

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

JUBILEE LECTURES

Delivered in the Beveridge Hall, the Senate
House, during the Spring Term, 1952, in
celebration of the foundation of the
Institute as the London Day
Training College on
6 October, 1902

Published for The University of London Institute
of Education by Evans Brothers Limited, London

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTITUTE IN RELATION TO THE COLONIES

Sir Christopher Cox

the Secretary of State for the Colonies in the Chair

It is indeed fitting that one of the lectures in this Jubilee series should be upon "The Development of the Institute in relation to the Colonies": for the Institute's relationship to the Colonies has been a distinctive and increasingly important part, not only of its own history, but of the history of Colonial education. Its Colonial work, indeed, is unique; I know of nothing comparable.

This side of the Institute's work is still young. The year 1952 marks not the Jubilee, but the Silver Jubilee, of the explicit and special connection between the Institute, or, as it then was, the London Day Training College, and Colonial education. It was in January, 1927, that Dr. Percy Nunn first became a member of the Colonial Office Advisory Committee on Native Education in Tropical Africa. It was at Dr. Nunn's first meeting that the Committee gave its blessing to the special course which, at its request, he was prepared to arrange at the College for missionaries who were to take charge of training colleges in Tanganyika. It was at his next meeting just twenty-five years ago—on February 17 1927—that, to quote from the Committee's minutes, "it was decided to inform the Secretary of State that in the view of the Committee it is very desirable that some postgraduate course should be adopted for educational candidates" for what we should now call the Colonial Education Service, "and to recommend that full particulars of such a course at the London Day Training College should be obtained from Dr. Nunn". It was later the same year that, under the enthusiastic leadership of Mr. Fairgrieve, a special course for a handful of missionaries actually began, and in the following year a further small batch of missionaries was joined, for the first time, by some half dozen United Kingdom probationers

destined for education departments in tropical Africa in taking, as an experiment, the Diploma course with certain special additions.

That was how it all started. Last year's Departmental Report referred to nearly 200 students, part- or whole-time, more than half of them Colonial teachers from the field itself, in a highly organized "Colonial Department for the Study of Education in Tropical Areas". From those first origins the work has thus grown remarkably in response to changing needs, and the history of its growth encourages us to believe that it will not only continue to develop and to exert a wide professional influence among the peoples whom it serves, but will increasingly become a source of mutual understanding and goodwill among the races of the Commonwealth.

The story of this growth is fascinating—so fascinating, indeed, that a week or two ago I made the disconcerting discovery that were I to deliver in this lecture the whole of my original typescript, you would still be sitting here—or perhaps it would be safer to say that I should still be standing here—at a quarter to eight. I hasten to add that I know well there is a limit to what even the patient and pious ears of a Jubilee audience can stand and I have made strenuous and I hope successful efforts to avoid overrunning my hour. At recent week-ends I have been rather like a man before a journey with half a dozen trunks full of stuff wondering what can be marked "NOT WANTED ON THE VOYAGE" and banished to the hold.

I mention this so that you will know that if the first part of my lecture—which must be historical—strikes you as being a bit bony in places, and the reflections which follow in the second part do not seem to be buttressed quite as stoutly as they should be, you may be able, for better or worse, to read a rather fuller version later on in the Jubilee publication in which the Director tells me this lecture series is to be embalmed.¹

¹ Pp. 59–79 as printed here do in fact include a number of passages from the unabridged typescript.

PART I

Studies of Colonial education as it has come to exist to-day usually begin with the 1866 of the Phelps-Stokes Educational Commissions to Africa, in the years following the First World War, and this is certainly the obvious starting-point of what I want to say this evening. But it may be easier to see the Institute's achievement in perspective if we recall for a moment that nearly 100 years earlier there had been a period, also the aftermath of storm, which was not wholly dissimilar in its formative opportunity. Then, in the convulsion that accompanied the Reform Bill of 1832, and the glow of creative idealism that immediately followed it, two events took place together which each had far-reaching consequences for Colonial education—the abolition of slavery and the legal sweeping away by Parliament of all inhibitions upon the employment of Indians in posts under the East India Company. From this last came Macaulay's minute and the historic decisions of 1835, which determined the main lines of educational policy in India for a century, which were in due course to set so much of the pattern for the educational framework of British non-self-governing territories in neighbouring parts of Asia, and the consequences of which were to influence those responsible for advising on educational policy in Africa nearly a century later. That same year saw the voting by Parliament of an annual grant, slightly larger than that which it had just begun to vote for education in this country, for helping voluntary bodies to educate freed slaves in British Colonies—for the most part, of course, in the West Indies, but apparently in the West African coastal settlements also and as far afield as Mauritius. The need for guidance on policy soon began to be felt, and a few years later the Colonial Office sought and got from the Educational Committee of the Privy Council what can be rightly called the first considered statement of the British Government on educational policy among non-European populations in the Colonies.¹ It was as notable a statement as one would expect from its signatory, Kay-Shuttleworth, but its main relevance to us to-day is,

¹ Cf. H. S. Scott, *The Yearbook of Education*, 1938, p. 708.

I am afraid, its lack of effect. The summary I had made of the three-quarters of a century of Colonial educational history that followed I must firmly consign to the hold. Education was certainly not static in these decades, for thanks almost entirely to the work of the missionary societies schools were established in increasing number; but so far as consistently held local educational policies are concerned, let alone a central Colonial educational policy and the machinery in London to help to give it effect, drift is perhaps not too strong a word to describe what happened.

And so we come to our real starting-point, and the period following another great convulsion, the First World War, which left behind it a quickened consciousness of the world scene and the conviction that a new historical epoch was beginning. The Colonial field was no exception, and attention was sharply focused on the importance of education in fulfilling the increasingly explicit purpose of guiding and helping Colonial peoples to stand on their own feet. The Phelps-Stokes Commission's first report, on their study of education in West and South Africa in 1920 and 1921, brought this right into the open. It provided for the first time a wide array of data, and made an immediate and lasting impression on several men in leading positions who were already deeply concerned—among them J. H. Oldham, Lugard, Guggisberg and Ormsby-Gore. After intensive discussion, Mr. Ormsby-Gore announced in Parliament, in 1923, the setting up of the Advisory Committee on Native Education in Tropical Africa (afterwards expanded into that on Education in the Colonies); and since then the machinery in London for constant review of Colonial educational needs has been continuously at work.

At an early meeting the Committee decided to draw up a memorandum on the broad principles of educational policy in Tropical Africa. This finally took shape in the White Paper of 1925—a document that has since been supplemented and modified but never wholly superseded. One of its most striking features was the welcome it gave to the widespread voluntary educational effort of the missionary societies, subject to Government's general direction of

educational policy on the one hand and the building up of a capable and enthusiastic educational service on the other. Immediately after adopting the White Paper, the Committee set to work on a further memorandum about staff. It was held that "for the proper discharge of the duties of an Education Officer it is essential that he should not only have a knowledge of the most recent developments in the science and technique of educational method, but that he should also have a knowledge of the habits of thought and motives of action, the traditions and the language of the community among whom he works". It was proposed that recruitment should no longer be confined to candidates of the right type already possessing professional qualifications, who were all too few, but should be widened to include the selection as probationers of candidates coming straight from the universities, and that these should be given special training in a postgraduate course of nine or twelve months before going oversea.

This is the point at which the Governor of Tanganyika's request for a special course to enable educational missionaries, particularly foreign missionaries, "to gain an insight into our educational methods and ideas" led to the invitation to Dr. Nunn to arrange this; and soon afterwards the London Day Training College, because of its reputation and resources and the standing, personality and keenness of its Principal, and in spite of the fact that probationers for the Colonial Administrative Service (as it now is) were to be trained at Oxford and Cambridge, became the centre for the postgraduate training of probationers for what later became the Colonial Education Service.

Since those beginnings the development of what is now the Institute in relation to the Colonies falls into four pretty clearly-marked periods—the first covering the early years and the worst part of the great slump when, under Sir Percy Nunn's Directorship, the special course was organized annually by Mr. Fairgrieve; the second, as the slump drew to an end, a period of vigorous revival and rapid expansion when the Colonial Department as it is to-day was reorganized and equipped and its reputation began to spread, with

Dr. Bryant Mumford as its head; the third period, which might have been a long winter sleep but was not, the Second World War, with Dr. Margaret Read holding the fort under the continued direction of Sir Fred Clarke; and, finally, the crowded post-war years, under Dr. Jeffery's Directorship, when the Institute itself has been transformed into an Area Training Organization and its Colonial work, in Professor Read's experienced hands, has thriven and adapted itself in sensitive response to the needs of a rapidly changing Colonial scene.

Period I. On the first period I must not dwell. Numbers were small and in its early years the course was regarded as experimental. Malaya and Hong Kong soon also began to participate, but just as the fourth course was starting the depression began and the supply of probationers for training dried up entirely for several years, during which time work was nevertheless continued mainly with experienced missionary teachers from the field. Dr. Nunn was throughout most helpful in meeting the demand from untrained men already in service, whether with mission or government, for some professional training while they were on leave, and in the year before the slump we find the Assistant Director of Education from an African territory taking the course alongside the probationers just before his appointment as Director; among the missionary students at this time, so Mr. Fairgrieve tells me, was a Roman Catholic bishop.

Throughout this early period the organization and administration of the course formed a voluntary and considerable addition to the duties of the Reader in Education, Mr. Fairgrieve, great teacher and pioneering philosopher in the teaching of geography for nearly a quarter of a century. Through the influence of those whom he taught, Fairgrieve has become a legend in his own lifetime, and the visitor to the Colonial field soon discovers that in no branch of teaching is there more informed enthusiasm among those who were trained here than in geography.

Period II. Mumford, who succeeded Fairgrieve in charge of the Colonial work on the latter's retirement in 1935, brought

with him many assets: knowledge of the field and its practical problems obtained in Tanganyika; unbounded energy; a fresh and enquiring mind; horizons that had been widened by study in Canada and the United States and by participation in study surveys of education in the Netherlands East Indies and French West Africa; a friendly accessible personality; and generous sympathies. A special trust created by his wife, the May Esther Bedford Fund, enabled him to translate many of his ideas into action.

At the very outset a grant from this Fund made possible the beginnings of the library, which was systematically supplemented each year until by the time war broke out the Institute's equipment for the study of Colonial education in the context of Colonial life and custom had already become second to none in this country. No single step could have done so much to provide, once and for all, the setting proper to an Institute of Education at a University, as the Day Training College had recently become. Nothing, too, could have done more to focus attention on the central problem in the Institute's Colonial work—namely, the peculiar difficulties that result from introducing Western schooling into the fabric of wholly different cultures.

An awakening to this problem had been one of the characteristics of the movement of the early 'twenties. It formed part of the decisive changes then occurring in progressive missionary circles, and it was one of the processes leading among other things to the establishment of the Advisory Committee, the selection of Major (later Sir) Hanns Vischer as its Secretary and the founding of the International Institute for African Languages and Cultures. It was marked by conscious reaction against mistakes made almost 100 years before in the determination of educational policy in India and by the widely held belief that hitherto the development of Western schooling in Africa had been the resultant not of pondered policy, but of forces operating more or less in the dark. Hence had come, at the opening of a period of expansion, the statement of principles in the 1925 White Paper; hence the importance given to the training of missionaries, to the establishment of a true partnership with

governments and to the building up of an Education Service with the right type of recruit given the right training.

But what was that to be? Events had brought the London Day Training College into the centre of the picture. Professionally this could not have been bettered. But was it equipped, could one in the nature of things expect it to be equipped, to prepare men and women to go out as educators from one culture to another culture, understanding what they were doing? One wonders, as one reads of those early debates on what the training should consist of and where it should be, and as one sees what a small proportion of recruits to education departments came to the Day Training College in those first years before the slump, whether Colonial governments and directors of education may not to start with have hesitated on that score. Some people too, as products of a self-contained part of the English educational system in which pre-service professional training played as a rule little part, may well in those days have wondered if "schoolmaster-craft", stressed by Nunn in the Advisory Committee as absolutely vital, might not be best learned on the job.

However that may be, after Mumford's arrival it could no longer be said that knowledge of the field was supplied only by some of the students and by the occasional lecturing visitors, and that the problem of adapting Western education to the needs of other cultures could not be studied. In his first term we find the organization of seminars—a method of study at the university level that has played a great part in the life of the Colonial Department ever since. We find, too, students of the Colonial Department at once attending Professor Malinowski's seminar at the London School of Economics "in which"—to quote—"fundamental aspects of African life and of the problems of education and administration were discussed". If too little had been said hitherto on what should be the central problem in educating future Colonial educators, it could not have been more drastically remedied than by this one step; Malinowski went straight from those seminars to deliver the addresses in South Africa the substance of which was afterwards printed in the article

"Native Education and Culture Contact".¹ This survey, by the pioneer of the anthropology of culture change, of the problems created by the impact of Western education on less developed societies lit up a field of study in which some fundamental questions could now be seen clearly for the first time in their appropriate setting.

The connection thus established with the Anthropology Department of the London School of Economics had its parallels in the ties already formed with the School of Oriental and African Studies and the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, while close relations were now being built up with a number of bodies outside the University, such as the International Institute of African Languages and Cultures, the Royal Empire Society, the Royal African Society, the Royal Institute of International Affairs and the International Missionary Council.

There is no time to speak to-day of other features of this period. Of Mumford's personal contribution, for example, to the study of comparative education among dependent peoples, for which he was especially qualified by the journeys that led to *Island India Goes to School* and *Africans Learn to be French*. Or of the powerful stimulus which *The Yearbook of Education*, first associated in these years with the Institute in a Joint Editorial Board, contributed to the development of Colonial educational studies focused upon the Institute, with one whole section breaking new ground in this field each year. Or of the conception of the Department as a clearing-house of information about Colonial dependencies, which was one of the most important consequences of the great growth of the Library. In particular I wish there were time to speak of the founding of *The Colonial Review*, a quarterly digest dealing with all aspects of life in the Colonies, and not only education. *The Colonial Review* soon established its value and has steadily maintained it since, under the wise editorship for the last eight or nine years of Mr. Harrison and in the early war years of Sir Herbert Scott, that staunch friend of the Institute whose continuous services to education in Africa also began just fifty years ago when, in 1902, he went

¹ *International Review of Missions*, xxv, 1936, pp. 480 ff.

out to train teachers in the Transvaal; they ended only with his sudden death early this year. The fact that such a journal, essentially colonial rather than educational, could have appeared almost as a by-product of the activities of the Colonial Department only ten years after the first experimental course at the London Day Training College, shows how far things had travelled from the days when it might have been said that the London connection had only professional authority, unsupported by Colonial knowledge or interests.

Fairly early in this second period, Sir Percy Nunn had been succeeded by Professor Fred Clarke, than whom, with his oversea experience including over twenty years in South Africa, the whole Commonwealth could have provided no one more keenly alive to the immense importance of this side of the Institute's work. The sociological historian, the prophet of critical self-awareness in educational thinking, the exposé of "the unconscious universalizing of what is distinctively English", the author of *The Double Mind in African Education*, cited so cordially by Malinowski, would need no initiation into those major problems which pre-occupied the successive heads of the Colonial Department. With Professor Fred Clarke as Director and Mumford as Head of the Colonial Department, there was indeed a bubbling of ideas and activity in the Institute's Colonial work during the years immediately preceding the war.

The direct interest of the Advisory Committee at the Colonial Office, which had been so deep in the early experimental years, but had lapsed with the temporary cessation of recruitment of Government probationers, was renewed when at the end of 1937 the Director asked that some medium of co-operation between the Colonial Office and the Colonial Department of the Institute should be established. He proposed that the Advisory Committee should nominate a Sub-Committee "to serve as a Consultative Committee for the Colonial Department of the Institute, to which it would like to refer all its projects and problems". In particular, the Director said, "it would seek

advice and guidance in pursuit of studies already embarked upon and in the selection of further topics of inquiry, whether by members of the staff or by senior students". The proposal was cordially endorsed and the Consultative Committee, which continues to-day, and on which the Advisory Committee, the Colonial Office and the Institute are represented, came into being.

The Consultative Committee's second report, presented two or three months before war broke out, was a thorough survey of the Colonial Department's activities up till that time, and contained a number of suggestions or opinions of which I will only mention three. The Committee endorsed the view that all those selected from this country for educational work in the Colonies, whether Government officers, missionaries or others, should take a properly devised course at the Colonial Department at some time or other during their service if it had not been practicable before they first went out; "experience at home or a training course not specially adapted to Colonial conditions was not a satisfactory equivalent for such a course". They set on record the great importance they attached to the information side of the Department's work which, they said, "not only renders valuable service to all those engaged in Colonial education, but also provides an almost indispensable background to the whole course of training in the Department". The Committee concluded by expressing the emphatic opinion that the three divisions of the Department's activities—namely, training, information and research—"are not really separable in any view of the Department as an actual working whole".

Such is the picture at the outbreak of war, just halfway through the quarter century that we are celebrating; and it may be noted in passing that both the Annual Reports of the Institute and the exhaustive early reports of the Consultative Committee are thinking solely in terms of those who have since then been christened "expatriates" and that there is no mention of Colonial students, even in the Consultative Committee's review of the probable expansion of the Colonial Department's work in the future.

Period III. The six years that followed were the second major setback in the story of the Institute's Colonial activities. The Institute itself migrated to the banks of the Trent, and with it went the handful of Colonial Department students who remained; but not the Department's staff, who, with its Research and Information Section, and the Library which fed them both, remained in London—initially to work with those invaders of the Institute building, the Ministry of Information, until Dr. Mumford left to take up other duties. The surprising thing is that in spite of all this the war years were for the Colonial Department a time of steady consolidation and in many ways of growth; a time in which its reputation was strengthened, new contacts innumerable made and maintained, the confidence of workers in the field quietly won; a time in which there had never been so much consultation of the Institute upon Colonial matters generally, nor a more generous and strenuous outpouring of work and counsel in response; a time of planning and methodical preparation and of putting down of roots deep enough to stand, as they have stood, all the strains and stresses of these post-war years. All this was partly because of two personalities: the Director of those years, Professor Fred Clarke, wise and beloved counsellor to us all, with whom, as with Sir Herbert Scott, I was only the other day talking over the subject of this lecture; and the colleague whom he asked to take charge of the Colonial Department in July, 1940, Dr. Margaret Read, about whom—in her presence—my lips must, I suppose, be sealed, though I cannot promise to eliminate her name entirely from what follows.

During the first four years of the war, then, until the Institute moved South again in the second half of 1943, the Colonial Department lived an arduous and useful, though rather peculiar, life of its own in London. Its story cannot be told here to-night. The Director got to know very well the main line scenery between London and Nottingham. So did the Department's Diploma and Certificate students, who came to London for a few weeks' concentrated study two or three times a year, when among other things intensive

Colonial Lecture Courses were arranged; the Special and Research students remained in London within access of the Library and tutorial staff. The Department undertook all sorts of special work on the information side. Enquiries poured in upon the Library, by visitor, telephone and letter, not only because it was the centre of professional study for Colonial education, but also because of the reputation it had now acquired as a centre and clearing-house of information on Colonial matters generally. It was in line with the Colonial Department's special interest in comparative education in Mumford's time that the Department should use to the full its strange wartime opportunities to establish close touch with representatives of the Allied governments then exiled in London, and should both give help and receive it. Most dramatic was the rapid improvisation by the Colonial Department acting jointly with the School of Oriental and African Studies of special courses, given in French, in the autumn and spring terms of 1940-1, and repeated the following winter, for French men or women going out to Colonial territories that had declared for the Free French; Lord Lugard and, I need hardly say, Sir Hanns Vischer were prominent among those who helped to launch these courses on the British side, and those at French Headquarters who took an active interest in the lectures included the Prime Minister of a few weeks ago, M. Plevén. Free French, Dutch and Belgian Government departments all helped the Department in its own Colonial Lecture Courses, and in their turn drew freely on the material in the Library, while help was also given to Czechs and Poles. Other international and Commonwealth contacts multiplied—American, South African, Chinese—and the Department's knowledge of tropical education and training was drawn upon from right across the globe by the Australian Army authorities when starting up civil administration in New Guinea after the campaigns. In fact, the Colonial Department's life in these wartime years, with its simultaneous deprivations and enrichments, is a not unfaithful mirror of a London that somehow seemed to be at once oecumenical and beleaguered.

The return of the Institute in 1943 from its Nottingham exile for the last two sessions of the war marked a change in the character and mood of its Colonial work, which in spite of all the continuing wartime limitations begins to assume the shape of things to come. The restoring of a better balance to the work of the Colonial Department is one sign of this. Another is the more frequent presence of Colonials among the Department's students. Rare hitherto, Colonials and Sudanese provide five out of eleven Colonial Department students in 1943-4, and in the last session of the war no less than fourteen out of twenty-three, itself the largest total of students since war began; the fourteen included Africans from Nigeria, Gold Coast, Sierra Leone and Uganda, West Indians from British Guiana and Antigua, and one Sudanese who for the last four years has been the Sudan's first Minister of Education. In these years too the place which the Colonial Department had now come to fill in the minds of the Colonial Education Service becomes almost embarrassingly evident as more and more of its members, and many missionaries also, formed the habit of using it as a port of call and consultation while on leave—a two-way exchange in which the callers enriched their consultants. All this promoted the Department's cross-fertilizing processes and gave vitality to its work. It was a time of active preparation for the future, when close concern with the post-war Colonial world had become a realistic and pressing duty.

That there was to be a great forward movement in education in most Colonial territories the moment the war ended had throughout been an underlying assumption and aim. The Colonial Development and Welfare Act provided the basis for a stocktaking and projected forward move in virtually every territory. So we find, in territory after territory, an overhaul of educational policy as the starting-point for a forward advance in the coming era and a great increase in the number of reports and proposals coming forward for the Secretary of State's approval. However discouraging the prospect of actual progress in carrying out new plans during the war, for lack of staff and materials, there was everything to be said for getting policy and programmes as

far forward as possible, so that in that respect nothing need impede the passage from paper to action as action at any point became a possibility, and the greatest Colonial power might at the moment of victory be found poised and ready to identify herself with educational advance in all the territories. The Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies had never been busier than in these middle and later war years, and in all this activity both the Director and Dr. Read were closely and continuously concerned.

In this planning and preparation two particular fields of educational policy were judged to be of outstanding importance at that time and to require the special and prolonged consideration which they received in the second half of the war: higher education and mass education (or, as it is more commonly called to-day, community development). On the bodies tendering counsel in both these fields, the Institute, through the Director or the Head of the Colonial Department or both, played its full part. In higher education Dr. Read served on the West African Elliot Commission, and one naturally suspects her hand in the chapter on teacher training that pointed the way to the first Institute of Education in West Africa; while on the Asquith Commission, whose Report has been the charter of the general higher educational achievement in the Colonies since the war, Sir Fred Clarke, fresh from the McNair Committee, is in his turn likely to have moulded the chapter on the university's function in the training of teachers at Colonial university institutions. As one of the three members from the University of London Sir Fred will have made his contribution, too, to the historic decision of the University to which our chairman has paid tribute.

The counterpart to this work on higher education was the prolonged attention given by the Advisory Committee, through a strong Sub-Committee, to mass education in the sense of the education of the whole community, outside as well as inside the school system. At the outset emphasis had inevitably been upon the proper development of a school system; even in the Committee's 1935 memorandum on *The Education of African Communities* it was the school's concern

with the improvement of the life of the community and its relationship with other agencies for improving community life that were dwelt upon; now, at the height of the war, and under the influence of evidence of accelerating change, the stress was laid on a filling out of the picture of community-conscious and accelerated school education by the education of adolescents and adults so that, as redefined a few years later, mass education would mean a movement "to promote better living for the whole community, with the active participation and if possible on the initiative of the community" itself and at any rate with "its active and enthusiastic response",¹ Sir Fred Clarke blazed the trail for the Sub-Committee's main report in a powerful memorandum; while the comprehensive annexure reviewing the task of planning and operating a system of mass education in Colonial territories was drafted by Dr. Margaret Read, who in so doing provided a quarry of rich material and suggestion for workers in the field, far beyond the African territories for which the Report was written.

Even after that Report was finished,² I notice that in the last session of the war the Head of the Department could still record that in various Colonial Office Committees and Sub-Committees she had been present at forty-four half-day meetings as well as at eighteen whole day meetings with the Elliot Commission, to which Sir Fred Clarke's Asquith Commission and Advisory Committee attendances have to be added for good measure. The Institute had certainly contributed to the preparations for the post-war Colonial world.

Period IV. And so we come to the post-war years. Both time and prudence suggest that I should not try to describe you to your faces—and I will only draw attention to one or two of the features which the future historian isn't likely to omit in describing this present period of the Institute's Colonial activities, over which Dr. Jeffery has presided with such vigour and distinction. He will at once remark the great increase in the size of the Department, with the numbers

¹ *The Encouragement of Initiative in African Society* (African, No. 1,174), p. 7.

² *Mass Education in African Society* (Colonial, No. 186).

mounting every year until last year its records show about four times the highest pre-war figure. He will note that there are more probationary education officers than before, and that missionary students, particularly from Commonwealth states and from foreign countries, still form a substantial quota. But the transformation which will hold the future historian's attention will be the dramatic increase in the number of Colonial students themselves. Nothing could be more significant of the post-war educational advance in the Colonial territories, and of the central importance of the overseas scholarship programme, than this contrast with the pre-war picture when the presence of a Colonial student at the Institute was something of an event. After the first post-war year or two, Colonial nationals will be seen to outnumber all the other students in the Department, and there were also studying at the Institute other Colonial teachers who, as subject specialists, did not take courses in the Colonial Department at all.

What will stand out in this period too will be the high proportion of the Department's students who are picked men and—most significantly—women, of mature overseas experience, and the ways in which this is reflected in the Department's work: renewed emphasis, for instance, on the personal tutorial system; further developments in the use of the seminar; the increasing part played by the Institute's Associateship course; and the great popularity of the three-week period given to the Rural Surveys.

One development in particular of the seminar system in this context will certainly call for special note. The significance of what now became a yearly seminar on the education of women and girls was greatly enhanced by the presence at the Institute in growing numbers of experienced Colonial women teachers, and this in itself reflects the progress at last being made in overtaking the leeway in girls' education which for far too many territories is probably—poverty apart—the greatest single obstacle to their educational progress.

The value of the Associateship course, in which the standards applied both for admission and to the final thesis are stiff, lies in the scope given to experienced teachers "for

work along lines of individual interests . . . made possible by the freedom from writing for an examination and attending required courses of lectures"; extensive visiting is usually required by the nature of the subjects chosen for investigation, the studies being pursued much more on research lines. The numbers admitted have increased, and last year the sixteen studying for the Associateship comprised nationals of the West Indies, British Guiana, Gold Coast, Nigeria, Mauritius and Fiji, as well as of the U.S.A. More than half the studies undertaken by Associates hitherto have been in the field of comparative study of rural education in this country and their home territory, particularly in relation to community needs.

The Rural Surveys, in which mixed groups of students with a tutor spend three weeks in a rural area of an English or Welsh county and carry out "a general survey of the community life and the part played by all the agents of education in it", will, I think, be judged to have had a manifold value, both social and educational; not least in that they do something to mitigate the rather unnatural concentration of Colonial educational studies inside the world's largest metropolis, and thereby reinforce the Department's very necessary policy of helping all Colonial students to get out of London and visit conferences, camps and summer schools of all kinds in different parts of the United Kingdom during vacations. The discovery "that in the countryside there exists, in fact, almost a different culture", "the chance of studying the educational system on a measurable scale", the opportunity, after living deep in the area for two or three weeks, of taking part on the spot in warm discussion of, for example, the Cardiganshire parents' firm conviction that the only true secondary education is at the grammar school or the many ramifications of the closing of small rural schools in Cumberland—these are only some of the reasons why this part of the course is so much valued. The Surveys indeed help to illustrate each of the three main purposes which the Department's prospectus ascribes to its various special courses: "to relate the educational methods practised in England to the conditions in

tropical areas, to indicate the interrelations of education and other social services, and to give an introduction both to the sociological background of education and to methods of studying different social systems".

The historian will note in passing the consolidation of the sociological element in the foundations of a Department concerned with the educational impact of one culture upon others, and he will see this reflected in the Head of the Department's inaugural lecture on "Education and Cultural Tradition in Dependent Territories" after her own work, and the Department's, had been recognized by the creation of a Chair of Education with special reference to Colonial Areas. He will note too the keen response of students to what for most of them was "a wholly new line of approach", and the small advanced seminar each year fostering "research on problems of education and social change in tropical areas".

It is probably also in this field of the application of social anthropological data and techniques to educational problems more than in any other that the Colonial Department's material and experience has been used by the relatively small number of students taking higher degrees in the Institute's Department for Advanced Studies. At the same time studies like those by which Mr. Bartels of the Gold Coast and Father Walsh from Nigeria have added sections to "the mosaic of West African educational history", will be noted as examples of the increasing use made in these years of the Department's rich documentary material and the encouragement given by the Professor to the charting of this neglected realm of social historical research, throwing light as it does on the sometimes perplexing educational pattern inherited by individual Colonies to-day.

I have only just time to mention another type of mature post-war student, with the rather cryptic label "Second Devonshires"—members of the administrative and professional branches of the Colonial Service brought back to this and other universities for a second period of training.¹ The Colonial Department has in particular been able to

¹ As recommended by the Duke of Devonshire's wartime Committee on post-war training for the Colonial Service.

provide for the special interest of the surprisingly high proportion of Colonial Administrative Service officers taking the general course at the London School of Economics who choose community development as a special or additional subject. This illustrates the extent to which the Department has become the focus for studies in this field since the war. In 1948 the Institute accepted an invitation by the Secretary of State for the Colonies to act, through its Colonial Department, "as the official clearing-house and bureau of information on mass education" (or community development), and a Development and Welfare Grant made possible the editing and distribution of *The Community Development Bulletin*. With its wealth of catalogued material to draw upon, the Department could feed not only the community development seminars required for the Second Devonshire Administrative Service officers just referred to, but the much larger Second Devonshire gatherings at the residential week-end conferences on community development now organized annually at High Leigh and, at a higher level, the special two- or three-week courses for selected senior officers from several branches of the Service which were held in 1950 and 1951 with the purpose of initiating a period of much more attention to this type of training in the field.

The justification for basing this work upon the Institute was, of course, that in this setting those participating were never likely to lose sight of the fact that the approach to all these strenuously argued problems of achieving the raising of standards of life in undeveloped rural areas by self-help has to be educational; that it is in fact an exercise under other names in informal adult education as applied to whole communities. It is not without significance that the concept of "fundamental education" formulated in its first years by U.N.E.S.C.O. and playing so prominent a part in its programmes for undeveloped countries to-day should have had a content so nearly resembling that of concepts of mass education or community development in our own thinking here. The Head of the Colonial Department, as a member of the United Kingdom delegation at the early full-dress conferences of U.N.E.S.C.O. at Paris and at Mexico City,

found herself one of the very small band of experts in this particular subject, and her influence both then and as a consultant to the U.N.E.S.C.O. Secretariat have had, I think, a good deal to do with the shaping of the "fundamental education" concept and with the decision to emphasize U.N.E.S.C.O.'s function as a central international clearing-house in this field.

That there should be close links between the two clearing-houses—U.N.E.S.C.O.'s in Paris and the Colonial Department's here—was in line with the Department's deliberate policy of responding whenever possible to the constant demands for help in "lecturing to outside bodies, attending conferences and writing articles and reviews" which the staff's specialized knowledge of international as well as Colonial education brought upon them. It was recognized that the Department, in giving its co-operation, had not only a duty to help the Colonies, but a responsibility to the United Kingdom for making known the problems and progress of Colonial education, and to the world at large for making available its knowledge and experience of education in tropical areas. These two additional responsibilities made many and unpredictable further calls on time and energy; in one year, for example, I happen to notice that intensive assistance over a number of weeks was given to enquirers from Guatemala and from Greenland.

A far more exacting demand met an equally ready response when the Director in person undertook, in the winter of 1949-50, an investigation in West Africa of the problem of examinations, after the West African Directors of Education had asked for authoritative help. The Jeffery Report was immediately recognized as a brilliant and timely contribution of decisive importance; it is the basis of examinations policy in West Africa to-day and has set a pattern which is likely to be followed elsewhere. Still more exacting, and some indication of Colonial claims upon the Institute on the eve of this Jubilee year, was the Director's acceptance of the chairmanship of the group that spent the second half of 1951 visiting West Africa as part of the project sponsored jointly by the Secretary of State and the Nuffield Foundation for

the first comprehensive study of educational policy and practice in the British tropical African territories since the Phelps-Stokes Commissions.

There will remain to be recorded by history two recent developments of major importance for the Institute's Colonial work. First, the fruitful post-war resumption of by far the most valuable of all its foreign connections, that with the U.S.A. At the Carnegie Corporation's invitation, the Institute in 1949 joined in arranging for a Commonwealth team of educators from Africa and the West Indies, including the Head of the Colonial Department, to take part in a conference at Teachers' College, Columbia, of white and Negro American educators on "Cultural Groups and Human Relations". Grants from the Corporation have promoted a series of temporary appointments to the Colonial Department's staff, which have ensured that current American experience should be available to staff and students, and at the moment a three-year Carnegie scheme makes it possible to bring over each year an American educator with a special contribution to offer, who will teach for the first and third terms at the Colonial Department, but who in between these will gain first-hand experience of African educational problems by being attached to one of the Institutes of Education that are coming into being in the new university colleges in Africa itself.

With the establishment of these Institutes at the Gold Coast University College and at Makerere and of potential Institutes at other Colonial universities and university colleges, we reach a point at which opportunities are for the first time being created locally for this type of educational leadership; such Institutes should be of great influence in the areas which they serve. The Director of the first Institute to come into being, in the Gold Coast, was himself one of the earliest students of the Colonial Department of this Institute and was for four years on its staff. I hope that the difficulties in the way of providing for a regular exchange of staff between the Institute here and those coming into being oversea can be surmounted. Seeing that the Colonial university colleges have since the war been admitted by this University into special

relationship and have been so immensely helped by it in their growth, it will be surprising if the London University Institute of Education, with its own long tradition of Colonial interest, does not have especially close links with these young Colonial Institutes as they take shape and does not serve for them as an inspiration and to some extent an exemplar.

Meanwhile, there can be no doubt of the profound influence which the Institute has exercised in the past twenty-five years. I was interested to hear Sir Ronald Adam speak of having found that the Director of the Institute at Delhi and several members of his staff were former students of the London Day Training College. The founder of the Sudan's Institute of Education at Bakht-er-Ruda was an old student of Mr. Fairgrieve; the present Director of Education for the Sudan, the present Assistant Director for the Southern Sudan, the present Minister of Education himself (Sayed Abdel Rahman Ali Taha) were all students of the Colonial Department. So it is also with the Colonial territories: dotted about among them everywhere by now are men and women working in the educational field, teaching, inspecting, administering, training teachers, officials (from directors of education downwards) and missionaries, from the United Kingdom, from the Dominions and foreign countries and in rapidly mounting numbers from the Colonies themselves, who have been students here.

PART II

What are the ideas for which the Institute stands? What is the Institute's distinctive contribution to the education of Colonial peoples?

As I see it, the Institute has stood in its Colonial work for two main ideas, and for two methods of approach. I must say something, however shortly, about these two ideas and these two methods of approach.

The two central ideas are the Colonial reflection of the two purposes of the Institute's existence as defined at the beginning of its Constitution: "to advance the knowledge and practice of education by research" and "encourage the university study of education", and "to improve, co-ordinate,

and extend the provision for the training of teachers". They are the training of teachers and the study of education—training and study.

First, training. In this company I need hardly linger on the central importance of teacher training. It is most fortunate that the McNair Report should have ensured that there would be now in all educational comment or advice going out to Colonial territories a steadier and more concentrated emphasis than ever before on the basic importance of professional training. For the right recognition of this is a matter almost of life or death for most of the young systems of which I am speaking.

The proportion of untrained to trained teachers varies from territory to territory, but to-day the figures almost everywhere remind one of those cited in earlier lectures, by Mr. Hayward for the L.C.C. area and by Sir Ronald Adam for England as a whole, from the beginning of this Jubilee period, 1902. But whereas in the England of 1902 the great expansion had just been more or less completed and a time of consolidation was at hand, the general picture in most Colonial territories to-day is one of school systems that are in process of rapid—sometimes very rapid—expansion. The expansion of school numbers is often far in excess of the expansion of the training college output, with the resulting danger of further and further dilution and of deterioration rather than improvement. Never in the history of these territories has there been a time when the core of trained teachers stood in more urgent need of strengthening to enable it to take the strains of expansion, and when the training and morale of the teaching profession, and the right deployment of the teachers who have been trained, mattered more.

In no way could the Institute in this field of training make a bigger contribution to the Colonial territories than in demonstrating the value of the transformation which it has itself undergone, under Dr. Jeffery's leadership, in becoming an area training organization comprising thirty-five Constituent Colleges and Departments as well as this Central College. For one of the biggest handicaps of the Colonial

territories in meeting programmes of improvement and expansion lies in the astonishing multiplicity of small training centres, self-contained, isolated, with no margin of staff or of equipment, which between them supply almost all the trained teachers in most African territories. Thus in 1950 there were in the East African territories alone—Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika, Zanzibar—no fewer than 109 separate training centres, with an average of forty-one students in each—four more, in fact, than the combined total of the recognized training colleges and university training departments in England at the time of the 1944 Act. It is a good thing therefore that experienced Colonial educators who study or visit us here should be able to see for themselves that the achievement of “a coherent training service” brings advantages. Incidentally, the training resources which the Institute, transformed as it is to-day, can now make available for the Colonial field have, of course, been much enriched by being widened in this way, embracing as they now do colleges such as Goldsmiths’, St. Mary’s, Strawberry Hill, the Froebel Institute and others which have long had some special Colonial interest, or the new Training College for Technical Teachers which began to help experienced teachers from the Colonies, and in so doing to fill a gap in the Institute’s resources, this winter.

And this is a reminder that the Institute has on its Colonial side throughout been concerned, of course, not only with the basic essential of training teachers, but with the provision of special courses for those with considerable teaching experience in the field, who may be going to hold wider educational posts in the course of their professional careers and for whom in any case additional education and study will enhance their value on their return.

And that brings me to the second of the two main purposes for which this Institute stands—the study of education. It is obvious that the special training to which I have just been referring can best be given in a setting such as this in which the enlargement of knowledge, the sifting of experience, the processes of reflection and discovery are the air one breathes. The title of the Colonial Department is not the

Colonial Training Department; it is the "Colonial Department for the Study of Education in Tropical Areas". The study of education, far from being an academic luxury of little present relevance for a young society, has the utmost practical importance in the actual Colonial scene of to-day and of to-morrow.

I am thinking partly, but only partly, of certain specific fields for educational investigation and research which are waiting to be worked, and the importance of which in the current Colonial setting is beyond question. There cannot surely be doubt as to the relevance of research into, for example, the teaching of English as a foreign language, such as the most important work now being undertaken under Professor Pattison here (or the recent field work at the University College of the Gold Coast).

But I think it would be a pity if those who have the enquiring mind and who get the opportunity to harness it at the research level to Colonial problems were to limit themselves to choosing the sort of strictly delimited topic which it is natural enough to select in the relatively mature system of this country, but which could be very wasteful in Colonial conditions where so much of the framework has not yet set firm. Often there are not one but several great central questions, both of curriculum and of policy, which are at least as fluid as, say, the secondary modern part of our own system at the present time.

There are major problems unanswered in Colonial education to-day that will go on demanding constant examination and enquiry. Yet how can this be provided for in rapidly expanding systems when there is never time to think, let alone to study, experiment or investigate? Specially appointed commissions, or such study groups as that which the Director of this Institute himself has only just returned from leading to West Africa, are rare events. How can the kind of constant study that I am thinking of be provided? Only, surely, by an attitude of mind in the men and women working in the field, and that is why I attach such importance to the second of the two purposes for which the Institute stands. Those who work here in the Colonial Department,

with their seminars and their essays and their rural surveys and the sociological approach, those particularly who are taking the Associateship, have as good a chance as could be found anywhere both of being imbued with the spirit of enquiry and of finding out how to bring it to bear, of developing the capacity both for identifying problems and for tackling them. They will have learned here the way to set about the study of problems in their social setting, and not least in the distinctively Colonial social setting in which one way of life has mingled with another; they will have learned too, I think, how to pursue truth without being blown away by the passing "gusts of doctrine", to which, as Professor Read would warn them, those who study education in this country may be exposed. They will form and strengthen, or reinvigorate, by practice here those powers of enquiry which they will use throughout their professional lives.

In Colonial training colleges in particular there could be a great opportunity for bringing this spirit continually to bear upon central problems—above all, upon two of them: the relationship of the curriculum to the needs and prejudices of society, and the challenge to fresh and bold thinking about the special needs of training in a setting that is often still totally different from our own—one in which territories can neither find nor pay for more than a small proportion of really well-educated and well-trained teachers for schools that are expanding at such speed. For the effective study of such problems, as well as for other reasons, the training systems should be organized in one or other of two ways: either in a strongly centralized system such as has for so long been based on the Institute of Education at Bakht-cr-Ruda in the Sudan or with some kind of area training organization, by which under the leadership, perhaps, of an Institute the keenest minds at many scattered centres are working to a common strategy on a common task as a single coherent team. Without one or other of these types of organization I do not myself see how the malaise that so often afflicts parts of a country's educational system is to be diagnosed, let alone cured.

To take a well-known example from a non-Colonial but comparable territory, which I select because I worked there myself as Director of Education for a time. Bakht-er-Ruda in the Sudan, under the inspiration of a former student here, has been a true educational laboratory and has shown what such a training centre, organized for investigation, properly staffed and with experimental schools, can do for the educational health of a young country. It has been a focus for Anglo-Sudanese thinking, maturing gradually in action, on a whole range of educational problems running far beyond the primary school curriculum—adult education, the functions of the inspectorate, the rôle of a publications bureau, boys' clubs and other forms of aftercare for school leavers; while on the curriculum itself the questioning experimental testing process, accompanying year after year the task of training teachers, has produced solid results in courses and textbooks as well as results not less valuable in the field of character training for the youth of a nation growing rapidly to self-government.

To our way of thinking in this country, an achievement of this kind, in which study and training are combined, may at first seem surprising, and even slightly shocking, because, by laying down lines for the primary schoolteacher to follow, the training college has been taking on itself the directly creative rôle which we think of as belonging to the teachers. True; but until a far larger supply of teachers can be found and paid for, with the necessary general education to enable them to devise courses and write books for themselves, someone has to do it, and who better than the training colleges? The sooner there are alternative courses or extra books the better. In the meantime, there is the actual situation in many territories, in which primary schooling will for years to come inevitably have to be staffed by teachers very many of whom have not themselves had anything approaching a full secondary course. The Sudan achievement sprang from the continuous study by a training college staff of actual needs.

Even where that stage is past and the students reach the training colleges with a full secondary schooling behind

them it will be important for the college staffs themselves to be working on the content of the curriculum, because of the swiftly changing background of local society and because of the ever-present need for adjustment between Western and traditional cultures; both of these are fields of study in respect of which the individual teacher may hardly have time to do more than co-operate with colleges which he knows to be working on them. All that apart, the college should, of course, as with us, be the centre of experiment, a place of trial and error in the conception of teaching and in the study of young people. Only with such an atmosphere in the training college are the teachers themselves likely to reach the point at the end of their course at which they go out as the "educated men and women trained to initiative and adaptability" of the McNair Report. If learning by the child is indeed primarily "an active quest for insight or skill or knowledge", then—in the words of the recent Barnes Report on Malay Education—"to set children on the paths of discovery and achievement, teachers in turn need to have disciplined, inquiring, problem-solving minds". It is the training college's business to provide the climate in which such minds grow.

With the conception, therefore, of the training college as a centre of investigation and also as the power-house for charging teachers themselves with the spirit of enquiry, staffing at the colleges has to be on a scale, as it has been in the Sudan, that allows time for reflection and experiment. The training college ceases to be a teacher factory when the teacher's mind comes to life. There is a certain danger that Colonial public opinion might, in its urgent eagerness for more and more schools, become preoccupied with expansion at all costs and grudge the relatively small price of staffing training colleges so as to be of the kind a live and modern country needs. That is one reason why it is important that responsible Colonial educators should study for themselves in such a place as this, which will inspire not only research by the Colonial Institutes of Education and the comprehensive study of local educational problems that these should be most fitted to inspire and guide, but at successive

levels the enquiring and purposeful spirit of the training colleges and the teachers.

So much for the two central purposes—training and study—for which, as I see it, the Institute stands. I suggest also that, in the way in which it translates these two central ideas into action, it has stood steadily for two methods of approach. Each can, I think, be quite simply stated.

In the first place, the Institute's Colonial work has for many years past been based on the Advisory Committee's principle that education is very much more than schooling and that "the true educational aim is the education, not only of the young, but of the whole community". This is a principle which needs steady emphasis and attention in Colonial territories, and is of even greater importance there than in this country.

One reason for that is that the very structure of administration in Colonial territories, with its range of Government departments collectively bulking far larger than in a more developed society, is such as to breed compartmental isolation rather than integrated effort and to foster the conception that education, seen as the job of the Education Department, is concerned only with the young; even, indeed, with the young only while they are at school. Yet there can be no question of the special and urgent need in the Colonial setting for the widest view of education envisaging a simultaneous effort to improve the total life of the community and to "attack the hindrances to social advance" from many sides at once. Nowhere is that more important than in undeveloped societies if these are not to form deep cleavages between schooled and unschooled during periods of transition and of that rapid but uneven change in which one main instrument must be the school of Western type. All this has been set out in successive Advisory Committee reports, it is part of the U.N.E.S.C.O. concept of fundamental education, and it has been one main characteristic of the Institute's approach in its Colonial work.

The other method of approach which characterizes the Institute's Colonial work is its unreserved acceptance, to use Sir Fred Clarke's terms, of the sociological standpoint. The

importance of this in the Institute's work generally is attested by the fact that the Chair in the Sociology of Education which came into being here at the end of the war was the first in an English university. But for the Institute's Colonial work it has a distinctive significance which is more or less implicit in the Colonial relationship. Such a relationship in these days usually implies a situation in which a Western power has introduced its Western forms of schooling to peoples with their own very different traditional way of life. Thus, characteristic of the whole educational situation in most Colonial territories—and in non-Colonial territories whose history has exposed them to a similar cultural process—is an interaction that has no parallel in education in this country; for, to quote Furnivall, with us "the school is the product of and is conditioned by the environment, and the instruction given there is reinforced by and reinforces the social environment outside the school". Mayhew and Furnivall have brought out very clearly some of the effects, in India and in South-east Asia, of the existence side by side, each forming part of the sum of educative processes which influence a child in his growth towards adult life, of Western schooling on the one hand and the operation of a still largely traditional environment and way of life on the other. When the Colonial Office began to set its educational house in order those who framed the 1925 White Paper for Africa were alive to some of the consequences of this impact of one culture upon another in the educational field. Since 1935 the heads of the Colonial Department here have been deeply concerned with this problem.

It is surely fitting, therefore, that those who study for educational work in the Colonial territories should do so in a setting in which is emphasized not only the sociological approach in educational thought generally, but the particular type of sociological insight needed for the understanding of these special situations in changing societies. And it is right that this kind of approach should be available not only for those who go from this country to work in Colonial fields, but for those who come here from the Colonies themselves. For it is they and their peoples who

will finally determine the extent to which they will build Western schooling into their social fabric, and which elements in their own traditional cultures they will incorporate in their educational system. It is wholly right, therefore, that in this Institute experienced educators from the Colonial territories should have the best opportunity there could be of learning to understand the nature and historical determinants of their own rapidly evolving educational heritage.

What about the future? One cannot say what precise forms the Institute's contribution to the educational growth of the Colonial territories will take in the future; but it is at least possible to feel certain of two things: firstly, that the part which it will play will be important; and, secondly, that its contribution will go on changing in response to changing needs. The rest is a matter of guesswork and of faith.

If I were to indulge in one or two purely personal reflections I should be inclined to expect that, with the increasing number of educational students from the Colonies at other Institutes in this country¹ and with the growth of local Institutes in Colonial territories, the curve of rising numbers here will flatten out; and that will be no bad thing, I think, if only because it will enable this Institute's Colonial studies to be more exclusively concentrated on the kind of work which its experience makes it so especially well qualified to give. However that may be, as long as the Institute's equipment for this kind of work remains unique, I find myself indulging in two hopes: firstly, that all those going from this country—and from foreign countries too—to educational work in Colonial territories, whether officials or not, might have a spell here some time, whether it be for their initial training or later on; and, secondly, that all Colonial nationals who come over here for further training or study in education, wherever the bulk of their time in this country is spent, may, at one stage or another, however shortly, have access to some part of what this place has to offer.

I am sure that many of these experienced teachers from

¹ Colonial Office records indicate that last year there were 110 such students in the Institute's Central College, thirty-four at its Constituent Colleges and Departments, and fifty-four elsewhere.

Colonial territories whom the Institute has always welcomed will continue to make this a main base for their studies over here; and, looking ahead, I hope that they may wish this link to continue long after their territories, in their progress to self-government, have ceased to be the concern of the Secretary of State's Advisers and Advisory Committees. For the Institute will be a common professional meeting ground, where educators from these territories will wish to study and understand this country's educational system, so much of which, for better or worse, has been built into their own; and to keep abreast of the changes in our own thought and practice since some of our ideas were originally exported. I venture to think that, in the communication of experience and ideas, such visits will mean a two-way traffic. I believe too that the work here, in which the two types of student, from these young countries and from the United Kingdom, come together on neutral ground, meeting in common professional interest in things that unite and do not divide—that the work here is laying the foundations of interracial partnership and building up that personal goodwill and mutual regard which in the long run is the only durable cement of a multi-racial Commonwealth.

The story which I have tried to tell in this lecture is one of vision and devotion, above all one of ready response to new challenge. I am certain that with this tradition the Institute will meet whatever further challenges the future holds.

For its work in what for us is only a Silver Jubilee, we are deeply grateful; we have nothing but confidence in what it will achieve for the Colonial peoples in the years ahead.