

DICE Occasional Papers No.11

✓ **'NOT WANTED ON THE VOYAGE'**
(A study of the Colonial Department, ULIE 1927-1956)
Clive Whitehead

**'AFRICAN SCIENCE' AND ITS MEANING FOR THE
SECONDARY SCHOOL CURRICULUM**
John Lowe

TEACHING AS A PROFESSION
Charles Farrugia

March 1988

Department of International and Comparative Education
Institute of Education, University of London
20 Bedford Way, London WC1H 0AL

Preface

The Institute
of Education,
University of London,
has been the
scene of a
series of
conferences
concerning
the history of
the Department
of Education,
University of London,
since 1955.

Not Wanted on the Voyage

(A study of the Colonial Department,
University of London Institute of Education,
1927-1955)

by

Clive Whitehead
University of Western Australia

. . . the Institute's relationship to the Colonies has been a distinctive and increasingly important part. . . of the history of Colonial education. Its Colonial work, indeed, is unique; . . . (Cox, 1952:57)

Origins

The Institute of Education at the University of London has long enjoyed a reputation as the foremost centre for the study of education in the Commonwealth. At the seventy-fifth anniversary celebrations in 1977, the renowned New Zealand educator, Dr C.E. Beeby, voiced the sentiments of thousands of former students when he remarked to the former Director, Lionel Elvin (1977:6) that the Institute "really was at the centre of things". Nowhere within the Institute has its international flavour and world-wide impact been so enduring as in the former Colonial Department, which subsequently underwent two name changes in the post-war years to become the Department of Education in Tropical Areas [ETA] and then the Department of Education in Developing Countries [EDC], before merging with the Department of Comparative Education in late 1985 to form the Department of International and Comparative Education (DICE).

A brief sketch of the origins of the Colonial Department was included in a paper delivered by Sir Christopher Cox (op.cit.), the Educational Adviser to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, at the Institute's fiftieth jubilee celebrations in 1952. However, as Cox remarked in his address, the limits of time forced him to exclude much of the material he had amassed on the early years of the Colonial Department.

At recent week-ends I have been rather like a man before a journey with half a dozen trunks of stuff wondering what can be marked Not Wanted On The Voyage and banished to the hold. (Cox, Ibid:58).

This paper attempts to retrieve some of Cox's long discarded luggage by examining in detail the origins and early history of the Colonial Department from the inception of the Colonial Course in 1927 through to the retirement of Professor Margaret Read in the mid 1950s.

The birth and early activities of the Colonial Department were closely linked to the establishment, in 1923, of the Colonial Office Advisory Committee on Native Education in British Tropical Africa.¹ The Committee was created partly in response to pressure from the missionary societies but also in recognition of the need for a more positive approach by the Colonial Office towards educational development in the colonial dependencies, especially in Africa. One of the first moves by the Committee was to draw up a memorandum outlining the general principles which it considered should govern education policy in British tropical Africa.² The document included a statement which stressed the importance of attracting British teachers and administrators of the highest calibre. The Committee therefore produced a second memorandum several months later which dealt specifically with the recruitment and training of staff for the education service in Africa.³

The second memorandum emphasized the need for attractive conditions of service, including the retention of superannuation rights, and the post-graduate training of approximately nine months' duration before recruits - then referred to as 'probationers' - proceeded overseas. It also favoured refresher courses for serving officers every five years and envisaged post-graduate training being conducted at either Oxford, Cambridge, or London or at all three. In a covering letter to the Secretary of State, the Chairman of the Advisory Committee requested that the memorandum be circulated to the East and West African colonies for comment. He also expressed the hope that the courses for new entrants to the education service would be established by the autumn of 1926.⁴ As always, colonial bureaucracy took its time and it was not until September 1928 that the first batch of probationers entered training.

The Committee was not alone in identifying the need for some kind of pre-service training for education personnel. Miss Margaret Wrong, then Missionary-Secretary to the Student Christian Movement, highlighted the same need to train prospective missionaries before they embarked on educational work in Africa. In a letter written from the Canary Islands in April 1926, she mentioned that she had raised the subject with Sir Gordon Guggisberg, the Governor of the Gold Coast, and that he had asked her for more details. "I think some course at home might be a great boon and perhaps give a cohesion and a unity which is lacking now in the extremely haphazard way things have developed."⁵ She subsequently wrote a memorandum on the subject suggesting the London Day Training Centre, the forerunner of the Institute of Education, as the venue for such a venture.⁶ The Bengal Government was also interested in courses that might be offered to educators from India who visited England on scholarships.⁷

In October 1926, the Committee considered a despatch from Sir Donald Cameron, the Governor of Tanganyika, in which he sought support for a scheme of educational training for missionaries in England before their departure for Africa.⁸ He proposed paying the missions three hundred pounds for each of their missionaries who took the proposed course, and asked the Committee to advise on suitable arrangements for it. After prolonged discussion it was agreed that Major Church and Dr Vischer should approach Professor T. Percy Nunn, the Principal of the London Day Training Centre, to ascertain whether he would agree to organise a course. At the December meeting of the Committee Nunn agreed, provided the entrants, of all nationalities, had the necessary academic qualifications. He also agreed to prepare a detailed course outline for submission to the Colonial Office.⁹

The course was subsequently launched in October 1927, under the direction of James Fairgrieve, a noted geographer and a brilliant teacher of method, who contributed more than any other member of the Institute to the initial build-up of the Department until his retirement in 1935. There were ten entrants comprising three Benedictine monks, four White Fathers, and three Protestant missionaries, including one woman.¹⁰ The Colonial Department of the Institute was not formally constituted until 1934 but for historical purposes its origins are dated from the commencement of this first course in 1927.

It was not until November 1927 that the Committee was in a position to review the comments of the African colonies on the earlier staffing memorandum. There was overall support for the proposed training course, although some commented to the effect that it might prove more beneficial to conduct it in Africa rather than in the United Kingdom.¹¹ There had already been some differences of opinion as to the best venue in the UK. Oxford, in particular, expressed concern at the prospect of losing out to London; while Nunn vehemently denied that he had tried to influence the Committee in favour of London claiming that he acceded to the original request to establish

a course 'with some reluctance'.¹² The Committee settled on London largely for practical reasons. There would be no more than twenty students at most in the first year of the course and it would have been uneconomic to split them three ways. Concern was also expressed about possible problems about student accommodation at Oxford or Cambridge, while London could offer a more varied programme of teaching practice and observation. It should be emphasised that Nunn had no wish to monopolise the probationers' course and said so openly to Hans Vischer, the Secretary of the Advisory Committee.¹³

Early days

The first group of seven probationers (as distinct from missionaries), began their studies at London in September 1928, together with a further seven missionaries.¹⁴ J.H. Oldham, the Secretary of the International Missionary Council, stressed that the new venture would have an important bearing on relations between the Christian missions and colonial governments in Africa and on missionary policy generally.¹⁵ This first combined course of probationers and missionaries included lectures on the principles and methods of teaching, educational psychology, elementary biology, physical training, handwork, tropical hygiene, psychology, African languages and anthropology. Students also did teaching practice, made observation visits to selected educational institutions, and took a short course with the Boy Scouts and Girl Guides Associations. Throughout there were discussions of the special aims, methods and difficulties associated with African education.

Nunn was reasonably satisfied with the first combined course, although he wanted more emphasis in future on the practical side. He also proposed to cut out some of the lectures on African languages, and to encourage the Far Eastern dependencies to participate in subsequent courses.¹⁶ In his report on the next course he was more outspoken, commenting that the group of thirteen probationers who took it contained a 'tail' of young men who did not strike him as particularly eligible recruits to the Colonial Service.¹⁷ The numbers of probationers increased each year until the onset of the economic depression in the early 1930s. Thereafter their numbers dropped, mainly because of the minimal recruitment of personnel throughout the years leading up to the outbreak of war. Had it not been for serving education officers taking refresher courses and continued support from the missions, it is doubtful whether the Colonial Department would have survived. The fluctuation in enrolments is illustrated in Table 1.

Growing pains

Colonial governments supported the preliminary training scheme in principle but in practice experienced a major difficulty in finding recruits because they had to anticipate staffing needs some eighteen months beforehand - the time required first to select them, and then to train them. In most cases, the colonial governments were obliged to declare 'immediate' rather than 'course' vacancies to fill their vacancies. In consequence, the figures in Table 1 represent only a small proportion of the total number of educational appointments made to the Colonial Service during those years. There were, for example, seventy-four such appointments made in 1928, sixty-two in 1929, sixty-three in 1930, eighteen in 1931, four in 1932, one in 1933, and nine each in 1935 and 1936.¹⁸ It was partly to offset the small number of probationers attending the training course in the 1930s, that the Director of the Institute proposed in 1936 to introduce a one-term refresher course for serving education officers on leave. (*ibid*).

By 1930, the course was well established and Nunn was casting around for someone to take over the general management of the Colonial Department.

Table 1: Enrolments in the Colonial Department 1927-39

	<u>1927/8</u>	<u>1928/9</u>	<u>1929/30</u>	<u>1930/1</u>	<u>1931/2</u>	<u>1932/3</u>	<u>1933/4</u>
Govt.	-	8	15	14	2	-	-
Miss.	9	8	5	3	4	7	8
TOTAL	9	16	20	17	6	7	8

	<u>1934/5</u>	<u>1935/6</u>	<u>1936/7</u>	<u>1937/8</u>	<u>1938/9</u>
<u>Govt. Officers</u>					
Probationers	0	2	3	5	6
Taking Refresher Courses	2	3	3	11	7
<u>Missionaries</u>					
In training	12	12	16	17	27
Taking Refresher Courses	4	4	7	7	13
Research Students	--	-	-	1	3
Students for Colonial Service in Other Depts. of the Institute	-	3	3	2	1
TOTAL	18	24	32	43	57

(Unpublished Report of the Consultative Committee surveying the activities of the Colonial Department. . .)

In correspondence with Vischer he suggested that Rivers-Smith, the Director of Education in Tanganyika, who was soon to retire, would be an ideal choice but nothing came of the suggestion:¹⁹ so Fairgrieve remained in charge until his retirement in 1935.

In 1932 the Day Training Centre was transferred to the University of London and renamed the Institute of Education, and the Department for Colonial Studies within it was officially recognised. The following year the Division of Overseas Students was created with Professor Fred Clarke as its first Adviser. He was to succeed Nunn as Director of the Institute three years later. Meanwhile, in April 1934, Dr W.B. Mumford was appointed as a lecturer in Comparative Education with special reference to 'primitive peoples' and in September 1935 replaced Fairgrieve as Head of the Colonial Department.

W.B. Mumford, Head of Department 1935-1940

Mumford remains something of an enigma. When he died prematurely in 1951, his successor at the Institute, Professor Margaret Read, wrote a tribute for The Times. It included a brief resume of his life but little else.²⁰ Annual reports and published works suggest that Mumford directed the work of the Department with energy and dedication until he left for the United States in 1940, but there is also evidence to suggest that he never enjoyed the full support of Clarke, his immediate superior, or of the Colonial Office.²¹

He was born in 1900, and educated at Manchester Grammar School, the Royal Naval College at Dartmouth, and St John's College, Cambridge, where he studied anthropology, before completing a Diploma of Education at the Institute of Education in London. In 1923, Rivers-Smith, the Director of Education in Tanganyika, persuaded him to join the colonial service. In 1925 he acted as secretary to the important education conference held in Dar es Salaam between the Tanganyika government and the missions.²² He then served as a Superintendent of Education (as the title of Education Officer then was) in Tanganyika for three years before taking up a Rockefeller Research Fellowship at the University of Toronto. In July 1927, he returned to Tanganyika and, with the backing of Rivers-Smith, as headmaster initiated an experiment at Malangali School, Southern Tanganyika, to adapt European education to local African culture and custom. The project generated much scepticism amongst colonial officials in the country both on account of its aims and because they believed, perhaps unfairly, that Mumford was conducting it mainly to further his own academic career (Morris-Hale, W, 1960:88; Thompson A.K., 1968). Rivers-Smith retired in 1931 and his successor A.M.M. Isherwood, who had little sympathy for the project, soon terminated it. Meanwhile, in November 1929, Mumford suffered a breakdown in health and spent ten months convalescing in Britain and Canada before returning to East Africa in late 1930. Thereafter, his relationship with Isherwood rapidly deteriorated. In September 1932 he again went on leave, this time to the United States, and resigned without returning to Tanganyika. At the time of his subsequent appointment to the London Institute he held an academic post at Yale.

It appears that the Colonial Office was not entirely happy about this appointment because in December 1931, Nunn informed Dr Edwin Deller, the Principal of the University of London, that the Colonial Office was prepared to support Mumford's appointment but not as Head of the Department, a view which Nunn shared.²³ Mumford's initial status at the Institute also calls for comment. In a memorandum which he wrote in 1938,²⁴ he claimed that the Colonial Department, as distinct from the Colonial Course, was established in 1934 with himself as its Head, but this was contrary to information supplied by Nunn to Mayhew in July 1935, for inclusion in the journal Oversea Education.²⁵ In outlining new arrangements following Fairgrieve's retirement, Nunn was explicit that Professor Fred Clarke was to be the Head of a newly-constituted Division for students from the Dominions and Colonies, and that Mumford would merely be his chief assistant. It was only in later brochures that Mumford was listed as the Head of the Colonial Department, which consisted of himself, a tutor, an adviser on records and a secretary, while his Department was, in turn, listed as a part of the Division of Overseas Students under Clarke's overall direction. Comments passed by both Clarke and Christopher Cox, the Educational Adviser at the Colonial Office, at the time of Mumford's departure for the United States in 1940, and his failure to return to the Institute after the war, provide some further support for the belief that he did not enjoy the full confidence of his superiors.²⁶

During the early months of the war, Mumford spent most of his time working for the British Council which involved frequent visits abroad; and in May 1940, after undertaking a mission to Iraq, he left the Institute at short notice to undertake voluntary work in the British Library in New York. While there he was granted leave of absence for the duration of the war. His departure for the United States was not altogether unexpected. In November 1939, he had suggested to Clarke that as a wartime measure he should have only an honorary position in the University.²⁷

Soon after arriving in New York in 1940 Mumford wrote an article on the 'Third British Empire' which offended the British Government. The Colonial Office thought the article "characteristically loose and inaccurate" and not the kind of apologia which could be properly issued (especially in time of war) under the seal of the British Library's authority.²⁸ Clarke expressed sympathy with the Colonial Office viewpoint and assured Cox that it would suit the Institute if Mumford stayed in New York stating that the range of work was much reduced by the war, and that Dr Margaret Read was making an excellent impression as temporary Head of the Department.²⁹

There is, of course, another side to Mumford. Under his enthusiastic leadership the numerical strength of the Colonial Department grew steadily. In 1938/39, the last academic year before the outbreak of war, the Department had an enrolment of fifty-seven students, the highest number since the inception of the colonial course a decade earlier.³⁰ This total also included three research students. The majority were missionaries undergoing the preliminary training course or taking refresher courses. Soon after joining the Department, Mumford was also responsible for a major overhaul of courses and their content. He was also responsible for obtaining a grant of two hundred pounds from the May Esther Bedford Trust Fund (which had been created by his American wife) in order to establish a Department library. Many of the books in the collection were also donated by Mumford from his own library.

This Trust Fund, established to further colonial research, also supplied one thousand pounds annually to the Department for five years before the war. The money was used to pay the salary of a record keeper, to purchase material for the library, and to produce the cyclostyled News Bulletin which contained extracts from colonial newspapers reflecting 'native' opinion. From the outset, Mumford was anxious to make the Colonial Department a clearing house for information about the colonies. To this end he actively encouraged the establishment of a records section, again with financial support from his wife. For this reason in February 1939, he was also involved in the launching by the Colonial Department of The Colonial Review, a quarterly digest of articles and illustrations relating to education in the colonies. This informative and highly esteemed publication, renamed the Oversea Quarterly in 1957, ran continuously, together with African Women, which was started in 1954, until it ceased publication in 1965. By then it had been superseded by Teacher Education, a new journal started in May 1960, which marked a new era in which the work of the Department was increasingly focussed on teachers in all developing countries.

In 1936, Mumford argued strongly but without success, for compulsory training for all Colonial Education Service appointees.³¹ Three years later he was in the forefront of efforts to establish a Board of Colonial Studies at London to coordinate colonial research in the various schools of the University. A strong supporter of cross-disciplinary studies in education, he outlined to Clarke in November 1939, the need for an exchange of views between sociologists, agriculturalists, medical men and teachers. To achieve this he argued in favour of a new University Department of Colonial Studies, claiming that a Colonial Department attached exclusively to an Education Institute was too limited in its range of interests.³² Clarke was enthusiastic about the idea and pursued it further after Mumford's departure.

Since he was interested mainly in comparative studies of native education in various colonial dependencies and in the problems of adapting western education to meet the needs of traditional cultures, he co-authored with Major G. St.J. Orde-Brown, the former Labour Commissioner in Tanganyika, the publication in 1936, of Africans Learn to be French, a review of educational activities in French West Africa, and wrote various articles on education in Africa for the journal Africa and the London-based Year Book of Education.

Pre-war development

In retrospect, the activities of the Colonial Department in the mid to late 1930s, are of great significance. Although the training of teachers for the colonies was an essential activity which gave it a strong practical bias, it was recognised from the outset that educational administration and inspection would also be the concern of the majority of colonial education officers. So, whilst all taking the course had to meet the minimum professional teaching requirements, considerable weight was given to matters of administration and policy. The gathering of information and student research also figured prominently. A theoretical concern arose over the problems resulting from the introduction of Western education into the fabric of wholly different cultures. Consequently, 'functional anthropology', as propounded by Professor Bronislaw Malinowski at the London School of Economics in the 1930s, provided a strong link between education and anthropology during this period. It was argued that cultural change in Africa at the turn of the century had been uncontrolled and had led to disruption and maladjustment. Ideally, there should be a judicious blending of cultures, and education, widely regarded as the main agent in transforming native societies, should be used to soften the impact of Western civilisation on traditional cultures.

Students were required to attend lectures on the principles of education, methods of teaching, psychology and hygiene, the English educational system, and either the history of education, comparative education, or further educational psychology. The course also involved visits to schools and teaching practice. Throughout the 1930s there were many prominent visiting lectures. The contents of those lectures are in most cases lost forever but one still wonders, for example, what Malinowski, Arthur Mayhew, Susan Isaacs and Rivers-Smith said to students in the 1934/35 academic year, or what Dr Audrey Richards, the noted anthropologist, said to them in the Spring Term of 1936? The programme of lectures for the Summer Term of 1937 listed such subjects as 'Cooperative Societies in Malaya'; 'The Settler point-of-view in Native Education'; 'Labour Movements in Africa and their effects on education'; 'Religion and education in the dependencies'; and 'Folk tales and their educational use'. Likewise in 1938, students were encouraged to attend lectures on technical education in British and foreign dependencies; Africans' and their place in the modern world; the training of teachers and the Jeanes system; the status of women and the education of girls in the colonies; and the position of the American negro. Dr Schrieke of the Colonial Institute, Amsterdam, spoke on Dutch ideals in native education; Sir George Anderson addressed students on rural education and the improvement of agriculture in India; while O.T. Dussek spoke about the Sultan Idris Training College in Malaya. In the same year Dr Margaret Read was first listed as a visiting lecturer in anthropology, although her contacts with students of the Colonial Department extended back to 1934.

The work of the Department was still focussed mainly, but not exclusively, on Africa. Major research topics included the use of textbooks in British dependencies; the problems of mass education; the educability of 'primitive' peoples; detailed surveys of educational problems in various British dependencies and the educational policies of other colonial powers; and the teaching of subjects like arithmetic and geography in colonial settings.³³

The Institute's buildings were requisitioned by the Ministry of Information at the outbreak of war and all teaching was transferred to Nottingham. However, most of the staff of the Colonial Department stayed in London, together with the Departmental library and the research and information section, and soon established a close working relationship with their

Ministerial colleagues. The Institute remained in Nottingham until the latter part of 1943, although colonial students did return to the capital for teaching practice and for some concentrated courses of lectures two or three times a year. The early years of the war were, as Cox aptly remarked, a period when the Colonial Department lived an arduous and useful, though rather peculiar life of its own in London, acting as a clearing-house of information on a wide array of colonial matters (Cox, 1952). Perhaps its most memorable activities in this period were the special courses, arranged by Margaret Read and conducted in French, for the Free French, in association with the School of Oriental and African Studies.

Margaret Read: temporary, then full-time, Head of Department 1940-1955

When Mumford left for the United States in July 1940, Clarke asked Margaret Read to assume temporary part-time responsibility for the Colonial Department. She was destined to remain as departmental head for a period of sixteen years until her retirement in 1955. During that time she established a thriving and unique department and forged deep and lasting links with senior staff at the Colonial Office, including a close friendship with Sir Christopher Cox. In the early post-war years she also became recognised as a leading authority on colonial education matters. In 1949, the Institute recognised her contribution by according her professorial status. In the early war years Cox referred to her as 'a remarkable person', a view which Clarke readily endorsed on behalf of her colleagues at the Institute.³⁴ She undoubtedly ranks with the late Dame Margery Perham and Freda Gwilliam as one of the most influential of the women who helped shape British colonial education policy both during and after the war.³⁵

Margaret Read was born in 1889 and educated at Cambridge where she completed a B.A. in history in 1911 and a diploma in geography a year later.³⁶ In the 1920s she was engaged in social work in India during which she developed a lifelong interest in social anthropology and, in particular, in the work of Professor Malinowski. In 1931, she was appointed as a lecturer in social anthropology at the London School of Economics and subsequently undertook field work in East Africa. She completed her doctorate in social anthropology at the University of London in 1934. She also gave lectures to students in the Colonial Department at the Institute of Education. This link was formalised in 1940 when, as stated above, she became the temporary part-time Head of the Department. The following year she joined the full-time staff of the Institute. During and after the war she played a very active and influential role in the work of the Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies. Together with Sir Fred Clarke, she was responsible for much of the report on Mass Education published in 1944,³⁷ and also served as a member of the Elliot Commission which reported on higher education in West Africa in 1945.³⁸ Two years later she teamed up with Miss Freda Gwilliam from the Colonial Office to report on the education of women and girls in Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia.³⁹ In 1945, she was appointed the permanent Head of the Department with the status of Reader. In 1949 she was awarded the CBE for her services to colonial education, and became Professor of Education "with special reference to colonial areas". Upon her retirement in September 1955 (at the age of sixty-six), she took up a position as Visiting Professor of Education at the University of Ibadan in Nigeria.

By all accounts she displayed great energy and dedication in her work. Clarke, who had a deep admiration and respect for her, praised her highly. Indeed, he claimed that there were times when he had to check an apparent disposition on her behalf to run away with the whole Institute in pursuit of her goal. The Headship of the Colonial Department was, he suspected, no more than a stepping stone in a wider purpose. His abiding impression of

her was of someone "out and out married" to a big idea. "If you should be standing in the way of it, then look out. All the resources then come into play".⁴⁰ In any dispute she was evidently a worthy opponent. Dr Jeffery, the Principal of the Institute in the early 1950s, once remarked to her in a friendly way that he sometimes called her the 'battleaxe'.⁴¹ She clearly gave the Colonial Department strong and purposeful leadership, especially during the difficult war years and in the aftermath when the Department grew rapidly both in size and influence and benefited greatly from the fact that she enjoyed the confidence of the Colonial Office to a remarkable degree.

Her abiding interest in the problems generated by the clash of cultures in Africa and elsewhere coincided with the central concern of British colonial policy in the inter-war years. She conceived of education as far more than the acquisition of basic skills. It should include ethics, values and a philosophic outlook or *weltanschauung*. Her early experience in India had aroused an interest in cultural change, especially in the ways that urbanisation transformed traditional Indian rural village life. At the Institute she maintained this interest which in 'mass' or 'fundamental' education, or 'community development' as it was termed in Britain at the time, reflected her anthropological background. In the colonial context, she was primarily interested in the impact of the culture of the metropolitan powers on local cultural traditions. The French had long espoused a policy of assimilation whereas the British had favoured a policy of adaptation - a fusing of the best elements in traditional and western culture. The results were uneven. As she herself admitted (1950:6) "The problems which have accumulated as the result of this cultural policy. . . are formidable". After 1945, the colonial powers had to attend at the bar of world opinion and justify their retention of colonial territories and their conduct towards them.

She identified two types of problems, both of which figured prominently in the work of the Colonial Department. The first concerned broad theoretical matters such as how best to fuse traditional and western cultures. The second were related to practical everyday matters. For example, should schooling be run by the government or left to voluntary initiative? How should schools be financed? What relative emphases should governments place on primary and secondary education respectively? What language should be used as the medium of instruction? By 1950, she was far from convinced that Europeans could synthesize or bring together in any coherent unity, habits of thought and modes of expression which had arisen in totally different milieux. She used as an example the culture of Bantu Africa and that of Western Europe with its Graeco-Roman Christian roots. They might not mix but she believed that they could co-exist as in any Englishman who was also a great scholar of Chinese or Indian culture. In the educational domain, she was convinced that the British should shed their paternalist attitude and learn to work with, rather than for, the colonial peoples.

Her contribution to the thought and practice of post-war British colonial education policy is clear enough but her record of published work is not voluminous for an academic of professorial rank.⁵⁸ This fact did not pass unnoticed when she was considered for promotion to full professor in 1948. Dr Jeffery, the Director of the Institute, strongly supported her case but freely admitted that her published record was slight. However, he believed that she had broken new ground and achieved a genuine advance in both the theory and practice of education. In a letter to Cox, he claimed that she had researched extensively but the result was written large in Africa and not tucked away in learned journals. Nevertheless, he admitted that it would be hard to convince the University of that fact.⁴³ As might be expected, Margaret Read was strongly supported by Clarke and Cox.⁴⁴ The latter high-

lighted the critical nature of the 1940s for colonial policy. It was a period, he claimed, when policy had to be thought out afresh and 'got across' to colonial peoples who were experiencing rapid social and economic changes, and Margaret Read had played a leading role in that process. Cox suggested that her lack of published material was due largely to the volume of vitally important work that she had done for the Colonial Office. In 1944-45, for example, she attended no fewer than forty-four half-day meetings on Advisory Committee affairs. She had, he concluded, brought the hallmark of scholarship and authority to the Colonial Department despite her many outside commitments. Even more convincing, at least to the outside world, was the influence she had on her students, among whom were Otto Raum and Hamed Ammar whose doctoral theses achieved international fame and are still regarded as seminal works.

Margaret Read eventually got her promotion but the controversy highlights the important practical aspect that was always associated with the work of the Colonial Department in its early years. This has been maintained ever since but, on occasions, it has been a source of criticism from the more 'academically-minded' staff in other departments of the Institute. Traditionally, the majority of staff in the Colonial Department were recruited from experienced and often distinguished members of the Colonial Education Service.⁴⁵ All were university graduates with many years of practical experience of teaching and administration, especially in Africa, but they generally lacked the published research records normally associated with appointees to university staff positions. Their practical experience and their numerous personal contacts with those 'in the field' helped to give the Department a unique overseas relationship but the volume and quality of research scholarship produced by the Department did not always compare favourably, at least in the minds of some critics, with that of other departments in the Institute.

The problem surfaced with Margaret Read's promotion but it was also evident when at the same time the Department embarked on a major expansionary phase. In making new staff appointments it was agreed that future staff should have a wide practical experience of colonial education but it was also acknowledged that there was now a place for younger persons with more limited experience abroad who were likely to develop the more academic aspects of the Department's work.⁴⁶ The Director also warned Margaret Read to be careful in suggesting staff appointments to the senior lecturer grade. 'I realise the importance of practical experience in your Department, but we may have a difficult job in balancing the length and kind of Colonial experience against weakness of academic qualifications'.⁴⁷ The relatively poor academic quality of many students recruited from colonial backgrounds, including in particular, their often severely limited knowledge of English, was also a frequent source of comment by the staff of other departments in the Institute.

At the end of the Second World War the Colonial Department had been established for little more than a decade, during which, as has been seen, growth had been adversely affected by the economic recession of the 1930s as well as by war. With the advent of peace and a fresh initiative in colonial policy, the Department was about to enter into a period of rapid and sustained expansion and to acquire an even greater reputation, especially in British Africa.

Because during the war the Colonial Department cooperated closely with the Ministry of Information its research and information services expanded accordingly. As already stated these services were supported initially by the May Esther Bedford Trust Fund but that source of finance lapsed in 1942. The Institute of Education then approached the Colonial Office for assistance.

The initial response was a grant of 750 pounds which did not satisfy the Institute, and eventually the sum was raised to one thousand pounds, to be paid annually. In arguing its case, the Institute emphasized that the time and energy of both the acting Head of the Colonial Department [Read] and the Director of the Institute [Clarke] were being increasingly drawn upon by the Colonial Office for services which did not constitute a necessary part of the duties which they owed to the University that paid them.⁴⁸

In December 1937, a joint Consultative Committee was established between the Colonial Office and the Institute. One of its first tasks was to report on the activities of the Colonial Department. Mumford was not a member of the sub-committee that compiled the report but he did attend all meetings to give evidence. The report traced the development of the Department and highlighted its threefold but intimately related activities of pre-service training, the gathering of information on the colonies, and research into problems associated with education in the colonies. Due acknowledgement was paid to the generous private donations and voluntary labours that had enabled the Department to expand its activities but the sub-committee was firmly of the opinion that the future maintenance of the Department should be borne from general Institute funds. It further recommended that there should be an increase in permanent staff and that the status of the Head of the Department should be raised to that of Reader.⁴⁹ Unfortunately, the war intervened before any of the recommendations could be implemented. Thereafter, the future of the Colonial Department was determined largely by the report of the Devonshire Committee which examined post-war training for the colonial service.⁵⁰

Post-war development

The Devonshire Committee foreshadowed a major increase in recruits to all branches of the Colonial Service after the war as colonial development programmes got under way. It argued that new and unprecedented demands would be placed on the Colonial Service at a time when colonial administration was increasingly the subject of searching criticism both at home and abroad. Therefore, it strongly recommended that all recruits should undergo a thorough course of pre-service training before proceeding abroad, and that this should be supplemented by a second but shorter course after a period of initial field experience.

The Committee was concerned primarily with the recruitment and training of administrative officers but the principles outlined in its report were also to be applied to the recruitment of all professional staff, including those joining the Education Service. Clearly the Colonial Department at the Institute would be expected to shoulder the main burden of training teachers and providing advanced courses for those on their second 'Devonshire' course. With this in mind, the Joint Consultative Committee set up a further sub-committee, which included Margaret Read, to report on post-war plans for the Colonial Department.⁵¹ It was her summary of the work of the Department and its future needs that provided the basis for discussion.⁵²

She stated that her Department was engaged mainly in supplementing, by special courses and tutorial guidance, the basic training for a Diploma of Education, for those going out to the colonies to engage in educational work for the first time, or for those sent to England for a course of study by the colonial governments or the missions. Her summary of the students in the Department at the start of the 1944-45 academic year reported that fifteen were doing the Diploma course. These included seven recruited in England and eight experienced teachers from Nigeria, the Gold Coast, British Guiana and the Sudan. There were also two part-time students, one from England and a missionary from northern Nigeria, and sixteen 'visiting' students.

They comprised thirteen experienced mission teachers home on leave; one student from the School of Oriental and African Studies; a further student from the American Office of War Information; and a nurse from the Methodist Missionary Society. Margaret Read also highlighted the consultative and information-gathering functions of the Department. In arguing for an extra tutor and a research assistant, she stressed the heterogeneous nature of the students and their special need for individual tuition. She also suggested that consideration be given to the idea that at some future date the work of her Department be separated from basic teacher-training.

The sub-committee thought that her plans for future development were far too modest and her budget proposals inadequate. They predicted a vast increase in recruits to the Colonial Education Service and a rapidly growing need for special courses for experienced expatriate teachers home on leave and indigenous teachers sent to the Institute by colonial governments. Accordingly it recommended a substantial expansion of the Department which far exceeded the modest increase in staff asked for by Margaret Read. It was agreed therefore, that the staff should eventually consist of the Head of Department, who should have the status of Reader, and six senior lecturers. It was not anticipated that young staff with the necessary experience would be available for recruitment at the lecturer level immediately after the war. The need to expand the size of the Department was duly approved in principle by both the Institute of Education and the Colonial Office. The University of London clearly attached major importance to the future of its fledgling as this extract from the Delegacy Minutes of the period clearly illustrates:

In the Colonial section of its Institute of Education it seems likely that the University will possess an organisation which will have a central importance in the functioning of colonial systems of education. As the main centre in Britain for research, for specialized training and advanced studies, it seems destined to move on to a plane out of all relation to the conditions under which it has worked hitherto.⁵³

In determining the Institute's development policy for the first post-war quinquennium (1947-52), the dramatic increase in student numbers in the Colonial Department was noted. In November 1946, there were 117 students, the largest number ever enrolled. A new and significant long-term phenomenon was the large influx of students from the colonial territories, and especially from west Africa.⁵⁴

The Institute also realised that a crucial aspect of British post-war education policy in the colonial territories would be an adequate supply of trained teachers. The Colonial Department was uniquely placed to meet that need and also to provide the specialized courses for Colonial Service Education Officers as outlined in the Devonshire training scheme. Accordingly, it was proposed to let student numbers in the Department rise to 160. Allowance was also to be made for up to forty students on follow-up second Devonshire courses lasting up to seven months. The staff was to be expanded to include five senior lecturers and seven lecturers, with the salaries of two senior lecturers and one lecturer being covered by a special grant from the Colonial Office.

In the event, the Department never reached the size envisaged, mainly because the projected number of 'second' Devonshire students failed to materialise. Nevertheless, there was a significant increase in the number of staff appointments after the war. Most were drawn from the ranks of education officers in the colonies. They brought a strong practical emphasis to their teaching, together with a wealth of personal contacts, which

enabled them to exert an influence on colonial education, especially in Africa, far beyond that of the staff of any other university education department. Indeed, in the 1960s the overriding emphasis in the Department on Africa gave rise to criticism in some quarters.

The rapid post-war proliferation of students from colonial backgrounds - each year they outnumbered all other students and represented as many as thirty or more different countries - was to prove an enduring and noteworthy feature of the Department. They provided a richness and heterogeneity which made it unique in British universities, although their presence was not always an unmixed blessing, because of their poor academic background. Most students studied for either what is now the Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE), but was then called the Diploma Course, or the non-graduate Professional Certificate. Those studying for the latter were all specially selected men and women, often with many years of teaching experience in the colonies, who were expected to fill senior positions on their return. The Professional Certificate was started in 1944 and ran uninterrupted until 1967, by which time the former colonies had their own training institutions and there was no longer any need for it. No less than 834 students took the course before it was terminated.⁵⁵ The Department also received its share of students who undertook the Associateship course, a unique feature of the Institute, which provided for experienced teachers to work for a year on a subject of their choice. Numbers remained below ten per year until the 1960s, but thereafter there was a marked upsurge. A variety of special and short courses were also run each year but higher degree work remained a comparatively minor feature of the work of the Department until the expansion of the 1960s. At whatever level its curriculum was an ambitious and pioneering one with increased emphases on the roles in education overseas of the mother-tongue, English as a second or foreign language, rural societies, and women and girls. Thus John Wilson was specially recruited to deal with language; Nick Evans to help with rural education, and Doris Baggott to look after the education of women and girls.

In the years immediately after the Second World War, the Department's main emphasis was on teacher-training but a strong link was also established with Mass Education or Community Development, which constituted a major thrust in British post-war colonial policy. The subject figured prominently in the Colonial Office Memorandum on the Education of African Communities (1935)⁵⁶ and later, in the Memorandum on Mass Education in African Society (1944) (*op.cit.*) to which both Clarke and Margaret Read made major contributions. Margaret Read also attended the early Unesco conferences at Paris and Mexico City, where she was soon acknowledged as an expert in Fundamental Education, the United Nations' term for Mass Education.

In consequence from 1949 onwards, the Department acted as the British clearing house and bureau of information on Community Development. A special government grant also made it possible to publish a quarterly called The Community Development Bulletin, and staff spent much of their time running seminars and short courses on community development for second Devonshire students and other senior colonial administrators. Information and lectures on Community Development were also provided to many outside bodies. Later under Dr Batten the courses were extended to the nationals of the countries concerned and under him achieved international recognition.

The strong links forged between the senior staff of the Colonial Office and the Department during the war continued unabated. Sir Christopher Cox, his deputy W.E.F. Ward, Freda Gwilliam, Harold Houghton, and Sir Andrew

Cohen, all lectured to students on aspects of their work. In return, Margaret Read served as a member of the Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies, the Social Sciences Research Council, and COCAST, the Colonial Office Committee, established in 1950, to oversee the establishment in the colonies of Colleges of Arts, Science and Technology. She was also a member of the sub-committee which compiled the report on Education for Citizenship in 1948.⁵⁷ Dr G.B. Jeffery, the Director of the Institute, also examined the problems of examinations in West Africa in the latter part of 1949 and later in 1951 headed a delegation, selected by the Colonial Office, that reported on education in the West African colonies in preparation for the major conference on African education held at Cambridge in 1952.⁵⁸ Margaret Read could not have served on so many committees and develop the public relations side of the Department without the support of her No. 2: A.S. Harrison. Not herself a professional educationist, she gave the Department its valuable anthropological bias, leaving him responsible for the day-to-day administration of the Department. Apart from developing this key back-up role to the Chair, an emphasis on forging close staff/student relations emerged through his influence - and remains a predominant feature of the Department to this day.

Change of title

After the war the 'colonial' label became an increasing source of concern because of its newly-acquired political connotation. Accordingly, in February 1950, Margaret Read wrote to Dr Jeffery suggesting a change of name to 'The Department of Tropical Education'.⁵⁹ In support of her case, she mentioned the political opprobrium latterly acquired by the term 'colonial', and also pointed out that many students in the Department were from the Sudan and other non-colonial areas. She further argued that the Department's primary focus of study was directed at education in tropical areas, and suggested that the change of name would bring it into line with the University of London's Department of Tropical Medicine.

Jeffery was not unsympathetic but he had reservations. He observed that every good English word used in connection with the colonies sooner or later became taboo and that it was becoming increasingly impossible to write anything about the colonies in plain English. He then questioned whether the Colonial Department should allow itself to be influenced by "this rather silly sentimentality. After all, we still have a Colonial Office and a Secretary of State for the Colonies". He also did not think that the word "tropical" had yet acquired the status of an adjective with a derived sense. "'Tropical Education', if it meant anything at all, surely meant education that was hot and damp. Is that what you provide?" he asked. In conclusion, he suggested that she should have further discussion with him on the matter.⁶⁰

Clearly she did, and to good effect, because in September 1952, the Colonial Department became known as the Department of Education in Tropical Areas (ETA). In explaining the change, Margaret Read claimed that the new title was indicative of a Department that had something to offer to students from all tropical areas and not solely those from British colonial territories.⁶¹

Change of Head after sixteen years

In 1955, Margaret Read retired. Dr Jeffery observed that she had given an important underlying philosophy to the work of her Department; namely, that education in tropical areas was a part of the general social problem, and that the study of education in such areas was closely linked with the social setting in which teachers worked. At the same time, he also hinted that there might well be a change of orientation with the appointment of a new Head of Department and the force of recent events, by which he meant the constitutional advances made by the west African colonies.⁶²

Consideration of who should succeed Margaret Read as Head of the Department of ETA began in late 1954. Amongst the names initially mentioned were those of Dr Audrey Richards, the anthropologist, Cox, Dr Camilla Wedgwood, V.L. Griffiths, and J.L. Lewis, but Jeffery doubted whether any of them except Audrey Richards "quite carried the guns".⁶³ Camilla Wedgwood was also an anthropologist who although British had spent much of her academic life in Australia. After the war she lectured on native education at the Australian School of Pacific Administration and was later in charge of the training of government officers for service in Papua New Guinea.⁶⁴ Perhaps it was just as well that she was ruled out of consideration because she died prematurely in March 1955, aged fifty-four years. Griffiths had formerly been the Principal of the Teachers' Training College at Bakht er Ruda in the Sudan (Griffiths, 1953). He then spent a short period on the staff of the Colonial Department before becoming a tutor in the Oxford University Department of Education. John Lewis had been a student in the Colonial Department in the early 1930s. He had then worked for the Church Missionary Society in Africa until he joined the staff of the Colonial Department in 1944. Five years later, he moved to the Overseas Department of Oxford University Press to become the Professor of Education and Director of the Institute of Education at the new University College of the Gold Coast. In September 1958, he was destined to return to the Institute of London as Professor and Head of the Department of ETA.

In January 1955, Jeffery informed Margaret Read that Cox had declined an offer to succeed her.⁶⁵ The approach was doubtless motivated by Cox's academic standing but it is also worth noting that over the years he and Margaret Read had developed a close personal friendship, based on their mutual professional interests, which was to endure until Cox's death in 1982.⁶⁶ Dr Jeffery also considered other senior education staff in the Colonial Office as potential successors but he doubted whether any of them would have been acceptable to the Institute's Board of Advisers. The fact that senior Colonial Office staff were some of the first to be considered to replace Margaret Read, illustrates the strength of the long-standing link between the Colonial Office and the Colonial Department.

A successor to Margaret Read was eventually found in Professor H.L. Elvin, the Director of the Unesco Department of Education, who took up his new appointment in April 1956; Sollis having acted as temporary head in the interim. Within two years, however, Elvin became Director of the Institute, in succession to Jeffery, and John Lewis returned from Ghana to take over the Department.

In his inaugural lecture in December 1956, Lionel Elvin emphasised how Margaret Read had been concerned primarily with the role of education in the clash of cultures and changing ways of life. Her viewpoint was essentially that of a functional anthropologist, and reflected the major preoccupation of British colonial policy in the period between the two world

wars. The Second World War, however, ushered in a new chapter in the history of colonialism leading to rapid political changes which heralded the dissolution of the colonial empire. Such was the environment in which the Department of ETA had to operate in future. It was no longer enough, said Elvin, to know what the aims of British education policy should be in the dependencies, for the policy was rapidly ceasing to be ours to make. The challenge ahead was to develop a new role by which British aid and technical assistance could be of maximum use to newly independent states.

End of an era

Margaret Read's retirement clearly marked the end of an era. It may not have been then obvious but the colonial empire was on the verge of dissolution. Soon the 'wind of change' would blow across Africa and elsewhere and the Department would forge a new role in association, first with the Department of Technical Cooperation and then with the Ministry of Overseas Development, as a spearhead of British technical assistance in what became the Third World.

In the mid 1950s the emphasis on the training of teachers for the colonies was as strong as ever - but the theoretical emphasis in the Department was fast shifting away from the sociological and anthropological approach towards a greater concern for the role of education as a vehicle of modernization and economic growth.

The Colonial Department was a unique creation and its early history a tale of initiative, frustration caused by prolonged economic recession, war, and eventual success. It brought together, through the study of education, people drawn from many countries and provided them with an unforgettable and richly rewarding experience.⁶⁷ It was, and still is, a heritage which merits greater acknowledgement.

The years since Margaret Read's departure in the mid 1950s have been no less significant, but, as Cox remarked in his 1952 jubilee address, prudence suggests that one should not attempt to describe the recent history of the Department to their faces.

Notes

1. For an account of the establishment of the Committee see Clatworthy, F.S. (1971). The Foundation of British Colonial Education Policy, 1923-1948, University of Michigan School of Education.
2. Education Policy in British Tropical Africa (1925). Cmd. 2374.
3. Education Staff in British Tropical Africa (November 1925). ACNEBTA. The joint IMC/CBMS Missionary Archives Africa and India 1910-1945, Box 223 (microfiche).
4. Chairman (W. Ormsby-Gore) to Secretary of State 13 November 1925, Joint IMC/CBMS Archives, Box 223.
5. Margaret Wrong to Miss Betty Gibson 21 April 1926, Joint IMC/CBMS Archives, Box 221.
6. A Special Teachers' Training Course for Candidates for the African Educational Service, July 1926, IMC/CBMS Archives, Box 221.
7. Michael West to J.H. Oldham, 11 May 1927, IMC/CBMS Archives, Box 221.
8. Minutes of the 28th meeting (14 October 1926) of the ACNEBTA, IMC/CBMS Archives, Box 222.
9. Minutes of the 29th meeting (2 December 1926) of the ACNEBTA, IMC/CBMS Archives, Box 222.
10. Colonial Office 1926-1930 file, Institute of Education (IOE) Archives.
11. Minutes of the 39th meeting (17 November 1927) of the ACNEBTA, IMC/CBMS Archives, Box 225.
12. Nunn to Dr. M.W. Keatinge, 15 March 1927, Colonial Office 1926-1930 file, IOE Archives.
13. Nunn to Vischer 23 December 1927, Early Colonial Department Correspondence 1927-35 file, IOE Archives.
14. Early Colonial Department Correspondence 1927-35 file, IOE Archives.
15. Oldham to Secretaries of Missions, 12 June 1928, IMC/CBMS Archives, Box 221.
16. Minutes of the 52nd meeting (13 May 1929) of the Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies (ACEC), formerly the ACNEBTA.
17. Early Colonial Department Correspondence file, IOE Archives.
18. Recruitment and Training of Education Officers. Memorandum prepared in the Appointments Department, Colonial Office [1936]. Colonial Department 1935-1952 file, IOE Archives.
19. Nunn to Vischer, 27 March 1930, Early Colonial Department Correspondence 1927-1935 file, IOE Archives.

20. The Times, 7 February 1951.
21. Sir Fred Clarke to Dr G.B. Jeffery, 19 Aug. 1948, file 409, Cox Papers. PRO (Kew).
22. Report of the Education Conference 5th-12th October 1925. Tanganyika Territory (1926).
23. Nunn to Deller, 1 December 1933, Early Colonial Department Correspondence file, IOE Archives.
24. See Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies Consultative Sub-Committee 1938-1944 file, IOE Archives.
25. Note from Nunn to Vischer, 12 July 1935, Early Colonial Correspondence file 1927-35, IOE Archives.
26. Clarke to Cox 31 October 1940, and Cox to Angus Fletcher 5 November 1940, file 412, Cox Papers.
27. Mumford to Clarke, 23 November 1930, Colonial Studies (Pension) Correspondence file, IOE Archives.
28. Cox to Fletcher, op.cit.
29. Clarke to Cox, op.cit.
30. See Table 1.
31. Draft Minute [1936] Colonial Department 1935-1952 file, IOE Archives.
32. Mumford to Clarke 23 November 1939, Colonial Studies (Pension) Correspondence 1939-1940 file, IOE Archives.
33. See Annual Report (cyclostyled) of the Colonial Department, Institute of Education.
34. Cox to Clarke 8 January 1941, and Clarke to Cox 10 January 1941, Dr M. Read file, IOE Archives.
35. When Cox delivered his jubilee lecture in 1952, Margaret Read was in attendance. She is now in her ninety-eighth year.
36. Brief details of her early life are to be found in her personal file 'Dr M. Read' in the IOE Archives.
37. Mass Education in African Society, Colonial No. 186, 1943.
38. Report of the Commission on Higher Education in West Africa, Cmd. 6655, 1945.
39. Report on the Education of Women and Girls in Northern Rhodesia, August and September 1947 (Lusaka 1948). Gwilliam, F. & Read, M. (1948), Report on the Education of Women and Girls in Nyasaland, August-September 1947 (typescript), ACEC 6/1948.
40. Clarke to Jeffery 19 August 1948, file 409, Cox Papers.
41. Jeffery to Read, 11 March 1953, Dr M. Read file, IOE Archives.

42. As a Lecturer in Anthropology at the London School of Economics, she wrote various journal articles including 'Native Standards of Living and African Culture Change', which appeared as a supplement to Africa, XI, 3, 1938. She also made major contributions to a variety of Colonial Office educational reports including Mass Education. . . (1943) op.cit. Her educational publications included Africans and Their Schools (1953) and Education and Social Change in Tropical Areas (1955) which consists of a selection of her more significant papers and journal articles.
43. Jeffery to Cox, 13 August 1948, Dr M. Read file, IOE Archives.
44. Clarke to Jeffery 19 August 1948, and Cox to Jeffery 28 September 1948, file 409, Cox Papers.
45. Early examples are Sollis, ex-Director of Education Malaysia, and Mort, founder of the prestigious Kaduna College, Northern Nigeria.
46. Notes on Colonial Department, 27 June 1947, Colonial Department 1946-51 file, IOE Archives.
47. Jeffery to Read 15 May 1946, Colonial Department Correspondence 1946-1951 file, IOE Archives.
48. For correspondence on this matter see Colonial Department 1935-1952 file, IOE Archives.
49. Report of the Consultative Committee Surveying the Activities of the Colonial Department of the University of London Institute of Education (June 1939), Colonial Department 1935-1952 file, IOE Archives.
50. Post-War Training for the Colonial Service, Colonial No. 198, 1946.
51. Report by the Consultative Sub-Committee (ACEC/IOE) on post-war plans for the Colonial Department of the Institute. . . ACEC 1/45. Institute Delegacy Notes 1944-48 file, IOE Archives.
52. See Appendix to the report.
53. IOE Delegacy Minutes of Meeting 15 February 1945, Appendix Document E. The Needs of the Colonial Department. Institute Delegacy Notes 1944-1948 file, IOE Archives.
55. Annual Report of the Department of Education in Tropical Areas 1966-1967.
56. Memorandum on the Education of African Communities. Colonial No. 105, 1935.
57. Education for Citizenship in Africa, Colonial No. 216, 1948.
58. Report by Dr G.B. Jeffery on a visit to West Africa December 1949 to March 1950, Gold Coast Colony 1950.
59. Read to Jeffery 17 February 1950, Colonial Department 1946-1951 file, IOE Archives.
60. Jeffery to Read, 21 March 1950, Colonial Department 1946-1951 file, IOE Archives.

61. Annual Report of the Colonial Department, Institute of Education 1951-1952.
62. Minutes of the 219th meeting (10 November 1955) of the ACEC, C0987/7.
63. Jeffery to Gen. Sir Ronald Forbes Adam (Chairman, University of London) 17 November 1954. Dr M. Read file, IOE Archives.
64. Alexander, J.A. (ed.), Who's Who in Australia 1950, Melbourne.
65. Jeffery to Read 5 January 1955, Dr M. Read file, IOE Archives.
66. See various correspondence in Cox Papers.
67. For example, in the 1956-1957 academic year, the Department comprised 160 students, 96 of whom were from overseas, representing no less than thirty-three separate territories.

Additional Bibliography

- Ammar, H. (1954). Growing up in an Egyptian Village: Silwa, Province of Aswan, Routledge.
- Cox, Sir C. (1952). 'The Development of the Institute in relation to the Colonies', Jubilee Lectures, University of London Institute of Education/Evans Bros.
- Elvin, L. (1956). Education and the End of Empire, University of London Institute of Education, Studies in Education 5.
- (1977). 'A World Dimension', Seventy-fifth Anniversary, University of London.
- Griffiths, V.L. (1953). An Experiment in Education: An account of the attempts to improve the lower stages of boys' education in the Moslem Anglo-Egyptian Sudan 1930-1950, London: Longmans.
- Morris-Hale, W. (1960). British Administration in Tanganyika from 1920 to 1945, University of Geneva unpublished PhD dissertation.
- Mumford, W.B. & Orde-Brown, G. St J. (1936). Africans Learn to be French, London: Evans Bros.
- Raum, O.F. (1940). Chaga Childhood, OUP/International Institute of African Languages and Cultures.
- Read, M. (1950). Education and Cultural Tradition, University of London Institute of Education, Studies in Education, 2.
- (1953). Africans and their Schools, Longmans, British Commonwealth Affairs 8.
- (1955). Education and Social Change in Tropical Areas, London: Nelson.
- Thompson, A.R. (1968). The Adaptation of Education to African Society in Tanganyika under British rule, University of London unpublished PhD dissertation.