



The Political Factor in the Development of Education in East Africa, 1920s–1963

Bhekithemba R. Mngomezulu *

University of Kwa-Zulu Natal, Ashwood, South Africa

The history of education in East Africa dates back to the early 1900s. For decades authors have tried to archive this history. Most tend to present a general account. Drawing from archival research and other sources, this article focuses on two themes. First, it demonstrates that the political factor played an instrumental role in the development of education in East Africa. Second, it shows that this development came as a result of African agitation for education and as part of British imperial policy. It concludes by stating that this history of education cannot be discussed outside of the political context.

Introduction

Education, however it is defined, is the verve and nerve of each and every society around the globe. All communities want to educate their youths so that they could fit into the societies in which they live. This view is predicated on the understanding that education does not take a single form everywhere all the time. The fact that societies do not develop at the same pace means that one society could have formal education while another one still offers an informal type. The key question is why should a society have an education system in the first place? The answer to this question determines the kind of education system a society embraces. This view was encapsulated in the *Education in East Africa* Report, which stated: “The determination of the aims of education is vital to the organization of an effective system of schools.” (*Education in East Africa*, 1925, p. 7). If the aim of education is to promote evangelism as was the case in most of Africa, everything would be done to achieve this goal. All education is goal directed.

*Corresponding author: University of Kwa-Zulu Natal, Ashwood, South Africa.
Email: kizulu@yahoo.com

Thus, we have *inter alia* elite-oriented education, production-oriented education, universal-access education, and so forth (Kerr, 1972). Each of these types aims to achieve a particular goal and is therefore structured accordingly. In the African context, these types of education cut across time, that is, the precolonial, colonial and postcolonial periods. Any discussion on the history of education in East Africa has to consider this broader overview.

There is vast literature on the history of education in East Africa produced by both African and Africanist scholars over the years (Ssekamwa and T-Ama, 2005; Ssekamwa and Lugumba, 2002; Nyaigotti-Chacha, 1997; Opio-Odongo, 1993; Furley and Watson, 1978; Barkan, 1975; King, 1971; Cameron, 1970; Furley and Watson, 1966; Goldthorpe, 1965; Macpherson, 1964; Hunter, 1963). Some of this history is contained in the various reports, which either have a country focus or discuss East Africa in general. By and large, these sources discuss the history of education in East Africa primarily in a narrative form. They present a chronological account of how education evolved in the region over time. While some sources focus on primary and secondary education, others invest time and effort, discussing the history of higher education. Southall (1974), for example, discusses the history of higher education in East Africa as part of the regional integration agenda.

The main objective of this article is to trace the role played by the political factor in the history of education in East Africa. It argues that both the colonial government authorities and the East-African academic and political leadership were largely influenced by the political factor when they planned education for individual countries in East Africa or for the region as whole. Drawing from archival research done in East Africa between 2002 and 2003 for a Ph.D. in African political history, the article expounds on this theme. Structurally, the article begins by drawing a link between education and politics. It then traces the role played by the political factor in the development of education in East Africa from the 1920s to 1963 when the Federal University of East Africa was established to cater for the educational needs of the East-African people

The Link between Education and Politics: A Theoretical Overview

Politics and education are inextricably interwoven. In its very loose form, the concept “politics” refers to “the art or science of government or governing, especially the governing of a political entity, such as a nation, and the administration and control of its internal and external affairs” (<http://www.answers.com/topic/politics>). If politics have to do with governing, it is logical to conclude that the colonial state in East Africa had to draw from politics when planning regional education. In 1964, John Hanson, a renowned educationist, elegantly spelt out the relationship between education and politics:

Education and politics are related in circular fashion: on the one hand, schooling influences formation of political norms and values and provides one of several qualifications for political office-holding; on the other hand, a political process is involved in educational policy-making and in public controversies over certain policies.

—cited in Morrison, 1976, p. 17.

While it is plausible to argue that British authorities were driven by empathy and altruism to develop education in East Africa, the reality is that they were constantly motivated by the potential political benefits that would accrue for Britain. From the 1920s right up to 1963 the political factor loomed large.

The Political Factor in East-African Education in the 1920s and 1930s

To have a better sense of the role played by the political factor in East-African education one has to consider the broader context in which education in this region was developed. The First World War broke out in 1914 as a result of a wide range of political and economic factors, most of which had very little to do with Africa. However, the end of this war in 1918 brought the political factor in the limelight. First, British authorities realized that Africans would have made a much better contribution to the allied forces during the war had they been capacitated through education. So, for Britain to remain a political giant globally it had to educate its subjects. Second, British Governors and other authorities working in East Africa were quick to notice that it would take them much longer to rebuild the East-African infrastructure destroyed by the war because there was lack of African artisans. The race riots that broke out in Britain in 1919 forced the British government to repatriate a significant number of colonial subjects to the colonies. By so doing, Britain hoped to insulate the youths from possible political agitation. Because the need for education facilities was real, these had to be provided locally. By the 1920s and 1930s British policy makers held the view that political independence was on the cards for Africa (Lewis, 1962). They resolved to invest in education so that when that time arrived Africans would sustain themselves economically and administratively and show the world that Britain had prepared them well to take up leadership positions.

In the East-African case the 1920s and 1930s witnessed tensions between Africans and British settlers. Although both groups stressed the urgent need for the development of education in the region at all levels, they had divergent views on why and how this could be achieved. Local chiefs and the youth exerted enormous pressure on the colonial government to establish schools of full secondary status. The thinking was that higher education would evolve from such schools. Budo in Uganda and Alliance High School in Kenya were singled out as having the potential to provide the foundation for university education in East Africa (Furley and Watson, 1978). As these plans were contemplated, East-African parents (especially chiefs) who could afford these expenses would send their children abroad to further their education. Those children who did not have money relied on overseas scholarships. Among those who studied abroad was Peter Mbiyu Koinange, son of Chief Koinange. He studied at different institutions in America before returning to Kenya where he held different ministerial positions. From Uganda came Danieri Kato, a younger brother to Joswa Kamulegeya, Secretary of the Young Baganda Association (YBA) formed in 1919. Another Ugandan was Hosea Nyabongo (King, 1971).

East-African colonial governments did not approve of overseas education. Their argument was that it would be better to expose the East-African youths to home-grown education. They feared that overseas education might make these youths impatient on their return when they realized how inferior East-African education was to that obtainable abroad. Moreover, there was always a

possibility of political influence from individuals and political movements the students would be exposed to while studying abroad. These factors converged and necessitated the development of higher education in East Africa. But education had to be developed from the lower levels to ensure that higher education had a solid foundation. It is imperative, therefore, to trace this history.

The Commission to East Africa and Its Impact on East-African Education

The appointment of a Commission to East Africa came as a result of a meeting of the Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund held on 21 November 1923 in America. At that meeting the Trustees authorized the appropriation of \$6,500 for the East-African survey (*Education in East Africa*, 1925:xviii). The idea was triggered by an earlier survey, which was conducted in West, South, and Equatorial Africa from 1920 to 1921. Its Report was published in 1922 titled: *Education in Africa: A Study of West, South and Equatorial Africa, by the African Education Commission*. In it, Thomas Jesse Jones, Chairperson of the Commission, raised concern about the fact that East Africa was not included in the initial survey. It was in this context that the second survey was contemplated. Like the first one, it was also chaired by Jones. It visited Kenya Colony, Uganda Protectorate, Tanganyika Territory, French Somaliland, Portuguese East Africa, and Zanzibar.

In its Report published in 1925, the Commission noted that there were no schools for natives in East Africa which in relation to Western standards could be properly described as secondary schools. There were no professional schools of college standard. This state of affairs forced the Commission to invoke the political foundation for the development of education in East Africa. It stated that those responsible for educational policies in East Africa should realize that the millions of Native people must have Native leaders. Already unwise and ignorant leaders “are teaching false doctrines that cause dissension, irritation and unrest.” (*Education in East Africa*, 1925, p. 44). The Commission agitated for education among East Africans so that they could be politically aware of the issues that surrounded them. It argued that by attaining higher education Africans would understand the essentials of their own development. They would see the advantages and disadvantages of independent countries like Abyssinia (now Ethiopia) and Liberia.

While it is true that the need to develop education in East Africa came from outside—both from Britain and America—it would be erroneous to remove agency from the African people. The latter made their voices heard. In Uganda, the YBA became the mouthpiece of the youth from Uganda on political and educational matters. It argued that Britain’s reluctance to develop education in the region had political foundations. In its view, British authorities feared that if East-African youths were educated they would subsequently challenge British policies and question the entire political administration.

The political influence among East Africans’ resolve to have their education facilities improved is encapsulated in a letter sent to the Negro Farmers’ Conference in Tuskegee by the YBA. In that letter the Association stated: “You know, dear brothers, that unless we Negroes get proper education and understand

modern civilized ways, we will never be advanced and enjoy all the privileges of the citizens of today” (Cited in Low, 1971, p. 53). Implicit in this letter was the view that education enhances people’s chances to enjoy a better life in a modern democratic dispensation.

Inspired by this philosophy, in 1921, the YBA submitted a memorandum to the colonial government in Uganda. Among other things, it called for establishment of a department of education and to introduce secularized education. Meanwhile, the colonial government had to provide scholarships for East Africans to study abroad. Sir Robert Coryndon, Uganda’s Governor from 1918 to 1922, found the memorandum reasonable and impressive. He resolved to improve the already existing educational facilities in Uganda to avert political agitation from the youth. He planned to invest in technical and vocational education. Although he deemed the memorandum sound and appropriate, Coryndon was constantly informed by the political situation under which he operated. His decision to embrace the YBA’s idea was influenced by his determination to curb the growing Baganda hunger for advanced (secondary) education (Motani, 1979).

This tone was reflected in Coryndon’s communication with Winston Churchill, the Colonial Secretary. Regarding the YBA’s call for the colonial government to provide scholarship to the Baganda, Coryndon responded negatively. He sought permission from Churchill to refuse passports to all the Baganda who planned to study abroad. Churchill consented and the ban started soon after that. But lack of educational facilities was a reality. So, the YBA persisted in making this call. Eventually the British Colonial Office allowed some students to study abroad provided they were channeled to Britain, not America. But not all the officials at the Colonial Office embraced this view. H. J. Read argued that it was wrong to send East-African students abroad as this might have long-term negative political repercussions. Instead, he proposed the establishment of a higher education college in East Africa. The envisaged college would play a dual role. On the one hand, it would make educational facilities available in East Africa. On the other hand, it would insulate young East Africans from possible political agitation. As discussed later in this article, endogenous and exogenous factors combined to put this dream into reality.

The fact that Coryndon was informed by his immediate political situation is given impetus by similar viewpoints articulated by other British officials in East Africa. A District Commander in Uganda was equally concerned about the political impact of not developing education facilities in East Africa. He confided that this was like a time bomb: “I am not happy about his going to a more advanced course. ...Certainly I feel that the political intrigues would be most ... unfortunate for him and I feel that probably you would feel the results when he returned.” (cited in Okello-Oculi, 1967, p. 15).

Some responses had a narrow focus, which was country specific. In the Ugandan case, both Governor Geoffrey Archer (1922–1925) and Governor William Gower (1925–1932) bought into the idea of developing educational facilities for East-African students. Accordingly, Governor Archer invited Eric Hussey who had been involved in educational development in Sudan to give his expert opinion on the way forward. Hussey came to the conclusion that the

technical school already existing at Makerere should be transformed into a central training college to address educational needs and contain the youth.

When Hussey was appointed the first Director of Education in Uganda in 1925, he found himself faced with the task of implementing the recommendations he had made as an advisor. It would be appropriate to credit the individuals mentioned above for the development of education in East Africa, but it would be wrong to overemphasize their role. The enthusiasm shown by East Africans in obtaining educational facilities wherever they were available was “one of the reasons that led the Uganda Government to establish a form of higher education locally, in the new Makerere College” (King, 1971, p. 72; see Macpherson, 1964). E. L. Scott, one of the British authorities attached to the education sector, made a realistic in his *Memo on Higher Education*:

I think we may be able to prevent young men going abroad for education, at any rate to Alabama, for the next two or three years, but each year will become more difficult, and there will come a time when we shall no longer be able to do so. We must if possible anticipate this by providing an advanced course of study locally.

—Scott, 1922, cited in King, 1971, p. 72.

It is clear from the discussion above that by the late 1920s there was general consensus between African and British constituencies that the need for higher educational facilities in East Africa was a stark reality. Both groups formulated their arguments on political grounds. Even the development of higher education was based on the political factor.

Politics and Higher Education in East Africa from the 1930s to 1945

The period from the 1930s to the end of WW II in 1945 was very crucial in the eventful history of higher education in East Africa. Until this time, the demand for educational facilities had come from traditional rulers and the youths. When British authorities gave it a hearing it was for their own political ends. By the 1930s it became more apparent that Africa’s future constitutional development would depend largely on the educated elite. Consequently, the demand for higher education “began to be listened to with a better understanding.” (Ajayi, Goma, and Johnson, 1996, p. 49). Mindful of this political context, the British Government started formulating policies geared towards the development of higher education in East Africa and elsewhere. A confluence of factors—both local and international—necessitated this change of heart. African agitation for higher education, the scarcity of skilled personnel among East Africans, the concerns raised by the international community about lack of educational facilities triggered this policy change.

The development of higher education in East Africa created tensions among British authorities. The locus of these tensions was the pace and the mode of operation to be followed in implementing the policy on higher education. There was polarization of the British administration. British Prime Ministers, successive Secretaries of State for the Colonies, and Members of the British Parliament espoused the view that East-African territories were under their jurisdiction and that they should have a final word in all matters affecting these colonies, including the development of higher education. British Governors and Directors of Education operating in East Africa felt that they were closer to the

reality on the ground and therefore were better qualified to determine the course of events in the region (Mngomezulu, 2004). However, there was no doubt that the need for the development of higher education in East Africa was real. Therefore, the process got underway in spite of these contestations. The next few pages outline the process.

The Currie Report of 1933

In June 1932, the Directors of Education from Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika, and Zanzibar met in Zanzibar for a conference whose aim was to discuss the state of education in East Africa and get a better sense of what was lacking and how this situation was to be improved in the short and long terms. During the deliberations the picture of Makerere College loomed large. The College had started in 1922 and had the potential to lay the foundation for the development of higher education in the region. When the conference ended there was consensus that Makerere would be the anchor point. What remained unclear was whether it would adopt London examinations or set its own examinations.

Lack of agreement on this issue forced the Directors of Education to approach the Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies (ACEC) for advice. In response, the Advisory Committee appointed a Sub-Committee chaired by James Currie and tasked it to investigate the issue and make concrete recommendations. The Currie Report was produced in December 1933. The political influence was evident in its recommendations. The Committee was particularly concerned about Britain's global political image. It felt that if the British Government did not provide higher education facilities in East Africa the impact would be disastrous. The political factor can be discerned below:

There is a grave danger, as we see it, of the Africans' zeal for education being neglected and ignored by the Government to whom they ought to be able to look for its reasonable satisfaction. There appears no prospect – nor is it in any event a prospect that can in the least be wished or desired – that the present vehement demand for higher education will slacken off. It follows then, that, if the demand is not adequately met by a natural development in Africa itself under the wise control, which only British government and experience can afford, it will spend itself in all sorts of individual and group educational enterprises, which can hardly fail to be eccentric, often self-defeating and sterile, and attended by social and political phenomena harmful alike to the prestige of this country and the true well-being of the Africans.

—*Currie Report*, December 1933, par. IV.

To avert a situation whereby Britain would be a laughing stock in the global arena, the Committee recommended that Britain should take a vanguard position in planning higher education in Africa in general. This would entail putting in place a scheme of developing a selected number of academic institutions up to a real university standard. This process would have to be done in the open so that all stakeholders were made aware of it. The process envisaged in the Currie Report would be similar to that used in Britain where University Colleges like Birmingham, Leeds, Manchester, Liverpool, and Reading went through an intensive development process before they gained university status. The Report stated that since a number of students from African countries already had links

with London University, it would be proper to approach this university to guide the proposed Colleges until such time that they were confident enough and capable to offer their own degrees. In the Committee's view, failure to develop higher education in East Africa would inevitably create social and political confusion.

The Currie Report considered the development of higher education in the broader African context. However, its recommendations had a direct impact on the development of higher education in East Africa. One of the most important recommendations made in the Report was that African communities should be involved in the envisaged process. Moreover, the Report discouraged a situation whereby higher education in individual countries in East Africa would be developed independently. It called for all the countries to move forward as a unit. It was encouraged to see that "Kenya and Tanganyika are looking definitely to Makerere to meet the need in higher education of the whole East-African area" (Currie Report, December 1933, par. XI).

Scholars who write about the history of education in East Africa hold Currie in high esteem for his work in the Sub-Committee. This respect is derived from the fact that he was reasonable, realistic, and understanding. Furley and Watson described him as an imaginative and farsighted individual with much sympathy for the African people and their educational aspirations. Most importantly, he had a "more down-to-earth awareness that political demands should be met wherever possible, otherwise trouble would follow" (Furley and Watson, 1978, p. 299). This was a fair comment. Currie considered a number of issues with a potential to cause problems and made practical recommendations. By suggesting that Africans be made part of the process of developing higher education he allayed the fears of the African students and the political leadership as well as traditional rulers that the fate of their children would be decided by outsiders. In short, the Currie Report preempted political tensions and recommended how those could be averted.

But despite concerted attempts by the Committee to satisfy different stakeholders, there were still those who objected to some of its recommendations or simply dismissed the Report in its entirety, arguing that it was unnecessary. The Report was adopted by the British Colonial Office in 1933 but was never published. It was circulated to all British Governors in East and West Africa for comments. Although the British Government dubbed the Report an impressive and farsighted document, Governors and Directors of Education held a different view. They argued that having worked in Africa they had a better opportunity to assess the social, economic, and political situation. They were fully convinced that there was no educational crisis in Africa, which necessitated taking drastic action to improve higher education. This was strange, especially given the fact that they were aware of the absence of higher educational facilities in their respective territories.

The fact that the Governors and Directors of Education did not take the Currie Report seriously is buttressed by the fact that they received it at the beginning of 1934 but did not act on it. It was after a series of reminders from the British Colonial Office that they eventually converged to discuss it. British Governors in East Africa referred the Report to the Directors of Education to study it and give their impression. That meeting took place in Kenya in January

1935. After the deliberations they reached the conclusion that it was inappropriate for the Currie Sub-Committee to argue that the demand for higher education in East Africa was vehement. In fact, they were not even prepared to stimulate it to reach that level of significance.

How should we interpret this negative response by education officials to the Currie Report? This question could be addressed in different ways. However, the main reason was that these officials did not want to be dictated to by their counterparts in Britain. Thus, their inability to quickly comment on the Currie Report was indicative of their disapproval of the process and the Report itself. It was “a symptom of the difference of white administrators on the spot” (Ashby, 1964, p. 17; Ashby and Anderson, 1996, p. 195). There is a view that despite his cogent attempt to preempt political tensions and avert them, Currie was unable to reckon with one key issue which his recommendation on the urgent need to develop higher education was bound to raise—the political issue. It was a reality that an unprecedented rise in the number of African graduates would be a major contribution to political evolution and the demand for self-rule—prospect most colonial administrators of the time were unwilling to promote (Furley and Watson, 1978).

Therefore the Currie Report unwittingly triggered a power struggle among British officials. In the process there was a delay in the implementation of its recommendations. But the common denominator on either side of the divide was the political factor. For the British Colonial Office developing higher education in East Africa would insulate the youths from potential political agitation. Directors of Education were adversely opposed to this idea fearing that its implementation might produce radical graduates.

These developments left the British Colonial Office in a state of confusion. There was no clear direction on the way forward. This process remained unchanged until late in the year (1935). Coincidentally, in September 1935, Mr. H. Jowitt, Director of Education in Uganda, took leave and traveled to Britain. The Advisory Committee was aware of his visit. It extended an invitation to Jowitt to meet with the Currie Sub-Committee in order to provide a detailed explanation regarding the general negative attitude shown by the East-African Directors of Education to the deemed prudent idea of initiating a process that would culminate in the establishment of a regional university in East Africa.

This meeting proved fruitful as it cleared some of the confusion. According to Jowitt, in essence neither the Governors nor Directors of Education were apathetic to the idea. Their concern was that there would be a vicious circle. This would be epitomized by a situation whereby Makerere College would have to halt its improvement of higher education facilities while waiting on the development of secondary schools. Similarly, secondary schools would have to wait on the expansion of Makerere. According to this logic, any delay in one area would inevitably frustrate the entire process. The credibility of Jowitt’s pronouncements can be debatable. He may have summarized the views of his colleagues in East Africa or may have presented Uganda’s viewpoint.

Whatever the reality was, it is worth noting that the meeting between Jowitt and the members of the Currie Sub-Committee had long-lasting effects. It was at this meeting that a recommendation was made to appoint a small but influential Commission to collect relevant information and make concrete

recommendations. Such a commission would be sent specifically to Uganda with a mandate to study the existing educational situation there and advise the British Colonial Office about the prospects of developing Makerere College into a regional University College. When the Currie Sub-Committee presented this recommendation to the British Colonial Office, the latter approved it unequivocally.

Philip Mitchell became the Governor of Uganda in 1935. After reading the Currie Report he accepted its recommendation that Makerere be developed to the status of a University College. He also embraced the idea that a Commission be appointed to study the educational situation in Uganda and make recommendations for the East-African region. Procedurally the final decision on the latter issue could not be taken immediately but had to wait for the meeting of the East-African Directors of Education scheduled to take place in May 1936. Once this meeting had taken place, W. G. A. Ormsby-Gore, Secretary of State for the Colonies, appointed the historic De-la-Warr Commission later in the year. This marked the first tangible attempt to develop higher education in East Africa. In fact, Governor Mitchell initiated this idea by requesting that an independent team be appointed to conduct what he called an educational stock taking and make recommendations for the years to come (Iliffe, 1998). In this regard, Governor Mitchell is sometimes dubbed as the most instrumental colonial Governor in the formulation of the policies on which Makerere was launched into university activities in East Africa.

But why was Governor Mitchell so enthusiastic about the gradual development of Makerere into a University College when his counterparts in Kenya and Tanganyika did not show similar interest? Was he motivated by the prospects of East Africa having a regional institution of higher learning or was he primarily fascinated by the fact that such an institution would be based in his territory? Most importantly, of what significance would the envisaged institution be to Britain? These are not easy questions to answer given their complex nature. However, we could glean some answers through an analysis of Governor Mitchell's actions and utterances. For example, during his address to the Higher College Conference held at Makerere in May 1938 he stated, *inter alia*, that

...there is only one civilization and one culture to which we are fitted to lead the peoples of these countries – our own: we know no other and we cannot dissect the one we know and pick out this piece or that as being good or bad for Africans.

—Mitchell, 1938.

Implicit in these utterances was that Governor Mitchell saw the envisaged University College of East Africa as a golden opportunity to spread British culture and civilization to the Africans. Uganda was different from the other territories in many respects. Nwauwa (2001) provides a tantalizing view on how Uganda's exceptionalism could be explained:

...the chasm between indirect rule and the colonial civil service was far less deep in Uganda because the demand for a university arose within the personnel for the Buganda government, seeking the 'leaven' which in theory the British appeared to desire. Ugandan colonial officials therefore felt less threatened than their compatriots elsewhere.

—Nwauwa, 2001, p. 86).

These views do not provide conclusive answers to the questions posed above but give the broader context within which certain actions could be interpreted. However one views Governor Mitchell's role in the development of higher education in East Africa, the reality is that the De-la-Warr Commission was a crucial step in the history of education in East Africa. Therefore this Commission needs to be discussed in detail.

The De-la-Warr Commission and Higher Education in East Africa, 1936–1938

This Commission was appointed towards the end of 1936 by W. G. A. Ormsby-Gore, Secretary of State for the Colonies. Its Chairperson was Earl De la Warr, the Parliamentary Undersecretary and an ex-officio Chairperson of the ACEC. It is in this context that the Commission was called the De-la-Warr Commission. Other members of this Commission were: Robert Bernays, B. Mouat Jones, Alexander Kerr, W. H. McLean, Z. K. Matthews, John Murray, Harold Nicolson, Hanns Vischer, and F. Pedler who was the Secretary from the Colonial Office. There was only one woman, Dr. Phillippa C. Esdaile. Three of the members had served in the Currie Sub-Committee. They were: Vischer, McLean, and Esdaile. The De-la-Warr Commission, or the Commission on Higher Education in East Africa, was guided by three terms of reference, which were stated as follows:

- 1) To examine and report upon the organization and working of Makerere College and of the institutions or other agencies for advanced vocational training connected with it in relation to (i) the society, which they were intended to serve, and (ii) the educational systems of the territories from which the students are drawn;
- 2) To make recommendations for the development and administrative control of Makerere College and its allied institutions to this end; and
- 3) In making such recommendations to consider: (i) the effect of the development of the College upon the educational organization of the territories concerned; (ii) the general interest and needs of the communities from which students are, or may in future be drawn, and (iii) the educational needs of women (De-la-Warr-Commission Report, 1937, p. 5).

After holding preliminary talks in London, the Commission embarked on its work of collecting evidence between November and December 1936. It then proceeded to Uganda where it set up its headquarters in Kampala. It visited schools and other institutions in the Uganda Protectorate. To broaden its understanding of the educational situation in the region, the Commission visited Kenya and Tanganyika although the main focus remained Uganda where Makerere (the institution the Commission was tasked to investigate) was located. After completing its task the Commission presented its Report to the Secretary of State on September 2, 1937. Part II of the Report considered primary, secondary, and vocational education while Part III focused specifically on advanced education.

The findings of the Commission were detailed and elegantly articulated. One of its concerns was that the education of African children was placed in the hands on non-Africans. This made the educational achievements of the students

irrelevant to their communities. The Commission reiterated the recommendations made by the Currie Sub-Committee. It stressed the need for the establishment of a regional University College that would eventually become a fully-fledge regional university. The Commission stated:

We are proposing the establishment of a University College in the near future, and of a University at no very distant date. We are aware of the present very flimsy foundations of primary and secondary education upon which such institutions will need to be based, and realize the possible risks of too rapid advance and of top-heavy structure. Nevertheless we are convinced that the material needs of the country and the intellectual needs of its people require that such risks as they may be should be taken.

—Report of the De la Warr Commission, Chapter 10, pp. 118–119.

Certainly, the proposed regional institution could not happen overnight, as alluded to in the recommendation. But the Commission stated that this change had to happen in spite of the evident problems. According to the Commission the endowment fund would come not only from Uganda but also from other East-African governments. Overall, the De-la-Warr-Commission Report became a landmark, both in the history of the development of Makerere and in providing the impetus for the foundation of university colleges in other parts of Africa. It was in this context that Hussey (1937:3) felt that the Report “will surely mark a new epoch in the educational history of East Africa and have repercussions in every part of our Colonial Empire.” There was optimism about the recommendations of the De-la-Warr-Commission Report even in the two British houses of Parliament (see Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, Vol. 328, 1937, Col. 919).

Governor Mitchell was particularly impressed by this Report and dubbed its recommendations both promising and forward-looking. The same view was shared by the Uganda Government which immediately started planning for the construction of the envisaged College. The Ugandan Public Works department dispatched someone to visit English universities to study their infrastructure. Similarly, an Architect was dispatched to the Union of South Africa for the same purpose. Then a Consultant Committee in England was consulted for professional advice regarding the construction process (Press Bulletin No. 19 of 1938, Kenya National Archives (hereafter KNA), ED. 52/4/6/1).

The ACEC was of the view that the Report of the De-la-Warr Commission should be implemented almost immediately. This was a sign of confidence shown on the Report. However, for practical reasons the process had to be allowed to run its course. After all, the consultation process could not be halted because various issues kept cropping up. Uganda’s Governor convened an interterritorial conference to examine the practical steps to be followed in implementing the recommendations of the Commission regarding the proposed Higher College of East Africa. Delegates who attended this meeting came from Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika, Zanzibar, Central Africa, and the Republic of the Sudan. They included Africans, Asians, and Europeans. In its resolve to make speedy progress, the conference organized itself into subcommittees, each with a specific task to perform. These tasks included finding a proper name for the Higher College, a site where it would be built and building plans. Another subcommittee focused specifically on the financial arrangements while the third

one was tasked to look into the overall status and organization of the envisaged institution (*Proceedings of the Interterritorial Conference* held at Makerere on May 21 to 24, 1938).

The interterritorial conference was a significant step in the development of higher education in East Africa. It was at this conference where the recommendations of the De-la-Warr-Commission Report were endorsed and a plan of action discussed. By the time the conference ended, it was clear that the site of the Makerere College would be in Uganda. A phased-in process was suggested in which secondary education would continue to be offered at the College whilst other processes were underway.

The outcomes of this conference were far-reaching. British politicians showed an interest in what was discussed during the four days of deliberations. This was reflected in the parliamentary debates. Mr. Barr, an MP, wanted to know from Malcom MacDonald (Secretary of State for the Colonies) if he could provide a detailed report on the outcomes of the interterritorial conference. He wanted to know Kenya's reaction to the idea of an interterritorial College. More specifically he wanted to know if Kenya, like Uganda and Tanganyika, had made a grant to accelerate the process of establishing Makerere College.

In response to this question, MacDonald stated that he was glad to report that the proposals for the establishment of Makerere College had, as a result of the interterritorial conference, reached an advanced and satisfactory stage. Regarding the position of the Government of Kenya, MacDonald indicated that indeed the Kenyan administration had shown support to the idea of establishing the envisaged College in Uganda. He further stated that promises had been made by all three East-African governments for the College's endowment fund and that the plans for the buildings of the College were being studied by British experts so that they could provide professional advice to those tasked to establish the regional College (Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, Vol. 336, Cols. 870–871; Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, Vol. 337, Col. 1061).

Following the conclusion of the interterritorial conference, the process of establishing Makerere College took a better shape. In November 1938, the process of drafting the first Makerere Ordinance ensued to have it coming into effect in 1939. Although the proposed College was going to emerge from Makerere Technical College, it would be a regional institution from the start and could not be placed under the Uganda Government. Therefore, Ugandan handed the College over to a regional Representative Council with members from all three East-African countries. These governments made financial contributions to the College's endowment fund albeit different amounts. Uganda topped the list with a generous contribution of £250,000. She was followed by Tanganyika, which contributed £100,000. Kenya came last with a contribution of £50,000. This contribution was made after lengthy deliberations in which some members of the Kenyan Parliament questioned the wisdom of donating money for a site and plan they had never seen. Other funds were donated by the British Government (£100,000). From Uganda, the Empire Cotton Growing Corporation made a grant of £10,000 and Uganda's local governments donated a total of £7,550. With all these amounts the plans for the construction of Makerere College got underway.

Higher Education in East Africa during the Second World War, 1939–1945

Britain's declaration of war against Germany on September 3, 1939 had a direct impact on Africa. Shils (1992, p. 1267) made the comment that "the coming of the war of 1939 to 1945 changed much in the world; it had its effects on universities too." In the East-African context one of the negative effects of WW II was that it disturbed the plans to construct the envisaged College in many ways. It was difficult to ship in building materials while the war was in progress. This meant that some construction work had to be halted. In one instance the girder to support the gallery in the College's main hall failed to arrive on time. Similarly, although the College library was completed, the students had to occupy it without steel shelves because it took long for them to arrive due to the war. The initial plan was to have furniture for the main building of the College and two chapels imported. However, the builders were forced to make such furniture locally. For the same reasons the construction of the men's hostel had to be halted indefinitely although the site had already been excavated. The construction of the women's hostel also was suspended.

Therefore, WW II had a direct impact on the development of higher education in East Africa. Had it not been for the enthusiasm and dedication shown by Governor Mitchell to the College, even the central building whose construction had begun in 1938 would have not been completed in 1940. Teaching was not spared by the war. School teachers, education officials, and College lecturers were called up to serve in the war. Most of them joined the Uganda Volunteer Reserve. Thus, departments like Engineering could not admit new students due to lack of staff. All these developments affected education in East Africa negatively. The problem was compounded by the fact that the Kabaka of Buganda and the Mukama of Bunyoro put their full weight behind the Allied Forces. They urged their subjects to support this course by joining the Uganda Reserve Volunteer Force. As the war continued in 1940, Britain passed an Ordinance which made service in the army compulsory for all British subjects and protected persons (those residing in the British Protectorates such as Uganda) between the ages of 18 and 45 (Mngomezulu, 2004; Macpherson, 1964; Goldthorpe, 1961; Ingham, 1958).

But despite all these developments, it would be erroneous to assume that nothing at all happened during the course of WW II in terms of developing higher education in East Africa. As the war continued, British officials started thinking about the postwar period and how they would carry out their education plans. They were concerned about reviving Britain's political image afterwards. In this regard, the Colonial Development and Welfare Act (CD & WA) was passed in 1940. It placed huge emphasis on education and provided funds for research on subjects like Agriculture and Science. The critics of the British Government, including the Fabian Colonial Bureau, interpreted the CD & WA as nothing but a bribe to the colonial subjects whose support the British Government so desperately needed for its war effort. The political flavor in the criticism is that the Act served as a good weapon of defense against those who insisted that "Britain was running a 'slummy' empire by ignoring measures that would advance the prosperity and social welfare of the colonial subjects"

(Nwauwa, 2001, p. 128). Through, *inter alia*, education facilities, Britain wanted to demonstrate to the international community that its empire was intact and progressive.

Groups and individuals embraced this idea. During the course of 1940, H. J. Channon, a Professor from the University of Liverpool and a member of the ACEC, initiated an ambitious process. He put together concrete proposals for a network of colonial universities, which would be used to train the leadership required for self-rule by British colonies, including those in East Africa. The Channon Memorandum was not sanctioned by the Colonial Office; it was an individual effort by Professor Channon. So, it did not have terms of reference as was the case with the De-la-Warr Commission and subsequent Commissions and Working Parties. Channon had been motivated by his visit to Malaya, University of Hong Kong, and University College, Colombo; his attendance at the meetings of the ACEC as well as his close reading of various reports on education in different British colonies around the world. This view is well captured in Channon's Memorandum where he stated the following:

These experiences leave me perplexed about many things, and in order to clear my own mind, I have thought it worth while to piece together my thoughts on the various problems to see if they would fit together to give a composite whole, or if any of them were in conflict with each other.

—Channon Memorandum, par.1.

When the Channon Memorandum was produced, it identified two diametrically opposed viewpoints. One conceded that the development of higher education in the colonies was inevitable. The other postulated that such development would have serious negative political and economic effects because it would produce an educated class that would squeeze colonial economies by demanding high pay and cause political instability as graduates challenged colonial policies (Mngomezulu, 2004). The Memorandum assessed the thinking of the ACEC about higher education in the British possessions. Most importantly, the Memorandum argued that it was not enough for postsecondary education to aim to produce manpower for the current needs only—important as this was. Higher education had to broaden the horizon and go beyond offering technical education.

According to the envisaged plan, Colleges offering technical education had to establish a relationship with British universities that would help them develop into fully-fledged universities. With regards to East-African education, Channon's Memorandum recommended that preexisting arrangements be utilized to their full potential. Since Makerere already had a working relationship with the University of Oxford in which the latter gave advice to Makerere on curriculum issues and constantly sent visiting lecturers to teach, such arrangements had to be harnessed.

Channon's Memorandum was well received in British circles at home and abroad, more especially within the education fraternity. The new advisor to the British Colonial Office on educational matters, Mr. (later Sir) Christopher W. M. Cox, put the Channon Memorandum before the Sub-Committee on Higher Education of the Advisory Committee to be considered for possible implementation after the war. This discussion took place at the 110th and 111th

meetings of the Advisory Committee. The latter meeting took place in April 1941 where the following resolution was made:

The Committee desires to express its appreciation of Professor Channon's Memorandum and its deep sense of the importance and urgency of the issues, which it raises. The Committee is in general agreement with Professor Channon's analysis of the character of the problem to be faced and strongly recommends that a suitable body should be constituted to advise the Secretary of State on the means whereby the universities of Great Britain could best assist in the development of Higher Education in the colonies.

—Report of the Sub-Committee on Higher Education

[The Channon Report], May 1943, par.1.

Through his historic memorandum Professor Channon made a name for himself in the area of education. In June 1941, Lord Moyne, Chief Secretary, stated that it was the desire of His Majesty's Government that all colonial Governments under Britain should strive to be prepared for rapid reaction as soon as the war ended while at the same time improving the standard of life in different areas in spite of the ongoing war. He continued:

I attach particular importance to the training of local personnel as rural teachers, health workers, agricultural demonstrators and so on since it is on an adequate supply of such subordinate staff that the rate of progress after the war may largely depend.

—Circular No. 20, June 5, 1941. KNA. PC/NZA/2/19/11. pars. 13 and 16.

On November 23, 1942, Oliver Stanley became the new Secretary of State. The baton to push for the development of higher education in the British colonies fell in his hands. He appointed Professor Channon as his advisor on higher education matters. The ACEC appointed a Sub-Committee to advise on the practical steps that needed to be followed in implementing Channon's Memorandum. Professor Channon was appointed Chairperson of this Sub-Committee. He was assisted by: Christopher Cox, Sir Fred Clarke, Eric Hussey, Julian Huxley, Mouat Jones, Professor W. M. Macmillan, and Margery Perham. The Sub-Committee was tasked to study the education situation in East Africa, West Africa, and Malaya. It submitted its Report to the Advisory Committee on May 15, 1943.

One of the key recommendations contained in the Report was that the University of London should take a vanguard position in assisting British colonies developing higher education. It would send staff, award degrees, and assist in drawing up the curriculum. The Advisory Committee officially accepted the Report on May 20, 1943. Nine days later the Secretary of State sent a letter to the Vice-Chancellors of all British universities, informing them that he was setting up a commission of inquiry to focus on educational matters. He asked for their cooperation in this regard. Subsequently, on July 13, 1943, the Secretary of State for the Colonies informed parliament about his plans to establish the Commission and that he would be announcing the names of its members in due course.

Indeed, Oliver Stanley announced this Commission on August 13, 1943, during his address to the House of Commons. He stated that he was setting up a Commission of Inquiry and was glad to report that Sir Cyril Asquith—Mr. Justice Asquith—had agreed to be the Chairman to “bring to the task not only

and honoured name and great academic record, but the qualities of intellect and judgment, which will be required.” (Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, Vol. 391, Col. 54). Justice Asquith was assisted by an equally credible team: Sir James C. Irvine (Vice-Chancellor of the University of St. Andrews), Sir Raymond E. Priesley (Principal and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Birmingham), Miss Margery Perham (Fellow of Nuffield College and a Reader in Colonial Administration at the University of Oxford), Sir Donald Cameron, Sir Alexander M. Carr-Saunders, Professor H. J. Channon, Sir Fred Clarke, The Lord Hailey, Sir Richard Livingstone, Professor Lillian M. Penson, Professor J. A. Ryle, Sir Richard V. Southwell, J. A. Venn, R. Marrs, and James Duff. Mr. D. W. Malcom served as the Secretary of the Commission up to May 1944 and was replaced by Mr. S. Robinson. The terms of reference which guided this Commission were:

To consider the principles, which should guide the promotion of higher education, learning and research and the development of universities in the colonies; and to explore means whereby universities and other appropriate bodies in the United Kingdom may be able to co-operate with institutions of higher education in the colonies in order to give effect to these principles.

—Asquith Report, p. 3.

The Commission completed its work in May 1945. It met thirty-one times, interviewed students and education officers and accepted written submissions from individuals and groups or organizations. It submitted its Report to the Secretary of State for his attention. The latter presented the Report to parliament in June 1945. The Report was adopted and published as Command Paper No. 6647. As stated above, the Commission focused on East Africa, West Africa, and Malaya. However, for the purposes of this article the analysis will be confined to those parts of the Report which concerned East Africa.

Commenting on Makerere and the development of education in East Africa, the Commission generally endorsed the recommendations of the De-la-Warr Commission. The Asquith Commission was particularly impressed by the idea that Makerere College should be promoted to the status of being an interterritorial college for the whole of East Africa. Where it differed with the De-la-Warr Commission Report was with regards to the pace in which educational changes should happen. The former Commission had proposed a gradual process and a later date for the establishment of the Colleges. The Asquith Commission recommended that these Colleges be established sooner than later. But it shared the earlier view that such Colleges should not hasten to grant their own degrees prematurely; they had to be linked to well-established British universities through the Special Relationship programme. This would achieve two aims. First, it would make these Colleges credible academic institutions. Second, it would capacitate them so that by the time they became independent institutions they already knew the rules of the game.

The University of London warmly accepted the invitation to enter into a Special Relationship with the proposed East-African Colleges. However, this university was not prepared to do something that would in one way or the other tarnish its revered international image as an institution of high excellence. In this regard, it stated that it would assist the Colleges provided the Committee of the Senate of the University appointed to administer these new arrangements

expressed its agreement with the general underlying assumptions about the characteristic features of a university as contained in the Asquith Report. More specifically, the following conceptions of a university had to be adhered to:

1) A university should encourage the pursuit of a regular and liberal course of education; promote research and the advancement of science and learning; and organize, improve, and extend education of a university standard;

2) It should be ready to accept the responsibilities of intellectual leadership in the community it serves and should endeavor to promote within that community a culture rooted in scholarship and knowledge. To this end it should establish and maintain close relations with other forms of educational activity within its area;

3) It should seek to attract to its services teachers of the highest quality who are able and prepared to contribute to the advancement of their respective subjects. To this end it should offer appropriate conditions of service and remunerations: in particular, it is of primary importance that the members of its staff should not be so burdened with teaching duties that they have not adequate time to devote to research;

4) It should make provision for the encouragement of corporate and social life among its students;

5) It should provide equipment and laboratories and build up a university library adequate not only for the needs of its undergraduate students but also for research needs of its teachers and senior students;

6) The constitution of its Governing Body and its Charter, Statutes, or other instruments of government should be such as are appropriate to an autonomous university capable of controlling the development of its academic policy (Statement made by the University of London. Cited by the Report of the Working Party on Higher Education in East Africa, 1955, pp. 4–5, par. 15).

These points were predicated on the understanding that an institution of a university status should be the pride of a nation. Also, the students who attend such an institution should feel proud while they are pursuing their studies and many years later when they have embarked on their different professions. The thinking was that the proposed University Colleges should have the same credibility enjoyed by those universities to which they were attached. All would be done to encourage the University Colleges to become centers of learning with a focus on research and teaching so that one was not compromised for the sake of the other. Those tasked to develop Makerere had to be guided by these points.

When the war ended in 1945 the British Government and the ACEC were ready to attend to the higher education situation in the colonies, including those in East Africa. What also became evident was that there was a power struggle among British officials. The locus of this struggle was on who would be responsible for executing the education plans contemplated. The Labour Government, like its predecessor, held the view that the development of the colonies and British Dependencies would remain the responsibility of the British Colonial Office, not the local Governors. The latter did not take this kindly. They insisted that they were close to the reality on the ground and had to take the lead.

East-African Governors from Kenya, Uganda, and Tanganyika subscribed to the latter view. In 1945, Creech Jones issued Colonial Paper No. 191 in which he presented an outline of the British Government's long-term vision about the

future of East Africa. While acknowledging the work done by the Governors' Conference since 1926, he insisted that these officials could not decide issues affecting East-African Dependencies independently. Thus tensions were sustained as the reconstruction process started after the end of WW II. Education became one of the sites of this continued confrontation.

Higher Education in East Africa from 1946 to 1963

With the war over, the political climate became conducive to put the various development plans into action, which included addressing lack of education facilities in East Africa. In July 1946, Creech Jones traversed East Africa to acquaint himself with the region and to see things for himself instead of relying on official reports. As part of his regional tour, he visited Makerere College, deemed the nerve center of higher education in East Africa. Jones held the view that a class of well-educated East Africans would be beneficial to the British Government in many ways. Not only would they make East Africa vibrant, they would also hopefully form the new crop of a political leadership that would take over from their British counterparts. Guided by this belief he wooed the African elite. He expressed his wish to see this class expanding through the provision of institutions of higher education such as Makerere College and a regional University of East Africa. Jones returned to Britain in high spirit about the prospects for this change.

Jones was not alone in this optimism. British MPs in both Houses shared his view. When George Hall (Secretary of State for the Colonies) addressed parliament he stated that it was pleasing to note that in the past ten years in which development plans had been submitted, education occupied a very crucial place in the deliberations. He observed that great stress was laid on every phase, whether it was primary or secondary; technical or adult; or mass or higher education. There was a sense that each and every type or level of education was receiving the kind of attention it deserved. This was encouraging to all stakeholders involved.

As mentioned earlier, the development of higher education in East Africa was not a one-stakeholder show. It was in response to African demand for it as was the case in West and Southern Africa, and in response to the pressure exerted by European officials and settlers as was the case in Central and Eastern Africa. All in all, education was developed as part of a conscious process and in pursuit of laid down colonial policies and objectives (Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, Vol. 425, Col. 249; Ajayi, Goma, and Johnson, 1996, p. 67). The ACEC conceded that the political factor played a key role in the development of higher education in Africa. It argued that it would be dangerous to British imperial prestige politically and socially if Africans were to be denied access to university education than if such desire was satisfied by the British Government.

Ironically, the development of higher education in East Africa owes it to the WW II. The war exposed lack of technical skills among Africans in East Africa. In response to this situation the Kenya Government established a Development Committee and tasked it to explore the possibility of putting in place a Technical and Commercial Institute in Nairobi. A Commission chaired by G. P. Willoughby (the Willoughby Commission) was set up to put this dream into reality. Presenting its Report in 1949, it recommended that Kenya should be

encouraged to establish the envisaged institution. But the initial idea was to have this college catering for European and Asian students only (University College, Nairobi, Calendar for 1967–1968, p. 45). Also, the college was meant solely for students from Kenya. It was at the insistence of Dr. F. J. Harlow (Assistant Advisor to the Secretary of State on Technical Education) that the college became a regional institution.

In 1951, Kenya approached the Colonial Development and Welfare Fund for financial support. The Kenya Government also invited Uganda and Tanganyika to partner with it. The Colonial Office made a grant of £150,000. On September 7, 1951, Kenya's Governor granted a Charter to the Royal Technical College (RTC) of East Africa. The stone-laying ceremony took place on April 25, 1952. Anticipating the magnitude of the occasion, the *East African Standard* newspaper stated the following:

Among the many foundation stones of future policy and practice, which His Excellency the Governor of Kenya, Sir Philip Mitchell has laid during the latter period of his service to the Colonial Empire in Africa few have greater importance in the long run for East Africa and all its peoples than that of the Royal Technical College, which he will place in position this morning.

—*East African Standard*, April 25, 1952.

Since the RTC had been given regional status, it was no longer linked solely to Kenya. In March 1953, the East-Africa High Commission established the Royal Technical College of East Africa after the approval of the Legislative Councils of Kenya, Uganda, and Tanganyika. Major-General C. Bullard became the first Principal. In April 1954, the East-Africa Central Legislative Assembly passed an Act officially establishing the RTC. The Gandhi Memorial Academy and the RTC merged. In 1956, the RTC opened its doors to the first students to join RTS's six departments (Architecture, Arts, Commerce, Domestic Science, and Engineering and Science). Princess Margaret formally opened the RTC on October 24, 1956, thus completing another important phase in the history of higher education in East Africa. Makerere had entered into a Special Relationship with the University of London in 1949. The RTC expanded educational facilities in East Africa.

Allan Lennox-Boyd, new Secretary of State, asked the Inter-University Council (IUC) and the Advisory Committee on Colleges of Arts, Science, and Technology (ACCAST) to appoint a Working Party. The aim of this structure would be to look into the possibility of expanding higher education in East Africa. After further deliberations the Working Party was appointed in July 1955, chaired by Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders, Director of the London School of Economics. It was guided by three terms of reference:

(i) To bring under review the existing provision for all postsecondary education in East Africa taking note of the plans in view for the development of the existing higher education institutions;

(ii) To bring under review the estimated requirements of higher education in East Africa for the next ten years; and

(iii) To make recommendations arising out of paragraphs (i) and (ii).

Members of this Working Party left for Nairobi in two groups between July 16 and 18, 1955. The visit triggered euphoria in the region, prompting the *East African Standard* (July 13, 1955) to report that a comprehensive tour of advanced

education institutions in Kenya had been arranged for the Working Party on higher education, led by Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders, beginning in Nairobi the next Monday.

During its stay in East Africa the Working Party visited Zanzibar and Uganda and presented its Report to the Secretary of State in January 1956. It recommended that drastic steps be taken to establish a federal university of East Africa without necessarily interfering with the development of the already existing institutions. The Report stated:

This does not mean that it is premature to make plans for the provision of university studies elsewhere in East Africa and to take steps in the direction of carrying them out; but it does mean that funds needed for the beginning of university institutions elsewhere should not be obtained by diverting to these new purposes money needed to complete the development of Makerere.

—Report of the Working Party on Higher Education in East Africa, 1955, p. 24.

The fact that East Africa was not a single entity meant that individual countries would continue to espouse territorial interests. Uganda would defend Makerere, Kenya would defend the RTC, and Tanganyika would want to have a similar institution as a national pride. This political context had to be borne in mind. The East-African leadership welcomed the recommendations of the first Working Party as reflected in their joint White Paper on Higher Education in East Africa. As way forward a second six-member Working Party was appointed under Dr. John F. Lockwood. Its terms of reference were:

(i) To examine and advise on the proposals for the creation of new institutions of higher education in East Africa and to advise on their desirability and scope and on the timing of their establishment;

(ii) To examine and advise on the pattern of future development of higher education in East Africa and to examine the desirability and practicability of carrying out any such development within the scope of a single university or University College of East Africa of which all colleges situated in the region would be constituent units; and

(iii) To examine and advise on the additional facilities (if any) for higher technological as well as professional training which are required in East Africa.

The Second Working Party conducted its business between July and August 1958. It visited Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika, and Zanzibar and submitted its Report to the Secretary of State on November 26, 1958. One of its key observations was contained in paragraph 83 of the Report, which stated that the idea of bringing together various colleges of higher education would have to be implemented within a period of ten to fifteen years. This would give rise to the University of East Africa, which would serve the region's higher education needs. Paragraph 89 stressed that all the colleges should be interterritorial to avoid unnecessary duplication of services and competition among the East-African territories (Report of the Working Party on Higher Education in East Africa, 1958, pars. 83 and 89). The Report endorsed the idea of establishing a College for Higher Education in Tanganyika. It also emphasized the need for all the colleges to enter into a Special Relationship with the University of London. Commentators hailed this Report a milestone with recommendations that were

“bold, imaginative and practical.” They pointed to great potentialities (*East African Standard*, February 26, 1959).

Plans were put in place to implement these recommendations. In 1960, the East-African Governors appointed the Quinquennial Advisory Committee under E. B. David. He was assisted by Yusuf K. Lule, W. Wenban-Smith, W. A. C. Mathieson, E. W. Russel, J. E. Richardson, R. Milnes Walker, and C. R. Morris. It was tasked to study the Lockwood Report and to advise on the financial and other implications of its recommendations. The Committee had “to consider the proposals for, and the estimated cost of Higher Education in East Africa in the five years from 1961 to 1966” (Report of the Quinquennial Advisory Committee, 1960, par.1; see Falola and Odhiambo (eds.), 2002). This Committee concluded its work and submitted its Report to the three East-African Governors on July 28, 1960.

Its recommendations did not deviate from those of the two Working Parties. Paragraph 6 noted that there were very strong educational reasons for the establishment of a regional university in East Africa. According to the envisaged plan each of the three territories would have an interterritorial College. The Governor of Tanganyika addressed the Legislative Council stating that in higher education his Government wished that early steps should be taken towards the setting up in Tanganyika of a University College. This proposal “accords with the recommendation of the Advisory Committee, which recently reported on the development of higher education in East Africa for the five-year period 1961–66” (Council Debates, (Hansard) Tanganyika Legislative Council, 1960, Col. 13).

In June 1961, the Provisional Council of the University of East Africa was set up, chaired by Sir Donald MacGillifray. It held its first meeting at the Royal College, Nairobi on June 21 and 22, 1961. During his opening address MacGillifray was excited about “the first meeting of a body charged with the task of bringing a new university into being in the stimulating and rapidly changing circumstances of East Africa” (Minutes of the First Meeting of the Provisional Council of the University of East Africa, University of Nairobi Archives, PUEA/IA/52). Outside observers were enthusiastic about the idea of a federal university. A conference on education in East Africa held in Princeton, New Jersey, in December 1960 stated that the University Colleges of East Africa would be strengthened academically by their integration into a regional university (Supplementary Notes to: The Press Release. University of Nairobi Archives, UEA University Council, PUEA/IA/57).

Once the Provisional Council was in place, it wanted to understand the manpower needs of the region. It tasked Guy Hunter to conduct a manpower study. Hunter produced a Report titled: “High-level Manpower in East Africa: A Preliminary Assessment.” It was never published but Hunter included its data in his book *Education for a Developing Region*. The Provisional Council also appointed a Committee under Davidson Nicol to review the needs and priorities of higher education in East Africa in view of the Reports. The Committee made concrete proposals on the way forward (Report of the Committee on Needs and Priorities, 1963). With the University-of-East-Africa Act enacted by the Governors-General of Kenya, Uganda, and Tanganyika in 1962 and with the financial and other implications considered by various Committees, the

University of East Africa was inaugurated in Nairobi on June 28, 1963 at *Taifa/Gloucester Hall*. This marked the apex of the development of higher education in East Africa. The university was disbanded in 1970 due to a combination of factors, which fall beyond the scope of this article.

Conclusion

The process of developing education in East Africa happened within the wider political context of the 1920s which was given more impetus by WW I. The agents of change were both East Africans and British authorities based in Britain and East Africa. Therefore, the history of education in East Africa cannot be discussed outside of the broader British imperial policy. The political factor remained the anchor point in most of the efforts aimed at developing education in East Africa.

It should also be noted that any discussion on the history of education in East Africa would be incomplete without considering the power dynamics that were at play throughout the process. Remnants of this power struggle among different constituencies can be traced from various sources including the British parliamentary debates and colonial correspondence documents. Makerere College provided the foundation on which the University of East Africa was established in 1963. The inauguration of this federal university marked the saturation point of the long and drawn-out process of developing education in East Africa. In conclusion, as argued at the beginning of this article and as demonstrated above, it is clear that education and politics are inextricably intertwined. The East-African case study expounds this submission elegantly.

References

Archival Documents

- Circular No. 20, June 5, 1941. KNA.PC/NZA/2/19/11.
- Colonial Paper No.191, 1945. KNA
- Minutes of the First Meeting of the Provisional Council of the University of East Africa, June 21 and 22, 1961, University of Nairobi Archives, PUEA/IA/52.
- Press Bulletin No. 19 of 1938, July 5, 1938. KNA.ED.52/4/6/1.
- Proceedings of the Inter-territorial conference held at Makerere on May 21, 1938. University of Nairobi Archives.
- Supplementary Notes to: The Press Release. University of Nairobi Archives. UEA University Council, PUEA/IA/57.
- University of East Africa: University College, Nairobi, Calendar for 1967–68. University of Nairobi Archives.

Books and Articles

- Ajayi JF, Goma LKH, and Johnson A. *The African Experience with Higher Education*. London: James Currey, 1996.
- Ashby E. *African Universities and Western Traditions*. Cambridge and Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1964.

- Ashby E, Anderson M. *Universities: British, Indian, African: A Study in the Ecology of Higher Education*. Cambridge and Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1996.
- Barkan JD. *An African Dilemma: University Students Development and Politics in Ghana, Tanzania and Uganda*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- Cameron J. *The Development of Education in East Africa*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1970.
- Falola T and Odhiambo ESA, eds. *The Challenges of History and Leadership in Africa: The Essays of Bethwell Allan Ogot*. Eritrea and Trenton: Africa World Press, 2002.
- Furley OW and Watson T. *A History of Education in East Africa*. New York, London, and Lagos: NOK, 1978.
- Furley OW and Watson T. **Education in Tanganyika between the wars: Attempts to blend two cultures**. *The South African Quarterly* 1966, LXV(4):471–490.
- Goldthorpe JE. *An African Elite: Makerere College Students 1922–1960*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Hunter G. *Education for a Developing Region: A Study of East Africa*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1963.
- Hussey ERJ. **Review of the Report of the Commission appointed by the Secretary of State for the colonies**. *Journal of the Royal African Society* 1937, XXXVI:3–19.
- Iliffe J. *East African Doctors: A History of the Modern Profession*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Ingham K. *The Making of Modern Uganda*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1958.
- Jones TJ. *Education in East Africa: A Study of East, Central and South Africa by the Second African Education Commission under the auspices of the PhelpsStokes Fund in Cooperation with the International Education Board*. New York: Negro Press, 1925.
- Kerr C. *Education and National Development: Reflections from an American Perspective during a Period of Global Reassessment*. Nairobi, 1972.
- King KJ. *Pan-Africanism and Education: A Study of Race Philanthropy and Education in the Southern States of America and East Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
- Lewis LJ. *Education and Political Independence in Africa: And Other Eessays*. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962.
- Low DA. *The Mind of Buganda: Documents of the Modern History of an African Kingdom*. London, Ibadan, and Nairobi: Heinemann, 1971.
- Macpherson M. *They Built for the Future: A Chronicle of Makerere University College 1922–1962*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.
- Mngomezulu BR. *A Political History of Higher Education in East Africa: The Rise and Fall of the University of East Africa, 1937–1970*, Doctoral Thesis, Dept. of History, Rice University, 2004.

- Morrison D. *Education and Politics in Africa: The Tanzanian Case*. Nairobi: Heinemann, 1976.
- Motani NA. Makerere College 1922–1940: **A study in colonial rule and educational retardation**. *African Affairs* 1979, **78**(312):357–369.
- Nwauwa A. **Creech Jones and African Universities, 1943–50**. In: *Agency and Action in Colonial Africa: Essays of John E. Flint*. Youe C and Stappleton, eds. London: Palgrave, 2001.
- Okello O. **East African Intellectuals**. *East African Journal* 1967, **5**(3):31–34.
- Nyaigotti-Chacha C. Eastern Africa. In: *Encyclopedia of Africa South of the Sahara. Volume 2*. Middleton J, ed. New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan, 1997:20–22.
- Pio-Odongo JMA. *Higher Education and Research in Uganda*. Nairobi: Acts Press, 1993.
- Shils E. Universities: Since 1900. In: *The Encyclopedia of Higher Education. Volume 2, Analytical Perspectives*. Clark BR and Neave GR, eds. Oxford: Pegamon Press.
- Southall RJ. *Federalism and Higher Education in East Africa*. Nairobi: East African Publishing House, 1974.
- Ssekamwa JC and T-Ama M. *A History of Education in East Africa*. Bangalore: Fountain Books, 2005.
- Ssekamwa JC and Lugumba SME. *History of Education in East Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Newspapers

- East African Standard*, April 25, 1952
- East African Standard*, July 13, 1955
- East African Standard*, February 26, 1959

Parliamentary Debates

- Council Debates (Hansard) Tanganyika Legislative Council, February 1961. Official Report (Dar es Salaam: Government Printer, 1960), Col. 13.
- Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, 5th Series. Official Report, Vol. 328. London: H. M. S. O., 1937.
- Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, 5th Series. Official Report, Vol. 336. London: H. M. S. O., 1938. Cols.870–871.
- Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, 5th Series. Official Report, Vol. 337. London: H. M. S. O., 1938. Col. 1061.
- Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, 5th Series. Official Report, Vol. 391. London: H. M. S. O., Col. 54.
- Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, 5th Series. Official Report, Vol. 425. London: H. M. S. O., 1946.

Reports

Currie Report. December 1933.

Report of the Commission on Higher Education in East Africa (De la Warr Commission), September 1937. Colonial No. 142.

Report of the Commission in Higher Education in the Colonies. London. H. M. S. O., June 1945. Cmd.6647.

Report of the First Education Commission. New York: Phelps-Stokes Fund, 1922.

Report of the Second African Education Commission. New York: Negro Universities Press, 1925.

Report of the Committee on Needs and Priorities. Entebbe: Government Printer, 1963.

Report of the Quinquennial Advisory Committee. 1960.

Report of the Working Party on Higher Education in East Africa. July/August 1955.

Report of the Working Party on Higher Education in East Africa. July/August 1958.

The Channon Memorandum. 1940

The Channon Report. May 1943.

Internet Sources

<http://www.answers.com/topic/politics>. Accessed on May 19, 2010.

Opinions expressed by authors are their own and not necessarily those of ARIE journal, the editorial staff, or any member of the editorial board.