Commons. This was carried out May 4 by Mr. Snell, M.P. for East Woolich, who asked if the Government was prepared to take steps to ensure that the policy for native education in the colonies was put into effect. Mr. Amery replied that it was the Colonial Office's intention and desire that the education authorities in the various colonies adopt the policy for guidance in dealing with the problems of native education.[46]

Question time in British parliamentary procedure does not afford additional time for debate on answers given by the Government, but there was an obvious weakness in Mr. Amery's reply. Adoption of policy was one thing, but financial resources to carry out policy was another. If a policy calls for community development and the necessary financial resources are not available within a colony, then does the Imperial government assist financially, or if it does not, does it accept the conditions that government policy intended to ameliorate?

This point had already been discussed by Currie, Oldham, and Lugard, but the ultimate responsibility was that of Parliament. Or was it? Did Parliament question the provisions of the memorandum on educational policy adopted by the Colonial Office? Of course not; the Advisory Committee had to plant a question

---

[46]Great Britain, Parliamentary Debates (Commons), Vol. 187, p. 89.

in Parliament for the purpose of a Parliamentary record of the official Colonial Office policy on education. Parliament would be kept informed of colonial education policy by the addition of Members of Parliament on the Advisory Committee, but the policy established in the 1925 White Paper was formulated without Parliamentary influence. The influence was from the Advisory Committee on Education to Parliament. This was built in by the nature of the Chairmanship of the Advisory Committee being vested in the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies. With changes in government, the Committee could educate the new Chairman who would then in turn answer for the Committee in Parliament and in a sense educate Parliament on the nature of colonial education.

To account for the discrepancy between actual educational conditions in the colonies and policy, it is necessary to examine Parliament's ultimate responsibility—the financial responsibility for the Colonial Office budget. As long as the Advisory Committee on Education did not cost the British government a shilling, nor its policy recommendations require additional expenditures by the British government, all was well, at least, for Parliament and Whitehall, although not necessarily for the colonies.

Education was considered a cost as were almost all government expenditures with the exception of capital outlays for economic development. These were considered costs, but they were also looked upon as investment since economic development would bring more trade and revenue to a given colony. Thus, Parliament acquiesced in Colonial Office educational policy as long as the cost for that policy was to be borne by the colonies themselves. It is difficult to assess whether it was Parliament's inaction, or the policies of a Treasury

Department that seemed determined to return to the halcyon days of a convertible gold standard and budget surpluses. One thing was clear. Parliament did have authority to act as it did eventually in 1929, and more substantially in the passage of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act of 1940.

The foundation for British colonial education policy was established with the publication of the memorandum on education policy in British Tropical Africa as a Parliamentary Paper in March, 1925. The process by which the policy paper was formulated reveals the pattern by which the Advisory Committee would formulate future policy statements as well as the influential nature of several key members of the Committee. An analysis of the basic education policy laid down in the 1925 White Paper and subsequent policy statements follows so as to examine the thesis that British colonial education policy was a continuous attempt to orient education policy in the colonies to meet the local needs for human resource development.

V

A HEURISTIC POLICY

The Memorandum entitled Educational Policy in British Tropical Africa (Cmd. 2374, 1925) was an attempt to establish value guidelines for colonial education, or in terms of recent computer terminology, a heuristic program. The concept of a heuristic program fits the policy statement of 1925 because the policy was an attempt to use general principles as guides for action.[1] The policy was deliberately general because conditions varied throughout the African colonies, but there was a need for giving a focus to educational development. This would require value judgments which the Advisory Committee considered and incorporated into its first statement on policy.

The main emphasis of the value guides for the 1925 educational policy was humanistic in terms of its recognition of community and individual development. Throughout the policy statement there is a general emphasis on the development of human resources, adaptation to local needs, conservation of indigenous culture, and the development of the whole community for the benefit of all the people. The requirement of economic development in the colonies was of major importance, but the Advisory Committee was also anxious to point out the danger of advancing material prosperity faster than the people's ability

---

[1] Robert Boguslaw, The New Utopians (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965), pp. 13-17, and pp. 71-98. But in computer terminology it is used interchangeably as a noun or adjective to mean a method or approach that does not have a specific formula to follow but it knows the goal to be attained. I shall use it in this sense.

to turn it to good use. The Committee could not require Governors or Directors of Education to act, but the suggestion for improving the conditions under which people lived was clear. It was also clear to the Committee that the cost to do so must be considered the Government's first charge on its revenue.

The 1925 policy statement contained four sections that dealt with the missionary schools in Africa. These might be interpreted as ample reason for Oldham's strong interest in formulating an African educational policy as the section guaranteed government and church cooperation, encouraged voluntary educational efforts, and suggested the adoption of "Grants-in-Aid" to assist private educational efforts. The charge of a government sell-out to the missionary societies might be accepted on the superficial evidence of the policy statement itself, but Oldham's desire to transform missionary schools was as uppermost in his mind as guiding government schools toward a more progressive and visionary educational policy. Developing human resources meant questioning what education was doing and then trying to guide education toward what it ought to be doing. Oldham was well aware that many missionary schools were completely inadequate, that rivalries which existed between missions to capture souls often gave Africans an example of white Christian hypocrisy, and that all too often the missions were preaching, "don't do as we do, do as we tell you."[2]

Oldham believed that the government policy of cooperation would create an educational free-market in which a healthy competition would develop between

---

[2]Interview with J.H.Oldham, February 10, 1965.

government and private (mission) schools, and that this competition would serve the peoples of Africa. As Oldham stated, "It is not a question of jealous rivalry but of honourable emulation. The field is clear and the prize is to the best runner."[3] The use of the word prize was unfortunate for it tends to imply a capturing of people by indoctrination. Many Africans might well agree that in fact this is what happended, but the "prize" in Oldham's opinion was an altruistic one of lifting the people above a life of disease and poverty to a level of health and self-sustaining economies.

In terms of its approach, the 1925 educational policy selected community development; in terms of its religious philosophy, it chose Christian brotherhood; and in terms of its modern African application, it was nearest to "Ujamaa"—familyhood. The real challenge for missionary and government education alike would be the attainment of the ideal education which the Advisory Committee saw as assisting in the growth of the peoples of the colonial territories into a fuller and richer manhood and womanhood. The ideal was an expression of a basic belief in the efficacy of maximizing human potential and as such, represents a value heuristic that would continue to influence colonial educational policy.

The Advisory Committee's first policy recommendations could have been specific recommendations to increase literacy by a certain percentage, or to open so many secondary school places, or to provide X-number of teacher training institutions, or similar recommendations. The policy statement was none of

---

[3] J. H. Oldham, "Educational Policy of the British Government in Africa," International Review of Missions (vol. XIV, no. 55, July, 1925), p. 427.

these; it was a general expression of what education should be rather than what education needed in order to be more like British education.

The basic policy guideline established by the Committee and accepted by the Colonial Office dealt primarily with value judgments and left specific recommendations on the educational structure as open-ended as possible to facilitate greater flexibility within each colony. The policy statement was drawn up in an outline form in fourteen sections. It is doubtful that the order of the sections was intended to reflect any priority, but rather to organize the policy statement into a manageable unit.

The first two sections dealt with voluntary educational effort and cooperation between the government agencies involved in education.[4] The government would welcome and encourage all voluntary educational effort, "which conforms to the general policy." But government would reserve to itself, "the direction of educational policy," and the supervision of all "Educational Institutions" by inspection or other means. If government was to direct educational policy, the mechanism to facilitate cooperation between government and private agencies was through the use of Advisory Boards of Education.

The second section entitled "Co-operation" specifically states that the Boards would be advisory to the government and should include senior officials from Medical, Agricultural, and Public Works Departments, as well as representatives from missionary, trader, settler, and native interests. The reason for the wide representation on the Advisory Boards was due to a basic value judgment

---

[4]Great Britain, Colonial Office, Education Policy in British Tropical Africa Cmd. 2374 (London: H.M.S.O., 1925), p. 3. Hereafter cited only as 1925 Policy.

which related education to all efforts by government or private citizens, for the welfare of the community.[5]

The third section of the 1925 Policy was entitled, "Adaptation to Native Life," which was an unfortunate title since it was taken to mean, all too often, keeping the African in his place. The section began with the idea that education should be adapted to the mentality, aptitudes, occupations, and traditions of the various peoples, but conserving as far as possible all sound healthy elements in their social life.[6]

The section went on to develop the idea that the aim of education should be to help each individual become more resourceful in order for the community to advance as a whole through the improvement of agriculture, health, the development of native industry, and "the training of the people in the management of their own affairs." The idea of adaptation was only a pedogical method of beginning the educational process where the individual was in relation to his own community, and advancing both, rather than treat the individual separate from the community and end up with a person who was isolated from his community because of his education. Adaptation to native life was intended to focus education on the needs of the community and assist both individuals and the community achieve a higher standard.

Government departments concerned with health, public works, railways, and agriculture were urged to cooperate closely with education, for the task was a

---

[5] Ibid., p. 4.

[6] Ibid.

broad frontal assault rather than a narrow spearhead attempt for short-term gains. The key to the section on "Adaptation to Native Life" can be found in the sentence that treats the needs of the masses of people as well as the leaders for the Committee considered that the first task of education was to raise the moral and economic standard of the bulk of the people, as well as provide for the "talented tenth."

> The first task of education is to raise the standard alike of character and efficiency of the bulk of the people, but provision must also be made for the training of those who are required to fill posts in the administrative and technical services, as well as of those who as chiefs will occupy positions of exceptional trust and responsibility.[7]

Unfortunately, the third section concludes with the financial reality that shatters the ideal picture of education becoming community development in the broadest sense with the ominous phrase, "as resources permit." The phrase was applied to opportunities for higher education in Africa, but clearly any increase in educational facilities or implementation of programs would cost money. As the whole character of the policy statement was focused on native education, there was a good probability that "as resources permit" would be generalized to the whole responsibility for African education. The suggestion for a concomitant financial policy to support education was suggested in other sections, but was never given major emphasis, or at least the emphasis necessary to implement the policy.

The fourth section in the White Paper on Education dealt with "Religion and Character Training." The values expressed in this section begin with the

---

[7] Ibid.

view that education should support the feeling of responsibility to the tribal community and improve what was sound in indigenous tradition. Yet education was also recognized as a force which strengthens will power; makes the conscience, "sensitive both to moral and intellectual truth"; and gives the individual the ability to discriminate between good and evil, between reality and superstition.[8] Religious teaching and moral instruction was recognized as the necessary buffer between old and new since tribal authority would be weakened and the strong belief in the supernatural would have to be redirected so as to filter out what was good in the old belief from what was defective.

Character education was given equal standing with secular school subjects and habits of self-discipline and loyalty to the community were stressed.[9] The foundation for character education was developed through the formation of, "habits of industry, of truthfulness, of manliness, of readiness for social service, and of disciplined co-operation."[10] The Committee's view was that the most effective means of "training" character was through the use of a residential school where faculty and older students would establish the type of atmosphere that would develop the character the Committee recommended.

The fifth section dealt with "The Educational Service" and recommended that the status and conditions of service would have to be commensurate with attracting the best people available, both British and African. This would

---

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid., p. 5.

[10] Ibid.

obviously cost money. The colonies were short of funds so the Committee preceded its recommendation with the statement that education must keep pace with the economic development or the gap between economic and moral development would constitute a danger. The Committee stressed the necessity of a corresponding fiscal policy which would have to be developed at the local level.

> A policy which aims at the improvement of conditions of the people must therefore be a primary concern of Government and one of the first charges on its revenue.[11]

The section on "Educational Service" ended with the suggestion that teachers from Great Britain ought to be allowed to continue their pension contributions during short service appointments to approved posts in Africa. This would facilitate exchanges and assist colonies in recruiting teachers for short terms.[12]

The sixth section in the policy statement dealt with "Grants-in-Aid," or government support for voluntary educational efforts. The premise was that voluntary educational agencies would save the government money in capital costs and thus make existing revenues go further to implement educational programs. The Committee specifically stated that Grants-in-Aid should not be given on the basis of examination results.[13] The Committee further developed the guidelines for Grants-in-Aid in a subsequent memorandum.

---

[11] Ibid.

[12] This was facilitated through the work of Sir Michael Sadler, A.C.N.E.B.T.A., 8th Meeting, December 11, 1924, and the Teacher Superannuation Act of 1925. The snag was the fact that teachers who went to Africa would have to make the full contribution of 10% of their salary. In 1933 Colonial Reciprocity was established but only for Government Schools. In 1937 Missionaries received the same option as government teachers received in 1925.

[13] 1925 Policy op. cit., p. 6.

The next section of the 1925 Policy dealt with a controversial, yet critical, area of the use of vernacular language, teaching and textbooks. The Committee had little empirical data to guide it so it simply stated that the study of the educational use of vernaculars was important, and suggested cooperation with scholars, governments, and missionary societies. The Committee stressed that the content and method of teaching be adapted to the conditions of Africa, as well as the textbooks used in the schools. The Committee would continue to investigate the question of whether the vernacular language should be used. An interesting value judgment emerged which focused attention on Africanization of the curriculum so that the whole educational experience would be relevant to Africans. The Advisory Committee on Education, long before the Agency for International Development, was advocating a policy of "adapt don't adopt."

The eighth section of the policy memorandum dealt with "Native Teaching Staff" which the Committee considered a "primary consideration" and the "key" to a sound educational system.[14] The Committee called for an African teaching staff that was adequate in numbers, qualifications and in character, and that included women. The training of teachers for village schools was to be carried out in the rural areas so that the teachers would be in direct contact with the environment in which they would have to live and teach about.[15] Again the Committee stressed the idea of local adaptation by having the teachers for a given district selected from the area so that language, customs, and local traditions would be familiar to the teacher. The Committee further recommended that at

---

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid.

least every five years the teachers should be given additional training.

The ninth section made recommendations on "Visiting Teachers" and closely supports the preceding section on Native Teaching Staff. As time and money were critical, the Committee strongly recommended that a system of specially trained itinerant teachers be developed. The teachers would visit the schools on a rotation schedule remaining long enough at each school to show the local teacher better methods. The idea was an adaptation of the Jeanes Schools in the rural southern United States. The Committee recommended that the traveling teachers should be, whenever possible, from the same tribe as the pupils and should be brought together at least every year for a conference and for sharing of experiences. The Committee saw the role of the visiting teachers when it stated, "The visiting teachers should be prepared to learn as well as to teach."[16] The use of traveling teachers was important for the development of more village schools, and for continuing the process of educational experimentation.

"Inspection and Supervision" followed the section on Visiting Teachers. In part, this was to avoid confusion between the role of the visiting teacher and government or missionary inspection of schools. The Government Inspectors were to make "frequent and unhurried" visits and base their reports on these visits rather than on examination results. The Committee advised that the duty of Government Inspectors was to clarify educational aims and give "friendly advice and help" in implementing policy. The Committee concluded with the

---

[16] Ibid., p. 7.

suggestion that missions also arrange to supervise their schools, but that the mission supervision of their own schools in no way "supersede" government inspection.[17]

The eleventh and twelfth sections of the 1925 Educational Policy discussed "Technical Training" and "Vocational Training." The Committee accepted technical industrial training in government or privately owned workshops as long as there was an "Instructor for Apprentices" who would devote his entire time to the Apprentices. The Committee considered that a "fair" knowledge of English and Arithmetic should be required of apprentices before their training began so that they could benefit from the instruction and be able to read blueprints. There was no mention that English and Mathematics instruction would be provided as part of on-the-job training. The Committee did specify that instruction in village crafts must be clearly differentiated from the "training of the skilled mechanic."[18]

The distinction between technical and vocational training was made on the basis of skilled trades in industry, government or private, as opposed to specialist skills acquired through service in the various government departments such as Medical, Agricultural, Forestry, Veterinary, Survey, and Post Office. The Committee expressed its concern that the prestige difference between manual and clerical labor be avoided and that the aim of government education policy should be to equalize the prestige of both types of

---

[17] Ibid.

[18] Ibid.

labor so as to counteract the disdain for manual labor.[19] The Committee's view was that government should take some action to make manual labor "at least as attractive" as clerical work. What this action should be was not specified, but all it could be other than words, was financial equalization. Government policy was on the horns of a dilemma since revenues were limited and financial resources were needed in every area.

The thirteenth section of the 1925 White Paper tactfully discussed the need for increased effort toward the "Education of Girls and Women." The Committee recommended that only those who were acquainted with the local needs and customs could judge the degree to which female education could be stressed. The Committee accepted the importance of female education and the adage that when you educate a man you educate an individual, but when you educate a woman you educate a family. The problem centered around the degree to which alienation and disharmony would develop as a result of breaking down tribal traditions or customs; yet community development was obviously needed to give the people a life with more hope and comfort. The Committee placed great trust in the personality and outlook of the teachers, but clearly saw female education as part of the overall educational development.

> Female education is not an isolated problem, but is an integral part of the whole question and cannot be separated from other aspects of it.[20]

The 1925 Educational Policy concluded with a general outline for school organization; not on how it should be organized, but on what it should embody

---

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid., p. 8.

when completed. The reason for this tactic was the varying conditions at the local level. When completed, the school system in a given colony was to include elementary, secondary, technical and vocational schools, and institutions which "may hereafter reach University rank."[21] Adult education was not to be overlooked and Directors of Education were cautioned to keep adult education constantly in view in relation to the education of young people.

The concluding sentence to the 1925 Educational Policy embraced a key value guideline, or heuristic, that went beyond the limits of adult education and was to become the corner stone of British educational policy in Africa and later other Colonial areas. The heuristic was that education of the whole community should advance on an equal step, pari passu, so that the entire community would benefit.

> The education of the whole community should advance pari passu, in order to avoid, as far as possible, a break in good tribal traditions by interesting the older people in the education of their children for the welfare of the community.[22]

The 1925 White Paper on British educational policy in Africa was the beginning of an attempt to guide new educational enterprises as well as redirect the energies of established educational agencies. The policy established value guidelines that would assist a given colony in developing its educational program. The policy attempted to widen the definition of education from successful examination results and school statistics to community development. In order to achieve real community development, the need for

---

[21] Ibid.

[22] Ibid.

cooperation between government and voluntary educational agencies was stressed, as well as religion and character training, and the education of women.

The innovative, or reactionary depending on the point of view, character of the colonial education policy was its attempt to adapt education to the needs of Africans on a broad front and thereby improve the standards and value of life throughout the whole community rather than take the spearhead, or specialist view, and concentrate on literacy, or secondary education.

The foundation for an education policy was established with the publication of the White Paper on colonial education policy, but continued public relations effort on the part of the Advisory Committee was necessary to give wider circulation to the ideas and recommendations in the White Paper. Both Lugard and Oldham took up the responsibility and drew attention to the Colonial Office policy by writing articles about the new colonial educational policy.

Lugard's article stressed the need for considering African colonies in light of their present condition and relating education to that condition in order to bring about basic changes.[23] Lugard's experience as a colonial administrator and his concern for "respect for authority" creates a somewhat conservative image of his insistence on "training of character."[24] Lugard disliked the idea of education for intellect only, with the end result of passed examinations and little else in the way of socially useful service.

---

[23] Sir F. D. Lugard, "Education in Tropical Africa," Edinburgh Review, Vol. 242, No. 493 (July, 1925), pp. 1-19. Hereafter cited as Lugard (July, 1925).

[24] Ibid., p. 9.

Lugard's concern for developing the qualities of integrity, self-reliance and a sense of personal and social responsibility stemmed in part from his own experiences in West Africa where education often meant individual privilege to avoid physical labor in emulation of the European rather than a commitment to community development. But in part, Lugard's concern for character training was influenced by Oldham's views on the necessity for missionary education to cooperate with government policy in the task of furthering community development.[25] Community development also meant involvement by the local people in their own affairs which Lugard felt was important for the development of "natural leaders."[26] Lugard drew attention to Achimota College in the Gold Coast as the institution where the 1925 Education Policy would be put to the test, and concluded his article by quoting Oldham as saying the 1925 Education Policy was "nothing less than a revolution in method." The "revolution in method" was Oldham's term for the concept of community development, or the idea that education should go beyond producing clerks for government offices, or mechanics for railways and public works, and elevate the life of the community through the improvement of agriculture, health, native industry, and training the people to manage their own affairs.[27]

Oldham's article stressed the responsibility that missionary societies had, now that government had created an educational policy that called for

---

[25] Lugard (July, 1925), op. cit., p. 13.

[26] Ibid., p. 15.

[27] Ibid., p. 19.

cooperation with voluntary educational agencies.[28] Oldham briefly outlined how the 1925 Educational Policy was a response by government to the missionary request for an educational policy with which missionary societies could cooperate, but he did not disclose the key role that he had played in moving the Colonial Office.

Oldham suggested that since government was willing to cooperate with missions, it would be up to the missions to establish "quality" schools that would become models.[29] Quality schools would cost money, but Oldham suggested that with government cooperation, missions could, and should, consolidate their efforts on behalf of Africans, rather than trying to create religious empires. Oldham knew that his task was to persuade missionary societies that the 1925 White Paper was formulated in the interest of Africans, and that what was in the best interest of Africans would be developed at Achimota in the Gold Coast.[30]

The Advisory Committee on Education looked upon the educational complex at Achimota in the Gold Coast as the model school for British educational policy in Africa. To clarify the 1925 Education Policy, Oldham, as co-editor of the International Review of Missions, asked Mr. Fraser, Principal of Achimota, to write an article on the "Aims of African Education."[31] Fraser's

[28] J. H. Oldham, "Educational Policy of the British Government," International Review of Missions, Vol. XIV, No. 55 (July, 1925), pp. 421-427.

[29] Ibid., p. 427.

[30] Personal Interview with J. H. Oldham, February 10, 1965.

[31] A. G. Fraser, "Aims of African Education," International Review of Missions, Vol. XIV, No. 56 (October, 1925), pp. 514-522.

article is a masterful blend of the ideas of both Lugard and Oldham, and incorporates much of Sir Michael Sadler's and Dr. David's[32] insights into the role of education.

Fraser's view which became the operational policy for Achimota was to root education in the culture of the people, and to avoid denationalization, which Fraser defined as, "irreverence for and ignorance of one's own nation and culture, and of things now chiefly affecting it."[33] Fraser saw the educational task as one in which the insight and initiative of the students to ask questions and further their thinking would be developed, and where the adaptation of old and new would be made by the student. The role of the teacher was to facilitate learning, not to tell students what was right.[34]

Fraser stressed the central idea of what he thought 1925 Education Policy called for—adaptation. Adaptation would involve a synthesis between old and new. It would use traditional subjects like history, science, and mathematics for the sake of knowing more about the local environment so that changes could be made which would benefit the people.[35] Fraser viewed the responsibility of the school in light of the total person and related "character training" in a secular humanistic way to the development of the complete man, meaning heart as well as head.

---

[32] Dr. A. A. David was Bishop of Liverpool and a close friend and supporter of Homer T. Lane who in turn influenced A. S. Neill.

[33] A. G. Fraser, op. cit., p. 517.

[34] Ibid., p. 516.

[35] Ibid., p. 521.

Fraser firmly believed that through character training, primarily in residential institutions, the real aim of education was to assist the student to do his very best for the service of his land and people.[36] To accomplish the aim, Fraser called for teachers who were willing to get alongside and be the servant of his students, and to facilitate the relationship, he strongly supported the use of the vernacular language in the early grades and knowledge of the local community.[37]

Criticism of the Colonial Office education policy was slow to develop. The African response was primarily limited to the West African colonies, in particular the Gold Coast. Both the Gold Coast Times and the Gold Coast Leader stressed the need for the same kind of education that Europeans had, and for more opportunities for secondary and higher education.[38] The fact that Achimota was being developed helped to ease some discontent, but the Colonial Office education policy was viewed by some as a complete acceptance of the American influence of Booker T. Washington on the recommendations of the two Phelps-Stokes Commissions to Africa, and the vested interest of missionary societies.[39]

---

[36] Ibid., p. 522.

[37] Ibid., pp. 520 and 516.

[38] The Gold Coast Times, February 16, 1924, p. 7, and the Gold Coast Leader, February 16, 1924, p. 4.

[39] This view was expressed by W.E.B. Du Bois in The World and After (New York: International Publishers, 1965), p. 37 and in Dusk of Dawn (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1940), p. 70. It is also suggested by Godfrey N. Brown in "British Educational Policy in West and Central Africa," The Journal of Modern African Studies, Vol. 2, No. 3 (November, 1964), p. 373, and by Dr. Okechukwu (ed.) in Nigerian Education (New York: F. A. Praeger, 1965), p. 11.

Perhaps the most bitter criticism of British colonial education policy followed the International Conference on the Christian Mission in Africa held in Le Zoute, Belgium, in September, 1926. The missions reached a concensus that the supervision of education and the formulation of educational policy were functions of government.[40] The missions further agreed with the idea that education should be planned with the complete awareness of the life of the community, and that the question of vernaculars should be studied further. The missions assumed that their responsibility was in the village, and especially with training of teachers while government, according to a mission consensus, was responsible for technical and higher education.[41]

The attack on missions and British educational policy came in October when Dr. Norman Leys wrote a letter to the Manchester Guardian. Dr. Leys was an advocate of native rights in East Africa and for several years had been a close supporter of Oldham in his efforts to secure an East African Commission on Native Land Rights. Dr. Leys harshly criticized both missionary societies and the Colonial Office education policy for trying to keep Africans in their place—a place whites had decided, not Africans. Dr. Leys called for subscribers to missions to inquire of their mission boards what they were doing with the money, and further suggested that the missions and government had conspired to exclude the native.

---

[40] J. H. Oldham, "The Christian Mission in Africa," International Review of Missions, Vol. XVI, No. 61 (January, 1927), p. 31.

[41] Ibid.

> It is highly questionable if by any means possible Africans can be prevented from getting what is a passion with them, the knowledge that has enabled Europeans to subjugate them and to conquer the world of nature.[42]

Dr. Leys' letter represented the view that education for the African should be the same as education for the European, and that if African education was geared to agriculture and vocationalism, it was only because Europeans wanted to keep Africans in their place.

Oldham's response to Dr. Leys' letter suggested that Dr. Leys examine what Achimota, under Mr. Fraser and Dr. Aggrey, was doing to give the best education to Africans. Oldham wanted Dr. Leys to know that leading educators in all countries were coming more and more to recognize that education must have regard for the environment of the pupil and that Sir Michael Sadler recognized that English education could benefit by the new conceptions regarding African education.[43]

The idea was clear, at least in the collective mind of the Advisory Committee, that the problem of Africa was fundamentally a human problem which needed a humanistic solution.

> These economic, political, racial and cultural problems are all interconnected and together constitute a problem entirely novel in history, to which there is no precedent or parallel in the memory or experience of mankind.[44]

---

[42] Dr. Norman Leys, Manchester Guardian, October 26, 1926.

[43] J.H.O. to the Editor, Manchester Guardian, October 29, 1926. Also J.H.O. to The Scots Observer, December 1, 1926.

[44] J. H. Oldham, "The Christian Mission in Africa," International Review of Missions, Vol. XV, No. 59, (July, 1926), p. 324.

What the Advisory Committee needed as well as the mission societies and governments was an international organization that could gather information on African languages, tribal customs, and sponsor social science research that would investigate the human problems of Africa.

The organization emerged in July, 1926, as the International Institute for African Languages and Culture under the chairmanship of Lugard and with the administrative directorship in the hands of the humanist crusader, Dr. J. H. Oldham.[45] One of the first tasks of the Institute was to explore fully the question of vernacular usage in education. The International Institute for African Languages and Culture would bring together research and people with field experience, and tap a wider source of knowledge and experience than could the Advisory Committee on Education, but the Advisory Committee would benefit almost instantly as Lugard, Oldham, and Hanns Vischer were all involved with both organizations.[46]

The question of vernacular languages was important for an effective education policy. In keeping with its promise in the 1925 White Paper, the Committee addressed itself to the question of the use of vernacular language for instruction.

---

[45] Oldham was not originally listed on official letterhead as Administrative Director because he was also responsible for securing a grant from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Foundation for $5,000 a year for five years. J.H.O. to Prof. Diedrich Westermann, December 23, 1924, and J.H.O. to Hanns Vischer, September 16, 1931, and Prof. Reginald Coupland to J.H.O., March 26, 1938. J. H. Oldham remained as Administrative Director until Prof. Coupland took over his job in 1938.

[46] Hanns Vischer was Organizing Secretary of the International Institute for African Languages and Culture as well as Executive Secretary for the Advisory Committee on Education.

In July, 1925, a Memorandum prepared by Hanns Vischer and Sir Michael Sadler was accepted by the Advisory Committee and circulated throughout the African colonies for responses to the "provisonal recommendations" that the Committee made.[47] By January, 1927, Oldham had prepared a preliminary memorandum based on the concensus of the replies. In the meantime, the International Institute of African Languages and Culture, and the preliminary work of Fraser and his staff at Achimota, were also collecting some evidence on the suitability of using vernacular languages in early education. The final draft of the memorandum on the use of vernacular languages was prepared by Lugard and Oldham and submitted to the Committee for final approval in April, 1927.[48]

The memorandum on vernacular languages stressed the aims of education which were taken from the 1925 Education Policy and focused on the adaptation of education to the needs of the people, community development, developing indigenous leaders, and for opening educational opportunities through higher education in Africa as funds permit. The object of the memorandum was to suggest a policy which might be followed, but one which could be adapted to different conditions. The value of vernacular languages was stressed to show that although English would be the language of further education and technical training, the language of the community was nearer to the real heart of

---

[47] A.C.N.E.B.T.A., 18th Meeting, July 17, 1925. These recommendations were based on the general assumption that the first language of the child was the language used to first make contact with the child and assist him to deal with his environment.

[48] A.C.N.E.B.T.A., 34th Meeting, 1927.

the people. If the vernacular language was not recognized, the educational system would tend to separate educated people from their own communities and create a class structure that could be detrimental to community development.[49] The Committee cited the Phelps-Stokes Commission; Professor Westermann, a German authority on African languages; and the Calcutta University Commission Report (1919) in addition to the Imperial Education Conference of 1923 as being supportive of the idea of using vernacular languages for involving people in the initial stages of education.

The Committee recognized the difficulties of using vernacular languages and listed three general areas with which it sympathized: (a) the wide variety of dialects even within the same tribes; (b) the improbability of trying to teach several languages to teachers; and (c) the production of suitable literature and textbooks in the vernacular language. From information the Committee acquired, it listed some of the vernacular languages being used in West and East African colonies and encouraged the spread of a dominant, or union language, rather than trying to use English in areas where too many dialects were being used. The Committee suggested that the reason for a dominant vernacular language rather than English was to meet the need of the child.

> The young mind finds its natural expression through a language which, in its structure and logic, has some affinity with its own and is more spontaneously assimilated.[50]

---

[49] Great Britain, Colonial Office, The Place of the Vernacular in Native Education (London: May, 1927), p. 6.

[50] Ibid., p. 8.

The Committee was not insistent upon the length of vernacular instruction, but suggested that in general three to four years was customary. The Committee did insist, however, that when English was introduced that it be taught well and that the native language should still be studied. In training colleges the Committee recommended that there be lectureships in each important vernacular language and that the post be held by an African.[51] The Committee insisted that when English was introduced, it be done on a full-time basis so that even if students spent a whole year on it they would have a substantial knowledge of English. Conditions in Africa suggested to the Committee that English was introduced over a two- or three-year period and only a "smattering" of bad English acquired. In the Committee's view it was educationally sounder to acquire English competency even if all other subjects were delayed than to have a poor knowledge of English.[52]

The Committee was willing to allow for the temporary abandonment of vernacular language teaching to meet the demand for more Africans with a good facility in English, but the Committee insisted that if its policy was followed there would be an adequate number of English speaking Africans. Of more importance to the Committee was the fact that those who acquired English in line with the Committee's recommendations would be more in touch with their communities; better able to pass on to their African brothers the new

---

[51] Ibid., p. 9.

[52] Ibid., p. 11.

knowledge they had acquired; and perhaps more likely to become the real leaders of their people.[53]

The Committee had further support in its efforts to promote the use of vernacular language education when the International Institute of African Languages and Culture came out in support of vernacular education in the fall of 1930. Their Executive Council passed a resolution in October, 1930, entitled, "The Use of Vernacular in Education." The resolution called for the use of vernacular for the first three years of school. The use of English in the higher grades was never to overshadow the continued study of the vernacular so that improvement of the language, and production of literature in the vernacular would create a closer bond between educated classes and the mass of the people. The justification for supporting the use of vernacular language in African education stemmed from the value judgment that education should be related to environment.

> We are of the opinion that no education which leads to the alienation of the child from his ancestral environment can be right, nor can it achieve the most important aim of education which consists in developing the powers and character of the pupil. Neglect of the vernacular involves the danger of crippling and destroying the pupil's productive powers by forcing him to express himself in a language foreign both to himself and to the genius of his race.[54]

The value heuristic embodied in the use of vernacular for African education was a reflection of the concern for the individual and the recognition of the necessity for community development in both a material and spiritual

---

[53] Ibid.

[54] Resolution passed at the Eighth Meeting of Executive Council, International Institute of African Languages and Cultures, Rome, October, 1930.

sense. The Advisory Committee accepted a value judgment that recognized the child's need first, not the needs of British administrators or colonial entrepreneurs. Unaware of American research, the Committee never mentioned in any of its publications, or in its Committee minutes, the research findings of the International Institute of Teacher's College Columbia whose work in Puerto Rico confirmed the Advisory Committee's basic value assumption. The International Institute in tests with over sixty-thousand Puerto Rican children in 1925 discovered that when Spanish speaking children were given basic Stanford Achievement tests written in Spanish, they scored on average higher than American children tested in English, but when they took the same test in English they scored lower than American children.[55]

In close collaboration with the International Institute for African Languages and Cultures, the Advisory Committee continued to pursue the question of the use of the vernacular. The expansion of the Advisory Committee in 1929 meant that many areas, where English was a second language, were not covered by the 1927 Memorandum which was limited to African vernaculars. In July, 1929, at the newly expanded Advisory Committee's seventh meeting, Arthur Mayhew, the new Joint-Executive Secretary, submitted a memorandum on Bilingual Education and a Sub-Committee was appointed with Sir Michael Sadler as chairman.[56] The Sub-Committee presented a revised draft to the main Committee

---

[55] The Center Forum, Vol. 4, No. 1 (September, 1969) pp. 7 and 11.

[56] A.C.E.C., 7th Meeting, July 18, 1929. Hereafter Minutes of the Advisory Committee on Education are cited as A.C.E.C.

in December, 1929. At the Advisory Committee meeting in February, 1930, the final draft of a memorandum on the Aims and Methods of Language Teaching in the Colonies was approved for printing and circulation.[57]

The memorandum on Language Teaching in the Colonies, largely the work of Sir Michael Sadler and Arthur Mayhew, did not change the original recommendation that the vernacular language be used as the language of instruction wherever possible. The Memorandum stressed the need to consider the language of the child in the initial stages of education and to facilitate a functional use of English at the post primary level.[58] The Committee desired to harmonize cultures, not to subordinate the native culture through an assimilation policy of using English as the only language of instruction in the school.[59]

The Committee was fully aware of the influence the United States was having on West Africans and other British colonial peoples because they could gain admission into American colleges more easily than into the limited number of British universities. The Advisory Committee reached some concensus through Sir Michael Sadler's remark that unless the British wished education to follow American lines, they would have to provide an education expressing, "characteristically British ideals and British policy."[60] The policy

---

[57] A.C.E.C., 13th Meeting, February 20, 1930. The Memorandum was not for general publication, nor released outside of the Colonial Office channels.

[58] Great Britain, Colonial Office, A Preliminary Memorandum on the Aims and Methods of Language Teaching in the Colonies, 1930, pp. 9 and 12.

[59] Ibid., p. 8.

[60] A.C.E.C., 11th Meeting, December 29, 1929.

of encouraging the use of local vernaculars for reasons the Advisory Committee considered essential to the intellectual well being of the child, and for the social well being of the community, required additional efforts in developing textbooks for instruction in both vernacular and English. The Advisory Committee dodged the problem of insufficient materials in vernacular languages by accepting the "oral tradition" and suggesting that materials could be developed at the local level.[61]

The attitude of Fraser at Achimota concerning the use of vernacular languages was never really stressed in any of the Committee publications, but since vernacular materials were for the most part non-existent, teachers were encouraged to use the "language arts" approach, and have students write their own materials; first through the teacher and later on their own.[62]

The Advisory Committee did issue a Memorandum on the Preparation and Selection of English Reading Books for Non-English-Speaking Pupils which resulted from the appointment of the Textbook Sub-Committee in February, 1929.

The Memorandum on the Preparation and Selection of English Reading Books for Non-English-Speaking Pupils recognized the need for special preparations of English reading books for students who were using English as a second language. The Committee accepted the view that the books should meet the educational maxim of starting from the familiar by relating to local surroundings

---

[61] The Place of Vernacular in Native Education, op. cit., p. 7 and Memorandum on Aims and Methods of Language Teaching, op. cit., p. 10.

[62] Personal interview with Mr. W.E.F. Ward, February 23, 1965.

and immediate experiences of the students.[63] The Committee was concerned about graduation of vocabulary and grammatical structure, but they also insisted that the colloquial and practical needs of the students be met through ample use of plays, poetry, customs and other cultural influences on the students.[64]

The Textbook Sub-Committee did establish a textbook reference library in the Colonial Office and encouraged local education departments to work cooperatively with publishers, and to consult the textbook reference library. The real influence with regard to providing suitable materials would remain with publishers and within given colonies, the Departments of Education. The Advisory Committee could suggest to both and send copies of the Memorandum to both, but the Committee could not order that materials be made available. The Committee's role with regard to textbooks was one of promoting communications between colonies and British publishers.[65]

The expansion of the Advisory Committee's responsibility from tropical Africa to all the colonies necessitated some action by the Committee to facilitate communication and standardized annual reporting, but there was also

---

[63] Great Britain, Colonial Office, Memorandum on the Preparation and Selection of English Reading Books for Non-English Speaking Pupils (London: September, 1929), p. 4. Hereafter cited as Memorandum on Reading Books.

[64] Ibid., pp. 10-11.

[65] A.C.E.C., 8th Meeting, September 26, 1929.

the necessity for emphasis and expansion of the 1925 White Paper on education with regard to Grants-in-Aid.[66]

In October, 1929, Arthur Mayhew submitted a memorandum on Grants-in-Aid and the Committee established a Sub-Committee composed of Lugard, Oldham, Bishop Bidwell, Miss Burstall, and Vischer and Mayhew. Oldham wanted to be sure there was time for "full consultation" with the missionary societies before the Committee issued any official document.[67] There was ample time as the draft on Grants-in-Aid was circulated to the colonial areas after approval by the full Committee in June, 1930.[68] The replies came in slowly over the next few years, but by January, 1933, Mayhew had prepared a memorandum which incorporated responses from the colonies as well as clarifications of the policy. A Sub-Committee with Lugard as chairman was appointed to draft the final memorandum which was submitted in April. Oldham wanted the memorandum given the widest circulation to people with any responsibility for education in the colonies. The Committee supported the request and designated the memorandum for general publication.[69]

The Memorandum on Educational Grants-in-Aid was intended only for schools under private management, not native schools or schools maintained

---

[66] The Advisory Committee accepted the idea of an Education Bulletin and general revision of the Annual Reports at their second meeting in February, 1929. The need for expansion on the 1925 Education Policy came with the Grants-in-Aid Memorandum submitted by Mayhew in October, 1929.

[67] A.C.E.C., 9th Meeting, October 17, 1929.

[68] A.C.E.C., 16th Meeting, June 19, 1930. The memorandum was not officially sent out until October 25, 1930, in a Secretary of State's Circular Dispatch.

[69] A.C.E.C., 44th Meeting, April 27, 1933.

for private profit. In the 1925 White Paper the Committee had endorsed the concept of voluntary effort in education, but the allocation of funds to voluntary schools had raised some questions which the Committee recommended be "decided locally with reference to the needs and circumstances of each area."[70] The Committee desired to emphasize and expand on the principle of grants-in-aid recommended in the 1925 Policy, and to draw the attention of the non-African Directors of Education to a principle the Committee considered generally applicable to all colonial areas.

The Committee accepted the concept of grants-in-aid because they accepted the premise that aided institutions would be a cheaper form of education than government institutions. Cheaper only because the voluntary school would be developed without government capital, but the operating costs for quality education would be similar. The Committee also regarded voluntary schools as vital to the process of developing educational variety and greater flexibility in personality development through character education.

The greatest need, however, was in the substitution of religious beliefs for resulting loss of tribal authority upon contact with western civilization.[71] The Committee wished to emphasize that aided schools would be under government control, but the basis for government inspection was whether the school was educationally sound and practical. The Committee agreed that in

---

[70] Great Britain, Colonial Office, Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies, Memorandum on Educational Grants-in-Aid (London: H.M.S.O., 1933), p. 4. Hereafter cited as Memorandum on Grants-in-Aid.

[71] Ibid., p. 5.

keeping with its general acceptance of the idea of voluntary schools as offering an educational variety, the "utmost" elasticity in school management and curriculum was desirable if education was not to be robbed of all of contributions of the local circumstances.[72]

The Committee's main concern with voluntary schools was in the area of standards. The policy suggested with regard to grants-in-aid was that voluntary schools should not be treated as cheap and inferior substitutes for government schools, nor that only government schools be regarded as model institutions. Grants-in-aid were to be used to widen the educational base and to create, as near as possible, economic parity between government and voluntary schools. In principle, the idea of parity between government and voluntary schools was sound in relation to a quality educational program that provided for experimentation and diversity. The discrepancy was to be found in the reality of colonial conditions where many voluntary schools existed only for religious purposes and to bring them up to government level would be both unnecessarily costly as well as hopeless.[73] The criteria the Committee suggested was that if the managing body of a school was willing and able, "with reasonable support from Government," to take its place alongside government schools then grants-in-aid should be considered, otherwise the whole concept of grants-in-aid would be misused.[74]

---

[72] Ibid.

[73] Ibid., p. 6.

[74] Ibid., p. 7.

The Committee further clarified its position with regard to improving voluntary schools. The Committee did not mean to imply that all voluntary schools were below government standards or that the cost of improvement had to be met solely by government.[75] Perhaps the key to the reason for the entire memorandum was in the financial problems of missionary societies and the suggestion that when conditions improve, the voluntary agencies would be able to contribute their share to the cost of educational progress.[76]

The proportion of salary costs to be assumed by government was to be worked out after careful consideration and discussion of local circumstances. The memorandum suggested that small amounts could be assumed by the local managers, whereas larger amounts would need government support.[77] This was an interesting example in light of Oldham's consistent effort to encourage missions to consolidate their educational efforts rather than try to operate a number of one teacher schools. The Memorandum on Grants-in-Aid also suggested that larger financial operations were more needful of government assistance than the small school operature. The suggestion for consolidation through the establishment of a policy designed to give grants-in-aid to larger educational institutions was a policy that Oldham could advocate with great leverage

---

[75] Ibid.

[76] Ibid.

[77] Ibid.

to move mission agencies that were reluctant to modernize their educational philosophy and practices.[78]

The Committee was fully aware of the difficulty of trying to tailor a policy to such a diverse area as the British colonies. To accommodate the different conditions that existed throughout the colonies, the Committee made a special effort to insist on the "Need for Elasticity." The recommendation by the Committee was that in all grants-in-aid codes developed at the local level there be a clause that secured the concept of "reasonable elasticity."[79]

The expansion of the 1925 Education Policy by the Memorandum on Grants-in-Aid came in the area of the types of grants which the Committee suggested as being suited to the aims of its original policy. The Committee recommended maintenance grants for periods of three years or longer to give the greatest opportunity to school managers to plan for development through a sense of economic stability. The Committee cautioned the award of grants on the basis of attendance or examination results because these two criteria often led to methods which were educationally unsound.[80] The use of efficiency as a means of awarding grants-in-aid was also discouraged as it was more often associated with examination results. However, since there seemed to be widespread acceptance of its use at the local level, the Committee suggested that efficiency

---

[78] Oldham's views on the real character of what he called "Christian Education" are to be found in Chapter III, "Can Education Be Left to the State?" in his book, The Remaking of Man in Africa (London: Oxford University Press, 1931), pp. 27-37.

[79] Memorandum on Grants-in-Aid, op. cit., p. 9.

[80] Ibid.

might be considered as a variable factor provided that expenditure on the staff was considered the main factor for determination of grants-in-aid.[81]

The government was to establish a salary scale and grants were to be paid on the basis of full-time teachers who met government qualifications for the various teaching assignments. The Committee desired to place the burden of meeting government standards for staff on the voluntary agency with the expressed purpose of increasing educational standards along a sound basis, rather than detract from the quality of an educational program by basing grants on criteria that could adversely affect the quality or innovative character of the educational program. Government would have the power to reduce its grants if the qualifications of a voluntary teacher were below the standards set for the colony.[82]

After extensive consultations, the Committee attempted to develop firm guidelines that would assist the implementation of a partnership in colonial education, while not losing sight of the need for quality education geared to the development of the community.

The formulation of policy by the Advisory Committee did not always result in the publication of memoranda that were made public or circulated confidentially within the colonial service. The educational functions of local authorities and compulsory education were two topics the Committee labored over for several years, trying to prepare recommendations that would have general implication for all of the colonial areas advised by the Committee.

---

[81] Ibid., p. 10.

[82] Ibid., p. 11.

In both areas the Committee had only limited success, and ended its work without publication of its findings and recommendations, although most colonial education departments were informed of the Committee's final action.

The Advisory Committee had taken on a wider frame of reference when it was expanded in 1929 to deal with non-African colonies. Prior to 1929, the Committee was limited to Native African education, but after 1929 the Committee had the responsibility to advise on all education and began receiving reports on European (white) education in the various African colonies.

The first report of the large discrepancy between native and European education came in September, 1929, when the Committee reviewed a proposal from Northern Rhodesia to expand their European educational facilities. The statistics indicated that with a ratio of African to European children of 500 to 1 the amount of money spent on European education was more than double African education.[83] The separation of African and European education was considered ex post facto by the Committee,[84] but an area that could be dealt with by the Committee was the distribution of financial and administrative responsibility of the central government in the colony in relation to the local colonial authority.

---

[83] A.C.E.C., 10th Meeting, November 21, 1929.

[84] Lugard stated it was ex post facto and the Committee accepted his view. The policy the Committee recommended was a special tax on Europeans to pay for their own education rather than using revenues that should have been spent on African education. The Committee had no power in relation to financial matters within a colony, but it could influence the actual conditions by direct influence on the colonial Director of Education, and by issuing a policy memorandum on local authority.

The Committee agreed to take up the question at its meeting in November and the draft of a preliminary memorandum was begun by Arthur Mayhew.[85] The task proved difficult and time consuming. It was not until February, 1931, that an approved memorandum was available and Oldham recommended a sub-committee be formed to confer with Directors of Education at home on leave.[86] In March, Oldham was appointed chairman of the Sub-Committee and the time consuming process of meeting with Directors of Education, or their assistants and other colonial administrators began.

The original thrust of the memorandum was to discuss financial as well as administrative responsibilities between central and local colonial administration in relation to the amount of funds expended on native education by native councils.[87] The financial question was at the heart of the matter. Control over the revenue could mean a great deal in relation to allocation of money for social service, especially when colonial revenues were on the decline.

Following more than a year of work on the educational functions of local authorities, the Sub-Committee issued an interim report in July, 1932. The report was accepted by the Committee but it produced a special memo by Lugard who disliked the mention of any specific colonial administration and recommended that only general comments be made.[88] The Sub-Committee complied and

---

[85] A.C.E.C., 10th Meeting, November 21, 1929.

[86] A.C.E.C., 24th Meeting, February 19, 1931.

[87] J.H.O. to H. S. Scott, Director of Education, Kenya, June 23, 1931.

[88] A.C.E.C., 38th Meeting, July 21, 1932.

issued a preliminary report on the Educational Functions of Local Authorities for comments. The replies were reported to the Committee in September, 1933, and the Sub-Committee was instructed to draft a final report.[89]

The final report was accepted in December and sent out to colonies shortly thereafter, but was not printed for general distribution. The reason is not specifically clear, although cost of printing may have been a factor, or Oldham's own persuasion as Chairman of the Sub-Committee and principal author. His own view was that what really mattered was not official reports, but what the "people on spot" thought, and if some "honest thinking" got into official reports they could be of some use.[90]

The main emphasis of the report on Educational Functions of Local Authorities was its strong insistence that African advice and help be enlisted in the formulation of educational policy and the extension of facilities.[91] The Committee supported the policy that the central government of a colony, or territory, had the ultimate control on educational policy, but the question of native interest and eventual African control was important to consider and worthy of implementation. African control could be increased if more Africans were involved in local education Boards or Councils so that more experienced Africans could be available for service on colonial boards.[92]

---

[89] A.C.E.C., 47th Meeting, September 28, 1933.

[90] J.H.O. to H. S. Scott, Director of Education, Kenya, October 24, 1933.

[91] A.C.E.C., 49th Meeting, December 21,1933, A.C.E.C. 42/33, p. 13, and 50th Meeting, March 15, 1934, A.C.E.C. 1/34, p. 12.

[92] A.C.E.C., (1/34), "Educational Functions of Local Bodies in the Tropical African Dependencies," p. 13.

The report called attention to the 1925 Policy that the first task of education was to raise the standard alike of character and efficiency of the bulk of the population, and suggested that the central government of a colony could not divest itself of this major responsibility by "developing" financial provision for elementary education entirely on local authorities.[93] The report also questioned the availability of public information regarding the amount of contributions from local funds to the cost of education and their use. The point the report stressed was the necessity that educational development in a colony be envisaged as a whole, and as a means to this end all the facts relating to local contributions should be known.[94]

The ultimate political goal was the control of African education by Africans. The surest way to facilitate that goal was to encourage African participation in local education authorities so that government and voluntary educational agencies could be more aware of African needs, and cooperation between all segments could be developed for the collective good of the community.[95]

The report on Educational Functions of Local Bodies in Tropical African Dependencies was an attempt to translate the 1925 Policy into a more specific area of educational practice in African colonies. How it was treated by the local colonial administrators is indicative of the bureaucratic problem which the Advisory Committee was beginning to find almost insurmountable. The

---

[93] Ibid., p. 6.

[94] Ibid.

[95] Ibid., p. 10.

Director of Education in Kenya, H. S. Scott, who had been in communication with Oldham and had met with the Advisory Committee several times, related his experience of trying to obtain a copy of the report:

> We have received officially the Advisory Committee's suggestions in regard to Local Education Authorities but unfortunately, the Colonial Office only forwarded one copy which the young gentleman who controls the Education desk in our Secretariat sticks to and will not let me have, though he kindly let me have a peep at it.[96]

The recommendations of the Advisory Committee and the aims of its policy recommendations would continue to chip away at colonial practices as approval for Education Ordinances, meetings with Colonial Governors and Directors of Education, and the development of training courses at London and Selly Oakes for teachers and colonial civil servants continued. The process was becoming more difficult as the financial picture continued to worsen for colonial revenues.

A good example of the effect of the financial difficulties many colonies found themselves in was the disposition of the original proposal by the Advisory Committee for compulsory education. In the spring of 1930, Mayhew initiated the preliminary memorandum calling for compulsory education for all colonial children for the purposes of reducing illiteracy and in support of the major aims of the 1925 Policy.[97] The influences that prompted Mayhew to initiate the memorandum are interesting in light of two Committee meetings where discussion was quite lively.

---

[96] H. S. Scott to J. H. Oldham, March 22, 1934.

[97] A.C.E.C., 14th Meeting, March 20, 1930.

The Committee meeting in December, 1929, discussed the American educational influences and raised the point that Africans and other colonials were easily attracted to American influences because of a more open educational system.[98]

The Committee meeting in January, 1930, discussed the Proposals for European Education in Northern Rhodesia and the possible effect that increases in European education might have on African attitudes. The argument put forward for increases in European education was to reduce the danger of increasing the illiterate white population; yet the chairman of the Committee, Dr. T. Drummond-Shiels, objected for he considered the real danger lay in African attitudes if only Europeans were educated.[99]

Lugard supported Drummond-Shiels and suggested that taxing Africans to pay for the education of whites who could not pay for their own education would be wrong, and not in keeping with the paramount policy of promoting the interest of Africans.[100] There was probably another source of encouraging influence, although undocumented, in the person of the Colonial Secretary of State, Lord Passfield (Sidney Webb).

The Colonial Governors Conference was scheduled for June, 1930, and Mayhew submitted the memorandum to the Conference which approved preliminary investigations.[101] The Colonial Office sent out a Circular Dispatch in September, 1930, and replies were considered at the Committee meeting in January, 1933. The purpose of the dispatch was to obtain information on provisions already made for compulsory education, and to solicit information

---

[98] A.C.E.C., 11th Meeting, December 12, 1929.

[99] A.C.E.C., 12th Meeting, January 23, 1930.

[100] Ibid.

[101] A.C.E.C., 17th Meeting, July 31, 1930.

on illiteracy rates, length of school attendance and school facilities which would bear on the question of compulsory education. The replies to the circular were not encouraging, especially from African colonies, and the data, when supplied, was insufficient.[102]

In the discussion by the Committee, Arthur Mayhew suggested that plans for compulsory education would take a long time, and he expressed the opinion that it would be a shame if preliminary considerations were postponed as they had been in India.[103] Sir George Maxwell suggested that the Committee had been effective because it worked slowly and did not attempt to over-ride local opinion. His suggestion was to wait until the census figures for 1940 were available and then pursue the matter. Currie expressed the feeling that compulsory education would create some political risk as it might be interpreted as an attempt to undermine native thought and religion.[104] The Committee's concern was quality before quantity, or so Mr. Mann thought, and he suggested that compulsory education should only be introduced in areas where there was support and feeling for it.[105]

The Committee appointed a sub-committee to draft a final report and in May, 1933, the Report on Compulsory Education was approved. The Compulsory Education report took the position of "voluntary compulsion" so as to encourage initiative on the part of the village community and to compromise on the

---

[102] A.C.E.C., 41st Meeting, January 12, 1933.

[103] Ibid.

[104] Ibid.

[105] Ibid.

economic issue.[106] The report was critical of "wastage" (dropout rate before literacy was achieved) and "stagnation" (holding children in same class because of attendance, irregular classification, or ineffective teaching) and cited Malaya, Ceylon, and Tonga as areas where compulsory education was effectively pursued.[107]

The emphasis on the lack of compulsory education and the need for it was focused on Africa. The main reason offered for the generally apathetic response to compulsory education was the depressed economic conditions in most of the colonies, but there was a clear case of racism when colonies were willing to provide compulsory education for Europeans, and in many instances tax Africans for the cost.

The separation of European and African education was an unfortunate circumstance that was driving Africans to demand education similar to European education when the Advisory Committee was trying to suggest that a sound educational program ought to relate to the environment and the needs of the local community. The memorandum on Compulsory Education ran into the economic, racial, and political snags that existed at the colonial level and the Committee was not sure how to effectively move education except through model schools and the personal education of hundreds of colonial civil servants, teachers, Directors of Education and Governors.

The amount of time and effort the Committee was spending on its reports and memoranda did not seem to be having the influence anticipated by the

---

[106] A.C.E.C., 45th Meeting, May 25, 1933.

[107] A.C.E.C., Compulsory Education (19/33), May 14, 1933.

Committee, but it would take up the question of compulsory, or mass education again, in a different economic and political context. The Committee was operating during the twenties and thirties on the assumption that most of the African colonies were fifty to sixty years from independent political status and that time was not a major priority.[108] However, during the thirties a balanced fiscal policy was a major priority and the Committee faced questions of how to economize on educational expenses when its own policy recommendations suggested educational investment.

The real power lay in the hands of Treasury Department officials who reviewed colonial budgets and pressured Governors to hold expenditures within their Colonial revenues which were shrinking from year to year. An example was the attempt by the Governor of Nyasaland to develop a training institute and boarding facility to serve the educational and medical needs of the colony, but because of a Treasury Department requirement the plan was blocked. The requirement stated that if the colonial government started any program in 1931 it would have to demonstrate that it would be able to finance the program in 1934.[109] With decreasing revenues it was almost impossible for colonies to demonstrate that they could finance programs two or three years in advance; yet colonies needed to expand their training facilities in order to develop the human resources necessary to further develop the natural resources of the country.

---

[108] Interview with J.H.O., February 10, 1965.

[109] Sir Thomas S.W. Thomas to J. H. Oldham, February 17, 1931.

The realization of a wider view of government spending and its relationship to development through education began to have an impact on some of the members of the Advisory Committee. There were other pressures that the Committee began to notice more clearly. The East African colonies seemed more concerned with European education than with African. The West African Colonies were under more pressure for secondary and higher education facilities, and the attraction of West Africans to American colleges and universities raised questions of American economic influence.[110] There were continual pressures for improved village education and the cooperation of missions with government and native councils to improve rural education. The pressures were building from all sides and the stage was set for the Advisory Committee to make another attempt at expressing fundamental values that would direct the educational effort toward meeting the needs of Africans or other colonial peoples.

The last major policy document to come from the Advisory Committee prior to World War II began, initially, with the discussion of the educational activities of local authorities in Tanganyika in March, 1933. The Advisory Committee was asked to comment on a memorandum by the acting Director of Education in Tanganyika, Mr. Isherwood.[111] A number of questions were raised by the Committee as it seemed to the Committee that the Tanganyika recommendations were calling for the transfer of the financial responsibility for African education

---

[110] A.C.E.C., 29th Meeting, July 23, 1931 and 30th Meeting, October 1, 1931.

[111] A.C.E.C., 43rd Meeting, March 16, 1933.

to the native administration funds when the cost of European education had just been transferred to the general revenue funds of the colony.[112] The Committee questioned that if financial responsibility was to be decentralized would the power to control also be decentralized, and was the government prepared to grant such power if the African authorities demanded it. The representative for the Colonial Office stated that government was trying to cut down on social services in order to cut costs and that only one tenth of the African population was being educated, as if to justify the Tanganyikan proposals.[113]

A Sub-Committee was formed with Lugard as chairman and at the next meeting the Sub-Committee reported that the Tanganyikan government was in a position of having to cut 300,000 pounds of expenses, and that there seemed to be no other way than to turn the cost of African education over to local educational authorities.[114] Oldham made a compromise admendment which would recommend local rates, but with government control and responsibility to supplement local expenditures out of general revenues when local expenditures were insufficient to meet the educational needs.[115] Oldham was fearful that the poorer districts would be left without education if the government did not assist them financially.

---

[112] Ibid.

[113] Ibid.

[114] A.C.E.C., 44th Meeting, April 27, 1933.

[115] Ibid.

The Sub-Committee was instructed to work with Oldham and redraft their recommendations. The final report incorporating Oldham's compromise was accepted at the June meeting of the Committee.[116] The problems of Tanganyika were also discussed at the East African Governors Conference in Dar-es-Salaam in June, and referred to the Directors of Education who were also meeting.

The Directors issued a Report which dealt with the aims of African educational policy and which was circulated to the Advisory Committee at their first meeting in the fall of 1933. The Report stressed two aims: (a) the extension of education in a pyramidal manner to develop the people of the country on the lines most suitable to their environment, and (b) the increase in useful production.[117]

The meeting in September, 1933, proved to be a major landmark in the history of the Committee for out of this single meeting grew the policy recommendations that were to guide both higher education and elementary and secondary education. The policy recommendations for higher education would be embodied in Sir James Currie's Sub-Committee report approved in December of 1933.[118] The essence of the final report was the acceptance of the policy of establishing African universities to grant degrees sponsored by British Universities. The institutions identified as potential University degree granting institutions were Gordon College, Khartoum; Achimota, Gold Coast;

---

[116] A.C.E.C., 46th Meeting, June 22, 1933.

[117] A.C.E.C., 48th Meeting, September 28, 1933.

[118] A.C.E.C., 49th Meeting, December 21, 1933. Final Report of Sub-Committee to consider Higher Education in Africa (A.C.E.C., 44/34).

Yaba, Nigeria; Fourah Bay, Sierra Leone; and Makerere, Uganda.

The relation of education to environment was central to the decision to develop African universities; otherwise the higher educational experience outside of Africa would not be related to African needs and problems but only provide Africans with status degrees.[119] The Committee was aware that British or American University degrees meant white collar employment and the social amenities of urban life, but it recommended that African degrees be considered equal to oversea degrees in salary schedules so as to encourage and emphasize the need for an African educational orientation rather than English or American. The Higher Education Report was the beginning of a long process whereby higher education in Africa would become Africanized.

The consideration of the Report by the Conference of East African Directors of Education at the September meeting led to the development of the memorandum which was published as Memorandum on the Education of African Communities and was the companion document to the Report on Higher Education. Together the two reports encompassed the totality of African education, and with only slight modifications for the local circumstances the educational design for all colonies. The essential work on the memorandum was done between January and July of 1934, largely by Oldham, and accepted by the Advisory Committee in October, 1934.[120]

The general response to the memorandum was enthusiastic because as Mr. Sommerville remarked, it encouraged the student to improve his environment

---

[119] Ibid.

[120] A.C.E.C., 55th Meeting, October 4, 1934.

rather than take him out of it.[121] This remark was in response to evidence the Committee had already heard from a West African Director of Education on how the American trained Africans were better prepared in industrial and agricultural subjects than Africans with Oxbridge degrees who tended to remain in the large cities.[122] Oldham, with assistance from Currie, Mayhew and Mr. Mann from the Board of Education, had opportunities to contact most of the key educational people for the purpose of clarifying what the East African Directors of Education meant when they stated that one of the aims of educational policy should be to increase useful production.[123]

Oldham stressed the main idea of the memorandum which was that if the advancement of people was an object of education then the whole community would have to be involved, not just the young, or some specialist fields.[124] Although the idea was generally accepted it was not put into practice, and it was hoped that the memorandum would help. In the nine years since the 1925 White Paper, a great deal of experience had been gained with Jeanes Schools and work in rural communities, and these wider experiences were reflected in the memorandum. The Committee considered the document "praiseworthy" and wanted it published.[125]

---

[121] Ibid.

[122] A.C.E.C., 54th Meeting, July 19, 1934.

[123] A.C.E.C., 48th Meeting, September 28, 1933.

[124] A.C.E.C., 55th Meeting, October 4, 1934.

[125] Ibid.

The reasons for the publication of the African Communities memorandum and not the memorandum on higher education, compulsory education, or the memorandum on the relationship between government and local education authorities, can be found in the value heuristic of the African Communities memorandum which included an economic component which minimized expense through maximizing cooperation. The memorandum was an educational policy guide under conditions of shrinking colonial budgets. The memorandum called for measures and actions that would save government revenues, not spend them.

In light of the Treasury Department policy with regard to colonial budgets and the serious international depression, the Memorandum on African Communities can be viewed as a policy designed to support progressive educational developments in an economic climate that was steadily deteriorating. The Memorandum on the Education of African Communities attempted to deal with the aims of education and the means by which they could be achieved. The aims of education were the same as the 1925 Policy: the principal aim of education was to raise the standard of the bulk of the people, and to train for the needed technical and administrative specialties.[126]

The experience of the Committee over the nine years since the issue of the 1925 White Paper indicated that the aims of education were sound, but the definition of education would have to be viewed in a wider context than just the school. The school would be able to fulfill its function only if

---

[126] 1925 Policy, op. cit., p. 4.

education was thought of in terms of community development.[127] Therefore, the relationship of educational policy to economic development was stressed because only through the development of human resources could economic resources be fully developed.[128] The concept of education for community development was linked with the need for economic development through improved health, agriculture, technical skills, and the necessary moral values that strengthened the bonds of social cooperation for mutual benefit rather than individual gain.[129]

The memorandum was focused on rural communities, but the justification was that in the foreseeable future the strength of colonial economies would be more dependent on agricultural and natural resources rather than industrial. Whether rural or urban, the concept of community development recognized the need for human development through a broad interpretation of social symbiosis. A central agent in the process of community development was the teacher and the institutions responsible for training teachers.

The memorandum stressed the need for more female education and for teacher training institutions to be in physical and philosophic harmony with the concept of community development.[130] Adult education was important in its wider connotation. Only when adults and youth were educated jointly could

---

[127] Great Britain, Colonial Office, Memorandum on the Education of African Communities (London: H.M.S.O., 1935), p. 6. Hereafter cited as Memo on African Communities.

[128] Ibid., p. 7.

[129] Ibid., p. 8.

[130] Ibid., p. 13.

any rapid changes be made.[131] Voluntary agencies were also included in the need for community development as they could provide additional resources beneficial to the community, provided they did not consider education a way of carrying on religious rivalry. Where missions found duplication they were encouraged to participate in community councils rather than carry on wasteful rivalry.[132]

The educational intent of the memorandum was similar to the 1925 Policy. Education was to be related to the needs of the community and individuals. Education was to be thought of in terms of individual and social advancement.

> Education as a whole in Africa is still very far from realising the broader aims which have been described. The view of education as an effort to improve the whole life of the community in spite of its apparent obviousness implies a definite and indeed radical breach with the traditional, more scholastic conception of education, and its whole-hearted acceptance may be expected to result in progressive and far reaching changes in existing educational practice and administration.[133]

The memorandum called for extensive cooperation with various government departments such as Health, Agriculture, Transportation, and with private agencies for a comprehensive program under the guidance and direction of the colonial government, but with full participation of native authorities. The community development program called for the development of African doctors, agriculturalists, veterinarians, engineers, teachers, and research workers, but it also recognized that changes in general educational curriculum would

---

[131] Ibid., p. 14.

[132] Ibid., p. 12.

[133] Ibid., p. 15.

be approved by Africans only when they were satisfied that the changes were in accord with progressive educational thought, and not designed to impose something inferior on them.[134] The suggestion for gaining African support was to give Africans opportunities of viewing the best in modern education both within Africa and overseas. The memorandum was clear that an executive order would not facilitate the basic changes and reforms which the Committee suggested. However, the beginning could be made by cooperation of all segments of society and by extending the training programs for Africans so that wider community participation would be possible.[135]

The economic implications of the memorandum on African Communities meant that colonies could economize on the total social service budgets by greater interdepartmental cooperation in conjunction with initiative from local native authorities and consolidation of efforts by missionary socieities. The intent of the memorandum was to offer colonial governments economies through effective cooperation of government departments. At the same time, rural community councils could be effective organizations for developing greater local initiative for individual and community improvement.[136]

The publication of the Memorandum on the Education of African Communities further amplified the humanistic value heuristic of the 1925 Educational Policy. As the Sub-Committee reported in the preface to its final report,

---

[134] Ibid., p. 20.

[135] Ibid., pp. 20-22.

[136] Ibid., pp. 23 and 24.

"The primary concern of education is always with men rather than wealth."[137] The Advisory Committee attempted to educate colonial administrators, Directors of Education, Governors, missionaries, and Africans already exposed to the more traditional and scholastic education of British universities. Responsible educational experts from various countries agreed that education should be related to the needs of the social and economic environment. The Committee did not suggest that African education should not come up to British standards; rather, it suggested a far more radical approach, perhaps too visionary, that African colonies, and indirectly other colonial areas, should establish their own high standards. The standards would be designed to benefit Africa because they were developed on African needs.

The publication of the Memorandum on the Education of African Communities would be the last major policy document by the Advisory Committee until the 1943 publication of Mass Education in African Society. The stage had been set for guiding the direction of education in African and non-African colonial areas. The responsibility for carrying out the development of colonial education was placed at the colonial level with the Advisory Committee continuing its educational efforts to convince Colonial Office and Treasury Department civil service officials that education should be considered an investment rather than an expense. The Committee seemed to have little difficulty educating the Colonial Secretary of State to the idea that community development included economic, educational, medical, and social service

---

[137] A.C.E.C., 55th Meeting, October 4, 1934 (A.C.E.C. 23/34).

development for the improvement of life for all peoples in colonial areas.[138] But in implementing the idea of community development as investment rather than expense, the Committee seemed to be faced with a more influential Treasury Department philosophy which convinced the same Secretary of State for the Colonies to state in his speech before Parliament that the educational improvements could be implemented "as the money becomes available to finance them."[139]

The basic values of British colonial education policy were well established by 1935. The values recognized education as a necessary component of community development and envisioned education's role as assisting the individual to develop his own potential for the purpose of serving the development of his community. The structure of education was to take on a universal appearance with elementary, secondary, and higher educational opportunities. The function of education was to provide western knowledge for the benefit of colonial peoples so as to facilitate the acquisition of greater knowledge of the local environment, and assist in the development of the local community. The structure of British education might be followed, but the curriculum was to be adapted to local need so that the end product of a colonial education would be people with skills related to their needs, and greater knowledge about indigenous culture as well as western culture.

Perhaps it was too idealistic, too visionary to assume that an altruistic educational policy could be developed in practice. The economic philosophy

---

[138] Great Britain, Parliamentary Debates (Commons), vol. 304, pp. 2045-2046.

[139] Ibid.

controlling the colonial areas was basically capitalistic which meant that social service expenses could only be justified on the basis of available tax revenues, and education encouraged for the individual's economic gain.

The need for educational evaluation, and the final commitment of the Advisory Committee to an educational policy in the 1940's, will conclude the study of the formulation of educational policy in the following chapter.

VI

EVALUATION AND COMMITMENT: A RECYCLE OF A HEURISTIC POLICY

The formulation of colonial education policy reached a plateau with the publication of the Committee's memorandum on Education of African Communities. The general heuristic of education for community development was conceived in terms of the coordination of all the social services, including those services provided by private agencies, and in close cooperation with the councils and organizations responsible for economic development. The emphasis on education for community development presented new problems for the Committee, both in the acquisition of statistical information from the colonies as well as in reorientation of the Colonial Office to reflect the priorities of community development.

The policy of education for community development was more comprehensive than the 1925 Education Policy, and the Committee agreed that it would attempt to study the economic and social aspect of educational development.[1] The idea was acceptable to the Colonial Office and to most colonies. What was proposed by Dr. William McLean and Arthur Mayhew was consideration of educational development in harmony with the economic development of a colony for the purpose of carrying out the policy of community development. The initial discussion around the proposal for a special inquiry into educational and social service expenditures revealed Oldham's preference for personal contacts with colonial governors as a more effective process for checking on the implementation of the policy for

---

[1] A.C.E.C., 56th Meeting, November 22, 1934.

community development. McLean and Mayhew wished to strengthen the Committee's effectiveness by having actual data on a given colony so that discussions with a Governor or Director of Education would be more beneficial in advancing the cause of education for community development.[2]

The Committee agreed that both personal contact with colonial officials and the preliminary statistical inquiry ought to be undertaken. The Joint-Secretaries for the Committee were authorized to work with the Colonial Office in the analysis of education figures supplied in accordance with the Annual Report forms which were revised in 1929.[3] The consideration of the educational statistics in line with the implementation of the policy on community development was passed on to the Sub-Committee on Annual Education Reports in May, 1935. This resulted in a Circular going out to the colonies in June, 1938, requesting changes in their reporting of educational and social service expenditures.[4]

The delays in acquiring a more precise financial picture of social service spending and the share education received out of total colonial budgets was largely due to the conception of social services as expenditures; whereas, economic expansion was considered investment. The Treasury Department carefully protected their responsibility as the guardians of the public money. Even though the Colonial Secretary of State supported the idea that economic development, educational development, and medical and social services must all be

---

[2] Ibid.

[3] A.C.E.C., 57th Meeting, December 20, 1934.

[4] A.C.E.C., 109th Meeting, January 30, 1941.

done in unison, he apparently succumbed to the Treasury Department influence by qualifying his statement on development programs with the phrase, "as the money becomes available to finance them."[5]

The perception of the influence of the Treasury Department was clear to some members of the Advisory Committee as attempts were made to focus more attention on the need for community development and the interrelated role that education would have in plans to implement the ideas of community development. Sir James Currie, for example, had been a consistent crusader for a percentage allocation of economic development funds for education similar to what had been done in the Sudan under Cromer, Kitchner, and Wingate, but the Colonial Office successfully absorbed the pressure.[6] Likewise, the efforts of Dr. William McLean (later Sir) in his attempts to develop a memorandum on the social and economic development and community education in the colonies were largely subverted by representatives from the Colonial Office economic department. In essence, the principle of community development was accepted, but in financial matters each colony was treated as a separate entity and economic investment was separated from social service expenditures.[7] In order to increase expenditures for social services, the general level of economic production had to

---

[5]Great Britain, Parliamentary Debates (Commons), Vol. 304, pp. 2045-6.

[6]Sir James Currie, "The Educational Experiment in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, 1900-1933," Journal of the African Society, Vol. 133 (October 1934), pp. 361-371 and Vol. 134 (January, 1935), pp. 41-59. Also A.C.E.C., 64th Meeting, November 21, 1935.

[7]A.C.E.C., 80th Meeting, October 28, 1937.

increase which meant that investment in capital necessary to develop and extract the natural wealth of raw materials in a colony would come before increased expenditure on social services.

However, the idea that the Colonial Office should dictate economic policy to the colonies was rejected in preference for the autochthonous relationship which necessitated consultation with the local governments.[8] Consultation with local governments left the financial policy of the colonies largely under the watchful eye of the Treasury Department which resulted in limitations for expenditures on social services based on available tax revenues, rather than a proportion of economic development expenditure.

The thrust of the idea of community development was in part directed at the financial limitations that most colonial governments faced, and offered them an opportunity to get more out of their social service expenditures by the elimination of duplicate services and the coordination of field work in several departments. Reorganization of colonial social service departments could have been accomplished sooner had the Colonial Office reorganized its administrative desks to reflect the needed changes in the colonies. The Colonial Office could have encouraged functional departments in the colonies by organizing into functional departments itself.

However, the reorganization of the Colonial Office to reflect functional departments within regional geographic areas was outside of the authority of the Advisory Committee on Education. The policy recommended to the colonies

---

[8] Great Britain, Parliamentary Debates (Commons), Vol. 314, p. 1460.

was education for community development and its focus was directed toward closer cooperation with all colonial departments engaged in social and economic development. The Colonial Office responded by creating an Economic Department in 1934, but the creation of a Social Service Department did not take place until April, 1939.[9]

The sense of urgency about educational development was largely absent from the Committee during the middle thirties. Rather, the need for re-evaluations of policy, Commissions of Inquiry, and surveys of conditions in the colonies reflected the general evaluative period of the middle and late thirties.

Perhaps, the most significant was the research survey conducted by Lord Hailey which resulted in his famous African Survey first published in 1939.[10] Commissions were created in 1936 to investigate Higher Education in East Africa and the West Indian Royal Commission on Inquiry in 1937. The former was a direct response to requests by the Advisory Committee,[11] and the latter resulted in revision of the Colonial Development Act to include Welfare, or in other words, expenditures on social services including education. The Colonial Development and Welfare Act of 1940 laid the groundwork for postwar educational development by providing limited amounts for capital expenditures as well as financial assistance for recurring expenses like teacher salaries, pension fund contribution, and travel assistance.

---

[9] A.C.E.C., 92nd Meeting, March 16, 1939.

[10] The survey was financed by the Carnegie Corporation at a total cost of $110,000. See Carnegie Corporation, Report of the President, 1934, p. 56, and and 1937, p. 31.

[11] A.C.E.C., 62nd Meeting, October 24, 1935.

The African research survey, the Commission on Inquiries, the inspection tours and the various surveys of agricultural and vocational education all highlight the transitionary phase of the Advisory Committee on Education during the middle and late thirties. Changes in personnel were also occurring. Alex Fraser retired from headmaster of Achimota in June, 1935; Sir Percy Nunn resigned from the Committee in September, 1936; Oldham and Lugard left the Committee in December, 1936; Sir James Currie died in March, 1937; Dr. Vaughan died in January, 1938; and almost a dozen new people had been appointed to the Committee over a two-year period from June, 1935 to June, 1937. The original leadership nucleus of the Committee composed of Lugard, Oldham, Currie, Sadler, Vaughan, Vischer, and later (1929) Mayhew, was reduced by June of 1937 to Mayhew and Vischer.

A new leadership nucleus was formed around Maynew and Vischer, but the reorganization of the Committee in 1940 and changes in membership delayed the development of new policy. The transformation was logical as the new members added to the Committee were not familiar with its functions and style; whereas, Mayhew, Vischer and other Colonial Office staff assigned to the Committee were accustomed to the operations and procedures of the Committee. There was some continuity of personal acquaintance with old and new members of the Committee from 1937 through the 1940's.[12] The reorganization of the Committee under Cox

---

[12] Reverend Dougall and Sir Donald Cameron took seats vacated by Oldham and Lugard; Professor Fred Clarke took Sir Percy Nunn's place; and an outspoken Labour M. P., Arthur Creech Jones was added the same time in January, 1937. Mr. H. S. Scott, former Director of Education, Kenya, was appointed in April, 1938, and Miss Margery Perham (later Dame Margery) joined in January, 1939, along with Dr. Julian Huxley and Lord Hailey's assistant Mr. Keith. In April, 1939, Sir Will Spens joined the Committee. All these people knew each other before service on the Advisory Committee.

(later Sir Christopher) in 1940 ushered in a new era for the Committee in its responsibility for the development of education policy.

The period of evaluation began shortly after the publication of the memorandum on Education for African Communities in 1935 and ended with publication of Lord Hailey's African Survey late in 1938. The year 1939 was for the Committee, as well as the world, an annus mirabilis. For the Committee, the year began with the addition of five new members and changes in the Constitution of the Committee so that each member served only three years and automatically retired, although they would be eligible for reappointment after one year.[13] This in itself was not significant but the addition of Huxley, Perham, Oakden, Keith, and Spens would greatly reinforce the remaining nucleus of advocates of policy action composed of Prof. Clarke, Creech-Jones, Dougall, Scott and the Joint Executive Secretaries Mayhew and Vischer.

The Colonial Office made some internal reorganization in April in anticipation of the changes to come from the recommendations of the West Indian Royal Commission, Lord Hailey's survey, and the Rhodesia-Nyasaland Royal Commission. A Social Services Department was created and its Director would become a member of the Advisory Committee on Education.[14]

---

[13] A.C.E.C., 90th Meeting, January 26, 1939. The war years intervened in this practice which was not initiated until the end of 1945. Members that joined were Dr. Julian Huxley; Mr. Keith, Lord Hailey's assistant; Miss Oakden, a representative from the Board of Education; Miss Perham, natural successor to Professor Coupland and close friend of Lord Lugard; and Mr. Stannard, an asst. editor of the Times. Sir Will Spens joined in April, 1939.

[14] A.C.E.C., 92nd Meeting, March 16, 1939. The director was Mr. Clauson, formerly of the Economic Department.

The stage was set for the beginning of a new phase in the formulation of policy when Lord Hailey attended the May and July meetings of the Committee. An extract from the education section of the African Survey was circulated to the members and the May meeting was devoted to discussion of the discrepancy between policy and practice.[15] The meeting did not establish policy but it laid the foundations for the creation of an Education Adviser and opened the discussion on the discrepancy between policy and practice which would continue at the July meeting.[16] Hailey's main point was that in his opinion the educational policy in general was right, but more effort should be made to implement the policy.[17]

In response to a question on what he would improve, correct, or develop for the colonial empire, Lord Hailey mentioned that the Government would have to consider the whole question of higher education; that teacher training would have to be extended; that vernacular education should be promoted; and that the content of education must be decided on the needs of popular education.[18] The immediate and long range effects of Lord Hailey's suggestions implied greater expenditures of money, but it was also clear from preliminary discussion of the West Indian situation that Great Britain would have to increase its financial assistance to its colonies.[19]

---

[15] A.C.E.C., 94th Meeting, May 18, 1939.

[16] For the creation of the position of Educational Advisor see pp. 72-75.

[17] A.C.E.C., 94th Meeting, May 18, 1939, and 96th Meeting, July 20, 1939.

[18] A.C.E.C., 96th Meeting, July 20, 1939.

[19] A.C.E.C., 95th Meeting, June 15, 1939.

The outbreak of the European phase of World War II had a catalytic effect on two important high level policy decisions which the Colonial Office and the Government faced. The immediate decision involved continuation of Colonial Office departments and Advisory Committees that assisted with the social service work in the colonies. Economies would have to be made, but the essential function of social service work including education would continue.[20]

Of more importance to Britain's colonial policy, and perhaps paramount to her political image in the colonies, was the decision to increase financial assistance to the colonies for colonial development and welfare expenditures. The offer of financial assistance to the colonies was more than political conscience money since the Colonial Office had been slowly moving in the direction of recognizing the need for greater financial assistance to the colonies. The outbreak of war and the findings of Lord Hailey and the West India Royal Commission had created a situation where further delays could seriously jeopardize Britain's war effort.

The announcement in February of an expanded Colonial Development and Welfare Act and the establishment of a Colonial Research Advisory Committee placed the Colonial Office in a position of supporting policy with a financial commitment.[21] The revised Colonial Development and Welfare Act increased the amount

---

[20] A.C.E.C., 97th Meeting, September 21, 1939.

[21] Great Britain, Colonial Office, Statement of Policy on Colonial Development and Welfare Cmd. 6175 (London: H.M.S.O., 1940). The amounts initially allocated called for a maximum of fifty million pounds over a ten-year period (five million a year) for Colonial Development and Welfare and five million pounds over ten years for research (500,000 pounds per year maximum).

of financial assistance available almost fivefold over the original C.D. and W. Act passed in 1929 and made all areas of education eligible for assistance. The Act of 1940 was also significant in that it allowed for financial assistance for recurring expenses in addition to capital expenses which meant that in the field of education the operating expenses of schools could be assisted through the revised Colonial Development and Welfare Act of 1940.[22]

The decision by the Colonial Office to continue the services of the Advisory Committee on Education and create a position of Education Adviser to take the place of the Joint Executive Secretaries sparked the beginning of efforts by the Committee to reformulate the education policy for the colonies.

A legacy left over from the policy of education for community development was the more specific question of the education of women. The matter was first raised by the Colonial Office Advisory Committee on Medicine in 1936 and a memorandum written by Dr. Mary Blacklock on "Certain Aspects of the Welfare of Women and Children in the Colonies" was circulated to the Advisory Committee on Education. The Committee supported the recommendation that the Secretary of State issue a circular dispatch asking for progress on the development of female education.[23] Nothing very specific was done over the next three years and it became increasingly obvious that more attention was needed.

In March, 1939, a memorandum written by Dr. Philipa Esdaile on the teaching of domestic science in England and its application to work in the colonies

---

[22] Ibid., p. 5.

[23] A.C.E.C., 72nd Meeting, November 26, 1936.

was circulated to the Committee along with Dr. Mary Blacklock's memorandum on the welfare of women and children in the colonies. The discussions with Lord Hailey in May and July spurred the Committee to appoint a Sub-Committee in September to consider, "the means of accelerating social progress in the Colonial Empire by increased education of women and girls and by welfare work among them."[24] The Sub-Committee met over a period of fifteen months and had its report accepted by the full Committee in January, 1941. The discussion around the acceptance of the report lead to the appointment of another Sub-Committee to consider ways and means of improving the field of recruitment and the method of training female recruits for the Colonial Education Service.[25]

The report on the Education and Welfare of Women and Girls was delayed for publication until February, 1943, and even then it was not printed for public circulation. The delay was due to having the report sent out to colonies for views, and its heavy emphasis on increased expenditure for female education. At the time the Report was accepted (January, 1941), it was doubtful whether Great Britain would be spared an invasion by Nazi Germany. Furthermore, the Colonial Office had issued a Circular Dispatch on September 10, 1940, stating that colonial development would have to come from local colonial revenues due to the emergencies of the war.

---

[24] A.C.E.C., 97th Meeting, September 21, 1939.

[25] A.C.E.C., 109th Meeting, January 30, 1941. This Sub-Committee Report was accepted in December, 1943, and printed for Colonial Office use only. Although the Report was not made public, the sixteen meetings the Sub-Committee had with representatives from Teacher Training Colleges, Departments of Education, and other influencial agencies would create a major portion of the necessary awareness of female education service overseas. A.C.E.C., 124th Meeting, December 2, 1943.

By June, 1941, the policy on grants available under the Colonial Development and Welfare Act of 1940 was clarified to explain the heavy taxation imposed on the residents of the British Isles. It suggested that colonies should follow suit and begin development of plans for rapid progress following the conclusion of the war.[26] The Secretary of State emphasized that colonies with surplus revenues should use those revenues to finance development plans rather than offer loans to Great Britain on an interest free basis to assist in the war effort. The Secretary of State called for colonial development plans based on a five-year period and coordinated in each colony through a central agency prepared to deal with community development which included economic as well as social development.[27]

It was unfortunate that the Colonial Office did not circulate the Report on the Education and Welfare of Women and Girls shortly after the Secretary of State's Circular Dispatch in June, 1941. The Secretary of State had strongly urged colonies to begin training local personnel for rural teachers, health-workers, agricultural demonstrators and other social service staff so that there would be an adequate supply of subordinate staff available when development plans went into effect after the war.[28] The report on the Education and Welfare of Women and Girls stressed the fact that during the war the necessary suspension of male education should be utilized to close the gap in female education,

---

[26] Great Britain, Colonial Office, Certain Aspects of Colonial Policy in War-Time Cmd. 6299 (London: H.M.S.O., 1941), p. 8.

[27] Ibid., p. 9.

[28] Ibid., p. 8.

especially teacher training, and training for community health and social agents.[29] Unfortunately, the Report was delayed for general circulation to the colonies until February, 1943, but the delay was understandable since there were many areas in Africa and other colonial territories where female education was not compatible with local customs, or the political climate of the local area.

The Report on the Education and Welfare of Women and Girls was focused on Africa but its recommendations were general enough for all colonial areas. The first recommendation was an immediate increase of expenditures for facilities to develop female education for specialized training as well as general female adult education.[30] The Committee wished to stress the fact that further inquiry should be made into the conditions and needs of African women with the goal of establishing a continuous study of African education and its effects.[31]

The Report made three other recommendations calling for, (1) the supplementation of the education of girls with the increase in adult female education; (2) increase in the number of positions for European women in the Departments of Education and Health; and (3) an increase of trained African women—"This is of paramount importance."[32]

---

[29] A.C.E.C., 124th Meeting, December 2, 1943.

[30] A.C.E.C., 124th Meeting, December 2, 1943. Report of a Sub-Committee on the Education and Welfare of Women and Girls in Africa, p. 12.

[31] Ibid., p. 16.

[32] Ibid.

The Report on the Education of Women and Girls in Africa became the first Committee document in the post 1939 period to be given general circulation even though it was limited to African colonies. The Report was consistent with the value guidelines laid down in the Memorandum of African Communities (1935) in its recognition that school education was only part of the question of the education of the community. If education was to meet the needs of the community, the remedy was to pay more attention to the community of which the school was only a part.[33]

The Report emphasized the 1935 Policy and stressed the point that, "the teaching in school will be effective in proportion as it is supplemented by the practical instruction of adults and by reforms in the general habits of the community."[34] The emphasis on community service developed the suggestion that community centers become the focus in each district for all common activities of educational value. The Report on the Education and Welfare of Women and Girls in Africa was significant for both its bold insistence on financial support for its recommendations as well as its affirmation in the soundness of education for community development.

The Committee had been stimulated through its discussions with Lord Hailey in May and July, 1939, to assume greater responsibility for policy formulation. The harassment and inconvenience of the war slowed the official actions of the Committee, but it in no way slowed the determination of the members to meet the challenge of their advisory capacity. The emphasis that Hailey had placed on

---

[33] Ibid., p. 18.

[34] Ibid.

extending teacher training was met both through the Report on the Education of Women, as well as Lord Moyne's Circular Dispatch to the Colonies in June, 1941. Both called for immediate efforts to resolve a situation that was considered by all informed opinion to be critical to social development in the colonies and, certainly to some extent, economic development. There were two other important areas that Lord Hailey had discussed: (1) higher education, and (2) popular education.[35]

The subject of popular or mass education was discussed by the Committee in May, 1940. However, the evacuation of Dunkirk and the subsequent fall of France tended to postpone the recommendation of Arthur Creech-Jones that a Sub-Committee be formed to examine the whole area of popular education in light of literacy, adult education and community development. Creech-Jones questioned the progress on adult education in February, 1941, and was informed by Mr. Cox, the Education Adviser to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, that conditions had not been suitable for sending questionnaires to the colonies over the past few months, but the matter would be considered.[36]

The Committee met with Lord Moyne, Secretary of State for the Colonies, in May, 1941, and was informed as to the position of the Government on the Colonial Development and Welfare Act of 1940, and the desirability of urging colonial territories to prepare development plans. In step with the Government's

---

[35] A.C.E.C., 96th Meeting, July 20, 1939.

[36] A.C.E.C., 110th Meeting, February 27, 1941.

attitude the Committee, through the Education Adviser, Mr. Cox, appointed a Sub-Committee to examine the need for mass education and adult education in line with the community education policy.[37]

The terms of reference for the Sub-Committee were modified at its first Sub-Committee meeting to "consider the best approach to the problem of mass literacy and adult education, other than literacy, in the more backward dependencies, taking into account the emphasis which the Advisory Committee has laid in past years upon community education; and to make recommendations."[38] The development of policy recommendations for mass education proceeded almost simultaneously with policy recommendations for higher education.

At the same meeting where Creech-Jones renewed the question of adult education, a memorandum written by Professor Channon on the development of higher education in the colonies stimulated discussion around the idea that to avoid frustration in the colonies, the people would have to have progress.[39] Professor Huxley suggested a Sub-Committee to draw in British universities and this led to the appointment of a Higher Education Sub-Committee at the next Committee meeting.[40] Over the next two years, the Sub-Committee met with representatives of British universities as well as representatives from Achimota and Makerere College who strongly urged a Commission to go out to Africe before

---

[37] A.C E.C., 112th Meeting, May 21, 1941.

[38] Great Britain, Colonial Office, Mass Education in African Society (London: H.M.S.O., 1943), p. 3. Hereafter cited as Mass Education Report.

[39] A.C.E.C., 110th Meeting, February 27, 1941.

[40] A.C.E.C., 111th Meeting, April 3, 1941.

the war ended.[41] The Higher Education Sub-Committee Report was accepted by the Committee in March, 1943, and urged the Secretary of State to form a Commission to investigate Higher Education in the colonies and make recommendations.

At the May meeting, the Sub-Committee set out the issues for the Secretary of State so he could make a decision on the appointment of a Commission. The issues were clearly presented so the Secretary could not fail to appoint a Commission: (1) the prospects of the war ending in an Allied victory; (2) the increased debt of Great Britain to her colonies for men, material, money, and moral support; (3) and finally the pronouncements by the British government in support of self-government for colonial territories.[42] Arthur Creech-Jones raised an important issue at the meeting in relation to the Commission on Higher Education and that was the fact that education had to be viewed as a whole process and that there should also be a drive for primary, secondary, and technical education.[43]

The recommendations of the Sub-Committee on Higher Education were accepted by the Secretary of State. In a speech in the House of Commons just two days before the Advisory Committee accepted the report on Mass Education, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Rt. Hon. Oliver G. Stanley, announced the appointment of the Asquith Commission to investigate Higher Education in the Colonies.[44]

---

[41] A.C.E.C., 120th Meeting, January 14, 1943.

[42] A.C.E.C., 122nd Meeting, May 20, 1943.

[43] Ibid.

[44] Great Britain, Parliamentary Debates (Commons), Vol. 391, p. 52.

At the same time as the announcement of the Asquith Commission, the Secretary of State for the Colonies also announced the Mass Education Report that was shortly due from the Advisory Committee on Education.[45] He wished to emphasize that mass education would have to be a community effort and that when he received the report he would ask all Governors to take the Mass Education Report into consideration in framing their own plans for educational development. A key to the whole process of development was financial support, but the Secretary announced that funds would be available under the Colonial Development and Welfare Act.[46]

The subsequent developments of the Asquith Commission recommendations, after extensive investigations by the Elliot Commission to Africa and the Irvine Commission to the West Indies, were to split off the consideration of higher education from the Advisory Committee by the creation of the Inter-University Council and the Colonial University Advisory Grants Committee. The Advisory Committee would have overlapping membership with the I.U.C. and was invited to suggest ways of strengthening cooperation if they were thought too weak.[47]

The efforts of the Advisory Committee were successful in the initiation of action in relation to subsequent university development. However, the Committee considered education in terms of vocational and technical training were

---

[45] Ibid., p. 58.

[46] Ibid.

[47] A.C.E.C., 145th Meeting, October 17, 1946.

possibly being reduced in importance due to the attraction of the status of a university as opposed to a training college or technical institute.[48]

With the anticipation of financial assistance, the prospects for educational development at the primary and secondary level looked promising after the Colonial Secretary's speech in July, 1943. The Advisory Committee accepted the Report of the Mass Education Sub-Committee in July, 1943. The Colonial Secretary also accepted it and had the report published in December, 1943.[49] The principal authors of the Mass Education Report were Sir Fred Clarke who wrote the first six pages of the report and Dr. Margaret Read who wrote the forty-five page Annexure.[50] The focus of the Report on Mass Education insisted on education for young and old and, therefore, the words "mass education" meaning the community as a whole was used.

Sir Fred Clarke began the Report with a review of the 1925 and 1935 Advisory Committee policies and then developed the idea of "education of the whole community."[51] The emphasis was not going to be placed on the expanding literacy of the young, although universal schooling was considered important, but on the education of the young, adolescent, and adult.[52] The urgency of the problem was stressed because of acceleration of social and political change, and the return following the war of tens of thousands of men who had been trained by the

---

[48] A.C.E.C., 129th Meeting, October 13, 1944.

[49] Mass Education Report, op. cit.

[50] A.C.E.C., 123rd Meeting, July 15, 1943.

[51] Mass Education Report, op. cit., p. 5.

[52] Ibid., p. 6.

military and had acquired new outlooks because of their experiences.[53] Professor Clarke's treatment of the essential needs of education for the development of the whole community stressed the necessity of involving the active support of the local community from the start, and coordination of welfare and education plans so that they formed a balanced whole.[54]

Professor Clarke's acceptance of education for community development and the strong support given to the 1935 Memorandum on the Education of African Communities was no mere coincidence. Professor Clarke had been a member of "The Moot" which was a private group convened by Oldham in 1939 for the purpose of planning for postwar social reconstruction.[55] His own monograph presented to the group on "Education and Social Change" appeared in 1940 as a part of a series published by the Christian News-Letter of which J. H. Oldham was editor. The essence of Clarke's thought was his insistence on the adaptation of institutions and the growing necessity for society to become more collectivist.[56] The role of education was critical to achieving a synthesis between service and change. In Clarke's view, if society were to progress the educational institutions would have to serve the function of change through the adaptation of education to the needs of society.[57] Sir Fred Clarke's ideas and influence

---

[53] Ibid., p. 10.

[54] Ibid.

[55] F. W. Mitchell, Sir Fred Clarke: Master Teacher, 1880-1952 (London: Longman, Greens and Co., 1967), p. 109.

[56] Fred Clarke (later Sir), Education and Social Change: An English Interpretation (London: The Sheldon Press, 1940), p. 4.

[57] Ibid., p. 26.

continued to serve the Advisory Committee and the general cause of educational development even though he officially left the Committee at the end of 1947.[58]

The publication of the Mass Education Report and the appointment of the Asquith Commission and its subsequent recommendations completed the areas that Lord Hailey had urged the Committee to pursue at the outbreak of World War II. The Committee turned its attention, therefore, to the pressing need to encourage the development of long range plans for educational advance as well as efforts to assist with recruiting and staffing which would receive specific attention at the conclusion of the war.

An asset the Committee had with an Education Adviser was the opportunity for him to visit colonies. The Adviser's trips created greater communication between people engaged in education and those engaged in the formulation of policy. An almost immediate consequence, for example, of Sir Christopher Cox's tour of Africa and Mauritius in late 1943 and early 1944 was the establishment of personal contacts with a number of Directors of Education and Deputy-Directors. It gave him the opportunity to encourage development and learn of various local problems as well as worthwhile educational experimentation.[59] A direct result of Sir Christopher's tour of Africa was his own favorable impression of the work being done at the Bakht-er-Ruda teacher training college in the Sudan. Sir Christopher invited Mr. V. L. Griffiths, Principal of the College, to discuss the program of citizenship training with the Committee in June, 1944.

---

[58] Sir Fred Clarke was co-opted for service on the African Policy Sub-Committee which led to the Cambridge Conference of 1948 and 1952. A.C.E.C., 157th Meeting, January 15, 1948.

[59] A.C.E.C., 125th Meeting, May 25, 1944.

The following November, Miss Margery Perham (later Dame Margery) suggested the Committee take up the question of political education as she was impressed with the work that Griffiths had done in the Sudan.[60] The importance of political education was clear to Miss Perham after her visits to the West Indies with the Irvine Committee for she realized the probable speed with which the West Indian government would move toward self-government.[61] Miss Perham's recommendation that the Committee take up the question of political education was supported by Creech-Jones, Professor Channon, Miss Oakden, and Mr. Burney. Miss Oakden remarked that the question of citizenship led back to the training of teachers, for as long as the training college merely repeated the school outlook, it was not likely that much advance could be made.[62]

The consideration of the creation of a Sub-Committee to examine the question of political education, or education for citizenship as Sir Christopher Cox preferred to call it, was delayed until the return of Creech-Jones from a visit to the United States and Cox from a visit to Gambia. The delay lasted almost a year, but by September, 1945, Arthur Creech-Jones had become Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies under the Labour government elected in July. He assured the Committee that the Colonial Office would take up the question of political education although there were a number of difficulties.[63] The number of difficulties and certain points of policy which had

---

[60] A.C.E.C., 130th Meeting, November 16, 1944.

[61] Ibid.

[62] Ibid.

[63] A.C.E.C., 136th Meeting, September 20, 1945.

to be considered combined with the influx of new members at the beginning of the year allowed the Colonial Office to postpone the appointment of a Sub-Committee until early in 1946.[64]

At the first meeting in 1946, Creech-Jones stated that he and the Secretary of State were anxious for the committee to show some initiative in regard to the problems of colonial education and formulate recommendations to remedy some of the situations. Creech-Jones specifically mentioned the hope that a Sub-Committee would consider the question of political education.[65] The Sub-Committee was eventually appointed in March, after Cox's return from a tour of the Middle East. The Committee's terms of reference called for the study of techniques needed to prepare people for responsibility and for increasing a sense of public responsibility, tolerance, and objectivity in discussion and practice, and for an appreciation of "political institutions, their evolution and progress."[66]

The Sub-Committee with the new Assistant Educational Adviser, Mr. W. E. F. Ward, as Chairman, and with the service of Sir Fred Clarke, Miss Perham, Dr. Margaret Read, and others lost no time in completion of their report which was presented to the Committee for comments in April, 1947, and finally accepted in July, 1947.[67]

---

[64] A.C.E.C., 137th Meeting, October 18, 1945.

[65] A.C.E.C., 140th Meeting, January 17, 1946.

[66] A.C.E.C., 142nd Meeting, March 21, 1946.

[67] A.C.E.C., 153rd Meeting, July 17, 1947.

Education for Citizenship in Africa was the last report issued by the Advisory Committee on Education and reflected a final attempt to focus on the educational process as a means of promoting good citizenship which in turn would lay the foundation for self-government. The Committee had an opportunity to use the title "Education for Self-Government" but chose "Education for Citizenship" because it implied a broader sense of responsibility and a commitment to the political fulfillment of education for community development.[68] The report did limit itself in a general manner to Africa, but only because most of the Sub-Committee members had gained their experience in tropical Africa and were more familiar with tribal society than other colonial social arrangements.

The principal recommendations of the Report on Education for Citizenship in Africa called for the use of character training as the foundation for citizenship both in and out of school, and for cooperative efforts in assisting adult education programs through participation in local government, along with a wide range of community service projects.[69] The report stressed the point that Britain was responsible for the insertion of Article 73 of the United Nations Charter which called for self-government of colonial areas and was pledged to uphold the Charter and assist colonies toward eventual self-government.

The key question which the Report raised, and attempted to answer, was whether or not the political institutions of Western democracy, or the main

---

[68] Ibid.

[69] Great Britain, Colonial Office, Education for Citizenship in Africa (London: H.M.S.O., 1948), pp. 18 and 30. Hereafter cited as Education for Citizenship.

principles inspiring them, could be rapidly and successfully transferred to tropical Africa or other colonial areas.[70] The Report questioned whether Britain had developed an adequate public sense of responsibility, tolerance and objectivity in political discussion and practice necessary for the operation and preservation of democracy. If education in Britain was inadequate as preparations for citizenship, then there was no reason to claim it was more adequate in the colonies.[71]

The Report recognized that the solution to education for citizenship was not simply an increased number of trained personnel, although that would assist a colony to become self-administered. It was more a matter of educating the general public through formal or informal means to understand and experience that if political freedom was to benefit "all the people and not merely the favored few, then all the people must be guided to use it for the common good."[72]

The Report did not suggest a new policy but merely illustrated how character training, or education for citizenship, fit in with the educational guidelines already established by the Committee in both the 1935 and 1943 policy memoranda. For example, adaptation to local environment had been a consistent thread in British colonial education policy and was no less so in the Report on Citizenship. The Report recognized that for education to be effective, it must be partly based on local cultural foundations.[73] It was not for the

---

[70] Education for Citizenship, op. cit., p. 6.

[71] Ibid.

[72] Ibid.

[73] Ibid., p. 7.

purpose of keeping the African in his place, although some Europeans in Africa wished it so, but for the purpose of allowing the African to remain an African.[74]

The Committee had been guided by cultural anthropologists who warned that cultural imperialism would be detrimental to Britain in both the long and short range and that a culture once dead could not be revived.[75] The fact that indigenous political institutions like that of the Akan continued to exist in the face of continuing contact with the disintegrating tendencies of European civilization was of great importance to the principle of adaptation. The Report drew attention to advantages for colonial peoples to appreciate and study their own culture, especially when it fostered the development of a humanistic spirit. The Report recognized that tribal society in many parts of Africa was ahead of European political institutions in the practice of democracy.

> Democracy is not merely a matter of political institutions, but of the spirit in which they are worked, democracy must arise from within, and cannot be imposed—though it may be helped or hindered—from without, democracy can only be judged by being seen in action.[76]

The premise that democracy came from within logically led to the principle of character training as essential to education for citizenship. Character training was another thread in the fabric of policy formulated by the Committee. It was not the character training attendant to British public schools, but rather character training concomitant with community development. Achimota in

---

[74] Ibid.

[75] Ibid., p. 8.

[76] Ibid., p. 9.

the Gold Coast and the Jeanes Training College in Kenya were developing models where the teachers were in close contact with the students both in and out of the classroom, for the curriculum was designed to bring the environment into the classroom and take the classroom into the environment.

Teacher training became a key link in the development of character training for the teacher was to perform a model role which the student could emulate. The Report stressed the importance of teacher training which emphasized the school and teacher's responsibility for participation in community development. "We become like that which we admire," was a psychological truism that placed great responsibility on the role of the teacher and the school in developing the spirit of democracy in an emergent nation.[77]

The Report was clear in its recommendations that education for citizenship went beyond the limits of the school in both curriculum and the age of the participants. The adult community or non-school attending segment of the community, was included, for the Report was consistent with previous policy in its insistence that education for citizenship, like education for community development, or mass education, should involve all segments of the community.

The advantages to Colonial governments of additional communication equipment becoming more readily available after the war meant that more information could be made available to the people, and hopefully, more involvement of the people in government at all levels.[78] The involvement factor was essential for

---

[77] Ibid., p. 18.

[78] Ibid., p. 32.

the development of democracy and the Report encouraged facilitation of councils where young men with education met with the traditional elders to discuss problems and policy in an attempt to gain from both the experience and knowledge. This was not an attempt at social synthesis but social symbiosis. Change was more acceptable to the young, but power and prestige needed to facilitate change rested with the older generation. Social symbiosis would facilitate a living together for mutual benefit through political action that would maintain community interest paramount to the individual, and subordinate individual rights to individual responsibility. The idea of social symbiosis was not limited to the African population, but to all races.

> One of the most urgent tasks facing Colonial Governments is to rally to their aid all people of any race in their territories who are able to contribute in this (education for citizenship) endeavour.[79]

Education for Citizenship in Africa was a final commitment to a heuristic policy of education for community development. The political role of education, if previous policy guidlines were followed, would foster the spirit and practice of democracy that would serve and hasten the arrival of self-government. The Committee was not naive enough to think that education alone could ensure the development of a democratic spirit, for the Report recognized that the political and economic organization of the colonial states, and especially the economic, would have to develop in such a way as to enable democracy to flourish.[80] The economic problems in the colonial territories was outside of

---

[79] Ibid., p. 35.

[80] Ibid., p. 15.

the official view of the Committee. Education for community development cut across the traditional view of education as that activity which took place in a school to incorporate the wider notion of the sum total of human activity which created a social symbiosis and led to the advance pari passu of the whole community.

The Committee had taken the wider view of education. The value heuristic created through the continuity of Reports beginning in 1925 and running through Education of Communities (1935), Mass Education (1943), and finally, Education for Citizenship (1947) could assist individual colonies. The colonies could benefit by the pooled wisdom of the Committee provided they recognized and acted upon the value guidelines set down by the Committee.

Change was catching up with the Committee and the ferment of nationalism combined with increased awareness of the need for development had shortened the original projected development span from fifty years to five to ten years, with an almost yearly revision of the lead time downward.[81] The pressures for change were reflected in a shift of initiative from the Committee to the Colonial Office and in a tactical strategy that placed more emphasis on the local rather than the Imperial level.

The initiative for the formulation of education policy which had rested with the Committee shifted as a result of more active participation by the Colonial Office staff. The change was gradual but the transition was completed by the Spring of 1947. It was not by chance that Education for Citizenship in

---

[81] Interview with J. H. Oldham, April 28, 1965, and with Sir Christopher Cox, June 9, 1965.

Africa was the last report issued by the Advisory Committee on Education. The influences which brought about the change were not hostile toward the Committee, but were more directly related to the pressures of the postwar period and the style of the Colonial Secretary of State, Arthur Creech-Jones.

The pressures the Colonial Office faced toward the end of the war began with colonial misinterpretations of the Mass Education Report. The Colonial Office turned over the critical replies to the Committee, but simultaneously facilitated the first joint meeting between the Colonial Social Welfare Committee and the Advisory Committee on Education.[82] The main concern of colonies seemed to be the cost involved in carrying out the recommendations of what they interpreted as mass education. The Committee quickly realized that development plans submitted to the Colonial Office for approval under the Colonial Development and Welfare Act asked for funds far in excess of the amounts that were available.[83] Therefore, a Mass Education Sub-Committee was established to clarify the objectives of the Mass Education Report. The Committee was almost deadlocked, however, on the problem of the cost of educational development in relation to need. The matter of finance was summarized by Mr. Scott when he stated that the question of finance would eventually have to be answered by the people of the colonies, not the Committee.[84]

---

[82] A.C.E.C., 132nd Meeting, March 15, 1945.

[83] A.C.E.C., 137th Meeting, October 18, 1945. The Parliamentary-Under Secretary announced that only 120 million pounds was available over a ten-year period (12 million a year).

[84] A.C.E.C., 143rd Meeting, May 16, 1946.

A new pressure entered into the discussion of educational development and that was world opinion expressed through the United Nations and UNESCO. Following the United Nations Trustee Council Assembly in November, 1946, the Committee was informed that unless rapid progress and development was made in Tanganyika, the Trustee Council would be sure to censure Britain and perhaps demand that Tanganyika be turned over to the Council.[85] Something had to be done and the Colonial Office recommended doubling up on Tanganyika's ten-year development plan so that what would be spent over ten years would be spent over three to five years.[86]

The UNESCO Conference late in 1946 also produced some interesting reaction from Committee members who were delegates. Although Mr. Morris and Dr. Read felt that more publicity should be given to British policy and that UNESCO members should be supplied with copies of the Mass Education Report, the Asquith Report, and Oversea Education, they both agreed with Mr. Ward who stated that if Britain did not show the concrete evidence of actual results, the whispers of criticism would come to be shouted from the roof tops in a few years.[87]

The Colonial Office was under pressure from both the United Nations Trustee Council and UNESCO to close the gap between policy and practice. The recommendations in the case of Tanganyika indicated that the Colonial Office would not increase allocations for education, although in emergency cases, funds for a ten-year period could be allocated into a three- to five-year period.

---

[85] A.C.E.C., 147th Meeting, December 19, 1946.

[86] Ibid.

[87] A.C.E.C., 148th Meeting, January 16, 1947.

Education was still considered a social service by the Colonial Office officials and had to share money available for social services. If a colony was given money to pay for its social services, it was feared the colony would not be able to stand on its own when it became independent.[88] In fact, independence might be delayed because a colony could not support itself. The funds available under the Colonial Development and Welfare Act of 1945 were not lavish, but they could be used to good advantage if local funds were concentrated on primary education. The Colonial Office took the initiative and in May, 1947, the Assistant Under-Secretary of State, Mr. A. B. Cohen, submitted a memorandum on educational policy which triggered a series of actions including summer conferences on African Administration and the beginning of a Colonial Office committee to examine the whole question of education policy.[89]

The first summer Conference in August, 1947, dealt with the topic of African Local Government but the second Conference in August, 1948, dealt with the topic of "The Encouragement of Initiative in African Society." The opening address by the Secretary of State, Rt. Hon. Arthur Creech-Jones, disclosed a shift in strategy on the part of the Colonial Office with regard to the problem of closing the gap between policy and practice. The Secretary announced that there should be an increase of responsibility at the local level rather than in the Colonial Office. Instead of policy by dispatch or White Paper, the Colonial Office would facilitate conferences where practitioners and

---

[88] Interview with Sir Christopher Cox, June 9, 1965. The view was promoted by the Treasury Department.

[89] A.C.E.C., 151st Meeting, May 22, 1947.

theorists came together, exchanged opinions, clarified tasks and techniques, and discussed new programs so that the actual work in the colonies proceeded at a faster rate than in the past.[90]

The focus of the second Cambridge Conference was mass education, but it was clear from summaries of the various study groups that education for community development was the intent of mass education and education for citizenship. The primary technique for implementation was local involvement and participation of the whole community—official, unofficial; educated, uneducated; and all races.[91] The topic of colonial nationalism was one of the main themes of the Conference since the initiative in the political sphere could strengthen initiative in the social services. The discussion, which was enriched through the participation of Africans, highlighted the frustration that newly educated Africans faced with the relatively stagnant socio-economic conditions of their people. The discussion group recognized that the relief of the frustration would be difficult for the British administrator since he was considered part of the problem by the African. If colonial administrators wished to modify the habit-patterns of the African, they would first have to modify their own.[92] The modification should be to encourage social construction and not exercise

---

[90] A.C.E.C., 164th Meeting, September 23, 1948.

[91] Great Britain, Colonial Office, "The Encouragement of Initiative in African Society" (printed but not published), p. 86. Appendix to A.C.E.C., 164th Meeting, September 23, 1948.

[92] Ibid., p. 72.

censorship over the very type of initiative that would be vital to increased participation of the people in their own social development.[93]

The Conference stressed financial reform within colonial territories to give more initiative to provincial levels. It was recommended that central department budgets be eliminated so that all the areas in need of development would come together in the formation of a community development budget.[94] The decentralization of finances would give more responsibility to provincial and local areas, and increase the participation of Africans in the formulation of local policy, as well as create greater initiative for assuming the financial responsibility for community development.[95]

The Colonial Office Summer Conference of 1948 did not terminate the need for the Advisory Committee on Education. The Committee was a composition of exceptional educational experience, blended with the highest calibre of scholars in social sciences, philosophy, and educational administration. But a body of people, however distinguished, sitting in London could not order the people working in colonial areas to do their jobs a certain way. The best that could be hoped for was that the Committee could offer its wisdom and ideas in an indirect manner through a Conference which brought practitioner and theorists together. The advantage of this process was that the people who would have the responsibility to carry out the work would have the opportunity to raise

---

[93] Ibid., p. 73.

[94] Ibid., p. 115.

[95] Ibid., p. 123.

questions, express their concerns, and generally satisfy their own doubts that what they were doing was part of a larger effort directed by a policy that they had an opportunity to shape.[96]

As a result of the memorandum on educational policy submitted by the Colonial Office to the Committee in May, 1947, and following the two summer Conferences held at Cambridge University, the Committee continued to discuss with the Colonial Office the need for a general review of colonial educational policy. The discussion to produce another White Paper on educational policy was eventually dropped in favor of the Conference format initiated by Creech-Jones during his four-year tenure as Colonial Secretary.[97] The Committee supported the idea of the Conference which eventually led to the surveys of East and West Africa under Mr. A. L. Binns and Dr. G. B. Jeffery and the Cambridge Conference of 1952 which produced the document African Education: A Study of Educational Policy and Practice in British Tropical Africa.

The result of the effort was a continued commitment to education for community development and an almost identical epilogue at the Cambridge Conference four years earlier, "The next phase which ought to succeed the Cambridge Conference must inevitably take place in Africa."[98] The realization that grew out of both Cambridge conferences was that a policy of education for community

---

[96]The Colonial Office had come to accept the ideas of J. H. Oldham with regard to policy and practice. J.H.O. to H. Scott, October 24, 1933, see p. 130.

[97]Colonial Office and Nuffield Foundation, African Education (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953), p. 5. Creech-Jones served from 1946-1950.

[98]Ibid., p. 183.

development could only succeed if in large measure it reflected the aims and aspirations of the community concerned.

The dilemma for British policy was found in the encounter of either little or no concern, or a concern that was decidedly in favor of a purely British educational import which had no relation to the needs of the colony other than supplying clerks for the government. The groundwork had been established by the summer of 1948 with the Conference on the "Encouragement of Initiative." The value guides begun by the Committee in 1925 and added to in more depth in Education of Communities (1935), Mass Education (1943), and Education for Citizenship (1946) was upheld as sound in the Binns and Jeffery study.[99] The discrepancy between policy and practice was in part blamed on colonial economic conditions, but there was never any attempt to examine the value premise of the colonial economic policy. The study of colonial economic policy is another task, but a speculative thesis might propose that an educational policy that was humanistic could not be fulfilled in practice because the economic policy was capitalistic, with a strong bias toward self-regarding individualism.

The formulation of British educational policy from the middle 1930's through 1948 represented a cycle of evaluation and a recommitment to a value heuristic that called for education for community development. The policy was consistent with the original values embodied in the 1925 Policy and the 1935 Memorandum on Education of African Communities. Education was envisioned as both a formal and informal process that should be related to the needs of the

---

[99] Ibid., p. 57 and p. 133.

community. To avoid dysfunctional elitism the policy stressed the advance of the whole community pari passu. In theory, the needs of the community were to engage the people in a democratic process of establishing priorities which would require their own involvement. It was the spark of indigenous involvement that would ignite the flame of community development and spread to encompass provincial and national development. Education guided by humanistic values was the envisioned catalyst in the enterprise of human socio-economic development.

VII

EDUCATION FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Educational planning has assumed an important role in national and international affairs. Governments spend large sums of money for a wide variety of technical assistance in the form of educational consultation. The advice is requested and given mainly because education is considered essential for the continuance of a high standard of living for industrial nations and to increase the standard of living of nearly two-thirds of the world's population.

The fact that Great Britain officially engaged in the process of cross-cultural educational planning with the creation of an Advisory Committee on Native Education in British Tropical Africa in 1923, and subsequently formulated an education policy, is of important historic and sociological significance. The Committee affords an opportunity to study the formation of policy for the purpose of clarifying the intent of the policy as well as the pressures and personalities which influenced its formation.

The central focus of this study has been the thesis that the policies formulated by the Committee reflected a continuous attempt to orient education policy in the colonies to the local needs for human resource development. The thesis has been substantiated in that the definition of human resource development was incorporated into general value guidelines accepted by the Committee and written into all of its policy recommendations. These value guidelines can best be classified by a comprehensive policy entitled education for community development.

Policy formulated by a committee can be a rather opaque process, but in the attempt to examine the major thesis a significant amount of data was discovered that supports Kenneth Gergen's hypothesis concerning leverage points in the process of policy formulation. Gergen contends that the sub-units of greatest importance are individual persons rather than organizations or institutions, and that a thorough understanding of policy will depend on knowledge of the individual participants.[1] The data accumulated for this study, and acquired through the generous cooperation of Dr. J. H. Oldham and the International Missionary Council office in London, discloses the key roles that individuals had in the formation of policy, and the manipulation of other resources to secure a degree of institutional security for the Committee. In this study, policy might be historically classified as pre and post Oldham, or as the Oldham-Clarke policy on a personality continuum scale. The initiation of policy as well as the administrative framework of a Committee structure can be influential in establishing a basic policy and in building an institutional allegiance to the policy.

The interaction of personalities and the dynamics that operate within the process of policy formation cannot be seen clearly from Committee minutes alone. The administrative technique that was adopted in the case of the Advisory Committee on Education was to resort to Sub-Committees to draft an initial memorandum for the Committee's written, and sometimes verbal, comments prior to a meeting with the full Committee. Discussion at the regular

---

[1] Raymond A. Bauer and Kenneth J. Gergen, The Study of Policy Formation (New York: The Free Press, 1968), p. 182.

Committee meeting would not always be recorded verbatim and many times important influences in policy might take place following a meeting or in private conversations with other Committee members. The value to a study of policy of knowing, or having access to, information on the individual participants involved in the formation of policy is indispensable to the task of objectively analyzing policy statements for the essence of their recommendations.

The analogy of the spirit and the letter of the law can be applied with regard to the study of policy. A knowledge of the key personalities involved in the drafting of policy statements assists in an attempt to understand fully the spirit of a policy as well as its letter.

In formulating policy guidelines the Committee was faced initially with the problem not of doing what was right, but of knowing what was right. This axiological question involved the Committee for its first ten years. It was answered in part by the 1925 policy statement which focused on the importance of adapting education to the individual in order for the community to advance as a whole.[2] The idea was not to educate the individual out of the community, but to educate the individual and the community so that both could advance pari passu.[3] The 1935 Policy focused on the synecological implications of policy and recognized that economic and educational policies were intricately interwoven. Close coordination should be made between the different agencies responsible for health, education, agricultural, and other areas.[4]

---

[2] 1925 Policy, op. cit., p. 4.

[3] Ibid., p. 8.

[4] Memo on African Communities (1935), op. cit., p. 6.

The Committee tried to influence economic policy in the colonies. It recommended the adoption of the principle that a fixed percentage of the total economic development in a colony be allocated to education. Between the Treasury Department and the Colonial Office, the idea was considered not applicable. The Treasury Department, for example, rejected the idea and tenaciously held to the principle that only with economic development could there be social service development.[5] In matters of finance, the Treasury Department views controlled the Colonial Office, so it was understandable that the Colonial Office accepted the Treasury Department's opinion rather than the Committee's. The idea that education policy should in any way have precedence over, or even equal standing with, economic policy was not considered sound thinking by the majority of Colonial Office and Treasury Department officials. The best the Committee could do was plant some seeds of doubt in conventional thinking by suggesting that the most important factor in production was the producer. The best means of increasing production, in accordance with the Committee's humanist attitude, was to use education to increase the individual's potential by removing ignorance and prejudice, and giving him a new outlook.[6]

The Committee had recognized education as an investment in human resources and established the parameters of its policy outside of the traditional (British) system of education, but not exclusive of it, to include

---

[5]Interview with J. H. Oldham, April 28, 1965. See also Memo on African Communities, op. cit., p. 7.

[6]Memo on African Communities, op. cit., p. 7.

the whole community. The policy was not a rejection of traditional education in its limited scholastic sense, but rather an emphasis and warning that traditional education would not serve the needs of all the people in the colonial territories. Indeed, the Committee's consideration of what was right in regard to education logically led them to accept the premise that what was right for the people ought to be right for education. The Committee viewed the general economic and social conditions of the African colonies and agreed that the economic and social development of the colony should begin with rural development. The task should be initiated at the local level and develop from community to community until it involved the whole colony. The place for the products of traditional education would be in service to the whole program of development. The reasons for acquiring a traditional education would then be for humanitarian service to the community, not for acquiring special privileges and status as a member of an elite group.

The educational policy recommended by the Committee was to be part of a general policy that the colonial government would have to adopt. The Committee recognized that for a comprehensive program of social advance, in the individual as well as the community sense, the general direction, initiative, and financial support would have to come from the central government of a colony.[7] But this direction, initiative and support was to facilitate local initiative, not order it, and allow for the widest variety of African initiative, independent effort, and self-help.[8]

---

[7] Ibid., p. 15.

[8] Ibid.

The Committee's vision was guided by humanistic values that recognized man's needs for individual freedom combined with individual responsibility to the community. The sense of social responsibility was paramount to the success of community development, for without it, the self-regarding individualism of economic prosperity would ravage the human and economic resources of colonies to their own detriment.

The essential ingredient of education envisioned by the Committee was supportive of its views on the necessity of social responsibility combined with individual freedom. The Committee recognized that the impact of Western civilization was tending to encourage the unregulated individualism which was destructive of the best elements in communal life, and insisted that character training, or moral education, be used to counter these forces.[9] Community development included moral education which would stress values of cooperation, social responsibility, tolerance, acceptance; in short, a program of human awareness which stressed man's basic unity, yet accepted and promoted difference and diversity that was not detrimental to the good of the community.

The idea of humanist values becoming a heuristic policy that would guide the development of a whole colony was beyond the authority of the Committee to implement, and the comprehension of the more practical minded colonial officials who were more concerned with maintaining than creating. In the 1920's and 1930's, the basic ideas behind the Committee's policy were compatible with Christian socialism, but as the ideas of secular humanism gained

---

[9] Ibid., p. 8.

more influence, community development could be seen in the framework of humanistic socialism with Tanzania as a good example.[10]

The question might be raised as to whether Britain actually had a policy for education in the colonies. The focus of this entire study has been centered on the thesis that British colonial education policy was formulated with a continuous attempt to orient education to meet the local needs for human resource development. The Committee which assumed the responsibility for formulating policy became the center of an historical investigation and the question of practice was determined by definition to be outside the limits of a study on the formulation of policy.

However, Bauer and Gergen contend that until behavior is actually effected it is not proper to speak of policy formation.[11] The evidence would seem to indicate that the Committee was fully aware of this point with its close involvement with the development of Achimota in the Gold Coast, the Jeanes School Training College in Kabete, Kenya, and numerous other schools and colleges. The whole reason for the journal Oversea Education, which the Committee initiated, was for the purpose of generating discussion on educational practices throughout the colonies, and in other parts of the world, so that initiative, experimentation, and experience in one place might benefit others.

---

[10] John Hatch, "Africa's Contribution to Socialism," New Statesman (September 9, 1968), pp. 342-343. As long as democracy exists within the single political party, and criticism and dissenting views are allowed free expression, the Arusha Declaration (1967) was the type of program needed to implement British educational policy.

[11] Raymond A. Bauer and Kenneth J. Gergen, op. cit., p. 188.

The Committee had no executive power and even the Secretary of State for the Colonies could not order colonial Governors to execute specific actions without extensive consultations and Parliamentary support as in the case of the Kenya land settlement controversy in 1923. The power of the Committee centered in its ability to influence individuals. The Committee realized after the reaction to the 1925 policy statement that in matters directly related to educational practices the responsibility for changing behavior rested with responsible officials and the self-initiative of citizens. Therefore, policy recommendations became value guides, or heuristic policy, in the sense of what ought to be done rather than what should be done under current conditions. Current conditions varied quite radically from colony to colony and even within colonies. Eventually the Colonial Office came around to recognize the importance of individual contacts. Through an Education Adviser, who travelled extensively throughout the colonies, and summer conferences, the Colonial Office was able to bring together practitioners and theorists to deal more effectively with the problems of policy and practice. But after World War II, lack of time and money were critical problems and the reluctance to invest in education in the thirties came back to plague the Colonial Office in the late forties and fifties.

The evidence would indicate that the spirit and letter of British colonial education policy was humanistic in its concern for the advancement of all people and its insistence on cooperation, social responsibility, democratic particpation, and adaptation of the curriculum to the local environment. The evidence also indicates that the key personalities who served on the Committee were primarily responsible for the foresight that recognized

community as the goal of the future, and development as the process by which self-initiative, combined with a sense of collective responsibility and democratic participation, would create a continuum of economic and social advancement.

The spirit of British colonial education policy might motivate further studies into the values inherent in the economic and political-administrative policy to discover whether a correlation exists between the value heuristic of educational policy and the value heuristic of other policy areas which clearly affect the community. If a humanistic community is a worthwile goal, then there needs to be a value heuristic that is developed not for segments of the community, or for isolated communities, but for the entire interrelated structure. This calls for the development of a value heuristic on a synecological level rather than along the lines of policy for segmented functions within the community.

The genius of British colonial education policy was its attempt to deal with education in its synecological context. Its incomplete fulfillment can probably be traced, not to the response of colonials,[12] but to the failure of the Colonial Office officials to understand the nature of policy and use it

---

[12]Sir Christopher Cox, "The Impact of British Education on the Indigenous Peoples of Oversea Territories," The Advancement of Science, vol. 50 (September, 1956), p. 131. The argument developed was that no policy from Britain could reverse the African demand for Western education which was costly and dysfunctional for African needs. However, it was the economic policy that promoted self-regarding individualism which drove Africans to demand the traditional British education complete with examination results and paper qualifications. An educational policy of community development would require a concomitant economic policy that would be more socialistic in its protection of community interests.

effectively. A coordination of policy for community development under a value heuristic that was essentially humanistic in its symbiosis might have achieved a greater fulfillment of the general Colonial Office responsibility as well as its more specific responsibility in relation to education.

People engaged in the process of educational policy formation as well as other areas of policy formation might take cognizance of the heuristic nature of British colonial education policy and the importance of viewing policy from a common axiological synecology position. When the overall value judgments are coordinated, then the fulfillment of policy in one area benefits other areas. Progress can be made across a wide front, or in depth, in relation to the human effort that can be applied and the priorities selected.

The British attempt at colonial educational planning and current efforts in parts of East Africa are steps in man's desire and effort to build a world where freedom and responsibility go hand in hand. The goal should be worth the challenge and effort to achieve it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

Great Britain. Board of Education. Educational Reconstruction. London: H.M.S.O., 1943.

_____. Teachers and Youth Leaders: Report of a commission Appointed by the President of the Board of Education to Consider the Supply, Recruitment and Training of Teachers and Youth Leaders. London: H.M.S.O., 1944.

Great Britain. Colonial Office. Certain Aspects of Colonial Policy in War-Time. Cmd. 6299. London: H.M.S.O., 1941.

_____. Colonial Office Conference, 1927. Cmd. 2883. London: H.M.S.O., 1927.

_____. Colonial Office Conference, 1930. Cmd. 3628. London: H.M.S.O., 1930.

_____. Colonial Office Conference, 1930. Appendices to the Summary of Proceedings. Cmd. 3629. London: H.M.S.O., 1930.

_____. Commonwealth Education Conference. Cmd. 841. London: H.M.S.O., 1959.

_____. East African Commission Report. Cmd. 2387. London: H.M.S.O., 1925.

_____. Future Policy in Regard to Eastern Africa. Cmd. 2904. London: H.M.S.O., 1927.

_____. Memorandum on the Advisory Committee on Native Education in Tropical Africa. Africa Pamphlets, Vol. 2, No. 47. Colonial Office Library.

_____. Statement of Policy on Colonial Development and Welfare. Cmd. 6175. London: H.M.S.O., 1940.

Great Britain. Colonial Office. Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies. Mass Education in African Society. Colonial No. 186. London: H.M.S.O., 1943.

_____. Memorandum on Educational Grants-in-Aid. Colonial No. 84. London: H.M.S.O., 1933.

_____. Memorandum on the Education of African Communities. Colonial No. 103. London: H.M.S.O., 1935.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

Great Britain. Colonial Office. Advisory Committee on Native Education in the British Tropical African Dependencies. Educational Policy in British Tropical Africa. Cmd. 2374. London: H.M.S.O., 1925.

Great Britain. Colonial Office. Colonial Development Advisory Committee. 1st Interim Report. Cmd. 3540. London: H.M.S.O., 1930.

_____. 11th and Final Report. Cmd. 6298. London: H.M.S.O., 1941.

Great Britain. Colonial Office. Colonial Research Commission. Progress Report, 1942-1943. Cmd. 6486. London: H.M.S.O., 1943.

Colonial Office and Nuffield Foundation. African Education. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953.

REPORTS AND MISCELLANEOUS DOCUMENTS

Carnegie Corporation of New York. Report of the President. New York: Carnegie Corporation, 1923-1943.

Greaves, L. B. Report on a Visit to South and Central Africa. London: Conference of Missionary Societies in Great Britain and Ireland, September, 1954.

Phelps-Stokes Fund. Twenty Year Report of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, 1911-1931. New York: Phelps-Stokes Fund, 1932.

Report of the Sixth Annual Intermissions Conference. Bo, Sierra Leone, July 1 and 2, 1942.

Shields, James J. The Reports of the Phelps-Stokes Fund on Education in Africa. New York: Phelps-Stokes Fund, 1961.

Williams, Peter R. C. British Aid—Educational Assistance. London: Overseas Development Institute, 1963.

Wrong, Margaret. For a Literate West Africa. London: Colonial Office. n.d.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

Anderson, E. Christian. "The Development of Government Policy for Education in Sierra Leone, 1882-1961." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1964.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

Church Missionary Society. "Conference on the Education of African Women." London: International Missionary Council, 1925. (Typewritten.)

_____. "Conference on Education in Sierra Leone." London: International Missionary Council, 1930. (Mimeographed.)

Graham, Sonia F. "A History of Education in Relation to the Development of the Protectorate of Northern Nigeria, 1900-1919, with Special Reference to the Work of Hanns Vischer." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of London, 1955.

Great Britain. Colonial Office. Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies. "A Preliminary Memorandum on the Aims and Methods of Language Teaching in the Colonies." London, 1930.

_____. "Educational Functions of Local Bodies in the Tropical African Dependencies." London, January 19, 1934.

_____. "Educational Policy and Practice: East and Central Africa." London, May, 1952.

_____. "Memorandum on Grants by Government in Aid of Certain Kinds of Educational Institutions." London, May, 1930.

_____. "Memorandum on Language in African School Education." London, November, 1943.

_____. "Memorandum on the Preparation and Selection of English Reading Books for Non-English-Speaking Pupils." London, September, 1929.

_____. "Memorandum Prepared by Sir Fred Clarke, Director of the University of London Institute of Education, for the use of the Adult and Mass Education Sub-Committee." London, December, 1943.

_____. "Notes on Educational Service in Nigeria by a Member of the Education Staff." London, February, 1938.

_____. "Report of a Sub-Committee on the Education and Welfare of Women and Girls in Africa." London, February, 1943.

_____. "Report of the Sub-Committee on Compulsory Education." London, May 14, 1933.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

Great Britain. Colonial Office. Advisory Committee on Native Education in Tropical Africa. "British Tropical Africa: The Place of the Vernacular in Native Education." London, May 1927.

_____. "Notes by Sir James Currie on an Interview with Mr. Alex Fraser." London, April, 1924.

_____. "Notes by Sir F. D. Lugard on Sir James Currie's Notes." London, April, 1924.

_____. Draft Report on Education in Tanganyika, Uganda and Kenya by Miss A. W. Whitelaw." London, October, 1926.

_____. "Report on Education in Tanganyika, Uganda and Kenya." London, November, 1926.

International Missionary Council. "Africa Committee Minutes." London, September 14, 1933. (Mimeographed.)

International Missionary Council. Africa Committee. "Information Desired on Work in Rural Areas in Africa." London (n.d.) circa 1933

_____. "Memorandum on Action of the Advisory Committee on Native Education in British Tropical Africa on the Use of Swahili in Uganda." London (n.d.) circa 1928. (Typewritten.)

_____. "Memorandum on African Policy." London, 1933.

_____. "Memorandum on Education Policy in Africa." London, 1923.

OTHER SOURCES

Micro-Film. Minutes of the Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies. January, 1929 to December, 1948. (Not complete.)

_____. Minutes of the Advisory Committee on Native Education in British Tropical Africa. January, 1924 to December, 1928.

PERSONAL INTERVIEWS

Sir Christopher Cox. April 21, 1965 and June 9, 1965.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

Dr. Philipa Esdaile. March 10, 1965.

Dr. J. H. Oldham. February 10, 1965 and April 28, 1965. (Tape-Recorded.)

Dame Margery Perham. June 23, 1965.

Sir Hilton Poynton. February 17, 1965. (Tape-Recorded.)

Dr. Margaret H. Read. June 30, 1965.

Rt. Rev. Robert W. Stopford (Bishop of London). April 13, 1965.

Mr. W. E. F. Ward. February 23, 1965 (Tape-Recorded) and June 18, 1965.

Secondary Sources

BOOKS

Azikiwe, Nnamdi. ZIK: A Selection From Speeches of Nnamdi Azikiwe. London: Cambridge University Press, 1961.

Beeby, C. E. The Quality of Education in Developing Countries. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966.

Bell, G. K. A. Life of Randall Davidson. 3rd edition. London: Oxford University Press, 1952.

Blood, Sir Hilary. The Smaller Territories. London: Conservative Political Centre, 1958.

Boyd, Malcolm (ed.). The Underground Church. New York: Sheed Press, 1968.

Bradley, Kenneth. Once a District Officer. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1966.

Burns, Sir Allan. Colonial Civil Servant. London: Allen and Unwin, 1949.

_____. In Defense of Colonies. London: Allen and Unwin, 1957.

Cantril, Hadley. The Human Dimension: Experiences in Policy Research. New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1967.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

Carrington, C. E. The Liquidation of the British Empire. London: George G. Harrap and Co., 1961.

Carr-Saunders, A. M. New Universities Overseas. London: Allen and Unwin, 1961.

Clark, Grover. The Balance Sheets of Imperialism. New York: Russell and Russell, 1967.

Clarke, Sir Fred. Education and Social Change. London: Sheldon Press, 1940. New York: Macmillan, 1940.

_____. The Study of Education in England. London: Humphrey Milford, 1943.

Cohen, Sir Andrew. British Policy in Changing Africa. Evanston: Northwestern Press, 1959.

Cole, Margaret. The Story of Fabian Socialism. London: Heinemann, 1961.

Cowan, L. Gray. The Dilemmas of African Independence. New York: Walker and Co., 1964.

Curle, Adam. Educational Strategy for Developing Societies. London: Tavistock Publications, 1963.

Davidson, Basil. Which Way Africa? London: Penquin African Library, 1964.

Du Bois, W. E. B. Dusk of Dawn. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1940.

_____. The Autobiography of W. E. B. Du Bois. New York: International Publishers, 1967.

_____. The World and Africa. New York: International Publishers, 1965.

Easton, Stewart C. The Rise and Fall of Western Colonialism. London: Pall Mall Press, 1964.

Elvin, Lionel. Education and the End of Empire. London: Evans Brothers Ltd., 1956.

Fanon, Frantz. Toward the African Revolution. New York: Grove Press, 1967.

_____. The Wretched of the Earth. New York: Grove Press, 1968.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

Fletcher, Basil A. Education and Colonial Development. London: Methuen and Co., 1936.

Foster, Philip. Education and Social Change in Ghana. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1965.

Furse, Sir Ralph. Aucuparius. London: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Gann, Lewis H. and Duignan, Peter. Burden of Empire. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1967.

Gree, F. C. A Comparative View of French and British Civilization. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., 1965.

Grimble, Sir Arthur. We Chose the Islands. New York: William Morrow and Co., 1952.

Hailey, Lord. African Survey. 2nd edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.

_____. Britain and Her Dependencies. London: Longmans Green and Co., 1943.

_____. The Future of Colonial Peoples. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1944.

_____. The Position of Colonies in a British Commonwealth of Nations. London: Oxford University Press, 1941.

Hans, Nicholas. Comparative Education: A Study of Educational Factors and Traditions. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1949.

Hanson, John W. and Brembeck, Cole S. (eds.). Education and the Development of Nations. New York: Holt, Rinehardt and Winston, 1966.

Harbison, Frederick H. and Myers, Charles A. Education, Manpower and Economic Growth. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Hauser, Charles J. Guide to Decision: The Royal Commission. Totowa, N. J.: Bedminster Press, 1965.

Helser, Albert D. Education of Primitive People. London: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1934.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

Herskovitz, Melville. The Human Factor in Changing Africa. New York: Alfred A. Knopt, Inc., 1962.

Heussler, Robert. Yesterday's Rulers. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1963.

Hilliard, F. H. A Short History of Education in British West Africa. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1957.

Hinden, Rita. Common Sense and Colonial Development. London: Fabian Colonial Bureau, 1949.

Hogg, William Richey. Ecumenical Foundations. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952.

Howitt, William. Colonization and Christianity. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1838.

Hunter, Guy. Education for a Developing Region: A Study in East Africa. London: Allen and Unwin, 1963.

Ikejiani, Dr. Okechukwu (ed.). Nigerian Education. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1965.

Ingrams, Harold. Arabia and the Isles. London: J. Murray, 1942.

Inter-Territorial 'Jeanes' Conference. Village Education in Africa. Lovedale, South Africa: Lovedale Press, 1936.

Jones, Thomas Jesse. Education in Africa. New York: Phelps-Stokes Fund, 1922.

Kaunda, Kenneth D. A Humanist in Africa. New York: Abingdon Press, 1968.

Keesing, Felix M. Education in Pacific Countries. London: Oxford University Press, 1938.

Kenyatta, Jomo. Facing Mount Kenya. London: Secker and Warburg, 1938.

Kirkman, W. P. Unscrambling An Empire: A Critique of British Colonial Policy, 1956-1966. London: Chatto and Windus, 1966.

Lancaster, Marie-Jacqueline (ed.). Brian Howard: Portrait of a Failure. London: Anthony Blond, Ltd., 1968.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

Lewis, L. J. Education and Political Independence in Africa. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1962.

_____. Educational Policy and Practice in British Tropical Areas. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1954.

_____. Partnership in Overseas Education. London: Evans Brothers, Ltd., 1959.

_____. Phelps-Stokes Reports on Education in Africa. London: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Lugard, Sir F. D. (Lord). The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa. 4th edition. London: William Blackwood and Sons, Ltd., 1929.

Marsh, David C. The Changing Social Structure of England and Wales, 1871-1961. Revised 1965. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1958.

Mason, R. J. British Education in Africa. London: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Mayhew, Arthur. Education in the Colonial Empire. London: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., 1938.

Memmi, Albert. The Colonizer and the Colonized. New York: The Orion Press, 1965.

Mitchell, Frank W. Sir Fred Clarke. London: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., 1967.

Mumford, W. Bryant. A Comparative Study of Native Education in Various Dependencies. London: Evans Brothers, Ltd., 1937.

_____. Africans Learn To Be French. London: Evans Brothers, Ltd., 1937.

Murray, A. Victor. The School in the Bush. London: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., 1929.

Newton, A. P. (ed.). The Crucial Problem of Imperial Development. London: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., 1938.

Nicholson, Max. The System: The Misgovernment of Modern Britain. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

Nicol, Davidson. Africa—A Subjective View. London: Ghana University Press, 1964.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

Niculescu, Barbu. Colonial Planning: A Comparative Study. London: Allen and Unwin, 1958.

Nkrumah, Kwame. Africa Must Unite. London: Heinemann, Ltd., 1963.

_____. Consciencism. London: Heinemann, Ltd., 1969.

_____. Dark Days in Ghana. New York: International Publishers, 1968.

Nunn, Sir T. Percy. Education: Its Data and First Principle. 3rd edition. London: Edward Arnold, Ltd., 1945.

Nyerere, Julius K. Uhuru na Umoja. Nairobi: Oxford University Press, 1967.

_____. Ujamaa: Essays on Socialism. London: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Oldham, J. H. Christianity and the Race Problem. New York: George H. Doran Co., 1925.

Oldham, J. H. and Gibson, B. D. The Remaking of Man in Africa. London: Oxford University Press, 1931.

Oldham, J. H. and Visser't Hooft. The Church and Its Function in Society. New York: Willett, Clark and Co., 1937.

Oldham, J. H., et al. Church, Community and State in Relation to Education. New York: Willett, Clark and Co., 1938.

Oliver, Roland. The Missionary Factor in East Africa. 2nd edition. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1952.

Padmore, George. How Britain Rules Africa. New York: Lothrop, Lee and Shepard, Co., 1936.

Perham, Margery (Dame). The Colonial Reckoning. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.

_____. Lugard: The Years of Authority, 1898-1945. London: Collins, 1960.

Perkins, Whitney T. Denial of Empire. Leyden: A. W. Sythoff, 1962.

Piper, Don C. and Cole, Taylor (ed.). Post-Primary Education and Political and Economic Development. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1964.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

Quigg, Philip W. Africa. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1964.

Read, Margaret. Africans and Their Schools. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1953.

_____. Education and Cultural Tradition. London: Evans Brothers, Ltd., 1950.

_____. Education and Social Change in Tropical Areas. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1955.

Robinson, Kenneth. The Dilemmas of Trusteeship. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Robinson, Kenneth and Madden, Frederick (ed.). Essays in Imperial Government. Oxford: Basil Blackwell,1963.

Rotberg, Robert I. A Political History of Tropical Africa. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1965.

Sayers, R. S. A History of Economic Change in England, 1880-1939. London: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Selormey, Francis. The Narrow Path. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966.

Smith, Edwin W. Aggrey of Africa. 10th edition. London: Students Christian Movement Press, 1937.

Smith, George Albert, Jr. Policy Formulation and Administration. Homewood, Ill.: R. D. Irwin, 1962.

Stewart, Michael. Keynes and After. London: Penquin Books, Ltd., 1967.

Strickland, C. F. Co-operation for Africa. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.

Strackey, John. The End of Empire. London: Victor Gollancz, Ltd., 1959.

Symonds, Richard. The British and Their Successors. London: Faber and Faber, 1966.

Tanner, Ralph S. Transition in Africa Beliefs. Mary Knoll, New York: Mary Knoll Publications, 1967.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

Vickers, Sir Geoffrey. The Art of Judgment. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. Social Change. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Ward, W. E. F. Educating Young Nations. London: Allen and Unwin, 1959.

_____. Fraser of Trinity and Achimota. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Williams, C. Kingsley. Achimota—The Early Years. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1962.

Wilson, John. Education and Changing West African Culture. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia, 1963.

Westermann, Diedrich. The African Today and Tomorrow. London: Oxford University Press, 1949.

Wilson, William J. (ed.). The Church in Africa. New York: Mary Knoll Publications, 1967.

Wraith, Ronald E. Guggisberg. London: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Wyndham, H. A. Native Education: Ceylon, Java, Formosa, the Philippines, French Indo-China, and British Malaya. London: Oxford University Press, 1935.

ARTICLES

"Achimota," The Round Table, Vol. XVI, No. 61 (December, 1925), pp. 78-95.

Azikiwe, Ben N. "How Shall We Educate the African?" Journal of African Society, Vol. 33, No. 131 (April, 1934), pp. 143-151.

Beck, Ann. "Colonial Policy and Education in British East Africa," Journal of British Studies, Vol. 5 (May, 1966), pp. 115-138.

Blackmore, J. T. C. "The Educational Work of the French Government in Algeria," The International Review of Missions, Vol. XIX, No. 74 (April, 1930), pp. 266-276.

Charmian, Cannon. "The Influence of Religion on Educational Policy," British Journal of Educational Studies, Vol. XII, No. 2 (May, 1964), pp. 143-160.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

Cavenagh, Prof. F. A. "The Development of Educational Thought in the United Kingdom, 1920-1935," The Yearbook of Education (1936), pp. 270-292.

Clarke, J. D. "Aim and Adaptation in Education," Oversea Education, Vol. V, No. 4 (July, 1934), pp. 164-168.

Clarke, Sir Fred. "An Education Institute for the Empire." Oversea Education, Vol. III, No. 3 (April, 1932), pp. 105-110.

_____. "The Conflict of Philosophies," The Yearbook of Education (1936), pp. 249-269.

_____. "The Double Mind in African Education," Africa, Vol. 5, No. 2 (April, 1932), pp. 158-168.

Cooper, Rt. Hon. A. Duff. "The Future Development of the British Empire," United Empire, Vol. XXXIV, No. 2 (March, April, 1943), pp. 32-34.

Cox, Sir Christopher. "The Impact of British Education on the Indigenous People of Overseas Territories," The Advancement of Science, No. 50 (September, 1956), pp. 125-136.

Currie, Sir James. "The Educational Experiment in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, 1900-1933," Journal of the African Society, Vol. 33, No. 133 (October, 1934), pp. 361-371. Also, Vol. 34, No. 134 (January, 1935), pp. 41-59.

Dougall, J. W. C. "Education and Evangelism," International Review of Missions, Vol. 36, No. 143 (July, 1947), pp. 313-323.

_____. "Thomas Jesse Jones: Crusader for Africa," International Review of Missions, Vol. 39, No. 155 (July, 1950), pp. 311-317.

Du Bois, W. E. B. "Back to Africa," Century Magazine, Vol. 105, (February, 1923), pp. 539-548.

_____. "Britain's Negro Problem in Sierra Leone," Current History Magazine (New York Times), Vol. 21 (February, 1925), pp. 690-700.

_____. "Worlds of Color," Foreign Affairs, Vol. III, No. 3 (April, 1925), pp. 423-444.

Evans, P. C. C. "Education and Productivity in Under-Developed Areas," Nature, Vol. 178 (November 3, 1956), pp. 951-954.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

Forster, L. "The Vernacular Schools of Hong Kong," Oversea Education, Vol. III, No. 3 (April, 1932), p. 139.

Fortes, M. "The Scope of Social Anthropology," Oversea Education, Vol. X, No. 3 (April, 1939), pp. 125-130.

Fraser, A. G. "Aims of African Education," The International Review of Missions, Vol. 15 (October, 1925), pp. 514-522.

_____. "Education and Responsibility," International Review of Missions, Vol. 23, No. 89 (April, 1934), pp. 172-185.

_____. "Educational and Vocational Training," Oversea Education, Vol. III, No. 2 (January, 1932), pp. 71-73.

Gammans, Capt. L. D. (M.P.) "Post-War Colonial Policy," United Empire, Vol. XXXIV, No. 5 (September-October, 1943), pp. 144-147.

Gordon, Dr. H. L. "The Mental Capacity of the African," Journal of the Royal African Society, Vol. 33, No. 132 (July, 1934), pp. 226-242.

Greaves, L. B. "The Educational Advisorship in East Africa," International Review of Missions, Vol. 36, No. 143 (July, 1947), pp. 329-337.

Hailey, Lord. "Recent Trends in Colonial Policy," The Colonial Review, Vol. 1, No. 3 (December, 1939), p. 64.

Haldane, Prof. J. B. S. "Educational Problems of the Colonial Territories," Nature, Vol. 176 (August 20, 1955), pp. 319-322.

Hatch, John. "Africa's Contribution to Socialism," New Statesman (September 20, 1968), pp. 342-343.

Huxley, Elspeth. "British Aims in Africa," Foreign Affairs, Vol. XXVIII, No. 1 (October, 1949), pp. 43-55.

Lacey, A. T. "Method Versus Aim in African Education," Oversea Education, Vol. IV, No. 4 (July, 1933), pp. 163-165.

Lewin, Evans. "The Black Cloud in Africa," Foreign Affairs, Vol. IV, No. 4 (July, 1926), pp. 637-647.

Lewis, L. J. "The British Contribution to Education in Africa," The Journal of the Royal Society of Arts, Vol. 109, No. 5033 (December, 1960), pp. 32-46.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

Lugard, F. D. "Education and Race Relations," Journal of the African Society, Vol. 32, No. 126 (January, 1933), pp. 1-11.

_____. "Education in Tropical Africa," Edinburgh Review, Vol. 242, No. 493 (July, 1925), pp. 1-19.

_____. "English in the Schools," Times (December 30, 1927), p. 11.

_____. "Future of the Colonies," Times (July 24, 1941).

_____. "Some Colonial Problems of Today," United Empire, Vol. XXVII, No. 12 (December, 1936), pp. 661-672.

_____. "The Case for Imperialism," The Colonial Review, Vol. 1. No. 3 (December, 1939), p. 65.

_____. "The Mandate System," Edinburgh Review, Vol. 238, No. 486 (October, 1923), pp. 398-408.

_____. "The White Man's Task in Tropical Africa," Foreign Affairs, Vol. V, No. 1 (October, 1926), pp. 57-68.

_____. "U.S. and British Colonies—Self-Government the Aim," Times (November 26, 1942), p. 5.

Macmillan, W. H. "The Importance of the Educated African," Journal of African Society, Vol. 33, No. 131 (April, 1934), pp. 137-142.

Malinowski, B. "Native Education and Culture Contact," International Review of Missions, Vol. 25, No. 100 (October, 1936), pp. 480-515.

_____. "The Limits of Functional Anthropology: Methods of Study of Culture Contact in Africa," Africa, Vol. XI (1938).

May, J. C. and Killby, L. G. "Sir James Currie," The Empire Cotton Growing Review, Vol. XIV, No. 3 (July, 1937), pp. 185-188.

Mayhew, Arthur. "A Comparative Survey of Educational Aims and Methods in British India and British Tropical Africa," Africa, Vol. VI, No. 2 (April, 1933), pp. 172-186.

_____. "Aims and Method of Indigenous Education in Primitive Societies," Oversea Education, Vol. X, No. 2 (January, 1939), pp. 68-74.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

Mayhew, Arthur. "Report of the Commission on Higher Education in the Colonies," Oversea Education, Vol. XVII, No. 1 (October, 1945), pp. 198-203.

_____. "Some Impressions on Education," Oversea Education, Vol. VIII, No. 2 (January, 1937), pp. 57-68.

McCulloch, Robert W. "Question Time in the House of Commons," American Political Science Review, Vol. XXVII, No. 6 (December, 1933), pp. 971-977.

McLean, Sir William H. "Balanced Expenditure of Colonial Revenues," The Crown Colonist (n.d.).

_____. "Colonial Economic and Social Development," The Crown Colonist (May, 1940), pp. 219-223.

Monroe, Paul. "Mission Education and National Policy," International Review of Missions, Vol. X, No. 39 (July, 1921), pp. 321-350.

Mumford, Dr. W. Bryant. "A Comparative Study of Native Education in Various Dependencies," 1936 Yearbook of Education. London: Evans Brothers, 1937.

_____. "Education in Tanganyika," Journal of African Society, Vol. 34, No. 135 (April, 1935), pp. 198-200.

_____. "The Conference on Native Education in Johannesburg," Journal of African Society, Vol. 33, No. 133 (October, 1934), pp. 411-413.

Murray, Prof. A. Victor. "Education Under Indirect Rule," Journal of the Royal African Society, Vol. XXXIV, No. 136 (July, 1935), pp. 227-268.

Nkrumah, Francis Nwia-Kofi. "Education and Nationalism in Africa," Education Outlook, Vol. 18 (November, 1943), pp. 32-40.

Oldham, J. H. "A New Beginning of International Missionary Co-operation," International Review of Missions, Vol. IX, No. 36 (October, 1920), pp. 481-494.

_____. "After Twenty-Five Years," International Review of Missions, Vol. 24, No. 95 (July, 1935), pp. 297-313.

_____. "Development in the Relations Between White and Black in Africa," Twenty Year Report of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, 1911-1931.

_____. "Educational Policy of the British Government in Africa," International Review of Missions, Vol. XIV, No. 55 (July, 1925), pp. 421-427.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

Oldham, J. H. "The Christian Mission in Africa," International Review of Missions, Vol. XVI, No. 61 (January, 1927), pp. 24-35.

_____. "The Educational Work of Missionary Societies," Africa, Vol. VII (1934), pp. 47-59.

_____. "The Success and Failure of Western Education in India," International Review of Missions, Vol. XV, No. 60 (October, 1926), pp. 692-703.

Ormsby-Gore, W. G. A. (later Lord Harlech). "Pooling Colonial Experience," United Empire, Vol. XXVII, No. 11 (November, 1936), pp. 613-615.

_____. "The British Commonwealth Education Conference," Overseas Education, Vol III, No. 1 (October, 1931), pp. 1-6.

_____. "The Meaning of 'Indirect Rule': A View of Cameron's Principles of Native Administration," Journal of African Society, Vol. 34, No. 136 (1935), pp. 283-286.

Perham, Margery (later Dame). "Education for Self-Government," Foreign Affairs, Vol. 24, No. 1 (October, 1945), pp. 130-142.

_____. "Some Problems of Indirect Rule in Africa," Journal of the African Society, Vol. 34, No. 135, (April, 1935), supplement.

_____. "The British Problem in Africa," Foreign Affairs, Vol. XXIX, No. 4 (July, 1951), pp. 637-650.

Rivers-Smith, S. "The Education of Backward Peoples," Oversea Education, Vol. III, No. 2 (January, 1932), pp. 60-67.

Sadler, Sir Michael E. "Education for Life and Duty," International Review of Missions, Vol. X, No. 40 (October, 1920), pp. 495-516.

_____. "Village Education in India," International Review of Missions, Vol. IX, No. 36 (October, 1920), pp. 495-516.

Scott, H. S. "Educational Policy and Problems in the African Colonies: General Survey," Yearbook of Education (1940), pp. 473-481.

_____. "Educational Policy in the British Colonial Empire," Yearbook of Education, (1937), pp. 411-438.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

Scott, H. S. "Report of the Commission on Higher Education in West Africa," Oversea Education, Vol. XVII, No. 1 (October, 1945), pp. 193-197.

_____. "The Development of the Education of the African in Relation to Western Contact," Yearbook of Education, (1938), pp. 693-739.

Sikatana, Eleazar. "A Jeanes School Teacher at Work in Northern Rhodesia," Oversea Education, Vol. VII, No. 3 (April, 1936), pp. 132-136.

Smith, Anthony. "British Colonial Education Policy—Tanganyika: A Variation on the Theme," Paedagogica Historica, Vol. 2 (1965), pp. 435-454.

Snell, Lord. "England and Empire," United Empire, Vol. XXVII, No. 11 (November, 1936), pp. 610-613.

Stanley, Rt. Hon. Oliver. "A Visit to West and East Africa," United Empire, Vol. XXXV, No. 1 (January-February, 1944), pp. 10-15.

Strickland, C. F. "The Co-operative Movement in Africa," Journal of Royal African Society, Vol. 34, No. 134 (January, 1935), supplement.

Van Der Poel, Dr. Jean. "Native Education in South Africa," Journal of Royal African Society, Vol. 34, No. 136 (July, 1935), pp. 313-331.

Vischer, Sir Hanns. "Mass Education in African Society," Africa, Vol. XIV (April, 1944), pp. 336-339.

_____. "The Place of Adult Education in African Life," West African Review, Vol. XVI, (January, 1945), pp. 15-17.

Ward, W. E. F. "Gold Coast Music in Education," Oversea Education, Vol. V, No. 2 (January, 1934), pp. 64-71.

_____. "This Mass Education Business," Oversea Education, Vol. XIX, No. 3 (April, 1948), pp. 678-682.

_____. "Mass Education in the Colonies," Journal of the Royal Society of Arts, Vol. XCVII, No. 4792 (April 8, 1949), pp. 326-338.

_____. "A New Attitude to Education," Oversea Education, Vol. XX, No. 4 (July, 1949), pp. 912-917.

_____. "The Beecher Report on African Education in Kenya," Oversea Education, Vol. 24, No. 4 (January, 1953), pp. 13-19.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Concluded)

Ward, W. E. F. "Educational Progress in Britain's Dependencies Since 1945," Education Forum, Vol. 22 (May, 1958), pp. 445-446.

Westermann, Diedrich. "The Place and Function of the Vernacular in African Education," International Review of Missions, Vol. XIV, No. 53 (January, 1925), pp. 25-36.

_____. "The International Institute of African Languages and Culture," International Review of Missions, Vol. 26, No. 104 (October, 1937), pp. 493-499.

Williams, Garfield H. "Relations with Government in Education: British Colonies in Tropical Africa," International Review of Missions, Vol. XIV, No. 53 (January, 1925), pp. 3-24.

Wrong, Margaret. "Colonial Development and Welfare," International Review of Missions, Vol. 29, No. 116 (October, 1940), pp. 470-476.

OE 6000 (REV. 9-66)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACCESSION NO.	CLEARINGHOUSE ACCESSION NUMBER	RESUME DATE	P.A.	T.A.
		10-19-70		

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES [X] NO [ ]

ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES [ ] NO [X]

TITLE

The Formulation of British Colonial Education Policy, 1923-1948

Final Report and Ph.D. Thesis

PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)

Clatworthy, F. James

INSTITUTION (SOURCE) The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, School of Education — SOURCE CODE

REPORT/SERIES NO. 07498-2-F

OTHER SOURCE Author's present affiliation: Oakland University, Rochester, Mich. — SOURCE CODE

OTHER REPORT NO.

OTHER SOURCE — SOURCE CODE

OTHER REPORT NO.

PUB'L. DATE 8 - - 70 | CONTRACT/~~XXXXX~~ NUMBER OE-6-10-050, Project No. 5-8235

PAGINATION, ETC.

214 p.

RETRIEVAL TERMS

British Colonial Education Policy; Axiological Synecology; Humanistic Heuristic Policy

IDENTIFIERS Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies, Dr. J. H. Oldham, Lord Lugard, Sir Michael Sadler, Sir Christopher Cox, W.E.F. Ward, Prof. Fred Clarke

ABSTRACT

The study investigates the formation of British colonial education policy and examines the hypothesis that policies formulated by the Advisory Committee on Education reflected a continuous attempt to direct education policy in the colonies to the local needs for human resource development. The use of open-ended interviews led to a large collection of primary source materials which otherwise would have been unavailable. An analysis of these data substantiates the hypothesis and further discloses that the framers of the first official policy statement on colonial education issued in 1925, and subsequent statements, were aware of the necessary correlation between education policy and policies in other areas. The key personalities who served on the Committee used what influence they could effectively exert to change other areas of colonial policy but were only partially successful. The autochthonous structure of the colonial empire and the failure of the Colonial Office to coordinate the value guidelines across the total socio-economic and political spectrum resulted in only partial fulfillment, as recognized by the Committee, of an education policy guided by a humanistic principle of education for community development. Perhaps the British experience of cross-cultural educational planning offers a significant model for further study into the use of heuristic policy which establishes value guidelines for the total synecological approach to the problems of development, or the problems of developed nations in amelioration of inequitable socio-economic conditions.