

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 INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION AND OVERSEA
STUDENTS

Dr. G. B. Jeffery

the Chairman of the British Council in the Chair

FOR all of us who belong to the Institute there must be a strain of sadness in our meeting this evening. When this series of Jubilee Lectures was first planned, we took it for granted that Sir Fred Clarke would have his place. There were two things he could have done with superb skill and with persuasive eloquence. Speaking after the other lecturers who have treated different aspects of our work, he could have drawn the threads together and woven them into a worthy pattern; or he could have spoken from his heart about our work with oversea students which had been his special care, not only throughout the period in which he was Director, but in the subsequent period, lasting up to the day of his death, in which he was Adviser to Oversea Students, to our great benefit.

In the hands of another lecturer these two themes might have been too diverse to be brought within the compass of one lecture. It would not have been so with Sir Fred. He would have been the last to speak in terms of the relative importance of the work of the Institute at home and oversea, yet he had so clear a vision of the oversea work that it was the mirror in which he could best see the inward significance of all that we do.

The privilege of hearing what would have been a great lecture is not to be ours. For some months the lecture had been much on his mind, and indeed our last talk together was about it, but he left nothing on paper except one brief note. Greatly daring, I have sought the privilege of stepping into his shoes. I am fortified by the belief that, as with so many of my colleagues, my own thoughts on education have gained in breadth and humanity by my friendship and collaboration with him, so that I may hope that, while what I say cannot have the polished form and merry humour that

he would have displayed, it will not differ greatly in substance from what he would have said.

Let me first state the facts about our oversea work and get rid of the statistics as soon as possible. In the Central College of the Institute we have 749 full-time students this session. Of these 286 come from oversea, more than one-third of the total number. In spite of the traditional jokes about certain colleges in Oxford and Cambridge, there can be few university institutions anywhere which include such a large proportion of oversea members. These 286 students come from 51 different countries; 110 from Africa, 29 from America, 96 from Asia, 22 from Australasia, and 29 from Europe. Classified in another way, they give 109 from the self-governing Dominions, 115 from other countries within the British Commonwealth, and 62 from foreign lands. With very few exceptions, all these students have had substantial experience in teaching or educational administration in their own countries before coming to the Institute. Some take courses for degrees, diplomas and certificates designed primarily for English students. The majority take one or other of the special courses designed to meet their needs in, for example, Colonial Education, English Educational Thought and Practice, and the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language. About thirty of the most senior among them are engaged on special investigations with a bearing on the educational problems of their own countries.

Lest I should fall into the cardinal error of identifying the Institute with the part of it which is in Bloomsbury, let me hasten to add that many of our thirty-five Constituent Colleges and Departments have oversea connections of long standing and are taking an increasing share in this important part of the work of the Institute as a whole. Next session a course is to be started at Goldsmiths' College for the training of non-graduate European teachers for Colonial territories. It will be a two-year course closely associated with the other two-year courses at Goldsmiths' and with the course in the Colonial Department. The National Training College of Domestic Subjects has a course for the training of teachers of domestic science for the Colonies, and the Training

College for Technical Teachers runs a course for Colonial officers concerned with technical education. There are often some students from the Colonies taking the normal training courses in several other Colleges. Many oversea students coming to the Central College are specially interested in teacher training, and the Principals and staffs of our Constituent Colleges are always ready to receive these students as visitors, and give generously of their time and experience. The concern for the international work of the Institute is widely spread among its Colleges and is one of the many factors which is welding the Institute into a corporate unity.

It is particularly appropriate in a Jubilee Lecture to enquire how this state of affairs arose. How has it come about that the College, founded fifty years ago by the London County Council for training teachers for the new secondary schools in England, has acquired such large responsibilities over a wider field?

My own recollection of the London Day Training College goes back to 1909, when the College was seven years old. For two years I was concerned only with Saturday-morning sessions in art and physical education which at that time were thought to be an appropriate supplement to undergraduate studies in science. In the session 1911-12, however, I was one of about a hundred students studying for the Teacher's Diploma, with John Adams as Professor and Principal and Thomas Percy Nunn and Margaret Punnett as Vice-Principals. The group included three men rather older than the rest of us. A. F. Thorpe was training as a teacher before going to China as a missionary. F. Hasler was home on leave after teaching for some years in India. W. J. Mulholland had trained in Australia and had been on the staff of a training college there. Each in his way was the prototype of many who were later to come to the College from oversea. Were they our first oversea students and, if so, how and by what stages did the three of 1911 become the 286 of 1952?

For the part of this lecture in which I endeavour to give some answer to these questions I am indebted to my friend and colleague, Miss Shirley Gordon. She has rummaged

among our archives with the zest of a historian and with the love of a true daughter of this place. Among her most interesting discoveries so far (I say "so far" for I am sure that she is going to make many more discoveries) is an undated, unsigned carbon copy of a "Memorandum on Proposed Course for Advanced Students of Education". It says that the College buildings are being erected in Southampton Row, and it was therefore written about 1906. The dynamic enthusiasm and the clarity of expression of the document bring Nunn under grave suspicion of its authorship, but it is not more than suspicion. The document does not seem to have emerged at any official level and it was probably intended for discussion among the staff. If it was discussed among the staff the discussion led to no very definite action—a circumstance not unique in the history of the College. Yet as a record of what someone within the College was thinking within four years of its birth, the document is profoundly interesting and significant. It opens with this pregnant passage:

"It has been suggested that much good to the education of South Africa would result from the sending each year of several more or less experienced teachers and inspectors from the Colony to study educational systems and methods in the old country. It is becoming increasingly clear that the study of Education has two important periods—the first before actual practice in teaching, the second after there have been several years of experience of teaching. The proposed scheme is to supply this latter form of training. London is the natural centre for such a course, supplying as it does unequalled facilities for the study of all forms of elementary, secondary and higher education."

It proceeds to give an account of the College and its amenities, and then gives details of the new course, as follows:

"The proposed scheme for ten or twelve students to be sent from the Colonies each year would differ considerably from the schemes at present in operation. The course being more for teachers of some experience would not only be postgraduate, but post-postgraduate. It would include attendance at the more advanced of the University

lectures, and at whichever of the specialist courses happen to meet the needs of individual students. While the students would be left a large measure of freedom in choosing their course of study, a reasonable minimum of attendance at systematic lectures would be insisted on. Speaking generally students would not be expected to take the Teacher's Diploma of the University, but this would be open to those who cared to enter for it. An important part of the work would consist in the systematic observation of all classes of schools. For this purpose there is every probability that the London County Council would give all facilities in connection with the schools governed or aided by them. The various training colleges in London have always shown themselves exceedingly willing to give Colonial visitors every opportunity of studying their methods. Observations, further, need not be confined to London, as it has been ascertained that most of the provincial universities and centres of training would welcome visits from this class of student."

The next passage will, I believe, command the ready assent of those of my colleagues who are concerned with the arrangement of school visits:

"In order that observation may not degenerate into mere gaping and aimless wandering from school to school, it is proposed that regular discussions of the results of observation should take place among these post-postgraduate students. These discussions would take place in the training college buildings, in some cases under the chairmanship of members of the college staff, in other cases without the presence of any but the students themselves. Out of these discussions problems would arise and experiments and definite lines of observation would be suggested. Interest and point would thus be given to the students' work. In a year or two it is expected that there will be a Bureau of Educational Theory and Practice in London connected with the London University and the County Council, and the post-postgraduate students will both give and receive valuable help in this connection."

The next paragraph is prophetic:

“In order that full advantage may be had of the educational opportunities of London it is desirable that these post-postgraduate students should live together. In the meantime there is no hostel connected with the training college, and the most feasible plan clearly is to engage a large private house where the students can be boarded at a reasonable rate.”

It is suggested that one of the many boarding houses in the Bloomsbury district would be used for this purpose, and this prophecy was fulfilled forty years later when we opened our hostel in Bedford Way, under Miss Stephenson, with the rule that one-half of the residents should be students from overseas.

Like all good policy documents, it concludes with a section on finance. Alas, the surviving interest of this section is only to show how much more difficult financial problems have become in fifty years. Fees would be £10 per annum, and board and lodging could be provided for £40 a year. Even under the heading of finance, the author cannot entirely abstain from prophecy, for the section, and the document, conclude with these words:

“Under the present regulations it does not appear that a grant can be made from the Imperial Treasury for students of this class, since no grant is at present made for the training of secondary teachers. This, however, need not be always the case.”

I wish we could know the full story of this document and what became of it. Any effect that it may have had on the development of the College was hardly discernible for many years to come. It is true that the first student who can be definitely identified as coming from overseas was enrolled in 1906.¹ He was a Hindu, Ammenhal Rama Rau, and a note refers to him as of “excellent ability and admirable industry”. It is appropriate that our first overseas student

¹ Miss Gordon has since identified three students of 1905 as coming from Australia—Percival R. Cole, Thomas T. Roberts and Gertrude A. Roseby, all graduates of Sydney.

should have come from India, for India, of all the oversea countries, has sent us by far the largest number of students. But one swallow does not make a summer, and it was to be many years before our accumulated total of oversea students could be held to indicate the coming of even the mildest summer. Yet, looking back to this document of 1906 through a longer span of time, we can see that every one of its prophecies has been fulfilled. Postgraduate students have come to us from South Africa and from many other countries. The College has become a great international centre for higher studies in education. The studies now pursued here by oversea students follow closely on the lines indicated in the document. We have hostels, and they are in Bloomsbury, as the prophet foretold. It was only on finance that the prophet was wide of the mark for, alas, the tuition and hostel fees are many times those which he predicted. But perhaps a good prophet ought not to be too sound on finance.

We have spent a lot of time on this document—not, I think, without justification. It is one of our proudest possessions, for it shows that our roots are in our beginnings. It brings home to us the quality of those who have gone before us from the very beginnings of our foundation. They were men and women who saw with remarkable clarity the destiny of the College long years before it could come to fulfilment. We who follow in their steps may ask whether we can see into the future of this place as far or as clearly as they did; are we as prepared as they were to sow where we may not reap?

The next notable landmark in our oversea history was the year 1919. There were then in this country many Australian soldier-teachers awaiting demobilization. Refresher courses were arranged for them varying in length from a few months to the whole year. This group of vigorous young men gave the College at least as much as they took from it. They captured its social life and made the "Year of the Australians" a memorable one in our history. They established a bond with Australia which has proved to be of a lasting quality.

This brings us close to 1922, the year in which the College was twenty years old, the year in which its first captain,

John Adams, left the bridge and handed his command to Sir Percy Nunn, who had served as first mate for eighteen years. Sir John's service in education was not finished, for he was invited to become a lecturer in education at the University of California at Los Angeles, and held this post until his death ten years later. An annual lecture is given in Los Angeles in his memory and in "witness of the esteem in which Sir John Adams and the interests of his useful life are held here in this far-western university in a country which he loved and served as sagely and helpfully as his own".

If we think of those things which we now take for granted as essential to the life of the Institute, the one which we can most clearly trace to the influence of Adams is our dual function of training teachers and sustaining them later in the exercise of their profession by providing opportunities for higher studies in education. Adams had kept these two aims clearly in view from the very beginning of the College. He gave his professor's lecture in the Scottish tradition to his students within the College; he gave his evening lectures to practising teachers. Our present Department for Advanced Studies is in continuous succession with those evening lectures, and it was in the natural order of evolution that, in the time of his Principalship, the degrees of Master of Arts and Doctor of Philosophy in Education were instituted by the University, and the College undertook the supervision of students reading for those degrees. The College was steadily developing within itself the resources which would later fit it to assume the responsibilities of an international centre for the study of education. Students had begun to come to us from other parts of the Commonwealth, but only in what we must now regard as tiny numbers. The foundations had been well and truly laid but there was still more preparatory work that had to be done before the building could assume its full proportions. The Principalship of Nunn covers the fourteen years from 1922 to 1936, and thus corresponds roughly to the period between the world wars, a period in which there were many changes within the Institute and in the wider world outside, changes which were interrelated at every point.

In 1927 the Colonial Course was started by Mr. Fairgrieve. The story of the development of our Colonial Department and its close, continuous and happy relations with the Colonial Office is a part of the story of the growth of our oversea work, but it is a part which has already been better told by Sir Christopher Cox, and I cannot match his intimate knowledge of this part of our history.

I have, rather, to attempt to place the story told by Sir Christopher in a wider setting, and this task leads us to the consideration of one of the deepest spiritual experiences of our national history. Those of us whose schooldays go back to the last century were taught that ours was a great country—by any count the greatest country in the world. This comforting conclusion was supported by maps in which red was the dominant colour, by figures showing the strength of our navy and merchant service and the extent of our international trade, and by somewhat mystical arguments tending to show that London was the financial centre of the world. I do not for one moment suppose that this is a full and accurate account of the way in which our patriots regarded this country, but it was the way in which the matter presented itself to the English schoolboy in the 'nineties and, no doubt, to the great majority of the common people of this land. As a nation we lived through the experience of Job. One by one we saw the material evidences of greatness and prosperity stripped from us, and we were ruthlessly driven to seek the deeper and inward sources of that greatness, if so be that they were there to find. That is not an easy experience either for a man or a nation, and to many it must have seemed that all was being lost. The Empire was disintegrating, and with it all that it meant for the good of the world would surely disappear. Our power in the affairs of the world was greatly diminished, and it was hard for us to believe that this was for the good of the world. But there were not lacking those who had a truer vision and who came to see that the diminution of material power presented a great opportunity.

An occasion which left a permanent impression on my own thought on these problems was some time in the early

'thirties, when Lord Macmillan, then Chairman of the Court of the University, gathered a small group for intimate discussion at his Club. He spoke of the Statute of Westminster, then recently enacted, and of the loosening of formal and political ties which it represented. He was utterly undismayed, and he spoke of the opportunity which it gave to us in the University of London to work together with our colleagues in the universities of the Dominions and thus to create binding forces within the Empire of a strength which no formal and political ties could assure. Lord Macmillan was speaking to colleagues within his own University and, if he had been speaking to another audience, I have no doubt that he would have presented the same hope in the wider field of education. He was, of course, not alone in his vision, for the same line of thought dominated the Imperial Education Conferences of 1923 and 1927, and the Education Section of the Centenary Meeting of the British Association in 1931. It was at this last meeting that Fred Clarke, then Professor at McGill University, lectured on a characteristic theme, "The Cultural Diversity of the Empire", and Lord Eustace Percy, underlining the empiricism of education in the English-speaking world, said that on account of this characteristic he saw the necessity to create "some central institution where the results of our experiments can be constantly compared and from which the conclusions drawn from them can be disseminated". A new note was imported into the discussion by Dr. M. P. West when he emphasized "the need of making the proposed institute as wide and international as possible in its character. The problems with which it will have to deal cannot be localized in their scope, nor confined even to so large a unit as the British Empire."

The possible identity of this central institution was no doubt in the mind of Lord Eustace as he spoke. Two months previously the Senate of the University had adopted a Statement of Policy submitted by the Academic Council of the London Day Training College on the College's future as the new University of London Institute of Education. "The creation in London of a strongly-equipped centre for the continuous discussion and investigation of educational

problems that are important to the constituents of the British Commonwealth" was stated as a major aim of the new Institute. The argument for this proposal was carefully defined in the Statement. The development of "a well-marked national character and conscience" in each Dominion was noted. "The continued solidarity of the Commonwealth" was therefore felt to depend largely "upon preserving and strengthening those fundamental ideas and ideals which are expressed in our common educational traditions and institutions and through them exercise a quiet but decisive influence upon each new generation of citizens".

Many references have rightly been made in these Jubilee Lectures to the unforgettable debt that we owe to the London County Council as our founders and to the wisdom with which the Council controlled the College in the first thirty years of its life. In no respect was that wisdom more manifest than in the way in which the Council permitted and encouraged the College to develop within itself the resources for a wider service and, at the appropriate stage, transferred the College freely to the control of the University. The documents of the time make it clear that one of the main arguments for the transference was to give the College a status more suited to its proposed functions in relation to oversea education.

The year of the transformation of the London Day Training College into the Institute of Education was marked by two other events of significance. Two Dominion scholarships tenable at the Institute were awarded by the Rhodes Trustees. The Year Book of Education, under the Editorship of Lord Eustace Percy, was established by Evans Brothers Limited under agreement with whom the Institute assumed editorial responsibility three years later. The first volume is divided into three parts dealing respectively with Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the British Commonwealth of Nations, and Foreign Countries, and, in accordance with the policy maintained ever since, it consists of articles contributed by recognized authorities writing from within each of the countries concerned.

It was at about this time that a beginning was made,

under Dr. L. Faucett, of what was later to become an important part of our work in relation to the teaching of English as a foreign language.

As we approach 1934, a year of outstanding importance in our history, we may note the confluence of two great streams—the recognition in the wider world of the need for an international centre for the continuous study of education and the shaping of educational policy—and the answer from within the Institute, under the leadership of Dr. Nunn, preparing itself to meet that need and to fulfil the hopes of the 1906 document.

It was at this critical stage that the Carnegie Corporation of New York made dreams come true by its magnificent generosity. The Corporation administered the fund bequeathed by Andrew Carnegie for the furtherance of educational and cultural interests in the British Dominions and Colonies. Under its wise and far-seeing President, the late Dr. F. P. Keppel, it had already set on foot a rich variety of fruitful activities. Keppel was quick to see the opportunities of the Institute as explained with the expansive enthusiasm of Nunn. After negotiations remarkable for their amity and celerity, the Corporation made a grant of 67,500 dollars to establish an Oversea Division within the Institute and to cover its cost for three years. A further period of three years was later covered by a second grant of the same amount. The grant included provision for the salary of an Adviser to Oversea Students, who it was agreed should if possible be a man of high standing in the educational world of one of the Dominions. It also included provision for eight Fellowships to be awarded each year, two each from Australia, Canada, New Zealand and South Africa. In both respects the scheme worked extraordinarily well. Fred Clarke, having been Professor of Education at Cape Town and McGill, fitted the specification for the Adviser to Oversea Students like a glove, and he was willing to come. In the characteristic Carnegie fashion of adding generosity to generosity, the Corporation sent him on a tour of those areas of the four Dominions with which he was not personally acquainted—Western Canada, New Zealand and Australia

—and he was thus able to establish personal relations which were of the greatest value in the later development of the Oversea Division.

The progress of the Fellowships was equally happy. In the selection of Fellows the Institute sought the assistance of the Dominion universities—the Vice-Chancellors' Committees in Australia and South Africa, the Senate of the University of New Zealand, and an *ad hoc* Selection Committee in Canada. This assistance was most readily forthcoming and, apart from the service given in inviting applications, interviewing candidates and making nominations, the resultant links between the Dominion universities and the Institute have been greatly valued in themselves. The Fellows were selected with care as men and women of experience and likely, by reason of their personal qualities, later to occupy positions of educational influence in their own countries. Within the Institute they, together with a small number of other students of similar standing, formed the senior seminar under the personal leadership of Sir Fred, and provided a solid core at the centre of our oversea work which gave character to the whole. Those of us who were privileged from time to time to sit in with this seminar know how well Sir Fred maintained his dominant theme of the two-way traffic. It was a place in which the true spirit of the Commonwealth lived and breathed in the sharing of experience between Canadian and Australian or Englishman and South African. Verily, dreams had come true.

I must pause here to pay tribute to Sir Percy Nunn, my predecessor in office and a teacher to whom I personally owe a debt I can never fully assess. In 1936 he retired and was succeeded by Professor Clarke. Was Nunn the author of the 1906 document? However that may be, his dynamic influence can be traced throughout the thirty-two years in which he served College and Institute. He left it firmly established within the University with an important rôle in education in this country and with all the plans laid for the extension of our activity to a wider field. We owe much to his vision, his acute mind, his infectious enthusiasm and his boundless energy.

When Professor Clarke became Director the omens for good progress could hardly have been more favourable. The number of oversea students had increased to about one hundred each year. In 1939 the first British Council Scholars came to us, including one from Lithuania and one from Rumania, and thus began a close and happy relationship with the British Council. Our debt to the British Council is not fully expressed in terms of the considerable number of Scholars it has since sent to us. In many other ways we have felt the support of a body working over so wide a field in pursuance of aims so closely similar to our own. It is no accident that the Chairman of the British Council and the Chairman of the Council of the Institute are united in the person of our Chairman this evening.

Then came the Second World War, with the inevitable interruption of communications and deferment of hopes. Of the period of nine years in which Sir Fred was Director, all but three years at the beginning and six weeks at the end was overshadowed by war.

The best evidence of the soundness of Sir Fred's work in the short period of his office before the war and during the war is to be seen in the remarkable rapidity with which the number of our students from oversea increased as soon as the war was over. The first post-war session opened only a few weeks after the cessation of hostilities with Japan, yet the number of oversea students in that session was almost equal to that immediately before the war. In the session 1946-7 we had our Carnegie Fellows from the Dominions with us again, and the number of oversea students was increasing so rapidly that Sir Fred was brought back to his original post as Adviser to Oversea Students, a post which he held to his own enjoyment and to the great benefit of the Institute until the day of his death. In pursuance of his ideals, the Carnegie Fellows continued as the heart and soul of our oversea work, and the future of these Fellowships provided one of our most anxious post-war problems. It had always been the policy of the Carnegie Corporation that it should not permanently undertake the financial support of any project, however excellent. The Corporation was willing

to take all the pioneering risks of a scheme if it was convinced that it was a good scheme for the furtherance of the objects of its trust. Once the scheme had been well launched, the Corporation expected that it would win financial support from other sources. This policy was loyally accepted by the Institute, and much thought was given to the search for other sources of financial support. In the meantime the Carnegie grant was relieved of any charge for the salary to the Adviser and was devoted entirely to the provision of the Fellowships. It was a great relief and reassurance when the Imperial Relations Trust made a generous benefaction of over £13,000, to cover the cost of the eight Fellowships over the three years 1949-52, and subsequently agreed to make a like provision for the year 1952-3. The Trust has agreed to make an annual grant of approximately the same amount for a further period of years provided that the scheme is extended to include Fellows from the newer Commonwealth states of Ceylon, India and Pakistan, and that the balance of the cost of the enlarged scheme shall be forthcoming from other sources. Canada and New Zealand have each agreed to meet the cost of one of the two Fellowships from their respective countries, and it is hoped that similar support will be forthcoming from the other Commonwealth states. This would enable the Institute to fulfil the conditions attaching to the offer of the Imperial Relations Trust, and thus ensure the continuation of the Fellowships for a further span of years. Until this position is secured there must be anxiety about something that is vital to our conception of the Institute as a Commonwealth and international centre for the study of education.

We have traced the growth of our oversea responsibilities from their small beginnings in the earliest years of our history down to the present, with its anxiety and its opportunity. We have given at least some kind of answer to the question as to how and by what stages did the three oversea students of 1911 become the 286 of 1952. But the purpose of a Jubilee would be ill-served if we thought only of the achievements of the past. It is right that we should know our history and measure the accomplishment of those who have

gone before us in this place. It is more important that we should understand the meaning of what they did in order that we, in our turn, may face the future with purpose and understanding. May we then ask not merely in what numbers students have come from other countries to this College, but why they came at all?

In the time at my disposal I can best try to answer this question by drawing together some streams of thought from different sources without attempting to systematize them or to make them comprehensive. In the first place I would like to go back to that discussion with Lord Macmillan twenty years ago. It was the beginning of so much of my own thought on these things that it may be that I attribute to Lord Macmillan more or less than he said and, if so, I hope that he will forgive me. His argument was not that, as political ties were loosening, it would be necessary to find some other ties to take their place, and that education afforded a useful opportunity for this purpose. On the contrary, I thought that I detected something like a sense of relief at the passing of the old ties and a triumphant confidence that the new ties would be better and stronger. The new conception of the British Commonwealth which was coming to birth was richer and more enduring than the not wholly unworthy conceptions that had preceded it. It is the application of democracy on the international plane. It has never seemed to me that the essence of democracy resides in any of the forms of democratic government with which we are familiar; it is to be found in the mutual respect between one man and another which makes any form of democratic government possible, and without which any form of democracy can be only a hollow sham. If there is this mutual respect between the peoples of the sister countries of the Commonwealth, it will emerge in the appropriate forms of political relations between them; without it there can be no political ties which will stand the strain of crisis.

This mutual respect is highly complex. As between man and man it extends to include every aspect of living. I must respect my neighbour's thoughts and feelings, his beliefs, his ambitions and his labour. The respect between the

peoples of the Commonwealth must be equally embracing if the Commonwealth is to have reality and strength. This conception of the Commonwealth is dynamic, for it is impossible to confine it in operation to any particular group of countries. It must inevitably be extended to include all peoples and races that are preparing to come together on this basis of mutual respect. It is a faith for the salvation of the world.

The next stream I would like to draw in is characteristic of the philosophy of Sir Fred, and is expressed in the only consecutive note he left in preparation for the lecture he was to have given this evening. It reads:

“Sense in which this country may have a mission. World-wide dissemination of valid ideas of human dignity and fellowship derived from what is best in national experience, checked and universalized so as to transcend differences of race and colour, while taking varied local form in accordance with distinctive cultural idioms. What it may require of us as a people—patience, humility, imagination.”

This brief note explains why the Oversea Department, under the leadership of Sir Fred, was much more than an opportunity to pool experience from different countries, valuable as that opportunity undoubtedly was. When we come together from different countries we do not find that we are all very much the same except for unimportant differences of colour or tradition. The differences between us are great and go very deep—very deep, but not to the root of things. The differences are valuable, not merely because they make our intercourse so much more lively and interesting than it would otherwise be, but because they invite us all to dig more deeply into our foundations to discover the things we have in common. Those things, when we discover them, are not superficial or accidental. They are the deep things from which all our living and thinking proceed. That there are such common possessions to discover is asserted by the Christian as part of the doctrine of the fatherhood of God, but it is an essential part of the faith of all who believe

that international understanding is possible. Thus it comes about that participation in the international life of the Institute brings a double experience to the individual—a deeper understanding of the life of his own people and a realization of the unity which lies beneath the diversities of race, creed and culture. Sir Fred himself exemplified this double experience for, on the one hand, he had the ready sympathy which enabled him to understand and appreciate the man from another country and, on the other hand, he was intensely proud of his own English tradition.

I am speaking of something quite different from an easy-going, back-slapping fellowship in which everyone is as good as anyone and differences do not matter. Such complacency might be possible if each of us within his own national setting was content with things as they are. We are not content, and we are constantly striving in one way or another to change, and in every part of the world change is now proceeding with unusual rapidity. In the course of that change we are constantly imitating one another across national boundaries, sometimes deliberately and wisely, often unconsciously or unwisely. It is all-important that we should recognize and understand our differences and be able to distinguish between those which arise from the expression in different circumstances of the same fundamental principles and those which are accidental and have no roots in the best things of our respective cultures.

When I as an Englishman meet a New Zealander, we have so much in common in language, history and philosophy that it is relatively easy to achieve a basis from which we can study our differences as revealing to each other the different circumstances of life in our respective countries. If, however, I meet a Nigerian, we are immediately faced with great differences of language, race, philosophy and tradition. Yet I have discovered to my own infinite advantage that, beneath all these manifest differences, there is a fundamental kinship. The discovery, to the Englishman and the African who will take the trouble to make it, brings a rich reward. It creates a situation in which there can be no giving without receiving in overflowing measure. It is a discovery which has been

made over and over again by hundreds of people of different races within the walls of this Institute.

The final stream I would like to draw into our thought is concerned with an enriched conception of education which, while it is in no sense the exclusive property or product of the Institute, has been continuously discussed within it throughout the time that I have known it. It makes education very much more than instruction. It includes the care which any people must necessarily give to the rearing of a new generation in their midst, with all its implications for the stabilization of society and for the progressive development of society. It includes, too, the dissemination of valid ideas referred to in Sir Fred's note. It cannot be confined to the teacher-pupil relationship, though the senior-junior relationship runs through the greater part of it. This latter relationship, however, is seldom static, for the one who is the junior in one respect may be the senior in another, and the teacher of one moment may well become the learner of the next. The growth of this conception has progressively influenced the technique of our work. While recognizing that the lecture has an important and honourable place in university life, we have turned increasingly to seminars and discussion groups in which there can be free action and reaction between teacher and student and between one student and another. As far back as the 1906 document this was prescribed as the appropriate method for our oversea work, and it has been followed throughout. I have no doubt that this is the reason why it has been said so often by those actively concerned with our oversea work that they have received at least as much as they have been able to give.

But here again we are concerned with things that go much deeper than technique. Sir Fred was fond of saying that the political institutions and economic circumstances of a people are determined by things which lie deeper in their cultural and spiritual nature. I know that there are those who argue strongly to the contrary, but in this, as in so many things, I follow my predecessor. On this view, one of the chief aims of education must be to promote right thinking and good standards—to disseminate valid ideas of human dignity and

fellowship derived from what is best in national experience. It is this which distinguishes education from propaganda in the sense in which that word is now so often used, for education is concerned with the spread of ideas which have been validated by the test of their application in a variety of circumstance. Our oversea experience has constantly taught us that valid ideas do not arise exclusively from the experience of any one nation or group of nations. In an international group, every member, speaking from within the experience of his own people, has something to give and something to receive.

In all this I am saying nothing that is new. I am merely repeating things that have been said in variety of form and language over and over again throughout the long period of the development of our oversea work. I have tried to catch and to interpret the thought of those who laboured in the past to give us the opportunity we now enjoy. What I would chiefly claim for them is a sensitivity of spirit to the needs of their times, and a readiness to embark upon new ventures to meet those needs. Some of us have had the privilege of travelling in various parts of the world and, if we pieced our stories together, they would tell how widely men and women are distributed who look back with filial regard to the Institute. Many of them are occupying positions of influence in the educational affairs of their countries and, through them, the Institute is playing a part in the education of the world. But the Institute has greatly received. The experience which has been brought to it from so many countries, and the continued interest in its affairs of this world-wide company, has enriched its own life and increased its power to serve the cause of education in this country. It is through education that any nation can bring to realization its dreams for its own future. Education is the history of the future in the making. This is the measure of the opportunity that has been given to us by those who laboured in the building up of this Institute, and whom we honour in its Jubilee.